

Towards Population III: Simulations of Primordial Gas Collapse and Fragmentation

Paolo Coppi

Department of Astronomy, Yale University, P.O. Box 201801, New Haven, CT 06520-8101, USA

Volker Bromm

Institute of Astronomy, Cambridge University, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0HA, UK

Richard Larson

Department of Astronomy, Yale University, P.O. Box 201801, New Haven, CT 06520-8101, USA

Abstract. We briefly review the motivations for studying the formation of the first “Population III” stars and present recent results from our numerical simulations in this area. We discuss the new questions raised as a result of the simulations presented by us and others at this meeting.

1. Introduction: Why Consider Population III (Again)?

At first glance, the study of the very first stars in the universe might appear to be a rather academic and even quixotic endeavor. After all, we have never directly seen such stars. Since we believe that heavy elements are synthesized almost exclusively in stars, the very first “Population III” stars were, by definition, made of zero metal gas. Intensive searches for metal poor stars in the halo galaxy, however, have only turned up stars with metallicities $Z \gtrsim 10^{-4} Z_{\odot}$ (Beers 2000). Furthermore, the formation of a zero metal star is in some sense a rather singular event. Once that star goes supernova and pollutes its environment with metals, the stars that subsequently form in its vicinity will no longer be Population III (with zero metallicity). Population III may also be suicidal in the sense that UV radiation from the first stars could destroy the molecular hydrogen that allows primordial gas to cool and form these stars in the first place. There has therefore been considerable speculation, e.g., Cayrel (1986) and Haiman, Rees, & Loeb (1997), that the Population III (Pop. III) phase in the evolution of our universe was very brief indeed.

Nonetheless, while the Pop. III phase may have been a brief one, it seems to have been a pervasive one. Even in the least evolved regions of the universe that we can probe today, the high redshift Lyman α clouds, we still find evidence for a non-zero metallicity $Z_{min} \sim 10^{-3} Z_{\odot}$ (Cowie & Songaila 1998). More importantly, the epoch of the Pop. III stars probably represents the first substantial input of energy, photons, and metals into the universe since the Big Bang and

marks the end of the “dark ages” (e.g., Loeb 1999, Rees 1999) that started when the cosmic background light redshifted out of the visible range (at $z \sim 1000$). Because structure formation depends critically on the ability of baryons to cool, and this in turn depends critically on the metallicity and ionization state of the baryonic gas, the “feedback” effects of the first stars on the intergalactic medium (IGM) in fact play a subtle but key role in determining the subsequent evolution of the Universe. The significant interest in primordial star formation at this conference is therefore not an accident. Large-scale cosmological simulations (e.g., Ostriker & Gnedin 1996; Abel et al. 1998; Fuller & Couchman 2000) are just now becoming good enough to resolve the $\sim 10^6 M_\odot$ scales of the first objects in the universe that can cool and collapse (Tegmark et al. 1997). Understanding the star formation that will occur in these objects and accurately incorporating its effects into cosmological codes therefore represents the next major challenge in our quest to integrate forwards from the Big Bang.

The interest in Population III, however, is not purely a theoretical one. Studies of cosmic microwave background (CMB) anisotropies are now providing us with information on the physical conditions at $z \sim 1000$, when the universe became transparent to CMB radiation, while observations of high-redshift quasars and galaxies tell us about the universe at redshifts $z \sim 5 - 6$ below. Current observations, however, give us little information on the “dark ages,” the crucial epoch in between. Reaching into this epoch is thus our next observational challenge and is the primary motivation, for example, of the *Next Generation Space Telescope* (NGST) which will provide unprecedented sensitivity at near-infrared wavelengths (Loeb 1998). The study of the first stars is thus timely, providing a theoretical framework for the interpretation of what NGST might discover, less than a decade from now. Even if NGST does not directly image the first stars, it will probe the epoch of the reionization of the IGM (e.g., Barkana, this proceedings). UV photons from the first stars, perhaps together with an early population of quasars, may have contributed significantly to this reionization (e.g., see Ciardi et al. 2000; Miralda-Escudé, Haehnelt, & Rees 2000). If the reionization occurred early enough, CMB fluctuations on scales $\lesssim 10^\circ$ will be damped by electron scattering (e.g., Haiman & Loeb 1997) and this effect could be detected by other next generation instruments like MAP and PLANCK. The energy input from the first stars may also have left a small but measurable imprint on the CMB on very small scales (e.g., see the contributions here by Sugiyama et al. and Bruscoli et al.). In sum, the implications of Pop.III star formation might be testable in the not too distant future!

Before that day arrives, however, a skeptical observer might still question whether concrete progress can actually be made in understanding primordial star formation. In the case of present-day star formation, we cannot predict the initial mass function from first principles despite the wealth of observational data available. How could we hope to do something like this for unseen primordial stars? A scan of the considerable early literature on primordial star formation (e.g., Yoneyama 1972; Hutchins 1976; Silk 1977, 1983; Carlberg 1981; Kashlinsky & Rees 1983; Palla, Salpeter, & Stahler 1983; Carr, Bond, & Arnett 1984; Couchman & Rees 1986; Uehara et al. 1996, Haiman, Thoul, & Loeb 1996; Omukai & Nishi 1998) would tend to support this conclusion. The range of mass estimates for the first stars spans six(!) decades, from 1 to $10^6 M_\odot$. There are reasons for hope, however.

First, the physics of the first stars is considerably simpler than that of present-day star formation (Larson 1998; Loeb 1998). The present-day interstellar medium is an exceedingly complex environment, but primordial gas initially has no metals, no dust grains and no cosmic rays to complicate the gas cooling function. Since we think we know the primordial abundances well and the number of relevant species is small, the gas chemistry and cooling function are relatively simple and have been extensively studied (e.g., see Galli & Palla 1998). Also, because there are no stars yet, the only relevant external radiation is the cosmic background whose behavior we also think is well-understood. Additionally, if one believes that galactic strength magnetic fields resulted from dynamo action perhaps enhanced by compression (e.g., Kulsrud 1997), then magnetic fields at early times are likely to be dynamically insignificant. Finally, before the first supernovae went off, the early IGM must also have been a rather quiescent place, with no sources to sustain turbulent motion. The remaining consideration in understanding how primordial gas collapses to form stars is knowledge of the typical initial conditions: the initial gas density and temperature profile, the gas angular momentum distribution, the density and velocity distribution of the dark matter halos containing the gas, and the underlying cosmology. Estimating these initial conditions for a specific cosmological scenario is no longer a problem given the current state of simulations. In sum, at least during the initial phases of primordial star formation, we have a well-posed problem where the relevant physics is in hand.

Secondly, computers can now follow the inherently three dimensional process of primordial gas fragmentation and collapse. This is critical because it is not immediately obvious when gas fragmentation in primordial clouds halts. To appreciate the difficulties, note that since gas can cool and increase its density arbitrarily (at least until an opacity limit sets in), the Jeans mass for a collapsing gas cloud, i.e., the scale below which fragmentation halts, can become extremely small. Such behavior is indeed seen in one dimensional simulations of isothermal filament collapse. One might therefore predict primordial stars to have very low masses. However, if the initial density perturbations in the cloud are not very large or the cloud has a very strong central density concentration, the cloud can collapse into a single object before the perturbations have time to grow and fragment the cloud (e.g., Tohline 1980). Thus, depending on exact initial conditions, one could also predict that the first objects to turn around and cool will collapse directly into very massive stars or black holes (the so-called “VMOs” or Very Massive Objects). Furthermore, one cannot straightforwardly apply the intuition on fragmentation developed in the more extensive studies of present-day star formation. In the present-day case, gas cooling is very efficient and one typically takes the collapsing gas to be isothermal. Molecular hydrogen is a very poor coolant, however, and the timescale for zero-metal gas to cool can often be comparable to or longer than the dynamical timescale for the gas to collapse. This has profound consequences, as we show next.

2. Numerical Simulations of a Collapsing Primordial Gas Cloud

The results shown are the thesis work of Volker Bromm. (See Bromm, Coppi, & Larson 1999 for a more extended discussion of the calculation.) Our goal here

is to follow the gravitational fragmentation of a cloud to see if there is indeed a characteristic mass scale at which fragmentation stops and gravitational collapse proceeds unhindered. This “clump” mass scale and the overall spectrum of runaway clump masses that we find, of course, cannot be directly translated into a stellar mass scale or IMF, but it is an important first step. In the case of present-day star formation, at least, there is increasing evidence that the two may in fact be closely related.

Our calculational approach is intermediate to that of the other two primordial gas collapse calculations shown at this meeting. The first of these (see contribution by Nakamura & Umemura) uses a high resolution 2-D mesh code to follow the evolution of an idealized primordial gas cloud for many different initial conditions and perturbations. The second (see contribution by Abel et al.) is a full 3-D calculation that starts from a large scale cosmological simulation and uses the adaptive mesh refinement (AMR) technique to zoom in on the evolution of the first object to undergo collapse in their simulation volume. Only a few realizations of the cosmological initial conditions have been explored. In an attempt to increase the number of realizations we can explore, we instead follow the cosmological evolution of a tophat density perturbation with parameters close to those expected for the first objects that can collapse ($M_{tot} \sim 10^6 M_\odot$, e.g., see Tegmark et al. 1997). We use a 3-D particle code based on the TreeSPH code of Hernquist & Katz (1990) that incorporates the full primordial chemistry of Galli & Palla (1998), including the effects of HD cooling. The SPH technique does not handle shocks as well as mesh techniques, but strong shocks are not important in the regime considered here and SPH is simple and flexible. For example, it is easy to turn a group of gas particles into a single “sink” particle without having to worry about mesh artifact/resampling issues. This is useful for allowing a simulation to continue beyond the runaway collapse of the first clump (which ordinarily would halt the calculation because of the Courant limit). It is also easy to increase our spatial resolution in a desired region (i.e., perform a “poor man’s” version of AMR) by tagging the particles that enter that region, and then restarting the calculation with each of the tagged particles replaced by many lower mass particles, e.g., see Fig. 7.

Fig. 1-4 show results of one of our typical top-hat collapse/fragmentation calculations. At $z = 100$ we endow a spherical, uniform density halo of total mass $2 \times 10^6 M_\odot$ (baryonic plus dark matter) with a Hubble expansion such that virialization occurs at $z_{vir} \simeq 30$. The dark matter is perturbed with a $P(k) \propto k^{-3}$ power spectrum expected from CDM on small scales. The baryons are uniformly distributed and have a mass fraction $\Omega_B = 0.05$. Both halo components are initially in solid body rotation about the z axis, with angular momentum corresponding to a cosmological spin parameter $\Lambda = 0.05$. These are typical parameters for the first objects (3σ density fluctuation) that turn around and are massive enough to cool in a Hubble time (e.g., see Tegmark et al. 1997). The dark matter initially plays a key role as the baryons fall into the potential wells of the growing small-scale dark matter perturbations (Fig 1). Eventually, the dark matter undergoes violent relaxation and starts to lose its substructure. The baryons sink into the center of the overall dark matter potential well and start to fragment (Fig. 2). In Fig. 3, we plot the properties of the gas particles at $z = 31.2$. Note the “pile up” of particles at density $n_H \sim 10^{3-4} \text{cm}^{-3}$ and temperature $T \sim 300$ K, corresponding to a Jeans mass $\sim 1000 M_\odot$. The pile up




Figure 1. Projected dark matter and gas distributions at $z = 33.5$. The positions of individual SPH particles are plotted.

reflects the fact that gas undergoing collapse “loiters” at these values (see the time history in Fig. 4, and discussion below).

We have carried out many other runs, varying quantities like the total angular momentum of the cloud, the slope of the dark matter perturbation spectrum, the degree to which the mass is centrally concentrated (the standard top-hat assumes a uniform density distribution, which is optimal in terms of producing many fragments but may not always be realistic), the baryon mass fraction (Ω_B), and the total mass and turnaround redshift of the cloud. We find two main results. First, in terms of the morphology of the collapsed gas and the overall “efficiency” of fragmentation (the fraction of gas that ends up in clumps), we find that varying the initial conditions of the cloud *does* make a significant difference, e.g., compare the gas morphology in Fig. 2 with that in Fig. 6. Similar dependences, e.g., on the cloud’s angular momentum and degree of central mass concentration, are in fact found in gas simulations of present-day star formation (e.g., Tsuribe & Inutsuka 1999). Note that this dependence on initial conditions means it is *not* possible to make statements about the overall efficiency of primordial star formation without first carrying out a comprehensive survey of the relevant conditions. Second, despite the differences in gas morphology, we always find roughly the *same* initial clump masses. Here, initial clump mass is defined as the amount of gas that is gravitationally bound and infalling when the center of a clump starts its runaway collapse, i.e., it does not include any further gas that may eventually accrete onto the clump.

The reason for this perhaps surprising second conclusion can be found in Fig. 3-5. If we plot the temperatures and densities of our gas particles when the first clumps start to collapse, we always find an excess of particles with temperatures $T \sim 200$ K and hydrogen densities $n \sim 10^{3-4} \text{ cm}^{-3}$. These two numbers are not accidental and are set by molecular hydrogen physics – which does *not* depend on the initial conditions. Specifically, a temperature $T \sim 100 - 200$




Figure 2. Dark matter and gas distributions at $z = 31.2$, just before the first gas clump undergoes runaway collapse.

K is the minimum one attainable via H_2 cooling because of the molecular energy levels. The corresponding critical density, beyond which the H_2 rotational levels are populated according to LTE, is then $n_{crit} \simeq 10^3 - 10^4 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. At the transition from NLTE to LTE, the cooling rate changes from being proportional to n^2 to merely linear in n , i.e., the cooling time required for the gas to lose a significant fraction of its energy now becomes independent of density. Due to this inefficient cooling, the gas ‘loiters’ and passes through a phase of quasi-hydrostatic, slow contraction before undergoing runaway collapse (see Fig. 4). This loitering appears to be crucial as it allows pressure waves to damp out density anisotropies and inhibits further fragmentation. Although our results are still somewhat preliminary, we have carried out higher resolutions runs (e.g., Fig. 7,8) to follow the collapse of a clump to much higher densities, and we indeed see no evidence for sub-fragmentation. Abel et al. have reached the same conclusion in the even higher resolution runs that they have carried out. Although we cannot guarantee that some of our clumps will not break up into a few objects, e.g., a binary system, it seems unlikely they will break up into hundreds or thousands of subclumps. In other words, to astrophysical accuracy, the Jeans mass $M_J \sim 1000 M_\odot$ that follows from the typical density and temperature values in Fig. 3 really is the characteristic clump mass scale for collapsing primordial gas. The fact that three groups at this conference arrived at the same conclusion using rather different codes and initial conditions tells us that a robust explanation, like the physics of molecular hydrogen, must lie behind it.

3. Implications and Future Directions

Although we are still far from solving the primordial star formation problem, the results presented at this meeting indicate we have made substantial progress.




Figure 3. Gas properties at $z = 31.2$. From top left clockwise, we plot for each gas particle its (a) free electron abundance, (b) fraction of gas in H_2 molecules, (c) temperature, and (d) Jeans mass corresponding to the particle’s density and temperature, all as functions of the hydrogen number density in the particle.

Unless our understanding of primordial gas cooling is very wrong (note that our simulations included HD cooling which some have speculated to be important) or the typical physical conditions during the early dark ages are very different from current expectations, it appears inescapable that the first typical objects to collapse will fragment into clumps of initial mass $\sim 1000M_\odot$. It also appears likely that these clumps will not fragment much further as their interiors collapse to form a star or a few stars. Therefore, typical primordial protostars are likely to look quite different from those around us today, and in particular, will be surrounded by much more massive $\sim 100 - 1000M_\odot$ envelopes. As noted at this meeting, it is not at all obvious how much of this mass actually makes it onto the final star. However, given that all the scales are so much larger and resemble those we find around present-day massive stars in the process of being born, it is difficult to see how one can make ordinary solar mass stars from such a gas configuration, i.e., primordial star formation is probably strongly biased towards massive ($\sim 10 - 100M_\odot$) and possibly very massive ($\sim 1000M_\odot$) stars. This would explain why we see no zero-metal stars today and has important consequences that have not been fully explored yet, e.g., massive primordial stars produce many more ionizing UV photons per unit mass than low mass ones (see Bromm, Kudritski, & Loeb 2000 for a detailed calculation of the spectrum from a massive zero metal star). Also, such massive stars could be good progenitors for hypernovae and gamma-ray bursts, or the seeds for massive black hole formation.

There remain important questions that do not require a major leap in computing power to answer. First, at this meeting it became clear we need to decide what are typical, realistic initial conditions, e.g, Nakamura & Umemura pointed out that it is possible to fragment down to $\sim 1M_\odot$ if one can start out with dense enough filaments ($n_H \gtrsim 10^6 \text{cm}^{-3}$). We agree since this would skip the “loitering” phase of the collapse, but we do not see how such filaments arise in a




Figure 4. Temperature and density time history for the first gas particle in Fig. 2 to undergo runaway collapse. Note the “loitering” phase, $\sim 10^6$ years spent at $n_H \sim 10^4$, $T = 300$ K.

realistic scenario. Quantifying the relevant initial conditions for primordial gas collapse will let us determine the efficiency of clump formation, which in turn gives us an upper limit on the primordial star formation efficiency and provides a first indication as to the importance of the first stars. Secondly, we can consider what happens to gas collapse and fragmentation in the presence of trace metals and UV background radiation from a previous generation of stars. Population III star formation is often considered to be a short-lived event because the pristine conditions required are wiped out once the first stars produce UV light and the first supernovae produce metals. However, as metallicity does not build up instantly, there may well be an extended window of time when star formation either proceeds in the massive clump/star mode described here (if H₂ is present) or not at all (if H₂ is destroyed by UV radiation). Our preliminary calculations indicate that metal cooling does not become important until the gas metallicity reaches $Z \gtrsim 10^{-4} - 10^{-3} Z_{\odot}$ – which coincidentally is the range of the lowest observed metallicities and also the range where abundance anomalies begin to appear in metal poor stars. (These anomalies are often interpreted as increased scatter due to enrichment by individual supernova events, but they could also reflect atypical progenitor stars, e.g., that had much hotter interiors than stars today.) Finally, it should be possible to push the spherically symmetric protostar calculation of Omukai and Nishi (1998) through to the accretion phase (along the lines of Masunaga, Miyama, and Inutsuka 1999 in the present-day star formation case). This will enable a first cut at understanding the feedback of the primordial protostar’s radiation on its envelope. The feedback is likely to be strong, and Abel conjectured at this meeting, for example, that all accretion may stop once the protostar reaches $\sim 10 M_{\odot}$ and produces enough ionizing radiation to destroy the envelope’s molecular hydrogen, thereby removing its primary means of cooling. Without a real calculation, however, it is not clear what the outcome will be. If the envelope gas simply becomes adiabatic, accretion can still occur if a sufficient central mass concentration has already been established (Bondi 1952).




Figure 5. Thermodynamic behavior (gas particle temperature vs. density) for different initial conditions: (a) the case of Fig.1 but with the number of gas particles increased by a factor 30, (b) the case of Fig. 1 but with a lower angular momentum ($\Lambda = 0.02$), (c) a less massive halo (Fig. 6, $z = 27.2$), and (d) a halo that virializes at $z_{vir} = 20$. Note the clumps at the same density and temperature as in Fig. 3.




Figure 6. Gas morphology at different times for a low mass halo with $M = 2 \times 10^5 M_\odot$ that marginally satisfies the requirement for efficient cooling, $t_{cool} < t_{freefall}$. Only one clump with final mass $\sim 2000 M_\odot$ forms. The result is qualitatively similar to Abel, Bryan, and Norman (1999) who followed the collapse of such a halo starting from a large-scale cosmological simulation.




Figure 7. Gas morphology and kinematics near density maximum of first clump to form in Fig. 1. The number of particles has been increased by a factor 100, and the linear size of the plot is now ~ 2500 AU. The longest arrow represents a velocity of 14.5 km/s. The spindle structure at the center has *not* fragmented and contains a few tens of solar masses. The surrounding flow is supersonic with Mach numbers $M \sim 3 - 5$.




Figure 8. *Solid lines:* mass averaged structure of the clump in Fig. 7 vs. radial distance from the clump density maximum. *Dashed lines:* same, but ~ 1000 years earlier. **(a)** Gas temperature. **(b)** Hydrogen number density. An extended envelope forms with an approximately isothermal density profile, $\rho \propto r^{-2}$. **(c)** Enclosed gas mass. A $\sim 100M_{\odot}$ core begins to freely fall, while the rest of the heavy envelope hardly moves on the evolutionary timescale $\sim 10^3$ yr. **(d)** H_2 fraction. At $r < 10^{16}$ cm, three-body reactions convert the hydrogen into almost fully molecular form.

References

- Abel, T., Anninos, P., Norman, M. L., & Zhang, Y. 1998, *ApJ*, 508, 518
- Beers, T. C. 2000, in “The First Stars”, ESO Astrophysics Symposia, ed. A. Weiss, T. Abel, & V. Hill (Berlin: Springer), 3
- Bromm, V., Coppi, P. S., & Larson, R. B. 1999, *ApJ*, 527, L5
- Bromm, V., Kudritski, R.P., & Loeb, A., astro-ph/0007248
- Carlberg, R. G. 1981, *MNRAS*, 197, 1021
- Carr, B.J., Bond, J.R., & Arnett, W.D., 1984, *ApJ*, 280, 825
- Cayrel, R., 1986, *A&A*, 168, 81
- Ciardi, B., Ferrara, A., Governato, F., & Jenkins, A. 2000, *MNRAS*, 314, 611
- Couchman, H. M. P., & Rees, M. J. 1986, *MNRAS*, 221, 53
- Cowie, L. L., & Songaila, A. 1998, *Nature*, 394, 44
- Fuller, T. M., & Couchman, H.M.P. 2000, *ApJ*, submitted (astro-ph/0003079)
- Galli, D., & Palla, F. 1998, *A&A*, 335, 403
- Haiman, Z., Thoul, A. A., & Loeb, A. 1996, *ApJ*, 464, 523
- Haiman, Z., Rees, M.J., & Loeb, A., 1997, *ApJ*, 476, 458
- Haiman, Z., & Loeb, A. 1997, *ApJ*, 483, 21
- Hutchins, J. B. 1976, *ApJ*, 205, 103
- Kashlinsky, A., & Rees, M. J. 1983, *MNRAS*, 205, 955
- Kulsrud, R. M. 1997, in “Critical Dialogues in Cosmology”, ed. N. Turok (Singapore: World Scientific), 328
- Larson, R. B. 1998, *MNRAS*, 301, 569
- Loeb, A. 1998, in ASP Conf. Ser. 133, *Science with the Next Generation Space Telescope*, ed. E. Smith & A. Koratkar (San Francisco: ASP), 73
- Loeb, A. 1999, astro-ph/9907187
- Miralda-Escudé, J., Haehnelt, M., & Rees, M. J. 2000, *ApJ*, 530, 1
- Omukai, K., & Nishi, R. 1998, *ApJ*, 508, 141
- Ostriker, J. P., & Gnedin, N. Y. 1996, *ApJ*, 472, L63
- Palla, F., Salpeter, E. E., & Stahler, S. W. 1983, *ApJ*, 271, 632
- Rees, M. J. 1999, *AIP Conf. Proc.* 470, 13
- Silk, J. 1977, *ApJ*, 211, 638
- Silk, J. 1983, *MNRAS*, 205, 705
- Tegmark, M., Silk, J., Rees, M. J., Blanchard, A., Abel, T., & Palla, F. 1997, *ApJ*, 474, 1
- Tohline, J.E., 1980, *ApJ*, 242, 209
- Tsuribe, T. & Inutsuka, S., 1999, *ApJ*, 526, 307
- Uehara, H., Susa, H., Nishi, R., Yamada, M., & Nakamura, T. 1996, *ApJ*, 473, L95
- Yoneyama, T. 1972, *PASJ*, 24, 87

*Our work was supported by NASA grant NAG5-7074. We thank the organizers for a well-run and stimulating conference.