

## Energy dissipation in interstellar cloud collisions

Massimo Ricotti<sup>1</sup>, Andrea Ferrara<sup>2</sup>, and Francesco Miniati<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dipartimento di Astronomia, Università di Firenze,  
50125 Firenze, Italy

E-mail: ricotti@arcetri.astro.it

<sup>2</sup>Osservatorio Astrofisico di Arcetri

50125 Firenze, Italy

E-mail: ferrara@arcetri.astro.it

<sup>3</sup>University of Minnesota, School of Physics & Astronomy

Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA

E-mail: min@astro.spa.umn.edu

Received \_\_\_\_\_; accepted \_\_\_\_\_

## ABSTRACT

We present a study of the kinetic energy dissipation in interstellar cloud collisions. The main aim is to understand the dependence of the elasticity (defined as the ratio of the final to the initial kinetic energy of the clouds) on the velocity and mass ratio of the colliding clouds, magnetic field strength, and gas metallicity for head-on collisions. The problem has been studied both analytically and via numerical simulations. We have derived handy analytical relationships that well approximate the analogous numerical results. The main findings of this work are: (i) the kinetic energy dissipation in cloud collisions is minimum (*i.e.* the collision elasticity is maximum) for a cloud relative velocity  $v_r \simeq 30 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ; (ii) the above minimum value is proportional  $ZL_c^2$ , where  $Z$  is the metallicity and  $L_c$  is the cloud size: the larger is  $ZL_c^2$  the more dissipative (*i.e.* inelastic) the collision will be; (iii) in general, we find that the energy dissipation decreases when the magnetic field strength, and mass ratio of the clouds are increased and the metallicity is decreased, respectively. We briefly discuss the relevance of this study to the global structure of the interstellar medium and to galaxy formation and evolution.

*Subject headings:* Hydrodynamics – Shock waves – ISM: kinematics and dynamics – Numerical methods

## 1. Introduction

The complex morphology and the variety of scales observed witness to the turbulent nature of the ISM. Nevertheless, the vast majority of the dynamic models of the ISM (but see Norman & Ferrara 1996, Vazquez-Semadeni *et al.* 1995) describe this medium in terms of dense, neutral clouds (CNM) moving into a smooth, diffuse intercloud medium (WNM) by which are pressure confined. If we assume that the cloud velocities are randomly distributed, a cloud undergoes a supersonic collision approximately every  $10^6 - 10^7$  years. Therefore, in the Galaxy, assuming a volume of the gaseous disk to be  $\sim 78 \text{ kpc}^3$ , about  $0.3 - 3$  cloud collisions occur every 100 years (we have assumed that a line of sight through the Galactic disk intersects  $\sim 7$  clouds per kpc [Spitzer, 1978]).

Cloud collisions play an important rôle in the evolution of a galaxy. For example, the large gas compression following an inelastic collision might be expected to enhance the star-formation rate (Gilden, 1984). Inelastic cloud collisions are important for the global energy budget of the ISM: as the energy input from SNe and HII regions accelerate the interstellar gas, the cloud kinetic energy is dissipated by cloud collisions (Spitzer, 1978). Also, since the vertical distribution of the HI in the Galaxy depends on the turbulent motions of the clouds (McKee 1990, Ferrara 1993), the structure of the gas is strongly regulated by the dissipation of bulk motions.

In addition, the buildup of the mass spectra of an ensemble of clouds is partially affected by cloud collisions (Oort 1954, Field & Saslaw 1965, Field & Hutchings 1968, Penston *et al.* 1969, Cowie 1980, Hausman 1982, Pumphrey & Scalo 1983, Struck-Marcell & Scalo 1984, Fleck 1996). The basic idea is that small clouds, due to inelastic collisions, coalesce to form larger ones which eventually collapse to form stars. Klein, McKee & Woods (1995) have recently pointed out that the outcome of an inelastic collision may be shattering rather than coalescence due to the fast growth of a nonlinear instability, the so-called bending mode instability. This result has a significant impact on the cloud buildup models. Moreover, the morphology of the clouds after the collision event is strongly dependent on both the elasticity (defined as the ratio of the final to the initial kinetic energy of the clouds) and the presence of a magnetic field.

The rationale for the assumption of inelastic collisions and subsequent coalescence of the colliding clouds commonly adopted by the buildup models can be summarized as follows. Interstellar clouds motions are highly supersonic; therefore, during collisional events, two shock waves arise and propagate from the contact discontinuity (CD) heating the gas; this hot gas, being optically thin, tends to cool quickly due to radiative losses. For a standard diffuse cloud, the typical cooling time of the shocked gas is much less than the characteristic timescale of the collision. This justifies the inelastic approximation. Nevertheless, this assumption might be rather crude for small clouds and/or primordial galaxies where the gas metallicity is low and therefore the cooling time is longer.

In this work we will investigate the physics of interstellar cloud collisions, with particular emphasis devoted to the dependence of the kinetic energy dissipation on the parameters of the problem, such as the cloud relative velocity, gas metallicity, cloud mass ratio, and magnetic field strength. The final goal is to identify the regions of the parameter space in which the collisions are elastic (adiabatic), inelastic (isothermal) or radiative.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In § II we discuss the main heating/cooling processes of the ISM and calculate its thermal balance. In § III, we will present a first analytical approach that will allow us to find approximate relationships between the elasticity and the cloud parameters (relative velocity, sizes, gas metallicity, dust-to-gas ratio). These analytical results should be useful for future works concerned

with a statistical approach to the dynamics of the galactic ISM, the mass spectrum of diffuse clouds, and star formation processes. In § IV, the results of a series of numerical simulations of head-on collisions are considered; in § V we will discuss the results and the dependence of the elasticity on the various parameters of the collision comparing the analytical and numerical approaches. A brief summary closes the paper.

## 2. Thermal balance of ISM

In this Section we calculate the thermal equilibrium of the diffuse interstellar medium that is illuminated by the local interstellar far-ultraviolet and X-ray radiation field and permeated by the cosmic-ray flow. We follow closely the work of Wolfire *et al.* (1995), which have incorporated the photoelectric heating from small grains and PAHs (with a distribution of sizes in the range 3–100 Å). Considering a realistic cooling/heating function is important for two reasons: (i) we want to study the energy dissipation in collisions occurring in a two-phase medium; (ii) the elasticity of the collision is closely connected to the emission processes. In addition we would like to explore the effects of gas metallicity,  $Z$ , and dust-to-gas ratio,  $D/G$  (normalized to the local value), on the equilibrium states of the ISM. A summary of the dominant cooling processes included in our function is given in Table 1. The Table is intended to complement the analogous one in Wolfire *et al.* (1995).

In order to obtain an analytical expression for the fractional ionization of H and He, and the electron density  $n_e$ , we have introduced the approximations described below. The motivation for this choice is to decrease the computational time of the numerical simulations which make use of the cooling function. We assume the ionization equilibrium and we neglect: recombination on dust grains, He dielectronic recombination, ionization due to hydrogen collisions, secondary ionization by cosmic-rays; in addition, we assume  $x_{H^+} = n_{H^+}/n = x_{He^+} = n_{He^+}/n(He)$ , where  $n = n_H + n_{H^+}$ ,  $n(He) = n_{He} + n_{He^+}$  and  $n(He)/n = 0.1$ . With these approximations the equation of the ionization equilibrium can be solved analytically to obtain an expression for  $n_e(n, T)$ .

In Figure 1 we show the phase diagram (pressure versus density) of the gas for different values of the metallicity and of the dust-to-gas ratio. When  $Z$  (which we will assume to be equal to  $D/G$  throughout the paper) is decreased the pressure range in which a multi-phase medium can exist becomes wider; in addition the mean equilibrium pressure and density of the clouds increase. The photoelectric heating of PAHs and small grains dominate on the cosmic-ray and X-ray heating both in the intercloud medium (WNM) and in the clouds (CNM). The WNM is cooled mainly by the emission of Ly $\alpha$ , CII (158  $\mu\text{m}$ ) and OI (63  $\mu\text{m}$ ). The CNM is cooled mainly by CII (158  $\mu\text{m}$ ).

## 3. Analytical approach

Before we describe the results of the numerical simulations, we present here a simple analytical model for the collision. As already stated in the Introduction, the motivation is twofold: on the one hand we can easily isolate the most important physical processes; on the other hand simple approximated relationships can be found that can be used to explore a wide region of the parameter space.

As a first approach to a parametric study of the energy dissipation in interstellar cloud collisions we focus on a 1D model, which allows us to consider centered collisions only; the study of off-center collisions is devoted to a future paper. We will initially assume that the two clouds are identical and we will release this assumption in Sec. 3.4. In this simple scenario, clouds are modeled as cylinders of base area  $S_c$  and initial length  $L_c$ . The time origin  $t = 0$  is defined as the moment at which the bases of the cylinders coincide in a plane, *i.e.* the contact discontinuity. We use a reference frame (LSR) with the  $x$ -axis along the symmetry axis of the cylinders and the  $y - z$  plane coinciding with the CD. In the LSR,  $v_c$  is the cloud velocity,  $v_f$  is the shock velocity (see below), and  $v_{CD}$  the velocity of the CD (for the collision of two identical clouds,  $v_{CD} = 0$ , and for the symmetry of the problem we can consider the evolution of one cloud only); the clouds have initial density  $n_0$ , and a mass  $M_0 = S_c L_c \mu m_H n_0$ , where  $\mu$  is the mean molecular weight of the gas and  $m_H$  is the proton mass.

Three main evolutionary stages of the collision can be identified: (Stone, 1970a,b): (1) a *compression* phase: two shocks propagate from the CD into the clouds converting the kinetic energy of the unperturbed gas into internal energy of the shocked gas. At the end of this phase the clouds are crushed into a disk whose thickness depends on the entity of radiative losses. (2) an *expansion* phase: when the shock reaches the rear side the cloud expands because of the decrease of the ram pressure of the incoming flow. The shock will propagate into the intercloud medium and a rarefaction wave will propagate backwards in the cloud. (3) a *collapse* phase: the rarefaction wave brings the pressure of the cloud below the ambient pressure: when the rarefaction wave is reflected by the cloud leading edge it becomes a compression wave thus halting the expansion. In this phase the cloud rear edge becomes Rayleigh-Taylor unstable.

Depending on the values of  $N_{cool} = n_0 v_c t_{cool}$ , the column density of the post-shock radiative region (where  $t_{cool}$  is the typical cooling time of the shocked gas), and  $N_c = n_0 L_c$ , the total cloud column density, the collision will be defined to be: (a) adiabatic:  $N_{cool} \gg n_0 L_c$  ( $t_{cool} \gg t_{coll}$ ); (b) isothermal:  $N_{cool} \ll n_0 L_c$  ( $t_{cool} \ll t_{coll}$ ); (c) radiative:  $N_{cool} \sim n_0 L_c$  ( $t_{cool} \sim t_{coll}$ ); where  $t_{coll} = L_c/v_c$  is the typical collision time. In the following we will briefly discuss the limiting cases (a) and (b) and present in more detail the radiative case.

### 3.1. Adiabatic collisions

The shock wave generated by the collision event will propagate from the CD through the cloud with a velocity  $v_f$  in the LSR and  $v_s = v_c + v_f$  with respect to the unperturbed gas; the shocked gas is at rest in the LSR and moves with velocity  $v_f$  with respect to the shock front. For a strong shock in a perfect gas with  $\gamma = 5/3$ , the density  $\rho_1$ , the pressure,  $p_1$ , the temperature,  $T_1$  and the sound speed,  $C_1$ , of the postshock gas are:

$$\frac{\rho_1}{\rho_0} = \frac{v_s}{v_f} \simeq 4, \quad \frac{P_1}{P_0} \simeq \frac{5}{4} \mathcal{M}^2, \quad \frac{T_1}{T_0} \simeq \frac{5}{16} \mathcal{M}^2, \quad C_1 \simeq \frac{\sqrt{5}}{4} v_s. \quad (1)$$

At the end of the compression phase,  $t \sim t_{coll}$ , the gas density is enhanced by a factor 4, the shock velocity is  $v_s \simeq (4/3)v_c$ , and the cloud length is  $L \simeq L_c/4$ . By definition, for an adiabatic collision the radiated energy,  $E_r$ , is zero:

$$\frac{E_r}{E_k^i} = 0, \quad (2)$$

where  $E_k^i = Mv_c^2$  is the initial kinetic energy of the clouds. The elasticity of the collision is:

$$\epsilon = \frac{E_k^f}{E_k^i} \simeq \frac{9}{4} \frac{C_1^2}{v_c^2} \simeq 1. \quad (3)$$

where  $E_k^f = Mv_f^2 \simeq (9/4)MC_1^2$  is the kinetic energy of the cloud in the expansion phase.

### 3.2. Isothermal collisions

In an analogous manner, for isothermal collisions we find:

$$\frac{P_1}{P_0} \simeq \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_0} = \frac{v_s}{v_f} \simeq \mathcal{M}^2, \quad \frac{T_1}{T_0} = \frac{C_1}{C_0} \simeq 1. \quad (4)$$

As a consequence, when the shock reaches the rear side of the cloud, the cloud size is reduced to  $L \simeq L_c/\mathcal{M}^2$  and the shock velocity is  $v_s \simeq [\mathcal{M}^2/(\mathcal{M}^2 - 1)]v_c \sim v_c$ . In this case the initial kinetic energy will be almost completely dissipated and  $\epsilon \simeq \mathcal{M}^{-2} \sim 0$ .

### 3.3. Radiative collisions between identical clouds

In the intermediate cases in which  $N_{cool} \sim n_0L_c$  (radiative collisions), it can be shown that the elasticity of the collision depends on a single parameter  $\eta \propto N_{cool}/(n_0L_c)$ ; we will refer to  $\eta$  as the “elasticity parameter”. After the shock has reached the rear side of the cloud, the cloud begins an expansion phase that we will assume to be adiabatic. This assumption is reasonable since the typical expansion timescale is much shorter than  $t_{cool}$ .

At this time there are two physically different regions in the cloud interior: (i) an adiabatic layer behind the shock front; we will assume that the column density of this region is proportional to the column density  $N_{cool}$  of the radiative region of the shock. (ii) an isothermal region in which the temperature of the gas is approximately in thermal equilibrium.

As we have seen in the previous Section, the major contribution to the radiated energy comes from the isothermal region, whereas the kinetic energy is essentially stored into the adiabatic region. If we define the “elasticity parameter” of the collision,  $\eta$ , as

$$\eta = \alpha \cdot \frac{N_{cool}}{n_0L_c}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\alpha$  is defined by  $N_{ad} = \alpha \cdot N_{cool}$  (*i.e.* we assume that the column density of the adiabatic region is proportional to the cooling column density) we obtain the following relationship for the radiated energy and collision elasticity  $\epsilon$ :

$$1 - \epsilon = \frac{E_r}{E_k^i} \simeq (1 - \eta), \quad (6)$$

$$\epsilon = \frac{E_k^f}{E_k^i} \simeq \eta; \quad (7)$$

obviously,  $\eta \ll 1$  corresponds to isothermal collisions;  $\eta = 1$  denotes adiabatic collisions.

From a dimensional analysis, we find:

$$t_{cool} = \frac{3}{2}(1.1 + x_e^{eq}) \frac{nk\delta T}{\mathcal{L}(x_e^{eq}, n^{eq}, T)}. \quad (8)$$

where  $\delta T = T - T^{eq}$ . Substitution of eq. (8) into eq. (5) yields,

$$\eta \propto \frac{v_s n_0 \delta T}{L_c |\mathcal{L}|}, \quad (9)$$

Behind the shock front it is  $|\mathcal{L}| = |n_0^2 \Lambda(T) - n_0 \Gamma(T)| \simeq n_0^2 \Lambda(T)$ , because the radiative losses dominate over the heating and  $\delta T \propto v_s^2$  for the adiabatic Rankine-Hugoniot jump conditions. It follows that

$$\eta \propto \frac{v_s^3}{n_0 L_c \Lambda(v_s, Z)}. \quad (10)$$

In Figs. 3 and 4 we show (solid lines) the dependence of  $(1 - \eta) = E_r/E_k^i$  on the relative velocity,  $v_r$ , of the clouds for different values of  $L_c$ , and  $Z$  as given by eq. 10. In Sec. 5 we will show how the above analytical solutions approximate quite well the analogous results obtained from the numerical simulations. We have assumed that  $v_s \sim v_c = v_r/2$  (this hypothesis holds exactly for a completely inelastic collision, see Sec. 3.2). The number density  $n_0$  and temperature  $T_0$  of the unperturbed clouds are computed imposing pressure equilibrium with the intercloud medium; if  $D/G = Z = 1$  we assume  $P/k = 2300 \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ K}$  for the equilibrium pressure. If  $Z \neq 1$ , the equilibrium pressure is computed fixing the CNM temperature to the value found with  $D/G = Z = 1$ ,  $T_0 \simeq 48 \text{ K}$ ; thus, if the metallicity decreases, clouds become more dense and the equilibrium pressure increases. The motivation for this choice is that the equilibrium temperature of the clouds is poorly sensitive to the value of the metallicity and pressure of the ISM.

### 3.4. Radiative collisions between different clouds

We now consider colliding clouds with different velocities and sizes; the indexes 1 and 2 refer to parameters of the left and right cloud, respectively. We define the nondimensional parameters:

$$\kappa = \frac{L_{c1}}{L_{c2}} = \frac{M_1}{M_2}, \quad \beta = \left| \frac{v_1}{v_2} \right|, \quad (11)$$

Since we have assumed the same number density  $n_0$  for the two clouds the size ratio is the same as the mass ratio;  $v_{CD}$ , is computed imposing the same ram pressure on the two sides of the discontinuity. Until the shock wave is inside the smaller cloud we have:

$$|v_{CD}| = \left| \frac{v_2}{2}(\beta - 1) \right|. \quad (12)$$

In the frame of reference comoving with the CD (DSR), the cloud velocity will be:

$$|v'_1| = |v'_2| = \frac{v_r}{2} = |v_2|(\beta + 1), \quad (13)$$

where  $v_r$  is the relative velocity of the clouds. This phase of the collision (in the DSR) is the same as for two identical clouds. The kinetic energy in DSR,  $E'_k$ , is related to the kinetic energy in the LSR,  $E_k^i$ , by the relationship:

$$E'_k = f(\kappa, \beta) \cdot E_k^i, \quad (14)$$

where

$$f(\kappa, \beta) = \frac{(\beta + 1)^2(\kappa + 1)}{4(1 + \kappa\beta^2)}; \quad (15)$$

obviously if  $\kappa = \beta = 1$  then  $f(1, 1) = 1$ . Since  $E_r$  is the same in both reference frames, then the elasticity in the LSR is just the product of the elasticity in the DSR and  $f(\kappa, \beta)$ .

As the shock wave exits from the smaller cloud, the discontinuity starts to move (in the DSR) under the effect of the ram pressure of the bigger cloud. The dynamics becomes rather complex since  $v_{CD}$  depends on the ram pressure ( $\propto v_s^2$ ) and  $v_s$  depends on  $v_{CD}$  as  $v_s(t) = v_s(0) - v_{CD}(t)$  (in the DSR). During this phase the shock velocity is not constant and the radiated energy must be derived by integration:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{E_r}{E_k^i} \propto \frac{1}{S_c N_c v_c^2} \int_0^{t_{coll}} dt n_0^2 \Lambda S_c L_r &= \frac{1}{N_c v_c^2} \int_0^{N_c - \alpha N_{cool}} dN v_s^2 = \\ \left(\frac{\bar{v}_s^2}{v_c^2}\right) \frac{N_c - \alpha N_{cool}}{N_c} &= \xi(1 - \eta), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where

$$\bar{v}_s^2 = \frac{1}{N_c - \alpha N_{cool}} \int_0^{N_c - \alpha N_{cool}} dN v_s^2 = \xi v_s^2, \quad (17)$$

where  $L_r$  is the length of the post-shock radiative region,  $\alpha N_{cool}$  is the column density of the adiabatic region at the moment in which the shock exits from the cloud. If  $v_s(t) = cost.$ , then  $\xi = 1$  and we recover the case of identical clouds:  $E_r/E_k^i = (1 - \eta)$ . After some algebra we find (in the DSR):

$$\frac{E_r}{E_k^i} = \left[ \frac{2 - \xi}{1 + \kappa} (1 - \eta_2) + \frac{\kappa \xi}{1 + \kappa} (1 - \eta_1) \right], \quad (18)$$

where

$$\eta_1 = \frac{N_{cool}(v_{s1})}{N_{c1}}, \quad \eta_2 = \frac{N_{cool}(v_{s2})}{N_{c2}}, \quad (19)$$

$v_{si}$  is the shock velocity exiting from cloud  $i$ ,  $N_{ci}$  is the column density of cloud  $i$ . If we assume that  $v_{CD} \sim v_{CM}/2$ , where  $v_{CM}$  is the velocity of the center of mass, at the end of the collision, we have:  $v_{s2} \simeq v_c$  and  $v_{s1} \simeq v_c(\kappa + 3)/[2(\kappa + 1)]$ . We derive  $\xi$  from an energy conservation argument: if all the kinetic energy relative to the center of mass is dissipated we obtain  $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = 0$ . In this case  $E_r/E_k^i = [2 + \xi(\kappa - 1)]/(1 + \kappa)$  is equal to  $1 - (E_{CM}/E_k^i) = 4\kappa/(\kappa + 1)^2$ , where  $E_{CM}$  is the kinetic energy of the center of mass. This allows us to conclude that  $\xi = 2/(\kappa + 1)$ ; finally in the LSR we have:

$$1 - \epsilon = \frac{E_r}{E_k^i} = f(\kappa, \beta) \left[ \frac{2 - \xi}{1 + \kappa} (1 - \eta_2) + \frac{\kappa \xi}{1 + \kappa} (1 - \eta_1) \right]. \quad (20)$$

### 3.5. Lateral outflow



In a realistic situation clouds have a finite size perpendicular to the collision direction ( $x$ -axis); thus the gas will be free to expand in the directions parallel to the shock front, possibly generating a lateral outflow. We will compute the amount of mass lost in the lateral outflow analytically. To this purpose, we integrate the flux of mass from the cloud surface on the typical collision time  $t_{coll} = L_c/v_c$ . The typical expansion velocity of a gas in the vacuum is proportional to the sound speed; as a consequence, most of the mass loss comes from the hotter post-shock adiabatic region. During the compression phase the amount of mass ejected in the lateral outflow will be:

$$M_{out} = \pi L_y L_{ad} v_{out} t_{coll} 4\rho_0, \quad (21)$$

where  $L_y$  is the cloud diameter (clouds are modeled as cylinders),  $L_{ad}$  if the length of the adiabatic region,  $v_{out}$  is the outflow velocity, and  $4\rho_0$  is the post-shock gas density. After some algebra, and recalling that  $v_{out} \simeq v_s$  and  $4\rho_0 L_{ad} \equiv \alpha N_{cool}$ , we find:

$$\frac{M_{out}}{M_c} \simeq \eta_y. \quad (22)$$

where  $\eta_y = N_{cool}/(n_0 L_y)$ . The kinetic energy,  $E_{k,out} \propto M_{out} v_{out}^2$ , lost in the lateral outflow is:

$$\frac{E_{k,out}}{E_k^i} \simeq \eta_y. \quad (23)$$

The kinetic energy lost in the lateral outflow depends both on the elasticity and the geometry of the collision. Since  $\eta_y = \eta(L_c/L_y)$ , (a) for spherical clouds ( $L_c/L_y = 1$ ), the kinetic energy lost in the lateral outflow is proportional to the elasticity parameter (*i.e.* is zero in a perfectly inelastic collision and 1 in a perfectly elastic one); (b) for a fixed of  $\eta$ , the energy loss is smaller for flattened clouds ( $L_y \gg L_c$ ).

We can rewrite eqs. (9) and (23) including the energy losses in the lateral outflow

$$1 - \epsilon = \frac{E_r}{E_k^i} \simeq (1 - \eta_y)(1 - \eta), \quad (24)$$

which is valid for a head-on collision between identical clouds,

$$1 - \epsilon = \frac{E_r}{E_k^i} \simeq f(\kappa, \beta) \left[ \frac{2 - \xi}{1 + \kappa} (1 - \eta_y)(1 - \eta_2) + \frac{\kappa \xi}{1 + \kappa} (1 - \eta_y)(1 - \eta_1) \right], \quad (25)$$

for a head-on collision between different clouds. These results are obtained supposing that the lateral outflow is adiabatic.

#### 4. Numerical results

In this Section we study cloud collisions via numerical simulations adopting the same 1D model as in the analytical approach. The numerical code is based on a shock-capturing scheme (Yee, 1989) suitable to resolve the hypersonic shocks that arise in the collisions. This scheme is characterized by a nonlinear numerical dissipation term with an automatic feedback mechanism which adjusts the amount of dissipation in any cell of the mesh according to the shape of the actual solution. The spatial discretization adopted in our code is based on upwind-differencing and the solution is advanced in time using a Godunov-type method (solving a set of Riemann problems at any cell interface forward in time). To obtain a  $2^{nd}$ -order spatial

accuracy we have used the TVD-MUSCL (Total Variation Diminishing-Monotone Upstream Scheme for Conservation Laws) reconstruction technique. We achieve  $2^{nd}$ -order accuracy in time by using a two-step Runge-Kutta explicit scheme.

The simulation starts when the two clouds are in contact. The cloud and intercloud density and temperature are computed from the corresponding phase diagram, as described in Sec. 2. The external medium is initially put into motion, with the same velocity as the clouds, to prevent the formation of a vacuum zone behind the cloud boundary due to the snowplow effect of the cloud motion.

In Figure 2 we show, as an example, the evolution of the collision of two identical clouds for the representative case  $v_r \simeq 19 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ,  $L_c = 0.1 \text{ pc}$ ,  $Z = D/G = 1$ . The three different phases discussed above are clearly seen in the various panels. At  $t = 0.5t_{coll}$  two shocks are already well formed and propagate through the cloud compressing the gas. The pressure jump across the shock is  $\propto v_s^2$  and the density jump is  $\sim 4$  because the shock is still adiabatic. Then, the temperature of the shocked gas starts to decrease due to radiative losses occurring in the transition region (see Sec. 3). At  $t \simeq t_{coll}$  an expansion phase begins driven by the hot gas near the cloud boundary whereas the gas in the cloud interior is almost at rest. The shock propagates through the intercloud medium increasing both its pressure and temperature. The cloud expansion is finally halted by the enhanced external pressure.

The behavior of the collision between two different clouds is initially analogous to that of identical clouds (except that the CD is not at the rest in the LSR). As the shock exits the smaller cloud, thus triggering its expansion phase, the ram pressure of the larger cloud accelerates the CD and the velocity of the shock in its interior decreases consequently.

Finally, we have performed some simulations of collisions between identical magnetized clouds with the field lines parallel to the shock front. As expected, the main effect is a lower compression of the postshock gas, which enhances the value of  $N_{cool}$ . This has important consequences on the elasticity of the collision as we will see in the next Section.

## 5. Elasticity of the collisions

In this Section we present (Figs. 3-7) the results concerning the elasticity of the collisions derived by analyzing the numerical simulations. The numerical results are compared with the appropriate analytical expressions obtained in Sec. 3. In order to achieve the best agreement between the two sets of results we have fixed the value of the free parameter  $\alpha$ , introduced in eq. (5), to 1/3. With this choice we find a very good agreement also varying the cloud size and gas metallicity. The error on the numerical calculation of  $E_r$  is less than 1% for all the runs, and it is due to the fact that we integrate the radiative losses during the simulation up to the time at which the fractional variation of the integral is  $< 1\%$ .

In the following we will discuss the detailed dependence of  $E_r/E_k^i$  on the various collision parameters, namely  $v_r, L_c, Z, \kappa, \beta, B$ .

- $E_r/E_k^i(v_r)$  (Fig. 3) If the relative velocity of the clouds, is  $v_r \ll v_m$  or  $v_r \gg v_m$ , with  $v_m \simeq 30 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ , the collision is approximately inelastic (*i.e.* all the initial kinetic energy of the clouds is dissipated radiatively). In a collision between identical clouds, this occurrence does not depend on any other parameter of the collision. For  $v_r$  in the interval  $(v_m - \delta v, v_m + \delta v)$  where  $\delta v \sim 10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ , the energy dissipation in the collision decreases and for  $v \simeq v_m$  it reaches a minimum (*i.e.* the elasticity is maximum). The

value of  $v_m$  is slightly dependent on the metallicity  $Z$  of the gas. This behavior of the elasticity as a function of the relative velocity can be understood as follows. We recall that  $N_{cool} = n_0 v_s t_{cool}$ , with  $v_s \propto v_r$ ; since  $t_{cool} \propto v_s^2/[n_0 \Lambda(v_s, Z)]$ , then  $N_{cool}$  is the product of two terms: the first,  $v_s^3$ , increasing, the second,  $\Lambda^{-1}(v_s, Z)$ , decreasing with  $v_s$ . Thus  $N_{cool}$  has a maximum and the same is true for  $\epsilon \propto N_{cool}$ . Differentiating *epsilon* with respect to  $v_r$  we find that  $\epsilon$  is maximum when:

$$\frac{\partial \Lambda(v_r)}{\partial v_r} = 3, \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\partial \Lambda(T)}{\partial T} = \frac{3}{2}, \quad (26)$$

- $E_r/E_k^i(L_c)$  The elasticity of the collision increases when the cloud size is decreased because  $\eta \propto L_c^{-1}$  (Fig. 3).
- $E_r/E_k^i(Z)$  The elasticity of the collision increases when the gas metallicity is decreased because  $\eta \propto \Lambda^{-1}$  and  $\Lambda$  is directly proportional to  $Z$ , as shown by Fig. 4. Interesting enough, collisions between clouds for which the relationship  $ZL_c^2 \approx \text{const.}$  holds, are equally elastic, for a given value of  $v_r$ . The physical explanation can be found from an inspection of eq. (10) and recalling that, to a first approximation,  $\Lambda \propto Z$  and the equilibrium density  $n_0$  of the cloud is  $\propto Z^{-1/2}$ . This relationship is illustrated by Fig. 5.
- $E_r/E_k^i(\kappa, \beta)$  When the cloud size ratio  $\kappa = L_1/L_2$  and the cloud velocity ratio  $\beta = v_1/v_2$  are not equal to one (*i.e.* different clouds), the maximum kinetic energy that can be dissipated in the collision is equal to the kinetic energy relative to the center of mass reference frame. Hence, the collision between two different clouds will be, in general, less dissipative with respect to the identical cloud case. Moreover, while the shock velocity in the smaller cloud is always  $\propto v_r$ , the shock will be slowed down in the larger cloud for the reasons discussed in Sec. 4. This will produce an additional minimum of  $E_r/E_k^i$  at  $v > v_m$  as shown by Fig.6. The analytical approximation in that region tends to overestimate the elasticity by about 10
- $E_r/E_k^i(B)$  The effect of a uniform magnetic field  $B_0$  in the cloud, is to decrease the energy dissipation (*i.e.* increase the elasticity) of the collision. Since the magnetic pressure limits the compression of the postshock gas; as a consequence,  $N_{cool}$  increases along with the elasticity of the collision (see Fig.7). In Figure 7 we show the behavior of  $(1 - \epsilon)$  vs.  $\mathcal{B} = P_B(0)/P(0)$  (the ratio of magnetic and thermal pressure at  $t = 0$ ).

## 6. Summary and discussion

We have presented a first step towards the study of the collisions between diffuse interstellar clouds in a multiphase medium, with particular focus to the dissipation of the kinetic energy of the clouds (described through the elasticity parameter, *i.e.* the ratio of the final to the initial kinetic energy of the clouds) as a function of the parameters of the problem such as the cloud relative velocity, gas metallicity, cloud mass and velocity ratio, and magnetic field strength.

The problem has been studied both analytically, obtaining approximate, albeit handy, relations valid for a wide range of parameter variation, and numerically, by means of a 1D *shock capturing* TVD numerical code. The comparison between the two approaches has been explored in detail (see Figs. 3-7); we conclude that the agreement is very good.

The following points summarize our main results:

- The kinetic energy dissipation in cloud collisions is minimum (*i.e.* the collision elasticity is maximum) for

a cloud relative velocity  $v_r \simeq 30 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ .

- The above minimum value is proportional  $ZL_c^2$  (where  $Z$  is the gas metallicity and  $L_c$  is the cloud size): the larger is  $ZL_c^2$  the more dissipative (*i.e.* more inelastic) the collision will be.
- We find that the energy dissipation decreases (*i.e.* elasticity increases) when the magnetic field strength, and mass ratio of the clouds are increased and the metallicity is decreased, respectively.

The previous results have been obtained assuming: (i) centered collisions: we have investigated a simple 1D model of the collision only; the extension to the analogous 2D problem will be presented in a future paper. However, we have already explored the effects of the lateral outflow analytically. (ii) ionization equilibrium: this holds only approximately if the temperature of the post-shock gas is  $T < 3 \times 10^4 \text{ K}$  and  $Z > 0.01$  (iii) the ionization of the pre-shock gas by the radiative precursor (Shull & McKee 1979) which could modify the shock structure is neglected. (iv) clouds are not self-gravitating.

Our results, mainly aimed at deriving the dependence of the elasticity on a wide range of parameters characterizing the initial conditions of the collision in a multiphase medium, do not allow us to draw any firm conclusion on the final fate of the remnant of the collision (shattering or coalescence). In order to make progress a 2D study is required. Nevertheless, our perception from the 1D study presented here is that the presence of a magnetic field must be invoked in order to prevent the shattering of the clouds found by Klein *et al.* (1995). A related point is the possible phase transition from the CNM to the WNM associated with the collisions, which could result in a net mass and energy exchange from the cold to the warm phase. This could be relevant as far as the overall thermal equilibrium of the ISM is concerned.

Cloud collisions might be responsible for the buildup of the observed mass spectrum ( $N(m) \propto m^{-2.14}$ , Dickey & Garwood 1989) of diffuse clouds and for the formation of molecular complexes. Das & Jog (1996) study the evolution of molecular clouds under the effect of collisions and local gravitational interactions. Their recipe for the collision is a simple extrapolation of the results by Hausman (1981), *i.e.* coalescence occurs in a subsonic collision, fragmentation is the product of a supersonic one. However, most of the standard buildup models of diffuse clouds – inspired by the pioneering work of Field & Saslaw (1965) – assume that collisions are inelastic, a hypothesis that is too simplistic by far, as already made clear by our 1D results. Also, as Jungwiert & Palous (1996) have pointed out, the elasticity of cloud collisions is a key parameter for the process of formation of multiple rings in disk galaxies.

In a cosmological context, collisions between primeval clouds could be important for two reasons. On the one hand, the nonlinear evolution of primordial fluctuations is thought to generate a very clumpy state of the intergalactic medium. One can expect these protogalactic seeds to move through the background gas, collide and eventually coalesce; during this process part of their orbital momentum can be transformed into spin momentum of the merger (Chernin 1993). On the other hand, energy dissipation by means of cloud collisions in a forming galaxy is found to produce flattened systems (Gott & Thuan 1976, Larson 1976, Abadi *et al.* 1990) and the disks of spiral galaxies. It is thus important to fully understand how the energy dissipation is affected both by the gas metallicity, which is supposed to be rather low, and by the phase structure of the ISM of these primeval objects. Our calculations provide a necessary ingredient for this type of studies.

We are grateful to S. Balbus, J. Dickey, G. Field, R. Klein, C. McKee, and M. Shull for stimulating

discussions.

## REFERENCES

- Abadi, M. G., Lambas, D. & Mosconi, M. B. 1990, ApJ, 360, 343
- Abgrall, R., Fezoui, L., & Talandier, J. 1991, *An extension of Osher's Riemann solver for chemical and vibrational non-equilibrium gas flows*, Int. J. for Numerical Methods in Fluids (submitted)
- Chernin, A. D. 1993, *ã*267, 315
- Cowie, L.L. 1980, ApJ, 236, 868
- Dickey, J. M. & Garwood, R. W. 1989, ApJ, 341, 201
- Ferrara, A. 1993, ApJ, 407, 157
- Field, G.B., & Saslaw, W.C. 1965, ApJ, 142, 568
- Field, G.B., & Hutchins, J. 1968, ApJ, 153, 737
- Fleck, R. C. 1996, ApJ, 458, 739
- Gaetz, T.J., & Salpeter, E.E. 1983, ApJS, 52, 155
- Gilden, D.L. 1984, ApJ, 279, 335
- Gott, J. R. & Thuan, T. X. 1976, ApJ, 204, 649
- Hausman, M.A. 1982, ApJ, 261, 532
- Hollenbach, D., & McKee, C.F. 1989, ApJ, 342, 306
- Jungwiert, B. & Palous, J. 1996, *ã*311, 397, 306
- Klein, R.I., McKee, C.F., & Woods, D.T. 1995, in *The Physics of Interstellar Medium and Intergalactic Medium*, ed. A.Ferrara, C.F.McKee, C. Heiles, & Shapiro: ASP, 80
- Larson, R. B. 1976, MNRAS, 166, 585
- McKee, C.F. 1990, in *The Evolution of the Interstellar Medium*, ed. L.Blitz (ASP Conf. Ser., 12), 3
- Norman, C. A. & Ferrara, A. 1996, ApJ, 467, 280
- Oort, J.H. 1954, *B.A.N.*, 12, 177
- Osher, S., & Solomon, F. 1982, *Upwind difference schemes for hyperbolic systems of conservation laws*, Mathematics of Computation, 38 (158), 339
- Penston, M.V., Munday, V.A., Stickland, D.J., & Penston, M.J. 1969, *M.N.R.A.S.*, 142, 355
- Péquignot, D. 1990, *A&A*, 231, 499
- Pumphrey, W.A., & Scalo, J.M. 1983, ApJ, 269, 531
- Shull, J.M., & McKee, C. F. 1979, ApJ, 227, 131
- Shull, J.M., & van Steenberg, M. 1982, ApJS, 48, 95
- Spitzer, L. 1978, *Physical Processes in the Interstellar Medium* (New York: Wiley)
- Stone, M.E. 1970a, ApJ, 159, 277
- Stone, M.E. 1970b, ApJ, 159, 293

Struck-Marcell, C., & Scalo, J.M. 1984, ApJ, 277, 132

Vazquez-Semadeni, E., Passot, T., & Pouquet, A. 1995, ApJ, 441, 702

Wolfire, M.G., Hollenbach, D., McKee, C.F., Tielens, A.G.G.M., & Bakes, E.L.O. 1995, ApJ, 443, 152

Yee, H.C. 1989, *A Class of High-Resolution Explicit and Implicit Shock-Capturing Methods*, Tech. Rep. Lecture Series 1989-04, von Karman Institute of Fluid Dynamics

Dominant cooling processes	Notes	Ref.
Cooling by fine-structure lines:		
CII(158 $\mu\text{m}$ )	Impacts with H <sup>0</sup> and e <sup>-</sup>	1
OI(63;44 $\mu\text{m}$ )	Impacts with H <sup>0</sup> , e <sup>-</sup> and H <sup>+</sup>	2
FeII(26;15 $\mu\text{m}$ ), SiII(34.8 $\mu\text{m}$ )	Impacts with H <sup>0</sup> and e <sup>-</sup>	3
Cooling by metastable lines:	Impacts with e <sup>-</sup>	3
CII(2326 $\text{\AA}$ )		
OI(6300;6363 $\text{\AA}$ ), OII(3229;3726 $\text{\AA}$ )	OI most important coolant	
NI(1.04 $\mu\text{m}$ ), NII(6548;6583 $\text{\AA}$ )		
FeII(5.34;4.12;1.26 $\mu\text{m}$ )		
SII(6731;6717 $\text{\AA}$ )		
SiII(2240 $\text{\AA}$ )		
Cooling by highly ionized elements:	Impacts with e <sup>-</sup>	4,5
CIII, CIV, OIII, OIV, OV	Important at $T > 10^5$ K	

Table 1: Dominant cooling processes by metal lines. Reference: (1)Wolfire *et al.*, 1995;(2)Péquignot, 1990;(3)Hollenbach & McKee, 1989;(4)Gaetz & Salpeter, 1983;(5)Shull & van Steenberg, 1982.



Fig. 1.— Thermal pressure  $P/k$  vs. hydrogen density  $n$ ; the curves refer to different values of the dust-to-gas ratio,  $D/G$ , and metallicity  $Z$ , with  $D/G = Z$ . The gas is thermally stable for  $(d \log P / d \log n) > 0$  (*i.e.* positive slope of the curves). Unless  $Z = 0$ , a stable two-phase medium is supported.

Fig. 2.— Evolution of a collision between identical clouds with relative velocity  $v_r \simeq 19 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ , size  $L_c = 0.1 \text{ pc}$ ,  $Z = D/G = 1$ . The panels show the density, velocity, pressure and temperature at the evolutionary times  $t \simeq 0.5, 0.98, 1.6, 4 t_{coll}$ , with  $t_{coll} = L_c / v_c \simeq 10^4$  years.

Fig. 3.— Behavior of the quantity  $(1 - \epsilon) = E_r / E_k^i$ , where  $\epsilon$  is the elasticity of the collision (see text) for a collision between two identical clouds of size  $L_c$  shown by the labels, as a function of the cloud relative velocity  $v_r$ . The gas metallicity is  $Z = 1$ . The solid curves represent the analytical expression for  $1 - \epsilon$  (where  $\alpha = 1/3$ ; see text); the points show the analogous results from the numerical simulations. Vertical bars denote the estimated error in the simulation (see text).


Fig. 4.— Same as Fig. 4, but for different values of  $D/G$ , and gas metallicity  $Z$ . We assume  $D/G = Z$ ,  $L_c = 1 \text{ pc}$  and  $T_0 = 48 \text{ K}$ ; the cloud density  $n_0$  is derived from the corresponding phase diagram. Vertical bars denote the estimated error in the simulation (see text).

Fig. 5.— Contour levels of the function  $1 - \epsilon = E_r / E_k^i$  in the plane  $L_c - Z$  for a relative velocity  $v_r = 30 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ .

Fig. 6.— Same as Fig. 4, but for a collision between different clouds as a function of the cloud relative velocity  $v_r$ ; the curves refer to different values of the cloud size  $\kappa = L_{c1} / L_{c2}$  and velocity  $\beta = |v_1 / v_2|$  ratios; we have assumed  $\beta^2 = 1 / \kappa$  so that the clouds have the same initial kinetic energy. The points show the analogous results from the numerical simulations. Vertical bars denote the estimated error in the simulation (see text).

Fig. 7.—  $1 - \epsilon = E_r / E_k^i$  curves plotted as a function of the initial ( $t = 0$ ) ratio between the magnetic and thermal pressure  $P_B(0) / P(0)$  in the cloud. The points shown in the picture are computed for:  $P_B(0) / P(0) = 0.1; 0.5; 1; 5; 10$  (*i.e.*  $B_0 \simeq 1; 2; 3; 6; 9 \mu\text{G}$ ). The collision parameters are the same as in Fig. 2. Vertical bars denote the estimated error in the simulation (see text).

Figure 1





# Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6






Figure 7

