Young Stars and Intermediate-mass Black Holes in the Galactic Center



Alessia Gualandris

Max-Planck Institut für Astrophysik, Garching Central Massive Objects, ESO Garching, 22-25 June, 2010



Sunday, June 27, 2010

The stellar disk(s)



90 O/WR stars M_K < 14

- clockwise orbits
- counter-clockwise orbits

Bartko et al. (2009)

The CW stellar disk



The S-star cluster



2009 N = 20 stars I 5 early-type stars 5 late-type stars

Gillessen et al. (2009)

I arcsec ~ 0.04 pc

Alessia Gualandris, ESO Garching, 22/06/2010

Sunday, June 27, 2010

The S-star cluster



NO Standard star formation!

critical density:

$$n_{crit} = 10^7 \text{ cm}^{-3} \left(\frac{1.6 \text{ pc}}{R}\right)^{1.8}$$

while observed densities: $10^4 - 10^5 \text{ cm}^{-3}$
 \downarrow

In-situ NON standard star formation
 Outside formation + migration

Common formation scenario for disk stars and S-stars?

DISK 0.8" < r < 12" O/WR stars disk <e> ~ 0.3-0.4 top-heavy MF

S-STARS 0.1'' < r < 0.8''B-type MS stars isotropic $<e> \sim 0.7$ standard MF

Different properties argue for different scenario

Origin of the youn

Proposed models:

(1) In-situ formation from infalling and/or colliding gas clumps
Star formation from fragmenting gas disks/streams
> production of disk
structures in the range
0.01-0.1 pc.





Bonnell & Rice (2008)

(1) In-situ formation from infalling and/or colliding gas clumps

Pros: Can reproduce properties of the disk stars: radial distribution, eccentricity and topheavy mass function.

Cons: Can not produce stars closer than ~ 0.1 pc. Can not explain isotropic B-stars population.

Disk(s)X B-stars

Proposed models:

(2) Binary capture Binary formation at large distance + scatter to radial orbits (need massive perturbers) + interaction with MBH => capture of one star and ejection of companion + resonant relaxation



(2) Binary capture

Pros: Can reproduce properties of observed B-stars.



Cons: Many steps scenario. Requires large reservoir of binaries, efficient scattering by massive perturbers, tidal interaction with MBH, randomization of eccentricities by resonant relaxation.

Proposed models:

(3) Cluster infall
(+IMBH)
Cluster formation
outside central pc with
runaway merger =>
IMBH + inspiral
+ tidal disruption =>
deposition of a disk



Fujii et al. (2008)

(3) Cluster infall (+IMBH)

Pros: IMBH quickly randomizes orbital planes and thermalizes eccentricities. Explains bias towards massive stars. IMBH ejects stars and produces a core.

? B-stars

Cons: Formation of massive IMBHs may be difficult. Inspiral timescale may be too long. Expected number of Bstars deposited outside S-cluster much larger than observed.

Origin of the S-star cluster: cluster infall with IMBH

Y (mpc)

BBH initial conditions: * $M_{SMBH} = 4.5 \times 10^{6} M_{\odot}$ * IMBH q = $10^{-4} - 10^{-3}$ * a = 10 - 80 mpc * e = 0.2 - 0.5

Stars initial conditions: * orbits similar to those of tidally stripped stars, with a small thickness

Numerical method: Regularized direct summation method (AR-CHAIN)



Stellar disk + IMBH evolution



Stellar disk + IMBH evolution



Stellar disk + IMBH evolution



Sunday, June 27, 2010

S-stars + IMBH evolution



- $\Box SMBH M_{SMBH} = 4 \times 10^6 M_{\odot}$
- \square 19 S-stars m = 10 M $_{\odot}$
- □ IMBH $M_{IMBH} = 400, 1000, 2000, 4000 M_{\odot}$
- **a** = 0.3, 1, 3, 10, 30 mpc
- I2 positions on the sky
- **D** $e_{IMBH} = 0, 0.7$

Alessia Gualandris, ESO Garching, 22/06/2010

Gualandris & Merritt (2009)

S-stars + IMBH evolution



M_{IMBH} = 2000 M₀ a = 10 mpc ejection

Gualandris & Merritt (2009)

Constraints on IMBHs



BBH com ~ peak stellar distribution within uncertainties (YT03)
lifetime T_{GW} > 10⁷ yr
mass enclosed within orbit of S2 < 0.02 М_{ВН}
motion of SgrA* (HM03, RB04)
stability of S-cluster



Gualandris, Gillessen, Merritt astro-ph/1006.3563 SMBH M=4.3×10⁶ M_☉

IMBH: $q = 10^{-4} - 10^{-3}$ a = 0.3, 1, 3, 10, 30 mpc e = 0, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9 21 S-stars

> S2: a = 5mpc e = 0.883 $r_p = 0.6 mpc$ $r_a = 9.4mpc$



Gualandris, Gillessen, Merritt astro-ph/1006.3563

inclination



Gualandris, Gillessen, Merritt astro-ph/1006.3563



 $q = 10^{-4}$ a = 30 mpc e = 0

 $q = 5 \times 10^{-4}$ a = 1 mpc e = 0

Gualandris, Gillessen, Merritt astro-ph/1006.3563



Gualandris, Gillessen, Merritt astro-ph/1006.3563



astro-ph/1006.3563



Gualandris, Gillessen, Merritt astro-ph/1006.3563

Origin of the S-star cluster: in-situ vs binary disruption

- Isotropic cusp N = 1200 r < 0.3 pc
- $N_1 = 200 N_2 = 1000$
- $m_1 = 3 M_{\odot} S$ -stars, $m_2 = 10 M_{\odot} bhs$
- $M_{BH} = 3.6 \times 10^6 M_{\odot}$
- Power-law distribution r^{α} $\alpha = 2$ for bhs , $\alpha = 1.5$ for stars

Origin of the S-star cluster: in-situ vs binary disruption



high initial eccentricities (e>0.96) binary disruption

low initial eccentricities (e<0.5) disk origin

Binary disruption t = 20 Myr

is the favored model

Perets, Gualandris, Merritt, Alexander (2009)

The B-stars population



Detection of early-type stars out to ~0.8 pc => Continuous population of

B-stars

The B-stars population

- $M_{BH} = 3.6 \times 10^{6} M_{\odot}$
- Isotropic cusp N = 16000 $m = 10 M_{\odot}$ stars
- Power-law distribution r^2 , 0.04 < r < 0.8 pc

follow stars with initial eccentricity 0.94 \leq e \leq 0.99 representative of binary disruption stars

The B-stars population



Alessia Gualandris, ESO Garching, 22/06/2010

Perets & Gualandris

arXiv:1004.2703

Conclusions

Models for origin of the young stars in the Galactic center: * In-situ formation consistent with stellar disk(s), not the B-stars.

Binary disruption scenario consistent with the properties of the B-stars population, but requires chain of events. It predicts dependency of eccentricity on distance.
Cluster infall scenario with IMBH consistent with all observed properties of the B-stars, but difficulties in the IMBH formation and inspiral and predicted number of B-stars outside central arcsecond.

* Short-term effects from an IMBH potentially detectable for star S2 at next pericenter passage.