FORMATION EFFICIENCIES OF OLD GLOBULAR CLUSTERS - FORM DWARF TO GIANT GALAXIES

Iskren Georgiev¹, Thomas Puzia², Paul Goudfrooij³ and Michael Hilker⁴

Abstract. For the full galaxy mass range, we find that previously observed trends of globular cluster (GC) system scaling parameters (number, luminosity or mass of all GCs in a galaxy normalized to the host galaxy luminosity or mass, e.g. S_L) as a function of galaxy mass, holds irrespective of galaxy type or environment. The S_L value of early-type galaxies is, on average, twice that of late-types. We derive theoretical predictions which describe remarkably well the observed GC system scaling parameter distributions given an assumed GC formation efficiency (η), i.e. the ratio of total mass in GCs to galaxy halo mass. It has a mean value of $\eta \simeq 5.5 \times 10^{-5}$, and increasing scatter toward low galaxy mass. The excess η -values of some massive galaxies compared to expectations from the mean model prediction, may be attributed to an efficient GC formation, inefficient production of field stars, accretion of low-mass high- η galaxies or likely a mixture of all these effects.

1 Introduction

The number, luminosity or mass of the entire globular cluster (GC) system normalized to the host galaxy luminosity or mass defines the fundamental quantities specific frequency (S_N) , luminosity (S_L) , specific mass (S_M) and specific number (\hat{T}) of GCs (cf. Eqns 2.1). These GC scaling relations indicate how efficiently galaxies form GCs per unit of their luminosity or mass. Those has been observed to vary significantly, being high for dwarf and giant galaxies (2, 3, 4), and with a minimum at a galaxy luminosity of $M_V \simeq -20.5 \,\mathrm{mag} \,(L_V \simeq 10^{10} L_{\odot})$. That

¹ Argelander Institut für Astronomie de Universität Bonn, Auf dem Hügel 71, 53225 Bonn, Germany, e-mail: iskren@astro.uni-bonn.de

 $^{^2}$ Departamento de Astronomia y Astrofisica, Avenida Vicuna Mackenna 4860, 7820436 Macul, Santiago de Chile

 $^{^3}$ Space Telescope Science Institute, 3700 San Martin Drive, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA

 $^{^4}$ European Southern Observatory, Karl-Schwarzschild-Str. 2, 85748 Garching bei München, Germany

is, the two extreme galaxy mass regimes, dwarfs and giants, seemingly form old GCs in similar proportions. This scaling relations provide important observational constraints and test for models of star, GC and galaxy formation (5, 6, 7, 4, 8).

2 Analysis and Results

In Georgiev et al. (2010), we investigate this trend with observations of GC populations of a large sample late-type dwarf galaxies with HST/ACS (9, 10). In order to sample the entire range in galaxy mass, environment, and morphology we augment our sample with data with data from the literature. We find that *i*) relations between the GCS scaling parameters and galaxy luminosity holds irrespective of galaxy morphological type and *ii*) on average, early-type galaxies have $\sim 2 \times$ higher S_L -values than late-types at the same luminosity. To investigate the observed trends, which have not yet been conclusively explained, we derive theoretical predictions of GC system scaling parameters as a function of the total host galaxy mass based on the models of Dekel & Brinboim (2006) in which star-formation processes (i.e. thermal properties of the gas) are regulated by stellar/supernova feedback below a stellar mass of $3 \times 10^{10} M_{\odot}$, and by virial shocks ('hot stream') above it, causing a suppression of star formation.

Specific frequency and luminosity

$$S_N = N_{\rm GC} \times 10^{0.4(M_V + 15)}; \ S_{L,V} = 10^2 \times L_{\rm GCS}/L_V$$
 (2.1)

can be related to the galaxy halo mass by defining the GC formation efficiency: $\eta = \mathcal{M}_{GCS}/\mathcal{M}_h$. Dekel & Birnboim (2006) model predicts $L_V = \mathcal{M}_h^{5/3}$ below and $L_V = \mathcal{M}_h^{1/2}$ above galaxy stellar mass $\sim 3 \times 10^{10} M_{\odot}$.

$$S_N = 10^{6+0.4M_{V,\odot}} \frac{\eta}{m_{\rm TO}} \left(\kappa_1^{0.6} L_V^{-0.4} + \kappa_2^2 L_V^{1.2} \right); \ S_L = 10^2 \frac{\eta}{\gamma_V} \left(\kappa_1^{0.6} L_V^{-0.4} + \kappa_2^2 L_V \right), (2.2)$$

where $\kappa_1 = 10^9$ and $\kappa_2 = 10^{-4.42}$ are observationally derived normalization constants, $m_{\rm TO} \simeq 2 \times 10^5 M_{\odot}$ and $\gamma_V = 2$ are the typical GC mass and mass-to-light ratio. The functional relations (Eqs 2.2) describe remarkably well the observed distributions (Fig. 1). This supports that GCs form in proportion to the strength of the host potential (galaxy mass) as well as the effect on the GC formation efficiency by the physical mechanisms in the Dekel & Birnboim model of galaxy evolution (thermal properties, shock stability and cooling physics of gas due to feedback from SNe, UV on dust, photoionization, AGN and dynamical friction). Therefore, this model is a good representation of the GC formation efficiency (η). A better model should, in addition, take into account variations in the individual galaxy star formation history, merging history, conditions for cluster formation and destruction and the stochastic nature of star formation at low galaxy mass. Observations of GCSs of late-type, spiral galaxies in the high galaxy mass regime are necessary to probe whether their GC formation efficiencies are statistically different than that of early-type galaxies at same galaxy mass.

2



Fig. 1. Left: GC specific specific luminosities (S_L) and right specific frequencies (S_N) as a function of galaxy luminosity. Solid curves are model predictions (cf. Eqs 2.2) reflecting the different M/L below and above $\mathcal{M} \sim 3 \times 10^{10} M_{\odot}$. Solid curve is the best-fit $\eta_L = 5.5 \times 10^{-5}$ to the S_L -value. Solid symbols connected with line show the co-added running average S_N -values per magnitude bin for early- and late-type galaxies. Dash-dotted line indicates the S_N -value if a galaxy has one GC (Eq.2.1). Grey triangles at the bottom of the plot represent galaxies for which no GC candidates were detected.

References

Georgiev, I.,Y., Puzia, T.,H., Goudfrooij, P., Hilker, M., 2010, MNRAS, 406, 1967

Harris, W. E. 1991, ARA&A, 29, 543

Miller, B. W. & Lotz, J. M. 2007, ApJ, 670, 1074

Peng, E. W., Jordan, A., Cote, P., et al. 2008, ApJ, 681, 197

McLaughlin, D. E. 1999, AJ, 117, 2398

Forbes, D. A. 2005, ApJL, 635, L137

Pipino, A., Puzia, T. H., & Matteucci, F. 2007, ApJ, 665, 295

Muratov, A. L. & Gnedin, O. Y. 2010, ApJ, 718, 1266

Georgiev, I. Y., Goudfrooij, P., Puzia, T. H., & Hilker, M. 2008, AJ, 135, 1858

Georgiev, I. Y., Puzia, T. H., Hilker, M., & Goudfrooij, P. 2009, MNRAS, 392, 879

Dekel, A. & Birnboim, Y. 2006, MNRAS, 368, 2