

XMM view of the COSMOS field



Obscured QSO: placing objects in the merging sequence (with ALMA)

**Marcella Brusa** 

MPE - Garching [+COSMOS/CDFS collaborations]

CNR-Bologna / Secondo workshop sull'Astronomia millimetrica e submillimetrica italiana / 2-3 Aprile 2012

Tuesday, April 3, 2012





# Obscured QSO: placing objects in the merging sequence (with ALMA)

**Marcella Brusa** 

MPE - Garching [+COSMOS/CDFS collaborations]

XMM view of the COSMOS field

# X-ray / mm synergies (space/ground)

CNR-Bologna / Secondo workshop sull'Astronomia millimetrica e submillimetrica italiana / 2-3 Aprile 2012

## WHY: the relevance of obscured AGN

- Obscured AGN are needed to:
  - reconcile the local BH mass function with mass accreted on BH

(via Soltan argument, e.g. Fabian & Iwasawa 1999, Marconi+2004, Merloni&Heinz 2008, Shankar+2009)

- reproduce the X-ray background peak

(Setti & Woltjer 1989, Comastri+1995, Gilli+2007, Treister+2005,2009, Ballantyne+2010)

- test AGN-galaxy co-evolutionary models and constrain growth phases

(Hopkins+2008, Hasinger2008, Menci+2008, Narayanan+2009 etc.)

# definition of obscured AGN

### • Unified models:

- "viewing angle/geometry"
   AGN emission absorbed by torus (or "clumpy" system)
  BL vs. NL classification
  X-ray obscured vs. X-ray unobscured
- optical/X-ray classifications agree at 80% level

### • Evolutionary models:

- "phase"

- AGN emission is obscured by host galaxy dust (and, maybe, absorbed by torus)

- time critical (absorption more common at high-z)



# mergers scenario (ULIRGs-QSO sequence)

### Hopkins et al. 2008



### Early on

Mergers between gas rich galaxies drive gas which fuel both SF and BH activity;

Violent starbursts episodes (ULIRGS);

Heavily obscured BH growth

### When galaxies coalesce

Accretion peaks;

SMBH becomes X-ray and optically "visible" QSO phase follow, AGN winds blow out gas

### Later times

(e.g. Sanders et al. 1988, Silk & Rees 1998, Granato et al. 2004, Di Matteo et al. SF & BH accretion quenched; 2005, Hopkins et al.2006-2009, Croton et al. 2006, Fontanot et al. 2006, De Lucia et al. 2006, Sijacki et al. 2007, Menci et al. 2008, Marulli et al. 2009) Dead guasars in red galaxies (passive evolution)

# mergers scenario (ULIRGs-QSO sequence)

### Hopkins et al. 2008



#### Early on

Mergers between gas rich galaxies drive gas which fuel both SF and BH activity;

Violent starbursts episodes (ULIRGS);

Heavily obscured BH growth

### When galaxies coalesce

Accretion peaks;

SMBH becomes X-ray and optically "visible" QSO phase follow, AGN winds blow out gas

### Later times

(e.g. Sanders et al. 1988, Silk & Rees 1998, Granato et al. 2004, Di Matteo et al. SF & BH accretion quenched; 2005, Hopkins et al.2006-2009, Croton et al. 2006, Fontanot et al. 2006, De Lucia et al. 2006, Sijacki et al. 2007, Menci et al. 2008, Marulli et al. 2009) Dead guasars in red galaxies (passive evolution)

N.B.

X-ray selection includes also optical QSO but not CT ones!

# Is this valid for all systems? (Starburst-AGN sequence)

A population of galaxies evolved without mergers does clearly exist (disks are observed at z~2; e.g. Genzel+2006, 2008; see also Giulia Rodighiero talk)

**no correlation** between M<sub>BH</sub> and disk or pseudobulge properties (Kormendy et al. 2011; see also Graham et al. 2010)

Stochastic/secular accretion can **explain some classes of low-L** AGN (NLS1) observed at low-z (see also Davies talk)

Dichotomy in formation history of galaxies

mergers vs. secular

(weak) activity driven stochastically by local processes (galaxies encounters, inflow, disks/bars instabilities etc.; Croton+2006, Ciotti&Ostriker, Cen 2011, Bournaud+2011, Di Matteo+2011)

see also Viviana Casasola talk for local UNiverse studies



# Tools: (hard) X-ray surveys

*most complete* (modulo Compton Thick sources)

*least contaminated* (normal galaxies and stars emerge only in deepest exposures)

### catch AGN in blowout and QSO phase



<u>Multiwavelength coverage</u> to assure identification, redshift determination, SED studies, host galaxy properties, and alternative AGN selection (e.g. Compton Thick census) COSMOS field, 2 deg<sup>2</sup> (Scoville+07) XMM 1.55 Ms (Hasinger+07, Cappelluti+09, Brusa+10) Chandra 1.8 Ms (Elvis+09, Civano+in prep) down to ~1e-15 cgs, ~1800 objects soft 0.5-2.0 keV



CDFS Chandra 1-2-4Ms XMM 3 Ms ~0.1 deg2, ~4e-17 cgs 300-750 objects (Giacconi+2002, Alexander +2003, Luo+ 2008,10, Xue +2011, Comastri+2011)

Ony two among the many (~40) XMM & Chandra surveys in russian-doll style

All wavelengths, very deep coverage available



# **HOW: efficiently isolating obscured QSO**

#### Use X-ray selection (most unbiased etc. etc.) Use correlations between observables for objs with spec-z and classifications



Mainieri et al. 2011

XMM-COSMOS quasars logNH>22, logLx > 44

sampling X-ray obscuration



Brusa et al. 2010

XMM-COSMOS luminous obscured AGN logX/O > 1, R-K>5

sampling X-ray and optical obscuration (complemented by similar diagnostics from Spitzer, e.g. Fiore+2009 diagnostics)

# Alternative approach: INFRARED

 AGN (unobs and obs) are expected to have warm powerlaw sed at >1micron (≠ from elliptical/starburst)

AGN (both type 1 and 2) can be isolated in NIR/MIR diagrams and they are ~ same order of magnitude of X-ray selected obscured AGN

(Lacy et al. 2004, Hatziminaouglou et al. 2005, Stern et al. 2005, Donley et al.2008, Pope et al. 2008, Daddi et al. 2007; Fiore et al. 2008, 2009, Luo et al. 2011)

#### Main issues:

# reliability (are only AGN selected?) completeness (are all AGN selected?)



see Brusa et al. 2010 Donley et al. 2012

# **During or Post?**

Most **luminous**, **obscured X-ray selected** sources at z>1 are red --> effect of (negative) feedback efficient in stopping star formation, or AGN is in dusty environment? Evidences for **both** ! --> different phases/timescales are sampled



# **Host properties of QSO2**

Mainieri et al. 2011 XMM-COSMOS QSO2 sample

all these sources are indistinguishable from an X-ray point of view, most likely to be in the QSO blow-out phase



# **Host properties of QSO2**

Mainieri et al. 2011 XMM-COSMOS QSO2 sample

all these sources are indistinguishable from an X-ray point of view, most likely to be in the QSO blow-out phase

Host galaxies both passive or star-forming

--> different phases!

SF = objects at the beginning of blowout phase PASSIVE = QSO feedback already effective in stopping SF



# How to test if objects are really caught in the blow-out phase, at 2 different times?

 SFR should be tested/validated against FAR-IR --> PACS/PEP measurements/checks "SFR ladder" also for AGN? (Wuyts et al. 2011)

 Gas mass in SF QSO2 (still available) should be higher than in passive QSO2 (already diminished/exhausted) --> IRAM and ALMA CO luminosities vs. LIR

 BH masses should be higher (or the same) in passive QSO2 (subsequent phase) than in SF QSO2 -->
 IR (SINFONI, Xshooter, LUCIFER) spectroscopy for selected sample to observe Halpha

# **IRAM observations/results**



Daddi et al. 2010



Tacconi et al. 2010

IRAM detection of BzK and SMG gas fraction higher than in local SB

it is time to extend these studies to AGN and larger samples --> ALMA! (see high prio program by Lonsdale)

# Mergers vs. smooth accretion in mm



# Mergers vs. smooth accretion in mm



Tuesday, April 3, 2012

## Summary

- AGN in "feedback" phase can be isolated through X-ray surveys (we know how to do it..)
- Caveat on IR selection (X-ray still the most reliable...)
- ALMA/mm observations can help in disentangling models of galaxy-BH co-evolution (mergers vs. smooth accretion)
- ALMA "survey" programs to preselect high-z candidate for follow-up studies of QSO outflows (full ALMA for CO or [CII] - see Roberto Maiolino talk)
- Natural X-ray (XMM, Chandra..) + mm (ALMA) synergies