

# THE PHYSICAL PROPERTIES OF AGN OUTFLOWS AND THEIR IMPACT ON HOST GALAXIES FROM LOW TO HIGH REDSHIFT

## ALESSANDRO MARCONI DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS & ASTRONOMY, UNIVERSITY OF FLORENCE INAF - ARCETRI ASTROPHYSICAL OBSERVATORY

G. VENTURI, S. CARNIANI, G. CRESCI, F. MANNUCCI, A. MARASCO, M. MINGOZZI, R. MAIOLINO, G. TOZZI, C. FERUGLIO, M. BISCHETTI, B. BALMAVERDE, V. MAINIERI, M. BRUSA, F. FIORE, ET AL.







1)  $M_{BH}$ - $L_{bul}$ ,  $M_{BH}$ - $\sigma_{bul}$ ,  $M_{BH}$ - $M_{bul}$  scaling relations

3) SFR similar to BH accretion history



# WHY AGN FEEDBACK?

### 4) Galaxy luminosity function

Cosmic Baryon Fraction ( $\Omega_{\rm b}/\Omega_0 = 0.15$  from WMAP)



Stellar feedback cannot explain missing massive galaxies (e.g. Murray+05, Di Matteo+05, Hopkins+06,18, Croton+06, Menci+08, Sijacki+15, Schaye+15 ...)



# EVIDENCES FOR AGN FEEDBACK?

Do we have convincing observational evidence for AGN outflows effectively quenching star formation?

- AGN activity.
- study of high redshift / high L outflows

\* Outflows at cosmic noon (z~2): AGN outflows during the peak of SF and

\* Outflows nowadays (low z): outflow in nearby AGN as laboratories for the



## IONISED OUTFLOWS IN Z~2 QUASARS anti-correlation of fast outflows and SF in host galaxies



Carniani+15,17

arcsec

Cresci et al. 2015, Brusa et al. 2018







## IONISED OUTFLOWS IN Z~2 QUASARS anti-correlation of fast outflows and SF in host galaxies





arcsec







Cresci et al. 2015, Brusa et al. 2018









## IONISED OUTFLOWS IN Z~2 QUASARS anti-correlation of fast outflows and SF in host galaxies











Cresci et al. 2015, Brusa et al. 2018















- Ionized outflows -> [OIII] 5007 (H)
- Star formation -> H (K)

### http://www.super-survey.org

Molecular gas content in AGN host and outflow impact  $\rightarrow$  Circosta et al. submitted

## CONNECTING LARGE SCALE WITH NUCLEAR OUTFLOWS AT Z~1.5







# MAGNUM: MEASURING ACTIVE GALACTIC NUCLEI UNDER MUSE MICROSCOPE

- \* Targeting Nearby AGNs (D < 50 Mpc) with VLT/MUSE
- \* Seeing limited (~1"): 15 pc (@4Mpc) 115 pc (@30Mpc)
- \* So far 9 objects observed (900,000 spectra!!), more to come
- \* Multi-wavelength data available: Chandra, XMM-Newton, Galex, HST, Spitzer, Herschel, ALMA, Radio...



# NGC 1365: DOUBLE-CONICAL OUTFLOW

## Outflow spatially traced by motions deviating from rotation

![](_page_9_Figure_2.jpeg)

[OIII] velocity

![](_page_9_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_7.jpeg)

### Venturi et al. 2018

# NGC 1365: DOUBLE-CONICAL OUTFLOW

## Outflow spatially traced by motions deviating from rotation

![](_page_10_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_3.jpeg)

 $\Delta RA [arcsecs]$ 

![](_page_10_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_8.jpeg)

[OIII] velocity

### Venturi et al. 2018

# NGC 1365: DOUBLE-CONICAL OUTFLOW

## Outflow spatially traced by motions deviating from rotation

![](_page_11_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_3.jpeg)

 $\Delta RA [arcsecs]$ 

![](_page_11_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_8.jpeg)

[OIII] velocity

### Venturi et al. 2018

![](_page_11_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_2.jpeg)

### Green: [OIII] Red: Ha Blue: stars

### **IC 5063** FOV ~ 14 kpc

![](_page_13_Picture_2.jpeg)

### **NGC 5643** FOV ~ 5 kpc

![](_page_13_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_5.jpeg)

Radio jet contours

### Broad linewidths (outflows/turbulence) perpendicular to AGN cones and radio jet!

# OUTFLOWS VS JETS

### **NGC 1386** FOV ~ 5 kpc

![](_page_13_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_13.jpeg)

### Venturi et al. 20, in prep.

![](_page_13_Picture_15.jpeg)

### Green: [OIII] Red: Ha Blue: stars

### IC 5063 FOV ~ 14 kpc

![](_page_14_Picture_2.jpeg)

### **NGC 5643** FOV ~ 5 kpc

![](_page_14_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_5.jpeg)

# OUTFLOWS VS JETS

![](_page_14_Picture_10.jpeg)

### Venturi et al. 20, in prep.

Broad linewidths (outflows/turbulence) perpendicular to AGN cones and radio jet!

![](_page_14_Picture_13.jpeg)

## DISENTANGLING OUTFLOW AND DISK PROPERTIES

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

Mingozzi et al. 2019

![](_page_15_Picture_3.jpeg)

NGC 4945

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

## MAGNUM SURVEY: OUTFLOW STRUCTURE

### Circinus

[OIII] velocity - Stellar velocity

![](_page_16_Figure_6.jpeg)

NGC 4945

![](_page_17_Figure_2.jpeg)

## MAGNUM SURVEY: OUTFLOW STRUCTURE

### Circinus

[OIII] velocity - Stellar velocity

![](_page_17_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_8.jpeg)

NGC 4945

![](_page_18_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_5.jpeg)

## MAGNUM SURVEY: OUTFLOW STRUCTURE

### Circinus

![](_page_18_Figure_8.jpeg)

A simple kinematical model: hollow cone

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_4.jpeg)

# MAGNUM SURVEY: OUTFLOW STRUCTURE

But velocity fields are complex: real motions or effect of clumpy line emission?

> A hollow conical outflow?

![](_page_19_Picture_8.jpeg)

## Circinus

[OIII] velocity - Stellar velocity

![](_page_19_Figure_11.jpeg)

A simple kinematical model: hollow cone

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

- \* Montecarlo "cloud" model, assumed velocity field
- (e.g. beam smearing, binning, etc.)
- \*assumption of velocity field

\* Takes into account all geometrical projection effects and observational effects

\* Weigh clouds according to measured flux in spaxel where cloud is "observed" Extremely versatile: allow tomographic reconstruction of 3D structure following

![](_page_21_Picture_1.jpeg)

- \* Montecarlo "cloud" model, assumed velocity field
- (e.g. beam smearing, binning, etc.)
- \*assumption of velocity field

\* Takes into account all geometrical projection effects and observational effects

\* Weigh clouds according to measured flux in spaxel where cloud is "observed" Extremely versatile: allow tomographic reconstruction of 3D structure following

### Circinus galaxy - MUSE observations, MAGNUM survey

![](_page_22_Figure_2.jpeg)

Marconi et al., in prep.

Wrong cone orientation + aperture, outflow

### Circinus galaxy - MUSE observations, MAGNUM survey

![](_page_23_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_4.jpeg)

With right cone geometry and outflow velocity model reproduces observations

### Marconi et al., in prep.

### Circinus galaxy - MUSE observations, MAGNUM survey

![](_page_24_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_3.jpeg)

## Model

With right cone geometry and outflow velocity model reproduces observations

### NGC4945 MUSE observations, MAGNUM survey

![](_page_25_Figure_2.jpeg)

Line velocity-integrated Map

![](_page_25_Figure_4.jpeg)

20

25

15

10

-5

0

-5

Model Unweighted

Observed

Model Flux Weighted

L.O.S Velocity Map

![](_page_25_Figure_8.jpeg)

L.O.S Velocity Map

![](_page_25_Figure_10.jpeg)

L.O.S Velocity Map

![](_page_25_Figure_12.jpeg)

Velocity Dispersion Map

![](_page_25_Figure_14.jpeg)

Velocity Dispersion Map

![](_page_25_Figure_16.jpeg)

Velocity Dispersion Map

![](_page_25_Figure_18.jpeg)

## NEXT GENERATION OF KINEMATICAL MODELS Models feature constant velocity field, complexity is given by clumpiness!

![](_page_26_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_3.jpeg)

## NEXT GENERATION OF KINEMATICAL MODELS Models feature constant velocity field, complexity is given by clumpiness!

![](_page_27_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_3.jpeg)

## NEXT GENERATION OF KINEMATICAL MODELS Models feature constant velocity field, complexity is given by clumpiness!

![](_page_28_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_3.jpeg)

- \* Outflows are impacting host galaxies (disturbed kinematics, filaments, cavities, positive and negative feedback)
- \* But overall effects are not significant: we are missing the evidence that AGN outflows are significantly quenching SF  $\rightarrow$  may work slowly on long timescales ...
- \* Complexity and spatial resolution of new IFU data require a new approach to model kinematics and to infer outflow properties

# CONCLUSIONS

![](_page_29_Figure_4.jpeg)