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Understanding Clustered Star Formation

**Question**

What is the clustering of stars at birth (and after)?

**Key Issues**

- “Typical” length-scales of Stellar Clustering.
- Time-scale for Star Formation / Structure survival.
- What processes determine these parameters?

**Requirement**

Complete samples of resolved young stellar populations
The MW – Magellanic Clouds System
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The Star-Forming Complex NGC 346

NGC 346 (N66) in the SMC
HST Program GO-10248 (PI: A. Nota)

60% of the star formation occurred earlier than ~ 5 Gyr ago
(Cignoni et al. 2011 AJ, 141, 31)

Photometric Catalogs:
Nota et al. 2006 ApJL, 640, 29
Gouliermis et al. 2006 ApJS, 166, 549

Credit: NASA/ESA HST & A. Nota (STScI)
Stellar Clustering in NGC 346


PMS Stars Sub-Clusters

- Ten individual stellar structures
- One dominant aggregate
- Sizes: 1 – 20 pc
- Stellar Numbers: few – ~1500
- Brightness: $V = 20 – 10^{\text{mag}}$
- ~ 70% PMS stars within 1σ
- ~ 40% Clustered PMS stars (2σ)
- $Q = 0.59 – 0.93$
- Substructure in 70% of clusters
Stellar Clustering Morphology in NGC 346

Gouliermis, Hony & Klessen 2014 (MNRAS, 439, 3775)
Stellar Clustering and Star Formation

Different Stages of Cluster formation
Correlation and Anti-correlation of IR peaks with PMS Sub-clusters

- Obvious relation between stellar clustering and SF centers.
- Connection between stellar and ISM morphology.
- YSO candidates indicate that SF is ongoing.

Characterizing Clustering with the Q-Param

**Minimal Spanning Tree and Q**  

\[
Q = \frac{\text{MST mean edge-length}}{\text{Average separation}} = \frac{m}{\langle s \rangle / R_c}
\]

\[Q_{\text{NGC346}} \approx 0.8\]

The \(Q\)-Parameter method is inconclusive in determining the nature of NGC 346
The Autocorrelation Function (ACF)


\[
1 + \xi(r) = \frac{1}{nN} \sum_{i=1}^{N} n_i(r)
\]


The fractal dimension \(D_2\) of the structure is related to the autocorrelation function slope (power-law index) \(\eta\) as:

\[
D_2 = \eta + 2
\]

Typical values of turbulent-driven hierarchy in the ISM: \(D_2 = 1.3 – 1.5\)
The ACF of NGC 346

At $r \leq 6$ pc

\[ 1 + \xi(r) \propto r^{-0.18} \]

\[ D_2 \approx 1.8 \]

At $6 \leq r \leq 20$ pc

\[ 1 + \xi(r) \propto r^{-0.58} \]

\[ D_2 \approx 1.4 \]
Characterizing Clustering is strenuous

Stellar Pair Separations PDF

\[ p(r_j) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{2N_{ij}}{N(N - 1)dr} \]

- The separations PDF gives false evidence of a condensed cluster!
The ACF of Centrally Condensed Clusters


\[
f(r) = f_0 \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{r}{\alpha} \right)^2 \right]^{-\gamma/2} + f_{\text{field}}, \quad r_c = \alpha \left( 2^{2/\gamma} - 1 \right)^{1/2}
\]
Surface Density Profiles can be misleading

- A good-fitting density profile misinterprets stellar clustering.
- The Autocorrelation function is a more robust representation.
Synthetic Self-Similar Distributions

Box-counting algorithm

\[ D = \frac{\ln N_{\text{ran}}}{\ln N_{\text{div}}} \]

\[ N_{\text{ran}} = N_{\text{div}}^D \]

\[ N_{\text{div}} : N_{\text{div}}^3 \text{ number of total subcubes} \]

\[ N_{\text{ran}} : \text{Number of cubes to be further divided} \]
NGC 346 is a Centrally Condensed Cluster …

… embedded in a Fractal Stellar Distribution

Gouliermis, Hony & Klessen 2014 (MNRAS, 439, 3775)

Best-Models Parameters:
- $r_c \approx 9''$ (2.5 pc)
- $\gamma = 2.2 - 2.35$
- $D_3 \approx 2.3$
- $f_{cl} \approx 40$
- Power-law break at $\sim 6$ pc

Shift in the correlated properties of young stars on scales $< 100$ pc.
Implications in our Understanding of CSF

The Origin of the bimodal distribution can be due to …

- **Nature:** Bimodal star formation (clustered + distributed).
  (Bonnell et al. 2011)
- **Nurture:** Dynamically merging sub-structures
  (Klessen & Burkert 2000; Bonnell, Bate & Vine 2003)

… and depends on the initial conditions (Parker et al. 2013)
Sub-structured *super-virial* agglomerations can evolve to systems like NGC 346

Implications about Self-similar Distributions

- Turbulent-Induced Hierarchy produces $D_3 \sim 1.5 – 2.5$.
- However, early dynamical evolution will partly erase substructure
  (Scally & Clarke 2002; Goodwin & Whitworth 2004)

- How much of the original Hierarchy has been retained in the last 3 to 5 Myr?
Star counts follow roughly the gas, i.e., dust column density.

See Sacha Hony’s talk later today.
Clusters typically form in Groups

(a) 8 µm (PAH and dust emission).
Blue contours: CO emission (Wong et al. 2011).  

(b) [OII]+[OIII]+Hα

Credit: F. Comeron and N. Delmotte (ESO).
Take-away messages

• Stellar clustering at birth is complex.
• Analysis methods require simulations.
• Clusters are born in Clusters.
• Bimodal stellar clustering on GMC-scales verified.
• Scale where Gravity prevails identified at few pc.
• Turbulence induces self-similar stellar topology in SF regions.