Modelling recombinations during cosmological reionization
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ABSTRACT
An ionization front expanding into a neutral medium can be slowed down significantly by recombinations. In cosmological numerical simulations the recombination rate is often computed using a ‘clumping factor’ that takes into account that not all scales in the simulated density field are resolved. Here we demonstrate that using a single value of the clumping factor significantly overestimates the recombination rate, and how a local estimate of the clumping factor is both easy to compute, and gives significantly better numerical convergence. We argue that this lower value of the recombination rate is more relevant during the reionization process and hence that the importance of recombinations during reionization has been overestimated.
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1 INTRODUCTION
The intergalactic medium (IGM) is highly ionized by the ultraviolet (UV) background produced by QSOs and galaxies, at least since \( z \sim 6 \) (Gunn & Peterson 1965; Haardt & Madau 1996; Rauch 1998). Reionization – the transition from neutral to ionized – occurred around \( z_{\text{reion}} \sim 10 \), according to the Thomson optical depth inferred from the cosmic microwave background (see Komatsu et al. 2011, for 7-year WMAP result). Reionization starts when the first sources of ionizing photons form small, isolated H II regions around them. As more and increasingly luminous sources form, ionized regions become larger and more numerous, until they eventually percolate space, signalling the end of the epoch of reionization (EoR, Arons 1972; Giroux & Shapiro 1996; Haardt & Madau 1996; Gnedin & Ostriker 1997; Haiman & Loeb 1997, see recent reviews by e.g. Barkana & Loeb 2001; Ciardi & Ferrara 2005; Loeb, Ferrara & Ellis 2008).

The nature of the sources of ionizing photons is currently unknown, with ‘first stars’, early galaxies, and black hole accretion, probably all contributing to some extent (e.g. Madau, Haardt & Rees 1999). We recently demonstrated that the early population of galaxies predicted by Durham’s GALFORM model produce enough ionizing photons to complete reionization by \( z \sim 10 \) (Raičević, Theuns & Lacey 2011). The same model also matches very well the luminosity function of redshift \( z \sim 7–10 \) galaxies recently discovered by the Hubble Space Telescope (Bouwens et al. 2008, 2011). In this model, the bulk of photons are produced in low-mass \( (M_\star \sim 10^6 h^{-1} M_\odot) \), gas-rich, faint galaxies (rest-frame UV magnitude \( M_{1500,\text{AB}} \sim -16 \)) during a star bursts \( (M_\star \sim 0.04 h^{-1} M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1}) \) induced by a merger.

The fraction \( \mathcal{R} \) of photons emitted per H I necessary to complete reionization is \( \mathcal{R} = (1 + N_{\text{rec}}) f_{\text{esc}} \), where \( f_{\text{esc}} \) is the fraction of ionizing photons that can escape their host galaxies and \( N_{\text{rec}} \) is the average number of recombinations per HI. We distinguish between recombinations that occur in (i) mini-haloes, (ii) Lyman-limit systems (LLS) and (iii) in the general IGM. Mini-haloes are small high-density clouds that are too cold to form stars via atomic line cooling. The presence of mini-haloes can have a significant effect on the propagation and size of H II regions during reionization (Furlanetto & Oh 2005; McQuinn et al. 2007). However, when overrun by an ionization front their gas will be photoheated and they will eventually evaporate (Shapiro, Iliev & Raga 2004; Iliev, Shapiro & Raga 2005a; Ciardi et al. 2006), which decreases their importance in the later stages and after reionization. On the other hand, Lyman-limit systems have sufficiently high column densities, \( N_{\text{HI}} \gtrsim 10^{17} \text{cm}^{-2} \), to self-shield. Ionizing photons impinging on such optically thick systems get converted to (non-ionizing) Lyman-\( \alpha \) radiation at high efficiency (Hogan & Weymann 1987; Rauch et al. 2008). These larger systems determine the mean free path of ionizing photons in the post-reionization era (e.g. Miralda-Escude 2003). Below we will concentrate on the third source of recombinations, those occurring in the IGM.

The recombination rate per unit volume, \( \dot{n}_{\text{rec}} \), depends on the particle density squared, \( \dot{n}_{\text{rec}} = \alpha x^2 n^2 \), where \( x \) is the mean ionized fraction, and hence varies throughout the inhomogeneous IGM. Early semi-analytical models of reionization used a mean recombination rate, with the IGM inhomogeneity expressed in terms of a ‘clumping factor’ \( C \), \( \dot{n}_{\text{rec}} = \alpha x^2 (n^2) = \alpha x^2 C(n^2) \) (e.g. Giroux & Shapiro 1996; Ciardi & Ferrara 1997; Haiman & Loeb 1997; Tegmark et al. 1997; Madau et al. 1999; Valageas & Silk 1999).

Numerical simulations of Gnedin & Ostriker (1997) yielded high estimates of \( C \sim 10 \) (40) at redshifts \( z = 8 \) (5), implying that
recombinations are generally quite important. Similar values have been used in the estimate of the comoving star formation rate density needed to keep the post-reionization Universe ionized by balancing ionizations with recombinations. The inferred value,

$$\dot{n}_e \approx 0.03 \frac{M_\odot}{yr^{-1} Mpc^{-3}} \times \frac{1}{f_{esc}} \left( \frac{1 + z}{8} \right)^3 \left( \frac{\Omega_b h^2_0}{0.0457} \right)^2 \left( \frac{C}{30} \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)$$

(e.g. Madau et al. 1999) is significantly higher at $z \sim 7$ than some currently observationally inferred rates (e.g. Bunker et al. 2010).

Current numerical simulations model reionization by directly following the propagation of ionization fronts through the inhomogeneous IGM, thus in principle eliminating the need for a clumping factor (e.g. Sokasian, Abel & Hernquist 2001; Ciardi, Stoehr & White 2003; Iliév et al. 2006; McQuinn et al. 2007; Trac & Cen 2007). However, the resolution of the radiative transfer (RT) calculation in general much coarser than that of the density field on which the sources are identified (e.g. Iliév et al. 2010), and a single clumping factor, usually derived from higher resolution small box runs, is used to take account of the density structure below the resolution of the RT mesh (e.g. Ciardi et al. 2003; Iliév et al. 2007).

In this Letter we will show that a single value of the clumping factor is, in fact, not appropriate for estimating the recombination rate in numerical RT reionization simulations, and leads to a significant overestimate of the importance of recombinations.

2 DEFINITION OF THE CLUMPING FACTOR

The recombination rate of Hydrogen-only gas in a volume $V$ is

$$N_{\text{rec}} = \alpha \int_V n_{H}^2 dV = \alpha C \langle n_{H}^2 \rangle V,$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)$$

where $\alpha$ is the recombination coefficient, $n_{H}$ the hydrogen number density, $C \equiv \langle n_{H}^2 \rangle / \langle n_{H} \rangle^2$ the clumping factor, and we assumed the gas to be fully ionized ($n_{H} = n_{H0}$); the angular brackets denote a volume average.

Most current numerical models of reionization follow the formation of dark matter structures in a cosmological setting, compute emissivities of galaxies associated with dark matter haloes, then follow how these galaxies ionize their surroundings with a RT calculation (Ciardi et al. 2003; Iliév et al. 2006; McQuinn et al. 2007; Trac & Cen 2007; Račić et al., in preparation). Our method in this Letter is designed to reproduce the steps taken to set up RT computational meshes in such simulations.

We use a dark matter simulation performed with the Tree-PM code GADGET-2 (Springel 2005). The simulation uses 1024$^3$ equal-mass particles in a periodic cosmological volume of size 20 $h^{-1}$ comoving Mpc, assuming a flat $\Lambda$CDM cosmology with cosmological parameters $\Omega_m$, $\Omega_b$, $\Omega_{\Lambda}$, $h$, $\sigma_8$, $n_s = [0.25, 0.045, 0.75, 0.73, 0.9, 1]$. Baryons are assumed to trace the dark matter, and hence the gas density $\rho_g$ is related to the matter density $\rho$ as $\rho_g = (\Omega_g / \Omega_m) \rho$. The matter density $\rho$ at the position $r_i$ of particle $i$ is estimated using the SPH algorithm (Gingold & Monaghan 1977; Lucy 1977),

$$\rho(r_i) = \sum_j m_j W \left( \frac{|r_i - r_j|}{h_i} \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)$$

where $m_i$ is the particle mass, and $h_i$ its ‘resolution length’ chosen so that it holds $\sim 40$ neighbouring particles $j$ that contribute to the sum; $W$ is the smoothing kernel. The (Hydrogen) number density is computed as $n_{H} = (1 - Y) \rho_g / m_p$, where $Y$ is the primordial Helium abundance by mass and $m_p$ is the proton mass.

Assigning a volume $V_i \approx m_i / \rho$, to particle $i$, allows us to compute the mean clumping factor as

$$C = \frac{1}{N_{\text{part}}} \sum_i \frac{n_{H,0}}{n_{H,0}} \sum_i \frac{1}{n_{H,0}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)$$

where $N_{\text{part}}$ is the number of particles in volume $V$ with number density lower than a given threshold density $n_{th}$. We use $n_{th} = \Delta n_{th}(n_{H})$ with $\Delta n_{th} = 100$, to exclude collapsed haloes from the IGM density field (see e.g. Miralda-Escude, Haehnelt & Rees 2000; Miralda-Escude 2003; Pawlik, Schaye & van der Schermen 2009). Baryons in haloes do not trace the dark matter but collapse to form galaxies. Due to their high densities, galaxies should not be treated as general IGM, but rather as LLS and their effect on the propagation of ionizing radiation described in terms of a mean free path, as in e.g. Madau, Meiksin & Rees (1997). We chose the overdensity threshold of $\Delta n_{th} = 100$ appropriate for the density at the virial radius of a halo, and also to allow for a direct comparison to other works (e.g. Pawlik et al. 2009).

Finally, the RT calculations for large-scale reionization models are usually performed on a uniform cubic mesh, with the density at each mesh point obtained from the $N$-body particles using, for example, nearest grid point interpolation (e.g. Hockney & Eastwood 1988). We employ several such grids in the following discussion. The details of the particular simulation we use, and the way we compute densities, are not important as far as our conclusions on recombinations are concerned.

3 THE LOCAL CLUMPING

We will make a distinction between two types of clumping factors in the following discussion, both based on equation (4). The global clumping factor, $C_{\text{global}}$, is computed by summing over all particles, as is done in e.g. Iliév, Scannapieco & Shapiro (2005b); Iliév et al. (2007) and Pawlik et al. (2009). However, we can also divide the computational volume in (equal volume, non-overlapping) subvolumes, i.e. a uniform mesh, and evaluate $C$ in each subvolume (mesh cell) by summing only over particles in that subvolume. We will call this a local clumping factor, $C_{\text{local}}$.

We compare $C_{\text{global}}$ and $C_{\text{local}}$ computed on 64$^3$ equal subvolumes of our 1024$^3$ particles, 20 $h^{-1}$ Mpc aside simulation box in Fig. 1. Our value for $C_{\text{global}}$ is in reasonable agreement with that obtained by Iliév et al. (2007), even though the relations are derived from significantly different $N$-body runs. Interestingly however, at any $z$, there is a large range of values of $C_{\text{local}}$, up to more than a factor of 10 at $z = 5$. In addition also the mean value of $C_{\text{local}}$ in all subvolumes of the simulation box is significantly lower than that of $C_{\text{global}}$. Clearly, a single value of $C$ is not able to characterize the recombination rate in every region of a simulation.

The mean $C_{\text{local}}$ in subvolumes with a given overdensity $\Delta$ is shown in Fig. 2. This type of $C(\Delta)$ relation was not previously discussed in the literature. The highest values of $C_{\text{local}}$ are found in subvolumes with intermediate overdensity, because clumping is a measure of inhomogeneity in the density field. Therefore high clumping is found in subvolumes that contain high gradients in the density field, for example, small high-density haloes in a low-density region, or the transition between a filament and a void.

1 The choice of the volume subdivision is motivated by simplicity. Our conclusions are not dependent on the shape of the mesh.

2 Note that in general the mean density in each subvolume will be different as well.
of studying the effects on a full RT reionization run, we show a
plies that the recombination rate is not accurate, and hence that
the total recombination rate.

Improving the sampling of the density field by using smaller sub-
volumes, decreases the peak amplitude in \(C_{\text{local}}\), and moves the
maximum toward higher overdensity regions, but does not change
the general shape of the distribution. The general shape is also not
strongly affected by the choice of \(\Delta_{\text{th}}\). Note that the recombi-
nation rate, which is \(\propto C_{\text{local}}^{\Delta - 2}\), is still highest in the highest density
regions. However, the use of \(C_{\text{local}}\) distribution shown in Fig. 2
increases the relative contribution of moderately overdense regions
to the total recombination rate.

An inaccurate estimate of the clumping factor of course also im-
plies that the recombination rate is not accurate, and hence that
the speed of ionization fronts are not computed correctly. Instead of studying the effects on a full RT reionization run, we show a
simpler example by calculating recombination rates in the 20 \(h^{-1}\)
Mpc, 1024\(^3\) particles simulation box at redshift \(z = 5\), including densities up to a threshold of \(\Delta_{\text{th}} = 100\) and assuming that all
gas is fully ionized. We can sum the recombination rate per parti-
cle, \(N_{\text{rec,i}} = \alpha (m/m_P^2) \rho_{g,i}\), over all particles \(i\), to get the total
recombination rate, \(N_{\text{rec,correct}} = \sum N_{\text{rec,i}}\). This is the ‘correct’ re-
combination rate as it takes into account all the available density
field information from the \(N\)-body simulation. We compare the
value of \(N_{\text{rec,correct}}\) to values obtained by first interpolating particle
densities to a mesh as described in Section 2, and computing the sum of \(N_{\text{local}}\) in each mesh cell using different expressions for
the clumping factor (Fig. 3). Not using a clumping factor (yellow bars)
shows the effect of the density field smoothing by the mesh as the recombination rates are both underestimated (a factor of two
even at the highest grid resolution) and strongly mesh resolution
dependent. On the other hand, when the global clumping \(C_{\text{global}}\) is
used to represent the subgrid matter distribution (red bars), it signifi-
cantly overestimates the recombination rate while not remedying
the dependence on mesh resolution. This is no surprise as a single
value of clumping simply linearly increases the no clumping result.
Crucially, using the locally estimated clumping factor, \(C_{\text{local}}\) (blue bars), leads to a much more accurate and resolution independent
description of recombinations (within \(\sim 25\) per cent of \(N_{\text{rec,correct}}\) on
all grid resolutions). Note that the assumption of a fully ionized
simulation box is a special case, chosen for illustrative purposes. A
more relevant case for the study of reionization is a partially ionized
cosmological density field. The most important consequence of us-
using \(C_{\text{local}}\) instead of \(C_{\text{global}}\) is a much lower average recombination
rate, for whichever overdensity regions are ionized at any time. The
convergence of recombination rates obtained in Fig. 3 with the use
of \(C_{\text{local}}\) also leads to the convergence of I-front speeds during reion-
ization as we will show in Raičević et al. (in preparation), where we
also discuss the ionized fraction as a function of overdensity during
reionization. Also, \(C_{\text{local}}\) is computed assuming a full ionization and
does not provide a perfectly accurate recombination rate estimate
for partially ionized subvolumes. Therefore, the use of a higher res-
olution RT computational mesh is always preferable to employing
any kind of clumping.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Clumping factors are often used in simulations of reionization to
represent the unresolved matter inhomogeneity, below the compu-
tational mesh resolution, which may significantly contribute to
the recombination rates (e.g. Ciardi et al. 2003; Iliev et al. 2007;
McQuinn et al. 2007). Here we have shown that, because the den-
sity field during reionization is so inhomogeneous, using a single
clumping factor in general leads to a significant over estimate of the
recombination rate (factors of several), which may in fact get
worse as the grid resolution is improved. As a consequence the
speed of ionization fronts is artificially depressed, reionization de-
layed and the outcome of the RT simulations significantly resolution
dependent.

Figure 1. Evolution of the clumping factor in a simulation with 1024\(^3\)
particles in a 20 \(h^{-1}\) Mpc box, neglecting particles with overdensities higher
than a threshold value of \(\Delta_{\text{th}} = 100\). The solid black line shows the global
clumping factor, which follows reasonably well the result obtained by Iliev
et al. (2007; black dotted line). We then divide the volume in 64 \(3\) equal
subvolumes and compute the local clumping factor in each of them. The
dashed line shows the mean local clumping factor, with the 50 per cent (99
per cent) percentiles indicated by the red (green) shaded region. Clearly
there is a large scatter in \(C_{\text{local}}\), and its mean value is significantly lower than
that of the global clumping factor.

Figure 2. Mean local clumping factor \((C_{\text{local}})\) as a function of the overden-
sity \(\Delta\) of the subvolume, at redshift \(z = 5\), for various subdivisions of the
computational volume; the corresponding cell sizes are 625, 312.5, 156.25
and 78.125 \(h^{-1}\) kpc. Coarser subcells yield higher values of \((C_{\text{local}})\) at a given
overdensity and \((C_{\text{local}})\) peaks at intermediate values of the overdensity. The
value of \(C_{\text{global}}\) is shown as a black dotted line.
still depends on the volume over which it is computed (i.e. equal subvolumes. However, both ignored the fact that clumping density dependence by splitting their simulation volumes into eight and also Kohler, Gnedin & Hamilton (2007) took into account some expensive.

per particle directly (Trac & Cen 2007), is far more computationally dependence. The alternative of computing the recombination rate simulations of reionization must include both density and volume argue that any future fits of clumping factors aimed for use in RT mass of the photoionized IGM (Pawlik et al. 2009). We therefore the structures are resolved, and should ideally be close to the Jeans solving the mesh used (see Fig. 3). In our dark matter-only simulations the cell size should be such that most of the subvolumes), and that dependence is not negligible as shown in Fig. 2. Not taking the volume into account will always lead to worse at improved sampling. Finally using a locally estimated clumping factor (C\textsubscript{local}; blue bars) gives a much more accurate value of \( \dot{N\textsubscript{rec}} \), which is also nearly independent of the sampling resolution.

McQuinn et al. (2007) improved on this issue by analytically deriving the clumping factor as a function of overdensity, \( C = C(\Delta) \), and also Kohler, Gnedin & Hamilton (2007) took into account some density dependence by splitting their simulation volumes into eight equal subvolumes. However, both ignored the fact that clumping still depends on the volume over which it is computed (i.e. the size of the subvolumes), and that dependence is not negligible as shown in Fig. 2. Not taking the volume into account will always lead to the RT results depending on the computational mesh resolution.

Fortunately it is not computationally intensive to compute a local clumping factor on a reasonably fine grid. The recombination rate obtained using this clumping factor is very close to the ‘correct’ value inferred directly form the particles themselves, and is not very sensitive to the resolution of the mesh used (see Fig. 3). In our dark matter-only simulations the cell size should be such that most of the structures are resolved, and should ideally be close to the Jeans mass of the photoionized IGM (Pawlik et al. 2009). We therefore argue that any future fits of clumping factors aimed for use in RT simulations of reionization must include both density and volume dependence. The alternative of computing the recombination rate per particle directly (Trac & Cen 2007), is far more computationally expensive.

Acknowledgments

MR would like to thank Garrelt Mellema and Joop Schaye for useful discussions. During the work on this Letter, MR was supported by a grant from Microsoft Research Cambridge.

References

Arons J., Wingert D. W., 1972, ApJ, 177, 1
Barkana R., Loeb A., 2001, Phys. Rep., 349, 125
Bouwens R. J., Illingworth G. D., Franx M., Ford H., 2008, ApJ, 686, 230
Bouwens R. J. et al., 2011, Nat, 469, 504
Bunker A. J. et al., 2010, MNRAS, 409, 855
Ciardi B., Ferrara A., 1997, ApJ, 483, L5
Ciardi B., Ferrara A., 2005, Space Sci. Rev., 116, 625
Ciardi B., Stoehr F., White S. D. M., 2003, MNRAS, 343, 1101
Ciardi B., Scannapieco E., Stoehr F., Ferrara A., Iliev I. T., Shapiro P. R., 2006, MNRAS, 366, 689
Furlanetto S. R., Oh S. P., 2005, MNRAS, 363, 1031
Gingold R. A., Monaghan J. J., 1977, MNRAS, 181, 375
Giroux M. L., Shapiro P. R., 1996, ApJS, 102, 191
Gnedin N. Y., Ostriker J. P., 1997, ApJ, 486, 581
Gunn J. E., Peterson B. A., 1965, ApJ, 142, 1633
Haardt F., Madau P., 1996, ApJ, 461, 20
Haiman Z., Loeb A., 1997, ApJ, 483, 21
Hockney R. W., Eastwood J. W., 1988, Computer Simulation Using Particles. Hilger, Bristol
Hogan C. J., Weymann R. J., 1987, MNRAS, 225, 1
Iliev I. T., Shapiro P. R., Raga A. C., 2005a, MNRAS, 361, 405
Iliev I. T., Scannapieco E., Shapiro P. R., 2005b, ApJ, 624, 491
Iliev I. T., Mellema G., Pen U., Merz H., Shapiro P. R., Alvarez M. A., 2006, MNRAS, 369, 1625
Iliev I. T., Mellema G., Shapiro P. R., Pen U., 2007, MNRAS, 376, 354
Iliev I. T., Ahn K., Koda J., Shapiro P. R., Pen U., 2010, preprint (arXiv:1005.2502)
Kohler K., Gnedin N. Y., Hamilton A. J. S., 2007, ApJ, 657, 15
Komatsu E. et al., 2011, ApJS, 192, 18
Loeb A., Ferrara A., Ellis R. S., 2008, First Light in the Universe: Saas-fee Advanced Course 36. Springer Verlag, Berlin
Lucy L. B., 1977, AJ, 82, 1013
McQuinn M., Lidz A., Zahn O., Dutta S., Hernquist L., Zaldarriaga M., 2007, MNRAS, 377, 1043
Madau P., Meiksin A., Rees M. J., 1997, ApJ, 475, 429
Madau P., Haardt F., Rees M. J., 1999, ApJ, 514, 648
Miralda-Escude J., 2003, ApJ, 597, 66
Miralda-Escude J., Hachnelt M., Rees M. J., 2000, ApJ, 530, 1
Pawlik A. H., Schaye J., van Scherpenzeel E., 2009, MNRAS, 394, 1812
Raichelli M., Theuns T., Lacey C., 2011, MNRAS, 410, 775
Rauch M., 1998, ARA&A, 36, 267
Rauch M. et al., 2008, ApJ, 681, 856
Shapiro P. R., Iliev I. T., Raga A. C., 2004, MNRAS, 348, 735
Sokasian A., Abel T., Hernquist L. E., 2001, New Astron., 6, 359
Springel V., 2005, MNRAS, 364, 1105
Tegmark M., Silk J., Rees M. J., Blanchard A., Abel T., Palla F., 1997, ApJ, 474, 1
Trac H., Cen R., 2007, ApJ, 671, 1
Valageas P., Silk J., 1999, A&A, 347, 1

This paper has been typeset from a \TeX/\LaTeX\ file prepared by the author.