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Why look at feedback in galaxy groups?

- Groups contain >50% of stars in the local Universe and most of the baryons.
- Group environment key to galaxy evolution, in which AGN play an important role.
- AGN Feedback in groups must be fine tuned. Outbursts must be weaker but occur more often (e.g., Gaspari et al. 2011)

![Diagram showing distribution of galaxy mass in groups](image-url)
No useful statistical samples of nearby groups available!

Our sample – 18 groups with Chandra/XMM X-ray data and GMRT low-frequency radio observations, covering a wide range of group and radio galaxy properties.

X-ray provides – 
1) Location/properties of most baryons. 
2) Estimation of energy in cavities, shocks, conduction & cooling rates. 
3) Dynamical limits of age of structures.

Radio provides – 
1) Timescales via Synchrotron aging. 
2) Constraints on source geometry. 
3) Direct view of AGN/gas interactions.
Benefits of low-frequency radio data

Gitti et al. (2010)  
David et al. (2009, 2011)

Smoothed Chandra 0.3-2 keV residual images  
235 MHz GMRT contours

HCG62 cavities are paired, NGC5044 cavities isotropically distributed by gas motions.
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### GMRT Groups sample (Giacintucci et al. 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>Chandra</th>
<th>XMM</th>
<th>150 MHz</th>
<th>235 MHz</th>
<th>327 MHz</th>
<th>610MHz</th>
<th>Papers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UGC 408</td>
<td>0.0147</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>CfA in prep...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 315</td>
<td>0.0165</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 383</td>
<td>0.0170</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 507</td>
<td>0.0165</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 741</td>
<td>0.0185</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Jetha 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCG 15</td>
<td>0.0208</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 1407</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 1587</td>
<td>0.0123</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKW 2</td>
<td>0.0368</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 3411</td>
<td>0.0153</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>O'Sullivan 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 4636</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Jones, O'S, Baldi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCG 62</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Gitti 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 5044</td>
<td>0.0090</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>David 09 &amp; 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 5813</td>
<td>0.0066</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Randall 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 5846</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>SG 08,O'S 10&amp;11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWM4</td>
<td>0.0318</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 6269</td>
<td>0.0348</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Baldi 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC 7626</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Randall 09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Clear cavities**  **Giant sources (too large)**  **Amorphous (no clear lobes)**
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AGN jets: mechanical power vs radio power

- In the local Universe, we can estimate $P_{\text{jet}}$ from cavity enthalpy ($E=4pV$) and buoyancy time.
- Measuring the $P_{\text{jet}}:P_{\text{radio}}$ relation allows us to estimate the amount of feedback from radio alone (e.g., at high redshift).
- Cavagnolo (2010) add 21 ellipticals, but with poor, low-resolution 200-400 MHz data.
- We add 9 groups, with high-quality GMRT 235 MHz data.
AGN jets: mechanical power vs radio power (O’Sullivan et al. 2011)

1.4 GHz

235 MHz

\[ \log(P_{\text{jet}} [10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}]) = \log(P_{\text{radio}} [10^{24} \text{ W Hz}^{-1}]) \]

\[ \text{GMRT + Birzan} \]

\[ \text{gradient}=0.63\pm0.10 \]

\[ \text{Cavagnolo (2010)} \]

\[ \text{gradient}=0.75\pm0.14 \]

\[ \text{Birzan et al. (2008)} \]

\[ \text{gradient}=0.35\pm0.07 \]

Radio Power

- Birzan et al used BCES Y|X fit, Cavagnolo and our fits use BCES orthogonal.
- Using low-frequencies and including groups reduces scatter:
  - Birzan 1.4 GHz: $\sigma_{\text{int}}=0.84$ dex
  - GMRT+Birzan 235 MHz: $\sigma_{\text{int}}=0.58$ dex

Structure in Clusters and Groups of Galaxies in the Chandra Era

Table: Boston, MA, 12 June 2011
AGN jets: mechanical power vs radio power
(O’Sullivan et al. 2011)

• Integrated radio power accounts for differences in spectral index \( \Rightarrow \) improved estimator of jet power.
• Gradient=0.71 identical to 235 MHz relation, \( \sigma_{\text{int}}=0.59 \) dex almost identical.

• Willott et al. (1999) use synchrotron theory to predict gradient = 0.86, assuming spectral index \( \alpha=0.5 \).
• For free spectral index, gradient \( =3/(\alpha+3) \), e.g. gradient=0.76 for our typical \( \alpha=0.95 \).
Mechanical power vs radio power: Caveats

- Cavity power may be a poor measure of jet power!
  - Energy in shocks can be 5-10x energy of cavities.
  - Buoyancy timescale is not always appropriate.
  - Young and old cavities likely to be missed.
  - Jet orientation (factor ~3, Mendygral et al. 2011).
  - AGN weather.
  - Filling factors <1 (c.f. AWM4, O’Sullivan et al. 2010).
- Correcting groups where possible flattens relation.
Power needed to balance cooling:
- In galaxy clusters ~4PV.
- In groups only ~1PV (as for Ellipticals, Nulsen et al 2007).
- Scatter at least factor 4.

Factoring in shocks, AGN power output can reach $P_{\text{jet}} > 10 \ L_{\text{cool}}$
- Most powerful outbursts in this sample still have cool cores.
- But sample is selected to have jet/gas interactions...

(Bolometric $L_X$ for region $t_{\text{cool}} \leq 7.7 \text{ Gyr}$)
**CLoGS: The Complete Local-Volume Groups Sample**

www.sr.bham.ac.uk/~ejos/CLoGS.html

- Complete, optically-selected sample of 53 groups:
  - 4+ galaxies, 1+ early-type
  - D<80 Mpc
  - Dec. > -30° (VLA & GMRT)
- Avoids bias toward cool-core systems in RASS-based X-ray samples (Eckert et al. 2011)
- Goal: complete coverage in X-ray (Chandra/XMM) and radio (GMRT 610 & 235 MHz).
- Richer half of will be almost complete by 2012.
Summary

1. Low-frequency or integrated radio measurements are a more reliable predictor of jet power than $L_{1.4 \text{ GHz}}$.

2. Samples including groups (and ellipticals) provide better constraints on the $P_{\text{jet}}:P_{\text{radio}}$ relations.
   - Best fit gradient $\sim 0.7 \pm 0.1$ with intrinsic scatter $\sim 0.6$ dex.
   - Theoretical predictions of gradient=0.86 may be too steep, impacting estimates of jet feedback at higher redshifts.

3. Uncertainties on the mechanical power output of jets are large (factor of $\sim 10$).
   - further work needed to get reliable jet power estimates.

4. Energy available from AGN much more than is needed to balance cooling in groups.
   - What happens to the other 3PV? How does feedback in clusters and groups differ?