Do Quasars Dominate the UV Background at z > 4?

Gábor Worseck (MPIA)

&

Girish Kulkarni (Cambridge), Joe Hennawi (MPIA)

Illuminating the Dark Ages Heidelberg, June 27 – July 1, 2016

Reionization Events – Two Baryonic Phase Transitions



Credits: NASA

The QSO Contribution to the UV Background

- Goal: Relative contribution from QSOs and galaxies to UV background measured from the Lyα forest
- Photoionization rate: $\Gamma_{HI}(z) = \int_{\nu_{g12}}^{\infty} \frac{4\pi J_{\nu}(\nu,z)}{h\nu} \sigma_{HI}(\nu) d\nu$
- z > 4: MFP \ll Horizon \rightarrow local-source approximation

 $4\pi J_{
u}(
u,z)\simeq\lambda_{\mathrm{mfp}}(
u,z)\left(1+z
ight)^{3}\epsilon_{
u}(
u,z)$



1. The Mean Free Path to Lyman Continuum Photons

• Rest-frame stacks of QSO spectra $\longrightarrow \lambda_{mfp,912}(z)$ $\lambda_{mfp}(\nu, z) \approx \lambda_{mfp,912}(z) \left(\frac{\nu}{\nu_{912}}\right)^{1.5} = 37 \left(\frac{1+z}{5}\right)^{-5.4} \left(\frac{\nu}{\nu_{912}}\right)^{1.5} pMpc$



2. QSOs Have Hard SEDs

• No SED break at $\lambda \sim 1200 \text{\AA} \longrightarrow$ Emissivity increases by $\sim 30\%$



3. Reassessment of the QSO UV Luminosity Function

- MCMC analysis of 2 < z < 6 QSO UV luminosity function data
- Homogenous re-analysis (K correction, targets, selection functions)
- All QLF parameters evolve with redshift
- Scatter of parameters in small z intervals \rightarrow survey systematics



Are QSOs dominatating the UV background?

- QSO emissivity depends on M_{*} and faint end slope
- Faint end of z > 4 QSO luminosity function poorly determined
- Severe systematics in selection functions (factor 2–5 at z = 5)
- Current data: UV background not QSO-dominated at *z* > 4



G. Worseck (MPIA)

Fluctuating Gunn-Peterson troughs



Far UV: He II at $z \sim 3.5$



Do Quasars Dominate the UV Background at z > 4?

He II transmission spikes at $z \sim 3.5$

- Unexpected based on handful of pre-COS He II spectra
- Unexpected based on quasar-driven He II reionization models
- Possibly due to transverse proximity effect (Tobias Schmidt's poster)



- Measurements: He II effective optical depth on \sim 10 proper Mpc
- $z \lesssim 2.7$: Agreement with semi-analytic model of photoionized IGM



- Measurements: He II effective optical depth on \sim 10 proper Mpc
- $z \lesssim$ 2.7: Agreement with semi-analytic model of photoionized IGM
- 2.7 \lesssim *z* \lesssim 3: Gradual increase & scatter reproduced for *z*_{reion} \simeq 2.7 (McQuinn et al. 2009)



- Measurements: He II effective optical depth on \sim 10 proper Mpc
- $z \lesssim 2.7$: Agreement with semi-analytic model of photoionized IGM
- 2.7 ≤ z ≤ 3: Gradual increase & scatter reproduced for z_{reion} ≃ 2.7 (McQuinn et al. 2009)
- $z \sim 3.2$: low effective optical depths, gradual He II reionization



- Measurements: He $\scriptstyle II$ effective optical depth on \sim 10 proper Mpc
- $z \lesssim 2.7$: Agreement with semi-analytic model of photoionized IGM
- 2.7 \lesssim *z* \lesssim 3: Gradual increase & scatter reproduced for *z*_{reion} \simeq 2.7 (McQuinn et al. 2009)
- $z \sim 3.2$: low effective optical depths, gradual He II reionization
- $z \sim 3.6$: One third of the IGM consistent with $\sim 1\%$ He II fraction \rightarrow He II reionization well underway at $z \sim 4$



- Reassessment of QSO UV luminosity function at z > 2
 - Homogeneous MCMC analysis of QSO UV luminosity function data
 - Redshift evolution of QLF parameters —> QSO emissivity
- UV background may not be dominated by QSOs at *z* > 4
 - Survey selection functions disagree for the same survey!
 - Large surveys need sophisicated modeling of selection effects
- Early and extended He II reionization by faint QSOs?
 - 25 He II sightlines probing 2.3 < z < 3.8
 - Low effective optical depths
 - \longrightarrow One third of the pathlength fully reionized at $z \sim 3.6$
 - \rightarrow He II reionization must have begun at $z \gg 4$
 - Modeling of QSO-driven He II reionization requires accurate luminosity function