# The future of the **HI mass function**

#### Martin Zwaan (ESO)



#### Luminosity function



Relevance:

. . .

- Theories of galaxy formation and evolution
- Luminosity density

#### Luminosity function



Relevance:

. . .

- Theories of galaxy formation and evolution
- Luminosity density

#### HI mass function



#### Relevance:

- Theories of galaxy formation and evolution
- Neutral hydrogen gas mass density
- Missing satellites
- Baryon mass functions

#### First HI mass functions

• Based on optical catalogues and assumptions on gas richness (Briggs 1990)



Compare with observations: Is the Universe filled with dark galaxies? Low surface brightness galaxies?

#### Schechter functions



# HI mass function from blind HI Surveys

- HIMF measured from blind 21-cm surveys:
  - **AHISS**: HI strip Survey (Zwaan et al 1997)
  - AS: Arecibo Slice (Spitzak & Schneider 1998)
  - ADBS: Arecibo Dual Beam Survey (Rosenberg & Schneider 2000)
  - **HIPASS**: HI Parkes All Sky Survey (Zwaan, Meyer et al 2003/2004/2005)
  - ALFALFA: Arecibo Legacy Fast ALFA Survey (Giovanelli et al 2005)





• SKA pathfinders...

# HI mass function from blind HI Surveys

- HIMF measured from blind 21-cm surveys:
  - AHISS: HI strip Survey (Zwaan et al 1997)
  - AS: Arecibo Slice (Spitzak & Schneider 1998)
  - ADBS: Arecibo Dual Beam Survey (Rosenberg & Schneider 2000)
  - **HIPASS**: HI Parkes All Sky Survey (Zwaan, Meyer et al 2003/2004/2005)
  - ALFALFA: Arecibo Legacy Fast ALFA Survey (Giovanelli et al 2005)
  - SKA pathfinders...





Blind survey covering whole southern sky up to dec=+25°. 5300 detections

## HIPASS results



•  $M_{HI} \propto S_{int} D^2$ 

- $M_{HI}=10^8 M_o$  out to ~12 Mpc
- peak at ~25 Mpc
- No sharp flux limit → complicated completeness corrections









## HIMF dependence on galaxy type



- Low mass end of HIMF dominated by Sm-Irr
- High mass end of HIMF dominated by Sbc-Sc
- Trend consistent with optical luminosity function

#### Environmental effects on HIMF?



- Steeper toward higher densities?
- Density contrast lower in HI samples than in optical samples
- Opposite effect seen by Springob et al (2004), based on optically selected galaxies

#### HIMF variations



Different surveys probe different depths

Large scale structure causes variations in HIMF?

Or is it differences in analysis?

#### Do larger surveys help?

## Do larger surveys help?

• Uncertainties in HI mass function dominated by **systematic** errors

## Do larger surveys help?

- Uncertainties in HI mass function dominated by **systematic** errors
- Compare optical luminosity function →



Driver et al 2005

#### Analysis techniques



- Most detection very close to the noise...
- Put fake sources in your data!

#### The HIMF and cosmic variance



HIPASS 1000 brightest galaxies

four different quadrants of the southern sky

#### Future challenges for HI mass function

#### low mass end

environment



#### Future challenges for HI mass function

#### low mass end







#### Future challenges for HI mass function



environment *wide* 

evolution deep

- Traditionally: 1/V<sub>max</sub> method (Schmidt 1968)
  - Summing volumes accessible to objects
  - Sensitive to large scale structure
- Maximum likelihood methods (Efstathiou et al 1988, Sandage et al 1979)
  - Find θ that yields maximal joint probability of detecting all sources in sample

- Traditionally: 1/Vmax method (Schmidt 1968)
  - Summing volumes accessible to objects
  - Sensitive to large scale structure
- Maximum likelihood methods (Efstathiou et al 1988, Sandage et al 1979)
  - Find θ that yields maximal joint probability of detecting all sources in sample

$$p(M_{\mathrm{HI},i}|D_i) = \frac{\theta(M_{\mathrm{HI},i})}{\int_{M_{\mathrm{HI,min}(D_i)}}^{\infty} \theta(M_{\mathrm{HI}}) dM_{\mathrm{HI}}}$$

- Traditionally: 1/Vmax method (Schmidt 1968)
  - Summing volumes accessible to objects
  - Sensitive to large scale structure
- Maximum likelihood methods (Efstathiou et al 1988, Sandage et al 1979)
  - Find θ that yields maximal joint probability of detecting all sources in sample



- solution: multi-dimensional stepwise maximum likelihood methods
- Find  $\theta(M_{HI},W)$
- Collapse to find HIMF
- Or, find ML-based effective volume accessible to each galaxy individually







#### **Biases** in HI mass determination

#### Biases in HI mass determination

Eddington effect

# cosmic variance

# noise bias

## confusion

HI self-absorption

inclination bias

resolve large galaxies

#### Simulations to test HIMF recovery

- Millennium Simulation (Springel et al 2005)
- 9 million galaxies in the full simulation box (500 Mpc/h on a side)
- Stich several cubes together
- Assume a HIPASS HI mass function
- Low mass (log M<sub>HI</sub><8.5) cluster around larger ones





#### Simulations

- Rotational velocity HI mass relation from Obreschkow & Rawlings (2009)
- Random inclinations -> velocity widths
- Realistic scatter on all parameters
- Select galaxies from simulated boxes, assuming 'optimal smoothing'



input catalogue









#### Simulated HI skies



#### Simulated HI catalogues



#### Wide field HIMFs



Four different realizations of Wallaby: huge variations in HIMF based on 1/V<sub>max</sub> method

#### Without large scale structure...



#### The magic of stepwise maximum likelihood



Solid: 1/V<sub>max</sub> method Open: 2DSWML

(ran 2DSWML only on galaxies  $M_{HI} < 10^8 M_{\odot}$ )

#### Wallaby-type survey: HIMF expectations

- ~600,000 galaxies (depending on selection technique)
- Can see  $M_{HI} = 10^7 M_o$  out to ~30 Mpc
- Can measure HIMF down to  $M_{HI} \sim 10^6 \; M_{\odot}$
- Excellent for measuring HI as function of environment

#### **Dingo** HI mass functions



Ten different realizations of Dingo ultradeep: huge variations in HIMF based on 1/V<sub>max</sub> method

#### The magic of stepwise maximum likelihood



Solid: 1/V<sub>max</sub> method Open: 2DSWML

#### with Dingo to higher redshifts



Can reliably measure HIMF above  $M_{HI}^*$  out to z=0.3

#### Use Dingo to study HIMF as function of redshift



#### **Dingo**-type survey: HIMF expectations

- ~45,000 galaxies per 30° ultradeep field (depending on selection technique)
- ~12,000 galaxies per 30° deep field
- Can see  $M_{HI} = 10^8 M_0$  out to  $z \sim 0.07$
- Can measure HIMF out to z~0.3
- Can measure evolution of  $\Omega_{HI}$  out to higher *z* using some assumptions/tricks

#### $\Omega_{HI}$ : the cosmic HI mass density

![](_page_43_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### $\Omega_{HI}$ : the cosmic **HI mass density**

![](_page_44_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Figure_1.jpeg)

 DLAs are a "phase" not a "reservoir"

![](_page_46_Figure_1.jpeg)

 DLAs are a "phase" not a "reservoir"

![](_page_47_Figure_1.jpeg)

 DLAs are a "phase" not a "reservoir"

![](_page_48_Figure_1.jpeg)

 DLAs are a "phase" not a "reservoir"

• Where is the missing gas?

#### HI column density distribution evolves slowly

![](_page_49_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### HI column density distribution evolves slowly

![](_page_50_Figure_1.jpeg)

- HI distribution in galaxies at z=3 similar to that today?
- Star formation laws similar at higher z?

#### Should we be looking at HI or H<sub>2</sub>?

![](_page_51_Figure_1.jpeg)

- Obreschkow & Rawlings (2009): pressure-based models predict that H<sub>2</sub> mass density rises quickly
- See also Zwaan & Prochaska (2006)
- Need to follow up part of a deep HIfield with ALMA

## What's next? (Before SKA pathfinders?)

![](_page_52_Picture_1.jpeg)

The Arecibo Legacy Fast ALFA Survey

	HIPASS	ALFALFA
sensitivity	13 mJy	1.7 mJy
beam	15'	3.5'
area	30000 deg <sup>2</sup>	7000 deg <sup>2</sup>
detections	5300	~18000?

- ALFALFA finished~ 2011/2012
- 2 times smaller error bars on HIMF, but uncertainty determined by systematics...

![](_page_52_Figure_6.jpeg)

Predicted

detections in

# Conclusions

- HI mass function fairly flat ( $\alpha$ =-1.3)
  - but we worry about cosmic variance
- More sophisticated techniques are essential for volume corrections
  - but don't help much with deep field evolution
- Need to know HIMF as function of environment
  - ▶ also to understand 'the' local HIMF
- Need to know how HI mass function evolves
  - but all the action is in the molecules?

## Implications for cosmic SFR density

![](_page_55_Figure_1.jpeg)

Even though H<sub>2</sub> has very small cross section, it contributes significantly to  $\Omega_{gas}$  and the SFRD

SFRD as function of HI and  $H_2$  (at z=0):

# HI at high and low z

#### low redshift

• 21-cm emission

![](_page_56_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### high redshift

Lyα absorption

![](_page_56_Figure_6.jpeg)

flux 0.5

flux 0.5

C

۷

flux 0.5

C

# HI at high and low z

#### low redshift

• 21-cm emission

#### high redshift

Lyα absorption

flux 0.5

C

flux 0.5

C

![](_page_57_Figure_5.jpeg)

#### QSO absorption line statistics from local galaxies:

![](_page_58_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### QSO absorption line statistics from local galaxies:

![](_page_59_Figure_1.jpeg)