# Classifying the Evolutionary States of Giant Molecular Clouds in M33

#### by Mélanie Armante, Gayathri Athikkat-Eknath, Huanqing Chen, Konstantin Grishunin, Eloïse Vitte











#### Supervisors: Erik Rosolowsky & Annie Hughes





# Motivations & Significance (why do we care?)

- Studying the evolution of molecular clouds in galaxies is crucial for understanding the mechanisms behind star formation
  - How does the mass function evolve with SF stages? What does it indicate about GMC accretion?
  - Does the evolutionary state of clouds affect the size-linewidth relationship in M33?
- Environment/morphology may be an indicator of the GMC's evolutionary stage
  - Can the galactocentric radius of a cloud inform its morphology and star formation activity?
  - Can the morphology of clouds tell us about their star formation activity?
  - Can properties like the virial mass and CO-traced luminosity of clouds shed light on the validity of the  $a_{CO}$  factor?
- Why M33?
  - M33 is nearby, close to face-on, and data are available in various bands
  - New ALMA data on M33!



### Observational Data & Methodology

- New ALMA-ACA mapping of CO(2-1) emission from M33 (d=840 kpc)
- Spatial resolution = 30 pc
- Use SCIMES to identify 442 GMCs ( $M=10^4M_{\odot}$  to  $10^6M_{\odot}$ )
- Examine and compare each GMC to archival data to assess star formation activity.



#### We visually checked each GMC region using a classification scheme



## **Results**

- Bigger and more complex shaped clouds have a higher star formation activity (more diverse content)
- Dark GMCs (no SF or w/ only embedded SF) tend to be less massive
- GMCs located in the inner part have a more complex morphology and a higher star formation activity than GMCs located in the outer part of M33
- Both M<sub>vir</sub> and M<sub>lum</sub> show weak evidence for decreasing outward suggesting more massive GMCs are located in the inner part; α<sub>CO</sub> increases with R (with decreasing metallicity)
- At first look, the evolutionary state of the cloud doesn't seem to affect sizelinewidth relation

## **APPENDIX**

#### Significant Differences in GMC Mass Function b/w Different SF Stages:

We classify the GMCs into four categories:



Absolutely No SF, only embedded SF, early SF, late SF

We performed K-S test to these samples, and p-value= No SF vs. All : 0.00007 embedded vs. All: 0.002

# GMCs without exposed SF have significantly lower mass

There is a hint that the lower end of the mass function is slightly higher in embedded subsample than the NoSF subsample, but it is not very significant p-value=0.09

## Morphology vs content and star formation indicators

Morphology : 2 criteria

- the shape : from round to more complex structures such as filaments or multipeaked clouds
- size : small to more extended

Content :

- type of the sources : far UV or medium IR or optical compact sources, HII compact regions or diffuse HII regions ...
- number of each type of source inside the cloud
- connection between types : finding the same source in more than one map (UV, IR, optical, ..)

#### Analysis :

content vs morphology kind + number of sources inside the cloud vs round/not round

## Morphology vs content and star formation indicators



As the cloud gets more complex in shape (round to multipeaked, ...) it increase his content as the type of sources and the number of each type of source Same trend as you grow in size

 $\rightarrow$  Impact on the size and morphology of the cloud on star formation

## Morphology and star forming cloud populations vary with their distance to the center of the galaxy



### Morphology and star forming cloud populations vary with their distance to the center of the galaxy





#### Relation between normalised turbulent linewidth coefficient and virial parameter in subsample of 73 clouds at 3 evolutionary states (Type I, Type II, Type III)

