The SOFIA Massive (SOMA) **Star Formation Survey**

Jonathan C. Tan

James M. De Buizer Mengyao Liu **Yichen Zhang**

Jan E. Staff Maria T. Beltrán Kei Tanaka **Barbara Whitney Ralph Shuping**

Nicola Da Rio Viviana Rosero Maria Drozdovskaya COBSERVATORY

ARED ASTRONOMY

The Importance of Massive Stars

McCaughrean+

O'Dell+

Vogelsberger+

Whitmore+

Gillessen-

Zinnecker & Yorke (2007) Tan et al. (2014)

Tuesday, April 4, 17

Abel+

The Physics of High-Mass Star Formation

A complicated, nonlinear process:

- Gravity vs pressure (thermal, magnetic, turbulence, radiation, cosmic rays) and shear.

 Heating and cooling, generation and decay of turbulence, generation (dynamo) and diffusion of B-fields.

- Chemical evolution of dust and gas.
- Fragmentation
- Stellar structure and evolution
- Feedback

- Wide range of scales (~12 dex in space, time) and multidimensional.

- Uncertain/unconstrained initial conditions/boundary conditions.



Notation for gas structures: Core -> star or close binary Clump -> star cluster

(Massive) Star Formation: Open Questions

- Causation: external triggering or spontaneous gravitational instability?
- Initial conditions: how close to equilibrium?
- Accretion mechanism: [turbulent/magnetic/thermalpressure]-regulated fragmentation to form cores vs competitive accretion / mergers
- Timescale: fast or slow (# of dynamical times)?
- End result
 - -Initial mass function (IMF)
 - -Binary fraction and properties



How do these properties vary with environment? Subgrid model of SF? Threshold n_{H*}? Efficiency ε_{ff}?













Massive Star Formation Theories

Core Accretion:

wide range of dm^{*}/dt ~10⁻⁵ - 10⁻² M_☉ yr⁻¹ (e.g. Myers & Fuller 1992; Caselli & Myers 1995; McLaughlin & Pudritz

1997; Osorio+ 1999; Nakano+ 2000; Behrend & Maeder 2001)

Turbulent Core Model:

(McKee & Tan 2002, 2003) Stars form from **"cores"** that fragment from the **"clump"**



 $\bar{P} = \phi_P G \Sigma^2$

If in equilibrium, then self-gravity is balanced by internal pressure: B-field, turbulence, radiation pressure (thermal P is small)

Cores form from this

turbulent/magnetized medium: at any instant there is a small mass fraction in cores. These cores collapse quickly to feed a central disk to form individual stars or binaries.

 $\dot{m}_* \sim M_{\rm core}/t_{\rm ff}$

Massive Star Formation Theories

Core Accretion:

wide range of dm*/dt ~10⁻⁵ - 10⁻² M_{\odot} yr⁻¹

(e.g. Myers & Fuller 1992; Caselli & Myers 1995; McLaughlin & Pudritz 1997; Osorio+ 1999; Nakano+ 2000; Behrend & Maeder 2001)

Turbulent Core Model:

(McKee & Tan 2002, 2003) Stars form from **"cores"** that fragment from the **"clump"**

$$ar{P}=\phi_P G \Sigma^2$$

If in equilibrium, then self-gravity is balanced by internal pressure: B-field, turbulence, radiation pressure (thermal P is small)

Cores form from this turbulent/magnetized medium: at any instant there is a small mass fraction in cores. These cores collapse quickly to feed a central disk to form individual stars or binaries.

 $\dot{m}_* \sim M_{\rm core}/t_{\rm ff}$

Competitive (Clump-fed) Accretion:

(Bonnell, Clarke, Bate, Pringle 2001; Bonnell, Vine, & Bate 2004; Schmeja & Klessen 2004; Wang, Li, Abel, Nakamura 2010; ...)

Massive stars gain most mass by Bondi-Hoyle accretion of ambient clump gas



Originally based on simulations including only thermal pressure.

Massive stars form on the timescale of the star cluster, with relatively low accretion rates.

Violent interactions? Mergers?

(Bonnell, Bate & Zinnecker 1998; Bally & Zinnecker 2005 Bally et al. 2011)



Massive Star Formation Theories

Core Accretion:

Σ~1 g cm⁻²

of Clump Infall

Vinfall ~ 0.1 Vff

(Wyrowski et al. 2016)

wide range of dm*/dt ~10⁻⁵ - 10⁻² M_{\odot} yr⁻¹

(e.g. Myers & Fuller 1992; Caselli & Myers 1995; McLaughlin & Pudritz 1997; Osorio+ 1999; Nakano+ 2000; Behrend & Maeder 2001)

Turbulent Core Model:

SOFIA measurement

1 [Jy/beam]

Limited fragmentation

Csengeri et al. 2017

(McKee & Tan 2002, 2003) Stars form from **"cores"** that fragment from the **"clump"**

Competitive (Clump-fed) Accretion:

(Bonnell, Clarke, Bate, Pringle 2001; Bonnell, Vine, & Bate 2004; Schmeja & Klessen 2004; Wang, Li, Abel, Nakamura 2010; ...)

Massive stars gain most mass by Bondi-Hoyle accretion of ambient clump gas



[degree]

gal

Schematic Differences Between Massive Star Formation Theories



Schematic Differences Between Massive Star Formation Theories



Schematic Differences Between Massive Star Formation Theories



The Initial Conditions of Massive Star Formation

Do massive starless cores exist? Are they close to virial equilibrium?





Mid-IR Extinction Mapping of Infrared Dark Clouds

(Butler & Tan 2009, 2012; see also Peretto & Fuller 2009; Ragan et al. 2009; Battersby et al. 2010)

G28.37+00.07



16'

Mid-IR Extinction Mapping of Infrared Dark Clouds

(Butler & Tan 2009, 2012; see also Peretto & Fuller 2009; Ragan et al. 2009; Battersby et al. 2010)

G28.37+00.07



Tuesday, April 4, 17

16'







Comparison to Turbulent Core Model Tan, K

Tan, Kong et al. (2013)



Predictions from Virial Equilibrium

Tan, Kong et al. (2013)

• 1D velocity dispersion if virialized:

$$m_A = \sqrt{3}\sigma_c/v_A$$

$$\sigma_{\rm c,vir} \rightarrow 1.09 \left(\frac{M_c}{60M_{\odot}}\right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{\Sigma_{\rm cl}}{1\,{\rm g\,cm^{-2}}}\right)^{1/4} \,{\rm km\,s^{-2}}$$

Core	C1-N	C1-S	F1	F2	G2-N	G2-S
Σ_{cl} (g cm ⁻²)	0.48	0.40	0.22	0.32	0.21	0.19
$M_{c}(M_{\odot})$	16	63	6.5	4.7	2.4	0.83
σ _{vir} (km/s)	0.66±0.22	0.88±0.30	0.43±0.15	0.44±0.15	0.33±0.11	0.25±0.09
σ _{obs} (km/s)	0.41±0.03	0.41±0.02	0.25±0.02	0.42±0.04	0.34±0.02	0.30±0.02

$< \sigma_{obs}/\sigma_{vir} > = 0.81 \pm 0.13$

 $\longrightarrow m_{A,vir} = 0.28 -> B_{vir} = 0.9mG$ $B_{med} \simeq 0.12 n_{H}^{0.65} \ \mu G \ (for \ n_{H} > 300 \ cm^{-3}) \ (Crutcher \ et \ al. \ 2010)$ $n_{H,c} = 6.4 \times 10^{5} cm^{-3} -> B_{med} = 0.7mG$

Tentative Conclusion: Cores appear to be near virial equilibrium, after accounting for clump envelope. Possibly slightly sub-virial; or have stronger B-fields (see also - Kauffmann, Pillai & Goldsmith 2013).

Massive Pre-Stellar Core C1-S High Resolution (0.2", 0.005pc @ 5kpc)

Core property (% error)	C1-S inner	C1-S outer
$ heta_c ('')$	1.10	1.85
$d~({ m kpc})~(20\%)$	5.0	5.0
$R_{\rm c} \ (0.01 \ {\rm pc}) \ (20\%)$	2.67	4.48
$M_{\rm c,mm} (M_{\odot})$	$16.2_{4.25}^{42.8}$	$47.9^{110}_{18.6}$
$n_{\rm H,c,mm}~(10^{6}{\rm cm}^{-3})$	$5.90^{15.4}_{1.94}$	$3.67^{8.26}_{1.74}$

(a) color: $C^{18}O(2-1)$ (c) color: N_2D^+ smooth (a) color: $DCO^+(3-2)$ 0.072 0.0540.048 0.027 0.064 +00.0685 $+00.0685^{\circ}$ 0.042 0.024 0.036 0.0560.030 $+00.0680^{\circ}$ 0.021 +00.06800.048 0.024 ę 0.018 Latit^L 810.0 0.040 $+00.0675^{\circ}$ $+00.0675^{\circ}$ 0.015 actic 210.0 0.032 0.012 $+00.0670^{\circ}$ 0.024 +00.0670 0.006 0.009 0.016 0.006 $+00.0665^{\circ}$ $+00.0665^{\circ}$ 0.008 0.003 0.000 0.0000.000 28.3230° 28.3225° 28.3210° 28.3220° 28.3215° 28.3230° 28.3225° 28.3220° 28.3215° 28.3210° 28.3225° 28.3220° 28.3215° 28.3210° 28.3230° Galactic Longitude Galactic Longitude Galactic Longitude

CO depletion factor: f_D>600

DCO⁺ Envelope

Kong, Tan et al. (2017b, submitted)

Constraints for Initial Conditions of Numerical Simulations

Peters et al. (2011) M = $100M_{\odot}$, R=0.5pc, n_H = 5400cm⁻³, B= 10μ G Seifried et al. (2012) M = $100M_{\odot}$, R=0.25pc, n_H = $4.4x10^4$ cm⁻³, B~1mG

Myers et al. (2013) $M = 300M_{\odot}, R=0.1pc,$ $n_{H} = 2.4x10^{6}cm^{-3}, B>~1mG$



Tuesday, April 4, 17

Observations:

Evidence for strong magnetic fields in some massive star-forming cores



Girart+ (2009) see also Q. Zhang+ (2015)

Evidence for nonthermal support

Do massive protostars have morphologies similar to low-mass protostars? What sets the star formation efficiency from the core? CMF -> IMF?



Protostellar Evolution

Zhang, Tan, Hosokawa (2014)



Protostellar Evolution

Zhang, Tan, Hosokawa (2014)



see also Palla & Stahler 1993; Hosokawa et al. (2010)

Tuesday, April 4, 17

Diagnostics of the Turbulent Core Model

Zhang & Tan (2011), Zhang, Tan & McKee (2013), Zhang, Tan & Hosokawa (2014), Tanaka, Tan & Zhang (2016)



THE ASTROPHYSICAL JOURNAL, 788:166 (35pp), 2014 June 20



 $\log(S/S_{max})$

NIR to FIR morphologies

ZHANG, TAN, & HOSOKAWA

Rotation and outflow axis inclined at 60° to line of sight.

Tuesday, April 4, 17

33

Massive Protostar G35.2N: d=2.2kpc; L~10⁵L_o



Spectral energy distribution






Tuesday, April 4, 17







$M_c = 60 M_{\odot}, \Sigma_{cl} = 0.3 \text{ g/cm}^2, \beta_c = 0.02$

10 -km/s

-1000, km/

100.0

20 µm

v, 20000 AU, 1 M_{\odot}

T, 20000 AU, 1 M_{\odot}

1000 km/s



37 µm



Tuesday, April 4, 17

Initial & Environmental Conditions

Evolutionary Tracks

Density/velocity Profiles

Continuum Radiative Transfer

(Code: Whitney+ 03, 12; also see Robitaille+ 11)



$M_c = 60 M_{\odot}, \Sigma_{cl} = 1 g/cm^2, \beta_c = 0.02$

$M_c = 60 M_{\odot}, \Sigma_{cl} = 0.3 \text{ g/cm}^2, \beta_c = 0.02$





Initial & Environmental Conditions

Evolutionary Tracks

Density/velocity Profiles

Continuum Radiative Transfer

(Code: Whitney+ 03, 12; also see Robitaille+ 11)



$M_c = 60 M_{\odot}, \Sigma_{cl} = 1 g/cm^2, \beta_c = 0.02$

$M_c = 60 M_{\odot}, \Sigma_{cl} = 0.3 \text{ g/cm}^2, \beta_c = 0.02$



$M_c = 60 M_{\odot}, \Sigma_{cl} = 1 g/cm^2, \beta_c = 0.02$ $M_c = 60 M_{\odot}, \Sigma_{cl} = 0.3 \text{ g/cm}^2, \beta_c = 0.02$ **Initial & Environmental** n_H, v, 1000 AU, 16 M_o n_H, v, 20000 AU, 16 M_o n_H, v, 1000 AU, 16 M_o n_H, v, 20000 AU, 16 M_o ງ ົຼ Conditions 1010 Density 10⁴ 10⁶ 10⁸ Density, n_H (cm⁻³) 102 **Evolutionary Tracks** 10-km-/-s 10 km/s -1000, km/s ° 1000, km/s 100AU 2000AU 1000 T<mark>,</mark> 20000 AU, 16 M_☉ T, 20000 AU, 16 Mo T, 1000 AU, 16 M T, 1000 AU, Temperature 100 Temperature, T (K) **Density/velocity Profiles** 100AL m∗=16M_☉ Continuum SED 10⁻⁶ **Radiative Transfer** 10⁻⁸ (Code: Whitney+ 03, 12; 10⁻¹⁰ also see Robitaille+ 11) 10⁻¹² Temperature 10⁻¹⁴ **Profiles** 1.0 10.0 100.0 0.1 λ (μm) Images **SEDs** 20 µm **8** μm 37 µm 8 µm 20 µm **IR Images**

37 µm

1000 km/s

Model grid

3+3 parameters:









The SOFIA Massive (SOMA) Star Formation Survey

Jonathan C. Tan, James M. De Buizer, Mengyao Liu, Yichen Zhang, Jan E. Staff, Maria T. Beltrán, Ralph Shuping, Barbara Whitney

THE SOFIA MASSIVE (SOMA) STAR FORMATION SURVEY: I. OVERVIEW AND FIRST RESULTS

JAMES M. DE BUIZER¹, MENGYAO LIU², JONATHAN C. TAN^{2,3}, YICHEN ZHANG^{4,5}, MARIA T. BELTRÁN⁶, RALPH SHUPING¹, JAN E. STAFF^{2,7}, KEI E. I. TANAKA², BARBARA WHITNEY⁸
¹SOFIA-USRA, NASA Ames Research Center, MS 232-12, Moffett Field, CA 94035, USA
²Department of Astronomy, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA
³Department of Physics, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA
⁴Departamento de Astronomía, Universidad de Chile, Casilla 36-D, Santiago, Chile
⁵The Institute of Physical and Chemical Research (RIKEN), Hirosawa 2-1, Wako-shi, Saitama 351-0198, Japan
⁶INAF-Osservatorio Astrofisico di Arcetri, Largo E. Fermi 5, I-50125 Firenze, Italy
⁷College of Science and Math, University of Virgin Islands, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands 00802
⁸Department of Astronomy, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 475 N. Charter St, Madison, WI 53706, USA

ABSTRACT

We present an overview and first results of the SOFIA Massive (SOMA) Star Formation Survey. which is using the FORCAST instrument to image massive protostars from $\sim 10-40 \ \mu m$. These wavelengths trace thermal emission from warm dust, which in Core Accretion models mainly emerges from the inner regions of protostellar outflow cavities. Dust in dense core envelopes also imprints characteristic extinction patterns at these wavelengths causing intensity peaks to shift along the outflow axis and profiles to become more symmetric at longer wavelengths. We present observational results for the first eight protostars in the survey, i.e., multiwavelength images, including some ancillar ground-based MIR observations and archival Spitzer and Herscheldata. These images generally show extended MIR/FIR emission along directions consistent with those of known outflows and with shorter wavelength peak flux positions displaced from the protostar along the blue-shifted, near-facing sides thus confirming qualitative predictions of Core Accretion models. We then compile spectral energy distributions and use these to derive protostellar properties by fitting theoretical radiative transfer models. Zhang & Tan models, based on the Turbulent Core Model of McKee & Tan, imply the sources have protostellar masses $m_* \sim 10-50 M_{\odot}$ accreting at $\sim 10^{-4}-10^{-3} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ inside cores of initial masses $M_c \sim 30-500 M_{\odot}$ embedded in clumps with mass surface densities $\Sigma_{cl} \sim 0.1-3 \,\mathrm{g \ cm^{-2}}$. Fitting Robitaille et al. models typically leads to slightly higher protostellar masses, but with disk accretion rates $\sim 100 \times$ smaller. We discuss reasons for these differences and overall implications of these first survey results for massive star formation theories.

Keywords: ISM: jets and outflows — dust — stars: formation — stars: winds, outflows — stars: earlytype — infrared radiation — ISM: individual(AFGL 4029, AFGL 437, IRAS 07299-1651, G35.20-0.74, G45.45+0.05, IRAS 20126+4104, Cepheus A, NGC 7538 IRS9)

1. INTRODUCTION

The enormous radiative and mechanical luminosities of massive stars impact a vast range of scales and prolent Core Model of McKee & Tan 2002; 2003 [hereafter MT03]), to Competitive Accretion models at the crowded centers of forming star clusters (Bonnell et al. ERVATORY

The SOMA Survey SOFIA-FORCAST observations of a sample of ~50 massive & intermediate-mass protostars (Cycles 0, 1, 2, 3, 4).

Those the south and the second s

The SOMA Survey SOFIA-FORCAST observations of a sample of ~50 massive & intermediate-mass protostars (Cycles 0, 1, 2, 3, 4).

Type I: MIR sources in IRDCs - relatively isolated sources in Infrared Dark Clouds, some without detected radio Type II: Hyper-compact - often jet-like, radio sources, where the MIR emission extends beyond the observed radio emission (e.g., G35.2) Type III: Ultra-compact - radio sources where the radio emission is more extended than the MIR emission Type IV: Clustered sources - a MIR source exhibiting radio emission is surrounded by several other MIR sources within ~60"

Also extended to Intermediate-Mass protostars.

First 8 Sources

Table 1. SOFIA FORCAST Observations: Obs. Dates & Exposure Times (s)

Source	R.A.(J2000)	Dec.(J2000)	d (kpc)	Obs. Date	$7.7~\mu{ m m}$	$11.1~\mu{ m m}$	$19.7~\mu{ m m}$	$25.3\mu{ m m}$	$31.5~\mu{ m m}$	$37.1~\mu{ m m}$
AFGL 4029	$03^h 01^m 31.^{s} 28$	$+60^{\circ}29'12''87$	2.0	2014-03-29	112		158		282	678
AFGL 437	$03^h 07^m 24.55$	$+58^{\circ}30'52''.76$	2.0	2014-06-11	217		2075	•••	2000	884
IRAS 07299-1651	$07^h 32^m 09.^{s} 74$	$-16^{\circ}58'11''_{\cdot}28$	1.68	2015-02-06	280		697	•••	449	1197
G35.20-0.74	$18^{h}58^{m}13.02$	$+01^{\circ}40'36''_{\cdot}2$	2.2	2011-05-25		909	959	•••	4068	4801
G45.47 + 0.05	$19^{h}14^{m}25.67$	$+11^{\circ}09'25.''45$	8.4	2013-06-26		309		588	316	585
IRAS 20126+4104	$20^{h}14^{m}26.05$	$+41^{\circ}13'32''_{\cdot}48$	1.64	2013-09-13		484		1276	487	1317
Cepheus A	$22^{h}56^{m}17.98$	$+62^{\circ}01'49''_{\cdot}39$	0.7	2014-03-25	242		214	•••	214	1321
NGC 7538 IRS9	$23^{h}14^{m}01.77$	$+61^{\circ}27'19''_{\cdot}8$	2.65	2014-06-06	215		653		491	923

De Buizer, Liu, Tan, Zhang et al. (2017)









G45.47+0.05

IRAS 20126+4104

NGC 7538 IRS9

$_{\text{o}} R_{\text{ap}}$	₹ 14.4	1.5	320	1.0	0.13 (3)	32 g	1908E	15.2	~252	24	8.2(-4)		
	, F	1.62	240	1.0	$0.11(3)^{-1}$	325	1,86	1.0	170	30	7.2(-4)	2.6(5)	
) 10 °		1.75	240	1.0	0.11(3)	24 م	55	J. A	192	23	6.6(-4)	1.7(5)	
s IRA	\$20126	1.82	80	0.3	0.12(15)	د 16	1074	B7.4	42	42	1.5(-4)	4.2(4)	
d = 12	L64 kpc	2.07	120	0.3	0.14(18)	24	74	69.7	57	47	1.8(-4)	9.3(4)	
R_{ap}^{0}	$= 12.8^{\#}$	2.32_{10}^{11}	80 ' '	$0.3^{+0.3^{+}}$	$-\frac{10!12}{(15)}$	12	1044_{1}^{-1}	73.7	<u>''53</u>	31	<u>1.4(-4)</u>	-3.4(4)	ററ
	1	$ 2.33^{10} $	$200_{(\mu m)}$	0.1^{100}	$0.33 (41)^{1000}$	12	86	65.7	174	λ^{20}	8.0(-5)	$2.0(4)^{+0.00}$	50
		2.39	100	0.3	0.13~(16)	16	51	66.7	61	36	1.6(-4)	4.5(4)	

1	1	ο λ (μ	100 um)	100	0	1		10	λ (μm)	100	1000
6		Се	рА			c		NG	C7538_I	RS9	
10^{-10} 10^{-7} 10^{-7} 10^{-7} 10^{-8} 10^{-8} 10^{-9} 10^{-10} 10^{-11} 10^{-12}					νF, (ergs s ⁻¹ cm ⁻²)	10^{-0} 10^{-7} 10^{-8} 10^{-9} 10^{-10} 10^{-11} 10^{-12}					
1	1	Ο λ (μ	100 um)	100	0	1	<u> </u>	10	λ (μm)	100	1000
				Z	Zhang &	z Tan r	nodels				
Source	χ^2	M_c	$\Sigma_{\rm cl}$	R_c	m_*	$ heta_{ ext{view}}$	A_V	$M_{\rm env}$	$ heta_{w,\mathrm{esc}}$	$\dot{M}_{ m disk}$	$L_{\rm bol}$
		(M_{\odot})	$(g \text{ cm}^{-2})$	(pc) $('')$	(M_{\odot})	$(^{\circ})$	(mag)	(M_{\odot})	$(^{\circ})$	$(M_{\odot}/{ m yr})$	(L_{\odot})
CepA	2.17	160	0.3	0.17~(47)	12	29	94.9	135	20	1.8(-4)	3.8(4)
d = 0.725 kpc	2.21	160	0.3	0.17~(47)	16	39	98.0	125	26	2.0(-4)	5.0(4)
$R_{\rm ap} = 48.0^{\prime\prime}$	2.65	400	0.1	0.47~(132)	16	86	100.0	364	17	1.1(-4)	3.8(4)
	2.71	480	0.1	0.51 (145)	12	83	80.8	460	12	1.1(-4)	2.4(4)
	2.81	160	0.3	0.17~(47)	24	74	100.0	98	37	2.2(-4)	9.9(4)
NGC7538	0.15	400	0.1	0.47(36)	16	22	23.2	364	17	1.1(-4)	3.8(4)
IRS9	0.19	320	0.1	0.42(32)	16	39	2.0	281	19	1.1(-4)	3.7(4)
d = 2.65 kpc	0.35	240	0.1	0.36~(28)	24	39	52.5	171	33	1.1(-4)	8.2(4)
$R_{\rm ap} = 25.6''$	0.47	480	0.1	0.51(40)	16	22	17.2	440	15	1.2(-4)	3.8(4)
10ap 2 010	0.11	100	0.1	0.01 (10)	10		11.2	110	10	_ (_)	

				7	Zhang &	z Tan r	nodels									Robit	taille et al.	models			
Source	χ^2	M_c	$\Sigma_{\rm cl}$	R_c	m_*	$\theta_{ m view}$	A_V	$M_{\rm env}$	$\theta_{w,\mathrm{esc}}$	$\dot{M}_{\rm disk}$	$L_{\rm bol}$	χ^2	m_*	$\theta_{ m view}$	A_V	$M_{\rm env}$	$R_{ m env}$	$\theta_{w,\mathrm{esc}}$	$\dot{M}_{ m env}$	$\dot{M}_{\rm disk}$	$L_{\rm bol}$
		(M_{\odot})	$(g \text{ cm}^{-2})$	(pc) ('')	(M_{\odot})	$(^{\circ})$	(mag)	(M_{\odot})	(°)	$(M_{\odot}/{ m yr})$	(L_{\odot})		(M_{\odot})	$(^{\circ})$	(mag)	(M_{\odot})	(pc) ('')	(°)	$(M_{\odot}/{ m yr})$	$(M_{\odot}/{ m yr})$	(L_{\odot})
IRAS07299	0.22	200	0.1	0.33(48)	8	89	20.2	181	14	6.8(-5)	9.5(3)	1.10	18	76	13.2	171	0.39(57)	10	4.3(-4)		8.3(3)
d = 1.4 kpc	0.23	320	0.1	0.42(61)	8	83	3.0	307	11	7.7(-5)	8.8(3)	1.13	17	76	10.0	62	0.20(30)	6	4.0(-4)		6.6(3)
$R_{\rm ap} = 7.7^{\prime\prime}$	0.32	240	0.1	0.36(53)	8	86	22.2	226	13	7.1(-5)	1.1(4)	1.15	17	81	10.0	62	0.20(30)	6	4.0(-4)		6.6(3)
	0.59	60	0.3	0.10(15)	12	77	9.1	32	40	1.2(-4)	2.7(4)	1.16	18	81	12.5	171	0.39(57)	10	4.3(-4)		8.3(3)
	0.67	160	0.1	0.29(43)	8	89	33.3	143	17	6.3(-5)	1.1(4)	1.17	17	87	10.0	62	0.20(30)	6	4.0(-4)		6.6(3)
G35.20-0.74	2.63	480	0.1	0.51(48)	16	48	40.4	440	15	1.2(-4)	3.8(4)	2.26	20	87	20.7	597	0.48(45)	34	1.6(-3)	2.8(-7)	4.7(4)
d = 2.2 kpc	2.64	100	3.2	0.04(4)	12	29	70.7	77	20	9.4(-4)	5.2(4)	2.40	20	81	24.1	597	0.48(45)	34	1.6(-3)	2.8(-7)	4.7(4)
$R_{\rm ap} = 32.0''$	2.76	320	0.1	0.42(39)	24	68	81.8	256	27	1.2(-4)	8.4(4)	2.49	20	76	33.0	597	0.48(45)	34	1.6(-3)	2.8(-7)	4.7(4)
	2.76	80	3.2	0.04(3)	12	39	15.2	58	22	8.4(-4)	5.0(4)	2.54	19	70	16.4	679	0.48(45)	27	1.5(-3)	2.6(-7)	4.3(4)
	2.77	200	0.3	0.19(17)	12	22	43.4	173	17	1.9(-4)	4.0(4)	2.70	18	76	16.8	560	0.48(45)	29	1.2(-3)	3.9(-6)	3.6(4)

SOMA Next Steps

SOMA II. Massive Protostars Across Environments (Liu et al.)

SOMA III. Model Fitting with SEDs & Image Intensity Profiles (Zhang et al.)

```
SOMA IV. HST NIR Follow-up
(Da Rio et al.)
```

SOMA V. ALMA Outflow Follow-up (Zhang et al.)

SOMA VI. ALMA Core Follow-up (Liu et al.)

Outflow-Confined HII Regions

Tan & McKee (2003), Tanaka, Tan & Zhang (2016)

Tuesday, April 4, 17

Feedback During Massive Star Formation

Is there a maximum stellar mass set by by formation processes?

Feedback processes:

- 1. Protostellar outflows
- 2. Ionization
- 3. Stellar winds
- 4. Radiation pressure
- 5. Supernovae

m_{*max}~150 M_☉ (e.g. Figer 2005).

But Crowther et al. (2010) claim most massive star to form was initially ~300M_☉, consistent with statistical sampling of Salpeter IMF with no maximum cutoff mass.

Staff+ (2010); Kuiper+ (2015)

Peters et al. 2010, 2011

Krumholz+ (2009); Rosen+ (2016) Kuiper et al. (2012); Klassen+ (2016)

Accretion processes: Core/disk fragmentation (Kratter & Matzner 06; Peters et al. 10) Stellar processes: Nuclear burning instabilities/enhanced mass loss Currently unclear what sets the shape of the massive star IMF

Conclusions

Massive Star Formation Theories:

Core Accretion; Competitive Accretion; Protostellar Collisions

Theory: "Turbulent Core Model": normalize core surface pressure to surrounding clump pressure, i.e. selfgravitating weight. Core supported by nonthermal pressure (B-fields/turbulence). Radiative transfer model grid (Zhang & Tan, in prep.)

1: Massive starless/early-stage cores exist in IRDCs (Tan+ 2013; Kong+ 2017b)

2: SOMA Survey of Massive Protostars: (De Buizer+ 2017) High- & intermediate-mass protostars often have a similar morphology to low-mass protostars, e.g., collimated outflows. Bipoloar outflow cavities shape MIR to FIR morphology and SEDs. SED fitting alone has significant degeneracies. We expect these to be broken by intensity profile fitting & multiwavelength follow-up.

