# Dissecting iDR2 disk data by GMM cluster models

#### Álvaro Rojas-Arriagada

Gaia-ESO Survey Second Science Meeting Porto, 2014













Bensby et al. 2005

Distribution of physical parameters overlaps in this thin/thick disc defined samples



# Good quality data $\rightarrow$ follow number density gap in the $[\alpha/Fe]$ vs. [Fe/H] plane



Recio-Blanco et al. 2014

We propose a different approach to split data in the abundance-metallicity plane

![](_page_4_Picture_1.jpeg)

**Clustering formalism** 

![](_page_4_Picture_3.jpeg)

To find substructure supported by data

![](_page_4_Picture_5.jpeg)

Mathematically rigorous procedure

#### GMM in 2D (Gaussian Mixture Models)

GMM defined as a weighted sum of bivariate normal distributions

$$M(z|\mu,\Sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^k w_i N(z|\mu_i,\Sigma_i)$$

- $\star\,$  With means  $\mu$  and covariance matrix  $\Sigma$
- \* Mixture with specific set of parameters  $\mu_i$ ,  $\sigma_i$  is an attempt to fit data set z composed by N observations

Given a GMM  $\rightarrow$  best set of parameters  $\rightarrow$  maximum likelihood

$$L(z|\mu, \Sigma) = \prod_{j=1}^{N} M(z_j|\mu, \Sigma).$$
 EM algorithm

Given several maximum likelihood GMM models  $\rightarrow$  complexity supported by data  $\rightarrow$  AIC

Best generating model

 $AIC = 2N_p - 2\ln(L_{max})$ 

## GMM in 2D

![](_page_6_Figure_1.jpeg)

Given several maximum likelihood GMM models  $\rightarrow$  complexity supported by data the "best" one??

Best generating mode

 $AIC = 2N_p - 2\ln(L_{max})$ 

#### GMM in 2D

![](_page_7_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Application to disc GES iDR2 data

Stellar parameters, metallicity and abundances derived from H10 + HR21setups  $\rightarrow$  clean sample of 1375 stars

![](_page_8_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### Best GMM model solution

- 5 components
- Thin/thick separation in good agreement with "follow-gap" procedure

![](_page_9_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### Best GMM model solution

- 5 components
- Thin/thick separation in good agreement with "follow-gap" procedure

![](_page_10_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### Best GMM model solution

- 5 components
- Thin/thick separation in good agreement with "follow-gap" procedure

![](_page_11_Figure_3.jpeg)

Statistically significant difference in slope for red and blue groups No significant slope difference for blue and green groups

#### Results for different stellar types

![](_page_12_Figure_1.jpeg)

- Gap thick-disc/hαmr stars more pronounced in RC
- Thin-disc overdensity at [Fe/H]~0.1 dex due to dwarfs
- Sequences in RC sample less dispersed than in dwarfs

## Results for different stellar types

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

Group slopes with homogeneous trends in the three samples

#### Red group

- Different trend for RC and dwarf sample
- RC red group split because subdensity
- No T<sub>eff</sub> correlation with [Fe/H] to explain discrepancy

#### The metal-poor thin disk "green group"

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

No statistically significant slope difference respect to "blue" group

![](_page_14_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_0.jpeg)

Intermediate scale height

Low radial cylindrical velocity dispersion

Radial migration?? Formation in-situ??

![](_page_15_Figure_4.jpeg)

# Summary

We propose a clustering approach to examine data structure

Metallicity-abundance plane 

Chemical tagging

Data structure Gaussian formalism

We found five mean components:

- Halo
- Thick disc
- Thin disc in three components

Changes in slope + local number overdensities

![](_page_17_Picture_0.jpeg)

Metal-rich "red" thin disc group: Different slope for dwarf and RC stars

![](_page_17_Picture_2.jpeg)

Metal-poor end "green" thin disc group: Some characteristics different respect to more metal-rich thin disc stars

![](_page_17_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_0.jpeg)