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ABSTRACT
We investigate the dependence of stellar properties on the opacity limit for fragmentation which is set by the metallicity of a molecular cloud. We compare the results from two large-scale hydrodynamical simulations of star cluster formation that resolve the fragmentation process down to the opacity limit, the first of which was reported by Bate, Bonnell & Bromm. The initial conditions of the two calculations are identical, but in the new simulation the onset of the opacity limit occurs at a lower gas density, and this is expected to increase the minimum mass of a brown dwarf by a factor of three (to \( \approx 9 \) Jupiter masses).

We find that the lowest mass object is a factor of three higher in the low-metallicity calculation, as expected. However, apart from this shift of the low-mass cut-off, the initial mass functions (IMFs) produced by the two calculations are indistinguishable. In particular, the median (characteristic) mass is unchanged. These results add support to the accretion-ejection model proposed by Bate & Bonnell for the origin of the IMF, which predicts that the characteristic mass should vary in proportion to the mean thermal Jeans mass in the cloud. They also indicate that the form of the IMF above the low-mass cut-off should not display a strong metallicity dependence, assuming that the cooling is dominated by dust and that the overall mean thermal Jeans mass of a molecular cloud does not depend on its metallicity. However, if the mean thermal Jeans mass of a molecular cloud is set by the thermal behaviour of gas during the formation of the cloud, this should lead to an indirect dependence of the characteristic mass of the IMF on metallicity because of the link between the characteristic mass and the mean thermal Jeans mass of the cloud.
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1 INTRODUCTION
Understanding the origin of the stellar initial mass function (IMF) is one of the fundamental goals of a complete theory of star formation. One of the primary characteristics of the IMF is its characteristic mass. Why is the typical stellar mass a few tenths of a solar mass? One possibility is that the characteristic mass originates from the typical Jeans mass in the progenitor molecular cloud. This may be the thermal Jeans mass (Larson 1992, 2005), a magnetic critical mass, or a turbulent Jeans mass (Silk 1995). A Jeans mass origin for the characteristic stellar mass has been backed up by early hydrodynamical calculations of the fragmentation of clumpy and turbulent molecular clouds in which it was found that the mean mass of the protostars was similar to the mean initial Jeans mass in the cloud (Klessen, Burkert & Bate 1998; Klessen & Burkert 2000, 2001; Klessen 2001). Another possibility is that the characteristic mass is due to the opacity limit for fragmentation, which sets a lower limit to the mass of a ‘star’ and all other objects accrete to final masses greater than this minimum mass (Hoyle 1953).

Over the past few years, we have performed large-scale hydrodynamical calculations of the collapse and fragmentation of turbulent molecular clouds to investigate the origins of stellar properties. The calculations resolve down to the opacity limit for fragmentation and, thus, capture the formation of all stars and brown dwarfs. Results from the first two calculations have already been published (Bate, Bonnell & Bromm 2002a, 2002b, 2003; Bate & Bonnell 2005). These calculations followed the fragmentation of turbulent 50-M\(_{\odot}\) clouds with mean initial thermal Jeans masses of 1 M\(_{\odot}\) and 1/3 M\(_{\odot}\). Here, we report the results of a third calculation, identical to the first, except that the opacity limit for fragmentation set in at a gas density nine times lower, resulting in a minimum mass that was three times greater than in the first calculation (\( \approx 9 \) Jupiter masses instead of 3 Jupiter masses for the first two calculations).

Together, these three calculations enable us to examine the dependence of stellar properties on the mean thermal Jeans mass and the opacity limit for fragmentation, at last answering the question of which mass scale determines the characteristic mass of the IMF.
We find that the opacity limit for fragmentation does not significantly influence the characteristic mass or the form of the IMF, except that it sets the value of the low-mass cut-off.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 briefly describes the numerical method and the initial conditions for the calculations. The results are discussed in Section 3. In Section 4, we discuss the implications of the results for the origin of the IMF. Our conclusions are given in Section 5.

2 COMPUTATIONAL METHOD

The calculations presented here were performed using a three-dimensional, smoothed particle hydrodynamics (SPH) code. The SPH code is based on a version originally developed by Benz (Benz 1990; Benz et al. 1990). The smoothing lengths of particles are variable in time and space, subject to the constraint that the number of neighbours for each particle must remain approximately constant at $N_{\text{neigh}} = 50$. The SPH equations are integrated using a second-order Runge-Kutta-Fehlberg integrator with individual time steps for each particle (Bate, Bonnell, & Price 1995). Gravitational forces between particles and a particle’s nearest neighbours are calculated using a binary tree. We use the standard form of artificial viscosity (Monaghan & Gingold 1983; Monaghan 1992) with strength parameters $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 2$. Further details can be found in Bate et al. (1995). The code has been parallelised by M. Bate using OpenMP.

2.1 Equation of state

To model the thermal behaviour of the gas without performing radiative transfer, we use a barotropic equation of state for the thermal pressure of the gas $p = K\rho^\gamma$, where $K$ is a measure of the entropy of the gas. The value of the effective polytropic exponent $\gamma$, varies with density as

$$\eta = \begin{cases} 1, & \rho \leq \rho_{\text{crit}} \\ 7/5, & \rho > \rho_{\text{crit}} \end{cases}$$

(1)

We take the mean molecular weight of the gas to be $\mu = 2.46$. The value of $K$ is defined such that when the gas is isothermal $K = c_s^2$, with the sound speed $c_s = 1.84 \times 10^4$ cm s$^{-1}$ at 10 K, and the pressure is continuous when the value of $\eta$ changes.

In this paper, three different calculations are discussed. The value of the critical density above which the gas becomes non-isothermal is set to $\rho_{\text{crit}} = 10^{-13}$ g cm$^{-3}$ in the first two calculations. This equation of state has been chosen to match closely the relation between temperature and density during the spherically-symmetric collapse of molecular cloud cores with solar metallicity as calculated with frequency-dependent radiative transfer (see Bate et al. 2003 for further details). In the third calculation (which is the main focus of this paper), we set the critical density to be a factor of nine lower at $\rho_{\text{crit}} = 1.1 \times 10^{-14}$ g cm$^{-3}$. This is meant to mimic the thermal behaviour of molecular gas that has a lower metallicity.

The heating of the molecular gas that begins at the critical density inhibits fragmentation at higher densities. This effect is known as the opacity limit for fragmentation (Low & Lynden-Bell 1976; Rees 1976; Silk 1977a, 1977b). It results in the formation of distinct pressure-supported fragments within collapsing gas because the temperature increases quickly enough with density that the Jeans mass increases, and the high density region that was collapsing becomes Jeans stable. It stops collapsing and can only contract as it accretes mass. The value of the initial mass of a fragment presumably also gives the minimum mass for a brown dwarf, since any subsequent accretion will only increase a fragment’s mass. This minimum mass depends on the value of the critical density and is approximately equal to the Jeans mass at that density and temperature. Since the critical density is a factor of nine lower in the third calculation, the minimum mass is expected to be a factor of three higher than in the other two calculations. The lowest mass object produced by Calculations 1 and 2 was $\approx 3$ Jupiter masses ($M_\odot$). Thus, the lowest mass object in the third calculation is expected to be $9 M_\odot$.

Physically, the heating of the gas that results in a minimum mass is due to the inability of the gas to radiate away energy as quickly as energy is being deposited into it during the collapse (Masunaga & Inutsuka 1999). The gas cooling depends on its metallicity, $Z$, and Low & Lynden-Bell (1976) found that the minimum mass scales weakly with metallicity as $Z^{-1/7}$. Thus, they assumed that the conditions in the minimum mass fragment were given by a balance between radiative cooling and compressional work done on the collapsing gas as the fragment became optically thick. Since radiative cooling is proportional to $kT^4$ where $k$ is the opacity and $T$ is the temperature, then a lower metallicity (and hence a lower opacity) results in the fragment having a greater temperature. By balancing the radiative cooling and compressional heating when the fragment becomes optically thick, Low & Lynden-Bell show that the fragment’s temperature scales as $T \propto k^{-4/7}$. However, for the fragment to be optically thick and marginally Jeans unstable requires $k\sigma_T/2 \approx 1$, where the Jeans unstable wavelength $\lambda_J = 2\pi \sqrt{R_e T/(4\pi G \rho)}$, $R_e$ is the gas constant, $G$ is the gravitational constant, and $\mu$ is the mean molecular weight (i.e., $kT/\mu = \text{a constant}$). Therefore, using the above scaling of temperature with opacity, the density of the fragment $\rho \propto k^{-10/7}$. Thus, both the temperature and density of the fragment are higher for lower metallicity gas. The weak dependence of the fragment’s mass on metallicity is due to a near cancellation of the two scalings of temperature and density on opacity since the Jeans mass is proportional to $T^{3/2}\rho^{-1/2} \propto k^{-1/7}$. Note that Masunaga & Inutsuka (1999) question Low & Lynden-Bell’s assumption that the fragment is always optically thick when cooling balances heating. However, if the minimum mass does scale as $Z^{-1/7}$, then Calculation 3 corresponds to a metallicity of around $5 \times 10^{-4}$ of the solar value (i.e., log($Z/Z_\odot$) = $-3.3$).

2.2 Sink particles

As the pressure-supported fragments accrete, their central density increases, and it becomes computationally impractical to follow their internal evolution because of the short dynamical timescales involved. Therefore, when the central density of a pressure-supported fragment exceeds $\rho_c = 100\rho_{\text{crit}}$, we insert a sink particle into the calculation (Bate et al. 1995).

In all the calculations discussed in this paper, a sink particle is formed by replacing the SPH gas particles contained within $r_{\text{sink}} = 5$ AU of the densest gas particle in a pressure-supported fragment by a point mass with the same mass and momentum. Any gas that later falls within this radius is accreted by the point mass if it is bound and its specific angular momentum is less than that required to form a circular orbit at radius $r_{\text{sink}}$ from the sink particle. Thus, gaseous discs around sink particles can only be resolved if they have radii $\geq 10$ AU. Sink particles interact with the gas only via gravity and accretion.

Since all sink particles are created from pressure-supported fragments, their initial masses are several $M_\odot$, as given by the opac-
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Initial Gas Mass (M_\odot)</th>
<th>Initial Radius pc</th>
<th>Jeans Mass (M_\odot)</th>
<th>Mach No.</th>
<th>Heating Density g cm(^{-2})</th>
<th>No. of Stars Formed</th>
<th>No. of Brown Dwarfs</th>
<th>Mass of Stars &amp; Brown Dwarfs (M_\odot)</th>
<th>Mean Mass (M_\odot)</th>
<th>Median Mass (M_\odot)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>(10^{-13})</td>
<td>(\geq 23)</td>
<td>(\leq 27)</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>0.1178</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>(10^{-13})</td>
<td>(\geq 19)</td>
<td>(\leq 60)</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>0.1003</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>(1.1 \times 10^{-14})</td>
<td>(\geq 16)</td>
<td>(\leq 18)</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>0.2024</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The initial conditions for calculations 1 (BBB2003), 2 (BB2005) and 3 (this paper) and the statistical properties of the stars and brown dwarfs formed. The initial conditions for Calculation 3 were identical to those of Calculation 1. The only difference was the density at which gas heating began which was a factor of 9 lower in Calculation 3 than in Calculation 1. Calculation 2 differed from Calculation 1 in that the initial cloud had a smaller radius making the mean thermal Jeans mass a factor of 3 lower. In each case, the initial turbulent velocity fields where identical and were scaled so that for each cloud the initial kinetic energy equalled the magnitude of the gravitational potential energy. All calculations were run for 1.40 initial cloud free-fall times. Brown dwarfs are defined as having final masses less than 0.075 \(M_\odot\). The numbers of stars (brown dwarfs) are lower (upper) limits because some of the brown dwarfs were still accreting when the calculations were stopped.

Finally, we note that the free-fall times of the clouds in Calculations 1 and 3 were \(t_\text{ff} = 6.0 \times 10^{12}\) s or 1.90 \times 10^{13} years, while in Calculation 2 \(t_\text{ff} = 2.0 \times 10^{12}\) s or 6.34 \times 10^{14} years.

2.4 Resolution

The local Jeans mass must be resolved throughout the calculations to model fragmentation correctly (Bate & Burkert 1997; Truelove et al. 1997; Whitworth 1998; Boss et al. 2000; Nelson 2005). This requires \(\geq 1.5N\text{neigh}\) SPH particles per Jeans mass; \(N\text{neigh}\) is insufficient (Bate et al. 2003). The minimum Jeans mass in Calculations 1 and 2 occurs at the maximum density during the isothermal phase of the collapse, \(\rho_\text{crit} = 10^{-13}\) g cm\(^{-3}\), and is \(\approx 0.0011 M_\odot\) (1.1 \(M_\odot\)). Thus, we used 3.5 \times 10^6 particles to model the 50-\(M_\odot\) clouds. For Calculation 3, the minimum Jeans mass is a factor of 3 greater because of the decrease in the value of \(\rho_\text{crit}\), but because the calculation is restarted from an early dump file of Calculation 1 it still uses 3.5 \times 10^6 particles. Thus, in Calculation 3, a local Jeans mass is always resolved by at least \(3 \times 1.1 \times 1.5N\text{neigh} \approx 250\) SPH particles.

The calculations required approximately 95000, 50000, and 75000 CPU hours, respectively, on the SGI Origin 3800 of the United Kingdom Astrophysical Fluids Facility (UKAFF).

3 COMPARISON OF RESULTS

The results of Calculations 1 and 2 were published in BBB2003 and BB2005. In these papers, the global evolution of the clouds, the star formation efficiencies and timescales, the forms of the stellar initial mass functions, the formation mechanisms of brown dwarfs and close binaries, the multiplicities and velocity dispersions of the objects, and the properties of their circumstellar discs we examined in detail. In this paper, we present the results of Calculation 3 in an identical manner to the past calculations through the figures and tables, but in the text we concentrate on how the results differ from the other two calculations. In particular, we concentrate on understanding the roles of the opacity limit for fragmentation (i.e., metallicity) and the mean thermal Jeans mass in the progenitor molecular cloud in determining the statistical properties of the stars and brown dwarfs.

3.1 Evolution of the clouds

As stated in Section 2.3, the initial conditions and evolution of Calculations 1 and 3 are identical up to the point that the gas first exceeds the density at which it departs from isothermality, \(\rho_\text{crit}\).
Table 2. The properties of the three dense cores that form during Calculation 3 and those of the cloud as a whole. The gas masses and sizes of the cores are calculated from gas with \( n(\text{H}_2) > 1 \times 10^6 \) cm\(^{-3}\) and \( n(\text{H}_2) > 1 \times 10^7 \) cm\(^{-3}\) (the latter values are given in parentheses). The initial gas mass is calculated just before star formation begins in that core (i.e. different times for each core). Brown dwarfs have final masses less than 0.075 M\(_\odot\). The star formation efficiency is taken to be the total mass of the stars and brown dwarfs that formed in a core divided by the sum of this mass and the mass in gas in that core at the end of the calculation. As with Calculation 1, the star formation efficiency is high locally, but low globally. The numbers of stars (brown dwarfs) are lower (upper) limits because fourteen of the brown dwarfs were still accreting when the calculation was stopped.

Figure 1. The global evolution of the cloud during Calculation 3 for comparison with Figure 2 of BBB2003 for Calculation 1. Images are only shown at times \( t = 1.10 \) to \( 1.40 t_f \) because Calculation 3 was started from the \( t = 1.028 t_f \) dump file of Calculation 1, while the molecular gas was still isothermal. The evolution prior to this time can be seen in Figure 2 of BBB2003. The last three panels all show the cloud at the end of the simulation (\( t = 1.40 t_f \)), but they are from three different angles (along the \( x \), \( y \), and \( z \)-axes). As in Calculation 1, by the end of Calculation 3, three dense cores have formed stars (one main dense core, and two smaller cores visible at the left-hand side of the bottom-left panel). Many of the stars and brown dwarfs that formed in the main dense core have been ejected from the cloud through dynamical interactions. Each panel is 0.4 pc (82400 AU) across. Time is given in units of the initial free-fall time of 1.90 \( \times 10^5 \) yr. The panels show the logarithm of column density, \( N \), through the cloud, with the scale covering \(-1.7 < \log N < 1.5 \) with \( N \) measured in g cm\(^{-2}\). This column density scale is chosen to allow direct comparison with Calculation 1.

and, thus, Calculation 3 is simply started from a dump file of Calculation 1 that was made at \( t = 1.028 t_f \). For a detailed discussion of the earlier evolution of the cloud the reader is referred to BBB2003. Briefly, however, due to the initial velocity dispersion the cloud quickly develops shocks, simultaneously losing kinetic energy and developing overdensities in regions with converging gas flows. When gravity dominates in an overdense region, gravitational collapse occurs and star formation begins.

The clouds modelled in Calculations 1 and 3 each form three dense star-forming cores with essentially identical locations and masses (compare Table 2 with Table 1 of BBB2003 and Figure 1 with Figure 2 of BBB2003). Because of the extra thermal support in Calculation 3, star formation (i.e., the replacing of collapsed gas with sink particles) occurs slightly later in each of the three dense cores than in Calculation 1. The three dense cores begin forming stars at \( t = 1.038 t_f \), \( t = 1.298 t_f \), and \( t = 1.320 t_f \), respectively.
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Figure 2. The star formation in the first (main) dense core of Calculation 3. The first objects form a binary at $t = 1.038 \tau_f$. Large gaseous filaments collapse to form single objects and multiple systems. These objects fall together to form a small group. In Calculation 1, the equivalent group quickly dissolved due to dynamical interactions. However, in Calculation 3 only one object is ejected quickly – the rest settle into a wide group of objects and, simultaneously, there is a quiet period ($t = 1.16 - 1.24 \tau_f$) in the star formation while more gas falls into the core. At $t = 1.26$, a new burst of star formation begins in the filamentary gas and in a large disc around a close binary. The sequence is continued in Figure 3. Each panel is 0.025 pc (5150 AU) across. Time is given in units of the initial free-fall time of $1.90 \times 10^5$ years. The panels show the logarithm of column density, $N$, through the cloud, with the scale covering $-0.5 < \log N < 2.5$ with $N$ measured in g cm$^{-2}$.
Figure 3. The star formation in the first (main) dense core, continued from Figure 2. The second burst of star formation again produces a small group of objects. This group has essentially dissolved by the time the calculation is stopped. Note the system at the top-right of the lower panels – this system is the 220-AU quadruple system (1,2),(6,8) consisting of two close binaries each surrounded by a circumbinary disc (see also Tables 3 and 4). The system at the bottom-right of the lower panels is the quadruple system (3,(5,22),17) which contains a circumstellar disc around object 3 and a circumbinary disc around the 39-AU binary (5,22). Each panel is 0.025 pc (5150 AU) across. Time is given in units of the initial free-fall time of $1.9 \times 10^5$ years. The panels show the logarithm of column density, $N$, through the cloud, with the scale covering $-0.5 < \log N < 2.5$ with $N$ measured in g cm$^{-2}$.

In each case, these times are approximately $0.002 t_f$ later than the corresponding times in Calculation 1.

All three calculations were stopped at $t = 1.40 t_f$ to allow direct comparison of the results. Star formation would continue in each cloud if the calculations were followed further. Calculation 3 produced 16 stars and 16 brown dwarfs. Two additional objects had substellar masses but were still accreting. Both of these formed shortly before the calculation was stopped and, therefore, it is impossible to tell whether or not they would become stars.

3.2 The star-formation process in the dense cores

Snapshots of the process of star formation in Calculation 3 are shown in Figures 2 and 3 for Core 1 and in Figure 4 for Cores 2 and 3. As with the earlier calculations, a true appreciation of how dynamic and chaotic the star-formation process is can only be obtained by studying an animation of the simulation. The reader is encouraged to download an animation comparing Calculations 1 and 3 from http://www.astro.ex.ac.uk/people/mbate/Research/Cluster.

As in Calculation 1, the star formation in the dense cores proceeds via gravitational collapse to produce filamentary structures that fragment (e.g. Bastien 1983; Bastien et al. 1991; Inutsuka & Miyama 1992) to form a combination of single objects and multiple systems (Figures 2, 3 and 4). In Calculation 1, many of the multiple systems result from the fragmentation of massive circumstellar discs (e.g. Bonnell 1994; Bonnell & Bate 1994; Whitworth et al. 1995; Burkert, Bate & Bodenheimer 1997; Hennebelle et al. 2004). This is still the case in Calculation 3 but there is less disc fragmentation than in Calculation 1 because the change in the equation of state results in a given disc being hotter and, thus, more stable against fragmentation. A particularly good example of the effect of the change in the equation of state is the evolution of the disc that forms around the first two objects seen in the upper-right of the four panels in Figure 2 and the equivalent figure of BBB2003). In Calculation 1, this disc fragments to form two stars and a brown dwarf in the interval $t = 1.06 - 1.08 t_f$, but in Calculation 3 this disc does not fragment.

In the most massive core, in both Calculations 1 and 3, the objects fall together into the gravitational potential well of the core to form a small stellar cluster (Figure 2, $t = 1.12 - 1.14 t_f$). At this point, Calculation 3’s cluster contains 10 objects (three fewer than in Calculation 1). From this point on, the clusters begin ejecting objects in dynamical interactions. We note that clusters containing more objects appear to be the most efficient at ejecting objects (i.e., they eject the largest number objects in the same fraction of a free-fall time). At $t = 1.26$, Calculation 3 had produced 14 objects but ejected only five of these, whereas Calculation 1 had produced 20 and ejected 15 of these. Calculation 2 had produced 45 objects in Core 1 and ejected $\approx 20$ of these at the same time and more than half of the objects shortly afterwards.

Another interesting point that is graphically illustrated by comparing the evolutions of the main dense cores of Calculations 1
and 3 is the chaotic nature of star formation. Even a small change in
the physics (in this case, a slight change to the equation of state) re-
results in parallel evolutions that diverge with time. This can be seen
by comparing Figures 2 and 3 with Figures 3 and 4 of BBB2003
(see also the animation). Up until $t = 1.20t_\text{ff}$, the spatial distribu-
tions of star formation within the main dense cores are very similar.
However, after this point they become very different, largely due to
the break up of a multiple system in Calculation 1 that does not
have a counterpart in Calculation 3.

Cores 2 and 3 each produce 3 stars during Calculation 3. Each
of these begins with a single star surrounded by a massive disc
that fragments to form a triple system. Core 3 also forms a fourth
object in a nearby filament, just before the calculation is stopped
(see also Figure 6 of BBB2003 for the counterpart of this filament).
Again, although disc fragmentation occurs in Calculation 3, it is
less prolific than in Calculation 1 in which cores 2 and 3 produced
7 and 5 objects, respectively.

### 3.3 Star formation timescale and efficiency

The timescale on which star formation occurs is the dynamical
one in all three calculations, consistent both with observational and
other theoretical arguments (Pringle 1989; Elmegreen 2000a; Hart-
mann, Ballesteros-Paredes & Bergin 2001), whether or not mag-
netic fields are present (MacLow et al. 1998; Ostriker et al. 2001;
Li et al. 2004). We note that Calculation 3 converts slightly more
gas into stars in the same amount of time as Calculation 1 (6.88
versus 5.89 $M_\odot$). Because the calculations are essentially identical
on large-scales, this difference probably indicates that accretion is
more efficient in clusters containing fewer objects (the gas is less
stirred up).

In all calculations, the local star-formation efficiency is high
within each of the dense cores (see Table 2 for Calculation 3). This
high star-formation efficiency is responsible for the bursts of star
formation seen in all three calculations (see Figure 5 for Calcula-
tion 3, where there is a burst of star formation in the main dense
core from $t = 1.03 - 1.13t_\text{ff}$, followed by a pause, and a second
burst during $t = 1.23 - 1.34t_\text{ff}$). Gas is rapidly converted into stars
in the most massive dense cores and depleted to such an extent that
star formation pauses. Fresh gas must fall into the gravitational po-
tential wells of the small clusters before new bursts of star forma-
tion can ensue. Although the local star-formation efficiency is high
in the dense cores, most of the gas in both calculations is in low-
density regions where no star formation occurs. Thus, the overall
star formation efficiencies are low (~ 10%) for all calculations. Al-
though none of the calculation have been followed until star forma-
tion ceases, in all calculations a large fraction of the gas has drifted
off to large distances by the end of the calculations due to the initial
velocity dispersion and pressure gradients and is not gravitationally
unstable. Thus, the global star formation efficiencies are unlikely
to exceed a few tens of percent. Furthermore, although none of our
calculations form high-mass stars, feedback from jets, outflows and
heating of the gas (none of which are included) would nevertheless
be expected to reduce the star formation efficiency further.

---

**Figure 4.** The star formation in the second and third dense cores. The first object in core 2 forms at $t = 1.298t_\text{ff}$, followed quickly by the first object in core 3
at $t = 1.320t_\text{ff}$. Both objects are subsequently surrounded by massive circumstellar discs that each fragment to form two triple stellar systems. Just before the
a fourth object forms from a filament in core 3 that has the mass of a brown dwarf but is still accreting rapidly when the calculation is stopped. Each panel is
0.025 pc (5150 AU) across. Time is given in units of the initial free-fall time of $1.90 \times 10^5$ yr. The panels show the logarithm of column density, $N$, through
the cloud, with the scale covering $-0.5 < \log N < 2.5$ with $N$ measured in g cm$^{-2}$. 

---
2, BBB2003 and BB2005 found that the final velocity dispersion of brown dwarfs in all three calculations is independent both of stellar mass and binarity. While the lack of dependence on mass was reported in past N-body simulations of the breakup of small-N clusters with $N > 3$ (Sterzik & Durisen 1998) and SPH calculations of $N = 5$ clusters embedded in gas (Delgado-Donate, Clarke & Bate 2003), these calculations found that binaries should have a smaller velocity dispersion than single objects due to the recoil velocities of binaries being lower, keeping them within the stellar groups.

The velocities of the stars and brown dwarfs relative to the centre of mass of all the objects are given in Figure 6 for Calculation 3. The rms velocity dispersion is 3.7 km s$^{-1}$ in three dimensions or 2.1 km s$^{-1}$ in one dimension (using the centre-of-mass velocity for binaries closer than 10 AU). This is intermediate between the velocity dispersions of Calculations 1 and 2, which had three-dimensional velocity dispersions of 2.1 and 4.3 km s$^{-1}$, respectively.

The three-dimensional velocity dispersions of brown dwarfs, stars, and binaries (semi-major axes $< 100$ AU) are 4.4, 2.8, and 1.2 km s$^{-1}$, respectively. The difference between the velocity dispersions of the stars and brown dwarfs is not significant since the high brown dwarf velocity dispersion is based purely on a single brown dwarf that was ejected with a velocity of 14 km s$^{-1}$ (removing this object from the sample gives a brown dwarf velocity dispersion of 2.8 km s$^{-1}$, exactly the same as that of the stars). However, the difference between singles and binaries does appear to be significant. This different result is due to the fact that in Calculations 1 and 2, both single and binary stars were ejected so that their velocity dispersions were indistinguishable whereas, in Calculation 3, all of the binaries are in fact members of triple or high-order systems (see Table 3) and none were ejected before the calculation was stopped resulting in them having a low velocity dispersion. This implies that the lack of dependence of the velocity dispersion on multiplicity that was found in Calculations 1 and 2 is brought about by the fact that most objects in those calculations formed in clusters of $N > 20$ objects so that both single objects and multiple systems were ejected. Small multiple systems are efficient at ejecting single objects, but without the larger clusters of objects that formed in Calculations 1 and 2 it is difficult to eject a multiple system. This matches well with the results of Delgado-Donate et al. (2004) who performed simulations of star formation in small turbulent clouds and found while the velocity dispersions of singles and binaries were indistinguishable, higher-order multiples had significantly lower velocity dispersions. The implications for observed star-forming regions are clear. In low-density star-forming regions such as Taurus and Chameleon that form only very small groups of stars, multiple systems may have a lower velocity dispersion than single objects, whereas in richer star-forming regions such as ρ Ophiuchus and Orion there may be no distinction between the velocity dispersions of single and multiple systems.

As discussed in BBB2003, observations show that star formation efficiencies vary widely across star-forming regions. Some parts of star-forming clouds contain no newly formed objects while in other parts, notably clusters and groups, the local efficiency can reach 50% or more. Overall, such a pattern results in low global star formation efficiencies, typically 10-30% (Wilking & Lada 1983; Lada 1992).

### 3.4 Stellar velocity dispersion

Dynamical interactions between cluster members eject stars and brown dwarfs in all three calculations. In both Calculations 1 and 2, BBB2003 and BB2005 found that the final velocity dispersion of the stars and brown dwarfs is independent both of stellar mass and binarity. While the lack of dependence on mass was reported from past N-body simulations of the breakup of small-N clusters with $N > 3$ (Sterzik & Durisen 1998) and SPH calculations of $N = 5$ clusters embedded in gas (Delgado-Donate, Clarke & Bate 2003), these calculations found that binaries should have a smaller velocity dispersion than single objects due to the recoil velocities of binaries being lower, keeping them within the stellar groups.

The velocities of the stars and brown dwarfs relative to the centre of mass of all the objects are given in Figure 6 for Calculation 3. The rms velocity dispersion is 3.7 km s$^{-1}$ in three dimensions or 2.1 km s$^{-1}$ in one dimension (using the centre-of-mass velocity for binaries closer than 10 AU). This is intermediate between the velocity dispersions of Calculations 1 and 2, which had three-dimensional velocity dispersions of 2.1 and 4.3 km s$^{-1}$, respectively.

The three-dimensional velocity dispersions of brown dwarfs, stars, and binaries (semi-major axes $< 100$ AU) are 4.4, 2.8, and 1.2 km s$^{-1}$, respectively. The difference between the velocity dispersions of the stars and brown dwarfs is not significant since the high brown dwarf velocity dispersion is based purely on a single brown dwarf that was ejected with a velocity of 14 km s$^{-1}$ (removing this object from the sample gives a brown dwarf velocity dispersion of 2.8 km s$^{-1}$, exactly the same as that of the stars). However, the difference between singles and binaries does appear to be significant. This different result is due to the fact that in Calculations 1 and 2, both single and binary stars were ejected so that their velocity dispersions were indistinguishable whereas, in Calculation 3, all of the binaries are in fact members of triple or high-order systems (see Table 3) and none were ejected before the calculation was stopped resulting in them having a low velocity dispersion. This implies that the lack of dependence of the velocity dispersion on multiplicity that was found in Calculations 1 and 2 is brought about by the fact that most objects in those calculations formed in clusters of $N > 20$ objects so that both single objects and multiple systems were ejected. Small multiple systems are efficient at ejecting single objects, but without the larger clusters of objects that formed in Calculations 1 and 2 it is difficult to eject a multiple system. This matches well with the results of Delgado-Donate et al. (2004) who performed simulations of star formation in small turbulent clouds and found while the velocity dispersions of singles and binaries were indistinguishable, higher-order multiples had significantly lower velocity dispersions. The implications for observed star-forming regions are clear. In low-density star-forming regions such as Taurus and Chameleon that form only very small groups of stars, multiple systems may have a lower velocity dispersion than single objects, whereas in richer star-forming regions such as ρ Ophiuchus and Orion there may be no distinction between the velocity dispersions of single and multiple systems.
The dependence of the IMF on metallicity

Figure 8. The initial mass functions produced by Calculations 1 and 3. Calculation 3 (right hand panel) is identical to Calculation 1 (left hand panel), except that the collapsing gas begins heating at a lower density, resulting in a greater minimum brown dwarf mass. The single shaded regions show all of the objects, the double shaded regions show only those objects that have finished accreting. The mass resolution of the simulations is 0.0011 $M_\odot$ (i.e. 1.1 $M_\odot$), but no objects have masses lower than 4.9 $M_\odot$ in Calculation 1 and 9.7 $M_\odot$ in Calculation 3 due to the opacity limit for fragmentation. We also plot fits to the observed IMF from Miller & Scalo (1979) (dashed line), Kroupa (2001) (solid broken line), and Chabrier (2003) (solid curve). The Salpeter (1955) slope (solid straight line) is equal to that of Kroupa (2001) for $M > 0.5 M_\odot$. The vertical dashed line marks the star/brown dwarf boundary.

Figure 7. The cumulative initial mass functions produced by Calculations 1 (solid line) and 3 (dotted line). A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test on the two distributions shows that there is a 45% probability that they are drawn from the same underlying IMF (i.e., statistically, they are indistinguishable). The vertical dashed line marks the star/brown dwarf boundary.

that Goodwin, Whitworth & Ward-Thompson (2004) argue that the mass function in Taurus may differ to other star-forming regions due to the fact that it only contains low-mass cores.

Observationally, in agreement with the calculations presented here, there is no evidence for brown dwarfs having a significantly higher velocity dispersion than stars (something that was suggested as a possible signature that brown dwarfs form as ejected stellar embryos by Reipurth & Clarke 2001). In fact, studies of the radial velocities of stars and brown dwarfs in the Chamaeleon I dark cloud find that brown dwarfs have a marginally lower velocity dispersion than the T Tauri stars (Joergens & Guenther 2001; Joergens 2003; Joergens 2005).

3.5 Initial mass function

A summary of the mass distributions of the stars and brown dwarfs formed in the three calculations is given in Table 1. From Calculations 1 and 2, BB2005 found that decreasing the mean thermal Jeans mass of the progenitor cloud by a factor of three resulted in a corresponding decrease in the median (characteristic) mass by a factor of almost exactly a factor of three. Thus, they concluded that the characteristic stellar mass is set by the mean thermal Jeans mass in molecular clouds. However, the opacity limit for fragmentation was the same in both these calculations, leaving open the question of its role in the origin of the IMF. We show in this section that changing the opacity limit for fragmentation only alters the value of the minimum mass cut-off and does not alter the rest of the IMF significantly.

Calculations 1 and 3 can be used to investigate the dependence of the IMF on the opacity limit for fragmentation since they are identical except for the minimum object mass. As described in Section 2.1, the minimum mass in Calculation 3 is a factor of three greater than that in Calculation 1 (roughly 9 $M_\odot$ as opposed to 3 $M_\odot$). The IMFs from the two calculations are given in Figure 8. Both calculations form roughly equal numbers of stars and brown dwarfs, indicating that changing the minimum object mass by a factor of three has little affect on the IMF (as opposed to Calculation 2 whose IMF was biased in favour of brown dwarfs). In Calculation 1, 50 objects were formed with a mean object mass of 0.118 $M_\odot$ and a median mass of 0.070 $M_\odot$. In Calculation 3, 34 objects were formed in the same time with a mean mass of 0.202 $M_\odot$ and a median mass of 0.054 $M_\odot$. As we have already discussed, heating of the gas at lower densities inhibits fragmentation, which is consistent with the fact that fewer objects are formed and their mean mass is greater. However, with such small numbers of objects, it is important to inquire whether any difference in the IMFs is statistically significant. In Figure 7, we give the cumulative IMFs. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test on the two distributions shows that there is a 45% probability that they are drawn from the same underlying IMF (i.e., statistically, they are indistinguishable). By contrast, BB2005 found that the IMFs from Calculations 1 and 2 had only a 1.9% probability of being drawn from the same under-
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Cululations 1 and 2 were 4.9 M
the lowest mass brown dwarf formed has a mass of 9.7 M
Indeed, the lowest mass brown dwarf formed has a mass of 9.7 M
The solid line gives the arithmetic mean of the accretion rates: 1.9x10^{-5} M_J/yr.

The time-averaged accretion rates of the objects formed in the calculation versus their final masses. The accretion rates are calculated as the final mass of an object divided by the time between their formation and the termination of their accretion or the end of the calculation. The horizontal solid line gives the arithmetic mean of the accretion rates: 1.9x10^{-5} M_J/yr.

The time-averaged accretion rates of the objects formed in the calculation versus their final masses. The accretion rates are calculated as the final mass of an object divided by the time between their formation and the termination of their accretion or the end of the calculation. The horizontal solid line gives the arithmetic mean of the accretion rates: 1.9x10^{-5} M_J/yr.

The time between the formation of each object and the termination of its accretion or the end of the calculation versus its final mass. As for the calculations in BB2005, there is a clear linear correlation between the time an object spends accreting and its final mass. The solid line gives the curve that the objects would lie on if each object accreted at the mean of the time-averaged accretion rates. The accretion times are given in units of the t_e on the left-hand axes and years on the right-hand axes. The vertical dashed line marks the star/brown dwarf boundary.

We note that the lowest mass objects in all three calculations were ejected before the end of the calculations and none of them are still accreting. The minimum resolvable mass in the calculations is 1.1 M_J (see Section 2.4).

In Figure 8, we compare the IMFs from Calculations 1 and 3 with parameterizations of the observed Galactic IMF by Miller & Scalo (1979), Kroupa (2001), and Chabrier (2003). Calculation 1 is in good agreement with Chabrier’s single star IMF (solid curve), although we cannot yet test the form of the high-mass end of the IMF (masses > 1 M_J) with calculations that simultaneously resolve down to the opacity limit for fragmentation. It is difficult to compare Calculation 3 with the parameterized IMFs due to the small number of objects formed but, within the large uncertainties, it too is consistent with the observed IMF.

BB2005 investigated in detail the origin of the IMF from Calculations 1 and 2. Since all objects in the calculations begin as opacity limited fragments at the minimum mass and then accrete to their final masses, low-mass objects could originate from objects with low accretion rates or from objects with a typical accretion rate whose accretion is terminated shortly after they form (e.g., by ejection in a dynamical interaction with other objects).

Following BB2005, in Figure 9, we plot the time-averaged accretion rates of all the objects in Calculation 3 as a function of their final masses. A time-averaged accretion rate is defined as the mass of an object at the end of the calculation divided by the time over which it accreted that mass. The accretion time is measured from the formation of an object (i.e., the insertion of a sink particle) to the last time at which its accretion rate drops below 10^{-7} M_J/yr, or the end of the calculation (which ever occurs first). We also define an ejection time, which is the time between the formation of an object and last time the magnitude of its acceleration drops below 2000 km/s/Myr (or the end of the calculation). The acceleration criterion is based on the fact that once an object is ejected from a stellar cluster through a dynamical encounter, its acceleration will drop to a low value. The specific value of the acceleration was chosen by comparing animations and graphs of acceleration versus time for individual objects. As with Calculations 1 and 2, the time-averaged accretion rates of the objects have a significant dispersion. How-
ever, there is no systematic trend for the lower-mass objects to have lower time-averaged accretion rates.

In Figure 10 we plot the time between the formation of an object and the termination of its accretion (or the end of the calculation) versus the final mass of the object. Those points with arrows denote those objects that are still accreting significantly at the end of the calculation. Accreting objects would move towards the upper right of the diagrams if the calculations were extended. Again, as with Calculations 1 and 2, it is clear that the lower the final mass of the object, the earlier its accretion was terminated. This is the origin of the mass distribution of the objects.

To check that the termination of the accretion is caused by the ejection of objects during dynamical interactions, in Figure 11, we plot the time between the formation of an object and its ejection from a stellar group versus the time between the formation of an object and the termination of its accretion. In this figure, we only plot those objects that have stopped accreting and reached their final masses by the end of the calculations. As in Calculations 1 and 2, the ejection and accretion times are closely correlated, showing that the termination of accretion on an object is usually associated with dynamical ejection of the object. These results confirm the speculation of Reipurth & Clarke (2001) and the conclusions of Bate et al. (2002a) and BB2005 that brown dwarfs are ‘failed stars’. They fall short of reaching stellar masses because they are cut off from their source of accretion prematurely due to ejection in dynamical interactions.

### 3.6 Multiple systems

In all three calculations, the dominant formation mechanism for binary and multiple systems was fragmentation, either of gaseous filaments (e.g. Bastian 1983; Bastien et al. 1991; Inutsuka & Miyama 1992) or of massive circumstellar discs (e.g. Bonnell 1994; Bate & Bonnell 1994; Whitworth et al. 1995; Burkert, Bate & Bodenheimer 1997; Hennebelle et al. 2004). Star-disc encounters played an important role in truncating discs (Section 3.7), and in dissipating kinetic energy (c.f. Larson 2002), but they did not play a significant role in forming binary and multiple systems from unbound objects (c.f. Clarke & Pringle 1991a). Only two star-disc encounters resulted in the formation of multiple systems in Calculation 1, while in Calculation 2 there was no obvious example of a multiple system being formed via a star-disc encounter.

In Calculation 3, there are three occurrences of star-disc encounters resulting in the formation of multiple systems. Given that there are only four multiple systems at the end of the calculation (which contain 5 binaries), star-disc encounters seem to play a greater role in Calculation 3. As in Section 3.4, which discussed velocity dispersion, we can attribute the greater importance of star-disc interactions in creating multiple systems to the smaller sizes of the stellar groups in Calculation 3. As pointed out by Clarke & Pringle (1991), star-disc encounters in larger-\(N\) clusters are less likely to result in capture because the virial speeds in the clusters will be higher and discs are more likely to be dispersed by high-velocity encounters prior to undergoing potential star-disc captures.

#### 3.6.1 Multiplicity

When Calculation 3 was stopped, there were 19 single objects, 1 triple, and 3 quadruple systems (taking any objects with semi-major axes greater than 2000 AU to be essentially unbound). The properties of the 4 multiple systems are displayed in Table 3 and in Figure 12. Two of these systems originated in the main dense core, and one each in Cores 2 and 3. Within these systems there are 5 single stars, 12 binaries, 1 quadruple system, and four of the ejected brown dwarfs are still very weakly bound to each other, but are all at large distances from each other. The two multiple systems in Cores 2 and 3 are also marginally bound to each other.

Calculation 3 produces a high companion star fraction

\[
CSF = \frac{B + 2T + 3Q + \ldots}{S + B + T + Q + \ldots}
\]

(2)
of 11/23 = 48 percent, where \(S\) is the number of single stars, \(B\) is the number of binaries, \(T\) is the number of triples, etc. Alternately, the number of companions divided by the total number of objects is 11/34 = 32 percent. These percentages are similar to those of Calculation 1. Although the systems with more than two components will continue to evolve and some will probably eject more mem-

---

**Table 3.** The properties of the 4 multiple systems with semi-major axes less than 2000 AU formed in Calculation 3 (see also Figure 11). One of these systems is a triple while the other three are quadruple systems. The structure of each system is described using a binary hierarchy. For each ‘binary’ we give the masses of the primary \(M_1\) and secondary \(M_2\), the mass ratio \(q = M_2/M_1\), the semi-major axis \(a\), and the eccentricity \(e\). The combined masses of multiple systems are given in parentheses. Orbital quantities marked with asterisks are unreliable because these close binaries have periastron distances less than the gravitational softening length. When the calculation is stopped, all four systems are unstable and/or are still accreting, so their final states are unknown. In the comments, BD companion refers to a wide brown dwarf companion to the tighter triple system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Numbers</th>
<th>(M_1)</th>
<th>(M_2)</th>
<th>(q)</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1,2)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.77*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24,28)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31,32)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,22)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System 1; In Core 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,2)(6,8)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,5,22),17</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24,28)(29),34</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD companion; System 3; In Core 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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systems with squares. This figure should be compared with Figure 12 of BBB2003 and Figure 11 of BB2005 for the equivalent results from the other calculations. Calculation 1 produced no wide binaries (separations $>20$ AU), but the lowest mass ratio is $M_2/M_1 = 0.28$.

![Mass ratios versus semi-major axes of the binary, triple and quadruple systems that exist at the end of the calculation (see also Table 3). Binas plotted with circles, triples with triangles and quadruple systems with squares. This figure should be compared with Figure 12 of BBB2003 and Figure 11 of BB2005 for the equivalent results from the other calculations. Calculation 1 produced no wide binaries (separations $>10$ AU) and no binaries with mass ratios $M_2/M_1 \leq 0.3$. Calculation 2 produced five wide binaries and three binaries with mass ratios $M_2/M_1 < 0.2$. This calculation produces wide binaries (separations $>10$ AU), but the lowest mass ratio is $M_2/M_1 = 0.28$.]

Figure 12. Mass ratios versus semi-major axes of the binary, triple and quadruple systems that exist at the end of the calculation (see also Table 3). Binas plotted with circles, triples with triangles and quadruple systems with squares. This figure should be compared with Figure 12 of BBB2003 and Figure 11 of BB2005 for the equivalent results from the other calculations. Calculation 1 produced no wide binaries (separations $>10$ AU) and no binaries with mass ratios $M_2/M_1 \leq 0.3$. Calculation 2 produced five wide binaries and three binaries with mass ratios $M_2/M_1 < 0.2$. This calculation produces wide binaries (separations $>10$ AU), but the lowest mass ratio is $M_2/M_1 = 0.28$.

As with Calculations 1 and 2, Calculation 3 produces a realistic frequency of close binaries (separations $<10$ AU) even though no two objects form closer than 13 AU from each other due to the opacity limit for fragmentation (see Bate et al. 2002b for a full discussion). Thus, although the change in the equation of state of the gas inhibits fragmentation more in Calculation 3 than in Calculation 1, this does not seem to affect the ability of close binaries to form. Even if all wider systems break up, the resulting frequency of close binaries would be $3/31 = 10$ percent. The corresponding values from Calculations 1 and 2 were 16 percent and 7 percent, respectively. The observed value is $\approx 20$ percent (Duquennoy & Mayor 1991). However, Duquennoy & Mayor were not sensitive to brown dwarfs. If only stars are considered, the frequency of close binaries becomes $3/13 \approx 23$ percent (for Calculations 1 and 2 the corresponding frequencies were similar at $5/18 \approx 28$ percent and $4/15 \approx 27$ percent, respectively). As in Calculations 1 and 2, there is a preference for close binaries to have equal masses (all three have mass ratios of $M_2/M_1 > 0.5$), and the frequency of close binaries is higher for more massive primaries – 6 of the 16 stars are members of close binaries, while no brown dwarfs are in close binaries. These preferences result from the formation mechanisms of close systems as discussed by Bate et al. (2002b).

### 3.6.2 Brown-dwarf companions to stars and brown dwarfs

Together, Calculations 1 and 2 produced 6 binaries consisting only of very-low-mass (VLM) stars ($M < 0.09 M_\odot$) or brown dwarfs out of $\approx 80$ VLM or brown dwarf systems, implying a frequency of binary brown dwarfs of $\approx 8$ percent. Calculation 3 is consistent with this frequency in that it produced no VLM binaries from $\approx 18$ VLM objects. Together, the three calculations give an overall VLM binary frequency of $\approx 6$ percent. For star-brown dwarf binary systems, the frequencies are also very low. Calculation 1 one produced one binary system consisting of a star ($0.13 M_\odot$) and a brown dwarf ($0.04 M_\odot$). The system had a separation of 7 AU and was part of an unstable septuple system. Both objects were still accreting. Calculations 2 and 3 did not produce any such star/brown dwarf binary systems. The reasons for these low frequencies are discussed by BB2005.

The observed frequency of very-low-mass and brown dwarf binaries is $\approx 15$ percent (Reid et al. 2001; Close et al. 2002, 2003; Bouy et al. 2003; Burgasser et al. 2003; Gizis et al. 2003; Martin et al. 2003; Siegler et al. 2005). Note, however, that the frequency of binary brown dwarfs as wide companions to stars may be higher (Burgasser, Kirkpatrick & Lowrance 2005). The vast majority of binary brown dwarfs have separations less than 20 AU (Close et al. 2003; Siegler et al. 2005), but there is at least one binary brown dwarf system with a separation greater than 200 AU (Luhman 2004a). Thus, the calculations correctly favour the production of close binary brown dwarfs, but they under-produce binary brown dwarfs by roughly a factor of two. This difficulty may be associated with our resolution limits – we are unable to resolve circumstellar discs at radii $\leq 10$ AU, and gravitational interactions between stars/brown dwarfs are softened at separations less than 4 AU. The rarity of brown dwarfs orbiting stars is consistent both with the so-called brown dwarf desert discovered through Doppler searches for planets orbiting solar-type stars (Marcy & Butler 2000) and from imaging surveys for wide systems (Gizis et al. 2001).

Finally, many of the multiple systems in all of our calculations have wide brown dwarf companions. Although they are still dynamically evolving when the calculations are stopped, we note that the small-scale turbulent star-formation simulations of Delgado-Donate et al. (2004), which were evolved until the systems reached dynamical stability, also predict that many close stellar binary systems should have wide brown dwarf companions.

### 3.7 Protoplanetary discs

The calculations resolve gaseous discs with radii $\geq 10$ AU around the young stars and brown dwarfs. Discs with typical radii of $\sim 50$ AU form around many of the objects due to the infall of gas with high specific angular momentum. However, in all calculations discs are severely truncated in subsequent dynamical interactions, leaving most of them too small to form analogues of our solar system (see BBB2003). The six resolved discs at the end of Calculation 3 are listed in Table 4, and in Figure 13 we plot the closest encounter distance for each object during the calculation as a function of its final mass. All but two stars have had encounters closer than 10 AU. None of the brown dwarfs or ejected stars have resolved discs and the stars with resolved discs are all members of multiple systems. Although they have had very close encounters, subsequent infalling gas has build up circumbinary and circutriple discs around them. This is a feature of all three calculations.
simple model for the origin of the IMF and found that it reproduced
the IMFs obtained from the first two calculations very well. Here
we show that the model also produces an acceptable fit to the IMF
from Calculation 3.

The simple accretion/ejection model for the IMF produced by
a star-forming molecular cloud is as follows.

- We assume all objects begin with masses set by the opacity
  limit for fragmentation (3 $M_\odot$ for Calculations 1 and 2 and 9 $M_\odot$
  for Calculation 3) and then accrete at a fixed rate $\dot{M}$ until they are
  ejected.
- We assume the accretion rates of individual objects are drawn
  from a log-normal distribution with a mean accretion rate (in log-
  space) given by $\log(\dot{M}) = \log(M_f) + \sigma G$, where $G$ is a random Gaussian deviate
  with zero mean and unity variance.
- The ejection of protostars from an $N$-body system is a stochastic
  process that can be described in terms of the half-life of the pro-
  cess. We assume that there is a single parameter, $\tau_{\text{eject}}$, that is the
  characteristic timescale between the formation of an object and its
  ejection from the cloud. The probability of an individual object be-
  ing ejected is then $\exp(-t/\tau_{\text{eject}})$ where $t$ is the time elapsed since
  its formation.

Calculation 3 supports this model in that Figure 9 shows there is no
correlation between an object’s time-averaged accretion rate and its
final mass, while Figure 10 shows a strong correlation between the
time an object spends accreting and its final mass and Figure 11
shows that accretion is usually terminated by gravitational interac-
tions with other objects leading to dynamical ejection.

Assuming that the cloud forms a large number of objects, $N$, and
that the time it evolves for is much greater than the character-
estic ejection time, $T \gg \tau_{\text{eject}}$, then a semi-analytic formula can be
derived for the form of the IMF (BB2005) and there are essentially
only three free parameters in the model. These are the mean accretion
rate times the ejection timescale, $\overline{M} = \overline{M}_{\tau_{\text{eject}}}$, the dispersion in
the time-averaged accretion rates, $\sigma$, and the minimum mass pro-
vided by the opacity limit for fragmentation, $M_{\text{min}}$. If $\overline{M} >> M_{\text{min}}$, $\overline{M}$
is the characteristic mass of an object.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disc Radius AU</th>
<th>Encircled Objects</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>(31,32),23</td>
<td>Circumtriple disc (Figure 2, $t = 1.40t_1$, right)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>(24,28),29</td>
<td>Circumtriple disc (Figure 4, $t = 1.40t_1$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>5,22</td>
<td>Circumbinary disc, forms triple system with 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Forms triple system with 5,22 (Figure 2, $t = 1.40t_1$, left)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>Circumbinary disc, forms quadruple system with 1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>Circumbinary disc, forms quadruple system with 6,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. The discs that exist around objects when the calculation is stopped. Discs with radii $\leq 10$ AU are not resolved. Unlike Calculation 1, in Calculation 3 no objects are ejected with resolved discs. This table should be compared with Tables 4 of BBB2003 and BB2005 for the equivalent results from Calculations 1 and 2, respectively.

Figure 13. The closest encounter distance of each star or brown dwarf during
the calculation versus the object’s final mass. This figure should be
compared with Figure 14 of BBB2003 and Figure 12 of BB2005 for the
equivalent results from Calculations 1 and 2. Objects that are still accreting
significantly at the end of the calculation are denoted with arrows indicating
that they are still evolving and that their masses are lower limits.
Objects that have resolved discs at the end of the simulation are circled.
Discs smaller than $\approx 10$ AU (horizontal dotted line) cannot be resolved by
the simulation. Objects that have close encounters may still have re-
solved discs due to subsequent accretion from the cloud. Note that there are
only 6 resolved discs at the end of the simulation, but many surrounding
binary and higher-order multiple systems (hence the 13 circles in the figure).
Binaries (semi-major axes $< 100$ AU) are plotted with the two components
connected by dotted lines and squares are used as opposed to circles.
Components of triple systems whose orbits have semi-major axes $10 < a < 100$
AU are denoted by triangles. All of the binaries are surrounded by resolved
discs. Encounter distances less than 4 AU are upper limits since the point
mass potential is softened within this radius. The vertical dashed line marks
the star/brown dwarf boundary. The two brown dwarfs in the top left corner
of the figure that are still accreting formed shortly before the calculation
was stopped are thus still evolving rapidly. They may not end up as brown
dwarfs. There are no brown dwarfs that have resolved discs and have finished
accreting.
Figure 14 shows that the simple accretion/ejection model matches the hydrodynamical IMF reasonably well. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test gives a 6.6 percent probability that the hydrodynamical IMF could have been drawn from the model IMF (i.e., they are consistent with each other). For Calculations 1 and 2, the hydrodynamical IMFs have 92 and 27 percent probabilities of being drawn from the simple accretion/ejection model IMFs, respectively (see BB2005).

4.2 The dependence of the IMF on temperature

Since the three hydrodynamical calculations discussed in this paper are very time consuming, they have been carefully designed to enable the origins of the statistical properties of stars to be investigated in the most possible detail. Comparison of Calculations 1 and 2 allowed BB2005 to investigate the dependence of star formation on the mean density $\bar{\rho}$ of the molecular cloud and, therefore, the mean thermal Jeans mass which scales as $1/\sqrt{\bar{\rho}}$. Comparison of Calculations 1 and 3 allows the role of the opacity limit for fragmentation to be investigated. However, it is also possible to compare Calculations 2 with Calculations 1 and 3 to investigate the dependence of star formation on the temperature of a molecular cloud and, thus, test further BB2005’s assertion that the characteristic stellar mass depends primarily on the mean thermal Jeans mass of a star-forming molecular cloud.

Purely isothermal models of the collapse of molecular clouds are often said to be scale-free in that they can be rescaled arbitrarily to different model clouds with different masses or radii. In these cases, only dimensionless quantities such as the ratio of thermal to gravitational potential energies remain fixed.

The calculations discussed in this paper have a characteristic density introduced through the change in the equation of state that occurs at the critical density $\rho_{\text{crit}}$. However, they can still be rescaled. Calculation 2 differed to Calculation 1 in that its density was greater by a factor of nine, decreasing the mean thermal Jeans mass from $1 \, M_\odot$ in Calculation 1 to $1/3 \, M_\odot$. This was achieved by decreasing the radius by a factor of $9^{1/6} \approx 2.08$. The only other difference was that, because the initial ‘turbulence’ was normalised so that the kinetic energy equaled the magnitude of the gravitational potential energy while the initial temperature was kept at 10 K, the Mach number was larger in Calculation 2 by a factor of $9^{1/6} \approx 1.44$.

We can also inquire what the star formation would be like if Calculation 2 was re-run, but with a greater initial cloud temperature. In particular, if we increased the temperature by a factor of $2^{3/2} = 2.08$, this would give the same initial mean thermal Jeans mass of $1 \, M_\odot$ as that in Calculations 1 and 3. Thus, rescaling the results of Calculations 1 and 3 by reducing all distances by a factor 2.08 gives the same evolution as running Calculation 2 with an initial temperature of 20.8 K instead of 10 K. The initial densities, velocities, and free-fall times of the clouds are the same as they were in Calculation 2. But now the results give the properties of stars formed in hotter clouds with critical densities of $\rho_{\text{crit}} = 9.0 \times 10^{-13}$ and $1.0 \times 10^{-13}$ for Calculations 1 and 3, respectively. The only slight difference between these rescaled versions of Calculations 1 and 3 and performing entirely new calculations of hotter clouds with these critical densities is that Calculations 1, 2, and 3 all used sink particles to model the stars and brown dwarfs with accretion radii of 5 AU and gravitational softening of dynamical interactions within 4 AU. The rescaled versions of Calculations 1 and 3 have sink particle radii and gravitational softening 2.08 times smaller than these values. However, the whole assumption of using sink particles is that the results are not sensitive to their introduction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$M_{\text{min}} / M_\odot$</th>
<th>$\bar{M}/M_\odot$</th>
<th>$\sigma_{\text{accretion}}$</th>
<th>$\tau_{\text{eject}}$ yr</th>
<th>$T$ yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>$6.17 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>$3.2 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$6.91 \times 10^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>$7.18 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$9.3 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>$3.67 \times 10^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>$1.00 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$6.91 \times 10^4$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. The parameters of the simple accretion/ejection IMF models that should reproduce the IMFs from the three hydrodynamical calculations (Figure 14). There are essentially three parameters in the models, the mean accretion rate times the characteristic timescale for ejection ($\bar{M} \tau_{\text{eject}}$), the dispersion in the accretion rates $\sigma_{\text{accretion}}$, and the minimum mass set by the opacity limit for fragmentation $M_{\text{min}}$. The time period over which the simulations are run, $T$, has a small effect on the form of the IMF. For example, the peak in the model IMF (Figure 14) at very low masses is because one object formed shortly before the calculation was stopped and therefore this object does not usually manage to accrete much mass in the model.
Certainly, it is assumed that the results do not change dramatically by varying accretion radii by factors of two.

With this one caveat, we can use the rescaled results to investigate the dependence of star formation on the temperature of a molecular cloud. Changing the distance scale of Calculations 1 and 3 does not alter the mass scaling. Thus, the IMFs of Calculations 1 and 3 do not change due to the rescaling. BB2005 showed that the characteristic (median) mass of Calculation 2 is a factor of 3.04 smaller than that of Calculation 1, following almost exactly the change in the mean thermal Jeans mass. Thus, the characteristic (median) mass of the rescaled Calculation 1 (which models a cloud identical to that of Calculation 2 except that its temperature is 2.08 times hotter) also follows the increase in the mean thermal Jeans mass due to the increase in the temperature $T$ (the Jeans mass scales as $T^{3/2}$). Furthermore, since the IMFs of Calculations 1 and 3 are indistinguishable (Section 8), the opacity limit for fragmentation which is modelled by the critical density at which the equation of state changes also plays no significant role in determining the IMF in the hotter high-density clouds represented by the rescaled versions of Calculations 1 and 3.

In summary, the characteristic (median) mass of the IMF is set by the mean thermal Jeans mass in the progenitor cloud (determined by the density and temperature), and not by the opacity limit for fragmentation (determined by metallicity). The question then arises as to what sets the mean thermal Jeans mass in a molecular cloud. Larson (2005) has argued that this is set by a change in the thermal behaviour of the gas forming molecular clouds when the cooling switches from being dominated by line cooling to dust cooling. This has been backed up by hydrodynamical simulations that study how the characteristic mass of fragments depends on the equation of state at low densities (Jappsen et al. 2005). Therefore, it is important to note that although metallicity may not affect the IMF above the low-mass cut-off through its effect on the opacity limit for fragmentation, it may still have an effect on the characteristic mass of the IMF if it alters the cooling during molecular cloud formation and, hence, the mean thermal Jeans mass of the molecular cloud.

5 CONCLUSIONS

We have presented results from the third hydrodynamical calculation to follow the collapse of a turbulent molecular cloud to form a stellar cluster while resolving fragmentation down to the opacity limit. We compare the results with those obtained from the calculations published by Bate et al. (2002a, 2002b, 2003) and Bate & Bonnell (2005). The new calculation is identical to that of Bate et al. (2003), except for the density above which the opacity limit inhibits fragmentation. It can also be rescaled to model a cloud that is identical to that of Bate & Bonnell (2005) except that the initial gas has a temperature of 20.8 K instead of 10 K.

We find that although the minimum mass of a brown dwarf increases when the opacity limit for fragmentation sets in at a lower gas density (i.e., a lower metallicity), the form of the IMF above the minimum cut-off mass is independent of the opacity limit for fragmentation.

Rather than being set by the opacity limit for fragmentation, Bate & Bonnell (2005) showed that the characteristic (median) mass of the IMF varies linearly with the mean thermal Jeans mass in the molecular cloud. They did this by running two calculations with different densities. However, the mean thermal Jeans mass is a function of both density and temperature. Here we also confirm that the characteristic mass of the IMF varies linearly with the mean thermal Jeans mass by comparing two clouds with the same initial densities, but with different initial temperatures.

Finally, the new calculation discussed in this paper displays several differences from the earlier calculations. Because collapsing gas begins to heat at a lower density, the degree of fragmentation is reduced and the stellar groups contain fewer objects. This has two main effects. First, the velocity dispersion of multiple stars is lower than that of single objects because it is difficult to eject binaries from small-$N$ groups (Section 3.4). Second, star-disc interactions play a greater role in forming binary and multiple systems than in the earlier calculations because the velocity dispersions of the objects in smaller groups tend to be lower and discs undergo fewer dispersive encounters (Section 3.6). We also note that Goodwin et al. (2004) found that the somewhat peculiar IMF of Taurus (with a peak at $\approx 0.8 M_\odot$) and few low-mass objects; Briceño et al. 2002; Luhman 2004b) may result from the molecular cloud being composed of a collection of low-mass cores with similar masses. Together, these results imply that in a region like Taurus, which contains only low-mass cores forming small groups of stars, the IMF may be abnormal, multiple systems may have a smaller velocity dispersion than singles, and star-disc encounters may be more important for forming multiple systems than in larger star clusters, which might help explain why binaries seem abnormally abundant in Taurus (Leinert et al. 2003; Ghez et al. 2003; Duchêne 1999).
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