J. W. Zhou¹, F. Wyrowski¹, S. Neupane¹, I. Barlach Christensen¹, K. M. Menten¹, S. H. Li², and T. Liu³

Accepted XXX. Received YYY; in original form ZZZ

ABSTRACT

Context. Feedback from young massive stars has an important impact on the star formation potential of their parental molecular clouds

Aims. We investigate the physical properties of gas structures under feedback in the G333 complex using data of the 13 CO J = 3 - 2 line observed with the LAsMA heterodyne camera on the APEX telescope.

Methods. We used the Dendrogram algorithm to identify molecular gas structures based on the integrated intensity map of the ¹³CO (3–2) emission, and extracted the average spectra of all structures to investigate their velocity components and gas kinematics.

Results. We derive the column density ratios between different transitions of the ¹³CO emission pixel-by-pixel, and find the peak values $N_{2-1}/N_{1-0} \approx 0.5$, $N_{3-2}/N_{1-0} \approx 0.3$, $N_{3-2}/N_{2-1} \approx 0.5$. These ratios can also be roughly predicted by the non-LTE molecular radiative transfer code RADEX for an average H₂ volume density of $\sim 4.2 \times 10^3$ cm⁻³. A classical virial analysis does not reflect the true physical state of the identified structures, and we find that external pressure from the ambient cloud plays an important role in confining the observed gas structures. For high column density structures, velocity dispersion and density show a clear correlation, while for low column density structures they do not, indicating the contribution of gravitational collapse to the velocity dispersion. Branch structures show a more significant correlation between 8 µm surface brightness and velocity dispersion than leaf structures, implying that feedback has a greater impact on large-scale structures. For both leaf and branch structures, $\sigma - N * R$ always has a stronger correlation compared to $\sigma - N$ and $\sigma - R$. The scaling relations are stronger, and have steeper slopes when considering only self-gravitating structures, which are the structures most closely associated with the Heyer-relation.

Conclusions. Although the feedback disrupting the molecular clouds will break up the original cloud complex, the substructures of the original complex can be reorganized into new gravitationally governed configurations around new gravitational centers. This process is accompanied by structural destruction and generation, and changes in gravitational centers, but gravitational collapse is always ongoing.

Key words. Submillimeter: ISM - ISM:structure - ISM: evolution - Stars: formation - methods: analytical - techniques: image processing

1. Introduction

High-mass stars (M>8 M_{\odot}) have a profound impact on the evolution of the interstellar medium (ISM). Throughout their short lifetimes (~10⁶ yr), radiation-driven stellar winds from highmass stars create HII regions in the surrounding giant molecular clouds (GMCs) (Zinnecker & Yorke 2007; Molinari et al. 2014; Motte et al. 2018). High-mass stars end their lives in the form of supernovae (SNe) whose explosions can release $\sim 10^{51}$ erg of energy near-instantaneously. Shocks from expanding HII regions and supernova remnants (SNRs) can accelerate and heat their surrounding gas, and add turbulence to the gas. In simulations, massive stellar feedback, including ionizing radiation, stellar winds and supernovae (Matzner 2002; Dale et al. 2012; Rogers & Pittard 2013; Dale et al. 2014; Rahner et al. 2017; Smith et al. 2018; Lewis et al. 2023), can suppress the star formation and destroy the natal cloud. However, whether the stellar feedback promotes or suppresses star formation remains controversial.

W49A is one of the most massive and luminous young starforming regions in the Galaxy. As presented in Rugel et al. (2019), it is more likely that only limited parts of W49A were affected by feedback from the central stellar cluster, while stars in the outer parts of W49A formed independently. Moreover, all feedback models used in Rugel et al. (2019) predict re-collapse of the shell after the first star formation event, which means that feedback of the first formed cluster is therefore not strong enough to disperse the cloud. Previous work on the G305 region observed with the Large APEX sub-Millimeter Array (LAsMA) 7 beam receiver on the Atacama Pathfinder Experiment 12 meter submillimeter telescope (APEX) found that strong stellar winds drive turbulence in the G305 GMC in which feedback has triggered star formation by the collect and collapse mechanism (Mazumdar et al. 2021a,b). The dense molecular gas structures inside the cloud serve as star-forming sites and their phys-

¹ Max-Planck-Institut für Radioastronomie, Auf dem Hügel 69, 53121 Bonn, Germany e-mail: jwzhou@mpifr-bonn.mpg.de

Max Planck Institute for Astronomy, Königstuhl 17, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany

Shanghai Astronomical Observatory, Chinese Academy of Sciences, 80 Nandan Road, Shanghai 200030, Peoples Republic of China

ical states directly determine the star formation capability of the molecular cloud under feedback. A basic question is how the dense gas structures survive and maintain star formation activity in a strong feedback environment, which depends on the relative strength between their gravity and turbulence.

The relative importance of turbulence and gravity in massive star-forming regions is a long and widely debated topic, distinct views lead to different physical pictures of massive star formation, such as turbulent-core model (McKee & Tan 2003; Krumholz et al. 2007), competitive-accretion model (Bonnell et al. 1997, 2001), inertial-inflow model (Padoan et al. 2020), and global hierarchical collapse model (Vázquez-Semadeni et al. 2009; Ballesteros-Paredes et al. 2011a; Hartmann et al. 2012; Vázquez-Semadeni et al. 2017, 2019a). Larson's laws claim that in molecular clouds the velocity dispersion σ scales proportionally to the scale R, and molecular clouds are approximately in virial equilibrium, with a mostly uniform column density. The Larson-relation ($\sigma_v \propto R^{0.5}$) is generally used to emphasize the importance of turbulence in molecular clouds, and turbulence acts to sustain the clouds against gravitational collapse (Larson 1981; Solomon et al. 1987; Heyer & Brunt 2004; Mac Low & Klessen 2004; McKee & Ostriker 2007; Hennebelle & Falgarone 2012). Heyer et al. (2009) generalized the Larson-relation by extending the Larson-ratio $L \equiv \sigma_v/R^{0.5}$ with the surface density Σ of Galactic GMCs, i.e. $\sigma_v/R^{0.5} \propto \Sigma^{0.5}$. Subsequently, the Heyerrelation has been used to emphasize the importance of gravity in molecular clouds (Ballesteros-Paredes et al. 2011b; Traficante et al. 2018b,a; Ballesteros-Paredes et al. 2018; Vázquez-Semadeni et al. 2019b; Ballesteros-Paredes et al. 2020). Especially, in the high-column density portions of star-forming regions, such as clumps or cores, the Heyer-relation always performs better than the Larson-relation (Ballesteros-Paredes et al. 2011b; Camacho et al. 2016; Traficante et al. 2018a), suggesting strong gravity at relatively small scales in molecular clouds. Ibáñez-Mejía et al. (2016) have shown that the Heyer-relation cannot be reproduced without self-gravity in simulations of the ISM with supernova-driven turbulence. In contrast, purely supernova-driven turbulence in the ISM generates the Larsonrelation.

Regarding the explanation of the Heyer-relation, Heyer et al. (2009) claimed that it is consistent with the clouds being in virial equilibrium, as it follows directly from the condition $2E_k = E_g$, where $E_k = M\sigma^2/2$, $E_g = 3GM^2/5R$. Ballesteros-Paredes et al. (2011b) further pointed out that the scaling is also consistent with the clouds undergoing free-fall, in which case $E_k = |E_g|$. However, the differences between the effects of free-fall and virial equilibrium in the $\sigma_v/R^{0.5}$ vs. Σ diagram are smaller than the typical uncertainty of the observational data (Ballesteros-Paredes et al. 2011b), thus difficult to distinguish. Both explanations involve only gravitational and kinetic energy, which may be a workable approximation for relatively isolated molecular clouds, but is often too simplistic for substructures inside a molecular cloud, especially for a cloud affected by feedback, such as our target G333. When the substructures can selfgravitationally collapse, they may decouple from the surrounding environment (Peretto et al. 2023). If not, the exchange of energy with the surrounding environment will break the conversion between gravitational potential energy, E_q , and kinetic energy, E_k , of the structures, and thus violate the Heyer-relation.

In Zhou et al. (2023), we found in the G333 complex that the larger scale inflow is driven by the larger scale cloud structure, indicating hierarchical structure in the GMC and gas inflow from large to small scales. The large-scale gas inflow is driven by gravity, implying that the molecular clouds in the G333 complex may be in a state of global gravitational collapse. However, the broken morphology of some very infrared bright structures in the G333 complex also indicates that feedback is disrupting star-forming regions. Here we are going to address the question of how the dense molecular structures survive and maintain the gravitational collapse state in a strong feedback environment.

2. Data

2.1. LAsMA data

The observations and data reduction have been described in detail in Zhou et al. (2023). We mapped a $3.4^{\circ} \times 1.2^{\circ}$ area centered at $(l, b) = (332.33^\circ, -0.29^\circ)$ using the APEX telescope (Güsten et al. 2006).¹ The 7 pixel Large APEX sub-Millimeter Array (LAsMA) receiver was used to observe the J = 3 - 2 transitions of 12 CO ($v_{rest} \sim 345.796$ GHz) and 13 CO ($v_{rest} \sim 330.588$ GHz) simultaneously. The local oscillator frequency was set at 338.190 GHz in order to avoid contamination of the 13 CO (3–2) spectra due to bright 12 CO (3–2) emission from the image side band. Observations were performed in a position switching onthe-fly (OTF) mode. The data were calibrated using a three load chopper wheel method, which is an extension of the "standard" method used for millimeter observations (Ulich & Haas 1976) to calibrate the data in the corrected antenna temperature T_{A}^{*} scale. The data were reduced using the GILDAS package². The final data cubes have a velocity resolution of 0.25 km s⁻¹, an angular resolution of 19.5" and a pixel size of 6". A beam efficiency value $\eta_{mb} = 0.71$ (Mazumdar et al. 2021a) was used to convert intensities from the T_A^* scale to main beam brightness temperatures, T_{mb} .

2.2. Archival data

To allow for column density estimates using different ¹³CO transitions, we also collect ¹³CO (1–0) data from the Mopra-CO survey (Burton et al. 2013) and ¹³CO (2–1) from the SEDIGISM survey (Schuller et al. 2021). However, the two surveys only cover galactic latitudes within $\pm 0.5^{\circ}$, while our LAsMA observations cover the latitudes range of ~ $-0.29\pm0.6^{\circ}$. Thus we only consider the overlap region of the three surveys. The data were smoothed to a common angular resolution ~35" and a velocity resolution ~0.25 km s⁻¹.

The observed region was covered in the infrared range by the Galactic Legacy Infrared Midplane Survey (GLIMPSE, Benjamin et al. 2003). The GLIMPS images, obtained with the Spitzer Infrared Array Camera (IRAC) at 4.5 and 8.0 μ m, were retrieved from the Spitzer archive. The angular resolution of the images in the IRAC bands is ~ 2". We also used 870 μ m continuum data from the APEX Telescope Survey of the Galaxy (AT-LASGAL, Schuller et al. 2009) combined with lower resolution data from the Planck spacecraft, which are sensitive to a wide range of spatial scales at a resolution of ~ 21" (Csengeri et al. 2016). Furthermore, we use Hi-GAL data (Molinari et al. 2010) processed using the PPMAP procedure (Marsh et al. 2015), which provides column density and dust temperature maps with a resolution of ~ 12" (the maps are available online³, Marsh et al. 2017).

¹ This publication is based on data acquired with the Atacama Pathfinder EXperiment (APEX). APEX is a collaboration between the Max-Planck-Institut für Radioastronomie, the European Southern Observatory and the Onsala Space Observatory.

² http://www.iram.fr/IRAMFR/GILDAS

³ http://www.astro.cardiff.ac.uk/research/ViaLactea/

3. Results

3.1. Dendrogram structures



Fig. 1. Hierarchical structures identified by the Dendrogram algorithm. A segment of the Dendrogram tree of sub-region S3 in Fig.2(c) is used to illustrate the structure types output by the Dendrogram algorithm.

We identify dense gas structures using the Dendrogram algorithm. As described in Rosolowsky et al. (2008), the Dendrogram algorithm decomposes intensity data (a position-position map or a position-position-velocity cube) into hierarchical structures called leaves, branches and trunks. The relationship between those structures is shown in Fig.1. Trunks are the largest continuous structures at the bottom of hierarchical structures ("bases"), but, by definition, they can also be isolated leaves ("ileaves") without any parent structure. Thus there are two kinds of "trunks", they are called "bases" and "i-leaves" in this work. Clustered leaves ("c-leaves") are defined as small-scale, bright structures at the top of the tree that do not decompose into further substructures, they are the smallest structures inside "branches". Branches are the relatively large scale structures in the tree, and they can be broken down into substructures. Between "bases" and "c-leaves", all hierarchical substructures are "branches", thus branches can span a wide range of scales. When we treat "bases" as the largest branches, and combine c-leaves and i-leaves, then there are only two kinds of structures (i.e. leaves and branches). However, in some cases, it is necessary to differentiate between i-leaves and c-leaves. In general, c-leaves are concentrated in regions of relatively high column density, i-leaves are low column density structures distributed at the periphery, as shown in Fig. 2. There are no definite limits to the size of the structures at different levels. The size of a leaf structure in a low column density region may be larger than a branch structure in a high column density region. As shown in Fig.3(a), there is considerable overlap of the scales between leaf and branch structures. In general, branches are larger scale structures than leaves. The physical properties of the overlapping parts of leaf and branch structures may be similar, we should remember the mixing in the discussion of the scaling relations below.

Using the *astrodendro* package⁴, there are three major input parameters for the Dendrogram algorithm: *min_value* for the minimum value to be considered in the dataset, *min_delta* for a leaf that can be considered as an independent entity, *min_npix* for the minimum area of a structure. From these parameters, we can see that the algorithm does not consider the velocity component and velocity range of the identified structure carefully. The structure is mainly identified according to the intensity, thus the velocity division of a structure is only a result of its intensity division. There is no criterion for a continuous velocity range across a dense structure. However, the velocity range of a structure is crucial for the estimation of its fundamental physical quantities, such as velocity dispersion and mass. Moreover, strict differentiation of the velocity components should be based on the spectral line profiles rather than the intensity thresholds in the algorithm. In this work, instead of identifying structures in the PPV cube, we first identify the intensity peaks on the integrated intensity (Moment 0) map of ¹³CO (3–2) emission, and then extract the average spectrum of each structure to investigate their velocity components and gas kinematics.

For the Moment 0 map, a 5σ threshold has been set, so we therefore only require the smallest area of a structure to be larger than one beam and do not set any other parameters, thereby reducing the dependence of structure identification on the algorithm parameters. In Fig. 4, the structures identified by the Dendrogram algorithm correspond well to the peaks on the integrated intensity maps. In order to retain as many structures as possible, the parameter *min_npix* was set to one beam, because the hierarchical structures in Dendrogram mean that a leaf structure under strict parameter settings can be a branch structure under loose parameter settings. Moreover, the average spectra fitting described below will also further screen the structures, allowing to exclude structures with poorly defined line profiles.

The algorithm approximates the morphology of each structure as an ellipse, which is used in this work. We do not use the mask output by the algorithm because different parameter settings around the intensity peak will give different masks. In the Dendrogram algorithm, the long and short axes of an ellipse *a* and *b* are the rms sizes (second moments) of the intensity distribution along the two spatial dimensions. However, as shown in Fig.5, *a* and *b* will give a smaller ellipse, compared to the size of the identified structure. Thus we tried to enlarge the ellipse by 2 and 3 times, and found that multiplying a factor of 2 is appropriate, similar to a factor of 1.91 suggested in Solomon et al. (1987); Rosolowsky & Leroy (2006). Then the effective physical radius of an ellipse is $R_{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{2a \times 2b} * d$, here d = 3.6 kpc for the distance to the G333 complex (Lockman 1979; Bains et al. 2006).

3.2. Velocity components

Based on the Moment 0 map of the ¹³CO (3–2) emission, 3608 structures are extracted by the Dendrogram algorithm, consisting of 1626 clustered leaves, 1367 branches and 615 trunks (486 isolated leaves and 129 bases). In the discussion below, we put bases into branches. We extract and fit the averaged spectra of 3608 structures individually using the fully automated Gaussian decomposer GAUSSPY+ (Lindner et al. 2015; Riener et al. 2019). The parameter settings of the decomposition are the same as in Zhou et al. (2023). According to the line profiles, all averaged spectra are divided into three categories:

1. Structures with single velocity components regarded as independent structures (type1, single, 65%, Fig.6(a));

2. Structures with more than one peak, which are separated (type2, separated, 19%, Fig.6(b));

3. Structures with more than one peak, blended together (type3, blended, 16%, Fig.6(c) and (d)).

Spectra averaged across regions which show a single peak in their line profiles probably represent independent structures. From the line profile, we can also determine the complete ve-

⁴ https://dendrograms.readthedocs.io/en/stable/index. html



Fig. 2. Different kinds of structures traced by ¹³CO (3–2) emission classified in Sec.3.2. (a) Type1 (single velocity component) leaf structures; (b) Type2 (separated velocity components) leaf structures; (c) Type3 (blended velocity components) leaf structures. Orange boxes mark the subregions divided in Zhou et al. (2023); (d) Type1 (orange) and type2 (magenta) branch structures. In panels (a), (b) and (c), orange and red ellipses represent i-leaves and c-leaves, respectively.

locity range of a structure. In order to ensure that other physical quantities (such as column density, temperature) match with ity range of each structure or each velocity component as $[v_c-$

the fitted line-width, as shown in Fig.5, we take the veloc-



Fig. 3. (a) Effective radius (scale) and (b) Column density distribution of Dendrogram structures. Only the type1 and type2 structures (see Fig.2) are included in the distributions. The probability density is estimated by the kernel density estimation (KDE) method.

FWHM, v_c +FWHM], which is necessary to calculate the physical quantities for structures with more than one velocity component.

For type3 structures with significant overlapping velocity components, complete decomposition cannot easily be obtained, thus the decomposition uncertainties directly affect the reliability of the subsequent analysis. In this work, we focus on the structures with independent line profiles (type1 and type2). As shown in Fig.2, a high-column density structure does not necessarily imply a complex line profile, thus discarding type3 structures won't produce significant sample bias. It is also important to emphasize that for any analysis involving continuum emission without velocity information, only type1 structures will be considered, and sub-regions 5 and 7 marked in Fig.2(c) will also be excluded due to the heavy blending of velocity components described in Zhou et al. (2023).

For a type2 structure, we determine the physical size scales of different velocity components based on their velocity ranges. In Fig.6(b), the total velocity range for deriving the Moment 0 map of the structure is [-60, -35] km s⁻¹, the area of a type2 structure on Moment 0 map is *s* and includes *n* pixels. For two velocity components in a type2 structure, we can also obtain their Moment 0 maps *m*01 and *m*02 in their velocity ranges [v_{c1} -FWHM₁, v_{c1} +FWHM₁] and [v_{c2} -FWHM₂, v_{c2} +FWHM₂], respectively. *m*01 and *m*02 contain *n*1 and *n*2 pixels, then their area are (*n*1/*n*) * *s* and (*n*2/*n*) * *s*, which can be used to estimate the physical size scales of the two velocity components.

Generally, the elliptic approximation for the identified structures is good for small-scale leaf structures, but for some largescale branch structures, due to their complex morphology, it cannot be satisfactory. We therefore exclude branch structures with complex morphology, if the proportion of empty pixels within the effective ellipse of each structure on the Moment 0 map is larger than 1/3. Another reason to exclude these morphologically complex structures is that they may not give good effective radius, velocity dispersion and density estimates. In Fig.2(d), the remaining branch structures correspond well to the background integrated intensity. For each structure, its velocity range and effective ellipse are used to extract the basic physical quantities based on the column density, temperature, optical depth cubes derived from the LTE analysis in Sec.3.3.3.

Branch structures are often contained within other branch structures. Some branch structures have similar central coordinates, scales, and morphology, thus they should be regarded as the same structure to avoid being repeatedly counted. Two branch structures with the area s1 and s2 (s1>s2) are considered repetitive if they meet the conditions: 1. The distance between their central coordinates is less than 1 beam size; 2. (s1-s2)/s2<1/3. The two clustering conditions can pack up the similar branch structures. Each clustering may contain multiple structures, and we keep only one of them in the subsequent analysis. This step will exclude nearly half of branch structures. Thus the duplication of branch structures identified by the Dendrogram algorithm is a big issue, it must be considered before making analysis for the identified structures.

3.3. Column density

In this section, we derive the column density of the entire observed field using different methods to find the best estimates for the masses of the identified structures.

3.3.1. Continuum emission

Fig.7(a) and (b) present the dust temperature and column density maps derived from the Hi-GAL data using the PPMAP procedure (Marsh et al. 2015). Since there are some missing values on the PPMAP column density map, we also produced the H₂ column density map using ATLASGAL+Planck 870 μ m data following the formalism of Kauffmann et al. (2008):

$$N_{\rm H_2} = 2.02 \cdot 10^{20} \,\mathrm{cm}^{-2} \left(\mathrm{e}^{1.439(\lambda/\mathrm{mm})^{-1}(T/10 \,\mathrm{K})^{-1}} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{\lambda}{\mathrm{mm}} \right)^3 \\ \cdot \left(\frac{\kappa_{\nu}}{0.01 \,\mathrm{cm}^2 \,\mathrm{g}^{-1}} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{F_{\nu}}{\mathrm{mJy \, beam^{-1}}} \right) \left(\frac{\theta_{\rm HPBW}}{10 \,\mathrm{arcsec}} \right)^{-2}, (1)$$

where F_{ν} is the flux density, $\theta_{\rm HPBW}$ is the beam FWHM, $\kappa_{\nu} = 0.0185 \,{\rm cm}^2 \,{\rm g}^{-1}$ (Csengeri et al. 2016). Assuming a single dust temperature is a crude simplification, therefore we calculate N_{H2} pixel-by-pixel by combining the ATLASGAL+Planck 870 μ m flux map with Herschel dust temperatures derived with the PPMAP procedure. We only use pixels that are above the ~5 σ noise level, ~ 0.3 Jy/beam (Urquhart et al. 2018). From Fig.7(b) and (c), we can see the column density derived from ATLASGAL+Planck 870 μ m data and Herschel multi-wavelength data agree with each other, both in their spatial distribution and magnitude.

3.3.2. Molecular line

In this work, we focus on the G333 complex, and limit the velocity range of the ¹³CO emission to [-60,-35] km s⁻¹ (Zhou et al. 2023). To derive the column densities from the ¹³CO emission, we assume local thermodynamic equilibrium (LTE) and a beam filling factor of unity. Following the procedures described in Garden et al. (1991) and Mangum & Shirley (2015), for a rotational transition from upper level J + 1 to lower level J, we can derive



Fig. 4. Masks of leaf structures identified by the Dendrogram algorithm toward the sub-regions marked in Fig.2(c). Only leaf structures are shown in here.



Fig. 5. A piece of sub-region S3 in Fig.2(c) is used to illustrate the structures identified by the Dendrogram algorithm. (a) The black contours show the masks of Dendrogram leaves. The long and short axes of the smallest ellipse *a* and *b* are the rms sizes (second moments) of the intensity distribution. The ellipses in the second and third layers are enlarged by factors of 2 and 3 in size compared to the smallest one. The middle ellipse visibly corresponds best to the mask; (b) Typical line profile of a leaf structure. The velocity range of the structure is [v_c-FWHM,v_c+FWHM].

the total column density by:

$$N_{tot} = \frac{3k}{8\pi^3 \mu^2 B(J+1)} \frac{(T_{\text{ex}} + hB/3k) \exp[hBJ(J+1)/kT_{\text{ex}})]}{1 - \exp(-h\nu/kT_{\text{ex}})} \int \tau dv,$$

Article number, page 6 of 17

(2)



Fig. 6. Typical ¹³CO (3–2) line profiles of Dendrogram structures.

$$\tau = -\ln[1 - \frac{T_{\rm mb}}{J(T_{\rm ex}) - J(T_{\rm bg})}],\tag{3}$$

$$\int \tau d\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{J(T_{ex}) - J(T_{bg})} \frac{\tau}{1 - e^{-\tau}} \int T_{mb} d\mathbf{v},$$
(4)

$$J(T) = \frac{h\nu/k}{e^{h\nu/kT} - 1},$$
(5)

where $B = \nu/[2(J+1)]$ is the rotational constant of the molecule, μ is the permanent dipole moment ($\mu = 0.112$ Debye for ¹³CO). $T_{\text{bg}} = 2.73$ is the background temperature, and $\int T_{\text{mb}} dv$ represents the integrated intensity. In the above formulas, the correction for high optical depth was applied (Frerking et al. 1982; Goldsmith et al. 2008; Areal et al. 2019). Assuming opticallythick emission of ¹²CO emission, we can estimate the excitation temperature T_{ex} following the formula (Garden et al. 1991; Pineda et al. 2008)

$$T_{\rm ex,3-2} = \frac{16.6\rm K}{\ln[1 + 16.6/({}^{12}T_{\rm peak,3-2} + 0.038)]},$$
(6)

$$T_{\rm ex,1-0} = \frac{5.53\rm K}{\ln[1 + 5.53/(^{12}T_{\rm peak,1-0} + 0.818)]},\tag{7}$$

where ${}^{12}T_{\text{peak},3-2}$ and ${}^{12}T_{\text{peak},1-0}$ are the observed ${}^{12}\text{CO}$ (3-2) and ${}^{12}\text{CO}$ (1-0) peak brightness temperature. For the ${}^{13}\text{CO}$ (2-1) transition, we do not have ${}^{12}\text{CO}$ (2-1) data and we assume $T_{\text{ex},2-1} = T_{\text{ex},3-2}$.

The distribution of the excitation temperature derived from 12 CO (3–2) in Fig.7(d) is somewhat similar to the distribution of the dust temperature derived from Herschel data shown in Fig.7(a), especially in high-column density regions. We transfer the column densities of 13 CO to H₂ column densities by taking the abundance ratio X₁₃CO of H₂ compared with 13 CO as ~ 7.1 × 10⁵ (Frerking et al. 1982).

3.3.3. Column density cube

A similar procedure as presented in Sec.3.3.2 can be performed for each velocity channel in the 13 CO (3-2) cube to obtain a column density cube, which allows to eliminate the effect of potential overlap of different velocity components on the mass estimation.

3.3.4. Column densities from different ¹³CO transitions

There are several factors that affect the mass estimate: 1.) the overlap of different velocity components; 2.) the observed molecular line transition; 3.) the choice between using molecular line or continuum emission. For the first factor, we have decomposed the velocity components in Zhou et al. (2023) and here we only focus on the peak3 component defined in Zhou et al. (2023) with the velocity range [-60,-35] km s⁻¹. For the second factor, Leroy et al. (2022) measured the low- J^{12} CO line ratio $R_{21} \equiv {}^{12}CO (2-1)/{}^{12}CO (1-0), R_{32} \equiv {}^{12}CO (3-2)/{}^{12}CO (2-1), R_{31} \equiv {}^{12}CO (3-2)/{}^{12}CO (1-0), using whole-disk CO maps$ of nearby galaxies, and found galaxy-integrated mean values in 16%-84% of the emission of $R_{21} = 0.65$ (0.50–0.83), $R_{32} =$ 0.50 (0.23–0.59), and $R_{31} = 0.31$ (0.20–0.42). Hence, the 3–2 transition of ¹²CO resulted in significantly smaller column density estimates compared to the 1-0 transition. To check whether different transitions of ¹³CO show a similar behavior in a Galactic giant molecular cloud, we collected ¹³CO (2-1) and ¹³CO (1-0) emission of the G333 complex, as described in Sec.2.2.

In Sec.3.3.2, we have derived the column density of different transitions by a LTE analysis. As shown in Fig. 8, the quality of the ¹³CO J=1-0 data is not as good as for ¹³CO J=2-1 and J=3-2, thus we set a column density threshold (> 10^{21} cm⁻²) to exclude the unreliable low-column density emission from the J=1-0 transition before the comparison. Fig. 9 shows the distribution of pixel-by-pixel column density ratios between different ¹³CO transitions. The peak values in the distributions are

$$\frac{N_{2-1}}{N_{1-0}} \approx 0.5 \tag{8}$$

Article number, page 7 of 17



Fig. 7. Temperature and column density maps of the entire field. (a) and (b) Dust temperature and column density distributions in the G333 complex and the G331 GMC derived from Hi-GAL data processed by PPMAP; (c) Column density distribution in the G333 complex and the G331 GMC derived from ATLASGAL+Planck 870 μ m data; (d) Excitation temperature distribution in the G333 complex derived from ¹²CO (3-2) emission by a LTE analysis in the velocity range [-60,-35] km s⁻¹.

$$\frac{N_{3-2}}{N_{1-0}} \approx 0.3$$
 (9)

$$\frac{N_{3-2}}{N_{2-1}} \approx 0.5. \tag{10}$$

Except for the slightly lower ratio between 2-1 and 1-0 transitions, the ratios calculated from different ¹³CO transitions are

Article number, page 8 of 17

comparable with the results derived from 12 CO emission in Leroy et al. (2022), although the ratios from 12 CO emission are derived from integrated intensity, rather than column density in the case of 13 CO.

J. W. Zhou: Gravitational collapse of dense gas structures under feedback



Fig. 8. H₂ column density distribution in the G333 complex derived from ¹³CO emission. (a) 1-0 transition; (b) 2-1 transition; (c) 3-2 transition.

3.3.5. Non-LTE estimates

The Non-LTE molecular radiative transfer algorithm RADEX was used to further test the above results: 1. The column density derived from ¹³CO J = 3 - 2 transition is significantly lower than J = 1 - 0 transition; 2. The ratios of the column density derived from different transitions of ¹³CO emission. We use the following input parameters for RADEX: we take T_{kin} =25 K as the kinematic temperature from Fig.7(a). It is a mean value of the temperature in Fig.7(a) for the relatively high-column density regions in Fig.7(b), which covers the main emission of 13 CO J=3-2. As background temperature we use again T_{bg} =2.73 K. A linewidth of ~ 2.5 km s⁻¹ is taken from the peak value of all type1 c-leaves, as shown in Fig.10. For the H_2 volume density log_{10} $(n_{\rm H_2})$ and ^{13}CO column density log_{10} (N_{CO}), we compute grids in the volume and column density range of [2,6] and [13,17], respectively. Then we obtain the intensity $T_{\rm R}$ output from RADEX. Assuming T_{ex} = 25 K, using the equations listed in Sec.3.3.2, for the J + 1 to J transition, the column density in the energy level J can be calculated as

$$N_{\rm J} = \frac{2J+1}{Q} N_{\rm tot,CO} \exp\left[-\frac{hBJ(J+1)}{kT_{\rm ex}}\right],\tag{11}$$

where the partition function Q is given by $kT_{ex}/hB + 1/3$, B is the rotational constant of the molecule. The rotation temperature T_{rot} can be estimated by the equation

$$\frac{N_{\rm j}}{N_{\rm i}} = \frac{g_{\rm j}}{g_{\rm i}} \exp[-\frac{E_{\rm j} - E_{\rm i}}{kT_{\rm rot}}],\tag{12}$$

where N_j and N_i are the column densities of any two levels i and j of statistical weights g_i and g_i and energies E_j and E_i . Us-

ing the equations listed in Sec.3.3.2 again, now the column density N_{CO,rot} can be derived by T_{rot} and T_R. We also derived the column density $N_{CO,ex}$ by assuming $T_{ex} = T_{kin} = 25$ K. Finally, $N_{CO,rot}$ and $N_{CO,ex}$ are compared with the ¹³CO column density $N_{CO,radex}$ input in RADEX. As shown in Fig.11, for $N_{CO,ex}$, using the ¹³CO (3–2) emission together with the LTE equations indeed gives lower column density estimates than using the 2-1 and 1-0 emission, consistent with the results in Sec.3.3.4. N_{CO,J=1-0,ex} provides upper limits of the column density derived by different ¹³CO transitions, thus it is used to calibrate the column density derived from ¹³CO (3-2) emission in this work. Generally, for each transition, the column density N_{CO,rot} is higher than N_{CO.ex}. The differences of N_{CO.rot} derived from different transitions are also smaller than that of N_{CO.ex}. Moreover, N_{CO,rot} is closer to the fiducial N_{CO,J=1-0,ex} than N_{CO,ex}. Therefore, using T_{rot} to derive the column density is better than using T_{ex} . However, both J = 2-1 and J = 1-0 data only cover part of the entire observed field, so that we cannot obtain the rotational temperature in the full region and do not use it here.

In Fig.11, we also investigate changes of the column density ratios $N_{CO,ex} J=3-2/J=1-0$, J=2-1/J=1-0 and J=3-2/J=2-1 with the RADEX input ¹³CO column density $N_{CO,radex}$ for different volume densities n_{H_2} . Interestingly, when n_{H_2} is around 4.2×10^3 cm⁻³ (the third column of Fig.11), the predicted ratios are close to the values in Sec.3.3.4 for all three ratios. With 4.2×10^3 cm⁻³ in the range of the typically volume densities of H₂ traced by ¹³CO (Shirley 2015; Liu et al. 2016b; Schuller et al. 2017; Finn et al. 2021), the column density ratios predicted by RADEX are consistent with the ratios derived using LTE from observations of different ¹³CO transitions.

Article number, page 9 of 17



Fig. 9. Distribution of column density ratios: (a) derived from the ¹³CO (3-2) and (2-1) emission; (b) derived from ¹³CO (3-2) and (1-0); (c) derived from ¹³CO (2-1) and (1-0); (d) derived from ATLASGAL+Planck 870 μ m and Hi-GAL data. The probability density is estimated by the kernel density estimation (KDE) method.

In summary, we divide the column density derived from 13 CO J=3-2 emission by a correction factor 0.3 before converting to H₂ column density.

3.4. Mass estimation

3.4.1. Mass

The mass of each identified structure is calculated by

$$M = \mu_{\rm H_2} m_{\rm H} \sum N({\rm H_2})(R_{\rm pixel})^2,$$
(13)

Article number, page 10 of 17



Fig. 10. Line-width distribution of all type1 c-leaves. The probability density is estimated by the kernel density estimation (KDE) method.

where $\mu_{\text{H}_2} = 2.8$ is the molecular weight per hydrogen molecule, m_{H} is the hydrogen atom mass, R_{pixel} is the size of a pixel. The sum is performed within the elliptical cylinder in the column density cube. As described in Sec.3.1, the elliptical cylinder has a bottom area $A = \pi \times 2a \times 2b \times d^2$ and a height range [v_c-FWHM,v_c+FWHM], *a* and *b* are the long and short axes of the ellipse, here d = 3.6 kpc for the distance to the G333 complex (Lockman 1979; Bains et al. 2006). Then the average surface density of each structure is calculated by $\Sigma = M/A$, and the average column density as $N = \Sigma/(\mu_{\text{H}_2} \text{m}_{\text{H}})$.

3.4.2. Molecular line vs. continuum emission mass estimates

As described in Zhou et al. (2023), sub-regions 5 and 7 have significant overlap of different velocity components, thus they should be excluded for column density estimates based on continuum emission. In Fig.9(d), the column density derived from ATLASGAL+Planck 870 μ m data is comparable with that estimated from Hi-GAL data processed by the PPMAP procedure. As shown in Fig. 2 and Fig. 12(a), i-leaves are relatively lowcolumn density structures distributed at the periphery, thus we expect that they will be less massive on average than c-leaves, considering i-leaves and c-leaves structures have similar scales in Fig.3(a). However, in Fig.12(a), i-leaves and c-leaves show similar masses based on the continuum emission. In addition, the continuum mass distribution is relatively narrow, indicating that the contrast between high-column density and low-column density structures is not as clear as that derived from molecular line emission due to line-of-sight contamination. In Fig.12(b), we only consider the structures with mean column density greater than 10^{22} cm⁻², now the distribution of the masses derived from molecular line emission is similar to that derived from continuum emission, after considering the mass correction factor 0.3. Therefore, in the subsequent analysis, we only adopt the masses estimated from molecular line emission.

3.5. Virial analysis

Having measured the basic physical quantities of the identified structures, we can now investigate their physical properties.

3.5.1. Virial parameter

To investigate the energy balance within the extracted structures, we determine the gravitational potential energy and internal kinetic energy to compute the virial parameter (McKee 1989;

J. W. Zhou: Gravitational collapse of dense gas structures under feedback



Fig. 11. The calculation results of RADEX. First row: correlation between RADEX input column densities with column densities of different ¹³CO transitions derived by LTE equations with T_{rot} and T_{ex} using T_R computed by RADEX for different volume densities; Second, third and fourth rows: Column density ratios of different ¹³CO transitions derived by LTE equations with T_{rot} and T_{ex} as a function of the RADEX column density input for different volume densities. Vertical lines mark the peak values of the ¹³CO column density derived from ¹³CO J=3-2, J=2-1, J=1-0 and ATLASGAL+Planck 870 μ m emission (from left to right) shown in Fig.7, Fig.8 and Fig.9, here the abundance ratio X_{13CO} of H₂ compared with ¹³CO ~ 7.1 × 10⁵ is used. Cyan circles mark the ratios predicted by RADEX when the input ¹³CO column density takes the peak values of the column density derived by different methods in Sec.3.3.

Bertoldi & McKee 1992):

$$E_g = -\frac{3}{5}a_1 a_2 \frac{GM^2}{R}$$
(14)

$$E_k = \frac{3}{2}M\sigma_{\rm tot}^2.$$
 (15)

The factor a_1 measures the effects of a nonuniform density distribution and the factor a_2 the effect of the clump's ellipticity. The virial parameter of each decomposed structure is calculated by:

$$\alpha_{\rm vir} = 2E_k / \left| E_g \right| = \frac{5}{a_1 a_2} \frac{\sigma_{\rm tot}^2 R}{GM},\tag{16}$$

with $\sigma_{\text{tot}} = \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{nt}}^2 + c_s^2}$ as the total velocity dispersion, *R* the effective radius, *G* the gravitational constant, parameter a_1 equals

to (1 - k/3)/(1 - 2k/5) for a power-law density profile $\rho \propto r^{-k}$, and $a_2 = (\arcsin e)/e$ as the geometry factor. Here, we assume a typical density profile of k = 1.6 for all decomposed structures (Butler & Tan 2012; Palau et al. 2014; Li et al. 2019). The eccentricity *e* is determined by the axis ratio of the dense structure, $e = \sqrt{1 - (b/a)^2}$, *a* and *b* are the long and short axes of the ellipse. Non-magnetized cores with $\alpha_{vir} < 2$, $\alpha_{vir} \sim 1$ and $\alpha_{vir} < 1$ are considered to be gravitationally bound, in hydrostatic equilibrium and gravitationally unstable, respectively (Bertoldi & McKee 1992; Kauffmann et al. 2013). Those with $\alpha_{vir} > 2$ could be gravitationally unbound, and are therefore either pressure-confined, or in the process of dispersal.

Fig.13(a) shows the distribution of virial parameters for all identified structures. We can see more than half of the leaf structures are gravitationally unbound and only a small fraction are in gravitational collapse. However, in Zhou et al. (2023), we argue that molecular clouds in the G333 complex are in a state



Fig. 12. M_{CO} and M_a represent the mass derived from ¹³CO (3–2) emission and ATLASGAL+Planck 870 μ m data, respectively. (a) Mass distribution of all type1 leaf structures; (b) Mass distribution of type1 c-leaves satisfied the density condition >10²² cm⁻². The probability density is estimated by the kernel density estimation (KDE) method.

of global gravitational collapse, since the ubiquitous density and velocity fluctuations towards hubs imply the widespread presence of local gravitational collapse. Our previous work provides a more comprehensive approach to study the gas kinematics in the clouds. The dense structures in the clouds are connected to the surrounding environment through filaments, the gravitational state of the structures can be reflected by the velocity gradients along the filaments, which indicate the converging motions toward gravitational centers (hubs). In Fig. 14, except for the low-column density structures, most of structures have obvious correlation between velocity dispersion and column density, which indicates a gravitational origin of velocity dispersion, as discussed later in Sec.4.1. Thus most of structures must be gravitationally bound, even in a state of gravitational collapse.

That more than half of the structures have virial parameters larger than 2 in Fig.13, seems likely from not considering other forces that can bind the structures. In the interstellar medium, each of the structures is embedded in larger scale structures and one can therefore assume that they are confined by various external pressures (Keto & Myers 1986; Lada et al. 2008; Field et al. 2011; Leroy et al. 2015; Kirk et al. 2017; Chen et al. 2019; Li et al. 2020). To reconcile the gravitational collapse evidence from Zhou et al. (2023) with the apparent small fraction of gravitational unstable gas structures based on the classical virial analysis, we discuss in the following the additional effect of external pressure from ambient cloud structures.

3.5.2. Pressure-confined hydrostatic equilibrium

Previous studies have suggested that the external pressure provided by the larger scale molecular cloud gas might help to confine dense structures in molecular clouds (Spitzer 1978; McKee 1989; Elmegreen 1989; Ballesteros-Paredes 2006; Kirk et al. 2006; Lada et al. 2008; Pattle et al. 2015; Kirk et al. 2017; Li

Article number, page 12 of 17



Fig. 13. Virial parameters of dense gas structures. (a) Virial parameters of all type1 and type2 structures. Dashed lines mark the positions $a_{vir} = 1$ and $a_{vir} = 2$. The probability density is estimated by the kernel density estimation (KDE) method; (b) Correlation between virial parameter $a_{vir} = 2E_k/E_g$ and average column density of structures; (c) Correlation between virial parameter $a_{vir} = 2E_k/(E_g + E_p)$ and average column density above the threshold $\sim 3.2 \times 10^{21}$ cm⁻².

et al. 2020). The external pressure energy can be calculated by

$$E_p = -4\pi P_{\rm cl} R^3,\tag{17}$$

and then the new estimation of the virial parameter is

$$\alpha_{\rm vir} = 2E_k/(|E_g| + |E_p|). \tag{18}$$

External pressure can have various origins, such as the turbulent pressure from the HI halo of molecular clouds (Elmegreen 1989), the recoil pressure from photodissociation regions (PDRs) (Field et al. 2011), the infall ram pressure, or other intercloud pressures (Bertoldi & McKee 1992; Lada et al. 2008; Belloche et al. 2011; Camacho et al. 2016). Here we mainly consider the external pressure from the ambient cloud for each decomposed structure using

$$P_{\rm cl} = \pi G \bar{\Sigma} \Sigma_r,\tag{19}$$

where P_{cl} is the gas pressure, $\bar{\Sigma}$ is the mean surface density of the cloud, Σ_r is the surface density at the location of each structure (McKee 1989; Kirk et al. 2017). We assumed that Σ_r is equal to half of the observed column density at the footprint of each decomposed structure (Kirk et al. 2017; Li et al. 2020).

The total mass of the G333 complex is calculated by Eq. 13 as ~1.03 \times 10⁶ M_{\odot}, comparable with the mass of ~ 1.7 \times 10⁶ M_{\odot} calculated in Miville-Deschênes et al. (2017) using CO (1-0) emission. Using the sum of all non-empty pixels as the total area, the mean surface density of the G333 complex is ~ 0.071 g cm⁻² (or ~340 $M_{\odot}~pc^{-2}$), corresponding to a column density of ~1.5 $\times 10^{22}~cm^{-2}$. The G333 complex is located in the molecular ring of the Milky Way, where the mean surface density is ${\sim}200~M_{\odot}$ pc^{-2} (Heyer & Dame 2015). Given that the G333 complex is the most ATLASGAL clump rich giant molecular cloud complex in the southern Milky Way, it should have a density higher than the mean value. The mean surface density of the G333 GMC in Miville-Deschênes et al. (2017) and Nguyen et al. (2015) are $\sim 120\,M_\odot\,pc^{-2}$ and $\sim 220\,M_\odot\,pc^{-2},$ respectively (see Sec.4.5 of Zhou et al. (2023) for more details). Adopting a conservative estimate, we take the value of $\bar{\Sigma} \sim 200 \text{ M}_{\odot} \text{ pc}^{-2}$ as a lower limit, corresponding to a column density of $\sim 9 \times 10^{21}$ cm⁻².

There are also many leaf structures with lower-column density, usually distributed in the periphery of the clouds. Eq. 19 may be not valid for them, because Σ_r in the equation is integrated from the cloud surface to depth *r* of each structure in the cloud (Kirk et al. 2017). We therefore need to set a density threshold for the structures to determine whether they are eligible to be bound by the external pressure from the ambient cloud. In Fig. 14, high-column density and low-column density structures show different behaviors, the turning point corresponds to a column density value ~ 3.2×10^{21} cm⁻², which will be used as the threshold.

We treat gravitationally unbound branch structures as cleaves. Here we ignore i-leaves structures, they are isolated structures at the cloud periphery and are unlikely to be confined by external pressure from the ambient cloud. For c-leaves and branches, the proportion of the structures above the density threshold $(\sim 3.2 \times 10^{21} \text{ cm}^{-2})$ is 82.5%. The proportions of $a_{\text{vir}} = 2E_k/E_g < 2$ and $a_{\text{vir}} = 2E_k/E_g \ge 2$ are 45.3% and 54.7%, respectively. After considering the external pressure $(a_{\text{vir}} = 2E_k/(E_g + E_p))$, their proportions become 93% and 7%. When accounting for external pressure, the majority of the structures are gravitationally bound, and susceptible to gravitational collapse, as shown in Fig. 13(c). The peripheral structures, however, are at low-column densities and less bound by external pressure, therefore are likely to be dispersed by feedback.

Here we do not consider the HI halo of molecular clouds and also ignore the external pressure exerted by HII regions. The latter should also be important due to the strong feedback in the G333 complex. But the energy injected into the clouds from HII regions might also destroy the clouds, therefore we only consider the external pressure from the ambient cloud in binding the structures. The rough estimate in this section shows the important role of the external pressure in confining the observed gas structures.

3.6. Scaling relation

The physical states of the structures can also be reflected by the scaling relations. Fig.14(a) show the velocity dispersion-scale relations of i-leaves, c-leaves and branch structures. It appears that only branch structures show a clear correlation between velocity dispersion and scale. i-leaves roughly inherit the trend of branch structures' $\sigma - R$ relation extending from large to small scales, they can be barely linked behind branch structures in Fig.14(a), although their velocity dispersion shows no significant correlation with scale, similar to c-leaves, which deviate more pronounced from the Larson-relation. The red dashed line,

which is fitted to branch and i-leaves structures, has a gradient of 0.33 ± 0.01 .

Fig.14(b) shows the velocity dispersion-column density relation. For c-leaves, there is a moderate correlation between velocity dispersion and column density, the Pearson coefficient is ~0.45. Interestingly, we can see different behaviors of highcolumn density and low-column density structures. For highcolumn density structures, the velocity dispersion and column density show a clear correlation, while low-column density structures do not. In recent simulations (Ganguly et al. 2022; Weis et al. 2022), dense structures roughly follow the Heyerrelation, and less dense structures show no trend with the column density, thus populate a low-density tail in the Heyer-relation, as shown in Fig.14(c). For a more convenient comparison with σ -*R* and σ -*N* relations, we convert the Heyer-relation $\sigma/R^{0.5} \propto N^{0.5}$ to the form $\sigma \propto (R * N)^{0.5}$ (Eq. 3 in Ballesteros-Paredes et al. 2011b). Both of them should have a slope of 0.5.

From Fig. 14(a) and (b), we conclude that the velocity dispersion of branch structures correlates with both scale and column density, that the velocity dispersion of c-leaves is only sensitive to column density, while the velocity dispersion of i-leaves has no significant dependence on either scale or column density.

The structures with column density >3.2 × 10²¹ cm⁻² can be divided into two types: those that can collapse after adding external pressure $(a_{vir} = 2E_k/(E_g + E_p) < 1$, pressure-assisted collapse), and those that can collapse by self-gravity alone $(a_{vir} = 2E_k/E_g < 1$, self-gravitating collapse). Now we have three structure sets: all identified structures, the structures in pressureassisted collapse and the structures in self-gravitating collapse, where the latter is a subset of the former. The scaling relations of the three structure sets are shown in Fig. 14, Fig. 15 and Fig. 16, respectively. For both leaf and branch structures, $\sigma - N * R$ has always a stronger correlation compared to $\sigma - N$ and $\sigma - R$. Moreover, the scaling relations show a stronger correlation and steeper slope when applied to self-gravitating structures, hence they best follow the Heyer-relation.

3.7. Feedback

In the study of the G305 molecular cloud complex, Mazumdar et al. (2021a) argued that the 8 µm emission can be a good indicator of feedback strength. We calculated the average 8 µm surface brightness over each structure to measure the strength of feedback on each structure. In Fig. 17, the 8 µm surface brightness shows a strong positive correlation with column density for both c-leaves and branch structures, which might be an indication for triggering in the G333 complex. However, branch structures show a more obvious correlation between 8 µm surface brightness and velocity dispersion than c-leaves, consistent with the results in Mazumdar et al. (2021b), implying that feedback has a greater impact on large-scale structures. The smallscale structures are embedded in large-scale structures, thus less affected by feedback. For large-scale structures, as shown in Fig.2(c), the more evolved sub-region 1 and sub-region s2b are fragmenting into several pieces, potentially torn apart by the expanding HII regions. These results may explain why the velocity dispersion of branch structure has clear correlation with scale, leaf structure does not, as shown in Fig.14. However, in Fig.15, after filtering low-column density and gravationally unbound structures, velocity dispersion and scale of c-leaves appear to show better correlation than that in Fig.14, the correlation between the 8 µm surface brightness and velocity dispersion of c-leaves is also improved in Fig.17, which mean that leaf structure is also affected by feedback. Here we should remember that



Fig. 14. Scaling relations of leaf and branch structures. (a) $\sigma - R$; (b) $\sigma - N$; (c) $\sigma - N * R$. σ , *R* and *N* are velocity dispersion, effective radius and column density of each structure, respectively. 'P' represents the Pearson coefficient.

there is a considerable overlap of the scales between leaf and branch structures, as described in Sec.3.1.

Our analysis is based on structural identification, when we say that feedback increases the density and velocity dispersion of the structures, provided that these structures can exist stably. $a_{vir} = 2E_k/(E_g + E_p) < 1$ and $a_{vir} = 2E_k/E_g < 1$ structures can be more tenacious in feedback than other structures, and thus exhibit better scaling relations in Fig. 15, Fig. 16 and Fig.17. Dale et al. (2014) examined the effects, in simulations, of photoionization and momentum-driven winds from O-stars on molecular clouds, and found that feedback is highly destructive to clouds with lower mass and density, but have little effect on more massive and denser clouds.

4. Discussion

4.1. The origin of velocity dispersion

As discussed in Ballesteros-Paredes et al. (2011b); Traficante et al. (2018b); Ballesteros-Paredes et al. (2018); Li et al. (2023), high-column density clumps or cores exhibit larger velocity dispersion than low-column density ones due to gas motions in gravitational collapse, as shown in Fig. 14(b) and Fig. 15(b), where the positive correlation between velocity dispersion and column density of c-leaves and branch structures indicates the gravitational origin of velocity dispersion. Combined with the discussions in Sec.3.6 and Sec.3.7, we conclude that both gravitational collapse and feedback contribute significantly to the velocity dispersion of large-scale structures. For small-scale structures, gravitational collapse is an important source of velocity

dispersion, while the contribution of feedback needs more discussion in future work.

4.2. The Heyer-relation in feedback

In Sec.3.6, self-gravitating structures can better fit the Heyerrelation. Considering that global collapse may lag behind the local collapse in the cloud (Heitsch et al. 2008), structures collapsing under self-gravity can be relatively independent of (or "decoupled from") the surrounding environment. Then the explanations of the Heyer-relation in Heyer et al. (2009) and Ballesteros-Paredes et al. (2011b) can hold. Contrarily, for nonself-gravitating structures, the exchange of energy with the surrounding environment will break the conversion between E_g and E_k , thus breaking the Heyer-relation.

Sun et al. (2018) measured cloud-scale molecular gas properties in 15 nearby galaxies, and observed an excess in the velocity dispersion σ at low surface density Σ relative to the expected relation for self-gravity-dominated gas. This behavior leads to a shallower $\sigma - \Sigma$ relation in several galaxies, clearly deviating from a $\sigma - \Sigma^{0.5}$ relation extrapolated from the high surface density regime. One of their explanation for the deviation is that gas structures in the low surface density regime may be more susceptible to external pressure originating from the ambient medium or motions due to the galaxy potential, similar to our above explanation.



Fig. 15. Scaling relations of c-leaves and branch structures satisfied the conditions $N>3.2 \times 10^{21}$ cm⁻² and $a_{vir} = 2E_k/(E_g + E_p) < 1$. (a) $\sigma - R$; (b) $\sigma - N$; (c) $\sigma - N * R$.

4.3. Cloud disruption and collapse under feedback

Peretto et al. (2023) performed an analysis of 27 infrared dark clouds (IRDCs) embedded within 24 molecular clouds. They found that the clumps are decoupling from their surrounding cloud and concluded that the observations are best explained by a universal global collapse of dense clumps embedded within stable molecular clouds, thus discovering direct evidence of a transition regime in the dynamical properties of the gas within individual molecular clouds. As discussed in Heitsch et al. (2008); Ballesteros-Paredes et al. (2011b), the decoupling may be due to the global collapse of the molecular cloud lagging behind the local collapse of dense clumps in the cloud. Invoking the notion of the "funnel" structure in PPV space (Zhou et al. 2023), a similar statement is that relatively small-scale hub-filament structures will have a more recognizable "funnel" morphology than large-scale ones due to their strong local gravitational field. Substructure s3a in the G333 complex is a vivid example of the decoupling highlighted in Fig.1 of Zhou et al. (2023), which is collapsing into a hub-filament structure and separating from its surrounding environment.

One implication in the work of Peretto et al. (2023) is that star formation is likely to be mostly confined to parsecscale collapsing clumps, also consistent with the results in Zhou et al. (2022, 2023). In our previous works, for both ALMA and LAsMA data, most of the fitted velocity gradients concentrate on scales ~ 1 pc, a scale that is considered to be the characteristic scale of massive clumps (Urquhart et al. 2018). Velocity gradients measured around 1 pc show that the most frequent velocity gradient is ~ $1.6 \,\mathrm{km \, s^{-1} \, pc^{-1}}$. Assuming free-fall, we estimate the kinematic mass corresponding to 1 pc is ~ $1190 \,\mathrm{M_{\odot}}$, which is also comparable with the typical mass of clumps in the ATLAS-GAL survey (Urquhart et al. 2018). Thus parsec-scale clumps are probably gravity-dominated collapsing objects.

The results in Zhou et al. (2022, 2023); Peretto et al. (2023) show that the physical properties of parsec-scale clumps in two very different physical environments (infrared dark and infrared bright) are comparable. Thus feedback in infrared bright star-

forming regions, such as the G333 complex, will not significantly change the physical properties of parsec-scale clumps, also consistent with the survey results that most Galactic parsecscale massive clumps seem to be gravitationally bound no matter how evolved they are (Liu et al. 2016a; Urquhart et al. 2018; Evans et al. 2021). Although the clumps are exposed to feedback and part of their velocity dispersion is due to feedback, as shown in Sec.3.7, the clumps are still self-gravitating sufficiently to continue their collapse, even after the lower density material has been disrupted and is being dispersed. Watkins et al. (2019) found that stellar feedback from O stars does not have much of an impact on the dynamical properties of the dense gas that has already been assembled, but does clearly modify the structure of the larger scale clouds. The broken morphology of some very infrared bright structures in the G333 complex also indicates that the feedback is disrupting the molecular clouds.

The effects of feedback in star-forming regions can redistribute, disperse and enhance preexisting gas structures, and create new structures (Elmegreen & Lada 1977; Dale et al. 2007; Lee & Chen 2007; Nagakura et al. 2009; Krumholz et al. 2014; Fukui et al. 2021). According to the physical picture described in Zhou et al. (2023), the hub-filament structures at different scales may be organized into a hierarchical system, extending up to the largest scales probed, through the coupling of gravitational centers at different scales. Large-scale velocity gradients always involve many intensity peaks, and the larger scale inflow is driven by the larger scale structure, implying that the clustering of local small-scale gravitational structures can act as the gravitational center on larger scale. Given that the hierarchical hub-filament structures or the coupling of local gravitational centers in molecular cloud, and feedback does not impact much the dynamical properties of the dense gas, thus although the feedback disrupting the molecular clouds will break up the original cloud complex, the substructures of the original complex can be reorganized into new gravitationally governed configurations around new gravitational centers. This process is accompanied



Fig. 16. Scaling relation $\sigma - N * R$ of c-leaves and branch structures satisfied the conditions $N > 3.2 \times 10^{21}$ cm⁻² and $a_{vir} = 2E_k/E_a < 1$.

by structural destruction and generation, and changes in gravitational centers, but gravitational collapse is always ongoing.

5. Summary

We investigated the kinematics and dynamics of gas structures under feedback in the G333 complex. The main conclusions are as follows:

1. The dense gas structures were identified by the Dendrogram algorithm based on the integrated intensity map of 13 CO (3–2). We obtained 3608 structures, their averaged spectra were extracted and fitted one by one. According to the line profiles, all averaged spectra were divided into three categories. Physical quantities of each structure were calculated based on their line profiles.

2. The column density of the entire observed field was derived from ATLASGAL+Planck 870 μ m data, Hi-GAL data, and different transitions of ¹³CO (*J*=1–0, 2–1 and 3–2). We investigated the column density ratios between them pixel-by-pixel, and found that the column density derived from ATLAS-GAL+Planck 870 μ m data is comparable with that estimated from Hi-GAL data. Molecular line emission gives significantly lower column density estimates than those derived from the continuum emission. The peak values of the column density ratios between different transitions of ¹³CO emission are $N_{2-1}/N_{1-0} \approx 0.5$, $N_{3-2}/N_{1-0} \approx 0.5$. These ratios can be

roughly reproduced by the Non-LTE molecular radiative transfer algorithm RADEX for typical volume densities of $\sim 4.2 \times 10^3$ cm⁻³. Thus we adopted a correction factor of 0.3 to calibrate the column density derive from ¹³CO J = 3 - 2 to be more representative of the total column density.

3. Classical virial analysis, suggesting many structures to be unbound, does not reflect the true physical state of the identified structures. After considering external pressure from the ambient cloud, almost all the structures with column density more than the threshold $\sim 3.2 \times 10^{21}$ cm⁻² are gravitationally bound, even undergoing gravitational collapse.

4. The positive correlation between velocity dispersion and column density of c-leaves and branch structures reveals the gravitational origin of velocity dispersion.

5. We use the average 8 μ m surface brightness as indicator of feedback strength, which shows a strongly positive correlation with the column density of both c-leaves and branch structures. However, branch structures show a more significant correlation between 8 μ m surface brightness and velocity dispersion than c-leaves, implying that feedback has a greater impact on largescale structures. We concluded that both gravitational collapse and feedback contribute significantly to the velocity dispersion of large-scale structures. For small-scale structures, gravitational collapse is an important source of velocity dispersion, while the contribution of feedback needs more discussion in future work.

6. For both leaf and branch structures, $\sigma - N * R$ always has a stronger correlation compared to $\sigma - N$ and $\sigma - R$. The scaling relations are stronger, and have steeper slopes when considering only self-gravitating structures, which are the structures most closely associated with the Heyer relation. However, due to the strong feedback in the G333 complex, only a small fraction of the structures are in a state of self-gravitational collapse.

7. Although the feedback disrupting the molecular clouds will break up the original cloud complex, the substructures of the original complex can be reorganized into new gravitationally governed configurations around new gravitational centers. This process is accompanied by structural destruction and generation, and changes in gravitational centers, but gravitational collapse is always ongoing.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank the referee for the detailed comments and suggestions that significantly improve and clarify this work. This publication is based on data acquired with the Atacama Pathfinder Experiment (APEX) under programme ID M-0109.F-9514A-2022. APEX has been a collaboration between the Max-Planck-Institut für Radioastronomie, the European Southern Observatory, and the Onsala Space Observatory. This research made use of astrodendro, a Python package to compute dendrograms of Astronomical data (http://www.dendrograms.org/). J. W. Zhou thanks E. Vázquez-Semadeni for the helpful discussions. This work has been supported by the National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2022YFA1603101). Tie Liu acknowledges the supports by National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) through grants No.12073061 and No.12122307, the international partnership program of Chinese Academy of Sciences through grant No.114231KYSB20200009, and Shanghai Pujiang Program 20PJ1415500.

References

Areal, M. B., Paron, S., Ortega, M. E., & Duvidovich, L. 2019, PASA, 36, e049 Bains, I., Wong, T., Cunningham, M., et al. 2006, MNRAS, 367, 1609

Ballesteros-Paredes, J. 2006, MNRAS, 372, 443

- Ballesteros-Paredes, J., André, P., Hennebelle, P., et al. 2020, Space Sci. Rev., 216, 76
- Ballesteros-Paredes, J., Hartmann, L. W., Vázquez-Semadeni, E., Heitsch, F., & Zamora-Avilés, M. A. 2011a, MNRAS, 411, 65
- Ballesteros-Paredes, J., Hartmann, L. W., Vázquez-Semadeni, E., Heitsch, F., & Zamora-Avilés, M. A. 2011b, MNRAS, 411, 65
- Ballesteros-Paredes, J., Vázquez-Semadeni, E., Palau, A., & Klessen, R. S. 2018, MNRAS, 479, 2112

J. W. Zhou: Gravitational collapse of dense gas structures under feedback



Fig. 17. Correlation between the 8 µm surface brightness and velocity dispersion and column density of the structures. First column: all type1 c-leaves and branch structures; Second column: type1 c-leaves and branch structures satisfied the condition $a_{vir} = 2E_k/(E_q + E_p) < 1$; Third column: type1 c-leaves and branch structures satisfied the condition $a_{vir} = 2E_k/E_q < 1$.

- Belloche, A., Schuller, F., Parise, B., et al. 2011, A&A, 527, A145
- Benjamin, R. A., Churchwell, E., Babler, B. L., et al. 2003, PASP, 115, 953 Bertoldi, F. & McKee, C. F. 1992, ApJ, 395, 140
- Bonnell, I. A., Bate, M. R., Clarke, C. J., & Pringle, J. E. 1997, MNRAS, 285, 201
- Bonnell, I. A., Bate, M. R., Clarke, C. J., & Pringle, J. E. 2001, MNRAS, 323, 785
- Burton, M. G., Braiding, C., Glueck, C., et al. 2013, PASA, 30, e044 Butler, M. J. & Tan, J. C. 2012, ApJ, 754, 5
- Camacho, V., Vázquez-Semadeni, E., Ballesteros-Paredes, J., et al. 2016, ApJ, 833, 113
- Chen, H.-R. V., Zhang, Q., Wright, M. C. H., et al. 2019, ApJ, 875, 24
- Csengeri, T., Weiss, A., Wyrowski, F., et al. 2016, A&A, 585, A104
- Dale, J. E., Bonnell, I. A., & Whitworth, A. P. 2007, MNRAS, 375, 1291
- Dale, J. E., Ercolano, B., & Bonnell, I. A. 2012, MNRAS, 424, 377
- Dale, J. E., Ngoumou, J., Ercolano, B., & Bonnell, I. A. 2014, MNRAS, 442, 694
- Elmegreen, B. G. 1989, ApJ, 338, 178
- Elmegreen, B. G. & Lada, C. J. 1977, ApJ, 214, 725 Evans, Neal J., I., Heyer, M., Miville-Deschênes, M.-A., Nguyen-Luong, Q., & Merello, M. 2021, ApJ, 920, 126
- Field, G. B., Blackman, E. G., & Keto, E. R. 2011, MNRAS, 416, 710
- Finn, M. K., Indebetouw, R., Johnson, K. E., et al. 2021, ApJ, 917, 106
- Frerking, M. A., Langer, W. D., & Wilson, R. W. 1982, ApJ, 262, 590
- Fukui, Y., Habe, A., Inoue, T., Enokiya, R., & Tachihara, K. 2021, PASJ, 73, S1
- Ganguly, S., Walch, S., Clarke, S. D., & Seifried, D. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2204.02511
- Garden, R. P., Hayashi, M., Gatley, I., Hasegawa, T., & Kaifu, N. 1991, ApJ, 374.540
- Goldsmith, P. F., Heyer, M., Narayanan, G., et al. 2008, ApJ, 680, 428
- Güsten, R., Nyman, L. Å., Schilke, P., et al. 2006, A&A, 454, L13
- Hartmann, L., Ballesteros-Paredes, J., & Heitsch, F. 2012, MNRAS, 420, 1457 Heitsch, F., Hartmann, L. W., Slyz, A. D., Devriendt, J. E. G., & Burkert, A.
- 2008, ApJ, 674, 316
- Hennebelle, P. & Falgarone, E. 2012, A&A Rev., 20, 55

- Heyer, M. & Dame, T. M. 2015, ARA&A, 53, 583
- Heyer, M., Krawczyk, C., Duval, J., & Jackson, J. M. 2009, ApJ, 699, 1092 Heyer, M. H. & Brunt, C. M. 2004, ApJ, 615, L45
- Ibáñez-Mejía, J. C., Mac Low, M.-M., Klessen, R. S., & Baczynski, C. 2016, ApJ, 824, 41
- Kauffmann, J., Bertoldi, F., Bourke, T. L., Evans, N. J., I., & Lee, C. W. 2008, A&A, 487, 993
- Kauffmann, J., Pillai, T., & Goldsmith, P. F. 2013, ApJ, 779, 185
- Keto, E. R. & Myers, P. C. 1986, ApJ, 304, 466
- Kirk, H., Friesen, R. K., Pineda, J. E., et al. 2017, ApJ, 846, 144
- Kirk, H., Johnstone, D., & Di Francesco, J. 2006, ApJ, 646, 1009
- Krumholz, M. R., Bate, M. R., Arce, H. G., et al. 2014, in Protostars and Planets VI, ed. H. Beuther, R. S. Klessen, C. P. Dullemond, & T. Henning, 243
- Krumholz, M. R., Klein, R. I., & McKee, C. F. 2007, ApJ, 656, 959
- Lada, C. J., Muench, A. A., Rathborne, J., Alves, J. F., & Lombardi, M. 2008, ApJ, 672, 410
- Larson, R. B. 1981, MNRAS, 194, 809
- Lee, H.-T. & Chen, W. P. 2007, ApJ, 657, 884
- Leroy, A. K., Bolatto, A. D., Ostriker, E. C., et al. 2015, ApJ, 801, 25
- Leroy, A. K., Rosolowsky, E., Usero, A., et al. 2022, ApJ, 927, 149
- Lewis, S. C., McMillan, S. L. W., Low, M.-M. M., et al. 2023, ApJ, 944, 211
- Li, S., Sanhueza, P., Zhang, Q., et al. 2023, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2304.01718 Li, S., Zhang, Q., Liu, H. B., et al. 2020, ApJ, 896, 110
- Li, S., Zhang, Q., Pillai, T., et al. 2019, ApJ, 886, 130 Lindner, R. R., Vera-Ciro, C., Murray, C. E., et al. 2015, AJ, 149, 138
- Liu, T., Kim, K.-T., Yoo, H., et al. 2016a, ApJ, 829, 59
- Liu, T., Zhang, Q., Kim, K.-T., et al. 2016b, ApJS, 222, 7
- Lockman, F. J. 1979, ApJ, 232, 761
- Mac Low, M.-M. & Klessen, R. S. 2004, Reviews of Modern Physics, 76, 125
- Mangum, J. G. & Shirley, Y. L. 2015, PASP, 127, 266
- Marsh, K. A., Whitworth, A. P., & Lomax, O. 2015, MNRAS, 454, 4282
- Marsh, K. A., Whitworth, A. P., Lomax, O., et al. 2017, MNRAS, 471, 2730 Matzner, C. D. 2002, ApJ, 566, 302
- Mazumdar, P., Wyrowski, F., Colombo, D., et al. 2021a, A&A, 650, A164
- Mazumdar, P., Wyrowski, F., Urquhart, J. S., et al. 2021b, A&A, 656, A101 McKee, C. F. 1989, ApJ, 345, 782

Article number, page 17 of 17

- McKee, C. F. & Ostriker, E. C. 2007, ARA&A, 45, 565
- McKee, C. F. & Tan, J. C. 2003, ApJ, 585, 850
- Miville-Deschênes, M.-A., Murray, N., & Lee, E. J. 2017, ApJ, 834, 57
- Molinari, S., Bally, J., Glover, S., et al. 2014, in Protostars and Planets VI, ed. H. Beuther, R. S. Klessen, C. P. Dullemond, & T. Henning, 125
- Molinari, S., Swinyard, B., Bally, J., et al. 2010, A&A, 518, L100
- Motte, F., Bontemps, S., & Louvet, F. 2018, ARA&A, 56, 41
- Nagakura, T., Hosokawa, T., & Omukai, K. 2009, MNRAS, 399, 2183
- Nguyen, H., Nguyen Lu'o'ng, Q., Martin, P. G., et al. 2015, ApJ, 812, 7
- Padoan, P., Pan, L., Juvela, M., Haugbølle, T., & Nordlund, Å. 2020, ApJ, 900, 82
- Palau, A., Estalella, R., Girart, J. M., et al. 2014, ApJ, 785, 42
- Pattle, K., Ward-Thompson, D., Kirk, J. M., et al. 2015, MNRAS, 450, 1094
- Peretto, N., Rigby, A. J., Louvet, F., et al. 2023, MNRAS, 525, 2935
- Pineda, J. E., Caselli, P., & Goodman, A. A. 2008, ApJ, 679, 481
- Rahner, D., Pellegrini, E. W., Glover, S. C. O., & Klessen, R. S. 2017, MNRAS, 470.4453
- Riener, M., Kainulainen, J., Henshaw, J. D., et al. 2019, A&A, 628, A78
- Rogers, H. & Pittard, J. M. 2013, MNRAS, 431, 1337
- Rosolowsky, E. & Leroy, A. 2006, PASP, 118, 590
- Rosolowsky, E. W., Pineda, J. E., Kauffmann, J., & Goodman, A. A. 2008, ApJ, 679.1338
- Rugel, M. R., Rahner, D., Beuther, H., et al. 2019, A&A, 622, A48
- Schuller, F., Csengeri, T., Urquhart, J. S., et al. 2017, A&A, 601, A124
- Schuller, F., Menten, K. M., Contreras, Y., et al. 2009, A&A, 504, 415
- Schuller, F., Urquhart, J. S., Csengeri, T., et al. 2021, MNRAS, 500, 3064
- Shirley, Y. L. 2015, PASP, 127, 299
- Smith, M. C., Sijacki, D., & Shen, S. 2018, MNRAS, 478, 302
- Solomon, P. M., Rivolo, A. R., Barrett, J., & Yahil, A. 1987, ApJ, 319, 730
- Spitzer, L. 1978, Physical processes in the interstellar medium
- Sun, J., Leroy, A. K., Schruba, A., et al. 2018, ApJ, 860, 172
- Traficante, A., Duarte-Cabral, A., Elia, D., et al. 2018a, MNRAS, 477, 2220
- Traficante, A., Fuller, G. A., Smith, R. J., et al. 2018b, MNRAS, 473, 4975
- Ulich, B. L. & Haas, R. W. 1976, ApJS, 30, 247
- Urquhart, J. S., König, C., Giannetti, A., et al. 2018, MNRAS, 473, 1059 Vázquez-Semadeni, E., Gómez, G. C., Jappsen, A. K., Ballesteros-Paredes, J., &
- Klessen, R. S. 2009, ApJ, 707, 1023 Vázquez-Semadeni, E., González-Samaniego, A., & Colín, P. 2017, MNRAS,
- 467, 1313 Vázquez-Semadeni, E., Palau, A., Ballesteros-Paredes, J., Gómez, G. C., & Zamora-Avilés, M. 2019a, MNRAS, 490, 3061
- Vázquez-Semadeni, E., Palau, A., Ballesteros-Paredes, J., Gómez, G. C., & Zamora-Avilés, M. 2019b, MNRAS, 490, 3061
- Watkins, E. J., Peretto, N., Marsh, K., & Fuller, G. A. 2019, A&A, 628, A21
- Weis, M., Walch, S., Seifried, D., & Ganguly, S. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2208.11705
- Zhou, J.-W., Liu, T., Evans, N. J., et al. 2022, MNRAS, 514, 6038
- Zhou, J. W., Wyrowski, F., Neupane, S., et al. 2023, A&A, 676, A69
- Zinnecker, H. & Yorke, H. W. 2007, ARA&A, 45, 481