# THE SPIN TEMPERATURE OF METHANOL IN COMET HALE-BOPP

C. Pardanaud<sup>1</sup>, J. Crovisier<sup>2</sup>, D. Bockelée-Morvan<sup>2</sup> and N. Biver<sup>2</sup>

Abstract. Measurements of the ortho-to-para ratio (OPR) of small hydrogenated molecules ( $H_2O$ ,  $NH_2$  which leads to  $NH_3$ , and  $CH_4$ ) in the coma of comets give spin temperatures clustered around 30 K, which is most of the time lower than the associated rotational temperatures. We investigate here the spin temperature of methanol from the observations of the 241 and 145 GHz sets of rotational lines, obtained on C/1995 O1 (Hale-Bopp) on two different dates with the 15-m and 30-m antennas of IRAM.

### 1 Introduction

Molecules such as  $H_2O$ ,  $H_2CO$ ,  $NH_3$ ,  $CH_4$ ,  $CH_3OH$ ... exist in several nuclear spin isomer species. Nuclear spin conversion between such isomers is thought to be radiatively and collisionally forbidden, so spin temperatures could remain unchanged for a long time, provided no conversion occurs in the solid phase. The spin temperatures measured for  $H_2O$  and  $NH_3$  (traced from  $NH_2$ ) are found to cluster near 30 K for different comets, whatever their dynamical origin, their distance to the Sun or their activity level (e.g., Kawakita et al. 2004; Bonev et al. 2007). The interpretation of this temperature is subject to debates. It might be of pristine origin, reflecting how the molecules were formed in the early Solar System (but the preservation of the spin temperatures are similar is still to be understood).

We investigate here the case for cometary methanol.  $CH_3OH$  is organized in two independent manifolds (Fig. 1): E-type (I = 1/2) and A-type (I = 3/2). As mentioned earlier (Crovisier 1998) the A/E ratio of this molecule is less sensitive to temperature than the ortho-to-para ratio of water. Despite this difficulty, we tried to constrain the spin temperature by applying the rotational diagram method to two sets of spectroscopic data secured on comet Hale-Bopp.

### 2 Observational data

We analysed two sets of data containing pure rotational lines of methanol coming from comet C/1995 O1 (Hale-Bopp). The first set was recorded on 12 March 1997, 19 days before perihelion, at 241 GHz, with the 15-m antennas of the IRAM interferometer used in single-dish mode (heliocentric distance  $r_h = 0.98$  AU, geocentric distance  $\Delta = 1.36$  AU). The second set was recorded on 29 May 1997, in the 145 GHz frequency band with the 30-m single-dish antenna of IRAM ( $r_h = 1.36$  AU,  $\Delta = 2.24$  AU). Figure 1 shows the pattern of the CH<sub>3</sub>OH rotational levels with the transitions observed for this study. Corresponding spectra are presented in Fig. 2.

# 3 Data analysis

#### 3.1 Excitation model

As shown previously in Bockelée-Morvan et al. (1994), cometary methanol is out of equilibrium. A direct estimation of the spin temperature of methanol in comet Hale-Bopp from the observational data is thus not

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Laboratoire de Physique Moléculaire pour l'Atmosphère et l'Astrophysique-UMR CNRS 1043, Université Paris 6, 4 place Jussieu, F-75252 Paris cedex 5

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  LESIA, Observatoire de Paris, 5 place Jules Janssen, F-92195 Meudon





Fig. 1. Rotational levels of methanol. The rotational transitions analysed in the present study are indicated by arrows.



Fig. 2. IRAM spectra of methanol observed in comet Hale-Bopp. Left: 241 GHz group observed on 12 March 1997 with the Plateau-de-Bure interferometer. Right: 145 GHz group observed on 29 May 1997 with the 30-m telescope.

possible. The excitation of methanol is governed by collisions with water molecules and electrons, spontaneous relaxation and excitation of the fundamental vibrational bands by solar radiation. In the present analysis, radiative excitation follows the model of Bockelée-Morvan et al. (1994) whereas collisions with electrons are modelled following the formalism of Xie & Mumma (1992) and Biver (1997).

For collisions, the model parameters are the collisional cross section with water molecules ( $\sigma_{coll} = 5 \times 10^{-14}$  cm<sup>2</sup>), the water production rate ( $Q_{H_2O} = 6 \times 10^{30} \text{ s}^{-1}$  and  $4 \times 10^{30} \text{ s}^{-1}$  for the two sets of data, respectively, as determined from other observations; Biver et al. 2002), the neutral gas kinetic temperature ( $T_{kin} = 110$  K and 72 K for the two sets of data, respectively, also determined from other observations) and  $x_{ne}$  which is a scaling factor accounting for electronic collisions (as discussed by Xie & Mumma 1992, Biver 1997 and Biver et al. 1999).

### Spin temperature of CH<sub>3</sub>OH in comet Hale-Bopp

#### 3.2 Rotational diagrams

When studying intensities linked with pure rotational transitions, it is of interest to use the rotational diagram method, currently employed in interstellar molecule studies (Goldsmith et al. 1999). In this method,  $\operatorname{Ln}(\gamma_u W/g_u)$  is plotted as a function of  $E_u$  for  $u \to l$  transitions, where W is the line intensity,  $g_u$  is the statistical weight of the u level,  $\gamma_u = (8\pi\nu_{ul}^2)/(hc^3A_{ul})$  with  $\nu_{ul}$  and  $A_{ul}$  being the frequency and Einstein coefficient of the transition.  $E_u$  is the energy of the u level (in K units).

In such a diagram, all points should be aligned if the rotational distribution of the molecule is thermal and if the lines are optically thin (which is the case here for cometary methanol). The inverse of the slope is then the rotational temperature  $T_{\rm rot}$ . If the excitation processes of methanol are governed by collisions, all the observational points relevant from a spin isomer are expected to be aligned, with  $T_{\rm rot} = T_{\rm kin}$ .

The rotational diagrams resulting from our observations are plotted in Fig. 3, together with those simulated with the excitation model.



Fig. 3. Comparison between observed and simulated rotational diagrams. a) 12 March 1997. b) 29 May 1997.

#### 4 Results and discussion

As can be seen in Fig. 3, this study is hampered by departures of the population distribution from a thermal distribution. By adjusting the main parameters of the model ( $\sigma_{coll}$ ,  $x_{ne}$ ,  $Q_{CH_3OH}$ ), the two rotational diagrams could be reasonably reproduced (Fig. 3). The retrieved rotational temperatures from least-square fits are  $T_{rot} = 79.2 \pm 2.7$  K for the data set secured on 12 March 1997,  $T_{rot} = 50.5 \pm 3.8$  K for the data set secured on 29 May 1997. These values are lower than the  $T_{kin}$  measured for the same dates, showing that CH<sub>3</sub>OH is rotationally relaxed.

The  $x_{ne}$  scale factor, employed to take into account the collisions of methanol with electrons, seems to be a crucial parameter. A value lower than 1 correspond to a small contribution whereas a value higher than 1 stands for a more important contribution. The rotational diagrams corresponding to two different values of  $x_{ne}$ are shown for the two data sets in Fig. 3. In Fig. 3a, it appears that the observations are better reproduced with a high value of  $x_{ne}$ , whereas this is not so clear farther from the Sun in Fig. 3b.

Using together the E and A lines of methanol, we find that the production rate  $Q_{CH_3OH} = 25 \pm 2.30 \times 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$  at a distance of 0.98 AU from the Sun, whereas a smaller value of  $8.9 \pm 1.0 \times 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$  is found at a distance of 1.36 AU. This is close to values obtained in previous studies (Biver et al. 2002).

Then, the E/A ratio is obtained by adjusting separately the observational points relevant to the E or A species and comparing the resulting E and A production rates. This leads to  $E/A = 1.14 \pm 0.28$  and  $1.30 \pm 0.38$  for the two sets of data, respectively. The large error bars stem from the failure of the model to reproduce

exactly the departures from the thermal distribution, rather than from the signal-to-noise ratio of the lines. The lower bounds are 0.86 and 0.92, leading to  $T_{\rm spin} > 15$  K and > 18 K for the two sets of data, respectively.

We note that for the collision rates of methanol with water, we have used a unique conventional cross section for all the transitions ( $\sigma_{coll} = 5 \times 10^{-14} \text{ cm}^2$ ), without any consideration on the total nuclear spin of the collisional partners or their rotational states. Varying this parameter between 2 and  $7 \times 10^{-14} \text{ cm}^2$  only slightly affects the shape of the rotational diagrams. Certainly, a significant improvement of the model in the future would be to use level-dependent cross sections for H<sub>2</sub>O-CH<sub>3</sub>OH collisions, when available. It is not excluded that the ortho-to-para ratio of water could play an important role in the collisional excitation of methanol if cross sections relative to ortho-H<sub>2</sub>O are different from para-H<sub>2</sub>O.

#### 5 Conclusions

In this work, we were able to determine a minimum value of the spin temperature of methanol, which does not contradict the earlier measures made with  $H_2O$ ,  $NH_2$  and  $CH_4$ , leading to a possible important gap between  $T_{spin}$  and  $T_{kin}$ . It has also been possible to show that collisions of methanol with electrons play an important role in order to reproduce observations.

Watanabe et al. (2006) have determined experimentally that methanol can be formed by CO hydrogenation contained in pure or mixed ices, but this process is efficient only at temperatures below 15 K. If the spin temperature limit we obtained is indeed relevant to the formation temperature of methanol, another formation mechanism should be envisaged for this species. Laboratory analyses simulating cometary environments are needed to solve this issue.

## References

Biver, N. 1997, PhD thesis, Université Paris 7
Biver, N., Bockelée-Morvan, D., Colom, P., et al. 2002, Earth Moon and Planets 90, 5
Biver, N., Bockelée-Morvan, D., Crovisier, J., et al. 1999, AJ 118, 1850
Bockelée-Morvan, D., Crovisier, J., Colom, P., & Despois, D 1994, A&A 287, 647
Bonev, B. P., Mumma, M. J., Villanueva, G., et al. 2007, ApJ 661, L97
Crovisier, J. 1998, Faraday Discuss. 109, 437
Goldsmith, P. F., Langer, W. D. 1999, ApJ 517, 209
Kawakita, H., Watanabe, J., Furusho, R., et al. 2004, ApJ 601, 1152
Watanabe, N., Nagaoka, A., Hidaka, H., et al. 2006, PSS 54, 1107
Xie, X., Mumma, M. J. 1992, ApJ 386, 720