Molecular Observations of Comets: Constraints for Planetary System Formation

Jacques Crovisier, Nicolas Biver, Dominique Bockelée-Morvan and Pierre Colom

Observatoire de Paris, F-92195 Meudon, France

Didier Despois

Observatoire de Bordeaux, France

D.C. Lis

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

Heike Rauer

DRL Inst. of Space Sensor Tech. and Planet. Explor., Berlin, Germany

and the team for target-of-opportunity radio observations of comets

Abstract. We review our knowledge of the composition of cometary volatiles in the light of recent observations of comets C/1996 B2 (Hyakutake) and C/1995 O1 (Hale-Bopp) and examine how this could constrain models of planetary system formation.

The recent observations of comets C/1996 B2 (Hyakutake) and C/1995 O1 (Hale-Bopp), especially at radio wavelengths, led to the detection of many new cometary molecules, thus allowing us to complement our inventory of the composition of cometary volatiles (Bockelée-Morvan 1997, Lis et al. 1997, Bockelée-Morvan et al. 2000 and references therein). A summary of the volatile abundances observed in these two comets is given in Table 1. In addition to abundant species (H₂O, CO, CO₂, CH₃OH, H₂CO...), this inventory now includes hydrocarbons, nitrogen compounds NH₃, HCN, HNC, HNCO, HC₃N, CH₃CN), sulphur compounds (H₂S, CS₂, SO, SO₂, OCS ...), and fairly complex organic molecules found at the trace level, such as formic acid (HCOOH), CH₃CHO, NH₂CHO, HCOOCH₃. Isotopic ratios, especially D/H in water and HCN, were evaluated (Bockelée-Morvan et al. 1998; Meier et al. 1998a, 1998b). Several species were also searched for unsuccessfully, some of them with stringent upper limits: ethanol, ketene (CH₂CO), methanimine (CH₂NH), HC₅N, and many others (a summary of these unpublished results is given in Table 2).

These results provide clues to the composition of the primitive Solar Nebula and give important constraints for models of planetary formation. For the most abundant species (H₂O, CO, CO₂, CH₃OH, H₂CO, CH₄, OCS, nitriles X–CN), there is a strong analogy between cometary volatiles and interstellar ices (such as those observed in the infrared by ISO towards deeply embedded protostars

Table 1.	Relative production rates of molecules observed in comets C/199	6
B2 (Hyaku	take) and C/1995 O1 (Hale-Bopp) at $r_h \approx 1$ AU.	

Molecule	a)	b)	C/1996 B2	C/1995 O1	remark
H_2O	IR	> 5	100	100	
CO	R IR UV	> 5	6-30	23	$\operatorname{extended}^{c)}$
CO_2	IR	2	-	$20^{d)}$	
$\mathrm{CH_4}$	IR	2	0.7	0.6	
$\mathrm{C_2H_2}$	IR	-	≈ 0.5	0.1	
C_2H_6	IR	2	0.4	0.3	
$\mathrm{CH_{3}OH}$	R IR	> 5	2	2.4	
$\mathrm{H_{2}CO}$	R IR	> 5	0.2 - 1	1.1	$\operatorname{extended}^{e)}$
HCOOH	\mathbf{R}	none.	_	0.08	
CH_3CHO	\mathbf{R}	_	_	0.02	
$HCOOCH_3$	R	_	_	0.08	
NH_3	R IR	1?	0.5	0.7	
HCN	R IR	> 5	0.1	0.25	
HNCO	\mathbf{R}	-	0.07	0.10	
HNC	\mathbf{R}	1	0.01	0.04	extended
$\mathrm{CH_{3}CN}$	\mathbf{R}	_	0.01	0.02	
$\mathrm{HC_3N}$	$\mathbf R$	_	_	0.02	
NH_2CHO	R	_	_	0.015	
H_2S	R	5	0.8	1.5	
ocs	R IR	_	0.1	0.4	extended
SO	\mathbf{R}	_	-	0.3	extended
CS_2	(R) (UV)	> 5	0.1	0.2	from $CS^{f)}$
SO_2	${f R}$	_	_	0.2	
$_{ m H_2CS}$	${ m R}$	_	_	0.02	
S_2	UV	2	0.005		

 $^{^{}a)}$ technique of observation (R = radio); $^{b)}$ number of detections in other comets;

(Ehrenfreund & Schutte 2000). This comparison cannot be extended to trace species because of the lack of sensitivity of infrared observations. A quantitative comparison was also made with the abundances observed by radio spectroscopy in hot molecular cores and bipolar flows (Bockelée-Morvan et al. 2000). There is a very good agreement for the N-bearing and CHO-bearing species. There is less agreement for the S-bearing species, an expected result since the abundances of sulphur species in hot cores and bipolar flows may be affected by a rapid gasphase chemistry in the post-evaporation phase.

c) abundance given for nuclear + extended source; d) measured at $r_h = 2.9$ AU;

e) abundance given for extended source; f) CS₂ abundance inferred from CS. Detailed references may be found in Bockelée-Morvan et al. 2000.

Molecule	line	$\mathrm{limit}^{a)}$	telescope	comet
	[GHz]		-	
$\mathrm{H_{2}O_{2}}$	362.156	< 0.04	CSO	Hyakutake
$\mathrm{CH_{3}CCH}$	222.167	< 0.045	IRAM PdB	Hale-Bopp
$\mathrm{CH_{2}CO}$	220.178	< 0.032	IRAM 30-m	Hale-Bopp
$\mathrm{C_2H_5OH}$	235.983	< 0.05	IRAM 30-m	Hale-Bopp
$\mathrm{CH_{3}OCH_{3}}$	several	< 0.45	IRAM 30-m	Hale-Bopp
CH_3COOH	several	b)		Hale-Bopp
glycine	several	< 0.5	IRAM 30-m	Hale-Bopp
$\mathrm{HC_5N}$	several	< 0.003	IRAM 30-m	Hale-Bopp
CH_2NH	226.548	< 0.032	IRAM 30-m	Hale-Bopp
$\mathrm{CH_{3}SH}$	radio	<i>b</i>)		Hale-Bopp
NaOH	251.226	< 0.0003	CSO	Hale-Bopp
NaCl	260.223	< 0.0008	CSO	Hale-Bopp

Table 2. Upper limits on the relative production rates of undetected molecules in comets (radio observations).

The correlations between molecular abundances ranging over several orders of magnitude reinforce the similarity between interstellar and cometary ices. There is now strong evidence that cometary ices were formed to a large extent by the same low temperature non-equilibrium processes which produce interstellar ices: grain surface reactions, condensation of products of ion-molecule reactions, UV processing. But is there a direct link between interstellar and cometary ices? In the inner part of the protoplanetary disc, the high temperature led to a complete volatilization (up to atomisation) of the grains and initiated a specific solar nebula thermochemistry. Assessing to which extent nebular chemistry and additional processes, such as accretion shocks and radial mixing in the nebula, have also contributed to cometary ice composition will need further studies, but the similarities with interstellar ices shown by the present data clearly set a limit to their relative importance.

References

Bockelée-Morvan, D. 1997, in *Molecules in Astrophysics: Probes and Processes*, van Dishoeck edt., Kluwer, p. 219

Bockelée-Morvan, D., Gautier, D., Lis, D.C., et al. 1998, Icarus, 147, 162

Bockelée-Morvan, D., Lis, D.C., Wink, J.E., et al. 2000, A&A, 353, 1101

Ehrenfreund, P. & Schutte, W.A. 2000, in *Astrochemistry*, IAU Symp. 197, Y.C. Minh & E.F. van Dishoeck eds, ASP, p. 135

Lis, D.C., Keene, J., Young, T.G., et al. 1997, Icarus, 130, 355

Meier, R., Owen, T.C., Jewitt, D.C., et al. 1998a, Science, 279, 1707

Meier, R., Owen, T.C., Matthews, H.E., et al. 1998b, Science, 279, 842

 $^{^{}a)}$ relative to water = 100. $^{b)}$ limit not yet evaluated