H<sub>2</sub> – 31 GHz.

Conclusions

# 

Simon Casassus<sup>1</sup>, Matías Vidal<sup>1,2</sup>, Pablo Castellanos<sup>1,3</sup>, Clive Dickinson<sup>2</sup>, Kieran Cleary<sup>4</sup>, Roberta Paladini<sup>4</sup>, Glenn White<sup>5</sup>, Michael Burton<sup>6</sup> & CBI/CBI2 teams.

<sup>1</sup>Departamento de Astronomía, Universidad de Chile

<sup>2</sup>Manchester <sup>3</sup>Leiden <sup>4</sup>Caltech <sup>5</sup>RAL <sup>6</sup>UNSW

Manchester, remote, July 2012

H<sub>2</sub> – 31 GHz.

Conclusions



#### What is the spin up mechanism? Bright radio continuum from $\rho$ Oph W

 $H_2 = 31$  GHz. An interesting datum: 31 GHz = rovib  $H_2$  correlation.

Conclusions

H<sub>2</sub> – 31 GHz.

Conclusions



#### What is the spin up mechanism? Bright radio continuum from $\rho$ Oph W

#### $H_2 - 31$ GHz. An interesting datum: 31 GHz - rovib $H_2$ correlation.

Conclusions

H<sub>2</sub> – 31 GHz.

Conclusions



#### What is the spin up mechanism? Bright radio continuum from $\rho$ Oph W

#### H<sub>2</sub> – 31 GHz.

An interesting datum: 31 GHz – rovib H<sub>2</sub> correlation.

Conclusions

H<sub>2</sub> – 31 GHz.

Conclusions

# Insights from Ophiucus.



- MIPS 24 μm, IRAC 8μm, 2MASS 2.2μm, CBI2 contours.
- S 1 coincides with the brightest IR nebula, also brightest in PAHs.
- Yet no detectable radio continuum in S 1!

# It's not VSG depletion. It's emissivity boost in $\rho$ Oph W.

• If spinning dust emissivity per nucleon was independent of environment, then since PAH intensities are  $\propto G_{\circ}$  (the local UV field)

 $\Rightarrow$   $R = G_{\circ} \times I_{\nu}(31 \text{GHz})/I(\text{PAH 11.3 } \mu\text{m})$  should be constant.

 Given Spitzer IRS PAH spectroscopy, G<sub>o</sub> from ISO, and CBI2 mosaic, R is 42 times greater in Oph W than in S 1 (at 3 σ)

 $\rightarrow$  the zero-order approximation *I*(31) GHz  $\propto$  *N*(VSG) breaks down. Environmental factors boost the spinning dust emissivities in  $\rho$  Oph W.

# What is boosting spinning dust in $\rho$ Oph W?

- Not G<sub>o</sub>: from *ISO* big-grain T<sub>d</sub> in S 1 is ~35 K and > than in ρ Oph W.
- Plasma drag (collisions with C<sup>+</sup> ions)? Models predict ~ linear dependence of  $j_{\nu}/n_{\rm H}$  as a function of  $n_{\rm H}$  (see Ali-Haïmoud et al. 2009).  $\Rightarrow$  search for carbon RRLs and correlate with continuum.
- Recoil momentum from H<sub>2</sub> formation? ⇒ search for kinematic signature in emergent H<sub>2</sub>.
- $\Rightarrow$  Need much more data!

H<sub>2</sub> – 31 GHz.

Conclusions

### Preliminary results from ATCA



Conclusions

# Preliminary results from ATCA

The matched beams at 8.8 GHz and 20.2 GHz allow placing limits on the spectral index ( $F_{\nu} \propto \nu^{\alpha}$ ):

 $\alpha_{\rm 8.8}^{\rm 20.2}>$  3.0 at 3  $\sigma,$ 

so we can rule out any thermal emission.

# Does 20 GHz follow PAHs on 30 arcsec scales?

Surprisingly well in  $\rho$  Oph W, despite differences with S 1.



Simulated ATCA-IRAC  $8\mu$ m contours overlaid on ATCA grey scale. Note spectral variations.

Conclusions

# Search for C RRLs

- Pankonin & Walmsley (1978) missed ρ Oph W, but detected C90α and C91α from S 1.
- $\rho$  Oph W: MOPRA 3  $\sigma$  limits on C73 $\alpha$  is 73 mJy beam<sup>-1</sup> in a 30 arcsec beam (Casassus et al. 2008).
- $\rho$  Oph W: ATCA CABB 3  $\sigma$  limit on C71 $\alpha$ , C72 $\alpha$  and C73 $\alpha$  is 6 mJy beam<sup>-1</sup>.
- Expected C71 $\alpha$  intensity is ~1 mJy beam<sup>-1</sup>....

H<sub>2</sub> – 31 GHz.

### An interesting datum: 31 GHz – $H_2(0-0)$ correlation.



**S1**: top.  $\rho$  **Oph W**: bottom. Note H<sub>2</sub>(0-0)S(2) at 12.278  $\mu$ m.

# 31 GHz – $H_2(0-0)S(2)$ correlation: 2 points + origin.

	ρ Oph W	SR 3	S 1	S 1 off
H <sub>2</sub> (0-0)S(2) <sup>a</sup>	2.9(-7)	1.9(-7)	< 1.0(-8)	<2.7(-9)
<i>I</i> <sub>31GHz</sub> <sup>b</sup>	2.2±0.2(-1)	1.4±0.2(-1)	< 2.4(-2)	<1.8(-3)
<sup>a</sup> W m <sup>-2</sup> sr <sup>-1</sup> <sup>b</sup> MJy sr <sup>-1</sup>				

H<sub>2</sub> − 31 GHz.

Conclusions

# UKIDSS H<sub>2</sub> mosaic.



WFCAM mosaic from Lucas et al. (2008).

### Origin of the H<sub>2</sub>–cm-wave correlation

 $C^+$  and fluorescent  $H_2$ : The fluorescent  $H_2$  layers in PDRs overlap with  $C^+$  (e.g. Hollenbach & Tielens, 1997). *Plasma drag* spin-up is driven by the ions.

Spinning dust and formation pumping : Spin-up by the recoil of  $H_2$  formation on VSG surfaces.  $H_2$  production may be enhanced in regions of high VSG abundance. If so the  $H_2$  near-IR spectrum should bear the signature of formation pumping.

 $\Rightarrow$  Test through near-IR area spectroscopy.

Conclusions

### Tracers of H<sub>2</sub> formation pumping

M17 H<sub>2</sub> (1-0)S(7) 1.7480µm

M17 H<sub>2</sub> (6-4)0(3) 1.7326µm



H<sub>2</sub> – 31 GHz.

Conclusions

# SINFONI H<sub>2</sub> spectroscopy



Conclusions

# H<sub>2</sub> formation on VSGs

- The SINFONI spectroscopy confirms the line ratios from the FP data, in support of (6-4)O(3) as formation-pumped line.
- Spectrum of ρ Oph W exhibits highest H<sub>2</sub>(6-4)O(3)/H<sub>2</sub>(1-0)S(7)~2 ⇒ formation pumping is very effective in ρ Oph W.
- $\Rightarrow$  Is the formation of H<sub>2</sub> exciting the rotation of VSGs in  $\rho$  Oph W?
- Same UV light dissociates and excites H<sub>2</sub>: 1 in 15 electronic transitions lead to dissociation. So for dissociation balance in steady state, the lack of H<sub>2</sub> emission from S 1 implies that H<sub>2</sub> is not efficiently forming in S 1.

# Rotational excitation by H<sub>2</sub> formation

- The reference model by Draine & Lazarian (1998) considers H<sub>2</sub> formation, but neglects it. Ali-Haïmoud, Hirata & Dickinson (2009) follow Draine & Lazarian for default H<sub>2</sub> parameters.
- However, choice of parameters is very uncertain:
  - The probably of formation per adsorbed H atom is taken  $\gamma \lesssim 0.1$  from the average H<sub>2</sub> formation rate of Jura (1975). However, regions of 5–10 times higher formation rates have been found (Habart et al. 2004)  $\Rightarrow \gamma \lesssim 1$ ?
  - The kinetic energy of emergent H<sub>2</sub> is taken as  $E_F = 0.2 \text{ eV}$ , following Hunter & Watson (1978), but usual equipartition arguments in current PDR models take  $E_F = 1.5 \text{ eV}$ .
- We can test the effect of enhancing  $E_F$  and  $\gamma$  using SPDUST (Ali-Haïmoud et al.). We absorb a factor of 10 in formation kinetic energy into  $\gamma$ , and compare spinning dust emissivities for  $\gamma = 0, 1, \text{ and } 10$ .

H<sub>2</sub> – 31 GHz.

Conclusions

### SPDUST models with enhanced H<sub>2</sub> formation

Red,  $\gamma = 0$  Green,  $\gamma = 1$  Black,  $\gamma = 10$ .



Quick experiment with SPDUST (Ali-Haïmoud et al. 2009) supports that  $H_2$  formation can dominate the rotational excitation.

Conclusions

# Future & on-going work

- SINFONI constraints on the H<sub>2</sub> formation state, and incorportation into PDR (the Meudon code).
- Measure formation kinetic energy of H<sub>2</sub> through CRIRES spectroscopy of formation-pumped lines in rarefied medium.
- Test H<sub>2</sub>–31 GHz correlation through wide-field H<sub>2</sub>(1-0)S(1) HAWKI imaging.
- Constrain physical conditions in ρ Oph W through observations of the atomic/molecular content: C I / CO transition with CHAMP+ at APEX.

H<sub>2</sub> – 31 GHz.

Conclusions

# ALMA band 1

- Expected by 2014.
- 36–52 GHz. Not good for diffuse obs, perfect for compact obs if plasma-drag is dominant (because peak freq. rises with n<sub>H</sub>).
- See 2009arXiv0910.1609J for science case in protoplanetary disks.