

MASS LOSS RATES OF THREE COMETS

P.D. Singh¹, W.F. Huebner², D.C. Boice², I. Konno², and E. Scalise, Jr.³

¹*Inst. Astronômico e Geofísico, Universidade de São Paulo, CP 9638, São Paulo, Brazil*

²*Southwest Research Inst., 6220 Culebra Rd., San Antonio, TX 78228-0510, USA*

³*Dept. of Astrophysics, INPE, Av. dos Astronautas, São Jose dos Campos, SP, Brazil*

ABSTRACT. Emission features of C₂, C₃, CN, and dust in Comets Thiele (1985m), Hartley-Good (1985I), and Giacobini-Zinner (1984e) have been analyzed and their mass loss rates of about 0.5, 1.1, and 0.8 Mg s⁻¹ have been determined.

Photoelectric photometry of Comets Thiele (1985m), Hartley-Good (1985I) and Giacobini-Zinner (1984e) in the system of standard IHW filters was performed at the 90-cm telescope of Lena University by Stecklum et al. (1987). They reported magnitude measurements at 387.1, 406.0, and 514.0 nm corresponding to CN, C₃, and C₂ emissions and at 365.0 and 484.5 nm continuum in CU and CB filters. The continuum brightness m_{em}^{cont} in the molecular emission filters can be interpolated from "short-" and "long-wavelength" filter magnitudes $m(CU)$ and $m(CB)$

$$\begin{aligned} m_{em}^{cont}(387.1 \text{ nm}) &= 0.8151 m(CU) + 0.1849 m(CB) + 0.494, \\ m_{em}^{cont}(514.0 \text{ nm}) &= -0.2469 m(CU) + 1.2469 m(CB) + 0.244, \\ m_{em}^{cont}(406.0 \text{ nm}) &= 0.6569 m(CU) + 0.3431 m(CB) + 0.088. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The filter magnitudes m_{em} at 514.0, 406.0 and 387.1 nm were converted into emission band fluxes F_{em} [erg cm⁻²s⁻¹] using the reduction formula

$$F_{em}(\lambda) = (D + E \cdot T) \cdot \left(10^{-0.4m_{em}} - 10^{-0.4m_{em}^{cont}} \right). \quad (2)$$

Here T denotes the filter temperature in °C assumed to be 0, $D = 5.38 \cdot 10^{-7}$, $1.38 \cdot 10^{-6}$, and $6.81 \cdot 10^{-7}$ for CN, C₃, and C₂, respectively; corresponding values of E are $-0.021 \cdot 10^{-7}$, $0.003 \cdot 10^{-6}$, and 0.0. For the column densities of CN, C₂, and C₃, we took g-factors at $r = 1$ AU from Tatum (1984), Landaberry et al. (1991), and de Almeida et al. (1989) combined with an r^{-2} power law. The magnitude measurements of Stecklum et al. (1987) at wavelength 484.5 nm for scattering by coma dust were converted into continuum fluxes by Singh et al. (1991).

Comet Hartley-Good (1985I): Since OH is a photodissociation product of H₂O, the Tacconi-Garman et al. (1990) vector model OH production rates correspond to an average H₂O production rate $Q(H_2O) \approx 3.2 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$ when interpolated to $r = 1$ AU. However, since the vector model gives production rates about 50% higher than the Haser model (Schleicher et al., 1987), the Haser model $Q(H_2O) \approx 2.1 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$ at $r = 1$ AU, which is in agreement with $2.8 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$ derived by Singh et al. (1991) considering Hartley-Good as a "normal" comet [i.e. $(Q(C_2)/Q(CN)) \approx 1.4$]. Assuming a gas mixture of 90% H₂O and 10% other gases of mean molecular weight 44 amu, we find that early in November, 1985, the comet was loosing $\sim 9.8 \cdot 10^5 \text{ g s}^{-1}$ gas and $\sim 1.4 \cdot 10^5 \text{ g s}^{-1}$ dust, for a total mass loss of about 1.1 Mg s⁻¹ at $r = 1$ AU preperihelion.

Comet Giacobini-Zinner (1984e): $Q(C_2)/Q(CN) \approx 0.3$ on August 14 and 29, 1985. In this comet C₂ is depleted by a factor of 5 relative to CN [$Q(C_2)/Q(CN) \approx 1.5$ in "normal" comets (Cochran, 1987)]. For Comet Giacobini-Zinner, $Q(CN)/Q(H_2O) \approx 1.8 \cdot 10^{-3}$ (Landaberry et al., 1991). Thus the CN production rate on August 14, 1985, assuming an expansion velocity of 1 km s⁻¹, yields a Haser model $Q(H_2O) \approx 4.5 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$ at $r = 1.08$ AU. Tacconi-Garman et al. (1990) determined $Q(OH) \approx 5.15 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$ during August 24 to 26, 1985, ($r \approx 1.04$ AU) using the vector model, which corresponds to a Haser model $Q(H_2O) \approx 4 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$ at $r \approx 1.04$ AU, in agreement with our value. Landaberry et al. (1991) derived $Q(H_2O) \approx 1.6 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Since H₂O is a major constituent of the coma, the gas production rate is $\sim 4.7 \cdot 10^5 \text{ g s}^{-1}$ at r

= 1.08 AU. The dust production rate on August 14, 1985, is $\sim 3.5 \cdot 10^5 \text{ g s}^{-1}$ (Singh et al., 1991). Thus the comet was losing a total mass of $\sim 0.8 \text{ Mg s}^{-1}$ at $r = 1.08 \text{ AU}$ before perihelion.

Comet Thiele (1985m): Tacconi-Garman et al. (1990) determined a $Q(\text{OH}) \approx 1.37 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$ from the November 12 and 14 to 18, 1985, observations ($r \approx 1.41 \text{ AU}$). This $Q(\text{OH})$ corresponds to a Haser model $Q(\text{H}_2\text{O}) \approx 3.2 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$ at $r = 1 \text{ AU}$ when extrapolated by an r^2 power law. This is a factor of ~ 2 lower than the H_2O production rate ($6 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$) derived by Singh et al. (1991) at $r = 1 \text{ AU}$, which was derived from a peak OH production rate of $3 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$ (December 9, 1985, $r = 1.3 \text{ AU}$; Gérard et al., 1987) and is an upper limit. On November 4, 1985 $Q(\text{C}_2)/Q(\text{CN}) \approx 1.1$ and shows that the comet belongs to the family of "normal" comets

TABLE 1. CN, C₂, & C₃ FLUXES & COLUMN DENSITIES

Date 1985	Time (UT)	r (AU)	Δ (Species) (AU)	Flux (erg cm ² s ⁻¹)	Col. density (cm ⁻²)
Comet Hartley-Good (1985I)					
Nov. 3	18.54	1.00	0.73	CN 4.77(-11)	7.966(10)
				C ₂ 4.25(-11)	7.916(10)
				C ₃ 1.42(-11)	3.720(10)
Nov. 4	18.23	0.98	0.74	CN 6.07(-11)	9.604(10)
				C ₂ 5.45(-11)	9.747(10)
				C ₃ 2.03(-11)	5.110(10)
Comet Thiele (1985m)					
Nov. 4	00.36	1.48	0.528	CN 6.93(-12)	2.777(10)
				C ₂ 3.89(-12)	1.587(10)
				C ₃ 2.93(-12)	1.681(10)
	19.37			CN 4.22(-12)	1.691(10)
				C ₂ 4.11(-12)	1.677(10)
				C ₃ 4.04(-12)	2.317(10)
	19.48			CN 6.39(-12)	2.561(10)
				C ₂ 3.19(-12)	1.302(10)
				C ₃ 4.03(-12)	2.312(10)
Comet Giacobini-Zinner (1984e)					
Aug14	23.25	1.08	0.53	CN 8.66(-11)	1.741(11)
				C ₂ 1.51(-11)	3.281(10)
Aug29	02.16	1.03	0.48	CN 2.66(-11)	6.143(10)
				C ₂ 5.33(-12)	1.053(10)
				C ₃ 6.05(-13)	1.481(09)

(Cochran, 1987). In a "normal" comet $Q(\text{CN})/Q(\text{H}_2\text{O}) \approx 1.33 \cdot 10^{-3}$ (Spinrad, 1987; Newburn and Spinrad, 1989). The November 4, 1985, observations of Comet Thiele by Stecklum et al. (1987) show a mean Haser model $Q(\text{CN}) \approx 1.6 \cdot 10^{25} \text{ s}^{-1}$ at $r = 1.48 \text{ AU}$ and hence the extrapolated Haser model $Q(\text{H}_2\text{O}) \approx 1.2 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$ at $r = 1.48 \text{ AU}$. If $Q(\text{H}_2\text{O})$ follows an r^2 power law, then the Haser model $Q(\text{H}_2\text{O}) \approx 2.6 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$ at $r = 1 \text{ AU}$. Since the vector model yields production rates about 50% higher than the Haser model, we consider our derived water production rate of $3.9 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$ at $r = 1 \text{ AU}$ in good agreement with the extrapolated value of $3.2 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ s}^{-1}$ obtained from the Tacconi-Garman et al. (1990) observations. Following the analyses of the above comets, our extrapolated Haser model H_2O production rate yields a gas production rate of $\sim 4.1 \cdot 10^5 \text{ g s}^{-1}$ at $r \approx 1.48 \text{ AU}$. The dust production rate on November 4, 1985, was $\sim 7.8 \cdot 10^4 \text{ g s}^{-1}$ (Singh et al., 1991). Thus the comet was losing a mass of $\sim 0.5 \text{ Mg s}^{-1}$ at $r = 1.48 \text{ AU}$.

REFERENCES

Cochran, A.L. 1987, *Astron. J.* **93**, 231-238.
 de Almeida, A.A., Singh, P.D., and Burgoyne, C.M. 1989, *Earth Moon Planets* **47**, 15-31.
 Gérard, E., Bockelée-Morvan, D., Bourgois, G., Colom, P., and Crovisier, J. 1987, in *Cometary Radio Astronomy*, NRAO workshop, Eds., W.M. Irvine, F.P. Schloerb, and L.E. Tacconi-Garman, p. 125-133.
 Landaberry, S.J.C., Singh, P.D., and de Freitas Pacheco, J.A. 1991, *Astron. Astrophys.*, **246**, 597.
 Newburn Jr., R.L., and Spinrad, H. 1989, *Astron. J.* **97**, 522-569.
 Schleicher, D.G., Millis, R.L., and Birch, P.V., 1987, *Astron. Astrophys.* **187**, 531-538.
 Singh, P.D., de Almeida, A.A., and Huebner, W.F. 1991. *Astron. J.*, in press.
 Spinrad, H. 1987, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **25**, 231-269.
 Stecklum, B., Pfau, W. and Hesse, M. 1987, *Astron. Nachr.* **308**, 239-246.
 Tacconi-Garman, L.E., Schloerb, F.P., and Claussen, M.J. 1990, *Astrophys. J.* **364**, 672-686.
 Tatum, J.B., 1984, *Astron. Astrophys.* **135**, 183-187.

This research was supported by grants from NASA (Nos. NAGW-2205, NAGW-2370), FAPESP (No. 90/1384-3), CNPq (No. 304076/77), and NSF (No. INT-8901811).