

## THE DUST TAIL OF ASTEROID (3200) PHAETHON

DAVID JEWITT<sup>1,2</sup>, JING LI<sup>1</sup>, AND JESSICA AGARWAL<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Earth and Space Sciences, University of California at Los Angeles, 595 Charles Young Drive East,  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1567, USA; [jewitt@ucla.edu](mailto:jewitt@ucla.edu)

<sup>2</sup> Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California at Los Angeles, 430 Portola Plaza, Box 951547, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1547, USA

<sup>3</sup> Max Planck Institute for Solar System Research, Max-Planck-Str. 2, D-37191 Katlenburg-Lindau, Germany

Received 2013 May 28; accepted 2013 June 12; published 2013 June 26

### ABSTRACT

We report the discovery of a comet-like tail on asteroid (3200) Phaethon when imaged at optical wavelengths near perihelion. In both 2009 and 2012, the tail appears  $\gtrsim 350''$  ( $2.5 \times 10^8$  m) in length and extends approximately in the projected anti-solar direction. We interpret the tail as being caused by dust particles accelerated by solar radiation pressure. The sudden appearance and the morphology of the tail indicate that the dust particles are small, with an effective radius  $\sim 1 \mu\text{m}$  and a combined mass  $\sim 3 \times 10^5$  kg. These particles are likely products of thermal fracture and/or desiccation cracking under the very high surface temperatures ( $\sim 1000$  K) experienced by Phaethon at perihelion. The existence of the tail confirms earlier inferences about activity in this body based on the detection of anomalous brightening. Phaethon, the presumed source of the Geminid meteoroids, is still active.

*Key words:* comets: general – meteorites, meteors, meteoroids – minor planets, asteroids: general – minor planets, asteroids: individual (3200 Phaethon)

*Online-only material:* color figures

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Asteroid (3200) Phaethon is a  $\sim 5$  km diameter body dynamically associated with the Geminid meteoroid stream (Whipple 1983) and with several kilometer-scale asteroids collectively known as the Phaethon–Geminid complex (PGC; Ohtsuka et al. 2009; Kasuga 2009). Most meteoroid streams have cometary parents (Jenniskens 2008) from which mass loss is driven by the sublimation of near-surface ice. However, Phaethon is dynamically an asteroid (semimajor axis 1.271 AU, eccentricity 0.89, inclination 22.2, Tisserand parameter relative to Jupiter,  $T_J = 4.54$ ), raising questions about the mechanisms by which it loses mass.

The formation of the PGC could be ancient (Ohtsuka et al. 2009), but the short dynamical lifetime of the Geminid meteoroid stream ( $\sim 10^3$  yr; Gustafson 1989; Ryabova 2007), opens the possibility that Phaethon might still be active. However, attempts over two decades to detect activity in Phaethon have proved negative (Cochran & Barker 1984; Chamberlin et al. 1996; Hsieh & Jewitt 2005; Wiegert et al. 2008). The first evidence for continuing activity was obtained only recently. Photometry in both 2009 (Jewitt & Li 2010) and 2012 (Li & Jewitt 2013) showed anomalous perihelion brightening, in which the apparent brightness increased suddenly at large phase angles, opposite to the fading trend expected from the phase function of a solid body. Numerous mechanisms (thermal emission, glints, fluorescence stimulated by the impact of the solar wind, sublimation of embedded ice, prompt emission from forbidden transitions in atomic oxygen) were considered and found incapable of producing the anomalous brightening (Li & Jewitt 2013). In particular, near-surface water ice is thermodynamically unstable on Phaethon as a result of its high surface temperature. Deeply buried water ice would be thermally insulated and phase-lagged from the surface heat, leaving no explanation for the coincidence between activity and perihelion (Jewitt & Li 2010) and (Li & Jewitt 2013). Instead, the release of dust from the nucleus is able to explain the data in a plausible way. The process responsible for forming and ejecting the dust is presumed to relate

to the high ( $\sim 1000$  K) temperatures attained by the surface of Phaethon when at perihelion ( $q = 0.14$  AU). Thermal fracture and cracking due to desiccation shrinkage of hydrated silicates are two processes capable of both producing the dust and ejecting it from the surface (Jewitt & Li 2010; Jewitt 2012; Li & Jewitt 2013).

Observations at perihelion are extremely challenging, because the solar elongation then is small ( $< 8^\circ$ ) and Phaethon must be viewed against the bright, structured and changing background of the solar corona. Here, we use data from the NASA-STEREO coronal imaging spacecraft to perform a search for spatially resolved evidence of activity at perihelion.

### 2. OBSERVATIONS

We used the Heliospheric Imagers (HIs) from the Sun Earth Connection Coronal and Heliospheric Investigation (SECCHI) package (Howard et al. 2008; Eyles et al. 2009) on the NASA STEREO spacecraft. Our observations exclusively employed the STEREO-A HI-1 camera, having a field center offset from the solar center by  $14^\circ$  and with a square field of view  $20^\circ$  in width. The  $2048 \times 2048$  pixel charge-coupled device (CCD) detectors are binned  $2 \times 2$  before transmission to Earth. The resulting angular size of each pixel is  $70''$ .

Each  $1024 \times 1024$  pixel-image is compiled from a set of 30 integrations each of 40 s, and taken at 1 minute intervals. A single downloaded image therefore has an effective exposure time of 1200 s (20 minutes). One such image is obtained every 40 minutes. The onboard combination of multiple short-exposure images permits the rejection of cosmic rays and other artifacts, and avoids saturation of the background corona that would otherwise occur owing to the large pixels in HI-1. The quantum efficiency of the camera is practically uniform across the 6300 to 7300 Å wavelength passband (Eyles et al. 2009).

We searched for extended emission in the HI-1 images used in our earlier work (Li & Jewitt 2013). Our procedure removed large angular scale structures in the coronal background, but left small scale and rapidly varying features, as well as background

stars. We used NASA’s HORIZONS software to compute the position of Phaethon as seen from the *STEREO* spacecraft and calculated the expected location on the CCD in pixel coordinates.


When displayed in rapid succession as a movie, the images from 2009 hint at the presence of a tail on Phaethon, but fluctuations in the surface brightness of the coronal and sky background from image to image are much larger than the surface brightness of the tail itself. Simple median stacks show that the tail appears concurrently with the anomalous brightening but is otherwise absent. Unlike the background fluctuations, the statistical significance of the tail grows as more images are combined. To test the possibility that the tail might be an artifact produced by only a fraction of the data, we separately combined subsets of the images (0.5 to 0.8 days at a time). The subsets all showed the tail but, as expected, at lower significance owing to the smaller number of images in the subsets.

Next, since the projected antisolar direction,  $\theta_{\odot}$ , changes rapidly in the period of interest, we re-combined the images including a correction for the changing  $\theta_{\odot}$ . We removed field stars from the images by hand prior to computing the median of an image stack. The resulting images improve the apparent brightness of the tail and show that it is aligned with the projected Sun–Phaethon line (Figure 1). To test the possibility that the improvement in the de-rotated images might be a result of chance in noisy data, we repeated the procedure but for a wide range of unphysical rotations. In these unphysical image combinations, the Phaethon tail became washed out or invisible, as expected if the tail is real. To test the possibility that the tail might be caused by a peculiar asymmetry or astigmatism in the images from the HI-1 camera, we examined the images of comparably bright field stars located close to the path of Phaethon in the period of interest. The stars showed no asymmetry and no evidence for a Phaethon-like tail (see the inset images of field stars in each panel of the 2009 data in Figure 1). Lastly, we note that no tail was detected in the image composite having start-time UT 2009 June 19<sup>d</sup>06<sup>h</sup>49<sup>m</sup> (i.e., 1 day pre-perihelion, top panel of Figure 1). The tail was detected only on the two subsequent days, coinciding with the anomalous brightening reported in Jewitt & Li (2010) and Li & Jewitt (2013). There are no useful later data from the *STEREO* spacecraft.

The entire procedure was repeated using the data from 2012, with the same result (Figure 2). In both years Phaethon shows a faint, approximately antisolar tail that becomes brighter when the blurring effects of differential image rotation in the image sequence are correctly removed and fainter, to the point of disappearing, when they are not. The tail appears only on the two days for which Phaethon showed anomalous brightening (Li & Jewitt 2013). We measured  $\theta_{\text{Ph}}$ , the position angle of the Phaethon tail and present the results in Table 1, along with the geometric circumstances of Phaethon in each year. The uncertainties on  $\theta_{\text{Ph}}$ , determined from azimuthal surface brightness profiles centered on Phaethon, reflect the large pixel scale, the faintness of Phaethon’s tail and the complexity of the sky background. The measured  $\theta_{\text{Ph}}$  are also plotted in Figure 3, where it may be seen that  $\theta_{\text{Ph}}$  and  $\theta_{\odot}$  are identical within the uncertainties of measurement.

### 3. DISCUSSION


Thermal emission, specular reflection “glints,” fluorescent excitation by the solar wind and prompt emission from the excited <sup>1</sup>D level of [O I] (produced by the photo-destruction



**Figure 1.** Composite images of (3200) Phaethon in 2009 compared with the projected Sun–comet line (white). The Sun is to the upper right in each panel. Insets are 490'' square and show field stars near to Phaethon to demonstrate the point spread function of the data. Each panel has north to the top, east to the left and shows the median of  $\sim 30$  images taken over a 1 day period starting at the times listed in Table 1. Anomalous brightening peaks were reported on June 20 and 21 in Jewitt & Li (2010).

(A color version of this figure is available in the online journal.)

of water) were all considered and rejected as sources of the anomalous perihelion brightening (Jewitt & Li 2010; Li & Jewitt 2013). The first three would all produce brightening only of the nucleus (i.e., the central pixel in our data) and hence are additionally inconsistent with the detection of a resolved tail. Sodium is depleted in Geminid meteors (Kasuga 2009) and might be baked-out from the nucleus of Phaethon. The Na D-lines at  $\sim 5890 \text{ \AA}$ , however, fall outside the 6300 to 7300  $\text{ \AA}$  passband of the HI-1 camera and so cannot contribute to the tail. Prompt emission from the forbidden lines of oxygen at 6300  $\text{ \AA}$  and 6363  $\text{ \AA}$  falls within the instrumental passband but would require a large production rate of  $\sim 10^{30} \text{ s}^{-1}$  to match the observed brightening (Li & Jewitt 2013). Furthermore, the photodissociation lifetime of water in sunlight at 0.14 AU is



**Figure 2.** Same as Figure 1 but for data from 2012 (see Table 1). Anomalous brightening peaks were detected on May 2 and 3 in Li & Jewitt (2013). (A color version of this figure is available in the online journal.)

**Table 1**  
Observing Geometry and Tail Position Angles

UT Date and Time <sup>a</sup>	$R^b$	$\Delta^c$	$\alpha^d$	$\theta_{\text{Ph}}^e$	$\theta_{\odot}$ (deg) <sup>f</sup>
2009 Jun 19 <sup>d</sup> 06 <sup>h</sup> 49 <sup>m</sup>	0.147	1.027	57	...	131
20 <sup>d</sup> 06 <sup>h</sup> 49 <sup>m</sup>	0.140	0.972	79	128 ± 23	124
21 <sup>d</sup> 06 <sup>h</sup> 49 <sup>m</sup>	0.146	0.916	102	108 ± 16	116
2012 May 01 <sup>d</sup> 08 <sup>h</sup> 09 <sup>m</sup>	0.146	1.052	46	...	137
02 <sup>d</sup> 08 <sup>h</sup> 09 <sup>m</sup>	0.140	1.003	67	124 ± 17	126
03 <sup>d</sup> 08 <sup>h</sup> 09 <sup>m</sup>	0.146	0.950	88	110 ± 18	117

**Notes.** <sup>a</sup> Start time of the image composite from which the tail properties were measured. Each composite consists of images taken over a period of one day with corrections for rotation of the projected antisolar direction applied. Other parameters in the table all refer to the start time.


<sup>b</sup> Heliocentric distance, in AU.

<sup>c</sup> Phaethon to *STEREO A* distance, in AU.

<sup>d</sup> Phase angle, in degrees.

<sup>e</sup> Measured position angle of the tail and estimated  $1\sigma$  uncertainty, in degrees.

<sup>f</sup> Position angle of the projected anti-solar direction, in degrees.



**Figure 3.** Measured position angle of the tail in 2009 (red circles) and 2012 (blue circles), compared with the projected antisolar direction (red and blue lines). Error bars on the position angle measurements show the estimated  $1\sigma$  uncertainties from composite images formed by averaging the data over one day intervals, as described in the text.

(A color version of this figure is available in the online journal.)

only  $\tau_d = 0.5$  hr (Huebner et al. 1992). It is unlikely that water molecules could travel the length of the tail in such a short time.

Our preferred interpretation is that the tail of Phaethon is a dust tail. The key observables are the time of appearance of the tail, the length of the tail and the position angle of the tail in the plane of the sky (Table 1). We computed the running median of  $\sim 30$  images having a range of start-times around perihelion. In both years, the emergence of the tail corresponded with times of perihelia (2009 June 20 07:22 and 2012 May 02 07:49). The length of the tail in the plane of the sky was estimated at  $\ell \sim 250,000$  km in both 2009 and 2012. Since our ability to identify the end of the tail is limited by signal-to-noise considerations, the measured  $\ell$  constitutes only a lower limit to the true length.

First, we estimate the dust properties from these measurements. The length and rise-time of the tail,  $\tau \sim 1$  day, imply an average speed  $V = \ell/\tau \sim 3$  km  $s^{-1}$ , which can be produced at a constant acceleration  $a = 2\ell/\tau^2 \sim 0.07$  m  $s^{-2}$ . For comparison, the solar gravitational acceleration at 0.14 AU is  $g_{\odot} = 0.3$  m  $s^{-2}$ , giving a ratio  $\beta = a/g_{\odot} \sim 0.2$ . The ratio of accelerations for a particle moving under the action of radiation pressure can be written in terms of particle properties as

$$\beta = \frac{3Q_{\text{pr}}F_{\odot}R_1^2}{4GM_{\odot}c\rho r}. \quad (1)$$

Here,  $Q_{\text{pr}}$  is the dimensionless radiation pressure factor,  $F_{\odot} = 1360$  W  $m^{-2}$  is the solar constant,  $R_1 = 1.5 \times 10^{11}$  m is the number of meters in 1 AU,  $G = 6.6 \times 10^{-11}$  N  $kg^{-2} m^2$  is the gravitational constant,  $M_{\odot} = 2 \times 10^{30}$  kg is the mass of the Sun and  $c = 3 \times 10^8$  m  $s^{-1}$  is the speed of light. Particle quantities  $\rho$  and  $r$  are the density and radius, respectively. We assume  $Q_{\text{pr}} = 1$ ,  $\rho = 3000$  kg  $m^{-3}$  and substitute  $\beta = 0.2$  into Equation (1) to obtain  $r \sim 1$   $\mu\text{m}$ . In other words, the sudden emergence



and the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory (NRL), Washington DC, USA. The *STEREO*/SECCHI project is an international collaboration.

## REFERENCES

- Bohren, C. F., & Huffman, D. R. 1983, *Absorption and Scattering of Light by Small Particles* (New York: Wiley)
- Chamberlin, A. B., McFadden, L.-A., Schulz, R., Schleicher, D. G., & Bus, S. J. 1996, *Icar*, **119**, 173
- Cochran, A. L., & Barker, E. S. 1984, *Icar*, **59**, 296
- Eyles, C. J., Harrison, R. A., Davis, C. J., et al. 2009, *SoPh*, **254**, 387
- Gustafson, B. A. S. 1989, *A&A*, **225**, 533
- Howard, R. A., Moses, J. D., Vourlidas, A., et al. 2008, *SSRv*, **136**, 67
- Hsieh, H. H., & Jewitt, D. 2005, *ApJ*, **624**, 1093
- Huebner, W. F., Keady, J. J., & Lyon, S. P. 1992, *Ap&SS*, **195**, 1
- Hughes, D. W., & McBride, N. 1989, *MNRAS*, **240**, 73
- Jenniskens, P. 1994, *A&A*, **287**, 990
- Jenniskens, P. 2008, *EM&P*, **102**, 505
- Jewitt, D. 2012, *AJ*, **143**, 66
- Jewitt, D., & Li, J. 2010, *AJ*, **140**, 1519
- Kasuga, T. 2009, *EM&P*, **105**, 321
- Li, J., & Jewitt, D. 2013, *AJ*, **145**, 154
- Ohtsuka, K., Nakato, A., Nakamura, T., et al. 2009, *PASJ*, **61**, 1375
- Ryabova, G. O. 2007, *MNRAS*, **375**, 1371
- Whipple, F. L. 1983, *IAUC*, **3881**, 1
- Wiegert, P. A., Houde, M., & Peng, R. 2008, *Icar*, **194**, 843