# Chemical probes of the turbulent diffuse ISM

# B. Godard, E. Falgarone, G. Pineau des Forêts, P. Lesaffre, V. Valdivia, M. Gerin, and P. Hennebelle

The hydride toolbox, Paris, 2016

- 1 Overview of turbulence and its unknowns
- 2 Tracers of turbulence and deduction of its properties in the framework of the TDR model
- 3
- Limitations of 1D models and future prospects

Turbulent cascade

- advection force  $\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}$
- dissipation forces
  - ✓ friction  $\nu \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}$
  - $\checkmark \text{ compression } \nu \nabla \left[ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} \right]$
  - ✓ ion-neutral diff.  $\gamma_{in}(\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_n)$
  - ✓ magnetic diff.  $μ∇^2 b$

• transfer rate  $\overline{\varepsilon} \sim 2 \times 10^{-25} \quad \mathrm{erg} \ \mathrm{cm}^{-3} \ \mathrm{s}^{-1}$ 



Hennebelle & Falgarone (2012)

# Intermittency





Moisy & Jimenez (2004)

Open questions

- dissipative scales ? structures ?
- physical processes involved ?
- Iocal dissipation rate ?
- Ink with the magnetic field ?

average heating rates (erg cm <sup>-3</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> )				
photons	cosmic rays	turbulence	magnetic	
5 x 10 <sup>-24</sup>	3 x 10 <sup>-25</sup>	2 x 10 <sup>-25</sup>	2 x 10 <sup>-25</sup>	

## photo dom. medium

# turbulent mixing

# dissipation



Le Petit et al. (2006) Röllig et al. (2007) Ferland et al. (2013)



Glover et al. (2010) Levrier et al. (2012) Valdivia et al. (2016)



Lazarian & Vishniac (1999) Lesaffre et al. (2013) Godard et al. (2014)



Neufeld et al. (2015)



Neufeld et al. (2015)

5/16

Chemistry of turbulent dissipation

Introduction The TDR model Chemistry of turbulent dissipation Limitations of 1D modeling Comparison with other molecular tracers

- magnetized vortices
- Lagrangian approach
- non equilibrium chemistry
- turbulent heating process
  - $\checkmark$  viscous friction
  - ✓ ion-neutral friction

# Relaxation phase

- Eulerian approach
- no turbulent heating



6/16

### Model parameters

- density  $n_{\mathrm{H}}$
- $A_V$ shielding
- CR ionization

stretching

$$a \rightarrow l$$

- max. rot. vel.  $u_{\theta m} \to u_{in}$ 0
- $\overline{\varepsilon} \to N_V$ • transfer rate
- $\tau_V \to N_R$ Iifetime



Introduction The TDR model Chemistry of turbulent dissipation Limitations of 1D modeling Comparison with other molecular tracers

8/16

# strategy to derive turbulent properties



- n<sub>H</sub> increases with symbol size
- $A_V = 0.4$   $\zeta = 3 \times 10^{-16} \text{ s}^{-1}$

 $CH^+ \ vs \ N_H$ 



 $C^+ + H_2 \rightarrow CH^+ + H$  ( $\Delta E/k = 4640 \text{ K}$ )

9/16

 $CH^+ vs N_H$ 



 $C^+ + H_2 \rightarrow CH^+ + H$  ( $\Delta E/k = 4640 \text{ K}$ )

10/16

CH+ vs SH+



 $\frac{\text{ion-neutral drift}}{N(\text{CH}^+)} \propto \exp(5220/T_{\text{eff}})$ 

• indep. of other param

10/16

CH+ vs SH+



ion-neutral drift

$$\frac{N(\mathrm{SH^+})}{N(\mathrm{CH^+})} \propto \exp(5220/T_{\mathrm{eff}})$$

• indep. of other param

CH+ vs SH+





10/16

• 
$$\frac{N(\mathrm{GH}^{+})}{N(\mathrm{CH}^{+})} \propto \exp(5220/T_{\mathrm{eff}})$$

• indep. of other param

CH+ vs SH+



ion-neutral drift  $\frac{N(\mathrm{SH}^{+})}{N(\mathrm{CH}^{+})} \propto \exp(5220/T_{\mathrm{eff}})$ 

10/16

• indep. of other param

• 
$$2.5 \leqslant u_{\theta m} \leqslant 3.5 \text{ km s}^{-1}$$

correlation reproduced

CO vs HCO+



dissipation timescale

•  $\tau_R(CO) \sim 100 \times \tau_R(CH^+) \sim 100 \times \tau_R(HCO^+)$ 

# CO vs HCO+



dissipation timescale

•  $\tau_R(CO) \sim 100 \times \tau_R(CH^+) \sim 100 \times \tau_R(HCO^+)$ 





dissipation timescale

•  $\tau_R(CO) \sim 100 \times \tau_R(CH^+) \sim 100 \times \tau_R(HCO^+)$ 

 $N(CO) \propto \tau_R / \tau_V \quad \rightarrow \quad 10^2 \leqslant \tau_V \leqslant 10^3 \text{ yr}$ 

Introduction The TDR model Chemistry of turbulent dissipation Limitations of 1D modeling Comparison with other molecular tracers

 $CO \ vs \ H_2$ 



# realistic fragmentation + PDR

- $N(CO)_{obs}/N(CO)_{PDR} > 10$
- bending explained

Turbulent dissipation regions

• if full fragmentation, no bending

Introduction The TDR model Chemistry of turbulent dissipation Limitations of 1D modeling Comparison with other molecular tracers



# Limitations of 1D modeling



chemical discrepancies

- SH require high velocity drift
- H<sub>2</sub>S, SO underestimated by a factor of 10

- distribution of events
- missing physical and chemical processes?

theoretical limitations

- ID idealized structures
- stationary model (see talk by P. Lesaffre)
- o no realistic distribution of events Lesaffre et al. (2013)
- Ine profile not predicted
- fluid cells history not included
- Iack realistic radiative conditions
- Iack of coupling between scales & coherence with turbulent cascade

- Joulain et al. (1998)
- Levrier et al. (2012)
- Momferratos et al. (2014)

need for a more realistic framework



implementation of chemistry

16/16

- ✓ computational time
- ✓ timescales / out-of-

equilibrium effects

- biphasic / monophasic
- impact of turbulent mixing
- dissipative scales / processes

# Summary

species influenced by turbulence (mixing or dissipation)

strongly	moderately	mildly
$CH^+$ $H_2^*$ $H_2S$	HCO+ CO	CH C <sub>2</sub> H
SH+ SH	SO	I(C+)

- extract turbulent properties in the framework of TDRs
  - CH+ / H dissipation rate and density
  - ► SH+ / CH+ → ion neutral decoupling
  - CO / HCO+ \_\_\_\_ dissipation timescale
- open issues and future prospects
  - formation of S-bearing species (H<sub>2</sub>S, SO, SH, ...)
  - lack of realistic distribution & line profiles in 1D models
  - need for chemistry in simulation of MHD turbulence