Planetary Model Refinements and Verifications: Uranus and Neptune

> Glenn Orton Jet Propulsion Laboratory California Institute of Technology





# Roadmap

- Assessment of the Uranus model that is based on Spitzer IRS data analysis
  - Re-assessment of the Spitzer IRS radiances
  - Use of updated H<sub>2</sub> absorption model
  - Comparison with PACS photometry
  - Changes from the ESA4 model
  - Remaining problems and unassessed issues
- Assessment of the Neptune model that is based on ISO LWS/ SWS data, using a PACS HD-derived profile as a first guess
  - Spitzer IRS constraints
  - ISO LWS/SWS constraints
  - Earth-based data constraints
  - Comparison with SPIRE results
  - Remaining problems
    - PACS photometry





H<sub>2</sub> dimer absorptions added: not much different – mostly around rotational lines, e.g. S(1) here at 587 cm<sup>-1</sup> Correction needed to estimate the flux lost from the slit due to Uranus' size: 3.2" diameter planet in a 3.6-3.7" tapered slit for the short-wavelength/low-resolution spectra (SL1, SL2, SL "bonus" orders).

- STINYTIM for the IRS run to simulate a point source
- Convolved with flat, limb-darkened, limb-brightened
- models of Uranus' disk.
- Compared with the observed function
- Lost flux evaluated

### STINYTIM convolution with uniform disk at 13.4 µm



Relative Response

### Correction factors: increase in flux of 5-9% for SL modes.









### This moves temperatures up, but by a small amount.











### Problem: incompatibility of T(p) and PACS HD data



#### We are sensitive to small differences in temperature.







### "ESA5" stratosphere is too cold to match the HD lines:







Changing the stratospheric T(p) has little effect on the HD R(0) and R(1) line fits, so the D/H ratio can be fitted independently.

But the ESA5 profile (coldest) is not compatible with these, i.e. for the moment, we haven't found a way to fit the Spitzer IRS H<sub>2</sub> S(1) and the ISO HD R(2) line simultaneously.

NB: The IRS  $H_2$  S(1) and ISO  $H_2$  S(1) are compatible.





## Time Variability?

Seasonal variations show a different perspective of Uranus as a strong function of time

Pseudo-images below show a simulation of 0.5-mm images of Uranus extrapolated from Voyager-2 IRIS T(p) retrievals, extrapolated downward (oriented so north is up)



# PACS Photometry vs. Time

- Ratio of PACS photometry of Uranus vs. Neptune
- Observations span 2010 Dec. 2012 June
- Uranus/Neptune radiance ratio changes by < 0.3%</li>









### <u>Issues</u>: adding 4.1 K to the Feuchtgruber et al. (2013) profile (red dashed) doesn't quite preserve the shape of HD lines At very least, some "tweaking" of the profile is required.



## <u>Issues</u>: the continuum model doesn't fit the PACS photometry: the model run colder than the data - $1\sigma$ .



### <u>Issues</u>: the continuum model doesn't fit the PACS photometry: the model run colder than the data - $1\sigma$ .





# Summary

- Uranus
  - Small 'tweaks' to the ESA4 model, suggested as ESA5
  - Consistent within the PACS photometry (5%)
  - 0-4% differences from ESA4
  - Unresolved inconsistency with PACS HD measurements, but probably minimal impact on the spectral continuum in the Herschel range
  - Indications are that time variability over 2009-2013 is < 1%
- Neptune
  - Small changes to the Feuchtgruber et al. (2013) T(p)
  - Consistent with ISO LWS+SWS, Spitzer IRS spectrum
    - Also ground-based
  - Match to 1K or better with SPIRE FTS data based on revised Uranus model (suggested as ESA5)
  - Small inconsistencies with PACS HD need to be resolved
  - Inconsistency with PACS photometry: unmodeled discrete emission features?



has an altached Skid Pad measuring 400 ft, by 350 ft, and a 60 ft, by 40 ft, parage Lippated ust porth of





