

From Rates to Fluxes of Meteoroid Streams

Jürgen Rendtel Leibniz-Institut für Astrophysik Potsdam (AIP) & International Meteor Organization (IMO)



AIP

International Meteor Conference (IMC), Poznan

1



- Meteor shower observable data
 - Numbers & magnitudes
 - Calibration quantities
- To physical meteoroid stream parameters
 - Population index r and mass index s
 - ZHR
 - Spatial number density (and meteoroid flux)
- Example and summary



- Observer in a poor situation:
- Only last and disturbed part of a meteoroid's orbit
- Small collecting area compared to the stream dimension
- Limited sample
- Observing errors
- Visual and video observations similar





- Observable quantities:
- Number of meteors per shower (association with uncertainties)
- Apparent magnitudes (subject to atmosphere situation: elevation, distance to observer etc.)



- Additional necessary data:
- Observed field

; ;;; ;+

AIP

- Mass distribution



- Additional necessary data:
- Observed field

Viewing direction:

#+ +*

AIP

Zenith – small field, simple geometry Horizon – huge field, different meteor distances (field size: visual → 100° diameter; video → lens determined) volume gain ~ sin³h extinction loss ~ 1/sin h (in useable range) meteor magnitude loss ~ $1/r^2 \rightarrow ~ 1/sin^2h$ Effects seem to compensate



- Additional necessary data:
- Observed field

Viewing direction:

#+ -+ +

AIP

Zenith – small field, simple geometry **Horizon** – huge field, different meteor distances (field size: visual $\rightarrow 100^{\circ}$ diameter; video \rightarrow lens determined) volume gain ~ sin³h extinction loss ~ 1/sin h (in useable range) meteor magnitude loss ~ $1/r^2 \rightarrow ~ 1/sin^2h$ *Effects seem to compensate* Attempt to use a defined volume



Рис. 149. Рамки для счета метеоров: а) для нескольких наблюдателей; б) индивидуальные.

24 August 2013

- Additional necessary data:
- Observed field

Viewing direction:

#+ +*

AIP

Zenith – small field, simple geometry Horizon – huge field, different meteor distances (field size: visual \rightarrow 100° diameter; video \rightarrow lens determined) volume gain ~ sin³h extinction loss ~ 1/sin h (in useable range) meteor magnitude loss ~ $1/r^2 \rightarrow ~ 1/sin^2h$ Effects seem to compensate Conclusion: visual field center h 50°-90° Video: avoid near horizon fields



- Additional necessary data:
- Observed field

Viewing direction:

#+ +*

AIP

Zenith – small field, simple geometry **Horizon** – huge field, different meteor distances (field size: visual \rightarrow 100° diameter;

video \rightarrow lens determined)

volume gain ~ sin³h

extinction loss ~ 1/sin h (in useable range) meteor magnitude loss ~ $1/r^2 \rightarrow ~ 1/sin^2h$

Effects seem to compensate

Detailed look: effects depend strongly on r! – why and how?



- Additional necessary data:
- Mass distribution apparent magnitudes \rightarrow population index *r*

3 purposes:

#+ +*

AIP

- number of particles as a function of particle mass (properly converted → mass distribution)
- construct the ZHR; info about missed meteors if LM ≠ +6.5
- 3. convert ZHR into spatial number density and flux



Probability of perception p as a function of Δm (difference to LM) for visual data (Koschack & Rendtel, 1990)



Population index as function of difference LM – mean mag (Arlt, 2003)

- Additional necessary data:
- Mass distribution

population index $r \rightarrow$ mass index *s*

 $s = 1 + 2.5 \, lg \, r$

#+ +*

AIP

 $r = 10^{(s-1)/2.5}$

(if a constant fraction of the kinetic energy is transformed into meteor luminosity)

Typical range for r:

- 2.0 central stream regions
- 2.5 outer regions of streams
- 3.0 sporadic meteors
- 3.5 few showers with a high fraction of small meteoroids



Population index profile, Geminids 2004 (Arlt & Rendtel, 2006),



Mass index profile, Geminids 2004 (Arlt & Rendtel, 2006)

24 August 2013

- Additional necessary data:
- Observed field

Viewing direction:

#+ ++

AIP

Zenith – small field, simple geometry **Horizon** – huge field, different meteor distances (field size: visual \rightarrow 100° diartestor, video \rightarrow lens determined) volume gain ~ sin³h extinction loss ~ $1/1^{2} \rightarrow - 1/1^{2}h$ *Effects set in to compensate*

Detailed look: effects depend strongly on r! – why and how?





Two extreme examples to clarify the effect:

- (1) Only very bright meteors observer sees ALL meteors compensations complete
- (2) Real shower, r = 2...3 many faint meteors most in distant part of volume apparent magnitude decreased determine calibrated field A(red) r low – large calibrated field r high – small A(red)

Table 3 – Area A_{red} in dependence on r for $h_f = 50^\circ$ and H = 100 km.

	r $A_{ m red}~({ m km}^2)$	1.8 62 120	1.9 54 750	2.0 48 940	2.1 44 260	2.2 40 450	2.3 37 290	2.4 34 630	2.5 32 390	2.6 30 460
1	r $A_{ m red}~(m km^2)$	2.7 28 790	2.8 27 330	2.9 26 050	3.0 24 920	3.1 23 910	3.2 23 000	3.3 22 190	3.4 21 450	3.5 20 770

(Koschack & Rendtel, 1990)



24 August 2013

ZHR calculation straightforward ZHR = N * C with

* ##+ ++

AIP

$$C = \frac{r^{6.5 - \text{LM}} F}{T_{\text{eff}} \sin h_{\text{R}}}$$

Effect of the population index *r* on ZHR is visible, about 10% difference



ZHR profile, Geminids 1996: r=const=2.5 vs. calculated r



Calculated population index profile, Geminids 1996

Considering the calibrated field A(red)=178700 r^-1.82 [km^2]

Effect of the population index *r* on the field is significant!



ZHR profile, Geminids 1996: r=const=2.5 vs. calculated r



Calculated population index profile, Geminids 1996

* ##+ ++

AIP

Calculation of the spatial number density

ND (m<+6.5) = $\frac{ZHR_0 c(r)}{3600 A_{red}(r) v_{\infty}}$

Where c(r) is a correction including the probabilities of perception and is also depending on r as

c(r) = 10.65 * *r* -12.15

(Koschack & Rendtel, 1990)

c(r) range: 10 (r=2.0) ... 20 (r=3.0)



ZHR profile, Geminids 1996: r=const=2.5 vs. calculated r



Calculated population index profile, Geminids 1996

24 August 2013

#+ _+*

AIP

Calculation of the meteoroid flux:

F = ND * V

#+ _+*

AIP

10^-9 km^-3 * km s^-1 [*3600 s/h] 3.6*10^-6 km^-2 h^-1

Earth moving at V through the stream volume



ZHR profile, Geminids 1996: r=const=2.5 vs. calculated r



Comparison of meteoroid streams best in terms of spatial number density, while the effect on spacecraft or the Earth's atmopshere is better described by flux (flux follows ZHR)

Calculated population index profile, Geminids 1996

24 August 2013

Effect of the population index *r* (2.5 or calculated values) on spatial number density

ca. factor 2

#+ ***

AIP



ND profile meteoroids +6.5 mag, Geminids 1996: r=2.5 / calculated r





ND profile meteoroids >1mg, Geminids 1996: r=2.5 / calculated r

Example: Perseids 1988-2007

350

Compilation of rate, spatial density and flux data from IMO analyses (re-calculated)



Perseid peak ZHR

Perseid spatial number density +6.5 mag

#+ ++

AIP

Example: Perseids 1988-2007

Compilation of rate, spatial density and flux data from IMO analyses (re-calculated)

Perseid spatial number density +6.5 mag



Perseid spatial number density >1 mg

24 August 2013

• # ++

AIP

Example: Perseids 1988-2007

Compilation of rate, spatial density and flux data from IMO analyses (re-calculated)

[Paper iunder preparation]

#+ +*

AIP

Perseid spatial number density +6.5 mag



YEAR

Perseid flux +6.5 mag (only multiplied by velocity)

24 August 2013



We need a complete data set, consisting of:

- Magnitude data (magnitude distributions)
- Rate data (numbers per shower)
- Calibration data (observing direction, LM)

Analysis steps:

- Population index r profile
- ZHR profile
- Spatial number density and flux
 Similar for visual and video observations

Live-graphs at <u>www.imo.net</u> are preliminary data (r=const)! Aim: motivation of observers, first view at activity profile, peaks, filaments etc.