

Hyperfine Group Ratio (HFGR): A Recipe for Deriving Kinetic Temperature from the Ammonia Inversion Lines

Shen Wang^{★1,2}, Zhiyuan Ren^{†1*}, Di Li^{‡1,2,3*}, Jens Kauffmann,⁴ Qizhou Zhang⁵, and Hui Shi^{1,2}

¹ National Astronomical Observatories, Chinese Academy of Sciences, A20 Datun Road, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100101, China

² University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, People's Republic of China

³ NAOC-UKZN Computational Astrophysics Centre, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban 4000, South Africa

⁴ Haystack Observatory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 99 Millstone Road, Westford, MA 01886, USA

⁵ Center for Astrophysics | Harvard & Smithsonian, 60 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

Accepted 2020 September 26. Received 2020 September 26; in original form 2020 June 25

ABSTRACT

Although ammonia is a widely used interstellar thermometer, the estimation of its rotational and kinetic temperatures can be affected by the blended Hyperfine Components (HFCs). We developed a new recipe, referred to as the HyperFine Group Ratio (*HFGR*), which utilizes only direct observables, namely the intensity ratios between the grouped HFCs. As tested on the model spectra, the empirical formulae in *HFGR* can derive the rotational temperature (T_{rot}) from the HFC group ratios in an unambiguous manner. We compared *HFGR* with two other classical methods, *intensity ratio* and *hyperfine fitting*, based on both simulated spectra and real data. *HFGR* has three major improvements. First, *HFGR* does not require modeling the HFC or fitting the line profiles, thus is more robust against the effect of HFC blending. Second, the simulation-enabled empirical formulae are much faster than fitting the spectra over the parameter space, so the computer time and human time can be both largely saved. Third, the statistical uncertainty of the temperature ΔT_{rot} as a function of the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) is a natural product of the *HFGR* recipe. The internal error of *HFGR* is $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} \leq 0.5$ K over a broad parameter space of rotational temperature (10 to 60 K), line width (0.3 to 4 km s⁻¹), and optical depth (0 to 5). When there is a spectral noise, *HFGR* can also maintain a reasonable uncertainty level at $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} \leq 1.0$ K (1 σ) when SNR > 4.

Key words: stars: formation - ISM: molecules - ISM: clouds - ISM: structure - ISM: individual objects: Orion A North

1 INTRODUCTION

Gas temperature is a fundamental parameter of molecular clouds. An accurate temperature measurement is indispensable for studying all the physical and chemical aspects of a cloud. As the first polyatomic molecule discovered in interstellar medium (Cheung et al. 1968), Ammonia (NH₃) is considered to be an ideal temperature tracer for the dense molecular gas (Ho & Townes 1983; Li et al. 2003; Mangum & Shirley 2015). The rotational levels (J, K) of the para-NH₃ have largely different excitation energies, but the inversion transition of each (J, K) level is distributed in a relatively small frequency range of 23–25 GHz. In the meantime, the NH₃

inversion lines are split into hyperfine components (HFCs) due to the varied alignment between the nitrogen and hydrogen nuclei (Ho & Townes 1983; Li et al. 2003; Mangum & Shirley 2015, also see Figure 1). The HFCs can be used to estimate the optical depth so that the temperature measurement become more accurate (Ho & Townes 1983). Due to these attributes, NH₃ is an invaluable tool of probing the physical conditions in molecular clouds. Over three decades, extensive NH₃ surveys have been carried out to map the giant molecular clouds (Purcell et al. 2012; Seo et al. 2015; Friesen et al. 2017; Hogge et al. 2018) and the individual dense molecular cores at different evolutionary stages (Myers & Benson 1983; Jijina et al. 1999; Wienen et al. 2018; Svoboda et al. 2016). These surveys demonstrate the reliability of the NH₃ inversion transitions in tracing the spatial and temperature distributions of the dense molecular gas in different spatial scales (from several parsec to 10³ AU) and in a broad temperature range (10 to 50 K).

★ Email: shenwang@mail.ustc.edu.cn

† Email: renzy@nao.cas.cn

‡ Email: dili@nao.cas.cn

There are two classic methods for the temperature calculation: (1) *Intensity ratio*, which starts from the observed spectra, using the integrated intensity ratios between high- and low-excitation lines to derive the temperature based on Boltzmann distribution (e.g. Ho & Townes 1983; Busquet et al. 2009; Ragan et al. 2011; Williams et al. 2018; Dhabal et al. 2019); (2) Hyperfine fitting (denoted as *HF fitting* hereafter), which uses radiative transfer functions to generate the model spectra, and the observed spectra can be fitted by adjusting the temperature and other parameters (e.g. Rosolowsky et al. 2008; Estalella 2017; Keown et al. 2017; Camacho et al. 2020). One can perform the spectral fitting using the Python Package Pyspeckit (Ginsburg & Mirocha 2011), or the compiled package *HfS* (Estalella 2017). *HfS* is featured by an easy operation of separating different velocity components and estimating the parameters of each component respectively.

Intensity ratio and *HF fitting* are both widely used for temperature measurement in a variety of molecular clouds. But they still have some major aspects to be improved. *Intensity ratio* method involves an approximation that each HFC group has one single average intensity and optical depth, which may cause potential uncertainty (described in Section 3.7). *HF fitting* requires to traverse over a broad parameter space to find the optimized values, which would be time-consuming, in particular when data size is large.

We tried to improve the accuracy and efficiency in calculation by building a recipe, which is based on more direct connection between the physical parameters and observed line intensities. The connections between the spectral line profiles and physical parameters include two major aspects:

(1) the intensity ratio between high- and low-excitation lines increases with T_{rot} ;

(2) the intensity ratio between optically thin (satellites) and thick (main) HFCs increases with the optical depth.

In the current work, we try to more directly use these two relations instead of rely on additional assumptions about the optical depths.

In modeling the spectra, we found that T_{rot} can sensitively determine the HFC intensities and its effect is not degenerated with the optical depth, so that the recipe can be expressed in a group of empirical formulae, which are as simple as *Intensity ratio*, but more stable over a broad parameter space. The recipe is named as the *Hyperfine Group Ratio (HFGR)*. It is described in details in the following sections. The physical background of the NH_3 inversion lines is described in Section 2. The spectra modeling is introduced in 3.1. The empirical formulae of T_{rot} are derived from the spectra in Section 3.2 to 3.4 and its intrinsic accuracy is examined in Section 3.5 to 3.6. A comparison between *HFGR* and other two methods for their accuracy and efficiency are presented in 3.7. And a further comparison based on the observed data is presented in 3.8. A summary is given in Section 4.

2 BACKGROUND OF THE NH_3 TEMPERATURE CALCULATION

2.1 Physical Basis of the NH_3 Inversion Transitions

NH_3 is a symmetric top molecule and has relatively simple rotational energy level structures. The physical basis of the population and line transitions are revealed and discussed in a series of papers (Kukolich 1967; Rydbeck et al. 1977; Ho & Townes 1983; Stahler & Palla 2005; Mangum & Shirley 2015). The major physical basis is that the NH_3 rotational energy levels are characterized by the quantum numbers of total angular momentum J and its projection along the molecular axis K . The para- NH_3 has the two lowest metastable levels with quantum numbers of $(J, K) = (1, 1)$ and $(2, 2)$, while the $(J, K) = (3n, 3n)$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$) levels are populated by ortho- NH_3 . The $(1, 1)$ and $(2, 2)$ levels have an energy difference of $\Delta E/k = 41.5$ K. The populations on the $(1, 1)$ and $(2, 2)$ levels mainly rely on collisional excitation. In typical cold dense clouds with number density of $n(\text{H}_2) \sim 10^4 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ and $T_{\text{gas}} \leq 15$ K (e.g. Friesen et al. 2017), the NH_3 molecules would be mainly populated on the $(1, 1)$ and $(2, 2)$ levels.

The $(1, 1)$ and $(2, 2)$ levels both have transitions between different parities of the nitrogen wave function over the plane of three hydrogen atoms. The transitions are further split into a series of HFCs, which are specified in Rydbeck et al. (1977) and shown in Figure 1. There are 18 HFCs in the $J_K^P = (1_1^- - 1_1^+)$ transition and 24 HFCs in the $J_K^P = (2_2^- - 2_2^+)$. The right panels in Figure 1 show the synthetic spectra for the two transitions. For both the $(1_1^- - 1_1^+)$ and $(2_2^- - 2_2^+)$ lines, the HFCs can be divided into the main group (mg), inner satellite group (isg) and outer satellite group (osg), as labeled in Figure 1. And these transitions have similar frequencies thus can be usually observed at the same time.

The intrinsic strengths of the HFC groups are measured from the laboratory spectra assuming all the transitions to have the same excitation temperature, total gas number density and NH_3 column density. We adopt the normalized line strengths listed in the review of Mangum & Shirley (2015, Table 19 and Table 20 therein). The information of 18 HFCs in $(1_1^- - 1_1^+)$ and 24 HFCs in $(2_2^- - 2_2^+)$ are presented in Table 1 and 2.

2.2 The Previous Methods: Aspects to be Improved

An example of the NH_3 $(1_1^- - 1_1^+)$ and $(2_2^- - 2_2^+)$ spectra and the major equations used by *Intensity ratio* and *HF fitting* methods are shown in Figure 2. The *Intensity ratio* method uses the intensities of the HFCs to derive T_{rot} assuming that the two levels obey the Boltzmann distribution (Ho & Townes 1983; Mangum et al. 1992; Ragan et al. 2011), that is

$$T_{\text{rot}} = -\Delta E/k \div \ln \left[-\frac{0.282}{\tau(1, 1, \text{mg})} \ln \left[1 - \frac{T_B(2, 2, \text{mg})}{T_B(1, 1, \text{mg})} (1 - e^{-\tau(1, 1, \text{mg})}) \right] \right]. \quad (1)$$

The $(1_1^- - 1_1^+)$ transition could be moderately optically thick. Its optical depth can be estimated from the ratio between the main and

satellite groups of HFCs in (Ho & Townes 1983, also see Figure 2)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{T_B(1, 1, \text{mg})}{T_B(1, 1, \text{isg})} &= \frac{1 - e^{-\tau(1, 1, \text{mg})}}{1 - e^{-\tau(1, 1, \text{isg})}} \\ &= \frac{1 - e^{-\tau(1, 1, \text{mg})}}{1 - e^{-a\tau(1, 1, \text{mg})}} = \frac{1 - e^{-\tau(1, 1, \text{mg})}}{1 - e^{-0.278\tau(1, 1, \text{mg})}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $a = 0.278$ is the intensity ratio between NH_3 ($1_1^- - 1_1^+$) main and inner satellite groups. $T_B(1, 1, \text{mg})$ and $T_B(1, 1, \text{isg})$ are the observed brightness temperatures of the two groups, respectively.

Equation (2) assumes that each HFC group has a unique optical depth τ_{group} . This is an approximation since each group actually contains several internal HFCs with slightly different frequencies (Table 1 and Figure 1 right panels), corresponding to an average velocity difference of $\overline{\Delta V}_{\text{HFC}} \approx 0.3 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. If the line width is relatively large ($\Delta V > \overline{\Delta V}_{\text{HFC}}$), the HFCs would be overlapped and the group could be regarded as an integrate spectral feature. In contrast, if $\Delta V < \overline{\Delta V}_{\text{HFC}}$, the internal HFCs would be further separated and have individual τ values, which are not necessarily equal. In this case, it would be less accurate to assume each HFC group to have a single value of τ_{group} . The two cases, namely separated and overlapped HFCs, are presented in Figure 3a.

For *HF fitting*, we estimated its T_{rot} deviation due to ΔV . The NH_3 ($1_1^- - 1_1^+$) and ($2_2^- - 2_2^+$) model spectra can be generated using the radiative transfer functions. The physical parameters to determine the spectra include optical depth τ_0 , rotational temperature T_{rot} , and the intrinsic line width ΔV . The optical depth as a function of the frequency is assumed to have a Gaussian profile for each HFC, that is

$$\tau(\nu) = \tau_0 \sum_i s_i \exp \left[- \left(\frac{\nu - \nu_i - \nu_0}{2\sigma_\nu^2} \right)^2 \right], \quad (3)$$

wherein τ_0 is the central optical depth of the ($1_1^- - 1_1^+$) transition, ν_0 is the observed central frequency of the mg component, s_i is the relative intensity of each HFC, and ν_i is the frequency shift of each HFC relative to ν_0 . The values of ν_i and s_i are adopted from Kukolich (1967) and are shown in Table 1. The spectral frequency is related to the radial velocity as $(\nu_0 - \nu)/\nu_0 = (V - V_0)/c$. And hence is the frequency and velocity dispersions, $\sigma_\nu/\nu_0 = \sigma_V/c$. And σ_V is related to the full-width half-maximum (FWHM) line width ΔV as $\sigma_\nu = \Delta V/\sqrt{8 \ln 2}$. Using the Planck-corrected brightness temperature

$$J(T) = \frac{h\nu_{ul}/k}{\exp(h\nu_{ul}/kT) - 1}, \quad (4)$$

the ($1_1^- - 1_1^+$) and ($2_2^- - 2_2^+$) spectra can be modeled using the radiative transfer function as:

$$T_{\text{mb}}(\nu) = \eta_f [J(T_{\text{ex}}) - J(T_{\text{bg}})] [1 - e^{-\tau(\nu)}], \quad (5)$$

Wherein $\tau(\nu)$ is the optical depth as a function of frequency ν , T_{ex} is the excitation temperature, $T_{\text{bg}} = 2.73 \text{ K}$ is the cosmic background temperature, η_f is the beam filling factor and is set to be $\eta_f = 1$ in modeling the line profile.

The output T_{rot} is calculated from the model spectra using Equation (1) and (2). Figure 3b exhibits the variation of output T_{rot} as a function of ΔV . As expected, when ΔV is relatively small, the output T_{rot} has a large error of $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} = 8$ to 10 K . As shown

in Figure 3b, ΔT_{rot} is also affected by τ . When τ increases by a factor of 10, the derived T_{rot} would have a variation of $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} = 2 \text{ K}$. The variation of ΔT_{rot} suggests the requirement to improve *Intensity ratio* method, in particular when ΔV is small.

The *HF fitting* method, in comparison, requires a traversal over the broad parameter space of $(\Delta V, T_{\text{rot}}, N(\text{NH}_3))$ to look for the best-fit spectra. The complexity of this algorithm should be proportional to the parameter space, which is estimated to be $O[n(\text{channels}) \times n(\Delta V) \times n(T_{\text{rot}}) \times n(N(\text{NH}_3))]$, wherein $n(\text{channels})$ is the number of channels in the spectrum. For other parameters, i.e., ΔV , T_{rot} , and $N(\text{NH}_3)$. $n(X)$ represents the number of data points to be sampled over its suspected range. One can attempt to reduce the calculation by carefully selecting the initial values of the parameters and using Monte Carlo sampling to more quickly approach the optimized values, as adopted by Estalella (2017). But the overall complexity of $O(n(X))$ is unlikely to be largely reduced.

In this work, we try to improve the T_{rot} calculation by utilizing the advantages of the two methods. Following the simplicity of *Intensity ratio*, we also adopt the strategy of using the HF groups to derive T_{rot} , but we do not assume an average optical depth for each HF group. Instead, we considered the more direct connections between T_{rot} and the HFC intensities as mentioned in Section 1. For the (1, 1) and (2, 2) levels, they turn out to be

(1) the intensity ratio of $T_{\text{mb}}(2, 2)/T_{\text{mb}}(1, 1)$ lines increases with T_{rot} ;

(2) the intensity ratio of $T_{\text{mb}}(1, 1, \text{sg})/T_{\text{mb}}(1, 1, \text{mg})$ increases with the optical depth or column density $N(\text{NH}_3)$.

Like in *HF fitting*, one needs to adjust the physical parameters in the model spectra to fit these two relations. But once they can be described in empirical formulae with acceptable accuracy, the formulae would be adopted to be an independent method to derive T_{rot} , and the spectral fitting over the parameter space is no longer needed.

3 RECIPE FOR NH_3 ROTATIONAL TEMPERATURE

3.1 Modeling the NH_3 inversion spectra

There are three major steps to build the new recipe of estimating T_{rot} , including:

- (1) generating the model spectra using radiation transfer functions based on the input parameters, namely Equation (3) to (5);
- (2) sampling the relation between T_{rot} and the HFC intensities from the model spectra to build the empirical formulae;
- (3) evaluating the T_{rot} uncertainty in the empirical formulae and its variation over the parameter space.

In the condition of Local Thermal Equilibrium (LTE), the (1,1) and (2,2) levels of the obey the Boltzmann distribution. Their column-density ratio is thus

$$\frac{N(2, 2)}{N(1, 1)} = \frac{g_{22}}{g_{11}} \exp \left[- \frac{\Delta E}{kT_{\text{rot}}} \right], \quad (6)$$

wherein $N(1, 1)$ and $N(2, 2)$ are the total column densities of the (1, 1) and (2, 2) levels, respectively. $\Delta E/k = (E_{22} - E_{11})/k = 40.99 \text{ K}$ is the energy difference; the statistic weight ratio is $g_{11}/g_{22} = 3/5$ (Pickett et al. 1998). The accuracy of Equation

(6) requires the two levels to have thermalized population. As calculated from the collisional excitations (Stutzki & Winnewisser 1985; Maret et al. 2009; Shirley 2015), the thermalization of the metastable levels mainly depend on the total gas number density. For example, as shown in Maret et al. (2009), when the density is low ($n(\text{H}_2) \leq 10^4 \text{ cm}^{-3}$), the two transitions have a difference of $T_{\text{ex},11} - T_{\text{ex},22} > 10 \text{ K}$. It declines to $T_{\text{ex},11} - T_{\text{ex},22} = 0 \text{ K}$ when $n(\text{H}_2) \geq 5 \times 10^5 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. Friesen et al. (2017) performed a similar calculation by directly solving the equations of statistical equilibrium using RADEX (van der Tak et al. 2007). In a typical physical condition of $n = 10^4 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, $T_{\text{kin}} = 15 \text{ K}$, and $N(\text{p-NH}_3) = 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, the temperatures are solved to be $T_{\text{ex}}(1,1) = 8.5 \text{ K}$ and $T_{\text{ex}}(2,2) = 6.9 \text{ K}$. Based on these results, we suggest that Equation (6) could be a reasonable approximation when $n(\text{H}_2) \geq 5 \times 10^4 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. At lower densities, the (J, K) levels are more deviated from LTE and it would become physically unfeasible to derive one single T_{rot} .

On the other hand, for each metastable level, the column density is related to the total optical depth as (Rosolowsky et al. 2008):

$$N(i, i) = \frac{8\pi\nu_0^2}{c^2} \frac{g_l}{g_u} \frac{1}{A_i} \left[1 - \exp\left(\frac{h\nu_i}{kT_{\text{ex}}}\right) \right]^{-1} \int \tau_\nu(i, i) d\nu \quad (7)$$

$$\approx \frac{8\pi\nu_0^2}{c^2} \frac{g_l}{g_u} \frac{1}{A_i} \left[1 - \exp\left(\frac{h\nu_i}{kT_{\text{ex}}}\right) \right]^{-1} \sqrt{2\pi} \sigma_\nu \tau_0(i, i),$$

wherein $i = 1, 2$ and the second term on the right side is obtained by using the $\tau(\nu)$ expression in Equation (3).

An example of $\text{NH}_3(1,1)$ and $(2,2)$ model spectra is presented in Figure 2. The input parameters are $T_{\text{rot}} = T_{\text{ex}} = 28 \text{ K}$, $\Delta V = 1.5 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, $\tau_{0,11} = 2.0$, and an rms noise of 0.1 K . Using Equation (6) and (7), one can derive $\tau_{0,22} = 0.44$. For the $(2,2)$ line, the satellite components appear to be much weaker compare to that in the $(1,1)$ spectrum.

3.2 Relation between T_{rot} and HFC intensities

Using Equation (5), the total optical depth can be manually connected to the observed line intensity as:

$$\int \tau_\nu d\nu \equiv \frac{\int \tau_\nu d\nu}{\int 1 - e^{-\tau_\nu} d\nu} \frac{\int T_{\text{mb}}(\nu) d\nu}{J(T_{\text{ex}}) - J(T_{\text{bg}})}. \quad (8)$$

Using this form, the ratio between the $(1,1)$ and $(2,2)$ column densities can be written as

$$\frac{N(1,1)}{N(2,2)} = \left[\frac{\nu_{11}^2}{\nu_{22}^2} \frac{A_{22}}{A_{11}} \frac{1 - \exp\left(\frac{h\nu_{22}}{kT_{\text{ex},22}}\right)}{1 - \exp\left(\frac{h\nu_{11}}{kT_{\text{ex},11}}\right)} \frac{\int \tau_\nu(1,1) d\nu}{\int \tau_\nu(2,2) d\nu} \right] \frac{\int T_{\text{mb}}(1,1) d\nu}{\int T_{\text{mb}}(2,2) d\nu} \frac{J(T_{\text{ex},11}) - J(T_{\text{bg}})}{J(T_{\text{ex},22}) - J(T_{\text{bg}})} \quad (9)$$

Combining Equation (9) and (6), we have

$$\exp\left[\frac{\Delta E}{kT_{\text{rot}}}\right] = C_{\text{ex}} \left[\frac{g(2,2)}{g(1,1)} \frac{\nu_{11} A_{22}}{\nu_{22} A_{11}} \frac{\int 1 - \exp[-\tau_\nu(1,1)] d\nu}{\int 1 - \exp[-\tau_\nu(2,2)] d\nu} \right] \frac{\int T_{\text{mb}}(1,1) d\nu}{\int T_{\text{mb}}(2,2) d\nu} \quad (10)$$

wherein the quantities depending on T_{ex} are combined into one factor of $C_{\text{ex}} = [1 - J(T_{\text{bg}})/J(T_{\text{ex},22})]/[1 - J(T_{\text{bg}})/J(T_{\text{ex},11})]$. We further reduced Equation (10) by assuming an LTE condition so that $C_{\text{ex}} = 1$. We estimated the C_{ex} variation with the difference between $T_{\text{ex},11}$ and $T_{\text{ex},22}$. Also adopting the T_{ex} variation scale in Friesen et al. (2017), namely $T_{\text{ex}}(2,2) - T_{\text{ex}}(1,1) = \pm 2 \text{ K}$, we can derive $C_{\text{ex}} = 0.9$ to 1.1 . That means if the $(1,1)$ and $(2,2)$ excitations are not largely deviated from LTE, we can still have the approximation of $C_{\text{ex}} \approx 1.0$.

Equation (10) can be further reduced by defining a correction factor C_f as

$$C_f = \frac{g_{22}}{g_{11}} \frac{\nu_{11} A_{22}}{\nu_{22} A_{11}} \left[\frac{\int \tau_\nu(1,1) d\nu}{\int \tau_\nu(2,2) d\nu} \frac{\int 1 - e^{-\tau_\nu(2,2)} d\nu}{\int 1 - e^{-\tau_\nu(1,1)} d\nu} \right]. \quad (11)$$

Using C_f , Equation (10) becomes

$$\exp\left[\frac{\Delta E}{T_{\text{rot}} k}\right] = C_f \times \frac{\int T_{\text{mb}}(1,1) d\nu}{\int T_{\text{mb}}(2,2) d\nu}, \quad (12)$$

Equation (12) is then transformed into an expression of T_{rot} ,

$$T_{\text{rot}} = \frac{\Delta E/k}{\ln \left[C_f \times \frac{\int T_{\text{mb}}(1,1) d\nu}{\int T_{\text{mb}}(2,2) d\nu} \right]}. \quad (13)$$

Now the key step is to express C_f using the observed quantities. Since a main purpose of this work is to circumvent the uncertainty due to the HFC-blending, we consider using the intensity ratios among the HFC groups (mg, isg, osg). Since C_f is related to the optical depth, a natural option is to consider the intensity ratio between mg and sg which is also proportional to the optical depth, that is

$$R_{\text{sm}} = \frac{\int T_{\text{mb}}^{\text{isg+osg}} d\nu}{\int T_{\text{mb}}^{\text{mg}} d\nu} \Big|_{(1,1)}. \quad (14)$$

Theoretically, the HFC groups in the $(2_2^- - 2_2^+)$ transition can also estimate C_f as shown in Equation (11). They are not adopted mainly because the satellite groups are much weaker than in $(1_1^- - 1_1^+)$ (Figure 1 and 2).

The relation between C_f and R_{sm} can be numerically sampled from the model spectra over the τ_0 range. In each sampling over the τ_0 range, the other two parameters, ΔV and T_{rot} are set to be constants. Then a number of samplings are carried out to obtain the $C_f(R_{\text{sm}})$ relation at different ΔV and T_{rot} values.

Figure 5a shows $C_f(R_{\text{sm}})$ sampled at temperatures from $T_{\text{rot}} = 10$ to 70 K . It shows that each $C_f(R_{\text{sm}})$ relation has a clear and smooth variation trend with R_{sm} . The slope of the $C_f(R_{\text{sm}})$ relation continuously varies with T_{rot} .

Figure 5b shows the $C_f(R_{\text{sm}})$ relations at line widths from $\Delta V = 0.3$ to 3.0 km s^{-1} . As shown in Figure 5b, the slope of the $C_f(R_{\text{sm}})$ relation increases from $\overline{C_f}/\overline{R_{\text{sm}}} = 0.25$ to 0.5 over the ΔV range. The changing of $C_f(R_{\text{sm}})$ curves with ΔV should also reflect the changing of blending condition of the internal components in each HFC group as shown in Figure 3a. This effect is now included in HFGF.

Figure 5a and 5b also show that all the $C_f(R_{\text{sm}})$ curves are exactly converged at $(R_{\text{sm}}, C_f) = (1.0, 0.9524)$, which represents the line intensity ratio at extremely low optical depth. When τ_0 is

very small, the HFC group intensities would become independent of ΔV and T_{rot} .

Since R_{sm} is a correction factor for optical depth τ_0 , we examined the relation between R_{sm} and τ_0 . For each (1,1) model spectrum, τ_0 can be estimated from Equation (7). As shown in Figure 5c, the two quantities are found to have a nearly linear relation of $\tau_0(1,1) = 3.52(R_{\text{sm}} - 1)$. Since τ_0 can be uniquely determined by R_{sm} , it is not necessary to be independently considered in our calculation.

There is still a caveat in using R_{sm} to estimate the optical depth due to the hyperfine intensity anomaly (HIA) (Camarata et al. 2015, and references therein), which would cause increased intensities of the $F=1-2$ (left isg) and $0-1$ (right osg) components due to the over population at $F=0$ and $F=1$ states during the $J_K=2_1 - 1_1$ transition. In LTE condition, the HIA would only enhance the hyperfine components, but would not change the overall population of the (2,2) and (1,1) levels. In order to circumvent the HIA-effect to the T_{rot} calculation, one can consider to use two times of the $F=1-0$ (left osg) and $F=2-1$ (right isg) intensities to estimate the numerator in Equation (14), namely $\int T_{\text{mb}}^{\text{isg+osg}} d\nu = 2 \int (T_{\text{mb}}^{F=1-0} + T_{\text{mb}}^{F=2-1}) d\nu$.

3.3 Coefficients in the Polynomial Expression of T_{rot}

At any ΔV and T_{rot} values, the $C_f(R_{\text{sm}})$ relation exhibits a linear increasing or decreasing trend with a slight curvature. We thus tried to fit it using a two-order polynomial,

$$C_f = a_0 + a_1(R_{\text{sm}} - R_{\text{sm}0}) + a_2(R_{\text{sm}} - R_{\text{sm}0})^2, \quad (15)$$

wherein $R_{\text{sm}0} = 1.0$, $a_0 = 0.9524$ represent the values at the convergent point (Figure 5a). The coefficients $a_{1,2}$ are constants for any individual $C_f(R_{\text{sm}})$ relation, but would depend on T_{rot} and ΔV .

In Figure 6, the solid dots represent a_1 and a_2 values sampled over the parameter space of ΔV and T_{rot} . The numerical functions of $a_{1,2}(T_{\text{rot}}, \Delta V)$ are also fitted by two-order polynomials,

$$a_i = h_0 + h_1\Delta V + h_2T_{\text{rot}} + h_3\Delta V^2 + h_4T_{\text{rot}}^2, \quad (16)$$

wherein coefficients $\{h_i\}$ are permanent constants that no longer depend on the parameters of τ_0 , T_{rot} , or ΔV . Based on the numerically sampled a_i , we found that T_{rot} and ΔV are independent in determining a_i . It is thus not necessary to have a crossing term of ΔVT_{rot} in Equation (16).

In Figure 6, the best-fit equations of $a_i(\Delta V, T_{\text{rot}})$ are presented in false-color surfaces in each panel. We see that the surface of $a_i(\Delta V, T_{\text{rot}})$ functions with the best-fit $\{h_i\}$ values are coincident with the sampled data points, suggesting that Equation (16) can closely describe the a_i variation as a function of T_{rot} and ΔV .

3.4 How to Perform the Recipe

The major steps of using the recipe are presented in a flow chart in Figure 7. In calculation, an initial value of T_{rot} should be provided. It can be calculated from Equation (11) assuming $C_f = 1.0$. And the line width ΔV can be measured from the (1,1) major group. As described above, compared to T_{rot} , ΔV has a minor influence to C_f . We only need to ensure that ΔV is not largely deviated from the actual value so that its influence to C_f can be corrected. $a_{1,2}$ and

C_f are then derived using Equation (16) and (15), respectively. And T_{rot} is calculated again using Equation (13). The calculation can be usually converged after several iterations.

One can also estimate the kinetic temperature T_{kin} . The recommended formula is from Tafalla et al. (2004),

$$T_{\text{kin}} = \frac{T_{\text{rot}}}{1 - \frac{T_{\text{rot}}}{\Delta E/k} \ln[1 + 1.1 \exp(-\frac{16}{T_{\text{rot}}})]}, \quad (17)$$

which is obtained from a Monte Carlo sampling of the (J, K) -level population as a function of T_{kin} .

3.5 Accuracy of the recipe

In order to test the accuracy of *HFGR*, it is applied to a series of model spectra. The $(1_1^- - 1_1^+)$ and $(2_2^- - 2_2^+)$ model spectra are generated using Equation (3), (4), and (5). The input parameters include T_{rot} , ΔV , and τ_0 . Figure 8a shows the output T_{rot} deviation as a function of $N(\text{NH}_3)$ (or τ_0) at a number of T_{rot} values. The T_{rot} deviation turns out to increase moderately with $N(\text{NH}_3)$ and remains $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} < 1.0$ K throughout the temperature range. In the high-mass dense molecular cores, the column densities have an average level of $N(\text{NH}_3) = 5 \times 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ and only occasionally exceed 10^{15} cm^{-2} (e.g. Lu et al. 2014, Table 6 therein). The $N(\text{NH}_3)$ values in real cases are thus well covered in our calculation range, and the T_{rot} deviation due to the $N(\text{NH}_3)$ would not be significant.

Figure 8b shows the T_{rot} deviation over the $(T_{\text{rot}}, \Delta V)$ parameter space at $\tau_0 = 3.0$. The T_{rot} -error is quite small in the major fraction of the parameter space, and the T_{rot} -error increases to a noticeable level only when ΔV is very small and T_{rot} is very high. There is an additional physical constraint that ΔV should be higher than the level of thermal velocity dispersion, that is $\Delta V_{\text{th}} = (8 \ln 2 kT_k / \mu m_{\text{NH}_3})^{1/2}$. This relation, as plotted in Figure 8b, represents a lower limit for the available ΔV . The region below this curve would not exist in reality. Above this curve, the T_{rot} deviation is lower than 0.15 K and only slightly increases to $\Delta T \approx 0.5$ K over the T_{rot} range.

3.6 The Modification at Low Temperatures

At low temperatures, the (2,2) line will become very weak so that the T_{rot} uncertainty would largely increase. This problem exists in all three methods. Figure 9 shows the output ΔT_{rot} distribution as a function of the real T_{rot} in the low temperature range for *HFGR*. There is a drastic increase of ΔT_{rot} dramatically increases when $T_{\text{rot}} < 15$ K. This is mainly due to the (2,2) emission becoming very weak at low temperatures. This uncertainty can be reduced by using a gaussian fitting to measure the HFC-group intensities. This can significantly eliminate the T_{rot} uncertainty as shown in Figure 9b.

3.7 Comparison between the *HFGR* and other Methods

We compared *HFGR* with other two classical methods (Section 2) for the efficiency and accuracy. For *Intensity ratio*, it seems that many studies used the peak line intensity of each HFC group (e.g. Friesen et al. 2009; Ragan et al. 2011; Chira et al. 2013; Dhabal et al. 2019). Actually, as the second option, one can also use the integrated intensity of each HFC group instead of its peak value (e.g.

Williams et al. 2018). This would increase the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). For example, if the line emission in a group extends over N channels, the SNR of the integrated emission would be increased by a factor of \sqrt{N} . It is worthwhile to have a comparison between the two options, namely using the peak value or integrated emission of each HFC group.

HFGR and other two methods are applied to the model spectra to make comparison of their accuracies. We first investigate the T_{rot} variation at a constant SNR and σ_v , the three methods, wherein the input parameters are $T_{\text{rot}} = 20$ K, $\Delta V = 1.0$ km s $^{-1}$, $\tau_0(1, 1) = 1.5$, and a spectral noise level of rms=0.2 K. The rms level corresponds to SNR ≈ 20 for the (1,1)-isg group. In each of the 2000 samplings, the rms noise is independently generated and added into the model spectra. In each sampling, T_{rot} is calculated from the noisy spectra using the three methods.

Figure 10a shows the temperature variation ΔT_{rot} relative to the actual value of $T_{\text{rot}} = 20$ K in all the samplings, wherein *HFGR* and the *HF fitting* turn out to have comparable variation of $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} = \pm 0.5$ K. For *intensity ratio*, the two options are both considered, namely using (i) total emission, and (ii) the peak value for each HF group are both investigated. As a result, option (i) exhibits a comparable ΔT_{rot} variation, while option (ii) has a larger variation of $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} = \pm 1$ K. The larger uncertainty is within our expectation since the peak T_{mb} of each hyperfine group is sensitive to the rms noise.

Figure 10b shows the ΔT_{rot} distribution as a function of the rms noise. As expected, in each method, ΔT_{rot} shows an increasing trend with the rms level. *HF fitting* has the lowest ΔT_{rot} over the rms range, while *HFGR* and *Intensity ratio* [option (i)] have slightly higher ΔT_{rot} than *HF fitting*. For all three methods, the variation can maintain a reasonable level of $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} \leq 2.0$ K if the SNR is not too low (SNR > 4). In comparison, *Intensity ratio* [option (ii)] has much larger uncertainty that increases to $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} = \pm 2.5$ K towards high rms level (1.0 K). It indicates that the option (ii) would have large uncertainty if applied to very noisy spectra. Therefore, when using the *Intensity ratio* method to derive T_{rot} , one should first attempt to follow option (i).

Figure 10c shows the average ΔT_{rot} as a function of the line width ΔV . A notable feature is that ΔT_{rot} becomes evidently deviated from the zero level over the ΔV range, in particular for *HF fitting* and *Intensity ratio*. And the three methods exhibit quite different variation trends. For *HF fitting*, the value decreases to $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} = -1.5$ K around $\Delta V = 2.5$ km s $^{-1}$. The ΔT_{rot} deviation with ΔV should be mainly due to the change of HFC blending conditions. At small ΔV , the internal HFCs within each group can be sufficiently resolved by the hyperfine fitting. While ΔV becomes higher, the HFCs would gradually become blended, letting the fitted spectra be less constrained.

Intensity ratio, in contrast, exhibits a nearly opposite trend. It has relatively large deviation of $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} = -1.7$ K at lower line width of $\Delta V = 0.1$ to 0.5 km s $^{-1}$, and becomes converged to $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} = \pm 0.5$ K at $\Delta V > 0.5$ km s $^{-1}$. The ΔT_{rot} deviation at low ΔV is similar as that shown in Figure 3.

HFGR exhibits an overall small variation in the ΔV range. This is within our expectation since the effect of ΔV is already considered in its calculation (Figure 5b). Its ΔT_{rot} slightly increases with a scale

of 0.4 K only towards small ΔV (≤ 0.2 km s $^{-1}$). At larger values of $\Delta V > 0.5$ km s $^{-1}$, ΔT_{rot} stays in a narrow range of -0.2 to 0 K.

Figure 10d shows the calculation time Δt_{cal} in the three methods. For each method, Δt_{cal} is measured from an average of 100 times of calculations run in the same computer. The *HFGR* and *Intensity ratio* has comparable $\Delta t_{\text{cal}} = 1$ to 2×10^{-4} seconds. *HFGR* has slightly higher Δt_{cal} than *Intensity ratio* because the *HFGR* performs several iterations to optimize C_f (Figure 7). *HF fitting* is much more time-consuming, with $\Delta t_{\text{cal}} = 3 - 4$ seconds, which is longer than the two other methods for a factor of 10^4 . This is because the *HF fitting* would traverse over a large parameter space to look for the optimized values.

Figure 10d also shows a feature that for *HF fitting*, its Δt_{cal} slightly increases towards the lowest SNR, while for *Intensity ratio* and *HFGR*, Δt_{cal} appears to be constant throughout the SNR range. As an explanation, for *Intensity ratio* and *HFGR*, its Δt_{cal} simply represents the time to run two or three analytical equations, thus would be clearly independent of the spectral noise. While *HF fitting* would be affected by spectral shape, thus would be slightly delayed if the line profiles are largely disturbed by the noise.

As a short summary, in the comparison test, *HFGR* shows a balanced advantage between efficiency and accuracy, and has a relatively stable performance over a broad range of ΔV and SNR.

3.8 Application to the Real Observational Data

We tested the performance of *HFGR* by applying it to the real observational data in Orion A region. This region contains compact and quiescent filament structures with moderate protostellar heating. The region is covered by the NH_3 ($1_1^- - 1_1^+$) and ($2_2^- - 2_2^+$) observations (Li et al. 2013; Friesen et al. 2017) with a sensitivity of ~ 0.1 K, allowing us to make a detailed comparison of the three methods.

Figure 11a to 11c show the NH_3 T_{rot} maps of the three methods over the region of Orion A North. The three methods exhibit quite similar T_{rot} distributions over the NH_3 emission region. In particular, around the Orion KL area, temperature sharply increase to $T_{\text{rot}} \sim 45$ K, which is demonstrated by all three T_{rot} maps.

The statistical distribution of T_{rot} for the three methods are shown in Figure 12a. For each method, the major fraction of the data points have quite similar and overlapped distribution profiles, concentrated in range of $T_{\text{rot}} = 10 - 30$ K, and a maximum distribution around $T_{\text{rot}} = 19$ K. The similar distributions suggests that the three methods have comparable accuracy in deriving T_{rot} .

The T_{rot} distributions of the different methods are compared from their T_{rot} values at the pixels within the NH_3 emission region, as shown in Figure 12b. The *intensity ratio* and *HF fitting* both exhibit a linear increasing trend with *HFGR* over the range of $T_{\text{rot}} = 5$ to 50 K, with a variation of $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} = \pm 3$ K. This also suggests that the three methods have not only similar T_{rot} ranges, but also spatially coherent T_{rot} variations. The only difference is that *HF fitting* has a small fraction of the pixels at higher T_{rot} values than in other two methods. These pixels are located in the relatively high temperature range from 30 to 50 K. Below this range ($T_{\text{rot}} < 30$ K), the data of three methods are almost fully overlapped. In Figure 11, the high-temperature areas are mainly from Orion KL region, where the NH_3

emission turns out to be weaker than the Northern part of the cloud. This could be due to the disruption of the NH_3 by the radiation from the massive stars in M42 (Trapezium Cluster). As the consequence, the weakness of the line emission, in particular for the $(2_2^- - 2_2^+)$ line, would be responsible for the T_{rot} deviation in *HF fitting*. In comparison, *HFGR* and *intensity ratio* have closely correlated T_{rot} distributions probably because they both use integrated intensities of the HFC groups.

Figure 12c shows the distribution of T_{rot} and the $(1_1^- - 1_1^+)$ integrated intensity. In this diagram, the three methods also exhibit largely overlapped distributions. It more clearly shows that the majority of high temperature points ($T_{\text{rot}} > 30$ K) have weak intensities, with $\int T_{\text{mb},11} dV < 12 \text{ K km s}^{-1}$, which is also suggestive of the NH_3 disruption in the hot region.

Figure 12d shows the distributions T_{rot} and the $(1_1^- - 1_1^+)$ line width ΔV_{11} . The data points for the three methods are also largely overlapped. And they all exhibit a trend of increasing T_{rot} with ΔV_{11} . The velocity due to the thermal motion can be calculated from $\sigma_{\text{th}} = \Delta V_{\text{th}} / \sqrt{8 \ln 2} = \sqrt{k_B T_{\text{kin}} / m_{\text{NH}_3}}$. Assuming that T_{rot} and T_{kin} follow Equation (17), we estimated the theoretical relation of $\Delta V_{\text{th}}(T_{\text{rot}})$, as plotted in dashed line in Figure 12d. The observed ΔV is shown to be much higher than ΔV_{th} throughout the T_{kin} range, suggesting that the gas motion traced by NH_3 is dominated by the non-thermal motion. Although the observed positive ΔV - T_{rot} relation is coherent with the normal case that thermal motion increases with the temperature, it actually reflect another property that the more turbulent gas components have higher temperatures. This could also be largely contributed by Orion KL region where the intense radiation field and gas expansion are providing strong heating and dynamical perturbation to increase the turbulence and temperature at the same time. In general, the observational test shows that the data points of the three methods are largely overlapped in the broad ΔV range, suggesting that *HFGR* should have a stable performance in the conditions of both low and high turbulence.

4 SUMMARY

In order to improve the accuracy and efficiency in calculating the gas temperature using NH_3 , we constructed a new recipe of using the total intensities of hyperfine groups in NH_3 ($1_1^- - 1_1^+$) and $(2_2^- - 2_2^+)$ inversion lines to derive T_{rot} . It is tested on the model spectra over a broad parameter space to guarantee the reliability. The python program for this calculation is provided freely¹.

In building *HFGR*, we made three major efforts to improve the T_{rot} calculation:

(1) *HFGR* uses a group of empirical formulae (mainly Equation 13 to 16) based on forward radiative transfer calculations to derive T_{rot} . The equations only rely on the intensities of HFC groups that requires no hyperfine fitting, thus the uncertainties due to the spectral profiles can be largely prevented. *HFGR* can maintain an intrinsic uncertainty of $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} < 0.15$ K over a parameter space of $T_{\text{rot}} = 10$ to 70 K, $\Delta V = 0.5$ to 3.5 km s^{-1} , and $N(\text{NH}_3) < 2 \times 10^{15} \text{ cm}^{-2}$. In

comparison, the two other methods are both sensitive to the spectral shape, thus their accuracy could be significantly affected by ΔV .

(2) Compared to *hyperfine fitting*, *HFGR* can substantially reduce a large amount of computational load because it does not require a traversal over the parameter space.

(3) When applied to the noisy spectra, *HFGR* can maintain an uncertainty at the level of $\Delta T_{\text{rot}} \leq 1.0$ K (1σ) when $\text{SNR} > 4$. One can directly estimate the error from the relation between ΔT_{rot} and the spectral noise.

HFGR is applied to the NH_3 lines observed in Orion A North region. As a result, the derived T_{rot} map exhibits a comparable result with *HF fitting* and *Intensity Ratio*. It suggests that *HFGR* can have an unbiased temperature measurement from the observational data.

5 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank the referee for very detailed comments that help improve the scientific analysis. This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China No. 11988101, No. 11725313, No. 11403041, No. 11373038, No. 11373045, CAS International Partnership Program No. 114A11KYSB20160008, the China Scholarship Council No. 201704910686, and the Young Researcher Grant of National Astronomical Observatories, Chinese Academy of Sciences.

6 DATA AVAILABILITY

The data underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

REFERENCES

- Busquet G., Palau A., Estalella R., Girart J. M., Anglada G., Sepúlveda I., 2009, *A&A*, **506**, 1183
- Camacho V., Vázquez-Semadeni E., Palau A., Busquet G., Zamora-Avilés M., 2020, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2002.01594
- Camarata M. A., Jackson J. M., Chambers E., 2015, *ApJ*, **806**, 74
- Cheung A. C., Rank D. M., Townes C. H., Thornton D. D., Welch W. J., 1968, *Physical Review Letters*, **21**, 1701
- Chira R.-A., Beuther H., Linz H., Schuller F., Walmsley C. M., Menten K. M., Bronfman L., 2013, *A&A*, **552**
- Danby G., Flower D. R., Valiron P., Schilke P., Walmsley C. M., 1988, *MNRAS*, **235**, 229
- Dhabal A., Mundy L. G., Chen C.-y., Teuben P., Storm S., 2019, *ApJ*, **876**, 108
- Estalella R., 2017, *PASP*, **129**, 025003
- Friesen R. K., Di Francesco J., Shirley Y. L., Myers P. C., 2009, *ApJ*, **697**, 1457
- Friesen R. K., et al., 2017, *ApJ*, **843**, 63
- Ginsburg A., Mirocha J., 2011, PySpecKit: Python Spectroscopic Toolkit, Astrophysics Source Code Library (ascl:1109.001)
- Ho P. T. P., Townes C. H., 1983, *ARA&A*, **21**, 239
- Hogge T., et al., 2018, *ApJS*, **237**, 27
- Jijina J., Myers P. C., Adams F. C., 1999, *ApJS*, **125**, 161
- Keown J., et al., 2017, *ApJ*, **850**, 3
- Kukolich S. G., 1967, *Physical Review*, **156**, 83
- Li D., Goldsmith P. F., Menten K., 2003, *ApJ*, **587**, 262

¹ All the python codes are publicly available this web site: https://github.com/plotxyz/nh3_trot.git

- Li D., Kauffmann J., Zhang Q., Chen W., 2013, [ApJ](#), **768**, L5
- Lu X., Zhang Q., Liu H. B., Wang J., Gu Q., 2014, [ApJ](#), **790**, 84
- Mangum J. G., Shirley Y. L., 2015, [PASP](#), **127**, 266
- Mangum J. G., Wootten A., Mundy L. G., 1992, [ApJ](#), **388**, 467
- Maret S., Faure A., Scifoni E., Wiesenfeld L., 2009, [MNRAS](#), **399**, 425
- Myers P. C., Benson P. J., 1983, [ApJ](#), **266**, 309
- Osorio M., Anglada G., Lizano S., D'Alessio P., 2009, [ApJ](#), **694**, 29
- Pickett H. M., Poynter R. L., Cohen E. A., Delitsky M. L., Pearson J. C., Müller H. S. P., 1998, [J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiative Transfer](#), **60**, 883
- Poynter R. L., Kakar R. K., 1975, [ApJS](#), **29**, 87
- Purcell C. R., et al., 2012, [MNRAS](#), **426**, 1972
- Ragan S. E., Bergin E. A., Wilner D., 2011, [ApJ](#), **736**, 163
- Rosolowsky E. W., Pineda J. E., Foster J. B., Borkin M. A., Kauffmann J., Caselli P., Myers P. C., Goodman A. A., 2008, [ApJS](#), **175**, 509
- Rydbeck O. E. H., Sume A., Hjalmarsen A., Ellder J., Ronnang B. O., Kollberg E., 1977, [ApJ](#), **215**, L35
- Seo Y. M., et al., 2015, [ApJ](#), **805**, 185
- Shirley Y. L., 2015, [PASP](#), **127**, 299
- Stahler S. W., Palla F., 2005, *The Formation of Stars*
- Stutzki J., Winnewisser G., 1985, [A&A](#), **148**, 254
- Svoboda B. E., et al., 2016, [ApJ](#), **822**, 59
- Tafalla M., Myers P. C., Caselli P., Walmsley C. M., 2004, [A&A](#), **416**, 191
- Wienen M., Wyrowski F., Menten K. M., Urquhart J. S., Walmsley C. M., Csengeri T., Koribalski B. S., Schuller F., 2018, [A&A](#), **609**, A125
- Williams G. M., Peretto N., Avison A., Duarte-Cabral A., Fuller G. A., 2018, [A&A](#), **613**, A11
- van der Tak F. F. S., Black J. H., Schöier F. L., Jansen D. J., van Dishoeck E. F., 2007, [A&A](#), **468**, 627

This paper has been typeset from a \LaTeX file prepared by the author.

Table 1. Hyperfine intensities of the NH_3 ($1_1^- - 1_1^+$) and ($2_2^- - 2_2^+$).

Hyper-fine Group	HFC number	$F' \rightarrow F$	$F'_1 \rightarrow F_1$	Frequency (kHz)	Relative Intensities ^a	Velocity km s ⁻¹	HFC number	$F' \rightarrow F$	$F'_1 \rightarrow F_1$	Frequency (kHz)	Relative Intensities ^a	Velocity km s ⁻¹
NH_3 ($1_1^- - 1_1^+$)							NH_3 ($2_2^- - 2_2^+$)					
osg.1	1	1/2, 1/2	(0,1)	-1568.49	1/27	-19.84	1	3/2, 3/2	(1,2)	-2099.03	1/300	-26.53
	2	1/2, 3/2	(0,1)	-1526.96	2/27	-19.32	2	3/2, 5/2	(1,2)	-2058.26	3/100	-26.01
							3	1/2, 3/2	(1,2)	-2053.46	1/60	-25.95
isg.1	3	3/2, 1/2	(2,1)	-623.31	5/108	-7.89	4	7/2, 5/2	(3,2)	-1297.08	4/135	-16.39
	4	5/2, 3/2	(2,1)	-590.34	1/12	-7.47	5	5/2, 3/2	(3,2)	-1296.10	14/675	-16.38
	5	3/2, 3/2	(2,1)	-580.92	1/108	-7.35	6	5/2, 5/2	(3,2)	-1255.33	1/675	-15.86
mg	6	1/2, 1/2	(1,1)	-36.54	1/54	-0.46	7	3/2, 1/2	(1,1)	-44.51	1/60	-0.56
	7	3/2, 1/2	(1,1)	-25.54	1/108	-0.32	8	5/2, 3/2	(2,2)	-41.81	1/108	-0.53
	8	5/2, 3/2	(2,2)	-24.39	1/60	-0.31	9	7/2, 5/2	(3,3)	-41.44	8/945	-0.52
	9	3/2, 3/2	(2,2)	-14.98	3/20	-0.19	10	5/2, 5/2	(2,2)	-1.05	7/54	-0.013
	10	1/2, 3/2	(1,1)	5.85	1/108	0.07	11	3/2, 3/2	(2,2)	-1.05	1/12	-0.013
	11	5/2, 5/2	(2,2)	10.52	7/30	0.13	12	7/2, 7/2	(3,3)	0.31	8/35	0.0039
	12	3/2, 3/2	(1,1)	16.85	5/108	0.21	13	5/2, 5/2	(3,3)	0.31	32/189	0.0039
	13	3/2, 5/2	(2,2)	19.93	1/60	0.25	14	3/2, 3/2	(1,1)	1.05	1/12	0.013
							15	1/2, 1/2	(1,1)	1.05	1/30	0.013
							16	3/2, 5/2	(2,2)	39.71	1/108	0.50
							17	5/2, 7/2	(3,3)	42.04	8/945	0.53
							18	1/2, 3/2	(1,1)	46.61	1/60	0.59
isg.2	14	1/2, 3/2	(1,2)	571.79	5/108	7.23	19	5/2, 5/2	(2,3)	1254.58	1/675	15.85
	15	3/2, 3/2	(1,2)	582.79	1/108	7.37	20	3/2, 5/2	(2,3)	1295.34	14/675	16.37
	16	3/2, 5/2	(1,2)	617.70	1/12	7.81	21	5/2, 7/2	(2,3)	1296.33	4/135	16.38
osg.2	17	1/2, 1/2	(1,0)	1534.05	1/27	19.41	22	3/2, 1/2	(2,1)	2053.46	1/60	25.95
	18	3/2, 1/2	(1,0)	1545.05	2/27	19.55	23	5/2, 3/2	(2,1)	2058.26	3/100	26.01
							24	3/2, 3/2	(2,1)	2099.03	1/300	26.53

a. The Hyperfine intensities are taken from [Kukolich \(1967\)](#); [Poynter & Kakar \(1975\)](#); [Mangum & Shirley \(2015\)](#). The sum of the relative intensities is 1.0.

Table 2. The Physical Parameters of The NH₃ Transitions.

Transition	Frequency ^a (GHz)	E_u (K)	A^b (10^{-7}s^{-1})	γ^c ($10^{-11}\text{cm}^3\text{s}^{-1}$)	n_{crit}^d (10^3cm^{-3})
$(1_1^- - 1_1^+)$	23.69449	24.35	1.86,5.58	8.3,9.5	2.0,6.7
$(2_2^- - 2_2^+)$	23.72263	65.34	0.83,6.63	11,13	0.6,6.0

a. NH₃ ($1_1^- - 1_1^+$) and ($2_2^- - 2_2^+$) inversion transition frequencies given by (Kukolich 1967).

b. Einstein A coefficients were previously measured by Osorio et al. (2009); Poynter & Kakar (1975); Mangum & Shirley (2015). The current values are from Mangum & Shirley (2015). The two values correspond to the lower and upper limits for all the HFCs, respectively.

c. Collisional coefficients γ are taken from Danby et al. (1988). For each transition, the two values correspond to that at the temperature of $T_{\text{kin}} = 10$ and 100 K, respectively.

d. Critical density of each transition, the two values correspond to the lower and upper limits among all the hyperfine groups.




Figure 1. The energy levels, hyperfine splitting, and the transitions of the NH_3 (1,1) and (2,2) levels (left and middle panels), and the locations of the hyperfine groups locations in the spectral profiles (right panels).




Figure 2. An example of $(1_1^- - 1_1^+)$ and $(2_2^- - 2_2^+)$ spectra, with HF groups are labeled on each HF group. The red solid lines represent the best-fit spectra from the method of *HF fitting*. The major equations in the two methods are also presented on the figure, including the equations used to calculate T_{rot} from the HF groups in *Intensity ratio* and the equations to produce the model spectra in *HF fitting*.




Figure 3. The T_{rot} deviation as a function of the line width ΔV . (a) two model spectra to elucidate how ΔV can alter the line profile and HF-group intensities. (b) The T_{rot} deviation as a function of ΔV in *Intensity ratio* method. The real temperature is $T_{\text{rot}} = 20$ K. The deviation curve is calculated at the two values of the optical depths.




Figure 4. The modeled spectra with a series of optical depths. The spectra are generated using the radiative transfer modeling as shown in Equation (1) to (3). The physical parameters are $T_{\text{rot}} = 20$ K, $\Delta V = 1.0 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. In each spectrum the rms noise is set to be 0.3 K.




Figure 5. (a) The correction factor C_f as a function of R_{sm} at different T_{rot} values, with the line width fixed to be $\Delta V = 1.0 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ and $\tau = 2.0$. (b) The C_f - R_{sm} function at $\Delta V = 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5$, and 3.0 km s^{-1} , with a fixed temperature of $T_{rot} = 20 \text{ K}$. (c) The relation between the (1, 1) optical depth τ_0 and R_{sm} estimated at $T_{rot} = 20 \text{ K}$ and $\tau_{11} = 2.0$. The slope of τ_0 - R_{sm} relation is almost not effected by T_{rot} .




Figure 6. The variation of a_i ($i = 1, 2$) as a function of ΔV and T_{rot} . The dots indicate the a_i values sampled from the modeled spectra. The surface in each panel represents best-fit 2D polynomial function as shown in Equation (16).




Figure 7. The flow chart showing the calculation process of the recipe. S_{mg} , S_{isg} and S_{osg} are integrated intensities of main group (mg), inner satellite group (isg) and outer satellite group (osg). C_f is a correction factor for optical depth. The coefficients h_i are constants and no longer depend on physical parameters τ_0 , T_{rot} , or ΔV .




Figure 8. Intrinsic T_{rot} error in our recipe. (a) The deviation of T_{rot} from the actual value as a function of NH_3 column density at different T_{rot} values. (b) The standard deviation of T_{rot} in the parameter space of $(T_{rot}, \Delta V)$. In calculation, the optical depth of $(1_1^- - 1_1^+)$ is adopted to be a constant of $\tau_0(1, 1) = 3.0$. The white curve denotes the line width due to the thermal motion under T_K estimated from Equation (17). The region below the curve would not exist in real condition.




Figure 9. (a) The T_{rot} -error distribution as a function of the actual T_{rot} for the current recipe. The temperature range is investigate with a step of 2.0 K. (b) Same as (a), but for lower T_{rot} range and in calculation, each hyperfine group is fitted with a Gaussian profile to measure its integrated intensity.




Figure 10. Comparison of the three procedures of deriving T_{rot} , wherein the real value is fixed at $T_{\text{rot}} = 20$ K. **(a)** The T_{rot} error distribution in 2000 times of calculations for each procedure: *Intensity ratio* (thin line), *HF fitting*, and *HFGR*. **(b)** The T_{rot} -error distribution as a function of rms noise level. At each rms value, the ΔT_{rot} distribution is also obtained from 2000 samplings. The rms range is investigated with a step of 0.2 K. **(c)** The calculation efficiency for each method as a function of the signal-to-noise ratio. The calculation time is that spent in deriving T_{rot} from one pair of $(1_1^- - 1_1^+)$ and $(2_2^- - 2_2^+)$ spectra. All the calculations are performed in one 2.3 GHz Intel Core i7 CPU.




Figure 11. The T_{rot} maps over Orion A North region calculated using three methods: (a) *HFGR*, (b) *Intensity Ratio*, and (c) *HF fitting*. The T_{rot} maps are calculated from the NH_3 ($1_1^- - 1_1^+$) and ($2_2^- - 2_2^+$) data cubes observed with GBT (Friesen et al. 2017), which have a sensitivity of $\text{rms}=0.1$ K, velocity resolution of 0.07 km s^{-1} , and spatial resolution (beam size) of $32''$.




Figure 12. (a) The statistical distribution of the T_{rot} values for the pixels over the emission region above 5σ detection limit of the NH_3 ($1_1^- - 1_1^+$) image. (b) Comparison of T_{rot} values derived from *HFGR* and the other two methods. (c) Relation between T_{rot} and NH_3 ($1_1^- - 1_1^+$) intensity for the three methods. (d) Relation between T_{rot} and ΔV for the three methods. The dashed line represents the expected NH_3 line width due to the thermal motion as a function of T_{rot} , assuming T_{rot} and T_{kin} satisfying Equation (17).