Comparison of ¹³CO Line and Far-Infrared Continuum Em ission as a D iagnostic of Dust and M olecular G as Physical Conditions: III. Systematic E ects and Scienti c Implications

W.F.Wall

Instituto Nacional de Astrof sica, Optica, y Electronica, Apdo. Postal 51 y 216, Puebla, Pue., Mexico

wwall@inaoep.mx

ABSTRACT

Far-infrared continuum data from the COBE/DIRBE instrument were combined with Nagoya 4-m¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 spectral line data to infer the multiparsec-scale physical conditions in the OrionA and B molecular clouds, using 140 m/240 m dust color temperatures and the 240 m/¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 intensity ratios. In theory, the ratio of far-IR, submillimeter, or millimeter continuum to that of a ¹³CO (or C¹⁸O) rotational line can place reliable upper limits on the temperature of the dust and molecular gas on multi-parsec scales; on such scales, both the line and continuum emission are optically thin, resulting in a continuum -to-line ratio that su ers no loss of temperature sensitivity in the high-temperature limit as occurs for ratios of CO rotational lines or ratios of continuum emission in di erent wavelength bands.

Two-component models t the Orion data best, where one has a xedtemperature and the other has a spatially varying temperature. The former represents gas and dust towards the surface of the clouds that are heated primarily by a very large-scale (i.e. 1 kpc) interstellar radiation eld. The latter represents gas and dust at greater depths into the clouds and are shielded from this interstellar radiation eld and heated by local stars. The inferred physical conditions are consistent with those determined from previously observed m aps of ¹²CO J = 1 ! 0 and J = 2 ! 1 that cover the entire O rion A and B m olecular clouds. The models require that the dust-gas temperature di erence is 0 2K. If this surprising result applies to much of the G alactic ISM, except in unusual regions such as the G alactic C enter, then there are a number in plications. These include dust-gas them all coupling that is commonly factors of 5 to 10 stronger than previously believed, G alactic-scale molecular gas temperatures closer to 20 K than to 10 K, an improved explanation for the N (H₂)/I(CO) conversion factor (a full discussion of this is deferred to a later paper), and ruling out at least one dust grain alignment mechanism. The simplest interpretation of the models suggests that about 40{50% of the O rion clouds are in the form of cold (i.e. 3-10 K) dust and gas, although alternative explanations are not ruled out. These alternatives include the contribution to the 240 m continuum by dust associated with atom ic hydrogen and reduced ¹³CO abundance towards the clouds' edges. Even considering these alternatives, it is still likely that cold material with temperatures of 7-10 K still exists. If this cold gas and dust are common in the G alaxy, then mass estimates of the G alactic ISM must be revised upwards by up to 60%.

The feasibility of submillimeter or millimeter continuum to ¹³CO line ratios constraining estimates of dust and molecular gas temperatures was tested. The model ts allowed the simulation of the necessary millimeter-continuum and ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 maps used in the test. In certain \hot spots" | that have continuum to ¹³CO ratio can estimate the dust temperature to within a factor of 2 over large ranges of physical conditions. Nevertheless, supplemental observations of the ¹³CO J = 2 ! 1 line or of shorter wavelength continuum are advisable in placing lower limits on the estimated temperature. Even without such supplemental observations, this test shows that the continuum to -line ratio places reliable upper limits on the temperature.

Subject headings: ISM : molecules and dust 0 rion

1. Introduction

W hile interesting in them selves, molecular clouds provide insights into star form ation. Since stars form in and from molecular clouds, knowing the physical conditions within these clouds is essential for a complete understanding of star formation. As mentioned in Paper I (W all 2007), the warm (i.e., $> 50{100 \text{ K}}$) molecular gas associated with star formation is often identied and diagnosed from observations of dierent rotational lines of CO (e.g., W ilson et al. 2001; Plum e et al. 2000; Howe et al. 1993; G rafet al. 1993, 1990; Boreiko and Betz 1989; Fixsen et al. 1999; Harris et al. 1985; Harrison et al. 1999;

W allet al. 1991; Gusten et al. 1993; Wild et al. 1992; Harris et al. 1991). Molecular gas, and the interstellarm edium in general, can also be observed in the millim eter, submillim eter, and far-IR continuum, which trace the emission of the dust grains associated with interstellar gas. Continuum surveys can probe the structure and excitation of the ISM (see, for example, D upac et al. 2000; W allet al. 1996; Bally et al. 1991; Zhang et al. 1989; W emer et al. 1976; Heiles et al. 2000; Reach et al. 1998; Boulanger et al. 1998; Lagache et al. 1998; Goldsmith et al. 1997; Sodroskiet al. 1994; Boulanger et al. 1990; Sellgren et al. 1990; Scoville & Good 1989; Sodroskiet al. 1989; Leisawitz & Hauser 1988). Estimating physical parameters like tem perature, and som etim es density, requires using the ratios of intensities of spectral lines or of the continuum at di erent wavelengths. Given that each of these ratios is dependent on the ratio of two P lanck functions at two di erent wavelengths, they often lose tem perature sensitivity at higher tem peratures. W hile there are m ethods of addressing this shortcom ing, having two tracers of molecular gas with di erent dependences on the tem perature would com plem ent other m ethods of tracing warm dust or m olecular gas. This is especially true if the tracers are optically thin, because low opacity em ission is more sensitive to the physical param eters of the bulk of the gas, rather than in just the surface layers.

0 ne such pair of tracers is a rotational line of an isotopologue of CO, such as that $of^{13}CO$ or C¹⁸O, and the submillimeter continuum. Both of these tracers are optically thin on the scales of m any parsecs, which are the scales of interest for the current work. Schloerb et al. (1987) and Swartz et al. (1989) showed that the intensity ratio of an optically thin isotopic CO line em ission to submillimeter continuum em ission can estimate the temperature of gas and dust in m olecular clouds. The Schloerb et al. (1987) expression for this ratio goes roughly like T^2 in the high-temperature limit. A coordingly, the I (submm)=I($C^{18}O$ J = 1 ! 0) and I (submm)=I($^{13}CO J = 1 ! 0$) ratios are actually more sensitive to temperature as that tem perature increases. This is in stark contrast to ratios of rotational lines of a given isotopologue of CO and to ratios of continuum intensities at di erent frequencies, which bse sensitivity to tem perature in the high-tem perature lim it. The I (submm)=I(^{13}CO) ratio can then serve as the needed diagnostic of high gas/dust tem peratures, provided that the shortcom ings and com plications of these tracers can be overcom e or at least m itigated. These complications include variations in the ¹³CO -to-dust mass ratio, non-molecular phases of the ISM along the line of sight, variations of gas density, variations in dust grain properties, appreciable optical depth variations in the ¹³CO line used, and others (see the Introduction of Paper I form ore details). Such complications are often reduced in the case of observations on multi-parsec scales, because spatial gradients on such scales are generally smaller than the extrem es that occur on very small scales. Consequently, testing the reliability of the I (subm m)=I(^{13}CO) ratio as high-tem perature diagnostic is best carried out with observations of a molecular cloud, or of clouds, on multi-parsec scales.

The Orion A and B molecular clouds were chosen as the clouds for testing the I (submm)=I(^{13}CO) ratio's diagnostic ability. They have been mapped in the ^{13}CO J = 1! 0 line (see, e.g., Nagaham a et al. 1998) and in the far-IR by IRAS (Bally et al. 1991) and COBE/DIRBE (Wallet al. 1996, W 96 hereafter). Avoiding the complication of the em ission of stochastically heated dust grains requires far-IR observations at wavelengths longer than 100 m (e.g. Desert et al. 1990, W 96). A coordingly, the far-IR observations of COBE/DIRBE were used instead of IRAS because the form er has two bands = 140 mand 240 m | longward of 100 m, whereas the latter does not. The Orion A and B clouds were chosen for this study because they have the advantages that they are bright in ¹³COJ=1! 0 and at far-IR wavelengths, are out of the Galactic plane to avoid confusion with foreground and background em ission, are several degrees in size so as to accommodate m any DIRBE beam s, and have the best range of dust tem peratures at the DIRBE resolution of 0:7 (see the Introduction of Paper I and COBE/DIRBE Explanatory Supplem ent 1998, for m ore details). Therefore, the I (240 m)=I(^{13}CO) ratio, hereafter called r_{240} , was plotted against the 140 m/240 m dust color tem perature, or T_{dc} , to test the r_{240} 's ability to recover m olecular cloud physical conditions. Physical models were applied to these data and physical conditions were inferred in Paper I. The reliability of the model results were tested with simulated data in Paper II (W all 2007a).

The next section summarizes the model results (i.e. Paper I) and the results of the simulations (i.e. Paper II). Section 3 then discusses general systematic e ects that had not been treated previously. Section 4 gives the scientic implications of the results.

2. Review of the Results of the M odelling and of the Sim ulations

The details of the treatment of the data and of the modeling and its results are found in Paper I.A fter a subtraction of large-scale emission from the Orion 140 m and 240 m maps representing foreground/background emission not associated with the Orion clouds (such subtraction was not necessary and, therefore, not applied to the ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 m ap), one-component and two-component model curves were tted to the observational data in the r_{240} versus T_{dc} plot. There were two types of one-component models: LTE and LVG (a type of non-LTE model). There were also two types of two-component models (both types being using the LVG code): simple two-component models and two-subsample, two-component models. These models all adopted some form of the following assumption:

The only physical parameters that change from one line of sight to the next are the dust tem – perature, T_d , and the gas kinetic tem perature, T_κ , while maintaining a constant di erence, $T_d = T_\kappa$. O ther physical parameters such as gas density, dust-to-gas mass ratio, dust

mass absorption one cient, etcetera are assumed to be constant from position to position.

This is referred to as the basic assumption. In the case of the one-component, LTE models, this means that the only tted parameter was T, while the T $_{\rm d}$ and T $_{\rm x}$ freely varied from position to position. For the one-component, LVG models, the tted parameters were T, the ${}^{13}CO$ column density per velocity interval, N (${}^{13}CO$) = v, and the molecular hydrogen density, n(H₂), while the T_d and T_{*} freely varied from position to position. Put very explicitly, the basic assumption applied to the one-component, LVG models means that the T, N (^{13}CO) = v, and n (H ₂) were assumed to be spatially unchanging and therefore are the param eters to be determ ined from the model ts. For the simple two-component models, there was a component 0, representing dust and gas in the surface of the clouds and largely heated by a large-scale interstellar radiation eld (ISRF), and a component 1, representing dust and gas deeper into the clouds heated by local stars and a large-scale ISRF attenuated by the surface layers of gas and dust. The physical parameters of component 0 were spatially unchanging and the physical param eters of component 1 were also spatially unchanging, except for T $_{\rm d}$ and T $_{\rm \kappa}$. The component-0 parameters were the dust temperature, T $_{\rm d0}$, the column density per velocity interval, $\frac{N_{c0}(^{13}CO)}{v_c}$, the density, n_{c0} , and the lling factor relative to com – ponent 1, c_0 . The component-1 parameters were $\frac{N_{c1}(^{l_3}CO)}{v_c}$ and n_{c1} . (The component-1 dust tem perature, T_{d1} , varied so as to generate a curve in the r_{d0} versus T_{dc} plot. Component 0, for example, would only generate a single point in this plot if there were no component 1 contributing to the model output.) One more parameter derived from the model t was the T, which was assumed to be the same for both components. The two-subsample, twocom ponent m odels were sim ilar to the sim ple two-com ponent m odels, except that the m odels were tted to two separate subsamples within the sample of data points: the points with $T_{dc} < 20$ K and those with $T_{dc} = 20$ K. Having two subsamples allowed a better t to the 20 K points; the ts are normally dominated by the T $_{\rm dc}$ < 20 K subsample of points, Tdc often preventing good ts to the T_{dc} 20K points. The resultant param eter values for all the model ts are sum marized in Table 1. (Notice that the two-component model results for the T_{dc} 20K subsample are shown for the two-subsample, two-component models, whereas in Table 2 of Paper I the one-component model results were shown for this subsample.)

To check the results, the system atics were tested. This was done by applying scale factors to the model curves that represented the elect of system atic uncertainties. These were the uncertainties most directly related to the comparison between the model curves and the observational data: the calibration of the observed I (240 m)=I(^{13}CO) ratio, the uncertainty in the dipole moment of CO, the uncertainty in the ^{13}CO abundance, and the uncertainty in the dust optical depth to total gas column density. A very rough uncertainty of 20% was adopted for each of these uncertainties (see Paper I for details). These uncertainties are independent and, when added in quadrature, give a total system atic uncertainty of 40%

for the ratio of the model curve to the observed data. Therefore, the scale factors applied to the model curves ranged between 0.6 and 1.4. They were chosen to change in steps of 0.2; the scale factors used were 0.6, 0.8, 1.0, 1.2, and 1.4. Each scale factor was multiplied by the model curve before each t for all the model types. This gave a range of tted values for each parameter and this range represents the system atic uncertainty for the given parameter.

For the two-component models an additional test was to slightly shift the starting search grid before running each t. This also gave a range of results that was comparable to the range found from changing the scale factor.

As a further check on the results, masses and beam lling factors were derived for each of the model types. Speci cally, the gas-derived column densities were compared against the dust-derived column densities as a self-consistency check: if the model curve acceptably t the data in the r_{240} versus T_{dc} plot, then there should be little scatter in the column density versus column density plot. As an additional check, the beam lling factors should be physically meaningful; they should be 1, given that they are area lling factors.

One aw of the above-mentioned tests is that they cannot guarantee that the true values are within the ranges of results found from changing the scale factor or the starting grid. The method employed here could be biased to ranges of results that are far from the correct values. Consequently, a third series of tests was performed by tting the one- and two-component models to simulated data (see Paper II). The results of the modeling and the tests are listed in Table 2 of Paper II. (See Table 2 of the current paper for an updated version of that table.)

The most basic result of this modeling was that the two-component models t the data better than the one-component models at the 99.9% condence level, according to the F-test. The dust-gas temperature di erence, T, was found to be zero to within 1 or 2K. The component-0 dust temperature, T_{d0} , was found to be 18K (uncertainty to be discussed in Section 3). The other parameters, such as the column densities per velocity interval and volume densities for the two components, were much less certain. This is understandable given that the ¹³CO J = 1 ! O line emission is well approximated by the optically thin, LTE limit form uch of the gas of the O rion clouds. Consequently, only rough lower limits could be applied to the densities and rough upper limits to the column densities per velocity interval. The lower limit on the column density per velocity interval of component 1 is simply the column density per velocity interval of the DIRBE beam. This lower limit for component 0 is near the lower limit of the master search grid.

O ne important consequence of the two-component models is that there is about 60% more mass than would be inferred from the simpler one-component models. This extra

material is in the form of cold (i.e. $3\{10 \text{ K}\}$) dust and gas.

3. Considerations of System atics

In this section we consider the system atics that are less directly connected with the comparison between models and data. Speci cally, we exam ine the elects of changing various assumptions, including the basic assumption itself, on the results; we see how the results change if we neglect to subtract the background/foreground emission from the data, the elects of the emission of the dust associated with the H I gas, the elects for dilerent values of the spectral emissivity index, the elects of a spatially varying ¹³CO abundance, the elects of varying the column density per velocity interval or density, and how the signal-to-noise litering has a lected the results.

3.1. The E ects of N o Background/Foreground Subtraction

As stated in Section 2.1 of Paper I, there are uncertainties in the subtraction of the large-scale emission (i.e., on the scale of the entire map shown in Figure 2 of Paper I). This large-scale emission was subtracted from the 140 m, 240 m, and H I m aps. Even though this uncertainty was estimated to be 10%, it is still a good idea to see how this subtraction a ects the model results. This was done by repeating the model in the LTE and LVG, one-component cases and in the LVG, two-component case (entire subsample) for the data without the background/foreground subtraction. The results were roughly similar to scaling up the data or, equivalently, scaling down the model curve. As such, the model results in the tested cases were roughly equivalent to those obtained for data that did indeed have the subtraction of the large-scale emission with a scale factor of about 0.9 applied to the model curve. Consequently, the system atic uncertainty in the observed data is much smaller than that of the total adopted calibration uncertainty of 40%. This therefore in plies that any reasonable estim ate of the uncertainty in determ ining the appropriate level of the large-scale emission to be subtracted will have an even smaller e ect on the model results (equivalent to adjusting the scale factor by a few percent).

3.2. The E ects of Dust A ssociated with H I

Even though the H I has only small column densities on all lines of sight in the O rion elds (i.e. the average N (H I) is 5 10^{20} cm² for those positions greater than 5- in

I (140 m), I (240 m), and I(¹³CO)), the dust associated with the H I may still have a non-negligible e ect on the model results. To test this, the 140 m/240 m color temperature of the dust was plotted against the atom ic gas to molecular gas column density ratio, N (H I)=2N (H₂). Figure 1 shows that the dust color tem perature tends to about 21K as the atom ic to molecular gas ratio increases. The correlation between the color temperature and the atom ic-to-m olecular gas ratio has a con dence level of better than 99.99% according to the Spearm an rank-order correlation test. (M ore speci cally, the signi cance of the null hypothesis of zero correlation is less than 10 24 .) The curves represent the hypothetical case of having all the dust in the molecular gas at one xed tem perature and all the dust in the atom ic gas at som e other xed tem perature. The lower curve assum es that the dust associated with the molecular gas has a tem perature of 16.5K, while the upper curve assumes a dust tem perature of 27K for the molecular-gas-associated dust. Both curves assume that the atom ic-gas associated dust has a tem perature of 22.5K. Both curves together crudely describe the trends in the data. Consequently, both curves together in ply that each line of sight either has molecular gas with cold dust, with $T_d = 16.5 K$, or with warm er dust, with $T_d = 27 K$, along with atom ic gas that has dust with a constant tem perature of 22.5 K for every line of sight. The variations in dust color tem perature would then be largely due to the variation in the atom ic-to-m olecular gas ratio (along with som e scatter). This contradicts the picture represented by the models applied to the r_{240} versus T_{dc} plot. In that picture, the dust in the molecular gas does indeed vary in temperature from one line of sight to another, at least for the dom inant component (i.e., component 1).

To resolve this discrepancy, the simulated m aps discussed previously were m odi ed by adding a layer of H I and its associated dust with uniform properties throughout: a constant column density of 5 10^{20} H atom s cm² and a constant dust temperature of 22.5 K. Noise was added to the H I column density map that was the same as the value for the observed H I map. The 140 m and 240 m intensities for this H I layer were computed and added to the original noise free m aps. The noise for the new continuum m aps, that include the H I layer's dust em ission, was then recomputed from the prescription used previously (i.e., expressions 1 and 2 of Paper II). The results are plotted in Figure 2 in the form of 140 m/240 m color tem perature versus atom ic-to-m olecular gas ratio, analogous to Figure 1. The simulated data does indeed reproduce the overall shape of the observed data, despite the lack of scatter in the form er com pared to the latter. This scatter in the simulated data can be increased realistically by including variations in the H I column density map and in its dust temperature. Nevertheless, it is clear that having only two possible constant dust tem peratures in the dust associated with the molecular gas is not necessary for explaining the trends in Figure 1. Figure 2 shows the same overall trends even though it uses model results that allow a changing dust tem perature in the molecular gas.

The question remains as to the size of the change in the model results because of this H I layer and its dust. This question has already been answered indirectly in the previous subsection, the subsection that dealt with the e ects of no subtraction of the background/foreground (i.e., large-scale) em ission. Such a subtraction was necessary for the continuum maps (i.e., maps of dust emission) and for the HImap (i.e., map of atom ic gas em ission), but not for the ¹³CO m ap. Therefore, the dust em ission on the large scale is associated alm ost completely with the H I gas and not with the molecular gas. A coordingly, not subtracting the large-scale em ission from the continuum maps is equivalent to piling on the atom ic gas and its associated dust. In fact, it is equivalent to increasing the quantity of the H I-associated dust by factors of 4 to 5 over that in the background/foreground-subtracted maps. And yet, as described previously, the e ect of this extra dust (not associated with m olecular gas) was to change the results of the models (that only considered the dust associated with molecular gas) in a way consistent with changing the scale factor by only about 10%. Therefore, the sm all am ount of H I gas and its associated dust that rem ains in the background/foreground-subtracted maps will have an even smaller e ect on the model results | equivalent to changing the scale factor by about 2 to 2.5%. It follows that the changes to the model results will be equivalent to only a tiny fraction of the full range of values for each parameter that is seen in such gures as Figure 21 of Paper I or in Table 2. (Or in the case where there are only lower limits, such as those for the densities listed in Table 2, those lower lim its would be essentially unchanged.)

3.2.1. The H I-A ssociated D ust and the Lower Tem perature L im it of the C old D ust and G as $$\rm G\,as$$

O ne in portant point that rem ains is whether the dust associated with the H I is responsible for the model result that there is cold dust and gas at temperatures as low as 3K. If so, then this result is incorrect. As discussed before, the H I-associated dust has little overall e ect on the majority of the plotted points. However, this does not mean that the e ect of this dust is negligible in every sub-grouping of points. Speci cally, the vertical section of the model curve in the r_{240} versus T_{dc} plot (see F igures 20 and 24 of P aper I) that represents this very cold material is located between r_{240} ' 25 and about 50M Jy sr¹ (K km⁻¹)s⁻¹ for T_{dc} ' 18K. If the r_{240} values were lower in this part of the plot, then no point would correspond to this \cold!" section of the model curve. And the r_{240} values would indeed be lower if the e ect of this H I-associated dust were removed, thereby allowing a higher lower limit on the gas and dust temperature of component 1 | i.e., lower limits on T_{k-1} and T_{d1} higher than 3K. Figure 3 shows plots of r_{240} versus the H I fraction (i.e. N (H I)/[N (H I)+2N (H₂)]) for the positions with T_{dc} between 17 and 19.5K and with signal-to-noise ratios greater than

or equal to 5 at 140 m, 240 m, in the ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 line, and greater than or equal to 3 in the H I 21-cm line. These plots show a clear correlation (better than 99% con dence from the Spearm an rank-order correlation test), suggesting that the higher r_{240} values are indeed due to dust associated with the atom ic hydrogen. The question is how strongly the H I-associated dust is contributing to the total 240 m em ission. This allows us to correct for the em ission of this dust, thereby e ectively giving us only the continuum em ission and line em ission from the molecular gas alone.

Estimating the appropriate correction to r_{240} for the H I associated dust is far from straightforward. One way is to make the crude assumption that the dust-emissivity per H-nucleon of the H I-associated dust, ____, and for the H₂-associated dust, ____, are each constant for all the positions in the subsample of points to be tested. This subsample is part of the sample used throughout this paper | signal-to-noise greater than or equal to 5 for I (140 m), I (240 m), and I(¹³CO) | with the additional criteria mentioned above:

- a) Integrated intensity of the H I line greater than or equal to 3 $\,$.
- b) T_{dc} between 17 and 19.5K.
- c) $r_{_{\!\!240}}$ between 25 and 50 M Jy $\,$ sr $^{\!\!1}$ (K $\,$ km 1)s $^{\!\!1}$.

The 240 m specic intensity, I (240 m), can be represented as

$$I (240 \text{ m}) = \prod_{H_1} N (H I) + 2 \prod_{H_2} N (H_2)$$
 (1)

Simple linear regression in three dimensions can be used to solve for the emissivities, $_{\rm HI}$ and $_{\rm H2}$, where we tan equation of the form

$$z = ax + by ; (2)$$

solving for the optim al values of the coe cients a and b. Since norm al linear regression only uses the uncertainties in the z values, the t should be repeated after interchanging the z values with the x values (and thereby using the x-uncertainties) and then again after interchanging the original z values with the y values (and thereby using the y-uncertainties). This gives us three ts. For the rst t, the I (240 m) are the z and the uncertainties in I (240 m) are used in the tting, N (H I) is x, and 2N (H₂) is y. The coe cients a and b then directly correspond to $_{HI}$ and $_{H2}$, respectively. The second t has N (H I) as z, the uncertainties in N (H I) are used in the tting, I (240 m) is x, and 2N (H₂) is still y. After solving for the optimum a and b values, expression (2) is rearranged to the form of (1) in order to solve for $_{HI}$ and $_{H2}$ in term sofa and b. The third t is sim ilar to the second t, but with 2N (H₂) as z, N (H I) as x, and I (240 m) as y. Again, with the resultant a and b values,

the expression (2) is rearranged to the form of (1) and $_{HI}$ and $_{H2}$ are found. (A nother way to include the errors from all three quantities is to use the orthogonal regression m ethod described at the beginning of Section 3 of Paper I.) In principle, the three di erent values determ ined for each of the em issivilies can be used as a measure of their uncertainties.

In practice, none of the tswere very good. The tswere applied using the molecular gas column densities (i.e., N (H₂)) derived from the one-component, non-LTE models and those using those column densities derived from the two-component, two-subsample, non-LTE models. Typical reduced chi-square values were from 30 to 200, although one was as low as 2 ' 6. None of the tsusing the two-component model column densities had reduced chi-square values less than 80. The poor quality of the ts re exts the invalidity of the assumption of spatially constant emissivities. If we nonetheless use the one twith the least unacceptable 2 value of about 6, then $_{\rm H\,2}$ \prime 5 $_{\rm H\,I}$. Given that the maximum atom ic gas fraction is about 0.3 (see Figure 3), the H I-associated dust contributes less than about 7% to the total 240 m emission. If we tighten criterion c) above to r_{240} between 40 and km 1)s 1 to see how the results are changed, and if we ignore the ts $50 \text{ MJy} \text{ sr}^1$ **(**K with 2 10 or with a negative value of either , then we nd that $_{12}$ ' 9 $_{11}$. The least unacceptable ts suggest that the H I associated dust makes a contribution of about 3 to 7% to the 240 m em ission. This result is similar, at least qualitatively, to the result found previously that the H I-associated dust em ission has a negligible e ect on whole sample of high signal-to-noise points.

G iven that no t was acceptable, at least a sim plistic correction should be applied to see what changes to the lower lim it of the dust and gas tem perature of com ponent 1 are possible. The sin plest kind of correction is to assume that the emissivities per H-nucleon are equal for the H I-associated dust and the H_2 -associated dust, a much more extrem e correction than the ts to equation (1) would suggest. A coordingly, the observed I (240 m) values, and therefore the r_{240} ratio values, must be scaled by 2N (H₂)/[N (H I)+2N (H₂)]. These correction factors were applied, using the one-component values for the molecular gas column densities. This is obviously not consistent with the two-component model results that predict the cold gas and dust. However, assuming correction factors from the one-component model column densities results in m ore extrem e (i.e. further from unity) values of the correction factors that perm it a greater appreciation of the tight constraint on the lower temperature lim it. These correction factors were applied to the whole sam ple of high signal-to-noise positions speci cally, all the points with I (140 m), I (240 m), and $I(^{13}CO)$ greater than 5 . Since the H I data were used, criterion a) reduced the sample to 609 points. The uncertainties in the correction factors were not propagated to the error bars in the $r_{\!_{240}}$ values in the sample. The larger error bars in the r_{240} ratios would have produced an ambiguity in the interpretation of the results: was the change in the lower tem perature lim it of component 1

really due to the correction for the H I-associated dust or was this simply due to the larger error bars? The results of thing the two-component models to the corrected data should not be taken literally in any case and only point to the potential elects of correcting for the unwanted continuum emission. We are testing the hypothetical case of observing in aginary molecular clouds absolutely free of atom ic hydrogen and its associated dust.

The results of thing a simple two-component model to the H I-corrected data are consistent with the previous two-component model results in Section 3.3 of Paper I. In particular, the results of these corrected models are within the range of values depicted in Figure 21 of Paper I (ignoring the c_o versus scale factor and the $\frac{N_{c0}}{v_c}$ versus scale factor plots in favor of the $c_0 \frac{N_{c0}}{v_c}$ product versus scale factor plot), except that the density n_{c0} is as small as 10 cm 3 . One noteworthy di erence is that 2 is higher for the two-component model tted to the corrected data, $^2 = 6:41$, than for the model tted to the uncorrected data, 2 = 5:69. If we now increase the lower tem perature lim it of component 1 from 2.8K to 5K and search for the optimum parameter values again, then 2 increases to 7.54. Speci cally, we set the lower limits of T_{κ_1} to 5K and of T to 0K, resulting in both T_{κ_1} and T_{d1} 5K. Again keeping in m ind that the points in the sample are not completely independent, the e ective number of degrees of freedom is about 60. A dopting this number, the F-test tells us that raising the lower lim it of component-1 temperature to 5K can only be rejected at a con dence level of nearly 75%. Such a con dence level does not inspire much con dence, and we should probably accept the t. Consequently, it is possible that gas and dust with tem peratures between 3 and 5K are not necessary for explaining the observations. If this is the case, then the correction factor of 1.6 to the one-component masses would have to be corrected downward.

In general, it seems that the H I-associated dust cannot provide an alternative explanation for the cold dust and gas (i.e. tem perature between 3 and 10 K). Nonetheless, there is a possibility that the lower lim it of the component-1 tem perature is about 5 K instead of 3 K. Then the estim ated fraction of the total gas m ass in the cold portion would be less than the original estim ate of about 40-50%.

W arin et al. (1996) exam ined the photodissocation and rotational excitation of CO and its isotopologues in di use, translucent, and dense dark clouds. They found that the ${}^{13}CO = {}^{12}CO$ abundance ratio (i.e. X (${}^{13}CO$)/X (${}^{12}CO$)) can vary by factors of 2 or 3 as a function of depth into the cloud (see the left-m ost panel of their F igure 16). G iven that T_d varies with N (H I+ 2H₂) in the O rion clouds (e.g., see F ig 4 of P aper II), is it then possible that the

observed variation of r_{240} with T_d is because X (¹³CO) is varying with N (H I+ 2H₂)? Exam ining the I(¹³CO)/I(¹²CO) as a function of N (H I+ 2H₂) (an approximation of their F igure 16) shows no consistent trend and is at odds with the results of W arin et al. (1996). Therefore, it is very unlikely that variations of X (¹³CO)/X (¹²CO) could account for the overall trends seen in r_{240} versus T_d .

Nevertheless, variations in X (^{13}CO)/X (^{12}CO) could still explain unusually smallor large r_{240} values for some points in the r_{240} versus T_d plots. In particular, the points near the top of the triangular cluster could be explained by a lower X (^{13}CO). This is discussed in detail in Section 4.5.

3.4. M odels with 62:0

Johnstone & Bally (1999) nd that the dust emissivity index, , m ight have a range as extrem e as from 1.5 to 2.5 in O rion A. Two-component models using adopted values of 1.5 and 2.5 for were applied to the data to see the elects on the results. The resultant parameter values were consistent with the ranges of values listed in Table 2, with one exception: the range of T_{d0} values is changed because is dilerent from before | all the inferred dust temperatures are changed. For = 1.5, T_{d0} = 21K was found and, for = 2.5, T_{d0} = 16K was the best t.

In short, with the exception noted above, the resultant parameter values are still within the range of values expected from the scale factor variations. Thus the most extrem e variations of still largely give model results within the ranges listed in Table 2.

3.5. M odels with Varying N (^{13}CO) = v or Varying n (H $_2$)

These were essentially one-component models with only three parameters on any one given line of sight: T, N (13 CO)= v and n (H₂). The approach here was to vary not only the T_d and T_K from one line of sight to another (keeping T constant), but also to vary one of two parameters: the column density per velocity interval (N (13 CO)= v) or the density (n (H₂)). To characterize all the lines of sight represented in the r₂₄₀ versus T_d plot, there were 9 parameters in total for a curve that was strongly decreasing through the triangular cluster of points at low T_d, gently rising for the intermediate T_d, and then strongly rising for high T_d. Thus there were 3 intervals of T_d that were delimited with 4 parameters: T₁, T₂, T₃, and T₄. If we consider rst only the models with varying N (13 CO)= v, then on the rst interval, [T₁;T₂], the N (13 CO)= v was equal to N₁ at T₁ and to N₂ at T₂ and the N (13 CO)= v value

at any point in this interval was determined by logarithm ically interpolating between N₁ and N₂. The same approach was used on the last interval, $[T_3;T_4]$, with N (¹³CO) = v values equal to N₂ at T₃ and to N₃ at T₄. On the interval $[T_2;T_3]$, N (¹³CO) = v was held constant at a value of N₂. The tted parameters were then T, T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄, N₁, N₂, N₃, and the xed density, n (with best-tvalues of 0 1K, 16 1K, 17 1K, 24 1K, 27 1K, (5 $\frac{3}{2}$) 10^{16} ¹³CO m olecules cm² (km $\frac{1}{5}$) $\frac{1}{2}$, $(2 \frac{1}{2})$ 10^{14} ¹³CO m olecules cm² (km $\frac{1}{5}$) $\frac{1}{2}$, and $(3 \frac{2}{1})$ 10^{3} H₂m olecules cm³, respectively). A chieving a reasonable-looking \best" t presented a number of problem s:

- 1. The tting is heavily biased towards the low $-T_d$ points (i.e., $T_d < 21$ K). The points with $T_d > 22$ K are almost excluded in the model ts.
- 2. Even within the low $-T_d$ points, the ts tend to bypass the central area of the large triangular cluster of points.
- 3. There is a very large hum p in the model curve for T_d around 22K that overestim ates the data points by more than an order of magnitude.
- 4. The best t for N₂ is more than order of magnitude lower than the observed large-scale N (^{13}CO) = v value (see Section 3.2 of Paper I).
- 5. In order to x the bias towards the low -T_d points and rem ove the hum p, it was necessary to apply weights to the data to reduce or rem ove this bias. This resulted in a chi-square value that was somewhat subjective, given that the choice of weights was somewhat subjective.

The models with varying n(H₂) had similar, though not identical, problem s. For these models, the N (¹³CO) = v parameters interchange with the n(H₂) parameters: T, T₁, T₂, T₃, T₄, n₁, n₂, n₃, and the xed column density per velocity interval, N (with best-t values of 2 1K, 14 1K, 18 1K, 22 1K, 30 1K, 10 $\frac{8}{2}$ H₂m olecules cm³, (5:6 $\frac{4:4}{2:5}$ 10⁴ H₂m olecules cm³, 10 $\frac{8}{2}$ H₂m olecules cm³, and (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) 10^{15 13}CO m olecules cm² (km 1 s) ¹, respectively). As with the models mentioned in the previous paragraph, these models have biases that inhibit good ts through the T_d > 22K points or through the central part of the triangular cluster. However, the problem s for n (H₂)-varying models di er in three ways from those of the N (13 CO) = v-varying models:

The hum p for the N $\binom{1}{3}$ CO) = v-varying m odels centered at about T _d = 22K is m uch sm aller for the n (H₂)-varying m odels. This hum p for the latter m odels only overestimates the data by about a factor of 2.

The best-tN $\frac{1}{3}$ CO) = v value is still low, but is now within a factor of 2 of the lower lim it in posed by the large-scale observed N (¹³CO) = v value.

The best way to reduce the bias towards the low $-T_d$ points was to x the T_1 , T_2 , T_3 , and T_4 values. The choice of these values and their uncertainties was somewhat subjective.

The best-tting model curve gave a reduced chi-square of 92.

W hile the best of these models is much better than the one-component models that used the basic assumption (i.e., $^2 = 16.5$ and 16.9), it is still much worse than the two-component models (i.e., $^2 = 5.7$ and 5.3). In addition, the models with varying n (H₂) (or varying N (^{13}CO) = v) require subjective judgement in determining the values to x for some of the parameters (or in adjusting the weights of di erent subsamples of data points). And despite having fewer parameters (9 as opposed to 15) than the two-component, two-subsample models | them ost elaborate of them odels that obey the basic assumption (within each subsample at least) | them odels with varying n (H₂) or varying N (^{13}CO) = v are actually more complicated than these two-component models. They are more complicated because these models essentially divide up the sample of data points into three subsamples instead of two, and two of these subsamples (in intervals [T_1 ; T_2] and [T_3 ; T_4]) allow n (H₂) (or N (^{13}CO) = v) to vary in addition to T_d (along with T_k so as to keep T constant). In contrast, the two-component, two-subsample models have only T_d varying (along with T_k so as to keep T constant) within each subsample | the basic assumption is obeyed in each subsample.

In short, relaxing the basic assumption by using models with simple system atic variations of either N (^{13}CO) = v or of n (H $_2$) results in poorer, and more subjective, ts than the best models following this assumption.

3.6. Signal-to-Noise Considerations

Given that the sample of points modeled in the r_{240} versus T_{dc} plots represents only 25.8% of the O rion Fields, how well does this sample represent the physical conditions in the O rion clouds as a whole? A related question is what fraction of the positions that have gas/dust emission from the O rion clouds is represented by the sample? The contour maps in Figure 2 of Paper I suggest that roughly three-quarters of the O rion Fields have gas and dust. Some low-level emission could come from elsewhere along the line of sight, so maybe only half of the O rion Fields are occupied by the O rion clouds. How ever, even in this extrem e possibility, the modeled positions still only represent about 50% of the O rion clouds' area conditions depend on the signal-to-noise threshold used in sample selection must be tested.

The most straightforward test, namely lowering the signal-to-noise threshold until most of the O rion Fields are represented, is not practical. There would be 2 to 4 times the number of points to t and the majority of these would have huge error bars. Consequently, this sample of points would be dicult to model reliably. The alternative test is to raise the signal-to-noise threshold and see how the inferred physical conditions change with this threshold. This has the disadvantage of going from a minority of the points to an even smaller minority. Nonetheless, this alternative has the very strong advantage that only very high signal-to-noise points are modeled, thereby yielding more reliable t parameters.

To do this alternative test, the threshold was increased appreciably: from 5 to 20 in I (140 m), I (240 m), I(¹³CO). This sam ple has only 6.6% of the O rion Field positions. An LVG, two-component model was tted to this sam ple. The resultant parameter values were consistent with those specie ed in Table 2, with one notable exception: T_{d0} was 17K instead of the usual 18K. This change in the component-0 dust temperature is not surprising. The signal-to-noise ratio is proportional to the surface brightness, and this depends mostly on the gas/dust column density. So signal-to-noise ratio is roughly equivalent to depth into the clouds. Increasing this ratio's threshold is alm ost like litering out the cloud edges and looking more deeply into the clouds. The T_{d0} is the roughly constant temperature on the scale of the 0 rion clouds of some dust component. If this dust component is on the surfaces of the clouds, then it is the temperature of the dust heated primarily by the general ISRF. If this dust component is just below the clouds' surfaces, then this is the temperature of the dust heated primarily by an ISRF shielded by the surface layers of gas and dust, resulting in a lower temperature. Then by extrapolation, modeling of all the positions in the 0 rion Fields (if there were su cient signal-to-noise) could yield T do ' 19K.

A coordingly, modeling the full spread of points in the r_{240} versus T_{dc} plot probably requires a spread in the physical parameter values that have been held constant. For example, the horizontal spread of the triangular cluster in an r_{240} versus T_{dc} plot (e.g., see Figure 20 of Paper I) probably means a component-0 dust temperature varying between about 16 and 19K. (As such, an updated version of Table 2 of Paper II becomes Table 2 of the current paper, which includes this estimate of the range of T_{d0} values.) A nalogously, other parameter values, such as the densities and column densities per velocity interval, must also vary to \setminus II" the space occupied by the sample of points, as suggested in Section 3.5 of Paper I. Nonetheless, the current modeling e ort is a su cient rst approximation.

The most important result of varying the signal-to-noise ratio is that the sample with only 25.8% of the O rion Field positions may indeed represent the bulk of the O rion clouds. There was no appreciable change (except a slight change in T_{d0}) in going from the factor of 4 from 6.6% of the elds to 25.8%. Therefore, extrapolating the extra factor of 4 to

100% may also yield no appreciable change. This is far from certain, of course, because the extrapolation from 25.8% to 100% could cross some depth threshold that appreciably alters the parameter values. On the other hand, the elective spatial resolution of these observations is 8 pc at the distance of the O rion clouds. A veraging over such large size scales may reduce the elects of varying the sample.

In short, varying the signal-to-ratio used in selecting the sample may have little e ect on the derived gas/dust physical conditions.

4. Scienti c Im plications and D iscussion

The astronom ical implications of the results are numerous and include modi cations to models of dust/gas therm all coupling, to estimates of mass and kinetic temperature of molecular gas on galactic scales, and to our understanding of the X-factor to name a few. These issues and others will be discussed in the following sections (or in subsequent papers as for the X-factor), after discussing the appropriateness of using the LVG models.

4.1. Use of the LVG Code

Som e literature suggests that the LVG m odels can give inconsistent results and that photodissociation region (PDR) m odels rem ove the inconsistencies (e.g., M ao et al. 2000). The PDR m odels represent a nearly complete explanation for the emission strength of m olecular lines, whereas the LVG m odels m erely relate the m olecular line strength to simple physical param eters in a simpli ed case. C onsequently, the PDR m odels should yield m ore reliable estimates of physical param eters like temperature and density than those of the LVG m odels. However, som e papers that use CO line ratios to claim that the LVG m odel results are unsatisfactory compared with those of PDR m odels offen su er from awed and inconsistent argum ents.

M ao et al. (2000), for example, m odel the physical conditions in the central 500 pc of the galaxy M 82. They claim that their CO data yield physically unreasonable results when using the LVG m odels | results that supposedly become more reasonable when using PDR m odels. The problem s with this claim is sum marized below. They state, am ong other things, that the LVG m odels im ply gas densities that are too low, cloud sizes that are too large, and area lling factors that are inconsistent with volume lling factors. Their rst claim of low gas densities is connected with their restriction of the X (^{13}CO)=(dv=dr) value. They use the observed large-scale velocity width of the lines compared with the size of

the observed region to x the num erical value of X $(^{13}CO) = (dv=dr)$ within a narrow range. However, the large-scale (i.e., on the scale of the beam) $X (^{13}CO) = (dv=dr)$ has little to do with this parameter value within the individual clum ps responsible form uch of the observed em ission. If their approach were also applied to the volum e density, then it would have been equivalent to dividing the mass of gas within the beam by the volum e of this gas to estimate and x the gas density, which is well known to be only a rough lower lim it to the density within the clumps. They did not make this mistake, but did make the equivalent mistake for the X $(^{13}CO) = (dv=dr)$ value. Had they allowed X $(^{13}CO) = (dv=dr)$ to vary over a wider range, they would have satis ed the density constraints suggested by the other observations they mentioned. Their second claim of overly large cloud sizes in plied by the LVG model results was based on two di erent m ethods. Both m ethods, however, overestim ated the cloud sizes by the ratio of the observed line velocity width to the cloud velocity width, which is about an order of magnitude. One method was dividing the column density of a single cloud by its volume density, where both the column density and volume density were LVG results. The second method estimated volume and area lling factors from LVG results, their ratio giving the size of a single cloud. Both m ethods were applied incorrectly. The rst m ethod converted from N (^{13}CO) = v to cloud N (H ₂) by using the entire observed line width, which also includes the rotation of the observed galaxy, instead of using an estim ate of a cloud line s^{1}). The second method su ered from the same overestimate. The width (i.e. 5-10 km cloud size depends on the ratio of the volum e to area lling factors, but the area lling factor must be for all the gas at all the velocities within the line pro le (assuming that there is never m ore than one cloud on any line of sight for all the velocities within the line pro le). However, they clearly used the ratio of the observed line strengths to those of the model, which gives the area lling factor within a narrow velocity interval and not the area lling factor over the entire line pro L. This second method must include the ratio of the cloud velocity width to the line velocity width, again reducing the estimated cloud size by an order of m agnitude. The third claim of inconsistent area and volume lling factors is weak at best, given that the relationship between the two is not a xed, straightforward expression that applies in every case. If we nonetheless accept the expression used by M ao et al. (2000), then there was indeed a minor discrepancy between the two types of lling factor for the LVG m odel results. However, what M ao et al. (2000) ignored entirely was that the corresponding discrepancy for the PDR models is much larger than that for the LVG model results. The

lling factor argum ent was applied in a clearly biased m anner. In short, all three claims are based on argum ents that are faulty or biased or both.

In addition to the problem s above, there is the strong evidence provided by W eiss et al. (2001): they used data sim ilar to those of M ao et al. (2000) and recovered the sam e physical conditions, while using only LVG models. O byiously, if W eiss et al. (2001) and M ao et al.

(2000) agree on the physical conditions, then they disagree on the necessity of the PDR models for recovering those conditions. And given that W eiss et al. (2001) recovered those conditions with only the LVG models, then the claim of M ao et al. (2000) that PDR models are necessary is clearly incorrect. Therefore, the LVG models are clearly as reliable as the PDR models when using CO lines (at least on scales of a few ormore parsecs).

C on sequently, the LVG models applied to the large-scale physical conditions in the O rion molecular clouds, as described in this paper, are also as reliable as the PDR models.

4.2. Comparison of D erived T_{κ} , n (H₂), and N (¹³CO) = v with P revious W ork

There are few papers that discuss the molecular gas physical conditions of the entire 0 rion A and B clouds, as inferred from two orm ore transitions of CO. Sakam oto et al. (1994) inferred these physical conditions using the J = 2 ! 1 and J = 1 ! 0 lines of ¹²CO. Of all the rotational lines of ¹²CO and its isotopologues, these are the least sensitive to the gas physical conditions. Nevertheless, they at least provide a rough comparison with the physical conditions obtained in the current paper that used the dust-continuum to gas-line ratio. As discussed in Paper II, the ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 em ission is dom inated by that of component 1 in all but the few points with T_d = T_K < 4K in that component. Since this is molecular gas em ission, rather than the FIR continuum, better identi es the component with which to compare single-component model results, such as those of Sakam oto et al. (1994). C onsequently, the component–1 param eters in Table 2 are compared with the Sakam oto et al. (1994) results.

The physical conditions inferred by Sakam oto et al. (1994) are consistent with those inferred in the current paper. They found the following physical conditions in the Orion molecular clouds:

- | N (¹²CO) = v between about 1 10¹⁶ and about 3 10¹⁸ ¹²CO m olecules cm², which corresponds to N (¹³CO) = v between about 2 10¹⁴ and 5 10¹⁶ ¹³CO m olecules cm²,
- $n(H_2)^3 = 10^3 \text{ cm}^3$ over m uch of the clouds' areas, except for $n(H_2)' = 2 = 10^2 \text{ cm}^3$ in the clouds' peripheries,

 T_{κ} between 10K and 40K, the latter tem perature found near the H II regions.

Sakam oto et al. (1994) chose to do their LVG analysis with diagram s of constant X (^{12}CO)=(dv=dr) instead of constant N (^{12}CO)= v. They considered only values of 1 10 ⁴

10 ⁵ (km s^{1} pc¹)¹. Given that the ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 clumps have velocand 1 ity widths and sizes consistent with dv=dr of a few km s^{1} pc¹ (see Nagaham a et al. 1998), the maximum X (^{12}CO)=(dv=dr) value should be a few 10 5 (km s $pc^{1})^{1}$, given the ¹²CO abundance mentioned in Appendix A of Paper I. Also, given that some structures have dv=dr of around 100 km s pd | even though seen with other tracers like CH₃OH (Cernicharo et al. 1999) these structures are nonetheless real the minimum $X (^{12}CO) = (dv=dr) should be around 10^{6} (km)$ sł pc^{1})¹. Nevertheless, because such structures have higher densities than those norm ally inferred from CO observations on parsec scales, the range of $(^{13}CO) = v$ values are probably still roughly those of Sakam oto et al. (1994). This range is larger than the range of $\frac{N_{cl} (l^{3}CO)}{v_{c}}$ values listed in Table 2, but includes the range listed in that table. The upper lim its of N (^{13}CO) = v for Sakam oto et al. (1994) and for Table 2 are similar to within a factor of 3, but the lower limits dier by more than an order of m agnitude. This disagreem ent is probably because Sakam oto et al. (1994) did not use the large-scale N (12CO) = v of the entire cloud as a rough lower lim it on that of the clum ps. Their densities are consistent with the lower lim it in Table 2 for component 1, except for their density for the peripheries. This density is consistent with the lower lim it we found for component 0. A coordingly, these peripheral regions may represent a low-density envelope surrounding the entire clouds and are seen in projection along the clouds' edges. The clum ps in this envelope m ay be, in fact, the component 0 of the current paper.

The comparison between the kinetic temperatures of Sakam oto et al. (1994) and those of the current paper is complicated by the high optical depths of the ¹²CO lines observed by the form er. The high optical depths in ply that the inferred densities and column densities per velocity interval are biased towards of the surfaces of clumps. This is especially true for the inferred kinetic tem peratures, because, in the optically thick case, these tem peratures are m ore directly related to the observed line radiation tem peratures than are the other physical param eters. The high optical depths then m ean that the warm er com ponent will dom inate the $^{12}\rm{CO}$ em ission in these lines. We then simplistically assume that the T $_{\rm dc}<$ 20 K subsam – ple is essentially component 0 and that the $T_{dc} = 20 \text{ K}$ subsample is component 1. (Note that this is not consistent with the choice of component used to compare the N $(^{13}CO) = v$ and n (H₂) results. If these other physical parameters had been compared with the component-0 results instead of those of component 1, then the agreem ent would still have been reasonable, given the loose restriction on the param eters.) With this approximation, the gas kinetic tem peratures as sampled by the ^{12}CO are approximately the same as the 140 m/240 m dust color tem perature, T_{dc} . Sakam oto et al. (1994) found $T_{\kappa} = 40$ K near the H II regions and 10{20K away from the H II regions. The current paper nds $T_d = T_{\kappa}$ / 25K near the H II regions and 15{20K away from those regions, a range of values less extrem e than, and inside of, that of Sakam oto et al. (1994). The range is less extrem e in the latter case because the

spatial resolution is worse by factors of 6 to 7 than those of Sakam oto et al. (1994).

In short, the physical conditions derived here basically agree with the previous results of Sakam oto et al. (1994).

4.3. Column Density Determ inations and the Two-Component M odels

As found in Paper I (and Paper Ia), the column densities derived from the ${}^{13}CO J = 1! O$ line agreed signi cantly (at a condence level better than 99.9%) better with those derived from the far-IR continuum for the two-component models than for the one-component models. An important difference between the two components is that component 0 has unvarying gas and dust temperatures from sightline to sightline, whereas component 1 has these temperatures varying spatially (while maintaining a constant dust-gas temperatures), except for those few sightlines where the component-0 and component-1 temperatures were the same. Hence, two temperatures along each sightline was necessary for recovering reliable column densities.

This result is similar to that found by Schnee et al. (2006). They compared the continuum – derived column densities with those derived from extinction for the Perseus and Ophiuchus molecular clouds. The scatter in those plots more or less matched that in a simulated cloud that assumed isothermal dust on each sightline. They concluded, therefore, that deriving reliable column densities requires assuming variations of temperature along each sightline. This supports the result of the current work that at least two temperatures are needed on each sightline for estimating reliable column densities.

$$4.4.$$
 T = 0

The result that the gas and dust tem peratures are the sam e is unexpected, both theoretically and observationally. For example, the theoretical model of PDRs applied to the O rion N ebula and its associated molecular gas (Tielens & Hollenbach 1985,a) predicts T ' 70 to + 20K for cloud depths for which the dom inant form of carbon is CO (i.e. $A_v^>$ 3m ag). This model, however, does not apply to multi-parsec scales in the O rion clouds: it uses a far-UV radiation eld strength of $G_o = 10^5$ and a density of 2:3 10^5 H nuclei cm³; both are too high for the molecular clouds on larger scales. The far-UV radiation eld on such scales is roughly G_o few (see Figure 17 and Section 4.1 of W 96) and the density could be as low as few 10^3 H₂ cm³ (see Table 1). Consequently, the \standard" PDR m odel

adopted by Mochizuki & Nakagawa (2000) | which assumes $n(H_2)$ 10³ cm³, at cloud depths for which H₂ is the dom inant form of hydrogen (i.e. N (H₂) > 10^{21} cm⁻²), and G_o = 10 is more appropriate for comparison with the work done here and yields T ' 13 to +5K. Considering the uncertainty in the T of the current work, these theoretical values are factors of about 5 to 10 too large. G iven that there are m any heating and cooling mechanisms in PDRs (see Tielens & Hollenbach 1985, for a comprehensive description) with di errent dependences on the density and on the radiation eld (as well as on other quantities), adjusting the theoretical expressions for these many mechanisms to give T near zero would only yield the desired result for an improbably narrow range of physical conditions (i.e., narrow range of G_0 and n (H_2) values). On the other hand, simply increasing the gas-dust therm alcoupling by the required factor will easily achieve the desired result. This corresponds to the gd function developed by Burke & Hollenbach (1983) and represents a cooling mechanism of the gas due to its collisions with the dust (and, of course if $_{qd} < 0$, it represents a heating mechanism of the gas due to those collisions). Therefore, increasing $_{\rm ad}$ by factors of 5 to 10 can explain the current observations.

A commonly used form of $_{\rm qd}$ is that of G oldsm ith (2001) and is given as equation (A 10) in Appendix A. Goldsmith (2001) used the Burke & Hollenbach (1983) expression and adopted certain param eter values, including a grain size that was a little too large. A loo the Burke & Hollenbach (1983) expression only assumes a single grain size, and not the range of grain sizes that exists in the ISM (see for example M athis et al. 1977; D esert et al. 1990). W hen a reasonably realistic range of grain sizes is considered, the $_{\rm ad}$ of Goldsm ith (2001) is increased by factors of 3 to 4 (see Appendix A). This is not quite the factor of 5 to 10 desired, but additional increases are easily possible when one considers grains with nonspherical shapes or with projections on their surfaces. A sm entioned in Appendix A, $_{\rm ad}$ is proportional to the ratio of the grain geom etric cross-section to the grain volum e (assuming uniform grain density). If the grains are elongated, then it would be easy to increase this ratio. (In reality it is the cross-section averaged over all viewing angles that is important here. However, even modest elongations of a factor of a few would still result in a larger average cross section than a sphere with the sam e volum e.) A Iternatively, projections on the grain surface could also increase this ratio, but, since the relevant area is the cross-section rather than the total surface area, these projections would have to be large compared to the grain size. In any event, achieving an additional factor of 2 is possible. This would m ean that simple geometric considerations could increase the commonly used form of $_{\rm ad}$ by factors of 6 to 8. Therefore, _{gd} can indeed be larger than had been previously assumed and could possibly explain the T' 0 result for the 0 rion clouds.

Observationally, T ' 0 is unexpected as well (e.g., W u & Evans 1989; M angum et al. 1999; L is et al. 2001). A s discussed in the introduction, the di erent tem perature and density

sensitivities of the dust continuum emission and gas line emission can result in incorrect inferences of the relative dust and gas temperatures at each point along the line of sight; the continuum and line emission preferentially trace di erent regions of the ISM within the same line of sight. In addition, in many cases the uncertainty in the dust temperature or in the gas tem perature, or both, is large enough that $T_d = T_{\kappa}$ cannot be ruled out. In W u & Evans (1989), for example, the uncertainties in T_d were usually 1K or 2K. The uncertainties in T_{κ} were not explicitly listed for som e sources, but would be at least about 10% due to the stated calibration uncertainty. Even though they did observe two lines of $CO \mid J = 1! 0$ and J = 2! 1 of ${}^{12}CO \mid$ they did not use their ratio to estimate T_{u} ; as shown in Figure 1 in the introduction of Paper I, this gives only a very uninteresting lower lim it on T_x. Instead, they used the peak radiation tem perature of each line, R ayleigh-Jeans corrected and corrected for the cosm ic background, to estim ate ${\rm T}_{\rm x}$. They assumed the lines to be optically thick and therm alized. However, they also implicitly assumed that the gas lls the beam at the peaks of the lines. As we have found in the current paper, this is not necessarily true, and may not be true even with the superior angular resolution of the W u & Evans (1989) observations (a factor of 30 to 60 sm aller beam). In addition, they used the 60 m and 100 m observations of IRAS. As stated before, the 60 m emission su ers the contamination of emission from stochastically heated dust grains (e.g., Desert et al. 1990, W 96). However, because the W u & Evans (1989) observations are on angular scales of 1^0 to 2^{0} , the radiation elds on such small size scales could be large enough that the 60 m em ission largely com es from grains in therm al equilibrium (i.e., the grains that would be stochastically heated in a norm al interstellar radiation eld reach therm al equilibrium in a strong radiation eld). A crude extrapolation of the trend in the data in Figure 10a of W 96 suggests that the column densities derived from 60 and 100 m data will agree with those derived from longer wavelengths for T_d ' 60 K. Since $T_d = 18$ K for the general ISRF (see W 96, Desert et al. 1990), and given that the ISRF is proportional to T_d^{+4} , then radiation elds of at least G $_{\circ}$ few 10^2 ensure that the 60 m em ission originates largely from grains in therm alequilibrium. One of the sources observed by W u & Evans (1989), B 35, has a radiation eld of G_o ' 30 (W ol re et al. 1989, and references therein), roughly an order of magnitude too low to exclude the likelihood of stochastically heated grains contributing to the 60 m emission. Therefore, for the source B 35, and probably a few others in their list, the derived dust tem perature overestim ates the dust tem perature of the large therm al equilibrium grains. In short, their estimates of T_{κ} are lower limits and their T_{d} values are likely to be overestimates (especially in the case of B 35). A coordingly, their conclusion that the observations are consistent with $T_d > Tk$ for the majority of their sources still does not exclude the possibility of $T_d = T_{\kappa}$ for these same sources.

The same can be said for the observations of M angum et al. (1999). They observed lines

of form aldehyde, H₂CO, towards dense gas condensations in NGC 2024 in the Orion B cloud with angular resolutions of 12° , 19° , and 30° . They found T_x values from around 50 K to around 250 K. They then compared the derived gas T_{κ} values with the dust temperatures of M ezger et al. (1992), derived from the ratio of the 870 m - to the 1300 m -continuum em ission at resolutions comparable to those of the H_2CO line observations (i.e., 24^{00} and $8^{\circ\circ}$, respectively). These continuum observations imply $T_{d} = 19K \cdot W$ hile, at face value, a di erence between a T $_{\rm K}$ of 250 K and a T $_{\rm d}$ of 19 K m ay seem substantial, the uncertainties in T_{κ} (see Table 4 of M angum et al. 1999) suggest that T_{κ} T_d is signi cant at levels of only 2 to 4 . These would be satisfactory levels of signi cance, except that the correct uncertainty in T_{π} T_{d} must also include the uncertainty in T_{d} as well an uncertainty that was ignored entirely. M ezger et al. (1992) state a 20% uncertainty in their continuum uxes, implying an uncertainty of about 30% in the 870 m to 1300 m continuum. This uncertainty in plies that $T_d = 19K$ is consistent with $T_d = 7K$ to 1 . (Note that, even if we optim istically assume the continuum intensity ratio uncertainty to be only 20%, the upper lim it on T_d would still be 1 .) In other words, the continuum observations do not place any upper lim it on T_d . In fact, the di erence between 19K and 250K corresponds to only a 16% change in the 870 m/1300 m intensity ratio | a change of 0.5-. Therefore, again, the observations do not exclude the possibility of $T_d = T_{\kappa}$.

In contrast, observations of giant molecular cloud cores in the Galactic Center by Liset al. (2001) seem to genuinely rule out equal dust and gas temperatures. They use continuum observations at a number of wavelengths from 45 to 850 m and observations of the molecular lines of H_2CO , CS and other molecules to determ ine reliable dust and gas tem peratures. They nd two components of dust: a warm component with T_d ' 35K, which dom instes for $< 100\,$ m, and a cooler component with T_d $'\,$ 18K, which dom instes for > 100 m. (Note that they also estimated the radiation eld strength to be G $_{\circ}$ ' 500 to 1000. Therefore, the shorter wavelengths can also give reliable dust tem peratures in this case.) The molecular gas temperatures are T_v ' 60 to 90 K, im plying gas-dust temperature di erence as high as about 70K. However, given the appreciable foreground em ission towards the Galactic Center and the lack of velocity information from the continuum observations, contam ination of these continuum observations by such foreground em ission cannot be ruled out. This foreground emission would be from the dust in the Galactic disk and has a tem perature of about 18K (Sodroskiet al. 1994). Consequently, only the 35K dust m ight be directly associated with the observed cores in the Galactic Center. The molecules observed have transitions with high critical densities $(n_{crit} > 10^4 H_2 - cm^3)$ and it could be argued that the observed transitions are only sam pling the densest portion of the molecular gas. However, given that the bulk of the gas in the Galactic Center is high-density gas (Bally et al. 1987), the observed transitions are probably sampling most of the molecular

gas in the observed cloud core. Therefore, the gas-dust temperature di erence cannot be any smaller than about 25 K, but is probably smaller than 70 K.

Considering the observations, we can draw an important conclusion about T: it seems that T ' 0 is not excluded for a weak ISRF of G $_{\circ}$ < 10² and that it is excluded for a strong ISRF. A nother possibility is that, given that the G alactic C enter represents a unique G alactic environment, nding T $\stackrel{\bullet}{\bullet}$ 0 m ay have more to do with other physical conditions than simply the strength of the radiation eld and the gas density. Nevertheless, for now, a good working assumption is that T is indeed near 0 for G $_{\circ}$ < 10² and that T is quite di erent from that, i.e. j T j > 25K, for G $_{\circ}$ > 10³. If this assumption is correct, then T ' 0 on multi-parsec scales for most molecular gas in the G alactic C enter or in regions with large-scale star form ation. This has a number of consequences, including the follow ing:

- 1. G alactic-scale m olecular gas tem peratures are nearly double the tem peratures previously believed. Applying corrections for the cosm ic background and for the Rayleigh-Jeans approximation, the peak radiation tem peratures found for the ¹²CO J = 1 ! 0 line in large-scale surveys of the G alaxy (e.g., Sanders et al. 1985) suggest that T_{κ} 10K. If T is indeed close to zero, then the true T_{κ} is close to that of T_{d} on large scales, which is T_{d} 20K (Sodroski et al. 1994). As discussed in Section 3 of Paper I and illustrated in Figures 11, 18, 23, and 26 of Paper I, the molecular gas sam pled by the ¹²CO J = 1 ! 0 line does not lithe beam within each velocity interval within the line pro le, especially if the linear beam size at the source is parsecs.
- 2. The gas not completely lling the beam in each velocity intervalm ay better explain the X-factor. The usual explanation given for the N (H₂)/I(CO) factor is some variation of that of D idkm an et al. (1986), that m olecular clouds are virialized and that the line width indicates cloud m ass and, therefore, cloud colum n density. In fact, in some cases the velocity-widths of a cloud are only weakly correlated with column n densities (e.g., see H eyer et al. 1996). Consequently, a better explanation springs from having lling factors less than unity. This will be discussed in a future paper (W all 2007b).
- 3. T = 0 constrains proposed explanations of the dust grain alignment that has been observed in the ISM (Hiltner 1949; Hall 1949). For example, the Davis-Greenstein mechanism is the relaxation of param agnetic grains spinning in a magnetic eld (Davis & Greenstein 1951). This relaxation mechanism requires that T_d ∈ T_κ (Jones & Spitzer 1967). How ever, there are number of other possible mechanisms that could explain dust grain alignment that require no such di erence in temperatures (e.g., see Lazarian et al. 1997; Abbas et al. 2004, and references therein).

Therefore, having equal gas and dust tem peratures has a number of interesting consequences that are not necessarily contradicted by theory or observations.

4.5. Cold Gas/Dust

The two-component m asses compared with those for the one-component m asses in Table 6 of Paper I imply about 60% m ore m ass of gas and dust in the G alaxy than previous estimates suggest. These estimates are on the order of 5 10^9 M of gas (i.e. m olecular and atom ic) in the G alaxy (D am e 1993; Sanders 1993). If the m odel results for O rion are taken at face value and if these results apply to other clouds throughout the G alaxy, then this total gas m ass increases to about 8 10^9 M . This increase is due to some positions in component 1 having temperatures below 10K and as low as about 3K, nearly that of the cosm ic background. Such cold dust and gas em its only weakly per unit m ass, allow ing m uch gas and dust to be \hidden" for the observed brightness. Indeed, Table 7 of Paper I lists the cold gas m ass and it is about 40% of the total m ass listed in Table 6 of Paper I (adopting C ase 4 as the m ore realistic of the two listed in Table 7 of Paper I). A coordingly, the total gas m ass is the warm gas m ass increased by about 60% to allow for the cold gas m ass. Such an increase, especially if it applies to the entire ISM of the G alaxy, is substantial and its validity m ust be exam ined carefully.

A sm entioned in Section 3.6 of Paper I, the existence of this cold dust and gas depends on the basic assumption used in the modeling. Even if this assumption has provided a good physical description form ost of the points in the r_{240} versus T_{dc} plots (e.g., see F igures 20 and 24 of Paper I), it does not necessarily apply to all of the triangular cluster of points from T_{dc} ' 15 to 21K and r_{240} ' 10 to 70M Jy sr¹ (K km⁻¹)s⁻¹, especially to those with r_{240} 30 M Jy sr¹ (K km⁻¹)s⁻¹. Indeed, it is the $r_{240} > 30M$ Jy sr¹ (K km⁻¹)s⁻¹, $T_{dc} = 18$ K points that require T_d as low as 3K when the basic assumption applies. If these high- r_{240} , $T_{dc} = 18$ K points are explained by other means, then such cold gas and dust m ay not be present. In other words, let us abandon, for the moment, all models that use any form of the basic assumption, at least for these points. There then exist a number of possibilities for the high- r_{240} , $T_{dc} = 18$ K points:

The N ${}^{3}CO$)= v or n (H ₂) is di erent from those of the rest of the points. M odels with N (${}^{13}CO$)= v or n (H ₂) that vary sm oothly with T_{dc} were discussed in Subsection 3.4. Even though such m odels have m ore di culties than m odels using the basic assum p-tion, it does not exclude this possibility. The N (${}^{13}CO$)= v value would be higher or the n (H₂) value would be lower. As we saw in Subsection 3.4, n (H₂) would be as low as about 10 cm 3 . Figure 29 of Paper I shows that these points occurm ostly on some

edges of the O rion clouds. A lower density for these points is consistent with them being on the cloud edges. However, such low densities in ply a peak T_R (¹³CO J = 1 ! 0) either barely as strong as, or as much as an order of magnitude weaker than, the observed ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 line strength. The other possibility of higher N (¹³CO) = v would indeed give strong ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 em ission, but in plies N (¹³CO) = v on the cloud edges a factor of a few higher than that for the cloud central regions. This is possible because N (¹³CO) = v is not equivalent to N (H₂), but still seem s som ew hat in plausible.

The points with high \underline{r}_{40} values at T_{dc} ' 18K have appreciable emission of dust associated with atom ic hydrogen. Given that this gas is largely found at some cloud edges, this explanation seems reasonable; the atom ic hydrogen and its associated dust would be found on molecular cloud edges, thereby providing the shielding necessary for the existence of the molecular gas. However, we exam ined this in Subsection 3.2 and found, based on the current data, that such emission was not likely to be important. The H I-associated dust contributes negligibly to the observed r_{240} values. Nonetheless, as discussed in that section, the gas and dust of component 1 with temperatures between 3 and 5K might still be explained by H I-associated dust.

The T is di erent for the high- r_{240} , $T_d = 18$ K points. Figure 7 of Paper I illustrates that T varying smoothly from 0 to less than 16K (e.g., ' 20K) could account for the vertical extent of the points at $T_d = 18$ K in the r_{240} versus T_d plot. However, Figure 17 of W 96 suggests that G_o is only a few and this would give T less extrem e than those of M ochizuki & Nakagawa (2000), rendering T ' 16 to 20 K unlikely. Figure 7 of Paper I also suggests that T = +14 K for these points could also account for their vertical extent. But again, this is too extrem e for the given G_o . A lso, this T combined with T $_d = 18$ K would still result in cold gas, $T_{_K} = 4$ K. A distinct T for these points is an unlikely explanation for their high r_{240} ratio.

The optical depth of the¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 line is high for these points, while T_{κ} is still well above 3K. This allows r_{240} to be high, while obviating the need for cold gas. G iven that the models require component 1 to be cold for these points (i.e., $T_{\kappa} = 3$ to 10K) and component 0 to be 18K, then the models already require at least some of this gas to be optically thick in the ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 line and some to be optically thin. So, if the observations in ply a high ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 optical depth for all of the gas, then the models would be in error. The gas density is near or above the critical density of the ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 transition, so the line is close to LTE. Consequently, the ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0. This ratio for these points is about 0.3 | signi cantly less

than unity. Therefore, at least some gas is indeed optically thin in ${}^{13}CO J = 1 ! O$, in agreem ent with the models.

A lower¹³CO abundance or a higher dust-to-gas ratio for these points could account for the high $r_{_{240}}$ values. A coordingly, X (¹³CO) would be factors of 2 to 3 lower or $x_{_{d}}$ would be sim ilar factors higher. There is no observational evidence for large changes in the ¹³CO abundance or the dust-to-gasm ass ratio. N evertheless, them odels of W arin et al. (1996) suggest that selective photodissociation of ¹³CO reduces its abundance by factors of 2 or 3 near m olecular cloud surfaces. If the triangular cluster of points in the $r_{_{240}}$ versus T $_{dc}$ plot were a ected by this reduced X (¹³CO), then correcting to the \norm all abundance would bring these points down by factors of 2 to 3. This would increase the lower tem perature lim it of the cold gas. The bend in the model curve from vertical to horizontal occurs m ore or less at the bottom of the triangular cluster and m ore or less for a component-1 tem perature of 7K. C onsequently, correcting for a possible reduced ¹³CO abundance could possibly bring the lower tem perature lim it up to slightly less than 7K.

A similar possibility would be an emissivity enhancement of the dust: the dust mass absorption coe cient, i.e. at 240 m, would be unusually large, by factors of 2 to 3, for these points. For example, a resonance in the dust absorption spectrum at 240 m could produce an increase in at 240 m. However, an increase by the same factor would be needed at 140 m in order to maintain T_{dc} at about 18K. This resonance feature would be at least 100 m wide. This is very unlikely. Instead of a resonance, dust with opacities 2 to 3 times higher than norm al dust at all FIR wavelengths is su cient. Dwek (2004), for example, discusses dust grains with far-IR opacities orders of magnitudes higher than the classical silicate, graphite grains. M ixing a very small portion of such grains with classical grains could give a m ix with an e ective far-IR opacity easily factors of 2 to 3 higher than considered here. However, the observations require the opacity to increase as the r_{240} value increases towards the top of the triangular cluster. Increasing opacity at far-IR wavelengths increases cooling as well. Consequently, there would be an obvious overall trend to lower and lower 140 m/240 m color tem perature as r_{240} increased resulting in a triangular cluster whose peak would be noticeably skewed towards lower colour temperatures. This is not observed. Increasing the far-IR emissivity while keeping the 140 m/240 m color tem perature constant requires having another warm er com ponent mixed in that dom inates the dust continuum emission. But this is nothing more than the original two-component models that have been used up to this point. A lso, grains with such high far-IR em issivities arem ore likely to be responsible for such low dust tem peratures (i.e. about 3 { 5K) rather than rule them out.

Yet another possibility is that points towards the peak of the triangular cluster are dom inated by a component with a large value of r_{240} and T_{dc} around 18K. In terms of the two-component models discussed in the current work, this is equivalent to increasing the parameter c_0 for the peak of the triangular cluster.

It seems that at least some alternatives to cold dust and gas may exist. Overall, however, the evidence is far from convincing. In addition, simply abandoning the basic assumption leads to ad hoc interpretations. This is probably unjustimed given the success of the basic assumption, and its associated models, at accounting for the overall trend in the data; the basic assumption and the models should not be so lightly discarded.

Can we explain the data without such cold dust and gas and still use the m odels and the basic assumption? In other words, is there some unexplored region of parameter space that perm its a higher lower lim it on the dust and gas tem perature of component 1? The answer is yes, but the changes are not dram atic. The lower lim it to T_{r_1} and T_{d1} depends on the position of the \com ponent-0 point". That is, the physical parameters of com ponent 0 are constant in every respect and therefore represent a single point in the $r_{_{240}}$ versus T_{dc} plot. In contrast, the gas and dust tem peratures of component 1 vary spatially, while the other param eters are held constant, and therefore the param eters of com ponent 1 represent a locus of points in this plot. The position of the component-0 point is just above the vertical section of the plotted two-component model curve. When the r_{240} of the component-0 point is higher than the apex of the triangular cluster, then the lower lim it on T_{d1} is higher. In fact, this lower lim it is roughly given by T_{d1} on the model curve at the apex position. Hence, the relevant parameter space area is where the component-0 point has higher r_{40} . This is easily accomplished by reducing the ¹³CO abundance of component 0 only by a factor of 2. Doing this, and re thing the two-component models, raises the component-0 point from (K km¹)s¹. However, simply keeping the ^{13}CO ${\tt r}_{{\rm _{240}}}$ ' 65 to about 110M Jy sr^1 abundance xed at its usual value and restricting c_0 to be 1 results in even higher r_{AB} for the component-O point. In spite of the more promising position of this point, T_{d1} at the apex of the triangular cluster changes only by about 0.5K. If we truncate the model curve above the $T_{d1} = 5K$ point (i.e. rem ove the tem peratures lower than this), and keeping T 0 K 5K as well, then the 2 increases from 5.6 to 8.1, an increase excluded by the to keep T _{K 1} F-test at a con dence level of m one than 90%. A coordingly, raising the component-O point to higher r_{240} m erely stretches the vertical section of the curve between $T_{d1} = 2.8 \text{ K}$ and $T_{\rm d1}$ ' 5K.Consequently, we only increase the lower lim it on $T_{\rm d1}$ from about 3K to about 3.5K. In short, there is no compelling evidence that rules out cold dust and gas.

Previous evidence for cold dust or gas is not compelling either, but does nonetheless com e from a wide variety of observations (e.g., Reach et al. 1995; M erluzzi et al. 1994;

R istorcelli et al. 1998). In addition, there is evidence for gas that had been previously undetected (e.g., Reach et al. 1998; Cuillandre et al. 2001). Reach et al. (1995) used COBE /FIRAS continuum data with observed wavelengths from 104 m to 2mm to infer a widespread cold component with dust temperatures 4 to 7K. This component is found at all Galactic latitudes from the Galactic plane to the Galactic poles. Lagache et al. (1998) re-exam ined the FIRAS data and concluded that the cold component of Reach et al. (1995) was not needed; the coldest component necessary was at about 15K.Finkbeiner et al. (1999), in yet another exam ination of the FIRAS data, concluded that the colder component has a tem perature of about 9K. Merluzziet al. (1994) found a cold component with a temperature of either 15K or 7K, depending on whether the spectral emissivity index, , was 1.1 or 2, respectively. R istorcelli et al. (1998) arm ed with continuum observations in four wavelength bands (ie., 180-240, 240-340, 340-560, 560-1050 m) discovered a \cold condensation" close to the O rion Nebula with a tem perature of 12.5 3K. This is not as cold as the 3 to 10K m aterial discussed here, but nevertheless shows that dust with tem peratures signi cantly lower than the 18K expected for dust heated primarily by the general ISRF is possible. In contrast to these previous papers, the current paper infers a cold component (i.e. T' 3 to 10K) without bene t of long-wavelength (i.e. > 1 mm) continuum data. The long-wavelength data used here is the 2.7 mm¹³CO J = 1! 0 spectral line in emission.

If we accept for the m om ent that a cold com ponent with tem peratures of 3 to 10K does indeed exist within the O rion clouds, then the obvious question is how can such cold gas and dust exist without being strongly a ected by the general ISRF or local stars? Reach et al. (1995) discuss a num ber of possible explanations in the context of cold dust throughout the G alaxy, especially in high-latitude clouds. W e revisit som e of the proposed explanations of R each et al. (1995), but in the context of the O rion clouds:

Shielding from the Interstellar Radiation Field. A sR each et al. (1995) point out, attenuating the heating rate by a factor of 10^3 requires a m inim um absorption equivalent to $A_v = 20 \text{ m}$ ag (M athis et al. 1983). G iven that the radiation eld is proportional to T_d^6 and that $T_d = 3 \text{ to } 10 \text{ K}$ is the cold dust tem perature range, then attenuation factors of roughly 30 to 5 10^4 are necessary. This then requires m inim um absorptions equivalent to A_v ' few m ag to A_v considerably m ore than 20 m ag (M athis et al. 1983). These correspond to column densities of a few 10^{21} to m ore than 3 10^{22} H nuclei cm². O ver m uch of their area, the O rion clouds have N (H) closer to the form er value. C onsequently, shielding m ight explain the $T_d = 10 \text{ K}$ m aterial, but is unlikely to explain the really cold m aterial ($T_d = 5 \text{ K}$). A lso, since m ost of this cold m aterial is on the cloud edges, shielding probably w ill not account for the cold dust and gas suggested by the m odels.

Fractal G rains. As previously mentioned, grains with enhanced submillimeter/FIR emission relative to UV/visible absorption, like the iron needles discussed by Dwek (2004) or fractal grains (see Reach et al. 1995, and references therein), can have tem – peratures near that of the cosm ic background. Reach et al. (1995) state that fractal grains m ay have greatly reduced m ass for the given absorption cross-section; the 60% upward correction to the single-com ponent m ass would be revised considerably dow n-ward. In addition, fractal grains m ay also have a reduced volume for the given geom etric cross-section, permitting T ' 0, as discussed previously (see also Appendix A).

Very Large G rains. Dust grains larger than the FIR wavelengths that they em it do so very e ciently and, therefore, cool very e ciently. Reach et al. (1995) nd that the size distribution of these grains must steepen beyond that of the power-law index of 3:5 of M athis et al. (1977) to explain their observations. This steepening prevents a dust-to-gas m ass ratio much higher than observed; the power-law index of 3:5 out to a maximum grain radius of 100 m increases the dust-to-gas m ass ratio by m ore than an order of magnitude. In addition, the current work requires the observed grains to have a large geom etric cross-section to volum e ratio, thereby ruling out such large grains being the bulk of the cold dust.

Long-W avelength Em issivity Enhancement. Reach et al. (1995) suggest that an enhancement of the continuum em issivity at ' 800 m could explain their observations instead of some hypothetical cold dust. O byiously, this explanation does not apply to the current paper because the models have been applied to 240 m continuum data and 2.7 mm spectral line data. If the cold material predicted by the models for the O rion clouds is indeed ubiquitous in the G alaxy, then the R each et al. (1995) proposed enhancement of the long-wavelength continuum em issivity cannot rule it out.

Of the explanations given above, fractal grains m ay be the most feasible.

Thus the observations neither completely exclude nor strongly support the existence of cold dust and gas (i.e. T' 3 to 10K) in the O rion clouds nor a widespread presence in the G alaxy as a whole. The least unlikely alternative to dust and gas at temperatures of 3{5K is probably that mentioned in Subsection 32: the additional emission of dust grains associated with atom ic hydrogen. Nevertheless, it seems likely that cold material with temperatures of 7 to 10K does exist in the O rion clouds. If cold dust and gas exist in the ISM in general with temperatures of 3 to 10K, then fractal dust grains or iron needles may be the most credible reason and the 60% upward correction to the G alactic ISM 's mass due to this cold material might be revised dow nw ard substantially. This dow nw ard revision is also necessary if the material at temperatures of 3 to 7K is really an artefact due to the other e ects just described.

4.6. The M illim eter C ontinuum to ${}^{13}CO J = 1! O R$ atio as a Tem perature D iagnostic

Given that we can now characterize the I (240 m)=I($^{13}CO J = 1 ! 0$) ratio as a function of physical parameters like the temperature, continuum and $^{13}CO J = 1 ! 0$ observations can constrain the temperature of the dust and molecular gas. In particular, using only ground-based observations to achieve such a constraint is advantageous. Consequently, we exam ine one particular representative case: using the I(1300 m)/I($^{13}CO J = 1 ! 0$) ratio | hereafter, r_{1300} | to estimate the dust temperature, T_d .

To this end, the simulations described previously in Paper II were used to generate a model 1300 m continuum map. The adopted mass absorption coe cient at 1300 m, (100 m) of 40 cm² q^1 and scaling by (1300 m), was determined from the adopted for = 2, yielding (1300 m) = $40 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ g}^1$ $(100=1300)^2$ or 0.24 cm² d¹. To adopt a reasonable noise level, we note that current bolom eters can achieve an im s noise value of 2 MJy sr^1 for a 1-hour integration in a 15⁰⁰ beam at wavelength of 450 m (D.Hughes, priv. com m.). A ssum ing a noise proportional to 2^{2} and, depending on the integration time and spatial averaging of the observations, a noise level of 0.075 M Jy sr¹ at 1300 m is possible. Therefore, this rm s noise level is adopted for the simulated 1300 m m ap. The simulated 1300 m continuum m ap was divided by the simulated ${}^{13}CO J = 1! O m ap$ to produce the r_{1300} m ap. Figure 4 shows the resultant simulated r_{1300} values plotted against the simulated T_{dc} values the 140 m/240 m color tem perature. This color tem perature is, of course, not directly relevant to 1300 m observations, but is included in Figure 4 to permit easy com parison with the standard r_{240} versus T $_{dc}$ plots used throughout the current paper.

The upper panel of F igure 4 shows that r_{1300} is not useful as a tem perature diagnostic for dust color tem peratures of 15 to 30 K; given that the vertical spread of the data points is about the size of the vertical error bars, we cannot unam biguously associate each r_{1300} with a single T_{dc} . The tem perature dependence is weak in this range, because both the continuum and line observations are close to the Rayleigh-Jeans limit. This im plies that neither component's emission will overwhelm ingly dominate over the other's for a larger range of tem perature di erences between the two components. In contrast, at = 240 m and in the 3 to 30 K range of dust physical tem peratures, component 1 goes from being overwhelm ingly dominated by to overwhelm ingly dominating the component-0 emission. At = 1:3 m m, component-1 goes from being dominated by only factors of a few to dominating by only a factor of 2. A coordingly, combined emission of the two components has a narrow range of brightnesses.

In contrast, the lower panel of Figure 4 dem onstates that $r_{_{1300}}$ can indeed be a tem – perature diagnostic. This plot shows the model curve up to tem peratures of 200 K, and the

simulated m ap data points in the lower left corner. The curve goes from nearly at (i.e. slope near 0) for T_{dc} ' 15 to 30 K to a power law with

$$r_{1300} / T_d^{1:4}$$
 (3)

above a threshold of

$$r_{1300}^{>} 0.5 M Jy sr^{1}$$
 (K km ¹)s¹ and $T_{d}^{>} 50 K$: (4)

(Note that T_d can serve in place of T_{dc} for high temperatures, because the e ect of component 0 is negligible in this limit.) Therefore, r_{1300} is a useful temperature diagnostic for temperatures above about 50 K or r_{1300} above 0.5 M Jy st¹ (K km⁻¹)s¹. Also, above this threshold the temperature sensitivity increases with increasing temperature. This is not quite as strong as the T_d^2 rise expected in the LTE, high-temperature limit, but is de nitely much better high-temperature sensitivity than for the ratio of two rotational lines of CO or for the ratio of two continuum bands.

Naturally, the real situation is considerably more complicated than simply reading the tem perature from this one curve that m ay apply only to the O rion clouds. A swe recall, there are a num ber of physical parameters that a ect this curve: T_{d0} , $\frac{N_{c0}}{v_c}$, c_0 , n_{c0} , $\frac{N_{c1}}{v_c}$, n_{c1} , T, (or), x_d , and N (H I)/N (H 2). Before we exam ine how variations of these parameters e ect the model curve, the curve in Figure 4 is adopted as the nom inal curve. The T_d inferred from an observed r_{1300} using this nom inal curve we call the nom inal T_d. Then the question is how the true T_d di ers from the nom inal T_d due to physical param eters di ering from their nom inalvalues (see the \Input Values" colum n of Table 1 of Paper II). A reasonable goal is a tem perature estim ate within a factor of 2 of the true tem perature for those \hot spots" where r_{1300} is above the threshold value of 0.5 M Jy sr¹ (K km¹)s¹. If we vary the component-0 param eter values (i.e. the rst four param eters listed above), then the true T_d stays within a factor of 2 of the nom inal T_d in most cases. Speci cally, varying T_{d0} from values lower than nominal to double this, $c_0 \frac{N_{c0}}{v_c}$ from factors 10 or more lower (since this represents the optically thin limit), and n_{c0} from 10 cm⁻³ to 10^5 cm⁻³ and higher (since this represents the LTE limit) changes r_{1300} by only 5-7%. Equivalently, the true T_d diers from the nominal value by 7-10%, well within the desired factor of 2. There are two potential di culties. One is if $c_0 \frac{N_{c0}}{V_c}$ is two orders of magnitude higher than the nom inalvalue, then the true r_{1300} is 80% lower than its nom inal value. In practice this would not be a problem because the observed r_{1300} would be low enough that this observed position would not be identified as a hot spot; there would be no false positives in the search for hot spots. Nevertheless, any false hot spot is easily identiable with supplemental observations of the J = 1 ! 0 line of $C^{18}O$ or ^{12}CO ; the $C^{18}O = {}^{13}CO$ intensity ratio would identify the position as having high ${}^{13}CO$ J = 1 ! 0 opacity. The ${}^{13}CO = {}^{12}CO$ intensity ratio could be used similarly, but $C^{18}O = {}^{13}CO$ would be

m ore reliable given that the corresponding abundance ratio is within an order of magnitude of unity. Another potential di culty is that, even though varying n _{c0} over m any orders of m agnitude has a negligible e ect on r_{1300} for T_{dc} 50 K, n_{c0} as low as 10 cm⁻³ can raise the spur of data points at T_{dc} ' 18 K (see Figure 4) by about 70%. A coordingly, the threshold listed above, expressions (4), is raised to

$$r_{1300} > 0.85 M Jy sr^{1}$$
 (K km ¹)s¹ and $T_{d} > 60 K$: (5)

Densities as low as 10 cm^{-3} are probably unlikely, so threshold (5) is probably unnecessary. Nevertheless, it can be used if extra caution is desired.

Varying the component-1 parameters $\frac{N_{cl}}{v_c}$ and n_{cl} results in the true T_d being up to a factor of 5 sm aller than the nom inal T_d . The $\frac{N_{cl}}{v_c}$ value was increased by an order of m agnitude or decreased similarly (or more because this is the optically thin limit). At the same time, the n_{cl} value was decreased to 100 cm⁻³ (again assuming that densities as low as 10 cm⁻³ are unlikely) and increased to 10^5 cm⁻³ (or more because this is the LTE limit). Over m ost of this parameter space the true T_d stayed within a factor of 2 of the nom inal T_d . However, the combination of n_{cl} as low as 10 cm⁻³ and $\frac{N_{cl}}{v_c}$ an order of magnitude larger gives a true T_d up to a factor of 5 sm aller than the nom inal T_d . This low temperature case can be identieed by observing the ¹³CO J = 2 ! 1 line. In the nom inal case, the ratio $I(^{13}CO J = 2 ! 1)=I(^{13}CO J = 1 ! 0)$ varies between 1.9 and 3.4 for $T_{\kappa} = 50$ to 200K. In this high $\frac{N_{cl}}{v_c}$, low $-n_{cl}$ case, $I(^{13}CO J = 2 ! 1)=I(^{13}CO J = 1 ! 0)$ is 0.5 to 0.7. Supplemental continuum observations help as well. The I (450 m)=I (1300 m) ratio, for example, is sensitive to temperatures up to T_d ' 60K for a ux ratio uncertainty of 20%.

Considering variations in T, the determ ination of T_d is remarkably insensitive to such variations. For example, T could range from 80K to +80K and the true T_d is still within about 20% of the nom inal T_d. Of course, the T_k would be quite di erent from T_d in that case. For T = 80K, the T_k is even higher than a nom inal T_d that was already high; this T_k is still within a factor of roughly 2 of the nom inal T_d. For T = +80K, T_k is quite sm all. The I(¹³CO J = 2 ! 1)=I(¹³CO J = 1 ! 0) ratio is low in this case, but it is di cult to distinguish this case from the low $-T_d$, low -density case described in the previous paragraph using only this CO -line ratio. Using the I (450 m)=I (1300 m) ratio in conjunction with the I(¹³CO J = 2 ! 1)=I(¹³CO J = 1 ! 0) m ay provide su cient inform ation to distinguish this high-T_d, low $-T_d$, low -density case.

Dealing with anom abus values of the remaining parameters | (or), x_a , and N (H I)/N (H₂) | is problem atic but still possible. If a source (a molecular cloud or part of another galaxy) is mapped in I (1300 m) and ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0, then the majority of the positions probably have roughly constant values for these parameters; the majority of these

positions would also have similar values of r_{1300} . For example, it is easy to imagine that the molecular clouds in another galaxy have an unusually high or low dust-to-gas ratio, i.e. high or low x_d , compared with such clouds in our Galaxy. Or we can imagine a cloud that has a non-negligible layer of atom ic gas (i.e. non-negligible N (H I)/N (H₂)). In cases such as these, the r_{1300} value itself would not be important, but that value in relation to the \average" r_{1300} values for the observed source. The hot spots are identified as those with r_{1300} values large compared to the typical value for the source. If, instead, such hot spots are not due to elevated temperatures but unusual x_d , and/or N (H I)/N (H₂) values, then such \hot spots" would still be interesting: they represent positions with unusual properties. Speci cally identifying those unusual properties would involve the supplemental observations described above | using the I(¹³CO J = 2 ! 1)=I(¹³CO J = 1 ! 0) and I (450 m)=I (1300 m) ratios | and other observations when possible.

Addressing the various points mentioned above, the following is a plausible observing plan:

- 1. First map the 1300 m continuum and the ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 line. The majority of points establish the typical r_{1300} value for the source. Any points with high r_{1300} values, above some threshold that applies to the source, would be hot spots to be ear-marked for further observations and study. The r_{1300} values for these hot spots will provide a temperature estimate to within a factor of 2 in the majority of cases.
- 2. Map the ¹³CO J = 2 ! 1 line. The I(¹³CO J = 2 ! 1)=I(¹³CO J = 1 ! 0) ratio can help con m whether the hot spots are indeed hot.
- 3. Map the 450 m (or shorter) continuum. The I (450 m)=I (1300 m) ratio is a further check on the tem perature and can, in some cases, check whether T = 0 or not.
- 4. Map the C¹⁸O J = 1 ! 0 line. The I(C¹⁸O J = 1 ! 0)=I(¹³CO J = 1 ! 0) ratio can con m that ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 is indeed optically thin, thereby further checking the tem perature inferred from the r_{1300} of the hot spots. Even though the ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 is expected to be optically thin on multi-parsec scales, as in the O rion clouds, veri cation of this can rule out other possibilities.

All of these observations are possible from the ground.

O by iously, this is only one proposed observing plan out of m any possibilities. Similar plans could be devised using other continuum wavelengths and other rotational lines. Two such alternatives would be the I (2700 m)=I(13 CO J = 1 ! 0) ratio or the I (1300 m)=I(13 CO J = 2 ! 1) ratio. This is re-discovering the line-to-continuum (similarly, the continuum -to-line) ratio or the equivalent width, but for m illim eter-or

submillim eter-wave molecular lines. Such equivalent widths are commonly used at visible, infrared, and centim eter wavelengths for inferring the physical properties of H II regions (O sterbrock 1989; Spitzer 1978). Likewise, the equivalent widths of millim eter-wave molecular lines can provide important physical insights into molecular clouds (i.e. H_2 regions).

Nevertheless, the ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 line has a big advantage over higher rotational lines of ¹³CO: relative insensitivity to physical parameters like density and column density per velocity interval. This is why the r_{1300} ratio can often predict T_d to within a factor of 2, despite varying n(H₂) and N(¹³CO) = v by orders of magnitude. At the very least, this method potentially places a realistic and interesting upper limit on dust and molecular gas temperatures.

5. Conclusions

Far-infrared continuum data from the DIRBE instrum ent aboard the COBE spacecraft were combined with ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 spectral line data from the Nagoya 4-m telescope to infer the large-scale (i.e. 5 to 100 pc) physical conditions in the Orion molecular clouds. The 140 m/240 m dust color temperatures, T_{dc} , were compared with the 240 m/¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 intensity ratios, r_{240} , to constrain dust and molecular gas physical conditions. In addition, such a comparison provides valuable insights into how the ratio of FIR/subm illim eter/m illim eter continuum to that of a ¹³CO (or C¹⁸O) rotational line can constrain temperature estimates of the dust and molecular gas. For example, ratios of rotational lines or ratios of continuum em ission in di erent wavelength bands often cannot place realistic upper limits on gas or dust temperature, whereas the continuum -to-line ratio can place such limits.

Two-componentmodels t the O rion data best. One component has a xed-temperature and represents the gas and dust towards the surface of the clouds and is heated primarily by a kiloparsec-scale interstellar radiation eld, referred to here as the general ISRF. The other component has a spatially varying temperature and represents gas and dust towards the interior of the clouds that can be both shielded from the general ISRF and heated by local stars. The model results and their implications are as follow s:

- 1) The inferred physical conditions are consistent with those derived from the large-scale observations of the J = 2! 1 and J = 1! 0 lines of ^{12}CO by Sakam oto et al. (1994).
- 2) At least two gas (dust) tem peratures are needed on the majority of sightlines through molecular clouds for reliably estimating column densities. This is supported by the work of Schnee et al. (2006).

- 3) The dust-gas tem perature di erence, $T_d = T_{\kappa}$ or T, is 0K to within 1 or 2K. If this result applies more generally to the Galactic-scale molecular ISM, except for unusual regions such as the Galactic Center, then there are a number of implications:
 - { Dust-gas therm alcoupling is factors of 5 to 10 stronger than has been previously assumed. Such factors may be due to the distribution of dust grain sizes and grains with larger cross-section to volume ratios than that of a simple sphere.
 - { G alactic-scale m olecular gas tem peratures are closer to 20 K than to 10 K, because the em ission from the CO rotational lines, even the optically thick ¹²CO J = 1 ! 0 line, does not llthe beam within the velocity interval about the line peak.
 - { This CO emission that does not 11 the beam provides a better explanation of the N (H_2)/I(CO) conversion factor or X-factor. D iscussion of this is deferred to a later paper (W all 2007b).
 - { Having T nearly 0 constrains which m echanism s explain dust grain alignment in the ISM . A negligible dust-gas temperature di erence rules out the Davis-G reenstein alignmentmechanism, but not other possible mechanisms (see Lazarian et al. 1997; Abbas et al. 2004, and references therein).
- 4) Roughly 40{50% of the ISM in Orion is cold (ie. 10K) to very cold (ie. down to 3K) dust and gas. A coordingly, there is roughly 60% more gas and dust in Orion than inferred from simple one-component models. This may also imply a similar increase in the estimated mass of entire G alactic ISM .Fractal dust grains (see Reach et al. 1995, and references therein) or iron needles (D wek 2004) may explain the low temperatures of this gas and dust and, at the same time, may account for the high dust-gas therm al coupling needed to explain T ' OK. Nevertheless, alternative explanations that do not require cold dust and gas cannot be ruled out; the least unlikely of these other explanations is a contribution to the 240 m continuum emission of the dust associated with atom ic hydrogen. The data suggest that the e ect of the H I-associated dust is negligible, but still might perm it raising the lower temperature lim it of this cold gas and dust from 3 to 5K.

The model parameter values derived from the ts to the r_{240} versus T_{dc} plots were used to create simulated 1300 m continuum and ${}^{13}CO J = 1 ! 0$ line maps. These simulated maps tested whether the millimeter continuum to ${}^{13}CO J = 1 ! 0$ line intensity ratio could constrain temperature estimates of the dust and molecular gas. The ratio I (1300 m)=I({}^{13}CO J = 1 ! 0), or r_{1300} , was found to estimate the dust temperature to within a factor of 2 in most cases, provided that r_{1300} was higher than a threshold level of 0.5M Jy sr¹ (K km⁻¹)s¹. Supplemental observations of the ${}^{13}CO J = 2 ! 1$ line and

shorter wavelength continuum would con m the high tem peratures in these high r_{1300} \hot spots". The results here can be easily generalized to other continuum wavelengths and other rotational lines, even permitting interpretation of m illim eter and subm illim eter m olecular line equivalent widths. And this is entirely possible with only ground-based observations.

The full potential of using m illimeter continuum and $^{13}{\rm CO}$ (or ${\rm C}\,^{18}{\rm O}$) rotational line comparisons has yet to be realized.

This work was supported by CONACyT grants # 211290-5-0008PE and # 202-PY .44676 to W .F.W .at INAOE.Iam very grateful to W .T.Reach for his comments and support. I owe a great debt of thanks to Y.Fukui and T.Nagaham a of Nagoya University for supplying the ¹³CO data that made this work possible. The author is grateful to R.Maddalena and T.Dame, who supplied the map of the peak ¹²CO J = 1 ! 0 line strengths and provided in portant calibration information. I thank P.F.Goldsmith, D.H.Hughes, R.Padman, W.T.Reach, Y.Fukui, M.Grænberg, T.A.D.Paglione, G.MacLeod, E.Vazquez Semadeni, and others for stimulating and valuable discussions.

A. The E ect of G rain Size on G as-G rain Therm al C oupling

Burke & Hollenbach (1983) describe the heat transfer rate from the gas to the dust (or vice versa) as

$$_{gd} = n_{_{H\,2}} n_{_{gr}gr} \frac{8kT_{_{K}}}{m_{_{H\,2}}} + \frac{1}{2} (2k) (T_{_{K}} - T_{_{d}}) ;$$
 (A1)

where $n_{_{\rm H\,2}}$ and $n_{_{\rm gr}}$ are the number densities of hydrogen molecules and dust grains, respectively, $_{_{\rm gr}}$ is the grain geometric cross-sectional area, $T_{_{\rm K}}$ is the gas kinetic temperature, $T_{\rm d}$ is the dust grain temperature, $m_{_{\rm H\,2}}$ is the mass of the hydrogen molecule, and $_{_{\rm T}}$ is the accommodation coecient. This coecient is a measure of how well the temperature of the gas particles that have collided with the dust grains accommodate to that of the grain surface (Burke & Hollenbach 1983). (Note that the $n_{_{\rm H\,2}}$ and $m_{_{\rm H\,2}}$ in this expression replace the $n_{_{\rm H}}$ and $m_{_{\rm H}}$ in expression 9 of Burke & Hollenbach (1983) because the colliders considered here are hydrogen molecules.) If we simplistically assume identical grains, then

$$x_{d} = \frac{n_{gr} m_{gr}}{n_{H_2} m_{H_2}}$$
 (A2)

or

$$n_{gr} = \frac{X_{d} n_{H2} m_{H2}}{m_{gr}}$$
; (A3)

where m_{gr} is the mass of a single dust grain. A ssum ing spherical grains of uniform density, $_{gr}$, yields

$$m_{gr} = \frac{4}{3} a^{3}_{gr}$$
 (A4)

and

$$_{gr} = a^2$$
; (A 5)

where a is the grain radius. Expression (A 4) substituted into (A 3) gives

$$n_{gr} = \frac{3}{4} \frac{x_{d} n_{H_{2}} m_{H_{2}}}{a^{3}}_{gr}$$
(A 6)

and multiplying the above by (A 5) yields

$$n_{gr gr} = \frac{3}{4} \frac{x_{d} n_{H_{2}} m_{H_{2}}}{a_{gr}} :$$
 (A7)

Note that expression (A7) is nearly identical to expression (5) of G oldsm ith (2001); he also included a Q-correction factor that is not necessary here because we are only concerned with the geometric cross-section and not the absorption cross-section. Note also that (A7) is proportional to the grain cross-section to volume ratio. (In reality, it is the grain cross-section to mass ratio that is relevant, but, for a uniform grain density, this is equivalent to a proportionality to the cross-section to volume ratio.) Substituting (A7) into (A1) yields

$$_{gd} = \frac{3}{2} \frac{8k^3m_{H2}}{2} \prod_{T} \frac{x_d}{a_{gr}} n_{H2}^2 (T_k T_d) T_k^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
 (A8)

Putting in the physical constants in cgs units gives

$$_{gd} = 7:11 \quad 10^{36} \quad _{T} \frac{X_{d}}{a_{gr}} n_{H_{2}}^{2} (T_{K} \quad T_{d}) T_{K}^{\frac{1}{2}} :$$
 (A 9)

Goldsm ith (2001) adopted the following values for the dust parameters: $x_d = 0.01$, $_{gr} = 2g$ cm³, and a = 1.7 10⁵ cm³. Note that Goldsm ith (2001) apparently adopted a = 1.7 10⁷ cm³, but this is near the lower limit of the dust grain size range (see Desert et al. 1990). Also, and more importantly, that value of a is inconsistent with the numerical coe cients in the expressions for $_{gd}$. Finally, a = 1.7 10⁵ cm³ was the actual intended dust grain radius (Goldsm ith, priv. comm.).] The recommended value of the accommodation coe cient is $_{T} = 0.3$ (Burke & Hollenbach 1983). Consequently,

$$g_{d} = 2:0 \quad 10^{33} n_{H^{2}}^{2} (T_{K} \quad T_{d}) \quad \frac{T_{K}}{10K} \stackrel{\frac{1}{2}}{;}$$
 (A 10)

asperGoldsmith (2001).

However, as stated in Section 4.4, $_{gd}$ must be factors of 5 to 10 larger to explain the observations. This is achieveable using a more realistic treatment of grain sizes in deriving $_{gd}$. Speci cally, a range of grain sizes must be considered instead of simplistically adopting a single radius. For example, D exert et al. (1990) suggest that a = 15 to 110 nm for the

big therm al equilibrium grains. Consequently, the 170 nm adopted by Goldsmith (2001) is clearly too large; instead, some appropriately weighted mean of 15 nm and 110 nm is the most realistic choice for the a in expression (A 9). From the work of M athis et al. (1977) we know that

$$n_{qr}(a) = k_0 a^{3.5}$$
; (A 11)

where n_{gr} (a) da is the number density of grains with radii between a and a + da and k_0 is a norm alizing constant. The k_0 is found from $\frac{1}{2}$

$$n_{gr}(tot) = k_0 \qquad a_{max}^{3:5} da ; \qquad (A12)$$

with n_{gr} (tot) as the number density of all the grains and corresponds to the n_{gr} in (A 2) and (A 3). From (A 12), k_0 can be expressed as

$$k_0 = n_{gr}$$
 (tot) k_1 : (A 13)

 k_1 is another constant of the distribution and depends on $a_{m in}$ and $a_{m ax}$. Its exact form is not relevant to the derivation here, but is nonetheless given below for completeness:

$$k_{1} = 2.5 \frac{(a_{\min} a_{\max} a_{\max})^{2.5}}{a_{\max}^{2.5} a_{\min}^{2.5}} \qquad (A \, 14)$$

To include the e ect of the range of grain sizes on $_{gd}$, the n_{gr}_{gr} in equation (A1) must be replaced with n_{gr} (tot)h $_{gr}$ (a) i_a , where h_{gr} (a) i_a is the grain cross-section after averaging over the size distribution. Thus,

$$n_{gr}(tot)h_{gr}(a)i_{a} = n_{gr}(a)_{gr}(a) da :$$
(A15)
$$a_{min}$$

= 2 k₁ n_{gr} (tot)
$$\frac{a_{\max}^{0.5} a_{\min}^{0.5}}{(a_{\min} a_{\max})^{0.5}}$$
; (A16)

where equations (A 11), (A 5), and (A 13) were used. The n_{gr} (tot) on the right side m ust now be expressed in term s of the m olecular gas density, n_{H_2} . This can be done using an expression analogous to that of (A 3) that uses the range of dust sizes:

$$n_{gr}$$
 (tot) m_{gr} (a) $i_{a} = x_{d} n_{H_{2}} m_{H_{2}}$; (A 17)

or

$${}^{Z} a_{m ax} = n_{gr} (a) m_{gr} (a) da = x_{d} n_{H 2} m_{H 2} :$$

 $a_{m in} = a_{m in} + a_{m$

Applying equations (A4), (A11), and (A13) yields

$$\frac{4}{3}_{gr}n_{gr}(tot)k_{1} = x_{d}n_{H2}m_{H2} = x_{d}n_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2} = x_{d}n_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2} = x_{d}n_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2} = x_{d}n_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2} = x_{d}n_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2} = x_{d}n_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2} = x_{d}n_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2}m_{H2}m_$$

Integrating and solving for $n_{\alpha r}$ (tot) gives us

$$n_{gr} \text{ (tot)} = \frac{3 x_{d} n_{H_{2}} m_{H_{2}}}{8 q_{r} k_{1} (a_{max}^{0.5} - a_{min}^{0.5})} \qquad : \qquad (A 18)$$

Substituting (A18) into the right side of (A16) yields

$$n_{gr}$$
 (tot) $h_{gr}(a)i_{a} = \frac{3}{4} \frac{x_{d}n_{H_{2}}m_{H_{2}}}{a_{eff}gr}$; (A 19)

where

$$a_{eff} (a_{m in} a_{m ax})^{0.5}$$
: (A 20)

Equation (A 19) replaces the $n_{gr gr}$ that appears in (A 1), yielding an expression nearly identical to (A 8) and (A 9), except that a is replaced with a_{eff} . Therefore, the relevant grain radius in the expressions for gd (e.g., equation A 9) is the geom etric mean of the minimum and maximum grain sizes (i.e., equation A 20).

The a_{min} and a_{max} should be those for the big grains, rather than for the full range of dust sizes that also include the VSGs (very sm all grains) and the PAHs (polycyclic arom atic hydrocarbons) (e.g., see Desert et al. 1990). The big grains are in therm al equilibrium and are the grains observed with the 140 m and 240 m DIRBE observations. According to Desert et al. (1990), the a_{min} and a_{max} are 15 and 110 nm, respectively, for the big grains. This gives $a_{aff} = 41 \text{ nm}$ and increases $_{gd}$ by a factor of 4.2. The full range of sizes over all grains, i.e. $a_{min} = 0.4 \text{ nm}$ and $a_{max} = 110 \text{ nm}$, results in $a_{eff} = 6.6 \text{ nm}$ and gd is increased by a factor of 26. How ever, there are at least two problem s with using the full size range of grains. One is that, as mentioned above, only the big grains are relevant to the observations discussed here. The second is that the treatm ent above in plicitly assumes that, within the grain size distribution, only the grain size changes; other grain properties, such as grain density and shape, are assumed constant despite changing grain size. For example, going from (A17) to (A18) assumes that $_{\rm gr}$ is independent of a. This is likely to be a bad approximation for the full size range, especially when grain type varies with grain size (e.g., see D esert et al. 1990). Therefore, the factor of 4.2 increase in $_{\rm gd}$ is appropriate when only considering the big grains.

A few corrections should be considered before using that factor of 4.2. Given that only the big grains were used, we must correct for not using the full population of dust grains. Speci cally, the dust-to-gas m ass ratio used must be replaced by the m ass ratio of the dust in big grains to that of the gas. The grain densities and sizes in D esert et al. (1990) in ply that the big grains represent 76% of the m ass of the dust. However, a more appropriate accommodation factor is necessary for the low dust and gas temperatures that considered here. This suggests that $_{\rm T}$ is 0.4 instead of 0.3 (see Burke & Hollenbach 1983). A coordingly, increasing the accommodation factor while decreasing the dust-to-m ass ratio by sim ilar amounts gives an overall correction of nearly unity (in fact it is about 0.9). Another possible correction, or at least uncertainty, is the density adopted for the big grains. W hile Goldsm ith (2001) adopts $_{\rm gr} = 2 \, {\rm gm}^3$, D esert et al. (1990) use 3 g cm³ for the big grains. This latter density brings the 4.2 factor down to about 3.

In conclusion, considering a realistic range of grain sizes increases the gas-grain therm al coupling by factors of about 3 to 4.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, M. M., Craven, P. D., Spann, J. F., Tankosic, D., LeClair, A., Gallagher, D. L., West, E. A., Weingartner, J. C., Witherow, W. K., and Tielens, A. G. G. M. 2004, ApJ, 614, 781
- Bally, J., Stark, A.A., Wilson, R.W., and Henkel, C. 1987, ApJS, 65, 13
- Bally, J., Langer, W. D., and Liu, W. 1991, ApJ, 383, 645
- Boreiko, R. T. and Betz, A. L. 1989, ApJ, 346, L97
- Boulanger, F., Bronfman, L., Dame, T.M., and Thaddeus, P. 1998, A & A, 332, 273
- Boulanger, F., Falgarone, E., Puget, J.-L., and Hebu, G. 1990, ApJ, 369, 136
- Burke, J.R. and Hollenbach, D.J. 1983, ApJ, 265, 223
- Cemicharo, J., Pardo, J.R., Gonzlez-Alfonso, E., Serabyn, E., Phillips, T.G., Benford, D. J., and Mehringer, D. 1999, ApJ, 520, L131
- COBE Diuse Infrared Background Experiment (DIRBE) Explanatory Supplement 1998, version 2.3, ed.M.G.Hauser, T.Kelsall, D.Leisawitz, and J.Weiland, COBE Ref. Pub. 98-A (Greenbelt, MD:NASA/GSFC), available in electronic form from the NSSDC.

Cuillandre, J.-C., Lequeux, J., Allen, R. J., Mellier, Y., and Bertin, E. 2001, ApJ, 554, 190

- Dame, T.M. 1993, Back to the Galaxy, A P Conf. 278, ed.S.S.Holt and F.Verter, New York: A P, 267
- Davis, L., Jr. and Greenstein, J.L. 1951, ApJ, 114, 206
- Desert, F.-X., Boulanger, F., & Puget, J.L. 1990, A&A, 237, 215
- D ickm an, R.L. 1975, ApJ, 202, 50
- Dickman, R.L., Snell, R.L., and Schlberb, F.P. 1986, ApJ, 309, 326
- Dupac, X., Giard, M., Bernard, J.P., Lamarre, J.M., Meny, C., Pajot, F., Ristorcelli, I., Serra, G., and Torre, J.P. 2000, ApJ, 553, 604
- Dwek, E. 2004, ApJ, 607, 848
- Finkbeiner, D.P., Davis, M., and Schlegel, D.J. 1999, ApJ, 527, 867
- Fixsen, D.J., Bennett, C.L., and Mather, J.C. 1999, ApJ, 526, 207
- Goldsm ith, P.F. 2001, ApJ, 557, 736
- Goldsm ith, P.F., Bergin, E.A., and Lis, D.C. 1997, ApJ, 491, 615
- Graf, U.U., Eckart, A., Genzel, R., Harris, A. I., Poglitsch, A., Russell, A.P.G., and Stutzki, J. 1993, ApJ, 405, 249
- Graf, U.U., Genzel, R., Harris, A.I., Hills, R.E., Russell, A.P.G., and Stutzki, J.1990, ApJ, 358, L49
- Gusten, R., Serabyn, E., Kasemann, C., Schinkel, A., Schneider, G., Schulz, A., and Young, K. 1993, ApJ, 402, 537
- Hall, J.S. 1949, Science, 109, 166
- Harris, A. I., Hills, R. E., Stutzki, J., Graf, U. U., Russell, A. P. G., and Genzel, R. 1991, ApJ, 382, L75
- Harris, A. I., Jae, D. T., Silber, M., and Genzel, R. 1985, ApJ, 294, L93
- Harrison, A., Henkel, C., and Russell, A. 1999, ApJ, 303, 157
- Heiles, C., Haner, L.M., Reynolds, R.J., and Tuffe, S.L. 2000, ApJ, 536, 335
- Heyer, M. H., Carpenter, J. M., and Ladd, E. F. 1996, ApJ, 463, 630

- Hiltner, W .A. 1949, ApJ, 109, 471
- Howe, J.E., Jae, D.T., Grossman, E.N., Wall, W.F., Mangum, J.G., and Stacey, G.J. 1993, ApJ, 410, 179
- Johnstone, D. and Bally, J. 1999, ApJ, 510, L49
- Jones, R.V. and Spitzer, L., Jr. 1967, ApJ, 147, 943
- Lagache, G., Abergel, A., Boulanger, F., and Puget, J.L. 1998, A&A, 333, 709
- Lazarian, A., Goodman, A.A., and Myers, P.C. 1997, ApJ, 490, 273
- Leisaw itz, D. and Hauser, M. J. 1988, ApJ, 332, 954
- Lis, D.C., Serabyn, E., Zylka, R., and Li, Y. 2001, ApJ, 550, 761
- M angum, J.G., W ootten, A., and Barsony, M. 1999, ApJ, 526, 845
- M ao, R Q ., Henkel, C ., Schulz, A ., Zielinsky, M ., M auersberger, R ., Storzer, H ., W ilson, T L ., and G ensheim er, P. 2000, a, 358, 433
- M athis, J.S., M ezger, P.G., and Panagia, N. 1983 A & A, 128, 212
- Mathis, J.S., Rumple, W., and Nordsieck, K.H. 1977, ApJ, 217, 425
- Merluzzi, P., Bussoletti, E., Dall'Oglio, G., and Piccorillo, L. 1994, ApJ, 436, 286
- Mezger, P.G., Sievers, A.W., Haslam, C.G.T., Kreysa, E., Lemke, R., Mauersberger, R., and Wilson, T.L. 1992, A&A, 256, 631
- Mochizuki, K. and Nakagawa, T. 2000, ApJ535, 118
- Nagahama, T., Mizuno, A., Ogawa, H., and Fukui, Y. 1998, AJ, 116, 336
- O sterbrock, D.E. 1989, A strophysics of G aseous Nebulae, M ill Valley : University Science Books
- Plume, R., Bensch, F., Howe, J.E., Ashby, M.L.N., Bergin, E.A., Chin, G., Erickson, N. R., Goldsmith, P.F., Harwit, M., Kleiner, S., Koch, D.G., Neufeld, D.A., Patten, B.M., Scheider, R., Snell, R.L., Stau er, J.R., Tolls, V., Wang, Z., Winnewisser, G., Zhang, Y.F., Reynolds, K., Joyce, R., Tavoletti, C., Jack, G., Rodkey, C.J., and Melnick, G.J. 2000, ApJ, L133

- Reach, W. T., Dwek, E., Fixsen, D. J., Hewagama, T., Mather, J.C., Shafer, R.A., Banday, A.J., Bennett, C.L., Cheng, E.S., Eplee, R.E., Jr., Leisawitz, D., Lubin, P.M., Read, S.M., Rosen, L.P., Shuman, F.G.D., Smoot, G.F., Sodroski, T.J., and Wright, E.L. 1995, ApJ, 451, 188
- Reach, W.T., Wall, W.F., and Odegard, N. 1998, ApJ, 507, 507
- Ristorcelli, I., Serra, G., Lamarre, J.M., Giard, M., Pajot, F., Bernard, J.P., Torre, J.P., De Luca, A., and Puget, J.L. 1998, ApJ, 496, 267
- Sakam oto, S., Hayashi, M., Hasegawa, T., Handa, T., and Oka, T. 1994, ApJ, 425, 641
- Sanders, D.B. 1993, Sky Surveys: Protostars to Protogalaxies, ed.B.T. Soifer, San Francisco : A SP 43, 65
- Sanders, D.B., Scoville, N.Z., and Solom on, P.M. 1985, ApJ, 289, 373
- Schberb, F.P., Snell, R.L., and Schwartz, P.R. 1987, ApJ, 319, 426
- Schnee, S., Bethell, T., Goodman, A. 2006, ApJ, 640, L47
- Scoville, N.Z. and Good, J.C. 1989, ApJ339, 149
- Sellgren, K., Luan, L., and Werner, M.W. 1990, ApJ, 359, 384
- Sodroski, T.J., Bennett, C., Boggess, N., Dwek, E., Franz, B.A., Hauser, M.G., Kelsall, T., Moseley, S.H., Odegard, N., Silverberg, R.F., and Weiland, J.L. 1994, ApJ, 428, 638
- Sodroski, T.J., Dwek, E., Hauser, M.G., and Kerr, F.J. 1989, ApJ, 336, 762
- Spitzer, L., Jr. 1978, Physical Processes in the Interstellar Medium, New York: Wiley
- Swartz, P.R., Snell, R.L., and Schlberb, F.P. 1989, ApJ, 336, 519
- Tielens, A.G.G.M. and Hollenbach, D. 1985, ApJ, 291, 722
- Tielens, A.G.G.M. and Hollenbach, D. 1985, ApJ, 291, 747
- Wall, W.F. 2007, MNRAS, 375, 278 (see also astro-ph) (Paper I)
- Wall, W.F. 2007a, MNRAS, accepted (see also astro-ph) (Paper II)
- Wall, W.F. 2007b, MNRAS, submitted (see also astro-ph)

W all, W . F., Ja e, D. T., Israel, F. P., and Bash, F. N. 1991, ApJ, 380, 384

- Wall, W.F., Reach, W.T., Hauser, M.G., Arendt, R.G., Weiland, J.L., Berriman, G.B., Bennett, C.L., Dwek, E., Leisawitz, D., Mitra, P.M., Odenwald, S.F., Sodroski, T. J., and Toller, G.N. 1996, ApJ, 456, 566 (W 96)
- Warin, S., Benayoun, J.J., and Viala, Y.P. 1996, A&A, 308, 535
- Weiss, A., Neininger, N., Hutten eister, S., and Klein, U. 2001, a, 365, 571
- Werner, M.W., Gatley, I., Harper, D.A., Becklin, E.E., Loewenstein, R.F., Telesco, C. M., and Thronson, H.A. 1976, ApJ, 204, 420
- W ild, W ., Harris, A. I., Eckart, A., Genzel, R., Graf, U.U., Jackson, J.M., Russell, A.P.
 G., and Stutzki, J. 1992, A & A, 265, 447
- W ilson, T.L., Muders, D., Kramer, C., and Henkel, C. 2001, ApJ, 557, 240
- W ol re, M.G., Hollenbach, D., and Tielens, A.G.G.M. 1989, ApJ, 344, 370
- W u, Y. and Evans, N. J. 1989, ApJ, 340, 307
- Zhang, C.Y., Laureijs, R.J., Chlewicki, G., Clark, F.O., and Wesselius, P.R. 1989, A&A, 218, 231

This preprint was prepared with the AAS IPT_EX m acros v5.0.

{ 47 {



Fig. 1.] Plots of the 140 m/240 m dust color tem perature versus the ratio of the atom ic gas to molecular gas column densities, N (H I)=2N (H₂), appear above. The upper two panels show these plots for the one-component, LVG models. The lower two panels are for the two-component, two-subsample, LVG models. The panels on the left include the error bars, while the panels on the right exclude the error bars. The curves in the panels on the right represent hypothetical cases where the dust associated with the molecular gas has one xed tem perature for all lines of sight and the dust associated with the atom ic gas has another xed tem perature. The lower curve in each of the right panels assumes that the dust in the molecular gas has $T_d = 165$ K and the dust in the atom ic gas has $T_d = 22.5$ K. The upper curve in each of the right panels assumes that the dust associated with molecular and atom ic gas, respectively. The plots only include those pixels with the intensities above the 5- level in I (140 m), I (240 m), I (¹³CO) and above the 3- level in I(H I) simultaneously.



Fig. 2. The is the equivalent of Figure 1, but for the simulated data. The H I layer has a constant column density of 5 10^{20} H atoms cm² and a constant dust temperature of 22.5K. The curves are the same as those in Figure 1.



Fig. 3. Plots of the I (240 m)=I(13 CO) ratio versus the atom ic hydrogen fraction, N (H I)/N (H I)+ 2N (H₂)] are shown for a subsample of the high signal-to-noise positions with a 140 m/240 m color temperature, T_{dc}, near 18K. Speci cally, this sample of points is higher than 5 in I (140 m), I (240 m), and I(13 CO), higher than 3 in I(H I 21 cm), and with T_{dc} in the range 17 to 19.5K. The upper plots use the N (H₂) values of the non-LTE, one-component m odels and the low er plots use those of the non-LTE, two-component, two-subsample m odels. The left plots include the error bars and right plots om it the error bars for clarity.



Fig. 4. | These are plots of simulated 1300 m continuum to ¹³CO J = 1 ! 0 spectral line ratio data, i.e. I (1300 m)=I(¹³CO), versus simulated 140 m/240 m color temperature data, i.e. T_{dc} . The simulations use the parameters listed in the second column of Table 1 of Paper II and a mass absorption coe cient appropriate for = 1300 m (see details in Section 4.6). The upper panel is the plot of I (1300 m)=I(¹³CO) versus T_{dc} for the temperature range T_{dc} = 14 to 30K. The lower panel plots the same quantities, but for the larger temperature range of T_{dc} = 0 to 200K. The lower panel also shows the model curve out to T_{dc} = 200K.

Table 1. Best-Fit Param eter Values for the Dierent Models

				0 ne-(Com	ponen	tΜ	odels				
LTE												
Full Sam ple												
				Т		2						
				4	1	6.5		673				
					T _d	20	K					
				9	(9.0		140				
						IVC						
					E. 1							
		-	Ν	(¹³ CO)	<u>r u</u>			2				
		T		v 1015	n	(H ₂)		1 C O				
		T	3	1010	T	10°		16.9	ť	5/1		
					T _d	20	K					
		3	3	10 ¹⁵	6	10 ³		10.0	1	L39		
Two-Component Models												
							_					
			N	(^{13}CO)	<u> </u>	LSamj	<u>ple</u> N.	(¹³ CO)			2	
Т	C 0	T _{d0}	IN CU	V _c	1	l ^{c0}	IN C.	V _c	1	n _{cl}	Z	
0	0.04	18	5	1016	2	10 ⁴	8	10 ¹⁵	1	10 ³	5.7	667
<u>Two Subsample</u>												
					Т _d	< 20	K	_				
Т	C ₀	T do	N _{c0}	(¹³ CO)	1	1 ₋₀	N _c	1 (¹³ CO)	1	1 _{c1}	2	
0	1.0	18	5	v _c 10 ¹⁵	1	10 ⁵	2	^v c 10 ¹⁶	1	10 ⁵	4.6	525
					<u>T</u> d	<u>2</u> 0	K					
0	0.4	18	5	10 ¹⁴	1	10 ⁴	5	10 ¹⁵	6	10 ³	82	135

Note. | T and T $_{d0}$ are in units of K elvins. The N (^{13}CO) = v quantities are in units of ^{13}CO molecules cm^2 (km ^{1}s) 1 . The n quantities are in units of H $_2$ molecules cm^3 . All two-component models used the LVG code. See Paper I for discussion of the form al and system atic uncertainties.

Param eter	R ange of Values								
T ^b	1 to + 2K								
T _{d0}		16 to 19K $^{\circ}$							
$C_0 \frac{N_{c0} (^{13}CO)}{v_c}$	2:0	10^{14} to 5:0 10^{15} 13 CO cm 2 (km 1 s) 1							
n _{c0}		$>$ 20 H $_{2}$ cm 3							
$\frac{N_{cl} (^{13}CO)}{v_c} d$	3	10^{15} to 2 10^{16} 13 CO cm 2 (km 1 s) 1							
n _{cl}		$>$ few 10 ³ H $_2$ cm 3							

Table 2. Best Estimates of Parameter Value Ranges^a

^aSee Paper II for details.

^bA ssum ing two-component models applied to both subsamples.

^cSee Section 3.6.

 $^{\rm d}For the two-component m odels applied to the two subsamples, the <math display="inline">\frac{N_{\rm cl}\,(^{13}{\rm C}\,O\,)}{v_{\rm c}}$ value would be at the higher end of this range for the $T_{\rm dc}<20\,K$ subsample and at the lower end for the $T_{\rm dc}$ 20K subsample.