MODELING COLLISIONAL CASCADES IN DEBRIS DISKS: STEEP DUST-SIZE DISTRIBUTIONS

ANDRÁS GÁSPÁR, DIMITRIOS PSALTIS, GEORGE H. RIEKE, AND FERYAL OZEL

Steward Observatory, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721

agaspar@as.arizona.edu, dpsaltis@as.arizona.edu, grieke@as.arizona.edu, fozel@as.arizona.edu

ABSTRACT

We explore the evolution of the mass distribution of dust in collision-dominated debris disks, using the collisional code introduced in our previous paper. We analyze the equilibrium distribution and its dependence on model parameters by evolving over 100 models to 10 Gyr. With our numerical models, we show that systems reach collisional equilibrium with a mass distribution that is steeper than the ones given by earlier analytic or current numerical methods. Our model yields a steady state slope of $n(m) \sim m^{-1.88}$ [$n(a) \sim a^{-3.65}$]. This steeper solution has observable effects in the submillimeter and millimeter wavelength regimes of the electromagnetic spectrum. We assemble data for nine debris disks that have been observed at these wavelengths and, using a simplified absorption efficiency model, show that the predicted slope of the particle mass distribution generates SEDs that are in agreement with the observed ones.

 $Subject\ headings:$ methods: numerical – circumstellar matter – planetary systems – infrared: stars

1. INTRODUCTION

The total mass within debris disks as well as the infrared excess emission produced by their dust are generally calculated assuming the analytic estimate of the distribution of masses in the asteroid belt by [Dohnanyi](#page-11-0) [\(1969\)](#page-11-0). This solution predicts that the sizes follow a power-law, with their numbers increasing with decreasing size a as $n(a) \sim a^{-3.5}$. However, a number of recent efforts to model observations of debris disks have found it necessary to adopt steeper slopes [\(Krist et al. 2010;](#page-11-1) [Golimowski et al. 2011\)](#page-11-2).

[Durda & Dermott \(1997\)](#page-11-3) showed that a steep tensile strength curve, i.e., the function that gives the minimum energy required to disrupt a body catastrophically (see, e.g., [Holsapple et al. 2002;](#page-11-4) [Benz & Asphaug 1999;](#page-11-5) Gáspár et al. 2011), results in a steeper steady-state distribution than the traditional solution. Collisional models of the dust in circumstellar disks (Thébault et al. [2003;](#page-11-7) [Krivov et al. 2005](#page-11-8); Thébault & Augereau 2007; Löhne et al. 2008; Müller et al. 2010; [Wyatt et al. 2011](#page-11-12)) have also shown that the dust particles will settle with a distribution $n(a) \sim a^{-3.61}$, on top of which additional structures appear. This steeper distribution has readily observable effects at the far-IR and submm wavelengths. It also results in higher total dust mass and lower planetesimal mass estimates for the systems.

In this paper, we investigate the slope of the mass distribution and the physical parameters that influence it with the numerical code, introduced in Gáspár et al. (2011, hereafter Paper I). Our code has been developed to calculate the evolution of the particle mass distribution in collisional systems, taking into account both erosive and catastrophic collisions. In §[2,](#page-0-0) we introduce models for the numerical analysis of the collisional cascades and give our findings. In §[3,](#page-6-0) we generate a set of synthetic spectra in order to analyze the effects certain distribution parameters have on different parts of the SEDs. In §[4,](#page-7-0) we introduce a simple relation between the Rayleigh-Jeans part of the spectral energy distributions and the particle size distribution. In §[5,](#page-7-1) we compare our results

to the observed far-IR and sub millimeter data for nine sources.

2. NUMERICAL MODELING

In this section, we analyze the steady-state dust distribution with our full numerical code (Paper I). We run a set of numerical models to study the evolution of the slope of the steady-state distribution function and its dependence on the model parameters. We investigate the time required for the distribution to settle into its steadystate and, with a wide coverage of the parameter space, we also examine the robustness of the solution.

2.1. Evolution of the reference model

We set up a reference debris disk as a basis for comparison to all other model runs. This model consists of a moderately dense debris disk situated at 25 AU around an A0 spectral-type star, with a width and height of 2.5 AU. This radial distance ensures a moderate evolution speed, but with a peak emission in the mid-infrared. It also guarantees a Rayleigh-Jeans tail in the far-infrared regime, which is the primary imaging window for the Herschel Space Telescope. The total mass in the debris disk is 1 M_{\oplus} , distributed within minimum and maximum particle masses that correspond to radii of 5 nm and 1000 km, when assuming a bulk density of 2.7 g cm[−]³ . We summarize the disk parameters of the reference model in Table [1.](#page-1-0) We evolve the reference model for 10 Gyr.

In Figure [1,](#page-1-1) we show the evolution of the particle distribution, plotting it at six different points in time up to 10 Gyr. On the vertical axis we plot $\log_{10} (n(m) \times m^2)$, which can be related to the "mass/bin" that is frequently used in other simulations. Even though the number densities decrease with increasing particle masses, the mass distribution increases towards the larger masses in this representation, as long as the mass distribution slope is smaller than 2.

The smallest particles reach collisional equilibrium first, roughly at $\overline{1}$ Myr, followed by larger particle sizes as the system evolves. After 50-100 Myr of evolution, the upper, gravity dominated part of the distribution

Table 1 Numerical, Collisional, and System parameters of our reference model

Variable	Description	Fiducial value						
System variables								
ρ		2.7 g cm^{-3}						
m_{\min}		1.42×10^{-21} kg						
$m_{\rm max}$		1.13×10^{22} kg						
$M_{\rm tot}$		1 M_{\oplus}						
η_0		1.87						
R		25 AU						
$\triangle R$		2.5 AU						
h_{\cdot}		2.5 AU						
Sp		A ₀						
Collisional variables								
γ		11/6						
β_X		1.24						
α		2.7×10^{-6}						
\boldsymbol{h}		1.23						
f_M		10^{-4}						
f_Y		0.2						
	Largest fraction of Y/X at super catastrophic collision boundary.	0.5						
$\int_{X}^{\rm max}$	Total scaling of the Q^* strength curve $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$							
S	Scaling of the strength regime of the Q^* strength curve	$3.5 \times 10^7 \text{ erg/g}$						
\overline{G}	Scaling of the gravity regime of the Q^* strength curve	$0.3 \text{ erg cm}^3/\text{g}^2$						
$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{S}}$	Power exponent of the strength regime of the Q^* strength curve	-0.38						
\boldsymbol{g}	Power exponent of the gravity regime of the Q^* strength curve	1.36						
Numerical parameters								
δ		1.104						
Θ	Constant in smoothing weight for large-mass collisional probability	$10^6 m_{\rm max}$						
\boldsymbol{P}	Exponent in smoothing weight for large-mass collisional probability	16						

Figure 1. Particle mass distribution of the reference model plotted at various points in time.

 $(m > 10^{13} \text{ kg})$ also reaches equilibrium. The distribution maintains its slope for masses below 10^{10} kg, which roughly corresponds to a planetesimal radius of 100 m. The kink in the distribution at the upper end is due to the change in the strength curve slope $\overline{O'}$ Brien & Greenberg [2005;](#page-11-13) [Bottke et al. 2005\)](#page-11-14).

Structures in the distribution slope, such as waves, may in principle occur at the low-mass end when assuming softer material properties or higher collision velocities. The distribution may also acquire some curvature (see Paper I). Because of these effects, we evaluate the average slope of the distribution by fitting a power-law over a large mass range, but one that remains below the kink in the distribution. Specifically, we fit the distribution between masses 10^{-8} and 10^4 kg, which roughly correspond to sizes of 0.1 mm and 1 m.

We examine the dependence of the steady-state distribution slope on the ad hoc initial conditions parametrized by the initial mass-distribution slope η_0 and the initial total mass in the disk M_{tot} . In Figure [2,](#page-2-0) we show the evolution of the particle mass distribution and its slope as a function of these parameters. The left panels show the dust distribution after 10 Gyr of evolution for different values of the two parameters, while the right panels show the evolution of the dustmass distribution slope. The top right panel shows the evolution of the dust distribution slope for varying initial mass-distribution slopes. Variations in η_0 do not affect the final dust distributions, although the high mass end evolves differently or reaches equilibrium at different timescales. A distribution with less dust initially $(\eta_0 < 1.87)$ also takes more time to reach equilibrium. A shallow distribution with an initial slope of $\eta_0 = 1.5$ takes as much as ~ 1 Gyr to reach equilibrium, although such initial distribution slopes are unlikely. As shown by Löhne et al. (2008) , the evolution of the particle mass distribution is scalable by the total mass (or number densities of particles), which is what we see in the bottom two panels of Figure [2.](#page-2-0) All systems with different initial masses reach the same equilibrium mass distribution, but on different timescales. More massive systems evolve on shorter timescales, thus reaching their equilibrium more quickly, while less massive systems evolve more slowly.

2.2. The dependence of the steady-state distribution function on the collision parameters

The parameters that describe the outcomes of collisions, in principle, should be roughly the same for all collisional systems. These are the fragmentation

Figure 2. (Left panels) Particle mass distribution at 10 Gyr, when varying the initial mass distribution slope (top) and the total mass of the system(bottom). (Right panels) Evolution of the dust-mass distribution slopes when varying the initial mass distribution slope (top) and the total mass of the system (bottom). The steady-state distribution slope is practically independent of these initial conditions.

constants and the parameters of the strength curve [\(Benz & Asphaug 1999](#page-11-5)). In order to investigate their effects on the evolution of the particle mass distribution, we vary their nominal values and evolve the models to the same 10 Gyr, as we did for the reference model.

We give here a detailed analysis of the effects of varying only five of the twelve parameters $(\alpha, b, Q_{\rm sc}, s, S)$, as the remaining seven $(\gamma, \beta_X, f_Y, f_X^{\max}, f_M, g, G)$ have no significant effects (see Table [1](#page-1-0) for the description of these parameters).

In Figure [3,](#page-3-0) we plot the resulting mass distributions when varying the cratered mass parameters α and b (Koschny & Grün 2001a[,b](#page-11-16)). The parameter α is the total scaling and b is the exponent of the projectile's kinetic energy in the equation of the cratered mass

$$
M_{\rm cr} = \alpha \left(\frac{\mu V^2}{2}\right)^b \tag{1}
$$

As can be seen in Figure [3,](#page-3-0) the resulting mass distributions depend on the values of α and \bar{b} only in the gravity dominated regime. At these larger masses, our model is incomplete, because we do not include aggregation. When increasing α , i.e., basically softening the materials or increasing the effects of erosions, the number of eroded particles in the gravity-dominated regime increases rapidly. A similar effect can be observed when increasing the value of b. However, within reasonable values of α and b , the variation of the equilibrium particle mass distribution slope in the dust mass regime is negligible.

In Figure [4,](#page-4-0) we plot the resulting distributions and the evolution of the dust distribution slope when we vary the parameters $Q_{\rm sc}$, S , and s . These are all variables in the tensile strength curve, which is given as [\(Benz & Asphaug 1999\)](#page-11-5)

$$
Q^*(a) = 10^{-4} Q_{\rm sc} \left[S \left(\frac{a}{\rm cm} \right)^s + G \rho \left(\frac{a}{\rm cm} \right)^g \right] \frac{\rm J g}{\rm erg \ kg} . \tag{2}
$$

The variable $Q_{\rm sc}$ is a global scaling factor, S is the scaling of the strength-dominated regime, s is the power dependence on particle size of the strength-dominated regime, G is the scaling of the gravity-dominated regime, and g is the power dependence on particle size of the gravitydominated regime. The tensile strength curve has been extensively studied for decades. However, as it is dependent on various material properties and the collisional velocity [\(Stewart & Leinhardt 2009;](#page-11-17) [Leinhardt & Stewart](#page-11-18) [2011\)](#page-11-18), its parameters do not have universally applicable values. Determining the tensile strength curve at large and small sizes is also extremely difficult experi-

ــا 20۔
20۔ -18 -16 -14 -12 -20 -10 0 10 20 log10[n(m) x m 2 /(kg m 3)] $log_{10}(m/kg)$ α 2.4x10⁻⁴
2.4x10⁻⁵
2.4x10⁻⁶
2.4x10⁻⁷ ــا 20۔
20۔ -18 -16 -14 -12 -20 -10 0 10 20 log10[n(m) x m 2 /(kg m 3)] $log_{10}(m/kg)$ b 1.16 1.23 1.26 1.34

Figure 3. Particle mass distribution at 10 Gyr, when varying the parameters α (left) and b (right) of the cratered mass (equation [1\)](#page-2-1).

mentally. However, because variations in the gravitydominated regime of the curve $(G \text{ and } g)$ do not have significant effects on the equilibrium dust-mass distribution, we do not consider these parameters further in the following discussion.

The slope s of the strength curve in the strengthdominated regime depends on the Weibull flaw-size distribution. Its measured values range anywhere between -0.7 and -0.3 [\(Holsapple et al. 2002](#page-11-4)). Steeper values of s make smaller materials harder to disrupt, which results in a steeper dust distribution slope. At $s = 1.0$, the smallest particles are hard enough to resist catastrophic disruption even when the projectile mass equals the target mass. This results in a mass distribution with a slope equal to the redistribution slope $\gamma = 1.83$. At $s = 0.6$, the smallest particles are still able to destroy each other and generate a dust distribution slope that is close to 1.91.

The scaling constants of the tensile strength curve are the dominant parameters in the evolution toward the steady state distribution. When reducing the complete tensile strength curve scaling $Q_{\rm sc}$, wave structures form more easily, as a particle becomes capable of affecting the evolution of particles much larger than itself (see Paper I). When upscaling the tensile strength curve, the steadystate distribution slope starts to resemble the redistribution slope, as it is the particle redistributions that lead the evolution of the particle mass distribution. When varying the scaling of only the strength side of the curve S, similar effects can be seen.

We conclude that, for all reasonable values of the collisional parameters, the steady-state dust-mass distribution slope is larger or equal to 1.88.

2.3. The dependence of the steady-state distribution function on system variables

There are a number of parameters that can change from one collisional system to another: the material density ρ , the maximum and the minimum particle mass in the system m_{\min} and m_{\max} , the radial distance R, height h, and width ΔR of the disk, and the spectral type of the central star. All these parameters affect three properties of the collisional model: the blow-out mass, the collisional velocity, and the number density of particles.

Varying these parameters will change the timescale of the evolution and affect the steady-state distribution slope. In this subsection, we analyze the effects of varying the radial distance, as it modifies the equilibrium mass distribution by setting the collisional velocity. Modifying either disk parameters ΔR and h or the spectral-type of the star would have similar effects. We do not discuss the variations in the timescales.

In the left panel of Figure [5,](#page-5-0) we show the effects of varying the radial distance, R , on the mass distribution evolved to 10 Gyr. Variations in the radial distance affect both the number density of particles and the collisional velocity, naturally changing the timescale of the evolution and also the outcome of the collisions. Decreasing the radial distance will increase the collisional velocity, resulting in the appearance of waves at the small-mass end of the distribution. It also generates a much more pronounced kink at the high mass end. On the other hand, when the velocity is decreased at large radii, the low mass end of the distribution starts resembling the redistribution function, as smaller particles are not destroyed due to the lower energy collisions. Moreover, no kink is produced at the high mass end. In the right panel of Figure [5,](#page-5-0) we show the evolution of the particle-mass distribution slope as a function of the collisional velocity. For high velocity collisions, the waves render the fitting of a single mass distribution slope ill constructed but the underlying slope of the wavy mass distribution is slightly steeper than for the smaller collisional velocity case.

2.4. The dependence of the steady-state distribution function on numerical parameters

We discuss here the effects of three non-physical variables that appear in the numerical algorithm. They are: the mass ratio δ between neighboring grid points and the parameters of the large particle collisional cross-section smoothing formula, Θ and p (see Paper I). In Figure [6,](#page-5-1) we plot the distribution of the model with varying values of δ at 10 Gyr (left panel) and the evolution in the slope of the dust distribution (right panel). The evolution of the dust distribution is affected by the number of grid points we use, converging at $\delta = 1.13$; this corresponds to 801 grid points between our m_{min} and m_{max} mass range. Using a lower number of grid points leads

Figure 4. (Left panels) Particle mass distribution at 10 Gyr, when varying the values of the tensile strength curve parameters Q_{sc} , S and s. $(Right\ panels)$ Evolution of the dust-mass distribution slopes when varying the values of the same parameters.

to errors in the numerical integration for the redistribution, leading to an offset larger than 7% for the smallest particles in the system, when only using half as many grid points. We find that the dust distribution slope is practically independent of the smoothing variables Θ and p .

2.5. The time to reach steady-state

In our model calculations, the dust distributions in the vast majority of cases reach steady state by 10-20 Myr

and only in a few cases do they take somewhat longer. The characteristic time is less than 100 Myr for all realistic cases. This shows that, apart from second generation debris disks, the majority of debris disks around stars of ages over 100 Myr are most likely to be in collisional steady-state, at least for the smallest particles (< 1 cm). However, young and extended systems, such as β Pic [\(Smith & Terrile 1984;](#page-11-19) [Vandenbussche et al. 2010](#page-11-20)), might not be in complete steady-state at the outer parts of their disks, where interaction timescales are longer.

Figure 5. (Left panel) Particle mass distribution at 10 Gyr, when varying the value of the radial distance of the disk. (Right panel) Evolution of the dust-mass distribution slopes when varying the same parameter.

Figure 6. (Left panel) Particle mass distribution at 10 Gyr, when varying the resolution of the numerical model. (Right panel) Evolution of the dust-mass distribution slopes when varying the same parameter.

Figure 7. Effect on the equilibrium particle mass and size distributions of varying each collisional and system variable by 50%.

2.6. The robustness of the solution One of the most surprising results of the wide range of numerical models we computed is the robustness of

the steady state distribution. Varying the values of the model parameters does not result in significant changes in the slope of the distributions. In Figure [7,](#page-5-2) we show the effect of varying each model parameter by 50% on the equilibrium slope of the dust-mass distribution function. We order the parameters on the horizontal axis as a function of decreasing magnitude of their effects. Note that we varied the parameters that typically span many orders of magnitude by 50% in log. The plot shows that the dominant parameter, by far, is the slope of the strength curve in the strength-dominated regime. This is followed by variables that affect the collisional velocity (ΔR and h) and the power b of the erosive cratered mass formula (equation [\[1\]](#page-2-1)). The plot also shows that neither of our arbitrarily chosen collision prescription constants have any significant effects on the outcome of the collisional cascade. The model runs predict an equilibrium dust mass distribution slope of $\eta = 1.88 \pm 0.02$ ($\eta_a = 3.65 \pm 0.05$), taking the maximum offsets originating from the 50%

3. SYNTHETIC SPECTRA

variation in the model parameters test as our error.

In the following sections, we compare the emission that results from the predicted particle-mass distributions to observations. As a first step, we generate an array of synthetic spectra using realistic astronomical silicate emission properties. We then analyze how the spectra are influenced by the particle mass distribution function.

The flux emitted by a distribution of particle masses at a certain frequency is equal to

$$
F_{\nu} = \frac{\mathfrak{v}\pi}{D^2} \int_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{x}} da \ n(a)a^2 Q_{\text{abs}}(a,\nu) B_{\nu}(T) , \qquad (3)
$$

where Q_{abs} is the absorption efficiency coefficient, $B_{\nu}(T)$ is the blackbody function, and ν is the total volume of the emitting region. Since in infrared astronomy it is customary to express the flux density as a function of wavelength, we rewrite this also as

$$
F_{\nu} = \frac{\mathfrak{v}\pi\lambda^2}{D^2c} \int_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{x}} da \ n(a)a^2 Q_{\text{abs}}(a,\lambda) B_{\lambda}(T) \ . \tag{4}
$$

the SEDs.

The exact function of the absorption efficiencies of par-

Figure 9. Synthetic SEDs for an array of model power-law particle mass distributions, with varied parameters. The fluxes are ticle mass distributions, with varied parameters. scaled to match at 1000 μ m. In the top panel, we show the synthetic SEDs generated for a variety of radial distances; in the middle panel, we show synthetic SEDs generated for a variety of minimum cut-offs $(1, 2, 4, 8, 15, \text{ and } 30 \mu\text{m})$; and in the bottom panel, we show synthetic SEDs generated for a variety of particle-mass distribution slopes (1.80, 1.84, 1.88, 1.92, 1.96 and 1.99). Note: In the middle-panel we vary the minimum cut-off of the particle mass distributions, even though it is a parameter inherently set by equations in our collisional model. Since in reality, the placement of the cut-off is set by the optical properties and structural build of the micron size particles, it is generally treated as a variable in SED models. In the plot we show that such variations in the placement of the minimum cut-off do not affect the long-wavelength part of

Figure 8. Absorption efficiency of astronomical silicates as a function of wavelength for a range of particle sizes between 0.1 and 80 μ m. Solid lines are the ~ $\lambda^{-\beta}$ approximations to the longwavelength regimes of the curves that we employ in this work.

ticles in the interstellar medium or in circumstellar disks is largely unknown. The most commonly used particle types for SED calculations are artificial astronomical silicate (the properties of which are adjusted to reproduce the typical 10 μ m silicate feature and measured laboratory dielectric functions) and graphite [\(Draine & Lee](#page-11-21) [1984\)](#page-11-21). In Figure [8,](#page-6-1) we plot the absorption efficiency as a function of wavelength for a few astronomical silicate particle sizes. Particles larger than $10 \mu m$ have nearly constant absorption efficiency curves at shorter wavelengths $(\lambda < 2\pi a$, where a is the particle radius) with $Q_{\text{abs}} = 1$, which is followed by a power-law cut off. The slope of this power-law becomes constant for wavelengths larger than $\sim 8\pi a$, and is commonly denoted by the variable β . Astronomical silicates of all sizes have a typical value of $\beta = 2$ [\(Draine & Lee 1984\)](#page-11-21).

In Figure [9,](#page-6-2) we show synthetic SEDs, all scaled to the same flux level at 1000 μ m. The top panel shows spectra calculated around an A0 spectral-type star, with debris rings placed at various distances between 2 and 292 AU. The minimum particle size cut-off was set at $\sim 5 \mu m$, in accordance with our model (see Paper I). All disks with radial distances below ∼ 130 AU have a common slope for wavelengths larger than $250 \mu m$, and the furthest disk at 292 AU joins this common slope around \sim 350 µm.

The blow-out size in a system depends on grain structure (porosity) and the exact value of the optical constants for small grains (which is largely unknown and is a function of grain material). For this reason, we also calculated synthetic SEDs for a debris ring at 25 AU around an A0 spectral-type star, with the minimum particle size of the distribution artificially cut off at sizes between 5 and 30 μ m. (Note that we normally calculate the blow-out mass self-consistently as described in Paper I.) We plot these SEDs in the middle panel of Figure [9.](#page-6-2) The offsets between the SEDs become apparent for wavelengths shorter than 200 μ m, while for longer wavelengths, the emission profiles agree and have a common Rayleigh-Jeans slope.

Finally, we explore the dependence of the SED on the slope of the steady-state particle-mass distribution. The bottom panel of Figure [9](#page-6-2) shows synthetic SEDs generated for a debris ring at 25 AU around an A0 spectral type star, with a minimum particle cut-off size at $5 \mu m$, but with particle mass distribution slopes between 1.81 and 1.99. These plots show that the slope of the Rayleigh-Jeans part of the emission is greatly influenced by the particle size distribution slope. In fact, they depend almost solely on it, with the temperature of the grains having mild effects at large orbital distances.

4. RELATION BETWEEN THE PARTICLE MASS DISTRIBUTION AND THE SED

The absorption efficiency curves can be simplified and described as

$$
Q_{\rm abs}(\lambda, a) \propto \begin{cases} 1 & \lambda < 4\pi a \\ \left(\frac{xa}{\lambda}\right)^{\beta} & \lambda > 4\pi a \end{cases}
$$

where x is a scaling constant for the power-law part of the function. Fitting the silicate absorption efficiency functions, we find

$$
x = 12 \left(\frac{a}{\mu \text{m}}\right)^{-0.5} \tag{5}
$$

Using this simplified absorption efficiency model and assuming that all particles contribute to the Rayleigh-Jeans tail of the SED with their own Rayleigh-Jeans emission, we estimate the emitted flux density at long wavelengths as

$$
F_{\nu} = \frac{2\mathfrak{v}\pi k_{\mathrm{b}}TC_{\mathrm{disk}}}{D^2\lambda^2} \left[10^{-3}\left(\frac{12}{\lambda}\right)^{\beta}\int_{0}^{\frac{\lambda}{4\pi}}\mathrm{d}a \ a^{2+\frac{\beta}{2}-\eta_a} + \int_{\frac{\lambda}{4\pi}}^{\infty}\mathrm{d}a \ a^{2-\eta_a}\right].
$$
 (6)

Here we assumed a β parameter that is independent of the particle size. The variable C_{disk} is the number density scaling (see Paper I), k_b is the Boltzmann constant, T is the temperature of the dust grains (which we also assume to be particle size independent), and D is the distance of the system from the observer. The quantity η_a is the steady state particle size distribution slope, and can be calculated from the mass distribution slope as $\eta_a = 3\eta$ – 2. Integrating these functions, we get

$$
F_{\nu}(\lambda) = C_1 \ \lambda^{1 - \frac{\beta}{2} - \eta_a} + C_2 \ \lambda^{1 - \eta_a} \ , \tag{7}
$$

where

$$
C_1 = \frac{2\pi k_b T C_{\text{disk}}}{D^2} \times \frac{10^{-3} 12^{\beta} 2^{2\eta_a - 5 - \beta} \pi^{\eta_a - 3 - \beta/2}}{6 + \beta - 2\eta_a} (8)
$$

$$
C_2 = \frac{2\pi k_b T C_{\text{disk}}}{D^2} \times \frac{(4\pi)^{\eta_a - 3}}{\eta_a - 3} \,. \tag{9}
$$

Assuming $\beta = 2$, which is appropriate for astronomical silicates, we find that the slope of the SED is equal to $-\eta_a$ for the short wavelength part of the Rayleigh-Jeans tail of the SED and $1-\eta_a$ for the long wavelength regime. Similar results have been found by [Wyatt & Dent \(2002](#page-11-22)).

Our models yield a steady-state distribution slope of $\eta_a \approx 3.65$, meaning that the Rayleigh-Jeans tail end of the SEDs should be proportional to

$$
F_{\nu} \propto \lambda^{-2.65} \,, \tag{10}
$$

as long as the particles are in collisional steady state.

5. COMPARISON TO OBSERVATIONS

To compare the computed spectra of steady-state collisional disks to data, we assembled the available data for debris disks with far-IR and submillimeter observations. As a result of our analysis in §[3,](#page-6-0) where we determined the wavelength range that is least sensitive to parameters, we use only data at wavelengths larger than $250 \mu m$. To fit a power-law to the Rayleigh-Jeans regime of the SEDs, we need a minimum of three data points above our wavelength cut-off. We found a total of only nine sources that fulfill these requirements. We present the far-IR/submillimeter fluxes for these sources in Table [2.](#page-8-0) Occasionally, published submillimeter measurements do not account for systematic errors. In these cases, we applied a total of 30% error to all ground based measurements at 350 and 450 μ m and 15% for all Herschel data and measurements above $850 \mu m$. We also made sure that the data included all the flux from each source and applied an aperture correction estimate otherwise. All corrections are listed as notes in Table [2.](#page-8-0)

Star	λ (μ m)	Flux (mJy)	Error (mJy)	Excess (mJy)	Reference	Notes
β Pic	250	1,900.0	285.0	1,897.5	Vandenbussche et al. (2010)	
	350	720.0	108.0	718.7	Vandenbussche et al. (2010)	
	500	380.0	57.0	379.4	Vandenbussche et al. (2010)	
	800	115.0	30.0	114.8	Zuckerman & Becklin (1993)	
	850	85.2	13.0	85.0	Holland et al. (1998)	
	850	104.3	16.0	103.8	Holland et al. (1998)	
	1200	24.3	4.0	24.2	Liseau et al. (2003)	
	1200	35.9	5.0	35.8	Liseau et al. (2003)	within 40"
	1300	24.9	4.0	24.8	Chini et al. (1991)	
ϵ Eri	350	366.0	109.8	359.45	Backman et al. (2009)	CSO/SHARCII
	450	250.0	75.0	246.06	Greaves et al. (2005)	JCMT/SCUBA
	850	37.0	5.55	35.92	Greaves et al. (2005)	JCMT/SCUBA
	1300	24.2	4.0	23.74	Chini et al. (1991)	JCMT/SCUBA
Fomalhaut	350	1,180.0	354.0	1,168.3	Marsh et al. (2005)	
	450	595.0	200.0	587.8	Holland et al. (2003)	
	850	97.0	14.55	95.1	Holland et al. (2003)	
	1300	21.0	3.5	20.17	Chini et al. (1991)	
HD 8907	450	22.0	11.0	21.87	Najita & Williams (2005)	
	850	4.8	1.2	4.76	Najita & Williams (2005)	
	1200	3.2	0.9	3.18	Roccatagliata et al. (2009)	
HD 104860	350	50.1	15.0	50.0	Roccatagliata et al. (2009)	
	450	47.0	14.0	46.9	Najita & Williams (2005)	
	850	6.8	1.2	6.78	Najita & Williams (2005)	
	1200	4.4	1.1	4.39	Roccatagliata et al. (2009)	
	3000	1.35	0.67	1.35	Carpenter et al. (2005)	
HD 107146	350	319.0	90.0	318.8	Roccatagliata et al. (2009)	
	450	130.0	39.0	129.9	Najita & Williams (2005)	
	850	20.0	3.2	19.96	Najita & Williams (2005)	
	1300	10.4	3.0	10.39	Najita & Williams (2005)	
	3000	1.42	0.3	1.41	Carpenter et al. (2005)	
HR 8799	350	89.0	26.0	88.8	Patience et al. (2011)	
	850	15.0	3.0	14.96	Williams & Andrews (2006)	Aperture Correction
	1200	4.0	2.7	3.98	Bockelée-Morvan et al. (1994)	
Vega	250	1,680.0	260.0	1,617.6	Sibthorpe et al. (2010)	
	350	610.0	100.0	578.5	Sibthorpe et al. (2010)	
	500	210.0	40.0	194.8	Sibthorpe et al. (2010)	
	850	45.7	7.0	40.5	Holland et al. (1998)	
HD 207129	250	113.0	18.0	111.78	Marshall et al. (2011)	
	350	44.3	9.0	43.68	Marshall et al. (2011)	
	500	25.9	8.0	25.60	Marshall et al. (2011)	
	870	5.1	2.7	5.00	Nilsson et al. (2010)	

Table 2 Observational data of debris disks

We perform individual power-law fits to the data of each source as well as a fit to all sources simultaneously with a common Rayleigh-Jeans slope. In Figure [10,](#page-9-0) we present the photosphere subtracted excess emissions for each source in the left panels and plot the best-fit powerlaw spectrum of the form

$$
F_{\nu} = A \times \left(\frac{\lambda}{200 \ \mu m}\right)^{-l},\tag{11}
$$

obtained from individual fits. We show in the right panels of Figure [10](#page-9-0) the error contours of the slope and normalization of the power-law at the 1, 2, and 3σ levels. The plots also indicate the $\chi^2_{\rm min}/\text{d.o.f.}$ (the minimum of the reduced χ^2) of each fit. The solid red line represents the Rayleigh-Jeans slope calculated from the [Dohnanyi](#page-11-0) [\(1969\)](#page-11-0) analytic solution, the green band represents the best slope given by our reference model calculation (including errors from 50% variations in the slope of the strength curve, see Figure [7\)](#page-5-2), and the blue band yields our global fit solution of

$$
l = 2.60 \pm 0.06 \tag{12}
$$

The global fit and our reference model agree within the errors of the prediction.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we used our numerical model introduced in Paper I to follow the evolution of a distribution of particle masses. We varied all twelve collisional, all six system, and all three numerical variables of our model and examined the effects of these variations on the evolution of the particle mass distribution. Our numerical model has been built to ensure mass conservation and that the resulting distribution of particles is not artificially offset due to numerical errors, as the integrations of the model span over 40 orders of magnitude in mass. In §[2.4](#page-3-1) of this paper, we demonstrate that lower precision integrations can lead to shallower particle distributions.

The steady-state particle distribution of the collisional system is extremely robust against variations in its variables, with the strongest effects occurring from changes to the tensile strength curve [\(Holsapple et al.](#page-11-4) [2002;](#page-11-4) [Benz & Asphaug 1999\)](#page-11-5). Even these variations have mild effects on the slope of the particle mass distribution, modifying it only between the values of 1.84 and 1.94 (3.52 and 3.82 in mass space, respectively). We find the dust distribution of our reference model to be 1.88 (3.65 in size space). We find that waves occur when the collisional velocities are high or when particle strengths are

Figure 10. Observed SEDs of debris disks with submillimeter and millimeter data. The left panels are the photosphere-subtracted fluxes of the excess emissions with the best fitting slopes, while the right panels are the 68%, 95% and 99% confidence contours of the individual fits. The error contours also show the slope given by the [Dohnanyi \(1969](#page-11-0)) mass distribution function in red, the value predicted by our numerical code in the green band, and the best global fit with errors in the blue band.

low at the mass distribution cut-off, where the radiation force blowout dominates the dynamics.

The Rayleigh-Jeans tail of the debris disk SEDs is dominated by the medium sized particles, whose mass distribution is less affected by possible wavy structures. We derive a simple formula that gives the slope of the measured flux density in the Rayleigh-Jeans part of the SEDs as

$$
F_{\nu} \propto \lambda^{1-\eta_a} .
$$

This implies that the mass distribution slope itself could, in principle, be measured from long-wavelength observations. We assemble a list of nine debris disks that have been measured at the far-IR, submillimeter, and

millimeter wavelengths and examine the Rayleigh-Jeans slope of their emissions. Our predictions of a slope of $l = 2.65 \pm 0.05$ agrees well with the observations, which have a global slope fit of $l = 2.60 \pm 0.06$.

HD 107146

HD 8907

HR 8799

HD 207129

Support for this work was provided by NASA through Contract Number 1255094 issued by JPL/Caltech. We thank Viktor Zubko and Karl Misselt for providing the numerical code to calculate the optical properties of large grains.

REFERENCES

Backman, D., et al. 2009, ApJ, 690, 1522

- Benz, W., & Asphaug, E. 1999, Icarus, 142, 5
- Bockelée-Morvan, D., André, P., Colom, P., Colas, F., Crovisier, J., Despois, D., & Jorda, L. 1994, in Circumstellar Dust Disks and Planet Formation, ed. R. Ferlet & A. Vidal-Madjar, 341
- Bottke, W. F., Durda, D. D., Nesvorný, D., Jedicke, R., Morbidelli, A., Vokrouhlick´y, D., & Levison, H. 2005, Icarus,
- 175, 111 Carpenter, J. M., Wolf, S., Schreyer, K., Launhardt, R., &
- Henning, T. 2005, AJ, 129, 1049
- Chini, R., Kruegel, E., Kreysa, E., Shustov, B., & Tutukov, A. 1991, A&A, 252, 220
- Dohnanyi, J. S. 1969, J. Geophys. Res., 74, 2531
- Draine, B. T., & Lee, H. M. 1984, ApJ, 285, 89
- Durda, D. D., & Dermott, S. F. 1997, Icarus, 130, 140
- Gáspár, A., Rieke, G. H., Psaltis, D., Özel, F., & Cooney, A.
- 2011, ApJ, submitted
- Golimowski, D. A., et al. 2011, AJ, 142, 30
- Greaves, J. S., et al. 2005, ApJ, 619, L187
- Holland, W. S., et al. 1998, Nature, 392, 788
- ———. 2003, ApJ, 582, 1141
- Holsapple, K., Giblin, I., Housen, K., Nakamura, A., & Ryan, E. 2002, Asteroids III, 443
- Koschny, D., & Grün, E. 2001a, Icarus, 154, 391
- ———. 2001b, Icarus, 154, 402
- Krist, J. E., et al. 2010, AJ, 140, 1051
- Krivov, A. V., Sremčević, M., & Spahn, F. 2005, Icarus, 174, 105
- Leinhardt, Z. M., & Stewart, S. T. 2011, [arXiv:1106.6084](http://arxiv.org/abs/1106.6084)
- Liseau, R., Brandeker, A., Fridlund, M., Olofsson, G., Takeuchi, T., & Artymowicz, P. 2003, A&A, 402, 183
- Löhne, T., Krivov, A. V., & Rodmann, J. 2008, ApJ, 673, 1123
- Marsh, K. A., Velusamy, T., Dowell, C. D., Grogan, K., & Beichman, C. A. 2005, ApJ, 620, L47
- Marshall, J. P., et al. 2011, A&A, 529, A117
- Müller, S., Löhne, T., & Krivov, A. V. 2010, ApJ, 708, 1728
- Najita, J., & Williams, J. P. 2005, ApJ, 635, 625
- Nilsson, R., et al. 2010, A&A, 518, A40
- O'Brien, D. P., & Greenberg, R. 2005, Icarus, 178, 179
- Patience, J., et al. 2011, A&A, 531, L17
- Roccatagliata, V., Henning, T., Wolf, S., Rodmann, J., Corder, S., Carpenter, J. M., Meyer, M. R., & Dowell, D. 2009, A&A, 497, 409
- Sibthorpe, B., et al. 2010, A&A, 518, L130
- Smith, B. A., & Terrile, R. J. 1984, Science, 226, 1421
- Stewart, S. T., & Leinhardt, Z. M. 2009, ApJ, 691, L133
- Thébault, P., & Augereau, J.-C. 2007, A&A, 472, 169
- Thébault, P., Augereau, J. C., & Beust, H. 2003, A&A, 408, 775
- Vandenbussche, B., et al. 2010, A&A, 518, L133
- Williams, J. P., & Andrews, S. M. 2006, ApJ, 653, 1480 Wyatt, M. C., Clarke, C. J., & Booth, M. 2011, Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy, 39
- Wyatt, M. C., & Dent, W. R. F. 2002, MNRAS, 334, 589
- Zuckerman, B., & Becklin, E. E. 1993, ApJ, 414, 793