


Faraday Discussions

Accepted Manuscript



This is an Accepted Manuscript, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this Accepted Manuscript with the edited and formatted Advance Article as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about Accepted Manuscripts in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this Accepted Manuscript or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.

Thermal Behavior of Astrophysical Amorphous Molecular Ices

Murthy S. Gudipati^{1,*}, Benjamin Fleury², Robert Wagner³, Bryana L. Henderson¹, Kathrin Altwegg⁴, Martin Rubin⁴

¹Science Division, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, CA 91109, USA. ²Universite Paris Est Creteil and Universite Paris Cité, CNRS, LISA, F-94010 Créteil, France, ³Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany, ⁴Physikalisches Institut, University of Bern, Sidlerstrasse 5, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland.

*Corresponding Author. Email: murthy.gudipati@jpl.nasa.gov

Abstract

Ice is a major component of astrophysical environment – from interstellar molecular clouds through protoplanetary disks to evolved solar systems. Ice and complex organic matter coexist in these environments as well, and it is thought primordial ice brought the molecules of life to Earth four billion years ago, which could have kickstarted the origin of life on Earth. To understand the journey of ice and organics from their origins to becoming a part of evolved planetary systems, it is important to complement high spatial and spectral resolution telescopes such as JWST with laboratory experimental studies that provide deeper insight into the processes that occur in these astrophysical environments. Our laboratory studies are aimed at providing this knowledge. In this article we present simultaneous mass spectrometric and

infrared spectroscopic investigation on how molecular ice mixtures behave at different temperatures and how this information is critical to interpret observational data from protoplanetary disks as well as comets. We find that amorphous to crystalline water ice transformation is the most critical phenomenon that differentiates between outgassing of trapped volatiles such as CO₂ vs. outgassing of pure molecular ice domains of the same in a mixed molecular ice. Crystalline water ice is found to trap only a small fraction of other volatiles (<5%), indicating ice grain composition in astrophysical and planetary environments must be different depending on whether the ice is in amorphous phase or transformed into crystalline phase, even if the crystalline ice undergoes radiation-induced amorphization subsequently. Crystallization of water ice is a key differentiator for many ices in astronomical environments as well as in our Solar System.

Introduction

Astrochemistry is aimed at simulating astrophysical environments to predict chemical processes as well as providing their underlying mechanisms in these environments. As JWST continues to provide outstanding data at better spatial and spectral resolution and sensitivity than the previous telescopic measurements¹⁻⁴, the need to obtain laboratory data at higher resolution is now more important than ever before. In addition to higher spectral resolution that enables better separation of individual absorption/emission bands and higher spatial resolution of observations that provides better contrast of the observed objects (whether interstellar molecular clouds or protoplanetary disks or other solar system objects), we need a better understanding of the effect of temperature, pressure, and local radiation in these

environments that are often spatially heterogeneous. Small temperature variations could have a significant effect on the ice vs. gas-phase composition in these environments^{5,6}. Temperature measurements in astrophysical environments are still averaged through the line of sight and often need to be approximated. For this reason, if laboratory studies could provide better handle on the effect of temperature on the ice/gas partitions, we should be able to use these data to better constrain temperatures of local astrophysical environments. Observations with higher spatial resolution can then be better interpreted using laboratory data.

In protoplanetary environments, ice-lines are drawn at various radial and lateral distances from the protostar⁶⁻⁸. However, these lines are dictated by not only ice composition and its phase (amorphous or crystalline), but also the exact temperature of the local environment. For this reason, we focused in our study on outgassing of mixed molecular ices and their composition at various temperatures. In protoplanetary disks, though temperature decreases with radial distance, volatile and supervolatile molecular species (with respect to water) would form pure ices or mixed ices trapped in water and other ices based on their local abundances. It is still not clear whether ice particles form in the protoplanetary disks freshly or retain their interstellar ice grain properties as they accrete on to a protoplanetary disk during its formation. Though radial transportation is used in many models, how far the grains and gas are transported and whether transport occurs primarily in one direction or both directions (high to low and low to high temperatures) are still open questions^{9,10}, particularly, when gas-phase observations are used as a proxy for ice composition¹¹. It is also assumed that the icy grains in the protoplanetary disks become a part of cometary nuclei retaining their chemical, structural, and compositional integrity¹²⁻¹⁴. Thus, there is an effort to correlate cometary outgassing

(reflecting thermal evolution of a comet during its travel around the Sun) with the ice grain composition of protoplanetary disks. In order to gain better constraints on interpreting observational data from icy environments – be they interstellar, protoplanetary, or cometary nuclei - we need a wide range of laboratory data. We conducted temperature programmed desorption (TPD) studies of mixed molecular ices by means of simultaneous mass spectrometry of outgassed molecules and infrared spectroscopy of mixed molecular ices. We also carried out calorimetric study of macroscopic water ice. Our experiments provide some of these critically needed data and understanding of the processes involved, complement existing experimental data as discussed in the following, and provide a deeper understanding of the role of local temperature on the ice physics.

Experimental:

All the experiments were conducted at the Ice Spectroscopy Laboratory (ISL) of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. We used standard Temperature Programmed Desorption (TPD) methods to determine sublimation of mixed molecular ices at various starting mixing ratios. The experimental station (named Himalaya) used for this work is shown in **Figure 1**.

TPD of Mixed Molecular Ices: Molecules used here are CO, O₂, CO₂, and H₂O as a realistic representative of supervolatiles (CO and O₂), volatiles (CO₂) in water ice. We chose much higher mixing ratio such that the volatiles are in “excess” compared to what has been observed in astrophysical or cometary ices¹⁵⁻¹⁸. This was deliberately done to ensure that there are pure volatile and supervolatile ice domains in the mixed molecular ices. This method differs slightly from previous methods^{19, 20}, where either observed mixing ratios were used for mixed

molecular ices or layered ices²¹⁻³³, or pure ices were studied through TPD^{34, 35}. In astrophysical environments it is unlikely that pure supervolatile ice grains exist where no other molecule is present in the ice grains, such as pure CO ice, though pure CO ice domains could exist in an ice grain that contains other volatiles as well. Properties of such mixed-molecular ices or layered ices also depend upon whether these ice grains travelled from cold to warmer regions of the protoplanetary disk or vice versa. It is easy to imagine grains moving from inner protoplanetary disk to the outer, which would lead to less volatile molecules to condense first forming layered ice grains with supervolatiles condensing on the top of the ice grain. The situation is more complex if the movement is from colder to warmer regions as the supervolatiles that are trapped within the less volatile molecular ices only survive in that ice grain. For this reason, we think our molecular mixing ratio provides a more realistic representative of pure ice domains in mixed molecular ice grains and complements data so far available on other ice compositions mentioned earlier.

All the ice mixtures were deposited at 10 K on a sapphire substrate at normal incidence for a duration of 3-6 min at a background pressure of $\sim 1 \times 10^{-6}$ mbar. The end of the vapor deposition tube (1/4-inch outer diameter stainless steel) was kept ~ 2 inches away from the sapphire optical window that was cooled with a Sumitomo (SHI-4-15, Janis Research) closed-cycle helium cryostat that reaches a minimum of 4.2 K. Calibration studies done on water ice under these conditions show the ice films are of ~ 250 nm (about 1000 monolayers) in thickness. Initial mixing ratios were controlled based on pressure in the ice chamber determined by an inverted magnetron pressure gauge (Agilent Varian IMG-300). We did not use the mass spectrometer to adjust the mixing ratios because of fragmentation of CO₂ to CO that

interferes with the exact ratios. Final mixing ratios are determined from the FTIR spectral integrated intensities normalized to the respective band strengths (see results section) of the individual molecules.

The temperature ramp was held at 0.5 K/min. Our Lakeshore (Model 340) temperature controller allows for a ramp rate as slow as 0.1 K/min, but the long duration experiments introduce artefacts such as background deposition that may lead to erroneous results. We experimented with faster ramp rates (1 K/min) and found that the rate did not show significant effect on the TPD-mass spectrometry (TPD-MS) of these ices. Most of the experiments were done with 0.5 K/min heating rate to ensure better equilibration of ice at any given temperature and better applicability of TPD data to typical astrophysical environments.

Desorption of molecular volatiles during TPD was quantified through quadrupole ion mass spectrometry (MS) using Stanford Research Systems (SRS RGA-300) quadrupole mass spectrometer and infrared (IR) spectroscopy using Thermo-Nicolet 6700 FTIR spectrometer equipped with KBr beam splitter and external liquid-nitrogen cooled MCT-A detector. IR spectroscopy provides independent and complementary data on the desorption process in terms of molecules remaining in the ice phase, whereas mass spectrometry provides composition of desorbed molecules in vacuum. We found that this combination of techniques was particularly useful in cases where species are less-efficiently pumped by the turbomolecular pump (i.e., CO molecules) and thus can be over-represented in the mass spectra, or for those that are unable to be quantified by the infrared spectra alone (i.e., N₂ and O₂ molecules). With IR spectroscopy, we were also able to track a slight increase in the IR

absorption of the H₂O ice band as the temperature is ramped due to sublimation from other parts of the cryostat and recondensation on the sapphire window.

Ionization of gases in the mass spectrometer was done at 70 eV. Electron-impact ionization cross-sections at 70 eV for these molecules are taken from NIST data (O₂ = 2.441 Å²; CO = 2.516 Å²; CO₂ = 3.521 Å²; H₂O = 2.275 Å²). Integrated mass spectral data were then normalized with respect to the CO₂ ionization cross-section to obtain molecular mixing ratios of deposited gas mixture (which in turn represents closely the ice composition determined through infrared spectroscopy). The scaling factors used are: O₂ (1.44); CO (1.4); CO₂ (1); H₂O (1.55). We note here that CO mass peak at 28 m/z has contribution from N₂ (which can be estimated to be about 8 times the partial pressure of N detected at 14 m/z) as well as ionization fragmentation of CO₂ to CO, which is about 10% of CO₂ partial pressure. These and slow pumping of CO by turbomolecular pumps cause difficulties to quantitatively interpret CO mixing ratio in the outgassing under our experimental conditions.

Using the integrated IR spectral absorbances, the relative molecular abundance was calculated using band strengths from the literature³⁶⁻³⁹ as follows: CO (1.1x 10⁻¹⁷ cm/molecule); CO₂ (7.7x10⁻¹⁷ cm/molecule); H₂O (1.6x10⁻¹⁶ cm/molecule). Please note that O₂ is IR inactive, and we rely upon mass spectrometry for O₂ mixing ratios. Further, we conducted calorimetry using the same conventional closed-cycle cryostat that is also used for the above mentioned TPD studies.

Calorimetry of Pure H₂O Ice: For the calorimetry experiments, we deposited macroscopic amounts of pure water at 10 K to form amorphous ice. Our goal was to capture the amorphous to crystalline phase transition of pure H₂O ice and determine if there were differences in

temperature range or any dependence on ice thickness on the crystallization of amorphous ice during TPD. For these experiments, we made an internal calibration between two temperature measuring silicon diodes, first diode (SD1) is mounted at the end of the heating tape where the sample holder is connected to the closed-cycle cryostat and the second silicon diode (SD2) is mounted at the bottom of the sample holder (see **Figure 2**). Amorphous ice was directly deposited on the copper sample holder where the SD2 is located for different durations. The water vapor inlet tube was brought about 5 mm closer to the SD2 location of the sample holder to avoid ice formation on the entire sample holder, but to limit it at the SD2 location. First, we ran a pre-programmed 2 K/min reference ramp prior to ice deposition using the Lakeshore temperature controller's temperature ramping with PID (proportional, integral, derivative) control. To obtain a smooth heating ramp devoid of the oscillations inherent in the PID control, we fitted the recorded time-dependent heater wattage values with a three-exponential fit and used these values to prescribe the heating ramp for the ice experiments. If there were no change in the heat absorbed or released by the ice, at each pre-programmed ramping stage, the temperatures of both the diodes SD1 and SD2 would have read the same as without the sample. However, if there were to be heat released due to the exothermic amorphous to crystalline phase transition, the SD2 would read a higher temperature than SD1 and the ratio SD2/SD1 would increase. Similarly, for an endothermic phase transition, this ratio would decrease. Indeed, subtle changes were measured corresponding to exothermic ice crystallization around 140 K and endothermic ice sublimation around 190 K. The ice samples deposited were estimated to be a few milligrams and the heating ramp was conducted at the maximum power setting on the heater controller at 100 W, starting at 35% of the output at 10

K and ending at ~90% at 200 K. Despite the high heater wattage needed to work against the cooling power, we were able to measure extremely small exothermic and endothermic peaks because we have used the two temperature sensor diodes located apart from each other that would otherwise have exactly the same conditions except for instantaneous minuscule differences in temperature. This is almost like weighing an elephant with and without a sparrow on it! But it indeed worked quantitatively as will be presented in the results section.

Results

TPD of Mixed Molecular Ices: We studied several mixed molecular ices, including two component CO:CO₂, three component CO:O₂:CO₂, and four component CO:O₂:CO₂:H₂O ices. We also varied the mixing ratios, except the CO to O₂ ratio was kept constant close to 1. In the TPD-MS, we followed gas-phase N (proxy of N₂ that comes at the same m/z as CO at 28; N:N₂ peak ratio from NIST Webbook is ~12:100), CO, O₂, CO₂, CO₃ (that could be an impurity in CO gas cylinders through reaction of CO with O₂), and H₂O. Some of these desorption mass spectral plots are shown in **Figures 3 – 7** along with their counterpart from integration of the FTIR spectra. In **Figure 8**, integrated mass spectral data, of outgassed volatiles trapped in amorphous water ice (>90 K) that are released during amorphous to crystalline ice transition ~140 K (black bars) and trapped in crystalline water ice (>145 K) that are released along with subliming water (orange bars), are shown as bar graphs. Full range mass spectra and infrared spectra for four component mixed molecular ice are shown in **Figures 9 and 10**. Our TPD-MS profiles are qualitatively in agreement with earlier work, especially pure and mixed-molecular ices containing H₂O, CO, CO₂, CH₃OH, and NH₃¹⁹ and H₂O, CO, CO₂, CH₄⁴⁰. In all the experiments we

conducted, most of the CO either exists as a pure CO ice domain or CO is outgassed prior to the start of CO₂ outgassing, even if CO is trapped in CO₂ ice, except with CO:O₂:CO₂:H₂O mixed molecular ices. During the formation of water-dominant amorphous ice, all the other volatiles are trapped to some extent within the amorphous ice. We also observed some entrapment of CO₂ in pure CO or O₂ ice domains evident from CO₂ outgassing along with CO and O₂, both of which have similar sublimation temperatures. N₂ sublimation starts after CO sublimation and along with O₂ sublimation, as inferred from tracing N in the TPD-MS profiles. Also, minor entrapment of CO and O₂ was observed in CO₂ ice domains as reflected in the CO₂ sublimation region of the TPD-MS profiles. Above 100 K, when all the excess pure ices of CO, O₂, and CO₂ are sublimed, the remaining ice on the substrate must be amorphous water ice and any residual volatiles/supervolatiles trapped in it. Indeed at ~130 K, we start observing another desorption event that maximizes at 145 K and completes at 150 K. During this period, a significant amount of all three volatiles CO, O₂, and CO₂ are released simultaneously into the gas-phase, along with a small amount of H₂O sublimation. We see consistently that more CO₂ is trapped in amorphous water ice than CO or O₂. From the integrated TPD-MS data we find that the sum of all trapped species in amorphous water ice is about 30%. Our data indicates that indeed amorphous water ice can trap significant amounts of other volatile species even at temperatures as high as 130 K. Interestingly, as soon as the temperature reaches 150 K all the trapped volatiles are desorbed and the amorphous to crystalline ice transformation is then complete as well. Above 150 K, water ice starts sublimation alone. At this point only an extremely small portion of other volatiles are trapped in the crystalline water ice, as evident from the desorption maxima around 160 K, where only about 2-3% of CO is seen to desorb along with H₂O. The rest of the molecules

have even lower mixing ratios. We can use the TPD-MS and IR data of our experiments to backtrack ice composition at different temperatures.

Infrared spectra have also been simultaneously obtained and the discrepancies between IR and mass spectral data reveal values obtained for CO from mass spectral data alone cannot be quantitatively used due to the longer residence time of CO in the vacuum chamber. For example, total integrated TPD-MS partial pressure ratios of CO:CO₂ is ~3:1, whereas IR spectral data indicate a CO:CO₂ ratio of 1:2.8 (**Figure 3**). It is well known that conventional turbomolecular pumps even at 10⁻⁹ mbar vacuum are less efficient at pumping CO. As a result, integrated mass spectra over-estimate CO outgassing. This is further complicated by continuous CO release from the ice into the vacuum that is clearly seen from the IR spectra of the ices (**Figures 3-7**). In the astrochemistry community, the majority of the cryogenic systems are equipped with these turbomolecular pumps, at ~10⁻⁹ mbar working pressures. As discussed below, under those conditions caution must be exercised in the interpretation of TPD-MS data alone.

Calorimetry of Pure H₂O Ice: In order to quantify the exothermicity of the amorphous to crystalline ice transition, we have relied on an internal standard, namely the heat of sublimation of crystalline ice. In our first experiment, where ice was deposited at 2-3*10⁻⁵ mbar for 900 min at a rate of 1*10⁻⁵ g/min (black line curve in **Figure 11**), the endothermic sublimation as well as the exothermic crystallization are well behaved. Subsequently, we increased the time of deposition as shown in **Figure 11** and both the exotherm and endotherm peaks increased, with the sublimation endotherm out of bound with thicker ice sample. At this point, ice sublimation is so fast that the vacuum in the system raised significantly (to ~1x10⁻³

mbar) and the data was no longer reliable. We excluded such data from calculating sublimation enthalpy. From the literature, we took the sublimation endotherm to be 2830 kJ/kg⁴¹ and multiplied it by the ratio of the integrated crystallization exotherm to the integrated sublimation endotherm. By this procedure, we obtained the heat of crystallization exotherm for amorphous ice to be 109 kJ/kg, 109 kJ/kg, 116 kJ/kg, and 138 kJ/kg for the four different experiments we conducted at different ice deposition durations ranging from 900 min to 5160 min, with an arithmetic mean and standard deviation of 118 ± 12 kJ/kg. This value is in very good agreement with the literature reports of ~ 100 kJ/kg⁴²⁻⁴⁵. Our method is simple and easy to implement for a wide range of equipment and ices.

Discussion:

There are a few major take aways from our experiments presented here. The first one is that super volatiles CO, O₂, and N₂ (proxy N) can only exist in significant mixing ratios in interstellar, protoplanetary, and cometary ices that are extremely cold – at or less than 30 K. The second take away is that the exothermicity of amorphous to crystalline pure water ice transition is confirmed again. At the same time, we also found that irrespective of the ice thickness – whether a few hundred nanometers thin ice films or few hundred micrometers to millimeters thick ice grains – the amorphous to crystalline ice transition occurs within a narrow temperature range of 130 K to 150 K, with a maximum at ~ 140 K. Another experimental take away is that quantification of CO in the gas-phase under vacuum should be carefully conducted and should be verified by complementary experiments. Finally, conventional cryogenic systems with no additional instrument modification can be used to carryout calorimetry of ices and we

plan to extend our calorimetric studies to mixed-molecular ices in the future. In the following we discuss more in detail temperature ranges and their effect on the ice/gas composition.

Below 30 K: Most interstellar ices, protoplanetary ices at greater radial distances, and Oort Cloud comet interiors are expected to be at or below 30 K. Under these conditions, based on our data presented here, we can expect no outgassing of any supervolatiles such as CO, O₂, N₂ (CH₄, Ar etc., by inference) either as pure ices or trapped in mixed molecular ices. So, supervolatile-rich ices should be present at temperatures below 30 K. We can approximately refer to this the CO ice line.

30 – 75 K: This is the temperature range one expects in protoplanetary disks at closer distances than the CO ice line mentioned above. These temperatures are also present as equilibrium temperatures of solar system icy bodies such as TNOs (Trans Neptune Objects) and Kuiper Belt Objects (KBOs), and Centaurs^{46, 47}. In these environments, the ice grains are expected to be depleted of significant amounts of supervolatiles CO, O₂, and N₂ (CH₄, Ar etc., by inference), but still contain significant amounts of CO₂. For this reason, Jupiter family short-period comets that originate from KBOs and Centaurs should be significantly depleted of CO and other supervolatiles, but still retain high amounts of CO₂. In the protoplanetary disks, the ice grains accreting from the interstellar environment and moving radially into the inner disk would have significant amounts of CO₂, but otherwise be depleted in supervolatiles. From the TPD-MS and TPD-IR data presented here, we find that though significant amount of CO is outgassed early (below 50K), CO continues to leave ice-phase gradually until CO₂ starts sublimation. This indicates that some of the CO molecules, either trapped in CO₂ or existing as a

CO ice domain covered by CO₂ ice, outgas at higher temperature. We should be cautious to over interpret this data, as this outgassing is expected to be both temperature and time dependent.

75 – 120 K: This temperature range leads to the loss of any excess pure CO₂ ice and any volatiles left behind are now completely trapped within amorphous water ice cages in the 4-component ices. In three and two component ices, where CO₂ is the dominant species, we observe very small amounts (<3%) of supervolatiles (including N₂, O₂, and CO) to outgas along with CO₂ (**Figures 3-5**), indicating CO₂ ice has crystallized expelling other impurities well before its sublimation onset⁴⁸. Centaurs, the precursors of Jupiter-family comets, could have their equilibrium temperatures in this range^{49, 50}

120 – 150 K: This is the most critical temperature in astrophysical environments, and it is a point of no return, when amorphous water ices irreversibly undergo phase transition into crystalline water ice, during which process all the volatiles trapped within the amorphous ice are released. Our experiments show that about 17% CO₂, ~9% CO, and ~4% O₂ are trapped in - warm amorphous ices beyond 90 K – and these are released during ice crystallization between 130 K and 150 K. These values are close to the modeling work done recently to reproduce comet 67P/Churyumov-Gerasimenko nucleus properties⁵¹. It is expected that crystallization of amorphous water ice is slower at lower temperatures and faster as the temperatures approach 150 K⁵². This temperature region in protoplanetary disks should be narrow but clearly marked by crystalline water-ice features in the IR spectral observations. JWST should be able to detect these regions and constrain the temperatures. Comets should also show unusual CO₂-rich outgassing and H₂O inactivity in these temperature ranges. Indeed, such dichotomy is observed

in the outgassing of many comets, including 67P/CG⁵³⁻⁵⁶, whereby subsolar regions with higher temperatures show H₂O outgassing (crystalline water ice sublimation – see below), whereas other regions with lower temperatures show enhanced CO₂ outgassing. It is very likely that amorphous water ice loaded with CO₂ and other volatiles, at depths where thermal equilibrium reaches ~130 K, eject these volatiles while undergoing crystallization. As a result, a significant amount of CO₂, CO, and other volatiles are observed from the regions where the surface temperatures are lower. Once crystallized, water ice from the same region, when temperatures are higher due to direct exposure to Sun, results in predominantly H₂O sublimation (and depleted in CO₂). Based on this laboratory observation alone, we can confidently conclude that cometary nuclei are predominantly made of amorphous water ice, at least deep inside the nucleus. We also note that presence of silicate dust and refractory organic mantle on short-period comets could further effect outgassing from comets^{53, 54, 57}.

150 – 190 K: Above 150 K crystalline water ice starts to sublimate rapidly. Based on the thickness of the crystalline water ice film, sublimation could be complete at 170 K or above. The sublimation temperature also depends on the ambient pressure of the ice, with higher pressures shifting sublimation to higher temperatures. Such a scenario does not exist in low-pressure protoplanetary environments but could be present in the near sub-surface ices of the outer Solar System icy bodies and cometary near sub-surface ices, as a comet gets closer to its perihelion. The location of crystalline water ice sublimation in the protoplanetary disks is also designated as H₂O ice line that is closer to 150 K. However, based on the above-mentioned variables, it is possible that water ice could persist at higher temperatures.

If an accreted interstellar amorphous ice grain makes its journey through each of the ice lines in a protoplanetary disk, shedding away volatiles, the remaining material on these grains would be highly refractory (silicates and complex organics). If these grains or silicate dust from the inner protoplanetary disk were subsequently to move radially outwards, then the ice condensation on these grains will be layered (onion-like), with the non-volatiles such as H₂O condensing first, followed by other volatiles such as CO₂, and finally the supervolatiles such as CO. Thus, the composition of an ice grain – layered vs. intimately mixed – depends on whether it was formed within the protoplanetary disk or retained from interstellar grains.

The structural composition of these grains (layered vs. intimately mixed) plays an important role in the subsequent chemistry of these ices. Because highly energetic particles can deposit energy in ionization tracks as they penetrate through matter, reactions tend to occur with nearby species. As a result, any radiation-induced chemistry of protoplanetary-disk-formed ice grains should be different from interstellar ice grain chemistry.

Cometary nuclei have been puzzling researchers for decades. Recent Rosetta mission provided more insight into the outgassing properties of comet 67P/CG⁵³. High porosity of cometary nuclei and large thermal gradients make predictions of cometary nucleus composition based on outgassing difficult. However, based on our data and earlier experimental work, we can provide some insight into cometary nuclei: (a) If the entire nucleus of a comet reaches its equilibrium temperature above 70 K, it would be unlikely that these comets contain regions of pure molecular ices of super volatiles such as CO, N₂, CH₄, etc. We observe continuous outgassing of CO from the mixed molecular ice above 30 K until CO₂ sublimation starts at 70 K. More laboratory work is needed to understand long-term effect of temperature between 30 K

and 70 K on the outgassing of these supervolatiles to determine if any of their pure ice domains would survive these temperatures. CO₂ ice domains are more likely to survive in the interiors of a comet nucleus with equilibrium temperature at or below 70 K, followed by trapped volatiles in amorphous H₂O ice below ~120 K. At closer heliocentric distances, where surface temperatures raise beyond H₂O ice sublimation temperatures below the dust mantle, outgassing properties of a comet would be most complex due to thermal wave propagating deeper that results in not only sublimation of crystalline water ice, but also outgassing from amorphous to crystalline phase transition at deeper regions releasing significant amount of trapped volatiles (also known as molecular volcanos on a comet)^{33, 58, 59}. However, at even greater depths CO₂ ice domains could start sublimation reaching the surface. However, outgassing dichotomy of comets indicates that CO₂ is predominantly from relatively lower temperature regions on surface compared to H₂O, indicating CO₂ outgassing could have contribution from all these processes. At larger heliocentric distances, however, H₂O amorphous-to-crystalline transition and sublimation are significantly suppressed, and it is expected that CO₂ ice domains dominate the outgassing in these regions. Rosetta mission also found strong correlation between H₂O and O₂ outgassing, up to 5% mixing ratio of O₂^{60, 61}. In our experiments, we see much smaller fraction of O₂ outgassing along with H₂O (see Figure 8). One possibility is that cometary nuclei and their precursors may have been irradiated by cosmic rays over the past 4.6 billion years, resulting radiation-induced trapping of O₂ in H₂O ice as it has been seen on the surface of Galilean moons Europa, Ganymede, and Callisto⁶² and experimentally demonstrated during ion irradiation of ice⁶³. More laboratory studies are

needed to understand complex thermal properties of cometary nuclei and their outgassing properties during their journey around the Sun.

In the outer Solar System, on icy satellites such as Europa and other Jovian and Saturnian moons, surface temperatures can vary between 150 K and 60 K depending on latitude and sub-solar regions⁶⁴⁻⁶⁷. Sub-solar equatorial regions sustain the highest possible temperatures, whereas polar regions remain cooler. Similarly, day and night temperatures also vary significantly. Under these conditions, water ice sublimation occurs from the crystalline ice phase into vapor, forming a tenuous atmosphere. When the water vapor condenses on the surface, amorphous water ice could form in cold higher latitude regions or at lower latitudes on the night side. At temperatures below 70 K, this refrozing process could also lead to trapping of CO₂ if it is present in the atmosphere.

Conclusions

Temperature plays an important role in the compositional properties of astrophysical ices. Laboratory data under various conditions will provide better constraints on the interpretation of observational data, whether it is protoplanetary disks, comets, or other Solar System icy bodies. H₂O can co-condense with significant amounts of other volatiles and supervolatiles can at very low temperatures (<30 K), whereas at warmer – above the CO₂ sublimation – temperature (>90 K), amorphous water ice has only a limited ability to trap volatiles, of which CO₂ has the highest mixing ratio. Crystallization of amorphous ice expels all the trapped volatiles around 130-150 K. This temperature region is the same, whether the ice grains are thin (a few hundred nanometers) or thick (a few hundred microns), based on our differential

calorimetry experiments. Such a process could lead to outgassing of significant amounts of CO₂, whereas H₂O is still in the solid form. This important process likely explains the outgassing dichotomy observed in comets where CO₂ outgassing occurs from a different region of the comet than H₂O outgassing, which is predominantly from the subsolar regions. We also found that crystalline water ice traps only a small fraction of other volatiles (<5%), indicating ice grain composition in astrophysical and planetary environments must be different depending on whether the ice is in amorphous phase or transformed into crystalline phase. Once irreversibly transformed into crystalline phase, water ice is expected not to trap anymore volatiles, even if the crystalline ice undergoes radiation-induced amorphization subsequently. As for the protoplanetary disks, any radial mixing over long distances from the protostar could lead to entirely different ice composition, namely layered ices, instead of the mixed molecular ices formed in the interstellar molecular clouds. The morphology of these layered ices could also lead to different radiation chemistry compared to mixed molecular ices. JWST observations should provide better insight and constraints on the formation and mobility of ice grains in protoplanetary environments.

Acknowledgments

This research work was carried out at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under a contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This research was enabled through funding to MSG from NASA SSW and DDAP Programs.

© 2023. All rights reserved.

References:

1. M. Jin, K. H. Lam, M. K. McClure, J. T. van Scheltinga, Z. Y. Li, A. Boogert, E. Herbst, S. W. Davis and R. T. Garrod, *Astrophysical Journal*, 2022, **935**.
2. B. Muller, B. M. Giuliano, A. Vasyunin, G. Fedoseev and P. Caselli, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 2022, **668**.
3. S. Hinkley, A. L. Carter, S. Ray, A. Skemer, B. Biller, E. Choquet, M. A. Millar-Blanchaer, S. Sallum, B. Miles, N. Whiteford, P. Patapis, M. Perrin, L. Pueyo, G. Schneider, K. Stapelfeldt, J. Wang, K. Ward-Duong, B. P. Bowler, A. Boccaletti, J. H. Girard, D. Hines, P. Kalas, J. Kammerer, P. Kervella, J. Leisenring, E. Pantin, Y. F. Zhou, M. Meyer, M. C. Liu, M. Bonnefoy, T. Currie, M. McElwain, S. Metchev, M. Wyatt, O. Absil, J. Adams, T. Barman, I. Baraffe, M. Bonavita, M. Booth, M. Bryan, G. Chauvin, C. Chen, C. Danielski, M. De Furio, S. M. Factor, M. P. Fitzgerald, J. J. Fortney, C. Grady, A. Greenbaum, T. Henning, K. K. W. Hoch, M. Janson, G. Kennedy, M. Kenworthy, A. Kraus, M. Kuzuhara, P. O. Lagage, A. M. Lagrange, R. Launhardt, C. Lazzoni, J. Lloyd, S. Marino, M. Marley, R. Martinez, C. Marois, B. Matthews, E. C. Matthews, D. Mawet, J. Mazoyer, M. Phillips, S. Petrus, S. P. Quanz, A. Quirrenbach, J. Rameau, I. Rebollido, E. Rickman, M. Samland, B. Sargent, J. E. Schlieder, A. Sivaramakrishnan, J. M. Stone, M. Tamura, P. Tremblin, T. Uyama, M. Vasist, A. Vigan, K. Wagner and M. Ygouf, *PASP*, 2022, **134**.
4. N. P. Ballering, L. I. Cleeves and D. E. Anderson, *Astrophysical Journal*, 2021, **920**.
5. M. Lecar, M. Podolak, D. Sasselov and E. Chiang, *Astrophysical Journal*, 2006, **640**, 1115-1118.
6. K. Baillie, S. Charnoz and E. Pantin, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 2015, **577**.
7. J. E. Owen, *Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 2014, **790**.
8. N. van der Marel, R. B. Dong, J. di Francesco, J. P. Williams and J. Tobin, *Astrophysical Journal*, 2019, **872**.
9. A. D. Bosman, A. Tielens and E. F. van Dishoeck, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 2018, **611**.
10. Y. Aikawa, in *Highlights of Astronomy, Vol 13*, ed. O. Engvold, Astronomical Soc Pacific, San Francisco, 2005, vol. 13, pp. 515-517.
11. C. Walsh, T. J. Millar, H. Nomura, E. Herbst, S. W. Weaver, Y. Aikawa, J. C. Laas and A. I. Vasyunin, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 2014, **563**.
12. C. M. O. Alexander, L. R. Nittler, J. Davidson and F. J. Ciesla, *Meteoritics & Planetary Science*, 2017, **52**, 1797-1821.
13. K. I. Oberg, V. V. Guzman, K. Furuya, C. H. Qi, Y. Aikawa, S. M. Andrews, R. Loomis and D. J. Wilner, *Nature*, 2015, **520**, 198-U128.
14. M. K. McClure, C. Espaillat, N. Calvet, E. Bergin, P. D'Alessio, D. M. Watson, P. Manoj, B. Sargent and L. I. Cleeves, *Astrophysical Journal*, 2015, **799**.
15. O. Mousis, A. Aguichine, A. Bouquet, J. I. Lunine, G. Danger, K. E. Mandt and A. Luspay-Kuti, *Planetary Science Journal*, 2021, **2**.
16. A. M. A. Piso, J. Pegues and K. I. Oberg, *Astrophysical Journal*, 2016, **833**.
17. K. I. Oberg, A. C. A. Boogert, K. M. Pontoppidan, S. van den Broek, E. F. van Dishoeck, S. Bottinelli, G. A. Blake and N. J. Evans, *Astrophysical Journal*, 2011, **740**, 109.

18. M. Rubin, C. Engrand, C. Snodgrass, P. Weissman, K. Altwegg, H. Busemann, A. Morbidelli and M. Mumma, *SSRv*, 2020, **216**.
19. R. Martin-Domenech, G. M. Munoz Caro, J. Bueno and F. Goesmann, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 2014, **564**.
20. S. Malyk, G. Kumi, H. Reisler and C. Wittig, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2007, **111**, 13365-13370.
21. K. Acharyya, G. W. Fuchs, H. J. Fraser, E. F. van Dishoeck and H. Linnartz, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 2007, **466**, 1005-U1169.
22. G. W. Fuchs, K. Acharyya, S. E. Bisschop, K. I. Oberg, F. A. van Broekhuizen, H. J. Fraser, S. Schlemmer, E. F. van Dishoeck and H. Linnartz, *Faraday Discuss.*, 2006, **133**, 331-345.
23. J. L. Edridge, K. Freimann, D. J. Burke and W. A. Brown, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society a-Mathematical Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 2013, **371**.
24. A. Bar-Nun, D. Laufer, O. Rebolledo, S. Malyk, H. Reisler and C. Wittig, in *The Science of Solar System Ices*, eds. M. S. Gudipati and J. Castillo-Rogez, Springer New York, 2013, vol. 356, ch. 14, pp. 487-499.
25. A. N. Greenberg, D. Laufer and A. Bar-Nun, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 2017, **469**, S517-S521.
26. B. Muller, B. M. Giuliano, L. Bizzocchi, A. I. Vasyunin and P. Caselli, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 2018, **620**.
27. S. Taj and M. R. S. McCoustra, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 2020, **498**, 1693-1699.
28. Rawlings, D. van, Black, Crovisier, Tsamis, Semenov, McCoustra, Mason, T. Ward, Lintott, Chakrabarti, Ehrenfreund, Kallenbach, Sims, Kaiser, Canosa, Costes, Paramo, P. Le, Daugey, Caubet, Bergeat, G. Cardoso, Casavecchia, Matthews, Sarre, Mitchell, Plane, Minard, Sephton, Heard, Linnartz, Duley, Visser, Rowe, Herbst, Biennier, H. Al, Fraser, Collings, Viti, Palumbo, B. de and Fuchs, *Faraday Discuss.*, 2006, **133**, 347-374.
29. M. P. Collings, J. W. Dever, H. J. Fraser, M. R. S. McCoustra and D. A. Williams, *Astrophysical Journal*, 2003, **583**, 1058-1062.
30. E. C. Fayolle, K. I. Oberg, H. M. Cuppen, R. Visser and H. Linnartz, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 2011, **529**.
31. M. P. Collings, J. W. Dever and M. R. S. McCoustra, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 2005, **415**, 40-45.
32. H. J. Fraser, M. P. Collings, J. W. Dever and M. R. S. McCoustra, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 2004, **353**, 59-68.
33. M. P. Collings, M. A. Anderson, R. Chen, J. W. Dever, S. Viti, D. A. Williams and M. R. S. McCoustra, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 2004, **354**, 1133-1140.
34. K. Isokoski, J. B. Bossa, T. Triemstra and H. Linnartz, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 2014, **16**, 3456-3465.
35. B. Mate, O. Galvez, B. Martin-Llorente, M. A. Moreno, V. J. Herrero, R. Escribano and E. Artacho, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2008, **112**, 457-465.
36. D. M. Hudgins, S. A. Sandford, L. J. Allamandola and A. Tielens, *ApJS*, 1993, **86**, 713-870.
37. P. A. Gerakines, W. A. Schutte, J. M. Greenberg and E. F. Vandishoeck, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 1995, **296**, 810-818.
38. P. A. Gerakines and R. L. Hudson, *Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 2015, **808**.
39. B. M. Giuliano, R. M. Escribano, R. Martin-Domenech, E. Dartois and G. M. Munoz Caro, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 2014, **565**.

40. A. Kouchi and T. Yamamoto, *Prog. Cryst. Growth Charact. Mater.*, 1995, **30**, 83-108.
41. R. Feistel and W. Wagner, *Geochimica Et Cosmochimica Acta*, 2007, **71**, 36-45.
42. A. Kouchi and S. Sirono, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 2001, **28**, 827-830.
43. R. S. Smith, J. Matthiesen, J. Knox and B. D. Kay, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2011, **115**, 5908-5917.
44. M. Chonde, M. Brindza and V. Sadtchenko, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2006, **125**.
45. Y. P. Handa, O. Mishima and E. Whalley, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1986, **84**, 2766-2770.
46. A. Guilbert-Lepoutre, S. Besse, O. Mousis, M. Ali-Dib, S. Hoefner, D. Koschny and P. Hager, *SSRv*, 2015, **197**, 271-296.
47. A. Guilbert-Lepoutre, A. Gkotsinas, S. N. Raymond and D. Nesvorny, *Astrophysical Journal*, 2023, **942**.
48. R. M. Escribano, G. M. M. Caro, G. A. Cruz-Diaz, Y. Rodriguez-Lazcano and B. Mate, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 2013, **110**, 12899-12904.
49. M. Drahus, B. Yang, D. C. Lis and D. Jewitt, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 2017, **468**, 2897-2909.
50. D. Jewitt, *Astronomical Journal*, 2009, **137**, 4296-4312.
51. B. J. R. Davidsson, N. H. Samarasinha, D. Farnocchia and P. J. Gutierrez, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 2022, **509**, 3065-3085.
52. R. E. Mastrapa, W. Grundy and M. Gudipati, in *The Science of Solar System Ices*, eds. M. S. Gudipati and J. Castillo-Rogez, Springer New York, 2013, vol. 356, ch. 11, pp. 371-408.
53. C. Herny, O. Mousis, R. Marschall, N. Thomas, M. Rubin, O. Pinzón-Rodríguez and I. P. Wright, *Planetary and Space Science*, 2021, **200**, 105194.
54. M. Hoang, P. Garnier, H. Goulaouen, J. Lasue, H. Reme, K. Altwegg, H. Balsiger, A. Beth, U. Calmonte, B. Fiethe, A. Galli, S. Gasc, A. Jackel, A. Korth, L. Le Roy, U. Mall, M. Rubin, T. Semon, C. Y. Tzou, J. H. Waite and P. Wurz, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 2019, **630**.
55. C. Tubiana, G. Rinaldi, C. Guttler, C. Snodgrass, X. Shi, X. Hu, R. Marschall, M. Fulle, D. Bockelee-Morvan, G. Naletto, F. Capaccioni, H. Sierks, G. Arnold, M. A. Barucci, J. L. Bertaux, I. Bertini, D. Bodewits, M. T. Capria, M. Ciarniello, G. Cremonese, J. Crovisier, V. Da Deppo, S. Debei, M. De Cecco, J. Deller, M. C. De Sanctis, B. Davidsson, L. Dose, S. Erard, G. Filacchione, U. Fink, M. Formisano, S. Fornasier, P. J. Gutierrez, W. H. Ip, S. Ivanovski, D. Kappel, H. U. Keller, L. Kolokolova, D. Koschny, H. Krueger, F. La Forgia, P. L. Lamy, L. M. Lara, M. Lazzarin, A. C. Lvasseur-Regourd, Z. Y. Lin, A. Longobardo, J. J. Lopez-Moreno, F. Marzari, A. Migliorini, S. Mottola, R. Rodrigo, F. Taylor, I. Toth and V. Zakharov, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 2019, **630**.
56. U. Fink, L. Dose, G. Rinaldi, A. Bieler, F. Capaccioni, D. Bockelee-Morvan, G. Filacchione, S. Erard, C. Leyrat, M. Blecka, M. T. Capria, M. Combi, J. Crovisier, M. C. De Sanctis, N. Fougere, F. Taylor, A. Migliorini and G. Piccioni, *Icar*, 2016, **277**, 78-97.
57. M. Hoang, P. Garnier, J. Lasue, H. Rème, M. T. Capria, K. Altwegg, M. Läuter, T. Kramer and M. Rubin, *A&A*, 2020, **638**, A106.
58. R. S. Smith, C. Huang, E. K. L. Wong and B. D. Kay, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1997, **79**, 909.
59. R. S. Smith, C. Huang and B. D. Kay, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 1997, **101**, 6123-6126.
60. K. L. Heritier, K. Altwegg, J. J. Berthelier, A. Beth, C. M. Carr, J. De Keyser, A. I. Eriksson, S. A. Fuselier, M. Galand, T. I. Gombosi, P. Henri, F. L. Johansson, H. Nilsson, M. Rubin, C. S. Wedlund, M. Taylor and E. Vigen, *Nature Communications*, 2018, **9**.

61. A. Bieler, K. Altwegg, H. Balsiger, A. Bar-Nun, J. J. Berthelier, P. Bochslers, C. Briois, U. Calmonte, M. Combi, J. De Keyser, E. F. van Dishoeck, B. Fiethe, S. A. Fuselier, S. Gasc, T. I. Gombosi, K. C. Hansen, M. Hassig, A. Jackel, E. Kopp, A. Korth, L. Le Roy, U. Mall, R. Maggiolo, B. Marty, O. Mousis, T. Owen, H. Reme, M. Rubin, T. Semon, C. Y. Tzou, J. H. Waite, C. Walsh and P. Wurz, *Nature*, 2015, **526**, 678-681.
62. J. R. Spencer, W. M. Calvin and M. J. Person, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Planets*, 1995, **100**, 19049-19056.
63. B. D. Teolis, J. Shi and R. A. Baragiola, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2009, **130**, 9.
64. J. R. Berdis, M. S. Gudipati, J. R. Murphy and N. J. Chanover, *Icar*, 2020, **341**.
65. A. V. Oza, F. Leblanc, R. E. Johnson, C. Schmidt, L. Leclercq, T. A. Cassidy and J. Y. Chaufray, *Planetary and Space Science*, 2019, **167**, 23-32.
66. Y. Ashkenazy, *Heliyon*, 2019, **5**.
67. J. A. Rathbun, N. J. Rodriguez and J. R. Spencer, *Icar*, 2010, **210**, 763-769.


Figures:

Figure 1: Experimental Station (named Himalaya) that is used to conduct TPD-MS, TPD-IR, and calorimetry experiments at the Ice Spectroscopy Laboratory (ISL) of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL). FTIR (Thermo-Nicolet 6700) beam is guided through Ni-coated tubes with high-throughput reflecting mirror and passed through the sapphire optical window mounted on a sample holder at the end of the closed-cycle helium cryostat in the vacuum chamber. The transmitted IR beam is focused with a parabolic gold-coated mirror on to the MCT-A detector. Once ice is deposited, the sample is then rotated to be perpendicular to the IR beam and held in that position for the entire TPD experiment. Also mounted on the vacuum chamber is the quadrupole mass spectrometer (Stanford Research Instruments, SRS 300 that is equipped with electron multiplier). In this configuration we have been able to simultaneously record FTIR and mass spectra at a given temperature during the TPD experiments.




Figure 2: Configuration of Calorimetry on conventional closed-cycle helium cryostat used for ice TPD-MS and TPD-IR experiments. The locations of Silicon Diode (SD) temperature sensors are shown. SD1 that cannot be seen in this photo, is mounted at the top of the ice sample holder that is connected to the end of the closed-cycle helium cryostat. SD2 is mounted at the bottom of the sample holder, which is made of oxygen-free copper. Also seen is the optical window mounted between the copper sample holder, on which normally ice is deposited for TPD experiments. Water vapor inlet is mounted closer to the sample holder and directed to the bottom part to ensure ice deposition is predominantly localized close to SD2.




Figure 3: TPD-MS profiles (left) and integrated TPD-IR integrated absorption intensities that are normalized to respective band-strengths (right) of a two-component CO:CO₂ ice deposited at 10 K and heated at 0.5 K/min. While the TPD-MS data show an onset of CO sublimation at ~ 25 K, FTIR spectra show observable sublimation starting after 30 K. N₂ sublimation (with N as the proxy) is offset by ~ 5 K. A small amount of CO₂ that is trapped in CO ice is also sublimed along with CO between 30 K and 70 K. Only a small fraction of CO ($\sim 10\%$) remains trapped in CO₂ ice at 70 K, the onset of CO₂ sublimation, as indicated by the IR data. Please note that CO₂ fragmentation in the mass spectrometer results in around 10% of CO, which makes it difficult to quantify the mass spectra, as can be seen in the curve obtained after CO partial pressure correcting for CO₂ fragmentation and N₂ contribution. We skip this procedure in the rest of the TPD-MS profiles to keep clarity. Here, FTIR spectra are useful for quantification. For mass spectra the initial deposition chamber pressure ratios are given. For IR spectral data, the ratios obtained from integrated and normalized (to their band strengths) relative absorbances are given. Both are from the same ice and are simultaneously measured.




Figure 4: TPD-MS profiles (left) and integrated TPD-IR absorption intensities (right) of two-component CO:CO₂ ice deposited at 10 K and heated at 1 K/min. Initial mixing ratio of CO is about 6-7% in CO₂ and most of the CO molecules are trapped in CO₂ ice. As a result, CO outgassing is delayed by about 10 K from the pure CO ice outgassing (refer to Figure 3). About 3% of CO remained trapped in CO₂ ice at 70 K, the onset of CO₂ sublimation. For the rest of the information on the figure details, please refer to Figure 3.




Figure 5: TPD-MS profiles (left) and integrated TPD-IR absorption intensities (right) of three-component CO:O₂:CO₂ ice deposited at 10 K and heated at 0.5 K/min. In the left figure, it can be seen that the O₂ partial pressure is slightly higher between 30 and 35 K and then drops rapidly while CO continues to remain in the vacuum chamber. Though the initial mixing ratio of CO:CO₂ is 1:5.4 (O₂ is IR inactive and assumed to be about the same mixing ratio as CO), most of the CO sublimates off between 30 K and 70 K, in agreement with the two-component experiments (Figures 3&4), leaving only about 4% CO in CO₂ ice at the onset of CO₂ sublimation. For the rest of the information on the figure details, please refer to Figure 3.




Figure 6: Zoomed-in part of the TPD-MS profiles (left) and integrated TPD-IR absorption intensities (right) of four-component CO:O₂:CO₂:H₂O ice deposited at 10 K and heated at 0.5 K/min. In the left figure, we see between ~137 K and ~147 K a significant outgassing of trapped volatiles in amorphous water ice. In the right figure, we observe similar outgassing onset of CO (hence O₂ as well) at 30 K and gradual outgassing until CO₂ outgassing that occurs between 70 K and 90 K. Above 90 K, the amount of CO trapped in the amorphous ice is far less than CO₂. The data confirm outgassing of almost all CO, O₂, and CO₂ during crystallization of amorphous ice. During water-ice sublimation only a few percent of these volatiles are still trapped. This experiment demonstrates that if crystalline water ice in astrophysical environments were to be formed, it could accommodate a maximum of 5% of other volatiles in its lattice. If crystalline water ice is observed along with other ices, they must have been formed separately after amorphous water ice has been crystallized (i.e., subjected to temperatures above 120 K for a given amount of time, which is dependent on the maximum exposed temperature below 160 K under vacuum conditions). Please note that water ice integrated absorbance increases constantly and reaches its maximum around 150 K. This is less likely to be due to the increased band strength of water ice with temperature, but rather due to sublimation of a small amount of water from warmer parts of the cryostat and redeposition on the sapphire optical window. For the rest of the information on the figure details, please refer to Figure 3.




Figure 7: Zoomed-in part of the TPD-MS profiles (left) and integrated TPD-IR absorption intensities (right) of a four-component CO:O₂:CO₂:H₂O ice deposited at 10 K and heated at 0.5 K/min. In this experiment, we increased the mixing ratio of water to test whether there would be any change in the thermal or trapping behavior. We found no changes and as expected, significant amounts of CO (O₂) and CO₂ were trapped in amorphous ice and released during crystallization. Otherwise, both the two four-component ice types behaved very similarly. Please refer to Figures 6 and 3 for additional details.




Figure 8: Relative abundances with respect to H₂O calculated from integrated TPD-MS spectra (shown in Figures 4 and 5) of four-component CO:O₂:CO₂:H₂O ice deposited at 10 K and heated at 0.5 K/min. Volatiles CO, O₂, and CO₂ outgassed during crystallization of amorphous water ice between 130 K and 150 K normalized to the total water content are shown in black bars and the same for crystalline water ice outgassing between 150 K and 190 K are shown in orange bars. In spite of different mixing ratios, in both experiments above 90 K, CO₂ is trapped in amorphous ice at an abundance of 17%, while CO and O₂ are much lower in abundance (6-9% and 3-4%, respectively). After amorphous ice crystallizes, the total amount of volatiles trapped is reduced to around 1%. Again, our experiments demonstrate that crystalline water ice does not trap significant amounts of volatiles.




Figure 9: Mass spectral profiles during TPD from 10 K to 190 K of four component mixed molecular ices CO:O₂:CO₂:H₂O.




Figure 10: FTIR absorbance spectra of four component CO:O₂:CO₂:H₂O mixed molecular ice during TPD. Spectra are stacked to provide clarity. CO absorption around 2140 cm⁻¹ quickly splits into two components, the higher energy one disappearing by 90 K, indicating the lower energy part should be due to CO trapped in amorphous water-ice. CO₂ absorption at 2340 cm⁻¹ starts as a single broad band and as the temperature increases a shoulder develops on the higher energy side, which becomes a clear band beyond CO₂ ice sublimation. Around 145 K all CO₂ sublimates and amorphous water ice band centered around 3250 cm⁻¹ develops into a three-band structure, typical of crystalline water ice. Around 185 K, all the water ice sublimates, leaving no residue behind.




Figure 11: Differential calorimetry during 2K/min pure water ice annealing from amorphous to crystalline to sublimation transitions. Ratio of SD2/SD1 (SD= silicon diode for temperature readout) at various temperatures is plotted for four different ice experiments. SD2 is directly in contact with the ice, whereas SD1 acts as internal reference at the top of the sample holder. For an exothermic phase transition, this ratio is higher and for an endothermic phase transition it is smaller with respect to a common baseline ratio. We consistently see an exothermic transition between 130 and 150 K with maximum at 140 K due to the amorphous to crystalline phase transition. This peak position remains independent of ice thickness, but the transition intensifies with thickness as expected (more ice deposition mass induces a greater heat release and larger differences in the temperatures read at SD1 and SD2). We also observe the endothermic sublimation transition with an onset around 170 K, which also intensifies with thickness. The sublimation onset is the same in all cases, but the sublimation maximum shifts depending on thickness, since it is a surface-driven phenomenon and takes longer for thicker ices to complete the sublimation process. For thinner ice it maximizes at ~ 190 K, and moves to higher temperatures for thicker ice.