

Secondary gas in debris discs released following the decay of long-lived radioactive nuclides, catastrophic or resurfacing collisions

Amy Bonsor, Mark C. Wyatt, Sebastian Marino, Björn J. R. Davidsson, Quentin Kral

2307.01574v1 · 27 October 2026

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.01574v1>

Source read: available full text.

Peer-review status is not independently confirmed. A journal reference alone does not establish it.

AI-assisted brief. Verify facts, interpretation and quotations against the original paper before publication.

Models compare radioactive heating and collisions as sources of debris-disc gas

Belts of icy bodies around other stars can release carbon monoxide gas as well as dust. This paper models gas release through destructive collisions, collisions that shatter bodies without dispersing them, and internal heating from radioactive decay. It finds that gas production need not track dust production, complicating attempts to infer the composition of distant comets. Radioactive heating could supply gas in young systems containing sufficiently large icy bodies, but the predicted timing and amounts depend on uncertain assumptions about their interiors.

The models support a credible warning that gas-to-dust production ratios are not universally direct measures of comet composition. They establish possible mechanisms and conditional predictions, not which mechanism dominates individual observed systems or a universal size or age threshold.

Asked to comment: what this paper shows

- The study compares three mechanisms for supplying secondary CO gas in debris belts.
- Resurfacing collisions can initially release gas faster than destructive collisions in the simulations.
- Radioactive heating is a plausible early source when sufficiently large bodies are present.
- Gas-to-dust production ratios need not directly represent comet composition.
- The models do not establish which mechanism dominates an individual observed system.

Strengths

- Tracking volatile and solid material separately allows the model to test rather than assume that gas follows dust production.

Source passage verified · 2.3 Collision Model · ¶1

“Additionally to Wyatt et al. (2011), the model presented here traces the volatile content of planetesimals separately to their refractory (solid) content.”

- The study explicitly distinguishes a proposed observational signature from a demonstrated identification

of resurfacing collisions.

Source passage verified · 5.3 Resurfacing or Catastrophic Collisions · ¶1

"It is currently difficult to find observational evidence that the gas observed in debris systems is produced in resurfacing collisions, rather than catastrophic collisions."

Weaknesses and open questions

- Separating thermal and collisional evolution leaves their interaction, including prior depletion of volatile reservoirs, unresolved.

Source passage verified · 5.1 Validity of Model · ¶9

"The model presented here treats the thermophysical evolution and collisions as separate processes. In reality both processes may act on the same bodies."

- The assumed constant thermal gas-release rate is a simplification of potentially time-dependent comet activity.

Source passage verified · 4 Volatiles release due to heating from long-lived radioactive nuclides... · ¶2

"This model provides an estimate for the total CO released by considering that every comet releases CO at a constant rate up until a time, $t_{\text{release}}(D)$, after which there is no further CO release."

- Collision-driven gas production depends on a poorly constrained treatment of fragment exposure and reassembly.

Source passage verified · 5.1 Validity of Model · ¶15

"Again, both the timescale, the size distribution and the symmetric nature of this process are poorly understood."

What would settle the main claim

Coupled thermal and collision models, calibrated against experiments or detailed impact simulations, should reproduce gas and dust production across belts of different ages. Observational tests would also need independent constraints on CO shielding and survival, composition and the population of large bodies to distinguish the mechanisms.

A comment to adapt in your own words

The useful result is that plausible gas-release processes can break the assumed link between CO and dust production, making composition estimates mechanism-dependent. What remains open is whether these simplified prescriptions predict real belts accurately enough to distinguish radioactive heating from different kinds of collisions.

What's new

The paper extends a collisional-evolution framework to track solids and volatile material separately, including gas released during resurfacing collisions. It compares those predictions with a simplified population model of gas release powered by long-lived radioactive nuclides. Its main contribution is the comparison of mechanisms and their consequences for interpreting gas-to-dust production ratios, rather than the first proposal that heating or collisions release gas.

Against the closest earlier papers

The supplied related-work abstracts already describe thermal gas release, collision-produced gas and predictions tied to dust luminosity. Against those abstracts alone, the distinctive contribution is explicit treatment of resurfacing collisions alongside radioactive heating; they do not establish priority across the entire literature.

- A molecular wind blows out of the Kuiper belt (2021)

Already done: Modeled gas release in the Solar System's Kuiper belt, including progressive internal warming of large planetesimals, and predicted present-day CO production.

This paper adds: Compares long-lived radioactive heating with catastrophic and resurfacing collisions across extrasolar planetesimal-belt populations.

- Predictions for the secondary CO, C and O gas content of debris discs from the destruction of volatile-rich planetesimals (2017)

Already done: Presented a semi-analytical model predicting secondary gas levels, assuming CO production could be inferred from debris-disc fractional luminosity.

This paper adds: Examines mechanisms under which gas production does not remain proportional to dust production, limiting composition estimates based on that proportionality.

- Carbon monoxide gas produced by a giant impact in the inner region of a young system (2021)

Already done: Reported a resolved CO ring in HD 172555 and interpreted its gas and dust as favoring a giant impact between volatile-rich bodies.

This paper adds: Models population-wide gas production in debris belts, including non-dispersive collisions and radioactive heating, rather than interpreting a particular giant-impact candidate.

Compared with the abstracts of the closest papers we know, chosen automatically: not a literature review.

Findings and source evidence

A matching quote confirms that the passage exists, not that the finding is independently validated.

1. Resurfacing collisions produce gas earlier and exhaust the available volatile supply faster than catastrophic collisions in the modeled comparison. [Result]

Gas brightness can depend on the belt's evolutionary stage, not just its initial volatile abundance.

Source passage verified · 3.1 The release of volatiles from collisions · ¶2

“Catastrophic collisions release volatiles at a lower rate than resurfacing collisions, but continue to do so on a timescale related to the catastrophic collision timescale (Eq. 8), whereas resurfacing collisions release volatiles at an initially higher rate, but this rate falls off on a timescale related to the shorter resurfacing collision timescale (Eq. 11), as shown by Fig. 7.”

Limit of this finding: This comparison depends on the assumed collision strengths and volatile-release efficiency; it is not an observed time sequence.

2. Increasing the modeled maximum body size from 100 to 1,000 km raises thermal gas production by more than tenfold at fixed dust mass. [Result]

Gas measurements could potentially constrain large bodies that are difficult to see directly.

Source passage verified · 4.1 A comparison between the volatile release from thermophysical evo... · ¶2

"When the largest planetesimal is increased from 100km (purple dotted line) to 1,000km (brown dotted line), whilst maintaining the same mass in dust, the gas production rate increases by over an order of magnitude."

Limit of this finding: This is a conditional model comparison, not a measured size distribution; the total belt mass changes as the maximum size increases.

3. The modeled thermal and collisional gas-release rates are comparable in scale. [Result]

Radioactive heating warrants consideration alongside collisions when interpreting young debris systems.

Source passage verified · 4.1 A comparison between the volatile release from thermophysical evo... · ¶3

"Both radiogenic heating and collisions release volatiles at rates which are within the same order of magnitude (see Fig. 10)."

Limit of this finding: Comparable predicted rates do not distinguish the mechanisms observationally, and the processes are not evolved together.

4. Observed CO alone is not necessarily a direct measure of comet CO abundance. [Interpretation]

Composition estimates require assumptions about release mechanisms, prior thermal evolution and gas survival.

Source passage verified · 5.5 The composition of comets, as derived from gas observations · ¶1

"This work highlights the difficulties in using observed CO as a probe of the total CO content of planetesimals."

Limit of this finding: The passage does not show that all existing composition estimates are wrong or quantify their individual biases.

Hype check

- Publication and version: The publication check dated 2026-10-27 found an MNRAS publication dated 2023-09-26 through Crossref, DOI 10.1093/mnras/stad2912. ArXiv metadata author-declares acceptance and updates following review comments; peer review was not independently verified, and the supplied text is v1.
- Model, not discovery: These are numerical and simplified thermal models, not new observations or laboratory demonstrations of the proposed release mechanisms.
- Data scale and comparison: Table 2 lists 14 previously observed systems, used for illustrative comparison rather than a statistical fit. The fiducial collision model assumes a 100-Earth-mass belt, bodies from 1 mm to 30 km and an initial volatile fraction of 4%.
- Uncertainty quantification: The paper varies selected parameters but does not present statistical confidence intervals or a significance test for identifying the dominant mechanism. Parameter sensitivity is

not a quantified probability that a mechanism explains an observed system.

- • Age claims: The abstract highlights systems younger than 50 million years, whereas the implemented thermal model stops releasing CO at around 30 million years. The authors acknowledge that this cutoff and its timing are uncertain.
- ⚠ Structural limitations: Thermal evolution and collisions are treated separately, comet interiors are not modeled explicitly, and collision-driven release uses an uncertain surface-layer prescription. The collision approximation also breaks down above roughly 30 km for the stated 100-au example, requiring care with larger-body comparisons.
- ✓ Reproducibility: The paper provides a public repository address for data and code and reports benchmarking the solid-component evolution against earlier work. Repository contents and reproducibility have not been independently checked here.
- • Funding and disclosures: The acknowledgements report Royal Society fellowship support and work at JPL under a NASA contract. An explicit conflict-of-interest declaration is not present in the supplied text, so conflict status is unknown.

Figures for the press

Figure 2

The schematic illustrates how collisions move solid material and release gas within the model.

Figure 2: A cartoon to illustrate how the movement of material following collisions is traced in the model presented in §2.3. +c refers to the mass gained from catastrophic collisions, -c to that lost from catastrophic collisions, shown by the black arrows and -r to the mass lost from resurfacing collisions, shown by the red arrows

Credit: Amy Bonsor et al., Figure 2, arXiv: 2307.01574v1, CC BY 4.0

<https://arxiv.org/html/2307.01574v1#S2.F2>

Figure 7

The modeled curves show why adding resurfacing collisions changes gas production without changing dust production.

Figure 7: The gas and dust production rate as a function of time (upper panel) and the ratio of the gas production rate to dust production rate as a function of time (lower panel), for the fiducial simulation with $D_{\max}=30\text{km}$ and $h=10\text{cm}$, with both resurfacing (RC) and catastrophic (CC) collisions (orange dashed line) and with only catastrophic collisions (blue dotted line). The green dot-dashed line shows both resurfacing (RC) and catastrophic collisions (CC) with $h=1\text{cm}$. The dust production rate (solid line top panel) is the same for all simulations. The dotted horizontal line in the bottom panel indicates the initial volatile fraction of 4%. Gas is released faster when resurfacing collisions are included, such that catastrophic collisions dominate the release of gas at late times when large planetesimals are volatile depleted (further discussion in §3.1).

Credit: Amy Bonsor et al., Figure 7, arXiv: 2307.01574v1, CC BY 4.0

<https://arxiv.org/html/2307.01574v1#S3.F7>

Key sentences from the paper

Copied word for word from the paper (checked against its text). Quote the paper, not us.

“We show that the rate of gas release is not proportional to the rate of dust release, if non-catastrophic collisions or thermal evolution dominate the release of CO gas.”

“Non-catastrophic collisions dominate the gas production at earlier times than catastrophic collisions, depending on the properties of the planetesimal belt.”

“Both radiogenic heating and collisions release volatiles at rates which are within the same order of magnitude (see Fig. 10).”

Researchers to approach for outside comment

They sign close papers first, last or as corresponding author, and neither sign this paper nor have signed with its authors in the last five years (OpenAlex). Their independence and possible conflicts of interest still need to be checked.

- Alexander James Mustill — Lund University

The evolution of exocomets and their source populations (2026)

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.08190>

- Kevin Righter B — University of Rochester

Ice Deposition Fronts In Porous Bodies From Transient Heating Events In a Protoplanetary Disk (2026)

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.11841>

- Stephen Li — University of Rochester

Ice Deposition Fronts In Porous Bodies From Transient Heating Events In a Protoplanetary Disk (2026)

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.11841>

- Xabier Pérez-Couto — Universidade da Coruña

The evolution of exocomets and their source populations (2026)

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.08190>

- Carlos Eiroa

The search for gas in debris discs: ALMA detection of CO gas in HD 36546 (2021)

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.02308v1>

- Élie Sevestre — Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique

Hot exozodiacal dust: an exocometary origin? (2019)

<https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.06130v1>

Glossary

- Debris disc: A belt of dust and larger orbiting bodies left in a planetary system after its gas-rich formation stage.
- Planetesimal: A small planetary building block, such as an icy comet-like body or asteroid.
- Secondary gas: Gas released from solid bodies rather than retained from the original planet-forming disc.
- Resurfacing collision: An impact that shatters a body without giving its fragments enough energy to escape their mutual gravity.

- Radiogenic heating: Internal heating produced by the decay of radioactive isotopes.
- CO shielding: Protection of carbon monoxide from destructive ultraviolet radiation by gas that absorbs the incoming radiation.

Editorial status: automatic verification

Publication found

Checked at: 2026-10-27T21:20:32.724448+00:00

Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society · 2023-09-26

arXiv: Accepted by MNRAS, 16 pages. Updated following review comments

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.01574>

Crossref: Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society · 2023-09-26

<https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stad2912>

A publication record does not independently establish peer review. No publication found does not mean the manuscript is unpublished; private submission and review decisions may be inaccessible.