Equilibrium Figure and tides (Part. II, orbital revolution)

V. Lainey (IMCCE-Paris Observatory) Contact: lainey@imcce.fr



V.Lainey

- Ecole Nice -

October 20th 2011

Introduction



1 000 W



Coal power plant 100-1 000 MW



Nuclear power plant 0.9 – 1.3 GW



1 000 W



Geyser on Enceladus 15.8 +/- 3.1 GW



Coal power plant 100-1 000 MW



Nuclear power plant 0.9 – 1.3 GW



1 000 W



Geyser on Enceladus 15.8 +/- 3.1 GW



Coal power plant 100-1 000 MW



Earth tidal dissipation 3.75 TW



Nuclear power plant 0.9 – 1.3 GW



1 000 W



Geyser on Enceladus 15.8 +/- 3.1 GW



Coal power plant 100-1 000 MW



Earth tidal dissipation 3.75 TW



Nuclear power plant 0.9 – 1.3 GW



Volcanism on Io (9.33 +/- 1.87) x 10¹ TW

How can we quantify tidal dissipation?

By direct IR measurements...



How can we quantify tidal dissipation?

Three important issues:

- 1- Only hot spots are quantified
- 2- Barely feasible in general!

Low signal, other sources of heating (radioactive decay, Solar heat, gravitational contraction...)

3- Thermal equilibrium is not sure

Orbital elements and interior properties may change while heat is transported at the surface



→ A more dynamical way to derive heat production is needed

The tidal effects and the estimation of Q from long term evolution

Tidal effects on the primary

Let's consider a satellite raising tides on its primary

Dissipation implies time lag Δt which is connected to the geometrical lag δ by: $2(\Omega - n)\Delta t = \delta$



L≈mna²+lΩ

$$dL/dt=0 \Rightarrow I = -\frac{1}{2}mna$$

$$E \approx -GMm/2a + 1/2 I\Omega^2$$

$$\mathbf{k} = I \Omega \mathbf{k} + \frac{1}{2} m n^2 a \mathbf{k}$$

Introducing k₂ and Q:

$$\frac{da}{dt} = \frac{3k_2m}{QM} \left(\frac{Er}{a}\right)^5 na$$

Tidal effects on the primary

The tides raised in the planet \rightarrow exchange of angular momentum



Tidal effects on the primary

Q is defined by:

 $Q^{-1} = \Delta E / (2 \mathbb{K} E)$

Where ΔE is the energy loss during one cycle and E is the maximum energy stored in the tidal distortion

Low $Q \rightarrow$ high dissipation, high $Q \rightarrow$ low dissipation

A second parameter of interest is the Love number k_2

which characterizes the response of the body to the tidal potential



The orbital tidal acceleration/deceleration of a satellite are dependent on the ratio k_2/Q

A paper of reference that estimates Q for the giant planets is Goldreich and Soter (1966)

Assuming that the main satellites were formed beyond the synchronous orbit, one can give a lower bound for Q



A paper of reference that estimates Q for the giant planets is Goldreich and Soter (1966)

Assuming that the main satellites were formed beyond the synchronous orbit, one can give a lower bound for Q



Estimation of lower bound of Q for the giant planets by Goldreich and Soter (1966)

$$\begin{split} & \mathsf{Q}_{\mathsf{Jupiter}} \geq 1.0 \ 10^5 \, \text{(Io)} \\ & \mathsf{Q}_{\mathsf{Saturn}} \geq \ 6.0 \ 10^4 \, \text{(Mimas)} \\ & \mathsf{Q}_{\mathsf{Uranus}} \geq 7.2 \ 10^4 \, \text{(Miranda)} \end{split}$$

Values further improved by Gavrilov and Zharkov (1977)

$$\begin{split} & Q_{Jupiter} \geq 2.5 \ 10^4 \ \text{(Io)} \\ & Q_{Saturn} \geq 1.4 \ 10^4 \ \text{(Mimas)} \\ & Q_{Uranus} \geq 5.0 \ 10^3 \ \text{(Miranda)} \end{split}$$

These values are still good references!

Let's remind that: $Q_{Mars} = 80$ $Q_{Earth} = 260$ $Q_{Io} = 20$

Caveats:

1- Strong assumption on the past evolution of the system (formation, resonances, dissipation in satellites...)

2- Only averaged value of Q over 4.5 Byr is obtained. In particular, current tidal dissipation may be somewhat different (Q≠cste)

A second example: the terrible fate of Phobos

Phobos and Deimos have been discovered by A.Hall in 1877.



Sharless (1945) discovered an unexpected acceleration on Phobos...

A second example: the terrible fate of Phobos



<u>Question:</u> how much time will that take place?

$$\frac{da}{dt} = \frac{3k_2m}{QM} \left(\frac{Er}{a}\right)^5 na$$

A second example: the terrible fate of Phobos

So far, only two frequency dependence of Q have been used: Q=cst (most of the time) Q α 1/f (Singer/Mignard model)

BUT: recent experiments strongly suggest: Q α f α (Karato 2009)



→ Depending of the rheology model, Phobos' lifetime changes by 50%!

The tidal effects and the estimation of Q from short term evolution

Satellite in spin-orbit resonance

If $e=0 \rightarrow$ no internal friction: the tidal bulges are facing the COM of the primary



Satellite in spin-orbit resonance

If $e \neq 0 \rightarrow$ internal friction: the tidal bulges are facing the COM of the primary



Competition between tidal dissipation effects



Secular deceleration on the mean motion



Secular acceleration on the mean motion

 \rightarrow Orbit determination of natural satellites and spacecraft follow exactly the same methodology...

Method in three steps:

- 1- modeling of the dynamical system
- 2- gathering the observations
- 3- fitting the model to the observations

Today, this kind of work is done completly numerically

<u>S/C:</u> GINS, DPODP, GEODYN, ...

<u>SAT:</u>NOE, SATELORB...

Step 1: Modeling of the dynamical system

$$\ddot{\vec{r}}_{i} = -G(m_{0} + m_{i}) \left(\frac{\vec{r}_{i}}{r_{i}^{3}} - \nabla_{i} U_{\vec{i}\hat{0}} + \nabla_{0} U_{\vec{0}\hat{i}} \right) + \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{N} Gm_{j} \left(\frac{\vec{r}_{j} - \vec{r}_{i}}{r_{j}^{3}} - \frac{\vec{r}_{j}}{r_{j}^{3}} - \nabla_{j} U_{\vec{j}\hat{i}} + \nabla_{i} U_{\vec{j}\hat{j}} + \nabla_{j} U_{\vec{j}\hat{0}} - \nabla_{0} U_{\vec{0}\hat{j}} \right)$$

$$+\frac{(m_{0}+m_{i})}{m_{i}m_{0}}\left(\vec{F}_{\bar{i}\hat{0}}{}^{T}-\vec{F}_{\bar{0}\hat{i}}{}^{T}\right)-\frac{1}{m_{0}}\sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{N}\left(\vec{F}_{\bar{j}\hat{0}}{}^{T}-\vec{F}_{\bar{0}\hat{j}}{}^{T}\right)$$

Step 1: Modeling of the dynamical system

$$\ddot{\vec{r}}_{i} = -G(m_{0} + m_{i}) \left(\frac{\vec{r}_{i}}{r_{i}^{3}} - \nabla_{i}U_{\bar{i}\hat{0}} + \nabla_{0}U_{\bar{0}\hat{i}} \right) + \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{N} Gm_{j} \left(\frac{\vec{r}_{j} - \vec{r}_{i}}{r_{j}^{3}} - \nabla_{j}U_{\bar{j}\hat{i}} + \nabla_{i}U_{\bar{j}\hat{j}} + \nabla_{j}U_{\bar{j}\hat{0}} - \nabla_{0}U_{\bar{0}\hat{j}} \right)$$

$$+ \frac{(m_{0} + m_{i})}{m_{i}m_{0}} \left(\vec{F}_{\bar{i}\hat{0}}^{T} - \vec{F}_{\bar{0}\hat{i}}^{T} \right) - \frac{1}{m_{0}} \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{N} \left(\vec{F}_{\bar{j}\hat{0}}^{T} - \vec{F}_{\bar{0}\hat{j}}^{T} \right)$$
N-body problem

Step 1: Modeling of the dynamical system

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\vec{r}}_{i} &= -G(m_{0} + m_{i}) \left(\frac{\vec{r}_{i}}{r_{i}^{3}} - \nabla_{i} U_{\vec{i}\hat{0}} + \nabla_{0} U_{\vec{0}\hat{i}} \right) + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N} Gm_{j} \left(\frac{\vec{r}_{j} - \vec{r}_{i}}{r_{j}^{3}} - \nabla_{j} U_{\vec{j}\hat{i}} + \nabla_{i} U_{\vec{j}j} + \nabla_{j} U_{\vec{j}\hat{0}} - \nabla_{0} U_{\vec{0}\hat{j}} \right) \\ &+ \frac{(m_{0} + m_{i})}{m_{i} m_{0}} \left(\vec{F}_{\vec{i}\hat{0}}^{T} - \vec{F}_{\vec{0}\hat{i}}^{T} \right) - \frac{1}{m_{0}} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N} \left(\vec{F}_{\vec{j}\hat{0}}^{T} - \vec{F}_{\vec{0}\hat{j}}^{T} \right) & \qquad \text{N-body problem} \\ \text{Extended gravity fields} \end{aligned}$$

Step 1: Modeling of the dynamical system

$$\ddot{\vec{r}}_{i} = -G(m_{0} + m_{i}) \left(\frac{\vec{r}_{i}}{r_{i}^{3}} - \nabla_{i} U_{\vec{i}\,\hat{0}} + \nabla_{0} U_{\vec{0}\,\hat{i}} \right) + \sum_{j=1,\,j\neq i}^{N} Gm_{j} \left(\frac{\vec{r}_{j} - \vec{r}_{i}}{r_{j}^{3}} - \frac{\vec{r}_{j}}{r_{j}^{3}} - \nabla_{j} U_{\vec{j}\,\hat{i}} + \nabla_{i} U_{\vec{j}\,\hat{j}} + \nabla_{j} U_{\vec{j}\,\hat{0}} - \nabla_{0} U_{\vec{0}\,\hat{j}} \right)$$



Step 1: Modeling of the dynamical system

Equations of motion

$$\ddot{\vec{r}}_{i} = -G(m_{0} + m_{i}) \left(\frac{\vec{r}_{i}}{r_{i}^{3}} - \nabla_{i} U_{\vec{i} \hat{0}} + \nabla_{0} U_{\vec{0} \hat{i}} \right) + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N} Gm_{j} \left(\frac{\vec{r}_{j} - \vec{r}_{i}}{r_{j}^{3}} - \frac{\vec{r}_{j}}{r_{j}^{3}} - \nabla_{j} U_{\vec{j} \hat{i}} + \nabla_{i} U_{\vec{j} \hat{j}} + \nabla_{j} U_{\vec{j} \hat{0}} - \nabla_{0} U_{\vec{0} \hat{j}} \right)$$

$$+\frac{(m_{0}+m_{i})}{m_{i}m_{0}}\left(\vec{F}_{\bar{i}\hat{0}}{}^{T}-\vec{F}_{\bar{0}\hat{i}}{}^{T}\right)-\frac{1}{m_{0}}\sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{N}\left(\vec{F}_{\bar{j}\hat{0}}{}^{T}-\vec{F}_{\bar{0}\hat{j}}{}^{T}\right)$$

N-body problem Extended gravity fields Tidal effects Relativistic terms

Step 1: Modeling of the dynamical system

Equations of motion

$$\ddot{\vec{r}}_{i} = -G(m_{0} + m_{i}) \left(\frac{\vec{r}_{i}}{r_{i}^{3}} - \nabla_{i} U_{\vec{i} \hat{0}} + \nabla_{0} U_{\vec{0} \hat{i}} \right) + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N} Gm_{j} \left(\frac{\vec{r}_{j} - \vec{r}_{i}}{r_{j}^{3}} - \frac{\vec{r}_{j}}{r_{j}^{3}} - \nabla_{j} U_{\vec{j} \hat{i}} + \nabla_{i} U_{\vec{j} \hat{j}} + \nabla_{j} U_{\vec{j} \hat{0}} - \nabla_{0} U_{\vec{0} \hat{j}} \right)$$

$$+\frac{(m_{0}+m_{i})}{m_{i}m_{0}}\left(\vec{F}_{\bar{i}\hat{0}}^{T}-\vec{F}_{\bar{0}\hat{i}}^{T}\right)-\frac{1}{m_{0}}\sum_{j=1,\,j\neq i}^{N}\left(\vec{F}_{\bar{j}\hat{0}}^{T}-\vec{F}_{\bar{0}\hat{j}}^{T}\right)$$

N-body problem Extended gravity fields Tidal effects Relativistic terms

Initial conditions are required to solve for equations of motion...

Problem: How will we find the « real » initial conditions of the system we consider?

Problem: How can we find the « real » initial conditions of the system we consider?

Clearly we need to know at every observation time *t* the quantity $\frac{\partial \vec{r}_i}{\partial c_i}\Big|_{t}$

Variational equations

$$\frac{d^2 r_i}{dt^2} = \frac{1}{m_i} \frac{r}{F_i}$$

Problem: How can we find the « real » initial conditions of the system we consider?

Clearly we need to know at every observation time *t* the quantity $\frac{\partial r_i}{\partial c_l}\Big|_t$

Variational equations

Problem: How can we find the « real » initial conditions of the system we consider? Clearly we need to know at every observation time *t* the quantity $\frac{\partial \vec{r_i}}{\partial c_l}_t$

Variational equations

$$\frac{d^2 r_i}{dt^2} = \frac{1}{m_i} \frac{r}{F_i} \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial c_l} \left(\frac{d^2 r_i}{dt^2} \right) = \frac{1}{m_i} \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial c_l}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial c_l} \left(\frac{d^2 \vec{r}_i}{dt^2} \right) = \frac{1}{m_i} \left[\sum_j \left(\frac{\partial \vec{F}_i}{\partial \vec{r}_j} \frac{\partial \vec{r}_j}{\partial c_l} + \frac{\partial \vec{F}_i}{\partial \dot{\vec{r}_j}} \frac{\partial \vec{r}_j}{\partial c_l} \right) + \frac{\partial \vec{F}_i}{\partial c_l} \right]$$

Problem: How can we find the « real » initial conditions of the system we consider? Clearly we need to know at every observation time *t* the quantity $\frac{\partial \vec{r_i}}{\partial c_i}$

Variational equations

$$\frac{d^2 r_i}{dt^2} = \frac{1}{m_i} \frac{\mathbf{r}}{F_i} \qquad \longrightarrow \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial c_l} \left(\frac{d^2 r_i}{dt^2} \right) = \frac{1}{m_i} \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial c_l}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial c_l} \left(\frac{d^2 \vec{r}_i}{dt^2} \right) = \frac{1}{m_i} \left[\sum_j \left(\frac{\partial \vec{F}_i}{\partial \vec{r}_j} \frac{\partial \vec{r}_j}{\partial c_l} + \frac{\partial \vec{F}_i}{\partial \dot{\vec{r}}_j} \frac{\partial \vec{r}_j}{\partial c_l} \right) + \frac{\partial \vec{F}_i}{\partial c_l} \right]$$

Computation of variational equations can be time consuming and requires a lot of development time!

Step 2: gathering the observations

Direct astrometric measurement



Undirect astrometric measurement (photometry)



Astrometric remeasurement (benefit from modern scanning machine)



Step 2: gathering the observations

Accuracy of the observations?

Direct astrometric measurement

rule of thumb: 100 mas

≈30 km (Mars), 300 km (Jupiter), 600 km (Saturne), 1200 km (Uranus)

Undirect astrometric measurement (photometry)

≈few tens of km (not dependent on the distance, but require larger telescopes for large distance)

Astrometric remeasurement (benefit from modern scanning machine)

35 mas (intersatellite) and 80 mas (RA, DEC) for good photographic plates (Robert et al. 2011). But may greatly depend on the quality of the plates...

Step 3: Fitting the model to the observations



Example of the Mars system



 \rightarrow All these models were analytic

Example of the Mars system

Astrometric post-fit residuals for Phobos after fit of initial state vectors, Mars **dissipation factor Q** and Phobos' oblate parameters c_{20} , c_{22} .



Lainey, Dehant and Pätzold (2007)

Example of the Mars system

Estimation of Phobos tidal acceleration over time (Jacobson 2010):

| Reference | $s \times 10^{-3}$ | к2 | Q | γ |
|---------------------------|--------------------|-------|----------------|-------------------------------------|
| | $(\deg yr^{-2})$ | _ | ~ | (deg) |
| Sharpless (1945) | 1.882 ± 0.171 | | | |
| Shor (1975) | 1.427 ± 0.147 | | | |
| Sinclair (1978) | 1.326 ± 0.118 | | | |
| Jacobson et al. (1989) | 1.249 ± 0.018 | | | |
| Chapront-Touzé (1990) | 1.270 ± 0.008 | | | |
| Emelyanov et al. (1993) | 1.290 ± 0.010 | | | |
| Bills et al. (2005) | 1.367 ± 0.006 | 0.163 | 85.6 ± 0.4 | 0.3346 ± 0.0014 |
| Rainey & Aharonson (2006) | 1.334 ± 0.006 | 0.153 | 78.6 ± 0.8 | $0^{\circ}.3645 \pm 0^{\circ}.0039$ |
| Lainey et al. (2007) | 1.270 ± 0.015 | 0.152 | 79.9 ± 0.7 | 0°.3585 ± 0°.0031 |
| Current | 1.270 ± 0.003 | 0.152 | 82.8 ± 0.2 | $0^{\circ}.3458 \pm 0^{\circ}.0009$ |

Pretty good agreement since decades!





Table of residuals

Remind: 0.1 arcsec ~ 300 km

| $<\mu_{acos\delta}>$ | $\sigma_{acos\delta}$ | < µ _δ > | σ_δ | N |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------|
| -0.0023 | 0.0655 | 0.0009 | 0.0661 | 2405 |
| 0.0003 | 0.0638 | 0.0036 | 0.0635 | 2423 |
| 0.0065 | 0.0817 | 0.0070 | 0.0884 | 2625 |
| 0.0005 | 0.0971 | -0.0052 | 0.1106 | 2824 |

Photographic and CCD observations

| <µ _s > | σ_{s} | <µ _p > | σ_{p} | N_s | N_p | Heliometer |
|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|-------|-------|---------------|
| -0.0375 | 0.1570 | 0.0042 | 0.1817 | 274 | 287 | observations |
| -0.0531 | 0.1515 | 0.0184 | 0.2311 | 186 | 194 | |
| -0.0402 | 0.1403 | 0.0375 | 0.3094 | 106 | 106 | (before 1902) |
| - | - | - | - | - | - | |

Our fit of Io's dissipation provides $k_2/Q = 0.015 \pm 0.003$

One can compare our value with the ones derived from IR emission



We obtained a very good agreement and confirm the values derived from heat flux observations!

Our value of the Jovian dissipation is Q=35600 \pm 6600 assuming k₂=0.379

The estimation from (Goldreich and Soter (1966), Gavrilov and Zharkov (1977))

 $2.5 \ 10^4 < Q_{jupiter} < 2.5 \ 10^5$



Our estimation gets a much smaller error bar AND it is derived from observations



Tidal bulges induce short periodic effect on artifical satellite motions!





Ray et al. (2001) provided the first estimation of Q (terrestrial tides) Q=260 +/- 80



Ray et al. (2001) provided the first estimation of Q (terrestrial tides) Q=260 +/- 80

Konopliv et al. (2011) still cannot derive Q from S/C

Coming to granular material...

Coming to granular media (short term dynamics)

First application of full dynamical model to MBA in 2010: (Marchis et al. 2010)



So far, the models consisted in a precessing orbit... New observations required a more sophisticated model

Coming to granular media (short term dynamics)

We have introduced a full dynamical model, including Eugania's J₂, Solar and planetary perturbations



We could initial state vectors, Eugenia's J₂ and its polar coordinates...

<u>Precision vs. Accuracy:</u> Our polar coordinates are close to the expected one from photometrie

But, our value of J_2 is much smaller than expected assuming constant density).

| | Petit-Prince | Princesse |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| Semi-major axis | | |
| $\langle a \rangle$ in km | 1164.6 | 611.1 |
| min, max (a) | 1164.4, 1164.8 | 610.8, 611.6 |
| $1-\sigma(a)$ | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Mean motion | | |
| (n) in rad/day | 1.3322 | 3.5047 |
| $\min, \max(n)$ | 1.3318, 1.3326 | 3.5008, 3.5077 |
| $1-\sigma(n)$ | 0.0002 | 0.0016 |
| Eccentricity | | |
| (e) | 0.0051 | 0.0708 |
| min. max (e) | 0.0040, 0.0062 | 0.0682, 0.0738 |
| 1-σ (e) | 0.0006 | 0.0018 |
| Inclination | | |
| /i) in deg | 9.22 | 18 10 |
| min max (i) | 8 97 9 35 | 17.98 18.19 |
| $1-\sigma(i)$ | 0.10 | 0.05 |
| 1-0 (1) | 0.10 | 0.05 |
| Mean rate for the node | | |
| $\langle d\Omega/dt \rangle$ in deg/day | -0.006 | -0.550 |
| min, max $(d\Omega/dt)$ | -0.068, -0.050 | -0.563, -0.537 |
| $1-\sigma (d\Omega/dt)$ | 0.004 | 0.006 |
| Mean rate for periapsis | | |
| $\langle d\omega/dt \rangle$ in deg/day | -0.003 | 1.0 |
| min, max $(d\omega/dt)$ | -2.16, -2.65 | 0.4, 1.6 |
| $1-\sigma (d\omega/dt)$ | 1.42 | 0.4 |
| | | |

Eugenia is far from a simple oblate body, our estimation is biased by other harmonics $(c_{22}, ...)$

This work is going on adding more observations and studying different systems (thesis of L.Beauvalet)

Coming to granular media (long term dynamics)

What about Phobos' history if it is a rubble pile? (ρ =1.876 g/cm³)



Significant tidal dissipation may have occured in the past (possible high eccentricity phase) \rightarrow capture scenario still possible?