Towards coupled giant impact and long term interior evolution models

G. J. Golabek - Institut für Geophysik, ETH Zürich, Switzerland.
M. Jutzi - Physikalisches Institut, Univ. Bern, Switzerland.
T.V. Gerya - Institut für Geophysik, ETH Zürich, Switzerland.
E.I. Asphaug - School of Earth and Space Exploration,   Arizona State University, AZ, USA.

The crustal dichotomy [1] is the dominant geological feature on planet Mars. The exogenic approach to the origin of the crustal dichotomy [2-6] assumes that the northern lowlands correspond to a giant impact basin formed after primordial crust formation. However these simulations only consider the impact phase without studying the long-term repercussions of such a collision.

The endogenic approach [7], suggesting a degree-1 mantle upwelling underneath the southern highlands [8-11], relies on a high Rayleigh number and a particular viscosity profile to form a low degree convective pattern within the geological constraints for the dichotomy formation. Such vigorous convection, however, results in continuous magmatic resurfacing, destroying the initially dichotomous crustal structure in the long-term.

A further option is a hybrid exogenic–endogenic approach [12-15], which proposes an impact-induced magma ocean and subsequent superplume in the southern hemisphere. However these models rely on simple scaling laws to impose the thermal effects of the collision.

Here we present the first results of impact simulations performed with a SPH code [16,17] serially coupled with geodynamical computations performed using the code I3VIS [18] to improve the latter approach and test it against observations. We are exploring collisions varying the impactor velocities, impact angles and target body properties.

References
[1] McCauley J.F., Carr M.H., Cutts J. A., Hartmann W.K., Masursky H., Milton D.J., Sharp R.P. and Wilhelms D.E., 1972. *Icarus* 17, 289-327.
[2] Wilhelms D.E. and Squyres S. W., 1984. *Nature* 309, 138-140.
[3] Frey H. and Schultz R.A., 1988. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 15, 229-232.
[4] Andrews-Hanna J.C., Zuber M.T. and Banerdt W.B., 2008. *Nature* 453, 1212-1215.
[5] Marinova M.M., Aharonson O. and Asphaug E., 2008. *Nature* 453, 1216-1219.
[6] Nimmo F., Hart S.D., Korycansky D.G. and Agnor C.B., 2008. *Nature* 453, 1220-1223.
[7] Weinstein S.A., 1995. *J. Geophys. Res.* 100, 11719-11728.
[8] Zhong S. and Zuber M.T., 2001. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 189, 75-84.
[9] Roberts J.H. and Zhong S., 2006. *J. Geophys. Res.* 111, E06013.
[10] Zhong S., 2009. *Nature Geosci.* 2, 19–23.
[11] Keller T. and Tackley P.J., 2009. *Icarus* 202, 429-443.
[12] Reese C.C. and Solomatov V.S., 2006. *Icarus* 184, 102-120.
[13] Reese C.C. and Solomatov V.S., 2010. *Icarus* 207, 82-97.
[14] Reese C.C., Orth C. P. and Solomatov V.S., 2010. *J. Geophys. Res.* 115, E05004.
[15] Golabek G.J., Keller T., Gerya T.V., Zhu G., Tackley P.J. and Connolly J.A.D. 2011. *Icarus* 215, 346-357.
[16] Benz W. and Asphaug E., 1995. *Computer Physics Communications* 87, 253–265.
[17] Jutzi M., Asphaug E., Gillet P., Barrat J-A. and Benz W., 2013. *Nature* 494, 207–210.
[18] Gerya T.V. and Yuen D. A., 2007. *Phys. Earth Planet. Int.* 163, 83-105.