

UC Santa Cruz

UC Santa Cruz Previously Published Works

Title

Powering Triton's recent geological activity by obliquity tides: Implications for Pluto geology

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/99s8t6zm>

Authors

Nimmo, F.
Spencer, J.R.

Publication Date

2015-01-01

DOI

10.1016/j.icarus.2014.01.044

Peer reviewed

Powering Triton's recent geological activity by obliquity tides: Implications for Pluto geology

F.Nimmo^aJ. R. Spencer^b

^a*Dept. Earth and Planetary Sciences, University of California, Santa Cruz, 1156
High St., Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA*

^b*Southwest Research Institute, 1050 Walnut St. Suite 300, Boulder CO 80302,
USA*

Number of pages: 27

Number of tables: 2

Number of figures: 3

Proposed Running Head:
Triton obliquity tidal heating

Please send Editorial Correspondence to:

Francis Nimmo
Dept. of Earth and Planetary Sciences, University of California, Santa Cruz
1156 High St.
Santa Cruz, CA, 95064, USA.

Email: fnimmo@es.ucsc.edu
Phone: (831) 459-1783

ABSTRACT

We investigate the origins of Triton's deformed and young surface. Assuming Triton was captured early in solar system history, the bulk of the energy released during capture will have been lost, and cannot be responsible for its present-day activity. Radiogenic heating is sufficient to maintain a long-lived ocean beneath a conductive ice shell, but insufficient to cause convective deformation and yielding at the surface. However, Triton's high inclination likely causes a significant ($\approx 0.7^\circ$) obliquity, resulting in large heat fluxes due to tidal dissipation in any subsurface ocean. For a 300 km thick ice shell, the estimated ocean heat production rate (≈ 0.3 TW) is capable of producing surface yielding and mobile-lid convection. Requiring convection places an upper bound on the ice shell viscosity, while the requirement for yielding imposes a lower bound. Both bounds can be satisfied with an ocean temperature ≈ 240 K for our nominal temperature-viscosity relationship, suggesting the presence of an antifreeze such as NH_3 . In our view, Triton's geological activity is driven by obliquity tides, which arise because of its inclination. In contrast, Pluto is unlikely to be experiencing significant tidal heating. While Pluto may have experienced ancient tectonic deformation, we do not anticipate seeing the kind of young, deformed surfaces seen at Triton.

Keywords: Satellites, dynamics ; Tides, solid body ; Pluto ; Triton

1 Introduction

In terms of their bulk properties, Triton and Pluto are remarkably similar (see Table 1). Both are presumed to have formed as Kuiper Belt objects, although retrograde Triton was captured into Neptune orbit at some point in its history (McKinnon and Kirk, 2007). Triton has a young (<100 Myr) surface (Schenk and Zahnle, 2007), deformed by a variety of tectonic and possibly cryovolcanic (Croft et al., 1995) features, and exhibits geysers that are probably powered by solar heating (Kirk et al., 1990). It is therefore of interest to consider the question: to what extent will Pluto resemble Triton?

In this MS we lean heavily on Triton’s youthful appearance in assessing its likely interior state. With Pluto, firm predictions are elusive. However, we argue that *New Horizons* observations will not only clarify Pluto’s interior state, but will also determine whether our favoured hypothesis for Triton’s activity is correct.

The logic of the MS is as follows. We first demonstrate that the heat released during Triton’s orbital evolution following capture only marginally affects its present-day behaviour (Section 3.1). Based on its young apparent age, we assume that Triton’s icy surface is being deformed, at least in part, by convection (Stern and McKinnon, 2000, c.f.), as similarly young surfaces on Europa and Enceladus are thought to do. We then argue that surface deformation and yielding require heat fluxes much greater than Triton’s radiogenic elements can supply (Section 3.2). However, the addition of tidal heating is sufficient to permit yielding to occur, and also makes a long-lived ocean possible. As argued by Jankowski et al. (1989), Triton’s odd orbital configuration makes heating by obliquity tides unusually effective. In contrast to these authors, however, we focus on dissipation within a subsurface ocean (Section 3.3). A Triton consisting of a thick convecting ice shell overlying a long-lived, cold (and currently dissipative) ocean is energetically plausible and consistent with the meagre observational constraints.

How does this picture relate to Pluto? The main difference is that tidal heating is unlikely to operate at Pluto and, as a result, surface yielding should not be occurring currently. If our scenario regarding Triton’s extra energy source is correct, Pluto should show no signs of recent geological activity. Conversely, if Pluto’s surface does turn out to be as young as Triton’s, this suggests that processes other than tidal heating are likely responsible for the activity of both moons. One possible explanation in this case would be the presence of highly volatile species enabling geological activity powered by radiogenic heat alone.

Because of the relative paucity of observational constraints compared to e.g. the Saturnian or Jovian satellites, we have favoured order-of-magnitude arguments over detailed models wherever possible. Uncertainties are generally so large that exploring parameter space with complex models is impractical, and unlikely to yield additional insight beyond the simple calculations presented here. We do, however, identify some questions which may be worth exploring in more detail.

1.1 Observations

An important clue to Triton’s present-day state is the fact that its surface is so lightly cratered, suggesting a surface age less than at most 100 Myr old (Schenk and Zahnle, 2007). There are only four other known outer solar system bodies with comparable surface ages. Titan and Io are unsuitable analogues, because the resurfacing is due in large part to erosion/sedimentation, and prodigious silicate volcanism, respectively. Europa’s heavily deformed surface is about 50 Myr old on average (Zahnle et al., 2003), while the south polar region of Enceladus is probably even younger

44 (Porco et al., 2006). In both cases, resurfacing is plausibly due to deformation driven by convection
45 involving motion of the entire near-surface lid (Showman and Han, 2005; Barr, 2008; O’Neill and
46 Nimmo, 2010). In both cases the ultimate energy source driving this motion is tidal heating. Given
47 the abundance of plausibly tectonic features on Triton’s surface (Croft et al., 1995), we shall assume
48 below that convection-related yielding and deformation is taking place. We note, however, the
49 possibility that mechanisms other than ice shell convection, such as cryovolcanism (Croft et al.,
50 1995) or diapirism driven by local density variations (Schenk and Jackson, 1993) may also contribute
51 to Triton’s resurfacing.

52 While Triton is also active up to the present time in the sense that it has active geysers, we do
53 not view this as a particularly useful constraint. Although the geysers at Enceladus are probably
54 related to its internally active state, Triton’s geyser activity is plausibly driven by solar heating
55 (Kirk et al., 1990) rather than endogenic geological activity.

56 1.2 *Orbital history*

57 Triton’s retrograde orbit indicates that it was captured. Three capture mechanisms have been
58 proposed: aerodynamic drag (McKinnon and Leith, 1995); collision with another satellite (Goldreich
59 et al., 1989); and exchange capture (Agnor and Hamilton, 2006). Of these, the last - in which a
60 binary object encounters Neptune and one member of the binary (Triton) is captured - is by far the
61 most probable. The timing of the capture event is somewhat unclear. Aerodynamic drag can only
62 have operated during Neptune’s formation, and the probability of a collision, always low, becomes
63 much lower once the main stage of accretion ended. Exchange capture could in theory occur at any
64 time, but modelling by Vokrouhlicky et al. (2008) suggests that it probably happened within the
65 first 5-10 Myr of solar system history.

66 The conventional picture of Triton’s post-capture orbital evolution may be divided into two
67 phases (Chyba et al., 1989; Ross and Schubert, 1990). In the first phase, its initially highly ec-
68 centric orbit was circularized by tidally-driven dissipation. Because of the strong positive feedback
69 between dissipation and temperature, the majority of the circularization probably took place rapidly
70 (<100 My). The duration of the entire circularization process depends on poorly-known rheological
71 parameters, but was almost certainly <1000 Myr. An alternative, more rapid (~ 0.1 My) mode of
72 circularization is via interaction with a disk resulting from collisions between other pre-existing
73 satellites (Cuk and Gladman, 2005). In either case, the end state was a body on an inclined, but
74 essentially circular orbit.

75 The second phase involves more gradual evolution to the present-day situation. Tidal dissipa-
76 tion in a satellite damps both eccentricity and inclination, while dissipation in the primary can have
77 the opposite effect (Murray and Dermott, 1999). For the Neptune-Triton system, it is not obvious
78 whether dissipation in the primary or the satellite dominates (Chyba et al., 1989). However, irre-
79 spective of this issue, the inclination will damp more slowly than the eccentricity (as is evident from
80 the current circularity of Triton’s orbit). We discuss this issue in more detail in Section 3.3 and
81 equation (9) below, and demonstrate that the inclination is not expected to have damped over the
82 age of the solar system. The reason this issue is important is that it is Triton’s non-zero inclination
83 which we hypothesize is the ultimate cause of present-day tidal heating (Section 3.3).

84 2 Structure and parameter choices

85 For a body consisting of two layers of uniform density, the bulk density ρ_b is given by

$$\rho_b = \rho_i \left(1 + \frac{(\rho_s - \rho_i)}{\rho_i} \left[\frac{R_s}{R} \right]^3 \right) \quad (1)$$

86 where the density of the outer and inner layers are ρ_i and ρ_s , respectively, and the radial position
 87 of the interface is R_s . For Triton and Pluto, we assume the outer layer is Ice I ($\rho_i=950 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$) and
 88 the inner layer is anhydrous silicates plus iron with a density similar to Io's ($\rho_s=3500 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$). The
 89 resulting radius of the rock-iron core R_s and the maximum thickness of the ice shell d_{max} are given
 90 in Table 1. Triton's maximum ice shell thickness is 327 km; a lower density inner layer results in a
 91 thinner shell (e.g. 284 km for $\rho_s=3200 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$). The actual shell thickness may also be smaller if a
 92 subsurface ocean is present.

93 This simple analysis ignores many details: the role of higher pressure ice phases, the possibility
 94 of a hydrated core, porosity in the near-surface of the ice shell, and so on. However, at the order-
 95 of-magnitude level that we are discussing, none of these details are likely to matter. One important
 96 exception is that Pluto (but not Triton) might not be fully differentiated. We discuss this issue
 97 briefly in Section 5.

98 Whether or not an ocean is present for either Triton or Pluto is unclear (Hussmann et al., 2006;
 99 Desch et al., 2009; Gaeman et al., 2012, e.g.). As discussed in Robuchon and Nimmo (2011), a
 100 present-day ocean on Pluto is likely if the ice shell is not convecting; conversely, a convecting ice
 101 shell prevents an ocean from developing. Whether a similar logic applies to Triton depends on the
 102 heat sources available to prevent an ocean from freezing (see Section 3 below). However, in the case
 103 of Pluto our principal conclusions do not depend on whether or not an ocean is present.

104 For ice, we assume a constant thermal conductivity of $3 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$. The temperature-dependent
 105 conductivity of ice (Klinger, 1980) would result in a higher mean value; on the other hand, the pres-
 106 ence of clathrates and/or porous material would lower the conductivity. The uncertainties involved
 107 do not significantly affect our conclusions. The viscosity of ice is dependent on temperature, grain
 108 size, melt fraction and stress (Goldsby and Kohlstedt, 2001). Where necessary we assume a simple
 109 Newtonian rheology with a reference viscosity near the melting point of about 10^{14} Pa s , appropriate
 110 for ice with grain size of order 1 mm under the low stresses characteristic of convection. Such grain
 111 sizes are appropriate for situations in which pinning by secondary phases prevents grain growth
 112 from occurring (Barr and McKinnon, 2007).

113 Although we do not include them here, the presence of clathrates could affect our results,
 114 since they have significantly lower thermal conductivities and higher viscosities than pure water ice
 115 (Durham et al., 2010). Both characteristics would tend to allow subsurface oceans to persist for
 116 longer. Similarly, we do not include the effects of ices other than water ice. The effect of antifreezes
 117 such as NH_3 is also to make a present-day ocean more likely (Hussmann et al., 2006, e.g.).

118 In the absence of any observational constraints, we adopt a chondritic heating rate using the
 119 same parameters used by Robuchon and Nimmo (2011), which yields a present-day radiogenic
 120 heat flux of 2.4 mW m^{-2} (or $3.4 \times 10^{-12} \text{ W kg}^{-1}$). This value is a little smaller than the range
 121 of $3.3 - 6.6 \text{ mW m}^{-2}$ used by Brown et al. (1991), but almost twice the present-day value of
 122 1.3 mW m^{-2} adopted by Gaeman et al. (2012). Part of the reason for the discrepancy with the
 123 latter study is that these authors assumed a differentiated inner layer containing roughly equal
 124 iron and silicate mass fractions, and then calculated heat production in the silicate layer alone.
 125 This results in an underestimate, because the chondritic heating rates they used are based on

undifferentiated materials (i.e. silicates plus iron).

3 Heat Sources

3.1 Primordial Heating

Immediately after capture, Triton's orbit was highly elliptical, leading to large tides. These tides in turn caused heating, reducing Triton's effective rigidity and thus further increasing the amplitude of tidal deformation and heating. This positive feedback probably led to a brief, intense period of heating, up to ~ 1 Gyr after capture, after which Triton's orbit was essentially circular (Ross and Schubert, 1990).

The total energy released, expressed as a mean temperature change, is given by (McKinnon and Kirk, 2007, e.g.)

$$\Delta T \approx \frac{Gm_p}{2aC_p} \approx 9600 \text{ K} \quad (2)$$

where m_p is the mass of the tide-raising body (Neptune), a is the semi-major axis and C_p is the mean specific heat capacity ($\approx 10^3 \text{ J kg}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$). Evidently circularization was sufficient to cause widespread melting and complete differentiation.

However, Triton's small size means that this initial heat is not readily stored. The diffusion timescale in a sphere of radius R is $R^2/\pi^2\kappa$, where κ is the thermal diffusivity (Carslaw and Jaeger, 1986). For a sphere 1000 km in radius with $\kappa = 10^{-6} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, this timescale is 3.2 Gyr, smaller than the age of the solar system. Thus, even in the most conservative case (i.e. neglecting convection and melt transport), primordial heat likely plays only a minor role in the present-day energy budget of Triton.

Figure 1 shows a slightly more sophisticated set of calculations which reinforce this conclusion. Here we are modelling a Triton consisting of a conductive rock-iron core heated by radiogenic decay and an outer H_2O region. This region consists of a conductive ice shell and potentially an ocean. The ocean will melt or freeze depending on the balance between heat transported from the top of the rock-iron layer (here referred to as the ice-core interface or ICI) and heat lost from the shell to space. Further details on the numerical technique employed are presented in the Appendix.

Fig 1a shows a case in which Triton is started from a cold temperature (150 K everywhere). The heat flux from the ICI increases as the rock-iron core heats up due to radioactive decay, and then wanes as the radiogenic elements are exhausted. The ice shell heats up, because heat transfer out of the shell is smaller than the heat being added from the ICI. Once the ice shell exceeds 270 K, it begins to melt. The ice shell reaches a minimum thickness at about 2 Gyr, and then proceeds to slowly refreeze thereafter, with a present-day thickness of 160 km and surface heat flux of 4.0 mW m^{-2} . The present-day surface heat flux and ICI heat flux are almost in balance, which is what one would expect because of the short heat transfer timescale across the ocean and ice shell. Both these heat fluxes exceed the present-day rate of radiogenic heat production (equivalent to 2.4 mW m^{-2} at the surface) because of the time it takes for this heat to diffuse outwards through the rock-iron core. This scenario is very similar to that shown in Figs 2e-f of Robuchon and Nimmo (2011). However, we differ from Gaeman et al. (2012) in that our models are able to maintain an ocean to the present day without requiring tidal heating. The reason is that Gaeman et al. (2012) assumed a silicate core volume of $1.79 \times 10^{17} \text{ m}^3$, which is roughly an order of magnitude too small. As a result, the contribution of radiogenic heating to maintaining an ocean is significantly underestimated (Hier-Majumder, pers.comm.).

167 Fig 1b shows the same situation, but now with a hot start (1000 K for the core and 250 K for
 168 the ice shell). Shell melting occurs almost immediately, and the ICI heat flux shows a monotonic
 169 decline because of the initial high temperature. However, the present-day situation is very similar
 170 to that shown in Fig 1a - the present-day surface heat flux is 4.9 mW m^{-2} and the shell thickness
 171 130 km. Thus, as expected the initial conditions have only a rather limited effect on the present-day
 172 state of the ice shell.

173 Of course, this simple scenario neglects the possibility of heat transport by convection or ad-
 174 vection (of melt). This is important for e.g. the thickness of the shell, and whether or not an ocean
 175 exists at the present day (see below). However, because more rapid heat transfer further reduces
 176 the influence of primordial heat on Triton's present-day thermal state, including such processes
 177 will only strengthen our conclusion that the initial conditions do not affect the present-day energy
 178 budget.

179 Thus, to first order Triton's initial heating should not affect its present-day behavior. Of course,
 180 there may be important details; for instance, early volatile loss driven by tidal heating could have
 181 important consequences for subsequent behavior. Nonetheless, unless Triton's capture happened
 182 late in solar system history - which is highly improbable - its young, deformed surface must be due
 183 to processes other than the initial capture event, and whether or not it possesses an ocean now is
 184 not sensitive to the initial conditions.

185 3.2 Convection, conduction and yielding

186 Fig 1 makes it clear that a present-day ocean on Triton can be sustained by radiogenic heating -
 187 assuming that the ice shell is conductive. Contrariwise, based on numerical modeling of Pluto, a con-
 188 ducting shell can be sufficiently efficient at removing heat that an ocean never develops (Robuchon
 189 and Nimmo, 2011). Unfortunately, it is hard to decide from a purely theoretical standpoint whether
 190 a conductive or convective shell is more likely. Fortunately, what we really care about is whether
 191 the surface is deforming or not - and we will argue below that this question can be addressed using
 192 a relatively simple criterion.

193 The viscosity of ice $\eta(T)$ is strongly temperature-dependent (Goldsby and Kohlstedt, 2001, e.g.):

$$\eta(T) = \eta_0 \exp \left[\frac{E_a}{R_g} \left(\frac{1}{T_0} - \frac{1}{T} \right) \right] \quad (3)$$

194 where η_0 is the reference viscosity at the reference temperature T_0 (=273 K), E_a is the activation
 195 energy and R_g is the gas constant. A typical ice reference viscosity is 10^{14} Pa s , but this depends
 196 on grain size and impurities (as noted above).

197 Convection ceases if the Rayleigh number Ra declines below some critical value Ra_{cr} , where Ra
 198 is given by

$$Ra = \frac{\rho_i g \alpha (T_b - T_s) d^3}{\kappa \eta_b} \quad (4)$$

199 with ρ_i the ice density, g the acceleration due to gravity, T_b and T_s the temperatures at the top and
 200 bottom of the shell, d the ice shell thickness, α the thermal expansivity, κ the thermal diffusivity
 201 and η_b the viscosity at the base of the ice shell, temperature T_b . A measure of the sensitivity of the
 202 ice viscosity to a change in temperature is given by $\gamma = E_a / R_g T_b^2$ (Solomatov, 1995), where for ice
 203 $\gamma \approx 0.1 \text{ K}^{-1}$.

204 For Newtonian materials the critical Rayleigh number Ra_{cr} is independent of the amplitude of

205 temperature perturbations and is given by

$$Ra_{cr} = 155(\gamma[T_b - T_s])^4 \quad (5)$$

206 where the prefactor depends on the aspect ratio $[1 - (d/R)]$ and is given here for a Triton-like aspect
 207 ratio of 0.72 (Robuchon and Nimmo, 2011). For $T_b=270$ K, $Ra_{cr} \approx 4 \times 10^7$.

208 Whether or not convection causes surface yielding and deformation depends on how large the
 209 convective stresses σ_c are compared to the yield stress of the material σ_y . The convective stresses
 210 in the mobile lid regime are given by (Moresi and Solomatov, 1998; Van Heck and Tackley, 2011):

$$\sigma_c \sim \frac{\eta_i \kappa}{\delta_0^2} \sim \frac{\eta_i \kappa}{k^2 (T_b - T_s)^2} F_c^2 \quad (6)$$

211 where η_i is the viscosity of the convecting interior, δ_0 is the thickness of the convecting boundary
 212 layer in the mobile-lid regime, F_c is the convective heat flux and the second equality is derived by
 213 taking $F_c \approx k(T_b - T_s)/\delta_0$, with k the thermal conductivity. Doubling the heat flux increases the
 214 convective stress by a factor of four; thus, more vigorous convection is more likely to cause yielding.
 215 The importance of equation (6) is that, for a given viscosity, it can be used to determine a critical
 216 convective heat flux below which surface yielding does not take place. Note that there is an implicit
 217 dependence on Ra , because the convective heat flux and δ_0 both depend on Ra .

218 For two different satellites, assuming that $(T_b - T_s)$, k and κ do not differ much between the
 219 bodies, we can write the ratio of the critical heat fluxes as follows

$$\frac{F'_c}{F_c} \approx \left(\frac{\sigma'_y \eta_b}{\sigma_y \eta'_b} \right)^{1/2} \quad (7)$$

220 where σ_y represents the yield stress and primed and unprimed variables refer to the two different
 221 bodies. For bottom-heated convection, the interior and bottom viscosities η_i and η_b are related by
 222 $\eta_i \approx 2.7\eta_b$, because the temperature drop across the bottom boundary layer is $\approx \gamma^{-1}$ (Solomatov,
 223 1995). We therefore assume that $\eta_b/\eta'_b = \eta_i/\eta'_i$. Physically, equation (7) is reasonable: a higher yield
 224 strength requires a higher heat flux (greater convective vigour) in order for yielding to occur. On the
 225 other hand, a higher basal viscosity (lower basal temperature) causes yielding at a lower convective
 226 heat flux, other things being equal. Note that the influence of gravity is implicit in this equation,
 227 because the convective heat flux F_c depends on the Rayleigh number and thus on gravity.

228 O'Neill and Nimmo (2010) investigated convection with frictional faulting on Enceladus and
 229 showed that for mobile lid convection to occur required heat fluxes of about 100 mW m^{-2} and surface
 230 convective stresses ~ 0.1 MPa when $\eta_b = 10^{14}$ Pa s. This heat flux is similar to independent estimates
 231 based on flexural (Giese et al., 2008), crater relaxation (Bland et al., 2012), and plate-spreading
 232 (Barr, 2008) studies. Similarly, Hammond and Barr (2013) found surface convective stresses in the
 233 range 0.02-0.05 MPa and a critical heat flux of about 120 mW m^{-2} for mobile lid deformation on
 234 Ganymede taking $\eta_b = 10^{14}$ Pa s. This result is broadly consistent with observational constraints
 235 of paleo-heat fluxes on Ganymede, which are 50 mW m^{-2} or greater (Nimmo et al., 2002; Nimmo
 236 and Pappalardo, 2004; Bland and Showman, 2007). Showman and Han (2005) showed that mobile
 237 lid convection on Europa required yield stresses in the range 0.02-0.1 MPa for a basal viscosity of
 238 10^{13} Pa s.

239 Using the results summarized above, equation (7) can be used to determine the critical heat
 240 flux F_c at Pluto or Triton based on the assumed basal viscosity. However, to do so requires some
 241 understanding of whether the yield stress σ_y depends on gravity. If the effective yield stress is deter-

242 mined by friction on faults, larger bodies with bigger g might have higher yield stresses (Van Heck
 243 and Tackley, 2011) and require higher heat fluxes for yielding to occur (equation 7). However, the
 244 fact that the observational constraints for heat flux on Ganymede are (if anything) smaller than
 245 inferred heat fluxes on Enceladus suggests that the effective yield stress is not gravity-dependent.
 246 We will therefore assume that $\sigma'_y \approx \sigma_y$ in equation (7), and based on the Enceladus example take
 247 $\eta'_b = 10^{14}$ Pa s and $F'_c = 100$ mW m⁻². If we had instead based our results on the Ganymede
 248 numbers from Hammond and Barr (2013), the required heat fluxes to cause yielding would have
 249 been a factor of roughly two larger.

250 Equation (7) shows that for yielding to occur a relatively high interior viscosity is desirable -
 251 but too high a viscosity will shut down convection entirely. This tradeoff is illustrated in Fig 2,
 252 where the minimum shell thickness required for convection to occur (equations 4 and 5) and the
 253 critical heat flux for yielding to occur (equation 7) are plotted for various basal temperatures T_b .
 254 Here we are assuming that heat production and (convective) heat transfer are in balance. As T_b
 255 increases, η_b decreases and so the shell thickness required for convection to occur decreases. On the
 256 other hand, higher basal temperatures require higher heat fluxes to generate stresses large enough
 257 to cause yielding (equation 7). As a result, there is a restricted region in parameter space in which
 258 convection-driven yielding can occur for likely shell thicknesses. Yielding requires moderate to high
 259 heat fluxes, with higher fluxes being required at higher values of T_b .

260 Fig 2a shows that if the heat flux is due only to stored radiogenic heat (≈ 4 mW m⁻²; see Fig 1),
 261 yielding is not going to occur given the shell thickness of Triton. On the other hand, if convection
 262 is transporting 18 mW m⁻², a basal temperature $T_b \approx 240$ K and $d \approx 300$ km will allow convection
 263 and yielding to occur. At $T_b > 245$ K, convection can occur but the viscosities are too low to cause
 264 yielding. Similar results apply if the reference viscosity is 10^{15} Pa s (Fig 2b), except that everything
 265 is shifted to higher basal temperatures.

266 An important consequence of these results is that for yielding to occur, Triton's putative ocean
 267 must be relatively cold, presumably due to the presence of antifreeze. Ammonia is one such sub-
 268 stance: an ocean temperature of 240-250 K at 200 MPa implies that the ocean contains 2-10 wt%
 269 NH₃ (Hogenboom et al., 1997). These kinds of ammonia concentrations are in line with theoretical
 270 predictions based on cosmochemical abundances (Lunine and Stevenson, 1987; Desch et al., 2009),
 271 especially if the ammonia has become concentrated in the ocean as the ice shell thickened.

272 As we discuss next, there are reasons to expect tidal dissipation in Triton to be able to generate
 273 up to ≈ 15 mW m⁻² of heating. For a shell thickness of 300 km, surface yielding and mobile lid
 274 convection can be driven by this rate of heat transfer. Conversely, radiogenic heating alone is not
 275 capable of causing yielding.

276 We can provide a crude reality check on this calculation by considering Ganymede and Callisto.
 277 Both bodies had surface radiogenic heat fluxes of about 15 – 20 mW m⁻² four billion years ago
 278 (Schubert et al., 2004; McKinnon, 2006), comparable to our estimate for Triton at the present day.
 279 Stagnant lid convection with a low basal viscosity and mobile lid convection with a higher viscosity
 280 can yield equal heat fluxes (Solomatov, 1995). Callisto, with a basal viscosity of 10^{14} Pa s, would
 281 permit heat fluxes of about 15 mW m⁻² via stagnant lid convection (McKinnon, 2006). However,
 282 the stresses would be too low to permit yielding and surface deformation. By our hypothesis Triton
 283 has a higher basal viscosity, which permits yielding and mobile lid convection to occur, and results
 284 in a similar rate of heat transfer. A key difference between Callisto and Triton is thus the ocean
 285 temperature, which is mainly a function of the amount of ammonia present. We infer colder ocean
 286 temperatures at Triton than Callisto, in line with the expectation that the Jovian environment was
 287 less NH₃-rich than more distant regions (Prinn and Fegley, 1981, e.g.). At Ganymede, Fig 2 shows

288 that the inferred ancient heat flux of $\sim 100 \text{ mW m}^{-2}$ would permit both convection and yielding
 289 to occur for a warm ($\approx 270 \text{ K}$) ocean even in the case of a relatively thin (100 km) shell. We thus
 290 regard our arguments as plausible, but acknowledge the desirability of future numerical models to
 291 further test the likelihood of mobile lid convection under Triton conditions

292 3.3 Present-day tidal heating

293 The most important aspect of Triton's inclined orbit is that as a consequence its obliquity (angle
 294 between the rotation pole and the orbit normal) is expected to be a few tenths of a degree. A finite
 295 obliquity is important because it provides an additional source of tidal heating (Jankowski et al.,
 296 1989) in addition to the well known eccentricity tides. This is explained in more detail below.

297 3.3.1 Triton's obliquity

298 For a moderately dissipative synchronous satellite on an inclined orbit, the obliquity is driven
 299 towards an equilibrium value at which the satellite spin axis and orbit normal remain coplanar
 300 with respect to the invariable plane as they precess - a so-called Cassini state (Jankowski et al.,
 301 1989, e.g.). The orbit precession period (of 690 years) is well known (Jacobson, 2009). However,
 302 to predict the obliquity, the difference between the polar and equatorial moments of inertia of the
 303 satellite is required (because it affects the spin pole precession rate), and this moment difference is
 304 usually unknown. The usual solution is to invoke the hydrostatic assumption, which means that the
 305 body has relaxed to its long-term (strengthless) state. In this case, given an assumed polar moment
 306 of inertia, the moment of inertia difference and hence the obliquity may be derived by use of the
 307 Radau-Darwin equation (Murray and Dermott, 1999).

308 Triton began life hot (see above) and is not much smaller than Europa, which is demonstrably
 309 hydrostatic (Schubert et al., 2004). The available shape data for Triton, while uncertain, are con-
 310 sistent with a hydrostatic body (Thomas, 2000). The hydrostatic assumption for Triton is therefore
 311 not unreasonable.

312 Taking a dimensionless moment of inertia of 0.33, Chen et al. (2014) predicted an obliquity of
 313 0.35° for a solid Triton; Chyba et al. (1989) obtained a similar value of 0.26° using pre-Voyager
 314 data. Chen et al. (2014) also pointed out that this value was likely to be an underestimate if Triton
 315 possessed an ocean, because in that case the shell is decoupled from the interior and the obliquity is
 316 increased. One possible example of this effect is Titan, where the measured obliquity is more than
 317 twice the predicted value based on a solid-body assumption (Bills and Nimmo, 2011). The obliquity
 318 of Triton with a decoupled shell would be approximately 0.7° (Chen et al., 2014). This factor of two
 319 difference is important because tidal heating goes as the cube of obliquity (see below).

320 3.3.2 Solid Body Tidal Heating

321 The rate of tidal dissipation in a solid, synchronous satellite is given by (Chyba et al., 1989,
 322 e.g.)

$$\dot{E}_{solid} = \frac{3}{2} \frac{k_2}{Q} \frac{n^5 R^5}{G} (7e^2 + \theta^2). \quad (8)$$

323 Here θ and e are the obliquity and eccentricity (both assumed small), k_2 is the degree-2 tidal
 324 Love number, Q is the dissipation factor, n is the mean motion, R is the satellite radius and G
 325 the gravitational constant. Because Triton's eccentricity $e \sim 10^{-5}$, equation (8) shows that even for
 326 $\theta = 0.1^\circ$, obliquity tidal heating will dominate by a factor of $\sim 10^4$.

327 Equation (8) can be used to determine the ratio of the eccentricity damping timescale τ_e to

328 the inclination damping timescale τ_i , assuming dissipation in the satellite dominates. The result is
 329 (Murray and Dermott, 1999)

$$\frac{\tau_i}{\tau_e} = 7 \left(\frac{\sin i}{\sin \theta} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1}{\cos i} \right) \frac{1}{f} \quad (9)$$

330 where i is the inclination and the final parameter f (≥ 1) takes into account the fact that the
 331 total obliquity tidal heating may exceed the solid body obliquity heating if an ocean is present (see
 332 below). Equation (9) shows that if $f=1$, inclination damping is always slower by a factor of at least
 333 7 than eccentricity damping. In the cases we consider below, inclination damping is actually slower
 334 than this because $(\sin i / \sin \theta)^2 > f$.

335 The eccentricity damping timescale τ_e is given by Murray and Dermott (1999):

$$\tau_e = \frac{2}{21} \frac{Ga^2 m}{n^3 R^5 (k_2/Q)} \quad (10)$$

336 where m is the mass of the satellite. Taking the nominal parameters given in Tables 1 and 2, we
 337 find $\tau_e \approx 60$ Myr, consistent with the rapid eccentricity damping found in the more sophisticated
 338 models of Ross and Schubert (1990).

339 Anticipating the results from the next sections, we find that $f \approx 180$ for $\theta = 0.7^\circ$. This in turn
 340 gives $(\sin i / \sin \theta)^2 / f \approx 6$, so that using equation (9) we obtain $\tau_i \approx 40\tau_e$, or about 2.5 Gyr. It is
 341 thus not unreasonable that Triton's eccentricity has damped, while its inclination (and obliquity)
 342 have persisted.

343 As noted by Chyba et al. (1989), dissipation in the primary has the opposite effect on inclination
 344 to dissipation in the satellite. Thus, primary dissipation can slow, or even reverse, the damping of
 345 inclination. For the nominal parameters given in Tables 1 and 2 and $\theta = 0.7^\circ$, dissipation in the
 346 satellite dominates by a factor of 3, where we take the k_2 of Neptune to be 0.2 (Kramm et al., 2011)
 347 and use the upper bound for Q of Neptune of 36,000 (Zhang and Hamilton, 2008). If dissipation in
 348 the primary is important, our conclusion that high inclinations can have persisted is reinforced.

349 3.3.3 Ocean Tidal Heating

350 Satellites which possess oceans may undergo turbulent tidal dissipation within those oceans.
 351 Obliquity-driven tides propagating in the opposite direction to the satellite's spin are especially
 352 likely to result in dissipation, because they have a resonant frequency equal to the orbital frequency
 353 of the satellite (Tyler, 2008). In Chen et al. (2014) we have modified the formulation used in Tyler
 354 (2011) to derive ocean dissipation rates as a function of the dimensionless bottom drag parameter
 355 C_D . The drag coefficient formulation has a long history in terrestrial oceanic studies (Taylor, 1920;
 356 Jayne and Laurent, 2001, e.g.) and is relatively well-constrained ($C_D \approx 0.002$). Although it is
 357 expected to vary slightly with Reynolds number, Sohl et al. (1995) concluded that values of C_D
 358 in the range 0.002-0.01 are likely appropriate for Titan's ocean. We will adopt $C_D=0.002$ to be
 359 conservative here. Below we will focus on obliquity heating, since eccentricity heating in oceans is
 360 always small (Chen et al., 2014). We assume that the thickness of the ocean is large compared to
 361 the bottom topography.

362 One potential complication that we ignore is the role of the ice shell. A thick, rigid lid will
 363 reduce the amplitude of the obliquity tide, and hence the amount of tidal heating (Matsuyama,
 364 2012). A Triton based on Table 1 consisting of a rigid rock-iron core overlain by a strengthless H_2O
 365 layer would have a Love number $k_2=0.39$. If the H_2O layer instead consisted of a 20 km thick ocean
 366 overlain by a 327 km thick convecting layer (viscosity 10^{14} Pa s, rigidity 3 GPa), k_2 is reduced to
 367 0.20. Because converting from k_2 to ocean dissipation is not straightforward, we ignore this potential

368 effect below, but note that it may be important to include in future.

369 After a certain amount of algebra, the oceanic dissipation rate \dot{E}_{ocean} due to obliquity tides for
 370 Triton can be expressed as

$$\dot{E}_{ocean} \approx 8\pi\rho_w R^5 C_D n^3 \theta^3 \approx 100 \text{ GW} \left(\frac{C_D}{0.002}\right) \left(\frac{\theta}{0.35^\circ}\right)^3 \quad (11)$$

371 where ρ_w is the fluid density. Here we have simplified the full solutions of Chen et al. (2014)
 372 by assuming that on Triton the quantity $C_D g \theta / n^2 R \ll 1$, which is only approximately correct.
 373 Comparison with the full solutions (see below) show that the result is a slight over-estimation of
 374 the heating rate. We nonetheless show equation (11) because it makes the underlying physics more
 375 transparent. For instance, the dependence on obliquity θ is cubic, so that an uncertainty of a factor
 376 of 2 in the obliquity can make a big difference.

377 Making use of equations (8) and (11) we may derive the ratio of obliquity tidal heating in the
 378 solid to that in the ocean:

$$\frac{E_{ocean}}{E_{solid}} = 4 \frac{\rho_w}{\bar{\rho}_p} \left(\frac{a}{R_p}\right)^3 \frac{C_D \theta}{k_2/Q} = 90 \left(\frac{\theta}{0.35^\circ}\right) \left(\frac{10^{-3}}{k_2/Q}\right) = f - 1 \quad (12)$$

379 where here $\bar{\rho}_p$ and R_p are the bulk density and radius of the primary (Neptune) and a is the semi-
 380 major axis. Equation (12) makes physical sense: for instance, ocean dissipation is more important
 381 if the drag coefficient or the fluid density are large. It also shows that we are most likely justified
 382 in neglecting solid body dissipation compared to ocean dissipation (since $f > 1$).

383 Fig 3 plots ocean tidal heating as a function of obliquity θ both for the approximate expression
 384 (equation 11) and for the full solution. As noted above, the approximate expression somewhat
 385 overestimates the true dissipation rate. Nonetheless, it does accurately capture the strong (roughly
 386 cubic) dependence of dissipation on obliquity. For the nominal solid-body obliquity (0.35°), Fig 3
 387 shows that the ocean tidal heating is comparable to the likely present-day rate of radiogenic heating
 388 (Fig 1). However, as discussed above, a more likely obliquity for a decoupled, ocean-bearing Triton
 389 is 0.7° , in which case the ocean heating rate is 320 GW (14 mW m^{-2}) assuming $C_D = 0.002$. Thus,
 390 depending on the obliquity, the likely surface heat flux from the combination of stored radiogenic
 391 heat and ocean tidal heating is 7-18 mW m^{-2} , with the higher value being more probable. As
 392 discussed in Section 3.2 above, the higher values are sufficient to cause convection and surface
 393 yielding (Fig 2), compatible with the observational constraints. Similar heat fluxes at ancient Callisto
 394 - assuming an ocean temperature $\approx 270 \text{ K}$ - could have been associated with convection, but not
 395 yielding.

396 Because we are assuming that for Triton the convective heat flux balances the total (tidal +
 397 radiogenic) heat production, this is a steady-state situation: as long as the tidal heating is available,
 398 a long-lived ocean is compatible with mobile-lid convection. The situation is also potentially self-
 399 regulating. If too much heat is being extracted across the shell compared to the heat input from
 400 below, shell solidification will concentrate NH_3 in the remaining ocean, reducing its temperature. As
 401 a result, convection will decline in vigour, and the ocean will heat back up. This self-regulation may
 402 explain how the relatively narrow temperature range consistent with convective yielding ($T_b \approx 240 \text{ K}$
 403 for the nominal parameters) could have been maintained at Triton. More sophisticated coupled
 404 thermal-orbital models would be required to address this issue further.

405 4 Implications for Pluto

406 Figure 2 summarizes the key results of this MS: for Triton, radiogenic heating alone is incompat-
407 ible with convection-driven surface yielding. Conversely, with the addition of obliquity tidal heating
408 in a subsurface ocean, convection-driven yielding is likely to occur if the ocean contains suitable
409 concentrations of antifreeze and the ice shell is sufficiently thick. Triton likely possesses a convecting
410 ice shell above a long-lived, cold, dissipative ocean, with the long-term evolution of the system being
411 determined primarily by the slow damping of the orbital inclination (equation 9).

412 How does this scenario inform our understanding of Pluto? In our view, the key difference
413 to Pluto is *not* that Triton started life hot (Section 3.1), but rather that its present-day orbital
414 configuration is so different (Section 3.3). In particular, tides raised by Neptune on Triton are
415 important, while tides raised by Charon on Pluto are expected to have almost no effect. The size of
416 the static tidal bulge depends on the quantity $(m_p/m)(R/a)^3$ and is an order of magnitude larger
417 for Triton than for Pluto. Furthermore, Triton’s highly inclined orbit results in a relatively large
418 predicted obliquity, while Pluto’s obliquity - although unknown - is expected to be much smaller.
419 Thus, we expect obliquity-driven tidal heating to be overwhelmingly more important on Triton than
420 on Pluto (or almost anywhere else). In this view, Triton’s unusually active present is a consequence
421 of its unusual orbital configuration (high inclination).

422 If Pluto’s ice shell is conductive, it may well be covering an ocean (Robuchon and Nimmo, 2011).
423 However, radiogenic heating in Pluto’s interior is insufficient to allow yielding of the ice shell, even
424 assuming that convection is taking place (Fig 2). As a result, the young surface age and tectonic
425 deformation seen on Triton are not predicted for Pluto. This is not to say that Pluto will have
426 no tectonic features: ocean freezing and thermal expansion/contraction can both generate large
427 stresses resulting in tectonics (Robuchon and Nimmo, 2011) and potentially even cryovolcanism
428 (Manga and Wang, 2007). But such tectonic activity is likely to be ancient, so we do not expect
429 to see the lightly-cratered, heavily resurfaced terrains characteristic of Triton. We also note that
430 Triton’s geyser activity is plausibly driven by sunlight (Kirk et al., 1990), so that analogous plumes
431 are possible on Pluto even in the absence of ongoing endogenic activity.

432 5 Discussion

433 We have argued above that Triton is unusually active because of heating caused by its unusual
434 orbit around Neptune; the corollary is that Pluto will not be active.

435 One potential flaw in this logic is that Triton might have been captured recently; for instance,
436 Fig 1b shows that a heat flux $> 10 \text{ mW m}^{-2}$ could be sustained for 1 Gyr. Recent capture could thus
437 explain ongoing activity, but (as noted in Section 1.2) this is considered a low-probability event.
438 Another possibility is that Triton’s young surface age might be due primarily to cryovolcanism,
439 rather than convective yielding as we have assumed. This would certainly change the details of the
440 argument. However, even in this case the overall logic that higher heating leads to more resurfacing
441 is probably robust, making it likely that Pluto’s surface will be much older and less active than
442 Triton’s.

443 More interesting is to consider the possibility that Pluto ultimately confounds our expectations
444 and shows evidence for recent tectonic activity. We can think of at least three possible explanations
445 for this eventuality.

446 Perhaps the likeliest possibility is that the potentially volatile-rich nature of Pluto’s interior
447 could affect its ability to deform. On Earth, the presence of fluids lubricates faults, reducing the

448 effective yield stress of the near-surface material and permitting surface deformation. Analogously,
449 antifreezes such as NH_3 (which we argue is present within Triton’s ocean - Section 3.2) could
450 permit fluid pockets to persist to relatively shallow depths within Pluto’s shell, thereby weakening
451 it (Arakawa and Maeno, 1994). Alternatively, CO_2 ice is significantly less resistive to flow than
452 water ice under the same conditions (Durham et al., 1999), and could make it easier for surface
453 deformation to occur. As noted in Section 1, Triton’s early intense heating may have removed some
454 of these volatile ices, but Pluto should still possess its full complement of volatiles.

455 A second intriguing possibility is that Pluto has not fully differentiated. Pluto’s energy of ac-
456 cretion is not sufficient to guarantee differentiation, and nor is the putative Charon-forming impact
457 (Canup, 2005). As pointed out by Rubin et al. (2013), a near-surface rock-rich layer would become
458 unstable on a timescale controlled by the viscosity of the material beneath. Something similar may
459 have happened at Triton to create the cantaloupe terrain (Schenk and Jackson, 1993). In theory,
460 this kind of process could be responsible for recent activity at Pluto, although it would require
461 fine-tuning (and an explanation for how it also happened recently at Triton).

462 A final possibility is that Pluto does in fact experience tidal heating. For instance, if its obliquity
463 relative to Charon’s orbit is sufficiently large, tidal heating could result. Of course, the fact that
464 Charon is so small limits the effectiveness of such heating, while dissipation is hard to sustain absent
465 some kind of resonant forcing (Murray and Dermott, 1999). Furthermore, the apparently low mutual
466 inclinations of Pluto and Charon make this possibility unlikely, but we include it for completeness.

467 In conclusion, we view Triton’s unusual activity as stemming from its unusual orbit. We thus
468 anticipate that Pluto will not resemble Triton; it is more likely to resemble bodies like Rhea which
469 do not appear to have undergone significant tidal deformation but have nonetheless experienced
470 some ancient deformation. We would, however, be delighted to be proved wrong, and await the
471 results from *New Horizons* with great anticipation.

472 Acknowledgments

473 We thank an anonymous reviewer and especially Sasawata Hier-Majumder for helpful comments
474 and discussion.

References

- Agnor, C. B., Hamilton, D. P., 2006. Neptune’s capture of its moon Triton in a binary-planetary gravitational encounter. *Nature* 441, 192–194.
- Arakawa, M., Maeno, N., 1994. Effective viscosity of partially melted ice in the ammonia-water system. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 21, 1515–1518.
- Barr, A., 2008. Mobile lid convection beneath Enceladus’ south polar terrain. *J. Geophys. Res.* 113, E07009.
- Barr, A., McKinnon, W. B., 2007. Convection in ice I shells and mantles with self-consistent grain size. *J. Geophys. Res.* 112, E02012.
- Bills, B. G., Nimmo, F., 2011. Rotational dynamics and internal structure of Titan. *Icarus* 214, 351–355.
- Bland, M. T., Showman, A. P., 2007. The formation of Ganymede’s grooved terrain: Numerical modeling of extensional necking instabilities. *Icarus* 189, 439–456.

- Bland, M. T., Singer, K. N., McKinnon, W. B., Schenk, P. M., 2012. Enceladus' extreme heat flux as revealed by its relaxed craters. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 39, L17204.
- Brown, R. H., Johnson, T. V., Goguen, J. D., Schubert, G., Ross, M. N., 1991. Triton's global heat budget. *Science* 251, 1465–1467.
- Buie, M. W., Tholen, D. J., Grundy, W. M., 2012. The orbit of Charon is circular. *Astron. J.* 144, 15.
- Canup, R. M., 2005. A giant impact origin of Pluto-Charon. *Science* 307, 546–550.
- Carslaw, H. S., Jaeger, J. C., 1986. *Conduction of heat in solids*. Oxford University Press.
- Chen, E. M. A., Nimmo, F., Glatzmaier, G. A., 2014. Tidal heating in icy satellite oceans. *Icarus* 229, 11–40.
- Chyba, C. F., Jankowski, D. G., Nicholson, P. D., 1989. Tidal evolution in the Neptune-Triton system. *Astron. Astrophys.* 219, L23–L26.
- Croft, S. K., Kargel, J. S., Kirk, R. L., Moore, J. M., Schenk, P. M., Strom, R. G., 1995. The geology of Triton. In: Cruikshank, D. P. (Ed.), *Neptune and Triton*. Univ. Arizona Press, pp. 879–947.
- Cuk, M., Gladman, B. J., 2005. Constraints on the orbital evolution of Triton. *Astrophys. J.* 626, L113–L116.
- Desch, S. J., Cook, J. C., Doggett, T., Porter, S. B., 2009. Thermal evolution of Kuiper Belt Objects with implications for cryovolcanism. *Icarus* 202, 694–714.
- Durham, W. B., Kirby, S. H., Stern, L. A., 1999. Steady-state flow of solid CO₂: Preliminary results. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 26, 3493–3496.
- Durham, W. B., Prieto-Ballesteros, O., Goldsby, D. L., Kargel, J. S., 2010. Rheological and thermal properties of icy materials. *Space Sci. Rev.* 153, 273–298.
- Gaeman, J., Hier-Majumder, S., Roberts, J. H., 2012. Sustainability of a subsurface ocean within Triton's interior. *Icarus* 220, 339–347.
- Giese, B., Wagner, R., Hussmann, H., Neukum, G., Perry, J., Helfenstein, P., Thomas, P. C., 2008. Enceladus: An estimate of heat flux and lithospheric thickness from flexurally supported topography. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 35, L24204.
- Goldreich, P., Murray, N., Longaretti, P. Y., Banfield, D., 1989. Neptune's story. *Science* 245, 500–504.
- Goldsby, D. L., Kohlstedt, D. L., 2001. Superplastic deformation of ice: Experimental observations. *J. Geophys. Res.* 106, 11017–11030.
- Hammond, N. P., Barr, A. C., 2013. Formation of Ganymede's grooved terrain by convection-driven resurfacing. *Icarus* .
- Hogenboom, D. L., Kargel, J. S., Consolmagno, G. J., Holden, T. C., Lee, L., Buyyounouski, M., 1997. The ammonia-water system and the chemical differentiation of icy satellites. *Icarus* 128, 171–180.
- Hussmann, H., Sohl, F., Spohn, T., 2006. Subsurface oceans and deep interiors of medium-sized outer planet satellites and large trans-neptunian objects. *Icarus* 185, 258–273.
- Jacobson, R. A., 2009. The orbits of the Neptunian satellites and the orientation of the pole of Neptune. *Astron. J.* 137, 4322–4329.
- Jankowski, D. G., Chyba, C. F., Nicholson, P. D., 1989. On the obliquity and tidal heating of Triton. *Icarus* 80, 211–219.
- Jayne, S. R., Laurent, L. C. S., 2001. Parameterizing tidal dissipation over rough topography. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 28, 211–219.
- Kirk, R. L., Brown, R. H., Soderblom, L. A., 1990. Subsurface energy storage and transport for solar-powered geysers on Triton. *Science* 250, 424–429.

- Klinger, J., 1980. Influence of a phase transition of ice on the heat and mass balance of comets. *Science* 209, 271–272.
- Kramm, U., Nettelmann, N., Redmer, R., Stevenson, D. J., 2011. On the degeneracy of the tidal Love number k_2 in multi-layer planetary models: application to Saturn and GJ436b. *Astron. Astrophys.* 528, A18.
- Lunine, J. I., Stevenson, D. J., 1987. Clathrate and ammonia hydrates at high pressure: Application to the origin of methane on Titan. *Icarus* 70, 61–77.
- Manga, M., Wang, C.-Y., 2007. Pressurized oceans and the eruption of liquid water on Europa and Enceladus. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 34, L07202.
- Matsuyama, I., 2012. Tidal dissipation in the subsurface oceans of icy satellites. *Lunar Planet. Sci. Conf.* 43, 2068.
- McKinnon, W., Leith, A. C., 1995. Gas drag and the orbital evolution of a captured Triton. *Icarus* 118, 392–413.
- McKinnon, W. B., 2006. On convection in ice I shells of outer solar system bodies, with detailed application to Callisto. *Icarus* 183, 435–450.
- McKinnon, W. B., Kirk, R. L., 2007. Triton. In: McFadden, L.-A., Weissman, P. R., Johnson, T. V. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of the solar system*. Academic Press, pp. 483–502.
- Moresi, L., Solomatov, V., 1998. Mantle convection with a brittle lithosphere: thoughts on the global tectonic styles of Earth and Venus. *Geophys. J. Int.* 133, 669–682.
- Murray, C. D., Dermott, S. F., 1999. *Solar System Dynamics*. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Nimmo, F., Pappalardo, R. T., 2004. Furrow flexure and ancient heat flux on Ganymede. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 31, L19701.
- Nimmo, F., Pappalardo, R. T., Giese, B., 2002. Effective elastic thickness and heat flux estimates on Ganymede. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 29, 1158.
- O’Neill, C., Nimmo, F., 2010. The role of episodic overturn in generating the surface geology and heat flow on Enceladus. *Nature Geosci.* 3, 88–91.
- Porco, C. C., et al., 2006. Cassini observes the active south pole of Enceladus. *Science* 311, 1393–1401.
- Prinn, R. G., Fegley, B., 1981. Kinetic inhibition of CO and N₂ reduction in circumplanetary nebulae - implications for satellite composition. *Astrophys. J.* 24, 308–317.
- Robuchon, G., Nimmo, F., 2011. Thermal evolution of Pluto and implications for surface tectonics and a subsurface ocean. *Icarus* 216, 426–439.
- Ross, M. N., Schubert, G., 1990. The coupled orbital and thermal evolution of Triton. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 17, 1749–1752.
- Rubin, M. E., Desch, S. J., Neveu, M., 2013. Limits on the overturn of undifferentiated crust on Kuiper Belt Objects due to Rayleigh-Taylor instabilities. *Icarus* submitted.
- Schenk, P. M., Jackson, M. P. A., 1993. Diapirism on Triton: a record of crustal layering and instability. *Geology* 21, 299–302.
- Schenk, P. M., Zahnle, K., 2007. On the negligible surface age of Triton. *Icarus* 192, 135–149.
- Schubert, G., Anderson, J. D., Spohn, T., McKinnon, W. B., 2004. Interior composition, structure and dynamics of the Galilean satellites. In: Bagenal, F., Dowling, T., McKinnon, W. (Eds.), *Jupiter: The planet, satellites and magnetosphere*. Cambridge Univ. Press, pp. 281–306.
- Showman, A. P., Han, L., 2005. Effects of plasticity on convection in an ice shell: Implications for Europa. *Icarus* 177, 425–437.
- Sohl, F., Sears, W. D., Lorenz, R. D., 1995. Tidal dissipation on Titan. *Icarus* 115, 278–294.
- Solomatov, V. S., 1995. Scaling of temperature-dependent and stress-dependent viscosity convection.

- Phys. Fluids 7, 266–274.
- Stern, S. A., McKinnon, W. B., 2000. Triton’s surface age and impactor population revised in light of Kuiper belt fluxes: Evidence for small Kuiper belt objects and recent geological activity. *Astron. J.* 119, 945–952.
- Taylor, G. I., 1920. Tidal friction in the Irish Sea. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* 220, 1–33.
- Thomas, P. C., 2000. The shape of Triton from limb profiles. *Icarus* 148, 587–588.
- Turcotte, D. L., Schubert, G., 2002. *Geodynamics*, 2nd Edition. Cambridge University Press.
- Tyler, R., 2011. Tidal dynamical considerations constrain the state of an ocean on Enceladus. *Icarus* 211, 770–779.
- Tyler, R. H., 2008. Strong ocean tidal flow and heating on moons of the outer planets. *Nature* 456, 770–772.
- Van Heck, H. J., Tackley, P. J., 2011. Plate tectonics on super-Earths: Equally or more likely than on Earth. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 310, 252–261.
- Vokrouhlicky, D., Nesvorny, D., Levison, H. F., 2008. Irregular satellite capture by exchange reactions. *Astron. J.* 136, 1463–1476.
- Zahnle, K., Schenk, P., Levison, H., Dones, L., 2003. Cratering rates in the outer solar system. *Icarus* 163, 263–289.
- Zhang, K., Hamilton, D. P., 2008. Orbital resonances in the inner neptunian system II: Resonant history of Proteus, Larissa, Galatea and Despina. *Icarus* 193, 267–282.

A Appendix: Description of numerical code

Here we outline our model of the thermal evolution of a multi-layered, conductive body used to produce the results shown in Fig 1. Our approach resembles that of Robuchon and Nimmo (2011), except that we do not consider convection and can thus adopt a 1-D approach. The heat conduction equation in spherical coordinates is

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{\kappa}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r^2 \frac{\partial T}{\partial r} \right) + \frac{H}{C_p} \quad (1)$$

where κ is the thermal diffusivity (assumed constant), H is the heat production rate in W kg^{-1} and C_p is the specific heat capacity. The heat production rate in the rock-iron core is calculated as in Robuchon and Nimmo (2011).

In the rock-iron core we solve equation (1) using a finite-difference scheme on 100 nodes with a constant node spacing Δr_c . The inner boundary condition is zero temperature gradient. The outer boundary condition depends on whether an ocean is present. In the absence of an ocean, the top node of the core is also the bottom node of the ice shell. If an ocean is present, the top node of the core has a temperature set to the ocean temperature (273 K). The specific heat capacity of the core is $1053 \text{ J kg}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$ and $\kappa_c = 1.1 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$.

Initially, the entire ice shell will be frozen. In this case, we use equation (1) in the shell, taking into account the radial step-change in thermal properties at the ice-core interface and setting the heat production term to zero in the shell (Gaeman et al., 2012, cf.). We use 100 nodes with fixed spacing Δr ; ice shell parameters are given in Table 2. The timestep Δt used in our numerical model is the smaller of $0.03\Delta r^2/\kappa$ and $0.03\Delta r_c^2/\kappa_c$.

When modelling the effects of melting and freezing, to avoid numerical instabilities we assume that both occur linearly across a temperature range from $T_m - \Delta T_m$ to T_m , where $T_m=273 \text{ K}$ and

$\Delta T_m = 3$ K. The energy density required for complete melting is given by $E_0 = \rho_i(C_p\Delta T_m + L_H)$, where L_H is the latent heat of fusion (0.33 MJ/kg) and $C_p = 1970$ J kg⁻¹ K⁻¹.

Melting is assumed to start at the lowermost ice node and to go to completion within each node before melting begins in the next node above. Each node has an initial energy content $E^i = 0$. For the melting node, for each timestep at which the predicted temperature in the node T^i equals or exceeds $T_m - \Delta T_m$, we increment E^i by an amount ΔE^i where

$$\Delta E^i = \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta r} \left(F_b^i - \frac{k(T^i - T^{i+1})}{\Delta r} \right) \quad (2)$$

If the node below is rock-iron, then the basal heatflux F_b^i can be calculated using the usual conduction approach and equation (2) resembles a finite-difference version of equation (1). If an ocean is present, we assume that heat transfer across the ocean is instantaneous, in which case we have

$$F_b^i = \left(\frac{R_s}{r^i} \right)^2 F_c \quad (3)$$

where r^i is the radial position of the i -th (melting) node, R_s is the radius of the rock-iron core and F_c is the conductive heat flux out of the core.

When a particular node is melting, the melt fraction $\phi^i = E^i/E_0$ and the temperature is $T^i = T_m - (1 - \phi^i)\Delta T_m$. If melting goes to completion, that node is then assigned to be part of the ocean (temperature T_m) and is no longer treated with equation (2); melting begins at the next node above. Because melting is discretized (only one node melts at a time), the heat flux across the base of the shell is also discretized, resulting in the stair-step pattern seen in Fig 1.

Freezing is modelled in an analogous fashion. If the change in energy given by equation (2) is negative, freezing is occurring and the melt fraction ϕ^i and temperature T^i are both reduced. When $E^i = 0$, freezing has gone to completion on the i -th node, and equation (2) is then applied to the next node down.

To ensure that our code was working correctly, we compared our results with the conductive case shown in Fig 2 of Robuchon and Nimmo (2011). The agreement was excellent, except for a brief period after the episode of tidal heating included in the calculations of Robuchon and Nimmo (2011), but neglected in our model. We also checked our solution against the analytical (Cartesian) Stefan solution (Turcotte and Schubert, 2002) by setting the heat flux out of the core to zero after 30 Myr (to allow initial melting) and allowing the shell to evolve conductively. Using the thermal parameter values of Gaeman et al. (2012) for which the quantity $\lambda = 0.72$ we found a shell thickness of 247 km after 300 Myr, which is within 3% of the analytical value of 254 km.

Qty.	Triton	Pluto	Units	Eqn.	Qty.	Triton	Pluto	Units	Eqn.
R	1353	1153	km	1	ρ_b	2061	2030	kg m ⁻³	1
R_s	1026	866	km	1	d_{max}	327	287	km	-
g	0.779	0.658	m s ⁻²	4	P	5.877	6.387	days	-
e	0.000016	<0.000075 ^a	-	8	i	156.87°	0 ^b	-	9
T_s	38	44	K	4	a	355,000	19,573	km	2
R_p	25,300	-	km	-	m_p	1.02×10^{26}	1.52×10^{21}	kg	2

Table 1

Parameter values for Triton and Pluto. “Eqn.”=equation, “Qty.”=quantity. For Pluto, orbital parameters (P, e, m_p, i, a) are for the relevant tide-raising body (Charon). ^a upper limit from Buie et al. (2012). ^b Inclination of Charon relative to Pluto rotation axis. This has not been measured but is expected to be very small due to tidal damping.

	Qty.	Symbol	Value	Units	Eqn.
Thermal conductivity		k	3	W m ⁻¹ K ⁻¹	6
Thermal expansivity		α	10 ⁻⁴	K ⁻¹	4
Ice density		ρ_i	950	kg m ⁻³	1
Water density		ρ_w	1000	kg m ⁻³	11
Thermal diffusivity		κ	1.6×10^{-6}	m ² s ⁻¹	4
Activation energy		E_a	60	kJ/mol	3
Drag coefficient		C_D	0.002	-	11
	-	k_2/Q	10 ⁻³	-	8
Reference temperature		T_0	273	K	3
Reference viscosity		η_0	10 ¹⁴	Pa s	3

Table 2

Nominal values for ice shell and other parameters of interest




Fig. 1. Thermal evolution models for a conductive Triton showing evolution of heat fluxes and ice shell thickness (see Appendix for more details). Plotted heat fluxes are all evaluated at the surface. Shell thinning occurs when the heat flux out of the ice-core interface exceeds that across the ice shell, and vice versa. Note that the instantaneous radiogenic heat production does not equal the heat flux out of the core, because of the time it takes for heat to be conducted across the core. a) Cold start (initial temperature 150 K). b) Hot start (1000 K for core, 250 K for ice shell). Stair-step pattern in surface heat flux is due to discretization employed (see Appendix).




Fig. 2. Minimum shell thickness for convection to occur (equations 4 and 5) and critical heat flux for yielding to occur (equation 7) for various basal temperatures T_b . Here we assume that the basal viscosity $\eta_b = \eta_i/2.7$ (see text) and we take reference values $F'_c = 100 \text{ mW m}^{-2}$ and $\eta'_b = 10^{14} \text{ Pa s}$. The horizontal dashed lines in the lower panels indicate the likely radiogenic heat flux, and the likely range of heat fluxes when obliquity tidal heating is included. a) $\eta_0 = 10^{14} \text{ Pa s}$. b) $\eta_0 = 10^{15} \text{ Pa s}$




Fig. 3. Obliquity tidal heating in an ocean for different drag coefficients C_D . Red and black lines are approximation (11) and full solution (from Chen et al. (2014)), respectively.