Giant ripples on comet 67P/Churyumov–Gerasimenko sculpted by sunset thermal wind
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Explaining the unexpected presence of dune-like patterns at the surface of the comet 67P/Churyumov–Gerasimenko requires conceptual and quantitative advances in the understanding of surface and outgassing processes. We show here that vapor flow emitted by the comet around its perihelion spreads laterally in a surface layer, due to the strong pressure difference between zones illuminated by sunlight and those in shadow. For such thermal winds to be dense enough to transport grains—10 times greater than previous estimates—outgassing must take place through a surface porous granular layer, and that layer must be composed of grains whose roughness lowers cohesion consistently with contact mechanics. The linear stability analysis of the problem, entirely tested against laboratory experiments, quantitatively predicts the emergence of bedforms in the observed wavelength range and their propagation at the scale of a comet revolution. Although generated by a rarefied atmosphere, they are paradoxically analogous to ripples emerging on granular beds submitted to viscous shear flows. This quantitative agreement shows that our understanding of the coupling between hydrodynamics and sediment transport is able to account for bedform emergence in extreme conditions and provides a reliable tool to predict the erosion and accretion processes controlling the evolution of small solar system bodies.

The OSIRIS imaging instrument on board the ESA’s (European Space Agency) Rosetta spacecraft has revealed unexpected bedforms (Fig. 1 and Fig. S1) on the neck of the comet 67P/Churyumov–Gerasimenko (67P) (the Hapi region) (1–3) and on both lobes (Ma’at and Ash regions). Several features suggest that these rhythmic patterns belong to the family of ripples and dunes (4). The bedforms present a characteristic asymmetric profile, with a small steep lee side resembling an avalanche slip face (Fig. 1A and Fig. S1B) and a longer gentle slope on the stoss side, which appears darker in Fig. 1B. Analyses of the available photographs show that their typical crest-to-crest distance is on the order of 10 m (Table S1), and that the surface is composed of centimeter-scale grains (6) (Fig. 2). However, the existence of sedimentary bedforms on a comet comes as a surprise—it requires sediment transport along the surface, i.e., erosion and deposition of particles. When heated by the sun, the ice at the surface of comets sublimates into gas. As gravity is extremely small, \( g \approx 2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m/s}^2 \), due to the kilometer scale of the comet (7, 8), the escape velocity is much smaller than the typical thermal velocity. Outgassing therefore feeds an extremely rarefied atmosphere, called the coma, around the nucleus. This gas envelope expands radially. By contrast, ripples and dunes observed in deserts, on the bed of rivers, and on Mars and Titan (4, 9–13) are formed by fluid flows parallel to the surface, dense enough to sustain sediment transport. The presence of these apparent dunes therefore challenges the common views of surface processes on comets and raises several questions. What could be the origin of the vapor flow exceeding the sediment transport velocity threshold (14, 15)? How could the particles of the bed remain confined to the surface of the comet rather than being ejected into the coma? Our goal here is to understand the emergence of the bedforms on 67P and to constrain the modeling of dynamical processes in the superficial layer of the comet nucleus.

Outgassing and Comet’s Atmosphere

Outgassing takes place in the illuminated part of the comet (16, 17). As ice sublimation requires an input of energy—the latent heat—the vapor flux is controlled by the thermal balance at the surface of the comet (Materials and Methods). The power per unit area received from the sun depends, at the seasonal scale, on the heliocentric distance and is modulated by the day–night alternation. The comet radiates some energy back to space with a power related to the surface temperature \( T_s \) by Stefan’s law. Finally, thermal inertia leads to a storage/release of internal energy over a penetration depth that is meter scale for seasonal variations and centimeter scale for daily variations.

The vapor production rate from outgassing, defined as the product of the vapor density \( \rho_v \) and the outward vapor velocity \( \overline{v}_w \), has been measured for 67P at different heliocentric distances (18–23) (Fig. 3B). Common models assume that ice sublimation takes place at the surface and produces a radial flow at the thermal velocity (25). This would result in a density \( \rho_v \) an order of magnitude smaller than that necessary to induce a fluid drag force large enough to overcome the threshold for grain motion (discussed below). We suggest that most of the vapor is emitted from subsurface ice and must travel through the porous surface granular layer (Fig. S2). Sublimation makes the ice trapped in the pores recede, releasing unglued grains in the surface that can be eroded. This process should lead to an ice level remaining at a constant distance from the surface, thus allowing bedform emergence.

Significance

The recent approach to comet 67P/Churyumov–Gerasimenko by the spacecraft Rosetta has revealed the presence of astonishing dune-like patterns. How can the radial outgassing, caused by heating when passing close to the sun, produce a vapor flow along the surface of the comet dense enough to transport grains? Drawing on the physical mechanisms at work for the formation of dunes on Earth and planetary bodies, we quantitatively explain the emergence and size of these bedforms, which are due to thermal winds. This work involves the understanding of the comet surface processes, especially regarding grain cohesion and grain–fluid interaction. It thus provides more keys to address the timely open question on the growth of planetesimals above the meter scale to form planets.
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comparable to the grain size \(d\). Using kinetic theory of gases, we predict that for such vapor flow the outgassing velocity is 10 times smaller than that of the spectacular vapor jets streaming from active pits (7, 26) (Materials and Methods). Accordingly, the vapor atmosphere is 10 times denser than previous estimates.

Altogether, both seasonal and diurnal time variations of the atmosphere characteristics can be obtained in a simplified spherical geometry (Fig. 3 and Fig. S3). At perihelion, we find that the pressure drops by 10 orders of magnitude from day to night (Fig. S3B). The comet’s atmosphere therefore presents a strong pressure gradient that drives a tangential flow from the warm, high-pressure toward the cold, low-pressure regions, in a surface boundary layer (Materials and Methods). The extension of the halo of vapor on the dark side of the comet is a signature of this surface wind (Fig. 4B). It reverses direction during the day and is maximal at sunrise and sunset, with a shear velocity \(u_s\) on the order of a fraction of the thermal velocity (Fig. 4A). The asymmetry between sunrise and sunset simply results from thermal inertia, as some heat is stored in the superficial layer during the morning and released in the afternoon.

**Threshold for Grain Motion and Cohesion**

The vapor density in the coma is still at most seven orders of magnitude lower than that of air on Earth. Can a surface flow with such density and shear velocity entrain grains into motion? The threshold shear velocity \(u_c\) above which sediments are transported by a wind is quantitatively determined by the balance between gravity, hydrodynamic drag, and cohesive contact force (Materials and Methods). Investigating this balance highlights the need to apply findings from contact mechanics of rough interfaces (5) to the study of small solar system bodies.

**Fig. 2.** Grain size. (A and B) Autocorrelation function \(C(\delta)\) (A) (red circles) computed from the photograph of the comet’s granular bed, taken by Philae just before its touchdown at a site called Agilkia in the Ma’at region (B), where large boulders and rocks have been excluded. The resolution of the picture is 9.5 mm/pixel. Photo credit: ESA/Rosetta/Philae/ROLIS/DLR. The correlation is compared with that computed with pictures of calibrated aeolian sand from the Atlantic Sahara (green square, lower axis, \(\delta\) is expressed in units of the grain diameter) taken in the laboratory (Materials and Methods). The best collapse of the correlation functions is obtained for a mean grain diameter \(d \approx 9.7\) mm on the comet. (C) Histogram of grain size \(d\) computed from the photograph of the comet’s granular bed shown in D taken by Rosetta just before its impact in the Ma’at region. The best fit by a log-normal distribution, shown in red, gives a mean grain diameter \(d \approx 38\) mm.
The adhesive free energy, resulting from van der Waals interactions, is proportional to the real area of contact between the grains, which is much smaller than the apparent one because of surface roughness. A realistic computation of this cohesion can be achieved under the assumption that contacts between grains are made of elastically deformed nanoscale asperities and that the apparent area of contact follows Hertz law for two spheres in contact. The cohesive force is then found to scale as the maximal load experienced by the grains to the power 1/3 (Materials and Methods) (27). Considering that this load is typically the weight of a surface grain, this force scales as \((\rho_0 g d^3 / E)^{1/3} \gamma d\), where \(\rho_0\) is the grain bulk density, \(E\) is the grain Young modulus, and \(\gamma\) is the surface tension of the grain material. It is therefore much lower than the force \(\gamma d\) obtained for ideally smooth grains. Importantly, the gravity force increases as \(d^3\), whereas the cohesive force increases as \(d^{3/3}\) only. This allows us to define a crossover diameter at which these two forces are comparable: \(d_m = (\gamma^3 / E \rho_0^2 g^2)^{1/5}\). It gives the typical grain diameter below which cohesive effects become important and are responsible for the increase of the threshold at small \(d\) (Fig. 5). On Earth, this diameter for natural grains is around 10 \(\mu\)m (Fig. S44). On 67P, making the simple assumption that the values of \(E\) and \(\gamma\) are similar to those on Earth, the value of \(d_m\) can be deduced from the gravity ratio to the power 2/5: \(d_m \approx (9.8/2.2 \times 10^{-4})^{2/5} \times 10 \mu\text{m} \approx 700 \mu\text{m}\). Such a millimeter scale is three orders of magnitude smaller than the capillary length \(\sqrt{\gamma / \rho_0 g} \approx 1 \text{m}\) suggested by traditional approaches, which ignore contact roughness (15).

A second difference from Earth is the large mean free path \(\ell\) of the vapor molecules, which leads to a reduced drag force for grains smaller than \(\ell\) (Thermo-Hydrodynamics of the Comet’s Atmosphere). This explains that the threshold velocity \(u_\text{t}\), plotted as a function of the grain size \(d\) (Fig. 5), presents a plateau extending from the millimeter scale to the meter scale (Materials and Methods). In conclusion, we find that, sufficiently close to perihelion, all these grains, and in particular those at the centimeter scale observed by Rosetta near bedforms, can be transported by the afternoonal thermal wind (Fig. 4). Importantly, this is only a small fraction of the time—typically \(\approx 6.9 \times 10^3\) s at perihelion, i.e., \(\approx 15\%\) of the comet’s day of 12 h. The asymmetry between sunrise and sunset winds has an important consequence: The morning thermal wind is not strong enough to entrain grains.

**Emergent Wavelength**

Aeolian dunes and subaqueous ripples form by the same linear instability, which is now well modeled and quantitatively tested against laboratory measurements (4). The destabilizing effect results from the phase advance of the wind velocity just above the surface with respect to the elevation profile (Fig. 6B). The stabilizing mechanism comes from the space lag between sediment transport and wind velocity. It is characterized by the saturation length \(L_{\text{sat}}\), defined as the sediment flux relaxation length toward...
equilibrium (4, 32, 33). As all other parameters are known, \( L_{\text{sat}} \) is the key quantity selecting the most unstable wavelength \( \lambda \). Applying linear stability analysis for 67P (Materials and Methods), we compute this wavelength and empirically find that it approximatively scales as \( \lambda \approx L_{\text{sat}} \sqrt{\nu / u_{\text{sat}}} \) (Fig. 6).4)

With the experience of terrestrial deserts, one can recognize the morphology of newborn dunes whose crest-to-crest distance provides a good estimate of \( \lambda \). They should be sufficiently young not to present a slip face but sufficiently old to be organized into a regularly spaced pattern. Depending on the location, the crest-to-crest distance is measured in the range 5–25 m (Table S1). Making an analogy with sediment transport processes on larger bodies—by transposing scaling laws established for salination—the analog of aeolian dunes (4, 9, 28) would have an emergent wavelength of 10^3 m due to the extremely large density ratio on the comet, i.e., much larger than the comet itself. Similarly, using the comet’s values, the analog for aeolian ripples (29) would produce a pattern of wavelength 10^2 m. As the other elements (asymmetric shape, granular bed, surface wind above transport threshold) do point to bedforms of the dune family, we conclude that the cometary sediment transport is specific and is associated with a saturation length on the order of 10 cm.

**Sediment Transport and Bedforms**

Given the very large density ratio \( \rho_0 / \rho \) between grains and vapor, the length needed to accelerate grains to the wind velocity is around 600 km for centimeter-scale grains. This is much larger than the comet size, meaning that the grains actually keep a velocity \( u^p \) negligible in front of the wind velocity \( u \). The moving grains are thus submitted to an almost constant drag force equal to that when the grains are static. We then argue that the mode of sediment transport along the comet’s surface is traction, where grains remain in contact with the substratum on which they roll or slide. Traction is a slow mode of transport, where the energy brought by the flow is dissipated during the collision of moving grains with the static grains of the bed. Sediment transport on the comet is therefore analogous to subaqueous bedload (Fig. S5).

Adapting Bagnold’s approach to the comet (Sediment Transport), the sediment flux is proportional to the product of the number of moving grains per unit surface and their mean horizontal velocity (34). In the subaqueous bedload case, because the density ratio \( \rho_0 / \rho \) is on the order of a few units (in the range 2–4), the moving grains quickly reach a velocity \( u^p \) comparable to that of the fluid \( u \). On the comet, the constant mechanical forcing resembles, for the thin transport layer, a granular avalanche, in which dissipation comes from the collisions between the grains and is increasing with \( u^p \) (35). In that case, close enough to the threshold, the grain velocity follows the scaling law \( u^p \sim \sqrt{gd} \sim 10^{-3} \) m/s and the density of moving grains is a fraction of \( 1/d^2 \), which means that all of the grains of this surface transport layer move. The corresponding volume sediment flux \( q_{\text{sat}} \) therefore scales as \( q_{\text{sat}} \approx \rho u^p / \rho_0 \).

In addition to the separation of scales between \( u^p \) and \( u \), there are important differences from Earth that prevent a cometary
salination (3) in which the grains would move by bouncing or hopping (14, 15). The flow is turbulent above a visous sub-layer, typically 0.7 m thick at perihelion, where turbulent fluctuations are damped by viscosity. After a rebound, grains with enough energy to reach the turbulent zone would be entrained into suspension, because the settling velocity is much smaller than turbulent fluctuations (Sediment Transport). These grains would acquire a vertical velocity larger than the escape velocity, on the order of 1 m/s, and would eventually be ejected into the coma.

We use here the analogy with subaqueous bedload, for which controlled experiments on emerging subaqueous ripples allow us to deduce $L_\text{min} = d^3 \approx 24 \pm 4$ (Fig. S4B) and retain this law for traction on the comet. As shown in Fig. 6d, for the mean grain diameter $d$ between 10 mm and 40 mm observed in the Ma'at region (Fig. 2), the model predicts an emergent wavelength $\lambda$ between 10 m and 20 m, in good agreement with the observed crest-to-crest distance (Table S1). For such grains, the traction sediment flux is on the order of $4 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$. The corresponding ripple growth time deduced from the linear stability analysis is $\sim 5 \cdot 10^3$ s. This time must be compared with the total time during which sediment transport takes place during a revolution around the sun, which is around $10^6$ s ($0.7\%$ of the revolution period), i.e., 20 times larger. The ripples therefore have enough time to emerge and mature during one comet revolution. In the neck region, pictures of the same location before and after perihelion (Fig. 1B) provide evidence for ripple activity: The smallest ripples have disappeared at the downwind end of the field and a large one has nucleated at the upwind entrance. In between, ripples may have survived and propagated downwind according to the direction of their slip faces. The displacement predicted by the linear stability analysis, on the order of 10 m (Fig. S6), is consistent with the observed pattern shift (Fig. 1B).

Concluding Remarks

We have argued here that the bedforms observed on 67P are likely to be giant ripples, due to their composition, their asymmetric morphology, and the existence of surface winds driven by the night/day alternation above the transport threshold. These conclusions are reached from a self-consistent analysis but are of course based on limited data. As bedforms reflect the characteristics of the bed and the flow they originate from, they provide strong constraints of the physical mechanisms at work, which challenge alternative explanations. Comets thus provide an opportunity to better understand erosion and accretion processes on planetesimals, with implications for the open question of how these bodies can grow from the meter to the kilometer scale (30, 31).

Materials and Methods

We provide here the main ingredients of our analysis and modeling. Supporting Information gives further technical details on the derivation of the model.

**Grain Size.** Following the technique developed in ref. 9, a series of calibrated photographs of a sand bed is used to relate the image autocorrelation to the mean grain diameter $d$ of the bed, whose value is measured independently by sieve analysis. The reference pictures are taken at resolutions going from 1 pixel to 10 pixels per grain diameter. The rescaled correlation functions $C(\delta)$ corresponding to these pictures at different resolutions collapse on a master curve when $\delta$ is divided by $d$—both expressed in the same units. To determine an unknown mean grain size from a picture whose resolution is known, one computes its autocorrelation $C(\delta)$, with $d$ expressed in meters or in pixels. One then fits by a least-squares method the value of $d$ that should be used as rescaling factor $\delta$ to collapse the new curve on the calibration master curve. Even when the grain size is comparable to the resolution, the decay of the correlation between neighboring pixels contains sufficient information to measure $d$ accurately.

**Ripple Propagation.** Two photographs of the same location—one well before perihelion and the other well after it—were used to estimate the bedform propagation distance over one revolution. The photographs are mapped on one the other, using fixed elements of relief (cliffs, rocks, holes, etc.) that can be recognized on both pictures. The mapping is performed through a projection, assuming in first approximation that the landscape is planar.

**Thermal Balance.** To determine the surface temperature $T_s$ and the vapor mass flux $q_m$ as a function of time (Fig. 3 and Fig. S3), we solve the power balance per unit surface

$$\left(1 - \Omega \right) \psi = \alpha C_s T_s^4 + J_t + L q_m. \quad [1]$$

This equation relates the solar radiation flux $\psi(t)$ (the albedo) to the power radiated according to Stefan's law ($\sigma$ is Stefan's constant and $\epsilon$ the emissivity), to the heat diffusive flux $J_t$ toward the center, and to the power absorbed by ice sublimation ($L$ is the latent heat). Heat diffusion in the nucleus is solved analytically, using the decomposition over normal modes in space and time: A mode of frequency $\omega$ penetrates exponentially over a depth $\sqrt{2\kappa t/\omega}$, where $\kappa$ is the thermal diffusivity. $J_t$ is therefore related to $T_s$, through a Fourier transform.

**Porous Layer.** To determine the outgassing vapor flux $q_m$, we model the close subsurface as a thin porous granular layer. Water molecules are emitted from the ice surface located below this porous layer and make frequent collisions with the grains, in a way analogous to a chaotic billiard. With a probability close to one, they bounce back and are adsorbed again on the ice surface. The probability to cross the porous layer decreases as the inverse of the porous layer thickness $h$. Using the kinetic theory of gases, the average radial velocity $u_0$ above the layer is determined analytically and corresponds to a Mach number around 0.15. By contrast, with ice directly in contact with the coma, the outgassing Mach number would have been close to 1.

**Turbulent Boundary Layer.** The pressure gradient along the comet's surface drives a turbulent superficial flow. We model the basal shear velocity $u_*$, associated with this thermal wind, which determines the ability to transport grains along the surface. $u_*$ is related to the surface pressure $p_0$ and to the outgassing velocity $u_0$ by the momentum equation integrated over the thickness of the turbulent boundary layer $\delta_i$,

$$\rho_0 u_* \left( u_0 \right) = \frac{\Lambda}{\sigma} \frac{\delta_i}{\kappa} \frac{d p_0}{d \theta}. \quad [2]$$

where $\Lambda = \ln \left(1 + \frac{u_0}{u_*} \delta_i \right)$ is the logarithm of the Reynolds number based on $u_*$ and $\delta_i$, and the viscosity $\nu$ is set by the crossover from the inner to the outer layer, i.e., where the inertial terms are comparable to the pressure gradient:

$$\Lambda = \frac{2 \delta_i}{\pi} \approx 1 + \frac{\Lambda}{\kappa} \frac{u_0}{u_*}. \quad [3]$$

**Cohesion Between Grains.** The sediment transport threshold depends on the adhesion force $A$ between grains, which is strongly influenced by the grain surface roughness. Considering two grains of diameter $d$ that have been placed in contact by means of a normal load $N$, the apparent area of contact is governed by Hertz law: $a_r \sim (N d^2 E)^{1/3}$, where $E$ is the Young modulus of the material. However, due to the roughness, the real area of contact $a_r$ is much smaller than the apparent one $a_r$ and, according to Greenwood's theory (5), is proportional to the normal load: $a_r \sim N/E$. The adhesion force therefore scales as

$$A \sim a_r \gamma \gamma \sim \left( \frac{N d^2 E}{E} \right)^{1/3}. \quad [4]$$

**Sediment Transport Threshold.** The shear velocity threshold $u_0$ for sediment transport is computed from the force balance applied on a surface grain on the verge of being entrained into motion. Such a grain is submitted to its traction $\tau_s$ on the ice surface. The probability to cross the porous layer decreases as the inverse of the porous layer thickness $h$. As shown in Fig. 6, $15. By contrast, with ice directly in contact with the coma, the outgassing Mach number would have been close to 1.
which gives the adhesion force. The resistive force of the bed is modeled as a friction of effective coefficient $\mu$. The expression of $u_t$ can then be derived analytically and takes the form

$$u_t = u_0 \left[1 + \left(\frac{d_m}{d} \right)^{5/3} \right]^{1/2},$$

where $d_m$ is the cohesive size defined above. In the large $d$ regime, the turbulent drag essentially balances the friction force:

$$u_t \sim \sqrt{\rho_p / \rho_g} g d \propto d^{-1/2}.$$  

In the intermediate regime for which $d_m < d < \ell$, the viscous drag balances the friction force:

$$u_t \sim \sqrt{\rho_p / \rho_g} g d \propto d^{2/3}.$$  

In the small $d$ regime, the viscous drag balances cohesion:

$$u_t \sim \left( \frac{\rho_p g d^2}{\varepsilon} \right)^{1/6} \left( \frac{\gamma \ell}{\rho_g g d^2} \right)^{1/2} \sqrt{\rho_p / \rho_g} g d \propto d^{-5/8}.$$

### Linear Stability Analysis

The wavelength $\lambda$ at which bedforms emerge can be predicted by the linear stability analysis of a flat sediment bed. The growth rate $\sigma$ and propagation velocity $c$ of a modulated bed are given by

$$\sigma = Q \left( \frac{B - S}{1 + (K_{sat})^2} \right), \quad c = Q \left( \frac{A + (B - S)K_{sat}}{1 + (K_{sat})^2} \right).$$

In these expressions, $k = 2\pi / \lambda$ is the bed wavenumber and $Q$ is the reference sediment flux. $A$ and $B$ are the components of the basal shear stress, respectively, in phase and in quadrature with the elevation profile, which are determined by hydrodynamics (Fig. 57) (4). $L_{sat}$ is the saturation length that reflects the space lag of sediment flux in response to a change of wind velocity. $S$ encodes the fact that the threshold for transport is sensitive to the bed slope with $S = \frac{1}{2} \left( \mu / (u_0^2) \right)$, where $\mu$ is the avalanche slope for the grains considered.
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