OR IG IN OF TIDAL DISSIPATION IN JUPITER: II. THE VALUE OF Q

Yanqin W u

D epartm ent of A stronom y and A strophysics, 60 St. G eorge Street, U niversity of Toronto, Toronto, O N M 5S 3H 8, C anada D raft version January 20, 2022

ABSTRACT

The process of tidal dissipation inside Jupiter is not yet understood. Its tidal quality factor (Q) is inferred to lie between 10⁵ and 10⁶. Having studied the structure and properties of inertialm odes in a neutrally buoyant, core-less, uniform ly rotating sphere (W u 2004), we exam ine here their e ects on tidal dissipation. The rate of dissipation caused by resonantly excited inertialm odes depends on the following three parameters: how well they are coupled to the tidal potential, how strongly they are dissipated (by the turbulent viscosity), and how densely distributed they are in frequency. We nd that as a function of tidal frequency, the Q value exhibits large uctuations, with its maximum value set by the group of inertial-modes that satisfy ! , where ! is the group's typical o set from an exact resonance, and their turbulent dam ping rates. These are interm ediate order inertialm odes with wave-number 60 and they are excited to a small surface displacem ent am plitude of order 10^3 cm. The Q value drops much below the maximum value whenever a lower order mode happens to be in resonance. In our model, inertial-modes shed their tidally acquired energy very close to the surface within a narrow latitudinal zone (the 'singularity belt'), and the tidal lum inosity escapes freely out of the planet.

Strength of coupling between the tidal potential and inertial modes is sensitive to the presence of density discontinuities inside Jupiter. In the case of a discreet density jump, as may be caused by the transition between m etallic and molecular hydrogen, we nd a time-averaged $Q = 10^7$, with a small but non-negligible chance (10%) that the current Q value falls within the empirically determined range. W hereas when such a jump does not exist, $Q = 10^7$. Even though it remains unclear whether tidal dissipation due to resonant inertial modes is the correct answer to the problem, it is impressive that our simple treatment here already leads to three to velocities of magnitude stronger damping than that from the equilibrium tide.

M oreover, our conclusions are not a ected by the presence of a small solid core, a di erent prescription for the turbulent viscosity, or nonlinear mode coupling, but they depend critically on the static stability in the upper atm osphere of Jupiter. This is currently uncertain. Lastly, we com pare our results with those from a competing work by O gilvie & Lin (2004) and discuss the prospect of extending this theory to exo-jupiters, which appear to possess Q values sim ilar to that of Jupiter.

Subject headings: hydrodynamics | waves | planets and satellites: individual (Jupiter) | stars: oscillations | stars: rotation | turbulence

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. the Puzzle

We tackle the classical problem of tidal dissipation in Jupiter. In the following, we brie y review the problem, both for Jupiter and for close-in extra-solar planets. For a contemporary and expansive overview of this issue, including a detailed discussion of previous work, we refer the readers to O gilvie & Lin (2004, hereafter O L).

As Jupiter spins faster than the orbital motion of its nearest satellite (Io), Io raises a time-dependent tide on Jupiter. The dissipation of this tide in Jupiter transfers its angularm on entum to Io and spins down Jupiter. We adopt the convention of quantifying the ine ciency of the dissipation¹ by a dimensionless quality factor Q, which is the ratio between the energy in the (equilibrium) tide

angular velocity, respectively, and f is the free anom aly. These two approaches are comparable if Q is frequency independent and if the eccentricity is not too large. (E_0 , see x2.2.1) and the energy dissipated per period

Q
$$H \frac{2 E_0}{\frac{dE}{dt} dt} = \frac{1}{\tan 2} - \frac{1}{2};$$
 (1)

where is called the lag angle. It corresponds to the angle between the directions of Io and the tidal bulge when we are concerned with the equilibrium tide. The rate of tidal synchronization scales inversely linearly with Q (M urray & D erm ott 1999),

$$\frac{d}{dt} = SIGN (!_{Io}) \frac{3k_2}{2Q} \frac{M_{Io}}{M_J}^2 \frac{R_J}{a}^3 !_{Io}^2; (2)$$

where is Jupiter's spin frequency, ! $_{\rm Io} = (G M_J = a^3)^{1=2}$ is Io's orbital frequency, a its orbital separation, M_J, R_J, k₂, are Jupiter's mass, radius, tidal love num ber (k₂ 0:38) and m om ent of inertia constant (= I=M_JR_J² 0:25), respectively. M_{Io} is Io's mass.

Based on the current resonant con guration of the Galilean satellites, Jupiter's Q value has been estimated to be 10^5 Q 2 10 with the actual value likely closer to the lower limit (Goldreich & Soter 1966; Peale & Greenberg 1980). The interior of Jupiter is comprised

¹ This assumes Q is independent of the orbital phase. Hut (1981) and others have adopted instead a constant lag time = = (f), where and f-are the rotational and instantaneous orbital

of (at most) a sm all heavy-elem ent core, a m etallic hydrogen region and a molecular hydrogen envelope (see, e.g.Guillot et al. 2004), with convection being the dom inant heat transfer mechanism outside the core. The most reliable theoretical estimate for the 0 value { based on turbulent viscosity acting on the equilibrium tide { 10^{13} (Goldreich & Nicholson 1977), well above puts Q the inferred value. The physical origin for this low Q value (and thus higher than expected dissipation) has remained elusive for a few decades, with suggestions ranging from a substantial inner core (Derm ott 1979), to helium hysteresis around the depth of hydrogen metallic phase transition (Stevenson 1983), to a postulated stratication in the interior that harbors rotationally-modied gravity-m odes (Ioannou & Lindzen 1993). Each proposal prom ises interesting im plication for the physics of dense m atter or for the structure of Jupiter. W here does the truth lie? Intriguingly, Satum's inferred Q value is sim ilar to that of Jupiter (Goldreich & Soter 1966).

The discovery of close-in extra-solar jupiters has rejuvenated our interest in this problem and provided new insights. While the majority of exo-planets are in eccentric orbits around their host stars, the closest-in ones have low or nearly zero eccentricities. This results from the dissipation of stellar tide inside the planets which converts orbital energy into heat without removing orbital angular momentum. O rbital circularization due to tidal dissipation inside the planet proceeds at a rate (H ut 1981):

$$\frac{1}{e}\frac{de}{dt} = \frac{27k_2}{2Q} \frac{M}{M_J} \frac{R_J}{a}^{5} !; \qquad (3)$$

where k_2 , Q and R_J are the planet's tidal love number, tidal quality factor and radius, respectively. It orbits its host star (mass M) with a sem imapraxis a and an orbital frequency !. Fig. 1 in W u (2003) shows that the observed upper envelope of planet eccentricity as a function of its sem imapraxis can be explained by a tidal quality factor of Q 3 10 if these are gaseous planets similar to Jupiter in their ages and sizes.²

The close-in exo-planets and Jupiter may well have dierent formation history, leading to dierent core sizes and di erent interior com positions. They certainly evolve in very di erent therm al environm ents, resulting in diverging them alstructure in their upper atm osphere. Nevertheless, they share sim ilar Q factors. This prompts us to seek a physical explanation for Q which is based on overt sim ilarities between these planets. The rst trait in common which we believe is important is that their interiors are fully convective. The second trait is that they rotate fast. Jupiter spins roughly four times for every Io orbit, while the spin of close-in (a < 0:1AU) planets should have long been (pseudo-)synchronized with their orbital motion. So in both cases, the (dom inant) tidal forcing frequencies viewed in the planets' rotating fram e are below 2.³ Could these two common traits be responsible for the tidal Q values?

1.2. The Inertial M ode Approach

In a spinning and neutrally buoyant uid sphere, a new branch of eigen-m odes arise: the inertial-m odes. Their m otion is restored not by pressure or buoyancy, but by C oriolis force. In the rotating fram e, these m odes have frequencies ranging from zero to twice the spin frequency. As noted above, the tidal frequencies also fall in this range. How does the presence of these m odes a ect tidal dissipation?

We have previously studied inertialm odes in nonuniform density spheres (W u 2004, hereafter Paper I), focusing on properties relevant to tidal dissipation. We found that inertialm odes which can couple to the tidal potential are much denser in frequency space compared to gravity- or pressurem odes, allowing for good resonance with the tidal forcing. Inertialm odes have unique \singularity belts" near the surface where both m ode am plitudes and velocity shear are the largest, leading to strong turbulent dissipation. Both these facts suggest that inertialm odes are good candidates to explain the tidal dissipation in planets. In this paper, we explore this possibility for Jupiter.

Because of mathematical di culties, rotation has been largely ignored in tidal theories (for an exception, see Savonije et al. 1995, as well as their subsequent papers). However, this can not be justied when rotational frequency is comparable to or faster than the tidal frequency. Tidal response of the uid is strongly in uenced by rotation. Our results here show that when rotation is taken into account, even the most rudimentary treatment gives orders of magnitude stronger tidal dissipation than when it is not.

In this direction, m ost noteworthy is a recent independent work by OL, which appeared while we were writing up our results. In this paper, OL calculated the e ect of inertial-m odes in planets, based on essentially the sam e physical picture as we consider here. We discuss their work in the context of our results. For un-initiated readers, we recommend their excellent and helpful review for issues related to tidal dissipation and to inertial-modes.

1.3. Organization

Paper I has laid a foundation by studying properties of inertial-modes. In x2, we rst sum marize results from that paper, then proceed to discuss two issues of in portance, i.e., how strongly an inertial-mode is coupled to the tidal potential, and how strongly an inertial-mode is damped by turbulent viscosity. Relevant contents of a highly technical nature are presented in Appendix D, where a simple toy model is constructed to help explain the results. In x3, we discuss the e ects of inertialmode dynamical tide on the tidal Q factor, using equilibrium tide as a comparison to illustrate the advantage of inertial-modes. Lastly, we discuss uncertainties in our model, and compare our results with previous work (x4). W e sum marize and discuss other possible applications in x5.

2. INERTIAL-MODES { RELEVANT PROPERTIES

In Paper I, we show that by introducing the ellipsoidal coordinates (B ryan 1889), the partial di erential equation governing inertialm odes can be separated into two ordinary di erential equations, both when the density is

 $^{^2}$ One exception is the planet H D 80606b whose abnorm ally high eccentricity m ay be acquired relatively recently (W u & M urray 2003).

 $^{^3}$ In this respect, it is interesting to point out that tidally circularizing solar-type binaries have convective envelopes and likely spin fast. Curiously, they exhibit sim ilar Q values as these giant planets M athieu et al. (2004).

uniform (Bryan 1889), and when the density satis es a power-law (/ $[1 (r=R)^2]$, where R is the planet radius and r the spherical radius). Moreover, for spheres of smooth but arbitrary density laws, we not that one could obtain su ciently accurate (albeit approximate) eigenfunctions using these coordinates.

Each inertial-mode in a sphere can then be characterized by three quantum numbers, n_1 ; n_2 and m. Here, n_1 and n_2 are the number of nodes along the x_1 or x_2 ellipsoidal coordinate lines, and m is the usual azim uthal num ber. All perturbations satisfy the form e^{im} with being the azim uthal angle. For a graphical presentation of an inertial-mode, see Figs. 4 & 5 in Paper I.W e also introduce in Paper I the dimensionless mode wavenum - $2(n_1 + n_2)$, which is related to the dimensionless ber mode frequency = !=2 sin ($n_1 =$), where ! is the inertial-mode frequency viewed in the rotating frame, the spin frequency, and 0 <1. Under this convention, m < 0 denotes retrograde m odes, while m > 0prograde ones.

2.1. Goodness of Resonance

In a non-rotating star, each eigenm ode is identi ed by three quantum num bers n; ';m where n is the num ber of nodes in the radial direction, and ';m relate to a single spherical harm onic function P^{m}_{λ} (;) that describes the angular dependence of the mode. In contrast, the angular dependence of each inertial-mode is composed of a series of such spherical harm onic functions. This has the consequence that while only the '= 2, m = 2 branch ofnon-rotating m odes can be driven by a potential forcing of the form P_2^2 (the dom inant tidal forcing term), every even-parity inertialm ode can potentially be driven. In this sense, the frequency spectrum of inertial-modes is dense, and the probability of nding a good frequency match (mode frequency forcing frequency) is much im proved over the non-rotating case.

For a given forcing frequency $_0$, how far in frequency does the closest inertial mode lie? We lim it ourselves to inertial modes with $2(n_l + n_2) = m_{ax} \cdot A pproximate$ mode frequency by $\sin(n_l =) = n_l = .$ Modes with the same n_2 but dierent n_1 are spaced in frequency by $= = m_{ax} \cdot N$ ow allow n_2 to vary between 1 and $m_{ax} = 4$, ⁴ we nd that the best frequency o -resonance to $_0$ is typically

()_{m in} =
$$\frac{!_{m in}}{2}$$
 $\frac{4}{m ax n_2}$ (4)

For comparison, gravity- or pressure-modes in nonrotating bodies can at best have a frequency detuning of !=! 1=n with n being the radial order for the mode of concern.

2.2. Overlap with Tidal Potential

Io orbits Jupiter in the equatorial plane with a frequency $!_{Io} = 2 = 1.769 \text{ day}^{-1}$ and at a distance a, while Jupiter spins with a frequency $= 2 = 0.413 \text{ day}^{-1}$. Viewed in Jupiter's rotating frame, Io rotates retrogradely with frequency $!^0 = !_{Io}$ and exerts a periodic tidal forcing on Jupiter. We ignore Io's orbital eccentricity (e = 0.004) in this problem. So at a point

⁴ Unless 0 or 1, we have $n_1 n_2$.

(r; ;) inside Jupiter, the potential of the tidal perturbation can be decomposed as

$$I_{D} = \frac{GM_{I_{D}}}{a}^{n} \frac{r}{a} \sin \cos(r + 1^{0}t)$$

$$\frac{3}{2} \frac{r}{a}^{2} \sin^{2} \frac{1}{3} \frac{3}{2} \frac{r}{a}^{2} \sin^{2}$$

$$\cos(2 + 21^{0}t) + 0 \frac{r}{a}^{3} : (5)$$

The rst term is necessary for maintaining the Keplerian motion of this point in Jupiter; the second term corresponds to the potential when Io is smeared into a ring along its orbit; the third term is the one of relevance here. It describes the periodic forcing by Io in Jupiter's rotating frame. Keeping only this term and writing

$$_{tide} = \frac{3GM_{Io}}{2a^{3}} \$^{2} \cos(2 + 2!^{0}t); \qquad (6)$$

we obtain $_{tide} = !_{tide} = 2 = 2! = 0:766$ and m = 2. Here, $\$ = r \sin n$ is the cylindrical radius.

We investigate here the coupling between inertialmodes and the above tidal potential. A ssum ing the two have the same time-dependence, we integrate the forcing over the planet and over a period to yield the overlap work integral,

$$\frac{Z}{dt} \frac{d^3r}{dt} \frac{\theta}{dt} r_{tide} = d^3r_{tide}r$$
 ()

$$= d^{3}r_{\text{tide}} = d^{3}r_{\text{tide}} = (7)$$

Here, and ⁰ are the displacement and Eulerian density perturbation from the inertial-mode, while its wavefunction is related to ⁰ by ⁰ = $!^2 = c_s^2$ (eq. [9] in Paper I). The overlap integral represents the energy pumped into the mode per period.

2.2.1. Tidal Overlap for the Equilibrium Tide

In the lim it where the tidal frequency falls well below the dynam ical frequency of the planet, the latter reacts alm ost instantaneously to satisfy hydrostatic equilibrium. This tidal response is term ed the 'equilibrium tide'. An extra response arises when !_{tide} has a nearresonant m atch with one of the free m odes in the planet, and this is called the 'dynam ical tide'. Physically speaking, the 'equilibrium tide' is the sum of all the 'dynam ical tide' response driven at o -resonance.

T idal overlap for the equilibrium tide is the largest am ong all tidal response. D isregard any time derivative in the uid equation of motion, take N² = 0 for the neutrally buoyant interior, and assume any perturbation to be adiabatic, we use equations in x2.1 of Paper I to obtain the following instantaneous response,

$$\stackrel{0}{\text{equi}} = \frac{2}{10} \quad \text{tide}: \quad (8)$$

The tidal overlap is,

$$E_{0} = d^{3}r \quad \text{tide equi} = \frac{24}{5} \quad \frac{GM_{IO}}{a^{3}} \quad \frac{{}^{2}Z_{R}}{{}^{0}} \quad \frac{{}^{2}r^{6}}{1P} dr$$
(9)

This is the energy stored in the equilibrium tide and it appears in equation (1). Taking M $_{\rm IO} = 8:93$ 16^{5} g, a =

4.22 10^{10} cm, and adopting a Jupiterm odel from G uillot et al. (2004), we nd E₀ 3 10^{0} erg. In comparison, the current potential energy of Io is 3 10^{8} erg. So, over the history of the solar system, Jupiter could have pushed Io outward for a negligible 10 ⁷ of its current orbit if Q 10^{13} , nam ely, only 10 ¹³ fraction of E₀ is dissipated per tidal period

As a side note, the spatial dependence of the tidal potential, as well as that of the equilibrium tide, can be expressed in the following form which resembles the spatial dependence of an inertial mode in a uniform - density sphere: tide / $\2 / $P_2^2(x_1)P_2^2(x_2)$, here x_1 and x_2 are the aforementioned ellipsoidal coordinates. In comparison, the lowest-order inertial mode $(n_1 = n_2 = 0, also called a R-m ode)$ has a wavefunction / $P_3^2(x_1)P_3^2(x_2)$.

222. Tidal Overlap for Inertial M odes

Consider rst the tidal coupling of a gravity-m ode in a solar-type star. Firstly, this m ode needs to have a spherical degree = 2 and an azim uthal number jm j= 2 to be compatible with the tidal potential. Its radial eigenfunction oscillates quickly in the W KB region and attens out in the upper evanescent region (the convection zone). O verlap with the (sm ooth) tidal potential therefore is largely contributed by the evanescent region, with the contribution from di erent nodal patches in the W KB region canceling out each other.

The situation is di erent for an inertialm ode. Firstly, every even-parity, in j= 2 inertialm ode contains a '= 2 spherical component that can couple to the tidal potential. Moreover, the upper evanescent region of an inertial mode is comparable in size to any other nodal patch but with much lower density. As such it is not particularly im portant for the tidal overlap. The net tidal overlap is the small residue after the cancellation between all regions. This property makes it di cult to reliably calculate the overlap integral. In fact, obtaining results in this section has been the most di cult part of this project. M uch attention is paid to ensure the accuracy of num erical integrations, and to analytically understand the num erical results.

W e delegate much of the technical discussions to the appendixes. In appendix xB, we evaluate tidaloverlap for inertial-modes in a uniform -density model. In appendix xC, we discuss results for models of a single power-law index (). Lastly, in appendix xD, we present results for models with more realistic density proles, including ones from Jupiterm odels. W e substantiate our num erical results by studying a simple toy-model where analytical results are available. Here, we list relevant conclusions.

We nd that the severity of cancellation rises with increasing mode order. We quantify this severity by the following dimensionless number,

$$C_{n} = \frac{\frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{1} \frac{$$

W hile $C_n = 1$ for the equilibrium tide, C_n decreases with rising (or with rising n where $n = n_1 + n_2$) with a slope that depends on the model. In detail, integration of the top integral over the spherical angles always leads to a cancellation of order n⁻¹, while integration over the

radius su ers a cancellation with a magnitude that depends on factors like the polytropic index of the model, or discontinuities in density or density gradient.

As is shown in Appendix B, in a uniform density sphere, tidal overlap for all modes is zero because the material is incompressible ($^{0} = 0$). When we adopt a constant pressure, constant density sphere, we not that only the two lowest order even-parity modes couple to the tide (Papaloizou & Savonije 1997).

Form odels satisfying a single power-law density pro le (/ [l (r=R \hat{y}]), C_n 1=r^{2 + 1} for even-parity m odes. For instance, = 1 and = 1.8 yield C_n 1=n³ and C_n 1=n^{4:6}, respectively. This expression is obtained from a simple toy-m odel and is supported by integration of the actual inertial-m ode eigenfunctions (Appendix C).

Inside Jupiter, gas pressure satis es the ideal gas law above a radius r=R 0:98, while it is dom inated by that from strongly interacting molecules below this radius (discussed in Appendix A.1). The density pro le can be roughly tted by two power-laws with varying from a value of 1:8 near the surface to 1 deeper down. This changing a ects the tidal overlap. Let the transition occur over a radius r. We nd C $_{n}$ 1= n^{3} for n R = r and C_n $1=n^{4:6}$ for larger n values. These are expected since lower order modes mostly sample the = 1 region and are evanescent in the = 1:8 envelope, while higher order modes experience the = 1.8 powerlaw. Realistic Jupiter m odels presented by Guillot et al. (2004) yield r=R 0:02, or r 4 local pressure scale heights.

The tidal overlap is also a ected by discontinuities in density or density gradient. The form er may occur if, for instance, the metallic hydrogen phase transition is of the rst-order, while latter occurs if it is of second-order. For a density discontinuity with a fractional value = , C_n (=) $n^{-1}=n / 1=n^2$, while for a density gradient discontinuity of ${}^{0}={}^{0}$, the overlap integral C_n (${}^{0}={}^{0}$) $1=n^3 / 1=n^3$.

So in conclusion, the m agnitude of the cancellation in the overlap integral depends on the density pro le, both its overall scaling with depth as well as its interior discontinuities and sharp changes.

In Appendix C, we show that one can obtain C_n by substituting the actual inertial mode eigenfunction with a fast-oscillating cosine function with the same number of nodes (see Fig. D10). It is as if one can almost make do without detailed knowledge of the eigenfunction. This insensitivity leads us to believe that, although we are in many cases using an approximate solution for the inertial mode eigenfunction, our results for the overlap integral is reliable (m ore discussion in Appendix D).

W hy is it necessary to go through all these detailed analysis? In the expression for C_n , while the denom inator is fairly straightforward to obtain through direct num erical integration, the severe cancellation su ered by the integral in the num erator renders the num erical results in m any cases untrustworthy. For instance, a 10⁴ inaccuracy in the Jupiter m odel presents itself as a sm all (but nite) density jump and a ects strongly the value of C_n at large n.

2.3. Turbulent D issipation

W e dem onstrated in Paper I that energy of an inertialm ode is stored m ostly in the form of kinetic energy. An inertialm ode causes little com pression. A s such, its dissipation is dom inated by shear viscosity.

The viscous force, ${\rm F}\,$, appears in the equation of motion as

+2 _=
$$rp^{0} + \frac{rp}{r} = r + F;$$
 (11)

where

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{r} \qquad \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{;} \tag{12}$$

and is the shear viscosity coe cient and arises from turbulent convection. We adopt the following mixinglength-formula

$$v_{v}'_{cv} \frac{1}{1 + (!_{cv}=2)^{s}}$$
: (13)

Here v_{cv} , v_{cv} and v_{cv} are the characteristic convection velocity, scale length and turn-over time. W hen convective turn-over time is long relative to the tidal period (! v_{cv} 1), the elective viscosity is reduced and we adopt a reduction coecients to describe this behavior. We adopt s = 2 in our main study (see Appendix A 2 form ore discussion) and discuss in x4 the elects on our results when taking s = 1. We further de ne the depth (R r) at which ! $v_{cv}=2$ = 1 to be z_{crit} . For the Jupiterm odels we adopt (see Appendix A 2 & Fig. A 8), z_{crit} 10^{2:8}R and

4 (z=R)¹ for
$$z > z_{crit}$$
;
2 $1\dot{\theta}^0 (z=R)^{1}$ ⁼³ for $z < z_{crit}$: (14)

Here, is taken to be the surface value (= 1.8). The deeper region where = 1.0 has too weak a viscosity to be of concern.

W e assume here that the viscous forcing is sm all com pared to the restoring force for inertial-m odes so we can ignore its e ect on the structure of inertial-m odes.⁵ V iscosity does, how ever, dissipate m ode energy. The rate of dissipation is

$$= \frac{1}{E}^{Z} d^{3}r - F = \frac{R}{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{d^{3}r}{d^{3}r} + \frac{r}{r};$$
(15)

where we have integrated by part taking the surface density to be zero. V is cosity always damps so < 0. In the following, we consider only the magnitude of , so we re-de ne = j j.

2.3.1. Dissipation Rate for Equilibrium Tide

The equilibrium tide su ers turbulent dissipation as the tidal bulge rotates around the planet. W e calculate its rate of dissipation here.

First, we obtain the displacement function () for the equilibrium tide. We ignore the e ect of rotation here. Them otion is barotropic so is irrotational, we can write

= $r [f_r Y_m (;)]$, where f_r is a function of radius alone. The equation of mass conservation, combined with equation (8), yields the following equation for f_r :

$$\frac{1}{r^2}\frac{\varrho}{\varrho r} r^2 \frac{\varrho f_r}{\varrho r} \qquad \frac{(+1)}{r^2} f_r = br^2 \frac{2}{1p}; \quad (16)$$

 5 This assumption is equivalent of requiring that the rate of turbulent dissipation $% 10^{-1}$ falls much below mode frequency !, an assumption we later con $\,\rm rm$.

where the tidal potential tide = $br^2 Y_{2; 2}(;)$ and $b = \frac{72}{15} GM_{Io} = a^3$. We solve for f_r with the following boundary conditions: near the center, the asymptotic expansion of the above equation yields f_r / r^2 , so $df_r = dr = 2f_r = r;$ at the surface, the Lagrangian pressure perturbation is zero so $_r = df_r = dr = br^2 = g$, where g is the surface gravitational acceleration.

O ver the whole planet, f_r rises roughly as r^2 , with a surface tidal height $_r$ 60 m eters (and a comparable tangential displacement). U sing the expression of (eq. [14]), we obtain a damping rate of $_{equi}$ 4 10¹⁶s¹.

This damping is distributed over the bulk of the planet, with roughly equal contribution coming from each decade of depth (but little from above z_{crit} where viscosity turns over). This rate can also be estimated using $=R^2$ with taken to be 10^4 cm²=s, the value for the e ective viscosity at the mid-point of logarithm ic depth (see Fig. A8). Lastly, this corresponds to an elective Ekman number (ratio of period to viscous time-scale) of E k 10^{13} .

2.3.2. Dissipation Rate for Inertial-M odes

Numerically, it is straight-forward to obtain the dissipation rates for inertial-modes. It is sensitive only to the density prole at the envelope, and is hardly a ected by phase transition or other density discontinuities in the interior. In this section, we rst derive how the rate of turbulent dissipation scales with inertial-mode wavenum – ber $(2(n_1 + n_2))$, and then present numerical con r-mations for these analytical scalings, using a variety of power-law models as well as realistic Jupiter models.

We use the WKB properties of inertialmodes, discussed in x3.1 of Paper I. Inertial-modes can propagate between the center and an upper turning point, de ned in the $(x_1; x_2)$ ellipsoidal coordinates by x_1 1= $j_{2}j_{2}j_{1}=$ or both. The physical depth of this or turning point depends on latitude. At \cos^1 (or x₁ $j_{2}j$), it is closest to the surface with 2)= 2 R = 2 (the 'singularity belt'); 2R = (1 \mathbb{Z}_1 while at other latitudes, the depth is R = . W ithinthe W KB cavity, the amplitude of inertial-m odes rises as 1= . In the x_1 and x_2 coordinates, nodes are spaced)= n_1 and $=n_2$, respectively, and each nodal by (1 patch (in total $n_1 n_2$ of these) contributes comparable am ount to the totalm ode energy.

V is cosity works on the gradient of the displacement. An inertialmode propagates with a roughly constant wavelength in most its W KB cavity, but its wavelength shrinks drastically near or inside the singularity belt (both x₁ and jyj 1=). This is where we expect the largest dissipation to occur. To order of m agnitude, ² in the WKB cavity, while within r² τ́r i the singularity belt, jr j $r^2 =_1$ 4 . W e rst consider modes for which $z_1 > z_{crit}$, so / z¹ (eq. [14]) in the region of interest. The work integral of turbulent dissipation can be estimated as,

d³r r :r

Ζ

 $^{^6}$ For Jupiter, this roughly translates to ~< 50 since $z_{\rm crit}$ 10 $^{2:8}R$.

O by iously, the viscous integral is dom inated by the contribution from the belt where $z = \frac{1}{2}$, and where

 \cos^1 . Meanwhile, the mode-energy integral is dominated by the WKB cavity with each nodal patch contributing a comparable amount,

$$Z = Z_{1} Z_{2} Z_{1} Z_{1} Z_{2} Z_{1} Z_{1}$$

A more accurate scaling for the energy integral has been established in Paper I (x3.2), yielding this integral to be / $n^{2:7}$ / $^{3:5}$. This latter scaling is applicable in the range of that is of interest to us and is fairly independent of the density pro le. Returning to equation (15), we obtain

$$/ {}^{3:5+2}$$
: (19)

Now we consider higher order modes for which $z_1 < z_{\rm crit}$. Most of the damping stillarises from near z_1 , where / z^1 ⁼³. We repeat the scaling exercise in equation (17) and obtain

$$/ 1:5+2=3$$
: (20)

In Fig. 1, we present the num erically obtained dam ping rates for power-law models with ranging from 1.0 to 3.0. Some of these models have double power-law density proles but only the envelope value a ects the scaling for the dam ping rates.⁷ These num erical results con m our above analytical scalings.

W e have also computed damping rates using realistic Jupiter m odels published by G uillot et al. (2004). These m odels are discussed in Appendix A and have = 1.3 in the outer envelope. The numerical results are shown in Fig. 2. They follow the scalings derived above and can be summarized as,

- 1

$$= 6 \quad 10^{13} \quad \frac{7:1}{7:59} \qquad \text{for } < 50;$$
$$= 3 \quad 10^{9} \quad \frac{3}{7:59} \qquad \text{for } > 50; \quad (21)$$

where we have scaled by 7:59, the value of for a low order inertial-m ode $(n_1 = n_2 = 1)$. Even this low order inertial-m ode is rather m ore strongly damped than the equilibrium tide. M ode with 50 have $z_{\rm crit}$ 10^{2:8}R. M oreover, damping rates depend only on but not on $(n_1;n_2)$ values.

3. TIDALQ FOR JUPITER

3.1. Q value by Equilibrium Tide

For the equilibrium tide, equation (1) (Goldreich & Soter 1966) yields $Q_{equi} = ! = _{equi}$, where ! is the tidal frequency in the rotating frame $(! = 2!)^0 = 2(!_{IO}) =$ 1:532), and $_{equi}$ is the turbulent damping rate for the equilibrium tide as calculated in x2.3.1. Substituting with the value $_{equi}$ 4 10¹⁶ s¹, we obtain 10^{12} , while Goldreich & Nicholson (1977) pre-Q_{equi} sented an estimate of Q_{equi} 5 $1b^3$. The discrepancy is partially due to the fact that they have adopted an e ective < > 10[°] while our e ective < > 10⁴ (x2.3.1) { the actual viscosity is of course uncertain, easily by a factor of 10. M oreover, their estim ate is m ore order-of-m agnitude in nature. In any case, dissipation of the equilibrium tide, as has been argued long and hard, can not be responsible for the outward migration of Io and other satellites.

3.2. Q value by Inertial M odes

How much stronger dissipation can inertial-modes bring about? Compared to the equilibrium tide, inertialmodes have the advantage that they can be resonantly driven by the tidal forcing as they are dense in the frequency range of interest (x2.1), and they are damped much more strongly than the equilibrium tide (x2.3.2). The disadvantage, however, lies in the generally weak coupling between an inertial-mode and the tidal potential. Can the rst two advantages overcome the last disadvantage? Here, we combine results from previous sections to calculate the tidal Q caused by inertial-modes.

32.1. Q value by Individual M odes

We start by calculating the amount of tidal energy dissipated via one inertialmode. The following forceddam ped oscillator equation describes the interaction between an inertial eigen-mode and the tidal forcing,

$$- -+ !_0^2 = r_{tide} \exp^{i!t};$$
 (22)

where is the displacement, and the three terms on the left-hand-side represent, respectively, the inertia, the viscous damping, and the restoring force. The free mode will have an eigenfrequency of $!_0$. The right-hand-side is the tidal forcing with frequency ! which we take to be ! $!_0$. A dopting the substitution = $\underset{R}{\sim}^0 = \sim^0 w$ ith the tilded quantities normalized as $!^2=2 \underset{R}{\sim} d^3 r \sim = 1$, multiply both sides by \sim and integrating over the planet, we obtain the amplitude

$$= \frac{C}{2} \frac{e^{i!t}}{\frac{!0}{12}} = \frac{C}{1 + \frac{2i}{1}} = \frac{C}{2} \frac{e^{i!t+i}}{\frac{10}{4}(1)^2 + \frac{2i}{2}}$$
(23)

where the tidal coupling $C = \begin{bmatrix} R \\ d^3 r \sim^0 \end{bmatrix}_{\text{tide}}$, the frequency detuning $! = ! \ b_0 \quad (!^2 \quad !_0^2) = 2!$, and the angle $= \tan^1(=2 \ !)$ (we assign > 0 for dam ping). For the equilibrium tide (! = !), this angle represents the lag-angle between the tidal bulge and the tide-raising body, 2 $2 \tan = _{equi} = ! = 1 = Q_{equi}$ (eq. [1] & x3.1).

Energy in the inertial mode is $\sin p ly^{2}$, and the energy dissipated via this mode over one period can be

⁷ For these double power-law models as well as for realistic Jupiter models, the inertial-mode eigenfunctions are obtained as described in Paper I.

found by

$$E = dt \frac{dE}{dt} = dt d^{3}rRe[-]Re[r _{tide}e^{i!t}]$$
$$= j jC dt! sin (!t+) cos(!t)$$

$$= j jC \sin = \frac{!C^2}{2(4 !^2 + 2)}:$$
 (24)

The tidal Q is related to the above quantity by eq. (1)

$$Q = \frac{2 E_0}{E} = \frac{4E_0}{!C^2} - \frac{4 !^2 + 2}{2} ; \qquad (25)$$

where again E_0 is the energy in the equilibrium tide, and the factor in the parenthesis describes the e ect of being o -resonance. This expression can also be derived more simply taking $E = 2 = ! E = 2 = ! ^2$.

We call a mode in resonance" with the tide whenever 2j ! j . The Q factor associated with a resonant mode, Q res, is proportional to the dissipation rate and inversely proportional to the norm alized tidal coupling,

$$Q_{\rm res} = \frac{4E_0}{C^2!} = \frac{128}{15!} \frac{R}{!} \frac{\frac{2^2r^6}{1p}dr}{R} \frac{\frac{1^2}{2}}{\frac{1^2}{1p}} \frac{^3dr}{t_2};$$

$$\frac{R}{R} \frac{1^2}{\frac{1^2}{1p}} \frac{1^2}{1p} \frac{1^2}{1p} \frac{1^2}{1p} \frac{1^2}{1p};$$
(26)

where equation (9) is used. Notice here that all dependences on Io's mass and sem im a jor axis drop out, leaving only the dependences on the tidal frequency and Jupiter's internal structure.

How does Q_{res} behave for di erent inertialmodes? Baæd on our previous discussions, we introduce the following scalings with $_0$ being the wavenum ber of reference,

$$= _{0} - _{0} ;$$

$$C_{n} n^{n_{c}} - _{0} : (27)$$

Here, C_n is the severity of cancellation in the tidal coupling, expressed by equation (10). The factor 1.25 in the second scaling is needed to accurately relate $n = n_1 + n_2$ to in the range of interest. The norm alized tidal coupling C can be related to C_n as

$$C = C_{n} \frac{\frac{tide^{\frac{1^{2}}{1p}} j j^{3}r}{\frac{1^{2}}{2}}}{(r-j)_{z_{1}}} / C_{n} \frac{(r-j)_{z_{1}}}{(r-j)_{z_{1}}(n_{1}n_{2})^{1-2}}} / \frac{C_{n}}{n} / \frac{C_{n}}{n} :$$
(28)

These scalings combine to yield the following expression for Q_{res} :

$$Q_{\text{res}} = Q_{0 \ 0} \quad - \frac{n_{Q}}{0} = Q_{0 \ 0} \quad - \frac{n + 2 + 2 \cdot 5 n_{c}}{0}$$
; (29)

where Q $_{\rm 0}$ is a constant that depends on Jupiter's internal structure.

W e obtain num erical results using two realistic Jupiter m odels published by G uillot et al. (2004): m odels B and D. They are discussed in detail in Appendix A. O fparticular relevance is that, while hydrogen m etallic phase transition is treated as a sm ooth transition in m odel B (interpolated equation of state), m odelD has a rst-order phase transition and the associated density jump occurring around r=R 0.8. As a result, $C_n = 1=n^3$ ($n_c = 3$) in m odel B,⁸ while $C_n = 1=2r^2$ ($n_c = 2$) in m odel D. These scalings are derived analytically in Appendix D, and tested using a toy-m odel integration. In Fig. 2, we further dem onstrate that these scalings indeed apply to inertial-m odes, albeit with quite a bit of uctuations.

From equation (21), we obtain n = 7:1 for low-order m odes (< 50). So n_Q is expected to be 16:6 form odelB and 14:1 form odelD .W e present num erically calculated Q res in Fig. 2 and they con rm these scalings. M oreover, Q res ranges from 10⁴ for the low est order inertial-m odes to 10^{10} form odelB (and 10^8 form odelD) when 50.

322. OverallQ Value

If we consider multiple inertial modes each causing Q $_{\rm i}$, the totale ect is

$$Q = \frac{P}{_{i} 1 = Q_{i}}$$
: (30)

So at any given tidal frequency, Q is dominated by the mode that contributes the smallest Q_i . Which mode is this and what is the resulting Q value? We derive analytical scalings here to answer these questions.

At a given forcing frequency, Q values (eq. [25]) for different m odes depend on non-m onotonically. Typically, as increases, Q rst decreases and then rises sharply. This is because low -order m odes typically are driven o resonance (2j ! j) while one can easily nd high order m odes to be in resonance with the tide. For low -order m odes, as increases, the chance for a good resonance with the tidal frequency in proves. This com pensates for the fact that tidal coupling weakens with and

Q
$$Q_{\rm res} \frac{4!^2}{2} = \frac{256^2 Q_0}{0!^4} = \frac{1}{0!} \frac{1}{0!}$$

Here n_Q 2n 4 = 2:5 n_c 2 n < 0. For highorder modes that satisfy 2j ! j , increasingly weaker tidal coupling accounts for the fact that Q rises with as Q Q_{res} / n_Q . The lowest Q value is to be found around modes that satisfy 2j ! j = 2j!₀ ! j . This occurs at

$$\frac{16}{0} \quad \frac{16}{0} \quad \frac{1}{0} \quad \frac{1}{0} \quad (n+2) \quad (32)$$

For Jupiter models, this yields 60 (also see Fig. 2). These are the modes that are most relevant for tidal dissipation. They give rise to a minimum Q value

Q Q_{0 0}
$$\frac{16}{0 0}$$
 $\frac{16}{0 0}$ $\frac{16}{0 0}$ (33)

 8 Two factors contribute comparably to this scaling: the sharp transition of equation of state near r=R $\,$ 0:98 and the discontinuous density gradient at the phase transition point.

This roughly corresponds to Q 10^{10} for m odel B, and Q 10^{6} for m odel D (see m ore detailed calculation below).

In the following, we con m and re ne the above analytical results by a num erical model. W hile we have a reasonably good handle on mode damping and tidal coupling, we do not have a perfect Jupiter model nor exact inertial-m ode solutions to produce exact m ode frequencies. So we could not reproduce exactly the tidal response of Jupiter as a function of Io's orbital period. Fortunately, this problem can be circum vented. In the following exercise, we produce an articial spectrum of inertial-modes, with frequencies that satisfy the WKB dispersion relation = $\sin(n_2 =)$ with $2(n_1 + n_2)$ (Paper I). To this frequency we add a sm all random com -= = (10n₁), which is of order 1=10 ponent of order the frequency spacing between neighboring modes of the same n₂ value. This random component is to encapsulate our above ignorance but neither its size nor its sign qualitatively a ect our conclusion. In this treatment, although we will not be able to obtain the exact tidal response of the planet at each forcing frequency, we can get a reasonable statistical impression. In fact, this is the only logical approach warranted by our current know ledge of the interior of Jupiter.

For each inertial mode, we assign a dam ping as in equation (21), and a Q res as in equation (29) (di erent for models B & D), and calculate, as a function of tidal frequency, the Q value for individual modes as well as the overall Q value. The results are presented in Figs. 3 & 4 for the two models. One observes that the Q value uctuates wildly as a function of the forcing frequency. W hile there is a ceiling to the overall Q value, there may be occasions when resonance with very low-order modes occurs, leading to deep valleys with Q reaching values as sm all as 10. The ceiling, on the other hand, is determined by 60 modes which are always in resonance at any forcing frequency. D ue to their high Q res values, modes of orders higher than these are not in portant.

The results should be interpreted statistically. One can infer from them twopieces of information about Jupiter's Q value. The rst is the average Q value across a certain frequency range, and the second the probability of Q value falling below 10^6 in this frequency range. Here, the value Q = 10^6 is taken to be the rough upper limit for the empirically inferred Q value.

The de nition for the word 'average' deserves som e deliberation. We follow Goodman & Oh (1997) and Terquem et al. (1998) in adopting the following average,

R

$$Q = \frac{\frac{1}{2} Q()Q()d}{\frac{1}{2} Q()d} :$$
(34)

This is equivalent to a time-weighted average since the time a system spends in a certain state is inversely proportional to the torque at that state. O ver the evolutionary timescale, the system quickly moves through the deep valleys (large torque) and lingers around in the large Q region. This is also where we most expect to nd Jupiter today.

We nd that for 2 [0:7;0:8], Q 1:4 10 form odel B and Q 5:8 10 form odel D, roughly consistent with our analytical estimates. Recall that Q_{equi} 10^{2} . M oreover, at any forcing frequency, the probability that Jupiter has $Q < 10^6$ is 3% in model B and 10% in model D.

4. DISCUSSION

Throughout our calculation, we have assumed that Jupiter is uniform ly rotating, neutrally buoyant and core-less. We have also assumed that its internal convection provides a turbulent viscosity which is quantied by the mixing length theory and which is reduced with an index s = 2 when the convection turn-over time is long compared to the tidal period. We obtained inertialm ode eigenfunctions for realistic Jupiter m odels using a combination of W KB approximation and exact surface solution (Paper I).

In this section, we discuss the validity of our various assumptions, factors that m ight in uence our results, as well as implications of our results.

4.1. Tidal Overlap

Firstly, a precaution about tidal overlap. We nd that this is the trickiest part of our work because inertialm odes propagate essentially over the whole planet, with a sm all evanescent region very close to the surface. Regions of positive and negative tidal coupling lay side by side, leading to strong cancellation and extrem e sensitivity to num erical accuracy. In fact, for a sphere with a density pro le that follows a single power-law, the net tidal coupling decreases with increasing m ode order so strongly (Appendix C) that num erical precision is soon strained even for fairly low-order m odes. Inertial-m odes are not in portant for tidal dissipation in these m odels.

In a realistic Jupiter model, the cancellation is less extrem e due to the following two features: the molecular to metallic hydrogen transition at r=R 0:8 (either a discreet phase transition or a continuous change) and the polytropic index change at r=R 0:98 where hydrogen molecules change from ideal gas to strongly interacting Coulomb gas (discussed in Appendix A.1). These two features act as some sort of 'internal re ection' for the inertial-m odes { their W K B envelopes inside and outside of these features di er. This weakens the above-m entioned near-perfect cancellation in the overlap contribution from di erent regions and leads to larger tidal coupling. This is con med by integration using both a toy-m odel (A ppendix D) and actual inertial-m ode eigenfunctions. In this case, tidal dissipation via inertialmodes outweighs that due to the equilibrium tide.

The inertial-m ode eigenfunctions for realistic Jupiter m odels are constructed as follows (see also Paper I). We rst obtain eigenfunctions for a single power-law m odel with the power-law index () determ ined by that in the outer envelope of the Jupiter m odel. This can be done exactly as long as we ignore the Eulerian density perturbation in the equation of motion.⁹ We multiply the resulting wave-function by a factor surf where surf is the density for the above single power-law and is the actual density. We showed in Paper I that in the W KB region, this construction approximates the actual eigenfunction to order O (1= ²), and it is exact in the surface evanescent region.

⁹ T his term is sm alland its rem oval from the equation of m otion, as we discussed in Paper I, does not preclude tidal forcing between the tide and the inertial-m odes.

The e ects of such a non-exact form ulation on mode eigenfrequencies will not signi cantly alter our results and its e ects on the damping rates are negligible. But does it a ect our results on tidal coupling, which, as we have show n, depends sensitively even on num erical accuracy? A de nitive answer may have to come from high resolution num erical calculations. But our toy-model gives us some con dence that our approach has captured the essence of the problem and that our overlap result is qualitatively correct.

4.2. Turbulent V iscosity

The next issue concerns the turbulent viscosity. We have presented the detailed viscosity prole in Appendix A 2 & Fig. A 8.. This is calculated based on the mixing-length theory which is order-of-magnitude in nature (also see eq. [13]). How much does the Q value change when the viscosity is raised (or decreased) by a factor of, say, 100? The scaling in equation (33) yields $Q / {0 \atop 1} {n_0} = {(n + 2) \atop 0}$, ot $Q / {0 \atop 0} {0 \atop 1} {0 \atop 0} {0 \atop 0} {0 \atop 1} {0 \atop 0} {0 \atop 0} {0 \atop 1} {0 \atop 0} {0 \atop 0}$

Zahn (1977) has advocated a less drastic reduction of the turbulent viscosity when the convective turn-over time is much longer than the tidal period: s = 1 in equation (13). This produces two di erences to our results. First, the equilibrium tidal Q is reduced to 10° as the e ective viscosity is increased over the bulk of the planet by a factor of 10° . Inertial-modes also in general experience stronger dissipation, with the change more striking for low -orderm odes. M oreover, m odes of low er order can now satisfy the resonance condition (2j ! j) and they are the dom inant m odes for tidal dissipation. How ever, the enhanced also means every mode now has a larger Q_{res} , as a result, the overall Q factor by inertial-modes is hardly modied from that in the s = 2 case (see Fig. 5).

4.3. Density Discontinuities

As our results in Figs. 3 & 4 show, when there exists a discreet density jump inside Jupiter, the overallQ factor is 10^7 , or 10^6 times smaller than the case when there is no jump, with 10^8 chance that the current Q value falls between 10^5 and 10^6 (the empirically inferred Q range for Jupiter). This dependence on density discontinuity deserves explanation.

It results from a di erence in the overlap integral. In the jump case, cancellation in the overlap contribution coming from dierent parts of the planet is less severe $(C_n / 1=n^2)$, while it is more complete in the no-jump case $(C_n / 1=n^3)$, as is explained using a toy-model in Appendix D. In the no-jump case, the $C_n / 1=n^3$ scaling may arise from two causes: a discontinuity in the density gradient due to, for instance, a second-order phase transition, and a sharp transition in the power law index (equivalently, the polytropic index $_1$) when the equation of state changes. In Jupiter models, the latter 0:98, spanning a range of r=R occurs at r=R 0:02, 4 local pressure scale heights (Appendix A.1). The or overallQ factor is little a ected if either transition region is shifted upward or downward by a few pressure scale heights. However, if the second-order phase transition

does not exist, and if the polytropic transition occurring over a range r=R = 0.02, we expect C $_n / 1=n^{4:6}$ and the overallQ factor to be much larger.

Does Jupiter harbor a density jum p?

One possibility is the so-called m etallic hydrogen phase transition. Our know ledge of the equation of state for hydrogen at M bar level is currently lim ited. W e do not know whether the transition from a molecular uid to a conductive uid (metallic hydrogen) is a plasm a phase transition (PPT) with a discreet density jump, or a continuous process with only a jum p in the density gradient. And in the case of PPT, we do not know whether the actual Jovian adiabat falls below or above the critical tem perature for a rst-order transition (Stevenson, private communication). Plighted by these uncertainties, planet modelers have typically chosen to insert (or not to insert) by hand a sm all density jump at the suspected PPT location, and then interpolated between very low and very high pressures (where we know the equation of state well), under certain assumptions, to obtain the pressure-density curves around this point. We build our analysis on two examples of such models (model B with a smooth transition and model D with a jump). Interestingly, Guillot et al. (2004) show ed that am ong m odels that m atch all observational constraints on Jupiter, the ones with PPT equation of state have larger core mass and lower total m ass of heavy elements, while the ones with smooth interpolated equation of state tend to the opposite.

A nother possibility may follow from helium /hydrogen phase separation. W henever the Jovian adiabat falls below the critical tem perature curve for helium imm iscibility, helium separates from hydrogen and form s helium rich droplets that fall tow ard the center (Salpeter 1973). D ue to its cooler interior, this process has proceeded further in Saturn than in Jupiter. But even in Jupiter there may be a density jump, or at worst, a jump in density gradient, associated with this e ect.

C lose-in hot exo-jupiters presum ably have higher overall entropy than Jupiter does, as radiation from their surface is e ectively sealed o by the stellar insulation. Their interior temperature is higher at a given pressure. Both PPT and helium rain-out are therefore less likely to occur in these bodies.

In sum mary, current Jupiter models exhibit features that warrant Q 10° . It is plausible to nd a nonnegligible density jump in the Jovian interior, due either to a rst-order PPT or helium /hydrogen separation, in which case we obtain Q 10° . This, how ever, is more di cult to justify in hot exo-jupiters, com prom ising our initial goal of searching for a universal mechanism.

4.4. Presence of a Solid Core

We have assumed here that convection penetrates into the center of Jupiter. But it is possible that Jupiter does have a solid core. Derm ott (1979) pointed out that body tide in the (imperfectly elastic) solid core of Jupiter with a core quality factor 30 can account for the observed tidal dissipation. However, this requires a core size which is at the upper-end of current determ inations ($r_{core}=R$ 0.15) as well as a core quality factor which is currently unknown. Moreover, the e ciency of such a mechanism depends sensitively on the core size and it may be unreasonable to expect that exo-jupiters all have core sizes within a narrow range. So we restrict ourselves to consider the e ect of a core on the tidal Q factor due to inertial modes.

Inertialm odes are excluded from the solid-core. For an estimate, we retain the inertialmode eigenfunctions calculated for the core-less case, but suppress from the core region contribution to mode energy, mode damping, and tidal overlap integral. We nd no substantial di erence between this and the core-less case (one can also compare results from modelB which is core-less and model D which has a 10M core). Contribution from the core region to the overlap integral, for instance, is insigni cant as the radial integrand drops as / r^6 (eq. [C3]): radial dependence of the tidal potential goes as r^2 , and inertialmodes are more anelastic (sm all ⁰) in the high density region.

A more subtle in uence of the core, how ever, may be present. W hile we have been able to separate spatial variables and calculate inertial-mode eigenfunctions in the ellipsoidal coordinates for core-less models, the presence of a spherical core destroys this convenience. The innerboundary conditions can no longer be de ned along constant ellipsoidal coordinate curves and we have to retum to the original partial di erential equations. This is analogous to the situation where the C oriolis force breaks the symmetry of a spherical star, with the result that the angular dependence of an eigen-mode in a rotating star can no longer be described by a single spherical harm on ic but only by a mixture of them . So it is perceivable that, if we adopt core-less inertial-m ode eigenfunctions as a com plete basis, inertial-mode eigenfunction in the presence of a spherical core m ay be a m ixture of these functions. This gives us a hint on how to proceed when there is a core. It is possible to obtain the mixing ratio and use these to calculate new damping rates, mode energy and tidal coupling. W e conjecture that the mixture becom es purer (m ore dom inated by one com ponent) as the core size approaches zero. In particular, we expect the mixing not to be important when the core size is much smaller than a wavelength of the inertial-mode (r_{core}=R 1=). W e plan to extend our calculation to the solid core case in the future.

The above conjecture seem s to be supported by num erical calculations by O gilvie (2005). He recovers low -order inertial-modes when he decreases the core size. When the core size is signi cant, how ever, O L's study discovered som ething else. Instead of global inertial-modes, they found that uid response to the tidal forcing is concentrated into characteristic rays which become singularly narrow as viscosity goes to zero. This appears a rather di erent picture from ours and the physical origin of these singular rays deserves understanding.

4.5. Radiative Atm osphere

We have also assumed that the convection zone extends all the way to zero density. This may be unrealistic for Jupiter, and worse still for exo-jupiters. In the Jupiter models we adopted, convection gives way to radiation just above the photosphere (p = 1bar). The reality is more complicated (also see discussions in Paper I). Tem perature in the Jovian atmosphere is such that as a uid parcel travels upward, its water content condenses and releases latent heat. The resulting adiabatic gradient (the 'wet adiabat') depends on the water content and is shallower than the one that does not include water condensation (the 'dry adiabat'). So for a given tem perature pro k, a particularly dry parcel can be convectively stabk. This is consistent with the G aliko probe data which indicates stable stratication down to 20bar after entering a dry spot on Jupiter (A llison & Atkinson 2001). A vailable Jupiter models are at best 1-D representation of the 3-D structure, and our results depend critically on the tem perature structure and turbulent viscosity in the upper atm osphere of Jupiter.

W hat is the e ect of a thin radiative atmosphere on inertialmodes? Inertialmodes may not be perfectly reected near the surface and some of its wave-ux can be smuggled out of the convective region in the form of gravity-waves. The radiative zone has a peak Brunt-V aisala buoyancy frequency

N
$$\frac{g}{c_s} = \frac{2700}{9.3 \ 10^4} = 0.029 \ s^1;$$
 (35)

which is much higher than the inertial-mode frequencies $3:5 \quad 10^4 \text{ s}^{-1}$). So the relevant we are interested in (! gravity-wave is high in radial order and is strongly modi ed by rotation, satisfying N ! . Such waves can be calculated (sem i)-analytically under the 'traditional approximation' and are called the 'Hough modes'. The smuggled wave-ux is subsequently lost in the higher atmosphere where the gravity-wave breaks. This brings about enhanced damping to the inertial-mode. Recall that the overall g factor scales roughly as inverse square root of the dam ping rate. So unless the resultant dam ping rate is orders of m agnitude above the rate of turbulent dam ping, the overall Q factor is little a ected.

There are other ways in which a radiative envelopem ay a ect inertial modes. The upper-turning point (z=R $1=^2$ when \cos^1 and z=R 1= otherwise) of a su ciently high order inertial mode may fall near or above the convective radiative interface. When this occurs, the structure of the inertial mode is signi cantly modi ed. The radiative region in poses a di erent surface boundary condition on the inertial mode than the one we assume here (vanishing Lagrangian pressure perturbation). This di erent boundary condition, as is illustrated by the toy model in Appendix D, may give rise to m uch di erent (likely larger) tidal overlap and therefore a di erent Q (likely sm aller) factor (see also x4.8).

Extra-solarhot jupiters are strongly irradiated by their host stars. Their atm osphere is more isotherm al leading to a substantially thicker radiative envelope (down 30 km below photosphere) than that in Jupiter. to This envelope may sustain rotationally-modied gravitywaves ('Hough Modes') which may be resonantly (if these waves are trapped) excited by the tidal potential. It is possible that this explains the tidal dissipation in these hot jupiters (Lubow et al. 1997). However, inertialmodes should still exist and will couple to the tidal potential even in these planets. The fact that the Q-values appear to be sim ilar between the exo-jupiters and our Jupiter leads us to suspect that inertialm odes will remain relevant. It is foreseeable, for instance, that these planets harbor a new branch of global modes which are inertial-mode like in the interior and gravity-mode like in the exterior.

4.6. W here is the tidal energy dissipated?

In our picture of resonant inertial-m ode tide, m ost of the tidal dissipation occurs very near the surface, where both the kinem atic viscosity and the velocity shear are the largest. In a realistic Jupiterm odel, the e ective turbulent viscosity peaks at a depth of 60 km (z_{rit}, Fig. A 8 in Appendix A 2), and decays sharply inward. M eanwhile, the displacement caused by inertial-modes rises outward toward the outer turning point. And the velocity shear reaches its maximum inside the 'singularity \cos^1 belt' (Paper I), which is found to be around R = 2. with an angular extent R = and a depth For inertial-modes most relevant for tidal dissipation 60), this depth roughly coincides with the location (of maximum viscosity. We have con med num erically that most of the dissipation indeed occur in this shallow belt.

The tidal luminosity in Jupiter is 7 10^{20} ($10^6=Q$) erg=s. W hat is the e ect of depositing this much energy in a shallow layer? We compare this against intrinsic Jovian ux of F $5000 \, \text{erg} = \, \text{cm}^2 = \, \text{s}.$ The total intrinsic lum inosity passing through the belt 3 $1\theta^2$ erg=s. This is larger than (or is $2 R^2 = F$ at worst comparable to) the tidal lum inosity. Another way of phrasing this is to say that the local therm al tim escale is shorter than (or at worst comparable to) the ratio between local therm all energy and the tidal ux. So the belt is expected to be able to get rid of the tidal energy without su ering signi cant m odi cation to its structure.

A ngular momentum is also deposited locally. We assume here that the convection zone is able to di use the excess angular momentum almost instantaneously toward the rest of the planet. However, if convective transport is highly anisotropic and prohibits di usion, it is possible that this (negative) angular momentum is shored up near the surface and contributes to surface m eteorology of Jupiter.

The transiting planet HD 209458b is observed to have a radius of $1.3R_J$ (B rown et al. 2001). Its proximity to its host star and its currently near-circular orbit raise the possibility that its over-size is a result of (past or current) tidal dissipation (G u et al. 2003). However, if our theory applies also to these hot jupiters, we would expect that the tidal heat is deposited so close to the planet surface that it can not be responsible for in ating the planet.¹⁰ M oreover, given the short local therm al tim escale, any change to the planet structure should disappear once tidal dissipation ceases.

4.7. Tidal Amplitude and Nonlinearity

If inertial-m odes are resonantly excited to large am plitudes, they can transfer energy to other inertial-m odes in the planet and be dissipated by nonlinearm ode coupling. To see whether this is in portant, we consider the am plitude of inertial-m odes. This is largest near the surface around the 'singularity belt'. When an inertial-m ode is resonantly excited (j ! j), we obtain a horizontal surface displacement h 10^{11} (=7:59) ⁷ cm. While this im plies extreme am plitudes for low-order m odes, they only come into resonance rarely. For m odes of interest (60), the typical surface displacem ent am plitude is 10^3 cm,¹¹ so the dimensionless am plitude (= R_J) is 10⁷. Can such an am plitude incur strong nonlinear damping?

At such sm all am plitudes, nonlinear e ects can be well described by three-mode couplings. The e ciency of this process scales with the am plitudes of the modes concerned. The most important nonlinear coupling is parametric resonance: when the inertial-mode reaches a threshold am plitude, pairs of daughter inertial-modes, at half the frequency and with m = 1, can be parametrically excited and can grow to signi cant am plitudes. Nonlinear mode coupling then drains energy quickly out of the originalmode. The threshold dimensionless am plitude is (Landau & Lifshitz 1969; W u & Goldreich 2001)

$$\frac{1}{R_{\rm J}}_{\rm para} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{1} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{1} ; \quad (36)$$

where is the coupling coe cient between the parent and the daughter pair, $_2$ the damping rate for the daughter modes, and ! the frequency detuning for this resonance. A mas et al. (2003) has studied the coupling coe cient for inertial-modes in a uniform density sphere and found $n_l = {}^2$: the maximum coupling coe cient obtains for daughter pairs that are spatially sim ilar and maxim ally overlap.¹² We adopt their result here. We further take ! = 0 and $_2 = {}_1$ 10⁷ to obtain the lowest possible threshold amplitude. For inertial-modes of interest, $=R_J j_{para}$ 10³. So param etric damping of the tidally forced inertial-modes is un-important.

Another three-mode coupling of consequence is between the inertial-mode, itself and a mode at twice the frequency (up-conversion). However, in the case of Jupiter, twice the tidal frequency falls outside the inertial-mode range.

Unconsidered here is another form of param etric resonance: simultaneous excitation of two inertialm odes by the tidal potential, with frequencies of the two modes summing up to the tidal frequency. We nd this to be also negligible for Jupiter-To system, but likely im portant for exo-jupiters.

4.8. Comparison with Ogilvie & Lin (2004)

The most relevant work to compare our results against is that of OL, which is an independent study that appeared while we were revising our paper. In their work, the same physical picture as that discussed here was considered, namely, tidal dissipation in a rotating planet. They employed a spectral method to solve the 2-D partial di erential equations which describe uid motion forced by the tidal potential inside a viscous, anelastic, neutrally buoyant, polytropic uid. This procedure directly yields the value of the tidal torque on the planet, without the need of a norm alm ode analysis. The num erical approach allows them to include the e ect of a solid core, as well as that of a radiative envelope. O verall, they concluded

 $^{^{10}~\}rm{It}$ is di cult to imagine how entropy deposited near the surface can be advected inward to raise the entropy level of the entire planet.

 $^{^{11}}$ In contrast, the displacement amplitude of the equilibrium tide is much larger, $_{\rm h}$ $\,$ 60 m. $Q_{\rm equi}$ is large, however, because the equilibrium tide is dissipated very weakly.

¹² In their norm alization, the dimensionless amplitude is unity when mode energy equals the rotational energy of the sphere. This is similar to setting the dimensionless amplitude to be the ratio between displacement and radius at the surface.

that inertial waves can provide an e cient mechanism for tidal dissipation, and that the tidal Q factor is an erratic function of the forcing frequency. W e concur with these m a pr conclusions.

However, many technical di erences exist between the two works. To better understand both works, it is illuminating to discuss som e of these di erences here.

Firstly, as is mentioned in x4.4, while we obtain global inertialmodes which have well de ned WKB properties and discreet frequencies, OL dem onstrated that the tidally-forced response of a planet is concentrated into characteristic rays which are singular lines in the lim it of zero viscosity. W hile viscous dissipation in their case occurs in regions harboring these rays, our inertial-modes are predom inately dissipated very near the surface (the 'singularity belt'). Moreover, although both our Q values exhibit large uctuations as a function of tidal frequency, the origin of the two may be dierent { in our case, a deep valley indicates a good resonance between the tide and a low-order inertial-mode, while the situation is less clear in their case. All these di erences may originate from the presence (absence) of a solid core in their (our) study. We are currently investigating the underlying m athem atical explanation for these di erences. Again, it is interesting to note that as the core size approaches zero, inertialm odes seem to reappear (O gilvie, 2004, private com m unication).

Secondly, OL's results are based on a n = 1 polytrope, for which we nd that tidal coupling is vanishingly sm all (see Appendix C),¹³ and that inertial-m odes are not in portant for tidal dissipation. It is currently unclear whether this di erence arises from the presence of a core or from the presence of a radiative envelope in their study. Despite a steep suppression of the tidal overlap integrand near the center (integrand / r^6), the presence of a solid core may a ect tidal overlap in a more substantial manner by re ecting inertial-waves and changing their mode structure (x4.4). Meanwhile, a surface boundary condition specied at a nite density (instead of at = 0) may cause extra tidal coupling (x4.5), as is shown by the analysis in Appendix C. This issue is more relevant for extra-solar hot jupiters which have deeper radiative envelopes.

Thirdly, OL assumed a constant Ekman number throughout the entire planet. Since

$$E k \quad \frac{1}{!} = \frac{1}{! R^2}; \qquad (37)$$

this in plies a viscosity = $!R^{2}E k = 2 = 10^{6}E k$ that is constant throughout the planet. We have argued that the e ective viscosity value for the equilibrium tide should be of order 10^{4} cm²=s (x2.3.1), or an elective E k 10^{-13} . However, such a weak viscosity is much smaller than is currently reachable by a numerical method in a reasonable amount of time. Instead, O L have opted for an alternative treatment in which they steadily decreased the E km an number from E k = 10^{-4} to 10^{-7} and argued (based both on numerical evidence and on an analytical toy-model) that the nal Q value is independent of the E km an number. This contrasts with our results that Q roughly scales as $_{0}^{-12}$ (x4.2), obtained for realistic viscosity proles, where $_{\rm 0}$ is the dam ping rate for a mode of wavenum ber $_{\rm 0}$.

To make the comparison more appropriate, we adopt a constant viscosity inside the planet and nd that mode dam ping rates = 5 10⁹ (E k=10⁷) (=7:59)^{3:0} s¹ in the Jupiter m odel D , while individual m ode Q $_{\rm res}$ value also scales linearly with the Ekm an number (eq. [26]). Applying scalings derived in x3.2.1, we nd an over- $10 (E k=10^{7})^{1}$. This value is consis-2:3 all Q tent with that obtained by OL for Ek 10⁷. M eanwhile, the equilibrium tide gives rise to Q_{equi} 4 $10^6 (\text{E k}=10^{-7})^{-1}$. So in models of a constant E km an num ber, inertial-m odes contribute com parably to tidal dissipation as does the equilibrium tide, but no better. These results are presented in Fig.6.

5. SUMMARY

In a series of two papers (Paper I & this), we have exam ined the physical picture of tidal dissipation via resonant inertial-modes. This applies to a neutrally-buoyant rotating object in which the tidal frequency in the rotating frame is less than twice the rotation frequency.

In Paper I, we rst demonstrate that under some circum stances (power-law density pro les of the form

 $/(1 \hat{r})$), the partial di erential equations governing inertialm odes can be separated into two ordinary di erential equations with sem i-analytical eigenfunctions. We also show that this method can be extended to apply to m ore general density pro les, with the price that the solution is exact in the surface region but only approxim ate in the W KB regime. Nevertheless, this approximate solution allows us to draw many physical conclusions concerning inertial-modes, including their spatial characteristics, their dispersion relation, their interaction with the tidalpotential and with turbulent convection. This sem ianalytical technique gives us an edge over current com putational capabilities, though full con mation of our conclusions may require careful and high-resolution numerical computation. It is clear from our study that any num erical approach would need to be able to resolve the so-called \singularity belt" near the surface where inertial-modes vary sharply, and that num erical results need to be taken cautiously when evaluating the tidal overlap.

In this paper, we discuss the role in tidal dissipation played by inertialm odes. This depends on the following three parameters: how well coupled an inertial-mode is to the tidal potential, how strongly dissipated an inertialmode is by turbulent viscosity, and how densely distributed in frequency are the inertial-modes. We have obtained all three param eters using both toy models and realistic Jupiter models. Low -order inertial-modes, if in resonance (! < , where ! is the frequency detuning between the tidal frequency and the mode frequency, is the mode dam ping rate), can dissipate tidal 10. However, such energy with Q as small as Q a resonance is not guaranteed at all tidal frequencies, and the system sweeps through a fortuitously good resonance with speed. Inertialm odes most relevant for tidal dissipation are those satisfying $\, ! \,$, where $\, ! \,$ decreases with mode wave-number as $\, ! \, / \, ^2$, and $\,$ rises steeply with mode wave-number. These are inertialm odes with wave-num bers 60 (or total num ber of nodes $n = n_1 + n_2$ 30). At any tidal frequency, one

 $^{^{13}}$ A lthough we only present results for a = 1 power-law model, they apply to a n = 1 polytrope as well since the two behave sim ilarly near the surface and near the core.

can always nd resonance with one such mode. They provide the continuum to the Q value, whereas previously mentioned good resonances appear as dense valleys superposed on this continuum (see, e.g., Fig. 4).

The continuum Q value depends sensitively on the presence of density discontinuities inside Jupiter, as the latter in uences strongly the magnitude of coupling between the tidal potential and inertial-modes. Current Jupiter models show a sharp change in the adiabatic index near the surface (hydrogen ideal-gas to C oulom b gas transition), this warrants a Q value of 10° . The presence of a discontinuity in density gradient due to a phase transition (m etallic hydrogen phase transition and/orhelium /hydrogen separation) has the same e ect. On the other hand, if the phase transition is rst-order in nature and incurs a density jump, Q 10° . Our results are uncertain up to perhaps, one order of m agnitude. But it is already clear that inertial-modes cause much stronger dissipation than the equilibrium tide, which 10^{12} . In the case of Q 10^{\prime} , there is a yields Q_{equi} 10% chance that the current Q value falls between 10^5

and 10^6 (the empirically inferred Q range for Jupiter).

Ourmodel also builds on the assumption that Jupiter is neutrally strati ed and turbulent all the way up to the photosphere, as turbulent dissipation for inertial-modes with 60 are calculated to arise mostly near or below the photospheric scale-height. E ects like water condensation may alter the static stability in Jupiter's atmosphere, making the atm ospheric strati cation a function of space and time.

W e also restrict ourselves to core-less Jupiter m odels. Our conclusion is little a ected when we include an inner core with a size that is compatible with current constraints. However, this is assuming that global inertialmodes still exist in the presence of a solid core. O gilvie (2005) extended the study in O gilvie & Lin (2004) and dem onstrated that a new kind of tidal response appears when Jupiter has a core: uid motion is tightly squeezed into 'characteristic rays' which becomes singular when the viscosity goes to zero. This is a drastically di erent picture than the global eigenm ode picture described here and may lead to dierent Q factors.

We have adopted the Goldreich & Keeley (1977) prescription (s = 2) to account for the reduction in turbulent viscosity when the convective tum-over time is long relative to the forcing period. Calculations adopting Zahn's

Allison, M. & Atkinson, D. H. 2001, Geophys. Res. Lett., 28, 2747

- Arras, P., Flanagan, E. E., Morsink, S. M., Schenk, A. K., Teukolsky, S.A., & W asserm an, I. 2003, ApJ, 591, 1129
- Brown, T.M., Charbonneau, D., Gilliland, R.L., Noyes, R.W., & Burrows, A. 2001, ApJ, 552, 699
- Bryan, G.H. 1889, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London, A 180, 187
- Derm ott, S.F. 1979, Icarus, 37, 310
- Goldreich, P. & Keeley, D. A. 1977, ApJ, 211, 934
- Goldreich, P. & Nicholson, P.D. 1977, Icarus, 30, 301
- Goldreich, P.& Soter, S. 1966, Icarus, 5, 375
- Goodman, J. & Oh, S. P. 1997, ApJ, 486, 403 Gu, P., Lin, D. N. C., & Bodenheimer, P. H. 2003, ApJ, 588, 509
- Guillot, T., Stevenson, D., Hubbard, W., & Saum on, D. 2004, in Jupiter eds. Bagenal et al., in press
- Hut, P. 1981, A & A, 99, 126
- Ioannou, P.J.& Lindzen, R.S. 1993, ApJ, 406, 266
- Landau, L. D. & Lifshitz, E. M. 1969, Mechanics (Course of Theoretical Physics, Oxford: Pergam on Press, 1969, 2nd ed.) Lubow, S.H., Tout, C.A., & Livio, M. 1997, ApJ, 484, 866

prescription (s = 1) produce no di erence in the Q value caused by inertial-modes, though we nd the equilibrium tide is signi cantly more strongly dam ped. Concerning possible e ects of nonlinearity: The surface movem ent of inertialm odes is predom inately horizontal. For inertialmodes that are most relevant for tidal dissipation, the surface displacem ent am plitude 10° cm, or 10 ' of the radius. W e estim ate that nonlinear e ects are negligible.

In our theory, tidal heat is deposited extrem ely close to the planet surface (inside the 'singularity belt') and can be lost quickly to the outside. For Jupiter, the tidal lum inosity in this region is smaller than (or at worst com parable to) the intrinsic lum inosity and so would not much alter the structure. However, there remains the intriguing possibility that the negative angular momentum deposited to the belt may a ect surface meteorology (jet stream s and anticyclones). M oreover, if this theory also applies to hot exo-jupiters, the tidal lum inosity is unlikely to be responsible for in a ting planets and solving the size-problem of close-in exo-jupiter HD 209458b.

A lthough our investigation was stimulated by the fact that exo-solar planets exhibit sim ilar Q values as Jupiter does, it may be dicult to draw a close analogy between Jupiter and hot exo-jupiters: the existence of a rstorder phase transition is less convincing in the latter due to their hotter interiors; the upper atm osphere of these planets are strongly irradiated by their host stars and are therefore likely to be radiative; they m ay have rather di erent core sizes depending on their form ation history. Nevertheless, it is our plan to extend the current study to exo-jupiters, as investigations into these bodies may ultimately yield clue for the story of Jupiter. It is also foreseeable that the theory developed here has in plications for Satum, Uranus, solar-type binaries, M -dwarfs and brow n-dw arfs.

PhilArras has contributed to the early stages of this work. I thank him for an enjoyable collaboration. I also acknow ledge stim ulating conversations with G ordon O gilvie and D oug L in, and thank T ristan G uillot form aking his Jupiterm odels publicly available. Lastly, this article bene ted greatly from the insightful comments by the referee, D avid Stevenson.

REFERENCES

- M athieu, R.D., M eibom, S., & Dolan, C.J. 2004, ApJ, 602, L121 Murray, C.D.& Dermott, S.F. 1999, Solar system dynamics (Solar
- system dynamics by Murray, C.D., 1999)
- Ogilvie, G. I. 2005, astro-ph/0506450, J. F luid M ech
- Ogilvie, G. I. & Lin, D. N. C. 2004, ApJ, 610, 477
- Papaloizou, J.C.B. & Savonije, G.J. 1997, MNRAS, 291, 651
- Peale, S. J. & Greenberg, R. J. 1980, in Lunar and Planetary Institute Conference Abstracts, 871 (873
- Ross, M., Ree, F.H., & Young, D.A. 1983, J. Chem. Physics, 79, 1487
- Salpeter, E.E. 1973, ApJ, 181, L83+
- Saum on, D., Chabrier, G., & van Horn, H.M. 1995, ApJS, 99, 713 Savonije, G.J., Papaloizou, J.C.B., & Alberts, F.1995, MNRAS,
- 277,471
- Stevenson, D. J. 1978, in Origin of the Solar System, 395 (431
- Stevenson, D. J. 1982, Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences, 10, 257
- . 1983, J. Geophys. Res., 88, 2445



Fig. 1. Numerically computed turbulent damping rates for inertial-modes in various power-law models, as a function of the mode wavenumber . Here, we have taken the reduction number s = 2 and included damping rates only for modes with $n_1 \quad n_2$, though other modes satisfy the same scalings observed here. Models a & b are single power-law models, while c & d are double power-law models ($_1$ the index in the interior and $_2$ that in the envelope) with the transition of occurring around $r=R \quad 0.98$. All models are normalized to have the same central density and their viscosity pro les are described by equations (A 2)-(A 3). The dotted lines are power-law to the numerical results with the numerical scalings sum marized in the top-left corner. These are well reproduced by our analytically derived relation / $^{3:5+2}_{2}$ (eq. [19]). Notice that only the envelope power-law index enters the relation. D amping rates in all models atten at large , and scale with roughly as 3 (eq. [20]).

- Terquem, C., Papaloizou, J.C.B., Nelson, R.P., & Lin, D.N.C. 1998, ApJ, 502, 788
- W u,Y.2003, in A SP C onf.Ser.294:Scienti c Frontiers in Research on Extrasolar P lanets, 213{216
- Wu,Y.2004, ApJ, submitted (Paper I)

W u, Y . & Goldreich, P.2001, ApJ, 546, 469 W u, Y . & M urray, N.2003, ApJ, 589, 605 Zahn, J.-P.1977, A & A, 57, 383



Fig. 2.| Tidal coupling, viscous damping rate and resonant Q res factor for various inertial-modes calculated using two Jupiter models. Model B (open circles) has no heavy metal core and no rst-order metallic hydrogen phase transition, while model D (solid triangles) has a core as well as a density jump at r=R 0.8 due to the plasm a phase transition. The upper-left panel presents the (norm alized) coupling integral C_n (eq. [10]) as a function of inertial-mode node numbers ($n = n_1 + n_2$). A linearly the scatter is large, model B results are best t by C_n 1=n³ (solid line), while model D results follow C_n 1=2n² (dotted line). The low er-left panel shows the energy damping rate as a function of mode wavenumber (2n). Results from both models scale as ^{7:1} for low-order modes and as ³ for high-order modes (two solid lines), consistent with analytical expectations (x2.3.2). The dotted line in the same panel is the minimum frequency detuning as a function of (eq. [4]). Q res, the Q value contributed by each models B & D are depicted by the solid and dotted lines, respectively. While low-order modes (< 40) from the two models largely share sim ilar Q res values, higher order modes follow more closely the analytical scalings. Here, we have included only inertial-modes with 0:776 but the results rem ain sim ilar for other inertial-modes.



Fig. 3. Numerically calculated values of Q for model B. The upper panel shows Q as a function of the tidal frequency in the rotating frame. Deep dips occur whenever the tide is in resonance with a low-order inertial-mode (60), and the ceiling to the Q value is determined by the group of modes with 60 which satisfy 2j ! j. The tide is always in resonance with one of these modes at any frequency. The lower left panel shows the cum ulative probability distribution of the Q value within the frequency range 0.7 < 0.8. At a given frequency there is 3 percent chance that we will nd Q < 16. The probability for this to occur at a given instant in time is smaller. The dashed vertical curve locates the time -weighted average Q value (Q, eq. [34]). We ndQ = 1.4 10 within this frequency range. The lower right panel expands the view of the upper panel over this frequency range. The locations of the nestructure in this plot are not to be taken literally as we have adopted an approxim ate dispersion relation for the inertial-modes.



Fig. 4. Same as Fig. 3, but for model D in which the tidal coupling decreases as $1=2n^2$ as opposed to $1=n^3$. This is related to the presence of a rst-order phase transition at r=R 0.8. While showing overall similar characteristics as those in Fig. 3, Q has now been reduced to 5.8 10 between = 0.7 and 0.8, and at any given tidal frequency, there is a 10% chance that Jupiter exhibits $Q < 10^6$.



Fig. 5. Same as Fig. 4, but calculated form odel D when the index for viscosity reduction is taken to be s = 1 (Zahn 1977) instead of s = 2. Mode damping rates now behave as $= 10^{-10}$ (=7:59)^{4:5} s⁻¹. We obtain Q = 2 10⁰, with 30% chance that Q < 10⁶ for the current tidal frequency. Moreover, Q_{equi} = 10⁹ in this case.



Fig. 6. | We repeat our calculation for m odel D, taking the turbulent viscosity to be a constant throughout the planet with the E km an num ber $E k = -! R^2 = 10^{-7}$. Mode damping rates scale much less steeply with inertial mode wave-numbers, $= 5 - 10^{-9} (-7.59)^{3:0} s^{-1}$. The resulting Q value from inertial modes is plotted against in the upper panel, with Q 2:3 16 over the range 2 [0:7;0:8]. A similar calculation for model B yields Q 3:5 16. We nd that the Q value is inversely proportional to the E km an number. The low er panel translates the Q result into a quantity used in Fig. A 2 of O L (the dimensionless viscous dissipation rate, / 1=Q), plotted here as a function of 2 = ! = . The two overlaid lines with $Q = 10^5$ (dotted) and $Q = 4 - 10^6$ (dot-dashed), respectively represent the empirically inferred Q value for Jupiter and the Q value associated with the equilibrium tide in this model. These results resemble those presented in Fig. A 2 of O L for the same E km an number.

APPENDIX

RELEVANT PROPERTIES IN A JUPITER MODEL

Here, we study properties of Jupiter that are relevant for the tidal process. This is based on publicly available models of Jupiter presented in Guillot et al. (2004). They are produced with the new est equation of state and opacity calculations, including the e ect of hydrogen phase transition, and alkalim etal opacity. They satisfy gravity measurements (esp. $J_2 \& J_4$) to much better than a percent and reproduce other global properties of Jupiter (radius, surface temperature, intrinsic ux).

In this study, we focus on two models, B and D, out of the ve sample models presented in Guillot et al. (2004). Model B is produced with an interpolated hydrogen equation of state (meaning no rst-order metallic hydrogen phase transition), and has no heavy metal core. Model D, in contrast, contains a rst-order phase transition (PPT equation of state) and has a core with mass 10M. The photosphere for both these models is located at a radius of $7 \quad 10^{\circ}$ cm, at a pressure of 10° dyne= cm², and with a temperature 170 K and a density 1:6 10^{-4} g= cm³.

The interiors of these models are fully convective (outside the core). Due to the high density in Jupiter (mean density $1:3 \text{ g}=\text{cm}^3$), the convection speed needed to carry the small intrinsic ux (5:4 $10^3 \text{ erg}=\text{s}=\text{cm}^2$) is highly subsonic, resulting in an almost exactly adiabatic temperature prole (super-adiabatic gradient 10^8 or smaller). This justiles our assumption of neutrally buoyant uid when investigating inertial-modes. Only the thin atmosphere above the photosphere, with a local pressure scale height 20 km, is radiative.

Density Pro le

Two features in the density pro le of these models deserve attention.

At radius r=R 0.8, pressure $1\dot{0}^2$ dyne= cm², and density $1g=cm^3$, hydrogen undergoes a phase transition. Above this layer, hydrogen is mostly neutral and molecular. Below this layer, the mean atom ic spacing becomes smaller than a Bohr radius and electrons are pressure ionized. The strong C oulom b interaction and electron degeneracy resemble those in a metal and the transition is referred to as 'liquid metallic hydrogen' transition (G uillot et al. 2004). The nature of this transition is still poorly understood. M odelB assumes this transition is of second-order and entails a discontinuity only in the gradient of density (of order 50%), while modelD assumes it is a rst-order transition with a density jump of order 10%. These two di erent treatments should bracket the actual equation of state of hydrogen.

A nother feature sets in nearer the surface, at radius r=R 0.98, pressure $1\dot{0}^0$ dyne= cm² and density 0.1 g= cm³. Above this region, the gas can be considered as ideal diatom ic gas (H₂). As the tem perature is below 2000 K, the mean degree of freedom for each molecule is 5 (three translational plus two rotational).¹⁴ The speci c heat per molecule at constant volume and constant pressure are, respectively, $C_V = 5=2k_B$, $C_p = 7=2k_B$, yielding $_1 = 0$ ln P=0 ln $\frac{1}{2} = C_p=C_V = 1.4$. Below this region, how ever, $_1$ rises to 1.8 2.2 in the main body of the planet, and approaches 3 in the very deep interior (Stevenson 1978, 1982).

This results in di erent density pro les above and below this region. Recallour de nition of : $/ [1 (r=R)^2]$. The Jupiter models show that 1:8 (corresponding to 1 1:4) above this layer, while 1 (corresponding to 1 2) in the interior. We also observe that this transition of occurs over a fairly narrow region of radial extent r 0:02R, or 4 local pressure scale height. As is discussed in x222, this transition is of signi cance to our tidal coupling scenario.

But what is the cause behind the rise of $_1$ near p 10^{10} dyne= cm²? The ionization fraction of electron is too low (10^{6}) in this region to make a di erence by degeneracy pressure; hydrogen is bound into H₂ and only starts to be dissociated near p 10^{12} dyne= cm². The true cause, it turns out, is the non-ideal behavior of molecules, a little-talked about e ect. At a density of 0:1 g= cm³, the mean molecular spacing is 2A.W hile the interaction potential between H₂ and H₂ molecules is mildly attractive at spacing > 3 A (the van der W aals force), it rises exponentially inward. By the time the spacing decreases to below 2A, this potential is more positive than k_B T and the gas pressure is no longer dom inated by thermal pressure, but is dom inated by the repulsive interaction between molecules. This is illustrated in Fig. A 7. A s density rises, molecules increasingly resemble hard spheres, leading to a steeper dependence of pressure on density, or $_1$ 2 (1). This non-ideal e ect loses out at p 10^{12} dyne= cm² above which H₂ molecules are dissociated and electrons are pressure ionized (the metallic hydrogen phase). s

Turbulent V iscosity Pro le

Inside Jupiter, molecular viscosity is too weak to cause any discernible dissipation on the inertial-modes. We turn to turbulent viscosity.

The kinematic shear viscosity is estimated from the mixing length theory as (Goldreich & Keeley 1977; Zahn 1977; Terquem et al. 1998)

$$T = V_{cv} '_{cv} \frac{1}{1 + (!_{cv} = 2)^{s}};$$
 (A1)

where v_{cv} , v_{cv} and v_{cv} are characteristic convection velocity, scale length and turn-over time. The exponent s describes the reduction in e ciency when convection is slow compared to the tidal period (! v_{cv} 1). Its value is still under

 $^{^{14}}$ This number is smaller near the photosphere when the tem perature cools toward the rotational tem perature of H $_2$ (85K). Not all rotational levels are populated (Saum on et al. 1995).



Fig. A 7. The e ect of H_2 - H_2 interaction on gas pressure. The upper panel shows pressure as a function of mean molecular separation (in A), with low er density to the right. The solid line is the actual Jupiter proceeding in a model from Guillot et al. (2004). The dotted line represents the ideal gas contribution (them all pressure) { it falls short of explaining the total pressure above a pressure proceeding of 10^{10} dyne= cm². The dashed curve shows the contribution from electron degeneracy which only becomes in portant for proceeding 10^{10} dyne= cm². For the inbetween region, another pressure contribution has to kick in. The low erplot examines what this extra contribution is. Here, gas tem perature inside Jupiter is plotted as a function of the mean separation (solid curve), while the dashed curve depicts the interparticle potential in unit of K elvin (the YR potential from Ross et al. 1983). Molecular interaction is repulsive for a separation below 3A and the interaction energy become scom parable to the therm all energy at a separation 2A. This contributes to the gas pressure. As density rises, the increasingly repulsive interaction dom inates the gas pressure and causes the pressure to rise with density m ore steeply than that of an ideal gas.

debate, but simple physical arguments (G oldreich & N icholson 1977; G oodman & O h 1997) have suggested that s = 2, while Zahn (1977) advocated for a less severe reduction with s = 1. We adopt s = 2 in our main study but discuss the scenario when s = 1. Some previous studies have adopted a form without 2 in the above expression. The viscosity is electively smaller but we will show that this does not a less not a less reductive main study.

In mixing length theory, v_{cv} (ux=)¹⁼³, $_{cv}$ $_{cv}=v_{cv}$, and $_{cv}$ H z=, where H is the density scale height, z is the physical depth (z = R r), and appears in the density power-law as = [1 (r=R²)] / z for z R.Let the depth at which ! $_{cv}=2$ 1 be z_{crit} . Above z_{crit} , T depends on z weakly,

$$_{\rm T}$$
 / z^1 =³; (A2)

while below this layer, the turbulent viscosity is signi cantly reduced and $_{T}$ decreases sharply inward as

$$_{\rm T}$$
 / $\rm z^{-1}$; (A.3)

when s = 2 and

Ζ

$$r / z^{2} = 3;$$
 (A4)

when s = 1. These approximate scalings are shown in Fig. A 8 for Jupiter models B & D. They compare well with numerical results.

TIDAL OVERLAP IN A CONSTANT DENSITY SPHERE

In a constant density sphere, m = 2 inertial modes are expressed in the following form (Paper I)

$${}^{0} = \frac{!^{2} {}^{2}}{{}_{1}p} = AR^{2} \frac{!^{2} {}^{2}}{{}_{1}p} P, {}^{2}(x_{1})P, {}^{2}(x_{2});$$
(B1)

where A 1 stands for the dimensionless amplitude of , and R is the radius of Jupiter. This density perturbation is related to the equilibrium tide value $0 \\ equi}$ as

$$\frac{0}{0}_{\text{equi}} = \frac{2}{3} \frac{!^2}{!^2} \frac{M_J}{M_{IO}} A (1 - {}^2)g_1(x_1)g_2(x_2); \tag{B2}$$

where Io's orbital frequency $!_{Io} = (G M_J = a^3)^{1=2}$, M_J and M_{Io} are the masses of Jupiter and Io, and the dimensionless frequency = !=2 = 0.766. The function $g_i(x_i) = P_i^m(x_i) = (1 - x_i^2)$ (introduced in Paper I).

Pressure in a constant density (= $_0$ = const), self-gravitating sphere is given by p = $p_0 [1 (r=R)^2]$ where $p_0 = 2 = 3 G R^2 \frac{2}{0} = 3 = (8) G M^2 = R^4$ with M being the totalm ass. Since $[1 (r=R)^2] = (x_1^2 \frac{2}{2})(2 \frac{x_2^2}{2}) = (1 \frac{2}{2}) = 2^2$, and volume elements in Cartesian coordinates and ellipsoidal coordinates are related to each other as dxdydz = $(x_1^2 \frac{x_2^2}{2}) = (1 \frac{2}{2}) = dx_1 dx_2 d$, we obtain the following tidal overlap,

tide
$${}^{0}d^{3}r = \frac{9}{4} \frac{!^{2}R^{5}M_{IO}}{_{1}a^{3}}A$$
 $\frac{Z}{(1-2)} \frac{(1-x_{1}^{2})(1-x_{2}^{2})(x_{1}^{2}-x_{2}^{2})}{(x_{1}^{2}-2)(2-x_{2}^{2})}P_{,2}(x_{1})P_{,2}(x_{1})P_{,2}(x_{2})dx_{1}dx_{2}$ (B3)

The spatial integration can be symbolically performed by M athem atica (best done after conversion to spherical coordinates) and it yields $0.4(1^{2}) = where^{2} = `(`+1) jn j(jn j+1)$. So the overlap is

tide
$${}^{0}d^{3}r = 0.4 \frac{9!^{2}R^{5}M_{Io}}{4^{-1}a^{3}}A \frac{(1 - 2)}{1}$$
: (B4)

However, the constant density case is pathological: the value of $_1$ form ally approaches in nity for incom pressible uid. Inertial-modes could not cause any density uctuation (eq. [B1]) and the tidal overlap is form ally zero.¹⁵

If we take p = constant over the entire sphere (so 1 is a nite constant), only two motion have non-zero overlap with the tidal potential: the equilibrium tide and the two low est order even-parity inertial-modes with '= 4. This fact has been pointed out in Papaloizou & Savonije (1997) when they considered the convective core of early-type stars.

TIDAL OVERLAP IN A SINGLE POWER-LAW MODEL

A re inertial-m odes in power-law m odels coupled to the tidal potential?

7.

In paper I, we show that one can obtain exact solutions for inertial-m odes when the density probe is a single power-law / $[1 (r=R^2)]$. This allows us to show that inertial-m odes in single power-law m odels do not couple appreciably to the tidal potential, except for the two lowest order even-parity m odes (corresponding to the '= 4 m odes in the constant density case).¹⁶ M oreover, the coupling strength falls o with increasing m ode order as a power-law with the index related to the polytrope index.

 $^{^{15}}$ The equilibrium tide, on the other hand, has nite tidal overlap. It is equivalent to an inertial-m ode with '= 2 so its spatial overlap diverges near the surface as p approaches 0, counteracting the form ally in nite 1.

 $^{^{16}}$ If we adopt conventional polytrope m odels with p / $^{1+1=}$, we can obtain approxim ate solution for the inertial-m odes (P aper I). We nd that they give essentially the same tidal overlap results as single power-law m odels of the same .



Fig. A 8. The elective turbulent viscosity $_{\rm T}$ is plotted here as ne dots against depth (z) for the Jupiter model, when various s values are adopted. The dashed curve (s = 0) is the un-reduced turbulent viscosity (corresponding to s = 0). The reduced viscosity (dotted curves) deviate from this curve below a depth $z_{\rm crit}$ 10^{2:8} R 10⁷ cm at which ! $_{\rm cv}$ =2 1. Above $z_{\rm crit}$, the viscosity is well described by line A: $_{\rm T}$ 2 16⁰ (z=R)¹ = ³ / z^{0:4} (with = 1:8 in the model). Below this depth, reduction is in portant and $_{\rm T}$ 4 (z=R)¹ / z^{2:8} for s = 2 (straight line B) and $_{\rm T}$ 3 16 (z=R)² = ³ / z^{1:2} for s = 1. Deeper down (z > 10⁸ cm), as value is varied from 1:8 to 1, $_{\rm T}$ takes on a di erent scaling with depth. How ever, this is irrelevant as turbulent dissipation from the deep interior is insigni cant.

24

The angular dependence of each even-parity, m = 2 inertial mode can be decomposed into

7.

$$= {}_{1}(\mathbf{x}_{1}) {}_{2}(\mathbf{x}_{2}) = {}^{X^{1}} P, {}^{2}()C, (\mathbf{r}); \qquad (C1)$$

where

$$C_{x}(r) = \frac{1}{2} (x_{1}) \frac{1}{2} (x_{2}) P_{x}^{2} (1) \sin d$$
 (C2)

is non-zero for $\prime = 2. C_{\prime}(r)$ is an oscillating function of the radius r. We nd num erically that $C_{2}(r) / r^{2}$ near the center, while near the surface C_2 (r) approaches a constant for > 1, and / [1 (r=R)] (r=R) for 0 < < 1. The tidal overlap integral is reduced to the follow ing radial integral,

$$Z_{\text{tide}} \frac{!^{2}}{!^{2}} d^{3}r = \frac{r}{\frac{32}{15}} \frac{3G M_{\text{Io}}}{2a^{3}}!^{2} \int_{0}^{R} D_{2}(r) dr = \frac{r}{\frac{32}{15}} \frac{3G M_{\text{Io}}}{2a^{3}}!^{2} \int_{0}^{R} C_{2}(r) \frac{2}{!^{2}} r^{4} dr; \quad (C3)$$

where we have introduced the integrand D₂ (r) = $r^4 C_r$ (r) 2 = $_1p$. It is also an oscillating function of r with an envelope that scales as r^6 near the center, and scales near the surface as $[1 (r=R)]^{1}$ for 1, and as $[1 (r=R)]^{2=(+1)}$ for 0 < < 1. So this integral diverges near the surface if $< \frac{1}{2}$ 1.

We nd that the integral decreases with increasing mode order in a power-law fashion with the index depending on . In the following, we explain the observed fall-o with a simple toy-model.

W e approxim ate D₂ (r) as a product of a rapidly oscillating function and a slow ly varying envelope. A rather accurate form turns out to be

$$D_{2}(r)dr = cos(n)f()d;$$
 (C4)

where the new variable = $\cos^{1} r=R$, n is an integer and is the number of radial nodes in D₂ (r). We nd n = $n_{1} + n_{2}$ for the inertial modes. The smooth function f() has a leading term of $(=2)^6$ near the center (=2) and a leading term of 2^{1} near the surface (0).¹⁷. For the moment we assume 2 is an integer, and that terms of order 2 and higher also exist near the surface. Interacting by part worldg

So the value of this integral depends only on behavior of the function f() at the two boundaries. W hen n is an even integer, only odd-order derivatives enter the above expression and we obtain the following results for the tidal integral, 7

where $f^{(2 1)}(0) = d^2 f^2 = d^2 j_{=0}$ and so on. When 2 is odd, the above scaling depends on the fact that near the surface, term s scaled as 2 and higher also exist. If they do not (as in the left panel of Fig. C 9), 1=n⁸ scaling prevails.

W hen n is an odd integer, slightly di erent scalings apply:

We have con med these scalings num erically with a range of expressions for f(). The result only depend on the boundary behavior of f () as long as it is su ciently sm ooth. 18 This explains why models with di erent polytrope representations (/ [l (r=R)] or p / $^{1+1=}$) give rise to essentially the same overlap integrals. Moreover, when is a fractional num ber (other than an integer or a half-integer), we nd num erically that $^{R_{R}}_{0}$ D₂(r)dr / 1=n² for

2 7, sim ilar to the above expressions.

¹⁷ Here, we focus only on models with > 1

 $^{^{18}}$ In Appendix D , we discuss what the meaning of 'su $% 10^{-10}$ ciently sm ooth 'is.



Fig. C9. Severity of cancellation in the overlap integral as a function of mode nodal number (n where n is even) in three single power-law models (solid triangles for = 1.0 solid circles for 1.5 and open circles for 1.8). The left-hand panel is the toy model result where we have taken the envelope of the cosine function (eq. [C4]) to be $f() = f = r^{6/2}$ -pdr=d where = $\cos^{-1} r$ =R. This allows the toy model tidal integrand to have the correct asymptotic behavior as the realistic tidal integrand both near the center and near the surface. The severity of cancellation is measured here by $f \cos(n) d = f j \cos(n) j d$ and it scales as (solid lines) n⁻², n⁻⁸ and n^{-3:6}, respectively, for the three models, consistent with results in equation (C6). The right panel is the severity of cancellation C_n (eq. [10]) calculated for inertial-modes in the same three models. A gain, the three straight lines are the analytically expected scalings, n⁻³, n⁻⁵ and n^{-4:6}, respectively, for the three models. The extra power of n compared to those for the toy model arises from cancellation in the angular direction, except for the = 1:5 model, which does not fallo as n⁻⁹ due to the presence of ⁻³ term near the surface. Results in the scaling but returns to it at large n and the = 1:5 model falls o more steeply than the = 1:8 m odel, as is expected.

Recall that the angular integration to yield C_2 (r) already involves a cancellation of order 1=n.¹⁹ M oreover, evenparity modes in plies $n = n_1 + n_2$ to be an even number. So for the following three power-law models, = 1.0, = 1.5and = 1.8, we expect that the overall tidal overlap falls o with n as n⁻³, n⁻⁵ and n^{-4:6}, respectively. These analytical expectations are plotted in Fig. C 9 along with numerical results. The agreement is reasonable, both when integrating using the toy model (f () cos(n)) and when integrating using realistic inertial-mode eigenfunctions.

In obtaining results like those presented in Fig. C 9, one needs to be extrem ely careful with num erical precision. Round-o errors in the num erically produced power-law models as well as in the inertial-mode eigenfunctions may occult the ne cancellation and lead to articially large coupling.

TIDAL OVERLAP IN OTHER MODELS

The derivation leading to equation (C 5) assumes that the integrand f () is su ciently smooth. W hat is 'su ciently smooth' and in what situation does this assumption break down? It turns out that the break-down occurs for realistic planet m odels and that the tidal overlap is much larger than what one obtains for single power-law m odels.

The sm oothness assumption is violated if f() has a discreet jump inside the planet. Such a discontinuity is caused by the density discontinuity associated with a rst-order phase transition region (e.g., gas-to-m etallic hydrogen phase transition region at r=R 0.30). Let the jump be f at = $_0$. It contributes a term, f sin (n $_0$)=n f=n, to the tidal overlap. Even if f is sm all, this term m ay dom inate for high order m odes. Sim ilar reasoning applies if f() exhibits a discontinuity at a higher order derivative, for instance, if the above mentioned phase transition is of second order in nature so that a discontinuity in the gradient of density exists. In this case, the contribution to the overlap integral is of order f⁰=n².

The sm oothness assumption can also be violated if f() is in nitely continuous yet it (or one of its derivatives) has a sharp transition over a small region, namely, if this transition occurs over a width of which encompasses only one node or less (n n = =2 1). This can be caused by, e.g., a relatively sharp power-law index change inside the planet. As is discussed in xA, gas pressure inside Jupiter changes its nature from that of an ideal gas to that of strongly interacting m olecules around r=R 0:98. Here we observe a variation in the polytropic index over one pressure scale height, or over a thickness of r=R 0:002. W ithin this narrow region, $f^{\circ}()$ varies rapidly for an

amount $f^{(2)}$, and $f^{(2)}$ () has a peak value of $f^{(2)} = .$ The overlap integral

$$\sum_{0}^{Z} = 2 \cos(n) f() d = \frac{\sin(n) f()}{n} = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\cos(n) f^{0}()}{n^{2}} = 2 \frac{1}{n^{2}} + \frac{1}{n^{2}} \cos(n) f^{0}() d; \quad (D1)$$

can be dominated by the last term and yields $f'=n^2$ if n n r=R n = =2 1, or n 1=0.002 500. For n 500, f() can be considered as su ciently sm ooth and the analysis in Appendix C applies.

We numerically con m these conclusions by integrating $f()\cos(n)$ using a range of density proles. Here, we take $f() = r^{6^{D}} \frac{1}{surf} = 2 = pdr = d$, where surf is $[1 (r=R)^{2}]$ with the value taken at the surface. This f() has the same asymptotic behavior as $D_{2}(r)$ near both boundaries.

We show that when a density discontinuity is superimposed to a single power-law model (dotted curves in Fig. D 10), the overlap integral indeed scales as 1=n. A lso, if the model has a sharp (but continuous) transition in the value of over a radius of r (dashed and solid curves in Fig. D 10), the integral scales as $1=n^2$ for n r=R, while for higher n values, it behaves as is predicted by equation (C 7). We have also studied integration results for two realistic Jupiter models taken from G uillot et al. (2004) (models B & D). Model D has a rst-order phase transition (dotted curve in Fig. D 11) and so its overlap integral scales as 1=n; while the same phase transition is considered to be second-order in model D, and the resulting discontinuity in density gradient (as well as the equation of state transition at r=R 0.98, see Appendix A.1) causes the integral to scale as $1=n^2$.

W hen the density pro le is not a single power-law (as is the case in this section), we could not solve for inertial-m ode eigenfunctions exactly. We could only obtain an approxim ate solution that is good to the second order in wavenum ber $(0 \ (^2), \sec P \operatorname{aper I})$. It is reasonable to suspect that the overlap results obtained by integrating such an approxim ate solution deviate from the true one. A de nite answer to this suspicion will likely be provided by fullnum erical solution. How ever, we argue below that the deviation should be unim portant.

The result of integrating a fast oscillation function, as is shown in this section and Appendix C, depends only on the boundary behavior and interior discontinuities in the envelope of such a function. It does not depend on the exact shape of the function in the interior. O ur approxim ate solution to the inertial modes is exact near the surface, and is su ciently accurate near the center (where the W KB approximation works well). Moreover, when a density discontinuity (or discontinuity in density derivatives) is present inside the W KB region, as inertial modes are insensitive to density structure, the solution is not expected to deviate qualitatively from the approximate solution that does not take this into account.

In con m ing the scalings derived in this section, we have only integrated the toy-m odel (f (cosn), instead of integrating inertial-m ode eigen-functions (in F ig. C 9 we integrate both). One can similarly argue that integrating an appropriately chosen f () is equivalent of integrating the real function. In fact, our toy m odel should produce results both qualitatively and quantitatively similar to that obtained using the actual eigenfunctions, one can alm ost m ake do w ithout detailed know ledge of the latteres such a density discontinuity.

Lastly, independent of the radial pro le, integration in the angular direction always introduces a factor of 1=n cancellation.



Fig. D10. The severity of cancellation in the overlap integral calculated using the toy model for three di erent density pro les are shown in the lower panelas a function of n (n even), while the top two panels show the corresponding f () (left) and df=d (right) as functions of 1 r=R = 1 cos . We take f (), the envelope of the cosine function to be f () = $\frac{f}{2} = p(_{surf} =)^{1=2} dr=d$ while the various density pro les are: a = 1.8 power-law model, overlaid with a 1% density jump at r=R = 0.8 (dots, exhibiting a -function in df=d); a mock Jupiter model where the power-law index varies from 1 in the interior to 1% in the envelope, with the transition occurring at r=R = 0.98 (solid lines, having a jump in df=d) and spanning a range of r=R 0.902 (FW HM of the spike in d² f=d²); a sim ilar model but with the transition occurring over a range of r 0.02 (dashed curves, the one with sm ooth df=d). A nalytically, we expect scalings of 1=n, 1=n² switching to 1=n^{3:6} when n > 500, and 1=n² switching to 1=n^{3:6} when n > 50, for the three models, respectively. These scalings are marked here as the three dot-dashed lines.



Fig. D11. Same as Fig. D10 but with the density pro le taken from two realistic Jupiter models: models B & D as in Guillot et al. (2004). M odel B (solid curves) is based on an interpolated equation of state with no core and no density discontinuity across the m etallic hydrogen phase transition region at r=R0:8 { but the st derivative of density is discontinuous there (df=d jumps by 50%).0 verlap integral in model B is expected to su er a cancellation with a 1=n² scaling (lower panel). The sharp transition in the equation of state around r=R 0:98, with a FW HM for $d^2 f = d^2 o f r = R$ 0:02, also contributes to this scaling. But this contribution falls o sharply 50. M odelD (dotted curves) has a 10M solid core, and is based on PPT equation of state with the phase transition 1=0:02 for n being 🛛 rst-order, giving rise to a fractional density jump of 🛛 20%. This is seen here as the jump in f () and the spike in df=d . O verlap integral in m odelD is dom inated by the density jump and it scales roughly as 1=n, as expected. These results are insensitive to core sizes, since the r⁶ scaling in f () near the center suppresses any in uence from the inner boundary condition. M oreover, severity of cancellation calculated for actual inertial-m ode eigenfunctions is expected to be one power of n steeper than those presented here, due to cancellation in the angular direction.