

## Comparing block populations across small bodies

C. Ernst<sup>1</sup>, O. Barnouin<sup>1,2</sup>, J. Noviello<sup>2</sup>, and M. Daly<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory

<sup>2</sup>Johns Hopkins University

<sup>3</sup>York University, Canada

Blocks have been resolved on the surfaces of many small bodies. Rendezvous missions have allowed for thorough global analyses down to sizes of 15 m for Eros [1] and 5–6 m for Itokawa [2,3]. Localized images have allowed measurements of blocks as small as 10 cm on both asteroids [1,4,5]. Several high-resolution images of Phobos [6–8] have allowed for localized block counts. Large blocks have been identified on Ida [9,10], Deimos [8], and Lutetia [11].

Blocks can give insight into the geologic processes that have affected small bodies. On Eros, most large blocks are linked to the Shoemaker crater, and pre-existing blocks were largely covered or eroded by Shoemaker ejecta [1]. Blocks on Phobos [7] and Lutetia [11] have also been linked to craters. On Itokawa, global analyses suggest the blocks are related to the accretion of the asteroid after a catastrophic disruption event [2,3]. Local comparisons of blocks in the smooth lowlands and the rough highlands indicate subsequent mobilization of smaller block sizes [4,5].

Cumulative size-frequency plots are common tools for characterizing block distributions. In log-log space, the plotted distributions typically exhibit linear trends. Best-fit slopes to the size-frequency distribution and the cumulative number of blocks per area may provide clues to the geologic evolution of small bodies. We will compare block size-frequency distributions of Eros, Itokawa, Phobos, Lutetia, and Deimos to determine whether the observed blocks are diagnostic of the processes that formed them and the properties of their host bodies.

**References:** [1] Thomas, P.C. et al. (2001) *Nature*, 413, 394–396. [2] Michikami, T. et al. (2008) *Earth Planets Space*, 60, 13–20. [3] Mazrouei, S. et al. (2014) *Icarus*, 229, 181–189. [4] Michikami, T. et al. (2010) *Icarus*, 207, 277–284. [5] Noviello, J.L. et al. (2014) *LPS*, 45, 1587. [6] Thomas, P.C. (1979) *Icarus*, 40, 223–243. [7] Thomas, P.C. et al. (2000) *JGR*, 105, 15091–15106. [8] Lee, S.W. et al. (1986) *Icarus*, 68, 77–86. [9] Sullivan, R. et al. (1996) *Icarus*, 120, 119–139. [10] Lee, P. et al. (1996) *Icarus*, 120, 87–105. [11] Küppers, M. et al. (2012) *Planetary and Space Science*, 66, 71–78.