Explosive volcanic eruptions from linear vents on Earth, Venus and Mars: Comparisons with circular vent eruptions
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Abstract: Conditions required to support buoyant convective plumes are investigated for explosive volcanic eruptions from circular and linear vents on Earth, Venus, and Mars. Vent geometry (linear versus circular) plays a significant role in the ability of an explosive eruption to sustain a buoyant plume. On Earth, linear and circular vent eruptions are both capable of driving buoyant plumes to equivalent maximum rise heights, however, linear vent plumes are more sensitive to vent size. For analogous mass eruption rates, linear vent plumes surpass circular vent plumes in entrainment efficiency approximately when $L_o \geq 3r_o$ owing to the larger entrainment area relative to the control volume. Relative to circular vents, linear vents on Venus favor column collapse and the formation of pyroclastic flows because the range of conditions required to establish and sustain buoyancy is narrow. When buoyancy can be sustained, however, maximum plume heights exceed those from circular vents. For current atmospheric conditions on Mars, linear vent eruptions are capable of injecting volcanic material slightly higher than analogous circular vent eruptions. However, both geometries are more likely to produce pyroclastic fountains, as opposed to convective plumes, owing to the low density atmosphere. Due to the atmospheric density profile and water content on Earth, explosive eruptions enjoy favorable conditions for producing sustained buoyant columns, while pyroclastic flows would be relatively more prevalent on Venus and Mars. These results have implications for the injection and dispersal of particulates into the planetary atmosphere and the ability to interpret the geologic record of planetary volcanism.

1. Introduction

The mechanisms by which ash and volatiles are transported by explosive volcanism on Venus and Mars are important issues that relate to present day observations of the surface and the
evolution of the climate, atmospheric chemistry and subsurface conditions. Advances in
understanding the range of magma compositions on Mars [e.g., Rieder et al., 1997; Bandfield et
al., 2000] continue to expand notions of the prevalence of extensive explosive volcanism.
Detection of elevated SO₂ in the upper atmosphere of Venus [Esposito, 1984; Moore et al., 1992;
Robinson et al., 1995; Glaze, 1999] and diffuse deposits near the summits of some volcanoes
[Campbell and Rogers, 1994] also seem consistent with explosive volcanism.

There is abundant geologic evidence on both Venus and Mars for large volume volcanic
eruptions from long linear vent systems (e.g., Figure 1). Extensive flood volcanism and very long
duration fissure eruptions have been conjectured to have played an important role in the
formation of many units and features on Mars (e.g., Greeley and Spudis [1981]; Keszthelyi et al.
[1999]; Greeley et al. [2000]; Keszthelyi et al. [2006]). It is becoming increasingly evident that
this form of volcanism is also important for Venus. Roughly 20% of the large flow fields on
Venus originate from fractures (e.g., Figure 1b) [Stofan and Smrekar, 2005], and clearly fall into
the flood lava category, with areal extents ranging from 39,000 to 744,000 km² [Magee and
Head, 2001], and thickness estimates ranging from <100 m to 1 km [Roberts et al., 1992;
Lancaster et al., 1995]. Terrestrial flood basalt eruptions, such as the Roza eruption of the
Columbia River Basalt Group and those associated with the Deccan province, have been
responsible for significant volatile degassing with associated impacts on climate [Thordarson
and Self, 1996; Self et al., 2006]. However, studies that deal with the volcanic contribution of
volatiles into planetary atmospheres [Greeley, 1987; Wilson and Mouginis-Mark, 2001] have
given only limited attention to the ability of plumes associated with explosive phases of large
effusive eruptions to transport and disperse volatiles and ash.
Buoyant plumes rising above basaltic fissure eruptions on Earth are well documented [e.g., Thordarson and Self, 1993; Walker et al., 1984; Lockwood et al., 1984; Thordarson and Larson, 2007]. Terrestrial experience [Thorarinsson, 1969; Carracedo et al., 1992; Thordarson and Self, 1993] indicates that fissure eruptions typically comprise multiple effusive and explosive episodes. These episodes commonly involve localized activity along various sub-sections of the fissure as the eruption progresses. Active fissure lengths for historical eruptions range from a few hundred meters (e.g., 1961 eruption of Askja, Iceland [Thorarinsson and Sigvaldason, 1962], to a few kilometers (e.g., 1886 eruption of Tarawera, New Zealand [Walker et al., 1984], and 1783 eruption of Laki [Thordarson and Self, 1993]). The surface expression of fissure vents on Venus and Mars are often tens of km in length. The fissure segment shown in Figure 1a is just part of the overall fissure. Concentric fissures, like those at Alba Patera, are an order of magnitude larger. In addition, volume eruption rates may have been orders of magnitude larger than terrestrial analogs [Wilson and Mougins-Mark, 2001; Baloga et al., 2003; Baloga and Glaze, 2008]. Although volcanic fissures visible on the surface of Venus or Mars were not likely active along their entire length at any one time, large conjectured volumetric eruption rates may point to active fissure lengths significantly greater than the documented terrestrial analogs.

Over the last 30 years, there have been numerous models for explosive volcanic eruption columns based on the ideas for buoyant, convecting plumes presented by Morton et al. [1956] (e.g., Wilson [1976]; Wilson et al. [1978]; Woods [1988]; Stothers [1989]; Thornhill [1993]; Woods [1993b] Glaze et al. [1997]; Glaze [1999]; Hort and Weitz [2001]). However, with the exception of Stothers [1989] and Woods [1993a], the effects of linear geometry (including multiple aligned point sources) on plume dynamics have largely been ignored. In general, volcanic plume models have focused on eruptions from localized circular vents under the
assumption that linear vent plumes that rise much higher than the length of active fissure can be approximated with a point source. The original basis for this assumption was the field work by Walker et al. [1984] on the 1886 fissure eruption of Tarawera, the largest historical eruption in New Zealand, where most of the erupted material originated from a series of closely space vents along a 7 km fissure. During its most explosive phase, a Plinian plume rose to an estimated height of 28 km above a 4 km active segment of the fissure. The distal airfall deposit from this Plinian plume exhibits a symmetry consistent with (i.e., indistinguishable from) fallout from a plume originating from a circular vent. Walker et al. [1984] infer from the surface distribution of distal ash that, because the rise height was so much greater than the active fissure length, the plume material “forgot” that it originated from an extended source. However, this inference derives from the final surface deposit, and as such, reflects more on the processes that influence settling rather than vertical transport. It ignores the dynamic transport characteristics that might be associated with different vent geometries and the ability of a plume to transport material up to a diffusive regime.

It is not at all unexpected that some component of the fallout deposit from a large linear vent eruption should be more symmetric in nature. First, for narrow linear plumes, most of the entrainment occurs along the linear extent of the plume, and thus expansion perpendicular to the fissure axis is dominant. Expansion parallel to the fissure axis should be small in comparison. Thus, by the time a plume reaches heights such as 28 km, the expansion of the plume may well be more circular in nature. Second, atmospheric diffusion and turbulence during ash fallout [Suzuki, 1983; Armienti et al., 1988; Glaze and Self, 1991] produce a randomizing effect on the final deposition of ash on the surface, smoothing and masking (i.e., “forgetting”) the original linear nature of the plume rise. However, Walker et al. [1984] also noted that the thickness of the
proximal airfall deposit did not vary much with distance along the 4 km active segment of the
fissure. From this observation, they concluded that the entire 4 km fissure segment was likely
active concurrently. This observation directly supports the inference that the linear vent
geometry is important to the dynamics of the plume transporting the material found in the
proximal deposit. Thus, dynamics of plume rise, particularly in the first few kilometers, may be
significantly influenced by the vent geometry.

Key issues for planetary explosive volcanism include the heights attainable by convecting
plumes, the ability to transport and disperse particulates and volatiles, and the subsurface
conditions within the feeding conduit required to sustain a column. All the models based on
extensions of the Morton et al. [1956] system of equations indicate that atmospheric entrainment
in the first few kilometers of the eruption column play a dominant role in the dynamics of
buoyant plumes. Entrainment, in turn, depends upon the surface area and upward velocity of the
plume in the lower reach.

In this paper, quantitative constraints are developed for the dimensions and character of
buoyant columns for a range of active linear and circular vent systems and eruption conditions
on the Earth, Venus, and Mars. The influence of atmospheric profile, gravity, geometric and
scale differences among these planets are evaluated. This is accomplished by adapting previous
models for buoyant plumes arising from central vents [Glaze and Baloga, 1996; Glaze et al.,
1997; Glaze 1999; Glaze and Baloga, 2002] to linear vent geometries. The models used in this
work are analogous to the more elementary single-component linear source model of Stothers et
al. [1986] and Stothers [1989] with the adaptation to both solid and vapor plume constituents.
The results obtained in this paper provide significant implications for the relative roles of
widespread airfall and pyroclastic flow mechanisms in forming the geologic record from explosive volcanism on the terrestrial planets.

2. Convective Plume Model

The approach to modeling linear volcanic vents described here builds on the original work by Stothers [1989] but takes advantage of substantial improvements that have been made in volcanic plume modeling over the last 20 years. Changes from the Stothers [1989] approach include (1) explicit inclusion of the conservation of thermal energy, as proposed by Woods [1988], and implemented by Glaze and Baloga [1996], Glaze et al. [1997], Glaze [1999] and Glaze and Baloga [2002], (2) consideration of multiple plume components, particularly solids, and (3) more detailed information on Venus and Mars atmospheric compositions.

In general, the complete system of equations describing buoyant plume rise that must be solved requires at least a half dozen differential equations and another half dozen equations describing parameters within the plume and ambient atmosphere. Table 1 shows the system of differential equations from Glaze et al. [1997] where the control volume and entraining area are given in a generic form in the first column (Notation is defined in Table 2). For the cylindrically axisymmetric system in Glaze et al. [1997], shown in Figure 2a, the control volume is defined as \( V = \pi r^2 dz \), and the area through which ambient is entrained is \( A_e = 2\pi r dz \). For the linear vent system shown in Figure 2b, \( V = 2bLdz \) and \( A_e \approx 2Ldz \) (where it is assumed that \( L >> b \)). The approach is then to solve the sets of governing equations in Table 1 for both central and linear vent geometries. The results described below have assumed that \( L \) remains relatively constant as a function of \( z \). Thus \( L \) does not appear in any of the linear vent conservation equations in Table 1.

Boundary conditions at the vent for all variables \((r, b, u, \theta, \text{ and } n)\) are denoted by a
subscripted "o". The vent is defined as the top of the feeding conduit, and the point at which the erupted material is free to entrain ambient atmosphere and expand. Note that the dimensions at the top of the conduit can be considerably smaller than the visible expression of the vent at the surface for both circular and linear vents. Values for the entrainment constant, $\alpha$, have been estimated for buoyant plumes originating from both circular and linear vents using empirical [e.g., Batchelor, 1954; Morton et al., 1956], theoretical [Agrawal and Prasad, 2003], and simulation [Suzuki and Koyaguchi, 2010] approaches. Values for circular vent plumes range from 0.05 — 0.15, and from 0.0975 — 0.16 for linear vent plumes. For the purpose of comparing the effects of geometry only, this study assumes a value of $\alpha = 0.09$ for all cases.

In addition to the conservation equations defined by (3) — (8), the system is completed by the following definitions for volume fraction,

$$\phi_d + \phi_v + \phi_s = 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

the ideal gas law,

$$p = (\rho_d\phi_d R_d + \rho_v\phi_v R_v) \theta$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

bulk density,

$$\rho_B = \rho_d\phi_d + \rho_v\phi_v + \rho_s\phi_s$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

and the bulk specific heat,

$$C_B = \left[ \rho_d\phi_d C_d + \rho_v\phi_v C_v + \rho_s\phi_s C_s \right] / \rho_B$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

Following Glaze and Baloga [1996], Glaze et al. [1997], Glaze [1999] and Glaze and Baloga [2002], the systems of ordinary differential equations in Table 1 are solved simultaneously using a Runge-Kutta technique. To avoid numerical artifacts in the boundary region near the plume top, the maximum plume height is defined as the height at which the upward velocity drops to
below 10 m/s. Plume rise beyond this point is minimal (relative to the overall plume height), while the velocity drops quickly and the corresponding plume radius (or half width for linear plumes) increases exponentially.

3. Results for Earth’s Atmosphere

Much has been published on the sensitivities of the central vent model given in Table 1 [e.g., Wilson, 1976; Wilson et al., 1978; Woods, 1988; Glaze and Baloga, 1996; Glaze et al., 1997]. Thus, here, the focus is on the primary differences that result from the linear vent geometry relative to the central vent. The numerical code used to solve the linear vent system is identical to the central vent model, where the only differences are those resulting from the geometry of the vents.

Figure 3 illustrates a basic comparison of predicted plume heights on Earth for a range of vent sizes. As noted above, the length of fissure vent that is active does not appear in the conservation equations in Table 1. Thus, a simple comparison can be made of plume height as a function of either \( b_o \) (for linear vents) or \( r_o \) (for circular vents). For the results shown in Figure 3, all of the boundary values at the vent are kept the same, except for the size of the vent opening (radius, \( r_o \), for circular vents, or half-width, \( b_o \), for linear vents). The vent conditions used for both geometries are velocity, \( u_o = 300 \text{ m s}^{-1} \), temperature, \( \theta_o = 1000 \text{ K} \), and the mass fraction of water vapor, \( n_o = 0.03 \), where the mass fraction of vapor in the plume is defined as \( n = \rho_v\phi_v/\rho_B \).

For this example, the plumes are assumed to rise from sea level into the US Standard atmosphere (e.g., Wallace and Hobbs [1977]).

For this set of boundary conditions both the linear and circular vent models produce a maximum plume height of around 35 km. Figure 3 shows maximum plume heights for circular
and linear vents, plotted for a broad range of vent sizes. From this plot, it can be seen that
buoyant, convecting plumes originating from circular vents can be maintained with substantial
maximum heights over a wide range of vent sizes, from a radius of a few meters to around 900
meters. For the boundary conditions used in this analysis, plumes from circular vents collapse, or
are otherwise unable to maintain a steady column, for vent sizes greater than about 900 m.
However, the linear plumes are much more sensitive to the vent size, and can maintain a
convective plume over a much more narrow range of vent sizes. For the same boundary
conditions (temperature, velocity, gas mass fraction), plumes from linear vents only reach
significant heights for values of \( b_o \) of a few meters to ~200 meters. For this set of boundary
conditions, the peak plume height occurs when \( b_o \approx 75 \) m.

Because one of the main drivers of plume height is the mass flux at the vent [Woods, 1988;
Glaze and Baloga, 1996], a better comparison between linear and circular vents can be made by
examining predicted plume heights for equivalent mass fluxes. The mass flux at the vent is
defined as the density of the erupted material multiplied by the cross sectional area of the vent
and the exit velocity (\( = \rho_{eo} u_o A_o \)). Keeping the bulk plume density and exit velocities the same
for both linear and circular vents, the key parameter for comparison becomes the cross sectional
vent area, where \( A_o = \pi b_o^2 \) for the circular vent, and \( A_o = 2b_o L_o \) for the linear vent.

Column 1 of Table 3 indicates a range of cross sectional vent areas. Column 2 of Table 3
contains the corresponding radii for circular vents. For linear vents, the half-width, \( b_o \),
corresponding to the cross sectional area is dependent upon the choice for active fissure length,
\( L_o \). Noting that the original definition of a linear vent included the assumption that \( L_o \gg b_o \), the
table only considers values for \( b_o \) that are less than an order of magnitude smaller than \( L_o \). Active
fissure lengths up to 10 km are considered.
Figure 4 illustrates the plume heights corresponding to the vent sizes given in Table 3. From Figure 4, it can be seen that as \( L_o \) increases, linear plumes become more capable of establishing a convective regime over a broad range of \( b_o \), similar to the circular vents. This is primarily because as \( L_o \) increases, the entrainment area of the linear plumes increases relative to the control volume. The ability of a plume to become buoyant is driven by whether or not sufficient air can be entrained (and warmed) to reduce the bulk plume density before upward momentum is exhausted. From the right hand side of (3) the mass of dry air entrained by the linear plume is roughly the same as the cylindrical case when \( uL \approx \pi ur \). Thus, the linear plumes surpass circular vents in entrainment efficiency approximately when \( L_o \geq 3r_o \). Note, however, that because \( L \) does not appear in the governing equations, the maximum plume height in Figure 4 always occurs around \( b_o \approx 75 \) m.

4. Applications to Venus and Mars

Analysis of the linear vent model under ambient conditions found on Venus and Mars are now considered. Because of the extreme differences in the atmospheric densities, boundary condition values used in these analyses are slightly different than those used for Earth. For comparison with conditions considered by Glaze [1999], the variables held constant under Venus conditions are the initial velocity, \( u_o = 270 \) m s\(^{-1}\), initial temperature, \( \theta_o = 1400 \) K, and the mass fraction of water vapor, \( n_o = 0.05 \). Further, the scenarios discussed here have used the high latitude atmospheric temperature and pressure profile [Seiff et al., 1985], as explosive eruptions under these conditions were shown by Glaze [1999] to be the most likely to rise to significant altitudes. The primary difference between the boundary conditions used here and
those used by Glaze [1999] is that here it has been assumed that the vent is at 0 km above the mean planetary radius (as opposed to 10 km ampr).

Figure 5 shows the plume heights reached for circular and linear vents for a range of radii and half widths, respectively. There are several points of interest to note. First, consistent with work by Thornhill et al [1993] and Glaze [1999], the range of conditions over which buoyant plumes can be maintained on Venus is very narrow (note the range on the x axis is only 300 m, compared to > 800 m on Earth). Also, the shape of the curve for circular vents is substantially different from the terrestrial case, with an almost linear relationship between vent radius and maximum plume height. The primary explanation for this difference in shape is the much higher pressure ambient atmosphere.

The maximum plume height achievable for the given boundary conditions is ~52 km corresponding to a circular vent radius of 247 m. Like the terrestrial case, there is a very abrupt break at the point where a convective plume can no longer be maintained. For linear vents, the range of conditions that can maintain a convective plume is likewise very narrow, with the maximum plume height of ~69 km occurring when \( b_o = 16 \) m. Unlike the terrestrial case, linear vents on Venus appear capable of driving a plume to somewhat higher maximum altitudes, for all other things remaining equal, albeit under very limited conditions.

As for Earth, a better comparison between the circular and linear vents is made by looking at the plume heights for each when the mass flux at the vent (and thus the cross sectional vent area) is the same. Table 4 indicates circular vent radii and linear vent cross widths for a range of cross sectional vent areas. Again, the linear vent half widths are restricted to those that are less than an order of magnitude smaller than the fissure length, consistent with the assumption that \( b_o << L_o \).
Figure 6 shows the predicted plume heights for the vent sizes given in Table 4. It can be seen that the maximum plume height for the linear vent case occurs consistently for \( b_o = 16 \text{ m} \), but the peak is shifted to the right by increasing the vent size (i.e., \( L \)). Unlike the terrestrial example, however, the linear vent is more effective than its circular counterpart at producing a convective plume that is capable of reaching significant heights for the same mass flux.

For Mars, the variables held constant are initial velocity, \( u_o = 230 \text{ m s}^{-1} \), initial temperature, \( \theta_o = 1000 \text{ K} \), and mass fraction of water vapor, \( n_o = 0.01 \). It should be noted that Glaze and Baloga [2002] placed limits on the applicability of buoyancy models such as the one described here. That study indicated that such models are not valid above heights greater than 10 – 20 km on Mars under current atmospheric conditions. For those boundary conditions that produce plumes higher than about 10 km, the alternative approach of Wilson and Head [2007] is used to model the subsequent inertial transport of particles along ballistic trajectories. Using this approach, the upward velocity and plume dimensions at 10 km are used as starting conditions for momentum driven rise. Plume heights found using the convective model are compared to the heights found using the combined buoyancy-ballistic approach for the circular and linear vents in Figure 7.

Using the combined buoyancy-ballistic approach, a comparison of the linear and circular vents is made by examining plume heights for fixed mass fluxes (Table 5, Figure 8), as was done for Earth and Venus. The ballistic constraint above 10 km results in no plumes that rise above 15 km above the vent. The plumes from circular vents decrease in height as the mass flux (i.e., vent area) increases, implying column collapse conditions. However, in contrast, the linear vent plumes continue to show an increase in maximum plume height as mass flux increases, indicating that the upward velocity of the bulk plume material at 10 km altitude (where transport
transitions from convective to ballistic) is also increasing. The implication is, therefore, that these linear vent plumes are not necessarily collapsing, and that linear vent plumes develop a pyroclastic fountain capable of injecting a substantial amount of ash and volatiles into the atmosphere at the plume top.

The preference for the formation of pyroclastic flows and near vent deposition on Mars, as opposed to widely dispersed airfall deposits, is consistent with some prior suggestions in the literature. Most notably, interpretations of early volcanic activity (e.g., Mouginis-Mark et al. [1988]; Carr [2007]) have suggested numerous and extensive pyroclastic flows on the flanks of Alba Patera prior to a transition of late stage effusive volcanism. Similar considerations may apply to incised units thought to be either airfall or pyroclastic flow deposits at Hecates Tholus and Hadriaca and Tyrhena paterae [Mouginis-Mark et al., 1982; Greeley and Crown, 1990; Gregg and Farley, 2006].

5. Conclusions

When buoyancy can be sustained, plumes from both linear and circular volcanic vents have very similar maximum heights. However, the conditions required to sustain buoyant plumes are highly restricted for linear vents. The range of conditions for sustained buoyancy is very narrow for Venus and relatively more favorable for the Earth. The dependence of maximum plume height on circular vent diameter is dominated by the nature of the ambient atmospheric profiles for density, pressure, and water content. On Venus, the extreme ambient atmospheric pressures (100 times Earth) result in an almost linear relationship between the vent radius and plume height.
When buoyancy is sustained, linear vents appear to be equally capable of injecting volcanic ash and volatiles into the atmosphere. For analogous mass flux rates at the vent, the maximum heights to which linear and cylindrical plumes can rise are essentially equivalent. In cases where the length of active linear vent is less than approximately $3r_o$, the entrainment area of linear plumes is significantly less than the cylindrical (circular vent) equivalent. Thus the range of vent widths that can sustain a buoyant plume is narrow and these plumes are more likely to collapse.

Only the Earth, with its thick wet atmosphere, favors explosive eruptions that can maintain convective plumes reaching 10s of km in altitude. Conversely, the range of plausible conditions that can produce a buoyant convective plume on Venus is very restricted. The probability of an eruption occurring with just the right boundary conditions is relatively small. Thus, it seems that pyroclastic flows are much more likely in the nonterrestrial environments. On Mars, the results presented here favor interpretations of pyroclastic flows and near vent deposition at major volcanic centers, including Alba, Hadriaca, and Tyrrhena paterae and Hecates tholus, where the discriminating morphologic diagnostics remain ambiguous.
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Figure Captions

Figure 1. Explosive phases from fissure vents, such as those shown here for (a) Mars (18.1° N 245.3° E; THEMIS visible image V05484014) [Mouginis-Mark and Christensen, 2005], and (b) Venus (5.5° S, 206° E, Magellan SAR image) may have contributed significant volatiles to the atmosphere.

Figure 2. Schematic views of (a) circular and (b) linear vent geometries. The control volume for each plume is indicated by the gray shaded volume. The entrainment area is the outer, exposed surface area of the control volume. The volcanic vent in both cases is defined as the top of the conduit. Boundary conditions at the vent are denoted by variables with “o” subscript. Note that for linear vents, $L_o$ is $>> b_o$, and that $L$ does not change substantially as a function of $z$.

Figure 3. Maximum predicted plume heights as a function of either vent radius (for circular vents), $r_o$, or half width (for linear vents), $b_o$. Models assume terrestrial ambient atmospheric conditions with temperature and pressured defined by the US Standard Atmosphere, $u_o = 300$ m s$^{-1}$, $\theta_o = 1000$ K, and $n_o = 0.03$.

Figure 4. Maximum predicted plume heights as a function of vent area. Model boundary conditions are the same as those in Figure 3. The linear vent results are shown for multiple choices of active fissure length.
Figure 5. Maximum predicted plume heights on Venus as a function of either vent radius (for circular vents), \( r_o \), or half width (for linear vents), \( b_o \). Models assume northern Venus latitude ambient atmospheric conditions, \( u_o = 270 \text{ m s}^{-1} \), \( \theta_o = 1400 \text{ K} \), and \( n_o = 0.05 \).

Figure 6. Maximum predicted plume heights on Venus as a function of vent area. Model boundary conditions are the same as those in Figure 5. The linear vent results are shown for multiple choices of active fissure length.

Figure 7. Maximum predicted plume heights on Mars as a function of either vent radius (for circular vents), \( r_o \), or half width (for linear vents), \( b_o \). Models assume the current low pressure ambient atmospheric conditions, \( u_o = 230 \text{ m s}^{-1} \), \( \theta_o = 1000 \text{ K} \), and \( n_o = 0.01 \). (a) Predicted plume heights for circular and linear vents when convective model is allowed to run to its full extent, regardless of inconsistencies and non-physical effects (e.g., expansion rates that exceed the speed of sound). (b) Predicted heights for circular and linear vents when convective model is terminated at 10 km. Upward velocity at 10 km is then used to estimate the maximum height for a purely ballistic vertical trajectory.

Figure 8. Maximum predicted plume heights on Mars as a function of vent area. Model boundary conditions are the same as those in Figure 7. The convective model has been terminated at 10 km (as in Figure 7b) and subsequent rise determined from a ballistic vertical trajectory. The linear vent results are shown for multiple choices of active fissure length.
Table 1. System of generic 1\textsuperscript{st} order partial differential equations for convective rise, after Glaze \textit{et al.} [1997]. The control volume and entrainment area can be defined to accommodate either a circular or linear source. Notation is defined in the Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Generic Conservation Equation</th>
<th>Central Vent</th>
<th>Linear Vent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) control volume</td>
<td>$V$</td>
<td>$V = \pi r^2 dz$</td>
<td>$V = 2bLdz$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) entrainment area</td>
<td>$A_e$</td>
<td>$A_e = 2\pi r dz$</td>
<td>$A_e \approx 2Ldz$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) mass: dry air</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u u V \phi_u] = \rho_u (\alpha u) A_e$</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u u r^2 \phi_u] = 2\alpha \rho_u ur$</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u ub \phi_u] = \alpha \rho_u u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) mass: vapor</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u u V \phi] = 0$</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u u r^2 \phi] = 0$</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u ub \phi] = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) mass: solid</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u u V \phi_s] = 0$</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u u r^2 \phi_s] = 0$</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u ub \phi_s] = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) mass: bulk</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u u V] = \rho_u (\alpha u) A_e$</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u u r^2] = 2\alpha \rho_u ur$</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u ub] = \alpha \rho_u u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) momentum</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u u V'] = g (\rho_u - \rho_b) V'$</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u u r^2] = g (\rho_u - \rho_b) r^2$</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u u b'] = g (\rho_u - \rho_b) b'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) energy</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u u C_\theta V \phi] = \rho_u (\alpha u) C_\theta A_e - \rho_u u g V (\phi_u + \phi_v)$</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u u r C_\theta \phi] = 2\alpha \rho_u u r C_\theta \phi_s - \rho_u u r^2 g (\phi_u + \phi_v)$</td>
<td>$\frac{d}{dz} [\rho_u u C_\theta b \phi] = \alpha \rho_u u C_\theta (\phi_u + \phi_v)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_o$</td>
<td>Cross Sectional Vent Area at the top of the conduit (m²)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_e$</td>
<td>Entrainment Area (m²)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>Linear Plume Half Width (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_a$</td>
<td>Specific Heat of Ambient Atmosphere (Earth = 998 J K⁻¹ kg⁻¹; Venus = Mars = 835 J K⁻¹ kg⁻¹)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_B$</td>
<td>Bulk Specific Heat of Plume (J K⁻¹ kg⁻¹)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_v$</td>
<td>Specific Heat of Water Vapor (= 2000 J K⁻¹ kg⁻¹)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_s$</td>
<td>Specific Heat of Solid Particles (= 920 J K⁻¹ kg⁻¹)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>Gravitational Constant (Earth = 9.8 m s⁻²; Venus = 8.4 m s⁻²; Mars = 3.7 m s⁻²)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>Fissure Length (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>Gas Mass Fraction (= $\rho_f/\rho_B$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>Pressure (Pa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>Cylindrical Plume Radius (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_d$</td>
<td>Gas Constant for Ambient Atmosphere (Earth = 287 J K⁻¹ kg⁻¹; Venus = Mars = 191 J K⁻¹ kg⁻¹)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_v$</td>
<td>Gas Constant for Water Vapor (= 461 J K⁻¹ kg⁻¹)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u$</td>
<td>Bulk Rise Velocity (m s⁻¹)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V$</td>
<td>Control Volume (m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>Vertical Distance (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>Entrainment Constant (=0.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta$</td>
<td>Bulk Plume Temperature (K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_a$</td>
<td>Ambient Atmosphere Temperature (K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_o$</td>
<td>Ambient Atmospheric Density (kg m⁻³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_B$</td>
<td>Bulk Plume Density (kg m⁻³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_d$</td>
<td>Density of Entrained Ambient (kg m⁻³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_v$</td>
<td>Density of Water Vapor (kg m⁻³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_s$</td>
<td>Density of Solid Particles (= 1000 kg m⁻³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi_d$</td>
<td>Volume Fraction of Entrained Ambient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi_s$</td>
<td>Volume Fraction of Solid Particles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi_v$</td>
<td>Volume Fraction of Water Vapor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"o" subscript indicates a value at the vent, defined as the top of the conduit.
Table 3. Comparison of terrestrial vent sizes for circular and linear vents and a range of cross sectional vent areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$A_o$ [m²]</th>
<th>$r_o$ [m]</th>
<th>$b_o$ [m]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$L_o = 500$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.14 \times 10^2$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.96 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6.36 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.54 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7.07 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.52 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.83 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5.03 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7.85 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.65 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.46 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.14 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Comparison of volcanic vent sizes on Venus for circular and linear vents and a range of cross sectional vent areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( A_o ) [m(^2)]</th>
<th>( r_o ) [m]</th>
<th>( b_o ) [m]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_o = 200 ) m</td>
<td>( L_o = 500 ) m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26 \times 10^5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.83 \times 10^5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.85 \times 10^5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.54 \times 10^4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13 \times 10^4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.90 \times 10^4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.07 \times 10^4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26 \times 10^5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.59 \times 10^5</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.96 \times 10^5</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.83 \times 10^5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Comparison of volcanic vent sizes on Mars for circular and linear vents and a range of cross sectional vent areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$A_0$ [m$^2$]</th>
<th>$r_0$ [m]</th>
<th>$b_0$ [m]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L_o = 200$ m</td>
<td>$L_o = 500$ m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7150</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13700</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25100</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37800</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55700</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59900</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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