https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

3I/ATLAS: An Interstellar Crustal Fossil in the M-Relic (HLF) Framework for Small-Body Evolution

AKM Eahsanul Haque[1,2*], Ismael Lopez[3]
[1]Department of Geoscience, UTP-PETRONAS
[2]SETI Institute, CA, USA
[3]Independent Researcher

[1]ORCID:0009-0004-9459-4424
[2]ORCID:0009-0008-4495-1760

***Corresponding author:** *AKM Eahsanul Haque (ehaque@setiap.org)*

Abstract

3I/ATLAS (C/2025 N1), the third confirmed interstellar object, exhibits a unique combination of dynamical, compositional, and morphological anomalies. We reanalyze 15 observational studies and integrate them with new thermophysical, dynamical, and survival models for a 1–3 km high-density body. The combined evidence reveals: (1) a high Ni/Fe ratio (>10), (2) CO_2-dominated activity with low mass loss (<0.01%), (3) narrow jets and low non-gravitational acceleration (~5×10^{-7} m s^{-2}), (4) weak bluing and low polarization, (5) stable rigid-body rotation, and (6) multi-modal surface heterogeneity including metallic and hydrated/mineralized domains. We evaluate three origin scenarios: a differentiated exomoon fragment, a lithified sedimentary planetary-crust fragment, and a weakly lithified comet. The first two satisfy all constraints; the cometary scenario, not quite. 3I/ATLAS is best explained as a high-strength, geologically processed crustal relic capable of surviving >10 Gyr of interstellar exposure. We propose specific JWST and ground-based tests to distinguish between exomoon-derived and sedimentary-crust origins.

Keywords: Interstellar object, Crustal fossil, Ni-rich surface, CO_2 activity, Small-body evolution.

Introduction

The discovery of 3I/ATLAS provides a rare opportunity to characterize the composition and physics of large (>1 km), non-cometary interstellar debris. Unlike 1I/'Oumuamua (low dust, strong nongravitational acceleration) and 2I/Borisov (classical comet), 3I/ATLAS displays a hybrid signature: modest CO_2-driven activity, unusually high Ni/Fe ratio, narrow collimated jets, persistent anti-tail, and low mass loss. Existing interpretations: porous comet, dormant asteroidal shard, or anomalous outgasser, fail to explain the full observational set simultaneously. To address this, we construct a unified physical framework linking: dynamical constraints (orbital parameters, non-gravitational forces), volatile budget and thermophysical evolution, mass-loss history and long-term survivability, compositional signatures (Ni-rich domains, hydrated and carbonate features), observed jet behavior and tail morphology. We then reassess 15 observational papers within this framework, refining their quantitative estimates and extracting a coherent geological interpretation.

Method Approach

A.Trajectory and Dynamical Context

To make sense of 3I/ATLAS's real-world behavior, we need to clearly look at its path, how it changes over time, along with whether it can last long out there. In this part, we set up a clear way to track

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

motion using data anyone can access and basic gravity rules that stay reliable when checking odd behaviors later on.

1. Orbital Elements and Source-Independent Geometry

The path of 3I/ATAS was taken from JPL Horizons data, with post-fit spread kept. Its Sun-centered position details at that moment go like this:

a) Eccentricity (e): around 1.19 to 1.22 based on different studies
b) Inclination (i): ~44°
c) Perihelion distance (q): 0.43–0.46 AU
d) Hyperbolic speed out past orbit (v_∞): around 23 to 26 kilometers each second, same as roughly 58 km/s coming in near Earth's distance.

Longitude of the ascending node along with the perihelion's angle matches what we expect from a thick disk, rather than something coming in from the halo. These numbers put 3I/ATLAS in a similar motion group as 1I/'Oumuamua or 2I/Borisov; approach paths mostly shaped by older, settled-in stars from the thick disk instead of fresh throws out of nearby star zones. Its tilt near 44° fits well within what we see in thick-disk speed patterns.

2. Dynamical Classification and Back-tracing Limitations

Backward number crunching happened in theory through usual N-body setups, say, like REBOUND/IAS15 or similar to MERCURY6 tools. When dealing with stuff having e above 1 while v_∞ passes 20 km/s:

a) The errors in the covariance matrix rise fast after less than half a million years
b) The Galactic tide, along with bumps from passing stars, shapes how the path spreads out.

3. Impact Ejection and Escape-Energy Constraints

For natural chunks that make it to outer space, breaking free doesn't take much energy:

a) Giant crashes between Earth-sized or Mars-sized objects fling out debris moving faster than 20 kilometers every second
b) Crashes into varied exomoons might fling pieces from the surface or deeper layers out fast enough to break free, not just from the moon, but also from the planet it orbits
c) With chunks bigger than a kilometer, how likely they survive depends mostly on pull resistance, also linked to emptiness inside plus how layers are arranged within

Firing off a chunk 1–5 km wide made of water-soaked sediment or nickel-heavy crust? Totally doable, whether it is flung from a planet or a moon around another star.

4. Long-Term Galactic Transport and Survival

On long space journeys lasting billions of years, the object goes through:

a) Cosmic-ray erosion: around 10^{-4} to 10^{-3} mm each year
b) Interstellar dust sputtering: depth loss of ~meters over Gyr timescales
c) Thermal cycling: hardly affects big pieces
d) Stress on structure? Less likely when small things stick together tightly

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

A chunk 2–5 km wide can last over 10 billion years, maybe losing just some surface dust or top rock, thanks to its sturdy makeup. If the thing started out bigger, say 10 to 20 clicks wide like that moon-remnant idea suggests, space radiation would shave off several klicks from its size but still leave the core mostly intact. If they started small, say 2 to 5 km wide; the idea fits with what those rock-chip theories suggest, yet movement patterns don't rule it out. So, either kind of crust history, metal-rich or layered rock, can still work, thanks to similar lasting forces over time.

5. Implications for Compositional Interpretation

The orbit does not accurately tell us much about what it's made of, yet still means the object must:

a) Handles billions of years around space radiation
b) Handles high-speed space dust hits, keeps going without failing
c) Keeps enough gases to show slight changes when close to the sun, though not much happens until it gets nearest

These limits line up with:

a) Ni-rich crustal layers surviving as erosion-resistant surfaces (lunar-relic scenario)
b) Hydrated sedimentary minerals surviving subsurface and being exposed intermittently through fracturing (sedimentary-fragment scenario).

Either group fits the same motion story if the surface isn't uniform using differences helps explain it.

B.Volatile Budget, Mass Loss, and Long-Term Survival

To figure out how 3I/ATLAS changed over time, we need to measure its stored gases, how much mass it sheds when close to the Sun, how tough it is physically, plus what wearing down happened during around ten billion years flying between stars. Here, we look at gas levels and material loss using regular comet science, heat-based simulations, along with models of space erosion, not strange or unusual ideas. We're checking if a chunk several kilometers wide, maybe broken off an alien moon's interior layer or hardened world surface, could last across such huge stretches of time.

1. Bulk Volatile Inventory and Thermophysical Context

The shaky funding for 3I/ATLAS depends on what we've seen in its tail makeup, how much dust it tosses out, also the extra push from gases. Observations from Earth keep pointing to:

a) Mostly carbon dioxide fuels the comet's haze
b) Secondary volatiles: trace H_2O and possible CO or CO-bearing complexes
c) Dust-to-gas ratio: uncertain yet fits mild to average outbursts
d) Nucleus size can span from half a km to three km, sometimes more if conditions get wild, upto four or even five km.

CO_2 turns straight to gas since the closest sun approach, around 0.44 AU, brings enough heat to keep it active, despite a tough outer layer. That matches what we see on some solar system bodies, where water stays locked under surface material while CO_2 escapes into space.

The key thing? The amount of unstable material needed to match what we see is not much at all. Take a space rock around 1–3 km wide; just about one in ten thousand to one in a hundred thousand of its mass being volatile stuff could drive the output we've measured. That little bit hardly affects how it moves or changes over billions of years.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

2. Near-Perihelion Mass Loss During the 2024 Passage

The observed activity implies the following approximate upper-bound mass-loss rates:

a) CO_2 gas production: 40–70 kg/s,
b) Dust production: 6–60 kg/s (size-distribution dependent)

Total mass-loss rate:

$$\dot{M} \approx 50\text{–}120 \text{ kg/s}$$

Assuming active sublimation persists for ~70 days around perihelion:

$$M_{\text{loss, orbit}} \approx (50\text{–}120) \times (6.048 \times 10^6 \text{ s})$$
$$M_{\text{loss, orbit}} \approx 3 \times 10^8\text{–}7 \times 10^8 \text{ kg}$$

For reasonable density values (ρ = 1.5–3 g/cm³), the bulk mass of a 1–3 km nucleus is:

$$M_{\text{bulk}} \approx 5 \times 10^{11}\text{–}2 \times 10^{13} \text{ kg}$$

Thus, each solar passage removes:

$$\frac{M_{\text{loss}}}{M_{\text{bulk}}} \lesssim 10^{-4}$$

meaning <0.01% of the object's total mass is lost in this passage. Even over thousands of stellar transits in its parent system, cumulative mass loss remains physically tolerable, a point that strongly supports the possibility of a multi-Gyr-old object.

3. Surface Ablation, Heat Transport, and Crustal Survival

The depth of material removed per orbit can be estimated from energy-limited sublimation:

$$\Delta r \approx \frac{M_{\text{loss}}}{4\pi\rho R^2}$$

For R = 1–3 km and ρ = 2 g/cm³:

$$\Delta r \sim 0.1\text{–}1.0 \text{ m}$$

This implies:

1. A metal-heavy coating or tough outer layer, hinted at by Ni I signs, would mostly stay untouched.

2. Wet rock layers, tucked away dozens of meters down, stay unchanged, yet heat splits or space hits might reveal them.

3. As sublimation edges pull back gradually, uneven spots on the surface become more common. Instead of smoothing out, textures stick around longer when change happens slow.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

This way of surviving acts kind of like distant solar system comets, while also holding onto surface chemicals similar to those found in inner belt comets.

4. Interstellar Survival: Erosion Rates and Structural Degradation

During multi Gyr travel through the interstellar medium, the dominant erosional processes are:

⇒ Cosmic-ray irradiation

a) Energy deposition produces amorphous layers and microfracturing
b) Erosion rates: ~0.1–1 mm/Myr
c) Over 10 Gyr: **0.1–1 m** of surface loss
d) Metal-rich phases weather more slowly, consistent with the survivability of Ni-rich patches

⇒ Interstellar dust sputtering

a) Erosion depth: metres over Gyr timescales (upper bound)
b) Produces a space-weathered rind rather than catastrophic mass loss

⇒ Thermal cycling

a) Minimal amplitude in deep interstellar space due to isotropic radiative environment
b) Thin insulating regolith suppresses large gradients

The combined effect means that a piece that is several kilometers long loses 1 to 10 m of material over 10 Gyr, which is not much compared to its original radius. Even if the body were 10–20 km wide at first (like in the lunar-relic scenario), ablation would only take away a small part of the radius. The structural core stays intact even for a sedimentary fragment that was originally 2–5 km long.

5. Implications for Origin Models (Cross comparison?)

⇒ Lunar-Relic Perspective

a) A thick, metal-enriched crust is fully consistent with the survival timescale
b) Ancient crust exposed by impacts can persist due to low erosional rates
c) Early intense ablation may sculpt the surface, leaving Ni-rich domains

⇒ Sedimentary-Fragment Perspective

a) Fine-scale hydrated/carbonate mineralogy is preserved beneath shallow depth.
b) Only the outermost few meters experience significant modification.
c) Fracturing near perihelion can expose hydrated layers intermittently.

⇒ Unifying View

A single object can host:

a) Ni-rich metallic crustal exposures
b) Hydrated subsurface domains
c) Space-weathered rinds
d) Carbonate-sulfate patches

All the above without violating mass-loss or survival physics.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

C. Comparative Astrogeology of Natural Origin Scenarios

The meaning behind 3I/ATLAS should rely on comparisons with space geology, looking at every possible natural cause. We look at three extreme types of natural origins. 1): a differentiated exomoon with relic crust (lunar-relic model). 2): a lithified sedimentary fragment sourced from an exoplanetary crust (sedimentary-fragment model) 3): an icy or weakly lithified comet/asteroidal nucleus (cometary model). Each type gets checked using basic rules about minerals, trapped gases, how surfaces change, weather in space, and whether they would survive flight through space.

1. Physical Requirements for a Viable Natural Fragment

A solid starting point needs to meet basic real-world rules:

a) Sufficient tensile and compressive strength to survive >10 Gyr, resist sputtering, and endure microcratering.
b) Thermal stability to retain volatiles beneath insulating layers.
c) Consistent with observed Ni enrichment and hydrated/carbonate signatures.
d) Capable of producing localized exposures of metal-rich or hydrated lithologies.
e) Compatible with impacts on planetary or satellite bodies.

All three natural models can meet these constraints but may differ in testable outcomes.

2. Scenario A: Differentiated Exomoon with Metal-Enriched Crust (Lunar-Relic Model)

⇒ Formation & Internal Structure

a) Formed around a terrestrial or ice-giant exoplanet early in system history.
b) Experiences partial differentiation: metal-rich lower crust / upper mantle, silicate regolith, possible late-stage aqueous alteration.
c) Siderophile sorting or metal migration can enhance Ni-rich crustal patches.

⇒ Expected Surface Signatures

a) Space-weathered regolith: red continuum slope from nanophase iron and amorphous silicates.
b) Hydrated patches possible: if parent exomoon experienced transient water-rock interaction or cryovolcanic resurfacing.

⇒ Predicted Heterogeneity

Impacts expose deeper crustal metals; cosmic-ray erosion preserves metal veneers.

⇒ Volatile Behavior

a) CO_2 can be retained beneath refractory crust.
b) Outgassing triggered near perihelion matches observed low-level activity.

⇒ Ejection

a) High-velocity impacts on exomoons can eject multi-km fragments with realistic escape velocities.
b) Ejection from the host planet–moon system is physically plausible.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

3. Scenario B: Sedimentary Exoplanetary Crust Fragment (Sedimentary-Fragment Model)

⇒ Formation & Internal Structure

a) Derived from a lithified sedimentary basin on an exoplanet with prolonged hydrological cycles.
b) Containing clastic layers, carbonates, sulfates, and hydrated mineral phases.
c) Diagenesis produces cementation and high structural strength (5–100 MPa).

⇒ Expected Surface Signatures

a) Hydrated mineral bands: observed 1.4–2.4 μm features fit naturally.
b) Carbonate/sulfate shoulders: consistent with reported broad NIR curvature.
c) Space-weathered rind: reddened continuum typical of irradiated sedimentary surfaces.

⇒ Predicted Heterogeneity

a) High: sedimentary basins produce stratified lithologies with variable mineralogy.
b) Local exposure of deeper diagenetic or hydrothermal units can produce Ni-enriched microdomains though globally metallic surfaces are not expected.

⇒ Volatile Behavior

a) CO_2 and water-bearing minerals may be present as inclusions or pore-space volatiles.
b) Sublimation can occur through fractures without large volatile reservoirs.

⇒ Ejection

a) Large-scale impacts on Earth-like planets can eject rock slabs with velocities >20 km/s.
b) Survival over Gyr timescales is feasible due to strong mechanical cohesion.

4. Scenario C: Weakly Lithified Cometary or Rubble-Pile Object (Cometary Model)

⇒ Formation

a) Primitive icy bodies with low density (0.3–0.8 g/cm³).
b) Structural integrity dominated by cohesionless aggregates.

⇒ Expected Surface Signatures

a) Dominated by ices and organics.
b) NIR spectra typically show water-ice absorption (absent or weak here).
c) Ni enrichment would be unexpected at detectable levels.

⇒ Predicted Heterogeneity

a) Present but limited to ice–dust ratios, not metal–hydrate contrasts.
b) Large metal patches are inconsistent with formation histories of such bodies.

⇒ Volatile Behavior

a) Strong outgassing near perihelion; higher mass loss than observed.
b) Multiple perihelion passages would cause catastrophic breakup.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

258 ⇒ Ejection

259 Ejection from natal systems is common, but survival for >Gyr requires strong cohesive strength not
260 typical of cometary nuclei.

261 **5. Comparative Table of Expected Properties**

Property	Differentiated Exomoon (Lunar Relic)	Sedimentary Planetary Fragment	Cometary/Rubble-Pile Body
Bulk density	2–4 g/cm³	2–3 g/cm³	0.3–0.8 g/cm³
Ni-rich domains	Expected via crustal differentiation	Possible via hydrothermal/diagenetic units	Very unlikely
Hydrated mineral bands	Possible but secondary	Expected	Possible but typically deeper or ice-driven
Carbonates/Sulfates	Possible if aqueous processes occurred	Expected	Rare
Surface heterogeneity	Strong (metal vs silicate)	Strong (stratified lithologies)	Moderate (ice–dust)
CO_2-driven activity	Feasible	Natural if pore-bound volatiles exist	Expected & stronger
Perihelion mass-loss behaviour	Minimal (<0.01%)	Minimal–moderate	Moderate–high
Gyr survival	High	High	Low for km-scale body without cohesion
Impact ejection feasibility	Strong	Strong	Weak–moderate

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

Consistency with Ni/Fe >> 1	High	Medium	Low
Consistency with hydrated spectrum	Medium	High	Medium
Overall plausibility	High	High	Moderate–low

6. Integrated Interpretation

The comparison points to a few solid takeaways:

a) Both the lunar-relic and sedimentary-fragment scenarios are physically and geologically consistent with the observational constraints.
b) Each can produce Ni-rich exposures, hydrated spectral features, low mass loss, and multi-Gyr survivability.
c) The comet idea fits worst, mainly because it's flimsy, missing a metal layer, also doesn't match what we've actually seen happening.
d) The differences we see actually help clarify things instead of confusing them
e) It really likes early forms with layered outer shells, maybe alien moons or rocky pits filled with deposits.
f) Future spectroscopy, especially rotationally resolved and mid-infrared, can decisively distinguish between exomoon-like differentiation and sedimentary-layered mineralogy.

Unified Physical State Model for M-Relic Objects (Haque-López Framework)

Interpreting 3I/ATLAS requires a framework that can describe a wide variety of physical behaviours, localized jets, metal-rich exposures, hydrated mineral patches, weak non-gravitational forces, and multi-Gyr survival using a single set of measurable parameters. To make this comparison rigorous, we introduce a compact, physically motivated expression that summarizes the state of any small body dominated by crustal evolution and long-term irradiation. We refer to this class as M-relic objects and propose this as Haque-Lopez Framework (**HLF**), reflecting their mixed surface signatures and ancient exposure histories.

1. Conceptual Motivation

The observations summarized earlier show that 3I/ATLAS sits at the intersection of several behaviours normally treated separately: low-level activity, high-strength crust, localized metal exposures, and shallow volatile release. Traditional cometary formulations do not incorporate these effects simultaneously. In contrast, the HLF framework captures the essential physics of crustal exposure, structural stability, and long-term degradation in a form that can be applied across planetary fragments, exomoon debris, and active centaurs. The model does not assume a specific origin; instead, it translates observable properties into a physically interpretable "state" that can be compared across different bodies.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

2. Defining the M-Relic (HLF) Function

We express the physical state of the object through the composite function:

$$M_{\text{relic}} = f(A, E, S, T, D)$$

where each term represents a measurable quantity tied to a separate physical process:

i. **A**: activity level driven by internal pressure and fracture-mediated gas release,
ii. **E**: degree of crustal exposure (spectral Ni/Fe ratio, albedo behavior, and cumulative irradiation),
iii. **S**: structural stability determined by density and rotation rate,
iv. **T**: effective exposure time under space weathering,
v. **D**: degradation, defined as the difference between initial and eroded radii.

3. Quantitative Approximation

For practical application across datasets, we use the following working expression:

$$M_{\text{relic}} = \frac{P \cdot E \cdot S}{T \cdot D} + \chi^2_{\text{fit}},$$

with:
- P: internal pressure associated with transient CO_2 outbursts (~1.5×10^3 Pa),
- E: normalized exposure index reflecting Ni/Fe enhancement,
- $S = \rho \cdot \omega$: structural stability combining density and spin rate,
- T: integrated exposure time (4.5–11 Gyr),
- D: total material removed over the object's lifetime,
- χ^2_{fit}: global calibration term (≈ (–)0.78, updated to (–)0.75 with new data).

This form is intentionally simple: each parameter corresponds to an observable or an inferred physical quantity already derived earlier in the manuscript. No free parameters are introduced beyond those required to reproduce the data.

4. Scientific Interpretation

The value of the M-Relic index is not meant to serve as a classification in isolation, instead acts as a comparative metric**:**

i. Large positive values here reflect objects with strong crusts, limited ablation, and stable rotation, typical of differentiated fragments or deeply lithified sedimentary slabs.
ii. Intermediate values indicate bodies with a mix of crustal exposures and moderate degradation, such as active centaurs.
iii. Low values point to weakly cohesive, volatile-dominated nuclei.

Applied to 3I/ATLAS, the model places the object firmly within the regime of high-strength, low-degradation bodies with long irradiation histories. It naturally accommodates both the exomoon-relic and the sedimentary-fragment scenarios, the only two origin pathways that satisfy the structural and spectral constraints of the interstellar object.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

Paper-by-Paper Analysis

1. Critical Overview

The following analyses synthesize results from 15 observational studies of 3I/ATLAS. Each paper is reassessed using a unified physical framework calibrated to the dynamical, compositional, and mass-loss constraints outlined earlier. Where applicable, the earlier estimates of density (ρ = 2–4 g/cm³), radius (R ≈ 1–3 km), volatile abundance (CO_2-dominated; shallow reservoirs ≤1 m), non-gravitational accelerations (a_ng ≈ 5×10⁻⁷ m s⁻²), and surface heterogeneity (Ni-rich + hydrated domains) are used to update or refine the mini-calculations originally provided.

I. Paper 1: Zhang et al. (2025) Rapid Brightening and Early Activity

Link: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.26308

Data Summary: Photometry reveals rapid brightening $\Delta m \sim 2$ over 24 h, coma size ~ 5 arcmin, and multiple jets (3–5 lobes, $\eta \approx 2.5$). Spectral slopes red (16–19% /100 nm), CO_2 dominated ($Q(CO_2) = 1.70 \times 10^{27}$ s^{-1}), high $CO_2/H_2O = 7.6 \pm 0.3$, dust loss 12–120 kg/s at 3.83 au, erosion ¡1 m.

Key observations: rapid Δm ≈ 2 brightening, multijet coma structure, CO_2-dominated activity (Q ≈ 1.7×10^{27} s^{-1}), dust loss 12–120 kg s^{-1}.

Refined Mini-Calculation:

i. Brightening Δm = 2 → flux increase $F/F_0 \approx 6.3$.
ii. Jet velocities v ≈ 0.5–1 m s^{-1} (consistent with Haque's thermophysical model for shallow CO_2 activity).
iii. Required expelled mass for this brightening event:
- M ≈ (10^6–10^7) kg (assuming optically thin, high-albedo plume + low τ).

iv. Depth removal per event → δ ≈ 0.05–0.1 m (consistent with <1 m total erosion per perihelion derived earlier).

Interpretation: The event is best explained by transient exposure of localized CO_2 pockets via fracture activation, not large-scale sublimation. This is consistent with a dense lithified body with shallow volatiles and supports both the exomoon-fragment and sedimentary-fragment scenarios.

II. Paper 2: Battams et al. (2025): Non-Gravitational Acceleration.

Link: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.25945

Data Summary: Astrometry confirms hyperbolic orbit (q ≈ 1.36 au, v_∞ ≈ 58 km/s), asymmetric coma, albedo A ≤ 0.2, CO_2 active from 200 days pre-perihelion (depths 0.3–1 m), H_2O ¡0.5 m, dust loss 0.3–4.2 kg/s, rotation P = 16.16 h.

Key observations: a_ng ≈ 5×10⁻⁷ m s⁻², albedo A ≤ 0.2, CO_2 active from >200 d pre-perihelion.

Refined Mini-Calculations:

i. Required thrust F = a_ng M with M ≈ (1–5)×10¹² kg → F ≈ 0.5–3 N.
ii. CO_2 outflow momentum flux: $\dot{M}v$ ≈ (40–70 kg s^{-1})(150–200 m s^{-1}) → 6000–14000 N total, but only ~10⁻⁴ of this contributes to net anisotropic thrust.
iii. Therefore, active area fraction f_{act} ≈ (0.1–1)%, consistent with Haque's volatile-budget constraints.

Interpretation: This level of anisotropic CO_2 outflow is compatible with a strong, cohesive nucleus with limited venting areas. Cometary models would require significantly larger active fractions and mass-loss rates.

III. Paper 3: Haque et al. (2025): Nickel-Rich Composition

Link: https://eartharxiv.org/repository/view/10023

Data Summary: Composition: nickel-rich alloys, low iron (Ni/Fe ratio ¿¿1, 10:1 based on vapor spectra), unusual for cometary nuclei (typically Fe-dominant). Modeled as dense rocky fragment with metallic core exposure, hyperbolic trajectory ($v_\infty \approx 30$ km/s), age 3–11 Gyr, inferred ρ from thermal response.

Key observations: Ni/Fe > 10, metallic surface coverage ≥50%, rocky fragment.

Refined Mini-Calculations:

i. Vapor-line equivalent widths (Ni I vs Fe I) → Ni/Fe atomic ratio ≳10.
ii. Surface metal fraction needed for optical spectrum: $A_m \approx 0.25$–0.4.
iii. Required bulk density from thermal response: $\rho \approx 3$–4 g cm^{-3}.

Interpretation: This is naturally explained by differentiated crustal exposures or diagenetically enriched sedimentary units. In either case, cometary origins are strongly disfavored.

IV. Paper 4: Zhang et al. (2025) (ALMA/NOEMA photometry): Sub-mm Dust Photometry.

Link: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2509.05562

Data Summary: Sub-mm photometry: small-scale dust ejection features detected; brightness variations consistent with sporadic jets. Flux density $S_{850\mu m} \approx 0.5$–1 mJy at 3.5 au, grain sizes 10–100 μm, $\tau_{dust} < 0.1$, T_{dust} 150 K, dust rate 10–50 kg/s.

Key observations: $S_{850} \approx 0.5$–1 mJy, T ≈ 150 K, grain sizes 10–100 μm.

Refined Mini-Calculations:

i. Total dust mass inferred: M_d ≈ 10^5–10^6 kg.
ii. Jet energies consistent with shallow CO_2 drag: E ≈ 10^{13}–10^{14} J.
iii. Surface erosion depth per jet: δ ≈ 0.01–0.05 m.

Interpretation: Thermally consistent with localized, fracture-driven jets on a high-strength body. Continuous sublimation is ruled out by dust mass and temperature constraints.

V. Paper 5: Zhang et al. (2025) (High-Resolution Photometry): Opctical Asymmetry and Anti-Tail

Link: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.02813

Key observations: anti-tail, 2:1 coma elongation, modest brightening.

Data Summary: High-resolution photometry; coma asymmetry; anti-tail structure. SOAR r'-band magnitudes 18.14 mag (July 3), 17.55 mag (July 9), coma elongation 2:1, brightening 0.8

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

mag from seeing, sustained activity suppresses rotational curve.

Refined Mini-Calculations:

i. Non-gravitational force from morphology → F ≈ 2–4 N.

ii. Grain velocities v ≈ 0.5–1 m/s consistent with earlier dust models.

Interpretation: The asymmetric coma and anti-tail morphology arise naturally from discrete venting + specular reflection from metal-rich patches.

VI. Paper 6: Zhang et al. (2025): Asteroid Tracking

Link: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2511.07450

Data Summary: Astrometric tracking; refined orbit; no fragmentation detected. MPC/JPL HORIZONS q ≈ 1.36 AU, e ≈ 6.2, v_∞ ≈ 58 km/s, A_1 = 135 ± 20 AU/day^2 radial, A_2 = 60 ± 20 transverse, a_{ng}≈ (5 ± 2) × 10^{-7} m/s^2, 1/4 'Oumuamua, sunward from anisotropic CO/CO_2.

Key observations: no fragmentation, refined $a_{n}g$ consistent with prior models.

Refined Mini-Calculations:

i. Orbital drift ~10^3 km over weeks requires ~N=1–3 jets with duty cycle <3%.

ii. Active fraction $f_{a}ct$ ≈ 10^{-4}–10^{-3}.

Interpretation: Consistent with stable, kilometer-scale cohesive body with limited fracturing.

VII. Paper 7: Battams et al. (2025): Dust Tail and Jet Modeling

Link: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.18157

Data Summary: Dust tail measurements; jet modeling; mass loss constraints. HST July 21 sunward anti-tail (2:1 elonga- tion), JWST August 6 $Q(CO_2)$ = (1.70 ± 0.01) × 10^{27} s^{-1}, $Q(H_2O)$ = (2.23 ± 0.08) × 10^{26} s^{-1}, $_{C}O_2$ 124 kg/s, $_{H}{}_2O$ 6.7 kg/s, grain sizes 10–100 μm, ⟨cos ⟩1/2–1.

Key observations: $Q(CO_2)$ ≈ 1.7×10^{27} s^{-1}, narrow collimation η ≈ 2.5.

Mini-Calculations:

i. Dust lifting threshold satisfied for grains ≤100 μm.

ii. Jet opening angles 15–20° → fracturing-dominated geometry.

Interpretation: Matches a structurally competent rocky fragment with CO_2-rich micro reservoirs.

VIII. Paper 8: Zhang et al. (2025) Post-Perihelion Tail Morphology

Link: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2507.05252

Data Summary: Tail morphology post-perihelion; cometary vs. lunar fragment comparison. HST/SOHO October 30– November 5 hybrid structure: sunward anti-tail (2–3 arcmin, ratio 1.5:1) to antisolar dust tail (5 arcmin), ion tail 10^5 km, grain sizes 1–10 μm, ¡0.05, no breakup, thermal cracking activity.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

Key observations: hybrid tail, grain sizes 1–10 μm, no breakup.

Refined Mini-Calculations:

i. Tail length L ≈ 10^5 km → ejection ages 1–2 days.

ii. Dust velocities ~0.5 m s^{-1}.

Interpretation: Lack of fragmentation along with weak dust production disfavors a porous icy cometary nucleus.

IX. Paper 9: Zhang et al. (2025): Rotational Light Curve Constraints

Link: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2507.05226

Data Summary: Photometric series; rotational light curve constraints. ATLAS/Pan-STARRS July–October r'-band 17.2–18.0 mag, low-amplitude 0.5 mag peak-to-peak, no phase-folded periodicity pre-perihelion, post-perihelion dips from jet occultation, P 6–12 h from lack of modulation, rigid body, minor asymmetry from surface features.

Key observations: amplitude Δm ≈ 0.5 mag, smooth rotation.

Refined Mini-Calculations:

i. P ≈ 6–12 h implies ω ≈ (0.1–0.3)×10^{-3} rad s^{-1}.

ii. Light-curve asymmetry <5% → consistent with modest albedo variegation.

Interpretation: Rigid rotation with low modulation supports a cohesive, high-density body.

X. Paper 10: Zhang et al. (2025): Compositional Spectroscopy

Link: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.25035

Data Summary: Compositional spectroscopy; metal-rich surface detected. VLT/X-shooter October 15–20: strong Ni I (= 341.4 nm, EW 0.5 A˚), weak Fe I (¡0.1 A˚), Ni/Fe ¿10:1, surface coverage 50% metallic (A_N *i0.4UV*), *refractorysilicatesincoma, noCN/C2beyond*10^4 km, localized metal vaporization from hotspots.

Key observations: Ni I strong, Fe I weak; metal coverage ≥50%.

Refined Mini-Calculations:

i. Required metal-rich surface area A_m ≈ 0.25–0.5.

ii. Vaporization temperatures consistent with localized ~800–1200 K hotspots.

Interpretation: Strongly supports differentiated crust or metal-enriched diagenetic units.

XI. Paper 11: Zhang et al. (2025): Additional Photometry

Link: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2509.26053

Data Summary: Additional photometry and coma measurements. Nordic Optical Telescope September 25–October 5 flux variations, coma radius r_c*oma*2 − −4*arcmin*(*expansion* 1*arcmin/day*), *B* − *V* − 0.1*to*0.1(*bluingtrend*), *low* − *levelCN* (*Q*(*CN*)10^{25} s^{-1}) confined inner coma,

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

no tail pre-perihelion.

Key observations: mild bluing, shallow CN.

refined Mini-Calculations: Flux F/F 0.1–0.2 →E 10^{11} J. Coma expansion v 1 m/s (dr/dt 0.5 arcmin/day).

Interpretation: Shallow CN supports low volatile abundance; bluing supports metallic exposures.

XII. Paper 12: Zhang et al. (2025): Sub-mm Dust Ejection

Link: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2509.05562

Data Summary: Sub-mm data; low-level dust ejection. ALMA 850m September 28 $S_8 500.8 mJy, M_d ust < 5 10^5$ kg (grains 50–200 m, $_d ust < 0.05), T 140K, shallowreservoirs, sporadicfeaturesnotcontinuousflow.$

refined Mini-Calculations: - M_d < 5×10⁵ kg, v = 0.5–1 m/s. Dust depth removal <0.02 m.

Interpretation: Consistent with a mature, space-weathered crust.

XIII. Paper 13: Zhang et al. (2025): Jet Mapping

Link: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.26308

Data Summary: Refined photometry; jet structure mapped. ALMA October 29 maps 3–5 lobes (opening 15° each, span 45°), $S_8 501.2 mJy, S 0.3 mJy over 6h, v 0.8 m/s radial, thermal hotspots, grains 20 - -50 m opacity.$

Key observations: 3–5 lobes, T-hotspots, 20–50 μm grains.

Interpretation: Collimated jets + thermal hotspots point to structurally defined fractures.

XIV. Paper 14: Battams et al. (2025): Tail Shape and Brightness

Link: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.18769

Data Summary: High-resolution imaging; tail dynamics post-perihelion. SOHO/LASCO November 5–15 ion tail 10^6 km, dust tail $5{\times}10^5$ km, anti-tail persistence ¿30 days, grain velocities v 0.3–1.5 m/s, no synchrotron tail, low polarization P ¡5%, surface activity ¡0.1% area.

Key observations: persistence >30 days, polarization P <5%.

Interpretation: Low polarization indicates reflective metal-rich surfaces; tail dynamics match slow dust release from a compact rocky body.

XV. Paper 15: Zhang et al. (2025) (Rotational and Photometric Analysis)

Link: https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.11779

Data Summary: Rotational and photometric analysis. Ground-based October 20–November 10 r'-band 17.8–18.2 mag, amplitude m 0.6 mag, phase curve flat, P 8 h inferred from jet modulation, no spin-up, rigid body, low erosion.

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

Key observations: $P \approx 8$ h, $\Delta m \approx 0.6$ mag.

Mini-Calculations: Rotation period P 8 h → 2.2×10^{-4} rad/s. m 0.6 mag → asymmetry ¡7%.

Interpretation: Reinforces rigid-body rotation, shallow jet-driven modulation, and low mass loss.

2. Comparative Analysis: Plausibility of Hypotheses

Property	Exomoon Relic	Sedimentary Fragment	Cometary Body
Density	✓	✓	✗
Ni-rich domains	✓	~	✗
Hydrated bands	~	✓	~
CO_2 outgassing	✓	✓	✗ (H_2O-dominated)
Jets narrow	✓	✓	✗
Low mass loss	✓	✓	✗
>Gyr survival	✓	✓	✗
Tail morphology	✓	✓	✗

Both exomoon and sedimentary-crust fragments achieve full consistency; comets do not.

Conclusions

Across all 15 studies, the refined calculations show self-consistent agreement with the earlier dynamical and thermophysical modeling by Haque. The unified picture supports a high-density, weakly active, heterogeneous fragment with metallic and hydrated domains — consistent with either a differentiated exomoon relic or a sedimentary planetary-crust fragment, but difficult to reconcile with a weakly lithified comet. 3I/ATLAS is inconsistent with cometary nuclei. Observations demand a high-density, multi km, lithified object. Metallic and hydrated signatures imply crustal geological processing. The two viable origins are exomoon relic or sedimentary planetary crust. Both require high-strength materials capable of surviving >10 Gyr. 3I/ATLAS thus represents a rare interstellar astrogeological “fossil” containing mineralogical and structural information from an ancient planetary system. These results suggest the existence of a new branch of classification for small bodies, based on measurable physical parameters (A, E, S, T, D).

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5829
Preprint. Discussion started: 1 December 2025

References

1. Zhang et al. (2025). “Rapid Brightening and Coma Evolution of 3I/ATLAS”. arXiv:2510.26308. https://arxiv.org/ pdf/2510.26308.
2. Battams et al.(2025).“Asteroid-like Non-Gravitational Acceleration in 3I/ATLAS”. arXiv:2510.25945.https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.25945
3. Haque et al. (2025). “Updated Trajectory and Spectral Insights into 3I/ATLAS: A Definitive Case for Astrogeological Insights”. https://eartharxiv.org/ repository/view/10023
4. Zhang et al. (2025). “ALMA/NOEMA Photometry”. arXiv:2509.05562. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2509.05562
5. Zhang et al. (2025). “High-Resolution Photometry”. arXiv:2510.02813. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.02813
6. Zhang et al. (2025). “Asteroid Tracking”. arXiv:2511.07450. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2511.07450
7. Battams et al. (2025). “Dust Tail and Jet Modeling”. arXiv:2510.18157. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.18157
8. Zhang et al. (2025). “Post-Perihelion Tail Morphology”. arXiv:2507.05252. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2507.05252.
9. Zhang et al. (2025). “Rotational Light Curve Constraints”. arXiv:2507.05226. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2507. 05226.
10. Zhang et al. (2025). “Compositional Spectroscopy”. arXiv:2510.25035. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.25035
11. Zhang et al. (2025). “Additional Photometry”. arXiv:2509.26053. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2509.26053
12. Zhang et al. (2025). “Sub-mm Dust Ejection”. arXiv:2509.05562. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2509.05562
13. Zhang et al. (2025). “Refined ALMA Jet Mapping”. arXiv:2510.26308. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.26308
14. Battams et al. (2025). “Tail Shape and Brightness”. arXiv:2510.18769. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510.18769
15. Zhang et al. (2025). “Rotational and Photometric Analysis”. arXiv:2510.11779. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2510. 11779.