

Figure 2. Size-frequency distribution of L_5 Trojans and the Ennomos family.



Figure 4. SFD of L4 and L5 Trojans



Figure 5. SFD for size-depdendent albedo according to Fernandez et al. (2003).



Figure 8. The synthetic family, which should correspond to the Aneas group, just after the impact disruption event ($f_{\rm imp} = 135^{\circ}$, $\omega_{\rm imp} = 233^{\circ}$, $R_{\rm PB} = 47 \,\rm km$, $\rho_{\rm PB} = 2.5 \,\rm kg/m^3$). The synthetic family is way too smaller than the observed Aneas group.



Figure 10. Eurybates spectra



Figure 1. resonant elements (e, I)



Figure 3. Size-frequency distributions N(>D) for L_4 and L_5 Trojans.



Figure 11. Ennomos spectra



Figure 6. Eurybates impact (a, I)



Figure 7. Ennomos impact





Figure 12. 2-dimensional Kolmogorov–Smirnov test of the (a, e) distributions for the synthetic family and the observed Eurybates family. Left panel: the KS distance $D_{\rm KS}$ vs time t. Right panel: the corresponding probability p(>D) that the distance is larger than $D_{\rm KS}$ and the underlaying distributions are the same.

Figure 13. The same as Figure 12 but for the synthetic distribution shifted by $\Delta a = -0.005$ AU and $\Delta e = +0.005$ in order to align the synthetic family with the observed Eurybates family. Note these distances correspond to typical excursions of bodies due to chaotic diffusion, so the Eurybates parent body might have been offset by this amount.



Figure 9. PCA analysis for the Eurybates family, the Aneas group (with four colour indices), the 1988 RG_{10} group (3 colour indices only was used because four-colour data was limited).



Figure 15. Evolution of the synthetic family over 4 Gyr versus the observed 1988 RG₁₀ group. The spreading is too slow and the synthetic family remains smaller than the observed group all the time.



Figure 14. Evolution of the synthetic family over 4 Gyr versus the observed Ennomos family.