

Post-landing major element quantification using SuperCam laser induced breakdown spectroscopy

Ryan B. Anderson, Olivier Forni, Agnes Cousin, Roger C. Wiens, Samuel M. Clegg, Jens Frydenvang, Travis S. J. Gabriel, Ann Ollila, Susanne Schröder, Olivier Beyssac, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

Ryan B. Anderson, Olivier Forni, Agnes Cousin, Roger C. Wiens, Samuel M. Clegg, et al.. Post-landing major element quantification using SuperCam laser induced breakdown spectroscopy. Spectrochimica Acta Part B: Atomic Spectroscopy, 2022, 188, pp.106437. 10.1016/j.sab.2021.106347. insu-03663667

HAL Id: insu-03663667 https://insu.hal.science/insu-03663667

Submitted on 7 Nov 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Post-Landing Major Element Quantification Using SuperCam Laser Induced Breakdown Spectroscopy

Rvan B. Anderson¹, Olivier Forni², Agnes Cousin², Roger C, Wiens³, Samuel M, Clegg³, Jens 3 4 Frydenvang⁴, Travis S.J. Gabriel¹, Ann Ollila³, Susanne Schröder⁵, Olivier Beyssac⁶, Erin Gibbons⁷, David S. Vogt⁵, Elise Clavé⁸, Jose-Antonio Manrique⁹, Carey Legett IV³, Paolo Pilleri², 5 Raymond T. Newell³, Joseph Sarrao³, Sylvestre Maurice², Gorka Arana¹⁰, Karim Benzerara¹¹, 6 7 Pernelle Bernardi¹², Sylvain Bernard¹¹, Bruno Bousquet⁸, Adrian J. Brown¹³, César Alvarez-Llamas¹⁴, Baptiste Chide², Edward Cloutis¹⁵, Jade Comellas³, Stephanie Connell¹⁵, Erwin 8 9 Dehouck¹⁶, Dorothea M. Delapp³, Ari Essunfeld³, Cecile Fabre¹⁷, Thierry Fouchet¹², Cristina 10 Garcia-Florentino¹⁰, Laura García-Gómez¹⁴, Patrick Gasda³, Olivier Gasnault², Elisabeth Hausrath¹⁸, Nina L. Lanza³, Javier Laserna¹⁴, Jeremie Lasue², Guillermo Lopez⁹, Juan Manuel 11 12 Madariaga¹⁰, Lucia Mandon¹², Nicolas Mangold¹⁹, Pierre-Yves Meslin², Marion Nachon²⁰, 13 Anthony E. Nelson³, Horton Newsom²¹, Adriana L. Reyes-Newell³, Scott Robinson³, Fernando Rull⁹, Shiv Sharma²², Justin I. Simon²³, Pablo Sobron²⁴, Imanol Torre Fernandez¹⁰, Arya Udry¹⁸, 14 Dawn Venhaus³, Scott M. McLennan²⁵, Richard V. Morris²³, Bethany Ehlmann²⁶ 15 16 ¹U. S. Geological Survey Astrogeology Science Center, Flagstaff, Arizona, USA 17 ²Institut de Recherche en Astrophysique et Planetologie (IRAP), Université de Toulouse, UPS, 18 19 CNRS, Toulouse, France 20 ³Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), Los Alamos, New Mexico, USA 21 ⁴Globe Institute, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark 22 ⁵Institute of Optical Sensor Systems, DLR, Berlin, Germany ⁶Institut de Minéralogie, de Physique des Matériaux et de Cosmochimie (IMPMC), Université 23 24 Pierre-et-Marie-Curie (UPMC), Paris, France 25 ⁷ McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada ⁸Centre Lasers Intenses et Applications, CNRS, CEA, Univ. Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France 26 27 ⁹University of Valladolid, Valladolid, Spain 28 ¹⁰University of Basque Country (UPV/EHU), Leioa, Bilbao, Spain 29 ¹¹Institut de Minéralogie, de Physique des Matériaux et de Cosmochimie, Muséum National 30 d'Histoire Naturelle, CNRS, Sorbonne Université, Paris, France 31 ¹²Laboratoire d'Etudes Spatiales et d'Instrumentation en Astrophysique, Observatoire de Paris,

- 32 CNRS, Sorbonne Univ., Univ. Paris-Diderot, Meudon, France
- 33 ¹³Planicus Research, Severna Park, Maryland, USA
- ¹⁴ UMALASERLAB, Department of Analytical Chemistry, University of Málaga, Málaga, Spain
- 35 ¹⁵University of Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada
- ¹⁶Univ. Lyon, Univ. Lyon 1, ENSL, CNRS, LGL-TPE, Villeurbanne, 69007 Lyon, France
- 37 ¹⁷GéoRessources, CNRS, Univ. Lorraine, Nancy, France
- 38 ¹⁸University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA
- ¹⁹Laboratoire de Planétologie et Géodynamique, Université de Nantes, Université d'Angers,
- 40 CNRS UMR 6112, Nantes, France
- 41 ²⁰Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA

- 42 ²¹University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA
- 43 ²²University of Hawaii, Manoa, Hawaii, USA
- 44 ²³Astromaterials Research and Exploration Science (ARES) Division, NASA Johnson Space
- 45 Center, Houston, Texas, USA
- 46 ²⁴SETI Institute, Mountain View, California, USA
- 47 ²⁵State University of New York (SUNY) Stony Brook, New York, USA
- 48 ²⁶Division of Geological and Planetary Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena,
- 49 California, USA
- 50

51 Abstract

- 52 The SuperCam instrument on the *Perseverance* Mars 2020 rover uses a pulsed 1064 nm laser
- to ablate targets at a distance and conduct laser induced breakdown spectroscopy (LIBS) by
- analyzing the light from the resulting plasma. SuperCam LIBS spectra are preprocessed to
- remove ambient light, noise, and the continuum signal present in LIBS observations. Prior to
- 56 quantification, spectra are masked to remove noisier spectrometer regions and spectra are
- 57 normalized to minimize signal fluctuations and effects of target distance. In some cases, the
- 58 spectra are also standardized or binned prior to quantification. To determine quantitative
- elemental compositions of diverse geologic materials at Jezero crater, Mars, we use a suite of
 1198 laboratory spectra of 334 well-characterized reference samples. The samples were
- 61 selected to span a wide range of compositions and include typical silicate rocks, pure minerals
- 62 (e.g., silicates, sulfates, carbonates, oxides), more unusual compositions (e.g., Mn ore and
- 63 sodalite), and replicates of the sintered SuperCam calibration targets (SCCTs) onboard the
- rover. For each major element (SiO₂, TiO₂, Al₂O₃, FeO_T, MgO, CaO, Na₂O, K₂O), the database
- 65 was subdivided into five "folds" with similar distributions of the element of interest. One fold was
- 66 held out as an independent test set, and the remaining four folds were used to optimize
- 67 multivariate regression models relating the spectrum to the composition. We considered a
- variety of models, and selected several for further investigation for each element, based
 primarily on the root mean squared error of prediction (RMSEP) on the test set, when analyzed
- 70 at 3 m. In cases with several models of comparable performance at 3 m, we incorporated the
- 71 SCCT performance at different distances to choose the preferred model. Shortly after landing
- 72 on Mars and collecting initial spectra of geologic targets, we selected one model per element.
- 73 Subsequently, with additional data from geologic targets, some models were revised to ensure
- results that are more consistent with geochemical constraints. The calibration discussed here is
- a snapshot of an ongoing effort to deliver the most accurate chemical compositions with
- 76 SuperCam LIBS.

77 Contents

78	Abstract		. 2
79	1. Intro	oduction	. 4
80	1.1.	Overview	. 6
81	1.2.	The Challenges of Quantitative LIBS	. 6

82	1.3. Multivariate vs Univariate Calibration	7
83	2. Experimental	8
84	2.1. Setup	8
85	2.2. Description of Standards	11
86	2.2.1. Spectral Variability	14
87	3. Data Processing	17
88	3.1. Preprocessing	17
89	3.1.1. Non-laser dark subtraction	17
90	3.1.2. Stitching	17
91	3.1.3. Denoising	18
92	3.1.4. Instrument Response Function and Conversion to Radiance	21
93	3.1.5. Continuum Removal	23
94	3.1.6. Wavelength Calibration	24
95	3.1.7. Additional Preprocessing for Quantification	26
96	3.2. Data Organization	27
97	3.2.1. Outlier Removal	29
98	4. Quantification	31
99	4.1. Algorithms	31
100	4.2. Model Selection	34
101	4.2.1. SiO ₂	
102	4.2.2. TiO ₂	40
103	4.2.3. Al ₂ O ₃	41
104	4.2.4. FeO _T	45
105	4.2.5. MgO	46
106	4.2.6. CaO	48
107	4.2.7. Na ₂ O	49
108	4.2.8. K ₂ O	51
109	5. Discussion	53
110	5.1. Accuracy	53
111	5.2. Precision	56
112	5.3. Environmental Factors	57
113	5.4. Future Work	59
114	5.4.1. Uncertainty Quantification	59

115		5.4.2.	Minor and trace elements	.60
116		5.4.3.	Alternative Normalization	.61
117		5.4.4.	Calibration Transfer	.61
118	6.	Conclus	ion	.62
119	Ack	nowledge	ements	.63
120	Ref	erences .		.63

- 121
- 122

123 **1. Introduction**

124 The SuperCam instrument suite on the Mars 2020 rover Perserverance [1] includes the second 125 remote laser-induced breakdown spectroscopy (LIBS) instrument to operate on another planet. 126 In addition to LIBS, SuperCam capabilities include visible and infrared reflectance spectroscopy, 127 time-resolved Raman and luminescence spectroscopy, remote imaging, and acoustic recording 128 [2,3]. SuperCam's first use was followed closely by the MarSCoDe instrument suite on the 129 Zhurong rover, which consists of a LIBS instrument, an infrared spectrometer, and an imager 130 [4]. Both instrument suites have LIBS instruments patterned after ChemCam [5,6], which has 131 been used on Mars since 2012 as part of the payload of the Mars Science Laboratory rover 132 Curiosity.

133 SuperCam contributes to three Mars 2020 mission science goals: to study the geology and 134 geochemistry of Jezero crater; to investigate habitability, materials with biosignature 135 preservation potential, and evidence of past life; and to assemble a cache of returnable 136 samples, including searching for the best samples and documenting their geological context and 137 general character [1]. The SuperCam investigation's specific goals include rock identification; 138 characterization of sedimentary stratigraphy and alteration, morphology, and texture; the search 139 for organic molecules and biosignatures; characterization of volatile elements; and investigation 140 of surface varnishes and coatings, regolith, igneous history, and atmospheric properties. LIBS 141 contributes to all of these goals as described in [2].

142 SuperCam's instrument architecture is similar to ChemCam's but with notable changes to 143 facilitate SuperCam's additional functionality. Both instruments consist of an internal body unit 144 containing the spectrometers and an external mast unit with the laser and 110 mm aperture 145 telescope to acquire observations of targets around the rover. SuperCam's telescope is 146 improved compared to ChemCam, enabling a slightly smaller laser footprint on targets with its 147 ~12 mJ, 1064 nm, 3-4 ns long laser pulse [2]. Plasma light is transmitted from the telescope to 148 the spectrometers in the body of the rover via a ~6 m optical fiber and an optical demultiplexer 149 [3]. Both ChemCam and SuperCam use a trio of spectrometers to cover wavelengths between 150 ~240 and 850 nm at similar wavelength resolution. The ultraviolet (UV) and violet (VIO) spectral 151 ranges on both SuperCam and ChemCam are covered by nearly identical Czerny-Turner [7]

152 spectrometers and ungated detectors. Unlike ChemCam, which uses a third Czerny-Turner 153 spectrometer, SuperCam uses a transmission spectrometer with a gated intensifier to cover the 154 ~535-850 nm range. This spectrometer enables remote time-resolved Raman spectroscopy. 155 This spectrometer has similar resolution to ChemCam over much of that range but has a factor 156 of 2 better resolution in the Raman range from 535 to ~610 nm. In addition to superior 157 resolution, the transmission spectrometer affords other advantages, including reduced collection 158 of ambient light (sunlight) due to a shorter exposure (10 µs is used for LIBS). The disadvantage 159 of the intensifier is increased noise relative to ChemCam's bare CCD (charge-coupled device). 160 The transmission spectrometer transmits light into three spectral ranges (Green, Orange, and 161 Red), thus using nearly three times the number of spectral channels relative to ChemCam 162 (Table 1), which uses ~2000 channels over a larger spectral range. SuperCam cannot acquire 163 simultaneous LIBS and Raman spectra even though both use the same spectrometer, because 164 the laser is frequency doubled and its beam path is changed for the Raman observations. Table 165 1 summarizes the SuperCam spectrometer spectral ranges and number of spectral channels in 166 a typical LIBS Calibrated Data Record (CDR) product. These values are valid for both Mars 167 spectra and the laboratory spectra used here.

Spectrometer	Abbreviation	Wavelength range (nm)	# of spectral channels after stitching	Range of channel indices used in stitching
Ultraviolet	UV	243.79 - 341.36	2040	n/a
Violet	VIO	379.26 - 464.54	2037	n/a
Green		537.57 - 619.82	1237	600-1837
Orange	VNIR	620.08 - 712.14	1114	471-1587
Red	-	712.17 - 852.77	1505	345-1850

Table 1: Overview of SuperCam LIBS calibrated data record (CDR)

168

A key advantage of SuperCam's LIBS system is the inclusion of a much larger number of onboard calibration targets that cover a greater compositional range than ChemCam's. The 23 LIBS targets include pure igneous mineral compositions, basaltic targets doped with trace elements, and a number of targets simulating typical rock compositions [8,9]. A titanium plate is included for wavelength calibration as was done on ChemCam. These onboard targets are not adequate to train a regression model, but they provide ground-truth comparisons that can be used to evaluate calibration models under martian conditions.

177 The *Perseverance* landing site, Jezero crater, appears to differ substantially in rock type and 178 composition from Curiosity's landing site in Gale crater. Like Gale crater (e.g., [10–12]), Jezero

179 crater was once a large lake, as indicated by a notable deltaic formation and outflow channel

180 which demonstrates that the crater was filled with water (e.g., [13–15]). However, the local 181 chemistries appear to be different. The Curiosity rover has encountered three main stratigraphic 182 groups in Gale crater: the Bradbury group, the Mount Sharp group, and the Siccar Point group 183 [10]. The Bradbury group consists of sorted detrital plagioclase-phyric basaltic sedimentary 184 rocks transported from the crater rim [16,17]. The composition of the Stimson formation in the 185 Siccar Point group is similar to the Mars global dust composition, and it consists of lithified 186 aeolian dunes [16]. The Murray formation, which constitutes much of the Mount Sharp group is 187 a dominantly lacustrine formation that has a relatively consistent silica-rich subalkaline basalt 188 composition that is distinct from the Bradbury group: with a more silica-rich basaltic source rich 189 in plagioclase and Fe, low in Ca and Mg (e.g., [18]). By contrast, from orbit, Jezero crater's 190 upstream regions contain olivine and pyroxene, areas of Jezero crater just inside the rim have a 191 distinctive Mg carbonate signature, and the crater floor farther from the rim appears to have an 192 olivine-rich mafic unit (e.g., [19]). The team thus expects minerals rich in Mg such as olivine 193 and its alteration-pathway minerals, e.g., serpentine and talc [20] as well as Mg-rich clays, and 194 C (carbonates; e.g. [21–23]). To address these expectations, we tuned both the onboard targets 195 and the overall spectral library with more carbonates and Mg-rich compositions.

196 **1.1**. Overview

197 This paper provides an overview of the current state of the SuperCam team's ongoing efforts at 198 developing quantitative calibration models for the major element oxides (SiO₂, TiO₂, Al₂O₃, 199 FeO_T, MgO, CaO, Na₂O, K₂O), and possible next steps. We first discuss the challenges of 200 quantitative LIBS and the different approaches to calibration. This is followed by a description of 201 the laboratory setup and details regarding the collection of a diverse database of LIBS spectra 202 used to train and test the calibration models. We then discuss the preprocessing steps applied 203 to the spectra, followed by the organization of spectra into training and test sets and the 204 assessment of data quality and removal of outliers. We discuss the multiple regression 205 algorithms tested and how models were tuned and selected for optimal performance. Finally, we discuss the results of applying the selected models to data on Mars and potential next steps in 206 207 our effort to improve the accuracy of SuperCam LIBS quantification.

208 1.2. The Challenges of Quantitative LIBS

209 Deriving quantitative elemental abundances of geologic targets from LIBS spectra is 210 challenging, both because of the nature of the stand-off LIBS technique itself and the nature of 211 the targets being analyzed. The distance to the target and target properties influence the 212 recorded LIBS spectra. The laser spot size, and therefore the laser irradiance on the target, 213 varies with distance: the spot size is \sim 170 µm at 2.4 m and increases to \sim 370 µm at 5.5 m [15]. 214 The amount of energy absorbed by a target per laser pulse is also strongly dependent on the 215 target opacity and albedo at the laser wavelength. Some materials absorb the laser well, but 216 others, particularly those with large crystals that are transparent or translucent to the laser, may 217 be absorbed poorly or not at all (e.g. [23,24]) resulting in low signal to noise or a lack of any 218 discernible LIBS signal. Moreover, the laser spot size is often bigger than the individual crystals 219 or grains in the geologic sample which can lead to heterogeneous mixtures in the targets 220 probed.

221 An additional challenge is that LIBS spectra record a process that is inherently transient: the 222 laser-induced plasma evolves rapidly during and after the laser pulse, changing in temperature, 223 density, and opacity [26]. Furthermore, the ions, atoms, and molecules in the plasma interact 224 with each other, causing the intensity of emission lines from any given element to depend on the 225 presence and concentration of other elements. Unconsolidated materials such as regolith/soil or 226 dust present an additional challenge; although they may absorb the laser well, the shock wave 227 from the laser ablation alter the material surface for subsequent laser shots and create a pit that 228 confines the plasma and changes its properties compared to an unconfined plasma generated 229 on a hard surface (the conditions under which our spectral database was acquired). Collectively 230 the chemical and physical effects that can complicate the simple relationship between emission

- 231 line strength and elemental abundance are called "matrix effects" [27].
- For terrestrial LIBS applications, it is possible to mitigate these analytical challenges by, e.g.,
- sample preprocessing, control of observation repeatability, and possibly by selection of
- calibration samples that are matrix matched to specific targets of interest. For SuperCam and
- other planetary LIBS instruments, these strategies are not available, but key features of LIBS
- 236 (e.g., speed, remote compositional analysis, and no sample-preparation requirements) led to
- 237 SuperCam's selection as part of the rover payload.
- Even when the laser is absorbed well and a quality LIBS spectrum is collected, quantifying the
- compositions of rocks and minerals is challenging compared to LIBS applications in industrial
- settings, where the range of compositions is relatively well constrained and the materials
- themselves are homogeneous in terms of their physical properties and composition. Although
- most Mars rocks are composed primarily of silicates and have a roughly basaltic composition
 (e.g., [27–29]), experience from Gale crater with ChemCam shows that "extreme" compositions
- (e.g., [27-29]), experience from Gale Grater with Chemical shows that extreme composition
 (often pure minerals) are observed and are scientifically interesting targets (e.g. [31–33]). An
- ideal quantification for Mars targets should be accurate for "typical" basaltic rocks, for pure
- silicate minerals such as olivine and plagioclase, and also for "unusual" non-silicate
- compositions such as manganese-, iron-, and titanium-oxides, sulfates, and carbonates.
- 248 Considering the range of variations in observational parameters and the expected heterogeneity
- of samples expected at Jezero crater, a physics-based approach like "calibration-free LIBS"
- 250 (CF-LIBS; e.g., [34]) might seem attractive. However, the SuperCam instrument is not suitable
- 251 for CF-LIBS because the whole plasma evolution from initiation to extinction is recorded in each
- spectrum, rather than only acquiring the spectrum during a narrow time-gate of the plasma
- evolution. Furthermore, not all contributing components in martian targets are easily quantified
- by LIBS (e.g., sulfur, or carbonates in a CO₂-dominated atmosphere), making the self-
- normalization implied in CF-LIBS problematic [35]. For these reasons, we have not investigated
 the use of CF-LIBS for the quantitative calibration model for SuperCam.

257 1.3. Multivariate vs Univariate Calibration

Our calibration approach was to seek an empirical calibration trained on data collected in the
 laboratory. Empirical calibrations can be "univariate" or "multivariate." Univariate calibration
 relates a single variable such as intensity at a given wavelength, or the integrated intensity of a

- 261 fitted emission line, to the abundance of the element of interest. Multivariate models instead
- incorporate information from many emission lines, and potentially from the entire spectrum, to
- 263 predict elemental abundances.

Univariate models have the advantage of being simple and easy to interpret, and the user has complete control over which emission line is used. However, although univariate models can be effective for minor and trace elements with few weak emission lines (e.g., [31,36]), they tend not to perform as well as multivariate models for major elements [37]. Multivariate models can incorporate information from the entire spectrum, including emission from elements other than the element being predicted, to mitigate matrix effects outlined above.

- Both univariate and multivariate models run the risk of giving spurious predictions for new data, either due to the prediction model being overfitted (i.e. tuning the parameters such that the model performs well on the training set but does not handle novel data well) or because the new
- observation represents an unusual composition relative to the samples on which the model was
- trained. If trained on a large and representative data set, the multivariate models have superior
- performance [37,38]; we therefore chose to focus our efforts on the multivariate approach for
- the major element calibrations discussed in this paper.

277 2. Experimental

278 2.1. Setup

279 The multivariate models used to extract quantitative chemical compositions are developed from 280 a spectral library of pressed rock powder and synthetic standards with known chemical 281 compositions. This spectral library was acquired prior to delivery of the SuperCam instrument to 282 the rover for assembly and integration. Data acquisition was performed in Los Alamos National 283 Laboratory using the flight Body Unit (i.e. the unit now in the *Perseverance* rover on Mars) 284 containing the spectrometers, and an Engineering Qualification Model (EQM) of the Mast Unit 285 (MU) containing the laser and telescope [2,3]. Differences between the EQM and flight versions 286 of the MU are minor. The most significant is that the flight MU uses an aluminum primary mirror 287 surface, while the EQM uses a nickel-coated aluminum mirror similar to ChemCam's [5]. The 288 flight mirror is an all-aluminum mirror because it was determined after the EQM build that the 289 nickel coating resulted in a slight degradation of the shape of the mirror at its normal 290 temperature on Mars (where it is maintained at ~-35°C) relative to the optimum shapeat room 291 temperature on Earth. The change in mirror surfaces resulted in a noticeable improvement in 292 the resolution of the Remote Micro-Imager (RMI) images at Mars temperatures, but the change 293 in laser beam size was not noticeable; however, it may have had a small but unquantified effect 294 on the LIBS. The other effect of the all-Al mirror surface was a slight loss (~10%) in reflectivity in 295 the UV range. Both flight and test setups were corrected for their respective optical responses, 296 compensating for this and any other differences in optical response.

297



Figure 1: Photographs of the laboratory setup: (a) environmental chamber, with a tube connecting to the chamber containing standards to be analyzed; (b) SuperCam inside the environmental chamber and (c) view down the connecting tube of several pressed powder samples and a Ti plate ready for analysis. Photo credit: R. Wiens.

The experimental arrangement is shown in Figure 1. Because the SuperCam laser is designed to give optimum performance at "Mars-like" temperatures in the -30 to +10°C range, the instrument was maintained in a thermal chamber for laboratory measurements. The Body Unit was in the chamber too, since the detectors should be operated at temperatures below 0°C. It was observed during early testing that the compressor of the thermal chamber vibrated the instrument slightly, causing the laser beam position on the target to vary by up to ~500 µm at nominal target distances. To provide consistent pointing such that successive pulses hit the
 same location, the thermal chamber was cooled to -15°C and turned off while observations were
 made of two targets, at which point the chamber was re-cooled to -15°C before repeating with
 the next two targets. The chamber temperature never exceeded -7°C

308 Samples were placed in the Mars chamber (Figure 1), which accommodated ~16 pressed 309 pellets (30 mm diameter) plus a Ti plate control sample. The chamber was sealed and 310 evacuated to <100 mTorr (~10 Pa) pressure. Gas was introduced to bring the pressure to 5.5 311 Torr (733 Pa, the mean surface pressure at Jezero crater) using CO₂, maintaining that pressure 312 with dynamic pumping so that the gas in the chamber was constantly refreshed. This minimizes 313 moisture and removes volatiles produced during ablation to minimize contamination of the 314 chamber window. Pressure was read by a vacuum gauge, which is calibrated for terrestrial air 315 composition (80% N₂). Pressure curves for CO₂ indicate that a reading of 3.5 Torr corresponds 316 to an actual pressure of 5.5 Torr. The pressure was maintained within $\pm 3\%$. Relative humidity in 317 the room was low (~20%); however, the pressed powder standards were stored without 318 desiccants, and notable hydrogen peaks in otherwise anhydrous standards suggest that the

319 pressed powders contained some adsorbed and/or absorbed water.

320 To be consistent with SuperCam optical geometry and to avoid unnecessary optical aberrations, 321 we used only a single window between the instrument and the samples, similar to the remote 322 warm electronics box (RWEB) window on the rover. To achieve this configuration while keeping 323 the targets at Mars pressure and keeping the instrument at Mars-like temperatures, a tube was 324 installed to enclose the beam path between the thermal chamber and the sample chamber. The 325 tube kept warm, humid air from entering the thermal chamber near the aperture of the 326 instrument, which would have resulted in condensation there. The tube extended to the window 327 of the sample chamber at Mars pressure (Figure 1). Different lengths of tubing were available, 328 so that targets could be observed at different distances.

329 Focusing was performed manually by setting the focus stage to the approximate distance to the 330 target, firing the laser, and checking the signal strength. Small adjustments to the focus were 331 made in the forward and backward directions to find the strongest signal. The focus was kept at 332 this position over a period of several days during the measurement campaigns, checking the 333 strength of the signal from a control sample (titanium plate) to ensure that focus was maintained 334 from one day to the next. The LIBS campaign was interrupted before the last standards were 335 observed, and upon resumption, a distance of 3.0 m was used instead of the original 2.85 m, 336 and a relatively small number of standards were observed at this slightly longer distance. In the 337 analyses discussed here, the data at 2.85 and 3.0 m are grouped together and referred to as 338 the "3 meter" data set.

2.2. Data for the spectral library were collected between 9 and 21 April 339 2019. Three separate locations were analyzed on each standard, 340 collecting 30 active and 30 non-laser ("dark") spectra from each location. 341 342 The average spectrum for each location was calculated, excluding the first five points to minimize surface contamination (e.g. adsorbed water). In a 343 344 few cases, four locations were probed if there was any question of the validity of the first three observations. The laser was energized with a 345 current of 140 A, which yields 12 mJ of energy measured on target at 346 Mars-like temperatures after passing through the telescopic system and 347 the window between the thermal chamber and the sample chamber. For 348 349 the UV and VIO spectral ranges, signal was collected over 200 rows of the detectors with an integration time set to 34 µs, although without a shutter, 350 351 the effective integration time was much longer due to the CCD readout time of several milliseconds. For the transmission spectrometer, the 352 353 intensifier gain was set to 2500 (See [3] for details regarding instrument 354 gain). The gate was set to open at the same time as laser firing by setting the delay to 650 ns relative to an arbitrary start time. The intensifier gate 355 (exposure duration) was 10 µs, and the CCD exposure duration was 356 4.9834 ms to allow time for the intensifier phosphor glow to decay before 357 358 transferring data. Additional details of the instrument operation are 359 provided by Maurice et al. and Wiens et al. [2,3]. Description of Standards

360 The SuperCam calibration database comprises 334 samples. Most of the standards used in this 361 library come from the database built for the ChemCam calibration [38]. These standards include 362 powdered geologic materials provided by several laboratories, in addition to those purchased 363 from Brammers and U.S. Geological Survey. A variety of igneous, sedimentary, and metamorphic rock types are represented, as well as multiple mineral types: primary igneous 364 365 minerals (olivines, pyroxenes, and feldspars of various compositions), carbonates (limestone, 366 dolomite, and aragonite), phyllosilicates (nontronite/smectite, kaolinite), sulfates (gypsum and 367 mixtures of sulfate and basalt), phosphates (apatite, heterosite/purpurite), oxides. These 368 samples are described in detail in [38], and are grouped by different mineralogies in (Table 9 in 369 [3]). Samples were prioritized to cover the expected mineral types in Jezero crater identified 370 from orbital spectroscopy, rock types common on Mars, and compositions found at previous 371 landing sites. An attempt was made to cover the geochemically relevant range for each element 372 (Figure 2) but, for several elements, certain compositional ranges (in particular, high 373 concentrations) are underrepresented, making accurate quantification in these ranges 374 challenging. Additional standards may need to be analyzed to improve the calibration in these 375 ranges.

Replicates of the onboard SuperCam Calibration Targets (SCCTs) [8,9] as well as several
 additional calibration targets that are not onboard the rover are also included in the spectral

- 378 library. These samples are not pressed powders, but sintered powders that make them more
- 379 durable. These calibration targets include primary igneous minerals, some standards, some
- 380 natural rocks (serpentine, chert, carbonates), an apatite, some basaltic mixtures doped in minor
- 381 elements, and a mixture between a basaltic standard with a sulfate [8,9].
- 382 A table containing the compositions and other metadata for all targets in the calibration
- 383 database is included in the supplementary material. The individual .fits files for each of the
- 384 laboratory observations, as well as a single .csv file containing compositions, metadata, and
- 385 spectra, are available at the SuperCam PDS archive: <u>https://pds-</u>
- 386 geosciences.wustl.edu/missions/mars2020/supercam.htm
- 387
- 388
- 389
- 209
- 390
- 391
- 392
- 393



sets for each major element oxide.

396 2.2.1.Spectral Variability

397 The performance of our calibration models depends on the diversity of the library of spectra on 398 which they are trained and their similarity to spectra collected on Mars. Given that the spectra 399 have thousands of wavelength channels but the underlying chemical variability is of far lower 400 dimensionality (most natural samples have a small number of major elements, and the emission 401 lines from a given element tend to be highly correlated), we can use dimensionality reduction 402 techniques to simplify exploration of library data and comparison with data from Mars. Principal 403 Component Analysis (PCA; [39-41]) allows us to capture the spectral response to chemical 404 variability by finding a set of only a few principal components that encapsulate most of the 405 variability of the data set. The first step in the PCA process is to compute an MxM variance-406 covariance matrix based on the library spectra, where M is the dimensionality of the spectra (the 407 number of spectral channels). This symmetric matrix relates the variability in one wavelength bin 408 to that of all other bins, illustrating their covariance with one another. For example, if Fe content 409 tends to be lower when Si content is higher, it is likely that the covariance of the wavelength bins 410 in those spectral lines/features will have a large negative and positive covariance respectively. If 411 Fe content is independent of Si content, the covariance will be near zero. Once the variance-412 covariance matrix is computed, an eigenvector decomposition of the matrix is performed, where 413 a set of M linearly independent unit vectors with length M (eigenvectors) are computed and their 414 scalar multiples (M eigenvalues) are computed. In PCA, each eigenvector is sorted according to 415 their eigenvalues and the first few eigenvectors (PCs) reflect the greatest variability in the 416 underlying data set.

417 Before the PCA process, each spectral range was normalized to its respective sum. In Figure 3 418 we show the amount of variance in the normalized library spectra that is represented by the first 419 several components and we show the first two eigenvectors (referred to as 'loadings' in PCA) for 420 the UV region of the LIBS spectra. The first two components together explain 60% of the variance 421 in the library spectra and the first ten components explain 95% of the variance. In Figure 4 we 422 show the projection of all library spectra into the principal component space of PC1 and PC2. The 423 maximum extent of the hull or "outline" of the library is defined by a few SCCTs due to their 424 "extreme" pure mineral end-member compositions. Some general compositional groupings and 425 trends can also be identified (Figure 4), for example, with metal oxides and olivines having high 426 PC2 values and carbonates and sulfates, having large PC1 values. These groupings are not strict, 427 and the loadings should be studied for a more detailed understanding of the location of a given 428 spectrum on the scores plot. The clinopyroxene calibration target, for example, is near the 429 (predominantly Ca-bearing) carbonates and sulfates due to their calcium contents. As shown in 430 Figure 3, the first component is strongly correlated with Ca content.

431 To understand whether the library data set encompasses observations on Mars, we plot the PC1 432 versus PC2 scores of all LIBS points acquired in Jezero crater uр to 433 Sol (solar day of the mission) 147 in Figure 5 with the hull of the library overlain. Nearly all Mars 434 spectra plot well within the library hull, demonstrating that the extent of the library is likely sufficient 435 in terms of its spectral variability in the dominant components. None of the points that fall outside 436 the hull are dramatically distinct from the library: they do not appear to represent a separate class 437 of materials that would require special analysis. It is worth noting that most of the observations on
438 Mars are centered near the igneous rock compositions, with some notable excursion into end-

439 member compositions at high values in the first two components.



Figure 3: (Top) The amount of variance in the library spectra explained by each principal component. (Bottom) Loadings of the first two principal components across the UV range. The first principal component is strongly correlated with Ca signal and the second is anticorrelated with Ca signal. Both PCs show correlations and anticorrelations in other elements.

440





Figure 5: All of the SuperCam LIBS data (circles) from Mars, up to sol 147, projected into the principal component space of the LIBS library (see Figure 4). The convex hull of the library is shown by the dashed line. Only very few observations on Mars fall out of the convex hull of the LIBS library database in this projection (red circles), indicating that the library is generally comprehensive with respect to the LIBS spectral variability observed in targets on Mars.

442 **3. Data Processing**

443 3.1. Preprocessing

444 3.1.1. Non-laser dark subtraction

445 SuperCam is commanded to take a non-laser "dark" spectrum immediately after the LIBS spectra 446 using the same spectrometer settings as the active spectrum, but without the laser firing. This is 447 not a true dark spectrum because light is still falling on the detector, but it serves a similar purpose. 448 allowing the fixed background signal of the instrument and ambient light to be removed. Signal 449 and darks for a given observation are stored in the same data file. Dark spectra are averaged and 450 then the mean spectrum is subtracted from each of the active collects. The dark subtraction also 451 removes an offset of 300-500 digital numbers (DNs; counts produced by the analog-to-digital 452 converter in the SuperCam instrument) which is added in the analog-to-digital conversion to 453 ensure that the converter does not encounter negative values.

454 3.1.2. Stitching

In the intensified transmission spectrometer, the light is split into three bands: the band closest
to the CCD serial register is referred to as the "Red" region and covers 707-853 nm; in the

457 center is the "Green" region covering 530-618 nm, and at the other side of the CCD is the 458 "Orange" region covering 598-720 nm[3]. The three bands overlap and are stitched together to 459 obtain a spectrum that has monotonically increasing wavelengths. The transition between 460 spectrometers is selected with two main criteria: 1. Given the choice between two 461 spectrometers, we want to use the higher signal to noise data as indicated by the Instrument 462 Response Function (IRF; see below); 2. To ensure a smooth spectrum, we want to transition 463 between spectrometers in a zone where no emission lines are present. The final spectral 464 channel indices used for the three ranges are listed in Table 1. 465

466 3.1.3. Denoising

To remove low level random signal variation across the spectrum (white noise), we use a "stationary" wavelet transform analysis to decompose the spectrum, remove noise, and then reconstruct the spectrum. The stationary wavelet transform is particularly useful for identifying noise [42,43] and the method we use for SuperCam is almost identical to that performed for ChemCam data reduction [44].

Wavelet analysis involves a convolution of the signal with orthogonal basis functions (wavelets) that have both scale and frequency properties. The process results in an invertible transform that can be considered as a series of band pass filters with a response function that is uniform in shape (a constant-shaped wavelet) but variable in scale and frequency. Using the orthogonality properties of the basis function, a spectrum can be completely characterized by the wavelet basis function and associated coefficients determined through the decomposition process.

478 A scaling function $\phi(x)$ and a wavelet function $\psi(x)$ are used for the wavelet transform. The 479 continuous scaling function satisfies the following equation:

480 $\phi(x) = \sqrt{2} \sum_{n} h(n) \phi(2x - n)$

481 where h(n) is the low-pass filter, x are the spectral channels, and n is the level of the wavelet 482 decomposition.

- 483 The continuous wavelet is defined in terms of the scaling function and the high-pass g(n) QMF 484 through:
- 485 $\psi(x) = \sqrt{2} \sum_{n} g(n) \psi(2x n)$

In the standard "discrete" wavelet transform (DWT), the input signal is broken down into a series of decomposition levels. At each level *L*, the wavelet has a resolution reduced by a factor of 2^{L} with respect to the original signal. That is, if the signal is defined across 100 nanometers, at level L=2, the wavelets will have a length of $100/2^{L}$ or 25 nanometers. At each level, the wavelet decreases in size, providing greater resolution of high frequency or sharper spectral features (Figure 6). 492 One downside to the discrete wavelet transform that is relevant to spectral noise characterization 493 is that all levels are required in the reconstruction of the signal (i.e. the levels are "non-redundant") 494 and the loss of the translation-invariance property in the DWT leads to a large number of artifacts 495 when a signal is reconstructed after modification of its wavelet coefficients. This is undesirable for 496 denoising because the goal is to isolate the noise, remove it, and reconstruct the signal without 497 noise. We instead use a stationary or undecimated form of the wavelet transform [45] in which 498 each level is redundant, with higher levels containing information necessary to deconstruct the 499 signal in the previous level. Thus, in the context of spectral analysis, the levels can be inspected 500 to distinguish between salient features, e.g., emission lines and white noise. We direct the reader 501 to [46] for a mathematical description and a comparative discussion of discrete and stationary 502 wavelet analysis for an analogous noise characterization analysis.

503





prior to wavelength calibration or

conversion to physical units.

505

In our application of the stationary transform, the wavelet coefficients are found by calculating the
 difference between two successive scaling passes. The scaling function used is a B₃-spline, and
 the associated low-pass filter h is defined in terms of its z-transform as:

509
$$h(z) = 1/16(z^{-2} + 4z^{-1} + 6z^{0} + 4z^{1} + z^{2})$$

510 We use the second generation of the transform described by [45] which is more robust to artefacts

511 than other wavelet-based denoising methods. The z-transform of the high-pass filter g is:

512
$$g(z) = 1/256(-z^4 - 8z^3 - 28z^2 - 56z^1 + 186z^0 - 56z^{-1} - 28z^{-2} - 8z^{-3} - z^{-4})$$

513 This differs from the high-pass filter used in [44]:

514
$$g(z) = 1/16(-z^{-1} - 6z^0 + 16z^1 + 6z^2 + z^3)$$

515 For more details on the stationary wavelet transform and its implementation, refer to [45].

516 At each scale, noise is identified and removed using "sigma clipping" as described in [47,48]. We 517 calculate the standard deviation of the absolute value of the wavelet spectrum at a given 518 decomposition scale and identify those spectral channels with values less than three times the 519 standard deviation. This process is repeated iteratively on the channels that fall below the 520 threshold several times to arrive at an estimate of the standard deviation of the noise in the 521 wavelet spectrum at each scale. Then, values in the wavelet spectrum below three times the 522 standard deviation are set to zero. Once this has been applied to each scale of the wavelet 523 decomposition, the de-noised spectrum is reconstructed by summing the wavelet scales.

524 Figure 7 illustrates the result of denoising applied to a spectrum acquired on Mars. The figure 525 shows a small subset of the spectrum so that the noise and the difference between the original 526 and denoised spectrum can be seen. The average absolute change in signal for this spectrum 527 after denoising is ~8 DNs.



528

3.1.4. Instrument Response Function and Conversion to Radiance

529 SuperCam spectra are converted to physical units of radiance (W/cm²/sr/nm) prior to quantitative 530 analysis. The conversion from photons to radiance is similar to that described in section 2.3.4 of 531 [44]. First, the recorded CCD signal in DN (digital number) is converted to photons using the 532 Instrument Response Function (IRF).. Figure 8 shows the IRF for the three spectrometers. After 533 the IRF has been applied, the spectrum is divided by the integration time, area on target, solid 534 angle subtended by the telescope, and spectral channel width for each CCD column. Finally, 535 photons/s is converted to watts using $E = hc/\lambda$ for each spectral channel. The calculation of both 536 the area of the target visible from the telescope and the solid angle subtended by the telescope 537 as seen from the target include the distance to the target, so applying the conversion to radiance 538 includes an implicit correction for distance for the light emitted by the plasma spark.

- 539
- 540



542 3.1.5.Continuum Removal

Laser-induced plasma emission contains a background continuum due to primarily to ion-electron recombination processes. In SuperCam spectra, this is most notable in the three transmission spectrometers. This continuum shows some correlation with chemical composition [49,50], but is more strongly influenced by the amount of laser energy absorbed by the target (e.g. due to distance or focus). We have found that removing the continuum prior to normalization helps to mitigate these variations. We use the same continuum removal procedure described by [44].

549 The continuum removal algorithm is based on the same wavelet decomposition as the de-noising 550 algorithm described above. It works by decomposing the spectrum to a specified scale and then 551 finding the local minima of the decomposed spectrum at that scale. Then, minima are found in 552 the original input spectrum within windows of $\pm 2^{L}$ around each local minimum from the decomposed signal, where L is the wavelet scale. A cubic spline is fit to these minima and 553 554 subtracted from the input spectrum. For each wavelet scale, beginning with the largest scale and 555 continuing to lower scales until reaching a specified minimum scale, the process is repeated 556 iteratively until the standard deviation of the corrected spectrum stops changing significantly or a 557 maximum number of iterations is reached. The advantage of this algorithm is that it is fast and 558 relies on very few parameters. Figure 9 illustrates how the removed continuum evolves with each 559 additional scale.

560



561

562 The default parameters for the minimum wavelength scale for continuum removal are 6 for the 563 UV and VIO spectral ranges, and 5 for the three transmission spectrometer ranges (Green, 564 Orange, Red). Increasing this parameter produces a smoother continuum, but a lower number 565 gives a continuum that follows the spectrum more closely (Figure 9).

566 3.1.6. Wavelength Calibration

567 Wavelength calibration is performed by comparing the spectrum to be calibrated with a 568 reference spectrum. The reference spectrum can be either a real spectrum acquired by the 569 instrument or a synthetic spectrum built from lines of interest. In either case, the known 570 positions of the emission lines are mapped to spectral channel indices using a pattern 571 recognition algorithm, and a continuous wavelength distribution is fit to these index-wavelength 572 pairs. The procedure is an updated version of the method described in section 2.3.3 of [44]. We use the vacuum wavelengths of the emission lines from the NIST spectral database [51] rather
than the wavelengths in air at 1 bar because all data were acquired at martian atmospheric
pressure (6 mbars).

576

577 The UV and VIO ranges of the calibration database are calibrated against a spectrum acquired 578 on a titanium plate. Titanium is well suited for the UV and VIO ranges because it contains a 579 large number of emission lines in these ranges. For the Green, Orange and Red spectrometers, 580 we used synthetic spectra built with emissions lines of identified elements in the respective 581 ranges. The wavelength calibration of the laboratory database serves as a reference for all the 582 spectra acquired on Mars.

583

584 Wavelength calibration for the flight instrument was calculated using LIBS spectra from a 585 titanium plate and two additional targets: IlmHem which is a mixture of ilmenite and hematite. 586 and ClinQzOrth which is a mixture of clinozoisite quartz and orthoclase. These spectra were 587 collected during the rover System Thermal Test in October 2019. Because wavelength 588 calibration alters the distance in wavelength space covered by each channel, we re-sample the 589 calibrated spectrum onto the baseline channel-to-wavelength map. Finally, the spectra are re-590 interpolated over the reference wavelength defined for the calibration database so that the 591 wavelengths of the Mars and laboratory data have precisely the same wavelength values.

592

593 On Mars, we observe slight changes in wavelength calibration as a function of temperature.

594 Figure 10 shows the average absolute pixel (spectral channel) shift calculated for the UV and

VIO ranges for all active LIBS sequences taken up to sol 147 of the mission. The median of the

average shift is 0.16 pixel for the UV range, and 0.2 pixel for the VIO range. All values remain

597 well within \pm 0.5 pixel shift in the UV range, and within \pm 1 pixel shift for the VIO range. The 598 transmission spectrometer calibrations have been checked to be robust to temperature

transmission spectrometer calibrations have been checked to be robust to temperature variations and typically present an average shift of about 0.02 pixels per degree, much lower

variations and typically present an average shift of about 0.02 pixels per degree, much lower
 than for the UV and VIO ranges. Given the small observed shifts, the wavelength calibration for

- 601 SuperCam spectra is not currently adjusted for temperature.
- 602



603

604 3.1.7. Additional Preprocessing for Quantification

605 In addition to the preprocessing applied to all spectra, we also applied several additional steps 606 prior to training regression models. The first is masking: to ensure that quantification is based on 607 the highest-quality data, we defined a mask to remove portions of the spectra with lower signal to noise, based on investigation of the instrument response function (Figure 8), while also 608 609 retaining key emission lines, such as the Ti lines at the long-wavelength end of the UV range. 610 We masked out the UV spectrometer for wavelengths less than 245.5 nm and the Red 611 spectrometer for regions where the instrument response is <1/5 the best instrument response 612 value for the Red spectrometer. This results in the removal of Red spectrometer data between 613 712.17 nm and 714 nm, and for wavelengths >848.3 nm. No masking was required for the VIO, 614 Green, or Orange spectrometers. There was also an anomalous feature in some of the 615 laboratory data in the wavelength range 796 nm $\leq \lambda \leq$ 808 nm that was masked.

616 We also normalized each spectrum. This involves dividing the portion of the spectrum from each

617 spectrometer by the total signal from that spectrometer. We treat the three spectral ranges of

618 the transmission spectrometer separately, so we have five spectral ranges for normalization.

Thus, after normalization is applied, the full spectrum across all five spectral ranges sums to 5.

Normalization helps to mitigate fluctuations in signal between observations and partly reducesthe effect of distance on the spectrum.

622 We also experimented with applying standardization and peak binning to the spectra. Peak 623 binning is an algorithm originally developed for ChemCam analysis as a fast and simple 624 alternative to fitting and summing all of the individual peaks in a spectrum [52]. It works by 625 calculating an average training set spectrum and using that average spectrum to identify the 626 wavelength values of local minima and local maxima. Each individual spectrum is then binned: 627 the signal between pairs of local minima is summed, and the resulting value is assigned to the 628 wavelength of the local maximum. In this way, the full spectrum (>7900 spectral channels after 629 masking) can be replaced with a "spectrum" of summed values (~560 channels). This has the 630 benefit of significantly reducing the size of the spectrum and collecting the signal from each line 631 into a single value, increasing robustness to small shifts in wavelength calibration. Peak binning 632 may also increase model sensitivity to broad or weak lines [52]. We applied peak binning prior 633 to normalization. Regression models with and without peak binning were evaluated for all 634 elements, but it did not always improve the accuracy of the quantification.

635 Standardization involves subtracting the average value and dividing by the standard deviation 636 for each spectral channel, resulting in a spectrum where each channel has a mean value of 0 637 and a standard deviation of 1. The mean and standard deviation are calculated based on the 638 training set spectra, and the same values are used to standardize unknown spectra to be 639 predicted. Standardization can help with regression in some cases by equalizing the influence of 640 all spectral channels on the model. It reduces the magnitude of very bright emission lines and 641 amplifies portions of the spectrum with few or weak emission lines. The resulting spectra and 642 regression coefficients are less intuitive for human interpretation but can lead to improved 643 regression models. Standardization was applied after normalization. As with peak binning, we 644 evaluated models with and without standardization for each of the major elements, but it did not 645 always improve the results.

646 We also shifted the wavelength calibration of the training spectra by \pm 1 to 3 pixels and used 647 both the shifted and unshifted data to train models. The observed variation in wavelength 648 calibration on Mars is small (Figure 10), but we found that models trained on shifted spectra did 649 not suffer in performance when predicting unshifted data but were more robust to shifts in 650 wavelength if they were to occur, so most of the models considered were trained on spectra 651 with shifts of up to 1 or 2 pixels.

652 3.2. Data Organization

One challenge for developing an empirical multivariate calibration is determining the optimal parameters to use for the regression algorithms considered. Many algorithms are susceptible to "overfitting" - tuning the parameters such that the model performs well on the training set but does not handle novel data well. To tune model parameters while avoiding overfitting, we use kfold cross validation [53] in which the data are split into k roughly equal-sized parts or "folds." We used five folds, defined separately for each major element. The exact number of folds used has been shown to have little effect on the performance of the final model as long as both the

- training set and test set provide a good representation of the sample variability [54]. We
- 661 "stratified" the data by sorting on the abundance of the element of interest, so that when the
- samples are sequentially assigned to the folds, the result is that the distribution of compositions
- is as similar as possible (Figure 11). This helps to reduce the likelihood that all of the samples
- 664 with the highest concentration of the element being predicted do not end up in one fold, causing
- it to behave dramatically differently than the other folds. To some extent this situation is
 unavoidable, given the "long tail" of higher compositions for many elements, but stratification
- 667 minimizes the effect. All spectra of the same target are grouped together when defining the
- 668 folds to ensure that the folds are independent
- 669 We held out one of the folds as a "test set" which is used for model selection and estimation of
- 670 accuracy only after cross validation and model tuning have been completed. All rover calibration
- 671 targets were kept in the test set so spectra from Mars can be used to assess model
- 672 performance.
- 673 The cross-validation process involves stepping through the remaining four folds, holding out one
- at a time, training a model based on the other three folds, and predicting the held-out data. This
- 675 gives an estimate of how the final model, trained on all four folds in the training set, will perform
- 676 on unknown data. The optimum parameters for a given algorithm can be determined by
- 677 examining how the root mean squared error of cross validation (RMSECV) varies with different
- 678 settings. When the RMSECV is similar for multiple different settings of a model, the least-
- 679 complex model was adopted.



680 3.2.1.Outlier Removal

We use several approaches to determine whether certain samples should be considered "outliers" in the development of our models for each element. First, we evaluate the data quality to determine if each spectrum is valid to use at all. Some spectra exhibit low total signal, low signal to noise, and anomalous curvature in the continuum of the UV spectrometer and are marked for potential removal, although they were not removed until after the outlier identification steps described here were applied.

687 We next evaluate target homogeneity by running a PCA analysis on the full data set and 688 gualitatively inspecting the PC1 vs PC2 score plots to visualize how tightly grouped the points 689 for a given target were. This analysis allowed us to remove several anomalous spectra. In other 690 cases, the points for a given target exhibited considerable variation on the scores plot. If one 691 point was significantly different from the others, it was removed while the homogeneous points 692 were kept. In cases where all spectra from a target showed significant scatter, we took this as 693 an indication that the target was not sufficiently homogenized during preparation; thus, the 694 reference composition may not match the composition of the spots analyzed. For these cases, 695 all spectra for the target were removed.

- 696 We also used several outlier identification approaches to more quantitatively identify potentially 697 problematic spectra. Two of these were algorithms available through the scikit-learn Python 698 library: local outlier factor (LOF) and isolation forest (IF) [55,56]. LOF works by calculating the 699 distance from each spectrum to its nearest neighbors and comparing with the average distance 700 to the nearest neighbors of the nearest neighbors. Outliers are expected to be farther from their 701 neighbors than average. IF works by randomly splitting the high-dimensionality point cloud of 702 spectra until the spectrum of interest is isolated. An outlier tends to require relatively few splits 703 to isolate, while a spectrum that is more "typical" will be in the dense part of the cloud and 704 require more splits to isolate. We ran both algorithms on the normalized spectra, with 705 parameters set so that they would flag 10% of the spectra as potential outliers. We then 706 removed those spectra that were flagged by both methods. Many of the spectra flagged by LOF
- and IF as potential outliers were also identified above as having low signal.
- Another approach to outlier identification is to generate a partial least squares (PLS) model and
- plot the Q residuals against the Hotelling T^2 values for each spectrum. For this, we used
- 710 PLS_toolbox 8.9 (Eigenvector Research Inc.) for MATLAB R2020b (MathWorks Inc.). For a
- 711 model that represents the spectra X using loadings P and scores T, with an error matrix E
- $X = TP^{\mathsf{T}} + E$
- 713 Q residuals are defined as

714
$$Q_i = e_i e_i^{\mathsf{T}} = x_i (I - P_k P_k^{\mathsf{T}}) x_i^{\mathsf{T}},$$

where e_i is the error for the ith spectrum, x_i is the ith spectrum, I is the identity matrix, and P_k are

the loadings for the k components of the model. Q_i is a summary of how well the selected

- components model the spectrum, with larger values indicating a spectrum that is not handledwell by the model.
- 719 Hotelling's T² statistic is defined as
- 720 $T_i^2 = t_i \lambda^{-1} t_i^{\mathsf{T}} = x_i P_k \lambda^{-1} P_k^{\mathsf{T}} x_i^{\mathsf{T}}$

where t_i refers to the i-th row of the scores matrix T, and λ is the matrix of eigenvalues corresponding to the k of components in the model. T_i² reflects the leverage of a spectrum on

the model.

Outliers on the Q vs T^2 plot are points that plot far away from the origin, particularly those with high values of both Q and T^2 , indicating that the spectrum has a significant amount of influence on the model (high T^2) but is still poorly predicted by the model (high Q).

727 A similar approach to calculating Q is to train a PLS model and identify training set samples that 728 are poorly predicted by the model. For each major element, we used both the Q vs T^2 and the 729 training set approach and flagged potential outliers. Spectra flagged as outliers for many or all of 730 the major elements using these two model-based methods were removed completely from all 731 models. These spectra included ilmenite, a mix of quartz and cobaltite, a Mn oxide, and 732 sodalite. If these model-based methods flagged a spectrum as an outlier for only a small 733 number of the major elements, then that spectrum was removed for those elements but kept for 734 other element models.

735 One of the challenges of defining outliers is how to handle high-guality spectra from samples 736 that are very different from the average. In our data set, these tend to be mineral samples with 737 unusually high concentrations of one element. These spectra may be flagged as outliers 738 because they are either poorly modeled or they exert an undue influence on the model, but they 739 are valid data and may improve the model performance at high concentrations at the expense of 740 the performance at low concentrations. Thus, we found it useful to handle these samples 741 differently depending on the model being trained. We remove them from fixed models intended 742 to accurately predict low concentrations but retain them for models restricted to high 743 concentrations, and for local regression models, which dynamically adjust the samples being 744 used to match the unknown spectrum (see below). To define which samples should be handled 745 in this way, we established a threshold for compositions to be considered "high" compared to 746 the rest of the data set. For each element, we calculated the median and standard deviation of 747 the composition across all standards in the database. Standards were considered "high" 748 concentration if they had values greater than 1 standard deviation above the median value. 749 Spectra that were both "high" in composition based on this criterion and flagged as outliers were 750 removed when training models intended to predict the full range (0-100 wt.%) for an element but 751 were kept for high-concentration submodels and local regression models. In total, out of 1198 752 individual spectra, 54 were removed from all major element models. The number of spectra 753 removed for each of the major elements is listed in Table 2. For "high" models, fewer spectra 754 are removed because those identified as high concentration are retained.

	# of Outlier Spectra	# of Outlier Spectra (for "High" models)
SiO ₂	102	92
TiO ₂	114	112
Al ₂ O ₃	101	89
FeO⊤	102	94
MgO	97	78
CaO	125	100
Na ₂ O	120	116
K ₂ O	115	97

Table 2: Outliers removed from laboratory data set

755 4. Quantification

756 4.1. Algorithms

No single multivariate regression algorithm is clearly the best choice for all major elements. For our work toward a quantitative prediction model for each major element, we take the approach of trying a wide variety of algorithms and choosing the model or models that give the best results. We first discuss the algorithms in this section and in the next section we discuss the criteria used to select the preferred model. The algorithms considered are listed in Table 3. We used the Python library scikit-learn [57] to implement these algorithms.

Table 3: Regression algorithms and abbreviations

Algorithm	Abbreviation
Ordinary Least Squares	OLS
Partial Least Squares	PLS
Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator	LASSO
Ridge regression	Ridge
Elastic Net	ENet
Orthogonal Matching Pursuit	OMP
Support Vector Regression	SVR

Random Forest	RF
Gradient Boosting Regression	GBR
Local Elastic Net	Local ENet
Blended submodels	Blend

763 Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) is the simplest approach to multivariate regression. For the *n* 764 spectra *x* with *p* spectral channels, it seeks to find the regression coefficients *w* to predict the 765 composition *y*:

 $y_{i,predict} = w_0 + w_1 x_{1i} + w_2 x_{2i} + w_3 x_{3i} + \dots + w_p x_{pi}$

767 while minimizing the sum of squared residuals:

768
$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} (y_{i,predict} - y_{i,true})^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{n} (x_i w - y_{i,true})^2$$

OLS tends to perform poorly when there is a high degree of correlation between the features in

the data, which is a common situation when working with spectroscopic data. However, we

included OLS as a point of comparison for other more sophisticated algorithms.

272 Least Absolute Selection and Shrinkage Operator (LASSO; Tibshirani, 1996) is one of several

773 methods that seek to improve upon OLS by adding a "regularization" term, which seeks to

impose constraints or certain behaviors on the regression model. LASSO adds a term

consisting of a constant (α) multiplied by the sum of the absolute values of the regression

coefficients *w*.

777
$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} (x_i w - y_{i,true})^2 + \alpha \sum_{j=0}^{p} |w_j|$$

Minimizing this regularized equation has the effect of simplifying the model by setting many of
the regression coefficients to zero. The value of α adjusts how strongly the regularization term is
weighted, and therefore how sparse the solution is. A sparse model has the benefit of being
easier to interpret and potentially faster, while still performing well [59].

Ridge regression [60] imposes a different form of regularization to the model, the sum of thesquares of the regression coefficients:

784
$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} (x_i w - y_{i,true})^2 + \alpha \sum_{j=0}^{p} w_j^2$$

785 This has the effect of penalizing models in which certain coefficients are significantly larger than

the others, which in turn can make the model more robust to correlation between x variables(spectral channels)

Elastic Net (Enet; [61]) combines the Ridge and Lasso regularizations, using the parameter ρ to
 control their relative strengths:

790
$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} (x_i w - y_{i,true})^2 + \alpha (1-\rho)/2 \sum_{j=0}^{p} w_j^2 + \alpha \rho \sum_{k=0}^{p} |w_k|$$

Orthogonal Matching Pursuit (OMP) [62,63] seeks to minimize the least squared error, with a
 constraint on the total number of non-zero regression coefficients. It iteratively selects spectral
 channels, with each additional channel chosen to be orthogonal to previously selected channels
 and highly correlated with the remaining residual.

Partial Least Squares (PLS; [63]) is a regression method that is closely related to PCA and has

previously been used successfully for LIBS calibration (e.g., [37,43,64,65]). Like PCA, PLS

seeks to reproject high-dimensionality data (spectra) into a lower-dimensionality space.

However, unlike PCA, PLS seeks a projection that maximizes the correlation between each

- component in the x space and the composition y. PLS handles data with a large number of highly correlated independent variables well, and thus is commonly used with spectroscopic
- 801 data.

802 Support vector regression is based on the Support Vector Machine (SVM), in which data are 803 projected into a space where they can be effectively separated using a hyperplane [67,68]. For

regression, this hyperplane defines a region around the prediction within which errors are not

805 penalized. This allows the algorithm to focus on reducing the largest errors rather than making

806 insignificant improvements on predictions that are already close to the true value.

807 We used two ensemble methods as well: Gradient Boosting Regression (GBR; Friedman, 2002, 808 2001) and Random Forest (RF; Breiman, 2001), both of which are based on decision trees [72]. 809 To build a decision tree, a series of binary splits ("branches") are chosen. For regression trees, 810 it is common to choose a split that minimizes the variance. Once the decision tree is built, an 811 unknown spectrum begins at the tree "trunk," and follows the set of branches, eventually arriving 812 at a "leaf", which represents the prediction result. Decision trees have the disadvantage of 813 overfitting test data if the hierarchy is too deep. To prevent this overfitting, rather than using a 814 single decision tree, ensemble methods form predictions from a combination of multiple decision 815 trees. See [72] for more details on decision trees.

816 In RF regression [71], a set of decision trees is created by training on random subsets of the 817 training set and using random subsets of the input variables (spectral channels) as well. Taking

818 the average of a larger number of randomized decision trees generally causes their individual

819 errors to balance out, yielding an accurate regression model without suffering from overfitting.

GBR [69,70], on the other hand, is a technique for repeatedly adding decision trees so that the
next decision tree corrects errors in the prediction from the previous decision tree. This is done
using "boosting" [73] which is a technique that aggregates models developed sequentially on a
given learning task, with the weights assigned to the input data adjusted as new models are
added. At each step of the process, a new model is added and fit to the negative gradient of a

loss function. The loss function can be the mean squared error (MSE) which is not robust to
 outliers, the mean absolute error (MAE) which is robust to outliers, or the Huber loss function

827 which transitions from MAE to MSE at a specified threshold [74].

828 As discussed above, one of the main challenges in developing a regression model for predicting 829 the composition of geologic materials on Mars is the wide range of potential compositions. 830 Models trained on a restricted range of compositions tend to perform well within that range, but 831 very poorly outside the training range. Models trained on a diverse set of samples, on the other 832 hand, tend to perform better overall, but within a specific range a specialized model may still do 833 better. For the calibration of the ChemCam instrument, we developed a "submodel" approach to 834 make use of this behavior [65]. By training several models on restricted ranges of composition, 835 and then using a single overarching model as a "first guess" to determine which submodel is 836 most appropriate for a given prediction, we can often improve the overall accuracy. The 837 disadvantage of the submodel approach is that it is relatively involved, requiring the cross 838 validation of several models, optimization of the blending of multiple models, and trial and error 839 to determine which algorithms and which training set ranges give the best results.

840 Local ENet is an algorithm that we developed as an alternative to the relatively involved process 841 of using blended submodels. It generates a new elastic net model for each unknown spectrum 842 being predicted, using the N most similar spectra in the training set, where N is a user-specified 843 number of nearest neighbors. The individual models are optimized using the automatic cross 844 validation capabilities of the implementation of Elastic Net in scikit-learn. Local Elastic Net is 845 inspired by the LOCAL algorithm [75], in which a weighted average of PLS models is used in a 846 similar manner. Local Elastic Net regression is time consuming since it trains many individual 847 models, but it has the advantage that it can adapt the training set to be as similar as possible to 848 the unknown spectrum without the need for human involvement. Our implementation of Local 849 ENet is available as part of the Python Hyperspectral Analysis Tool (https://github.com/USGS-850 Astrogeology/PyHAT).

851 To investigate the behavior of regression models, it is useful to see which spectral channels 852 influence the model the most. For the linear models above (PLS, Ridge, LASSO, Enet, OMP) 853 we use the vector of regression coefficients w that is multiplied by each spectrum to yield a 854 predicted composition. These can be plotted as a function of wavelength much like a spectrum 855 to see which parts of the spectrum have a strong positive or negative correlation with the 856 prediction. Ensemble methods do not have a perfectly analogous vector, since they comprise 857 many decision tree models. Instead, the scikit-learn implementation of GBR and RF provides a 858 "feature importance" or "Gini importance" vector. This is a vector of values that indicates which 859 spectral channels had the greatest influence on the model, but it is not a vector of weights that 860 is multiplied by the spectrum to yield a prediction.

861 4.2. Model Selection

With such a large variety of regression algorithms, the process of selecting between the models for each element is very important. As discussed above, we use cross validation on the training set to optimize the parameters of each model to minimize the RMSECV. Once the parameters are set, we use the optimized models to predict the test set. The Root Mean Squared Error of
Prediction (RMSEP) of those test set predictions is the primary basis on which the best model is
selected. Rather than using a single RMSEP, we subdivide the test set and calculate the
RMSEP for all test set data acquired at 3 m, and SCCTs observed at 3, 1.545, and 4.25 m.

869 The primary metric we use to select a model is the RMSEP for the test set spectra at 3 meters 870 (the most typical distance at which targets will be analyzed on Mars). For each element, several 871 models typically had a better performance than other models evaluated (lower RMSEP). For 872 models with similar RMSEP for data obtained at 3 m, we next evaluated the RMSEP with SCCT 873 data obtained at 1.545 and 4.25 m. All models for all elements performed worse at 4.25 m, 874 suggesting that there may be a problem with that set of data. Although the poor performance at 4.25 m is not fully understood, we favored models that were more robust to the differences in 875 876 that data set. We also calculated the RMSEP for just the SCCTs at 3 m. This was not used as 877 the primary statistic for model selection because the calibration targets include several 878 "extreme" compositions, but if the 3 m overall RMSEP was similar for multiple models, the 879 model with better performance on the calibration targets was preferred. Based on these 880 RMSEPs and other considerations such as model performance at low and high concentrations, 881 we identified several candidate regression models for each element for more detailed 882 evaluation.

883 The model selection steps described above were completed prior to landing on Mars. Once 884 initial spectra of calibration targets and geologic targets from the surface of Mars were available, 885 we began an additional stage of evaluation using those data. The calibration targets are useful 886 because they have a known composition; however, they are analyzed at closer distance than 887 the Mars target and a lower power must be used to prevent saturation. Mars geologic targets 888 are of unknown composition but can still serve as a valuable check to ensure that the 889 predictions are geochemically reasonable and are consistent with comparable spectra of known 890 composition from the laboratory. Depending on the grain size of minerals in a rock, the LIBS 891 analytical footprint may be small enough to analyze individual grains and return a pure mineral 892 composition. Observations that appear to be pure minerals or simple mixtures of minerals are 893 useful for evaluating model performance, because there are known geochemical constraints on 894 mineral compositions.

In April 2021, roughly two months after landing on Mars, the initial results were used in conjunction with laboratory results to select a preferred model for each of the major elements from among the candidates identified prior to landing. After that initial selection, we continued to monitor the predicted compositions as additional targets were observed over the following months. In September 2021, we reviewed the results from Mars and in several cases switched to a different model based on our findings. We discuss this in more detail below for each individual major element.

902 The test set predictions of the final selected models are shown in Figure 12, the SCCT
903 predictions on Mars are shown in Figure 13, and histograms of the compositions predicted for
904 Mars targets through Sol 239 are shown in Figure 14.
905



results are the average of GBR and PLS predictions. Al₂O₃ results are the average of predictions using several different algorithms. CaO and Na₂O results use a blend of two



models to obtain more accurate results at both low and high concentrations (see text for details).



the selected major element models.

906 4.2.1.SiO₂

SiO₂ is a critical element for understanding both igneous and sedimentary geochemistry.
In Gale crater, ChemCam analyzed targets with a wide range of predicted SiO₂ values from
nearly 0 to >70 weight % [32,76]. Therefore, accurate predictions across a wide range of SiO₂
values are critical for SuperCam as well.

911 Of the models considered for SiO₂, five had lower RMSEPs at 3 m and were investigated 912 in more detail: RF, GBR, PLS, Local Elastic Net, and a blend of SVR, Elastic Net, and PLS

- submodels. The blended model performed considerably worse on the 4.25 m data than the
- other models and performed poorly at compositions >75 wt.%, so it was removed from
- 915 consideration. PLS had the best performance on the 4.25 m data, but GBR had a lower RMSEP
- 916 on the 3 m data, so an average of the GBR and PLS predictions was used to mitigate the errors
- 917 of the individual models (Figure 12). Figure 15 shows the feature importance values for the GBR
- 918 model and the regression coefficients for the PLS model.
- 919 The most important feature for the GBR model is the 413.04 nm spectral channel, 920 corresponding to the Si II lines at 412.9 nm and 413.2 nm. The PLS model does not show a 921 single dominant spectral channel. This PLS model uses standardized spectra, which results in a 922 more even spread of influence across the full spectrum.
- Figure 13 shows results from the SCCT data collected on Mars. The low compositional range is predicted accurately while the higher end tends to underpredict. The mid-range, from ~38-60 wt.%, shows similar predicted values with considerable scatter, indicating poor discrimination among these targets for SiO₂. This behavior is also observed in the other regression models considered; it is not unique to the GBR and PLS models.
- 928

Figure 14 shows a histogram of SiO₂ predictions on Mars, excluding SCCTs, through sol 239. The majority of martian targets fall between ~40 and 65 wt.%, with a small number of points exceeding 65 wt.%, and a significant number of predictions in the 0-40 wt.% range, likely indicating mixtures between silicate and non-silicate minerals such as Fe oxides. In investigation of LIBS points on possible pyroxenes, we find that the predicted SiO₂ content is 5-10 wt.% lower than that of typical martian meteorites.







Figure 15: (top) Feature importance values for the SiO_2 GBR model. The most important feature is at 413.04 nm, corresponding to the Si II lines at 412.9 nm and 413.2 nm. (bottom) Regression coefficients for the SiO_2 PLS model. This model uses standardized spectra, so individual strong lines are less favored, and the influence on the model is more evenly spread across the spectrum.

936

937 4.2.2.TiO₂

938 The choice of regression model for TiO_2 was relatively straightforward: the models with the best 939 performance at 3 m were GBR, RF, and a blend of elastic net submodels, all with an RMSEP of ~0.3 wt.%. Of these models, RF exhibited better performance at 4.25 m, and was therefore 940 941 selected. Figure 12 shows the performance on the laboratory test set. The scatter in the 942 predictions is smaller at the low end and increases toward higher concentrations. A group of 943 samples at ~0.6 wt.% actual TiO₂ content are overpredicted and are visually notable in the plots, 944 but most samples with compositions <1 wt.% TiO₂ are predicted accurately. Figure 16 shows 945 the feature importance values for the RF model. This model uses a different mask than other 946 models discussed in this paper. It was trained on spectra with the full transmission spectrometer 947 masked out and thus relies strictly on the UV and VIO spectrometers. The most important 948 spectral channels (Figure 16) correspond to several Ti II lines in the UV.

949

Figure 13 shows the TiO₂ predictions on the SCCTs on Mars. The TiO₂ model performs well on SCCTs with TiO₂ <1 wt.%, but predicts a range of 1.3 wt.% - 1.5 wt.% for LBHVO2 (actual TiO₂ wt.% of 2.84 wt.%). This target is predicted accurately in the laboratory data. The other high TiO₂ SCCT (LJSC1; actual TiO₂ of 3.05 wt.%) is underpredicted in both the laboratory and on Mars.

955

In martian data, several observations for which the RF model predicts compositions between 2
and 3 wt.% have LIBS spectra that suggest a far greater TiO₂ content, more similar to the
laboratory spectra of ilmenite. These points highlight a limitation of the ensemble methods such
as RF and GBR. Whereas methods such as LASSO or PLS may underpredict samples with



- 961 predicted compositions outside of the training set used for the model. RF and GBR, on the other
- hand, do not predict values outside of the range of compositions in their training set. The training set used for TiO_2 has a maximum value of 3.4 wt.%, and therefore no higher TiO_2
- 964 predictions are possible from the RF model. Two samples in the laboratory database did have
- 965 higher TiO₂ concentrations but were excluded from modeling because they were too spectrally
- 966 distinct. One is pure ilmenite (36 wt.% TiO_2) and one is a mixture of basalt and ilmenite (6.6
- 967 wt.% TiO₂). We experimented with a RF model that incorporated these higher TiO₂ samples in
- 968 the training set, and it did yield much higher TiO₂ predictions on the Mars spectra in question,
- but at the expense of degraded performance on low- TiO_2 samples. It was also impossible to
- 970 evaluate the accuracy of this high TiO_2 model for high-concentration (>5 wt.%) targets, since the 971 only high-TiO₂ samples were used to train it, and the Mars sample compositions are unknown.
- 972 Since most geologic targets are low in TiO_2 (<2 wt.%), we chose to continue to use the original
- 973 RF model and flag spectra that predict near the upper end of the training set range as requiring
- 974 special attention.
- 975
- 976



Figure 16: Feature importance values for the TiO₂ Random Forest (RF) model. The most important features in the model and their corresponding Ti lines are: 322.37 nm (Ti II at 322.38 nm), 321.83 nm (Ti II at 321.80 nm), 333.29 nm (Ti II at 332.39 nm and 333.04 nm), 323.99 nm (Ti II at 324.0 nm), and 323.72 nm (Ti II at 323.75 nm).

977

978 4.2.3.Al₂O₃

For Al₂O₃, the four models investigated in detail were Local ENet, RF, and two variants of PLS;
one with peak binning and standardization and one without. Local ENet had the lowest 3 m
RMSEP (1.97 wt.%), but we found that an average of the predictions from these four models
resulted in a lower 3 m RMSEP than any of the individual models (1.8 wt.%), so the average
was chosen as the preferred "model." Figure 12 shows that the test set predictions perform well
across the range of compositions, although moderate concentrations (10-20 wt.%) exhibit more

985 scatter in the predictions than either the low or high ends. Figure 17 shows the feature

986 importance values for the RF model and the regression coefficients for the two PLS models.

987





that are averaged for the Al₂O₃ predictions. The Local ENet model does not have a fixed set of coefficients, since the local model trains on the fly based on the unknown spectrum. (top) The RF model relies almost solely on the spectral channel at 704.38 nm corresponding to the Al II line at 704.4 nm. (middle) PLS using 11 components, without peak binning or standardization applied. Strongest coefficients correspond to the following lines: Al I at 309.37 nm, Al II at 704.4 nm, Na I 568.98 nm, Na I 819.71 nm. There are notable negative coefficients at 288.24 nm (Si I), 390.67 nm (Si I at 390.66 nm), and 422.8 nm (Fe I at 422.86 nm or Ca I at 422.79 nm). (bottom) PLS using 13 components on peak binned, standardized spectra. The five strongest coefficients are at 281.75 nm (Al II at 281.7 nm), 748.05 nm (O I at 748.24 nm), 705.89 nm (Al II at 705.86 nm), 837.01 nm (Al II at 836.58 nm), and 704.38 nm (Al II at 704.4 nm), although standardization results in numerous other strong coefficients.

988The Al_2O_3 model performs well on the Mars SCCTs, with most predictions close to the true989composition (Figure 13). Of particular interest are the SCCTs PMIAN (andesine; 24.84 wt.%990Al_2O_3), LJSC1 (JSC Mars-1 simulant; 20.83 wt.% Al_2O_3), and PMIOR (orthoclase; 18.18 wt.%991Al_2O_3). These targets are accurately predicted by the Al_2O_3 model, indicating that the model992performs well on feldspars. Figure 14 shows the distribution of Al_2O_3 predictions on Mars. Most993targets have <10 wt.% Al_2O_3, but a significant "tail" of predictions extends up to ~27 wt.%.</td>

Based on Mars surface data gathered so far at Jezero crater, restricted to samples with concentrations of SiO₂ (>35%), Al₂O₃ (>10%), Na₂O (<20%) and CaO (<30%) compatible with feldspars, no target has sufficient K₂O to be clearly identified as K-rich feldspar. However, there are many candidates with compositions similar to those calculated for the Andesine and JSC Mars-1 SCCTs (Figure 18). Plagioclases are the dominant feldspars detected by CheMin at Gale crater [77], with the exception of the Windjana location which contained K-rich feldspar 1000 [78].

1001

1002



1003 We observe some evidence that spectra from targets with high TiO₂ concentrations may result 1004 in overestimates of Al₂O₃. This is likely due to the large number of emission lines present in the spectra of high-TiO₂ samples, which overlap with positive loadings in the Al_2O_3 models. For 1005 1006 example, consider the surface target Ha'íí'áago (Haa ii aah¹) Point 1 on this target has a very high concentration of TiO₂ (predicted as 2.6 wt.% but likely significantly higher) and the Al₂O₃ 1007 model predicts a concentration of 17.4 wt.%. The spectra from this point have weak Al lines, but 1008 1009 numerous Ti lines. Table 4 compares the predictions from each Al₂O₃ model for this target. The 1010 RF model predicts a much lower concentration (4.8 wt.% Al₂O₃), which is more similar to the 1011 composition of other points on the target. The features with higher weight in RF calculations are 1012 mainly located at 704 nm (Figure 17). Ti has many emission lines, particularly in the UV range, 1013 so the reliance on a longer wavelength Al line may make the RF model less sensitive to high Ti. 1014 The overall performance of the averaged models is more accurate than that of RF alone, so we

¹ Targets early in the mission were given names in the Navajo language because the rover landed in an area of the landing site named after Canyon de Chelly National Monument, which is within the Navajo Nation. For situations where special characters cannot be used, such as in commands sent to the rover, a "plain text" version of the name that approximates the pronunciation is used. We list both versions.

1015 still use the average as the default prediction. However, this illustrates that caution should be 1016 used in cases with high Ti and that the RF model may be a viable alternative in such cases.

		Al ₂ O ₃ Predictions					
Point	TiO ₂ Predictions	PLS (binned + standardized)	Local ENet	PLS	RF	Average	
1	2.6	21.4	26.0	17.4	4.8	17.4	
2	0.8	8.0	9.6	7.3	5.1	7.5	
3	1.6	3.5	7.6	5.6	5.1	5.5	
4	0.1	5.2	7.8	3.8	5.3	5.6	
5	0.5	12.2	13.5	11.6	15.0	13.1	
6	0.8	10.0	10.2	8.9	5.6	8.7	
7	0.7	6.5	9.4	7.1	12.8	9.0	
8	0.9	8.0	10.5	8.1	13.1	9.9	
9	0.9	6.9	10.8	7.5	5.9	7.8	
10	0.3	14.0	11.1	11.5	12.5	12.3	

Table 4: TiO₂ and Al₂O₃ predictions in wt.% for target Ha'íí'áago (Haa_ii_aah)

1017 4.2.4.FeO_T

1018 Selection of an FeO_T model was subject to considerable discussion. Of the models evaluated, 1019 GBR and RF had the best performance at 3 m and at 4.25 m. The RF model was initially 1020 selected as the preferred model, based on its performance at both high and low extremes of 1021 composition in the test set. Preliminary Mars results seemed to support the selection of RF as 1022 the preferred model. In particular, point 1 on the target Díj' (Dii scam) and point 6 on the target 1023 Tsé libá (Tselhbahih) both exhibited high FeO_T concentrations. Comparison with laboratory 1024 spectra indicated that the RF model was likely closer to the true composition, while GBR was 1025 likely overestimating FeO_T in Fe-rich targets.

1026

1027 However, additional results from Mars have led us to revisit the decision to use the RF model 1028 rather than the GBR model. In particular, in studying the results from candidate high-Ca 1029 pyroxenes, the stoichiometry using RF indicated that the FeO_T content may be underestimated 1030 by ~4 wt.%, and resulted in compositions that fell outside those permitted for pyroxenes. 1031 Substituting the GBR FeO_T predictions for the RF predictions resulted in more realistic 1032 stoichiometry overall, but also increased the overall scatter in the results. The effect of switching 1033 from RF to GBR was evaluated on several other groups of targets as well. For points with MgO 1034 content >20 wt.%, switching to GBR yields stoichiometries more consistent with olivines. For

1035targets where the sum of the major elements is >110 wt.%, switching from RF to GBR brings the1036totals closer to 100 wt.%. For these reasons, we chose to switch to GBR as the preferred model1037for FeO_T . The results for the laboratory 3 m test set are shown in Figure 12, and the Mars SCCT1038results are shown in Figure 13. Figure 19 shows the feature importance values for the GBR1039model and indicates that the model results are primarily driven by Fe I and II lines in the UV and1040VIO spectrometers.

1041

1042 The distribution of the GBR FeO_T predictions for all Mars geologic targets to date (Figure 14) 1043 peaks at ~12-15 wt.%, with a long tail toward higher concentrations. In general, we find that the 1044 estimated FeO_T content of rocks and soils analyzed by *Perseverance* is lower than other sites 1045 on Mars. This is best illustrated by examining the results from the first LIBS shots on geologic 1046 targets, which are dominated by dust. Since martian dust is highly mobile and globally 1047 distributed, it is assumed to be homogeneous across different landing sites. Results from 1048 ChemCam at Gale crater give a dust FeO_T content of ~ 20 wt.% [79], similar to the estimated 1049 FeO_T content for dust rich soils (17 wt.%) and the average martian crust (18 wt.%; By contrast, 1050 all of the regression models considered for SuperCam tend to underpredict FeO_T abundance in 1051 the dust, giving results closer to 12 wt.%.

1052



Figure 19: Feature importance values for the FeO_T GBR model. The most important features are at 438.46 nm (Fe I at 438.48 nm), 440.61 nm (Fe I at 440.6 nm), and 251.59 nm (Fe II at 251.51 nm).

1053

1054 4.2.5.MgO

1055 The four MgO models that were evaluated in detail were RF, GBR, ENet, and PLS, and they all 1056 performed well for the 3 m test set data. GBR had the lowest RMSEP (1.1 wt.%), closely followed 1057 by RF (1.22 wt.%). Both models also inherently avoid negative predictions, while the ENet and 1058 PLS models had some negative predictions for low-MgO targets. RF showed a slight tendency to 1059 overpredict MgO for high concentration samples, so GBR was selected as the preferred model. Figure 12 shows GBR results for the 3 m test set. The GBR model relies heavily on two spectralchannels corresponding to the Mg II emission line at 448.238 nm (Figure 20).

The GBR model performs well on most of the SCCTs in Mars data, as shown in Figure 13. The model underpredicts the diopside SCCT (PMIDN) both on Mars and in the laboratory data set (actual MgO content of 16.32 wt.%) but performs well on the ankerite SCCT (LANKE; actual MgO content of 17.46 wt.%). The most notable deviation is that GBR predicts values of 34.6-36.4 wt.% for the Serpentine/Talc SCCT (TSERP), when the actual MgO content is 45.68 wt.%. This underprediction is not observed in the laboratory results.

In the LIBS data collected on Mars, the GBR model appears to be performing relatively well,
predicting a wide range of composition from depleted to significantly Mg-rich rocks (Figure 14).
There is no clear correlation with any other of the major elements except some clusters of points
that may correspond to major mineral classes (e.g. olivines, pyroxenes). There is no noticeable
relation between MgO prediction and distance to the target.

1073 One possible area of concern is that the points that are highest in MgO also tend to be the points 1074 with major element totals exceeding 100 wt.%. Some of these cases approach 130 wt.%, which 1075 is well beyond what can be explained by the RMSEPs for each element and suggests a systematic 1076 bias in one or more of the most abundant elements in the target (MgO, SiO₂, or FeO_T). A number 1077 of these points have LIBS spectra and estimated compositions consistent with olivine based on 1078 comparison with SCCT PMIFA on Mars, and the presence of olivine has been confirmed by 1079 SuperCam Raman spectroscopy. The stoichiometric ratios of FeO_T, MgO, and SiO₂ in the olivine-1080 bearing points are consistent with olivine, but MgO is not particularly high for olivine (e.g. 1081 compared to PMIFA). The high totals may come from the contribution of other elements rather 1082 than an overestimate of MgO. Note that predictions for the analysis of SCCT PMIFA on Mars do 1083 not show a high total.



1084 4.2.6.CaO

1085 The five best models for CaO calibration were RF, Elastic Net, SVR, and two instances of PLS 1086 (with and without peak binning). The RF model yielded the lowest 3 m RMSEP (1.51 wt.%) and 1087 was the only algorithm that produced universally positive predictions; all other tested models 1088 predicted negative CaO values for some low-CaO samples. Consequently, the RF model was 1089 selected as the preferred model for CaO.

1090 However, martian surface measurements indicated that the RF model was not performing as 1091 well as expected. The CaO predictions showed a bimodal distribution, with most predictions 1092 falling in one of two clusters centered around 6 and 20 wt.%, respectively. This bimodal 1093 distribution is not reflected in the Ca emission line intensities in normalized spectra, which are 1094 more evenly distributed. Likewise, the bimodal distribution predicted by the RF model is not 1095 reflected in any of the other candidate models, suggesting that the observed data structure is 1096 intrinsic to the RF algorithm and is not representative of the true distribution of CaO at Jezero 1097 crater.

1098 In response to this behavior on martian data, we evaluated the average of the two best models: 1099 RF and PLS without peak binning. This reduced but did not eliminate the bimodal behavior, and introduced numerous negative predictions at low concentrations due to the PLS model. 1100 1101 However, the PLS model alone showed better results for higher concentrations and lacked the 1102 spurious bimodal behavior. This led us to use a blended submodel approach, with the RF model 1103 used as both the "reference" model and the "low" model, and the PLS model used for cases in 1104 which the reference model predicts high concentrations of CaO. The range over which the two 1105 models are blended was optimized based on the training set, resulting in the following values: 1106 For RF predictions <4.33 wt.%, the results are used without any modification. For RF 1107 predictions between 4.33 wt.% and 8.9 wt.% the RF and PLS predictions are combined in a 1108 weighted sum, with the weights determined by where in the range the initial RF prediction falls. 1109 For RF predictions >8.9 wt.% the PLS prediction is used instead. The result has a RMSEP on 1110 the 3 m test set of 1.3 wt.% (Figure 12), and performs well on the Mars SCCT data (Figure 13). 1111 The regression coefficients for the PLS model (Figure 21) show a strong positive weight on 1112 several Ca emission lines, and the RF model feature importance highlights the Ca I 442.67 nm 1113 line.

The histogram of CaO predictions for Mars geologic targets (Figure 14) shows that the group of predictions at ~20 wt.% is no longer evident, though there is still some degree of bimodality in the lower CaO results, with groups of predictions at ~2 wt.% and at 4-5 wt.%. Preliminary attempts to correct for this behavior suggest that models based on just the UV and VIO spectrometers produce a smoother CaO distribution, and work is ongoing to evaluate these results.



CaO predictions. (top) The PLS model is used for higher concentrations. This model has its strongest positive coefficients at 317.9 nm - 318.2 nm and 315.9 nm - 316.1 nm, corresponding to the Ca II lines at 318.05 nm and 315.98 nm, respectively. (bottom) The Random Forest (RF) model is used as the reference model and for lower concentrations. The most important feature for this model is at 442.71 nm (Ca I at 442.67 nm).

1120 4.2.7.Na₂O

1121 For Na₂O, four models had a similarly low 3 m test set RMSEP (between 0.5 and 0.6 wt.%): 1122 LASSO, GBR, and two different Blend models, referred to as "Blend A" and "Blend B." To 1123 choose among these models, we compared their predictions on initial Mars data. The Blend A 1124 and Blend B model had similar results, with their highest predictions reaching ~4.5 wt. %. In 1125 contrast, GBR and LASSO had predictions >5.5 wt. %. By comparing the LIBS spectra of the 1126 points with the highest Na₂O predictions with laboratory spectra, we determined that the Na₂O 1127 content seemed to be underestimated with the Blend A and B models, so those models were 1128 eliminated from consideration.

We next investigated the differences between the GBR and LASSO. We initially picked
GBR; however, we found that some Mars data were trending towards plagioclase composition
in terms of each major element, except for Na₂O, which appeared to be underestimated. We
found that LASSO predicted higher values (up to 7.5 wt.%) compared to GBR (up to 6 wt.%).
This behavior was confirmed by evaluating the GBR and LASSO predictions of the andesine
SCCT: LASSO predicts the Na₂O in andesine more accurately than GBR. The disadvantage of

- the LASSO model was that it gave a large number of negative values on observations with low
 Na₂O.
- 1137 To combine the better performance of the GBR model at low concentrations with the 1138 better performance of LASSO at high concentrations, we developed a blended model that uses 1139 GBR as the "reference" model and at the low end (when GBR predicts Na₂O <3.335 wt. %), a 1140 weighted sum of GBR and LASSO between 3.335 wt.% and 5.458 wt.%, and LASSO only when 1141 GBR predicts Na₂O > 5.458 wt. %. These blending ranges were optimized on the training set. 1142 See [65] for details of the submodel blending process.

The performance of this blended model on the 3 m test set is shown in Figure 12 (RMSEP of 0.5 wt.%), and the Mars SCCT performance is shown in Figure 13. The feature importance values and regression coefficients for the GBR and LASSO models (Figure 22) show that the GBR model relies heavily on the Na I lines at 819.704 nm and 819.708 nm. The LASSO model uses several Na emission lines, but also uses negative coefficients corresponding to Ca. Figure 14 shows the distribution of Na₂O predictions for Mars geologic targets.

1149 1150





Figure 22: Feature importance and model coefficients for the two models used in the Na₂O predictions. (top) The GBR model is used as the reference model and for predictions of low concentrations. The most important features for this model occur at 819.79 nm (Na I lines at 819.704 nm and 819.708 nm), and 819.09 nm (Na I at 818.55 nm). (bottom) The LASSO model has several important coefficients, both positive and negative: 818.66 nm and 818.74 nm (Na I at 818.55 nm), 644.18 nm (Ca I at 644.09 nm), 445.61 nm (Ca I at 445.60 nm and 445.71 nm), and several coefficients, both positive and negative, related to the strong Na I doublet at 589.158 nm and 589.756 nm.

- 1151
- 1152 4.2.8.K₂O

1153 As shown in Figure 2, most samples in the LIBS data set have K_2O concentrations <6 1154 wt.%. There are several samples between ~6 wt.% and ~10 wt.%, and two very high K_2O SCCTs: 1155 TSRICH (37.99 wt.%; a mixture of BHVO-2 basalt and K-sulfate) and PMIOR (12.63 wt.%; 1156 orthoclase). As a result of this distribution, it is challenging to train models that predict K_2O 1157 accurately both in the 0 to 5 wt.% range and for higher potassium contents. The TSRICH 1158 composition is so extreme that it is unrealistic to expect any model using our data set to predict it 1159 reliably.

Five models were considered in detail for the K_2O calibration, and they showed different behaviors at low and high potassium concentrations. In general, the models presented a tradeoff between the variability of predictions and performance at high K_2O contents. The PLS, ENet, and LASSO models have broader variations for a given K_2O content, which results in negative predictions for some low K_2O samples but perform better at high concentrations. The SVR and Local ENet models are less noisy but tend to severely underestimate high K_2O compositions.

We found that averaging the predictions of these five models resulted in slightly improved
 performance for concentrations <10 wt.% compared to the LASSO model (low-concentration 3 m
 RMSEP of 0.59 wt.% for averaging vs 0.64 wt.% for LASSO). Therefore the averaged result was

selected as the initial preferred "model". This averaging still resulted in negative values for some
 low-K₂O targets. In these cases, we set the potassium content to 0 wt.%.

1171 In our evaluation of the Mars results, we found the averaged results underpredicted both high K₂O SCCTs (PMIOR 12.63 wt.% and TSRICH 37.99 wt.%) while the LASSO model 1172 1173 performed better on both targets. Although the LASSO predictions of TSRICH were still 1174 significantly low and highly variable, this is expected given the limitations of our data set. The 1175 Mars results were consistent with the laboratory results, but upon further discussion of the LASSO 1176 vs averaging results, we decided that the slight improvement of the averaged models over LASSO 1177 at low concentrations was not sufficient to sacrifice the better performance of LASSO at the high 1178 concentrations and we decided to switch to using the LASSO model alone as the preferred model. 1179 The 3 m test data set performance is shown in Figure 12. The RMSEP is 0.6, and the PMIOR 1180 target at 12.6 wt.% is predicted well. The test set predictions for targets with actual compositions 1181 between ~2-4 wt.% are grouped at ~3.5 wt.%. However, this behavior is not observed in the 1182 distribution of predictions from Mars (Figure 14). Mars SCCT results (Figure 13) include the 1183 extremely high K₂O TSRICH target, showing the predictions for this target vary widely from 1184 approximately correct to significant underprediction. Figure 23 shows the regression coefficients 1185 for the LASSO model, which relies heavily on the K II emission line at 438.94 nm, rather than the 1186 stronger K I lines at 766.7 nm and 770.1 nm.

1187 In the Mars results, the potassium content is mostly low, with steadily decreasing 1188 frequency toward higher concentrations (Figure 14). On the low end of this range, we observe 1189 that the model sometimes predicts negative values (which we set to 0 wt.% K_2O) for points that 1190 have potassium lines in their spectra, especially for points with high Mg, Ca or Fe content. This is not unique to LASSO; it is observed for all of the K₂O models considered. LIBS is highly sensitive 1191 1192 to K₂O, particularly at the two strong K I emission lines mentioned above, so it is not surprising 1193 that at low K₂O contents, models with a RMSEP of ~1 wt.% may predict negative or zero K_2O 1194 contents when weak K₂O lines are still present. Blended submodels trained on an expanded 1195 training set could help to mitigate this behavior while also improving high K₂O predictions.



438.9 nm, which corresponds to K II at 438.94 nm.

1196 **5. Discussion**

1197 5.1. Accuracy

1198 The 3 m test set performance (RMSEP) provides an estimate of the accuracy of each

1199 regression model (Table 5), but in most cases the prediction accuracy varies with predicted

1200 composition and depends on the distribution of samples in the calibration data set. To provide

1201 the most representative estimate of the accuracy of each prediction, we calculate the RMSEP

1202 as a function of predicted concentration ("local RMSEP") similar to that used for ChemCam [38].

Table 5: Summary of 3 m test set RMSEPs and						
selected r	nodels					
Element	RMSEP wt.%	Model				

SiO ₂	6.1	Average (GBR, PLS)
TiO ₂	0.3	RF
AI_2O_3	1.8	Average
FeO⊤	3.1	GBR
MgO	1.1	GBR
CaO	1.3	Blend RF+PLS
Na ₂ O	0.5	Blend GBR+LASSO
K ₂ O	0.6	LASSO

1203

1204 Local RMSEP is calculated for each element by first creating an evenly spaced array of 1205 simulated predicted values. For each simulated prediction, we calculate the RMSEP of the 60 1206 nearest test set predictions. As described in the Setup section, each target in the database was 1207 analyzed three times, so 60 test set predictions represent the nearest 20 targets. In cases 1208 where the distribution of test set compositions is sparse, a range of simulated predicted 1209 compositions may have the same nearest 60 test set predictions and therefore identical local 1210 RMSEPs. This is an artifact of the test set, and the "true" local RMSEP is assumed to vary 1211 smoothly. We handle these cases by removing duplicate values from the array of local 1212 RMSEPs. The local RMSEP values with duplicates removed are shown in black in Figure 24. 1213 After removal, we re-interpolate the RMSEP values, effectively creating a linear ramp in places where there was previously a "stair step." To avoid neighboring predictions with significantly 1214 1215 different RMSEPs, we smooth the RMSEP vs prediction curve such that it captures large-scale 1216 variations but removes small jumps in value.

1217 It is also necessary to extrapolate the local RMSEP values beyond the range of the test set.
1218 This is preferable to reporting no RMSEP at all for high predictions or reporting a "flat" RMSEP

1219 which would almost certainly underestimate the true uncertainty. We prefer to instead make an

1220 educated guess at the trend of RMSEP with predicted composition. With no test set data to

- 1221 compare with, extrapolated RMSEP values are speculative and should be used with caution.
- 1222 For most major elements, we calculate the slope of the extrapolated line based on a linear fit to
- 1223 the RMSEP values after removal of duplicates but prior to the re-interpolation. Since most
- 1224 elements have a general trend correlating RMSEP with predicted wt.%, this results in a line with
- 1225 a positive slope. Al_2O_3 is an exception: its RMSEP vs prediction curve rises and then drops back
- down, so a line fit to all of the RMSEP points has a nearly flat slope. We want our extrapolated
- 1227 local RMSEPs to be conservative, with the uncertainty increasing with the degree of
- 1228 extrapolation. So, for Al_2O_3 we instead fit the extrapolation line to only the RMSEP points from
- 1229 the minimum value at ~16 wt.% and above.



Figure 24: Local RMSEP vs prediction wt.% for each of the major elements. Black points are the unsmoothed values calculated using the nearest 60 test set predictions. Blue curves show the result of smoothing and extrapolating as described in the text.

1230 5.2. Precision

1231 According to the definition in ISO 5725-1:1994 [80], the accuracy of a model-how close its 1232 prediction is to the true value—is a combination of its trueness and precision Trueness is how 1233 far the average prediction is from the true composition, while precision indicates the distribution 1234 of individual predictions around that average prediction value. RMSEP is a measure of the 1235 accuracy of our quantification, which is useful to understand when we compare derived 1236 abundances with stoichiometric mineral compositions or with abundances derived from other 1237 instruments (e.g., PIXL, ChemCam, APXS). Precision is important in determining whether 1238 groups of targets observed by the same instrument can be distinguished from one another[81]. 1239 For example, to understand if the rover has entered a new geological formation by testing for a 1240 change in the distribution of chemical abundances [e.g., 15,81,82].

1241 We assess SuperCam precision in two ways. The first is to calculate the standard deviation of 1242 predictions across several locations on each target in the laboratory test set, assuming that 1243 these targets are homogeneous and that the predictions will be normally distributed. Then we 1244 take an average of the standard deviations across all targets. Effectively, this provides an 1245 estimate of the average spread around the typical predicted value expected in each oxide. Most 1246 standards were observed in three locations on the same target. Although standard deviations 1247 are usually computed from a larger number of samples, we apply it here on only three values for 1248 each standard. We argue that this statistic should be robust because we are averaging the 1249 standard deviations of ~60-70 standards, depending on the element. We find that the standard 1250 deviations are not correlated with concentration, so the mean standard deviation is taken in all 1251 cases (Table 6).

1252 A similar exercise can be conducted using the results from the SCCTs on Mars. This benefits 1253 from a greater number of observations per target, which makes the standard deviation estimate 1254 more robust. It also benefits from the fact that the measurements are made with the flight 1255 instrument on Mars rather than the laboratory instrument, making the precision estimates more 1256 relevant to measurements on Mars. In the Mars SCCT results, the standard deviations for high-1257 MgO and high-Na₂O targets were somewhat higher than those for lower concentrations. In 1258 these cases we report the overall average precision and the precision with higher concentration 1259 targets excluded (the value in parentheses) in Table 6. The results for K₂O exclude the very 1260 high K₂O TSRICH target.

1261 Several factors affect the standard deviations from replicate measurements on standards. We 1262 suspect that some standards that are outliers in terms of standard deviations have larger grain 1263 sizes and/or more diverse compositions in individual grains despite efforts during sample 1264 preparation to homogenize the sample powders. Although the diameter of the laser beam is 1265 \sim 250 µm [2], the center of the beam can produce a large fraction of the ablation and emission, 1266 so grain sizes must ideally be much smaller than 50 µm. Other factors that will contribute to 1267 variations in reproducibility on surface targets include variations in focus, laser energy, and 1268 distance to the sample. On Mars, these factors will cause more day-to-day and sample-to-1269 sample variations than are quantified in the test set standard deviations.

	SiO ₂	TiO ₂	AI_2O_3	FeO⊤	MgO	CaO	Na ₂ O	K ₂ O
3 m Test Set (Laboratory)	0.8	0.06	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
SCCTs (Mars)	1.6	0.02	0.7	1.3	0.5 (0.3)	0.5	0.3 (0.2)	0.3

Table 6: Estimated precision for each of the major elements in wt.%. Numbers in parentheses exclude some higher concentration samples.

By comparing the values in Table 6 to the RMSEPs in Table 5 and Figure 12, we find that
SuperCam LIBS quantification is more precise than it is accurate, similar to the results from

1272 ChemCam (e.g., [84]). Thus, although we strive to provide accurate stoichiometry, the greater 1273 precision of the results combined with the ability to make frequent observations over the course

1273 of the rover traverse, makes LIBS particularly useful for distinguishing trends in composition,

1275 both within a single heterogeneous target, and across multiple targets.

SuperCam's estimated precision is comparable to that of ChemCam. Two measures of
ChemCam's precision are given from repeated observations of its onboard calibration targets
[84] and of homogeneous, fine-grained bedrock [e.g.,81]. Many of the rocks encountered to date
in Jezero crater are heterogeneous at the scale of SuperCam LIBS points, so we do not yet
have enough observations of fine-grained rocks to provide an estimate of precision using data
from Mars surface targets.

1282 5.3. Environmental Factors

As discussed above, numerous factors can cause changes in LIBS spectra, resulting in changes in the quantitative results. These include shifts in wavelength calibration, variations with distance and focus quality, and sensitivity to anomalous features in the spectra or faulty continuum removal. Some factors can be assessed now, while assessing others would require additional data collection either in the laboratory or on Mars.

1288

1289 One effect that can be readily assessed with available data is the influence of shifts in 1290 wavelength. Although we do not observe significant shifts in wavelength calibration in the Mars 1291 data, slight shifts are unavoidable, and larger changes may occur due to changing seasonal 1292 temperatures, observations conducted at unusual times of day, and changes in the instrument 1293 itself over time. We trained our regression models on spectra that had been artificially shifted by 1294 ±1 or 2 pixels to improve robustness to any shift that may occur. The peak binning 1295 preprocessing used by some models also increases robustness to any shifts. Figure 25 shows 1296 the 3 m test set RMSEP as a function of wavelength shift in pixels, with horizontal black bars 1297 providing a reference value of 1.2 times the RMSEP without any shift. Within ±1 pixel of 1298 wavelength shift, all models show little change in RMSEP.



Figure 25: Test set RMSEP for each major element as a function of pixel shift. Horizontal black lines indicate a 20% increase in RMSEP relative to the value at 3 m. Wavelength shifts observed in Mars data correspond to less than 1 pixel of shift, which causes little variation in RMSEP for all elements.

1300 Distance effects have been observed in data from ChemCam. Multiple studies [85–87] observed 1301 that predicted abundances of several elements (AI, Na, K, and to some extent Si) increased as 1302 a function of distance. For SuperCam, our models have the advantage of being based primarily 1303 on data acquired at 3 m, whereas the ChemCam models were trained on data acquired at 1.5 m 1304 [38]. The SuperCam models were also selected based in part on robustness to distance trends. 1305 However, additional Mars data at varying distances may still reveal a distance effect, particularly 1306 since SuperCam has shown greater ability than ChemCam to observe targets at long distances. 1307 SuperCam LIBS operates at least to 8.75 m compared to ChemCam's longest observation of 1308 \sim 7.2 m on bedrock. Both instruments area able to achieve a LIBS spark at even longer 1309 distances on iron meteorites (due to iron's excellent absorption of the laser), which are 1310 encountered occasionally on the surface of Mars. However, pure metal targets have significantly 1311 different matrix effects than typical geologic targets composed of oxides and must be handled 1312 separately. As additional data are collected on Mars, especially on fine-grained, uniform 1313 geologic units, it will be possible to better assess distance effects and develop methods to 1314 mitigate it.

We do not have laboratory data suitable to assess variations in results due to changing focusSuch data could be collected on Mars, either as a dedicated experiment or over the course of the mission, as occasional observations with poor focus are inadvertently acquired. The effects of poor focus are similar to the effects of distance in that the laser energy per unit area on the target is decreased. Thus, it may be that a distance correction (if needed) also can help to mitigate the effects of poor focus.

1321 In Mars data, we have observed a bump in the baseline of processed data that covers several 1322 nm around 290 nm in the UV spectrometer that was not present in the cleanroom data. The origin 1323 of this feature is not well understood and still under investigation, but it may be related to the SiO₂ 1324 content of the target. We are currently testing a correction to the continuum removal algorithm 1325 parameters for the UV spectrometer to remove the bump. Alternatively, or in addition, it may be 1326 possible to remove the anomalous bump using calibration transfer methods, as described below.

1327 5.4. Future Work

Although the current models selected for the major elements are acceptable, they could be
improved. In addition, developing methods by which new spectra could be evaluated prior to
quantification would ensure that they are similar enough to the training data set to give accurate
results. The sections discussing Spectral Variability and Outlier Removal above suggest
possible approaches to evaluating and identifying outliers that could be applied to the Mars
data. In addition, it may be beneficial to develop tests to verify the presence of emission lines
from an element prior to predicting it.

1335 5.4.1. Uncertainty Quantification

Although our calculation of Local RMSEP seeks to provide an estimate of the uncertainty of a
prediction as a function of composition, it is not able to account for the possibility that the "true"
uncertainty in the predicted composition may be differ even for the same predicted composition.

1339 For example, two samples may have the same SiO₂ content, but one may have significantly 1340 more FeO_T and as a result have an increased uncertainty in the predictability of SiO2. Under our 1341 current scheme, the local RMSEP at a certain predicted SiO₂ content is constant, regardless of 1342 any other factors. Additionally, while the extrapolated Local RMSEP values are a better solution 1343 for predictions outside the training set than simply providing a constant RMSEP, it should be 1344 possible to achieve a more statistically rigorous estimate of uncertainties in these cases. One 1345 approach is to use Bayesian regression methods, which are inherently based on probability 1346 distributions. Rather than returning a single value, they return a distribution of predictions for 1347 each unknown spectrum. Statistical measures, such as the mean and standard deviation of that 1348 distribution, can be used to describe the model's "best" prediction and its associated 1349 uncertainty. Preliminary work on quantifying LIBS using gaussian process variational 1350 autoencoders [88] is promising, and has additional benefits such as the ability to estimate the 1351 spectrum corresponding to a given composition, with uncertainties on the estimated spectrum.

1352 5.4.2. Minor and trace elements

Minor and trace elements are important to quantify because they provide distinctive tracers
among largely similar rock targets, related to their primary petrogenesis (i.e. magmatism) and
information about past alteration. Such elements typically present only a few detectable
emission lines, which are relatively weak compared to the lines from major elements. Both
univariate and multivariate methods have been used to quantify minor and trace elements with
LIBS.

1359

1360 For the ChemCam instrument, several methods were investigated for guantifying trace 1361 elements. Ollila et al. [89] developed univariate and multivariate (PLS) models for the 1362 quantification of Li, Rb, Sr, and Ba, For Li, they found that the univariate model was more 1363 accurate than the PLS models. However, for Rb, Sr, and Ba, the univariate and PLS models 1364 gave similar results. [36] revised the quantification of these elements, using univariate models 1365 and the updated ChemCam database with more than 400 samples [38]. The updated 1366 guantification showed improvement for Li and Ba and similar results for Rb and Sr, although a 1367 direct comparison of RMSE is difficult because the range of compositions in the models was 1368 different.

Mn is an important element to quantify because it provides information about redox and pH of
the ancient martian environment. It was first quantified for ChemCam using a univariate
approach [31] based on a database of ~60 samples. Then, using the expanded database from
[38] with additional Mn-bearing samples, [90] developed an improved quantification for Mn,
based on blended multivariate submodels.

1375

1369

Several other minor/trace elements are quantified with ChemCam: Cl, H, S, P, Ni, F, Zn [e.g.
48,51,90–92]. Quantification of minor and trace elements to which LIBS is relatively sensitive
(Li, Rb, Sr, Ba, and Mn) is likely to be more straightforward, while elements with weaker spectral
lines (Cl, S, H, P, Ni, F) will likely be more challenging.

1380 5.4.3. Alternative Normalization

1381 Prior to significant efforts to revise the major element calibration or develop new calibrations for 1382 trace and minor elements, it would be prudent to review the preprocessing steps applied to the 1383 spectra before quantification, such as normalization. Although normalization helps to correct for 1384 fluctuations intrinsic to the LIBS process, and to mitigate distance, focus, and signal quality 1385 effects, the normalization scheme itself can introduce artifacts. Our normalization is currently 1386 applied after the continuum has been removed. Because of this, the sum of the signal in each 1387 spectrometer by which the spectrum is divided, is highly dependent upon the composition of the 1388 target [25]. For example, consider two targets with identical Ca content, one with a very high Fe 1389 content and one with very low Fe. Fe has numerous emission lines, particularly in the UV 1390 spectrometer. Thus, the high-Fe sample will be divided by a larger number (the sum of the 1391 emission lines) effectively resulting in "smaller" Ca lines compared to the other target, despite 1392 having identical Ca content.

Finding an alternative method of normalization that can avoid these issues may be possible One possibility is to divide the spectrum in each spectrometer by the total of the continuum in that spectrometer, which is far less influenced by the composition of the target than the total of the emission lines. However, part of the initial motivation for removing the continuum before normalization was to mitigate distance effects. Normalizing by the continuum may reduce normalization artifacts related to composition at the expense of stronger artifacts due to distance, necessitating a separate distance correction.

1400 5.4.4. Calibration Transfer

1401 Although the application of the instrument response function corrects for the most significant 1402 differences between spectra collected in the laboratory and those collected on Mars, there are 1403 still differences. The origin of these differences is not fully understood, but they represent a common scenario in chemometrics, where a calibration was developed using data from a 1404 1405 specific instrument in certain conditions and then is implemented on another instrument or the 1406 same instrument in different conditions. The process of correcting for such differences is 1407 referred to as "calibration transfer," and various methods are available for performing this task. 1408 In general, calibration transfer relies on a set of spectra collected by both instruments to derive 1409 a transformation that can be applied to one or both sets of spectra to minimize differences and 1410 enable accurate intercomparison. For ChemCam, a simple calibration transfer approach based 1411 on the average ratio between rover calibration target spectra from Mars and those in the 1412 laboratory was used by Clegg et al. [38]. Similarly, for SuperCam the SCCTs provide the suite 1413 of common spectra on Earth and Mars. 1414

1415 We have begun investigating calibration transfer corrections that may improve the performance

1416 of our quantifications. In Figure 26, we show the results of applying the piecewise direct

1417 standardization (PDS) calibration transfer method [94] to the lab SCCT data. We find the

1418 transformed data are spectrally 'closer' to the Mars data by examining the distance between the

1419 principal components of Mars and laboratory spectra before and after calibration transfer.

1420 Additional work is needed to assess the influence of calibration transfer on quantification and to

understand how the differences in laser power between SCCT and Mars surface targetobservations affect the correction.

- 1423
- 1424
- 1425



the corresponding average spectra from the laboratory (blue squares). Laboratory spectra with Piecewise Direct Standardization (PDS) calibration transfer applied are shown as green triangles. Dashed lines connect the untransformed and transformed lab data points. In general, calibration transfer brings the laboratory spectra closer to the corresponding Mars spectra.

1426

1427

1428 6. Conclusion

1429 This paper represents a summary of the current status of SuperCam LIBS quantification efforts.

- 1430 By using a suite of 1198 laboratory spectra of 334 diverse standards, we have developed
- 1431 multivariate regression models for the quantification of the major elements SiO_2 , TiO_2 , Al_2O_3 ,
- 1432 FeO_T, MgO, CaO, Na₂O, and K₂O. Initial model selection was based primarily on test set
- 1433 RMSEPs and early results from Mars. With additional data from Mars, we were able to identify
- 1434 issues with the initial calibration which were not apparent in laboratory data alone and adjust the 1435 selected models accordingly to eliminate or reduce the issues identified. Although many areas
- 1436 of potential improvement remain, the SuperCam major element calibration is more mature than
- 1437 the ChemCam calibration was at a similar point in the mission. As additional data are collected

on Mars and in the laboratory, it will be possible to continue to improve SuperCam's quantitative
LIBS capabilities, which play a fundamental role in the *Perseverance* rover's science mission.

1440

1441 Acknowledgements

1442 This project was supported in the USA by the NASA Mars Exploration Program and in France by

1443 CNES, CNRS, and local universities. Support in Spain was provided by the Spanish Science

1444 Ministry. SuperCam benefitted from LANL laboratory-directed research and development funding

- 1445 which provided early prototypes of the new technologies incorporated in the SuperCam BU. JF
- acknowledges the support from the Carlsberg Foundation. Any use of trade, firm, or product names
- 1447 is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

1448 **References**

- [1] K.A. Farley, K.H. Williford, K.M. Stack, R. Bhartia, A. Chen, M. de la Torre, K. Hand, Y.
 Goreva, C.D.K. Herd, R. Hueso, Y. Liu, J.N. Maki, G. Martinez, R.C. Moeller, A. Nelessen,
 C.E. Newman, D. Nunes, A. Ponce, N. Spanovich, P.A. Willis, L.W. Beegle, J.F. Bell, A.J.
 Brown, S.-E. Hamran, J.A. Hurowitz, S. Maurice, D.A. Paige, J.A. Rodriguez-Manfredi, M.
 Schulte, R.C. Wiens, Mars 2020 Mission Overview, Space Sci. Rev. 216 (2020) 142.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-020-00762-y.
- 1455 [2] S. Maurice, R.C. Wiens, P. Bernardi, P. Caïs, S. Robinson, T. Nelson, O. Gasnault, J.-M. Reess, M. Deleuze, F. Rull, J.-A. Manrique, S. Abbaki, R.B. Anderson, Y. André, S.M. 1456 Angel, G. Arana, T. Battault, P. Beck, K. Benzerara, S. Bernard, J.-P. Berthias, O. 1457 1458 Beyssac, M. Bonafous, B. Bousquet, M. Boutillier, A. Cadu, K. Castro, F. Chapron, B. Chide, K. Clark, E. Clavé, S. Clegg, E. Cloutis, C. Collin, E.C. Cordoba, A. Cousin, J.-C. 1459 1460 Dameury, W. D'Anna, Y. Daydou, A. Debus, L. Deflores, E. Dehouck, D. Delapp, G. De 1461 Los Santos, C. Donny, A. Doressoundiram, G. Dromart, B. Dubois, A. Dufour, M. Dupieux, M. Egan, J. Ervin, C. Fabre, A. Fau, W. Fischer, O. Forni, T. Fouchet, J. Frvdenvang, S. 1462 1463 Gauffre, M. Gauthier, V. Gharakanian, O. Gilard, I. Gontijo, R. Gonzalez, D. Granena, J. 1464 Grotzinger, R. Hassen-Khodja, M. Heim, Y. Hello, G. Hervet, O. Humeau, X. Jacob, S. Jacquinod, J.R. Johnson, D. Kouach, G. Lacombe, N. Lanza, L. Lapauw, J. Laserna, J. 1465 1466 Lasue, L. Le Deit, S. Le Mouélic, E. Le Comte, Q.-M. Lee, C. Legett, R. Leveille, E. Lewin, 1467 C. Levrat, G. Lopez-Reves, R. Lorenz, B. Lucero, J.M. Madariaga, S. Madsen, M. Madsen, 1468 N. Mangold, F. Manni, J.-F. Mariscal, J. Martinez-Frias, K. Mathieu, R. Mathon, K.P. 1469 McCabe, T. McConnochie, S.M. McLennan, J. Mekki, N. Melikechi, P.-Y. Meslin, Y. Micheau, Y. Michel, J.M. Michel, D. Mimoun, A. Misra, G. Montagnac, C. Montaron, F. 1470 1471 Montmessin, J. Moros, V. Mousset, Y. Morizet, N. Murdoch, R.T. Newell, H. Newsom, N. 1472 Nguyen Tuong, A.M. Ollila, G. Orttner, L. Oudda, L. Pares, J. Parisot, Y. Parot, R. Pérez, D. Pheav, L. Picot, P. Pilleri, C. Pilorget, P. Pinet, G. Pont, F. Poulet, C. Quantin-Nataf, B. 1473 1474 Quertier, D. Rambaud, W. Rapin, P. Romano, L. Roucayrol, C. Royer, M. Ruellan, B.F. Sandoval, V. Sautter, M.J. Schoppers, S. Schröder, H.-C. Seran, S.K. Sharma, P. Sobron. 1475 1476 M. Sodki, A. Sournac, V. Sridhar, D. Standarovsky, S. Storms, N. Striebig, M. Tatat, M. 1477 Toplis, I. Torre-Fdez, N. Toulemont, C. Velasco, M. Veneranda, D. Venhaus, C. Virmontois, M. Viso, P. Willis, K.W. Wong, The SuperCam Instrument Suite on the Mars 1478 1479 2020 Rover: Science Objectives and Mast-Unit Description, Space Sci. Rev. 217 (2021) 1480 47. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-021-00807-w.

1481 R.C. Wiens, S. Maurice, S.H. Robinson, A.E. Nelson, P. Cais, P. Bernardi, R.T. Newell, S. [3] Clegg, S.K. Sharma, S. Storms, J. Deming, D. Beckman, A.M. Ollila, O. Gasnault, R.B. 1482 1483 Anderson, Y. André, S. Michael Angel, G. Arana, E. Auden, P. Beck, J. Becker, K. Benzerara, S. Bernard, O. Beyssac, L. Borges, B. Bousquet, K. Boyd, M. Caffrey, J. 1484 Carlson, K. Castro, J. Celis, B. Chide, K. Clark, E. Cloutis, E.C. Cordoba, A. Cousin, M. 1485 1486 Dale, L. Deflores, D. Delapp, M. Deleuze, M. Dirmyer, C. Donny, G. Dromart, M. George 1487 Duran, M. Egan, J. Ervin, C. Fabre, A. Fau, W. Fischer, O. Forni, T. Fouchet, R. Fresquez, J. Frydenvang, D. Gasway, I. Gontijo, J. Grotzinger, X. Jacob, S. Jacquinod, J.R. Johnson, 1488 R.A. Klisiewicz, J. Lake, N. Lanza, J. Laserna, J. Lasue, S. Le Mouélic, C. Legett, R. 1489 1490 Leveille, E. Lewin, G. Lopez-Reves, R. Lorenz, E. Lorigny, S.P. Love, B. Lucero, J.M. Madariaga, M. Madsen, S. Madsen, N. Mangold, J.A. Manrique, J.P. Martinez, J. Martinez-1491 1492 Frias, K.P. McCabe, T.H. McConnochie, J.M. McGlown, S.M. McLennan, N. Melikechi, P.-1493 Y. Meslin, J.M. Michel, D. Mimoun, A. Misra, G. Montagnac, F. Montmessin, V. Mousset, N. Murdoch, H. Newsom, L.A. Ott, Z.R. Ousnamer, L. Pares, Y. Parot, R. Pawluczyk, C. 1494 1495 Glen Peterson, P. Pilleri, P. Pinet, G. Pont, F. Poulet, C. Provost, B. Quertier, H. Quinn, W. Rapin, J.-M. Reess, A.H. Regan, A.L. Reyes-Newell, P.J. Romano, C. Royer, F. Rull, B. 1496 Sandoval, J.H. Sarrao, V. Sautter, M.J. Schoppers, S. Schröder, D. Seitz, T. Shepherd, P. 1497 Sobron, B. Dubois, V. Sridhar, M.J. Toplis, I. Torre-Fdez, I.A. Trettel, M. Underwood, A. 1498 Valdez, J. Valdez, D. Venhaus, P. Willis, The SuperCam Instrument Suite on the NASA 1499 1500 Mars 2020 Rover: Body Unit and Combined System Tests, Space Sci. Rev. 217 (2021) 4. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-020-00777-5. 1501 1502 W. Xu, X. Liu, Z. Yan, L. Li, Z. Zhang, Y. Kuang, H. Jiang, H. Yu, F. Yang, C. Liu, T. Wang, [4] 1503 C. Li, Y. Jin, J. Shen, B. Wang, W. Wan, J. Chen, S. Ni, Y. Ruan, R. Xu, C. Zhang, Z. Yuan, X. Wan, Y. Yang, Z. Li, Y. Shen, D. Liu, B. Wang, R. Yuan, T. Bao, R. Shu, The 1504 MarSCoDe Instrument Suite on the Mars Rover of China's Tianwen-1 Mission, Space Sci. 1505 1506 Rev. 217 (2021) 64. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-021-00836-5. S. Maurice, R.C. Wiens, M. Saccoccio, B. Barraclough, O. Gasnault, O. Forni, N. Mangold, 1507 [5] 1508 D. Baratoux, S. Bender, G. Berger, J. Bernardin, M. Berthé, N. Bridges, D. Blanev, M. Bouyé, P. Caïs, B. Clark, S. Clegg, A. Cousin, D. Cremers, A. Cros, L. DeFlores, C. 1509 1510 Derycke, B. Dingler, G. Dromart, B. Dubois, M. Dupieux, E. Durand, L. d'Uston, C. Fabre, 1511 B. Faure, A. Gaboriaud, T. Gharsa, K. Herkenhoff, E. Kan, L. Kirkland, D. Kouach, J.-L. Lacour, Y. Langevin, J. Lasue, S. Mouélic, M. Lescure, E. Lewin, D. Limonadi, G. Manhès, 1512 P. Mauchien, C. McKay, P.-Y. Meslin, Y. Michel, E. Miller, H.E. Newsom, G. Orttner, A. 1513 1514 Paillet, L. Parès, Y. Parot, R. Pérez, P. Pinet, F. Poitrasson, B. Quertier, B. Sallé, C. Sotin, V. Sautter, H. Séran, J.J. Simmonds, J.-B. Sirven, R. Stiglich, N. Striebig, J.-J. Thocaven, 1515 1516 M.J. Toplis, D. Vaniman, The ChemCam Instrument Suite on the Mars Science Laboratory 1517 (MSL) Rover: Science Objectives and Mast Unit Description, Space Sci. Rev. 170 (2012) 95-166. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-012-9912-2. 1518 1519 R.C. Wiens, S. Maurice, B. Barraclough, M. Saccoccio, W.C. Barkley, J.F. Bell, S. Bender, [6] 1520 J. Bernardin, D. Blaney, J. Blank, M. Bouyé, N. Bridges, N. Bultman, P. Caïs, R.C. 1521 Clanton, B. Clark, S. Clegg, A. Cousin, D. Cremers, A. Cros, L. DeFlores, D. Delapp, R. 1522 Dingler, C. D'Uston, M. Darby Dyar, T. Elliott, D. Enemark, C. Fabre, M. Flores, O. Forni, 1523 O. Gasnault, T. Hale, C. Hays, K. Herkenhoff, E. Kan, L. Kirkland, D. Kouach, D. Landis, Y. 1524 Langevin, N. Lanza, F. LaRocca, J. Lasue, J. Latino, D. Limonadi, C. Lindensmith, C. Little, N. Mangold, G. Manhes, P. Mauchien, C. McKay, E. Miller, J. Mooney, R.V. Morris, 1525 L. Morrison, T. Nelson, H. Newsom, A. Ollila, M. Ott, L. Pares, R. Perez, F. Poitrasson, C. 1526 Provost, J.W. Reiter, T. Roberts, F. Romero, V. Sautter, S. Salazar, J.J. Simmonds, R. 1527 Stiglich, S. Storms, N. Striebig, J.-J. Thocaven, T. Trujillo, M. Ulibarri, D. Vaniman, N. 1528 Warner, R. Waterbury, R. Whitaker, J. Witt, B. Wong-Swanson, The ChemCam Instrument 1529 1530 Suite on the Mars Science Laboratory (MSL) Rover: Body Unit and Combined System Tests, Space Sci. Rev. 170 (2012) 167–227. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-012-9902-4. 1531

- 1532 [7] M. Czerny, A.F. Turner, Über den Astigmatismus bei Spiegelspektrometern, Z. Für Phys. 1533 61 (1930) 792–797. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01340206.
- 1534 [8] J.A. Manrique, G. Lopez-Reyes, A. Cousin, F. Rull, S. Maurice, R.C. Wiens, M.B. Madsen, J.M. Madariaga, O. Gasnault, J. Aramendia, G. Arana, P. Beck, S. Bernard, P. Bernardi, 1535 M.H. Bernt, A. Berrocal, O. Beyssac, P. Caïs, C. Castro, K. Castro, S.M. Clegg, E. Cloutis, 1536 1537 G. Dromart, C. Drouet, B. Dubois, D. Escribano, C. Fabre, A. Fernandez, O. Forni, V. 1538 Garcia-Baonza, I. Gontijo, J. Johnson, J. Laserna, J. Lasue, S. Madsen, E. Mateo-Marti, J. 1539 Medina, P.-Y. Meslin, G. Montagnac, A. Moral, J. Moros, A.M. Ollila, C. Ortega, O. Prieto-Ballesteros, J.M. Reess, S. Robinson, J. Rodriguez, J. Saiz, J.A. Sanz-Arranz, I. Sard, V. 1540 1541 Sautter, P. Sobron, M. Toplis, M. Veneranda, SuperCam Calibration Targets: Design and Development, Space Sci. Rev. 216 (2020) 138. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-020-00764-1542 1543 w.
- A. Cousin, V. Sautter, C. Fabre, G. Dromart, G. Montagnac, C. Drouet, P.Y. Meslin, O.
 Gasnault, O. Beyssac, S. Bernard, E. Cloutis, O. Forni, P. Beck, T. Fouchet, J.R. Johnson,
 J. Lasue, A.M. Ollila, P. De Parseval, S. Gouy, B. Caron, J.M. Madariaga, G. Arana, M.B.
 Madsen, J. Laserna, J. Moros, J.A. Manrique, G. Lopez-Reyes, F. Rull, S. Maurice, R.C.
 Wiens, SuperCam calibration targets on board the perseverance rover: Fabrication and
 quantitative characterization, Spectrochim. Acta Part B At. Spectrosc. (2021) 106341.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sab.2021.106341.
- [10] L.A. Edgar, C.M. Fedo, S. Gupta, S.G. Banham, A.A. Fraeman, J.P. Grotzinger, K.M.
 Stack, N.T. Stein, K.A. Bennett, F. Rivera-Hernández, V.Z. Sun, K.S. Edgett, D.M. Rubin,
 C. House, J. Van Beek, A Lacustrine Paleoenvironment Recorded at Vera RubinRidge,
 Gale Crater: Overview of the Sedimentology and Stratigraphy Observed by the Mars
 ScienceLaboratory Curiosity Rover, J. Geophys. Res. Planets. 125 (2020).
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JE006307.
- [11] J.P. Grotzinger, S. Gupta, M.C. Malin, D.M. Rubin, J. Schieber, K. Siebach, D.Y. Sumner, 1557 1558 K.M. Stack, A.R. Vasavada, R.E. Arvidson, F. Calef, L. Edgar, W.F. Fischer, J.A. Grant, J. 1559 Griffes, L.C. Kah, M.P. Lamb, K.W. Lewis, N. Mangold, M.E. Minitti, M. Palucis, M. Rice, 1560 R.M.E. Williams, R.A. Yingst, D. Blake, D. Blaney, P. Conrad, J. Crisp, W.E. Dietrich, G. Dromart, K.S. Edgett, R.C. Ewing, R. Gellert, J.A. Hurowitz, G. Kocurek, P. Mahaffy, M.J. 1561 1562 McBride, S.M. McLennan, M. Mischna, D. Ming, R. Milliken, H. Newsom, D. Oehler, T.J. Parker, D. Vaniman, R.C. Wiens, S.A. Wilson, Deposition, exhumation, and paleoclimate 1563 1564 of an ancient lake deposit, Gale crater, Mars, Science. 350 (2015) aac7575-aac7575. 1565 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac7575.
- 1566 [12] M.S. Rice, S. Gupta, A.H. Treiman, K.M. Stack, F. Calef, L.A. Edgar, J. Grotzinger, N.
 1567 Lanza, L. Le Deit, J. Lasue, K.L. Siebach, A. Vasavada, R.C. Wiens, J. Williams, Geologic
 1568 overview of the Mars Science Laboratory rover mission at the Kimberley, Gale crater,
 1569 Mars: Overview of MSL at the Kimberley, J. Geophys. Res. Planets. 122 (2017) 2–20.
 1570 https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JE005200.
- 1571 [13] C.I. Fassett, J.W. Head, Fluvial sedimentary deposits on Mars: Ancient deltas in a crater
 1572 lake in the Nili Fossae region: FLUVIAL SEDIMENTARY DEPOSITS ON MARS, Geophys.
 1573 Res. Lett. 32 (2005) n/a-n/a. https://doi.org/10.1029/2005GL023456.
- 1574 [14] T.A. Goudge, R.E. Milliken, J.W. Head, J.F. Mustard, C.I. Fassett, Sedimentological
 1575 evidence for a deltaic origin of the western fan deposit in Jezero crater, Mars and
 1576 implications for future exploration, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 458 (2017) 357–365.
 1577 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2016.10.056.
- 1578 [15] N. Mangold, S. Gupta, O. Gasnault, G. Dromart, J.D. Tarnas, S.F. Sholes, B. Horgan, C.
 1579 Quantin-Nataf, A.J. Brown, S. Le Mouélic, R.A. Yingst, J.F. Bell, O. Beyssac, T. Bosak, F.
 1580 Calef, B.L. Ehlmann, K.A. Farley, J.P. Grotzinger, K. Hickman-Lewis, S. Holm-Alwmark,
 1581 L.C. Kah, J. Martinez-Frias, S.M. McLennan, S. Maurice, J.I. Nuñez, A.M. Ollila, P. Pilleri,
 1582 J.W. Rice, M. Rice, J.I. Simon, D.L. Shuster, K.M. Stack, V.Z. Sun, A.H. Treiman, B.P.

- Weiss, R.C. Wiens, A.J. Williams, N.R. Williams, K.H. Williford, Perseverance rover
 reveals an ancient delta-lake system and flood deposits at Jezero crater, Mars, Science.
 374 (2021) 711–717. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abl4051.
- [16] C.C. Bedford, S.P. Schwenzer, J.C. Bridges, S. Banham, R.C. Wiens, O. Gasnault, E.B.
 Rampe, J. Frydenvang, P.J. Gasda, Geochemical variation in the Stimson formation of
 Gale crater: Provenance, mineral sorting, and a comparison with modern Martian dunes,
 Icarus. 341 (2020) 113622. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2020.113622.
- [17] K.L. Siebach, M.B. Baker, J.P. Grotzinger, S.M. McLennan, R. Gellert, L.M. Thompson,
 J.A. Hurowitz, Sorting out compositional trends in sedimentary rocks of the Bradbury group (Aeolis Palus), Gale crater, Mars: Bradbury Group Compositional Trends in Gale Crater, J.
 Geophys. Res. Planets. 122 (2017) 295–328. https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JE005195.
- [18] C.C. Bedford, J.C. Bridges, S.P. Schwenzer, R.C. Wiens, E.B. Rampe, J. Frydenvang, P.J.
 Gasda, Alteration trends and geochemical source region characteristics preserved in the
 fluviolacustrine sedimentary record of Gale crater, Mars, Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta. 246
 (2019) 234–266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2018.11.031.
- [19] B.H.N. Horgan, R.B. Anderson, G. Dromart, E.S. Amador, M.S. Rice, The mineral diversity
 of Jezero crater: Evidence for possible lacustrine carbonates on Mars, Icarus. 339 (2020)
 113526. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2019.113526.
- 1601 [20] A.J. Brown, S.J. Hook, A.M. Baldridge, J.K. Crowley, N.T. Bridges, B.J. Thomson, G.M.
 1602 Marion, C.R. de Souza Filho, J.L. Bishop, Hydrothermal formation of Clay-Carbonate
 1603 alteration assemblages in the Nili Fossae region of Mars, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 297
 1604 (2010) 174–182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2010.06.018.
- 1605 [21] À.J. Brown, C.E. Viviano, T.A. Goudge, Olivine-Carbonate Mineralogy of the Jezero Crater 1606 Region, J. Geophys. Res. Planets. 125 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JE006011.
- 1607 [22] L. Mandon, C. Quantin-Nataf, P. Thollot, N. Mangold, L. Lozac'h, G. Dromart, P. Beck, E.
 1608 Dehouck, S. Breton, C. Millot, M. Volat, Refining the age, emplacement and alteration
 1609 scenarios of the olivine-rich unit in the Nili Fossae region, Mars, Icarus. 336 (2020)
 113436. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2019.113436.
- 1611 [23] A.M. Zastrow, T.D. Glotch, Distinct Carbonate Lithologies in Jezero Crater, Mars,
 1612 Geophys. Res. Lett. 48 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL092365.
- 1613 [24] R.B. Anderson, R.V. Morris, S.M. Clegg, J.F. Bell, R.C. Wiens, S.D. Humphries, S.A.
 1614 Mertzman, T.G. Graff, R. McInroy, The influence of multivariate analysis methods and
 1615 target grain size on the accuracy of remote quantitative chemical analysis of rocks using
 1616 laser induced breakdown spectroscopy, Icarus. 215 (2011) 608–627.
 1617 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2011.07.034.
- 1618 [25] S. Schröder, K. Rammelkamp, D.S. Vogt, O. Gasnault, H.-W. Hübers, Contribution of a
 1619 martian atmosphere to laser-induced breakdown spectroscopy (LIBS) data and testing its
 1620 emission characteristics for normalization applications, Icarus. 325 (2019) 1–15.
 1621 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2019.02.017.
- S.M. Clegg, R.B. Anderson, N. Melikechi, Laser Induced Breakdown Spectroscopy: Theory
 and Laboratory Spectra of Geological Materials, in: Remote Compos. Anal., Cambridge
 University Press, 2018.
- 1625 [27] D.A. Cremers, L. Radziemski, History and fundamentals of LIBS, in: A. Miziolek, I.
 1626 Schechter, V. Palleschi (Eds.), Laser Induc. Breakdown Spectrosc. Fundam. Appl.,
 1627 Cambridge University Press, 2006: pp. 9–16.
- 1628 [28] H.Y. McSween, G.J. Taylor, M.B. Wyatt, Elemental Composition of the Martian Crust, 1629 Science. 324 (2009) 736–739. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1165871.
- 1630 [29] R.V. Morris, G. Klingelhöfer, C. Schröder, D.S. Rodionov, A. Yen, D.W. Ming, P.A. de
 1631 Souza, I. Fleischer, T. Wdowiak, R. Gellert, B. Bernhardt, E.N. Evlanov, B. Zubkov, J. Foh,
 1632 U. Bonnes, E. Kankeleit, P. Gütlich, F. Renz, S.W. Squyres, R.E. Arvidson, Mössbauer
 1633 mineralogy of rock, soil, and dust at Gusev crater, Mars: Spirit's journey through weakly

- altered olivine basalt on the plains and pervasively altered basalt in the Columbia Hills:
 MÖSSBAUER MINERALOGY AT GUSEV CRATER, MARS, J. Geophys. Res. Planets.
 111 (2006) n/a-n/a. https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JE002584.
- [30] R.V. Morris, G. Klingelhöfer, C. Schröder, D.S. Rodionov, A. Yen, D.W. Ming, P.A. de
 Souza, T. Wdowiak, I. Fleischer, R. Gellert, B. Bernhardt, U. Bonnes, B.A. Cohen, E.N.
 Evlanov, J. Foh, P. Gütlich, E. Kankeleit, T. McCoy, D.W. Mittlefehldt, F. Renz, M.E.
 Schmidt, B. Zubkov, S.W. Squyres, R.E. Arvidson, Mössbauer mineralogy of rock, soil, and
 dust at Meridiani Planum, Mars: Opportunity's journey across sulfate-rich outcrop, basaltic
 sand and dust, and hematite lag deposits: IRON MINERALOGY AT MERIDIANI PLANUM,
 J. Geophys. Res. Planets. 111 (2006) n/a-n/a. https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JE002791.
- 1644 [31] N.L. Lanza, W.W. Fischer, R.C. Wiens, J. Grotzinger, A.M. Ollila, A. Cousin, R.B.
 1645 Anderson, B.C. Clark, R. Gellert, N. Mangold, S. Maurice, S. Le Mouélic, M. Nachon, M.
 1646 Schmidt, J. Berger, S.M. Clegg, O. Forni, C. Hardgrove, N. Melikechi, H.E. Newsom, V.
 1647 Sautter, High manganese concentrations in rocks at Gale crater, Mars, Geophys. Res.
 1648 Lett. (2014) 2014GL060329. https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL060329.
- 1649 [32] S. Maurice, S.M. Clegg, R.C. Wiens, O. Gasnault, W. Rapin, O. Forni, A. Cousin, V. 1650 Sautter, N. Mangold, L. Le Deit, M. Nachon, R.B. Anderson, N.L. Lanza, C. Fabre, V. Payré, J. Lasue, P.-Y. Meslin, R.J. Léveillé, B.L. Barraclough, P. Beck, S.C. Bender, G. 1651 Berger, J.C. Bridges, N.T. Bridges, G. Dromart, M.D. Dyar, R. Francis, J. Frydenvang, B. 1652 1653 Gondet, B.L. Ehlmann, K.E. Herkenhoff, J.R. Johnson, Y. Langevin, M.B. Madsen, N. Melikechi, J.-L. Lacour, S. Le Mouélic, E. Lewin, H.E. Newsom, A.M. Ollila, P. Pinet, S. 1654 1655 Schröder, J.-B. Sirven, R.L. Tokar, M.J. Toplis, C. d'Uston, D.T. Vaniman, A.R. Vasavada, 1656 ChemCam activities and discoveries during the nominal mission of the Mars Science Laboratory in Gale crater, Mars, J Anal Spectrom. 31 (2016) 863-889. 1657 https://doi.org/10.1039/C5JA00417A. 1658
- [33] M. Nachon, S.M. Clegg, N. Mangold, S. Schröder, L.C. Kah, G. Dromart, A. Ollila, J.R.
 Johnson, D.Z. Oehler, J.C. Bridges, S. Le Mouélic, O. Forni, R. c. Wiens, R.B. Anderson,
 D.L. Blaney, J. f. Bell, B. Clark, A. Cousin, M.D. Dyar, B. Ehlmann, C. Fabre, O. Gasnault,
 J. Grotzinger, J. Lasue, E. Lewin, R. Léveillé, S. McLennan, S. Maurice, P.-Y. Meslin, W.
 Rapin, M. Rice, S.W. Squyres, K. Stack, D.Y. Sumner, D. Vaniman, D. Wellington, Calcium
 sulfate veins characterized by ChemCam/Curiosity at Gale crater, Mars, J. Geophys. Res.
 Planets. (2014) 2013JE004588. https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JE004588.
- 1666 [34] A. Ciucci, M. Corsi, V. Palleschi, S. Rastelli, A. Salvetti, E. Tognoni, New Procedure for
 1667 Quantitative Elemental Analysis by Laser-Induced Plasma Spectroscopy, Appl. Spectrosc.
 1668 53 (1999) 960–964. https://doi.org/10.1366/0003702991947612.
- 1669 [35] E. Tognóni, G. Cristoforetti, S. Legnaioli, V. Palleschi, Calibration-Free Laser-Induced
 1670 Breakdown Spectroscopy: State of the art, Spectrochim. Acta Part B At. Spectrosc. 65
 1671 (2010) 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sab.2009.11.006.
- [36] V. Payré, C. Fabre, A. Cousin, V. Sautter, R.C. Wiens, O. Forni, O. Gasnault, N. Mangold,
 P.-Y. Meslin, J. Lasue, A. Ollila, W. Rapin, S. Maurice, M. Nachon, L. Le Deit, N. Lanza, S.
 Clegg, Alkali trace elements in Gale crater, Mars, with ChemCam: Calibration update and
 geological implications: ALKALI TRACE ELEMENTS WITH CHEMCAM, J. Geophys. Res.
 Planets. 122 (2017) 650–679. https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JE005201.
- 1677 [37] M.D. Dyar, C.I. Fassett, S. Giguere, K. Lepore, S. Byrne, T. Boucher, C.J. Carey, S.
 1678 Mahadevan, Comparison of univariate and multivariate models of predictiton of major and
 1679 minor elements from laser-induced breakdown spectra with and without masking,
 1680 Spectrochim. Acta Part B At. Spectrosc. 123 (2016) 93–104.
 1681 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/i.sab.2016.07.010.
- [38] S.M. Clegg, R.C. Wiens, R.B. Anderson, O. Forni, J. Frydenvang, J. Lasue, A. Cousin, V.
 Payre, T. Boucher, M.D. Dyar, S.M. McLennan, R.V. Morris, T.G. Graff, S.A. Mertzman,
 B.L. Ehlmann, I. Belgacem, H.E. Newsom, B.C. Clark, N. Melikechi, A. Mezzacappa, R.

- McInroy, R. Martinez, P.J. Gasda, O. Gasnault, S. Maurice, Recalibration of the Mars
 Science Laboratory ChemCam Instrument with an Expanded Geochemical Database,
 Spectrochim. Acta Part B At. Spectrosc. 129 (2017) 64–85.
- 1688 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sab.2016.12.003.
- [39] H. Hotelling, Analysis of a Complex of Statistical Variables into Principal Components, J.
 Educ. Psychol. 24 (1933) 417–441. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0071325.
- [40] K. Pearson, On lines and planes of closest fit to systems of points in space, Lond. Edinb.
 Dublin Philos. Mag. J. Sci. 2 (1901) 559–572.
- 1693 https://doi.org/10.1080/14786440109462720.
- 1694 [41] S. Wold, K. Esbensen, P. Geladi, Principal Component Analysis, Chemom. Intell. Lab.
 1695 Syst. 2 (1987) 37–52.
- 1696 [42] R.R. Coifman, D.L. Donoho, Translation-Invariant De-Noising, in: A. Antoniadis, G.
 1697 Oppenheim (Eds.), Wavelets Stat., Springer New York, New York, NY, 1995: pp. 125–150.
 1698 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-2544-7_9.
- 1699 [43] J.L. Starck, F. Murtagh, Handbook of Astronomical Data Analysis, 2nd ed., Springer-1700 Verlag, 2006.
- [44] R.C. Wiens, S. Maurice, J. Lasue, O. Forni, R.B. Anderson, S. Clegg, S. Bender, D.
 Blaney, B.L. Barraclough, A. Cousin, L. Deflores, D. Delapp, M.D. Dyar, C. Fabre, O.
 Gasnault, N. Lanza, J. Mazoyer, N. Melikechi, P.-Y. Meslin, H. Newsom, A. Ollila, R.
 Perez, R.L. Tokar, D. Vaniman, Pre-flight calibration and initial data processing for the
 ChemCam laser-induced breakdown spectroscopy instrument on the Mars Science
 Laboratory rover, Spectrochim. Acta Part B At. Spectrosc. 82 (2013) 1–27.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sab.2013.02.003.
- [45] J.-L. Starck, J. Fadili, F. Murtagh, The Undecimated Wavelet Decomposition and its
 Reconstruction, IEEE Trans. Image Process. 16 (2007) 297–309.
 https://doi.org/10.1109/TIP.2006.887733.
- 1711 [46] E. Stefanutti, F. Bruni, Signal denoising using the Stationary Wavelet Decomposition, 1712 (2017) 7.
- 1713 [47] Å. Bijaoui, M. Giudicelli, Optimal image addition using the Wavelet Transform, Exp. Astron.
 1714 1 (1990) 347–363. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00426718.
- 1715 [48] J.-L. Starck, M. Pierre, Structure detection in low intensity X-ray images, Astron.
 1716 Astrophys. Suppl. Ser. 128 (1998) 397–407. https://doi.org/10.1051/aas:1998150.
- [49] D.E. Anderson, B.L. Ehlmann, O. Forni, S.M. Clegg, A. Cousin, N.H. Thomas, J. Lasue,
 D.M. Delapp, R.E. McInroy, O. Gasnault, M.D. Dyar, S. Schröder, S. Maurice, R.C. Wiens,
 Characterization of LIBS emission lines for the identification of chlorides, carbonates, and
 sulfates in salt/basalt mixtures for the application to MSL ChemCam data: LIBS OF CL, C,
 S IN SALT-BASALT MIXTURES, J. Geophys. Res. Planets. 122 (2017) 744–770.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JE005164.
- 1723 [50] J.M. Tucker, M.D. Dyar, M.W. Schaefer, S.M. Clegg, R.C. Wiens, Optimization of laserinduced breakdown spectroscopy for rapid geochemical analysis, Chem. Geol. 277 (2010) 137–148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2010.07.016.
- 1726 [51] A. Kramida, Y. Ralchenko, J. Reader, NIST Atomic Spectra Database (version 5.9), Natl. 1727 Inst. Stand. Technol. (2021). https://doi.org/10.18434/T4W30F.
- [52] S.M. Clegg, J. Frydenvang, R.B. Anderson, D.T. Vaniman, P. Gasda, O. Forni, H.
 Newsom, D. Blaney, R.C. Wiens, Quantitative Sulfur Chemistry Observed on Diverse
 Samples from Sols 1800-2300, in: 2020: p. 2561.
- 1731 https://www.hou.usra.edu/meetings/lpsc2020/pdf/2561.pdf.
- 1732 [53] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, J. Friedman, The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining,
- 1733 Inference, and Prediction, 2nd ed., Springer, 2017.

- 1734 [54] M.D. Dyar, C.R. Ytsma, Effect of data set size on geochemical quantification accuracy with
 1735 laser-induced breakdown spectroscopy, Spectrochim. Acta Part B At. Spectrosc. 177
 1736 (2021) 106073. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sab.2021.106073.
- 1737 [55] M.M. Breunig, H.-P. Kriegel, R.T. Ng, J. Sander, LOF: Identifying Density-Based Local 1738 Outliers, in: Proc. 2000 ACM SIGMOD Int. Conf. Manag. Data, 2000: p. 12.
- 1739 [56] F.T. Liu, K.M. Ting, Z.-H. Zhou, Isolation-Based Anomaly Detection, ACM Trans. Knowl.
 1740 Discov. Data. 6 (2012) 1–39. https://doi.org/10.1145/2133360.2133363.
- 1741 [57] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P.
 1742 Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, others, Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python, J.
 1743 Mach. Learn. Res. 12 (2011) 2825–2830.
- 1744 [58] R. Tibshirani, Regression Shrinkage and Selection Via the Lasso, J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B 1745 Methodol. 58 (1996) 267–288. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1996.tb02080.x.
- M.D. Dyar, M.L. Carmosino, E.A. Breves, M.V. Ozanne, S.M. Clegg, R.C. Wiens,
 Comparison of partial least squares and lasso regression techniques as applied to laserinduced breakdown spectroscopy of geological samples, Spectrochim. Acta Part B At.
 Spectrosc. 70 (2012) 51–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sab.2012.04.011.
- 1750 [60] A.E. Hoerl, R.W. Kennard, Ridge Regression: Biased Estimation for Nonorthogonal
 1751 Problems, Technometrics. 42 (2000) 80–86.
- 1752 [61] H. Zou, T. Hastie, Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net, J. R. Stat. Soc.
 1753 Ser. B Stat. Methodol. 67 (2005) 301–320. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2005.00503.x.
- 1755[62]S.G. Mallat, Zhifeng Zhang, Matching pursuits with time-frequency dictionaries, IEEE1756Trans. Signal Process. 41 (1993) 3397–3415. https://doi.org/10.1109/78.258082.
- 1757 [63] R. Rubinstein, M. Zibulevsky, M. Elad, Efficient Implementation of the K-SVD Algorithm1758 using Batch Orthogonal Matching Pursuit, (2008) 15.
- 1759 [64] S. Wold, M. Sjöström, L. Eriksson, PLS-regression: a basic tool of chemometrics,
 1760 Chemom. Intell. Lab. Syst. 58 (2001) 109–130.
- [65] R.B. Anderson, S.M. Clegg, J. Frydenvang, R.C. Wiens, S. McLennan, R.V. Morris, B.L.
 Ehlmann, M.D. Dyar, Improved accuracy in quantitative laser-induced breakdown
 spectroscopy using sub-models, Spectrochim. Acta Part B At. Spectrosc. 129 (2017) 49–
 57. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sab.2016.12.003.
- [66] S.M. Clegg, E. Sklute, M.D. Dyar, J.E. Barefield, R.C. Wiens, Multivariate analysis of
 remote laser-induced breakdown spectroscopy spectra using partial least squares,
 principal component analysis, and related techniques, Spectrochim. Acta Part B At.
 Spectrosc. 64 (2009) 79–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sab.2008.10.045.
- 1769 [67] S.R. Gunn, Support Vector Machines for Classification and Regression, University of 1770 Southampton, 1998.
- 1771 [68] C.-J. Lu, T.-S. Lee, C.-C. Chiu, Financial time series forecasting using independent
 1772 component analysis and support vector regression, Decis. Support Syst. 47 (2009) 115–
 125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2009.02.001.
- 1774 [69] J.H. Friedman, Stochastic gradient boosting, Comput. Stat. Data Anal. 38 (2002) 367–378.
 1775 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-9473(01)00065-2.
- 1776 [70] J.H. Friedman, Greedy function approximation: A gradient boosting machine., Ann. Stat.
 1777 29 (2001). https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1013203451.
- 1778 [71] L. Breiman, Random Forests, Mach. Learn. 45 (2001) 5–32.
 1779 https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324.
- 1780 [72] S.B. Kotsiantis, Decision trees: a recent overview, Artif. Intell. Rev. 39 (2013) 261–283.
 1781 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-011-9272-4.
- 1782 [73] R.E. Schapire, A Brief Introduction to Boosting, in: Proc. Sixt. Int. Jt. Conf. Artif. Intell.,1783 1999: p. 6.

- 1784 [74] P.J. Huber, Robust Estimation of a Location Parameter, Ann. Math. Stat. 35 (1964) 73–
 1785 101. https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177703732.
- 1786 [75] J. Shenk, M. Westerhaus, P. Berzaghi, Investigation of a LOCAL calibration procedure for near infrared instruments, J. Infrared Spectrosc. 5 (1997) 223.
 1788 https://doi.org/10.1255/jnirs.115.
- 1789 [76] J. Frydenvang, P.J. Gasda, J.A. Hurowitz, J.P. Grotzinger, R.C. Wiens, H.E. Newsom, K.S. 1790 Edgett, J. Watkins, J.C. Bridges, S. Maurice, M.R. Fisk, J.R. Johnson, W. Rapin, N.T. 1791 Stein, S.M. Clegg, S.P. Schwenzer, C.C. Bedford, P. Edwards, N. Mangold, A. Cousin, R.B. Anderson, V. Payré, D. Vaniman, D.F. Blake, N.L. Lanza, S. Gupta, J. Van Beek, V. 1792 1793 Sautter, P.-Y. Meslin, M. Rice, R. Milliken, R. Gellert, L. Thompson, B.C. Clark, D.Y. 1794 Sumner, A.A. Fraeman, K.M. Kinch, M.B. Madsen, I.G. Mitrofanov, I. Jun, F. Calef, A.R. 1795 Vasavada, Diagenetic silica enrichment and late-stage groundwater activity in Gale crater, 1796 Mars: Silica Enriching Diagenesis, Gale, Mars, Geophys. Res. Lett. 44 (2017) 4716–4724. 1797 https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL073323.
- 1798 [77] E.B. Rampe, D.F. Blake, T.F. Bristow, D.W. Ming, D.T. Vaniman, R.V. Morris, C.N. 1799 Achilles, S.J. Chipera, S.M. Morrison, V.M. Tu, A.S. Yen, N. Castle, G.W. Downs, R.T. 1800 Downs, J.P. Grotzinger, R.M. Hazen, A.H. Treiman, T.S. Peretyazhko, D.J. Des Marais, R.C. Walroth, P.I. Craig, J.A. Crisp, B. Lafuente, J.M. Morookian, P.C. Sarrazin, M.T. 1801 1802 Thorpe, J.C. Bridges, L.A. Edgar, C.M. Fedo, C. Freissinet, R. Gellert, P.R. Mahaffy, H.E. 1803 Newsom, J.R. Johnson, L.C. Kah, K.L. Siebach, J. Schieber, V.Z. Sun, A.R. Vasavada, D. Wellington, R.C. Wiens, Mineralogy and geochemistry of sedimentary rocks and eolian 1804 1805 sediments in Gale crater, Mars: A review after six Earth years of exploration with Curiosity, 1806 Geochemistry. 80 (2020) 125605. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemer.2020.125605.
- [78] A.H. Treiman, D.L. Bish, D.T. Vaniman, S.J. Chipera, D.F. Blake, D.W. Ming, R.V. Morris, 1807 T.F. Bristow, S.M. Morrison, M.B. Baker, E.B. Rampe, R.T. Downs, J. Filiberto, A.F. 1808 1809 Glazner, R. Gellert, L.M. Thompson, M.E. Schmidt, L. Le Deit, R.C. Wiens, A.C. McAdam, C.N. Achilles, K.S. Edgett, J.D. Farmer, K.V. Fendrich, J.P. Grotzinger, S. Gupta, J.M. 1810 1811 Morookian, M.E. Newcombe, M.S. Rice, J.G. Sprav, E.M. Stolper, D.Y. Sumner, A.R. Vasavada, A.S. Yen, Mineralogy, provenance, and diagenesis of a potassic basaltic 1812 1813 sandstone on Mars: CheMin X-ray diffraction of the Windjana sample (Kimberley area, 1814 Gale Crater), J. Geophys. Res. Planets. 121 (2016) 75-106. 1815 https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JE004932.
- [79] J. Lasue, A. Cousin, P. -Y. Meslin, N. Mangold, R.C. Wiens, G. Berger, E. Dehouck, O.
 Forni, W. Goetz, O. Gasnault, W. Rapin, S. Schroeder, A. Ollila, J. Johnson, S. Le Mouélic,
 S. Maurice, R. Anderson, D. Blaney, B. Clark, S.M. Clegg, C. d'Uston, C. Fabre, N. Lanza,
 M.B. Madsen, J. Martin-Torres, N. Melikechi, H. Newsom, V. Sautter, M.P. Zorzano,
 Martian Eolian Dust Probed by ChemCam, Geophys. Res. Lett. 45 (2018).
- 1821 https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL079210.
- 1822[80] International Organization for Standardization, ISO 5725-1: 1994: accuracy (trueness and
precision) of measurement methods and results-part 1: general principles and definitions,
(1994).
- 1825 [81] M. Thompson, Precision in chemical analysis: a critical survey of uses and abuses, Anal. 1826 Methods. 4 (2012) 1598. https://doi.org/10.1039/c2ay25083g.
- 1827 [82] N. Mangold, O. Forni, G. Dromart, K. Stack, R.C. Wiens, O. Gasnault, D.Y. Sumner, M. Nachon, P.-Y. Meslin, R.B. Anderson, B. Barraclough, J.F. Bell, G. Berger, D.L. Blaney, 1828 1829 J.C. Bridges, F. Calef, B. Clark, S.M. Clegg, A. Cousin, L. Edgar, K. Edgett, B. Ehlmann, 1830 C. Fabre, M. Fisk, J. Grotzinger, S. Gupta, K.E. Herkenhoff, J. Hurowitz, J.R. Johnson, 1831 L.C. Kah, N. Lanza, J. Lasue, S. Le Mouélic, R. Léveillé, E. Lewin, M. Malin, S. McLennan, S. Maurice, N. Melikechi, A. Mezzacappa, R. Milliken, H. Newsom, A. Ollila, S.K. Rowland, 1832 V. Sautter, M. Schmidt, S. Schröder, C. d'Uston, D. Vaniman, R. Williams, Chemical 1833 variations in Yellowknife Bay formation sedimentary rocks analyzed by ChemCam on 1834

- 1835
 board the Curiosity rover on Mars, J. Geophys. Res. Planets. 120 (2015) 2014JE004681.

 1836
 https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JE004681.
- 1837 [83] K. Rammelkamp, O. Gasnault, O. Forni, C.C. Bedford, E. Dehouck, A. Cousin, J. Lasue,
 1838 G. David, T.S.J. Gabriel, S. Maurice, R.C. Wiens, Clustering supported classification of
 1839 ChemCam data from Gale crater, Mars, Earth Space Sci. (2021).
 1840 https://doi.org/10.1029/2021EA001903.
- [84] D.L. Blaney, R.C. Wiens, S. Maurice, S.M. Clegg, R.B. Anderson, L.C. Kah, S. Le Mouélic,
 A. Ollila, N. Bridges, R. Tokar, G. Berger, J.C. Bridges, A. Cousin, B. Clark, M.D. Dyar,
 P.L. King, N. Lanza, N. Mangold, P.-Y. Meslin, H. Newsom, S. Schröder, S. Rowland, J.
 Johnson, L. Edgar, O. Gasnault, O. Forni, M. Schmidt, W. Goetz, K. Stack, D. Sumner, M.
 Fisk, M.B. Madsen, Chemistry and texture of the rocks at Rocknest, Gale Crater: Evidence
 for sedimentary origin and diagenetic alteration, J. Geophys. Res. Planets. (2014)
 2013JE004590. https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JE004590.
- 1848 [85] N. Melikechi, A. Mezzacappa, A. Cousin, N.L. Lanza, J. Lasue, S.M. Clegg, G. Berger,
 1849 R.C. Wiens, S. Maurice, R.L. Tokar, S. Bender, O. Forni, E.A. Breves, M.D. Dyar, J.
 1850 Frydenvang, D. Delapp, O. Gasnault, H. Newsom, A.M. Ollila, E. Lewin, B.C. Clark, B.L.
 1851 Ehlmann, D. Blaney, C. Fabre, Correcting for variable laser-target distances of laser1852 induced breakdown spectroscopy measurements with ChemCam using emission lines of
 1853 Martian dust spectra, Spectrochim. Acta Part B At. Spectrosc. 96 (2014) 51–60.
 1854 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sab.2014.04.004.
- 1855 [86] A. Mezzacappa, N. Melikechi, A. Cousin, R.C. Wiens, J. Lasue, S.M. Clegg, R. Tokar, S.
 1856 Bender, N.L. Lanza, S. Maurice, G. Berger, O. Forni, O. Gasnault, M.D. Dyar, T. Boucher,
 1857 E. Lewin, C. Fabre, Application of distance correction to ChemCam laser-induced
 1858 breakdown spectroscopy measurements, Spectrochim. Acta Part B At. Spectrosc. 120
 1859 (2016) 19–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sab.2016.03.009.
- 1860 [87] R.C. Wiens, A.J. Blazon-Brown, N. Melikechi, J. Frydenvang, E. Dehouck, S.M. Clegg, D.
 1861 Delapp, R.B. Anderson, A. Cousin, S. Maurice, Improving ChemCam LIBS long-distance
 1862 elemental compositions using empirical abundance trends, Spectrochim. Acta Part B At.
 1863 Spectrosc. 182 (2021) 106247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sab.2021.106247.
- 1864 [88] N. Klein, P.J. Gasda, J. Castorena, D. Oyen, Gaussian Process Variational Autoencoders
 1865 for Generative Modeling of ChemCam Data, in: Lunar and Planetary Institute, 2021: p.
 1866 2549. https://www.hou.usra.edu/meetings/planetdata2021/pdf/7052.pdf.
- 1867 [89] A.M. Ollila, H.E. Newsom, B. Clark, R.C. Wiens, A. Cousin, J.G. Blank, N. Mangold, V.
 1868 Sautter, S. Maurice, S.M. Clegg, O. Gasnault, O. Forni, R. Tokar, E. Lewin, M.D. Dyar, J.
 1869 Lasue, R. Anderson, S.M. McLennan, J. Bridges, D. Vaniman, N. Lanza, C. Fabre, N.
 1870 Melikechi, G.M. Perrett, J.L. Campbell, P.L. King, B. Barraclough, D. Delapp, S.
 1871 Johnstone, P.-Y. Meslin, A. Rosen-Gooding, J. Williams, The MSL Science Team, Trace
- element geochemistry (Li, Ba, Sr, and Rb) using Curiosity's ChemCam: Early results for
 Gale crater from Bradbury Landing Site to Rocknest, J. Geophys. Res. Planets. 119 (2014)
 2013JE004517. https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JE004517.
- [90] P.J. Gasda, R.B. Anderson, A. Cousin, O. Forni, S.M. Clegg, A. Ollila, N. Lanza, J.
 Frydenvang, S. Lamm, R.C. Wiens, S. Maurice, O. Gasnault, R. Beal, A. Reyes-Newell, D.
 Delapp, Quantification of manganese for ChemCam Mars and laboratory spectra using a
 multivariate model, Spectrochim. Acta Part B At. Spectrosc. 181 (2021) 106223.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sab.2021.106223.
- [91] O. Forni, P.-Y. Meslin, A. Cousin, S.M. Clegg, N. Mangold, L. Le Deit, O. Gasnault, G.
 David, M. Nachon, D.L. Blaney, H. Newsom, S. Maurice, R.C. Wiens, M. Gaft, Fluorine on
 Mars: Seven Years of Detection with ChemCam Onboard MSL, in: 2019: p. 6095.
 https://www.hou.usra.edu/meetings/ninthmars2019/pdf/6095.pdf.
- 1884 [92] J. Lasue, S.M. Clegg, O. Forni, A. Cousin, R.C. Wiens, N. Lanza, N. Mangold, L. Le Deit,
 1885 O. Gasnault, S. Maurice, J.A. Berger, K. Stack, D. Blaney, C. Fabre, W. Goetz, J. Johnson,
- S. Le Mouélic, M. Nachon, V. Payré, W. Rapin, D.Y. Sumner, Observation of > 5 wt %
 zinc at the Kimberley outcrop, Gale crater, Mars, J. Geophys. Res. Planets. 121 (2016)
 338–352. https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JE004946.
- [93] W. Rapin, B.L. Ehlmann, G. Dromart, J. Schieber, N.H. Thomas, W.W. Fischer, V.K. Fox,
 N.T. Stein, M. Nachon, B.C. Clark, L.C. Kah, L. Thompson, H.A. Meyer, T.S.J. Gabriel, C.
 Hardgrove, N. Mangold, F. Rivera-Hernandez, R.C. Wiens, A.R. Vasavada, An interval of
 high salinity in ancient Gale crater lake on Mars, Nat. Geosci. 12 (2019) 889–895.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-019-0458-8.
- 1894 [94] Yongdong. Wang, D.J. Veltkamp, B.R. Kowalski, Multivariate instrument standardization, 1895 Anal. Chem. 63 (1991) 2750–2756. https://doi.org/10.1021/ac00023a016.

1896

1897