



HAL
open science

Insight into martian crater degradation history based on crater depth and diameter statistics

Sylvain Breton, Cathy Quantin-Nataf, Lu Pan, Lucia Mandon, Matthieu Volat

► To cite this version:

Sylvain Breton, Cathy Quantin-Nataf, Lu Pan, Lucia Mandon, Matthieu Volat. Insight into martian crater degradation history based on crater depth and diameter statistics. *Icarus*, 2022, 377, 10.1016/j.icarus.2022.114898 . insu-03710163

HAL Id: insu-03710163

<https://insu.hal.science/insu-03710163>

Submitted on 22 Jul 2024

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 Insight into Martian crater degradation history based on crater 2 depth and diameter statistics

3

4 *Sylvain Breton¹, Cathy Quantin-Nataf², Lu Pan³, Lucia Mandon², Matthieu Volat²*

5 *1: Université de Lorraine, CRPG, 2: Université de Lyon, 3: University of Copenhagen*

6

7

8 1. Introduction

9 Planetary landscapes are shaped by a wide range of geologic processes leading to diverse
10 morphologies. Among those processes, impact cratering is observed from asteroids to planets'
11 surfaces. The bowl-shaped cavities formed by hypervelocity impacts are easy to observe from
12 orbit at a planetary scale, and are therefore studied since the 1940s (Young, 1940). Despite
13 their ubiquity, crater densities and shapes are significantly different from a surface to another,
14 even on the same body.

15 As the exposure duration to impact bombardment of the surface increases, the number
16 of craters on the surface increases. In other words, the number of craters on a surface,
17 represented as Crater Size Frequency Distributions (CSFD), is proportional to its age. Crater
18 density was first used to date surfaces in a relative sense (Baldwin, 1949). Later, returned
19 samples from the Apollo and Luna missions provided absolute ages for Lunar surfaces
20 (Shoemaker, 1970; Stöffler and Ryder, 2001), allowing the calibration a model that links the
21 absolute age to the crater density of a surface (Hartmann, 1970; Neukum et al., 1977). This
22 field of research yielded a dating method that is now widely used on many bodies of the solar
23 system (Daubar et al., 2013; Ivanov, 2001; Neukum et al., 2001).

24 Shape of craters depends on both initial crater shape and later modification by geologic
25 processes. The initial shape of a crater mainly depends on impactor size, target properties
26 (Melosh, 1989; Schenk et al., 2021) and impact velocity and angle (Daubar et al., 2014; Plescia
27 and Cintala, 2012). Despite this variability, fresh crater shape can be estimated for a given
28 diameter, especially when considering an homogenous geological unit with consistent surface
29 properties (Garvin and Frawley, 1998; Pike, 1974; Robbins and Hynek, 2012a). Crater shapes
30 are thereafter modified by surface processes of various kinds and intensities. As an example,
31 the absence of rim can be interpreted by a strong erosion (Mangold et al., 2012; Neukum et

32 al., 2001) and a flat crater floor often indicates infilling with sediments or lava flows (Craddock
33 et al., 1997).

34 The last stage of crater modification is the total disappearance of the crater. Since small
35 craters are degraded faster than big ones, this phenomenon creates complications when using
36 crater densities to date planetary surfaces. This lack of small craters, called the Opik effect
37 (Opik, 1966), has first been observed on Mars, where the density of craters smaller than 20
38 km of diameter is lower than the density predicted by the isochrons determined from bigger
39 craters. This observation is one of the many evidences that Mars surface witnessed surface
40 modification processes which were more intense than the ones observed today (Opik, 1966)

41 Measuring intensity, age and duration of resurfacing events remains challenging (Michael,
42 2013), as information on previous events is lost alongside erased craters. Including crater
43 obliteration in the cratering models provide a better understanding of crater population and
44 surface processes that affected them (Pan et al., 2019; Quantin-Nataf et al., 2019). However,
45 those models remain under-constrained, and requires additional assumptions on geological
46 processes involved to explain the observed CSFD. Moreover, in those models, the shape of
47 fresh craters is considered known and independent from the target properties. In these cases,
48 scaling models deduced from global crater statistics are used to set their initial crater shape,
49 ignoring target properties effect on the initial crater shape which is not well known especially
50 for craters smaller than 1 km (Barlow, 2005; Pike, 1980).

51 Adding systematic crater morphometric measurements can provide better understanding
52 of crater populations evolution beyond what CSFDs can provide. Studying crater obliteration
53 using a dataset of crater diameter and depth was first proposed by Carr (1992). With the
54 recent improvement of mathematical tools, data and computer power, it is now possible to
55 develop the idea, providing a continuous and global picture of Martian crater obliteration.
56 Here, we propose the introduction of a new representation of crater population that provides
57 information on the degradation state of the craters. By analogy with CSFD, we produced
58 Crater Size and Depth Frequency Distribution (CSDFD) along with the tools to interpret this
59 representation in terms of crater obliteration. This type of analysis is especially useful for
60 interpreting Martian landscapes as crater populations are often modified. We also highlight
61 at the end new insights into Mars geologic history by applying our method to a Martian crater
62 database (Robbins et al., 2012ab).

63

64 2. Method

65 In this section, we describe in detail the methodology to analyze crater size and depth
66 distribution developed in this study. We first introduce the crater size and depth frequency
67 distribution (CSDFD). Then we describe the forward modelling approach to estimate the
68 varying obliteration rate with time from the built-in CSDFD. In the end, we discuss the Martian
69 crater database used to apply our approach.

70

71 2.1 Building CSDFD

72 To account for the increased number of small craters, frequencies of craters relative to
73 their diameter, or crater size frequency distribution (CSFD) (Young, 1940), are generated
74 based on an exhaustive catalogue of craters observed on the surface.

75 This representation is originally a histogram of crater density plotted against different
76 crater size bins. In this study, we used differential CSFDs as they are more sensitive to slope
77 variation of the crater size distribution such as the ones due to the Opik effect (Hartmann,
78 2005). Hereafter, CSFD only refers to differential CSFD. For a given diameter bin j , the crater
79 density is calculated as:

80
$$\text{CSFD}_j = \frac{N_j}{\text{Area} \times \delta D_j},$$
 with N_j the number of craters in the bin, Area the studied area
81 in km^2 and δD_j the width of the diameter bin in km.

82 Recently, Robbins et al. (2018a) presented a new approach to build CSFD using kernel
83 estimator and estimated error using a method of bootstrapping. This approach presents many
84 advantages such as offering a continuous representation of the CSFD or the inclusion of the
85 error on measured diameters.

86 The kernel estimator aims to find the frequency distribution (the CSFD) that produces
87 an observed dataset of crater diameter $\mathbb{D} = \{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n\}$. The kernel density estimator can
88 be described as the sum of the observed data, convoluted with a kernel function K with a
89 bandwidth h (equation 1).

90

$$\widehat{\text{CSFD}}_h(D) = \frac{1}{n \times h} \sum_{i=0}^n K\left(\frac{D - D_i}{h}\right) \quad (1)$$

91

92 In our case the dataset is now composed of 2 parameters, each crater C_i is defined by
 93 its diameter and depth. Since the crater density has a power-law relationship with the
 94 diameter, we used the logarithm of diameter $C_i = (\log(D_i), d_i)^T$. The whole set of craters is
 95 denoted $\mathbb{C} = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n\}$. In this case, the kernel function used is a bivariate distribution,
 96 function of depth and diameter. The kernel function choice does not change much the
 97 produced density (Robbins et al., 2018a). We used a multivariate normal kernel function. The
 98 CSDFD is then computed as:
 99

$$\begin{cases} \widehat{CSDFD}_H(D, d) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^n K_H(C - C_i) \\ K_H(c) = \frac{1}{2\pi} H^{-1/2} \times \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} c^T H^{-1} c\right) \end{cases} \quad (2)$$


100

101 In the 2D case, the bandwidth h has been replaced by a 2×2 bandwidth matrix H .
 102 The choice of the bandwidth is more critical than the used kernel function (Robbins et al.,
 103 2018a; Scott, 2012). This is also true for the choice of H . Not only H affects how much the
 104 kernel spreads, but it can also rotate and modify its ellipticity.

105 We used a rule of thumb (Scott, 2012) to compute the bandwidth matrix H (e.g. the
 106 width, aspect ratio and rotation of the kernel function) and the final kernel density. This
 107 process was performed using a Gaussian kernel function (the built-in Python function,
 108 `gaussian_kde` from `scipy stats`). Like the CSFD, the density of crater is normalized by the
 109 diameter step δD and the depth step δd . Hence, the produced densities are expressed in
 110 km^{-4} (equation 3):

$$CSDFD_{i,j} = \frac{\widehat{CSDFD}_h(D_i, d_j)}{Area \times \delta D_i \times \delta d_j} \quad (3)$$

111 In our analysis, starting from the new formalism proposed by Robbins et al. (2018a),
 112 we implemented a kernel density estimator to produce a continuous representation of the
 113 diameter and depths of a crater population. This representation, called CSDFD contains
 114 information not only on the number of craters, but also on their diameter and depth.
 115



116

117 *Figure 1: Example of a Crater Size and Depth Frequency Distribution computed from 57 333 craters present on the Martian*
 118 *Noachian Highlands (Robbins and Hynes, 2012b). A The crater frequency is represented by the colormap, each crater used to*
 119 *compute the CSDFD is represented as a grey dot. Black lines indicate the diameter and depth cross-section represented in B*
 120 *and C.*

121

122

123 2.2 Deriving crater obliteration rates from CSDFD

124 CSDFDs are a representation of a crater population that includes information on the
125 degradation state of a crater population. We build this representation using new statistical
126 methods. However, note that CSDFD can also be built faster and more easily using a 2D
127 histogram of depth and diameter. We propose here a method to interpret CSDFD in terms of
128 crater obliteration rates.

129 To interpret CSDFD, we used a cratering model and an obliteration model. No model
130 of the initial shape of crater is needed as the deepest observed craters are directly considered
131 to be the freshest.

132 As mentioned earlier, the density of craters depends on the age of the surface, T , and
133 the diameter, D . Equation 4 describes this model (Hartmann and Neukum, 2001; Neukum et
134 al., 2001).

135

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \log(F_{crat}(D, T)) = \log(F_{crat, 1 km, T}) \times \sum_{k=1}^m a_k \times \log(D)^k \\ F_{crat, 1 km}(T) = C_1 \times (e^{T \times C_2} - 1) + C_3 \times T \end{array} \right. \quad (4)$$

136

137 With F_{crat} the cumulative density of craters (km^2), D the diameter (km) and T the
138 age of the surface (Gy). The indexes a_k and C_l are specific to the studied body and the model
139 used. We used the crater production function from Ivanov (2001) for Mars. The differential
140 form of this equation is used to get the density of crater for a specific diameter and is denoted

$$141 f_{crat}(D, T) = \frac{\delta F(D, T)}{\delta D} .$$

142 To mimic the condition where we have no prior knowledge about the specific
143 geological processes operating, we used a very simplistic model in which craters are only
144 degraded through a reduction of their depth at a rate r (equation 5).

145

$$D(T) = D_0 - r \times T \quad (5)$$

146

147 In this representation of the crater size-frequency, for a given diameter, the youngest
148 craters are the deepest ones, and they evolve toward shallower depth without any change in
149 diameter. To first order, the reduced crater depth is within expectation in all geological

150 processes that result in crater degradation. In most cases, the decrease of crater depth leads
 151 to an increase in the diameter, here, for computation stakes, this phenomenon is not
 152 considered. The effects of this assumption will be discussed in section 5.1.1.


153 For a given diameter bin, we can model the expected density according to age. An
 154 inverse cumulative crater depth frequency distribution $CDFD_i(d)$ is computed for every
 155 diameter bin i (equation 6) with $f_{crat}(D_i, age)$ computed thanks to equation 4.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} CDFD_i(d_j) = \sum_{u=j}^{N_j} \delta d_u \times CSDFD_{i,u} \\ CDFD_i(d_j) = f_{crat}(D_i, T) = \frac{\delta F(D_i, T)}{\delta D_i} \end{array} \right. \quad (6)$$

156
 157 Repeating this process, a depth can be computed for each diameter and age. The rate
 158 of depth decrease, which we would refer to as obliteration rate (r in m/Ga), is then computed.
 159 In this analysis, we do not assume an initial morphology (depth/Diameter ratio) of the craters,
 160 which is poorly constrained, while we estimate the obliteration rate (rate of depth decrease)
 161 directly from the dataset.

162 In order to remove artifacts induced by scarce data and by our workflow, we applied
 163 two filters. First, due to the use of a kernel estimator, densities are computed beyond the
 164 range of observed values. In order to exclude obliteration rates computed with those
 165 densities, we computed an alpha-shape curve from our data set \mathbb{C} . Alpha-shape curve
 166 delineates the limit of the cloud of points in diameter-depth space. It is computed using a
 167 Delaunay triangulation, where every triangle with an edge longer than a given threshold
 168 (0.001 in our case) is then deleted.

169 The second filter removes obliteration rates computed in part of the CSDFD where the
 170 number of craters is too small. We computed the square root of the inverse depth cumulative
 171 density distribution in order to mimic a Poisson error (Arvidson et al., 1979). We set the error
 172 threshold to $l=0.2$, below which the obliteration rate is excluded.



173
174
175
176
177
178
179

Figure 2: Explanation of the computation of crater obliteration rate. A: the crater density is plotted as the colormap. Data range not used in the computation is greyed. Colored lines represent isochrons, i.e. the depth to diameter relation of crater of a given age. B: For each diameter bin, an inverse cumulative crater frequency is computed (black line). Using cratering model, expected frequencies are computed for each time step (colored dashed lines). The result is a depth diameter relation for each time step (colored lines, also shown in A as previously mentioned). The obliteration rate is finally computed as the derivative of the depth relative to the age. Crater dataset used here comes from (Robbins and Hynek, 2012b).

180

181 2.3 Data

182 Many morphometric parameters can describe the shape of a crater, providing clues on
183 processes undergone by the crater since its formation. A commonly used parameter is the
184 depth of craters, often found as the depth to diameter ratio (d/D) (Garvin and Frawley, 1998;
185 Golombek et al., 2006; Martellato et al., 2017; McEwen et al., 2005; Robbins and Hynek,
186 2012a; Stepinski et al., 2009; Warner et al., 2010; Watters et al., 2015; Wood and Andersson,
187 1978). This parameter is quite simple to interpret, as surface processes tend to erode the rim
188 and fill the depression. There is no established definition for crater depth (Robbins et al.,
189 2018b). In this study, we used the difference between the median rim elevation and the
190 average floor elevation. This definition allows to register both erosion of the rim and infilling
191 of the cavity.

192 Several Martian crater databases exist in the literature (Barlow et al., 2006; Robbins
193 and Hynek 2012ab). To this date, Robbins and Hynek (2012b, 2012a) provides the more
194 complete database down to 2 km in diameter with morphometry measurements on craters
195 down to 3 km. We used the floor elevation and the median rim elevation parameters from the
196 global crater data base to compute the depth of the craters.


197 However, many craters of less than 10 km of diameter do not have such morphometric
 198 information. Table 1 summarizes the percentage of craters with morphometric information
 199 available in the database, according to their diameter.
 200

Diameter (km)	3 < D < 4	4 < D < 5	5 < D < 6	6 < D < 10	10 < D
Percentage of craters with morphometric information	68	77	85	90	96

201 *Table 1: the percentage of craters with morphometric information available in the Martian crater database (Robbins and*
 202 *Hynek, 2012b).*

203 In order to study spatial variations of the CSDFD of Martian terrains, we divided the
 204 surface of Mars into several areas. We used a modified version of the geologic map from
 205 Tanaka et al. (2014) to delineate surfaces with different age and geologic background.

206 In the map of Tanaka et al. (2014), large Amazonian craters are mapped separately as
 207 “Impact Units”. These units were merged to their underlying units, when it was possible to
 208 identify it, so that the CSDFDs of the surfaces include these Amazonian craters. To increase
 209 the number of craters used in our analysis we merged several units. Noachian terrains are
 210 merged in a single unit, we regrouped the volcanic units according to their volcanic provinces.
 211 Geologic surfaces with a resurfacing history such as channel outflows or transition units are
 212 kept as separate units. The final map is displayed on figure 3.
 213



214 *Figure 3: Map of the studied areas. Tanaka (2014) geologic map has been used as a base. We included the impact units in the*
 215 *underlying units and regrouped some geologic units to work on larger area with better crater statistics (AH: Amazonian and*
 216 *Hesperian, AN: Amazonian and Noachian, H: Hesperian, IH: late Hesperian, HN: Hesperian and Noachian, N: Noachian, IN:*
 217 *late Noachian).*
 218

219 Specifically, we investigated the crater size-depth frequency in the following units:


- 220 1. The Noachian highland unit. The Noachian highlands consist of almost half of the
221 planet's surface. This unit groups the early, middle and late Noachian units from initial
222 map in a single unit as the initial ones were spatially scattered. its ages range from 4.2
223 to 3.8 Ga (Carr and Head, 2010). This unit is heavily cratered, with abundant evidence
224 for liquid water on the surface, as evidenced by fluvial networks (Carr and Clow, 1981;
225 Craddock and Howard, 2002; Fassett and Head, 2008a; Howard et al., 2005; Pieri,
226 1980; Stepinski and Collier, 2003), alluvial fans (Fassett and Head, 2008b; Palucis et al.,
227 2014), paleolakes (Fassett and Head, 2008b; Goudge et al., 2016, 2012) and hydrated
228 minerals (Bibring et al., 2006; Murchie et al., 2009). This fluvial activity is mainly dated
229 from the Noachian and the early Hesperian, though some younger evidences can be
230 found (Fassett and Head, 2008a; Gulick, 1998). Thus, the obliteration rate on this unit
231 could shed light on the variation of fluvial processes through time.
- 232 2. Volcanic units. Volcanism is widespread on Mars and active throughout Martian
233 history (Werner, 2009). In this work, we identify five main volcanic units, including
234 Tharsis, Elysium, Hesperia, Syrtis, and a late Noachian volcanic unit (Malea Planum).
235 We also highlight the Amazonis Planitia unit as a volcanic unit since it is located
236 between Elysium and Tharsis, and thus recorded mostly the volcanic resurfacing from
237 the surroundings. Apparently, volcanism and infill of lava flows would be the most
238 important geologic processes in these units that affect crater obliteration.
- 239 3. The northern plains: The northern lowlands of Mars are underlain by an ancient
240 Noachian or pre-Noachian basement (Frey et al., 2002), and experienced multiple
241 episodes of volcanism and sedimentation, throughout Martian history (Carr and Head,
242 2003; Pan et al., 2017). For this analysis we included most of the lowlands as the
243 Hesperian lowlands unit, but delineated the Amazonis unit due to its close proximity
244 to Elysium and Tharsis volcanoes.

245

246 3. Synthetic tests

247 To assess our method's accuracy and sensitivity to the different hypotheses made, we
248 performed synthetic tests. We modeled crater populations with known obliteration rates, built
249 CSDFD and measured obliteration rates using the method above described (details on modeled
250 population generation is given in the supplementary material).

251 Figure 4 presents the result for a model population with a fixed initial depth and where
 252 craters are degraded according to equation 5. The erosion model is the same as what we
 253 assume in our interpretation. The computed obliteration rates accurately retrieve the intensity
 254 and timing of the input obliteration rates (Figure 4). High obliteration rates are generally more
 255 precise than low obliteration rates. However, the highest obliteration rates at older ages
 256 (e.g., >2 Ga) cannot be computed. This is explained because most craters older than the
 257 threshold ages have been totally erased. The method detects the timing of brutal changes in
 258 obliteration; however, the intensity of single resurfacing event is spread over a longer period.




259
 260 *Figure 4: Synthetic tests comparing computed obliteration rates to known input rates. Input obliteration rates are represented*
 261 *as dotted lines. Plain lines represent the mean obliteration rates of craters between 9 and 11 km in diameter computed using*
 262 *our method. A. Obliteration rate is proportional to age, each color represents a different obliteration intensity. B. Obliteration*
 263 *rate is proportional to the exponential of the age, each color represents a different obliteration intensity. C. Obliteration rates*
 264 *dramatically decrease during Hesperian, each color represent a different timing for the stop of obliteration. D. One-time*
 265 *resurfacing event with a pic of obliteration during Hesperian, each color represents a different timing for the pic.*

266 Figure 5 presents the result for a model including backwasting, with an increase in
 267 diameter proportional to the decrease in depth according to equation 7 (Ivanov, 2018).

$$\frac{D_t}{D_0} = \left(\frac{\frac{d_0}{D_0} - 4/3 \left(\frac{d_0}{D_0} \right)^3}{\frac{d_t}{D_t} - 4/3 \left(\frac{d_t}{D_t} \right)^3} \right)^{1/3} \quad (7)$$

268


269 Backwasting introduces an underestimation of the obliteration rates. For older ages,
 270 obliteration is computed from shallow craters that have an initial diameter smaller than the
 271 one used to compute the theoretical distribution of craters. Hence, the cratering rate is
 272 overestimated, leading to an underestimation of the obliteration rates. This underestimation
 273 increases with total obliteration, as the proportion of craters with smaller initial diameter
 274 increase in the diameter bin used to compute obliteration rate. Hence, measured obliteration
 275 rates in the first Ga are within 20% of the input rates.



276
 277 *Figure 5: Synthetic tests comparing computed obliteration rates to known input rates. Input obliteration rates are represented*
 278 *as dotted lines. Plain and dashed lines represent the mean obliteration rates of craters between 9 and 11 km in diameter*
 279 *computed using our method. For plain lines, diameter of modeled craters remains constant. For dashed lines, a model of the*
 280 *increase of diameter with the degradation of crater is used to build the synthetic populations. A. Obliteration rate is*
 281 *proportional to age, each color represents a different obliteration intensity. B. Obliteration rate is proportional to the*
 282 *exponential of the age, each color represents a different obliteration intensity. C. Obliteration rates dramatically decrease*
 283 *during Hesperian, each color represent a different timing for the stop of obliteration. D. One-time resurfacing event with a pic*
 284 *of obliteration during Hesperian, each color represents a different timing for the pic.*

285
 286 Figure 6 presents the result for a model population where depth of fresh crater presents
 287 an increasing variability. The chosen erosion model is again the simplest one with a decrease
 288 of depth with time (equation 5). Fresh depth variability is expected to have an influence on
 289 measured obliteration rates as they are computed from depth distribution of craters.

290 Introducing an initial depth variability of 20% does not change much the computed obliteration rates
 291 rates. However, with a variability of 50%, several artifacts can be identified. First the apparition
 292 of a base level obliteration rate, even with an input obliteration set to 0 m/Ga, an obliteration
 293 of several hundred of m/Ga is measured. The second effect is an increase of recent obliteration
 294 rates younger than 1 Ga. This second effect is still observed for lower initial depth variability.



295
 296 *Figure 6: Synthetic tests comparing computed obliteration rates to known input rates. Input obliteration rate is the dotted*
 297 *line. Populations are built with different initial depth variabilities, increasing from green to red (green 10% variability, orange*
 298 *20% and red 50 %). A. Obliteration rate is proportional to age. B. Obliteration rate is proportional to the exponential of the*
 299 *age. C. Obliteration rates dramatically decrease during Hesperian. D. One-time resurfacing event with a pic of obliteration*
 300 *during Hesperian.*

301 Synthetic tests were used both to assess the precision of our method and to calibrate
 302 filters such as l parameter. We then computed the obliteration rates to study Martian
 303 obliteration rates.

304

305 4. Applications to Martian datasets


306 4.1. Highlands

307 Figure 7 presents the obliteration rates computed for the Noachian highland. We were
 308 able to compute obliteration rates up to 4 Ga, beyond which there is not enough craters.
 309 Above 3.7 Ga, obliteration rates are only computed for the larger diameters, because most of
 310 the craters of less than 20 km of diameter have been totally erased by resurfacing processes.

311 On the other hand, recent obliteration rates cannot be computed on the largest craters as the
312 number of large young craters is insufficient to perform our computations.

313 The highest obliteration rates on the Highlands, around 10,000 m/Ga, are observed
314 before 3.8 Ga, only for large craters (Figure 7A). From 3.8 Ga to 3.2 Ga, obliteration rates
315 decrease down to 1000 m/Ga. After 3 Ga, obliteration rates remain constant below 100 m/Ga.
316 For very recent ages, i.e., less than 1 Ga, the apparent increase in obliteration rate is explained
317 as a methodological bias which will be discussed in section 5.1.


318 To better visualize the temporal variations of obliteration rates, we also represented
319 the evolution of the obliteration rates for craters between 9 and 11 km of diameter (Figure
320 7B). This range has been chosen as it provides the most complete record of obliteration in
321 time. This curve shows a dramatic decrease of obliteration rates during the Hesperian, from
322 2500 m/Ga at 3.8 Ga to less than 100 m/Ga at 3.2 Ga.



323
324 *Figure 7: Obliteration rates of craters computed on the Noachian Highlands unit. 57,333 craters were used on a surface of 63×10^6 km². A: The obliteration rates are shown relative to the age and the diameter using the color scale. Darkened area*
325 *represents the results excluded by our filters. B: The mean obliteration rates of craters between 9 and 11 km in diameter is*
326 *represented relative to time.*
327

328 329 4.2. Volcanic provinces


330 Tharsis is the biggest Martian Volcanic province. Its surface is dated from late Noachian
331 to Amazonian (Werner, 2009). Figure 8 presents the obliteration rates computed for the
332 Tharsis province. We only retrieve obliteration rates younger than 3.5 Ga, due to limit in crater
333 densities. The obliteration rate quickly decreases from 3000 m/Ga to about 100 m/Ga.
334 However, the end of the decline occurs later, reaching less than 100 m/Ga around 2.7 Ga
335 instead of 3.2 Ga for the Noachian Highlands unit.



336
337
338
339
340

Figure 8: Obliteration rates computed on the Tharsis province unit. 2970 craters were used on a surface of $18 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2$. A: The obliteration rates are shown relative to the age and the diameter using the color scale. Darkened area represents the results excluded by our filters. B: The mean obliteration rates of craters between 9 and 11 km in diameter is represented relative to time.

341 Figure 9 presents the obliteration computed for Amazonis Planitia which is one of the
342 youngest Amazonian volcanic units (Carr and Head, 2010). The maximum obliteration rates
343 are much smaller than the Noachian highlands unit and Tharsis, with a maximum of 700 m/Ga.
344 It is interesting to note that the oldest computed obliteration rates are older than the unit
345 itself, as craters buried under the unit are included in the database. During the Amazonian
346 however, obliteration rates are around 300 m/Ga, which is higher than on most of Mars
347 surface at the same time (figure 11).



348
349
350
351
352
353

Figure 9: Obliteration rates computed on the Amazonis Planitia unit. 514 craters were used on a surface of $4 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2$. A: The obliteration rates are shown relative to the age and the diameter using the color scale. Darkened area represents the results excluded by our filters. B: The mean obliteration rates of craters between 9 and 11 km in diameter is represented relative to time.


354 Obliteration rates measured on Tharsis and Amazonis present changes with the
355 diameter. On Tharsis, obliteration rates peak at crater diameter between 20 and 30 km and
356 the peak shifts toward bigger craters from 3 to 1.5 Ga. A similar observation can be made on
357 Amazonis Planitia for craters between 8 and 20 km. This observation is not yet well
358 understood. Further work will help determinate if this results from an artifact or if this is
359 specific to volcanic areas.

360

361 4.3. Northern Lowlands

362 Figure 10 presents the obliteration computed for the Hesperian lowlands unit.
363 Obliteration rates are computed up to 3.5 Ga and decrease exponentially with time like what
364 is observed on the units previously described. However, after displaying low obliteration rates
365 from 3 to 1.8 Ga, obliteration increases again reaching a rate of about 500 m/Ga. This value is
366 the highest obliteration rate observed on Mars during the Amazonian and corresponds well
367 to the timing and depth of VBF deposit previously inferred from the crater density of buried
368 impact craters (Head et al., 2002).

369 Once again, our method not only computes obliteration rates for the most surficial
370 geologic units, since 1.5 Ga, but also retrieves information from the underlying buried craters,
371 as seen here with obliteration rates before 3 Ga.



372

373 *Figure 10: Obliteration rates computed on the Hesperian lowlands unit. 4082 craters were used on a surface of 19×10^6 km².*
374 *A: The obliteration rates are shown relative to the age and the diameter using the color scale. Darkened area represents the*
375 *results excluded by our filters. B: The mean obliteration rates of craters between 9 and 11 km in diameter is represented*
376 *relative to time.*

377

378

379

380 4.4. Global scale

381 Figure 11 presents the evolution of obliteration on Mars at a global scale from the late
382 Noachian to the Amazonian. The displayed obliteration is computed as the mean value
383 observed between 9 to 11 km of diameter. The map offers a better view of spatial variations
384 of obliteration rates on Mars, while plotting the obliteration relative to the age offers insight
385 in long term variation of Mars obliteration rates.

386 Above 3.7 Ga, only few geologic surfaces are old and big enough to estimate
387 obliteration rates, namely Noachian Highlands, Amazonian and Hesperian Transition unit and
388 late Hesperian transition unit. In this timespan obliteration rates are steady around 3000
389 m/Ga. From 3.7 Ga to 3.2 Ga obliteration rates decrease down to few hundreds of m/Ga.
390 During this period, obliteration rates present high spatial variations with Argyre slope unit and
391 Hellas slope unit having still obliteration rate up to 3000 m/Ga at 3.6 Ga. After 3.2 Ga,
392 obliteration rates reach values close to 0 m/Ga except in the case of Amazonian Lowlands.

393 Geologic units related to volcanic processes present a slightly different variation of
394 obliteration rates. The oldest retrieved obliteration rates are the most important for each unit.
395 Then, in a few hundreds of Ma, obliteration rates decrease down to a few hundreds of m/Ga.
396 Each unit presents a different timing: Syrtis, Hesperia, Isidis and Tharsis, from the oldest to
397 the youngest.

398 We show that the obliteration rates in general decrease with time on Mars with the
399 exception of Hesperian lowlands unit during Amazonian. During the Hesperian, volcanic
400 provinces like Tharsis, Syrtis and Hesperia present high obliteration rates ranging from 1000
401 to 3000 m/Ga. Amazonis Planitia, located between two largest volcanic provinces (Elysium
402 and Tharsis) also shows an increase in obliteration rates around 2.0 Ga, likely due to
403 Amazonian volcanism which filled this plains unit.


404 Our results show that on Mars the processes that obliterate craters occur at different
405 epochs in spatially distinct units. Our findings are consistent with previous estimates on crater
406 obliteration rates in the Noachian highlands (Carr, 1992; Grant et al., 2006; Quantin-Nataf et
407 al., 2019), the timing of the activity of large volcanic provinces (Werner, 2009), as well as the
408 geologic history of the northern lowlands (Carr and Head, 2003). In addition, our work
409 presents a continuous function of the obliteration rate through time based on crater size and
410 depth statistics, providing new information on the geologic processes in smaller provinces
411 (e.g. Amazonis) that may not be obvious in previous studies. This analysis also presents the

412 absolute values of obliteration rates so the amplitude of geological processes could be
413 compared. For example, we showed that the obliteration rates in the Hesperian age volcanic
414 provinces, likely due to volcanic infilling, is more significant compared to those obliteration
415 rate in Noachian terrains, possibly due to fluvial activity.

416

417

418



419

420 *Figure 11: Evolution of the obliteration rates during Mars history at a global scale. Displayed obliteration rate is the mean*
 421 *value of crater obliteration rates between 9 to 11 km in diameter. A. Global map showing the evolution of obliteration rates*
 422 *with time. White is displayed where obliteration rates cannot be computed. B. and C. obliteration rates comparison between*
 423 *different areas. B. For geologic unit except volcanic units which are represented on C.*

424 5. Discussion

425 5.1 Validation and limit of the method

426 Our starting hypothesis was that crater population would be better represented using
427 a 3D CSDFD in diameter, depth and frequency rather than the usual 2D CSFD. The method
428 developed in this study aims to build and interpret those CSDFDs. We show here that, from a
429 crater map associated with morphometry information, we were able to trace the obliteration
430 history of the mapped surface using the CSDFD representation and cratering models.

431

432 *5.1.1 Limitation due to Kernel estimator*

433 Computing crater frequency in 3D is more difficult than classic CSFD. It requires a
434 greater number of craters, as we need good statistics in both diameter and depth dimension.
435 Using kernel estimators has proven useful to produce a continuous representation of crater
436 frequency in diameter-depth space.

437 The method proposed by (Robbins et al., 2018a) opens a new field for crater
438 representation. However, many improvements are still possible. To better represent the
439 crater density, it may be possible to improve the current CSDFD, using adaptative kernel
440 estimator and mirroring methods. Those two approaches could help reduce the rollover
441 observed at the border of the distribution when the actual decrease in number density is more
442 important than the kernel shape (as shown in Robbins et al. (2018a)). A better understanding
443 of processes that shape CSDFD along with a better estimation of analytical errors will help
444 build better representations.

445 Increasing the number of craters used to build the CSDFD improve the quality of the
446 computed kernel. Hence, increasing the size of the data set, by including smaller diameter
447 craters could provide a better time resolution, especially during Amazonian when the impact
448 flux was lower.

449 Construction of CSDFDs from a population of craters remains difficult, as diameter,
450 depth and frequency have ranges crossing several orders of magnitude. The steep decrease
451 in frequency when reaching shallow depths is poorly passed to CSDFDs, which results in the
452 lost of information on the oldest craters. Therefore, the obliteration rates are less likely to be
453 retrieved. To circumvent this issue, further work should focus on building models of CSDFDs
454 that can predict the frequency of crater for a given diameter, depth, age and obliteration

455 history. Those models could later be compared with observed population with a probabilistic
456 approach similar to the one proposed by Michael et al., 2016.

457

458 *5.1.2 Validation and limits of the method: synthetic tests*

459 Synthetic tests presented in section 3 and in the supplementary material show that,
460 given known impact flux and obliteration model, our method is efficient to retrieve absolute
461 values of obliteration rates along with its change in time with good accuracy.

462 It is difficult to provide an error for the measured obliteration rates as we cannot
463 predict the exact geologic processes that result in crater degradation. Synthetic tests show
464 that backwasting leads to an underestimation of the measured obliteration rates. This error
465 can reach a factor of two when the obliteration rates remain high during several billions of
466 years. Variability of the depth of fresh craters can also have an influence, increasing
467 obliteration rates for ages lower than 2 Ga.

468 Although those effects can be significant, we expect obliteration rates we measured
469 on Mars to be accurate enough to be interpreted. Backwasting artifacts are unlikely as
470 synthetic tests similar to Mars results (e.g. with a steep decrease of obliteration rates few
471 billion years ago) are not strongly modified compared to input obliteration rates. Variability
472 of the depth of fresh craters has, probably, a stronger effect. Similar to synthetic tests, we
473 observe an increase of obliteration for recent ages (<1-1.5 Ga) and base level obliteration
474 rates. The recent increase in obliteration rates remains small enough, and we considered
475 other sides effects of fresh depth variability to be negligible.

476 Our method could be improved by considering more complicated processes. As shown
477 in the synthetic tests (figure 5), considering backwasting will be critical to better constrain long
478 lasting obliteration rates. A better understanding of crater populations and initial shape of
479 crater could also enhance computed obliteration rates.

480 Additionally, the model presented here used the simplistic model of crater
481 degradation, as an illustration of the CSDFD methodology. Different degradation processes
482 (e.g., eolian or fluvial deposition or erosion) imply different equations for modeling the crater
483 morphometry evolution. Therefore, using forward modeling of crater size and depth
484 frequency distribution, one can eventually try to retrieve the processes that created a given
485 state of degradation. The potential application would be explored in future studies.

486

487 *5.1.3 Validation and limits of the method: actual data application*

488 Obliteration rates computed from CSDFD compare very well with values found from
489 other approaches. On Mars, Noachian obliteration rates are estimated around several
490 thousands of m/Ga, similar to our results (Carr, 1992; Craddock et al., 1997; Golombek and
491 Bridges, 2000; Quantin-Nataf et al., 2019). Our measured Amazonian obliteration rates,
492 around 100 m/Ga, are larger than literature values, that range from tens of meters/Ga (Carr,
493 1992; Farley et al., 2013; Palucis et al., 2014) to less than 1 m/Ga (Golombek et al., 2014; Grant
494 et al., 2006). This discrepancy can be explained two factors. First, we reach the resolution limit
495 of our method: the precision of depth measurements is less than the expected variation for
496 very low obliteration rates. Second, since our method monitors obliteration rates at different
497 time scales, the unsteadiness of obliteration processes can thus explain this variation. Higher
498 resolution dataset will be more appropriate to study obliteration variation during the
499 Amazonian.

500 As seen in figures 7 and 8, very recent obliteration rates, i.e., less than 1 Ga old,
501 increase up to several hundreds of kilometers/Ga. Increasing the error threshold l to higher
502 values than 0.2 reduces this effect. However, increasing l will also remove too much
503 information on some surfaces as this effect seems to increase for larger area. From data and
504 synthetic tests, we set $l=0.2$ as it provided a good compromise between the artifact intensity
505 and the loss of information on smaller surfaces.

506 Oldest obliteration rates are often computed with few craters, as the oldest craters are
507 erased from the surface, and it is thus difficult to retrieve Noachian obliteration rates,
508 especially for craters less than 20 km in diameter.

509 Classic crater dating is using all craters observed on a surface as related to its
510 subsequent exposition to the bombardment. But in some case, older craters emplaced on
511 buried layers are still visible, like the quasi-circular depressions in the northern lowlands. Here,
512 our method is free from this limitation. As illustrated by the cases of the Northern lowlands
513 and Amazonis Planitia, we were able to retrieve not only obliteration of the surficial unit but
514 also of the buried unit. This could also prove useful in the case of a unit with a continuous
515 emplacement, e.g., a lava flow unit, as we trace the activity of the surface from start to the
516 end of the emplacement rather to give a single age.

517 It is hard to assess the resolution of our method in time and intensity of obliteration.
518 First source of error is the cratering model that lacks anchor points on Mars, resulting in very

519 large uncertainties on absolute ages provided by crater dating and thus on the intensity and
520 timing of our estimated obliteration rates. Unless future sample returns provide absolute ages
521 of the surface rocks, the computed obliteration rates estimated using the CSDFD presentation
522 above provide the best possible analysis given present knowledge of Martian chronology.

523

524 5.2 Interpretation of the CSDFD of Mars database

525 *5.2.1 Noachian obliteration rates*

526 Noachian obliteration can only be computed on the oldest and largest units. However,
527 the computed values are in compliance with previous studies. Our method offers a
528 quantitative measurement of crater obliteration without specifying the geologic process. It
529 would require more detailed morphometry measurements and models to estimate the nature
530 of the processes that obliterated the craters.

531 Such high obliteration rates in the Noachian (several thousands of m/Ga) can be
532 produced either by cratering, erosion and sedimentation or volcanism. In order to
533 discriminate those processes, further work is needed to investigate the different crater
534 morphometry, e.g., the increase in diameter and reduction in rim height during erosional
535 processes. Investigating the area with supplementary geomorphologic tools will clarify the
536 processes at work. Including more complex models for the different processes may also result
537 in better interpretation of the CSDFD.

538 Increasing the number of used craters, mapping down to 1 km of diameter, using the
539 High-Resolution Stereo Imager (HRSC), could help having a better view on the Hesperian and
540 Amazonian obliteration rates. However, a complete mapping including smaller craters would
541 involve a very high number of craters. Automated crater mapping methods would be desirable
542 for such types of studies.

543 5.2.2 Volcanism

544 Obliteration rates on volcanic province units stand apart with obliteration rates one
545 order of magnitude higher than on the rest of Mars (Figure 11). The highest obliterations rates
546 associated to these volcanic provinces coincide with their known activity (Carr and Head,
547 2010; Werner, 2009). However, as previously mentioned in the method section (Section 2.1),
548 rather than providing a single age for a surface, our method gives a continuous information in
549 time about the activity of the surface.

550 Transforming crater obliteration in term of volume of lava emitted, our method could
551 be used to better track the volcanic activity of Mars, which could provide precious insight on
552 the thermal evolution of Mars. For these analyses, higher resolution maps could also provide
553 better obliteration rates, especially for recent activity such as on Olympus Mons or Amazonis
554 Planitia.

555

556 5.2.3 Northern Lowlands

557 Northern lowland presents an abnormally high obliteration rate from 1.5 Ga to
558 present. This result is very interesting in many regards. This high rate is unexpected as
559 Amazonian surface activity is quite low. Several hypotheses can be proposed to account for
560 those obliteration rates. The first is infilling with lava flow. However, the timing and intensity
561 of the obliteration are different from Amazonis Planitia, and there is no known large-scale
562 volcanic activity operating during this time period. The second explanation can be infilling with
563 aeolian processes. Indeed, large dune fields (Olympus Undae) are observed around the north
564 polar cap (Tanaka et al., 2005). But it is unlikely that only aeolian processes account for this
565 amount of obliteration (Grant et al., 2006). Aqueous sedimentation would be able to produce
566 the observed obliteration intensities, but we do not expect large scale aqueous activities on
567 Mars based on the observations of fluvial morphology globally (Carr and Head, 2010).

568 Another explanation can be linked with the presence of ice on the surface. High
569 latitudes of Mars are known to contain ice (Boynton et al., 2002; Feldman, 2002; Mellon et al.,
570 2009; Smith et al., 2009). This increase could be linked to the accumulation of ice in the
571 craters. Our method could then give precious insight on the activity of Martian cryosphere
572 during Amazonian.

573 Finally, we note that our identification of the elevated obliteration rate is likely
574 consistent with the prior geologic interpretation of the emplacement of the Vastitas Borealis
575 Formation (VBF) that covers most of the Northern lowlands (Tanaka et al., 2005). This origin
576 of the VBF formation is still not well understood. The age dating of the Vastitas Borealis
577 Formation ranges from the Hesperian (Kreslavsky and Head, 2002) to the Amazonian (Tanaka
578 et al., 2005). This discrepancy in proposed ages is linked with the high degradation state of
579 craters. Our results seem to favor an Amazonian age with a continuous formation starting 1.5
580 Ga ago. The obliteration rates of the impact craters in the northern lowlands may be used to
581 provide further insights into the origin of this recent geologic unit.

582

583 Conclusion

584 We propose here a brand-new method that can retrace the obliteration history of a
585 crater population of known depth. Using the crater size-depth-frequency (CSDFD)
586 representation, we can now provide constraints of continuous obliteration of craters on any
587 surface with topographic information and a known impactor flux without additional
588 assumption on the initial crater shape. This method is based on a new representation of
589 scattered crater size-depth dataset, providing continuous crater frequency according to depth
590 and diameter. Obliteration rate can be computed as a function of time given different size
591 populations.

592 As we implemented this methodology to a global Martian dataset, our method
593 provided important new observations on Martian obliteration rates: quantifying Noachian
594 obliteration rates, tracing volcanic activity, and revealing high rate of Amazonian surface
595 activity on the Northern Lowlands. We also identified the volcanic activity in the Hesperian
596 age presents a much higher obliteration rate than any other units during other epochs.

597 Further development will include better obliteration models along with proper
598 inversion between data (CSDFD) and models. Increasing the resolution of the crater map will
599 also provide better quantification and time resolution along with a constrain on the processes
600 at stake.

601 Obliteration rate analysis as we presented using CSDFD is useful to evaluate erosion
602 rate, as well as how long a surface was exposed to UV radiation, with astrobiology
603 implications. Extending our field of study to other planetary bodies such as the Moon or icy
604 satellites could provide exciting new results on their geologic and surface evolution.

605

606 Bibliography

- 607 Arvidson, R.E., Boyce, J.M., Chapman, C.R., Cintala, M., Fulchignoni, M., Moore, H., Neukum,
608 G., Schultz, P., Soderblom, L.A., Strom, R.G., Woronow, A., Young, R., 1979. Standard
609 techniques for presentation and analysis of crater size-frequency data. *Icarus* 37, 467–
610 474. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0019-1035\(79\)90009-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0019-1035(79)90009-5)
- 611 Baldwin, R.B., 1949. *The face of the moon*. [Chicago] Univ. Chicago Press [1949].
- 612 Barlow, N.G., 2005. *A review of Martian impact crater ejecta structures and their*

613 implications for target properties, in: Large Meteorite Impacts III. Geological Society of
614 America, pp. 433–442. <https://doi.org/10.1130/0-8137-2384-1.433>

615 Bibring, J.P., Langevin, Y., Mustard, J.F., Poulet, F., Arvidson, Raymond, Gendrin, A., Gondet,
616 B., Mangold, N., Pinet, P., Forget, F., Berthe, M., Gomez, C., Jouglet, D., Soufflot, A.,
617 Vincendon, M., Combes, M., Drossart, P., Encrenaz, T., Fouchet, T., Merchiorri, R.,
618 Belluci, G.C., Altieri, F., Formisano, V., Capaccioni, F., Cerroni, P., Coradini, A., Fonti, S.,
619 Korablev, O., Kottsov, V., Ignatiev, N., Moroz, V., Titov, D., Zasova, L., Loiseau, D., Pinet,
620 Patrick, Douté, S., Schmitt, B., Sotin, C., Hauber, E., Hoffmann, H., Jaumann, R., Keller,
621 U., Arvidson, Ray, Duxbury, T., Forget, François, Neukum, G., 2006. Global mineralogical
622 and aqueous Mars history derived from OMEGA/Mars express data. *Science* (80-). 312,
623 400–404. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1122659>

624 Boynton, W. V., Feldman, W.C., Squyres, S.W., Prettyman, T.H., Brückner, J., Evans, L.G.,
625 Reedy, R.C., Starr, R., Arnold, J.R., Drake, D.M., Englert, P.A.J., Metzger, A.E.,
626 Mitrofanov, I., Trombka, J.I., D’Uston, C., Wänke, H., Gasnault, O., Hamara, D.K., Janes,
627 D.M., Marcialis, R.L., Maurice, S., Mikheeva, I., Taylor, G.J., Tokar, R., Shinohara, C.,
628 2002. Distribution of hydrogen in the near surface of Mars: Evidence for subsurface ice
629 deposits. *Science* (80-). 297, 81–85. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1073722>

630 Carr, M.H., 1992. Post-Noachian Erosion Rates: Implications for Mars Climate Change, in:
631 Lunar and Planetary Science Conference. pp. 205–206.

632 Carr, M.H., Clow, G.D., 1981. Martian channels and valleys: Their characteristics, distribution,
633 and age. *Icarus* 48, 91–117. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0019-1035\(81\)90156-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0019-1035(81)90156-1)

634 Carr, M.H., Head, J.W., 2010. Geologic history of Mars. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 294, 185–203.
635 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2009.06.042>

636 Carr, M.H., Head, J.W., 2003. Oceans on Mars: An assessment of the observational evidence
637 and possible fate. *J. Geophys. Res. E Planets* 108.
638 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002je001963>

639 Craddock, R.A., Howard, A.D., 2002. The case for rainfall on a warm, wet early Mars. *J.*
640 *Geophys. Res. E Planets* 107, 21-1-21–36. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001JE001505>

641 Craddock, R.A., Maxwell, T. a., Howard, A.D., 1997. Crater morphometry and modification in
642 the Sinus Sabaeus and Margaritifer Sinus regions of Mars. *J. Geophys. Res.* 102, 13321.
643 <https://doi.org/10.1029/97JE01084>

644 Daubar, I.J., Atwood-Stone, C., Byrne, S., McEwen, A.S., Russell, P.S., 2014. The morphology

645 of small fresh craters on Mars and the Moon. *J. Geophys. Res. Planets* 119, 2620–2639.
646 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JE004671>

647 Daubar, I.J., McEwen, A.S., Byrne, S., Kennedy, M.R., Ivanov, B.A., 2013. The current martian
648 cratering rate. *Icarus* 225, 506–516. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2013.04.009>

649 Farley, K.A., Malespin, C., Mahaffy, P., Grotzinger, J.P., 2013. In Situ Radiometric and
650 Exposure Age Dating of the Martian Surface — Supplementary Materials 1–9.

651 Fassett, C.I., Head, J.W., 2008a. The timing of martian valley network activity: Constraints
652 from buffered crater counting. *Icarus* 195, 61–89.
653 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2007.12.009>

654 Fassett, C.I., Head, J.W., 2008b. Valley network-fed, open-basin lakes on Mars: Distribution
655 and implications for Noachian surface and subsurface hydrology. *Icarus* 198, 37–56.
656 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2008.06.016>

657 Feldman, W.C., 2002. Global Distribution of Neutrons from Mars: Results from Mars
658 Odyssey. *Science* (80-.). 297, 75–78. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1073541>

659 Frey, H. V., Roark, J.H., Shockey, K.M., Frey, E.L., Sakimoto, S.E.H., 2002. Ancient lowlands on
660 Mars. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 29, 22-1-22–4. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001gl013832>

661 Garvin, J.B., Frawley, J.J., 1998. Geometric properties of Martian impact craters: Preliminary
662 results from the Mars Orbiter Laser Altimeter. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 25, 4405–4408.
663 <https://doi.org/10.1029/1998GL900177>

664 Golombek, M.P., Bridges, N.T., 2000. Erosion rates on Mars and implications for climate
665 change: Constraints from the Pathfinder landing site. *J. Geophys. Res. E Planets* 105,
666 1841–1853. <https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JE001043>

667 Golombek, M.P., Grant, J.A., Crumpler, L.S., Greeley, R., Arvidson, R.E., Bell, J.F., Weitz, C.M.,
668 Sullivan, R.J., Christensen, P.R., Soderblom, L.A., Squyres, S.W., 2006. Erosion rates at
669 the Mars Exploration Rover landing sites and long-term climate change on Mars. *J.*
670 *Geophys. Res. E Planets* 111, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JE002754>

671 Golombek, M.P., Warner, N.H., Ganti, V., Lamb, M.P., Parker, T.J., Fergason, R.L., Sullivan,
672 R.J., 2014. Small crater modification on Meridiani Planum and implications for erosion
673 rates and climate change on Mars *M.* 2522–2547.
674 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JE004658>.Received

675 Goudge, T.A., Fassett, C.I., Head, J.W., Mustard, J.F., Aureli, K.L., 2016. Insights into surface
676 runoff on early Mars from paleolake basin morphology and stratigraphy. *Geology* 44,

677 419–422. <https://doi.org/10.1130/G37734.1>

678 Goudge, T.A., Head, J.W., Mustard, J.F., Fassett, C.I., 2012. An analysis of open-basin lake
679 deposits on Mars: Evidence for the nature of associated lacustrine deposits and post-
680 lacustrine modification processes. *Icarus* 219, 211–229.
681 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2012.02.027>

682 Grant, J.A., Arvidson, R.E., Crumpler, L.S., Golombek, M.P., Hahn, B., Haldemann, A.F.C., Li,
683 R., Soderblom, L.A., Squyres, S.W., Wright, S.P., Watters, W.A., 2006. Crater gradation
684 in Gusev crater and Meridiani Planum, Mars. *J. Geophys. Res. E Planets* 111, 1–23.
685 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JE002465>

686 Gulick, V.C., 1998. Magmatic intrusions and a hydrothermal origin for fluvial valleys on Mars.
687 *J. Geophys. Res. E Planets* 103, 19365–19387. <https://doi.org/10.1029/98JE01321>

688 Hartmann, W.K., 2005. Martian cratering 8: Isochron refinement and the chronology of
689 Mars. *Icarus* 174, 294–320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2004.11.023>

690 Hartmann, W.K., 1970. Lunar cratering chronology. *Icarus* 13, 299–301.
691 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0019-1035\(70\)90059-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0019-1035(70)90059-X)

692 Hartmann, W.K., Neukum, G., 2001. Cratering chronology and the evolution of Mars. *Space*
693 *Sci. Rev.* 96, 165–194. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011945222010>

694 Head, J.W., Kreslavsky, M.A., Pratt, S., 2002. Northern lowlands of Mars: Evidence for
695 widespread volcanic flooding and tectonic deformation in the Hesperian Period. *J.*
696 *Geophys. Res. E Planets* 107. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000je001445>

697 Howard, A.D., Moore, J.M., Irwin, R.P., 2005. An intense terminal epoch of widespread fluvial
698 activity on early Mars: 1. Valley network incision and associated deposits. *J. Geophys.*
699 *Res. E Planets* 110, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JE002459>

700 Ivanov, B.A., 2018. Size-Frequency Distribution of Small Lunar Craters: Widening with
701 Degradation and Crater Lifetime. *Sol. Syst. Res.* 52, 1–25.
702 <https://doi.org/10.1134/S0038094618010021>

703 Ivanov, B.A., 2001. Mars/Moon cratering rate ratio estimates. *Space Sci. Rev.* 96, 87–104.
704 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011941121102>

705 Kreslavsky, M.A., Head, J.W., 2002. Fate of outflow channel effluents in the northern
706 lowlands of Mars: The Vastitas Borealis Formation as a sublimation residue from frozen
707 ponded bodies of water. *J. Geophys. Res. E Planets* 107, 4–1.
708 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001JE001831>

709 Mangold, N., Adeli, S., Conway, S., Ansan, V., Langlais, B., 2012. A chronology of early Mars
710 climatic evolution from impact crater degradation. *J. Geophys. Res. E Planets* 117, 1–22.
711 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JE004005>

712 Martellato, E., Vivaldi, V., Massironi, M., Cremonese, G., Marzari, F., Ninfo, A., Haruyama, J.,
713 2017. Is the Linné impact crater morphology influenced by the rheological layering on
714 the Moon's surface? Insights from numerical modeling. *Meteorit. Planet. Sci.* 52, 1388–
715 1411. <https://doi.org/10.1111/maps.12892>

716 McEwen, A.S., Preblich, B.S., Turtle, E.P., Artemieva, N.A., Golombek, M.P., Hurst, M., Kirk,
717 R.L., Burr, D.M., Christensen, P.R., 2005. The rayed crater Zunil and interpretations of
718 small impact craters on Mars. *Icarus* 176, 351–381.
719 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2005.02.009>

720 Mellon, M.T., Arvidson, R.E., Marlow, J.J., Phillips, R.J., Asphaug, E., 2009. Periglacial
721 landforms at the Phoenix landing site and the northern plains of Mars. *J. Geophys. Res.*
722 *E Planets*. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JE003039>

723 Melosh, H.J., 1989. *Impact cratering: A Geologic Process*. <https://doi.org/1989icgp.book.....M>

724 Michael, G.G., 2013. Planetary surface dating from crater size–frequency distribution
725 measurements: Multiple resurfacing episodes and differential isochron fitting. *Icarus*
726 226, 885–890. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2013.07.004>

727 Michael, G.G., Kneissl, T., Neesemann, A., 2016. Planetary surface dating from crater size-
728 frequency distribution measurements: Poisson timing analysis. *Icarus* 277, 279–285.
729 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2016.05.019>

730 Murchie, S.L., Mustard, J.F., Ehlmann, B.L., Milliken, R.E., Bishop, J.L., McKeown, N.K., Noe
731 Dobrea, E.Z., Seelos, F.P., Buczkowski, D.L., Wiseman, S.M., Arvidson, R.E., Wray, J.J.,
732 Swayze, G., Clark, R.N., Des Marais, D.J., McEwen, A.S., Bibring, J.P., 2009. A synthesis of
733 Martian aqueous mineralogy after 1 Mars year of observations from the Mars
734 Reconnaissance Orbiter. *J. Geophys. Res. E Planets* 114.
735 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JE003342>

736 Neukum, G., Ivanov, B.A., Hartmann, W.K., 2001. Cratering records in the inner solar system
737 in relation to the lunar reference system. *Space Sci. Rev.* 96, 55–86.
738 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011989004263>

739 Neukum, G., König, B., Fechtig, H., 1977. Cratering in the Earth-Moon system-Consequences
740 for age determination by crater counting. *J. Geophys. Res.* 82, 376–388.

741 Opik, E.J., 1966. The Martian Surface. *Science* (80-.). 153, 255–265.
742 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.153.3733.255>

743 Palucis, M.C., Dietrich, W.E., Hayes, A.G., Williams, R.M.E., Gupta, S., Mangold, N., Newsom,
744 H.E., Hardgrove, C., Calef, F.J., Sumner, D.Y., 2014. The origin and evolution of the
745 Peace Vallis fan system that drains to the Curiosity landing area, Gale Crater, Mars 705–
746 728. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JE004583>.Received

747 Pan, L., Ehlmann, B.L., Carter, J., Ernst, C.M., 2017. The stratigraphy and history of Mars’
748 northern lowlands through mineralogy of impact craters: A comprehensive survey. *J.*
749 *Geophys. Res. Planets* 122, 1824–1854. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JE005276>

750 Pan, L., Quantin-Nataf, C., Breton, S., Michaut, C., 2019. The impact origin and evolution of
751 Chryse Planitia on Mars revealed by buried craters. *Nat. Commun.* 10, 4257.
752 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-12162-0>

753 Pieri, D.C., 1980. Martian Valleys: Morphology, Distribution, Age, and Origin. *Science* (80-.).
754 210, 895–897. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.210.4472.895>

755 Pike, R.J., 1980. Control of crater morphology by gravity and target type: Mars, Earth, Moon.
756 *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta, Suppl.* 14, 2159–2189.

757 Pike, R.J., 1974. Depth/diameter relations of fresh lunar craters: Revision from spacecraft
758 data. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 1, 291–294. <https://doi.org/10.1029/GL001i007p00291>

759 Plescia, J.B., Cintala, M.J., 2012. Impact melt in small lunar highland craters. *J. Geophys. Res.*
760 *E Planets* 117, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JE003941>

761 Quantin-Nataf, C., Craddock, R.A., Dubuffet, F., Lozac’h, L., Martinot, M., 2019. Decline of
762 crater obliteration rates during early martian history. *Icarus* 317, 427–433.
763 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2018.08.005>

764 Robbins, S.J., Hynek, B.M., 2012a. A new global database of Mars impact craters ≥ 1 km: 2.
765 Global crater properties and regional variations of the simple-to-complex transition
766 diameter. *J. Geophys. Res. E Planets* 117, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JE003967>

767 Robbins, S.J., Hynek, B.M., 2012b. A new global database of Mars impact craters ≥ 1 km: 1.
768 Database creation, properties, and parameters. *J. Geophys. Res. E Planets* 117, 1–18.
769 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JE003966>

770 Robbins, S.J., Riggs, J.D., Weaver, B.P., Bierhaus, E.B., Chapman, C.R., Kirchoff, M.R., Singer,
771 K.N., Gaddis, L.R., 2018a. Revised recommended methods for analyzing crater size-
772 frequency distributions. *Meteorit. Planet. Sci.* 53, 891–931.

773 <https://doi.org/10.1111/maps.12990>

774 Robbins, S.J., Watters, W.A., Chappelow, J.E., Bray, V.J., Daubar, I.J., Craddock, R.A., Beyer,
775 R.A., Landis, M., Ostrach, L.R., Tornabene, L., Riggs, J.D., Weaver, B.P., 2018b.
776 Measuring impact crater depth throughout the solar system. *Meteorit. Planet. Sci.* 53,
777 583–637. <https://doi.org/10.1111/maps.12956>

778 Schenk, P., Castillo-Rogez, J., Otto, K.A., Marchi, S., O’Brien, D., Bland, M., Hughson, K.,
779 Schmidt, B., Scully, J., Buczkowski, D., Krohn, K., Hoogenboom, T., Kramer, G., Bray, V.,
780 Neesemann, A., Hiesinger, H., Platz, T., De Sanctis, M.C., Schroeder, S., Le Corre, L.,
781 McFadden, L., Sykes, M., Raymond, C., Russell, C.T., 2021. Compositional control on
782 impact crater formation on mid-sized planetary bodies: Dawn at Ceres and Vesta,
783 Cassini at Saturn. *Icarus* 359, 114343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2021.114343>

784 Scott, D.W., 2012. Multivariate density estimation and visualization, *Handbook of*
785 *Computational Statistics: Concepts and Methods: Second Edition*. John Wiley & Sons.
786 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-21551-3__19

787 Shoemaker, E.M., 1970. Origin of fragmental debris on the lunar surface and the history of
788 bombardment of the Moon. *Inst. Investig. Geol. la Diput. Prov. XXV* 24, 27–56.

789 Smith, P.H., Tamppari, L.K., Arvidson, R.E., Bass, D., Blaney, D., Boynton, W. V., Carswell, A.,
790 Catling, D.C., Clark, B.C., Duck, T., DeJong, E., Fisher, D., Goetz, W., Gunnlaugsson, H.P.,
791 Hecht, M.H., Hipkin, V., Hoffman, J., Hviid, S.F., Keller, H.U., Kounaves, S.P., Lange, C.F.,
792 Lemmon, M.T., Madsen, M.B., Markiewicz, W.J., Marshall, J., McKay, C.P., Mellon, M.T.,
793 Ming, D.W., Morris, R. V., Pike, W.T., Renno, N., Stauffer, U., Stoker, C., Taylor, P.,
794 Whiteway, J.A., Zent, A.P., 2009. H₂O at the Phoenix Landing Site. *Science* (80-.). 325,
795 58–61. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1172339>

796 Stepinski, T.F., Collier, M.L., 2003. Drainage densities of computationally extracted Martian
797 drainage basins, in: *Sixth International Conference on Mars*.

798 Stepinski, T.F., Mendenhall, M.P., Bue, B.D., 2009. Machine cataloging of impact craters on
799 Mars. *Icarus* 203, 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2009.04.026>

800 Stöffler, D., Ryder, G., 2001. Stratigraphy and isotope ages of lunar geologic units:
801 Chronological standard for the inner solar system. *Space Sci. Rev.* 96, 9–54.
802 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011937020193>

803 Tanaka, K.L., Skinner, J.A., J., Dohm, J.M., Irwin, R.P., Kolb, E.J., Fortezzo, C.M., Platz, T.,
804 Michael, G.G., Hare, T.M., 2014. Geologic map of Mars. USGS.

805 <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.3133/sim3292>

806 Tanaka, K.L., Skinner, J.A., Hare, T.M., 2005. Geologic Map of the Northern Plains of Mars.
807 U.S. Geol. Surv. Geol. Investig. SIM 2888, 80225.

808 Warner, N., Gupta, S., Lin, S.Y., Kim, J.R., Muller, J.P., Morley, J.G., 2010. Late Noachian to
809 Hesperian climate change on Mars: Evidence of episodic warming from transient crater
810 lakes near ares vallis. *J. Geophys. Res. Planets* 115.
811 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JE003522>

812 Watters, W.A., Geiger, L.M., Fendrock, M., Gibson, R., 2015. Morphometry of small recent
813 impact craters on Mars: Size and terrain dependence, short-term modification. *J.*
814 *Geophys. Res. Planets* 120, 226–254. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JE004630>

815 Werner, S.C., 2009. The global martian volcanic evolutionary history. *Icarus* 201, 44–68.
816 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2008.12.019>

817 Wood, C.A., Andersson, L., 1978. New Morphometric Data for Fresh Lunar Craters. *Lunar*
818 *Planet. Sci. Conf.* 9, 16–91.

819 Young, J., 1940. A Statistical Investigation of Diameter and Distribution of Lunar Craters. *J.*
820 *Br. Astron. Assoc.* 50, 309–326.

821