

# Dear Author:

Thank you for publishing with AGU. Your proofs are attached. AGU and Wiley are committed to rapid posting of accepted papers. The accepted version of your paper is already available online (except for embargoed papers), providing visibility, and we strive to have final versions available within a few weeks. Following the guidelines for marking corrections and returning the proofs quickly will allow prompt online posting of the final version of your paper.

AGU Publications recently <u>updated</u> our style to follow leading practices in scholarly publishing, to simplify corrections and reduce copyediting changes. We are now following the APA style for grammar and markup. This style is used by many other journals and we hope that this change, over time, will lead to a simpler and standard experience for authors.

We have collected some information on how to increase the visibility of your paper <u>here</u>. Many of these steps can be taken after publication, so it is not too late to start. The online version of your paper includes "Altmetrics," which continually tracks and links to mentions in news outlets, Twitter, blogs, and other social media. A link to articles that cite your paper is also provided. Papers are also linked directly to any highlights provided by AGU and other similar AGU content. Recent highlights across AGU journals are collected <u>here</u>.

AGU is also, through Wiley, working to expand sharing of articles. Wiley piloted an <u>initiative</u> through the PDF reader Readcube that allows content to be shared freely to colleagues by authors and subscribers. This is now available for AGU content. For authors and subscribers, just click on the "share" link of your article in the Readcube reader. For the public and general reader, this service also allows free access to Wiley and thus AGU content from links in news stories.

Finally, your feedback is important to us. If you have questions or comments regarding your AGU Publications experience, including information on production and proofs, please contact us at <u>publications@agu.org</u>. We will also be contacting you soon after your article is published with an author survey. Please take a few minutes to respond to this online survey; your input is important in improving the overall editorial and production process. Thank you again for supporting AGU.

Sincerely,

R. Elde

Brooks Hanson Sr. Vice President, Publications

2000 Florida Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20009-1277 Tel: 202.462.6900 Fax: +1 202.328.0566 www.agu.org

# **USING e-ANNOTATION TOOLS FOR ELECTRONIC PROOF CORRECTION**

Required software to e-Annotate PDFs: <u>Adobe Acrobat Professional</u> or <u>Adobe Reader</u> (version 11 or above). (Note that this document uses screenshots from <u>Adobe Reader DC.</u>) The latest version of Acrobat Reader can be downloaded for free at: <u>http://get.adobe.com/reader/</u>

Once you have Acrobat Reader open on your computer, click of (right-hand panel or under the Tools menu). This will open up a ribbon panel at the top of the document. Using a comment in the right-hand panel. The tools you will use for an are shown below: $\bigcirc  \bigcirc  \bigcirc  \swarrow   \qquad  \qquad $	n the Comment tab  In the
<ol> <li>Replace (Ins) Tool – for replacing text.</li> <li>Strikes a line through text and opens up a text box where replacement text can be entered.</li> <li>How to use it:         <ul> <li>Highlight a word or sentence.</li> <li>Click on ::                  <ul></ul></li></ul></li></ol>	<ul> <li>2. Strikethrough (Del) Tool – for deleting text.</li> <li>Strikes a red line through text that is to be deleted.</li> <li>How to use it: <ul> <li>Highlight a word or sentence.</li> <li>Click on T</li> <li>The text will be struck out in red.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
and is initiated after and is initiated after carbon source [1]. Sa are referred to as mein n of meiosis-specific g revisiae depends on the inducer of meiosis) [3] I functions as a repre- repression, the genes pression) and RGRI and rase II mediator subur- osome density [8]. Sin- irectly or indirectly re	<ul> <li>experimental data if available. For OREs to be had to meet all of the following criteria:</li> <li>1. Small size (35-250 amino acids).</li> <li>2. Absence of similarity to known proteins.</li> <li>3. Absence of functional data which could not the real overlapping gene.</li> <li>4. Greater than 25% overlap at the N-termin terminus with another coding feature; over both ends; or ORF containing a tRNA.</li> </ul>





Use these 2 tools to highlight the text where a comment is then made.

# How to use it:

- Click on 🖌 .
- Click and drag over the text you need to highlight for the comment you will add.

- Insert Tool for inserting missing text at specific points in the text.
  - T<sub>a</sub> Mar oper can

# Marks an insertion point in the text and opens up a text box where comments can be entered.

# How to use it:

- Click on  $T_{a}$ .
- Click at the point in the proof where the comment



- Click close to the text you just highlighted.
- Type any instructions regarding the text to be altered into the box that appears.



- should be inserted.
- Type the comment into the box that appears.

Meiosis has a central role	in the sexual reproducti	on of nearly a	all
eukaryotes paccharom			or det
analysis of meiosis, esp	jstaddon	Reply 🗙	🕘 trigg
by a simple change of n			ts are
conveniently monitored	Yeast,		us sin
cells. Sporulation of Sae			ne ty
cell, the a/α cell, and is			the a
of a fermentable carbor			only d
sporulation and are refe			c gen
2b]. Transcription of me			tion o
meiosis, in S. cerevisiae			ional
activator, IME1 (inducer			he pro
of the gene RME1 funct	05/05/2017 15:57	Post	DNA-k
Rmelp to exert repressi			ve reg
of GAL1 gene expression)	and RGR1 are required [	1237.0	nese ge
	distant suburity (constant	•-:\b:-b	

# WILEY

# **USING e-ANNOTATION TOOLS FOR ELECTRONIC PROOF CORRECTION**



# <u>How to use it:</u>

comment

ribbon

• Click on one of the shapes in the Drawing Markups section.

Expand Drawing Tools

Cloud Connected Lines

- Click on the proof at the relevant point and draw the selected shape with the cursor.
- To add a comment to the drawn shape, right-click on shape and select *Open Pop-up Note.*
- Type any text in the red box that appears.



_		
	-	υ.

# Online Support F1 Welcome... Image: Comparison of the second second



THIS IS NOT AN INVOICE



# PLEASE COMPLETE THE PUBLICATION FEE CONSENT FORM BELOW AND RETURN TO THE PRODUCTION EDITOR WITH YOUR PROOF CORRECTIONS

Please return this completed form and direct any questions to the Wiley Journal Production Editor at JGREprod@wiley.com.

# To order OnlineOpen, you must complete the OnlineOpen order form at:

https://authorservices.wiley.com/bauthor/onlineopen\_order.asp

Authors who select OnlineOpen will be charged the standard OnlineOpen fee for your journal, but excess publication fees will still apply, if applicable. If your paper has generated excess publication fees, please complete and return the form below in addition to completing the OnlineOpen order form online (excess fees are billed separately). If you would like to choose OnlineOpen and you have not already submitted your order online, please do so now.

# YOUR ARTICLE DETAILS

Journal: Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets

Article: Mansfield, M., Kite, E. S., & Mischna, M. A. (2018). Effect of Mars atmospheric loss on snowmelt potential in a 3.5 Gyr Mars climate evolution model. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 123,* 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JE005422

# Please provide the information requested below.

Bill to:

Name:	
Institution:	
Address:	
Phone:	Email:
Signature:	Date:

An invoice will be mailed to the address you have provided once your edited article publishes online in its final format. Please include on this publication fee form any information that must be included on the invoice.

# Publication Fees and Length Guidelines:

http://publications.agu.org/author-resource-center/

# **Frequently Asked Billing Questions:**

http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/(ISSN)2169-8996/homepage/billing\_faqs.pdf

# **Purchase Order Instructions:**

Wiley must be listed as the contractor on purchase orders to prevent delay in processing invoices and payments.

# Journal: Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets

# Article: jgre20815

Dear Author,

During the copyediting of your manuscript the following queries arose.

Please refer to the query reference call out numbers in the page proofs and respond to each by marking the necessary comments using the PDF annotation tools.

Please remember illegible or unclear comments and corrections may delay publication.

Many thanks for your assistance.

Query No.	Query	Remark
Q1	AUTHOR: Please complete the Publication Fee Consent Form included with your article and return to the Production Editor with your proofs.	
Q2	AUTHOR: Please confirm that given names (red) and surnames/family names (green) have been identified correctly.	
Q3	AUTHOR: Please verify that the linked ORCID identifiers are correct for each author.	
Q4	AUTHOR: AGU now allows citations in abstracts for all paper types. The citations will include a linkable DOI. This means an in-text citation in the abstract that includes the DOI, e.g., "In Izett and Fennel (2018, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GB005667)" or "Research shows (Izett & Fennel, 2018, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GB005667)." Please check all the provided DOI and please provide DOI for reference Tu et al. (2015).	
Q5	AUTHOR: Please define GCM if this is an acronym.	
Q6	AUTHOR: References Dundas and Byrne (2010), Carr and Head (2003), and Turcotte and Schubert (2014) were cited in the text but not given in the Reference List. Please provide details or delete the citation from the text.	
Q7	AUTHOR: Please provide city location for reference Woo (2012).	

Please confirm that the funding sponsor list below was correctly extracted from your article: that it includes all funders and that the text has been matched to the correct FundRef Registry organization names. If a name was not found in the FundRef registry, it may not be the canonical name form, it may be a program name rather than an organization name, or it may be an organization not yet included in FundRef Registry. If you know of another name form or a parent organization name for a "not found" item on this list below, please share that information.

FundRef name	FundRef Organization Name
NASA	not found

P	Jou	rnal Co	ode:		Article ID	Dispatch: 15.03.18	CE: RMAP
* SPi	J	G	R	E	20815	No. of Pages: 13	ME:

# **@AGU** PUBLICATIONS

# Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets

# **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

10.1002/2017JE005422

# **Key Points:**

- We create an energy balance model to investigate snowmelt potential on Mars over the last 3.5 Gyr
- Melting is allowed only for high atmospheric pressures, and obliquity changes are less important than atmospheric pressure in allowing melt
- For low surface albedo and thermal inertia, melting at high pressures matches selected key geologic constraints on Hesperian river networks

## Correspondence to:

M. Mansfield, meganmansfield@uchicago.edu

## Citation:

Mansfield, M., Kite, E. S., & Mischna, M. A. (2018). Effect of Mars atmospheric loss on snowmelt potential in a 3.5 Gyr Mars climate evolution model. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 123.* https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JE005422

Received 15 AUG 2017 Accepted 17 FEB 2018 Accepted article online 23 FEB 2018

Q4: We have provided DOIs for Tu et al. (2015) and Jakosky et al. (2017) and corrected the DOI for Kite, Gao et al. (2017) below.

> ©2018. American Geophysical Union. All Rights Reserved.

# Revised proofs are sent only in the case of extensive corrections upon request.

# JGR

- 1 2
- )3

04

05

Q3

# Megan Mansfield<sup>1</sup>, Edwin S. Kite<sup>1</sup>, and Michael A. Mischna<sup>2</sup> Q2 and Q3: These are all correct

<sup>1</sup>Department of the Geophysical Sciences, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA, <sup>2</sup>Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA

Effect of Mars Atmospheric Loss on Snowmelt Potential

in a 3.5 Gyr Mars Climate Evolution Model

Abstract Post-Noachian Martian paleochannels indicate the existence of liquid water on the surface of Mars after about 3.5 Gya (Irwin et al., 2015, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2014.10.012; Palucis et al., 2016, https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JE004905). In order to explore the effects of variations in CO<sub>2</sub> partial pressure and obliquity on the possibility of surface water, we created a zero-dimensional surface energy balance model. We combine this model with physically consistent orbital histories to track conditions over the last 3.5 Gyr of Martian history. We find that melting is allowed for atmospheric pressures corresponding to exponential loss rates of  $dP/dt \propto t^{-3.73}$  or faster, but this rate is within  $0.5\sigma$  of the rate calculated from initial measurements made by the Mars Atmosphere and Volatile EvolutioN (MAVEN) mission, if we assume all the escaping oxygen measured by MAVEN comes from atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> (Lillis et al., 2017, https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JA023525; Tu et al., 2015). Melting at this loss rate matches selected key geologic constraints on the formation of Hesperian river networks, assuming optimal melt conditions during the warmest part of each Mars year (Irwin et al., 2015, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2014.10.012; Kite, Gao, et al., 2017, https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo3033; Kite, Sneed et al., 2017, https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL072660; Stopar et al., 2006, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2006.07.039). The atmospheric pressure has a larger effect on the surface energy than changes in Mars's mean obliquity. These results show that initial measurements of atmosphere loss by MAVEN are consistent with atmospheric loss being the dominant process that switched Mars from a melt-permitting to a melt-absent climate (Jakosky et al., 2017), but non- $CO_2$ warming will be required if <2 Gya paleochannels are confirmed or if most of the escaping oxygen measured by MAVEN comes from H<sub>2</sub>O.

# 1. Introduction

Large (>10 km<sup>2</sup>), late-stage Martian alluvial fans and river deltas provide evidence for surface liquid water on post-Noachian Mars after about 3.5 Gya (Grant & Wilson, 2012; Irwin et al., 2015; Palucis et al., 2016; Williams & Weitz, 2014). However, by about 3.5 Gya most of the conditions favorable to the existence of surface liquid water no longer existed: much of Mars's atmosphere was lost before the end of the Noachian and the Martian dynamo shut down around the mid-Noachian (Pepin, 1994; Lillis et al., 2013). Additionally, the amount of greenhouse gases released by volcanism on Mars is less than on Earth because the mantle is more reducing (Stanley et al., 2011), and by 3.5 Gya the rate of volcanic degassing had slowed down significantly (Kite et al., 2009). Because orbiters detect only minor post-Noachian carbonate, which may be due to SO<sub>2</sub> or acidity (Bullock & Moore, 2007; Halevy & Schrag, 2009), it is difficult to justify post-Noachian carbonate sequestration of more CO<sub>2</sub> than exists in the present, thin atmosphere (Edwards & Ehlmann, 2015).

Atmospheric pressure has a strong effect on permitting surface liquid water because lower atmospheric pressures as strong effect on permitting surface liquid water because lower atmospheric pressures can preclude melting by decreasing the strength of greenhouse warming and increasing the amount48of evaporative cooling. Clow (1987) showed these effects in a model which determined the minimum atmospheric pressure necessary to melt dusty snow on the surface of Mars. They found that melting could occur50at relatively low pressures if the snowpack was assumed to be thick enough that melt accumulated at the51base of the thick snow layer while the upper layers of snow were at colder temperatures. Hecht (2002) used52a similar model to determine the necessary surface properties, such as albedo and conductivity, to allow53melting on Mars. Additionally, Hecht emphasized the importance of evaporative cooling at low atmospheric54pressures, as first pointed out by Ingersoll (1970). Models which have not included evaporative cooling55

produce much more melting on the surface of Mars, which indicates its importance in setting melting conditions (Costard et al., 2002; Williams et al., 2008). The high rate of evaporative cooling at low atmospheric pressure precludes melting of pure water ice on present-day Mars, which has an average atmospheric pressure of 600 Pa.

Although atmospheric pressure can have a strong effect on the surface energy balance, changes in Mars's orbital parameters, especially large changes in its mean obliquity, can also affect melt conditions. Kite et al. (2013) determined the conditions for snowmelt at a variety of atmospheric pressures, obliquities, and eccentricities. They found that combining these factors could produce intermittent melting that could provide small amounts of liquid water for sediment induration at low latitudes.

While models that study moments in time can provide some insight into the past Martian climate, models showing evolution over time give a better understanding of the timing of melting in Mars's past. Manning et al. (2006) addressed the time evolution of the Martian climate by examining the relative sizes of various CO<sub>2</sub> reservoirs over the history of Mars. Their model determined that different climate states are stable for different obliquities, but they only considered a subset of the full range of obliquities that Mars has experienced.

A model that simultaneously studies the effects of time evolution, orbital variations, and changing energy balance with changing atmospheric pressure is needed to more fully understand the timing and intermittency of melting on Mars. To address this, we created a zero-dimensional energy balance model that spans over 3.5 Gyr of Mars history and examines how changes in orbital parameters, solar luminosity, and atmospheric pressure impact the melt conditions of snow on the surface of Mars. We consider snowmelt as a source of water as opposed to catastrophic flows after impacts because recent work suggests that lakes lasted for at least a few thousand years, and this relatively long lifetime implies a climate favorable to melting and not just a sudden catastrophic event that allowed melting for a brief period (Grant & Wilson, 2012; Irwin et al., 2015; Palucis et al., 2016; Turbet et al., 2017; Williams & Weitz, 2014). We also ignore the effects of impacts and eruptions because changes due to atmospheric loss, solar brightening, and orbital variations are more well understood and because the melt potential of impacts themselves depends on the atmospheric heat capacity and therefore the atmospheric pressure. Our model is zero-dimensional because this allows fast computation of a full 3.5 Gyr energy balance, whereas previous 3-D models have been unable to include time evolution because of computational limits (Wordsworth et al., 2013). This model is timely because the Mars Atmosphere and Volatile EvolutioN (MAVEN) mission is currently in orbit around Mars collecting data on rates of atmospheric loss and is presumably providing better constraints on the atmospheric pressure over time on Mars which we can use in our model to constrain the conditions that explain melting on post-Noachian Mars (Lillis et al., 2017). We describe our model in section 2. In section 3 we present our results, which indicate that atmospheric pressure has a more dominant effect on surface melt conditions than obliquity variations. In section 4 we discuss assumptions of our model and possible future extensions, and we summarize our findings in section 5.

## 2. Model Description

## 2.1. Chaotic Orbital Histories

To investigate the influence of orbital variability on post-Noachian surface liquid water, we created a model that combined the effects of orbital variations, atmospheric loss, and solar brightening, as illustrated in 43 F1 Figure 1. Physically consistent orbital histories were constructed using the mercury6 N-body integrator and an obliquity code (Armstrong et al., 2014; Chambers, 1999). The orbital histories recorded the orbital parameters of the simulated Mars at 200 year intervals over the last 3.5 Gyr and included quasiperiodic variations in orbital parameters (Kite et al., 2015). Most importantly, they included changes in obliquity, which for Mars has probably jumped from low mean values around 20° to high mean values around 40° between two and nine times in its history on ≥200 Myr time scales (Li & Batygin, 2014). The orbital histories were sampled at 2,000 year intervals. Eight possible orbital histories were studied, all of which have obliquity jumps at different times in their time lines but which all end with obliquities within 12° of the modern-day value of 25.19°. Several obliquity tracks were considered because the chaotic nature of the Solar System means that the exact value of Mars's obliguity is not known beyond a few hundred million years ago. Therefore, we studied a distribution of possible orbital histories to statistically constrain the influence of the orbital parameters on melting. The eight orbital histories all produced similar energy histories, so only two will be examined in detail in this 55 F2 paper. Obliguity histories for tracks 1 and 2, which will be examined in more detail later, are shown in Figure 2.

# **AGU** Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets





### 2.2. Loss of Atmospheric Pressure

The chaotic orbital histories were combined with a model of solar brightening over time and loss of atmospheric pressure (Bahcall et al., 2001). Although there are several possible loss mechanisms for  $CO_2$  in past Mars, such as chemical fixation of  $CO_2$  in deep aquifers (Chassefiére & Leblanc, 2011) and basal melting of a  $CO_2$  ice cap (Kurahashi-Nakamura & Tajika, 2006), we chose to focus on escape to space and assumed all atmospheric loss was due to escape to space. Additionally, we neglected carbonate formation because it is thought to be relatively ineffective in the post-Noachian, although this is debated (Edwards & Ehlmann, 2015; Hu et al., 2015).

The current atmospheric pressure on Mars is approximately 600 Pa, but at the temperatures that would allow liquid water on the surface of Mars, the approximately 600 Pa of additional CO<sub>2</sub> currently trapped in Martian polar caps would be released into the atmosphere, and so we assume a modern-day atmospheric pressure of 1,200 Pa (Bierson et al., 2016). Atmospheric loss to space was parameterized as a power law



Figure 2. Obliquity histories for orbital tracks 1 (top) and 2 (bottom). The overplotted red lines show 200 Myr averages.

(1)

### Table 1

Maximum Pressure in the 3.5 Gyr Energy Balance for Different Rates of Atmospheric Loss, as Given by Equation (1), Assuming that all Oxygen Loss Measured by MAVEN Corresponds to Loss Over Geologic Time of CO<sub>2</sub> and Not H<sub>2</sub>O (Lillis et al., 2017)

α	Maximum pressure (bar)
2.20	0.243
2.71	0.390
3.22	0.654
3.73	1.133
4.24	2.020

Note.  $\alpha = 3.22$  is the mean value of  $\alpha$  inferred from initial Mars Atmosphere and Volatile EvolutioN (MAVEN) results, while  $\alpha = 2.20, 2.71, 3.73, and 4.24$  represent values that are -1, -0.5, 0.5, and 1 standard deviations away from this value, respectively (Lillis et al., 2017; Tu et al., 2015).

where P is the atmospheric pressure in Pa, t is time in Gyr since the Sun formed,  $t_0 = 4.56 Gyr_t$  and k = 1,270 Pa Gyr<sup>-1</sup> is a constant chosen to match the parameterization to the current rate of Mars atmospheric loss due to solar UV flux, which we estimated MAVEN measurements of hot atomic oxygen escape (Lillis et al., 2017). This estimate of k assumes that the oxygen loss which was measured by MAVEN corresponds entirely to loss of  $CO_2$  over geologic time and not to loss of other atmospheric constituents such as  $H_2O$ . We assume that the oxygen loss is due to loss of  $CO_2$  because Mars does not have significant carbonate deposits and a thick CO<sub>2</sub> atmosphere was likely necessary on early Mars. However, MAVEN has yet to identify a major loss channel for carbon, and some authors (e.g., Hodges, 2002) argue that Mars has lost negligible amounts of carbon to space since the Noachian, so that almost all of the oxygen loss corresponds to net loss of H<sub>2</sub>O to space. Therefore, our assumption that all of the oxygen loss is due to loss of  $CO_2$  is the most optimistic situation for producing higher past atmospheric pressures.  $\alpha$  represents the increase in atmospheric loss rate in the past relative to the current loss rate, due to increased solar UV flux earlier in the Sun's lifetime (Tu et al., 2015). In the model,  $\alpha$ was varied between  $\alpha = 0$  and  $\alpha = 4.24$ . A variety of values of  $\alpha$  were investigated because, while the solar brightening over time is well understood (Bahcall et al., 2001), the atmospheric pressure over time is poorly understood. A constant loss rate with  $\alpha = 0$  is unrealistic, as the past atmospheric loss should have been faster because of higher solar UV flux (Tu et al., 2015), flaring, and solar wind, but we include this value as a reference.  $\alpha = 4.24$  was the maximum value considered because it leads to an atmospheric pressure of approximately 2 bars at 3.5 Gya. Two bars is estimated to be an approximate upper limit on the atmospheric pressure at about 3.5 Gya from the size distribution of craters formed

at this time (Kite et al., 2014). The current best estimate of a realistic value for  $\alpha$  comes from an estimate of modern-day atmospheric loss on Mars based on initial MAVEN results, combined with an estimate of the evolution of the Sun's UV flux over time (Lillis et al., 2017; Tu et al., 2015). The initial results from the MAVEN mission suggest that the average modern rate of photochemical loss of oxygen is  $4.3 \times 10^{25}$  s<sup>-1</sup>, with upper and lower bounds of  $9.6 \times 10^{25}$  s<sup>-1</sup> and  $1.9 \times 10^{25}$  s<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. Our estimate considers only photochemical loss of oxygen but not ion escape or sputtering. (See Lillis et al., 2015, for a review of these fluxes and how they are measured.) Currently published estimates indicate that the present-day escape rate due to ion escape is approximately 1 order of magnitude lower than photochemical loss (Barabash et al., 2007; Dong et al., 2017; Ramstad et al., 2015) and that the present-day escape rate due to sputtering is smaller still (Leblanc et al., 2015). These escape rates would differ in the past, because the solar wind evolves as the Sun ages. However, in part because of the uncertain rotation history of the Sun and the difficulty of directly observing stellar winds from solar-analog stars, there is still significant uncertainty about how to extrapolate solar wind interaction into the past (Johnstone et al., 2015). Therefore, based on publications to date, it appears that photochemical loss of oxygen is the dominant loss channel for mass loss from today's Mars. If either ion escape or sputtering played a proportionately more important role in the past, then this would have the effect of increasing  $\alpha$  in our two-parameter model given in equation (1).

Table 1 shows the maximum atmospheric pressure in the model (the pressure at 3.5 Gya) for  $\alpha = 3.22$ , which is38T13939UV flux from Tu et al. (2015), and values that are 0.5 and 1 standard deviations away from this value. To calculate40values of  $\alpha$  corresponding to 0.5 and 1 standard deviations away from  $\alpha = 3.22$ , we combined error estimates41from Lillis et al. (2017) and Tu et al. (2015). While Lillis et al. (2017) quote  $1\sigma$  errors on their measurement, Tu42et al. (2015) only provide information on the 10th, 50th, and 90th percentiles of their calculations, and so we43assumed a Gaussian distribution to estimate  $0.5\sigma$  and  $1\sigma$  errors from Tu et al. (2015). The ongoing MAVEN44mission will continue to improve estimates of  $\alpha$  (Lillis et al., 2017).45

# 2.3. Snow Surface Energy Balance Model

To evaluate whether the orbital histories could produce melting conditions, we wrote a zero-dimensional 48 energy balance model in MATLAB for a snow surface on Mars. We primarily considered snow surfaces at low 49 latitudes between 0° and 20° because we expect these latitudes to be the most stable locations for snow and 50° ice when the obliquity is higher than 40°, but we also considered slightly higher latitudes of 40° at which 51 ice would be stable for intermediate obliquities between 30° and 40° (Forget et al., 2006; Jakosky & Carr, 52 1985; Mischna et al., 2003). Because we only consider melting when the obliquity is high, the pole temperature should be high enough to prevent atmospheric collapse and to swiftly reverse a preexisting collapse 54 (Forget et al., 2013; Soto et al., 2015). We assumed a snow surface at the melting point (T = 273 K) 55

# **AGU** Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets



**Figure 3.** Schematic of the fluxes included in the energy balance model for a snow surface at T = 273 K.

and calculated whether the net energy delivered to the snow surface per second was positive, which would indicate melting was possible, or negative, which would indicate that the snow surface would not 03 be warm enough to melt. We assumed an albedo for dusty snow of 04 0.3, a thermal inertia of  $\approx$ 275 J m<sup>-2</sup> K<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1/2</sup>, and a relative humidity of 0.25 (Kite et al., 2013). These assumptions will be discussed more in section 4.1. The energy balance model incorporated the effects of insolation, upwelling longwave radiation from the surface, the greenhouse effect from the CO<sub>2</sub> atmosphere, latent cooling due to evaporation, sensible cooling due to atmosphere-surface temperature differences, and conduction. We do not consider the effects of meridional advection. Additionally, we do not include warming from water ice clouds, because the amplitude of warming depends on the optical depth and altitude of the clouds, and these are unknown for early Mars (Ramirez & Kasting, 2017). Figure 3 shows a schematic of the terms in the 15 F3 energy balance.

The incoming solar flux,  $F_{SW}$ , was estimated for a peak melting period measured over the warmest 4 h in the warmest season of the year. We chose to calculate the energy balance only for the most optimal melting conditions in the year because periodic warm conditions could still result in melting for part of the year that could create the observed large alluvial fan features (Clow, 1987). In contrast to previous studies (e.g., Schorghofer, 2008, which looked at averaged temperatures for ground ice), we only consider peak temperatures because we are interested in studying surface ice and snow. The effect of Rayleigh scattering was included (Kite et al., 2013).

The upwelling longwave radiation,  $F_{LW}$ , was modeled as a gray body following the equation

$$F_{\rm LW} = \varepsilon \sigma T^4 \tag{2}$$

where  $\sigma$  is the Stefan-Boltzmann constant, the emissivity  $\epsilon$  was assumed to be 0.98, and the temperature was held fixed at the melting point (T = 273K). Values for all constants used in the energy balance equations are given in Table 2.

# Q5: we have defined GCM here

The greenhouse effect was estimated based on a fit to a Mars GCM (Mischna et al., 2012, 2013). In the GCM, we used the radtran model from Mischna et al. (2012) with no water vapor and present-day topography to estimate the greenhouse effect for atmospheric pressures of 6, 60, 600, and 1,200 mbar, and for obliquities of 15°, 25°, 35°, 45°, and 60°. The model used present-day values for Mars's eccentricity (0.0935) and longitude of perihelion (251°). The greenhouse effect from the atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> should scale with the longwave flux out of the surface, which is proportional to the temperature to the fourth power. Additionally, for saturated bands such as the 15  $\mu$ m CO<sub>2</sub> absorption band, the greenhouse effect is proportional to the square root of the pressure because of pressure broadening (Goody & Yung, 1989). Therefore, a linear regression was performed to find a fit to an equation in the form  $F_{gh} = a + bT^4 \sqrt{P}$ , where *T* is the surface temperature in Kelvin, *P* is the atmospheric pressure in Pa, and *a* and *b* are constants. Before performing the fit, points that had elevations lower than -6 km or higher than 11 km, albedo less than 0.15, or thermal inertia less than 150 J m<sup>-2</sup> K<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1/2</sup> were removed from the model output. Additionally, we considered only points with latitude between -25° and 25°, because we are primarily interested in melting near the equator and because this resulted in a data set with less scatter (Kraal et al., 2008). The final fit to the greenhouse forcing gave

$$F_{\rm ab} = (9.981 \pm 0.145) + (9.662 \pm 0.017) \times 10^{-9} T^4 \sqrt{P}$$
(3)

with  $F_{\rm qh}$  in W m<sup>-2</sup>, T in K, and P in Pa. The fit had  $R^2 = 0.98$ .

The GCM was also used to estimate a diurnal temperature range, which was used to calculate conductive cooling. The conductive cooling calculated over the same 4 h peak melting period as the incoming solar flux was calculated using

$$F_{\rm cond} = \frac{\Delta T k \sin(7200\omega)}{14400\omega d} \tag{4}$$

30 T2

Values of Key	alues of Key Constants used in the Energy Balance Equations				
Symbol	Parameter	Value	Source		
σ	Stefan-Boltzmann constant	$5.67 \times 10^{-8} \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-4}$			
$\epsilon$	Emissivity of ice	0.98			
k	Thermal conductivity of snow	0.125 W/m/K	Carr and Head (2003)		
τ	Length of Martian day	88200 s			
d	Diurnal skin depth	0.22 m	Turcotte and Schubert (2014)		
T <sub>s</sub>	Surface temperature	273.15 K			
k <sub>a</sub>	Thermal conductivity of atmosphere	0.0138 W/m/K	Vesovic et al. (1990)		
Cp	Specific heat capacity of atmosphere	770 J/kg/K	Kite et al. (2013)		
g	Mars surface gravity	3.7 m/s <sup>2</sup>			
m <sub>c</sub>	Molar mass of CO <sub>2</sub>	0.044 kg/mol			
m <sub>w</sub>	Molar mass of H <sub>2</sub> O	0.018 kg/mol			
r <sub>h</sub>	Atmospheric relative humidity	0.25			
A <sub>v</sub>	von Karman's constant	0.4			
z <sub>anem</sub>	Anemometer height	5.53 m	Kite et al. (2013)		
<i>z</i> <sub>0</sub>	Surface roughness	10 <sup>-4</sup> m	Dundas and Byrne (2010)		
L <sub>e</sub>	Latent heat of evaporation	$2.83 imes10^{6}$ J/kg			
M <sub>w</sub>	Molecular mass of H <sub>2</sub> O	$2.99 \times 10^{-26} \text{ kg}$			
k	Boltzmann's constant	$1.381 \times 10^{-23} \text{ J/K}$			

Table 2

where  $\Delta T$  is the diurnal temperature range estimated from the Mars GCM (Mischna et al., 2012, 2013), k is the thermal conductivity of the snow surface,  $\omega = \frac{2\pi}{\tau} s^{-1}$  is the frequency of temperature oscillations,  $\tau$  is the length of a Martian day, and d is the diurnal skin depth.

The forced and free sensible and latent cooling fluxes were calculated following the parameterizations in Dundas and Byrne (2010), Hecht (2002), and Ingersoll (1970). Free sensible cooling is due to the buoyancy of air near the surface and was described by

$$S_{\rm fr} = 0.14(T_s - T_a)k_a \left[ \left( \frac{C_p v_a \rho_a}{k_a} \right) \left( \frac{g}{v_a^2} \right) \left( \frac{\Delta \rho}{\rho_a} \right) \right]^{1/3}$$
(5)

where  $T_s$  is the surface temperature,  $T_a$  is the atmospheric temperature,  $k_a$  is the atmospheric thermal conductivity,  $C_p$  is the specific heat capacity of air,  $v_a$  is the air viscosity,  $\rho_a$  is the density of the atmosphere, g is Mars gravity, and  $\frac{\Delta \rho}{\rho_a}$  is given by

$$\frac{\Delta\rho}{\rho_a} = \frac{(m_c - m_w)e_{\text{sat}}(1 - r_h)}{m_c P} \tag{6}$$

where  $m_c$  is the molar mass of  $CO_2$ ,  $m_w$  is the molar mass of water,  $e_{sat}$  is the saturation vapor pressure at temperature  $T_s$ ,  $r_h$  is the relative humidity of the atmosphere, and P is the atmospheric pressure in Pa (Kite et al., 2013). The thermal conductivity  $k_a$  was determined by interpolating data from Vesovic et al. (1990) to a temperature of T = 257 K, which was the average atmospheric temperature in our model. The atmospheric temperature  $T_a$  was determined from a fit to data for the warmest part of the warmest day of the year from the Mars GCM described above, based on the model in Mischna et al. (2012). These data were used because our model determines the surface energy balance for the warmest part of the year. Atmospheric temperatures were determined from a linear fit of ln  $T_a$  versus ln P, which had  $R^2 = 0.85$ . The air viscosity was given by

$$\nu_a = (1.48 \times 10^{-5}) \left(\frac{RT_{\rm bl}}{m_c P}\right) \left(\frac{240 + 293.15}{240 + T_{\rm bl}}\right) \left(\frac{T_{\rm bl}}{293.15}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}$$
(7)

where *R* is the universal gas constant and  $T_{bl}$  is the temperature of the atmospheric boundary layer 5 (Dundas & Byrne, 2010). The boundary layer temperature was determined from a fit to the Mars GCM 5 (Mischna et al., 2012) in the same manner as the fit to the atmospheric temperature  $T_a$ . The density of the atmosphere was determined using the ideal gas law.

# **AGU** Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets



**Figure 4.** Magnitude of each term in the energy balance versus pressure, at 77% modern solar luminosity, which is the approximate solar luminosity at 3.5 Gya. Solid/dashed lines indicate warming/cooling. The lines show incoming shortwave solar radiation (light blue), outgoing longwave radiation (orange), greenhouse forcing (yellow), conductive cooling (purple), free latent cooling (green), forced latent cooling (magenta), free sensible cooling (dark blue), forced sensible cooling (dark red), and the magnitude of the net forcing (black). Small wiggles in the net forcing are artifacts of interpolation to calculate incoming shortwave radiation. The net forcing is negative for P < 56, 039 Pa because latent cooling dominates over greenhouse forcing, and positive for P > 56, 039 Pa.

Forced sensible cooling is due to advection by the wind and was given by

$$S_{\rm fo} = \rho_a C_p u_s A(T_s - T_a) \tag{8}$$

where  $u_s$  is the wind speed near the surface, and A is given by

$$A = \frac{A_v^2}{\ln(z_{\rm norm}/z_0)^2}$$
(9)

where  $A_v$  is von Karman's constant,  $z_{anem}$  is the anemometer height, and  $z_0$  is the surface roughness (Dundas & Byrne, 2010). The wind speed was also determined from a fit to the Ames Mars GCM wind speeds (Kahre et al., 2006). A linear fit of ln  $u_s$  versus ln *P* for pressures of 7, 50, and 80 mbar was extrapolated to higher pressures. The fit had  $R^2 = 0.96$ .

Free latent cooling was given by

$$L_{\rm fr} = 1.57 \times 0.14 L_e \Delta \eta \rho_a D_a \left[ \left( \frac{v_a}{D_a} \right) \left( \frac{g}{v_a^2} \right) \left( \frac{\Delta \rho}{\rho_a} \right) \right]^{1/3} \tag{10}$$

where  $L_e$  is the latent heat of evaporation,  $\Delta \eta$  is the difference between the water mass fractions in the atmosphere and surface, and  $D_a$  is the diffusion coefficient of H<sub>2</sub>O in CO<sub>2</sub> (Dundas & Byrne, 2010). The factor of 1.57 was added to the beginning of the equation to make the amount of latent cooling match experimental results for evaporative losses at current Mars pressure (Moore & Sears, 2006).  $\Delta \eta$  was given by

$$\eta = \frac{\rho_{\text{sat}}(1 - r_h)}{\rho_a} \tag{11}$$

where  $\rho_{sat}$  is the saturation vapor density, determined from  $e_{sat}$  and the ideal gas law (Kite et al., 2013). The diffusion coefficient of H<sub>2</sub>O in CO<sub>2</sub> was given by

$$T_a = (1.387 \times 10^{-5}) \left(\frac{T_{bl}}{273.15}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{10^5}{P}\right)$$
 (12)

where P is in Pa (Dundas & Byrne, 2010).

D



**Figure 5.** Minimum pressure at which surface melting is permitted for a flat surface at 0° latitude as a function of time, assuming zero obliquity and values of eccentricity and longitude of perihelion equal to those for modern-day Mars. This curve was smoothed to remove artifacts of the interpolation to calculate incoming shortwave radiation. Earlier in time the minimum pressure to allow melting is higher because the Sun was fainter.

Forced latent cooling was given by

L

$$f_{fo} = L_e \left(\frac{M_w}{kT_{bl}}\right) u_s A(e_{sat}(1 - r_h))$$
(13)

where  $M_w$  is the molecular mass of water and k is Boltzmann's constant (Dundas & Byrne, 2010). Following Dundas and Byrne (2010), Williams and Malin (2008), and Toon et al. (1980), we sum all of the sensible and latent cooling terms together in our energy balance model instead of considering one dominant term.

The final energy balance is given by  $F_{net} = F_{SW} - F_{LW} + F_{gh} - F_{cond} - S_{fo} - 46$   $S_{fr} - L_{fo} - L_{fr}$ . A positive value of  $F_{net}$  represented that there was excess energy available to melt snow on the surface, while a negative value of  $F_{net}$ indicated that melting was prohibited. Figure 4 shows each of the terms in the energy balance model and the overall surface energy for a variety of atmospheric pressures at 77% modern-day solar luminosity, which is approximately the solar luminosity at 3.5 Gya. At very low pressures, latent cooling dominates over most of the other terms and prevents melting. At higher pressures, the greenhouse forcing dominates over latent cooling, and melting occurs. This is because the greenhouse forcing scales as  $\sqrt{P}$ , 55



**Figure 6.** Energy balance over time for obliquity track 1, for a surface at a latitude of 20° with a 20° pole-facing slope. The blue curve shows energy balance at constant pressure. The orange and yellow curves show energy balances for pressure loss parameterized by equation (1) with  $\alpha$  = 3.22 and  $\alpha$  = 3.73, respectively.  $\alpha$  = 3.22 is the best estimate of  $\alpha$  from initial Mars Atmosphere and Volatile EvolutioN (MAVEN) results, found by combining an estimate from MAVEN of the dependence of the loss rate on solar extreme ultraviolet flux with an estimate of the rate at which solar UV flux has changed over time (Lillis et al., 2017; Tu et al., 2015).  $\alpha$  = 3.73 is 0.5 standard deviations away from the best estimate of  $\alpha$  = 3.22 inferred from MAVEN data (Lillis et al., 2017; Tu et al., 2015). Black lines show 200 Myr averages, which average over orbital variations and show changes due to solar brightening and atmospheric loss. The increase in energy around 3.5 Gyr is where the obliquity around 40°.

while the free latent cooling scales as  $P^{-2/3}$ . Figure 5 shows the minimum pressure to permit melting as a function of time, assuming zero obliquity and values of eccentricity and longitude of perihelion equal to those for modern-day Mars. The minimum pressure to allow melting at 3.5 Ga is 0.676 bar. At earlier times, with the orbital parameters held constant, the lower solar luminosity means that a higher pressure is required in order to allow melting.

For each possible orbital history, an energy balance was computed at latitudes of 0°, 20°, and 40° in order to understand the relative importance of obliquity and atmospheric pressure changes on a variety of latitudes throughout the areas where young fluvial features are seen on Mars. Additionally, the water source regions we are modeling are on sloped surfaces with slopes of approximately 20°, so energy balances were computed for a surface at 20° with a 20° pole-facing slope and for a surface at 40° with both a 20° pole-facing and 20° equator-facing slope.

# 3. Results

# 3.1. Relative Impact of Atmospheric Pressure and Obliquity

Figure 6 shows an energy balance history for a surface at 20° with a 20° 20 **F6** pole-facing slope, using the obliquity history for track 1. The blue curve 21 shows an energy balance at constant pressure, while the orange and yel-22 low curves show energy balances with atmospheric loss parameterized by 23 equation (1) with  $\alpha$  = 3.22 (P = 0.654 bars at 3.5 Gya) and  $\alpha$  = 3.73 24 (P = 1.133 bars at 3.5 Gya), respectively. Black lines show 200 Myr averages, 25 which average over variations in eccentricity, obliquity, and longitude of 26 perihelion. The upward trend that is visible in the earliest 1.5 Gyr of the fit 27

to the blue curve demonstrates the effect of solar brightening. The downward trend of the fits to the orange and yellow curves shows the effect of atmospheric loss. The bump in all curves around 3.5 Gyr shows the effect of a rapid change from a low mean obliquity around 10° to a high mean obliquity around 40°, which increases the energy available for melting because a pole-facing surface at a latitude of 20° will receive more direct sunlight for an obliquity around 40° than for an obliquity around 10°. For almost all times and values of  $\alpha$ , the energy balance is negative, indicating that melting is prohibited. In all potential orbital histories considered, only  $\alpha \gtrsim 3.73$  allows melting, which indicates that atmospheric pressure has a stronger influence on whether melt is permitted at the surface than obliquity. However, this value of  $\alpha$  is within 0.5 $\sigma$  of the value inferred from initial MAVEN data, indicating that large post-Noachian alluvial fans and deltas might be explained by a rate of atmospheric loss only slightly higher than that estimated by Lillis et al. (2017).

# 3.2. Comparison to Key Geologic Constraints

For the high values of  $\alpha$  that allowed melting, we compared the amount of melting and intermittency of melt periods to three key geologic constraints. First, the amount of fluvial sediment transported by large post-Noachian alluvial fans indicates that the longest runoff event must have had liquid water at the surface for >10<sup>4</sup> years (Irwin et al., 2015). Here we use runoff event to mean a time interval during which seasonal melt-water runoff sustains lakes at an approximately constant lake level (Irwin et al., 2015). Second, the presence of olivine in the catchments of alluvial fans and deltas strongly suggests that the most recent runoff event must have lasted <10<sup>7</sup> years (Kite, Gao et al., 2017; Stopar et al., 2006). Third, counting interbedded craters indicates that there must have been >10<sup>7</sup> years between the first and last runoff events Kite, Sneed et al. (2017). Some estimates of melting in young channels, like those found in Lyot crater, suggest that the time between the first and last runoff events lasted for much longer than 10<sup>7</sup> years (Dickson et al., 2009).

In order to produce melt, high temperatures are required, but the snow and ice also need to be available in the location where melting can occur. At obliquities greater than 40°, snow and water ice are most stable near the equator, while for lower obliquities they are more stable at the poles (Forget et al., 2006; Jakosky & Carr, 1985; Sischna et al., 2003). If the amount of ice contained in the polar caps was spread over the equatorial region, it would produce an ice sheet about 100 m – 1 km thick, which would melt or sublimate in 100–10,000 years (Madeleine et al., 2009). This melting time is much less than the length of warm periods produced by obliquity 5

F7



**Figure 7.** Energy available for melting versus the number of years that energy was exceeded for obliquity track 1 at 20° latitude with a 20° pole-facing slope, for  $\alpha = 2.20, 2.71, 3.22, 3.73$ , and 4.24. For this graph, only times with obliquity >40° are plotted, because snow and ice will only be available for melting at low latitudes during times of high obliquity (Kite et al., 2013). The red dashed line indicates a net energy of 15 W/m<sup>2</sup>, above which runoff can occur. Only values of  $\alpha$  above about 3.73 allowed any runoff. MAVEN = Mars Atmosphere and Volatile EvolutioN.

changes in our model, and so the time scale for the ice to migrate to the coldest location on the planet is less than the time scale at which changes in obliquity shift the latitude of the coldest point on the planet. This means that when the obliquity is high, we can make the assumption that all of the snow and ice are found near the equator, where snow and ice are most stable. Therefore, for latitudes of 0° and 20°, we assumed that melting could only have happened when the obliquity was greater than 40°. For a latitude of 40°, we assumed that snow and ice would only be available when the obliquity was between 30° and 40°. Additionally, we assumed that runoff would not begin to occur until some amount of liquid water had pooled and refroze within the snow to create an impermeable ice layer for runoff (Woo, 2012), and so we only began recording a melt period when the energy available for melting went above 15 W/m<sup>2</sup>.

Figure 7 shows a plot of the net surface energy versus the number of years that energy was exceeded for obliquity track 1. This plot shows results for a 20° pole-facing sloped surface at 20° latitude, with values of  $\alpha$  within 1 standard deviation of the mean value inferred by Lillis et al. (2017). Only years for which the obliquity was greater than 40° are counted, because these are the only years when ice would be available for melting. The vertical dashed red line indicates a surface energy of 15 W/m<sup>2</sup>, above

which runoff would occur. For  $\alpha = 3.73$  (P = 1.133 bars at 3.5 Gya) and  $\alpha = 4.24$  (P = 2.020 bars at 3.5 Gya), some runoff is produced when the orbital history is at high obliquity. For  $\alpha = 3.73$ , the longest melting event lasts  $4.44 \times 10^7$  years, the most recent melting event lasts  $2.40 \times 10^4$  years, and the total time between the first and last melting events is  $2.78 \times 10^8$  years. For  $\alpha = 4.24$ , these values are  $2.55 \times 10^8$  years,  $1.80 \times 10^4$  years, and  $5.10 \times 10^8$  years, respectively. Therefore, both of these values of  $\alpha$  produce melt periods that match the three geologic constraints. For  $\alpha = 3.73$ , the rate of runoff production is approximately 0.05 mm/h for approximately 18 Myr, which is consistent with estimated runoff production rates of 0.03-0.4 mm/h (Dietrich et al., 2017; Irwin et al., 2015; Morgan et al., 2014).

Smaller values of  $\alpha$ , corresponding to lower past pressures, do not allow melting under the current model, but this model only considered greenhouse forcing from a pure CO<sub>2</sub> atmosphere. Some amount of non-CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse forcing could increase the surface energy balance enough that lower values of  $\alpha$  would still produce some melting, as discussed in section 4.2.





The distribution of the length of melting periods shows how the melt conditions depend on orbital cycles. Figure 8 shows a histogram of the length 38 **F8** of melting periods in obliquity track 1 for all latitudes and slopes considered for  $\alpha = 3.73$ . During all of these melting periods, melting occurs every year during the warmest part of the year. The majority of time periods when melting is allowed last around 100,000 years, which is about the time scale of a single peak-to-trough oscillation of obliquity, eccentricity, or longitude of perihelion. Therefore, most of the melting occurs in short time periods about 100 kyr long during optimal orbital conditions. For example, at high latitudes much of the melting occurs when the eccentricity and longitude of perihelion line up such that Mars is near perihelion at solstice and the obliguity is such that the amount of direct sunlight is maximized during the warmest part of the day. There are fewer melting periods of 1 to 10 Myr duration, which correspond to the length of larger oscillations in obliquity and eccentricity. The couple of periods that last longer than 50 Myr corresponds to long periods of optimal conditions due to a much higher mean obliquity. Between these intermittent melting periods were several dry periods, which could affect the ability of organisms to survive

on the surface of Mars. All eight obliquity tracks contained at least one such dry period longer than 10 Myr, which is long enough that the top few meters of soil would be sterilized by galactic cosmic radiation even for radiation-resistant microbes like *D. radiodurans* (Hassler et al., 2014).

# 4. Discussion

### 4.1. Model Assumptions

Our model made several assumptions about physical characteristics of Mars's surface and atmosphere which made it more likely to produce liquid water. Here we consider the key assumptions and how changes to these assumptions could affect our conclusions. First, the surface albedo was assumed to be 0.3. Assuming a higher albedo value would reduce the net energy flux into the surface, and so less melting would be permitted. Second, we assumed a thermal inertia of  $\approx 275 \text{ J m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1/2}$ . A higher thermal inertia value would also reduce the time over which melting was permitted for a given value of  $\alpha$  because the surface would conductively cool faster. Third, we assumed no refreezing or infiltration losses of meltwater, both of which would decrease the amount of runoff produced. These assumptions combine to create the most optimal conditions for producing runoff.

We also assumed the latitudes where ice is stable change abruptly at obliquities of 40° and 30°. In other words, we assumed that at an obliquity just below 40°, all ice would be located at middle or high latitudes, and at an obliquity just above 40°, all ice would be in the equatorial region. In reality, this transition may be less abrupt. However, since we found that atmospheric pressure was the primary control on melting, the exact value of obliquity at which ice migrates to the equator should not have a strong influence on the results. Additionally, it is possible that at high pressures, water ice will be located near the equator for all obliquities (Wordsworth, 2016). If this were the case, melting at the equator would potentially occur even at lower obliquities, because water ice would still be in the equatorial region.

### 4.2. Open Questions

We found that a rate of atmospheric loss consistent with that inferred by Lillis et al. (2017) to within 0.5 standard deviations allowed melting and produced an amount of runoff which matched three key geologic constraints (Irwin et al., 2015; Kite, Gao, et al., 2017; Kite, Sneed, et al., 2017; Lillis et al., 2017; Stopar et al., 2006; Tu et al., 2015). However, atmospheric loss by escape to space is not the only process that may have affected the energy balance on Mars's surface. Non-CO<sub>2</sub> forcing from a variety of sources could have permitted melting at lower atmospheric pressures. Our model did not include clouds, which can warm the surface (Ramirez & Kasting, 2017). At higher obliquities, when water ice is most stable in the equatorial region, the warm temperatures at those low latitudes might produce more water vapor, which could form into cirrus clouds that would warm the planet. The water vapor would also provide direct vapor warming on the order of a few Kelvin (Mischna et al., 2013). We also did not consider warming from other minor atmospheric constituents. In particular,  $CO_2$ -H<sub>2</sub> and  $CO_2$ -CH<sub>4</sub> collision-induced absorption can have a significant impact on the greenhouse forcing (Wordsworth et al., 2017). Because melting only occurs before 3.3 Gya in our model, additional warming may also be necessary to explain observations of anomalously young (< 2 Gya) supraglacial channels at the low-elevation Lyot crater (Dickson et al., 2009) and in isolated cases elsewhere (Fassett et al., 2010). Some very young alluvial fans, like those in the 5 Myr old Mojave crater, are likely related to impact processes (Williams & Malin, 2008).

Another possible explanation for these young fluvial features is higher atmospheric pressure than was estimated in our model. The atmospheric pressure could have been higher in the past if  $CO_2$  was lost through other mechanisms, such as chemical fixation in deep aquifers (Chassefiére & Leblanc, 2011) or basal melting of a  $CO_2$  ice cap (Kurahashi-Nakamura & Tajika, 2006; Longhi, 2006). Higher atmospheric pressure would increase the amount of runoff compared to our calculations. Additionally, volcanic degassing could increase the amount of melt by adding more  $CO_2$  (and other greenhouse gases such as  $CH_4$ ,  $SO_2$ , and  $H_2S$ ) into the atmosphere. However, Stanley et al. (2011) calculate that Mars magmas have less  $CO_2$  than on Earth because the Mars mantle is more reducing. Stanley et al. (2011) estimate that the volcanic  $CO_2$  content is approximately 50-70 ppm, which would correspond to about 30 mbar of volcanic outgassing. If the Martian atmosphere was more oxidizing, the volcanic  $CO_2$  content could be as high as 500-700 ppm, but the pressure contribution would still be relatively small, about 300 mbar (Stanley et al., 2011). These Stanley et al. (2011) numbers imply a substantial downward revision from Craddock and Greeley (2009), who estimated that Martian 50 volcanoes contained 0.7 wt.% CO<sub>2</sub>. Carbonate formation may also have been underestimated, which would 01 mean higher past atmospheric pressures could exist without invoking larger loss rates due to solar UV flux 02 (Hu et al., 2015).

# **5.** Conclusions

We wrote a minimal zero-dimensional energy balance model containing only effects of a  $CO_2$  atmosphere, solar brightening, and obliquity changes, to investigate whether conditions on the surface of Mars could have produced enough melting to explain observed large (>10 km<sup>2</sup>) alluvial fan features in the last 3.5 Gyr. We find that melting is only permitted for thick atmospheres that require high rates of atmospheric loss and that the effect of high atmospheric pressure is more important than varying values of obliquity in producing melt over the history of Mars. However, if we make the end-member assumption that all atmospheric loss is due to escape to space and all escaping oxygen is from  $CO_2$ , rates of atmospheric loss consistent to within 0.5 standard deviations with the best estimate of atmospheric loss based on initial results from the MAVEN mission produce melting. Additionally, the amount and timing of runoff from this melting matches three specific, recently obtained key geologic constraints on the formation of alluvial fans (Lillis et al., 2017; Tu et al., 2015; Irwin et al., 2015; Stopar et al., 2006; Kite, Gao, et al., 2017; Kite, Sneed, et al., 2017).

Although our model only produced melting for very high atmospheric pressures, additional warming due to, for example, cirrus clouds, water vapor warming, or collision-induced absorption could warm the surface enough to allow melting at lower pressures (Mischna et al., 2013; Ramirez & Kasting, 2017; Wordsworth et al., 2017). Further research into non- $CO_2$  warming can determine whether it produces a large enough effect to allow melting at lower past atmospheric pressures.

### Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Rob Lillis, Itay Halevy, John Armstrong, and the University of Chicago Research Computing Center. The authors would like to thank the referees, whose comments greatly improved the paper. This paper contains no new data, but the energy balance model is available at https://github.com/meganmansfield/ MarsEnergyBalance. We are grateful for support from NASA grant NNX16AG55G.

Q6: The reference for Carr and Head (2003) is as follows:

Carr, M. H., & Head, J. W. (2003). Basal melting of snow on early Mars: *A* possible origin of some valley networks. Geophysical Research Letters, 30(24).

Q6: the reference for Dundas & Byrne is already listed here

# References

	Armstrong, J. C., Barnes, R., Domagal-Goldman, S., Breiner, J., Quinn, T. R., & Meadows, V. S. (2014). Effects of extreme obliquity variations on the habitability of exoplanets. <i>Astrobiology</i> , 14(4), 277–291.	25 26	,
	Bahcall, J. N., Pinsonneault, M. H., & Basu, S. (2001). Solar models: Current epoch and time dependences, neutrinos, and helioseismological	27	
	properties. The Astrophysical Journal, 555(2), 990–1012.	28	
	barabash, S., reductor, A., Luthulin, K., & Sauvadu, JA. (2007). Mariatian autospheric elosion faces. <i>Science</i> , 313(3617), 301–303.	29	ļ
	in the Martian could polar can Geophysical Bergarch Latter, 13, 4172, 4172, 4172, 4172, 4172, 01661 06467		
	million Markan Source J M (2007) Atmospheric conditions on early Mars and the missing layered carbonates Geophysical Research Letters	21	
	34 119201 https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GL030688	31	
	Chambers, J. E. (1999). A hybrid symplectic integrator that permits close encounters between massive bodies. Monthly Notices of the Royal	32	
	Astronomical Society, 304(4), 793–799.	33	
	Chassefiére, E., & Leblanc, F. (2011). Methane release and the carbon cycle on Mars. Planetary and Space Science, 59(2), 207–217.	37	
	Clow, G. D. (1987). Generation of liquid water on Mars through the melting of a dusty snowpack. <i>Icarus, 72</i> , 95–127.	57	
	Costard, F., Forget, F., Mangold, N., & Peulvast, J. P. (2002). Formation of recent Martian debris flows by melting of near-surface ground ice at	35	
	high obliquity. <i>Science, 295</i> (5552), 110–113.		1
	Craddock, R. A., & Greeley, R. (2009). Minimum estimates of the amount and timing of gases released into the Martian atmosphere from	37	
	volcanic eruptions. <i>lcarus, 204</i> , 512–526.		
	Dickson, J. L., Fassett, C. I., & Head, J. W. (2009). Amazonian-aged fluvial valley systems in a climatic microenvironment on Mars: Melting of		
	ice deposits on the interior of Lyot Crater. Geophysical Research Letters, 36, L08201. https://doi.org/10.1029/2009GL037472		
	Dietrich, W. E., Palucis, M. C., Williams, R. M. E., Lewis, K. W., Rivera-Hernandez, F., & Sumner, D. Y. (2017). Fluvial gravels on Mars: Analysis and	40	
ľ	implications. In Tsutsum, D., & Laronne, J. B. (Eds.), ( <i>Gravel-Bed Rivers: Processes and Disasters</i> pp. 755–783). Chichester, UK: Wiley.	41	
	Dong, Y., Fang, X., Brain, D. A., McFadden, J. P., Halekas, J. S., Connerney, J. E. P., et al. (2017). Seasonal variability of Martian ion	/12	
ł	escape through the plume and tail from MAVEN observations. Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics, 122, 4009–4022.	12	
	nuclos/Jaol.org/10.1002/2010/A025317 Pundas C. M. & Burna S. (2010). Modeling sublimation of ice exposed by new impacts in the Martian mid-latitudes. <i>Icerus</i> . 206, 716–728	43	
	Edwards C. S. & Ehlmann B. I. (2015). Carbon sequentistration on Mars. <i>Genloav</i> , 43(10):863–866.	44	
	Eassett C. D. Rehmann, S. E. (2013). Carbon sequestration of march D. B. (2010). Supraglacial and proglacial valleys on Amazonian Mars	45	
	(carus 208(1), 86-100.	46	
	Forget, F., Haberle, R. M., Montmessin, F., Levrard, B., & Head, J. W. (2006). Formation of glaciers on Mars by atmospheric precipitation at high	10	
	obliquity. Science, 311(5759), 368–371.	47	
	Forget, F., Wordsworth, R., Millour, E., Madeleine, JB., Kerber, L., Leconte, J., et al. (2013). 3D modelling of the early Martian climate under a	48	
	denser CO <sub>2</sub> atmosphere: Temperatures and CO <sub>2</sub> ice clouds. <i>lcarus</i> , 222(1), 81–99.	49	ļ
	Goody, R. M., & Yung, Y. L. (1989). Atmospheric radiation: Theoretical basis. New York: Oxford University Press.		
	Grant, J. A., & Wilson, S. A. (2012). A possible synoptic source of water for alluvial fan formation in southern Margaritifer Terra, Mars.	E 1	
	Planetary and Space Science, 72(1), 44–52.	ЭI	
	Halevy, I., & Schrag, D. P. (2009). Sulfur dioxide inhibits calcium carbonate precipitation: Implications for early Mars and Earth.	52	
	Geophysical Research Letters, 36, L23201. https://doi.org/10.1029/2009GL040792	53	
	Hassier, D. M., Zeitlin, C., Wilmmer-Schweingruber, K. F., Ehresmann, B., Katkin, S., Eigenbrode, J. L., et al. (2014). Mars' surface radiation	54	
	environment measured with the Mars Science Laboratory's Curlosity Rover. <i>Science</i> , 343(6169), 1–6.	EE	
	necht, M. n. (2002). Metastability of liquid water off Mars. <i>Icarus, 15</i> 0, 373–380.		

Q6

Hodges, R. R. (2002). The rate of loss of water from Mars. <i>Geophysical Research Letters, 29</i> (3), 8–1–8–3.	
https://doi.org/10.1029/2001GL013853	
Hu, R., Kass, D. M., Ehlmann, B. L., & Yung, Y. L. (2015). Tracing the fate of carbon and the atmospheric evolution of Mars.	
Ingersoll, A. P. (1970). Mars: Occurrence of liquid water. <i>Science</i> , 168, 972–973.	
Irwin, R. P., Lewis, K. W., Howard, A. D., & Grant, J. A. (2015). Paleohydrology of Eberswalde crater, Mars. Geomorphology, 240, 83-101.	
Jakosky, B. M., & Carr, M. H. (1985). Possible precipitation of ice at low latitudes of Mars during periods of high obliquity. <i>Nature</i> , 315(6020),	
Jakosky, B. M., Slipski, M., Benna, M., Mahaffy, P., Elrod, M., Yelle, R., Alsaeed, N. (2017). Mars' atmospheric history derived from	07
upper-atmosphere measurements of <sup>38</sup> Ar/ <sup>36</sup> Ar. <i>Science</i> , <i>355</i> , 1408–1410.	
Johnstone, C. P., Gudel, M., Brott, I., & Luftinger, I. (2015). Stellar winds on the main-sequence II. The evolution of rotation and winds. Astronomy and Astrophysics, 577(A28), 1–25.	
Kahre, M. A., Murphy, J. R., & Haberle, R. M. (2006). Modeling the Martian dust cycle and surface dust reservoirs with the NASA Ames general	1(
circulation model. Journal of Geophysical Research, 111, E06008. https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JE002588	1
distribution of paleopolar deposits on Mars. Earth and Planetary Science Letters. 280, 254–267.	12
Kite, E. S., Halevy, I., Kahre, M. A., Wolff, M. J., & Manga, M. (2013). Seasonal melting and the formation of sedimentary rocks on Mars, with	13
predictions for the Gale Crater mound. <i>Icarus</i> , 223, 181–210.	14
(ite, E. S., Williams, J. P., Lucas, A., & Aharonson, O. (2014). Low palaeopressure of the martian atmosphere estimated from the size distribution of ancient craters. <i>Nature Geoscience</i> , 7(5), 335–339.	1
Kite, E. S., Howard, A. D., Lucas, A. S., Armstrong, J. C., Aharonson, O., & Lamb, M. P. (2015). Stratigraphy of Aeolis Dorsa, Mars: Stratigraphic	10
context of the great river deposits. Icarus, 253, 223-242.	1
Kite, E. S., Gao, P., Goldblatt, C., Mischna, M. A., Mayer, D. P., & Yung, Y. L. (2017). Methane bursts as a trigger for intermittent lake-forming	18
cumates on post-Noachian Mars. <i>Nature Geoscience, 10</i> (10), 737–740. Kite, F. S., Sneed, J., Mayer, D. P. & Wilson, S. A. (2017). Persistent or repeated surface babitability on Mars during the late	19
Hesperian — Amazonian. Geophysical Research Letters, 44, 3991–3999. https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL072660	20
Kraal, E. R., Asphaug, E., Moore, J. M., Howard, A., & Bredt, A. (2008). Catalogue of large alluvial fans in Martian impact craters. <i>lcarus</i> , 194(1),	2
	2
Kurahashi-Nakamura, I., & Jajika, E. (2006). Atmospheric collapse and transport of carbon dioxide into the subsurface on early Mars. Geophysical Research Letters, 33, 118205, https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GL027170	21
Leblanc, F., Modolo, R., Curry, S., Luhmann, J., Lillis, R., Chaufray, J. Y., et al. (2015). Mars heavy ion precipitating flux as measured by Mars	2.
Atmosphere and Volatile EvolutioN. Geophysical Research Letters, 42, 9135–9141. https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL066170	2
Li, G., & Batygin, K. (2014). On the spin-axis dynamics of a moonless Earth. <i>The Astrophysical Journal, 790</i> (69), 7.	2.
through time, with MAVEN. Space Science Reviews. 195. 357–422.	20
Lillis, R. J., Robbins, S., Manga, M., Halekas, J. S., & Frey, H. V. (2013). Time history of the Martian dynamo from crater magnetic field analysis.	21
Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 118, 1488–1511. https://doi.org/10.1002/jgre.20105	20
Lillis, R. J., Deighan, J., Fox, J. L., Bougher, S. W., Lee, Y., Combi, M. R., et al. (2017). Photochemical escape of oxygen from Mars: First results from MAVEN in city data. <i>Journal of Geophysical Research:</i> Space Diverse 122, 3815–3836. https://doi.org/10.1002/20161A023525	2:
Longhi, J. (2006). Phase equilibrium in the system CO <sub>2</sub> -H <sub>2</sub> O: Application to Mars. <i>Journal of Geophysical Research</i> , 111, E06011.	21
https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JE002552	3
Madeleine, J. B., Forget, F., Head, J. W., Levrard, B., Montmessin, F., & Millour, E. (2009). Amazonian northern mid-latitude glaciation on Mars:	3.
A proposed climate scenario. <i>Icarus, 203</i> (2), 390–405. Manning, C. V., McKay, C. P., & Zahnle, K. J. (2006). Thick and thin models of the evolution of carbon dioxide on Mars. <i>Icarus, 180</i> (1), 38–59.	3.
Mischna, M. A., Richardson, M. I., Wilson, R. J., & McCleese, D. J. (2003). On the orbital forcing of Martian water and CO <sub>2</sub> cycles: A general cir-	3
culation model study with simplified volatile schemes. Journal of Geophysical Research, 108, 5062. https://doi.org/10.1029/2003JE002051	3
Mischna, M. A., Lee, C., & Richardson, M. (2012). Development of a fast, accurate radiative transfer model for the Martian atmosphere, past	
and present. Journal of Geophysical Research, 117, E10009. https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JE004110 Mischna, M. A., Baker, V., Milliken, R., Richardson, M., & Lee, C. (2013). Effects of obliguity and water vapor/trace gas greenhouses in the early	31
Martian climate. Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 118, 560–576. https://doi.org/10.1002/jgre.20054	
Moore, S. R., & Sears, D. W. G. (2006). On laboratory simulation and the effect of small temperature oscillations about the freezing point and	3
ice formation on the evaporation rate of water on Mars. Astrobiology, 6(4), 644–650. Morgan, A. M. Howard, A. D. Hobley, D. F. L. Moore, L. M. Dietrich, W. F. Williams, R. M. F. et al. (2014). Sedimentology and climatic	4
environment of alluvial fans in the Martian Saheki crater and a comparison with terrestrial fans in the Atacama Desert. <i>Icarus</i> , 229,	4
131–156.	4
Palucis, M. C., Dietrich, W. E., Williams, R. M. E., Hayes, A. G., Parker, T., Sumner, D. Y., et al. (2016). Sequence and relative timing	4
of large lakes in Gale crater (Mars) after the formation of Mount Sharp. Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 121, 472–496.	4
Pepin, R. O. (1994). Evolution of the Martian atmosphere. <i>Icarus</i> , 111(2), 289–304.	4
Ramirez, R. M., & Kasting, J. F. (2017). Could cirrus clouds have warmed early Mars?. <i>Icarus, 281</i> , 248–261.	4
Ramstad, R., Barabash, S., Futaana, Y., Nilsson, H., Wang, X. D., & Holmstrom, M. (2015). The Martian atmospheric ion escape rate depen-	4
dence on solar wind and solar EUV conditions: 1. Seven years of Mars Express observations. Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 120, 1298–1309. https://doi.org/10.1002/2015.E004816	4
Schorghofer, N. (2008). Temperature response of Mars to Milankovitch cycles. <i>Geophysical Research Letters</i> , 35, L18201.	4
https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GL034954	
Soto, A., Mischna, M., Schneider, T., Lee, C., & Richardson, M. (2015). Martian atmospheric collapse: Idealized GCM studies.	5
וגעועז, באט - כבס אין אין איז	5
Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 75(20), 5987–6003.	5:
Stopar, J. D., Taylor, G. J., Hamilton, V. E., & Browning, L. (2006). Kinetic model of olivine dissolution and extent of aqueous alteration on Mars.	53
Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 70(24), 6136–6152.	54
Ioon, O. B., Pollack, J. B., Ward, W., Burns, J. A., & Bilski, K. (1980). The astronomical theory of climatic change on Mars. <i>lcarus</i> , 44(3), 552–607.	5

10.1002/2017JE005422

Q6: The reference for Turcotte and Schubert (2014) is as follows: Turcotte, D., & Schubert, G. (2014). Geodynamics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tu, L., Johnstone, C. P., Gudel, M., & Lammer, H. (2015). The extreme ultraviolet and X-ray Sun in time: High-energy evolutionary tracks of a	
solar-like star. Astronomy and Astrophysics, 577(L3), 1–4. Turbet, M. Forget, F. Svetsov, V. Tran, H. Hartmann, J. M. Karatekin, O. et al. (2017). The environmental effect of meteoritic impacts on early	
Mars with a versatile 3-D global climate model. In <i>4th International Conference on Early Mars</i> , pp. Flagstaff, Arizona.	
Vesovic, V., Wakeham, W. A., Olchowy, G. A., Sengers, J. V., Watson, J. T. R., & Millat, J. (1990). The transport properties of carbon dioxide.	04
Williams, K. E., Toon, O. B., Heldmann, J. L., McKay, C., & Mellon, M. T. (2008). Stability of mid-latitude snowpacks on Mars.	
Icarus, 196(2), 565–577.	00
Williams, R. M. E., & Wallh, M. C. (2008). Sub-kilometer rans in Mojave Crater, Mars. <i>Icarus</i> , 198(2), 365–383. Williams, R. M. E., & Weitz, C. M. (2014). Reconstructing the aqueous history within the southwestern Melas basin, Mars: Clues from	
stratigraphic and morphometric analyses of fans. <i>Icarus</i> , 242, 19–37.	
Woo, M. (2012). Permafrost hydrology: Springer. Wordsworth R. Forget F. Millour, F. Head, J.W. Madeleine, JB. & Charnay, B. (2013). Global modelling of the early martian climate under	1
a denser CO <sub>2</sub> atmosphere: Water cycle and ice evolution. <i>Icarus</i> , 222(1), 1–19.	1
Wordsworth, R., Kalugina, Y., Lokshtanov, S., Vigasin, A., Ehlmann, B., Head, J., et al. (2017). Transient reducing greenhouse warming on early	1
Wordsworth, R. D. (2016). The climate of early Mars. Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences, 44, 381–408.	1
	14
07: The city for Mac (2012) is Parlin	1
	10
	1
	18
	19
	20
	2
	2
	2
	2
	2
	2
	2
	2
	3
	3.
	3.
	2
	3
	3
	3
	3
	4
	4
	4
	4
	4
	4
	4( 7
	-

Q7