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1. Introduction

In their first geologic map of Mercury derived from Mariner 10 (M10) imagery, Trask and Guest (1975) introduced the concept of ‘terrain units’ asserting that ‘[…] on Mercury, surface morphology reflects the age, composition, lithology, and mode of formation of the underlying rock unit’ (p. 2461). Terrain units of Mercury were revisited during geologic mapping of Mercury at 1:5,000,000 scale, based on M10 images (De Hon, Scott, & Underwood, 1981; Grolier & Boyce, 1984; Guest & Greeley, 1983; King & Scott, 1990; McGill & King, 1983; Schaber & McCauley, 1980; Spudis & Prosser, 1984; Strom, Malin, & Leake, 1990; Trask & Dzurisin, 1984; merged maps, Frigeri, Federico, Pauselli, & Coradini, 2009) and termed ‘geologic provinces’ by Spudis and Guest (1988), who adopted this term to denote regional scale areas characterized by a similar inferred origin or a distinctive history (McCauley & Wilhelms, 1971, p. 363).

For the M10 geologic mapping project, Mercury was officially divided into 15 quadrangles (see Davies, Dwornik, Gault, & Strom, 1978) named after prominent topographic features where M10 coverage data were available, and telescopic albedo features elsewhere. Global coverage by the MESSENGER mission (orbit 2011–2015) enabled all quadrangles to be named after topographic features.

Victoria quadrangle (270°E–360°E; 22.5°N–65°N) is named after a lobate scarp at ~340°E longitude that is its most prominent feature. Victoria Rupes is aligned with Endeavour Rupes and Antoniadi Dorsum, and altogether form a ~900 km long N–S striking fault system interpreted as a fold-and-thrust belt by Byrne et al. (2014).

In the first geologic map by McGill and King (1983), more than 60% of Victoria quadrangle remained unmapped because of the lack of M10 basemap images. Recently, the MESSENGER team has completed a 1:15,000,000-scale global geologic map of Mercury (Prockter et al., 2016), covering all previously unmapped regions. Here we exploit the available MESSENGER data to make a geological survey of the Victoria Quadrangle at a scale of 1:5,000,000.
A schematic summary of the image-derived basemaps used in this project is shown in Table 1. The listing from top to bottom reflects the priority order, principally based on image resolution.

To date, no highly controlled base (e.g. such as the Lunar Orbiter Laser Altimeter data) has been released for Mercury, and our basemaps show some discrepancies and are not perfectly georeferenced to each other. The map-projected Basemap reduced Data Record (BDR) products have with the highest available resolution (~166 m/pixel, Murchie et al., 2016), thus they were considered as a reference basemap.

H02 has no overlap with the adjacent quadrangles but we worked with a 5° for better interpretation of features near the quadrangle’s edges. Thus, we mosaicked 13 BDR tiles to obtain our complete BDR reference basemap in Figure 1.

Most of the basemaps listed in Table 1 were obtained during the basemap imaging campaign of MESSENGER’s primary mission and they mostly use the same source frames. Nonetheless, there are some areas were different mosaic tiles were used, sometimes showing different lighting conditions (e.g. note the variation for both MDR and the MD3 basemaps are best seen when using red: 996 nm, green: 749 nm and blue: 433 nm. We relied on the MDR basemap only when the MD3 higher resolution coverage was unavailable.

M10 basemaps were used as an historical record of the past mission. Although their resolution is very low and the coverage is poor, they are useful for comparing with the McGill and King (1983) geologic map.

The BDR basemap associated with the other basemaps in Table 1 provided enough information for mapping the whole quadrangle, but several issues arose from their uneven appearance. Figure 1 shows that the reference basemap is missing some tiles, especially in its eastern part. These gaps are covered by the other basemaps but with a lower resolution. Extremely high incidence angles cause long shadows that can hide important features (e.g. irregular pits inside crater floors), whereas extremely low-incidence angles can fail to reveal topographic features such as faults. We partially circumvented these issues by toggling the visibility of each basemap to compare them.

Table 1. List of used basemaps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Original basemap</th>
<th>Resolution (m/pixel)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MDIS_BDR_256PPD_Hxdx*</td>
<td>166</td>
<td><a href="http://pds-imaging.jpl.nasa.gov/data/messenger/msgmds_4001/">http://pds-imaging.jpl.nasa.gov/data/messenger/msgmds_4001/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20130514_complete_mono_basemap</td>
<td>250</td>
<td><a href="http://messenger.jhuapl.edu/the_mission/mosaics.html">http://messenger.jhuapl.edu/the_mission/mosaics.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MDIS_v6_750nm_250mpp</td>
<td>250</td>
<td><a href="http://messenger.jhuapl.edu/the_mission/mosaic.html">http://messenger.jhuapl.edu/the_mission/mosaic.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MDIS_v7_mono_250mpp</td>
<td>250</td>
<td><a href="http://messenger.jhuapl.edu/the_mission/mosaic.html">http://messenger.jhuapl.edu/the_mission/mosaic.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MDIS_v6_mono_250mpp</td>
<td>250</td>
<td><a href="http://messenger.jhuapl.edu/the_mission/mosaic.html">http://messenger.jhuapl.edu/the_mission/mosaic.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M1_M2_M3_M10Filt (Becker et al., 2009)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td><a href="http://astrogeology.usgs.gov/maps/mercury-messenger-global-mosaic">http://astrogeology.usgs.gov/maps/mercury-messenger-global-mosaic</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MESSENGER_color_mon⁵</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>ftp://pdsimage2.wr.usgs.gov/pub/pigpen/mercury/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>usgs_20110913_albedo③</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>ftp://pdsimage2.wr.usgs.gov/pub/pigpen/mercury/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MDIS_v6_3color (MD3 basemap)</td>
<td>322</td>
<td><a href="http://messenger.jhuapl.edu/the_mission/mosaic.html">http://messenger.jhuapl.edu/the_mission/mosaic.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MDIS_v5_8color (MDR basemap)</td>
<td>665</td>
<td><a href="http://messenger.jhuapl.edu/the_mission/mosaic.html">http://messenger.jhuapl.edu/the_mission/mosaic.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M10 Mercury Mosaic (Calibrated)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td><a href="http://ser.sese.asu.edu/M10/IMAGE_ARCHIVE/MOSAICS/">http://ser.sese.asu.edu/M10/IMAGE_ARCHIVE/MOSAICS/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M10 Mercury Shaded Relief</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td><a href="http://ser.sese.asu.edu/M10/IMAGE_ARCHIVE/MOSAICS/">http://ser.sese.asu.edu/M10/IMAGE_ARCHIVE/MOSAICS/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*xxd indicates the quadrangles and d indicates the tiles NP, NW, NE, SE, SE shown in Figure 1.

*MercuryGIS_DVD_v03 previously available at USGS FTP.

Figure 1. Mosaicked BDR basemap (~166 m/pixel) of the Victoria quadrangle of Mercury in LCC projection with 5° overlap. Thick black line: actual H02 boundary; solid white lines: other quadrangle boundaries; dashed white lines: BDR tile boundaries (including names).
and lower the biases deriving from lighting conditions. However, when necessary, we used single frames or generated local mosaics.

2.2. Topography

Topographic information for Mercury was gathered through two separate MESSENGER sources: (1) Mercury Laser Altimeter (MLA) data (Zuber et al., 2012) and (2) Deutsche Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt, German Aerospace Center (DLR) stereo-mosaics (Preusker et al., 2011).

The MLA data sets by Zuber et al. (2012) provide 665 m spatial resolution coverage of the entire quadrangle (Figure 2(a)) and a 500 m spatial resolution coverage of the North Pole (Figure 2(b)). However, the 665 m layer is affected by a decrease in quality towards the south of H02 because of the widening spacing between MLA tracks (up to ~100 km at 22.5°N). The DLR stereo-topography is a product of three MESSENGER flybys (M1, M2 and M3) that covered 30% of the planet with a spatial resolution of 1000 m (Preusker et al., 2011). About 80% of the Victoria quadrangle is covered by the M2 stereo-mosaic as shown in Figure 2(c).

3. Methods

3.1. Projection

Victoria quadrangle is located at mid-latitudes where it is conventional to use a Lambert Conformal Conic (LCC) projection (see Davies et al., 1978). This uses two standard parallels that represent the secants between the sphere and the cone of projection, conventionally at $d$ of $1/6$ and $5/6$ of the latitudinal range (Deetz & Adams, 1945). When the H02 quadrangle was first defined, its latitudinal range was 20° N–70°N so the standard parallels were fixed at 30°N and 60°N (McGill & King, 1983). Because of the newly defined post-MESSENGER latitudinal boundaries (i.e. 22.5°N–65°N), the second standard parallel is now 58°N.

The scale of features is true along the standard parallels, slightly smaller between them and slightly larger beyond them. As a reference datum we used a sphere with a radius of 2440 km as often used in the data released by the MESSENGER team.

3.2. Mapping and final output scales

To obtain the final output scale of 1:3,000,000 shown in the Main Map, we used a mapping scale based on both USGS guidelines and raster resolution. The mapping scale is the scale at which it is recommended to draw lines. USGS guidelines suggest drawing contacts at a scale two to five times larger than the final output scale (Tanaka, Skinner, & Hare, 2011). Generally, drawing contacts at a scale five times larger generates cleaner and smoother linework. Following this rule, a 1:3,000,000 map could be generated using a mapping scale of 1:600,000. However, another common rule for choosing the mapping scale was defined by Tobler (1987), saying that $Sm = Rr \times 2000$, where $Sm$ is the mapping scale and $Rr$ the raster resolution; thus, the
features on the BDR reference basemap (~166 m/pixel) could be drawn at a scale of ~1:300,000. Taking into consideration both rules, the variability of the used basemap resolution (Table 1) and the uneven appearance of most basemap mosaics, we drew contacts at a variable scale between ~1:300,000 and ~1:600,000.

3.3. Geodatabase structure and line drawing

We organised vector layers (i.e. feature classes) for digitising using a geographic information system (GIS) geodatabase, following most of the USGS recommendations and established features. In particular, we used three main feature classes: (1) geologic contacts (i.e. polyline layer); (2) linear features (i.e. polyline layer) and (3) surface features (i.e. polygon layer).

Geologic contacts define boundaries between the various geologic units and crater material classes. They constitute the main digitising layer since they were converted to polygons during map finalisation. They were divided into: (a) certain, where there is a clear and sharp contrast between terrain textures or morphologies and (b) approximate, where there is an uncertain, unclear or gradational transition between terrains.

Linear features include faults, wrinkle ridges, crater rim crests and volcanic structures. Faults were divided into two categories: (a) thrusts and (b) contractional faults (no extensional faults are apparent in this region). Both categories were divided into certain in case of clear segment traces and uncertain where segments were inferred as scarp shadows. Common morphologies such as lobate scarps (see Massironi, Byrne, & van der Bogert, 2015) and high-relief ridges (see Massironi & Byrne, 2015) were mapped as thrusts. Structures showing no significant break in slope nor a lobate trace were assigned to the 'contractional fault' category, based on the observation of the dominant contractional nature of Mercury tectonics (e.g. Byrne et al., 2014; Di Achille et al., 2012). Wrinkle ridges (see Korteniemi, Walsh, & Hughes, 2015), although they are considered a 'contractional feature', were mapped separately as they are typically located within smooth plains (SP; e.g. Byrne et al., 2014).

We used different symbologies for craters according to their size. Craters with diameter >20 km were mapped as standard craters, meaning that they are characterised by a geologic contact defining their material boundaries (e.g. ejecta and central peaks). Their rims were denoted by ornamental ticks facing the steep inner scarp. We classified craters with diameters of 5–20 km as ‘small craters’, and did not record any geologic contact defining their deposits. Craters, or parts of them, whose rim crest is still visible but profoundly degraded or covered by other units were mapped as ‘buried or degraded craters’. Surface features include secondary crater clusters and chains, and clusters of hollows (see Blewett, 2015). Hollows are features peculiar to Mercury; they are flat-floored irregular and rimless depressions, surrounded by high-reflectance material, probably caused by volatile loss (Blewett et al., 2011; Thomas, Rothery, Conway, & Anand, 2014a). Considering their small size, we mapped only the brighter and larger clusters (>10 km long), consistent with the larger hollow groups collected in the database of Thomas et al. (2014a). Following USGS recommendations (Tanaka et al., 2011), our mapping scale led us to avoid digitising outcrops (e.g. central peaks) smaller than 4 km.

4. Map description

4.1. Crater material classification

Since craters are progressively degraded over time, mostly by subsequent impacts, many authors have tried to use morphological evidence to classify crater degradation and assess their relative ages (e.g. Arthur, Agnieray, Horvath, Wood, & Chapman, 1963; Baker & Head, 2013; Cintala, Head, & Mutch, 1976; Leake, 1982; McCauley, Guest, Schaber, Trask, & Greeley, 1981; Pohn & Offield, 1970; Spudis & Guest, 1988; Wood, 1979; Wood & Anderson, 1978; Wood, Head, & Cintala, 1977). The M10 geological mapping project used a crater classification system with five classes of craters (McCauley et al., 1981): M10/C1 are the oldest and most degraded craters, while M10/C5 are the youngest and least degraded craters. The ascending class order from subdued to crisp craters was chosen to reflect a normal stratigraphic order. Recently, Kinczyk, Prockter, Chapman, and Susorney (2016) revisited this crater classification using MESSENGER (M) data; they inverted the class order (M/C1 fresh, M/C5 very degraded) and assigned each crater class to a corresponding division of the global stratigraphy.

However, the resolution of MESSENGER images highlights a diversity of crater morphologies at our mapping scale. The relationship between crater relative age and crater degradation is not always direct and straightforward. Morphological differences among craters that we mapped in H02, depend on both their relative age and their size. Smaller craters reach a higher level of degradation more quickly than larger craters. Moreover, isolated craters experience less degradation than overlapping or adjacent craters. Relying on a pure morphological classification of craters, with a high number of classes, could thus lead to a stratigraphic misinterpretation of impact events. We elected to distinguish only three crater classes, in order to reduce the error in assigning relative ages, based on a crater’s morphological appearance. This avoided contradictions encountered in the five-class scheme, in
which morphologically ‘older’ craters sometimes overlie morphological ‘younger’ craters.

We defined our three-class morpho-stratigraphic system by the type examples from within H02 shown in Figure 3. Class 3 and class 1 represent two end-member cases for the youngest and oldest craters, respectively, while class 2 encompasses all the other intermediate cases. The rim sharpness (from sharp and continuous to subdued and discontinuous), the texture of the ejecta blanket (from textured ejecta to subdued or absent ejecta) and the secondary crater density inside crater floors (from poorly cratered to intensely cratered) are the key attributes used in assigning craters to each class. We defined this scheme for this quadrangle only since we made no global crater survey, though it could form the basis of a relative-age classification scheme to be used planet-wide.

4.2. Mapped geologic provinces

In this quadrangle, we mapped three main geologic provinces: intercrater plains (ICP), intermediate plains (IMP) and SP.

4.2.1. Intercrater plains

Trask and Guest (1975, p. 2463) defined the ICP as ‘level to gently rolling ground between and around large craters and basins’ (Figure 4). This is the most widespread unit on Mercury and is thought to be the remnants of volcanic flows by most authors (Denevi et al., 2016; Kiefer & Murray, 1987; Murray et al., 1974, 1975; Spudis & Guest, 1988; Strom, 1977; Trask & Guest, 1975; Whitten, Head, Denevi, & Solomon, 2014). The emplacement of ICP predates the end of the Late Heavy Bombardment (e.g. Trask & Guest, 1975) of the Inner Solar System, thus these materials are Tolstojan to pre-Tolstojan (Whitten et al., 2014) and represent the oldest surface on Mercury (>3.9 Ga, Denevi et al., 2016). In the H02 quadrangle, ICP cover a larger area than any other province.

4.2.2. Intermediate plains

These terrains form ‘planar to undulating surfaces that have higher crater density than SP material, but are less heavily cratered than intercrater plains material’ (Spudis & Prosser, 1984). However, recent work concludes that there is no clear contrast between IMP and ICP, which seem to have a ‘patchy’ distribution, and the adjacent terrains (Denevi et al., 2013; Whitten et al., 2014). Despite the similarity with ICP at a regional scale, our mapping scale (i.e. ∼1:450,000) allowed us to recognise localised textural changes, sometimes confirmed by colour variations (see Figure 5(a) and 5(b)). We mapped less IMP than McGill and King (1983). This is probably due to the difference in resolution between M10 and MESSENGER data. Moreover,
where there are gradational contacts, IMP was limited to smoother terrains, leaving areas with slightly higher crater density outside the contact. In the western region of H02, IMP are approximately located inside the high-Mg region described by Weider et al. (2015). In the eastern region, IMP correspond approximately to an area previously mapped as SP by Denevi et al. (2013), p. 894, which is characterised by high Al abundance (Weider et al., 2015). Whitten et al. (2014) state that IMP show similar ages to ICP of Tolstojan and Pre-Tolstojan period, though the lower crater density and superposition relationships (where apparent) confirm that IMP is younger than ICP.

4.2.3. Smooth plains
SP were defined for their morphological characteristics as ‘relatively flat, sparsely cratered material’ (Spudis & Guest, 1988; Strom, Trask, & Guest, 1975; Trask & Guest, 1975) “that displays sharp boundaries with adjacent regions and is level to gently sloped over a baseline of ~100–200 km’ (Denevi et al., 2013, p. 894). Recently their volcanic nature was confirmed due to evidence of flow and sharp colour contrasts with adjacent units (Denevi et al., 2013). In the north polar region of Mercury, SP are known as the ‘Northern smooth plains’ (SPn, Denevi et al., 2013; Ostrach et al., 2015); inside the H02 quadrangle most of the mapped SP pertain to this unit (Figure 6). Several authors believe SP belong to the Calorian period estimating an age of 3.7–3.9 Ga based on crater density distribution (Denevi et al., 2013; Fassett et al., 2009; Head et al., 2011; Ostrach, Robinson, Denevi, & Thomas, 2011; Strom, Chapman, Merline, Solomon, & Head, 2008, 2011).

4.3. Description of map units
4.3.1. Crater material – well preserved: fresh craters with sharp rims. Clearly recognisable, textured ejecta blanket. Largest craters usually have radial chains of secondary craters. When central peaks or peak rings are
present, their boundary is sharp and well recognisable. Crater floor is pristine or sparsely cratered by <5 km craters. This class broadly corresponds to M10/C5 to M10/C4 craters of McCauley et al. (1981). Type-areas: 304.8°E, 37.7°N (Figure 3(c)); 320.0°E, 41.4°N (Figure 3(f)).

c2, crater material – degraded: degraded craters with subdued but still easily recognisable rims. Proximal ejecta are more recognisable than distant ejecta. They may not always present a textured ejecta blanket. Central peaks and peak rings are still recognisable. Crater floor may have smooth to hummocky morphology and is more densely cratered than c3. This class approximately corresponds to M10/C3 to M10/C2 craters of McCauley et al. (1981). Type-areas: 323.1°E, 45.6°N (Figure 3(b)); 325.4°E, 40.8°N (Figure 3(e)).

c1, crater material – heavily degraded: heavily degraded craters with subdued or discontinuous rims sometimes recognisable only with the aid of topography. Largest craters (>150 km) may still preserve recognisable proximal ejecta and internal subdued peak rings. These craters often have a hummocky and densely cratered floor. This class approximately corresponds to M10/C2 to M10/C1 craters of McCauley et al. (1981). Type-areas: 310.3°E, 30.80°N (Figure 3(a)); 289.3°E, 36.4°N (Figure 3(d)).

cfs, crater floor material – smooth: very smooth, planar and sparsely cratered crater floor surfaces. Mostly found inside c3 and c2 craters or on resurfaced floors of c1 craters. Type-areas: 280.1°E, 51.6°N; 315.8°E, 31.7°N.

cfh, crater floor material – hummocky: rough or gently rolling, moderately cratered crater floor surfaces. For c3 and c2 craters, this unit corresponds mostly to crater wall debris, while for c1 craters it is represented by very degraded floors. Type-areas: 351.0°E, 61.8°N; 351.2°E, 43.6°N.

sp, SP material: smooth and sparsely cratered planar surfaces. The boundary with adjacent materials is sharp and easily recognisable. In H02, it is found only on small areas over crater ejecta in the form of lava pools of ejecta melts. Type-areas: 302.9°E, 39.2°N; 279.2°E, 50.4°N.

spn, SP material – northern: smooth and poorly cratered planar surfaces confined to the high northern latitudes of the quadrangle, superposed only by c3 craters. The boundary is usually sharp and easily recognisable, against older crater rims, ICP material relief or tectonic features. Older underlying craters are often recognisable as ‘ghost craters’. Characterised by a widespread presence of wrinkle ridges. Type-areas: 354.8°E, 56.1°N (Figure 6); 287.1°E, 64.5°N.

imp, IMP material: smooth undulating to planar surfaces, more densely cratered than the SP and superposed by both c3 and c2 craters. May have partially covered older c1 craters. These materials always adjoin ICP material, but seldom present clear boundaries; they rather blend from smooth to rough surfaces with a gradational contact. In the eastern area of the quadrangle the undulation of these materials is caused by systematic lobate scarps. Type-areas: 331.4°E, 32.1°N; 301.6°E, 50.9°N (Figure 5).
**Figure 8.** Crater counting results for the seven study areas inside the Victoria quadrangle (i.e. ICP1–ICP4, IMP1, IMP2 and SPn), where N is the number of counted craters. The larger CSFD diagram shows a comparison between the three units (the results from ICP1–4 and IMP1–2 were merged together).

*icp*, ICP material: rough or gently rolling surfaces, densely cratered and superposed by all three crater classes. These materials encompass distal crater ejecta, all the older unrecognisable crater materials and subdued secondary clusters and chains. They have a sharp contact with *spn* and a gradational contact with
imp. Lobate scarps and high-relief ridges are widespread on this unit. Type-areas: 318.4°E, 39.6°N; 325.6°E, 63.6°N (Figure 4).

4.4. Relative age estimation

The geologic map of quadrangle H02 provides a database of craters with a diameter size larger than 5 km (Figure 7) up to the largest crater Vyasa (260 km, 275.35°E; 49.20°N). We used this database to estimate the units’ ages following the methods described in Crater Analysis Techniques Working Group (1979) and Neukum (1983) to build cumulative size-frequency distribution (CSFD) diagrams of the seven areas shown in Figure 8.

A schematic view of the frequencies of craters with diameter $\geq D$ (i.e. 5, 10 and 20 km) is shown in Table 2, where values are also normalised to an area of $1 \times 10^6$ km$^2$ and presented with their standard error (see Crater Analysis Techniques Working Group, 1979). While SPn values support a clear distinction in age with respect to the other units, ICP and IMP overlap for N(5) and N(10) values. This may be caused both by a bias due to counted secondary craters and by an actual age overlapping between the two units. The IMP unit seems to maintain a distinct intermediate age only for N(20) values. This is apparent also in the plotted crater counting data shown in Figure 8, where IMP craters $\geq 20$ km plot well below ICP confirming a younger age.

4.5. Correlation of main units

Based on the above considerations, we propose the stratigraphic scheme shown in Figure 9 as a summary of the main units mapped in the quadrangle. In this scheme, crater materials are drawn with a breccia-like texture, representing their simple stratigraphic order.

Table 2. Crater frequencies of the study areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area name</th>
<th>Unit description</th>
<th>A (km$^2$)</th>
<th>n(5) ± σ</th>
<th>n(10) ± σ</th>
<th>n(20) ± σ</th>
<th>N(5) ± op</th>
<th>N(10) ± op</th>
<th>N(20) ± op</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPn</td>
<td>Northern smooth plains, NE</td>
<td>$4.2 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>83 ± 9</td>
<td>39 ± 6</td>
<td>17 ± 4</td>
<td>198 ± 22</td>
<td>93 ± 15</td>
<td>40 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP1</td>
<td>Intermediate plains, E</td>
<td>$2.0 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>61 ± 8</td>
<td>46 ± 7</td>
<td>13 ± 4</td>
<td>308 ± 39</td>
<td>232 ± 34</td>
<td>76 ± 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP2</td>
<td>Intermediate plains, W</td>
<td>$7.9 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>30 ± 5</td>
<td>17 ± 4</td>
<td>7 ± 3</td>
<td>382 ± 70</td>
<td>216 ± 52</td>
<td>89 ± 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Intermediate Plains, all areas</td>
<td>$2.8 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>91 ± 10</td>
<td>63 ± 8</td>
<td>22 ± 5</td>
<td>329 ± 34</td>
<td>228 ± 29</td>
<td>80 ± 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP1</td>
<td>Intercrater Plains, NW</td>
<td>$1.6 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>57 ± 8</td>
<td>34 ± 6</td>
<td>16 ± 4</td>
<td>362 ± 48</td>
<td>216 ± 37</td>
<td>102 ± 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP2</td>
<td>Intercrater Plains, central</td>
<td>$1.6 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>94 ± 10</td>
<td>53 ± 7</td>
<td>24 ± 5</td>
<td>353 ± 60</td>
<td>232 ± 45</td>
<td>142 ± 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP3</td>
<td>Intercrater Plains, E</td>
<td>$1.6 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>59 ± 8</td>
<td>38 ± 6</td>
<td>16 ± 4</td>
<td>380 ± 49</td>
<td>251 ± 40</td>
<td>103 ± 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP4</td>
<td>Intercrater Plains, SW</td>
<td>$1.6 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>36 ± 6</td>
<td>27 ± 5</td>
<td>18 ± 4</td>
<td>211 ± 36</td>
<td>167 ± 32</td>
<td>111 ± 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP</td>
<td>Intercrater Plains, all areas</td>
<td>$6.3 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>246 ± 16</td>
<td>152 ± 12</td>
<td>74 ± 9</td>
<td>375 ± 24</td>
<td>238 ± 19</td>
<td>114 ± 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: A: actual size of the counting areas in Figure 8. n(D): actual number of craters with diameters $\geq D$ (5, 10 or 20 km) counted within the reference areas in Figure 8. σ: standard error for counted craters, $[n(D)^{1/2}]$ (Crater Analysis Techniques Working Group, 1979). N(D): n(D) normalised to an area of $10^6$ km$^2$, $[n(D)^{1/2} \times A]/10^6$. σp: error propagation for the normalised counted craters, $[(n(D)^{1/2} \times A)/10^6]$.
rather than all the possible superposition relationships among continuous crater ejecta found in the quadrangle (e.g. c3 craters superposing c1 craters are not represented).

Figure 9 stresses the importance of using the three crater classes as stratigraphic markers to assess the units’ relative ages. ICP are confirmed to be the oldest unit, the IMP relative age is constrained by the superposition of crater classes (i.e. only c2 and c3), while the northern SP are confirmed to be the youngest unit sealed on top only by c1 craters. However, this regional scale stratigraphic scheme may not hold true for the entire planet.

5. Conclusions

We produced the Main Map presented here using MESSENGER data. The average mapping scale of 1:450,000 was chosen to take advantage of the best basemap images available. This represents the first complete geological survey of the Victoria quadrangle and covers the areas left unmapped in the previous M10 map by McGill and King (1983). The results address the importance of further investigating the IMP unit that, at this mapping scale, is morphologically distinguishable from the ICP unit and has a distinct N(20) frequency value (bulk: 80 ± 17) in comparison with the SP unit (40 ± 10) and the ICP unit (bulk: 114 ± 13). This geologic survey will be a support to future local-scale advanced studies, operation simulations and targeting choices for the remote sensing instruments on-board the future ESA-JAXA (European Space Agency, Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency) BepiColombo mission to Mercury.

Software

We used ESRI ArcGIS during map production. Some images were processed using ISIS3 (Integrated Software for Imagers and Spectrometers v3; Elison, 1997; Gaddis et al., 1997; Torson & Becker, 1997, software developed by the USGS, United States Geological Survey). For crater counting and plotting purposes we used Crater Tools (Kneissl, Van Gasselt, & Neukum, 2011) and Craterstats2 (e.g. see Michael & Neukum, 2010). We also made use of ‘Tools for Graphics and Shapes’ and ‘Polar Plots’ by Jenness Enterprises (Jenness, 2011, 2014).
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