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Abstract

The discovery of buried carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) ice between water (H$_2$O) ice layers within the martian south polar layered deposits has renewed interest in subsurface CO$_2$ ice. In this thesis, subsurface CO$_2$ ice stability is explored using a 1-D thermal and vapour diffusion numerical model that simulates three phases of H$_2$O, two phases of CO$_2$, and adsorption of both for the first time.

Numerical experiments were run to examine how these two ices influence one another, under a variety of ice-layer configurations that are expected to be valid for Mars. The results demonstrate that an overlying near-surface H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer increases subsurface CO$_2$ ice stability by an order of magnitude. This stability increases further with the addition of an underlying H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer. The initial porosity and geological materials used to represent the subsurface also have a large influence on CO$_2$ ice stability. The porosity limits the vapour diffusion rate, while the geological materials influence thermal conductivity and, therefore, subsurface temperatures.

Simulations at different orbital obliquities demonstrate that CO$_2$ ice stability in the polar regions is greatest at low obliquities and smallest at high obliquities. The reverse is true for the equatorial regions. At higher obliquities (>45°) and atmospheric pressures, the results suggest subsurface CO$_2$ ice deposition could occur in the equatorial region.

The model results suggest that a 0.7–27 km CO$_2$ ice layer could sublimate away while 1 m of low-porosity H$_2$O ice forms (in 14–550 kyr depending on method) in the south polar layered deposits. The results also suggest CO$_2$ ice sublimation is dependent on obliquity: ~0.15 km sublimates at low obliquity and ~1.9 km sublimates at high obliquity over 100 kyr.

The subsurface model is a useful tool for future investigations into the historical behaviour of ices on Mars, particularly during the Noachian period when the CO$_2$ frost-point temperature was higher.
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<td>Average annual H₂O sublimation rates (excluding first year) for all latitudes in the S35 to S45 baseline simulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.17</td>
<td>Average annual H₂O sublimation rates (excluding first year) for all latitudes in the S48 to S51 baseline simulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.18</td>
<td>Average annual H₂O sublimation rates for all latitudes in the different initial ice porosity simulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.19</td>
<td>Average annual H₂O sublimation rates for all latitudes in the different subsurface structure simulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.20</td>
<td>Regional average H₂O sublimation rates for each baseline scenario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.21 Regional average H$_2$O sublimation rates for each different initial ice porosity scenario .................................................. 347
C.22 Regional average H$_2$O sublimation rates for each different subsurface structure scenario ........................................... 348
albedo  Property of a material that indicates how well a surface reflects solar energy

aphelion  Point in the orbit when Mars is furthest from the Sun

epoch  A period of time in history. On Mars these are split into the Noachian, Hesperian and Amazonian (present day).

perennial  Continuous or surviving between years

perihelion  Point in the orbit when Mars is closest to the Sun

permafrost  A subsurface layer of soil that remains frozen throughout the year

permeability  Property of a rock that indicates how easily fluids (or gas) can flow through it

spin-up  A run of the MGCM that starts with no initial climate state and is run until the climate equilibrates

thermal inertia  Property of a material that expresses how quickly its temperature reaches that of the environment
List of Acronyms

1-D one dimensional

1-D GCM 1-D version of the LMD-UK Mars General Circulation Model

3-D three dimensional

CCSR/NIES AGCM Center for Climate System Research, University of Tokyo and National Institute for Environmental Studies, Japan atmospheric general circulation model

CO₂ carbon dioxide

GCM global circulation model

GEL global equivalent layer

GEM-Mars GCM global environmental multiscale Mars general circulation model

GFDL Geophysical Fluid Dynamic Laboratory

Gyr billion years

H₂O water

IAA Instituto de Astrofísica de Andalucía

LDA Lobate Debris Apron

LDM Latitude Dependent Mantle

LMD Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique

MAOAM Mars atmosphere observation and modelling project

MCD Mars Climate Database

MEPAG Mars Exploration Program Analysis Group

MGCM LMD-UK Mars global circulation model

MSSM Martian Subsurface Model

MTGCM University of Arizona’s Mars thermospheric general circulation model

MY Mars Year

Mars-GRAM Mars global reference atmospheric model
MarsWRF GCM  Mars weather research and forecasting global circulation model

Myr million years

NASA National Aeronautics and Space Administration

NPLD North Polar Layered Deposits

OU The Open University

PBL planetary boundary layer

PLD polar layered deposits

SPLD South Polar Layered Deposits

SPRC South Polar Residual Cap

TDMA tri-diagonal matrix algorithm

VFF viscous flow feature

WEH water equivalent hydrogen

kyr thousand years

pr µm precipitable micrometres

IV.I Missions and Instruments

Curiosity

   DAN Dynamic Albedo of Neutrons
   REMS Rover Environmental Monitoring System

InSight Lander

   HP³ Heat Flow and Physical Properties Package

MGS Mars Global Surveyor

   MOLA Mars Orbiter Laser Altimeter
   TES Thermal Emission Spectrometer

MRO Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter

   CRISM Compact Reconnaissance Imaging Spectrometer for Mars
   CTX Context Camera
   HiRISE High Resolution Imaging Science Experiment
   MCS Mars Climate Sounder
SHARAD Shallow Radar

Mars Express

OMEGA Observatoire pour la Minéralogie, l’Eau, les Glaces et l’Activité

Mars Odyssey

GRS Mars Odyssey Gamma Ray Spectrometer

HEND High Energy Neutron Detector

MONS Mars Odyssey Neutron Spectrometer

THEMIS Thermal Emission Spectrometer

Phoenix Lander

LIDAR Light Detection and Ranging

Viking Orbiter

MAWD Mars Atmospheric Water Detector

i-MIM international Mars Ice Mapper
# List of Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A$</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>$m^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>Diffusion coefficient</td>
<td>$m^2 s^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>Flux from the regolith to the atmosphere</td>
<td>$kg m^{-1} s^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{eff}}$</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity of entire regolith</td>
<td>$W m^{-1} K^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q_{\text{atm}}$</td>
<td>Mass mixing ratio in the atmosphere</td>
<td>$kg kg^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>Ideal gas constant</td>
<td>$J \text{ mol}^{-1} K^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>$s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_p$</td>
<td>Time period of a cycle</td>
<td>$s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V$</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>$m^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>$m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>Thermal diffusivity</td>
<td>$m^2 s^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{\text{eff}}$</td>
<td>Density of the entire regolith</td>
<td>$kg m^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi$</td>
<td>Total porosity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi_{\text{ice}}$</td>
<td>Ice porosity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi_{\text{ice,ini}}$</td>
<td>Minimum Ice Porosity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi_{\text{tot}}$</td>
<td>Total porosity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$c_p$</td>
<td>Specific Heat Capacity</td>
<td>$JK^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k$</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity</td>
<td>$W m^{-1} K^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\infty}$</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity of the regolith at an infinite depth</td>
<td>$W m^{-1} K^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_0$</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity of the regolith at the surface</td>
<td>$W m^{-1} K^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_r$</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity of the regolith matrix</td>
<td>$W m^{-1} K^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>$K$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$z^*$  Thermal Skin Depth  
\(\rho\)  Density  kg m\(^{-3}\)
\(\rho_\infty\)  Density at an infinite depth  kg m\(^{-3}\)
\(\rho_0\)  Density at the surface  kg m\(^{-3}\)
\(\rho_r\)  Density of the regolith matrix  kg m\(^{-3}\)
\(\omega\)  Angular frequency  rad s\(^{-1}\)
\(\phi_r\)  Regolith matrix porosity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D_{\text{H}_2\text{O}})</td>
<td>Diffusion coefficient for water</td>
<td>m(^2) s(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D_K)</td>
<td>Knudsen diffusion coefficient for water</td>
<td>m(^2) s(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D_N)</td>
<td>Fickian diffusion coefficient for water</td>
<td>m(^2) s(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E_{\text{sub}_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}})</td>
<td>Sublimation rate of water ice</td>
<td>m s(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f_{\text{H}_2\text{O}})</td>
<td>Flux from the regolith to the atmosphere</td>
<td>m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h_{\text{H}_2\text{O}})</td>
<td>Hertz factor for water ice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_{\text{H}_2\text{O}})</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity of water ice</td>
<td>W m(^{-1}) K(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n_{\text{H}_2\text{O}})</td>
<td>Water vapour density</td>
<td>kg m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P_{\text{H}_2\text{O}})</td>
<td>Water vapour partial pressure</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P_{\text{sat}_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}})</td>
<td>Water saturation vapour pressure</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha_{\text{H}_2\text{O}})</td>
<td>Amount of adsorbed water</td>
<td>kg m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\zeta_{\text{H}_2\text{O}})</td>
<td>Amount of water ice</td>
<td>kg m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\rho_{\text{H}_2\text{O}})</td>
<td>Density of water ice</td>
<td>kg m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}})</td>
<td>Total amount of water</td>
<td>kg m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\tau)</td>
<td>Tortuosity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\epsilon_{\text{H}_2\text{O}})</td>
<td>Amount of liquid water</td>
<td>kg m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO(_2)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D_{\text{CO}_2})</td>
<td>Diffusion coefficient for CO(_2)</td>
<td>m(^2) s(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E_{\text{sub}_{\text{CO}_2}})</td>
<td>Sublimation rate of CO(_2) ice</td>
<td>m s(^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h_{\text{CO}_2})</td>
<td>Hertz factor for CO(_2) ice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{CO_2}$</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity of CO$_2$ ice</td>
<td>W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_{CO_2}$</td>
<td>CO$_2$ vapour density</td>
<td>kg m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{sat_{CO_2}}$</td>
<td>CO$_2$ saturation vapour pressure</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{CO_2}$</td>
<td>Amount of adsorbed CO$_2$</td>
<td>kg m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\zeta_{CO_2}$</td>
<td>Amount of CO$_2$ ice</td>
<td>kg m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{CO_2}$</td>
<td>Density of CO$_2$ ice</td>
<td>kg m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{CO_2}$</td>
<td>Total amount of CO$_2$</td>
<td>kg m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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VII | List of Simulations and MSSM Versions

A summary of all of the versions of the Martian Subsurface Model (MSSM), the acronyms used to define the different ice layer configurations and of all of the simulations referred to throughout the thesis for reference.

VII.I MSSM Versions

Table VII.I: List of the versions of the MSSM used for this thesis with the baseline subsurface structure. The simulation prefix is the letters used in front of the simulation set number, as the number was reset for each of the versions used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Description of version</th>
<th>Simulation prefix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>The version described in Chapter 3 with all features enabled and an annual cycle (1 sol timesteps)</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diurnal</td>
<td>Uses the diurnal cycle (1 hour timesteps) instead of the annual cycle</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No sublimation</td>
<td>The sublimation rate feature is turned off. The amount that sublimes is determined by the difference between vapour pressure and saturation vapour pressure</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No flux</td>
<td>The flux from the atmosphere to the subsurface is turned off. There is still a flux of vapour from the subsurface to the atmosphere</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable ice porosity</td>
<td>The initial ice porosity of a completely ice-filled regolith is set to a different value. In the Baseline it is set to 0.001</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VII.I: List of the different subsurface structure versions of the MSSM used for this thesis. Each one is composed of a regolith unit and some have a basement unit. To define the regolith unit, values for a surface and a compacted material are input into the equations from Grott et al. (2007) (Equations 3.9a, 3.9b and 3.11; Section 3.2). The simulation prefix is the letters used in front of the simulation set number, as the number was reset for each of the versions used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regolith Unit</th>
<th>Compact Material</th>
<th>Basement Unit Material</th>
<th>Simulation Prefix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconsolidated regolith</td>
<td>Coarse dry sand</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconsolidated regolith</td>
<td>Fine dry sand</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>UR-FDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine dry sand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Basalt</td>
<td>CDS-SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse dry sand</td>
<td>Coarse dry sand</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>CDS-SS-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconsolidated regolith</td>
<td>Coarse dry sand</td>
<td>Basalt</td>
<td>UR-CDS-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse dry sand</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>Basalt</td>
<td>CDS-SS-B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII.II Ice Layer Configurations

This is a list of the acronyms used for the initial ice layer configurations.

*Alternate Layers* Alternate Model layers of H₂O ice and CO₂ ice-filled regolith

*C*  CO₂ Ice-filled Regolith across the entire subsurface

*C-IF*  CO₂ Ice-filled Regolith Over Ice-free Regolith

*C-W*  CO₂ Ice-filled Regolith Over H₂O Ice-filled Regolith

*IF*  ice-free regolith across the entire subsurface

*IF-C*  Ice-free Regolith over CO₂ Ice-filled Regolith

*IF-W*  Ice-free Regolith over H₂O Ice-filled Regolith

*IF-W-C*  Ice-free Regolith Over H₂O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO₂ Ice-filled Regolith

*Mixed Layer*  H₂O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO₂ Ice-filled Regolith With A Mixed Layer

*W*  H₂O Ice-filled Regolith across the entire subsurface
**W-C** $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ Ice-filled Regolith Over $\text{CO}_2$ Ice-filled Regolith

**W-C-W** $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ Ice-filled Regolith Over $\text{CO}_2$ Ice-filled Regolith Over $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ Ice-filled Regolith

**W-IF** $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ Ice-filled Regolith over Ice-free Regolith

### VII.III MSSM Simulations List

Table VII.III: List of all simulations run with the baseline version of the MSSM at present day obliquity ($25^\circ$). The initial ice conditions use the acronyms from Ice Layer Configurations List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>Obliquity</th>
<th>Initial ice layer configuration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S01</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$C-W$ with the boundary at 0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$C-W$ with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$C-W$ with the boundary at 2 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$W-C$ with the boundary at 0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$W-C$ with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$W-C$ with the boundary at 2 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>IF-$C$ with the boundary at 0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>IF-$C$ with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>IF-$C$ with the boundary at 2 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>IF-$W$ with the boundary at 0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>IF-$W$ with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>IF-$W$ with the boundary at 2 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$W$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$C$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>W-IF with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Alternate Layers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>W-C-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>IF-W-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mixed Layer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VII.4: List of the simulations run with different versions of the MSSM. All of the minimum porosity and different geological layering simulations have been run with the initial scenario \( W-C \) with the boundary at 1 m (Figure VII.1b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>Obliquity</th>
<th>Initial ice layer configuration</th>
<th>Version of the MSSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS01</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>( W-C ) with the boundary at 1 m</td>
<td>No Sublimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF01</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>( C-W ) with the boundary at 1 m</td>
<td>No Flux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF02</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>( W-C ) with the boundary at 1 m</td>
<td>No Flux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF03</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>( H_2O ) ice-filled regolith only</td>
<td>No Flux</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>Obliquity</th>
<th>Initial Ice Porosity</th>
<th>Version of the MSSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM01</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>( \phi_{\text{ini}} = 0 )</td>
<td>Variable ice porosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM02</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>( \phi_{\text{ini}} = 0.01 )</td>
<td>Variable ice porosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM03</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>( \phi_{\text{ini}} = 0.1 )</td>
<td>Variable ice porosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM04</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>( \phi_{\text{ini}} = 0.0001 )</td>
<td>Variable ice porosity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>Obliquity</th>
<th>Description of geological layering</th>
<th>Version of the MSSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UR-FDS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Unconsolidated regolith to fine dry sand</td>
<td>UR-FDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDS-CDS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fine dry sand to coarse dry sand</td>
<td>FDS-CDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS-SS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Coarse dry sand to sandstone</td>
<td>CDS-SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR-CDS-B</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Unconsolidated regolith to fine dry sand with basalt below 10 m</td>
<td>UR-CDS-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS-SS-B</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Coarse dry sand to sandstone with basalt below 10 m</td>
<td>CDS-SS-B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VII.V: List of all simulations run at 15°, 35° or 45° obliquity with the baseline version of the MSSM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>Obliquity</th>
<th>Initial ice layer configuration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>C-W with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W-C with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>IF-C with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>IF-W with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>C-W with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>W-C with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>IF-C with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>IF-W with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>C-W with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>W-C with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>IF-C with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>IF-W with the boundary at 1 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Alternate Layers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Alternate Layers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Alternate Layers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W-C-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>W-C-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>W-C-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>IF-W-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>IF-W-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>IF-W-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mixed Layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mixed Layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mixed Layer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure VII.1: Initial subsurface profiles showing the distribution of H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice for the two-ice-layer configurations with the boundary at 1 m and all multiple-ice-layer configurations. (a) C-W, (b) W-C, (c) IF-C, (d) IF-W, (e) Alternate Layers, (f) W-C-W, (g) IF-W-C, and (h) Mixed Layer. White represents an ice-free regolith, blue represents a H$_2$O ice-filled regolith and red represents a CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith. The dashed grey lines represent the boundary between model layers.
1 | Introduction

Carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) ice and water (H$_2$O) ice have been observed across the martian surface and H$_2$O ice has also been observed within the subsurface. The martian polar ice caps have been observed telescopically from Earth since at least the 16th century by William Herschel and were determined to be composed of predominantly CO$_2$ ice at the surface through spacecraft observation (e.g. Hess et al., 1977; Leovy, 1966). Surface H$_2$O ice frost has been observed by the Viking landers (e.g., Christensen and Zurek, 1984; Clark, 1980), while subsurface H$_2$O ice was discovered in a trench dug by the Phoenix lander (Mellon et al., 2009). Over time, the distribution of ices has been observed in more detail. As a result, the surface reservoirs of CO$_2$ ice and H$_2$O ice, and the subsurface reservoirs of H$_2$O ice are currently well characterised.

The polar regions host the largest ice reservoirs, with permanent polar caps that are seasonally covered in CO$_2$ ice (Aharonson et al., 2004; Hansen, 1999). The permanent polar cap in the northern hemisphere is composed only of H$_2$O ice, whereas the southern polar cap is composed of a H$_2$O ice layer overlain by a CO$_2$ ice layer (Thomas et al., 2000). Both permanent polar ice caps overlie a series of layered deposits composed of H$_2$O ice and dust mixtures that are known as the polar layered deposits (PLD). Outside of the polar regions, subsurface H$_2$O ice is found across the mid-latitudes in the form of an extensive ice-rich layer known as the Latitude Dependent Mantle (LDM; Mustard et al., 2001). Alongside the LDM, many glacial-like surface features such as Lobate Debris Aprons (LDAs) and viscous flow features (VFFs) are thought to contain ice (Holt et al., 2008; Plaut et al., 2009).

Studies investigating the distribution of H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice have shown that the present-day distribution is a mixture of the current stable distribution and of remnants from previous periods in Mars' history that are not in direct contact with the atmosphere and so take longer to sublimate away. One such example of a remnant deposit is the LDM (Laskar et al., 2004; Levrard et al., 2004). The distribution of
subsurface ices is primarily dependent on the obliquity cycle, which alters the distribution of solar insolation across the surface (Laskar et al., 2004). During periods of low obliquity (<15°), large permanent polar caps form, composed of both H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice. During periods of higher obliquity (>45°), these permanent polar caps become unstable and sublime away, with only seasonal polar caps forming. At these high obliquities, temperatures in the mid-latitudes are reduced enough that H$_2$O ice becomes stable and the H$_2$O ice sublimating from the polar regions is redeposited in the mid-latitudes, forming features such as the LDM. This cycling of H$_2$O ice between the polar regions and mid-latitudes also forms the PLD that are observed in both polar regions (Kreslavsky and Head, 2002; Laskar et al., 2002).

The formation of the PLD has been studied using both observations and numerical modelling (e.g., Lasue et al., 2012; Phillips et al., 2008). Most studies have assumed the layers are composed of H$_2$O ice with a small dust content and that any CO$_2$ ice that formed during a period of low obliquity would have fully sublimated away during a period of high obliquity before the next CO$_2$ ice layer was deposited in the next low obliquity period (e.g., Kreslavsky and Head, 2002). However, recent observations have since shown that there are massive CO$_2$ ice deposits within the South Polar Layered Deposits (SPLD) and recent efforts have been made towards modelling the formation and persistence of these CO$_2$ ice deposits (Bierson et al., 2016; Buhler et al., 2019; Manning et al., 2019). The existence of these buried CO$_2$ ice deposits suggests that modelling of CO$_2$ ice needs to be expanded to include the subsurface processes (such as the reduced sublimation rate with depth) that have already been demonstrated to influence the distribution and stability of subsurface H$_2$O ice (e.g., Mellon and Jakosky, 1993; Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005). The record of these subsurface CO$_2$ ice deposits and the processes related to their formation have been identified as one of the main goals for future martian ice studies by the Mars Exploration Program Analysis Group (MEPAG; Banfield, 2020; Diniega and Putzig, 2019). These goals also include investigating the interactions between the H$_2$O and CO$_2$ cycles during sublimation/condensation; the influences of these interactions on the distribution of ices at seasonal and multi-annual timescales; and constraining the processes by which volatiles exchange between the subsurface and the atmosphere (Banfield, 2020; Diniega
The purpose of this thesis is, therefore, to begin the investigation into the impacts of subsurface CO$_2$ ice processes on CO$_2$ ice persistence and on the rest of the martian system, through the development of a detailed subsurface model (the Martian Subsurface Model, ‘MSSM’). The MSSM is a one dimensional (1-D) thermal and vapour diffusion model that determines the partitioning of H$_2$O and CO$_2$ between the vapour, ice and adsorbate phases (as well as the liquid phase for H$_2$O). The subsurface model has been coupled to a fixed annual atmospheric cycle taken from the results of a Mars global circulation model (MGCM) that was jointly designed by the Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique (‘LMD’, France), The Open University (‘OU’, UK), Oxford University (UK) and the Instituto de Astrofísica de Andalucía (‘IAA’, Spain) to simulate climatic processes in detail. In future investigations, the MSSM will be integrated into the MGCM, but for the purpose of this thesis, only the fixed annual atmospheric cycles are used, partially due to the computational time required to run the MGCM for 10,400 martian years in total, where each martian year is 669 sols or 360° of solar longitude ($L_s$) long. The stand-alone MSSM is also used because many experiments are required due to the large regions of parameter space to be explored, as there is currently a lack of constraints on the initial conditions. To date, only the surface CO$_2$ ice distribution has been observed or modelled (e.g., Aharonson et al., 2004; Titov, 2002; Vincendon et al., 2010). While the surface distribution could be used as an initial indicator of where subsurface CO$_2$ ice is expected, observations of subsurface H$_2$O ice in the mid-latitudes have proven that the subsurface ice distribution does not necessarily follow the surface ice distribution (Dundas et al., 2018; Feldman et al., 2004). Therefore, the simulations presented in this thesis have been designed to present initial investigations into the distribution and stability of subsurface CO$_2$ ice. The chosen scenarios cover a variety of situations expected to describe the martian environment, both in the present-day and under different obliquity conditions, with the aim to investigate the research questions outlined in the next section.
1.1 Research Questions

1. What is the impact of adding CO\textsubscript{2} ice physics on the H\textsubscript{2}O ice distribution predicted by models that previously only took H\textsubscript{2}O physics into account?

2. How do CO\textsubscript{2} ice and H\textsubscript{2}O ice interact in the subsurface of Mars?

3. What impact does layering have on the stability of both subsurface H\textsubscript{2}O ice and CO\textsubscript{2} ice?

4. How do changes in the orbital obliquity of Mars change the stability of subsurface CO\textsubscript{2} ice?

5. How important are subsurface properties for the distribution of ices?

1.2 Thesis Structure

In Chapter 2, I give an overview of the behaviour of the states of H\textsubscript{2}O and CO\textsubscript{2} (vapour, ice, adsorbate and liquid) that exist on Mars, both in the present-day and throughout Mars’ history. The chapter also includes a summary of the influence of climatic processes, orbital parameters and geology on H\textsubscript{2}O and CO\textsubscript{2}, particularly on their ice phases.

In Chapter 3, I outline the details of the subsurface model I developed for this work to simulate the distribution of subsurface H\textsubscript{2}O and CO\textsubscript{2} ice, referred to as the MSSM. This chapter includes both the equations used in the MSSM and the reasoning behind their use over other available equations. The chapter also includes a description of the MGCM and the method used to produce the annual atmospheric cycles for the MSSM from the output of the MGCM.

In Chapters 4 to 6, I present the results of this thesis, starting in Chapter 4 with the use of two-ice-layer scenarios under present-day conditions. These results include a discussion about the ability of the MSSM to reproduce similar subsurface H\textsubscript{2}O ice results to previous studies, alongside a discussion on how the presence of both ices influences the stability of each other. Alongside the two-ice-layer scenarios, the results
from a series of simulations using different assumptions within the MSSM are also presented.

Chapter 5 continues the investigation into the effects of assumptions in the MSSM on the stability of both ices, as I present a series of investigations exploring how different initial porosities and subsurface structures influence the outputs. This chapter concludes with a series of multiple-ice-layer scenarios, exploring the influence of thin ice-layers on the stability of both CO$_2$ ice and H$_2$O ice.

In Chapter 6, the influence of planetary obliquity on subsurface CO$_2$ ice and H$_2$O ice is explored. I present a series of simulations at obliquities of 15°, 35° and 45° for the different ice-layer scenarios presented in Chapters 4 and 5. The chapter concludes with a synthesis of the implications of the results presented in Chapters 4 to 6 for subsurface CO$_2$ ice.

In Chapter 7, I summarise the results of this thesis, including an explanation of how each of the research questions has been answered by the results presented. I also identify several avenues for future research.
Water and Carbon Dioxide on Mars

The presence of ice on Mars, both at the surface and within the subsurface, is well established (e.g., Anderson et al., 1967; Dundas et al., 2018; Hansen, 1999; Kieffer, 1970; Leovy, 1966; Souness et al., 2012; Warren et al., 1990). This ice is either carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) ice (at the poles or as seasonal frost) or water (H$_2$O) ice (at the poles, as seasonal frost or buried in the mid-latitudes). Previous work has investigated the surface distribution of both ices and the subsurface distribution of H$_2$O ice in the present and throughout Mars' history (e.g., Aharonson et al., 2004; Feldman et al., 2004; Leighton and Murray, 1966). These studies show that the conditions during previous geological periods have influenced both the present-day geology and the present-day distribution of both ices.

On Mars, the geologic history has been split into four main periods based on crater counting and changes in global conditions (e.g., Carr, 2007a; Carr and Head, 2010; Tanaka and Kolb, 2001): pre-Noachian (4.5–4.0 Gyr$^1$), the Noachian (most heavily cratered surfaces; 4.0–3.7 Gyr), the Hesperian (3.7–3.0 Gyr), and the Amazonian (sparsely cratered; 3.0 Gyr–present-day). The three periods also approximately correspond with significant changes in global conditions from the high atmospheric pressures during the Noachian (estimates of up to 5 bar) to the low atmospheric pressures at present (6 mbar; e.g., Head et al., 2003; Mustard et al., 2001; Nakamura and Tajika, 2001; Wordsworth et al., 2013). These changes in atmospheric conditions have been shown to influence the formation and survival of subsurface H$_2$O ice and will also influence subsurface CO$_2$ ice. However, this is an area with limited evidence and, therefore, research. The recent discovery of buried CO$_2$ ice deposits within the South Polar Layered Deposits ('SPLD'; Phillips et al., 2011) renewed interest in the potential for subsurface CO$_2$ ice and consequently, subsurface CO$_2$ ice is the focus of this work.

$^1$kyr, Myr and Gyr are counted in Earth years rather martian years and smaller timescales are counted in martian years.
The formation and survival of subsurface CO$_2$ ice is dependent on many factors that are themselves interdependent. Therefore, in order to study subsurface CO$_2$ ice distribution an initial understanding of the different forms in which H$_2$O and CO$_2$ exists across Mars (e.g. vapour, ice, hydrous minerals and carbonates), alongside the factors that influence their formation and distribution (e.g. climate and surface geology), is needed. An overview of the relevant aspects of Mars research is provided in this chapter, starting with a summary of the surface and subsurface geology (Section 2.1), with a more detailed look at the forms, other than ice, of H$_2$O (Sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.4) and CO$_2$ (Sections 2.1.3 and 2.1.4) that exist within the subsurface. This leads to an overview of the distribution of surface ices (Section 2.2), subsurface H$_2$O ice (Section 2.3) and subsurface CO$_2$ ice (Section 2.4).

The overview of surface and subsurface ices is followed by an overview of the climate (Section 2.6) including an overview of the processes within the planetary boundary layer (‘PBL’; Section 2.6.1) as well as the atmospheric CO$_2$ (Section 2.6.2) and H$_2$O (Section 2.6.3) cycles. This is followed by an overview of the orbital parameters and their influences on ice distribution (Section 2.7). The final section discusses the evolution of H$_2$O and CO$_2$ over Mars’ history (Section 2.8). Each of these topics has been summarised because the interactions between them are what result in the behaviour and distribution of the subsurface ices discussed throughout the remainder of this thesis.

2.1 The Surface and Subsurface

Research concerning the surface of Mars is ongoing as there are still many unknowns but as more observations, of different properties and/or increasing resolution, become available more information is revealed and existing knowledge is constrained further. Current knowledge is limited by what can be determined from remote observations or surface observations by landers and rovers. The instruments that make these observations have a variety of vertical resolutions and depths of penetration below the surface (a few centimetres to several kilometres) and data from them can be synthesised to produce an overall picture of the present-day and past geology of the planet (Sections 2.1.1 and 2.8).
Alongside geological materials, volatiles (H$_2$O and CO$_2$) are an important component of the surface and subsurface that are of particular interest for this work. When investigating variations in volatile abundance over both short (10s to 100s martian years) and long (kyr to Gyr) timescales, all possible reservoirs for H$_2$O and CO$_2$ on Mars need to be accounted for, as some reservoirs are only relevant at either short or long timescales. The work in this thesis focuses on simulating variations over hundreds of martian years and consequently on the reservoirs that exchange volatiles on short timescales, known as the exchangeable reservoirs (discussed across Sections 2.1.2, 2.1.3 and 2.2 to 2.4).

While the reservoirs that only interact at long timescales (kyr–Gyr; non-exchangeable) are not directly relevant for the simulations discussed here, they need to be considered when interpreting observations and when putting the simulation results into historical context. This is particularly the case for simulations of earlier epochs on Mars, when these reservoirs are expected to have formed. The main non-exchangeable reservoirs for H$_2$O and CO$_2$ are carbonates, hydrous minerals, and CO$_2$ clathrate hydrates (Section 2.1.4). Each of these has been observed in some way on Mars and hydrous minerals in particular must be considered when interpreting observations of hydrogen content within the subsurface, as some instruments cannot differentiate between hydrous minerals, adsorbed H$_2$O and H$_2$O ice.

The surface (and subsurface) material (geological and ice) also influences the amount of heat adsorbed and conducted through the subsurface, which impacts both subsurface H$_2$O and CO$_2$ ice formation and stability. A summary of the main factors that will influence subsurface temperatures and subsurface ice is therefore given in Section 2.1.5.

2.1.1 Surface Geology

For most of Mars, the geology can only be characterised by remote observations which means most of the current knowledge is from properties that can be determined remotely such as elevation, morphology, and gravity (Carr, 2007a). Figure 2.1 shows the topography of Mars (based on Mars Orbiter Laser Altimeter, ‘MOLA’, data; Smith et al., 1999) and the stark difference in elevation between the northern lowlands and
the southern highlands is immediately noticeable. The boundary between these two provinces is mostly transitional across varying distances and can be traced across the surface. In general, this global dichotomy can be summarised by describing the northern regions as sparsely cratered plains underlain by a thin crust, whereas the southern regions are heavily cratered uplands underlain by a thick crust (Carr, 2007b).
sets, such as thermal inertia and albedo observations, to be considered before any characterisations can be made (e.g., Bandfield, 2007; Putzig et al., 2005). Thermal inertia (Equation 2.2 on 18) is an important material property that indicates how quickly a material's temperature responds to that of its environment (Section 2.1.5.2), while albedo is a material property that indicates how well a surface reflects solar energy (Section 2.1.5.4). Thermal inertia (derived from surface temperature observations by the Thermal Emission Spectrometer, ‘TES’, on Mars Global Surveyor, ‘MGS’) can be used to infer broad-scale surface geological materials on its own. However, each type of material has a large range of thermal inertias. From a map of thermal inertia (Figure 2.2), surfaces can be broadly characterised as either unconsolidated fines (low values); indurated fines or sand-sized particles (intermediate values); and rocks or exposed bedrock or ice (high values). Putzig et al. (2005) then combined this thermal inertia data with albedo data, and split the surface into seven broad thermal inertia-albedo (thermophysical) units (information in Table 2.1 and shown in Figure 2.3).

Table 2.1: The thermal inertia and albedo units derived by Putzig et al. (2005) to characterise the material at the surface of Mars. Data taken from Putzig et al. (2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Thermal Inertia [J m$^{-2}$ K$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$]</th>
<th>Albedo</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Percentage of surface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Low (28–135)</td>
<td>High (0.23–0.31)</td>
<td>Surfaces dominated by unconsolidated fines (dust grain sizes &lt;40 µm)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>High (160–355)</td>
<td>Low (0.10–0.19)</td>
<td>Surfaces composed of coarser grained sediments, rocks, bedrock exposures and some duricrust</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>High (110–330)</td>
<td>Medium (0.19–0.26)</td>
<td>Surfaces dominated by duricrust with some rocks and/or bedrock exposures</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Low (24 – 170)</td>
<td>Low-medium (0.09–0.24)</td>
<td>Low density mantle or dark dust</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>High (140–386)</td>
<td>Very Low (&lt;0.09)</td>
<td>As B, but little or no fines</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Very High (&gt;386)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Rocks, bedrock, duricrust, and polar ice</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Low–high (40–386)</td>
<td>Very high (&gt;0.23)</td>
<td>As A, thermally thin at higher inertia</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to these thermophysical units, over half of the surface is covered in units A and B, both of which are interpreted to be composed (at least partially) of sediments with varying grain size and these units may contain enough pore space for ice to form within. However, the regions of unit B are more likely to have surfaces that are a mixture of fines, coarser sand-sized particles, bedrock and ice because high thermal inertia values have non-unique interpretations (Ruff and Christensen, 2002) and only part of this unit will therefore have a subsurface with large enough pores for ice to form within. The possibility of unit B containing unconsolidated sediments is supported by data from the Viking landers and the Pathfinder rover (VL-1, VL-2 and MPF on Figure 2.3), all of which landed within this unit. These ground based observations showed the surface was covered in a fine-textured soil that is compositionally similar to atmospheric dust (Banin, 2005).

Thermal inertia and albedo observations provide information on the grain size and consolidation of the surface geologic material, but do not indicate the composition of this material, which also needs to be considered for subsurface modelling. To determine composition, remote spectral observations (e.g., from the Observatoire pour la Minéralogie, l’Eau, les Glaces et l’Activité, ‘OMEGA’, on Mars Express, and the Compact Reconnaissance Imaging Spectrometer for Mars, ‘CRISM’, on Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter, ‘MRO’) and observations by rovers (e.g. Phoenix, Pathfinder, Opportunity, and Curiosity) are needed (e.g., Banin, 2005; Bell et al., 2000; Bibring et al., 2005; Moore et al., 1982). OMEGA and CRISM observations have revealed that the surface mineralogy is diverse and complex (e.g., Bibring et al., 2005; Ehlmann et al., 2011). These observations have revealed a variety of mafic silicates and hydrated minerals, which indicate magmatic, volcanic and hydrous alteration processes occurred over Mars’ history (Ehlmann et al., 2011).
Figure 2.3: Map of the thermal inertia and albedo units derived by Putzig et al. (2005) to characterise the material at the surface of Mars. Lander locations and several key regions for the Putzig et al. (2005) study are noted on the map as follows: VL-1, Viking Lander 1; VL-2, Viking Lander 2; MPF, Mars Pathfinder Lander; Ac, Acidalia; AF, Amethystes Fossae; Am, Amazonis; AP, Alba Patera; Ar, Argyre; AT, Arabia Terra; CP, Chryse Planitia; CM, Cydonia Mensae; EM, Elysium Mons; EP, Elysium Planitia; H, Hellas; I, Isidis; MP, Malea Planum; P, Prometheus Terra; OM, Olympus Mons; OP, Olympia Planitia; S, Syrtis Major; T, Tharsis; U, Utopia Planitia; VB, Vastitas Borealis; VM, Valles Marineris; X, Xanthe Terra.

2.1.2 Water in the Subsurface

The exchangeable subsurface reservoir of H$_2$O is composed primarily of H$_2$O vapour, H$_2$O adsorbed onto regolith grains and subsurface H$_2$O ice (e.g., Farris et al., 2018; Steele et al., 2017a). The phase in which H$_2$O is present will depend on the subsurface thermal gradient (Section 2.1.5) and local humidity values (Farris et al., 2018; Fischer et al., 2014). H$_2$O also exists in the form of hydrous minerals where it is chemically bound (observed in Noachian age terrain; e.g., Bibring et al., 2005; Bish et al., 2003; Ehlmann et al., 2011), as CO$_2$ clathrate hydrates (Section 2.1.4; Buffett, 2000; Kargel et al., 2000) and as liquid H$_2$O/brines, which have been suggested to form in the deep subsurface and beneath the polar caps (Section 2.5; Clifford and Parker, 2001; Orosei
H$_2$O vapour in the near surface is in diffusive equilibrium with the atmosphere, as long as the subsurface material is porous and responds to changes in the atmospheric H$_2$O column abundance over short timescales (on the order of hours for the top 1 m of soil; Squyres and Carr, 1986; Williams et al., 2015). This exchange is dependent on the rate of diffusion of vapour through the pore space, which is affected by the presence of ice, the total porosity, and the connected pathways through the pore space (tortuosity; e.g., Bryson et al., 2008; Hudson et al., 2007; Steele et al., 2017a). Vapour diffusion is a key feature of subsurface H$_2$O models and the theory behind it is discussed in Section 3.3.1.

The vapour pressure within the pore space also responds to changes in the amount of H$_2$O adsorbed onto regolith grains, which in turn is dependent on the size, composition, and temperature of the regolith material (Fanale and Jakosky, 1982b; Haberle et al., 1994). The regolith material is particularly important for determining the amount of H$_2$O adsorbed because the adsorptive capacity of clay is significantly higher than the adsorptive capacity of basalt due to its larger specific surface area (e.g., Bryson et al., 2008; Fanale and Cannon, 1971). The absorptive capacity of the martian regolith has been studied many times (discussed further in Section 3.3.2.3; e.g., Böttger et al., 2005; Bryson et al., 2008; Fanale and Cannon, 1971; Pommerol et al., 2009; Zent et al., 1993), showing that adsorption has the largest influence on the diurnal cycle and a smaller influence over long timescales (> tens of martian years; Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005). The influence of adsorption on the regolith-atmosphere exchange is also dependent on the presence of H$_2$O ice, since, if present, H$_2$O ice will be the main control on vapour pressure in the pore space rather than adsorption (Böttger et al., 2005).

### 2.1.3 Carbon Dioxide in the Subsurface

The exchangeable regolith reservoir of CO$_2$ is similar to H$_2$O and comprises CO$_2$ vapour, CO$_2$ adsorbed onto regolith grains and CO$_2$ ice (e.g., Fanale and Cannon, 1974; Phillips et al., 2011). The phase of CO$_2$ is also dependent on the subsurface thermal gradient and the partial CO$_2$ vapour pressure. Carbonates (which formed early in
Mars’ history when liquid H$_2$O was available; Bandfield, 2003; Ehlmann et al., 2011; Gooding, 1992) and CO$_2$ clathrate hydrates (Buffett, 2000; Kargel et al., 2000, see Section 2.1.4) are also expected to have formed from the CO$_2$ atmosphere. However, these reservoirs are expected to be more stable on short geological timescales and, therefore, are not included in studies of the short-term changes in ice distribution.

While the behaviour of CO$_2$ within the regolith is similar to that of H$_2$O, there is much less research on its behaviour: subsurface studies have mainly focussed on subsurface H$_2$O as this species is more prevalent as ice, easier to observe and has been observed in significant quantities across the planet (e.g., Feldman et al., 2004). Most of the subsurface CO$_2$ research has focussed on the amount of CO$_2$ adsorbed in the regolith, since the regolith has been suggested to be a potential reservoir for exchangeable CO$_2$ that could have stored large amounts when the CO$_2$ inventory was larger earlier in martian history (Armstrong et al., 2004; Fanale and Jakosky, 1982b; Fanale and Salvail, 1994; Toon et al., 1980). While experiments have shown that large amounts of CO$_2$ can be adsorbed by the regolith (e.g., Fanale and Cannon, 1971, 1979), later experiments have found that CO$_2$ molecules spent orders of magnitude longer adsorbed onto the grain surfaces than diffusing through the pore space (Fanale and Jakosky, 1982b). This implies that the exchange between the CO$_2$ regolith reservoir and the atmosphere is ineffective on seasonal timescales and this has since been supported by observations (Armstrong et al., 2004; Hess et al., 1980; Zent and Quinn, 1995). The seasonal exchange of CO$_2$ adsorbed in the regolith is also limited by the rate of CO$_2$ vapour diffusion which is smaller than the diffusion rate of H$_2$O vapour (Fanale et al., 1982a; Toon et al., 1980). However, while not effective on seasonal timescales, the exchange between the regolith and atmosphere is still expected to be effective on the timescale of an obliquity cycle ($10^5$ years) and should therefore be considered as a reservoir for studies over long geological timescales (Fanale and Jakosky, 1982b).

2.1.4 Carbon Dioxide Clathrate Hydrates

Clathrate Hydrates are ice-like solids that have similar structures to pure H$_2$O ice but the arrangement of H$_2$O molecules allows for smaller gas molecules to be trapped inside (Buffett, 2000). On Mars, the expected dominant clathrate forming gas is CO$_2$ (Kargel
et al., 2000). CO₂ clathrate hydrates have the same appearance and spectral signature as H₂O ice, making them difficult to observe remotely (Dobrovolskis and Ingersoll, 1975). There is potential for large amounts to be present in the upper crust and polar deposits (Dobrovolskis and Ingersoll, 1975; Kargel et al., 2000), although the small amount of H₂O in the atmosphere could limit the amount that can form under present atmospheric conditions (Miller and Smythe, 1970).

CO₂ clathrate hydrates form at temperatures around 5 K warmer than CO₂ frost (Ingersoll, 1974; Miller and Smythe, 1970). They can also only exist with either H₂O ice or CO₂ ice present and probably form between layers of pure H₂O ice and pure CO₂ ice (Miller and Smythe, 1970). Some suggested formation mechanisms for CO₂ clathrate hydrate on Mars include: (i) the reaction of permafrost ice with CO₂ vapour; (ii) polar precipitation of H₂O ice reacting with either atmospheric CO₂ vapour or CO₂ ice; (iii) trapping and subsequent burial of atmospheric CO₂ vapour within polar ice deposits that reacts with H₂O ice under pressure; and (iv) direct atmospheric precipitation and accumulation of CO₂ clathrate hydrates from a formerly denser and warmer CO₂ atmosphere (Kargel et al., 2000). While all of these mechanisms are plausible, the existence and amount of CO₂ clathrate hydrates on Mars remains unknown (Titus et al., 2017).

2.1.5 Influences on Subsurface Temperature and Ice Deposition

Surface and subsurface temperatures have been shown to have the largest influence on the stability of H₂O ice. When temperatures are low and atmospheric H₂O vapour partial pressure is equal to or higher than the subsurface saturation vapour pressure of H₂O, subsurface H₂O ice is stable and will not sublimate (Chevrier et al., 2007). On the other hand, when temperatures are higher or the atmospheric H₂O partial pressure is lower than the subsurface saturation vapour pressure, H₂O ice will gradually sublimate away (Smoluchowski, 1968). Therefore, the main influences on subsurface temperatures need to be understood for subsurface modelling of ices. These include: insolation, radiative heat transfer, geothermal flux, heat conduction into the subsurface, thermal conductivity and thermal inertia variations, albedo variations, the condensation-sublimation cycles of CO₂ and H₂O (Sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4), and the
obliquity cycle (Section 2.7). Alongside these factors, it is also important to understand how the presence of either H$_2$O ice or CO$_2$ ice will influence subsurface properties and, therefore, their influence on further deposition in that region.

2.1.5.1 Solar Insolation

The amount of solar insolation that reaches the surface varies seasonally, diurnally and latitudinally according to variations in the orbital parameters (Section 2.7; François et al., 1990). The heat adsorbed by the surface is then conducted through the subsurface by radiative heat transfer, which is increasingly damped with depth. The magnitude of this damping is determined by the skin depth, $z^*$:

$$z^* = \sqrt{\frac{2k}{\omega \rho c_p}}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $k$ is the thermal conductivity [W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$], $\rho$ is the density of the regolith [kg m$^{-3}$], $c_p$ is the specific heat capacity of the regolith [J K$^{-1}$] and $\omega$ is the angular frequency [rad s$^{-1}$]. Due to the large magnitude of the thermal wave near the surface (where damping is small), variations in the seasonal and diurnal cycles dominate subsurface temperatures. At greater depths, where the thermal wave is mostly damped out, the geothermal heat flux has the largest influence on subsurface temperatures (Section 2.1.5.5; Grott et al., 2007). The seasonal skin depth is around 26 times deeper than the diurnal skin depth, with the diurnal thermal wave damped out after a few centimetres while the seasonal thermal wave is damped out after a few 10s of centimetres (Leighton and Murray, 1966; Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005). However, it is important to include these cycles in thermal models, because disregarding the seasonal and diurnal cycles in models of the subsurface produces subsurface temperatures that are too high (François et al., 1990).

2.1.5.2 Thermal Inertia

The thermal inertia, $I$, of the surface has been shown to be one of the main influences on regional H$_2$O ice distributions (Mellon and Jakosky, 1993), particularly on the
longitudinal variations in H$_2$O ice stability (Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005). It is
a measure of heat conduction into the subsurface and is calculated by the following
equation:

$$ I = \sqrt{k \rho c_p} $$

(2.2)

These three parameters can also be combined to produce thermal diffusivity, $k$, a
measure of the rate of transfer of heat, and is given by:

$$ \kappa = \frac{k}{\rho c_p} $$

(2.3)

Although thermal inertia is used more often for characterising surfaces. Of the three
parameters, thermal conductivity has the largest range (0.01 to 7 W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$; e.g.,
Grott et al., 2007; Labus and Labus, 2018), and therefore influence, on thermal inertia
values (see Section 2.1.5.3 for details). Measured martian thermal inertias range from
30 to 2000 J m$^{-2}$ K$^{-1}$ s$^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ (see Figure 2.2; Pilorget et al., 2011; Putzig et al., 2005)
depending on the material at the surface, as discussed in Section 2.1.1.

Thermal inertia also has implications for the depth of stability of H$_2$O ice (Bandfield,
2007). In high thermal inertia regions, the depth to the H$_2$O ice table should lie deeper
and the latitudinal limit closer to the poles than for low thermal inertia regions (Paige,
1992), due to the increased depth of penetration of annual thermal oscillations (Mellon
and Jakosky, 1993). As a result, low thermal inertia regions (Figure 2.2) are more
favourable for near-surface H$_2$O ice deposits (Paige, 1992). However, the presence of
H$_2$O ice in these low thermal inertia regions is also dependent on other local surface
properties such as albedo and surface slope (Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005).

2.1.5.3 Thermal Conductivity

Thermal conductivity, $k$, determines the ability of a material to conduct heat (Hoffman,
2001; Presley and Christensen, 1997a). It varies with material and temperature (e.g.
Grott et al., 2007; Mellon and Jakosky, 1993), and has a large influence on the energy
balance of a planet. On Mars, large portions of the surface are expected to be covered
in a particulate regolith (see Section 2.1.1). The thermal conductivity of these partic-
ulate materials is a function of four components: the conductivity of the solid grains, the solid conductivity at the contact between the grains, the radiative heat transfer between grains through the pores and the interstitial gas conductivity (e.g. Piqueux and Christensen, 2009; Presley and Christensen, 1997a,b). Piqueux and Christensen (2009) showed that the radiative contribution is not significant for most martian surfaces and as a result, this is not included in most thermal models. Consequently, the thermal conductivity increases within increasing atmospheric pressure, particle size and bulk density, and is also dependent on temperature (Presley and Christensen, 1997a,c, 2010).

There is only one martian measurement of thermal conductivity so far, which was taken by the Heat Flow and Physical Properties Package (HP3) instrument on the InSight Lander (Grott et al., 2021). The measurement was taken between depths of 0.03 and 0.37 m, and thermal conductivity was determined to be $0.039 \pm 0.002 \, \text{W m}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1}$. Using a specific heat capacity of $630 \, \text{J K}^{-1}\text{kg}^{-1}$ and the measured soil density ($1211 \, \text{kg m}^{-3}$), Grott et al. (2021) estimated a thermal inertia of $172 \, \text{J m}^{-2}\text{K}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1/2}$ for this location. This value is consistent with previous thermal inertia measurements (orbital and in-situ) of the landing site (Elysium Planitia), which found thermal inertia to be between 160 and 230 $\, \text{J m}^{-2}\text{K}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1/2}$, consistent with an unconsolidated regolith (Grott et al., 2021). Soil density at the landing site was also measured ($1211 \, \text{kg m}^{-3}$), indicating a porosity of 0.61, where porosity is the ratio of the volume of pores to the volume of bulk rock. This porosity is also consistent with that of an unconsolidated regolith (Grott et al., 2007, 2021).

Another factor that impacts the thermal conductivity, alongside the geological material, is the presence of $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ice within the regolith, which increases the bulk thermal conductivity of the regolith and causes a feedback loop between temperature and the amount of $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ice (Paige, 1992; Schorghofer and Forget, 2012; Siegler et al., 2012). The increase in thermal conductivity causes more heat to be conducted deeper and stored during summer, before being released back to the surface during autumn and winter (Paige, 1992; Schorghofer and Forget, 2012). This increased conduction enables $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ice to be stable at shallower depths than it would be without the presence of $\text{H}_2\text{O}$.
ice (e.g. Haberle et al., 2008; Paige, 1992). The increased thermal conductivity also causes higher near-surface winter temperatures and has been shown to reduce CO$_2$ frost deposition by up to three times the amount that would be deposited if the H$_2$O ice table is below 1 m (Haberle et al., 2008). This effect is very sensitive to the depth of the H$_2$O ice layer, and the closer the H$_2$O ice is to the surface, the less CO$_2$ ice will be deposited (Schorghofer and Forget, 2012).

2.1.5.4 Albedo

Surface albedo variations have a large impact on surface temperatures (Grott et al., 2007) and, as a result, on the regions of H$_2$O ice stability (Mellon and Jakosky, 1993; Piqueux et al., 2003). In maps of surface albedo values, regions of high albedo show where H$_2$O ice is more likely to be stable on the surface (Palluconi and Kieffer, 1981). The surface albedo value therefore influences the geographic boundary of the polar caps and the depth of stability for subsurface ice at all latitudes (Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005). Lower albedo regions are likely to have a deeper ice table (Bandfield, 2007) and the limit of surface ice stability will be at higher latitudes (Mellon and Jakosky, 1993). While these studies focused on the effects of albedo on subsurface H$_2$O ice, albedo will have a similar effect on subsurface CO$_2$ ice.

The high surface albedos are often the result of ice at the surface and variations in ice albedo will also impact the stability of ice. The albedo of the polar caps varies between hemispheres due to the higher dust content of the northern cap during ice formation. This is because the northern cap forms during the time of year when martian dust storms occur (François et al., 1990). Alongside this, the albedo varies within each polar cap and is much brighter within the central region of both polar caps than along the edges (Wood and Griffiths, 2009). The albedo is also impacted by the type of CO$_2$ ice deposition (either as a translucent slab or snow; e.g., Haberle et al., 1994; Kieffer et al., 2006; Soto et al., 2011). Translucent slab ice has the same low albedo as the underlying regolith (around 0.2), which warms and sublimes the ice from the base and is observed in the southern polar cap (Kieffer et al., 2006). CO$_2$ snow, on the other hand, has a much higher albedo (ranges from 0.60 to 0.75; Haberle et al., 1994; Mellon and Jakosky,
1993; Soto et al., 2011), causing lower surface and atmospheric temperatures. The lower temperatures enhance the likelihood of condensation, resulting in more ice formation (Jakosky and Carr, 1985b).

### 2.1.5.5 Geothermal Flux

Geothermal flux, $F$, is an important parameter for subsurface thermal models because, along with the thermal conductivity, it determines the geothermal gradient, $\frac{\partial T}{\partial z}$, according to Fourier's law of heat conduction (e.g., Beardsmore and Cull, 2001; Turcotte and Schubert, 2002):

$$F = k \frac{\partial T}{\partial z}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.4)

The geothermal gradient influences the depth at which ice deposition ceases (Mellon and Jakosky, 1993; Wood, 2011). A lower geothermal gradient is produced by a higher thermal conductivity, such as that produced by the presence of H$_2$O ice in regolith (Mellon and Jakosky, 1993). This increases the depth of the lower ice deposition boundary, increasing the amount of ice that can form within the subsurface (Hoffman, 2001; Mellon and Jakosky, 1993).

Across the surface of Mars, geothermal heat flux is expected to be relatively homogeneous (Grott et al., 2012). However, its value is not well constrained and the values used in models vary greatly. Subsurface studies often use estimated values for the geothermal heat flux from various models of planetary heat evolution (e.g., Dehant et al., 2012). Dehant et al. (2012) presented a summary of heat flow models for Mars, showing that these models suggest a range of 5 - 50 mW m$^{-2}$ and the value depends on the method used to derive the heat flow estimate. Within this range, geographical variations from 17 to 37 mW m$^{-2}$ are expected due to factors such as the enrichment of radioactive elements and crustal thickness (e.g., Grott and Breuer, 2010; Neumann et al., 2004; Taylor et al., 2006; Zuber et al., 2000). However, in general estimates of average geothermal flux around 30 mW m$^{-2}$ have been used (e.g., Plesa et al., 2016; Soto et al., 2015) and this value is the best estimate until a measurement of geothermal heat flux is made.
2.2 Surface Ice

Surface H$_2$O and CO$_2$ ice play a major role in the diurnal, seasonal and annual cycling of both volatiles (e.g., Mischna et al., 2003; Titus et al., 2017). In the present-day, they are found in the polar ice caps (see Section 2.2.1), as seasonal surface frost across the mid-latitudes on pole-facing slopes (see Section 2.2.2) and in the highest altitude regions of Tharsis (Titus et al., 2017).

The accumulation of surface ice is dependent on solar insolation, topography and the thermal inertia of the underlying subsurface (Blackburn et al., 2010; Mischna et al., 2003). H$_2$O ice is preferentially found in regions with high altitude or high thermal inertia due to the lower surface temperatures (Mischna et al., 2003). However, while CO$_2$ ice is also preferentially found in regions of high thermal inertia, at high altitudes the decrease in pressure causes a corresponding decrease in the frost point temperature (Vincendon et al., 2010). Another difference is that H$_2$O ice forms on the surface earlier than CO$_2$ ice due to its higher frost point temperature ($\sim$195 K for H$_2$O and $\sim$145 K for CO$_2$ at average martian pressures; Hardy, 1998; Kasting, 1991) and when temperatures have cooled enough for CO$_2$ ice to form the atmosphere is generally depleted in H$_2$O vapour (Leighton and Murray, 1966). The reverse is also the case, as H$_2$O ice will remain at a surface until all of the overlying CO$_2$ ice has sublimated away.

Observations have revealed mid-latitude and tropical surface features, such as Lobate Debris Aprons (LDAs) and glacial-related landforms (see Section 2.3.3), that are indicative of long-term (10–100s Myr) stability of surface H$_2$O ice in the past (e.g., Fastook et al., 2008; Forget et al., 2006; Levrard et al., 2004; Madeleine et al., 2009; Steele et al., 2018). For H$_2$O ice to be stable at these latitudes, the past climate would have had to be significantly different from that of the present-day, where H$_2$O ice preferentially deposits at the poles (Chamberlain and Boynton, 2007). Changes in solar insolation distribution and climate caused by variations in orbital parameters have been found to allow H$_2$O ice to deposit at these lower latitudes (Sections 2.7 and 2.8; e.g., Jakosky, 1985a; Mischna et al., 2003; Richardson and Wilson, 2002).
2.2.1 Polar Caps

In both polar regions, a perennial ice cap underlies the seasonal ice cap that forms each winter and sublimes each summer (e.g., Haberle et al., 2008; Hansen, 1999). The seasonal cap at both poles is mainly composed of CO$_2$ ice, with small amounts of H$_2$O ice, and around 30% of the atmospheric CO$_2$ inventory is condensed to form these seasonal caps each year (Forget et al., 1998).

![Figure 2.4: Seasonal changes in the North Polar Ice Cap. Credit: JPL/NASA/STScI (1998)](image)

The perennial caps, however, have different compositions in each hemisphere. The northern perennial cap is composed of mostly H$_2$O ice, whereas the southern perennial cap contains a thin layer of CO$_2$ ice overlying a layer of H$_2$O ice (Bibring et al., 2004; Bierson et al., 2016; Thomas et al., 2000). The southern polar cap has a permanent CO$_2$ ice cap due to the asymmetrical global circulation throughout the martian year (Aharonson et al., 2004; Schorghofer and Edgett, 2006). This is dependent on the eccentricity and the longitude of perihelion, both of which have the largest affect at moderate obliquities ($\sim 25^\circ$) such as at present (Toon et al., 1980), implying that the
northern pole would have had a perennial CO$_2$ ice cap at some point in Mars’ history (Toon et al., 1980).

During summer, when the overlying seasonal cap has sublimated away, the perennial caps also start to sublimate and around 0.4 m of CO$_2$ ice is lost from the southern perennial cap each year (Blackburn et al., 2010). In the northern polar cap, however, the amount of H$_2$O ice that sublimates (and is transported away from the pole as vapour) during summer is returned to the pole through various transport mechanisms and is redeposited in winter, forming the observed nearly closed H$_2$O cycle (Forget et al., 2017; Titov, 2002). Both perennial caps also form the top layer of a series of layered deposits (the polar layered deposits, PLD), composed predominantly of H$_2$O ice, from previous cycles of accumulation and sublimation that occurred throughout Mars history (see Section 2.3.4).

2.2.2 Seasonal Frost

Both H$_2$O and CO$_2$ frost have been observed during winter in both hemispheres spanning the poles to the mid-latitudes. In the polar regions, frost forms the seasonal polar caps discussed in the previous section and the thickness of this frost cover decreases with decreasing latitude (Aharonson et al., 2004).

Outside of the polar regions, both types of frost are found either on or near pole-facing slopes during winter. This occurs because these slopes remain shadowed for longer than the surrounding surfaces and temperatures remain lower as a result (Carrozzo et al., 2009; Schorghofer and Edgett, 2006). H$_2$O frost is more widespread than CO$_2$ frost because of its higher frost point temperature (Hardy, 1998; Kasting, 1991) and has consequently been observed at lower latitudes. CO$_2$ frost has only been observed to 38°S (Schorghofer and Edgett, 2006), whereas H$_2$O frost has been observed down to 15°S (Carrozzo et al., 2009; Schorghofer and Edgett, 2006; Vincendon et al., 2010). In the mid-latitudes, simulations found that buried subsurface H$_2$O ice (below a dry regolith cover) was needed for CO$_2$ frost to form on pole-facing slopes as found in observations (Vincendon et al., 2009).

Night-time frost has also been observed by the Opportunity Rover at 2°S, further
Figure 2.5: Examples of surface frost on (a) sandy dunes in the northern plains and (b) on gullies on a south facing slope within a crater. Credit: (a) NASA/JPL-Caltech/University of Arizona (2021) (b) NASA/JPL-Caltech/University of Arizona (2014).
equatorward than remote observations suggest (Schorghofer and Edgett, 2006). This is because remote observations require reflected light to observe frost which is not available at night (Piqueux et al., 2016). Night-time CO$_2$ frost has also been inferred from surface temperature observations and it has been suggested that the CO$_2$ ice crystals form optically thin layers which are not visible in images (Piqueux et al., 2016).

Seasonal frosts are an important consideration for subsurface ice modelling because their presence slows the loss of any underlying subsurface ice by providing a near-surface source of vapour and has been shown to result in shallower ice table depths (Williams et al., 2015). Therefore, surface frost, of both ice types, is likely to impact the persistence of any subsurface ice of the same type.

2.3 Subsurface Water Ice

Subsurface H$_2$O ice has been predicted (e.g., Leighton and Murray, 1966) and observed (in images, see Figure 2.6 for some examples, and as hydrogen by spectrometers; e.g., Dundas and Byrne, 2010; Feldman et al., 2004; Smith et al., 2009) in the polar and mid-latitude regions. It is found near the surface at high latitudes and the H$_2$O ice table increases in depth with decreasing latitude (Bandfield, 2007; Squyres et al., 1992). The observed latitudinal distribution of H$_2$O ice is sensitive to variations in topography (Aharonson and Schorghofer, 2006), surface heterogeneities (such as surface rocks; Sizemore and Mellon, 2006), changes in the global distribution of atmospheric H$_2$O vapour concentration (Chamberlain and Boynton, 2007) and obliquity variations (discussed in more detail in Section 2.7.1; Fanale et al., 1986; Mellon and Jakosky, 1993). All of these factors increase or decrease the latitudinal limit of H$_2$O ice stability at different longitudes and comparisons have shown that the modelled effects correspond to the observed effects of these factors (e.g., Bandfield, 2007; Bandfield and Feldman, 2008; Feldman et al., 2004). The stability of H$_2$O ice is also sensitive to the presence of H$_2$O ice in the subsurface, as the high thermal conductivity of ice-rich soil results in heat being transported away from the surface and extends the region of ice stability towards the surface (Paige, 1992).
Figure 2.6: Observations of subsurface H$_2$O ice. (a) H$_2$O ice observed in the trenches dug by Phoenix, (b) Exposed subsurface ice sheet (blue) on a scarp. Credit: (a) NASA/JPL - Caltech/University of Arizona/Texas A&M University (2008) (b) Dundas et al. (2018).
Subsurface H$_2$O ice can be emplaced by one of two methods (Schorghofer and Forget, 2012) and the type of subsurface ice (pore-filling or excess) can be used to infer which method led to the deposition of the ice (Bramson et al., 2015). Pore ice forms by direct deposition from the vapour phase within the available pore space, whereas excess ice forms from snowfall or direct deposition on the surface forming a layer on the surface that is later buried. Burial of an ice layer can occur either by dust deposition from a change in climatic conditions or by the retreat of ice leaving a protective sublimation lag layer of dust (Schorghofer and Forget, 2012). Pore ice that sublimes can reform due to recharge from atmospheric H$_2$O vapour, although excess ice that has sublimated is unlikely to be recharged by the atmosphere (Bramson et al., 2015). This is because it is difficult to produce ice volumes that exceed the regolith pore space from vapour diffusion alone (Dundas and Byrne, 2010; Fisher, 2005; Kreslavsky and Head, 2000).

The time that subsurface H$_2$O ice can survive is dependent on both subsurface temperatures (Section 2.1.5) and on the thickness of the overlying regolith layer, which drastically reduces the rate of sublimation (see Section 3.3.1; e.g., Boynton et al., 2002; Chevrier et al., 2007; Feldman et al., 2004; Hudson et al., 2007). Laboratory experiments and numerical simulations have shown that a 1m layer of H$_2$O ice can survive around 800 martian years under a 1 m layer of regolith and up to 400 kyr under a 2 m layer of regolith at 235 K (e.g., Bryson et al., 2008; Chevrier et al., 2007, 2008; Jakosky et al., 2005).

### 2.3.1 Observations of Water Ice Distribution

Observations from the Mars Odyssey Neutron Spectrometer (MONS) instrument are sensitive to the abundance of hydrogen in the upper metre of the subsurface and vary non-linearly with ice fraction (Aharonson and Schorghofer, 2006; Bandfield and Feldman, 2008; Feldman et al., 2004). Feldman et al. (2004) used this technique to determine a lower limit for the global inventory of water equivalent hydrogen (WEH) within the upper metre of the subsurface, which is shown in Figure 2.7. Their results showed the expected hydrogen-rich deposits (20–100%) at high latitudes where the polar caps are observed and also significant deposits (2–10%) in the mid-latitudes (discussed further in Section 2.3.3). From these observations, they estimate that the lower limit of
the global inventory (for the upper metre of the subsurface) is equivalent to a global H$_2$O layer 14 cm thick. This is a lower limit because the presence of an overlying dessicated layer can mask an underlying H$_2$O-rich layer (Feldman et al., 2004).

Figure 2.7: Water equivalent hydrogen (WEH) content of H$_2$O bearing soils derived from Mars Odyssey Neutron Spectrometer (MONS) data. Figure from Feldman et al. (2004).

The permafrost depths derived from the MONS data are consistent with depths derived from TES surface temperature data at high latitudes (Bandfield and Feldman, 2008) and with the high hydrogen concentrations found in Mars Odyssey Gamma Ray Spectrometer (GRS) detections (e.g., Bandfield, 2007; Boynton et al., 2002; Levrard et al., 2004). The GRS detections showed that H$_2$O ice is insulated by several centimetres of ground cover that decreases in thickness towards the pole (Bandfield, 2007; Boynton et al., 2002). Subsurface H$_2$O ice concentrations are also estimated to increase towards the pole (from 70% at 60° latitude to 100% near the poles; Levrard et al., 2004). At these concentrations, ice volume is greater than the available pore space, implying that at least some of the ice is excess ice (Levrard et al., 2004). This has been confirmed in observations by the Phoenix lander, which found both pore ice and excess ice confirming the suggestion that the ground ice detected by Mars Odyssey
is in diffusive equilibrium with the atmosphere (Cull et al., 2010; Mellon and Feldman, 2006; Mellon et al., 2009). The presence of an insulating ground cover layer over a \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice-filled layer has been confirmed by multiple observations, including observations from the High Energy Neutron Detector (HEND) instrument on Mars Odyssey (Mitrofanov et al., 2003) and ice-related features in images from the High Resolution Imaging Science Experiment (HiRISE) on MRO (e.g., Byrne et al., 2009; Dundas et al., 2018; Schon et al., 2009; Viola et al., 2015).

2.3.2 Simulations of Water Ice Distribution

Alongside observations, many numerical simulation studies have predicted present-day or long term subsurface \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice distribution and many different subsurface models have been developed to do this, each incorporating different features of the subsurface according to the purpose of the model. From these simulations, a lower latitudinal limit of 49° (for flat ground) and \( \sim 25° \) (for slopes of 30°) for permanent subsurface \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice has been suggested (Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005; Schorghofer and Edgett, 2006). These limits are consistent with the observed zonally averaged boundaries from Feldman et al. (2004) and correspond with the locations that require subsurface \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice below 1 m to match surface \( \text{CO}_2 \) frost observations (Vincendon et al., 2010).

Thermal and vapour diffusion models are the main method used to investigate subsurface \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice (e.g., Fanale et al., 1986; Mellon and Jakosky, 1993; Paige, 1992; Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005) and some have been coupled to GCMs to simulate global changes (e.g., Böttger et al., 2005; Guo et al., 2009; Richardson et al., 2003; Steele et al., 2017a; Wilson and Smith, 2006). The thermal schemes in these models are capable of resolving diurnal and seasonal temperature changes, due to variations in solar insolation, heat conduction and orbital parameters (see Section 2.1.5; e.g., Aharonson and Schorghofer, 2006; Grott et al., 2007; Hapke, 1996; Leighton and Murray, 1966). Many subsurface models also include a vapour diffusion scheme to investigate the stability and evolution of subsurface \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice, alongside the increase in thermal conductivity caused by the presence of \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice (e.g., Fisher, 2005; Mellon and Jakosky, 1993; Paige, 1992; Vincendon et al., 2010). These thermal and vapour diffusion models only simulate pore ice deposition since ice deposition by vapour diffusion
(with no other processes occurring) cannot exceed pore volume, and excess ice can,
therefore, only be incorporated into these models as an initial condition (Fisher, 2005;
Schorghofer, 2007).

Models that simulate both pore ice and excess ice suggest that the near-surface H$_2$O
ice in the mid-latitudes is mostly pore ice, whereas at high latitudes, there is a three
layered depth distribution (a dry layer over a pore ice layer over a zone of excess ice;
Schorghofer, 2007). The suggestion of only pore ice in the mid-latitudes implies that
the estimates of the latitudinal limits of the near-surface H$_2$O ice already discussed
are unlikely to be impacted by the addition of excess ice into the models. At high
latitudes, however, excess ice should be considered when investigating the stability of
subsurface ices. In these high latitudes, the excess ice is likely the remanent of an ice
sheet that has since been buried either by deposition of an overlying ice layer or by the
formation of an overlying dust lag deposit that forms as the ice sheet sublimates away

2.3.3 Mid-latitude Water Ice

In the mid-latitudes (30° to 60° N/S) observations show the subsurface contains 2% to
10% WEH (Feldman et al., 2004). Further observations have shown the existence of a
thick, ice-rich layer (or layers) that drapes the existing topography and has a protective
cover of ice-free regolith. This layer becomes thinner at lower latitudes and is known as
the Latitude Dependent Mantle (‘LDM’; e.g., Byrne et al., 2009; Dundas et al., 2018;
Mustard et al., 2001). It covers more than 23% of Mars’ surface (Holt et al., 2008) and
is estimated to be at least metres thick with a high ice content (Conway and Balme,
2014; Dundas et al., 2018; Kreslavsky and Head, 2002). The LDM is proposed to be
the remnant of an extensive ice sheet that formed during a previous high obliquity
epoch, when ice was stable in the mid-latitudes, and that has since been buried and
protected from sublimation by either a sublimation lag or dust cover (e.g Forget et al.,
2006; Head et al., 2003; Holt et al., 2008; Mischna et al., 2003; Mustard et al., 2001).

Alongside the buried H$_2$O ice sheet, features similar to debris-covered glaciers on
Earth (known as Lobate Debris Apron, ‘LDAs’, on Mars; Figure 2.8) and other viscous
flow features (that have a core of H$_2$O ice) have been observed (Holt et al., 2008;
The observed LDAs consist of multiple lobate flows and are remnants of glaciers that existed at higher obliquities that have been protected from sublimation by overlying debris cover (Brough et al., 2019; Dickson et al., 2008). Other surface features such as eskers (Gallagher and Balme, 2015) and fan-shaped deposits (Kadish et al., 2014) in equatorial regions are indicative of glacial flow. These features occur in locations with existing glaciers and in locations with evidence of past glaciers that have since sublimated away, providing further evidence of H$_2$O ice accumulation closer to the equator in the past (Head and Marchant, 2003; Kadish et al., 2014; Shean et al., 2007).

### 2.3.4 Polar Layered Deposits

The seasonal and perennial polar caps (see Section 2.2.1) form the upper layer of deposits at each pole known as the polar layered deposits (PLD), which are the largest known ice reservoirs on Mars (e.g., Kreslavsky and Head, 2002; Levrard et al., 2007). The exact composition of the layers is not known, but observations show the layers are spatially distinct (at the resolution of HiRISE: 30 cm) and composed of different mixtures of H$_2$O ice and dust (Lasue et al., 2012). Results from the Shallow Radar (SHARAD) instrument have shown that the North Polar Layered Deposits (NPLD) have a volume fraction of dust around 2%, while the SPLD contain around 10%
Figure 2.9: Images of the (a) North and (b) South Polar Layered Deposits. Credit: (a) NASA/JPL-Caltech/University of Arizona (2014) and (b) NASA/JPL-Caltech (2003)
The layering in the PLD is due to variations in orbital parameters altering the latitudes where H₂O ice preferentially deposits on timescales of tens to hundreds of thousands of years (Laskar et al., 2002; Melkonich, 2005; Mischna et al., 2003). The dust content of each layer is also influenced by variations in obliquity since H₂O ice sublimes more during summer at high obliquities, leaving a dust lag and at low obliquities, polar deposition of dust increases, resulting in dust-rich ice layers. Hvidberg et al. (2012) showed this by modelling accumulation of the NPLD using a combination of the insolation record (based on obliquity variations) and these two mechanisms for producing dust-rich layers. Their model produced simulated NPLD with a similar thickness to the observed thickness reported in Phillips et al. (2008) and suggested that formation began 4.2 Ma, corresponding to the age found from LMD-UK Mars global circulation model (MGCM) simulations by Levrard et al. (2007).

The SPLD were formed by the same mechanisms as the NPLD, but the surface of the SPLD is around 2 orders of magnitude older (around 10 Ma) than the NPLD (around 100 ka). Herkenhoff (2000) found that modelled resurfacing rates are 20 times larger in the NPLD compared with the SPLD. From these values, they suggest that the NPLD have been a recent active site for deposition and erosion, whereas the SPLD are expected to have been relatively stable over the last 10 Myr, explaining the difference in their surface ages. Another difference between the NPLD and the SPLD is the recent discovery of CO₂ ice deposits within the SPLD by the SHARAD instrument (Bierson et al., 2016; Manning et al., 2019; Phillips et al., 2011), which is discussed in more detail in Section 2.4.1.

### 2.4 Subsurface Carbon Dioxide Ice

The existence of subsurface CO₂ ice on present-day Mars has been suggested and debated for many years. CO₂ ice has been considered to be largely non-existent in the near subsurface (e.g., Leighton and Murray, 1966; Mellon, 1996; Tanaka et al., 2001; Ward et al., 1974b) and only expected to be feasible for a CO₂ ice layer completely sealed from the atmosphere by a H₂O ice layer for many years (Ingersoll, 1974; Kargel et al., 2000). In this scenario, CO₂ ice has no influence on surface processes but would have provided a sink for large amounts of CO₂ (Ingersoll, 1974). Observations of the
SPLD have revealed three buried CO₂ ice layers in larger quantities than were thought to be able to remain following obliquity changes (Bierson et al., 2016; Phillips et al., 2011). These deposits and their implications are discussed in detail in the following section.

The presence of subsurface CO₂ ice has also been proposed to have acted as a fluidising agent for the observed debris flows at the edge of the northern plains and for gully formation (e.g., Pilorget and Forget, 2015; Tanaka et al., 2001). This is because CO₂ ice is more volatile than H₂O ice so debris-rich gas buoyancy flows would form more easily and be more energetic if caused by the melting or sublimation of CO₂ ice compared with H₂O ice. Flow of material due to CO₂ ice has also been considered in the context of glaciers and some studies have investigated both glacier-like flow of CO₂ ice and the existence of CO₂ glaciers (e.g., Clark and Mullin, 1976; Smith et al., 2016). These studies ran experiments under martian temperatures and pressures, predicting that CO₂ ice will flow more easily than H₂O ice, especially on the steep flanking slopes of the SPLD topographic basin (Clark and Mullin, 1976; Cross et al., 2020; Nye et al., 2000). Smith et al. (2016) compared observations of the SPLD with simulations of CO₂ glaciers, finding that their simulations provided a plausible scenario for the observed topography. Further evidence for the flow of CO₂ ice includes a series of narrow ridges with lobate planforms on steep west- and northwest-facing slopes of the NPLD that have been suggested to be drop moraines from a CO₂ glacier (Kreslavsky and Head, 2010, 2011).

2.4.1 Carbon Dioxide Ice in the South Polar Layered Deposits

Deposits of buried CO₂ ice were revealed by observations from the MRO SHARAD instrument (Bierson et al., 2016; Phillips et al., 2011). From analyses of these observations, the volume of the CO₂ ice deposits were estimated to be 7700 kg m⁻³ and an extrapolation towards the pole implies that there is 14,800 kg m⁻³ of CO₂ ice across the entire region (Bierson et al., 2016). This extrapolation implies that there is enough buried CO₂ ice within the SPLD to more than double the current atmospheric CO₂ inventory (Bierson et al., 2016).

The regions containing buried CO₂ ice are all sheltered regions of the SPLD and
amount to around 10% of the SPLD surface area. This suggests that in more exposed regions, CO$_2$ ice will sublimate when obliquity rises (Manning et al., 2019). In their analysis of the SHARAD data, Bierson et al. (2016) observed three distinct CO$_2$ ice units (Figure 2.10), each capped by a thin, 10–60m bounding layer of mostly H$_2$O ice. Simulations of the formation of the SPLD suggest that the three units would have formed during three separate periods and that an overlying H$_2$O ice layer of 15 to 60m is sufficient to reduce the sublimation rate of the underlying CO$_2$ ice layer to near-zero values (Bierson et al., 2016).

For the CO$_2$ ice deposits to persist, their formation must be followed by the deposition of an insulating layer of porous H$_2$O ice which can seal in the CO$_2$ ice (Buhler et al., 2019; Manning et al., 2019). There are currently two main hypotheses for the formation of a H$_2$O ice layer overlying a CO$_2$ ice layer proposed by Buhler et al. (2019) and Manning et al. (2019).

The Buhler et al. (2019) hypothesis suggests that H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice are simultaneously deposited at low obliquities. Then as obliquity increases and polar temperatures rise, CO$_2$ ice will sublimate away, leaving a H$_2$O ice lag deposit behind. This H$_2$O ice lag deposit can then protect the remaining CO$_2$ ice from rapid sublimation. If the overlying H$_2$O ice layer is too thin, the CO$_2$ ice deposit will sublimate away fully,
leaving only a H$_2$O ice lag deposit that combines with the H$_2$O ice lag deposit from the
previous obliquity cycle. This lag deposit would then be re-covered by surface CO$_2$ ice
during the next low obliquity period and the cycle will continue (Buhler et al., 2019).

The Manning et al. (2019) hypothesis uses the idea that the different cadences of
the obliquity, eccentricity and longitude of perihelion cycles can result in alternating
deposition cycles of CO$_2$ ice and H$_2$O ice within a low obliquity excursion, producing
the observed layered deposit. This is because eccentricity and timing of perihelion
influence which pole accumulates the most ice. When perihelion occurs in northern
summer, around 50 m of H$_2$O ice would be expected to accumulate over 10 kyr. Since
the rate and timing of accumulation is dependent on orbital parameters, the ages of
the layers within the NPLD and SPLD are expected to be offset by $\sim$25 kyr (Manning
et al., 2019). The accumulation of the overlying H$_2$O ice layer would also have been
significantly thicker initially, given the 70% porosity of snow, and would have densified
over time to densities greater than 800 kg m$^{-3}$, which is the pore cut off limit. The
timescale for this densification process is expected to have accelerated due to an increase
in sintering and compression of the lowest parts of the layer as temperatures increase
with depth. Manning et al. (2019) suggest the densification process could take $\sim$14 kyr,
whereas Arthern (2000) suggest it could take between 300–550 kyr.

2.5 Liquid Water

The existence of liquid H$_2$O on Mars has been the focus of many studies over the
years because of its implications for astrobiology. Pure liquid H$_2$O is not permanently
stable at the surface at present because surface conditions are below the triple point
of H$_2$O (Hardy, 1998; Jakosky and Carr, 1985b), however, it has been suggested to be
present in the deep subsurface. Liquid brines are more stable near the surface because
their melting temperature is significantly lower than pure liquid H$_2$O (Hoffman, 2001;
Martín-Torres et al., 2015). Identification of minerals such as clays/phylllosilicates (e.g.,
Bibring et al., 2005; Ehlmann et al., 2011), sulphates (e.g., Bibring et al., 2005) and
carbonates (e.g., Ehlmann et al., 2008), each of which require liquid H$_2$O to form,
indicates that liquid H$_2$O was present at some point in Mars’ history (Bibring et al.,
2005; Ehlmann et al., 2011).
In the present-day, liquid H$_2$O has been suggested to form at night by deliquescence, which is a mechanism to form thin films of liquid brines when large amounts of liquid H$_2$O are unavailable (Martín-Torres et al., 2015; Pál and Kereszturi, 2020). However, the amounts that can form are very small and do not persist throughout the day. Another form of liquid H$_2$O on present-day Mars has been proposed from analyses of radar observations which suggest there is a stable subsurface body of liquid perchlorate brine under parts of the SPLD either mixed with basal soils or on top of impermeable material as localized brine pools (Lauro et al., 2020; Orosei et al., 2018). This scenario is suggested to be plausible because perchlorates have been observed on the surface elsewhere on the planet and they suppress the freezing point of H$_2$O to below the temperature estimated for the base of the SPLD (205 K; Lauro et al., 2020; Orosei et al., 2018), although this is still debated.

2.6 Climate

The atmosphere of Mars is mainly composed of CO$_2$ (~95%), with smaller amounts of argon, nitrogen, and other trace gases (such as H$_2$O, oxygen, and carbon monoxide; Read and Lewis, 2004). Seasonal variations in pressure, temperature, CO$_2$, dust and H$_2$O are the key drivers of the climate and subsurface-atmosphere exchanges, while the other components of the atmosphere predominantly respond to changes in these cycles (Toon et al., 1980). Within the atmosphere, three broad layers can be defined: the lower, middle and upper atmosphere (Smith et al., 2017). The lower atmosphere is the region below an altitude of 50 km (containing ~99% of total atmospheric mass; Zurek et al., 2017) and, since the focus of this thesis is the subsurface, only processes within this region will be discussed. Within the lower atmosphere, there is a smaller subregion known as the planetary boundary layer (PBL) where the atmosphere interacts directly with the surface and processes within this region are discussed separately (Section 2.6.1) to processes that occur across the entire lower atmosphere.

Circulation in the lower atmosphere is dominated by two asymmetrical meridional overturning cells (known as Hadley cells), which can extend to over 50 km in the vertical and over 5000 km in latitude, encircling the planet in longitude. These form due to asymmetric seasonal heating between the spring-summer and the autumn-winter
hemispheres (Haberle et al., 1993; Lewis, 2003). The Hadley cells are important for cross-equatorial transport as the near-equinox cells are not completely symmetric about the equator, allowing material to be transported between hemispheres (summarised by Barnes et al., 2017). Around the northern spring equinox ($L_s = 0^\circ$–$30^\circ$), the rising branches of both cells are in the northern hemisphere, whereas around the northern autumn equinox ($L_s = 180^\circ$–$210^\circ$), the rising branches are centred in the southern hemisphere. When centred in the southern hemisphere, the cells extend further poleward due to a combination of the asymmetry in zonal-mean topography, the stronger thermal forcing (which is related to the thermal structure) and the larger atmospheric dust loading. The final two factors are a consequence of northern autumn occurring closer to perihelion (summarised by Barnes et al., 2017), which is discussed further in Section 2.7.2.

Alongside the longitude of perihelion, the thermal structure of the lower atmosphere is influenced by a combination of surface temperature, seasonal changes, diurnal changes, atmospheric dust distribution and the dynamics of the entire atmosphere (Bandfield, 2007; Smith et al., 2017; Toon et al., 1980). At low latitudes, the longitude of perihelion and degree of orbital eccentricity (Section 2.7.2) are the dominant influence, with warmer temperatures occurring during the perihelion season ($L_s = 180^\circ$–$360^\circ$ at present) and cooler temperatures during the aphelion season in both hemispheres. At high latitudes, however, the dominant influence is the obliquity, which controls seasonal changes by varying the latitudinal distribution of solar insolation (discussed further in Section 2.7.1; Bandfield, 2007). Surface temperatures are also influenced by surface albedo (Section 2.1.5.4), thermal inertia (Section 2.1.5.2), slope (and subsequent shadowing) and atmospheric opacity (Aharonson and Schorghofer, 2006; Bandfield, 2007; Bandfield and Feldman, 2008; Smith et al., 2017). These properties also affect the lowest region of the atmosphere (the PBL; <10 km) which has temperatures that correspond to surface temperatures.

Atmospheric pressures are influenced by the same processes as the thermal structure. However, for pressure, another main influence is the ‘freezing out’ of around 30% of the atmospheric CO$_2$ to form the seasonal polar caps (Sections 2.2.1 and 2.6.2),
which is partially responsible for the observed semi-annual cycle in atmospheric pressures (Hourdin et al., 1995; Leighton and Murray, 1966; Mischna et al., 2003). Some other main influences on the seasonal pressure cycle include the latitudinal redistribution of atmospheric mass between the hemispheres and variations in mean zonal winds caused by geostrophic balance changes (Hourdin et al., 1995). Surface pressures (6.36 mbar on average) also vary spatially according to surface elevation, with higher pressures at low elevations and vice versa (Smith et al., 2017). This effect also influences atmospheric dynamics: the large difference in mean elevation (1 to 3 km) between the northern and southern hemispheres causes topographically-steered flows (Hourdin et al., 1993).

The presence of dust in the atmosphere plays a major role in the annual climate, specifically through its influence on the atmospheric thermal structure as airborne dust absorbs and scatters radiant energy, resulting in atmospheric heating (Kahre et al., 2017; Smith et al., 2017). Its presence also provides a nucleation site for the formation of both H$_2$O and CO$_2$ ice clouds, which are important components of the CO$_2$ and H$_2$O cycles (Sections 2.6.2 and 2.6.3; Gooding, 1986; Kahre et al., 2017; Montmessin et al., 2017). The atmospheric dust cycle can be characterised using two overarching seasons, the ‘non-dusty’ season (with low-level atmospheric dust loading; $L_s = 0^\circ$ to $135^\circ$) and the ‘dusty’ season (with a higher atmospheric dust loading; $L_s = 135^\circ$ to $360^\circ$; Smith et al., 2017). During the ‘dusty’ season, dust is generally transported from regions that act as dust sources to regions that act as dust sinks. The polar caps are expected to be dust sinks as dust storms tend to deposit rather than remove dust there (Toon et al., 1980) and as a result, the variations in dust storm activity have been suggested to affect the dustiness of the PLD. The dust loading of the atmosphere has also been shown to impact the stability of subsurface H$_2$O ice, as a dusty atmosphere results in a higher atmospheric H$_2$O vapour content and consequently reduces the sublimation of any subsurface H$_2$O ice deposits (Steele et al., 2017a).

2.6.1 Planetary Boundary Layer

The planetary boundary layer (PBL) refers to the lowest region of the atmosphere that interacts directly with the surface (summarised in Read et al., 2017). Observations by
the Phoenix lander and from orbital measurements have shown that the PBL is well mixed. It is in this region that short and long term exchanges of heat, $\text{H}_2\text{O}$, $\text{CO}_2$, dust, and other chemical tracers are exchanged between the surface/subsurface and atmospheric reservoirs (Read et al., 2017; Whiteway et al., 2009).

The height of the PBL varies between 1 and 10 km depending on the time of day and interactions with local surface topography (Read et al., 2017). During the day, intense surface heating-driven convection occurs, increasing the height of the PBL to 10 km in some locations. This leads to efficient mixing and vertical transport of quantities such as heat, dust, and moisture from the atmosphere directly above the surface to greater heights, where the global circulation is likely to pick them up and distribute them around the rest of the planet (Jakosky et al., 1997; Read et al., 2017; Tillman et al., 1994). The vertical transport of quantities such as $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ vapour into the upper atmosphere suggests that any $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ vapour lost from the subsurface during the day may be quickly transported upwards and into the global circulation and any local vapour concentration increase will not persist for long.

At night, however, convection with the upper portions of the atmosphere is inhibited and radiative cooling results in a stably stratified layer. During this period, the PBL is forced by mechanical turbulence at the bottom of the stable layer and the maximum height is reduced to around 1 km (Read et al., 2017). Any vapour lost from the atmosphere during the night will remain in the near surface, increasing the near surface vapour concentration and impacting the flux of vapour between the subsurface and atmosphere.

### 2.6.2 Carbon Dioxide Cycle

The atmospheric $\text{CO}_2$ seasonal cycle is controlled by the polar energy budget which is highly dependent on both the albedo of the polar cap and orbital parameters (Section 2.7; Toon et al., 1980). $\text{CO}_2$ vapour is transported from the subliming to the condensing pole by the global circulations described in the earlier sections. The presence of dust and $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ice clouds in the atmosphere influence the rate of $\text{CO}_2$ condensation and sublimation in the polar regions as discussed earlier.
CO₂ clouds also influence the rate of surface CO₂ ice formation. CO₂ clouds form when the atmosphere is supersaturated and dust or H₂O ice is available for nucleation to occur (Hu et al., 2012). In remote observations, CO₂ clouds are difficult to distinguish from surface CO₂ frosts, since they have the same spectral signature and altitude is needed to distinguish them. They have been observed over the poles in vertical atmospheric profiles determined using a combination of MGS, Mars Climate Sounder (MCS) on MRO and MOLA data (Hayne et al., 2012; Hu et al., 2012; Titus et al., 2017). Most observed clouds appear to extend down to the surface and cloud opacity increases towards the pole. The most persistent and densest clouds are observed over the South Polar Residual Cap (SPRC) where a 500 km diameter cloud was observed to persist throughout winter (Hayne et al., 2012).

The presence of CO₂ ice clouds reduces net accumulation of surface CO₂ ice, and consequently subsurface CO₂ ice, via the low emissivities of the clouds themselves and the low emissivity of the resulting CO₂ snowfall. The low emissivity snow on the surface causes backscattering of incoming radiation (Hayne et al., 2012; Wood and Paige, 1992), whereas CO₂ ice deposits that have directly condensed on the ground, or have undergone sintering, are more likely to act as black-body emitters (Forget et al., 1998). This means that the presence of clouds and snow on the ground will increase temperatures resulting in a smaller net accumulation of surface CO₂ ice. The reduction of surface ice accumulation due to the presence of clouds also applies to surface H₂O ice accumulation when H₂O ice clouds form at high altitudes.

2.6.3 Water Cycle

The atmospheric H₂O cycle is governed by interactions between the atmosphere and H₂O ice exposed at the northern polar cap during northern summer (Chamberlain and Boynton, 2007; Forget et al., 2017; Titov, 2002). Figure 2.11 shows a schematic overview of the main events within the annual H₂O cycle (from Montmessin et al., 2004). The highest H₂O column abundances occur in the north polar region during northern summer, when the overlying seasonal CO₂ polar cap has sublimated and the underlying H₂O ice cap is exposed (85% of all H₂O vapour is in the northern hemisphere during northern summer; Chamberlain and Boynton, 2007; Montmessin et al., 2017;
A small peak in H$_2$O vapour column abundance also occurs over the south pole during southern summer (Chamberlain and Boynton, 2007), with only 60% of all H$_2$O vapour in the southern hemisphere at this time of year (Montmessin et al., 2017). The southern peak is smaller because the southern perennial polar cap is mostly CO$_2$ ice, with few locations of exposed H$_2$O ice (as shown by OMEGA observations; Bibring et al., 2004; Section 2.2.1), as well as due to asymmetries in global transport due to southern summer occurring in perihelion (Montmessin et al., 2004).

At lower latitudes, seasonal variations in H$_2$O vapour column abundance are smaller in magnitude than at either pole (Chamberlain and Boynton, 2007). This is because the non-polar H$_2$O ice sources, such as the LDM (see Sections 2.2 and 2.3), respond to polar atmospheric H$_2$O vapour variations (Chamberlain and Boynton, 2007; Jakosky, 1983) which are transported by meridional circulations to the rest of the planet (Forget et al., 2017; Steele et al., 2017a). This means that the strength and direction of the Hadley cells play a more important role in the H$_2$O vapour abundances of the mid- and equatorial latitudes than the presence of H$_2$O ice at these latitudes (Montmessin...
and Lefèvre, 2013; Montmessin et al., 2017). The non-polar H$_2$O ice sources become more important for atmospheric H$_2$O when the orbital parameters are different from the present-day (see Section 2.7).

The vertical distribution of H$_2$O vapour throughout the year is an important consideration for subsurface models since the abundance can be strongly inhomogeneous across a vertical profile through the atmosphere (Titov, 2002). This vertical distribution is the result of a combination of advection and convection in the atmosphere as well as regolith-atmosphere exchanges (Böttger et al., 2005b; Titov, 2002).

### 2.7 Orbital Parameters

The orbital parameters of Mars (obliquity, degree of orbital eccentricity and areocentric longitude of perihelion) have a large influence on solar insolation and therefore on the climate of Mars (Toon et al., 1980). The obliquity is the tilt of the axis of rotation with respect to a line normal to the plane of Mars’ orbit around the Sun, the degree of orbital eccentricity is a measure of the ellipticity of Mars’ orbit around the Sun, and the longitude of perihelion is the solar longitude ($L_S$) at which Mars is closest to the Sun in its orbit (Laskar et al., 2004; Toon et al., 1980). Variations in the longitude of perihelion and changes in the orientation of Mars’ spin axis about the vertical plane are known as apsidal precession and axial precession respectively. Over the course of these precession cycles, the relative times of perihelion and seasons change, influencing the strength of seasons in each hemisphere (discussed further in Section 2.7.2). All three orbital parameters undergo large dynamical variations due to perturbations from other bodies in the solar system (Toon et al., 1980; Touma and Wisdom, 1993; Ward, 1974a; Ward et al., 1974b, 1979). These perturbations are stronger than those experienced by the Earth due to a resonance overlap in the orbit of Mars and nearby bodies in the Solar System (Bills, 1990; Bills and Keane, 2019; Forget et al., 2017). These resonances cause the obliquity cycle to be strongly chaotic, whereas the eccentricity and longitude of perihelion cycles are relatively predictable (Laskar et al., 2004, as shown in Figure 2.12).

Obliquity has the largest influence on the climate because it controls the latitudinal
Figure 2.12: Obliquity, eccentricity and longitude of perihelion variations over the last 20 million years. Plotted using data from Laskar et al. (2004)

distribution of solar insolation directly (e.g., Mischna et al., 2003; Schorghofer, 2008). Eccentricity and longitude of perihelion are not significant individually, but combined they determine which season (summer or winter) is longer (Mischna et al., 2003). This in turn influences the size of the atmospheric and surface volatile inventories (Mischna et al., 2003).

### 2.7.1 Obliquity

The current martian obliquity is 25.19° and this value oscillates between 10° and 35° with a period of ∼120,000 years (Fanale et al., 1982a; Laskar et al., 2002; Ward et al., 1979). The period of the cycle is controlled by the differential between the spin axis and orbital plane precession rates, which have stronger resonances than on Earth resulting in larger amplitude oscillations (Forget et al., 2017). This cycle is modulated by a longer (∼1.3 Myr) cycle from the slow oscillations in the inclination of the martian orbital plane (Forget et al., 2017). Laskar et al. (2004) showed that the most probable obliquity over the last 4 Gyr is 41.8° and Figure 2.12 shows their best solution for obliquity over
the last 20 Myr, which is commonly used in studies of the effect of obliquity on the martian atmosphere (e.g., Forget et al., 2006; Levrard et al., 2004; Read et al., 2015; Steele et al., 2017a). The solution for the obliquity cycle is only reliable for the past 10 Myr because the obliquity cycle is strongly chaotic and the present understanding of the rotational state of Mars is only reliable for this period. The Laskar et al. (2004) obliquity solution in Figure 2.12 shows a distinct transition around 5 Myr ago between a high mean obliquity regime (∼35°) and a low mean obliquity regime (∼25°), which was a robust solution for the range of parameters in their study. This transition was also found in the obliquity model of Touma and Wisdom (1993). After this transition, the lower mean obliquity results in a decrease in the summer insolation around the north pole, therefore changing the distribution of surface ices (Laskar et al., 2002).

Obliquity variations impact the latitudinal distribution of solar insolation and significantly impact the peak radiative heating of the polar regions, since the polar energy supply over summer increases with obliquity (Mischna et al., 2003; Toon et al., 1980). Estimates of surface temperature for obliquities between 10° and 40° have suggested that annual mean regolith temperatures change by 4 K at equatorial latitudes, 15 K in the mid-latitudes and by as much as 45 K at polar latitudes (Mellon and Jakosky, 1993). For obliquities greater than 50°, which are expected to have occurred during the Hesperian (3.7–3.0 Gyr; Laskar et al., 2004), the polar regions receive more insolation on average than the tropics (Forget et al., 2017). These surface temperature variations impact both atmospheric circulation and the redistribution of volatiles across the surface.

Volatile redistribution takes 10 kyr to 1 Myr to respond to the variations in surface temperature caused by obliquity variations (Levrard et al., 2004). This is similar to on Earth, where the obliquity cycles control the oscillations between glacial (at low obliquities) and interglacial (at high obliquities) periods, that are characterised by the transfer of H2O between ice sheets (glacial) and oceans (interglacial; Levrard et al., 2004). On Mars, the obliquity cycle is also the dominant factor that controls subsurface ice distributions and the partitioning of CO2 between phases (Schorghofer and Forget, 2012). However, the larger amplitude of obliquity oscillations results in a very different
redistribution of surface ice from that seen on Earth. On Mars, during periods of high obliquity (>30°), the equatorward transport of atmospheric H$_2$O vapour is enhanced, producing the observed mid-latitude ice deposits (and only seasonal polar caps form; discussed further in Section 2.7.1.1), whereas at low obliquities, ice accumulates at the poles (see Section 2.7.1.2; e.g., Forget et al., 2017; Head et al., 2003; Jakosky and Carr, 1984; Mischena et al., 2003). There is a transition period between these two scenarios, which typically occurs at moderate obliquities (such as at present) where the climate system changes from hosting permanent polar caps (low obliquity) to hosting only seasonal polar caps and permanent mid-latitude ice deposits (high obliquity; Nakamura and Tajika, 2003).

### 2.7.1.1 High Obliquity

During periods of high obliquity (>35°), variations in solar insolation are larger across the year, particularly in the polar regions which experience the largest temperature variations (>150 K at 60° obliquity; Mischena et al., 2003). Consequently, the seasonal cycles discussed earlier become more extreme. Over the winter season, polar temperatures are cooler than at present and are low enough for large seasonal CO$_2$ ice caps to form. These seasonal CO$_2$ ice caps extend further equatorward than at present and therefore cause a larger annual pressure cycle (Mischena et al., 2003; Toon et al., 1980).

The summer season shows the largest difference from the present-day as insolation at the poles increases by up to 75%, increasing temperatures to as high as 273 K. At these high temperatures, both CO$_2$ and H$_2$O ice are unstable and the permanent polar CO$_2$ ice caps will sublimate away (Toon et al., 1980). This exposes the underlying H$_2$O ice cap at both poles (rather than just the northern pole) and, since temperatures are higher than the H$_2$O frost point, the H$_2$O ice caps begin to sublimate away (Head et al., 2003; Jakosky and Carr, 1984). As much as a few centimetres of H$_2$O ice sublimates from the poles each year (Forget et al., 2017; Mischena et al., 2003) which is then transported equatorward by the stronger and broader meridional circulation that is the result of the higher solar insolation in the polar regions (Mischena et al., 2003; Newman et al., 2005). Since summer polar temperatures are greater than summer equatorial
temperatures at very high obliquities (>45°), the atmosphere in the equatorial regions becomes supersaturated and ice is deposited at the surface (Jakosky, 1985a; Mischna et al., 2003; Richardson and Wilson, 2002). This ice remains trapped in the equatorial region during winter, rather than returning back to the pole, because the influx of H₂O vapour from the other hemisphere keeps atmospheric H₂O vapour concentration high (Jakosky and Carr, 1984; Mischna et al., 2003). At mid to high obliquities (~35°), however, the coldest regions are in the mid-latitudes and ice is deposited there instead of in the equatorial region, resulting in the formation of the mid-latitude glaciers that are still observed today (see Section 2.3.3; e.g., Holt et al., 2008; Mischna et al., 2003).

2.7.1.2 Low Obliquity

When obliquity is low (<20°), the polar regions become colder, the equatorial regions become warmer, and the amplitude of the annual temperature cycle decreases (Toon et al., 1980). Seasonal variations are also much smaller than at moderate (~25°) or high obliquities (>35°) and the mean overturning circulation of the atmosphere becomes weaker (Forget et al., 2017; Newman et al., 2005).

The colder temperatures in the polar regions result in the formation of thick permanent polar ice caps, which extend further equatorward than the present-day permanent caps but not as far as the seasonal polar caps at high obliquities. The fall in atmospheric pressure caused by the growth of the polar caps has implications for the subsurface reservoirs of CO₂ and H₂O (Toon et al., 1980; Wood and Griffiths, 2007a). Simulations suggest that mean surface pressure would fall to below 1 mbar and perhaps even as low as 0.3 mbar (Toon et al., 1980; Wood and Griffiths, 2007a,b). At such low pressures, the thermal conductivity (see Section 2.1.5.3) of porous regolith is reduced, which causes near surface temperatures to increase (by up to 20–30 K in regions where subsurface H₂O ice is expected at present-day; Wood and Griffiths, 2007b), which would reduce the stability of any existing subsurface ice (Presley and Christensen, 1997b; Toon et al., 1980; Wood and Griffiths, 2007a). This will have a larger influence on the H₂O ice distribution in the tropics and mid-latitudes than any changes in the eccentricity or longitude of perihelion, but still not be as large an influence as the change in obliquity.
The extent of the equatorward expansion of the polar caps at low obliquities is dependent on the size of the initial CO$_2$ inventory (Forget et al., 2013; Kahre et al., 2013; Soto et al., 2011, 2015). During the Noachian (4.0–3.7 Gyr ago; see Section 2.8), the CO$_2$ inventory is estimated to have been larger than in the present-day, which would impact the size of the polar caps and the climatic response to their formation. Simulations suggest that permanent CO$_2$ polar caps only form at low obliquities when pressure is higher than 3 bar or lower than 1 bar (Forget et al., 2013). It has also been suggested that larger CO$_2$ inventories result in permanent CO$_2$ ice caps forming at higher obliquities than for the present-day atmosphere (Soto et al., 2015).

2.7.2 Longitude of Perihelion and Eccentricity

The eccentricity of Mars' orbit oscillates with a period of 95 kyr with a modulating period of 2.4 Myr due to resonances with other bodies in the solar system (Laskar et al., 2002, 2004; Toon et al., 1980). Over the last 10 Myr the degree of orbital eccentricity has varied between 0 and 0.12 and over the last 4 Gyr, the most probable value for eccentricity is 0.068 (Laskar et al., 2004). Changes in the degree of orbital eccentricity alter the amount of energy received seasonally by varying the length of the seasons (Mischna et al., 2003; Toon et al., 1980). At the present eccentricity (0.093; Jakosky et al., 1995; Newman et al., 2005), Mars receives around one third less sunlight during the aphelion season (when Mars is furthest from the Sun) than the perihelion season (when Mars is nearest to the Sun; Forget et al., 2017). As eccentricity increases, the length of the season at aphelion increases, while the season during perihelion decreases (Mischna et al., 2003). The winter season at aphelion is, therefore, longer and colder than the winter season at perihelion. The hemisphere with the winter season at perihelion is dependent on the longitude of perihelion, which at present is at $L_S = 251^\circ$ (late northern fall), resulting in southern winter being longer and colder than northern winter (Mischna et al., 2003). As eccentricity decreases, the importance of the longitude of perihelion also decreases as the length and amount of solar insolation during the seasons become more symmetrical (Newman et al., 2005). In general, the influence of eccentricity and longitude of perihelion is greatest at moderate
obliquities (~25°; Pollack and Toon, 1982; Toon et al., 1980) when the influence of obliquity is at its weakest.

The timing of the areocentric longitude, $L_S$, of perihelion is related to the precession of the spin axis which oscillates with a period of 51 kyr (Forget et al., 2017; Schorghofer, 2008). Areocentric longitude of perihelion has the largest influence around latitude ±60° where annual surface temperatures are not closely related to annual mean insolation (Schorghofer, 2008; Schorghofer and Forget, 2012). This region where longitude of perihelion dominates also corresponds to the margins of the ice-rich layers in each hemisphere. Across the rest of Mars, the mean annual surface temperature is controlled by the obliquity cycle (Schorghofer, 2008), as discussed earlier. When perihelion occurs during northern autumn, such as at present, it minimises the H$_2$O ice loss from the northern cap since heating rates are lower (Forget et al., 2017; Mischna et al., 2003). The opposite is true when perihelion occurs during northern spring/summer, as H$_2$O ice becomes unstable at the north pole and accumulates at the south pole instead (Forget et al., 2017). When this happens atmospheric H$_2$O vapour concentrations can be an order of magnitude greater at perihelion than at aphelion (Clancy et al., 1996).

2.8 Planetary History

The above sections provide an overview of the state of Mars during the Amazonian (the most recent geological period). However, this recent atmospheric state is the result of the processes that Mars has undergone over its history and so knowledge of the historical evolution is needed to place the observations and predictions into context. This is particularly important for volatile related features (such as valley networks and glaciers) as many are the result of conditions different from the present, such as variations in orbital parameters and climate conditions throughout history (such as increased atmospheric pressure, lower solar luminosity and increased impact rates; e.g., Kahre et al., 2012; Kasting, 1991; Wordsworth et al., 2013). The main changes in conditions can be understood using three of the geological periods: the Noachian (4.0–3.7 Gyr), the Hesperian (3.7–3.0 Gyr) and the Amazonian (3.0 Gyr – present-day; Carr, 2007a).
The Noachian period (4.0–3.7 Gyr ago) is characterised by high impact and erosion rates, higher surface pressures and a lower solar luminosity (Carr and Head, 2010; Golombek and Bridges, 2000; Tanaka, 1986). Surface pressures are estimated to have been significantly higher during this period based on estimates of the amount of CO$_2$ that would have been lost to space, trapped in carbonates, or trapped in ice (or clathrate) deposits (Section 2.4; Ehlmann et al., 2011). Estimates of the initial atmospheric inventory range from 0.1–10 bar depending on the method used to find the estimate (e.g., Haberle et al., 1994; Kahn, 1985; Kite et al., 2014; Manning et al., 2006; Nakamura and Tajika, 2001). However, an initial inventory much greater than 1 bar is considered unlikely as none of the known mechanisms of atmospheric loss will remove more than 1 bar (Forget et al., 2013).

Higher atmospheric pressures in the Noachian would have meant the climate was very different from the present-day and features within Noachian terrains (such as dendritic valley networks and the presence of hydrated minerals) show evidence of liquid H$_2$O related processes occurring (Carr and Head, 2010; Fasset and Head, 2008; Golombek and Bridges, 2000; Tanaka, 1986). Two end-member scenarios have been proposed to explain the presence of liquid H$_2$O (e.g., Wordsworth et al., 2015). The ‘warm and wet’ scenario suggests that the global average surface temperature was higher than 273 K and that liquid H$_2$O was stable across most of the surface for long periods of time during the Noachian (Kasting, 1991; Wordsworth et al., 2015). The ‘cold and icy’ scenario, on the other hand, assumes that surface temperatures remained below the freezing point of H$_2$O and that liquid H$_2$O only formed by episodic melting due to a combination of seasonal, volcanic and impact forcing (Wordsworth et al., 2015). Simulations suggest that the ‘cold and icy’ scenario is more likely, while geological evidence suggests the opposite and that the ‘warm and wet’ scenario is more likely. It has been suggested, that the true Noachian climate is most likely to be a combination of both scenarios, with a mostly ‘cold and icy’ climate that periodically becomes ‘warm and wet’ (Wordsworth, 2016). Consequently, it is still debated which of the two scenarios best fits the available evidence for the conditions of Early Mars. Despite the debate on the climate conditions, one common point is that the volume of H$_2$O during the Noachian was significantly larger than at present and has decreased.
over time (Scheller et al., 2021, estimated a decrease of 40–95%).

The Hesperian period (3.7–3.0 Gyr ago) saw the rate of impacts, volcanism and fluvial activity decrease (Carr and Head, 2010; Hoffman, 2000). This led to a decline in the rate of \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \)-related rock alteration processes that formed phyllosilicates and other hydrous minerals, changes in global groundwater chemistry and the formation of sulphate-rich deposits (Carr and Head, 2010; Ehlmann et al., 2011). The change in these processes, alongside the reduced amount of valley formation, indicate that the surface conditions required for liquid \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) to form were rare during the Hesperian (unlike the Noachian where evidence for liquid \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) is more widespread) and conditions were closer to the present-day climate. In contrast, some geological evidence, such as the distribution of martian deltas, has been suggested to indicate the potential existence of an ocean in the northern lowlands during the Hesperian (e.g. Clifford and Parker, 2001; Di Achille and Hynek, 2010; Parker et al., 1993). However, the existence of this ocean is heavily debated.

The Amazonian period (3.0 Gyr ago–present) experienced a further slowing of geologic activity, and evidence of processes involving liquid \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) from this period are rare. Features related to ice and wind processes are more evident, especially for ice related processes in the high and mid-latitudes (Carr and Head, 2010). It is during this period that many of the features observed at the surface, such as the PLD and mid-latitude glaciers, would have formed (Head and Pratt, 2001; Head et al., 2003; Howard, 1981; Kargel and Strom, 1992). These features probably formed as a result of changes in climatic conditions caused by variations in orbital parameters (see Section 2.7) rather than due to global conditions vastly different from the present-day.

2.8.1 Distribution of Carbon Dioxide Ice Early in Martian History?

At the higher atmospheric pressures expected during the Noachian and early Hesperian, the higher CO\(_2\) partial pressures will result in an increased frost point temperature (\( \sim \)195 K; Kasting, 1991), expanding the regions of CO\(_2\) ice stability on the surface. Simulations under higher atmospheric pressures indicate that CO\(_2\) ice could have been more
widespread than it is at present (Forget et al., 2013; Nakamura and Tajika, 2003; Soto et al., 2015). However, all of these simulations used the present-day martian topography for the simulations, and volcanic features (such as Olympus Mons) are estimated to have formed at the end of the Noachian and their presence has a large impact on the climate. Therefore, the results of these simulations only relate to the post-Tharsis Mars, when the topography of the present-day had mostly formed. Another issue with these simulations is that the climate during the Noachian and Hesperian is largely unknown and GCMs are based on present-day Mars and Earth.

In most simulations under higher atmospheric pressures (6 mbar–3 bar), the polar caps form as is expected from previous obliquity simulations, with permanent polar caps at low obliquities (<15°) and large seasonal caps at high obliquities (>35°; see Section 2.7.1 Forget et al., 2013; Soto et al., 2015). The main impact of higher atmospheric pressure in these simulations is that permanent polar caps can form at higher obliquities as pressure increases, as would be expected due to the higher frost point temperature at higher pressures. The other interesting result from these simulations is the formation of CO$_2$ ice deposits at around 15° latitude when the CO$_2$ inventory is greater than 300–600 mbar (depending on obliquity; see Figure 2.13 for an example of the zonally averaged results), likely on the flanks of Olympus Mons (Soto et al., 2015). This is much further equatorward than previous work has suggested that surface CO$_2$ ice could have formed and its presence at these latitudes could have implications for the processes that occurred in the equatorial region during Early Mars.

The formation of CO$_2$ ice deposits further equatorward than at present and deposits at around 45° latitude were simulated by Nakamura and Tajika (2003) in simulations with a lower solar constant (70% of present-day). In their simulations, they found that when obliquity was lower than 50°, the minimum mean-annual solar incident flux occurred at the poles and the CO$_2$ ice deposits would form there, which is the case at present and in all other simulations. However, when obliquity was increased to 60° (which would have occurred earlier in Mars’ history; Laskar et al., 2004), the minimum mean-annual solar incident flux now occurred in the mid-latitudes. This resulted in CO$_2$ ice depositing there and permanent CO$_2$ ice deposits forming circularly around
Figure 2.13: Zonal CO\textsubscript{2} ice depth over time for the 15\degree obliquity simulations from Soto et al. (2015), assuming a CO\textsubscript{2} ice density of 1600 kg m\textsuperscript{-3}. The simulations in their study used initial surface pressures of (a) 6 mbar, (b) 60 mbar, (c) 300 mbar, (d) 600 mbar, (e) 1200 mbar and (f) 3000 mbar. Figure from Soto et al. (2015).

Figure 2.14: Seasonal distribution of CO\textsubscript{2} ice from simulations by Nakamura and Tajika (2003) at an obliquity of 60\degree and with a solar constant 70\% of the present-day value. The white regions represent permanent CO\textsubscript{2} ice and the grey represents an uncovered surface. The dashed white lines represent the areal extent of seasonal CO\textsubscript{2} ice. Figure taken from Nakamura and Tajika (2003).
the mid-latitudes (see Figure 2.14), which could have implications for mid-latitude processes during Early Mars.

2.9 Summary and Remaining Questions

The sections above provide a brief summary of martian research related to H$_2$O and CO$_2$ ice to date, focussing primarily on subsurface ices. From the research already done, it can be seen that the distribution of surface ices and subsurface H$_2$O ice is heavily dependent on climatic conditions and the geological material (at the surface and in the subsurface). While the surface geological material is expected to have remained almost the same throughout the Amazonian, the climate is highly variable according to variations in the orbital parameters. The climate has also changed drastically over time, as atmospheric pressures are expected to have been higher during the Noachian and to have decreased over time until the present-day atmospheric pressures were reached. All of these factors will also impact the distribution of subsurface CO$_2$ ice. However, subsurface CO$_2$ ice has only recently been observed in the southern polar region and is not expected outside of the polar regions at the present obliquity. This means its global distribution is an area that is not well studied and there are a lot of questions still remaining about the existence of subsurface CO$_2$ ice in the present-day and its recent history, including:

- How long does CO$_2$ ice remain in the subsurface?
- What conditions are needed for CO$_2$ ice to be buried?
- When and where would CO$_2$ ice have formed in the subsurface in the recent past?

These questions can be answered using the current understanding of present-day Mars, which has characterised many of the factors that will influence subsurface CO$_2$ ice. The main remaining unknowns are related to the global distribution of subsurface CO$_2$ ice, which is difficult to observe and the properties of CO$_2$ ice when underlying either a dust or H$_2$O ice layer.

Answering these questions about present-day subsurface CO$_2$ ice will provide a starting point for future investigations into its distribution earlier in Mars’ history when subsurface CO$_2$ ice was likely more prevalent, particularly during the Noachian.
when atmospheric pressures were higher and CO$_2$ ice could form at higher temperatures. However, in order to study subsurface CO$_2$ ice during this period, the Noachian climate needs to first be well characterised. Therefore, this work is focused on characterising the behaviour of subsurface CO$_2$ ice during the Amazonian period at all relevant obliquities.
3  |  The Martian Subsurface Model

A stand-alone one dimensional (1-D) subsurface model, hereafter referred to as the Martian Subsurface Model (MSSM), was developed to investigate the distribution of water (H$_2$O) and carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) within the subsurface of Mars for this work. The MSSM has been designed to simulate both vapour diffusion and the phase distribution for both H$_2$O and CO$_2$ over an annual cycle, using timesteps of one sol. The MSSM is comprised of three main parts: the temperature scheme, the water scheme, and the carbon dioxide scheme, which are all described in this chapter. Each scheme was developed sequentially in the order listed to ensure each was working as expected before incorporating a new scheme.

The main feature of the MSSM is the inclusion of CO$_2$ in all phases (vapour, ice and adsorbate). In all previous numerical modelling studies of the subsurface of Mars, H$_2$O has been the only volatile investigated (e.g. Fanale et al., 1982c; Meslin et al., 2008; Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005; Steele et al., 2017a) and until the recent discovery of CO$_2$ within the polar layered deposits (PLD; Phillips et al., 2011) it was assumed that CO$_2$ ice could only be present at the surface in the present-day. The MSSM provides a way to investigate how well CO$_2$ could survive under present-day martian conditions, as well as at different obliquities and under the conditions expected during the Noachian and early Hesperian. The model is particularly useful for Noachian studies because atmospheric pressures during the Noachian are expected to have been higher (Section 2.8; Hu et al., 2015; Jakosky et al., 2017; Kite et al., 2014), which would allow CO$_2$ ice to form at higher temperatures and make the build-up of CO$_2$ ice in the subsurface more likely. Investigating the survival conditions of any CO$_2$ that could have formed during the Noachian will provide information about where in the subsurface CO$_2$ ice might have survived for long periods of time.

In this thesis, the MSSM is used as a stand-alone model to allow for many multi-year simulations to be run. However, the MSSM has been designed so that it can
be integrated into the LMD-UK Mars global circulation model (MGCM) to allow for future simulations to be run over the entire surface of Mars with the full 3D climate, which accounts for spatial and temporal variations in all properties. This will be useful for more detailed studies when the diurnal cycle is more important, or when investigating how the H$_2$O and CO$_2$ distribution changes on a global scale. The MSSM differs from the subsurface model that is currently included in the MGCM (Steele et al., 2017a) in many ways. These include a different discretisation for the diffusion of H$_2$O vapour, H$_2$O equations of state, H$_2$O thermal conductivity, the thermal scheme, variable regolith density and porosity, and the inclusion of CO$_2$ vapour, adsorbate and ice. A full description of the subsurface model currently used in the MGCM can be found in Appendix B.3, while the differences between the Steele et al. (2017a) model and the water scheme in the MSSM (and the reasoning behind these differences) are discussed in this chapter. The integration of the MSSM into the MGCM has been started and a description of how the MSSM can be integrated into the MGCM is provided in Appendix B.2 for future reference.

The methods and equations used to develop the rest of the MSSM (and the justifications for them) are also discussed throughout this chapter. Starting with the grid the model has been discretised onto (Section 3.1), followed by the thermal scheme (Section 3.2), water scheme (Section 3.3) and CO$_2$ scheme (Section 3.4). These sections are followed by a discussion on the methods to calculate surface flux (Section 3.5) and the sublimation and accumulation rates (Section 3.6) since these methods are the same for both H$_2$O and CO$_2$. The final section provides a brief introduction to the MGCM, alongside a description of the atmospheric condition used for the MSSM in this thesis (Section 3.7).

3.1 Grid Stretch

The numerical solution of differential equations requires a mesh (to discretise the domain), a timestep and a numerical method to solve the equation (the finite volume method is used here and is described in Sections 3.2, 3.3.1 and 3.4.2). Since the MSSM is a 1-D model of the subsurface, the mesh is in the form of a series of grid points at different depths, with increasing spacing between them. This is referred to as the
grid stretch and the increasing spacing between grid points with depth accounts for the higher resolution required near the surface (<1 m), where properties, such as temperature, change more rapidly with depth and time than at depths greater than 5 m.

The method used to increase the spacing between the grid points with depth is important since the grid stretch impacts the accuracy of the solution, the conservation of the property, and the time it takes to solve the equations. Therefore, to decide on the grid stretch to be used I compared the grid stretch originally used in the MGCM (Hourdin et al., 1993), the grid stretch currently used (Steele et al., 2017a), a constant grid stretch and a new variable grid stretch. Figure 3.1 shows a comparison of these grid stretches.

![Figure 3.1: Relationship between grid point number and the depth below the surface for the grid stretch by Hourdin et al. (1993) that was originally in the MGCM (light blue), the grid stretch by Steele et al. (2017a) currently in the MGCM (dark blue), the constant grid stretch (black), and the variable grid stretch used in the thesis (red).](image)

The original grid stretch used by the MGCM was developed by Hourdin et al. (1993). In this version of the MGCM an 11-layer soil model was used. This version of the model used the e-folding timescale instead of depths for each layer and the first
layer was at a tenth of the diurnal cycle \( t_{\text{min}} = 887.75 \text{s} \), and subsequent layers were calculated by

\[
z[i] = z_0 \frac{\psi^{i-1}}{\psi - 1}
\]

where \( \psi \) is the ratio of the depth between two successive layers and is set to 2. This gives the e-folding timescale in seconds, which cannot be directly compared with the depths of the other grid stretches. The equivalent depth for these timescales can be calculated using the skin depth, \( z^* \), for \( z_0 \) (see Section 2.1.5.1 and Equation 2.1 for a full description of the equation).

\[
z^* = \sqrt{\frac{t_p k}{\pi \rho c_p}}
\]

For the purpose of comparison, values of \( k, \rho, c_p \), and \( t_p \) have been chosen based on those used in the MSSM, 0.1 W m\(^{-1}\)K\(^{-1}\), 1740 kg m\(^{-3}\), 830 J K\(^{-1}\)kg\(^{-1}\), and 88806.7 s, respectively. This results in a skin depth equal to 0.04 m. Since Equation 3.1b uses a \( t_{\text{min}} \) of a tenth of the diurnal cycle, one tenth of the skin depth is used as the new \( z_0 \). The grid stretch in metres can then be calculated using Equation 3.1a and the resulting grid stretch is shown in Figure 3.1 in light blue.

The grid stretch currently used in the MGCM was developed by Steele et al. (2017a, dark blue in Figure 3.1) and starts at a set depth and increases by a factor, \( \psi^{i-1} \), where \( i \) is the grid point number. The equation calculates depths directly and is an updated version of the equation used in the Hourdin et al. (1993) method which uses timescales:

\[
z[i] = z_0 \times \psi^{i-1},
\]

where \( z_0 = 2e^{-4} \) and \( \psi = 2 \). The similarity between the Steele et al. (2017a) and Hourdin et al. (1993) grid stretches, seen in Figure 3.1, is expected because they were developed for the same model, but with slightly different aims. The Steele et al. (2017a) work on subsurface H\(_2\)O ice needed physical depths and a higher resolution near the surface in order to calculate H\(_2\)O vapour diffusion, whereas the Hourdin et al. (1993)
model aimed to calculate subsurface thermal profiles only, for which timescales were sufficient.

For the variable grid, the first grid point is at the surface and subsequent grid points have an increasing grid spacing between them. The initial grid spacing is 0.01 m and this gets multiplied by 1.2 for the first 28 grid points and then by 1.8 for the remaining grid points (Equation 3.4).

\[
\begin{aligned}
\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \quad z[i] &= \begin{cases} 
0.01 & \text{when } i = 1 \\
(z[i-1] \times 1.2) & \text{if } i < 28 \\
(z[i-1] \times 1.8) & \text{if } i \geq 28
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
\] (3.4)

This particular grid stretch has a high resolution near the surface and the resolution decreases with depth, while insuring that the resolution at depth is small enough that changes on annual timescales can still be resolved. This is important since only the upper few centimetres are affected by diurnal changes in the surface temperature according to the skin depth at that location (Equation 2.1; e.g., see Section 2.1.5.1 for more details). Table 3.1 shows how skin depths vary with the temperature cycle and the geological material that are being considered. On Mars the lowest observed thermal inertias (Equation 2.2) are \(24 \text{ J m}^{-2} \text{K}^{-1} \text{s}^{1/2}\) (for unconsolidated regolith), the highest are \(>800 \text{ J m}^{-2} \text{K}^{-1} \text{s}^{1/2}\). In general, the observed range of thermal inertias for most martian surfaces is around \(200-300 \text{ J m}^{-2} \text{K}^{-1} \text{s}^{1/2}\) (Putzig et al., 2005). In this range of thermal inertias, the annual skin depth can vary from 0.4 m to \(>3.6 \text{ m}\). This means a maximum depth of at least 20 m is needed, since the annual thermal cycle will be fully damped within 5 skin depths (Beardsmore and Cull, 2001).

A top-hat tracer distribution experiment was run to compare the grid stretches described above with a constant grid stretch. The constant grid stretch had grid spacing fixed at 0.01 m and was included as a reference to which the results from the other grid stretches could be compared, as ideally the grid stretch would have many small layers. However, this would increase the computational time to unrealistically high values.
Table 3.1: Skin depths for the timescales and materials relevant to Mars, including the values used for each property of the materials to calculate skin depth from Equation 2.1. The material properties for regolith and sandstone are from Grott et al. (2007), the properties for Basalt are from Mellon et al. (2008), the properties for CO$_2$ ice are from Konstantinov et al. (1988); Maass and Barnes (1926); Mangan et al. (2017) and the properties for H$_2$O ice are from Cuffey and Paterson (2010); Klinger (1981); Paige (1992). A temperature cycle is fully damped after around 4 skin depths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Period (s)</th>
<th>Skin Depth (m)</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Period (s)</th>
<th>Skin Depth (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regolith</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>Basalt</td>
<td>CO$_2$ Ice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sol</td>
<td>8880.67</td>
<td>0.0185</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>5.93 x 10$^7$</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>1.19 x 10$^8$</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>5.93 x 10$^8$</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 years</td>
<td>5.93 x 10$^9$</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 years</td>
<td>5.93 x 10$^{10}$</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 years</td>
<td>5.93 x 10$^{11}$</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124,000 years (Obliquity cycle)</td>
<td>7.36 x 10$^{12}$</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parameters Used to Calculate Skin Depth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Regolith</th>
<th>Sandstone</th>
<th>Basalt</th>
<th>CO$_2$ Ice</th>
<th>H$_2$O Ice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity, $k$</td>
<td>W m$^{-1}$K$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density, $\rho$</td>
<td>kg m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity, $c_p$</td>
<td>J K$^{-1}$kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>2097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal inertia</td>
<td>J m$^{-2}$K$^{-1}$s$^{-\frac{3}{2}}$</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>2208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top-hat tracer distribution experiment involved starting with an initial amount of vapour concentrated in a small portion of the grid and allowing it to diffuse through the grid. The tests were done using the H$_2$O vapour diffusion scheme described in Section 3.3.1 and were run until the vapour was fully diffused through all grid stretches. The aim of the tests was to understand the effectiveness of each grid stretch both for conserving the amount of vapour and the time taken to reach equilibrium. This is a common type of test for a diffusion scheme and has been used in other studies (e.g Devkota and Imberger, 2009; Scheepbouwer et al., 2008).
An initial concentration of vapour of $1\text{kg}\text{m}^{-3}$ was assumed only in the region between $0.02\text{m}$ and $0.15\text{m}$ for the Hourdin et al. (1993) and Steele et al. (2017a) grid stretches, and between $0.02\text{m}$ and $0.17\text{m}$ for the constant and variable grid stretches. The initial vapour region was extended for the constant and variable grid stretches to keep the total amount of vapour considered in each simulated test nearly equal. There is still a slight difference between the total amount of vapour in the grids despite the extended region considered, which affects the final equilibrium values. The experiments were initialised with no flux at the upper and lower boundaries, and the model was run for 10 minutes to allow the system to reach equilibrium. Figure 3.2 shows the initial vapour profiles and the grid for each grid stretch tested. The maximum depth of all four of the grid stretches used for the test reached around 30 cm because the upper 30 cm of the subsurface experience the largest changes in temperature across diurnal and annual cycles and therefore will experience the largest vapour fluxes. A summary of the four grid stretches used in these tests is shown in Table 3.2.

### Table 3.2: The details of the grid stretches used for the top-hat tracer distribution tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grid stretch</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Steele et al. (2017a)</th>
<th>Hourdin et al. (1993)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial grid depth [m]</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid spacing [m]</td>
<td>$dz[i]$ = 0.01</td>
<td>$z[i] = z[i-1] \times 1.2$</td>
<td>$z[i] = 2e^{-4} \times 2^{i-0.5}$</td>
<td>$z[i] = z_0 e^{\psi i}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. grid layers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final depth (m)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of these tests (Figure 3.3) show that the four grid stretches equilibrated within 5 minutes and produced similar final equilibrium values, with slight differences due to their slightly different initial total amount of vapour. All four grid stretches equilibrate at the same rate, which means that the time for the MSSM to equilibrate would be unaffected by the grid stretch. In Figure 3.3, the Steele et al. (2017a) and Hourdin et al. (1993) grid stretches appear to have an equilibrated value, in each
Figure 3.2: Top-hat tracer distribution experiment initial condition over the grid stretch used for (a) the constant grid stretch, (b) the variable grid stretch, (c) the Steele et al. (2017a) grid stretch and (d) the Hourdin et al. (1993) grid stretch. The location of the grid points is shown in light grey and the colours correspond to the colours used for each grid stretch in Figures 3.1 and 3.3 for comparison.
numerical layer, that is closer to the constant stretch’s equilibrated value than the variable grid stretch. However, the total amount of vapour is smaller in the Steele et al. (2017a) and Hourdin et al. (1993) grid stretches than in the variable grid stretch, and the observed difference in the figure is due to the differing grid stretches and boundaries of the grid stretches.

Since the four grid stretches produce similar equilibrated values, the conservation of the grid stretch is the next most important factor to consider. Table 3.3 shows the initial total amount of vapour, the final total amount of vapour and the percentage loss of vapour over the time period for all four grid stretches. While the constant grid stretch conserves the amount of vapour the best, using a constant grid stretch would be computationally infeasible. The next best grid stretch is the variable grid stretch, which conserves the total amount of vapour better than both the Steele et al. (2017a) and Hourdin et al. (1993) grid stretches.

Table 3.3: Checking whether the finite volume discretisation is conservative for four grid stretches, see Table 3.2 for details on the stretches and Section 3.1 for details on the tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Steele et al. (2017a)</th>
<th>Hourdin et al. (1993)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[kg m$^{-3}$]</td>
<td>0.1355</td>
<td>0.1340</td>
<td>0.1334</td>
<td>0.1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[kg m$^{-3}$]</td>
<td>0.1354</td>
<td>0.1325</td>
<td>0.1266</td>
<td>0.1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Loss</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over entire time [%]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These diffusion tests were also run with the Steele et al. (2017a) H$_2$O vapour diffusion method (Section B.3.1) and using their method, the system was still equilibrating after 4000 simulated minutes, whereas for the H$_2$O vapour diffusion scheme used in the MSSM, the system equilibrated within 5 simulated minutes for all grid stretches. This showed that the new vapour diffusion scheme is more efficient than that used by Steele et al. (2017a). The tests also showed that vapour in the variable grid stretch was equilibrating to similar values to the constant grid stretch and at a faster rate than in the Steele et al. (2017a) or Hourdin et al. (1993) grid stretches.
Figure 3.3: Top-hat experiment results to test different grid stretches. (a) An initial ‘top hat’ profile was applied at the beginning of each run and left to diffuse through the regolith. The rest of the plots show how these profiles changed after (b) 1 minute, (c) 2 minutes, (d) 5 minutes, (e) 20 minutes, (f) 70 minutes. Each line represents a different grid stretch, with black representing the constant grid stretch, red representing the final grid stretch and blue representing the grid stretch of Steele et al. (2017a, see Table 3.2 for more details).
Overall, the Hourdin et al. (1993) and Steele et al. (2017a) grid stretches, which were originally and currently used in the MGCM respectively, have a resolution that is too low for depths greater than 5 cm for the MSSM and a constant grid would require too many layers to be computationally realistic. The variable grid stretch is also nearly as conservative as the constant grid stretch, which is desirable for the MSSM since the amount of vapour in the subsurface should be controlled by the initial condition and fluxes at the boundaries. Therefore, I decided that the variable grid stretch would be the most appropriate for the MSSM as this type of grid ensures a high resolution in the upper 4 m, where the greatest temperature changes occur, and a slightly lower resolution at depths where subsurface temperatures become stable across diurnal and annual cycles in regolith and sandstone materials (>4 m). The resolution at these depths is also still high enough for the diffusion scheme to work effectively.

Since the MSSM is being used for 200 martian year runs, the maximum depth of the model was determined by the depth needed for the annual cycle to be fully damped at the base of the model for all materials being considered. Compact H$_2$O ice has the largest thermal diffusivity (Equation 2.3) and therefore has the greatest skin depth of the materials used (annual skin depth of H$_2$O ice is 5 m compared with 0.5 m for regolith; see Table 3.1). As a result, Equation 3.4 is used with 33 grid points to generate a maximum depth of 38 m, which is sufficient for the annual cycle to be damped when the pore space is filled with H$_2$O ice.
3.2 Thermal Scheme

The thermal scheme was developed before the water and carbon dioxide schemes because subsurface temperature is one of the controlling factors for the diffusion of vapour through a porous soil and because the saturation vapour pressure over an ice or adsorbate surface is exponentially dependent on temperature (Mellon and Jakosky, 1993).

The scheme uses the steady state 1-D heat conduction equation (Equation 3.5) which governs heat transport through the subsurface.

\[ \rho(z)c_p \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( k(z) \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \right), \tag{3.5} \]

where \( T \) is the temperature [K] at a depth \( z \) [m] and time \( t \) [s], \( k \) is the thermal conductivity [W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\)], \( \rho \) is the density [kg m\(^{-3}\)] and \( c_p \) is the specific heat capacity [J K\(^{-1}\) kg\(^{-1}\)]. In the MSSM a surface boundary of surface temperatures (from the MGCM) and a base boundary of geothermal heat flux (30 mW m\(^{-2}\); see Section 2.1.5.5) is used. This equation is discretised (onto the grid shown in Figure 3.4) using the finite control volume method described by Patankar (1980) and Versteeg and Malalasekera (2007) producing Equation 3.6. The discretisation (Equation 3.6) assumes that the value of temperature, \( T \), suddenly changes from \( T^0 \) to \( T^1 \) over a timestep and then stays at \( T^1 \) for the entire timestep.

Figure 3.4: Grid used for tri-diagonal matrix algorithm (TDMA), where \( i \) is the midpoint of the layer at which the value is currently being calculated, \( i - 1 \) is the midpoint of the layer before and \( i + 1 \) is the midpoint of the layer after. \( \delta z_{i-0.5} \) and \( \delta z_{i+0.5} \) represent the distance between the midpoints of the layers before and after the current layer with the current layer’s midpoint, \( i \). \( \Delta z \) is the distance between the interface of layer \( i - 1 \) (interface \( i - 0.5 \)) and layer \( i + 1 \) (interface \( i + 0.5 \)), i.e. the thickness of layer \( i \). Figure is adapted from Patankar (1980).
\[ \rho c_p \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} (T_i - T_i^0) = \frac{k_{i+0.5}(T_{i+1} - T_i)}{(\delta z)_{i+0.5}} - \frac{k_{i-0.5}(T_i - T_{i-1})}{(\delta z)_{i-0.5}}, \quad (3.6) \]

where the superscript 0 represents the value from the previous timestep and the subscripts \( i, i - 1 \) and \( i + 1 \) represent the values at the current, previous and next grid point respectively. In these equations \((\delta z)_{i-0.5}\) represents the distance between midpoints and \(\Delta z\) represents the thickness of each layer. The subscripts \( i - 0.5 \) and \( i + 0.5 \) represent the values at the interface between the grid points, as shown in Figure 3.4. The values at the interface are calculated assuming the value is constant within one layer and changes instantly at the interface, which is not midway between the grid points since the layers have different thicknesses. Thermal conductivity at the interface is calculated using a weighted harmonic mean to account for the different layer thicknesses:

\[ k_{i-0.5} = \left( \frac{1 - f_{i-0.5}}{k_{i-1}} + \frac{f_{i-0.5}}{k_i} \right)^{-1} \quad (3.7a) \]

where

\[ f_{i-0.5} = \frac{(\delta z)_{i-0.5}^+}{(\delta z)_{i-0.5}} \quad (3.7b) \]

To numerically solve Equation 3.6, it is rearranged into the form of a fully implicit tri-diagonal matrix algorithm (‘TDMA’; Equation 3.8), which is time efficient to solve computationally. The implicit version of the TDMA method is used because it allows for the use of substantially larger timesteps than an explicit method. This was an important consideration because the MSSM is used to model an annual cycle with the diurnal cycle smoothed out. If an explicit model was used, a much smaller timestep would be required (\( \sim 1 \) minute), increasing the number of timesteps for one martian year from 669 (for 1 sol timesteps) to 963,360 (for 1 minute timesteps). This would increase the actual time to run the long multi-year simulations from hours to months and is therefore computationally infeasible in the course of this project.

\[ a_i'T_i = b_i'T_{i+1} + c_i'T_{i-1} + d_i' \quad (3.8a) \]

where

\[ a_i' = \rho c_p \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} + \frac{k_{i+0.5}}{(\delta z)_{i+0.5}} + \frac{k_{i-0.5}}{(\delta z)_{i-0.5}} \quad (3.8b) \]
\( b_i = \frac{k_i+0.5}{(\delta z)_{i+0.5}} \) \hspace{1cm} (3.8c)

\( c_i = \frac{k_i-0.5}{(\delta z)_{i-0.5}} \) \hspace{1cm} (3.8d)

\( d_i = \frac{\rho \Delta \zeta}{\Delta t} T_i^0 \) \hspace{1cm} (3.8e)

For a full overview of the method used to discretise and numerically solve the heat conduction equation see Appendix A.1. Figure 3.5 shows an example of the thermal profiles over a diurnal cycle using Equation 3.8.

![Figure 3.5: Thermal profile of the subsurface at 60°N 180°E and \( L_S = 90° \). The surface temperatures are taken from the Mars Climate Database (MCD), geothermal heat flux is 30 mW m\(^{-2}\), and average temperature is 230.3 K. The grey dashed line represents 5 diurnal skin depths.](image)

Figure 3.5: Thermal profile of the subsurface at 60°N 180°E and \( L_S = 90° \). The surface temperatures are taken from the Mars Climate Database (MCD), geothermal heat flux is 30 mW m\(^{-2}\), and average temperature is 230.3 K. The grey dashed line represents 5 diurnal skin depths.

The value used for specific heat capacity, \( c_p = 830 \text{ J K}^{-1}\text{kg}^{-1} \), is kept constant with depth, and is the value used by both Siegler et al. (2012) and Cornwall (2014) for unconsolidated regolith. The regolith matrix density, \( \rho_r \), is varied with depth (Equation 3.9a), using the method of Grott et al. (2007), to account for unconsolidated regolith at the surface that is then compacted with depth. The constants \( c_3 \) and \( c_4 \) in Equation 3.9a are calculated using the conditions \( \rho(z = 0) = \rho_0 \) and \( \rho(z = 10m) = 0.95\rho_\infty \), where \( \rho_0 \) is the density at the surface and \( \rho_\infty \) is the density of the final compacted
material. The regolith porosity, $\phi_r$, is then determined from the density difference between the regolith matrix density, $\rho_r(z)$, and the grain material density (assumed to be 2730 kg m$^{-3}$), using Equation 3.9b (Hütter et al., 2008).

$$\rho_r(z) = \rho_{\infty} \frac{z + c_3}{z + c_4}$$

$$\phi_r = 1 - \frac{\rho(z)}{2730 \text{ kg m}^{-3}}$$

In the model, $\rho_0$ and $\rho_{\infty}$ are assumed to be 1000 kg m$^{-3}$ and 1750 kg m$^{-3}$, respectively, assuming an unconsolidated regolith at the surface and that the geological material at depth is a coarse sandstone (Grott et al., 2007). The surface density ($\rho_0 = 1000 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$) corresponds to a very low surface porosity ($\approx 63\%$), which is consistent with the estimated porosity of regolith by Demidov et al. (2015) and the lower end of the measurements from the Viking landing site 1, which had an estimated bulk density ranging from 1000 to 1600 kg m$^{-3}$ (Shorthill et al., 1976). This low value of porosity has also been supported by the recent measurements by Heat Flow and Physical Properties Package (HP$^3$) on the InSight Lander, which measured a porosity of 61% between depths of 0.03 and 0.37 m (Grott et al., 2021). A very low porosity has also been interpreted in regions with extremely low thermal inertia as the result of atmospherically sedimented dust (Presley and Christensen, 1997b).

The density of the bulk regolith, $\rho_{\text{eff}}$, and the bulk porosity, $\phi$, in the model will also increase with the amount of H$_2$O ice or CO$_2$ ice present within the pore space.

$$\rho_{\text{eff}} = \rho_r + \zeta_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} + \zeta_{\text{CO}_2}$$

$$\phi = \phi_r \times \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{\zeta_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}{\phi_r \times \rho_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}} \right) \left( \frac{\zeta_{\text{CO}_2}}{\phi_r \times \rho_{\text{CO}_2}} \right) \right],$$

where $\zeta_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ and $\zeta_{\text{CO}_2}$ are the concentration of H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice in the pore space. Both of the density of the bulk regolith and the bulk porosity are dependent on the amount of ice that fills the pore space. Pure H$_2$O ice is assumed to have a constant density, $\rho_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$, of 920 kg m$^{-3}$ at martian temperatures (Mellon, 1996), whereas, the density of pure CO$_2$ ice, $\rho_{\text{CO}_2}$, is highly dependent on temperature, as discussed in
The method to calculate the effective thermal conductivity of the bulk regolith, \( k_{\text{eff}} \), is more complex, since it needs to account for conduction through the bulk solid, conduction via pore spaces, and radiative conduction through the pore space since the bulk regolith is porous (Presley and Christensen, 1997a; Siegler et al., 2012). The method used to account for all of these in the model is discussed in the following sections.

### 3.2.1 Thermal Conductivity of Regolith

The method used for thermal conductivity of the regolith in this model is different from the method currently used in the original subsurface model of the MGCM (Böttger et al., 2005b; Steele et al., 2017a) because the original method assumes that thermal conductivity of the regolith is constant with depth. This assumption is insufficient to describe subsurface thermal properties because thermal conductivity will increase with depth as density increases and porosity decreases (Grott et al., 2007; Presley and Christensen, 1997c) and the method described here accounts for this increase.

The thermal conductivity of the regolith matrix varies with depth and remains constant throughout a single simulation (see Figure 3.6). It is calculated using the following equation from Grott et al. (2007):

\[
k_r(z) = k_{\infty} \frac{z + c_1}{z + c_2}
\]

(3.11)

The constants \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) are calculated using the conditions \( k_r(z=0) = k_0 \) and \( k_r(z=10m) = 0.95k_{\infty} \), where \( k_0 \) is the thermal conductivity at the surface and \( k_{\infty} \) is the thermal conductivity at depth. The increasing thermal conductivity with depth correlates with the increasing regolith matrix density, \( \rho_r \), and decreasing porosity, \( \phi_r \), that also occurs with depth, which was found from measurements of the lunar regolith (Heiken et al., 1991). Grott et al. (2007) use the assumption that there is a fine dust layer above the martian regolith, and that heat conduction in the gas filled pores dominates its thermal conductivity at the surface. The surface thermal conductivity \( (k_0) \) is therefore the thermal conductivity of CO\(_2\) gas at martian pressures and tempera-
Their model also used two end member values of $k_{\infty}$ for fine (0.02 W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$) and coarse (0.1 W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$) dry sand. In the baseline version of the MSSM used in this work, the compacted geological material is assumed to be coarse dry sand in order to simulate the compaction from an unconsolidated surface layer to a coarse dry sand layer.

The regolith matrix that is used in the baseline version of the MSSM is a simple distribution that captures some of the complexity of the regolith surface (see Section 2.1.1), but it is only representative of some locations on Mars. In reality, the surface material varies with location and is likely to contain several smaller layers of different sedimentary materials, due to redistribution of surface materials over time. Alongside layers of sedimentary materials, a massive basaltic bedrock is expected to underlie the regolith layer and in some locations this bedrock is exposed at the surface. To account for these differences, a series of simulations have been run using different configurations of the regolith matrix, including with a basement layer (see Section 5.2).

![Figure 3.6: Thermal conductivity of the regolith matrix with no ice in the pore space.](image)

Calculated using Equation 3.11 and $k_0 = 0.01$ W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$ and $k_{\infty} = 0.02$ W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$. 
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3.2.2 Effective Thermal Conductivity

The effective thermal conductivity is needed in the thermal scheme, but instead of only using the matrix thermal conductivity \(k_r\), the new model takes into account the presence of ice (either \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) or \(\text{CO}_2\)) which changes the thermal conductivity enough that the temperature is significantly affected (e.g., Paige, 1992). This can be seen in Figure 3.7, which shows the seasonal temperature cycle for a subsurface with no ice in the pore space (Figure 3.7a) and a layer of \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) ice in the upper 1 m and a layer of \(\text{CO}_2\) ice below the \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) ice (Figure 3.7b). As can be seen in the two plots, the presence of \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) and \(\text{CO}_2\) ice significantly increases the annual skin depth (the depth scale over which the temperature cycle is damped) and the temperature profile extends deeper into the subsurface. This will impact the timescales of stability for both \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) and \(\text{CO}_2\) ice which are dependent on temperature.

When calculating the effective thermal conductivity, \(k_{\text{eff}}\), of the subsurface, changes in porosity and contact area of the solid materials need to be considered, as heat is conducted through either the contact points between the regolith grains of the matrix or within void spaces. Both the increased contact area of the regolith grains and decreasing porosity of the regolith with depth are intrinsically accounted for within the equation for the thermal conductivity of the regolith, \(k_r\), (Equation 3.11), and do not need to be accounted for in the calculation for the effective thermal conductivity. However, the increase in thermal conductivity due to the increased contact area with increasing ice content is accounted for by the Hertz factor, \(h\) (see Section 3.2.2.1). The values used for the thermal conductivity of both \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) ice, \(k_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}\), and \(\text{CO}_2\) ice, \(k_{\text{CO}_2}\), are discussed in more detail in sections 3.3.2.4 and 3.4.1, respectively.

\[
k_{\text{eff}} = k_r + h_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} k_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} + h_{\text{CO}_2} k_{\text{CO}_2} \tag{3.12}
\]

3.2.2.1 Hertz Factor

The Hertz factor, \(h\), is defined as the ratio of contact area, \(A_{\text{cont}}\), to total area, \(A_{\text{tot}}\), if the medium is cut along an arbitrary plane (Shoshany et al., 2002), as shown in
Figure 3.7: The seasonal temperature cycle at 82°N and 104°W with depth using a) only the matrix thermal conductivity and b) the effective thermal conductivity when there is a H$_2$O ice layer to a depth of 1 m, and a CO$_2$ ice layer from 1 m to the base. Each line in the plot represents the average diurnal temperature profile for 1 individual sol and all lines together show the variations over an entire year (669 sols).

Equation 3.13.

\[ h = \frac{A_{cont}}{A_{tot}} \] (3.13)

It is used to calculate the effective thermal conductivity (Equation 3.12) of the icy regolith (Seiferlin et al., 1996), because the ice contact area will have a large influence on the solid state conduction via grain contact points (Steiner et al., 1991).

The arrangement of the regolith grains to produce each porosity is needed to calculate the Hertz factor. This can be quite difficult to estimate due to the non-uniqueness of packing arrangements that can produce different porosities. To account for this,
I have assumed that the regolith is composed of uniform spherical grains and that they are arranged in the simple cubic structure suggested by Piqueux and Christensen (2009). This structure is shown in Figure 3.8 and produces a regolith with a porosity of 47.6%. This structure was then used to calculate ice volumes as a percentage of pore space and the contact area of the ice for a range of grain sizes typical for Martian regolith (from 17 µm to 0.4 cm, as determined from thermal inertia values by Palluconi and Kieffer, 1981).

The range of Hertz factors calculated using Equation 3.13 is only applicable for a porosity of 47.6%, due to the arrangement of grains used to calculate $A_{\text{cont}}$ and $A_{\text{tot}}$, and the model uses a variable porosity with depth (Grott et al., 2007, Equation 3.9b). As a result, the calculation for the Hertz factor must also account for the variable initial porosity and I achieved this by applying a scaling law (Equation 3.14) to the Hertz factor value calculated from the initial porosity of 47.6% ($h_{47}$). The scaling law accounts for the increase in contact area between grains as porosity decreases and the matrix becomes more compacted.

$$h = h_{47} \frac{1 - \phi_0}{1 - 0.47}$$ (3.14)

3.2.3 Testing the Thermal Scheme

To ensure that the thermal scheme was calculating an accurate thermal profile with depth, continuous testing was done during development. Testing involved comparing the results from the thermal scheme with analytical solutions for the same problems. The initial thermal scheme (with no grid stretching, layering or basal heat flux) was
tested against Equation 3.15 for a diurnal cycle (Buntebarth, 1984).

\[
T(z, t) = T_0 \exp\left(-z \sqrt{\frac{\omega}{2\kappa}}\right) \cos\left(\omega t - z \sqrt{\frac{\omega}{2\kappa}}\right),
\]  

(3.15)

where \(\kappa\) is the thermal diffusivity (Equation 2.3). This equation is a well-accepted analytical solution for heat conduction into the subsurface with depth, which makes it ideal for testing the thermal scheme. The resulting plots for a normalised temperature cycle (Figure 3.9) are near identical showing that the thermal scheme works as expected.

![Figure 3.9: The thermal profiles produced by (a) the analytical solution (Equation 3.15) and (b) the MSSM using a normalised temperature range](image)

Each successive feature of the regolith that was implemented (variable grid steps, a multi-layered regolith, constant surface temperatures and a heat flux from the base) was tested against several of the analytical models in Carslaw and Jaeger (1959). This testing ensured that all aspects of the scheme were working as expected.

### 3.3 Water Scheme

Water is assumed to exist in one of four states: vapour \((n)\), adsorbate \((\alpha)\), pore ice \((\zeta)\) and liquid \(\text{H}_2\text{O} \,(\epsilon)\), and the model determines the total \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) content using:

\[
\sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} = n_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} + \alpha_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} + \zeta_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} + \epsilon_{\text{H}_2\text{O}},
\]  

(3.16)
where $\sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ is the total amount of H$_2$O [kg m$^{-3}$], $n_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ is the density of H$_2$O vapour per unit volume of regolith [kg m$^{-3}$], $\alpha_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ is the density of adsorbed H$_2$O [kg m$^{-3}$], $\zeta_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ is the density of subsurface H$_2$O ice [kg m$^{-3}$], and $\epsilon_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ is the density of subsurface liquid H$_2$O [kg m$^{-3}$]. This equation is based on the water scheme that is currently included in the MGCM (see Appendix B.3 for details on the current model; Böttger et al., 2005b; Steele et al., 2017a; Zent et al., 1993). The amount of H$_2$O vapour is calculated using a vapour diffusion scheme (Section 3.3.1), alongside a scheme to determine the partitioning of H$_2$O between the vapour, liquid and ice phases (Section 3.3.2). All of the properties that need to be calculated for vapour diffusion and the partitioning of H$_2$O are described in the following sections, and where possible equations and values from the current subsurface model in the MGCM (Steele et al., 2017a) have been used for consistency with previous work.

For the purpose of this study, a constant adsorption value has been included to simplify the overall model, and because the studies of H$_2$O adsorption on Mars for a variety of geological materials show a very large distribution of values (discussed in more detail in Section 3.3.2.3). I also decided a constant adsorption value would be used because there are a limited number of studies on the adsorption of CO$_2$ in the martian regolith (Section 3.4.3.2) and I have only included features that could be added for both H$_2$O and CO$_2$ since I am primarily investigating subsurface CO$_2$ ice. This decision limited the overall complexity, which proved useful since there has not been a similar study into subsurface CO$_2$ to compare the results of this work with and there is a limited understanding of what processes will impact subsurface CO$_2$ ice in the literature.

### 3.3.1 Vapour Diffusion through the Regolith

The process by which H$_2$O vapour is transported through the regolith is controlled by the unsteady diffusion equation (Fick’s 1st law), which is expressed as follows in 1-D:

$$f_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} = D_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} \frac{\partial n_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}{\partial z},$$

(3.17)
where $f_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ is the H$_2$O vapour flux [kg m$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$], $D_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ is the H$_2$O diffusion coefficient [m$^2$s$^{-1}$] (see Section 3.3.1.1), and $n_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ the H$_2$O vapour concentration [kg m$^{-3}$]. This is combined with the relation $\frac{\partial n_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial f_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}{\partial z}$ to form the diffusion equation that needs to be solved:

$$\frac{\partial n_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( D_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} \frac{\partial n_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}{\partial z} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.18)

The base boundary has no flux and there is a positive flux towards the atmosphere from the subsurface (see Section 3.5 for details) in the MSSM.

The discretised form is calculated by integrating Equation 3.18 over a finite timestep, $\delta t$, and control volume, $cv$ (Equation 3.19; Patankar, 1980; Versteeg and Malalasekera, 2007), following the same method used for the thermal scheme (Equations 3.6-3.8). To make the following equations easier to read $n$ and $D$ have been used instead of $n_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ and $D_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ since in this case all the variables relate to H$_2$O vapour. The superscripts relate to time (where $t$ represents the current timestep) and the subscripts relate to the grid point (where $i$ represents the current grid point).

$$\int_{cv} \int_{t}^{t+\delta t} \left( \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} \right) dt \, dV = \int_{t}^{t+\delta t} \int_{cv} \left( \frac{\partial D_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}{\partial z} \frac{\partial n}{\partial z} \right) dt$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.19)

The discretised form of this equation (Equation 3.20a) can be divided by $A \Delta t$ to produce Equation 3.20b, which is in the same form as the discretised form of the heat conduction equation (Equation 3.6)

$$\left( \Delta V + \frac{D_{i+0.5} A_i \delta t}{\delta z_i} + \frac{D_{i-0.5} A_{i-1} \delta t}{\delta z_{i-1}} \right) n_i^t - \frac{D_{i+0.5} A_i \delta t}{\delta z_i} n_{i+1}^t - \frac{D_{i-0.5} A_{i-1} \delta t}{\delta z_{i-1}} n_{i-1}^t = \Delta V n_i^{t-\delta t}$$

$$\left( \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} + \frac{D_{i+0.5} \delta t}{\delta z_i} + \frac{D_{i-0.5} \delta t}{\delta z_{i-1}} \right) n_i^t - \frac{D_{i+0.5} \delta t}{\delta z_i} n_{i+1}^t - \frac{D_{i-0.5} \delta t}{\delta z_{i-1}} n_{i-1}^t = \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} n_i^{t-\delta t}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.20a)

The matrix from this equation is diagonally dominant and is now in the correct form to be numerically solved with a fully implicit TDMA, similar to the thermal scheme. The implicit version of the TDMA is required for vapour diffusion because using an explicit scheme would require a timestep of less than 2 milliseconds for stability according to the Courant-Fredric-Lewy condition for stability. This timestep is much smaller than the timestep of 1 sol being used in this study, whereas an implicit method allows for a
large timestep to be used, which is required for the stand-alone MSSM.

Equations 3.21a-e show the rearrangement of Equation 3.20b for a TDMA. For a detailed derivation of the equations used for the diffusion scheme see Appendix A.2.

\[ a^t_i n_i = b^t_i n_{i+1} + c^t_i n_{i-1} + d^t_i \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.21a)

where

\[ a^t_i = \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} + \frac{D^t_{i+0.5}}{\delta z_i} + \frac{D^t_{i-0.5}}{\delta z_{i-1}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.21b)
\[ b^t_i = \frac{D^t_{i+0.5}}{\delta z_i} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.21c)
\[ c^t_i = \frac{D^t_{i-0.5}}{\delta z_{i-1}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.21d)
\[ d^t_i = \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} n_i^{l-\delta t} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.21e)

### 3.3.1.1 Diffusion Coefficient

In the MSSM I have used the diffusion coefficient experimentally determined by Hudson et al. (2007) (also used in the current subsurface model of the MSSM; Steele et al., 2017a), which considers the effects of both normal \((D_N)\) and Knudsen Diffusion \((D_K)\), with the coefficients for each type of diffusion described by Equations 3.22a and 3.22b respectively. The two types of diffusion describe whether the molecules are colliding predominantly with each other (normal or molecular diffusion), or predominantly with the walls of the pores (Knudsen diffusion). The type of diffusion that occurs within the pore space depends on the ratio between the pore size and the mean free path of the molecules, \(\lambda\). If the ratio is much greater than 1 then diffusion is occurring in the normal regime, if it is much less than 1 then diffusion is occurring in the Knudsen regime. In the transition region between these two regimes, where collisions with pore walls and with other molecules occur frequently, a combined or effective diffusion coefficient is needed (Equations 3.22c and 3.22d). For H\(_2\)O diffusing in a 6 mbar dry CO\(_2\) atmosphere, the mean free path of H\(_2\)O vapour is roughly 9 \(\mu\)m (Hudson et al., 2007). In this model, it is assumed that the pore radius is 50 \(\mu\)m, with a ratio of \(~5.5,\)
and therefore diffusion is always occurring in the transition region.

\[
D_N = 0.1654 \text{cm}^2\text{s}^{-1} \phi_r^{4/3} \frac{P_{\text{ref}}}{P(z)} \left(1 - \frac{\zeta}{\rho_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} \phi_r}\right)^2 \left[\frac{T(z)}{T_{\text{ref}}}\right]^{3/2} 
\]

(3.22a)

\[
D_K = \frac{\pi}{8 + \pi} \frac{\phi}{1 - \phi} \frac{\bar{\nu}}{\bar{r}}
\]

(3.22b)

\[
D_{N_{\text{new}}} = \frac{\phi}{\tau} D_N
\]

(3.22c)

\[
D_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} = \left(\frac{1}{D_{N_{\text{new}}}} + \frac{1}{D_K}\right)^{-1}
\]

(3.22d)

In Equations 3.22a to 3.22d: \(D_N\) is the normal diffusion coefficient [m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\)], \(\phi_r\) is the ice-free porosity, \(T_{\text{ref}}\) is the reference temperature \((T_{\text{ref}} = 273.15\ \text{K})\), \(P_{\text{ref}}\) is the reference pressure \((P_{\text{ref}} = 1013\ \text{mbar})\), \(P(z)\) is the pressure at depth \(z\) [mbar], \(D_K\) is the Knudsen diffusion coefficient [m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\)], \(\phi\) is the porosity, \(\bar{\nu} = (8k_BT/\pi m_w)^{1/2}\) is the mean velocity of the diffusing molecules (where \(m_w\) is the mass of one molecule of \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) and \(k_B\) is the Boltzmann constant), \(\bar{r}\) is the average pore size in the regolith [m], \(\tau\) is the tortuosity (see Section 3.3.1.2), \(D_{N_{\text{new}}}\) is the updated normal diffusion coefficient that accounts for porosity and tortuosity [m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\)], and \(D_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}\) is the final diffusion coefficient [m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\)] that is used in the MSSM.


\[
D_N = 0.1654 \text{cm}^2\text{s}^{-1} \phi_0^{4/3} \frac{P_{\text{ref}}}{p(z)} \left[\frac{T(z)}{T_{\text{ref}}}\right]^{3/2}
\]

(3.23a)

\[
D_K = \frac{1}{3} \langle l_p \rangle \langle \nu \rangle \left[\frac{\langle l_p^2 \rangle}{2\langle l_p \rangle^2 - \beta}\right]
\]

(3.23b)

\[
D_{\text{Hudson08}} = \frac{\phi}{\tau} \left(\frac{1}{D_F} + \frac{1}{D_K}\right)^{-1}
\]

(3.23c)

where \(\langle l_p \rangle\) is the first moment of the chord length distribution (Levitz, 1993), \(\beta\) is a series sum of cosine angles between sequential trajectory segments that are separated by wall collisions. The chord length distribution, \(l_p\), is the range of distances that a vapour particle can travel before hitting a pore wall, assuming random trajectories, and the first moment, \(\langle l_p \rangle\), represents the most likely distance that a particle will
travel. It is determined using the method of Zalc et al. (2004) and can be estimated by $\langle l_p \rangle_{\text{estimated}} = \frac{4\phi}{S_v}$, where $S_v$ is the surface area per unit volume. Zalc et al. (2004) and Hudson and Aharonson (2008) have shown that $\beta \approx 4/3 = 0.3077$. The porosity, $\phi$, is dependent on ice content and is calculated using the method described in Section 3.2.2.1 and Equation 3.9b.

This method uses a more realistic Knudsen diffusion equation (Equation 3.23b), which accounts for variable pore sizes throughout the regolith using a theoretical pore size distribution. Another difference between the methods is the way the final diffusion coefficient, $D$, is calculated, using Equation 3.23c. The method of Hudson and Aharonson (2008) uses the average of the diffusion coefficients before accounting for the effect of porosity and tortuosity, whereas the method of Hudson et al. (2007) accounts for the effect of porosity and tortuosity on normal and Knudsen diffusion individually before calculating the average. While this is an improved version of the diffusion coefficient equations of Hudson et al. (2007), these equations are not used in the MSSM due to uncertainties in the calculations of $\langle l_p \rangle$, $S_v$ and $\beta$.

### 3.3.1.2 Tortuosity

In porous media, the interconnectedness of pores and the sinuosity between them will impact the transport of vapour through them (also known as the permeability; Clennell, 1997; Smoluchowski, 1968; Toon et al., 1980), and this is accounted for by the tortuosity factor. The tortuosity is a structural property of a porous medium that is independent of diffusive regime (Sizemore and Mellon, 2008) and encompasses the effects of all geometrical and chemical interactions that could impact diffusion of vapour through the pore space (Clennell, 1997). In general, porosity effects are excluded from the tortuosity factor (as they are accounted for elsewhere), and the tortuosity only accounts for the effects of sinuosity and dead-end pore space (Clennell, 1997). Tortuosity can be defined as the ratio of the shortest available path to the straight line between two connected pores (Clennell, 1997).

The value for tortuosity is not well constrained as it cannot be directly measured and its value varies depending on the method used. There is also no unique relationship
between the porosity and tortuosity that can be applied to all porous materials, but previous studies show an inverse relationship between the two (Currie, 1960; Sizemore and Mellon, 2008; Smoluchowski, 1968). In a study by Sizemore and Mellon (2008), the value of tortuosity was determined from a combination of experimental measurements of flux, porosity, pore size and martian environmental conditions. They found that measured values of tortuosity for glass spheres range from 1.33 to 1.62, which is consistent with previous measurements by Currie (1960). They used the empirical relationship that is often used for beds of unconsolidated particles:

\[ \tau = \frac{1}{(\phi - C)^n}, \quad (3.24) \]

where \( \tau \) is the tortuosity, \( \phi \) is the porosity, \( n \) is typically a value between 0.3 and 0.5, and \( C \) is a constant related to the range of porosities for a given particulate material. They found that when using \( n = 0.3 \) and \( C=0 \), the empirical relationship fit their data well. For JSC Mars-1 (an analog for martian regolith), Sizemore and Mellon (2008) determined that tortuosity ranges from 1.77 to 2.31 for porosities between 0.5 and 0.8, and these results also fit Equation 3.24 when \( C = 0.2 \) and \( n = 0.5 \). Similar tortuosity values to those for JSC Mars-1 were also found for soil samples from the Antarctic Dry Valleys (Sizemore and Mellon, 2008). These values were at the lower end of tortuosities reported in previous work (between 1 and 16; Satterfield, 1970) and two to three times lower than the values that are generally used in theoretical studies of martian diffusion (Hudson and Aharonson, 2008; Hudson et al., 2007; Mellon and Jakosky, 1993; Smoluchowski, 1968; Titov, 2002). These previous martian studies all used the values of Smoluchowski (1968), who state tortuosity values of 1, 2 and 10 for porosities of 0.8, 0.5 and less than 0.5, respectively. Smoluchowski (1968) concludes that there is a rough upper limit of 2.5 on the tortuosity of unconsolidated dry soils, with values typically between 1.5 and 2.

Ideally a different value of tortuosity would be used depending on both the material and the porosity based on the literature described above. This is not possible since porosity and tortuosity are related but not dependent on each other, and therefore there is no unique relationship between them that can be used for all porous mate-
rials (Sizemore and Mellon, 2008). The relationship described above (Equation 3.24; Sizemore and Mellon, 2008) is also only applicable for unconsolidated dry soils, while the values for porosity in the MSSM assume that the regolith is compacted with depth from an unconsolidated regolith (Equation 3.9b). This compaction with depth will cause a corresponding increase in the tortuosity value as the lower porosity will reduce the number of available pathways between pores. Since the equation discussed for tortuosity is only applicable for an unconsolidated regolith, it is not suitable for this work. As a result, the MSSM uses a constant tortuosity of 1.5, which is the lower limit of the range found by Sizemore and Mellon (2008) under martian conditions, and is applicable for high porosities which is the case for the near-surface empty regolith used here.

The presence of ice within the subsurface will also have an impact on the tortuosity, because it will reduce the number of free pathways for vapour to travel through. Therefore, when ice is present within the subsurface, the tortuosity value will be expected to increase. This increase in tortuosity value will cause a reduction in the diffusion coefficient (e.g. Equation 3.23c) and will result vapour taking longer to diffuse out of the subsurface. This in turn would cause ice (either H$_2$O or CO$_2$) to survive even longer when buried beneath an overlying porous layer. However, the effect of the presence of ice on the tortuosity value is unknown and since the regolith tortuosity value is uncertain, I have decided to not incorporate the impact of a variable tortuosity with ice content into the MSSM because of this uncertainty, and investigating the impact of tortuosity will be an area for future work.

### 3.3.2 Distribution of H$_2$O through the Regolith

The presence of H$_2$O vapour, ice and liquid is dependent on where in the phase diagram (Figure 3.10) the pressure and temperature conditions fall. H$_2$O ice forms at all pressures as long as the temperature is below the frost point temperature, but the equation for frost point temperature is different above and below the triple point pressure of H$_2$O (6.11 mbar; Hardy, 1998). To account for this, different equations of state are used for above and below the triple point, as shown in the phase diagram in Figure 3.10 and described in the following sections. For the temperatures and pressures expected in
Mars’ shallow subsurface, H_2O ice is assumed to have a density of 920 kg m\(^{-3}\), since the density of H_2O ice does not vary with temperature as much as the density of CO_2 ice does (Cuffey and Paterson, 2010; Mangan et al., 2017). The change in density due to high pressures, such as at the base of glaciers, is not considered in this work, since H_2O ice is assumed to form as pore ice, with very little overburden pressure.

The presence of liquid H_2O on Mars, on the other hand, is only possible if the partial pressure of H_2O rises above the triple point. While the presence of liquid H_2O is not expected at the surface in the present-day (e.g., Hoffman, 2001), the inclusion of it in the water scheme allows for this theory to be tested and for future studies to test its formation under the higher H_2O partial pressure conditions expected during the Noachian (such studies have already been done for surface H_2O ice; e.g., Wordsworth et al., 2013).

![Phase diagram for H_2O](image)

**Figure 3.10:** Phase diagram for H_2O from the equations incorporated into the model. The blue dot represents the triple point at 273.16 K and 6.11 mbar (Hardy, 1998). The saturation vapour pressure over ice (black line) is Equation 3.28, the saturation vapour pressure over liquid H_2O (green line) is Equation 3.29 and the melting point curve (pink line) is constant with pressure at 273.16 K. The conditions appropriate to Mars (red box) show the range of partial pressures expected in the atmosphere and does not represent regions of localised higher partial pressure such as at the base of glaciers.
3.3.2.1 Conditions Below the Triple Point Pressure

In general, conditions on Mars are below the triple point pressure of H$_2$O (e.g., Jakosky, 1985a). Consequently, the main phase transition that needs to be considered is between vapour and ice. This occurs when the saturation vapour pressure over ice is reached (Hardy, 1998).

Several equations have been used to calculate the saturation vapour pressure over ice, at a temperature $T$, in martian studies including those in Steele et al. (2017a); Stevens et al. (2001), and Bryson et al. (2008): Equations 3.25-3.27 respectively.

\[ P_{\text{Steele}} = 611 \exp \left( \frac{22.5 \times (1 - 273.16)}{T} \right) \]  
(3.25)

\[ P_{\text{Stevens}} = \exp \left( 28.868 - \frac{6132.935}{T} \right) \]  
(3.26)

\[ P_{\text{Bryson}} = 10^{7.551 - \frac{2666}{100000}} \times 100000 \]  
(3.27)

Another equation for the saturation vapour pressure over ice is given by Hardy (1998, Equation 3.28), and is the generally accepted equation for saturation vapour pressure over ice. It is only valid below the triple point of H$_2$O (273.16 K and 6.11 mbar; Jakosky, 1985a) and is therefore appropriate for martian conditions. A comparison of the four equations (Figure 3.11) shows that the equations only differ slightly near the triple point and the variation is quite small. From this comparison, Equation 3.28 was chosen to be used in the water scheme because it is widely accepted as the standard equation for the vapour pressure of H$_2$O over ice.

\[ \ln(P_{\text{sat}_{H_2O}}) = \frac{k_0}{T} + k_1 + k_2 T + k_3 T^2 + k_4 T^3 + k_5 \ln(T), \quad k_0 = -5866.6426 \]  
(3.28a)

\[ k_1 = 22.32870244 \]  
(3.28b)

\[ k_2 = 0.0139387003 \]  
(3.28c)
\( k_3 = -3.4262402 \times 10^{-5} \) \hspace{1cm} (3.28d)

\( k_4 = 2.7040955 \times 10^{-8} \) \hspace{1cm} (3.28e)

\( k_5 = 0.67063522 \) \hspace{1cm} (3.28f)

3.3.2.2 Conditions Above the Triple Point Pressure

Above the triple point pressure, liquid H\(_2\)O becomes stable and a different set of equations of state are needed to determine the state of H\(_2\)O. In this region, the saturation vapour pressure is found over liquid H\(_2\)O rather than H\(_2\)O ice, and Equation 3.29 is the accepted equation for this (Hardy, 1998).

\[
\ln(P_{\text{sat, H}_2\text{O}}) = \frac{g_0}{T^2} + \frac{g_1}{T} + g_2 + g_3 T + g_4 T^2 + g_5 T^3 + g_6 T^4 + g_7 \ln(T),
\]

\hspace{1cm} (3.29a)

Figure 3.11: (a) Comparison of different equations for saturation vapour pressure over ice (b) The difference in saturation vapour pressure between Equations 3.25-3.27 and Equation 3.28 which is used in the final water scheme (Bryson et al., 2008; Hardy, 1998; Steele et al., 2017a; Stevens et al., 2001).
where

\[
\begin{align*}
g_0 &= -2836.5744 \quad (3.29b) \\
g_1 &= -6028.076559 \quad (3.29c) \\
g_2 &= 19.54263612 \quad (3.29d) \\
g_3 &= -0.02737830188 \quad (3.29e) \\
g_4 &= 1.6261698 \times 10^{-5} \quad (3.29f) \\
g_5 &= 7.0229056 \times 10^{-10} \quad (3.29g) \\
g_6 &= -1.8680009 \times 10^{-13} \quad (3.29h) \\
g_7 &= 2.7150305 \quad (3.29i)
\end{align*}
\]

The phase transition from liquid H\textsubscript{2}O to ice is different from the phase transition from vapour to liquid, as the freezing temperature remains near enough constant at 273.16 K with increasing pressure up to pressures of around 10 MPa (Sanz et al., 2004). Using this constant temperature condition for the phase change from liquid H\textsubscript{2}O to ice is applicable for the MSSM, as H\textsubscript{2}O partial pressures are not expected to reach 10 MPa near the martian surface at any point in Mars' history.

### 3.3.2.3 Adsorption

The adsorption of H\textsubscript{2}O onto regolith grains is a complex topic that has been studied many times experimentally under martian conditions (e.g., Fanale and Cannon, 1974; Jänchen et al., 2006; Zent and Quinn, 1995). However, the results from these studies use a variety of different geological materials and show variations greater than an order of magnitude in the amount adsorbed between the different geological materials used. The experimental study of Fanale and Cannon (1974) on basalt grains (and the equation to fit these data points from Zent et al., 1993) have been well cited in previous studies (e.g., Blackburn et al., 2010; Schorghofer and Forget, 2012; Steele et al., 2017a). Steele et al. (2017a) incorporated this isotherm into their vapour diffusion scheme, which was found to be not conservative, and the assumptions used to simplify the adsorption equation for the diffusion scheme resulted in values that greatly differed from those
produced by the original equation (see Appendix B.3.2 for details on the testing done on the Steele et al., 2017a, scheme). This led to the decision that the adsorption equation should no longer be incorporated into the diffusion scheme, and this is one reason why the diffusion equation I used for the MSSM differs from the one currently used in the MGCM. The decision to not incorporate the adsorption isotherm into the diffusion scheme resulted in a detailed study of adsorption studies for Mars to ensure that the most appropriate representation of adsorption was used.

The amount of H$_2$O that is adsorbed onto a regolith grain is heavily dependent on the adsorptive capacity of the grain and the conditions (temperature and pressure) of the system (Möhlmann, 2002). Basalt is a common geological material across the surface of Mars (alongside its weathering products) and is often used as a representative for the entire surface, but it is not very adsorptive (e.g., Fanale and Cannon, 1971). Clay minerals (e.g. montmorillonite and nontronite), on the other hand, are around twice as adsorptive as basalts and occur in several locations across Mars (Jächen et al., 2006). Different geological materials therefore have a large influence on the amount of H$_2$O that is adsorbed and will also affect the diffusion of H$_2$O through the regolith. Consequently, a comparison of the experimental work on the amount of H$_2$O adsorbed by these materials under martian conditions was undertaken.

Figure 3.12 shows the wide range of values for the amount of adsorbed H$_2$O that have been measured across various geological materials (including basalt, palagonite, zeolitic minerals and clay minerals) under martian conditions (Fanale and Cannon, 1974; Jächen et al., 2006, 2009; Zent and Quinn, 1995). The results from several studies (Bryson et al., 2008; Farris et al., 2018; Nikolakakos and Whiteway, 2018; Pommerol et al., 2009) are not shown in Figure 3.12 because the units$^1$ used to present their results are not compatible for conversion to kg m$^{-3}$, the units used in this work, and therefore are not comparable to the results shown in the figure. Consequently, the values in the excluded studies (Bryson et al., 2008; Farris et al., 2018; Nikolakakos and Whiteway, 2018; Pommerol et al., 2009) were not considered for use in the MSSM.

$^1$Results were presented in H$_2$O content (Farris et al., 2018; Pommerol et al., 2009), ramen signal (Nikolakakos and Whiteway, 2018; Pommerol et al., 2009) or as BET coefficients (Bryson et al., 2008; Farris et al., 2018)
Figure 3.12: H$_2$O adsorption results from the experimental studies of (a) Fanale and Cannon (1974), Zent and Quinn (1995), Jächen et al. (2009) and (b) Jächen et al. (2006). The results have been split according to the differences in pressures used for the experiments.
The experimental studies included in Figure 3.12 show the importance of the geological material being considered: the basaltic materials (basalt and palagonite; Figure 3.12a) adsorb a significantly smaller amount of H$_2$O than the rest of the geological materials considered (Figure 3.12b) which are all strongly adsorbing due to their larger specific surface areas (Zent and Quinn, 1997). The large difference in adsorptive capacity for different geological materials is the main issue with using one method to describe adsorption in the regolith across the entirety of Mars. In their paper, Bryson et al. (2008) compared their results with those of Fanale and Cannon (1971) and Zent and Quinn (1997), correcting for the differences in conditions between the studies, and found that the clay in their study adsorbed 1.3 to 7 times more H$_2$O than the Fanale and Cannon (1971) and Zent and Quinn (1997) studies. They concluded that more work would be needed to resolve the discrepancy, which is supported by the comparison of results shown in Figure 3.12.

An alternative method for determining the adsorption of H$_2$O in the martian regolith for low to mid latitudes is outlined by Möhlmann (2002) and is further expanded in Möhlmann (2003, 2004, 2005). The Möhlmann (2002) model determines the number of adsorption layers, $n$, on a grain according to the relative pressure, $x$ (where $x$ = pressure over saturation pressure), using Equation 3.30 which was originally published by Mikhail and Robens (1983).

$$n(x) = (1.03 + (1.9 + (-1 + (3.33 + (-1.21 \times 10^{-13}) + (16.66 + (-55.55 + 213.29(-0.8 + x)) (-0.6 + x))(-0.5 + x))(-0.4 + x))(-0.3 + x))(-0.2 + x))(-0.1 + x))$$

(3.30)

The number of monolayers is then converted into a mass density of adsorbed H$_2$O, $\rho_a$, using Equation 3.31.

$$\rho_a = \rho_s n S_A \Sigma,$$

(3.31)

where $\rho_s$ is the soil mean mass density (1300 kg m$^{-3}$) and $\Sigma$ is the surface mass density of a monolayer of H$_2$O molecules ($2.84 \times 10^{-7}$ kg m$^{-2}$). $S_A$ is the specific surface area and a value of $1.7 \times 10^4$ m$^2$ kg$^{-1}$ was used, corresponding to the value measured at the Viking 1 lander site (Ballou et al., 1978). Using these values, a monolayer of adsorbed
$H_2O$ is equivalent to a mass density of 6.3 kg m$^{-3}$. If an adsorbed $H_2O$ content of 1 wt% is assumed in the martian crust, with the specific surface area value mentioned above, then the equivalent number of adsorption layers is 2, which is equivalent to an adsorption mass density of 12.6 kg m$^{-3}$.

Mars Odyssey observations have shown regionally high subsurface $H_2O$ contents of up to 9 wt% in the equatorial regions (Feldman et al., 2004). This could be in the form of either $H_2O$ ice, liquid $H_2O$, adsorbed $H_2O$, or hydrated minerals. Möhlmann (2002, 2003) suggests that the existence of two layers of adsorbed $H_2O$ (on average) could be used to explain the $H_2O$ content in the upper martian surface observed by Mars Odyssey. This suggestion assumes that the specific surface area was the only property that would change between locations across the surface. If a value of $S_A = 1.5 \times 10^5$ m$^2$ kg$^{-1}$ is used instead of the measured Viking value mentioned earlier, then two layers of adsorbed $H_2O$ would correspond to a subsurface $H_2O$ content of 9 wt%.

Möhlmann (2004) uses the assumption of two monolayers of adsorbed $H_2O$ to give maximum estimates for specific surface area for the range of $H_2O$ contents measured by Feldman et al. (2004). The $H_2O$ content ranged from 2 wt% to 10 wt%, which corresponded to specific surface areas in the range from $3.3 \times 10^4$ m$^2$ kg$^{-1}$ to $1.66 \times 10^5$ m$^2$ kg$^{-1}$ assuming the entire $H_2O$ content was adsorbed $H_2O$. These values are comparable to the measured values of terrestrial materials (Van Olphen and Fripiat, 1979) and shows the applicability of the model of Möhlmann (2002, 2003, 2004, 2005).

After comparing all of the available experimental data and models for adsorbed $H_2O$ within the martian subsurface, I decided that a constant value would be the best option for the MSSM, because the aim is to investigate the long-term ice distribution. This decision was supported by the study of Schorghofer and Aharonson (2005) which compared the net accumulation of ice with and without adsorption over a period of 35 martian years. The results of this study showed that, while adsorption can inhibit diffusion and ice formation over short time periods (a few martian years), it has a negligible effect on the long-term (>30 martian years) amount of ice accumulated. This is because adsorption impacts the transient diffusion and overall mass balance of the subsurface, but will not impact the stationary diffusion between the air and
ground ice, which is governed by the difference between the mean vapour densities at the surface of the ice and the air in contact with ice (Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005).

An adsorption concentration of 12.6 kg m$^{-3}$ is, therefore, used for the entire subsurface based on the work of Möhlmann (2004). This value is equivalent to 2 layers of adsorbed H$_2$O when using the value for specific surface area from Ballou et al. (1978). It is used because it is currently the only published value for the specific surface area of martian soil, even though it is still uncertain whether this local measurement for a specific surface area can be used as an approximation for the global value. The value chosen for the amount of adsorbed H$_2$O is also within a similar range to the measured values of adsorbed H$_2$O found from experimental studies on basalt and some of the palagonite studies (Figure 3.12; Fanale and Cannon, 1974; Jänchen et al., 2009; Zent and Quinn, 1995). Basalt (and palagonite, which is an altered form of basalt) is considered to be one of the geological materials that is an important constituent of the martian surface (Bryson et al., 2008; Christensen et al., 2004). The Thermal Emission Spectrometer (TES) found that over 8% of the planet is covered by at least 30% concentrations of basalt (Bryson et al., 2008) and values for basalt are often used as representative for the entire surface in martian adsorption studies because it represents the lower end of adsorption capability. Future work will be required to update the way adsorption is calculated to better represent the range of materials found at the surface. However, for investigating long term subsurface ice distribution, the constant value is sufficient.

### 3.3.2.4 Thermal Conductivity of H$_2$O Ice

The thermal conductivity of H$_2$O ice varies with temperature and ice content. The variation in thermal conductivity with temperature is accounted for using the model of Klinger (1981) shown in Equation 3.32a. However, many other studies use the equation of Hobbs (1974) instead (Equation 3.32b), including the subsurface thermal
model currently in the MGCM (Steele et al., 2017a).

\[ k_{H_2O} = \frac{567}{T} \quad (3.32a) \]

\[ k_{H_2O}^{Hobbs} = \frac{488.19}{T} + 0.4685 \quad (3.32b) \]

Both equations produce similar values for the range of Martian temperatures, as shown in Table 3.4. For the purpose of my thermal model, Equation 3.32a (Klinger, 1981) is more appropriate because it was developed for cometary ices and other low pressure environments such as Mars (e.g. Kossacki et al., 1994), whereas Equation 3.32b was developed for environments with Earth-like pressures (Hobbs, 1974).

Table 3.4: Values for the thermal conductivity [W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\)] of H\(_2\)O ice appropriate for Martian temperatures [K] using the equation by Hobbs (1974) and Klinger (1981).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>(k_{H_2O}^{Hobbs}) (Hobbs, 1974)</th>
<th>(k_{H_2O}^{Klinger}) (Klinger, 1981)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.7449</td>
<td>3.8053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>2.7497</td>
<td>2.6495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The method used here to account for the increase in effective thermal conductivity, \(k_{eff}\) with H\(_2\)O ice content also differs from that in the Steele et al. (2017a) model, which uses the method of Siegler et al. (2012) rather than a Hertz factor (\(h_{H_2O}\); Section 3.2.2.1). Siegler et al. (2012) use the fraction of the pore space filled with ice, rather than the contact area to determine the effect of H\(_2\)O ice within the pores, and account for the change in porosity of the regolith from the formation of H\(_2\)O ice explicitly when determining the effective thermal conductivity, as shown in their equation:

\[ k_{eff} = k_r + \phi_r k_{H_2O} F \quad (3.33) \]

where \(F\) is the fraction of the pore space filled with ice. The method used in the MSSM (Grott et al., 2007, see Section 3.2.1) accounts for the change in porosity within the calculation of the effective thermal conductivity, using the Hertz factor. The decrease in porosity of the regolith matrix with depth is also accounted for in this model and is not included in the method of Siegler et al. (2012). Figure 3.13 shows the effect of a diurnal temperature cycle on the thermal conductivity if the pore space is filled with
H₂O ice and the Hertz factor is used to determine the subsequent increase in thermal conductivity.

Figure 3.13: Thermal conductivity of the regolith matrix with the pore space filled with H₂O ice over one sol. Calculated using Equation 3.11 and using the diurnal temperature cycle at 40°N, 120°E and Lₜ = 270° from the MCD. The parameters for the matrix are the same as those in Figure 3.6.

3.4 Carbon Dioxide Scheme

The carbon dioxide scheme shares many of the same elements as the water scheme, with the same method used for vapour diffusion and phase distribution. The main differences between the two schemes are the equations that are dependent on the species being considered, in this case CO₂. A description of the equations used for CO₂ are presented in the following sections.

3.4.1 Thermal Conductivity of CO₂ Ice

The thermal conductivity of CO₂ ice does not have as much of an impact on the total thermal conductivity of the regolith as that of H₂O ice. However, it does still have an influence and therefore a temperature dependent thermal conductivity of CO₂ ice is used in the MSSM (Equation 3.34; Ross and Kargel, 1998). The equation is derived
from the experimental data of Konstantinov et al. (1988).

\[
\log_{10}(k_{\text{CO}_2}) = -5.39941 + 5.45894 \log_{10}(T) - 1.41326 \log_{10}(T^2) \tag{3.34}
\]

An alternative thermal conductivity equation (Equation 3.4.1) is used by Manning et al. (2019) from the work of Kravchenko and Krupskii (1986). This equation is also used in the work of Mellon (1996), Wieczorek (2008), Stewart and Nimmo (2002), and Heldmann and Mellon (2004). However, it was not possible to follow the derivation for this equation through the literature, which is the reason Equation 3.34 was used instead.

\[
k_{\text{CO}_2}(T) = \frac{93.4}{T} \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1} \tag{3.35}
\]

### 3.4.2 Vapour Diffusion

The diffusion scheme for CO₂ vapour is similar to the scheme used for H₂O vapour diffusion. The scheme uses the same equations and finite volume method, because the overall process of vapour diffusion is insensitive to the species that is diffused. The final equation for the CO₂ vapour diffusion scheme (Equation 3.36a) is identical to the one for H₂O vapour diffusion, apart from the fact that in this case \( n \) and \( D \) represent \( n_{\text{CO}_2} \) and \( D_{\text{CO}_2} \), respectively.

\[
a_i^t n_i = b_i^t n_{i+1} + c_i^t n_{i-1} + d_i^t \tag{3.36a}
\]

where

\[
a_i^t = \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} + \frac{D_{i+0.5}}{\delta z_i} + \frac{D_{i-0.5}}{\delta z_{i-1}} \tag{3.36b}
\]

\[
b_i^t = \frac{D_{i+0.5}}{\delta z_i} \tag{3.36c}
\]

\[
c_i^t = \frac{D_{i-0.5}}{\delta z_{i-1}} \tag{3.36d}
\]

\[
d_i^t = \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} n_{i-\delta t} \tag{3.36e}
\]
3.4.2.1 Diffusion Coefficient

The diffusion of CO$_2$ into martian regolith is a complex topic that has a limited amount of literature. Fanale et al. (1982a) ran experiments to measure diffusion and give the following diffusion coefficient:

$$D = \phi \tau D_p,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.37)

where $D$ is the gas diffusivity [m$^2$s$^{-1}$], $\phi$ is the porosity, $\tau$ is the tortuosity and $D_p$ is the diffusivity of a single pore (m$^2$s$^{-1}$, Equation 3.38; Fanale et al., 1982a).

$$D_p = \frac{4r}{3} \left( \frac{2RT}{\pi M_{CO_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.38)

where $r$ is the pore radius [µm], $T$ is the temperature, $R$ is the ideal gas constant [m$^3$PaK$^{-1}$mol$^{-1}$] and $M$ is the molecular mass (kg; Fanale et al., 1982a). The combined equation (Equation 3.39) is used for the diffusion coefficient in the carbon dioxide scheme.

$$D_{CO_2} = \phi \tau \frac{4r}{3} \left( \frac{2RT}{\pi M_{CO_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.39)

3.4.3 Phase Distribution of CO$_2$

Similar to H$_2$O, CO$_2$ forms as either vapour, adsorbate or ice within the subsurface (Equation 3.40). Liquid CO$_2$ is not stable under any expected conditions on Mars and is therefore not included. Figure 3.14 shows the CO$_2$ phase diagram (using the equations used in the MSSM) and shows that the saturation vapour pressure over ice equation is the only relevant part of the phase diagram for the temperatures and pressures that are relevant on Mars (red box on Figure 3.14).

$$\sigma_{CO_2} = n_{CO_2} + \alpha_{CO_2} + \zeta_{CO_2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.40)

where $\sigma_{CO_2}$ is the total amount of CO$_2$ [kgm$^{-3}$], $n_{CO_2}$ is the concentration of CO$_2$ vapour per unit volume of regolith [kgm$^{-3}$], $\alpha_{CO_2}$ is the concentration of adsorbed CO$_2$ [kgm$^{-3}$] and $\zeta_{CO_2}$ is the concentration of subsurface CO$_2$ ice [kgm$^{-3}$].
Figure 3.14: Phase diagram for CO\(_2\) from the equations incorporated into the model. The blue dot represents the triple point at 216.56 K and 5100 mbar. The saturation vapour pressure over ice (black line) is Equation 3.41b, the saturation vapour pressure over liquid CO\(_2\) (green line) is Equation 3.41a and the melting point curve was determined using the phase diagram in Witkowski et al. (2014). The conditions appropriate to Mars (red box) are all far below the triple point (216.56 K and 5100 mbar), which means that only the saturation vapour pressure over ice equation is relevant for this work.
3.4.3.1 Saturation Vapour Pressure Over Ice

The equation for saturation vapour pressure over CO$_2$ ice (also known as frost point pressure) used is from Kasting (1991). Their study included equations for above (Equation 3.41a) and below (Equation 3.41b) the triple point temperature of CO$_2$ (216.56 K), and as shown by the red box in Figure 3.14, the equation for above the triple point is not relevant for Mars conditions. The equation for below the triple point is used in several Mars studies including Hu et al. (2012), which makes it an appropriate equation to use for this study.

\[
\log_{10}(P_{satCO_2}(\text{atm})) = 3.128082 - \frac{867.2124}{T} + 18.65612 \times 10^{-3} T - 72.48820 \times 10^{-6} T^2 + 93 \times 10^{-9} T^3 \tag{3.41a}
\]

\[
\log_{10}(P_{satCO_2}(\text{atm})) = 6.760956 - \frac{1284.07}{T - 4.718} + 1.256 \times 10^4(T - 143.15) \tag{3.41b}
\]

Other studies have used different equations for frost point pressure which are only used within the cited study (e.g., Hourdin et al., 1993; Miller and Smythe, 1970; Span and Wagner, 1996, Equations 3.42a-c respectively) and were therefore not considered appropriate for this work.

\[
T_{CO_2} = 149.2 + 6.48 \ln(P), \tag{3.42a}
\]

where $T_{CO_2}$ is in kelvin and $P$ is in hectopascals.

\[
\log_{10}(P(\text{mb})) = 11.3450 - \frac{1470.2}{T} - 4.1024 \times 10^{-3}T \tag{3.42b}
\]

\[
\ln \left( \frac{P_{\text{sub}}}{P_t} \right) = \frac{T_t}{T} \left[ a_1 \left( 1 - \frac{T}{T_t} \right) + a_2 \left( 1 - \frac{T}{T_t} \right)^{1.9} + a_3 \left( 1 - \frac{T}{T_t} \right)^{2.9} \right], \tag{3.42c}
\]

where $T_t = 216.592$ K, $P_t = 0.51795$ MPa, $a_1 = -14.740846$, $a_2 = 2.4327015$, and $a_3 = -5.3061778$. 
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3.4.3.2 Adsorption

A detailed investigation of experimental studies on the adsorption of CO$_2$ under martian conditions was also undertaken to find the most appropriate value or equation to use. Figure 3.15 shows the results from all experimental studies of CO$_2$ adsorption (Fanale and Cannon, 1971; Jänchen et al., 2006; Zent and Quinn, 1995; Zent et al., 1987). These were all completed using either basalt (Fanale and Cannon, 1971) or palagonite, a weathering product of basalt (Jänchen et al., 2009; Zent and Quinn, 1995; Zent et al., 1987). It shows that for a range of Mars-relevant temperatures and pressures, the amount of CO$_2$ that can be adsorbed has a wide spread. There is very little correlation between the data sets (despite each data set showing individual correlation) making it difficult to define a CO$_2$ adsorption isotherm, which led to the decision to also use a constant value for CO$_2$ adsorption. A value of 10.7 kg m$^{-2}$ was chosen because this is the average value across all experiments in the pressure range shown in Figure 3.15 (0 to 1050 Pa).

Figure 3.15: Results from experimental studies of CO$_2$ adsorption. The studies shown in this figure are [1] Fanale and Cannon (1971), [2] Zent et al. (1987), [3] Zent and Quinn (1995) and [4] Jänchen et al. (2006). All experiments (apart from those indicated in the legend) were done under a relative humidity (RH) of 0, i.e. no H$_2$O in the system. The experimental study of [1] Fanale and Cannon (1971) was done on basalt, whereas all of the other studies in the figure used palagonite.
3.4.4 Density of CO$_2$ ice

CO$_2$ ice density is more heavily dependent on temperature than that of H$_2$O ice (Mangan et al., 2017). As a result, the temperature dependent equation for CO$_2$ density of Mangan et al. (2017) is used in this work (Equation 3.43). They developed this equation from a combination of their own experimental data at Mars-relevant conditions and previous experimental data in the literature, making it appropriate for use in this study.

\[
\rho_{\text{CO}_2} = 1.7239 - 2.53 \times 10^{-4} T - 2.87 \times 10^{-6} T^2
\]  

(3.43)

3.5 Surface Flux

In the MSSM, a fixed atmospheric annual cycle is used for the atmospheric boundary. The annual cycles used are taken from one of four baseline MGCM simulations (Section 3.7), one at each obliquity considered (15°, 25°, 35°, and 45°). The details of these baseline runs can be found in Section 3.7.1. The atmospheric values for H$_2$O and CO$_2$ vapour density are then used to calculate the regolith-to-atmosphere flux of each volatile using Fick’s 1st law (Equation 3.17), which can be written as:

\[
f = D \frac{n_{\text{surf}} - n_{\text{atm}}}{z_{0.5}},
\]  

(3.44a)

where

\[
n_{\text{atm}} = \rho_{\text{atm}} \times q_{\text{atm}}.
\]  

(3.44b)

Here, $f$ is the surface flux from the regolith to the atmosphere [kg m$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$], $D$ is the diffusion coefficient [m$^2$ s$^{-1}$], $n_{\text{surf}}$ is the vapour concentration in the top layer of the subsurface [kg m$^{-3}$], $n_{\text{atm}}$ is the vapour concentration in the lowest layer of the atmosphere [kg m$^{-3}$] and $z_{0.5}$ is the depth to the midpoint of the first regolith layer [m]. $n_{\text{atm}}$ is not calculated directly by the MGCM, which is used to provide the atmospheric inputs, and has to be calculated from the density of the atmosphere in the lowest atmospheric layer, $\rho_{\text{atm}}$ [kg m$^{-3}$], and the mass mixing ratio for the volatile
being considered, $q_{atm}$. The same equation is used for H$_2$O and CO$_2$, but the values used for $D$, $n_{surf}$, $\rho_{atm}$ and $n_{surf}$ are those appropriate for the volatile being considered.

### 3.6 Sublimation and Accumulation Rates

The sublimation rate of ice is included because temperature changes can drastically change the saturation vapour pressure for both H$_2$O and CO$_2$ ice. When the saturation vapour pressure is much higher than in the previous timestep, and if there is enough ice to increase the amount of vapour in the pore space to the amount needed to be at saturation vapour pressure, then all of the ice that would need to sublimate for that to occur would sublimate instantaneously. In reality, this process would be gradual and several studies investigating the change in sublimation rate when a H$_2$O ice layer is overlain by a porous regolith on Mars have shown that sublimation rate is inversely proportional to the depth of the layer (Bryson et al., 2008; Chevrier et al., 2007, 2008; Dundas and Byrne, 2010; Soare et al., 2008). Consequently, I have included the experimental equation for H$_2$O ice sublimation rate, $E_{sw}$ of Chevrier et al. (2008, Equation 3.45), which takes into account the depth of the ice layer and the difference in vapour pressure between the subsurface pore space and the atmosphere.

\[
E_{\text{sw} \text{H}_2\text{O}} = \frac{D_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} M_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} P_{\text{satH}_2\text{O}}}{L R T_s \rho_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}} \left[1 - \frac{T_s P_{\text{atm}}}{T_{\text{atm}} P_{\text{satH}_2\text{O}}} \right],
\tag{3.45}
\]

where $D_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ is the H$_2$O diffusion coefficient [m$^2$s$^{-1}$], $M_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ is the molecular weight of H$_2$O [kg], $P_{\text{satH}_2\text{O}}$ is the saturation pressure [Pa] of H$_2$O ice at temperature $T_s$ [K], $L$ is the thickness of the regolith layer [m], $R$ is the ideal gas constant [m$^3$PaK$^{-1}$ mol$^{-1}$], $\rho_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ is the density of H$_2$O ice [kg m$^{-3}$], $P_{\text{atm}}$ is the H$_2$O vapour pressure [Pa] in the atmosphere and $T_{\text{atm}}$ is the temperature [K] in the atmosphere (Chevrier et al., 2008). I have adapted this for use within the MSSM by using the vapour pressure and temperature in the overlying model layer rather than the atmosphere, and the thickness of the current layer, rather than the thickness of the entire subsurface for layers below the surface layer. This allows for a unique sublimation rate to be calculated in each layer and a more accurate estimation of the rate of H$_2$O ice loss within the subsurface.

There have been a few experimental studies to determine the sublimation rate of
The sublimation rate determined by Blackburn et al. (2010) was found to be most appropriate for the MSSM after an investigation into the other studies showed the sublimation rate values were either measured under standard Earth pressure and temperature conditions (Aylward et al., 2019) or were calculated to determine an expected gas flux rate (Cedillo-Flores et al., 2011). In the experiments done by Blackburn et al. (2010) sublimation rate was measured from pure CO$_2$ ice under simulated martian conditions, although there was no consideration of the effect of either dust within the ice or an overlying regolith/water ice layer, both of which would impact the sublimation rate. Despite this, their value for the average sublimation rate of CO$_2$ ice, 1.2 mm h$^{-1}$, is used since it is the most appropriate of the experimental values.

Ideally an accumulation/deposition rate for both H$_2$O and CO$_2$ ice would be included in the model alongside the sublimation rate. However, there is no known value for the accumulation rates within regolith for Mars. There are values for the accumulation rate of the PLD; for example Banks et al. (2010) found an average accumulation rate of 0.5 mm MY$^{-1}$ from resurfacing rates of the North Polar Layered Deposits (NPLD). These values, however, are only applicable for surface accumulation and more work is needed to understand subsurface accumulation. Consequently, I have assumed that any amount of vapour above the saturation vapour concentration is converted into ice instantaneously, which is the method used in many studies (e.g., Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005; Steele et al., 2017a). This is likely an overestimation of the amount of ice that will accumulate within a timestep, but should provide a good first approximation for deposition of ice within the regolith for simulations longer than 20 martian years.

### 3.7 The LMD-UK Mars global circulation model

The Mars global circulation model that has been co-developed between the Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique (LMD) du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Paris, The Open University (OU) and Oxford University in the UK, and the Instituto de Astrofísica de Andalucía (IAA) in Granada (referred to as the MGCM; Forget et al., 1999; Lewis et al., 1999) is used to generate the annual atmospheric cycles (of surface temperature, pressure, H$_2$O vapour density and CO$_2$ vapour density) that are surface
inputs for the MSSM. The MGCM uses the physical parametrisations from the LMD global circulation model (GCM; Forget et al., 1999) coupled with a UK-only spectral dynamical core and a semi-Lagrangian advection scheme for tracers (dust and H\textsubscript{2}O; Holmes et al., 2018; Newman et al., 2002). It uses topography from Mars Orbiter Laser Altimeter (MOLA) data, a dust scenario that can be prescribed from Mars Global Surveyor (MGS) data, and cloud microphysics for both H\textsubscript{2}O and CO\textsubscript{2} (Forget et al., 1998; Holmes et al., 2018; Levrard et al., 2004; Montmessin et al., 2004; Navarro et al., 2014; Steele et al., 2017a).

The MGCM also includes a thermal and water scheme for the subsurface. The original aim of this work was to expand the subsurface water scheme (Steele et al., 2017a) to include all states of CO\textsubscript{2}, although on testing of the subsurface water scheme, it was found to not conserve H\textsubscript{2}O when assuming a closed system. A full description of the subsurface water scheme of Steele et al. (2017a) and the testing done on the scheme is described in Appendix B.3. Consequently, the MSSM has been designed so that it can be incorporated into the MGCM in the future and a description of this integration can be found in Appendix B.2. However, this thesis only uses the stand-alone MSSM and the MGCM is only used to provide surface atmospheric profiles.

### 3.7.1 Atmospheric Profiles from MGCM Simulations

The MGCM is used throughout this thesis to provide the surface conditions for all of the subsurface runs. Four MGCM runs were completed to be used as surface conditions, one at each of the four orbital obliquities considered in this thesis (15°, 25°, 35° and 45°). A different MGCM run was done for each obliquity because obliquity has a significant influence on the climate (see Section 2.7) and the change in surface conditions will impact the results.

The MGCM simulations were run for 4 martian years using the results from previous 20 martian year spin-up runs at each obliquity (15°, 25°, 35°, and 45°) and the present-day eccentricity and longitude of perihelion. The MGCM simulations were run at a T31 resolution (refers to a triangular truncation at a total wavenumber of 31), which relates to a physical grid with a resolution of 5° latitude x 5° longitude (72 x 36 grid points in total) and 25 vertical levels, extending to an altitude of 80 km at the top.
of the model. The MGCM simulations were also run using the MGS dust profile for MY 24, timesteps of 1.5 minutes (960 time steps per day) and no radiatively active dust or ice. For a detailed description of the parameters used for the MGCM simulations see Appendix B.1.

Surface annual cycles for each latitude (averaged over longitude) and for 12 individual locations (Section 4.1.1) were determined from the final year of these MGCM simulations by averaging out the diurnal cycle. These annual cycles are then used as the surface condition for the MSSM in all of the simulations discussed in this thesis. While MGCM simulations were run for all four obliquities, only the 25° obliquity atmospheric profiles are discussed here. The atmospheric profiles for the other obliquities (15°, 35°, and 45°) can be found in Section 6.1 before the obliquity simulations are discussed.

Annual temperature, pressure, CO$_2$ vapour density and H$_2$O vapour density cycles at each latitude are shown in Figure 3.16. The CO$_2$ vapour and H$_2$O vapour concentrations are output as mass mixing ratios in the MGCM, so vapour density values have been calculated by multiplying the mass mixing ratio by atmospheric density, which follows the same patterns as surface pressure. Therefore, any variations in surface pressure are replicated in the CO$_2$ vapour density and H$_2$O vapour density cycles. This will have the largest influence in the northern polar region (55°–80°N), where the longitudinally averaged surface pressure values are highest during northern winter, which is also seen in the CO$_2$ vapour density cycle. At this time of year, it would be expected that CO$_2$ vapour density is lowest (due to the formation of the seasonal polar cap). However, the higher surface pressures will mean that CO$_2$ ice forms at both higher temperature and with a higher saturation vapour density (Figure 3.14), resulting in higher CO$_2$ vapour densities.

Overall, each of the four cycles shows the expected annual atmospheric patterns (see Section 2.6) and the results have been compared with observations and the MCD (e.g., Lewis et al., 1999; Smith, 2002, 2004). The main patterns that can be seen are large variations in the polar regions from the formation of seasonal polar caps (Figure 3.17) during the winter of each hemisphere and smaller variations in the equatorial
Figure 3.16: Longitudinal averages as a function of latitude over time for the surface (a) temperature, (b) pressure, (c) H\textsubscript{2}O vapor and (d) atmospheric CO\textsubscript{2} vapor cycles in the present-day (obliquity = 25\textdegree). The values are taken from the lowest atmospheric layer in the MGCM to represent the near-surface atmospheric values.
regions. These small equatorial variations will influence the long term ice stability in this region. Figure 3.18 shows the variations between 40°N and 40°S, demonstrating that the annual cycle is more pronounced at these latitudes than it appears to be in Figure 3.16.
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Figure 3.17: Annual surface (a) CO$_2$ ice and (b) H$_2$O ice cycles with zonal latitude for the present-day (Obliquity = 25°).
Figure 3.18: Longitudinal averages as a function of latitude over time for the surface (a) temperature and (b) pressure (c) H₂O vapour and (d) CO₂ vapour cycles across the equatorial region (40°N to 40°S) for the present-day (Obliquity = 25°). The values are taken from the lowest atmospheric layer in the MGCM to represent the near-surface values.
3.8 Summary

The MSSM is a thermal and vapour diffusion subsurface model that simulates the partitioning of H$_2$O and CO$_2$ into vapour, ice and adsorbate (and liquid H$_2$O). This chapter describes the equations and methods used to develop the MSSM and the justifications for the equations chosen over other available equations.

The thermal scheme uses a thermal conductivity that varies with depth and ice content, ensuring subsurface temperatures reflect the changes expected for a regolith with variable ice content. The vapour diffusion scheme is consistent for both H$_2$O and CO$_2$ vapour, with diffusion coefficients calculated for each vapour separately. Saturated vapour densities for H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice are calculated for the updated surface temperature, then used to determine whether ice is deposited or sublimated in each timestep.

Both the thermal scheme and the vapour diffusion schemes require a surface boundary condition which is taken from the MGCM. The thermal scheme uses a fixed daily average surface temperature, while the vapour diffusion schemes use a surface flux condition. In this thesis, the stand-alone version of the MSSM is used, so a prescribed annual atmospheric cycle (i.e. a fixed value for each sol) is used as the surface condition for each property. These annual atmospheric cycles are taken from the results of a MGCM simulation that has been diurnally averaged.
4 | How do CO₂ ice and H₂O ice interact within the regolith?

Until recently, carbon dioxide (CO₂) ice has been assumed to mainly exist at the surface in the polar caps and as CO₂ frost at lower latitudes. This idea relates to studies of surface CO₂ ice which show that, in the present-day, surface CO₂ ice is seasonal at nearly all latitudes and persists throughout the year only at the highest southern latitudes (e.g., Ingersoll, 1974; Lambert and Chamberlain, 1978). This has been shown through both observational, theoretical and numerical studies (e.g., Aharonson et al., 2004; Blackburn et al., 2010; Leighton and Murray, 1966; Piqueux et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2001a) as discussed in Sections 2.2 and 2.4. The recent discovery of metre-scale CO₂ ice deposits within the South Polar Layered Deposits (SPLD) demonstrates the existence of subsurface CO₂ ice in a large enough quantity to significantly impact atmospheric pressure if released (∼6 mbar; Bierson et al., 2016; Phillips et al., 2011).

Previous studies of the martian subsurface have focused on water (H₂O) ice and the conditions that control its formation and stability over time (e.g., Aharonson and Schorghofer, 2006; Bandfield and Feldman, 2008; Mellon et al., 2004; Schorghofer, 2010). In these studies, the impact of subsurface CO₂ ice on the formation and stability of H₂O ice has not been considered. The amount of time that CO₂ ice can survive in the subsurface with H₂O ice has also not yet been explored. This chapter explores several scenarios with one and two ice-layers within the subsurface to investigate whether subsurface CO₂ ice can survive longer at depth within a regolith matrix than at the surface and whether its presence has an impact on the distribution of H₂O ice and vice versa. The results presented here suggest that while CO₂ ice is unstable when there is no overlying protective layer, a metre-scale overlying layer of H₂O ice-filled regolith is sufficient for CO₂ ice to survive for long periods of time. The presence of subsurface CO₂ ice also has a complex effect on the behaviour of H₂O ice, due to variations in
temperature and diffusion coefficient caused by the presence of both ices. When interpreting the results in this chapter it is important to keep in mind that the initial amounts of CO$_2$ ice and H$_2$O ice used are probably higher than the amounts expected within the subsurface across the low and mid-latitude regions. The high values are used to simplify the initial conditions and to investigate overall effects that may not be as noticeable for small amounts of either ice.

Section 4.1 outlines the methods specific to the simulations described in this chapter, including an overview of the initial subsurface conditions used. The results from the simulations with only one type of ice present are discussed in Section 4.2 and those with two ices present are discussed in Section 4.3. A series of simulations where fixed model parameters, such as the maximum sublimation rate, are changed to reflect the range expected on Mars are described in Section 4.4 and all of the results are summarised in Section 4.5.

4.1 Initial Conditions

The Martian Subsurface Model (MSSM) simulations discussed in this chapter were initialised with a subsurface containing either one or two ice-layers. Ice layers refer to the regions in the subsurface that contain either completely ice-free pore space or pore space filled with either H$_2$O or CO$_2$ ice. These ice layers are different from the model layers discussed in Section 3.1, which refer to the regions between the numerical grid points that the equations in the MSSM are discretised onto. In the scenarios used, the different ice layers are either an ice-free regolith, a regolith with the pore space filled with H$_2$O ice, or a regolith with pore space filled with CO$_2$ ice. In the rest of this thesis when the pore space is filled with H$_2$O ice, or when the pore space is filled with CO$_2$ ice, the ice layers will be referred to as a H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer or a CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layer, respectively.

The amount of ice in the pore space is assumed to fill all available space when ice is present. This assumption has been used because this is an initial study to investigate how CO$_2$ ice and H$_2$O ice affect each other within the subsurface. Previous work has only investigated H$_2$O ice distribution within the subsurface, both as pore ice and as
excess ice (where the volume of ice is greater than the pore volume; Bramson et al., 2015; Schorghofer and Forget, 2012), and there is no previous work on CO₂ ice in the subsurface to use as an indicator of the amount of CO₂ ice that is expected to be present. For this initial study, it is assumed that only pore ice can exist, as excess ice can only form by vapour diffusion when there are fractures within the subsurface geology (Fisher, 2005) and is generally assumed to form by the burial of ice sheets (Section 2.3). Similar to the design of early models of subsurface H₂O ice (e.g., Mellon, 1996; Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005), an understanding of the behaviour of pore ice is useful before the additional complexities of the inclusion of excess ice are investigated (Schorghofer and Forget, 2012). Future studies could, therefore, include the presence of excess CO₂ ice into the MSSM after the impact of the inclusion of CO₂ pore ice has been investigated further. In this chapter it is also assumed that the pore space is entirely filled with only one ice when ice is present. This is generally expected when both ices exist in the same location since the frost point temperatures of both ices are different (∼195 K for water and ∼145 K for CO₂; Hardy, 1998; Kasting, 1991). Alongside this, it has been suggested that CO₂ clathrate hydrates might form between layers of pure H₂O ice and pure CO₂ ice (Section 2.1.4; e.g., Hoffman, 2001; Lambert and Chamberlain, 1978; Miller and Smythe, 1970).

The amounts of H₂O ice and CO₂ ice used (see Table 4.1 for column density values) are likely to be greater than the amount that would be deposited on Mars. Especially in some latitudes where, in the present-day, CO₂ and H₂O ice are not stable and there is not enough of either vapour in the atmosphere to form such ice deposits. However, higher atmospheric pressures in previous martian epochs (during the Noachian and Hesperian; see Section 2.8) and the different atmospheric conditions during different obliquities (see Section 2.7.1) are expected to have caused deposition in locations where ices are not expected in the present-day. This is due to the increased frost point temperature of both ices with increased pressure (see Figures 3.10 and 3.14) and to different climatic conditions that occur at higher atmospheric pressures and different obliquities. Alongside the change in climatic conditions and frost point temperatures, higher amounts of ice will also be expected to be deposited under higher atmospheric pressures (>0.5 bar) than at present due to the increase in vapour concentration of
both volatiles that occurs with the increased pressures, which is how features such as glaciers would have formed (Souness and Hubbard, 2012). Therefore, a large initial amount of ice can be used to investigate how long any of these larger ice deposits could have survived.

Table 4.1: The column density of ice within the subsurface if the ice fills the pore space between 2 depths within the subsurface. The volume of the pore space decreases with depth as compaction increases according to Equation 3.9b (see Section 3.2 for more details) and the volume of ice within the pore space is adjusted accordingly. H$_2$O ice density = 927kg m$^{-3}$ and CO$_2$ ice density is calculated at 145 K. The equivalent thickness of ice in each model layer is calculated by multiplying the porosity by the thickness of the model layer. The column density of ice is calculated by multiplying the thickness of the ice layer by the density of ice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Column density of ice (kg m$^{-2}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H$_2$O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 0.5</td>
<td>9.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 1</td>
<td>19.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 2</td>
<td>26.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 to 38</td>
<td>355.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 38</td>
<td>345.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 38</td>
<td>338.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All configurations of the three ice layer types have been run with the depth of the boundary between the ice layers varying between 0.5 m, 1 m and 2 m. Table 4.1 shows how the amount of ice in the two ice-layers varies according to the type of ice, the depth of the boundary and which ice is in the upper or lower region. The different initial ice layer scenarios are referred to using an acronym defined in Chapter VII and simulations are referred to using a short code which includes the run number and a prefix corresponding to the version of the MSSM used (e.g. S01 for run 1 with the baseline version). This can be used to find the details of the scenarios in Tables VII.III and VII.IV. Table VII.III is the list of the scenarios that used the present-day obliquity and the baseline version of the MSSM described in Chapter 3, while Table VII.IV is the list of scenarios that use different parameters in the MSSM to investigate the effect of assumptions included in the baseline. The details of the different versions of the MSSM can be found in Table VII.I and the results of these simulations in
Section 4.4 and Chapter 5. \( \text{CO}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) sublimation rates have been calculated for all simulations and are only discussed in the text where relevant. The sublimation rates for all simulations discussed in this thesis have therefore been included in Appendix C for reference.

The combinations of ice layers used in this chapter are either observed on Mars at present or are expected to occur under different obliquities, although the amounts of each ice are likely to be smaller than in the scenarios presented here or as pure ice rather than ice-filled regolith. Schematics for each scenario can be found in Section VII.IV. Table 4.2 summarises some of the potential locations where the two-ice-layer configurations investigated could be found across Mars. All of the scenarios discussed in this chapter only consider the present-day solar luminosity and obliquity (25°). Under these conditions \( \text{CO}_2 \) ice is only expected to form in the polar regions or as frost at lower latitudes (see Section 2.2; e.g., Bibring et al., 2004; Forget et al., 1998; Schorghofer and Edgett, 2006). Any subsurface \( \text{CO}_2 \) ice in the present-day outside of these regions is unlikely. However, during the Hesperian (when atmospheric pressures were decreasing), remnants of \( \text{CO}_2 \) ice deposits that formed under high atmospheric pressures may have persisted for a few thousand years after atmospheric conditions changed (discussed in Sections 2.7 and 2.8; e.g., Forget et al., 2013; Nakamura and Tajika, 2003).

The MSSM simulations in this chapter use a fixed annual cycle, with the diurnal cycle smoothed out, taken from the present-day LMD-UK Mars global circulation model (MGCM) run discussed in Section 3.7.1. The annual cycle for \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) and \( \text{CO}_2 \) vapour is used to calculate the surface flux into the regolith (Section 3.5) and one of the limitations of this model is that it assumes the atmosphere acts as both an infinite supply and an infinite sink for both \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) vapour and \( \text{CO}_2 \) vapour. The assumption that the atmosphere is an infinite source is unlikely to have a large effect on the results shown here because the initial amount of both ices used in these scenarios are greater than the atmospheric vapour content and sublimation of each ice is more likely. Simulations with no supply of vapour from the atmosphere (i.e. the atmosphere is an infinite sink only) have been run in order to test the impact of an atmospheric source in Section
Table 4.2: Potential locations on Mars where the two-ice-layer configurations could occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ice-layer configuration</th>
<th>Potential Locations on Mars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ice-free Regolith over CO₂ Ice-filled Regolith</td>
<td>This scenario occurs while the CO₂ polar caps are sublimating away at high obliquities, leaving behind an overlying dust lag layer. This scenario could also occur in regions where surface temperatures are around the CO₂ frost point and no surface CO₂ ice forms, but the subsurface is cold enough (~145 K) for CO₂ pore ice to form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice-free Regolith over H₂O Ice-filled Regolith</td>
<td>This scenario is observed in the mid-latitudes, where features such as the Latitude Dependent Mantle (LDM) and debris covered glaciers are found under a metre-scale debris cover (e.g., Brough et al., 2019; Kreslavsky and Head, 2002; Souness et al., 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ Ice-filled Regolith Over H₂O Ice-filled Regolith</td>
<td>This scenario is observed with the formation of the northern CO₂ seasonal polar cap over the permanent H₂O ice cap (e.g., Kieffer and Titus, 2001; Langevin et al., 2007; Schmidt et al., 2009). This scenario may also occur when CO₂ frost (Piqueux et al., 2019) forms in a location with buried subsurface H₂O ice (e.g., over the latitude dependent mantle or buried glaciers; Conway and Balme, 2014; Kreslavsky and Head, 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO₂ Ice-filled Regolith</td>
<td>This scenario has been observed at the polar caps, within the SPLD, where H₂O ice layers have been found to cap buried CO₂ ice deposits (Bierson et al., 2016; Phillips et al., 2011). This scenario could potentially have occurred in the mid-latitudes during the Noachian. In general it is assumed that the mid latitudes only contain subsurface H₂O ice, although Nakamura and Tajika (2003) found that under the Noachian solar luminosity, a band of CO₂ surface ice forms in the mid-latitudes. If this CO₂ ice-filled regolith layer was then covered in H₂O ice and dust before it could fully sublimate, then there could be some CO₂ ice trapped deep in the subsurface. Several studies have shown that mid-latitude H₂O ice deposits form only at high obliquity (e.g., Mischna et al., 2003) and take a long time to sublimate away. Consequently, they may have insulated some CO₂ ice in the subsurface for long periods of time. Another possibility is that a CO₂ ice deposit that forms above a H₂O ice deposit would act as a diapir due to the density difference between the two ices and would eventually sink below the H₂O ice deposit (Turbet et al., 2017). In their study, Turbet et al. (2017) suggest that a 100 m diapir of CO₂ ice would take around 10⁴ years to sink to the base of a 1km thick water ice layer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2. The opposite case of the atmosphere acting only as an infinite source has not been simulated because without the potential for vapour to be lost to the atmosphere, the subsurface becomes a closed system, since there is no flux at the base of the MSSM and the amount of ice will not change over time.

4.1.1 Zonal Latitudes and Individual Locations

For every initial scenario considered, the MSSM was run at every 5 degrees of latitude and at 12 locations on the surface (see Figure 4.1), using the corresponding atmospheric data from the present-day MGCM run described in Section 3.7.1. Of the 12 individual locations in Figure 4.1, 9 locations are landing sites, 2 are key features (Olympus Mons and Hellas Basin), and one is a ‘typical’ location on Mars. The locations of all of the features used for the atmospheric profiles are from the grid point that site falls within rather than the actual location, since the 3D MGCM was run with a spatial resolution of 5° latitude and longitude.

Figure 4.1: Map of the individual locations at which the MSSM is run. Landing sites, features on the surface, and the ‘typical’ location are shown with different symbols.

The ‘typical’ location was chosen using annual surface pressure, albedo and thermal inertia data. The thermal inertia and albedo maps used were derived from TES observations by Wilson et al. (2007) and Christensen et al. (2001) respectively. The surface pressure values are from the final year of a 4 martian year run of the MGCM which was initialised using a restart file from the end of a 20 martian year spin up run (see Section 3.7.1 for details). The criteria used to select this typical point were an annual average
surface pressure within ±10 Pa of the global average (636 Pa), an albedo within ±0.05 of the global average (0.206) and a thermal inertia within ±20 J m⁻² K⁻¹ s⁻¹² of the global average (258 J m⁻² K⁻¹ s⁻¹²), resulting in only one location on the MGCM grid (at 5° resolution): 22.5°N -125°E (P1 on Figure 4.1). At this location, the annual average surface pressure is 632 Pa, albedo is 0.22 and thermal inertia is 244 J m⁻² K⁻¹ s⁻¹².

The majority of the results discussed in this chapter are from the simulations at each latitude (where the atmosphere is averaged over longitude) since these simulations capture the general patterns observed at each latitude that are also seen in the individual location results. However, the individual location results are discussed when they differ from the corresponding latitude simulation. An important note for the figures shown is that, unless stated, the results are from 200 martian year simulations, which output only one time step per year at spring equinox ($L_s = 0°$ or sol 0) to reduce the run time of each simulation. This means that all of the results shown reflect the state of the volatile reservoirs during northern hemisphere spring (see Figure 3.17b), when the northern polar cap has started to recede and the southern polar cap is at its smallest extent. Simulations spanning 50 martian years that output every sol were also run to show the seasonal cycle of all properties. The results from simulations spanning 50 martian years have been used to show either annual averages or to explain specific features within the results of the simulations spanning 200 martian years and it is stated when a figure shows results from simulations spanning 50 martian years instead of 200 martian years.

### 4.2 Simulations with Only One Ice Present

The simulations with one ice present assume that each ice (H₂O or CO₂) either fills the pore space of the entire subsurface (S29 and S30), fills the pore space below the boundary between ice layers (S08 to S13) or fills the pore space above the boundary at a depth of 1 m (S31). For scenarios where ice fills the pore space below a boundary depth, three different boundary depths were used: 0.5 m (S08, S11), 1 m (S09, S12) and 2 m (S10, S13). The scenario with ice filling the pore space above 1 m was only run for H₂O ice because all of the scenarios with CO₂ ice in the upper region showed the same general distribution over time. This decision was made because the individual ice
scenarios were performed to examine how each ice behaves individually and as baselines to be compared with when both ices are present.

A completely ice-free regolith across the entire subsurface ($IF$) simulation was also run as a baseline that the rest of the simulations can be compared with. The $IF$ simulation shows no accumulation of CO$_2$ ice and accumulation of very small amounts of H$_2$O ice ($<1\times10^{-6}$ kg m$^{-3}$) at some latitudes. This is because the atmospheric vapour density profiles that are used as the atmospheric boundary for all simulations are taken from a complete MGCM simulation (see Section 3.7.1 for details) which deposits both H$_2$O and CO$_2$ ice when the temperature reaches the frost point for each ice. When the frost point is reached in the MGCM, any vapour above the saturation vapour density is condensed into ice, reducing the vapour density to the saturation vapour density. This means that the value from the MGCM that is used as the atmospheric condition in the MSSM is the saturation vapour density (in locations where ice is present in the MGCM) rather than the supersaturated vapour density value which would be the case before deposition. Therefore, the value used as the atmospheric condition in the MSSM is unlikely to exceed the saturation vapour density. Ice deposition in the MSSM can only occur within the subsurface where vapour densities are increased (or decreased) due to vapour exchange between the atmosphere and subsurface, or due to diffusion throughout the subsurface. The results from this $IF$ simulation therefore show that if the atmosphere acts as an infinite source for the subsurface, this has a negligible impact due to the way the MSSM has been set up. Ideally, a full three dimensional (3-D) global circulation model (GCM) would be used to accurately simulate the vapour exchange and formation of both ices at the surface and in the subsurface. However, as mentioned in Section 1.1, this work is an initial investigation into subsurface CO$_2$ ice that can be used as a baseline for future work using a full GCM.

The $IF$ simulation (S01) can be used to show the expected pattern of average annual surface flux at each latitude when both ices are either fully sublimated away or are in equilibrium with the atmosphere. The annual average surface flux over each martian year can then be used to investigate inter-annual variations. However, it can only be calculated for the 50 martian year simulations because it requires a surface flux value
Figure 4.2: Results from the 50 martian year completely IF set of simulations (S01): (a) annual average H$_2$O vapour surface flux, (b) surface flux over simulated martian year 50, (c) is the atmospheric H$_2$O vapour density for 1 martian year between 40°N and 40°S.
Figure 4.3: Results from the 50 martian year completely IF set of simulations (S01): (a) annual average CO₂ vapour surface flux, (b) CO₂ vapour surface flux over simulated martian year 50 (c) is the atmospheric CO₂ vapour density for 1 martian year between 40°N and 40°S.
for each sol, rather than just the one value per year (at $L_S = 0^\circ$) that is output in the 200 martian year simulations. When the annual average surface flux in scenarios that are initialised with ice have the same patterns over time as in the $IF$ simulation (see Figures 4.2a and 4.3a) the subsurface vapour in the simulation has reached equilibrium with the atmosphere. This equilibrium can be seen in Figures 4.2a and 4.3a, as the annual average surface flux remains fairly constant within each latitude over the 50 martian years. On average, H$_2$O vapour flows out of the subsurface (positive flux) within the equatorial and mid-latitude regions and into the subsurface (negative flux) in the polar regions, whereas CO$_2$ vapour flows out of the subsurface on average at all latitudes. These values show CO$_2$ vapour flows out of the subsurface for more of the year than into it, rather than CO$_2$ vapour always flowing out of the subsurface, which would eventually deplete the subsurface of CO$_2$ vapour. This is because the annual average surface flux summarises the general behaviour of vapour over a year (i.e. whether more vapour flows out of the subsurface than in, or vice versa) rather than showing the detailed seasonal variations.

The seasonal cycles of H$_2$O and CO$_2$ surface flux from the final year of the 50 martian year simulations are shown in Figures 4.2b and 4.3b. In these figures, vapour fluctuates between flowing into (negative flux) or out of (positive flux) the subsurface throughout the year and the patterns within the cycles directly correspond to the variations in atmospheric vapour density (see Figure 3.16 for the annual atmospheric vapour cycles). Atmospheric vapour density fluctuations are largest at the poles, which can also be seen in the seasonal surface flux cycles. This is most obvious for H$_2$O vapour density which varies by around 6 orders of magnitude (between $10^{-11}$ and $10^{-5}$kg m$^{-3}$) in the polar regions over the course of a martian year. This large amplitude is partially due to the deposition and removal of the seasonal caps, which cover the H$_2$O ice cap during winter. The large amplitude is also the result of the atmospheric H$_2$O vapour density being limited by the H$_2$O saturation vapour density, which varies drastically with the seasonal surface temperature cycle (see Figure 3.16a). Surface temperatures are both higher and less variable in the mid- to low latitudes, resulting in H$_2$O saturation vapour densities higher than atmospheric H$_2$O vapour densities. Consequently, H$_2$O vapour density variations in these regions are dominated by the atmospheric cir-
ulation rather than ice formation and have a much smaller amplitude throughout the year. Figures 4.2c and 4.3c show the atmospheric vapour density (for H$_2$O and CO$_2$ respectively) between 40$^\circ$N and 40$^\circ$S, showcasing the small-scale annual variations that are not visible at the scale of Figure 3.16. Comparing the small-scale variations in these figures with the surface flux, it can be seen that the surface flux variations in Figures 4.2b and 4.3b directly correspond to these small-scale variations.

In the rest of this section, the results from the individual ice simulations are discussed in detail and compared with the IF simulations described above.

### 4.2.1 H$_2$O Ice

A series of H$_2$O ice-filled regolith simulations were run to investigate the behaviour of H$_2$O ice within the MSSM when it is the only ice initially present. Three scenarios have been run: H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith across the entire subsurface (‘W’, S29); Ice-free Regolith over H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith below a boundary depth of 0.5 m, 1 m or 2 m (‘IF-W’, S11, S12 and S13, respectively); and H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith over Ice-free Regolith with the boundary at 1 m (‘W-IF’, S31). In the rest of this section, the results for the IF-W scenario will be from the simulations with a boundary depth at 1 m (S12) since the results from the W-IF scenario (S31) also assume a boundary depth at 1 m.

The results from all three scenarios are shown in Figure 4.4 and each scenario is plotted over a different scale due to differences in the initial column density of H$_2$O ice and the amount that sublimates away over 200 martian years in each scenario. While there are clear differences in the behaviour of H$_2$O ice between the scenarios, there are a few general trends which will be discussed first.

Over the first martian year, there is an initial rapid decrease in the column density of H$_2$O ice (decrease of $\sim212$ kg m$^{-2}$ in S12 and S29, $\sim0.88$ kg m$^{-2}$ in S31), as H$_2$O ice sublimates within the pore space until the H$_2$O vapour density reaches H$_2$O saturation vapour density. Once the H$_2$O vapour density has reached H$_2$O saturation vapour density in the model layers where H$_2$O ice is present, the rate of sublimation becomes more strongly latitudinally dependent and is limited by the rate of diffusion through the subsurface into the ice-free region and out into the atmosphere by surface flux. For
Figure 4.4: Column density of H$_2$O ice at each latitude over time for the (a) H$_2$O ice only (S29), (b) W-IF (S31) and (c) IF-W (S12) sets of simulations. Each figure is plotted using a different scale due to the differences in the initial column density of H$_2$O ice between the scenarios. Grey represents where the H$_2$O ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$. 
the \( W \) (S29) and \( IF-W \) (S12) scenarios, only sublimation occurs as the \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) vapour density is highest in the lowest portion of the subsurface and will, therefore, always diffuse upward and out of the subsurface. In the \( W-IF \) regolith scenario (S31) on the other hand, small amounts of \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice (\( \sim 1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ kg m}^{-3} \)) form initially at some latitudes as the subsurface region below the \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice-filled regolith layer has a lower \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) vapour density than the \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) vapour density in the \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice-filled regolith layer, leading to \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) vapour flowing further into the subsurface as well as out into the atmosphere. This increases the \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) vapour density in the model layers below the \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice-filled regolith layer, which can lead to a slight increase in \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice column density if this increase in \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) vapour density raises \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) vapour density to above the saturation vapour density. This is the case between latitudes 20\(^\circ\) to 30\(^\circ\)S during the first few martian years in Figure 4.4b.

After the initial rapid decrease in \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice column density, the column density remains mostly consistent over time within the polar and mid-latitude regions for all three scenarios and the sublimation rate drops from 228 mm MY\(^{-1}\) to <0.0004 mm MY\(^{-1}\) (in S12 and S29). The column density of \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice with latitude after the first year is slightly different between the three scenarios due to the slight subsurface temperature differences caused by the different subsurface thermal conductivities. In the \( IF-W \) scenario (S12), there are also a few latitudes (55\(^\circ\)N and 55\(^\circ\)-70\(^\circ\)S) with slightly higher \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice column densities than the rest of the polar and mid-latitude regions. At these latitudes, a small amount of \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice formed in the model layer above the initial \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice-filled regolith layer within the first martian year as \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) vapour density in the model layer increased above the \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) saturation vapour density. This small amount of \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice persists once formed, resulting in the slightly higher \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice column densities observed at these latitudes. In the equatorial regions (15\(^\circ\)N to 35\(^\circ\)S) there is a steady decrease in the column density of \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice over time in all three scenarios. At these latitudes, \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice is not expected to be stable due to the high surface and subsurface temperatures. The rate of this decline is limited by the rate of diffusion of \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) vapour through the subsurface and out into the atmosphere.
4.2.2 CO₂ Ice

A series of CO₂ ice-filled regolith simulations were run to investigate the behaviour of CO₂ ice within the MSSM when it is the only ice initially present. Two scenarios were run: CO₂ Ice-filled Regolith across the entire subsurface (‘C’, S30) and Ice-free Regolith over CO₂ Ice-filled Regolith (IF-C) with boundary depths of 0.5 m, 1 m and 2 m (S08, S09 and S10 respectively). In all of these scenarios, CO₂ ice fully sublimated within the 200 martian years at all latitudes, with global average sublimation rates ranging from 1220 mm MY⁻¹ (S30) to 1795 mm MY⁻¹ (S10). CO₂ ice survived around twice as long when CO₂ ice filled the entire subsurface pore space compared with when there was an overlying ice-free layer, as shown in Figure 4.5.

Another interesting feature of these results is that CO₂ ice takes longer to sublimate in the southern polar region (average sublimation rate of ~367 mm MY⁻¹ in S09) than in the northern polar region (average sublimation rate of ~512 mm MY⁻¹ in S09). This matches present-day observations, as any CO₂ ice that would have been deposited in the northern polar region during a previous epoch (and would now be exposed at the surface) has fully sublimated, whereas in the south polar region, a thin CO₂ ice cap is still in the process of sublimating away after its formation during a previous epoch (e.g., Aharonson et al., 2004; Kelly et al., 2006).

The slower sublimation of CO₂ ice in the southern polar region can be understood by looking at the annual average surface flux from the 50 martian year simulation of the entire subsurface pore space filled with CO₂ ice (S30; Figure 4.6a). The annual average surface flux is highest in the mid- to low latitudes, where CO₂ ice sublimates away the fastest and once CO₂ ice has fully sublimated the annual average surface flux follows the same pattern as when there is no ice present in the subsurface (the IF scenario; Figure 4.3a). In the polar regions, however, the rate of sublimation is more variable. Initially CO₂ ice sublimates at a faster rate in the southern polar region than in the northern polar region, due to the higher annual average surface flux of CO₂ vapour out of the atmosphere in the southern polar region. Annual average surface flux is higher in the southern region because of the lower atmospheric CO₂ vapour density throughout the year (Figure 4.3c). However, in the northern region,
Figure 4.5: Column density of CO$_2$ ice at each latitude over time for the (a) IF-C with a boundary at 1 m (S09) and (b) the C (S30) set of simulations. Grey represents where the CO$_2$ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$. 

(a) IF-C (S09)

(b) C (S30)
the annual average surface flux increases over time, due to the deposition of H$_2$O ice as CO$_2$ ice sublimes away (see Figure 4.6b). The increase in the column density of H$_2$O ice over time increases subsurface temperatures during summer, which in turn increases the diffusion coefficient of CO$_2$ ice (Equation 3.39). The higher diffusion coefficient increases the surface flux rate, leading to more CO$_2$ ice loss over time and the pattern that can be seen in Figure 4.6a. In the southern polar region, however, the annual average surface flux remains consistent over time, leading to CO$_2$ ice surviving less time overall in the northern polar region. This scenario is consistent with previous observations of surface CO$_2$ ice and previous modelling studies of the behaviour of surface CO$_2$ ice (e.g., Aharonson et al., 2004; Kelly et al., 2006).
Figure 4.6: (a) Annual average CO$_2$ surface flux over time for the 50 martian year simulation and (b) the column density of H$_2$O ice over the 200 martian year simulation for the $C$ set of simulations (S30). A positive surface flux means CO$_2$ vapour is flowing out of the subsurface and into the atmosphere. Grey on the H$_2$O ice column density figure represents where the H$_2$O ice density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.
4.3 Simulations with Both Ices

The simulations with both ices present have two ice-layers and assume that all of the pore space within each layer is filled with one of the two ices. There are two ice-layer configurations, one with CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith Over H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith (‘C-W’; S02, S03, S04) and vice versa (‘W-C’; S05, S06 and S07). For each of the two configurations, three different boundary depths were used (0.5 m, 1 m and 2 m) and the results from the six scenarios are summarised in this section.

4.3.1 CO$_2$ Ice Filled Regolith over H$_2$O Ice Filled Regolith

In the scenarios with CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith Over H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith (‘C-W’; S02, S03, S04), all of the CO$_2$ ice within the subsurface has sublimated away within a maximum of 20 martian years, which can be seen in Figure 4.7. The initial amount of H$_2$O ice also sublimates slightly in the first year (as discussed in Section 4.2.1) and then remains mostly stable for the remainder of the 200 year simulation due to the repeatable surface flux replenishing the amount of H$_2$O vapour each year. Small amounts of H$_2$O ice form after CO$_2$ ice has fully sublimated away, following the same pattern described for the IF scenario (Section 4.2).

![Figure 4.7: Column density of CO$_2$ ice at each latitude over time for the C-W with the boundary at 1 m set of simulations (S03). Grey represents where the CO$_2$ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.](image-url)
Figure 4.7 shows that CO$_2$ ice survives longer in the northern polar region than in the southern polar region. This is opposite to the results from the CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith across the entire subsurface (C) scenario (Section 4.2.2) and observed for the polar caps at present, where there is both a seasonal and perennial CO$_2$ ice cap in the south and only a seasonal CO$_2$ ice cap in the north (e.g., Blackburn et al., 2010; Pollack et al., 1990). This is because atmospheric CO$_2$ vapour density is higher over the northern polar region during northern summer than over the southern polar region during southern summer (Figure 3.16d). This means that the southern polar region will have a larger difference between the atmospheric CO$_2$ vapour density and the subsurface CO$_2$ vapour density, which is held at CO$_2$ saturation vapour density while CO$_2$ ice is still present. To account for the larger difference, more CO$_2$ vapour diffuses out of the subsurface in each time step and, consequently, more CO$_2$ ice will sublimate in each time step to keep CO$_2$ vapour density at CO$_2$ saturation vapour density within the pore space of each model layer after diffusion has occurred. This is shown in the annual average CO$_2$ surface flux which is higher in the southern polar region than in the northern polar region for the first few years (Figure 4.8). However, the annual average surface flux in the northern polar region increases over time. This increase occurs due to the increase in the diffusion coefficient and temperature within each model layer as the amount of CO$_2$ ice within the subsurface of the northern region decreases and the column density of H$_2$O ice increases. This in turn causes the surface flux to increase.

The annual average surface flux (Figure 4.8) remains high for a few years after all of the CO$_2$ ice within the subsurface has sublimated away because the CO$_2$ saturation vapour density is higher than the atmospheric CO$_2$ vapour density across the planet. This means that when all of the CO$_2$ ice has sublimated, the CO$_2$ vapour density within the pore space is still greater than the atmospheric CO$_2$ vapour density and it takes a few years before the subsurface CO$_2$ vapour density reaches equilibrium with the atmospheric CO$_2$ vapour density. Once all of the excess CO$_2$ vapour has been removed from the subsurface, the annual average surface flux returns to the same values as for the IF scenario (S01; Figure 4.3a).
4.3.2 \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) Ice Filled Regolith over \( \text{CO}_2 \) Ice Filled Regolith

The results from the \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) Ice-filled Regolith Over \( \text{CO}_2 \) Ice-filled Regolith (\( \text{W-C} \) ) simulations at all three boundary depths (0.5, 1 and 2 m) are shown in Figure 4.9, showing significantly different results from those shown previously in this chapter. In all three figures, \( \text{CO}_2 \) ice takes at least 200 martian years to fully sublimate at nearly all latitudes and the final column density of \( \text{CO}_2 \) ice decreases with decreasing latitude. The behaviour of \( \text{CO}_2 \) ice with latitude can be understood by splitting the planet into three broad regions: polar (>60° latitude), mid-latitude (15°N to 60°N and 30°S to 60°S) and equatorial (15°N to 30°S) regions, with latitude ranges that differ slightly from their purely geographical definition. To understand the differences between these regions the scenario with the boundary between the \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice-filled regolith layer and the \( \text{CO}_2 \) ice-filled regolith layer at 1 m (S06) is looked at in more detail.

In the polar regions (of scenario S06), \( \text{CO}_2 \) ice sublimates at a very similar rate in both the northern and southern polar regions, with \( \text{CO}_2 \) ice taking slightly longer to sublimate away in the southern hemisphere compared with the northern. This difference is reflected in the slightly lower annual average surface flux in the southern hemisphere over the first 50 martian years compared with the northern hemisphere (see Figure 4.10). In Figure 4.10, this difference looks insignificant, but over the hundreds to thousands of martian years that it will take for the \( \text{CO}_2 \) ice to fully sublimate, these
Figure 4.9: Column density of CO$_2$ ice at each latitude over time for the W-C with a boundary at (a) 0.5 m (S05) (b) 1 m (S06) and (c) 2 m (S07) sets of simulations. Grey represents where the CO$_2$ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.
small differences have a significant impact that is discussed in more detail in Section 4.3.2.3. The other important aspect of the annual average surface flux figure is that, at all latitudes, CO$_2$ ice is sublimating away for more of the year than it is accumulating, implying there is net depletion of near surface polar CO$_2$ ice reservoirs, which matches observations.

Figure 4.10: Annual average CO$_2$ surface flux over time for the 50 martian year W-C set of simulations (S06).

In the mid-latitudes, a hemispherical difference also exists in the behaviour of CO$_2$ ice. In the northern hemisphere, the rate of sublimation of CO$_2$ ice increases only slightly with decreasing latitude: from 19.5 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 58°N to 28.6 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 38°N in S06. Whereas in the southern mid-latitude region, there is a more pronounced latitudinal difference in the rate that the column density of CO$_2$ ice changes over time, with sublimation rates increasing from 16.2 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 57°S to 35.8 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 37°S in S06. This relates to the change in the average subsurface temperature with latitude, which can be seen in Figure 4.11. From this figure, it can be seen that temperatures increase from around 180 K (at the base of the polar region) to 225 K (at the top of the equatorial region) occurs over 45° of latitude in the northern hemisphere and only over 30° of latitude in the southern hemisphere. The more drastic change in temperature with decreasing latitude in the southern hemisphere is therefore the cause of the sharper increase in rate of sublimation of CO$_2$ ice with decreasing latitude.

The influence of the more gradual change in temperature in the northern mid-
latitude region compared with the southern mid-latitude region can also be seen in
the annual average surface flux (Figure 4.10), which increases over a smaller latitude
range in the southern mid-latitudes than in the northern mid-latitudes. In the northern
mid-latitudes, the region of gradually increasing surface flux actually extends down to
between 10° and 15°N in the northern hemisphere, rather than to 30° as in the southern
hemisphere. This is due to the 1 to 3 km variations in topography with longitude
between ~20°N and the equator: these latitudes cover the transition region between
the northern lowlands and southern highlands for most longitudes. This latitude region
also includes Olympus Mons, the Tharsis volcanic province and the Elysium volcanic
province, all of which are substantial enough to impact the surrounding climate. Lon-
gitudinal variations in climate within this region are, therefore, substantial enough to
affect the atmospheric zonal averages used and result in values that are artificially
higher or lower than would be expected at individual longitudes. The impact of using
the zonally averaged atmosphere rather than the individual latitude/longitude values
is discussed in more detail in Section 4.3.2.2. The mid-latitudes of the southern hemi-
sphere have a much stronger variation in surface flux across each martian year, and the
rate of sublimation of CO\textsubscript{2} ice decreases steadily with increasing latitude from around
30°S (36.8 mm MY\textsuperscript{-1}) to the southern pole (2.66 mm MY\textsuperscript{-1}).

Throughout the equatorial region (~15°N to 30°S in these simulations), CO\textsubscript{2} ice
sublimates rapidly and has almost fully sublimated at every latitude within the region
over the 200 martian years. This is expected due to the higher temperatures in this
region compared with the mid-latitudes and polar regions (see Figure 4.11). Alongside
the higher temperatures, the atmospheric CO\textsubscript{2} vapour density (0.011 to 0.017 kg m\textsuperscript{-3};
Figure 3.18d) is several orders of magnitude lower than the CO\textsubscript{2} saturation vapour
density (10 to 16 kg m\textsuperscript{-3}) at equatorial temperatures. Since the regolith is initialised
with a CO\textsubscript{2} vapour density equal to the atmospheric CO\textsubscript{2} vapour density, the initial
CO\textsubscript{2} ice in the subsurface is unstable and CO\textsubscript{2} ice will sublimate until the CO\textsubscript{2} vapour
density in the pore space is equal to the CO\textsubscript{2} saturation vapour density. After the CO\textsubscript{2}
vapour density within the pore space has reached CO\textsubscript{2} saturation vapour density, the
rate of sublimation is then limited by the rate of diffusion of CO\textsubscript{2} vapour out of the
subsurface.
Figure 4.11: Average subsurface temperature over 200 martian years (left) and the latitudinally averaged temperature (right) for the W-C set of simulations (S06).

Between 5°N and 10°S, the column density of CO₂ ice takes around 5 martian years longer to sublimate away than the surrounding latitudes (20°N to 5°N and 10°S to 30°S). Based on the gradual increase in temperature from 20°N to 30°S (Figure 4.11), a gradual increase in sublimation rate is expected across the region. This means the gradual decrease in the annual average CO₂ sublimation rate from 46.1 mm MY⁻¹ at 5°S to 36.8 mm MY⁻¹ at 30°S is the expected variation with latitude from subsurface temperature variations. The faster sublimation of CO₂ ice with latitude between 20°N and the equator (annual average sublimation rates of 30.6–45.0 mm MY⁻¹), on the other hand, is not explained by the increase in subsurface temperatures from 20°N to 30°S, since the CO₂ ice column density is expected to be higher at 20°N than at the equator. The observed faster sublimation rate in this region is a consequence of the higher H₂O ice density, higher atmospheric H₂O vapour density and the smaller annual variations in surface temperature between 20°N and the equator than between the equator and 10°S. The variations in surface temperature throughout the year from 20°N to 10°S (Figure 3.18a) influence the saturation vapour density of each ice, as saturation vapour density increases at higher temperatures. This in turn influences the annual sublimation rate, which is dependent on the difference between saturation vapour density and vapour
density. Between 20°N and the equator, surface temperatures vary by less than 10 K throughout the year, whereas between the equator and 10°S, surface temperatures vary by 20-30 K throughout the year. The more consistent surface temperatures between 20°N and the equator result in a more continuous high sublimation rate of CO₂ ice, that in the long term results in a faster loss of CO₂ ice over time. Alongside the effect of surface temperature, the slightly larger (by \( \sim 3 \times 10^{-6} \text{ kg m}^{-2} \)) subsurface column density of H₂O ice at these latitudes compared with that found between the equator and 10°S (Figure 4.12) also results in a faster sublimation rate. This slightly higher column density of H₂O ice is a consequence of a smaller amount of sublimation occurring within the first year due to the higher initial subsurface H₂O vapour density used at these latitudes from the higher atmospheric H₂O vapour densities. The subsurface H₂O vapour density is initialised with atmospheric H₂O vapour density values which are generally lower than the H₂O saturation vapour density, particularly in the equatorial region where temperatures are above the average frost point on Mars (195 K; Mellon and Jakosky, 1993). Therefore, in the first year H₂O ice sublimates rapidly until the H₂O vapour density within the pore space equals the H₂O saturation vapour density. Since atmospheric H₂O vapour density is on average higher in the northern equatorial region than in the southern equatorial region throughout the year (see Figure 4.2c), less sublimation is required for the subsurface H₂O vapour density to increase to the H₂O saturation vapour density value in the northern equatorial region. This results in the H₂O ice column density remaining slightly higher than in the southern equatorial regions and this small amount of extra H₂O ice has a long term impact through its effect on subsurface thermal properties.

H₂O ice has a significantly larger thermal conductivity (\( \sim 2.5 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1} \)) than both the empty regolith (0.01 to 0.1 W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\)) and CO₂ ice (\( \sim 0.7 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1} \)). Therefore, the presence of small amounts of H₂O ice can have a large impact on the effective thermal conductivity of the regolith. The small amount extra at latitudes 20°N to 5°N result in a thermal conductivity that is \( \sim 0.01-0.02 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1} \) greater than in the latitudes below the equator. The difference in thermal conductivity seems small, but it is a \( \sim 100\% \) increase in thermal conductivity from that of an empty regolith at the surface and results in a slight increase in subsurface temperatures over time (\(<1 \text{ K}\))
Figure 4.12: Column density of H$_2$O ice between 20°N and 10°S over time, for the W-C set of simulations (S06). A difference of $1 \times 10^{-6}$ kg m$^{-2}$ is within the same order of magnitude as atmospheric H$_2$O vapour density. Grey represents where the H$_2$O ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.

at the latitudes containing extra H$_2$O ice. This is due to the greater amount of heat conducted and stored throughout the year. The slightly higher temperatures at these latitudes result in an increase in the CO$_2$ saturation vapour density, resulting in the observed faster rate of CO$_2$ ice sublimation.

Alongside latitudinal differences already discussed, the sublimation of CO$_2$ ice in these simulations is highly dependent on the depth of the boundary. In the equatorial region of Figure 4.9, it can be seen that the deeper the boundary, the less time it takes for CO$_2$ ice to fully sublimate away. However, through estimating the number of years that CO$_2$ ice takes to sublimate using the average sublimation rate over the 200 martian year period, shown in Figure 4.13, it can be seen that this is only the case in parts of the equatorial region. At higher latitudes, the reverse is true, as CO$_2$ ice survives longer when buried deeper in the subsurface.

In the equatorial region, the faster sublimation as CO$_2$ ice is buried deeper is due to both the decrease in the initial column density of CO$_2$ ice and the corresponding increase in the amount of H$_2$O ice. As the depth of the boundary increases, the initial amount of CO$_2$ ice decreases, resulting in a decrease in the time taken for the CO$_2$ to fully sublimate. Alongside this, the increase in the amount of H$_2$O ice results in higher
equatorial temperatures due to the higher thermal conductivity between depths of 0.5 m to 2 m, which has a larger effect than the rate of sublimation and diffusion of CO₂ vapour at these latitudes. Across the equatorial region, these increased temperatures result in higher CO₂ and H₂O saturation vapour densities, causing more of both ices to sublimate. This increases the porosity and the diffusion coefficient across the regolith, resulting in a more rapid loss of vapour to the atmosphere over each sol. Consequently, the initial amount of CO₂ ice in this region sublimates rapidly for all boundary depths.

At latitudes higher than 55°N and 55°S, on the other hand, surface temperatures are lower than 190 K (the frost point of H₂O on Mars; Mellon and Jakosky, 1993), which means that the initial H₂O vapour density will be close to the H₂O saturation vapour density in all model layers within the subsurface. This means that only a small initial decrease in the column density of H₂O ice will occur during the first year and the porosity of the overlying H₂O ice-filled regolith layer will be small for all three boundary depths (0.5, 1 and 2 m). The small porosity in the overlying H₂O ice-filled regolith layer reduces the diffusion coefficient enough that the rate of CO₂ ice sublimation is dominated by the rate of diffusion out of the subsurface rather than the difference between subsurface CO₂ vapour density and CO₂ saturation vapour density.

Figure 4.13: Comparison of the estimated number of years that CO₂ ice survives in the W-C set of simulations with the boundary depth at (a) 0.5 m (S05), (b) 1 m (S06) and (c) 2 m (S07)
4.3.2.1 Time Taken To Fully Sublimate CO$_2$ Ice When Under H$_2$O Ice

Figure 4.14: Annual sublimation rate of CO$_2$ ice in the 200 martian year set of simulations for the W-C scenario (S06). The sublimation rate is calculated using the difference in column density of CO$_2$ ice between each year at $L_S = 0^\circ$, when the model data are output.

The number of years that CO$_2$ ice could survive in the subsurface can be estimated using the average annual sublimation rate (the change in CO$_2$ ice column density over time) to calculate how long it would take for the initial amount of CO$_2$ ice to fully sublimate. The annual sublimation rate changes with both time and latitude, as shown in Figure 4.14 for the 200 martian year W-C scenario (S06). In the polar regions (and across most of the mid-latitudes), the sublimation rate is fairly consistent after the first few years when a large amount of CO$_2$ ice initially sublimates to increase the CO$_2$ vapour density within the pore space to that of the CO$_2$ saturation vapour density at all latitudes. Once CO$_2$ vapour density has reached CO$_2$ saturation vapour density (for the temperatures at each latitude) the sublimation rate decreases rapidly until a repeatable pattern of sublimation rate is reached, limited by the rate of diffusion.

Within the low to mid-latitudes ($40^\circ$N to $40^\circ$S), the sublimation rate is more variable. This variability is a consequence of the way CO$_2$ ice column density is calculated using the model layers: in each time step, the density of CO$_2$ ice is calculated separately for each model layer, which represents a percentage of the total column. The
Figure 4.15: CO$_2$ ice density with depth at latitude 7°S (a) over the entire 200 MY period and at (b) 119 MY and, (c) 121 MY for the W-C scenario (S06). The dashed grey lines on the panels (b) and (c) represent depths of the boundaries between the model layers.
CO₂ ice density is multiplied by this percentage and the sum of this across all model layers is the total column density. The sublimation rate is then calculated using the change in this total column density. Therefore, the sublimation rate is representative of changes across all model layers, and when one model layer becomes fully depleted of CO₂ ice, this layer no longer contributes to the sublimation rate and causes the drop in sublimation rate seen in Figure 4.14. Figure 4.15 shows an example of the CO₂ ice density at 7°S for two individual years (119 and 121 MY) and across the entire 200 MY period. Looking at the entire time period, it can be seen that the timing of the drops in CO₂ sublimation rate in Figure 4.14 corresponds with the timing of model layer depletion in Figure 4.15a. The two individual years (Figure 4.15b-c) demonstrate how the depletion of one model layer can also have a significant impact on total column density, which will further impact the sublimation rate.

The high variability of sublimation rate in the mid- to low latitudes means that estimates of the number of years that it will take for CO₂ ice to sublimate based on the average sublimation rate over the entire 200 martian year period will likely be slightly lower than the actual number of years it will take for the initial amount CO₂ ice to fully sublimate. This also implies that the estimates for the polar (and parts of the mid-latitude) regions will also be slightly lower than the actual number of years for CO₂ ice to fully sublimate away. This is because the estimate of the number of years for CO₂ ice to fully sublimate away uses the annual average sublimation rate calculated when there are larger column densities of CO₂ ice remaining within the subsurface. This is equivalent to the situation in the first 50 martian years in the equatorial regions, which implies that as the column density of CO₂ ice falls and the model layers become depleted in CO₂ ice, so will the sublimation rate. Despite this, the average annual sublimation rate is a useful way to estimate the number of years CO₂ ice can be expected to survive based on the results shown here. Figure 4.16 compares the estimated survival time from the W-C scenario with the estimated survival time from the scenarios with only CO₂ ice present, showing the significant impact the overlying H₂O ice-filled regolith layer has on the number of martian years that CO₂ ice can survive at all latitudes.

While CO₂ ice was still present after 200 martian years at nearly all latitudes of
Figure 4.16: Comparison of the estimated number of years that CO$_2$ ice survives of the W-C set of simulations (S06) with the estimated number of years from both C sets of simulations (S09, S30)

the W-C simulations (Figure 4.9), the estimated survival times in Figure 4.16 suggest that CO$_2$ ice is expected to fully sublimate within 1000 martian years across the mid-latitude and equatorial regions. Therefore, a 1000 martian year set of simulations with the W-C ice layer scenario were run to investigate whether this is the case. Ideally a several thousand year simulation would be done to compare all of the estimated values. However, a simulation of that length would take several months to run making it infeasible in the timescale of this work. Figure 4.17 shows the results of this 1000 martian year simulation for the W-C with the boundary at 1 m scenario. The 1000 martian year results show the expected distribution based on Figure 4.16 and is similar to the C simulations described in Section 4.2.2. CO$_2$ ice entirely sublimates within the equatorial region (15°N to 30°S) first and is fully sublimated in the mid-latitudes of both hemispheres after 1000 martian years. The polar regions of both hemispheres also show a decrease in the column density of CO$_2$ ice, with a smaller amount remaining in the northern polar region than in the southern polar region. This is the expected pattern based on present-day observations of the perennial polar caps (e.g., Hansen, 1999), as a small CO$_2$ ice cap remains at the southern pole, while any surface CO$_2$ ice that was deposited during a previous epoch at the northern pole has fully sublimated away.
Figure 4.17: Column density of CO\(_2\) ice over time for W-C (boundary at 1 m) scenario (S06) over 1000 martian years. Grey represents where the CO\(_2\) ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m\(^{-2}\).

In Figure 4.18, the number of years it takes for CO\(_2\) ice to fully sublimate within the 1000 martian year simulation is compared with the estimates made from the 200 martian year simulation in Figure 4.16, along with estimates from the 50 martian year simulation, to test the accuracy of the estimates. I have truncated the line for the actual number of years to fully sublimate CO\(_2\) ice in the 1000 martian year simulation at 1000 Mars Year (MY) if sublimation takes longer than 1000 MY. From Figure 4.16 it can be seen that the shorter length (50 and 200 martian year) simulations tend to underestimate the number of years it would take for CO\(_2\) ice to fully sublimate in the equatorial and mid-latitude regions, although the estimated number of years is within the right order of magnitude. This means that the estimates for the number of years it would take to fully sublimate CO\(_2\) ice within the polar regions are likely to be within the right order of magnitude, but are unlikely to represent the exact number of years CO\(_2\) could survive.

The average sublimation rates used for these estimates, therefore, do not give an accurate estimate of the number of years for CO\(_2\) ice to fully sublimate away when the number of years the simulation is run for is significantly shorter than the estimated number of years it takes for CO\(_2\) ice to sublimate. For example, the estimated time...
for CO₂ ice to fully sublimate at 30°S in the 50 martian year simulation was ∼130 martian years, whereas the actual time in the 1000 martian year simulation was ∼220 martian years. This is because sublimation rate is highly variable over time (see Figure 4.14). The sublimation rate is dependent on factors such as thermal conductivity, temperature, porosity of the overlying model layer and surface flux, all of which have been shown to vary considerably with ice content. The calculated number of years for CO₂ ice to fully sublimate can, therefore, be used to compare how the behaviour of CO₂ ice might change under different scenarios, even though the actual number of years might be an underestimate if CO₂ ice becomes stable at a certain depth or an overestimate if CO₂ ice fully sublimes at a faster rate.

Figure 4.18: Comparison of the estimated number of years that CO₂ ice survives in the 50, 200 and 1000 martian year simulations of the W-C (boundary at 1 m) scenario (S06). The actual number of years taken for CO₂ ice to fully sublimate in the 1000 martian year simulation is also included, with a limit of 1000 martian years at latitudes where CO₂ ice survives longer than the 1000 martian years of the simulation.

4.3.2.2 Zonal Latitudes vs Longitudes

In the W-C simulations, there is a sharp boundary in the behaviour of CO₂ ice at ∼15°N, as shown in all three examples in Figure 4.9. This boundary corresponds partially with the topographic boundary between the northern lowland and the southern highlands. However, as mentioned earlier, the topographic boundary extends across
multiple latitudes and is therefore not likely to be the main cause of the shift in CO$_2$ ice behaviour. Alongside the topographic boundary, the zonal latitude simulation at 15°N corresponds with the zonal latitude into which Olympus Mons falls. Olympus Mons will significantly affect surface atmospheric properties since the atmospheric values are zonally averaged across all longitudes and the presence of Olympus Mons will affect the surrounding climate. The effect of Olympus Mons can be investigated using the individual location simulations, since three of the other individual locations fall within the same 5° latitude band as Olympus Mons: the landing sites of Pathfinder, Rosalind Franklin and Perseverance.

A comparison of the results at these four locations for the set of simulations with the boundary between H$_2$O ice-filled regolith and the underlying CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith at 1 m (S06; Figure 4.19), shows that the presence of Olympus Mons drastically impacts the survival of CO$_2$ ice within the subsurface. In the three lander locations, the amount of CO$_2$ ice decreases at the same rate across the sites and is nearly fully sublimated by the end of the 200 martian years. At Olympus Mons however, the amount of CO$_2$ ice after 200 martian years is equivalent to the amount remaining after 50 martian years at the landing sites and CO$_2$ ice remains in the subsurface for around four times longer. This implies that a longitude region with significantly different atmospheric conditions caused by surface topographical features, such as Olympus Mons, can drastically change the zonal latitude results, since the atmospheric conditions used are an average of the values at all longitudes. This is clearly shown in Figure 4.19, where the amount of CO$_2$ ice over time for the zonally averaged atmosphere simulation decreases at a rate between that of the Olympus Mons and the three lander simulations. Therefore, the zonal latitude results for this latitude region (latitudes 15° to 20°N) do not represent the scenario at any specific point on Mars, and a more detailed study that takes into account latitude and longitude topographic and climate variations is needed for this.

The difference between the results using zonally averaged atmospheric profiles and atmospheric profiles at individual locations is smaller across the rest of the planet, where topographic variations with longitude are much smaller. This can be seen when comparing the results from the simulation that uses the atmospheric profiles at the
location of Hellas Basin with the corresponding results that use the zonally averaged atmospheric profiles for the same latitude (-42.5°S). A third location at the same latitude was chosen at random since Hellas Basin is a topographic low and may not be representative of the average behaviour at that latitude. Figure 4.20 shows the column density of CO$_2$ ice over time for these three simulations and the results are very similar. There are slight differences in the rate of sublimation between the three, but the differences are small enough that they will not have a substantial impact on the overall results. Therefore, using zonally averaged atmospheric profiles for each latitude will probably provide a good indication of the expected behaviour of ice within the subsurface over time as long as any topographic variations with longitude only have a small influence on global scale circulations.

4.3.2.3 Effect on the Behaviour of H$_2$O Ice

The presence of CO$_2$ ice impacts subsurface temperatures and the diffusion of H$_2$O vapour, both of which will impact the survival of H$_2$O ice. In order to investigate the impact of CO$_2$ ice on H$_2$O ice when both exist within the subsurface, the behaviour of H$_2$O ice in the three scenarios that contain H$_2$O ice-filled regolith in the upper metre can be compared. In the rest of the subsurface, these scenarios contain either no ice (W-IF; S31), H$_2$O ice-filled regolith (W; S29) or CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith (W-C; S06). Figure 4.21 shows the column density of H$_2$O ice in the upper metre for
Figure 4.20: Variation in the column density of CO$_2$ ice over time for the zonal average simulation at 42.5°S simulation compared with the results at Hellas Basin and at 42°S, 170°W for the W-C with the boundary at 1 m set of simulations (S06).

each of these scenarios. The column density is only calculated for the upper metre to allow for comparisons between the scenarios, since the scenario with H$_2$O ice-filled regolith throughout the subsurface has a higher overall column density, due to the larger amounts of H$_2$O ice that are stored below 1 m (Table 4.1). The three scenarios produce a similar rate of H$_2$O ice sublimation poleward of 15°N and 35°S in the figure. However, within the equatorial region (15°N to 35°S) the column density of H$_2$O ice is more variable between the scenarios, showing the impact of the three different lower ice layers.

In the scenarios with H$_2$O ice-filled regolith (S29) or CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith (S06) in the lower ice layer (Figures 4.21b and 4.21c), the amount of H$_2$O ice in the equatorial region decreases slowly over time, as only sublimation can occur due to the lack of available pore space throughout the subsurface for any ice to form. In the scenario with an ice-free lower ice layer (S31), on the other hand, H$_2$O ice can form within the pore space of this lower ice-free layer. The formation of H$_2$O ice within this ice-free region occurs between 20° to 35°S in Figure 4.21a. H$_2$O ice forms in the lower ice layer because the higher H$_2$O vapour density in the H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer is diffused to the lower ice-free layer at a faster rate than out of the subsurface (into the atmosphere) due to the higher diffusion coefficient in the uppermost ice-free model layer compared with the surface model layer (Figure 4.22 shows an example of the change in diffusion coefficient with depth at 17°S). This results in a faster increase in
Figure 4.21: Column density of H$_2$O ice in the upper metre of the subsurface at each latitude over time. For the (a) W-IF (S31), (b) W-C (S06) and (c) W (S29) sets of simulations. Simulations S06 and S31 only contain H$_2$O ice-filled regolith between the surface and a depth of 1 m, so the results for S29 only show the column density of the upper metre so the values can be compared. Grey represents where the H$_2$O ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.
the H\textsubscript{2}O vapour density across the ice-free layer than is lost to the atmosphere. In the region between 20\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree and 35\textdegree\textdegree\textdegreeS, this increase in H\textsubscript{2}O vapour density is enough for H\textsubscript{2}O ice to form within the ice-free layer, whereas at all other latitudes the increase in H\textsubscript{2}O vapour density is either insufficient for H\textsubscript{2}O ice formation or the amount that forms in the ice-free region is less than the amount sublimated in the upper H\textsubscript{2}O ice layer. Once H\textsubscript{2}O vapour equilibrium is reached across the subsurface, the exchange of H\textsubscript{2}O vapour to or from the atmosphere becomes the dominant process affecting H\textsubscript{2}O ice deposition or sublimation. From this point, H\textsubscript{2}O vapour tends to flow out of the subsurface for more of the year resulting in H\textsubscript{2}O ice sublimation, which occurs after around 10 martian years at 20\textdegree to 35\textdegree\textdegree\textdegreeS in Figure 4.21a.

![Figure 4.22: The diffusion coefficient at 17\textdegree\textdegree\textdegreeS for the W-IF (S31) set of simulations.](image)

Another difference between the three scenarios that impacts H\textsubscript{2}O ice deposition or sublimation is the thermal conductivity of the subsurface. Both H\textsubscript{2}O ice and CO\textsubscript{2} ice have higher thermal conductivities than the empty regolith (0.01 to 0.1 W m\textsuperscript{-1} K\textsuperscript{-1}), but the thermal conductivity of CO\textsubscript{2} ice (0.7 W m\textsuperscript{-1} K\textsuperscript{-1}) is still significantly lower than that of H\textsubscript{2}O ice (2.5 W m\textsuperscript{-1} K\textsuperscript{-1}). A high thermal conductivity throughout the subsurface, as in S29, causes more heat to be conducted deeper into the subsurface during summer and this heat is gradually released during winter. Since H\textsubscript{2}O ice has a much higher thermal conductivity, when all of the pore space is filled with H\textsubscript{2}O
ice (S29) subsurface temperatures are expected to be higher than when the lower ice layer (below 1 m) is either completely ice-free (S31) or filled with CO₂ ice (S06). This can be clearly seen when comparing average subsurface temperatures across the equatorial region for the W scenario (S29; Figure 4.23a) with that of the W-IF (S31; Figure 4.23b) and the W-C scenarios (S06; Figure 4.23c). It can also be seen that average subsurface temperatures are similar in both the W-IF (S31) and W-C (S06) scenarios despite the slight differences in thermal conductivity of the lower ice layer: 0.1 and 0.7 W m⁻¹ K⁻¹, respectively. This is because in both scenarios, roughly the same amount of heat is stored and released by the subsurface throughout the year as the abrupt change in thermal conductivity at the 1 m boundary acts to insulate the H₂O ice-filled regolith layer, reducing heat conduction further into the subsurface compared with the W scenario (S29).

Since subsurface temperatures are highest when H₂O ice fills the entire pore space, it might be expected that H₂O ice sublimates away the fastest in this scenario. However, H₂O ice actually sublimates fastest in the W-C scenario (see Figure 4.21), due to a combination of different effects. The first is a process that occurs in all scenarios initialised with H₂O ice. In the initial profiles, H₂O vapour in all model layers is set to the atmospheric vapour density, which is generally lower than the H₂O saturation vapour density. Therefore where H₂O ice is present, it will sublimate until the H₂O vapour density in the model reaches the H₂O saturation vapour density. When this occurs, the H₂O vapour density in these model layers is higher than in the surrounding model layers that contain no H₂O ice. As a result, the excess H₂O vapour is either redistributed vertically within the subsurface by diffusion (into the ice-free model layers) or flows out of the subsurface and into the atmosphere, which is most likely to have a lower H₂O vapour density. This process occurs until an equilibrium is reached between the H₂O vapour density in the pore space within the entire subsurface and the atmospheric H₂O vapour density. The rate of vertical redistribution is heavily dependent on the number of model layers that do not contain H₂O ice and the diffusion coefficient between the subsurface model layers containing H₂O ice and those that do not. In the W scenario (S29), the region below 1 m is also H₂O ice-filled regolith, which means that the H₂O vapour density in all model layers will be at H₂O saturation vapour density after the
initial period of H$_2$O ice sublimation. This means the H$_2$O vapour gradient within the subsurface will be small and vapour loss will only occur from H$_2$O vapour exchange with the atmosphere, which is expected to have a smaller H$_2$O vapour density than H$_2$O saturation vapour density. In the W-C scenario (S06), on the other hand, the lower region is filled with CO$_2$ ice and H$_2$O vapour density in these model layers remains at the initial atmospheric H$_2$O vapour density until diffusion occurs. This causes a large H$_2$O vapour gradient between the upper region that contains H$_2$O ice-filled regolith and the lower region that contains CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith. As H$_2$O vapour is redistributed into the lower model layers, the H$_2$O vapour density in the model layers containing H$_2$O ice will fall below H$_2$O vapour saturation vapour density, leading to further sublimation of the subsurface H$_2$O ice. At the same time as H$_2$O vapour is redistributed into the lower model layers, H$_2$O vapour also flows out of the subsurface into the atmosphere, due to the strong vapour gradient between the uppermost model layer (which contains H$_2$O ice) and the atmosphere. The combination of both of these processes cause H$_2$O ice to sublimate away faster in the W-C scenario (S06), than the W scenario (S29; where only H$_2$O vapour loss to the atmosphere occurs) even though subsurface temperatures are higher in the W scenario and H$_2$O saturation vapour density is higher.
Figure 4.23: Average subsurface temperature for the equatorial region of the (a) $W$ (S29), (b) $W-IF$ (S31), and (c) $W-C$ (S06) set of simulations.
4.4 Alternate Assumptions within the MSSM

The results described in the sections above assume that all of the parameters of the MSSM are set as described in Chapter 3 and this version of the model is referred to as the baseline version (see Table VII.I). There are several assumptions made for the baseline version which may impact the results discussed so far and to account for these assumptions, a series of simulations has been run to test how they have affected the results. To make comparison simpler, all of the different versions were run using the same initial condition of $W\cdot C$ with the boundary at $1\,m$. For the baseline version of the MSSM, the comparative results are from simulation S06, which are shown in Figure 4.9b. A summary of the different versions of the MSSM used in this section is given in Table VII.I and a list of the simulations run with these versions can be found in Table VII.IV.

4.4.1 Maximum Sublimation Rate

In the baseline simulations, the rate of sublimation per year is limited by a maximum sublimation rate value based on previous studies (Section 3.6). While there have been many studies on the sublimation of $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ice under a regolith layer (e.g., Chevrier et al., 2007; Hudson et al., 2007), there have been no previous studies on the effect of an overlying regolith on the sublimation rate of $\text{CO}_2$ ice. Therefore, since the maximum sublimation rate values used in the MSSM are for $\text{CO}_2$ ice exposed at the surface, a simulation was run without a limit for the maximum amount of sublimation per timestep. This limit was calculated depending on the depth of the ice for $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ice (Equation 3.45) and was the measured surface $\text{CO}_2$ sublimation rate for $\text{CO}_2$ ice (see Section 3.6). The results of this simulation (Figure 4.24) showed very little difference to the baseline results (Figure 4.9b), which proves that the use of a maximum sublimation rate is not drastically altering the result. This is as expected because an overlying regolith will lower the sublimation rate, rather than increase it, based on previous experimental studies of $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ice under an ice-free regolith layer (e.g., Chevrier et al., 2007; Hudson et al., 2007).
Figure 4.24: Column density of CO$_2$ ice at each latitude over time. For the simulations using the version of the model with the sublimation routine turned off (NS01). Grey represents where the CO$_2$ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.

### 4.4.2 Atmospheric Source

Another assumption in the baseline version of the MSSM is that the atmosphere can act as a constant source for H$_2$O and CO$_2$ vapour. In reality, the atmosphere is not an unlimited resource and to test how this assumption has impacted the results, several simulations were run assuming there is no flux into the regolith from the atmosphere, but vapour could still diffuse out of the regolith. This represents the other extreme to an atmosphere that is a never ending supply of vapour. To test this, three scenarios were run: C-W with a boundary at 1 m (NF01); W-C with a boundary at 1 m (NF02); and W (NF03) were chosen in order to investigate the effect on both H$_2$O and CO$_2$ ice sublimation.

In the case of H$_2$O ice sublimation, both the W-C scenario (NF02) and the H$_2$O ice-filled regolith scenario (NF03) show the same rate of sublimation as the baseline simulations with the same initial scenarios, S06 and S29 respectively. The rate of H$_2$O ice sublimation in three all scenarios is limited by the H$_2$O vapour surface flux and rate of H$_2$O vapour diffusion through the subsurface, showing that any replenishment of H$_2$O vapour from the atmosphere throughout a martian year is not enough to prevent H$_2$O ice sublimation. This is also seen for CO$_2$ ice in all three scenarios, as CO$_2$ also
sublimates away at the same rate in both the C-W (NF01) and the W-C (NF02) scenarios.

4.5 Discussion and Summary

The scenarios discussed in this chapter show that the presence of both CO$_2$ ice and H$_2$O ice can impact the behaviour of each ice by altering the subsurface thermal structure and by reducing the porosity, thus slowing the rate of diffusion. When only CO$_2$ ice is present, it is unstable at nearly all latitudes and survives, at most, 90 years (Figure 4.5). This is the scenario that is expected based on previous studies, which have only considered surface CO$_2$ ice and assume there is no overlying H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer to trap the CO$_2$ ice (e.g., Aharonson et al., 2004; Schmidt et al., 2009). However, the recent discovery of subsurface CO$_2$ ice in the southern polar layered deposits (PLD) (Phillips et al., 2011) showed that CO$_2$ ice could survive underneath H$_2$O ice-filled regolith for longer and in larger quantities than previously thought. The simulations of W-C shown here confirm these observations and from them, it can be estimated that CO$_2$ ice could persist under a porous H$_2$O ice layer for thousands of years in the polar regions.

The porosity of the overlying subsurface model layer is shown to have a significant influence on the number of years it takes to fully sublimate CO$_2$ ice. When the CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layer is at the top of the subsurface or there is an overlying ice-free regolith, CO$_2$ ice survives less than 100 years at most latitudes (Figure 4.16). However, when a H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer overlies the CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layer, CO$_2$ ice can survive hundreds to thousands of years depending on the latitude (Figure 4.9).

The porosity in the upper region of the subsurface also affects the rate of surface flux, which is dependent on the diffusion coefficient which, in turn, is dependent on the porosity. A low outward surface flux limits the amount of vapour that will diffuse out of the subsurface within a time step, which will limit the amount of ice that sublimates. This is because the amount sublimated will only be enough to replenish the vapour lost from each model layer by diffusion either throughout the subsurface or into the atmosphere.
After porosity, the change in thermal properties caused by the presence of either ice has the next largest influence on the behaviour of each ice. When H$_2$O ice fills the pore space of the entire subsurface and is the only ice present, average subsurface temperatures are higher than when the pore space in the regolith is empty (Figure 4.23). This is due to the increased thermal conductivity, which increases conduction and storage of heat deeper in the subsurface throughout the martian year. When CO$_2$ ice is also present, the rise in average subsurface temperature is smaller than when only H$_2$O ice fills the pore space. This smaller rise in temperature means that the saturation vapour density for both H$_2$O and CO$_2$ remains lower compared with when only H$_2$O ice is present, which will make H$_2$O ice stable for longer. When this H$_2$O ice-filled regolith is overlying the CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layer, the slower sublimation of the H$_2$O ice keeps the porosity in the upper regolith layers low which limits the rate of CO$_2$ vapour diffusion out into the atmosphere. This in turn limits the CO$_2$ sublimation rate and keeps CO$_2$ ice stable for longer.

The W-C simulations show that CO$_2$ ice in the pore space of a regolith, below a 1 m H$_2$O ice filled pore space regolith layer, can survive thousands of martian years in the polar regions and several hundred martian years in the equatorial and mid-latitude regions, as shown in Figure 4.18. This is considerably longer than is expected from previous surface CO$_2$ ice studies, especially in the equatorial and mid-latitude regions, where CO$_2$ ice is assumed to not exist at present since temperatures are too high for CO$_2$ ice to form. This can be used to provide an estimate for the age of the CO$_2$ ice layers buried within the PLD since the thinnest layers in the PLD are 1.6 m (Hvidberg et al., 2012). These results can also be used to infer that, provided a layer of H$_2$O ice formed over the CO$_2$ ice before it could fully sublimate, some CO$_2$ ice could have remained underneath the LDM or under the mid-latitude glaciers for many years after atmospheric conditions became unsuitable for CO$_2$ ice formation in these regions. However, it is unlikely that these deposits survived to the present-day. The CO$_2$ ice would have needed to be deposited during the Noachian (or early Hesperian), when CO$_2$ partial pressures are assumed to have been higher (estimates range from 0.1 bar to 10 bar; e.g., Forget et al., 2013; Haberle et al., 1994; Nakamura and Tajika, 2001) and CO$_2$ ice could have formed at higher temperatures as a result (∼195 K; see
CO₂ ice is also only likely to form outside of the polar region at very low obliquities (<15°), when the polar caps extend further equatorward, or at very high obliquities (>45°), when temperatures in the northern mid-latitudes (Figure 6.2a) are around the frost point of CO₂ at the high pressures expected during the Noachian (e.g., Nakamura and Tajika, 2003). However, any CO₂ ice deposits formed in the Noachian (or in other periods of Mars’ history) are unlikely to have survived to the present-day and subsurface CO₂ ice is therefore not expected outside of the polar regions in the present-day.

During the late Noachian and early Hesperian, when surface pressures remained higher than 600 mbar (estimates are up to 1 bar; e.g., Kite et al., 2014; Manning et al., 2006), previous work has suggested that permanent surface CO₂ ice deposits would form on Olympus Mons (after its formation) at an obliquity of 15° and the current solar luminosity (Soto et al., 2015). Soto et al. (2015) also showed that at even higher pressures, surface CO₂ ice forms at the latitude of Olympus Mons for higher obliquities as well. Nakamura and Tajika (2003) found that at the low solar luminosities expected during the Noachian (70% of the current solar constant) and high obliquity (>45°), a permanent CO₂ ice reservoir forms a belt around the mid-latitudes as well as the extensive seasonal polar CO₂ caps that have been shown to form in other studies. If a permanent CO₂ ice reservoir formed in the mid-latitudes, as suggested by Nakamura and Tajika (2003), then the formation of H₂O ice glaciers (similar to those observed in the present-day) or other H₂O ice deposits could have overlain remnants of these CO₂ ice deposits allowing them to persist for several thousand martian years longer than they would have. However, none of these CO₂ ice deposits would survive to the present-day.

In the scenarios shown here, the thickness of the overlying H₂O ice-filled regolith layer is at most 2 m and the underlying CO₂ ice is estimated to survive thousands of years. However, the number of years it would take for the initial amount of CO₂ ice to fully sublimate cannot be directly compared between the scenarios with different boundary depths since it is partially dependent on the initial column density of CO₂ ice, which differs between scenarios (see Table 4.1). Therefore, the number of years it
would take for CO$_2$ ice to fully sublimate has been recalculated for the initial amount of CO$_2$ ice below 2 m in all scenarios so a comparison can be made. When the boundary between the H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer and the CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layer is at 0.5 m, the maximum number of years that CO$_2$ ice can survive (for the CO$_2$ ice below 2 m) is estimated to be 2000 martian years, whereas when the boundary is at 1 m, it is estimated to take 2640 martian years and when the boundary is at 2 m, it is estimated to take 3530 martian years. This can be extrapolated to suggest that a further increase in burial depth of 0.5 m will result in the same initial amount of CO$_2$ ice taking around 500 martian years longer to fully sublimate. For an overlying H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer of 130 m (the average thickness of the mid-latitude glaciers; Brough et al., 2019), CO$_2$ ice can be estimated to take around 130,000 martian years to fully sublimate away in the polar regions. However, this assumes that the estimation that it takes 500 martian years longer to sublimate away the same amount of CO$_2$ ice for each subsequent 0.5 m of H$_2$O ice continues to apply to a depth of 130 m. Further work would be needed to demonstrate that this extrapolation can be used for H$_2$O ice thicknesses equivalent to H$_2$O ice glaciers.

![CO$_2$ phase diagram using the phase equations in the MSSM. The red box is the partial pressure conditions from present-day Mars, yellow box is the partial pressure conditions expected during the Noachian and early Hesperian (e.g., Kasting, 1991; Kite et al., 2014; Wordsworth et al., 2013).](image)

Figure 4.25: CO$_2$ phase diagram using the phase equations in the MSSM. The red box is the partial pressure conditions from present-day Mars, yellow box is the partial pressure conditions expected during the Noachian and early Hesperian (e.g., Kasting, 1991; Kite et al., 2014; Wordsworth et al., 2013).
In summary, a \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice-filled regolith layer overlying \( \text{CO}_2 \) ice-filled regolith results in \( \text{CO}_2 \) ice surviving for longer than without the overlying \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice-filled regolith. The overlying \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice-filled regolith in this scenario is also likely to be more stable near the surface, than when only \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice in the upper region is present due to the lower temperatures and rates of diffusion caused by the presence of \( \text{CO}_2 \) ice instead of empty regolith.
5 What role do subsurface properties and ice layer configurations play in the stability of CO$_2$ ice?

The surface and subsurface of Mars are heterogeneous and a variety of geological materials have been observed and are expected (see Section 2.1; e.g., Bandfield, 2007; Bibring et al., 2005; Putzig et al., 2005). Alongside the diverse geological materials, ice formation can occur in multiple ways and over varying timescales, leading to a range of layered configurations and porosities. In the previous chapter, simple two-ice-layer configurations were discussed to investigate the general behaviour of both water (H$_2$O) ice and carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) ice when both ices are present using the baseline version of the Martian Subsurface Model (MSSM) and all of the assumptions included within it (see Chapter 3). In this chapter I investigate how CO$_2$ ice sublimation is impacted by changes to the assumptions incorporated into the MSSM and by multiple small ice-layers compared with the simple two-ice-layer configuration previously used. The sublimation rates from all scenarios discussed in this chapter can be found in Appendix C.

One of the assumptions incorporated into the MSSM is that of a fixed initial ice porosity ($\phi_{\text{ice ini}}$) of 0.001, which is also the minimum possible value within that simulation. This initial ice porosity ensures that the vapour in the deepest model layers are in contact with the atmosphere from the beginning and vapour exchanges can always occur. Vapour exchange is necessary for sublimation to occur as the vapour density within a model layer can only be reduced (to below the saturation vapour density) by the removal of vapour into either the surrounding subsurface model layers or into the atmosphere. However, across Mars the porosity of ice-filled regolith is likely to vary considerably. Therefore, a series of simulations with initial ice porosities ranging from
0 to 0.1 have been run to encompass the range of porosities that would be expected. The results of these simulations are discussed in detail in Section 5.1, showing that when the porosity is smaller, CO$_2$ ice takes longer to sublimate away.

In the scenarios discussed in the previous chapter, the geological composition of the subsurface with depth has been assumed to be homogeneous across the entire planet, which is not the case. Mars’ surface is diverse and geological materials vary from very fine dust to solid bedrock or ice (described in Section 2.1.1). The thickness of the surface geological unit is also expected to vary across the planet. Across much of the planet the surface material is expected to be a fine dust cover of varying thicknesses (Ruff and Christensen, 2002). In many places, rather than an abrupt boundary between this surface dust layer and the underlying geological unit, there is likely to be a gradual compaction of the surface dust deposited by winds, into a denser dry sand layer that will be further compacted with depth (and time) into a sandstone. The baseline version of the MSSM that is used throughout most of Chapter 4 assumes a subsurface structure of a single regolith unit composed of an unconsolidated regolith (with similar properties to a surface dust layer) that is gradually compacted with depth into a coarse dry sand. While this subsurface structure will occur across parts of the martian surface, many other subsurface structures are also expected. Consequently, simulations using an initial ice-layer configuration of H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith (W-C) have been run for a few different subsurface structures that encompass some of the diversity in subsurface structures on Mars. These simulations are discussed in detail in Section 5.2 and show that, while the different subsurface structures alter thermal properties, the largest influence on the stability of CO$_2$ ice is the initial column density of CO$_2$ ice that can be stored within the pore space.

The two-ice-layer configurations discussed in the previous chapter are likely to occur in some places, but the actual configuration of ices with depth is likely to be more complex in many locations. To investigate the impact of the chosen ice-layer configurations, a series of simulations with different combinations of ice-free regolith, H$_2$O ice-filled regolith and CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layers have been run and the results of these simulations are discussed in detail in Section 5.3. The main impact of the differ-
ent combinations of ice-layers is on the thermal properties of the subsurface, showing that higher subsurface thermal conductivities can increase the stability of CO$_2$ ice.

5.1 Initial Ice Porosity

Across the regions of Mars containing either CO$_2$ ice or H$_2$O ice, the porosity of the ice is likely to vary with location and depth depending on the compaction of the ice (from snow to compacted ice) and on the presence of fractures within the ice. On Earth, snow porosity has been found to range between $\sim 60$ and $80\%$ (Clifton et al., 2007). However, these porosity values are for pure ice, whereas in the MSSM, ice forms within the regolith matrix which has a fixed porosity profile (see Section 3.2) across all simulations discussed in this section. Therefore, two types of porosity are referred to across this work: the regolith matrix porosity and ice porosity. The regolith matrix porosity, $\phi_r$, is the porosity of the ice-free regolith matrix and ranges from 0.63 to 0.37 in the baseline version of the MSSM (Table VII). The ice porosity, $\phi_{\text{ice}}$, refers to the proportion of the empty pore space within the regolith that is filled with ice. Combining the regolith matrix porosity with the ice porosity produces the total porosity, $\phi_{\text{tot}}$, in each model layer. For example, if there is no ice within the pore space in the uppermost model layer, $\phi_{\text{ice}}=1$ and $\phi_{\text{tot}}=0.63$. Whereas if 10% of the pore space in the uppermost model layer is filled with ice, $\phi_{\text{ice}}$ is now 0.9 and $\phi_{\text{tot}}=0.567$.

Throughout this section, porosity refers to the ice porosity since the regolith matrix porosity is constant over time and between the simulations discussed in this section. All of the simulations in this section also assume a fixed permeability that is defined by a tortuosity value of 1 (see Section 3.3.1.2) to ensure that vapour can always travel through the pore space when porosity is greater than zero.

The initial ice porosity, $\phi_{\text{ice,ini}}$, used in the MSSM is an important factor for the sublimation rate of both ices, since the presence of any porosity ensures that vapour exchange can occur across the entire subsurface. In the baseline version, the initial ice porosity is fixed at 0.001, but this assumption is unlikely to hold across the entirety of Mars. There are many scenarios when the ice porosity will be higher or lower than 0.001, such as when ice is deposited, sublimating away or when fractures form. In these scenarios, the rate of ice deposition and sublimation at depth will be drastically
different as the porosity is one of the main controls on the rate of diffusion and a large porosity (>0.1) will allow vapour to diffuse through the subsurface rapidly, whereas, when ice fills the entire pore space (when $\phi_{\text{ice \ ini}} = 0$ in the MSSM), the ice at the base of the model is completely isolated from the atmosphere until the overlying ice has started to sublimate away and porosity increases. Variations in the porosity of ice will also occur with location as compaction and fracturing of ice can vary on much smaller scales (<1m) than the 5° latitude resolution used for the MSSM. Within that 5° latitude region, porosity could have a range of 0 to 0.9 across the different longitudes and this is a limitation of using fixed zonally averaged atmospheric values.

![Column density of CO$_2$ ice at each latitude over time for the W-C with a boundary at 1 m (S06) using the baseline version of the MSSM. Grey represents where the CO$_2$ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.](image)

Figure 5.1: Column density of CO$_2$ ice at each latitude over time for the W-C with a boundary at 1 m (S06) using the baseline version of the MSSM. Grey represents where the CO$_2$ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.

A series of simulations have been run to investigate how the chosen $\phi_{\text{ice \ ini}}$ value (0.001 in the baseline version) impacts the sublimation rate of CO$_2$ ice with time and latitude, using the W-C scenario from Chapter 4 (boundary at 1m; S06) as the initial ice-layer configuration. Initial ice porosities of 0, 0.0001, 0.01, and 0.1 (PM01, PM02, PM03 and PM04, respectively) were chosen to encompass the wide range of porosities that could occur in the scenarios mentioned previously. Figure 5.1 shows the column density of CO$_2$ ice over time from the initial baseline simulation with $\phi_{\text{ice \ ini}} = 0.001$ (S06) while Figures 5.2 and 5.4 show results for each of the simulations with different
initial ice porosities. The results all show a similar pattern in CO$_2$ ice sublimation, as CO$_2$ ice sublimates fastest in the equatorial region and slowest in the polar regions. The smaller latitudinal variations are also consistent across all of the simulations and show that the porosity is a dominant factor controlling the rate of sublimation through limiting the amount of CO$_2$ vapour that can diffuse out of the subsurface within a sol.

![Figure 5.2](image)

Figure 5.2: Column density of CO$_2$ ice at each latitude over time for the variable initial ice porosity sets of simulations and the initial ice porosity ($\phi_{\text{ice ini}}$) used is (a) 0 and (b) 0.0001, which correspond to simulations PM01 and PM02, respectively. Grey represents where the CO$_2$ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.

In the simulations with a smaller initial ice porosity than in the baseline version ($\phi_{\text{ice ini}} < 0.001$; Figure 5.2), CO$_2$ ice sublimates at a slower rate (global average is 5.66 mm MY$^{-1}$ in PM02) than when initial ice porosity is 0.001 (global average is 165
25.7 mm MY$^{-1}$ in S06; Figure 5.1). This is expected as smaller porosities will result in smaller diffusion coefficients (Equation 3.22d) and slower vapour transport between the atmosphere and the CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layer. In the simulations shown here (Figure 5.2), the column density of CO$_2$ ice decreases over time at all latitudes. The rate of this decrease shows the same three latitudinal zones as would be expected from surface temperature observations as well as in the results in Section 4.3.2: polar, mid-latitude and equatorial.

In the results from the $\phi_{\text{ice ini}} = 0$ set of simulations (PM01), the column density of CO$_2$ ice changes at a nearly constant rate within each of the three zones. The average sublimation rate in each region across both hemispheres is 1.37 mm MY$^{-1}$ in the polar regions, 1.81 mm MY$^{-1}$ in the mid-latitudes, and 2.29 mm MY$^{-1}$ in the equatorial region. Whereas in the results from the $\phi_{\text{ice ini}} = 0.001$ set of simulations (PM02), the CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate increases steadily with decreasing latitude, with average sublimation rates of 2.16 mm MY$^{-1}$ in the polar regions; 5.53 mm MY$^{-1}$ in the mid-latitudes and 9.28 mm MY$^{-1}$ in the equatorial region. This gradual increase makes the three latitudinal zones harder to distinguish in Figure 5.2a. This is because when the initial ice porosity is 0, vapour diffusion, and therefore sublimation, can only occur when some of the H$_2$O ice within the overlying H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer has sublimated away. This creates a pathway for the CO$_2$ vapour to travel from the top of the CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layer to the surface. If no H$_2$O ice sublimes, the underlying CO$_2$ ice remains trapped and cannot sublimate even if it is out of equilibrium with the atmosphere. Figure 5.3a shows the column density of H$_2$O ice over time for the $\phi_{\text{ice ini}} = 0$ set of simulations (PM01). In this figure, it can be seen that there is a small decrease in the column density of H$_2$O ice at most latitudes ($\sim 0.1 - 1 \times 10^{-5}$ kg m$^{-2}$) within the first martian year, which is the result of H$_2$O ice sublimating to increase the vapour density in the pore space to saturation vapour density. Around the mid-latitudes ($65-50^\circ$N and $65-75^\circ$S), there appears to be no change in the column density of H$_2$O ice in the figure, but this is because the initial drop in column density is an order of magnitude smaller at these latitudes ($\sim 0.1 - 1 \times 10^{-6}$ kg m$^{-2}$) and is not visible at the scale of the figure. At these latitudes, the atmospheric H$_2$O vapour density is closest to the saturation vapour density and the smallest amount of H$_2$O ice sublimates.
as a result ($<1 \times 10^{-6}$ kg m$^{-2}$). From this, it would be expected that CO$_2$ ice sublimes the slowest at the latitudes where the least amount of H$_2$O ice sublimates. However, temperatures in the mid-latitudes remain higher than the CO$_2$ frost point for a larger portion of the year than in the polar regions, resulting in more sublimation of CO$_2$ ice overall in the mid-latitudes (average sublimation rates of 5.53 mm MY$^{-1}$ in the mid-latitudes rather than 2.16 mm MY$^{-1}$ in the polar regions), despite the lower porosity.

The increase in the column density of H$_2$O ice over time in the equatorial region of Figure 5.3a, is due to H$_2$O ice forming where CO$_2$ ice has already sublimated and the H$_2$O vapour density has increased to above the saturation vapour density. This was discussed previously in Section 4.3.2.3 and while the increase in H$_2$O ice will result in a slight increase in subsurface temperatures, it will not impact the porosity of the overlying H$_2$O ice-layer and therefore only has a small impact on the rate of sublimation of CO$_2$ ice.

The simulations with a higher porosity than in the baseline version ($\phi_{\text{ice ini}} > 0.001$; Figure 5.4) show the expected, opposite, results to the simulations with a lower porosity in the baseline, as CO$_2$ ice sublimates away at a much faster rate. In these simulations ($\phi_{\text{ice ini}} = 0.01$ and $\phi_{\text{ice ini}} = 0.1$; PM03 and PM04, respectively), CO$_2$ ice fully sublimates away within 200 martian years across the mid- and equatorial latitudes and when $\phi_{\text{ice ini}} = 0.1$, at all polar latitudes as well. The porosity in these simulations is lower than that of snow (≈0.6-0.8) implying that any H$_2$O snow that forms on top of surface CO$_2$ ice would need to be compacted enough that the porosity was reduced to around 0.01 or lower within the first 20 martian years for this amount of CO$_2$ ice to survive longer. If the overlying H$_2$O ice had not compacted enough within that time, the underlying CO$_2$ ice would have mostly sublimated away. However, if the total column density of CO$_2$ ice (≈640 kg m$^{-2}$) within the regolith matrix was compressed into a single solid CO$_2$ ice-layer, the layer would only be 40 cm, which is drastically smaller than the smallest CO$_2$ ice-layer discovered within the SPLD (Bierson et al., 2016). This implies that while CO$_2$ ice will sublimate more rapidly at higher porosities, at the sublimation rate at 88°S (49.01 mm MY$^{-1}$) in the time it would take for the overlying H$_2$O snow to compact into a low-porosity ($<0.001$) H$_2$O ice (14 kyr; Manning et al., 2019), 686 m of pure CO$_2$ ice would have sublimated away which is small enough
Figure 5.3: Column density of H$_2$O ice at each latitude over time for the (a) $\phi_{\text{ice ini}} = 0$ (PM01) and (b) $\phi_{\text{ice ini}} = 0.0001$ (PM02) sets of simulations. Grey represents where the H$_2$O ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.

that it is plausible for some CO$_2$ ice to remain after this amount of CO$_2$ ice has sublimated away. This assumes the sublimation rate would be the same for both pure CO$_2$ ice and CO$_2$ ice within a regolith matrix, which is plausible because the thermal conductivities of CO$_2$ ice ($\sim$0.7 W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$) and the regolith at the base of the model where CO$_2$ ice exists in this scenario ($\sim$0.1 W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$), will have a similar influence on subsurface temperatures and therefore on sublimation rates. Once the overlying H$_2$O ice has compacted to 0.001, CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate has been reduced by an order of magnitude (2.66 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 88°S in S06) and any remaining CO$_2$ ice will take even longer to sublimate away.
Figure 5.4: Column density of CO$_2$ ice at each latitude over time for the variable initial ice porosity sets of simulations and the initial ice porosity ($\phi_{\text{ice ini}}$) used is (a) 0.01 and (b) 0.1, which correspond to simulations PM03 and PM04, respectively. Grey represents where the CO$_2$ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.

The presence of fractures and pathways within the overlying ice therefore has considerable influence on the amount of time that CO$_2$ ice takes to sublime when overlain by a H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer. Figure 5.5 shows the estimated number of years it would take for this underlying CO$_2$ ice to fully sublime for the range of initial ice porosities discussed (0.1 to 0). As expected, CO$_2$ ice survives longest when the overlying H$_2$O ice-layer is initially impermeable and survives the least amount of time when the initial ice porosity is largest (0.1 in this case). In general, CO$_2$ ice survives the longest at the poles, following a similar pattern with latitude for each initial
ice porosity value. The main exception is within the equatorial region for the $\phi_{\text{ice ini}} = 0.0001$ (FM02) set of simulations. In this region, CO$_2$ ice takes longer to fully sublimate at 30°N than at 30°S. This reflects the gradual increase in temperature from 30°N to 30°S (Figure 4.11) which was discussed in detail in Section 4.3.2. As temperatures increase over this latitude range, the amount of H$_2$O ice that sublimes away increases (Figure 5.3b), increasing the porosity, and therefore diffusion coefficient, in the upper model layers. This in turn allows CO$_2$ vapour to diffuse out of the subsurface faster and consequently, sublimation of CO$_2$ ice occurs at a faster rate.

![Figure 5.5: Comparison of the number of years that CO$_2$ ice survives for the varying initial ice porosity simulations and the baseline simulation (S06). $\phi_{\text{ice ini}}$ is the initial ice porosity value used in each version of the MSSM.](image)

5.2 Geological Properties

Observations by the Thermal Emission Spectrometer (TES) on the Mars Global Surveyor (MGS) have shown that the surface material is highly variable across the planet (Putzig et al., 2005, see Section 2.1.1 for more details on variations in surface geology). This diversity extends into the subsurface where geological units of varying thickness and composition are expected. The exact thickness and composition of these geological units remain unknown as most observations can only be used to infer the geological material at the surface and even this remains uncertain in many locations due to the non-uniqueness of thermal inertia and albedo values for different geological materials. Therefore, the assumption of a homogeneous subsurface structure at all latitudes used in the MSSM does not fully represent the diversity in both surface and subsurface
geological materials that is expected across Mars. In the MSSM, the fixed subsurface structure is that of a single regolith unit composed of an unconsolidated regolith at the surface that is compacted with depth into a coarse dry sand. The thermal conductivity value measured by the Heat Flow and Physical Properties Package (HP³) on the InSight lander (0.039 W m⁻¹ K⁻¹; Grott et al., 2021) falls within the range of thermal conductivities used for this regolith unit (0.01 to 0.1 W m⁻¹ K⁻¹), confirming the likelihood of regions with geological properties similar to those used for the baseline subsurface structure. However, many other combinations of geological materials and unit thicknesses are also likely. There are also areas where the subsurface contains layers that are composed of mainly H₂O ice (excess ice or a buried ice sheet) rather than an ice-filled regolith. All of these different scenarios will impact the formation and stability of both ices. Therefore, simulations with a few different subsurface structures have been run to investigate the effect of subsurface structure on the stability of H₂O ice and CO₂ ice at different latitudes.

The subsurface properties (density, porosity and thermal conductivity) for the regolith unit used in the MSSM are all calculated using equations from Grott et al. (2007, Equations 3.9a, 3.9b and 3.11) that were developed, based on measurements of lunar regolith, to simulate the martian regolith and the expected compaction of surface regolith material with depth. These equations require two bounding values, one for the surface geological material and one for the final compacted geological material deeper within the subsurface (i.e. resulting from compaction of the surface material). In the baseline version of the model, the surface values used are for an unconsolidated regolith and the compacted values are for a coarse dry sand, the values for which are also taken from Grott et al. (2007). These equations for density, porosity and thermal conductivity (Equations 3.9a, 3.9b and 3.11; Grott et al., 2007) assume that the regolith unit is composed of a material that is initially unconsolidated and is then compacted to 95% of a constant geological material (referred to as the compacted material) at 10 m. This assumption, while developed for lunar regolith, is plausible in the near surface at locations where the surface is covered in atmospheric dust, making this equation appropriate for large portions of the martian surface. However, there are also large areas where either the surface is not covered in atmospheric dust or the unconsolidated
dust layer is thin and overlies another geological material rather than consolidated dust (coarse dry sand in the Grott et al., 2007, model). In these cases, the assumption of an unconsolidated regolith that is then compacted into a consolidated dust unit is no longer valid. Consequently some of the subsurface structures investigated assumed a surface material other than unconsolidated regolith.

While the subsurface of Mars is likely to be composed of a diverse mixture of geological materials, only five materials are considered here for simplicity: an unconsolidated regolith (UR); coarse dry sand (CDS); fine dry sand (FDS); sandstone (SS); and basalt (B). These geological materials were also chosen because their properties correspond to those expected across the surface of Mars based on the thermophysical units determined by Putzig et al. (2005, discussed in Section 2.1.1). These units split the surface according to thermal inertia and albedo (Figure 2.3 and Table 2.1), covering the entire range of surface geological materials. The thermal inertias of unconsolidated regolith (UR) and fine dry sand (FDS) correspond to those used for units A and D, the thermal inertia of coarse dry sand (CDS) corresponds to units B and E, while sandstone and basalt correspond to the thermal inertias of unit F. This covers the entire thermal inertia range used for the Putzig et al. (2005) thermophysical units and, therefore, is likely to cover the majority of the expected range in geological material.

In these simulations, different subsurface structures are defined using a combination of these five materials. Thermal conductivity, density and specific heat capacity values are needed to define the subsurface structure and values for all of the geological materials are given in Table 5.1. Four of the five geological materials (UR, FDS, CDS and SS) are used to define the subsurface structure within the regolith unit. The values for the regolith unit are then input into the same equations (from Grott et al., 2007) as for the baseline version of the MSSM, with the material used for the surface and compacted geological material changing according to the subsurface structure being investigated. The final geological material considered here (basalt) cannot be formed by compaction of atmospheric dust and therefore cannot be used as one of the two bounding materials for the regolith unit. Instead, basalt is used as a basement unit that does not have enough pore space to store large quantities of H₂O ice or CO₂ ice,
Table 5.1: Properties of the geological materials used across the different subsurface structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Thermal Conductivity $\text{W m}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$</th>
<th>Density $\text{kg m}^{-3}$</th>
<th>Specific Heat Capacity $\text{J K}^{-1} \text{kg}^{-1}$</th>
<th>Thermal Inertia $\text{J m}^{-2} \text{K}^{-1} \text{s}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unconsolidated Regolith (UR)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Grott et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Dry Sand (CDS)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>Grott et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Dry Sand (FDS)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Grott et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone (SS)</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2414</td>
<td>Mellon et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basalt (B)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>Mellon et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
but will impact the thermal properties of the subsurface and consequently the stability of both ices. The subsurface structures containing only a regolith unit are discussed first, followed by a discussion on the subsurface structures which also contain a basalt basement unit below a depth of 10 m.

5.2.1 Varying the Regolith Unit Materials

Three different combinations of surface and compacted geological material for the regolith unit were tested to investigate the effect of the chosen regolith properties on results (the geological materials used are summarised in Table 5.1). The first two combinations tested were chosen based on the materials used by Grott et al. (2007) to represent the regolith that is expected to cover large portions of the martian surface. In Grott et al. (2007), an unconsolidated regolith was used as the surface geological material and either a fine dry sand or a coarse dry sand (equivalent to consolidated dust layers) were used as the compacted geological material. The unconsolidated regolith properties represent surface dust cover from wind driven redistribution of dust across the majority of the planet, whereas, fine dry sand and coarse dry sand represent the material at depth from compaction of the unconsolidated regolith. Since the subsurface structure of the baseline version of the MSSM assumes an unconsolidated regolith at the surface that gets compacted to a coarse dry sand (S06), a complimentary simulation with an unconsolidated regolith that is compacted to a fine dry sand (UR-FDS) is investigated. Alongside this, a simulation with fine dry sand to coarse dry sand (FDS-CDS) was also run to investigate the other plausible structure that could occur from the three geological materials. The final subsurface structure tested was from a coarse dry sand to a sandstone (CDS-SS), which is another stage of compaction that would be expected. The two subsurface structures with no unconsolidated regolith at the surface, represent locations where dust has been removed from the surface, rather than deposited, and the more compacted geological layers are exposed at the surface. The final common subsurface structure that is expected is a small unconsolidated regolith dust layer (<10 m) over basalt, however, in locations where this occurs, the dust layer is expected to be thin and since basalt has a very small porosity (<0.01), only small amounts of ice are expected in the pore space of these regions, which will sublimate
away rapidly. As a result, this subsurface structure is not considered in this work.

Figure 5.6 shows a comparison of the density, porosity and thermal conductivity profiles of the baseline subsurface structure with the different subsurface structures investigated, including the profiles for the subsurface structures that include a basalt basement unit below 10 m that are discussed in the next section. The profiles show the gradual change in values as the surface material becomes compacted into the final compacted material, with the steps in the figures showing the layering caused by the numerical grid (i.e. the model layers). In the profiles for the subsurface structures with a basalt basement unit, the values instantaneously change from the compacted material’s value to that of basalt and remain constant with depth from this point.

The results from the three different regolith units (UR-FDS, FDS-CDS and CDS-SS) are shown in Figure 5.7 and the column density of CO$_2$ ice from all the three subsurface structures show a similar latitudinal pattern to the results from the baseline structure (S06; Figure 5.1). The latitudes that sublimated fastest in the simulation with the baseline structure, 5°S to 25°S, still sublimate fastest for all three subsurface structures and the polar regions take the longest to sublimate. However, there are differences between the scenarios that are the result of the differing thermal properties and column densities of both ices within the subsurface. The initial column density of CO$_2$ ice is limited by the maximum amount of CO$_2$ ice that can fit within the pore space (see porosity profiles in Figure 5.6b). The three subsurface structures each have a different porosity profile with depth and therefore each is initialised with a different amount of CO$_2$ ice (see Table 5.2).

The UR-FDS results are the closest to those from the baseline subsurface structure because the density and porosity profiles of the subsurface with depth are the same between the two models, which means the initial column density of each ice is the same and only the thermal conductivity differs. The thermal conductivity of fine dry sand is significantly lower than that of coarse dry sand (see Table 5.1), which means that the skin depth is significantly shallower (0.5 m instead of 1.14 m). Since the CO$_2$ ice is mostly deeper in the subsurface than the depth at which the surface thermal cycle is damped (below 2.5 m) in the UR-FDS scenario, temperatures will be stable at the
Figure 5.6: Comparison of (a) density $[\text{kg m}^{-3}]$, (b) porosity and (c) thermal conductivity $[\text{W m}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}]$ profiles for the different subsurface structures. The labels on the figure refer to the subsurface structure: $S_0$ is the baseline structure (unconsolidated regolith to coarse dry sand), $UR$ is unconsolidated regolith to the coarse dry sand, $CDS$ is coarse dry sand to sandstone, $FDS$ is fine dry sand to coarse dry sand, $UR-FDS$ is unconsolidated regolith to the coarse dry sand to fine dry sand, and $UR-CDS$ is unconsolidated regolith to the coarse dry sand to coarse dry sand with a basalt basement layer below 10 m and $CDS-SS-B$ is coarse dry sand to sandstone with a basalt basement layer below 10 m. The steps in these figures represent the layering caused by the discretization onto the numerical grid rather than distinct geological layers, since a single value is used within each model layer.
Figure 5.7: Column density of CO$_2$ ice over time for the scenarios with different subsurface structures: (a) unconsolidated regolith to fine dry sand (UR-FDS), (b) fine dry sand to coarse dry sand (FDS-CDS) and (c) coarse dry sand to sandstone (CDS-SS). Grey represents where the CO$_2$ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$. 
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Table 5.2: The column density of ice for the upper H\textsubscript{2}O ice-filled regolith layer and the lower CO\textsubscript{2} ice-filled regolith layer for all subsurface structures. Column densities are calculated using a H\textsubscript{2}O ice density of 927 kg m\textsuperscript{-3} and the CO\textsubscript{2} ice density is calculated at 145 K. The equivalent thickness of ice in each model layer is calculated by multiplying the porosity by the thickness of the model layer. The total column density of ice is then calculated by multiplying the thickness of the ice-layer by the density of ice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsurface structure (m)</th>
<th>Column density of ice (kg m\textsuperscript{-2})</th>
<th>H\textsubscript{2}O</th>
<th>CO\textsubscript{2}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>606.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR-FDS</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>606.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDS-CDS</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>560.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS-SS</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>297.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR-CDS-B</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>186.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS-SS-B</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>100.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

depths of the CO\textsubscript{2} ice-filled regolith layer and CO\textsubscript{2} ice will tend to survive slightly longer, as is shown in the results.

The FDS-CDS results are also very similar to those from the baseline structure (S06; Figure 5.1) and the rate of sublimation is actually closer in the simulation with the baseline structure than for the UR-FDS simulation at some latitudes. The main difference is in the amount of CO\textsubscript{2} ice that is initially present in the subsurface. In this scenario (FDS-CDS), the porosity is constant throughout the subsurface as fine dry sand and coarse dry sand are assumed to have the same density but different thermal conductivities, as shown in Figure 5.6. Since the amount of CO\textsubscript{2} ice that can fill the pore space is controlled by the regolith porosity, the larger density of the surface material means that less ice is required to fill the pore space. The smaller initial column density will also mean that CO\textsubscript{2} ice will generally sublimate away faster than in the baseline structure, even if the sublimation rate is the same.

The final subsurface structure (CDS-SS) results in a distribution over time that looks very different at a first glance. This is due to the 2-3 times smaller capacity of the pore space, depending on depth, in this subsurface structure, which results in an initial column density that is drastically smaller than the others. Despite this large difference in initial column density, the overall behaviour of CO\textsubscript{2} ice in the equatorial
Figure 5.8: Comparison of the average annual CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate [mm MY$^{-1}$] for the different regolith unit subsurface structures and the baseline simulation (S06). Region and northern mid-latitudes is similar to the other simulations with CO$_2$ ice sublimating away the fastest at these latitudes. In the polar and southern mid-latitude regions, on the other hand, the sublimation rate follows a different trend from the other scenarios. This can be seen in Figure 5.8 which shows the annual average sublimation rate for each subsurface structure. As already mentioned, CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate in the equatorial region and northern mid-latitudes ($20^\circ$S to $50^\circ$N) follows the same trend as in the other subsurface structures, but across the rest of the latitudes, CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate is much higher. This difference is due to the higher thermal conductivity throughout the subsurface structure (Figure 5.6c) which results in more heat being conducted (and stored) deeper into the subsurface (to the depths of the CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layer) during summer and more being released during winter. This in turn causes warmer winter temperatures, which result in more sublimation during that time and increase the annual sublimation rate of CO$_2$ ice. Figure 5.9 shows the difference in average subsurface temperature between the baseline simulation (S06) and the CDS-SS simulation at $L_S = 0^\circ$, when the northern hemisphere is at the beginning of spring. In the figure, temperatures are warmer in the northern hemisphere and cooler in the southern hemisphere, following what is expected from the higher thermal conductivity. The latitudes with the largest changes in temperature correspond to those with the higher sublimation rates in Figure 5.8, showcasing the large effect that subsurface thermal conductivity can have on CO$_2$ ice stability.
Figure 5.9: Difference in average temperature across the subsurface between the baseline simulation (S06) and the CDS-SS simulation.

Figure 5.10: Comparison of the number of years it takes to fully sublimate CO$_2$ ice for the different regolith unit subsurface structures and the baseline simulation (S06).
The subsurface structure of the regolith unit used in the simulations, therefore, can have a large impact on the number of martian years it would take to fully sublimate an initial amount of CO$_2$ ice when overlain by an H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer, as shown in Figure 5.10. In the equatorial region, the length of time that CO$_2$ ice takes to fully sublimate is similar across all subsurface structures, even if the initial amount of ice differs. However, as latitude increases, the amount of time that CO$_2$ ice can survive becomes more dependent on the initial amount of CO$_2$ ice that is present and the thermal conductivity of the subsurface. This is especially noticeable for the CDS-SS simulation, since CO$_2$ ice takes between 200 and 400 martian years to fully sublimate at all latitudes, whereas for the other three scenarios, the CO$_2$ ice takes an order of magnitude longer to fully sublimate in the polar regions than in the equatorial region. These differences caused by the different subsurface structures are important to remember since the surface of Mars is not homogeneous and the locations where subsurface CO$_2$ ice could survive will be highly dependent on the subsurface structure and the thermal properties of the region.

5.2.2 Inclusion of a Basalt Basement Unit

In many locations with a regolith at the surface, the regolith is expected to be overlying a basement unit (Ruff and Christensen, 2002). The starting depth of this basement unit is unknown and it is expected to be composed of basalt based on surface geology observations (see Section 2.1.1). Therefore, two simulations have been run with a compacting regolith unit overlying a basalt basement unit from 10 m. In one scenario, the regolith unit has a surface material of unconsolidated regolith and the compacted material is coarse dry sand (UR-CDS-B), in the other the surface material is coarse dry sand and the compacted material is sandstone (CDS-SS-B). These subsurface structures cover the main differences discussed in the previous section and Figure 5.11 shows the results from these scenarios. It is important to note that the initial amount of CO$_2$ ice is significantly less than in all of the previous scenarios because the basalt basement unit occurs from a depth of 10 m and very little CO$_2$ ice is stored in this region, since below this depth the regolith porosity is less than 0.01. In all previous simulations, a large portion of the total CO$_2$ ice column density is stored below 10 m because of the
uneven grid, as shown in Table 4.1 and consequently, the simulations with a basement layer are initialised with less than a third of the initial CO$_2$ ice than for the baseline structure (S06). Therefore, a different scale has been used in Figure 5.11 compared with all other figures of CO$_2$ ice column density.

Figure 5.11: Column density of CO$_2$ ice over time for the scenarios with different subsurface structures with a basalt basement unit below 10 m: (a) unconsolidated regolith to coarse dry sand with a basalt basement (UR-CDS-B), (b) coarse dry sand to sandstone with a basalt basement (CDS-SS-B). Grey represents where the CO$_2$ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.

CO$_2$ ice in both simulations with a basement unit fully sublimes away within 200 martian years at more latitudes than in the simulations without a basement unit, which is expected due to the smaller initial amount of CO$_2$ ice and higher subsurface
thermal conductivities. Out of the two subsurface structures with a basement layer, the CDS-SS-B structure has a smaller initial column density of CO$_2$ ice because the porosity of the entire subsurface structure is smaller (Figure 5.6b) than in the UR-CDS-B structure. This will contribute to CO$_2$ ice fully sublimating away in less time in the CDS-SS-B structure, which is seen in Figure 5.11.

![Figure 5.12: Difference in the average temperature across the entire subsurface between the UR-CDS-B structure and the CDS-SS-B structure sets of simulations. Positive values mean average subsurface temperature is higher in the UR-CDS-B simulations, while negative values mean average subsurface temperatures are higher in the CDS-SS-B simulations.](image)

The CO$_2$ ice column density pattern over time also differs between the two scenarios with a basement unit. The CDS-SS-B structure produces a column density pattern that is symmetric around 25°S, correlating with the surface temperature distribution at $L_S = 0°$ (the date of output in the 200 martian year simulations; Figure 3.16a). In these results, there is no clear distinction between the different latitude zones: polar, mid-latitude, and equatorial. In the simulations using the UR-CDS-B structure, on the other hand, these latitude zones can be clearly picked out in the northern region (Figure 5.11a). This is due to the influence of the thermal conductivities of the two subsurface structures (Figure 5.6c). While the higher thermal conductivity of CDS-SS-B regolith unit will result in faster sublimation rates (as discussed in the previous section), the change in thermal conductivity at the top of the basement unit will have a larger ef-
fect. In the CDS-SS-B structure, thermal conductivity drops from the sandstone value \((2.97 \text{ W m}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1})\) to the basalt value \((1.75 \text{ W m}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1})\) at 10 m, whereas in the UR-CDS-B, the thermal conductivity actually increases from \(\sim 0.1 \text{ W m}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1}\) (CDS) to \(1.75 \text{ W m}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1}\) (B) at this depth. Since thermal conductivity increases at the boundary in one subsurface structure, but decreases at the boundary in the other, the effect of the basement unit on temperature will be different. Figure 5.12 shows the difference in the average subsurface temperature between the simulation with the UR-CDS-B structure and the simulation with the CDS-SS-B structure. The differences between the two scenarios are also dependent on the hemisphere being considered, which is expected as the northern hemisphere is experiencing spring conditions, whereas in the southern hemisphere it is autumn. As the thermal conductivity of the subsurface increases, more heat is conducted deeper (and stored) during summer and then is released out of the subsurface during winter. Therefore, in the UR-CDS-B scenario, the large increase in thermal conductivity at the basement boundary causes an increase in conduction and storage of heat during summer and a corresponding release of heat in winter, resulting in cooler surface temperatures during summer and warmer temperatures during winter than when there is no basement unit. In the CDS-SS-B scenario, the opposite occurs and temperatures are warmer in summer and cooler in winter than when there is no basement unit. This in turn means that the UR-CDS-B scenario is expected to be warmer than the CDS-SS-B scenario during spring due to the extra heat released by the subsurface over winter, which causes the positive values that can be seen in the northern hemisphere (Figure 5.12). During autumn the reverse is expected with the average subsurface temperature being colder in the UR-CDS-B scenario due to the increased conduction and deeper storage of heat than in the CDS-SS-B scenario, which results in the negative values seen in the southern hemisphere (Figure 5.12).

The opposite effect of the basement unit on the two subsurface structure scenarios also impacts the behaviour of \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) ice in the upper \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) ice-filled regolith layer (Figure 5.13). While \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) ice sublimates the most around 20° to 30°S in both scenarios, more sublimates away in the CDS-SS-B scenario than in the UR-CDS-B scenario. This is a consequence of the warmer summer subsurface temperatures in the CDS-SS-B scenario at these latitudes due to the thermal conductivity differences already discussed. These
Figure 5.13: Column density of H$_2$O ice at each latitude over time. For the (a) unconsolidated regolith to coarse dry sand with a basalt basement (UR-CDS-B) and (b) coarse dry sand to sandstone with a basalt basement (CDS-SS-B) sets of simulations. Grey represents where the H$_2$O ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.
differences in the column densities of H$_2$O ice at these latitudes will impact the rate of sublimation of the underlying CO$_2$ ice and the bulk thermal conductivity of the upper subsurface. This in turn, will have contributed to the more distinct latitudinal zones that can be observed in the column density of CO$_2$ ice in the UR-CDS-B scenario (Figure 5.11a) compared with the CDS-SS-B scenario (Figure 5.11b). Another effect that can be seen in Figure 5.13a is the decrease then increase in H$_2$O ice column density in the first 50 martian years at 10°-20°S, which is due to the gradual decrease in temperature that occurs while the system reaches equilibrium in the first 50 martian years. In this time, subsurface temperatures decrease by $\sim$2 K in the upper few metres (Figure 5.14) which causes a gradual decrease in H$_2$O saturation vapour density. At the start of the simulation, the H$_2$O saturation vapour density is $3.5 \times 10^{-5}$ kg m$^{-3}$ which is reduced to $2.9 \times 10^{-5}$ kg m$^{-3}$ in the first 50 martian years. As a result, in the first 40-50 martian years (while temperatures are $\sim$222 K), H$_2$O ice sublimates away rapidly based on the higher saturation vapour pressure, but when temperature drops to $\sim$221 K, the corresponding drop in saturation vapour density is enough that the H$_2$O vapour density is now higher than saturation vapour density. This causes H$_2$O ice deposition until an equilibrium value is reached and is the cause of the increasing H$_2$O ice column density between 40 and 50 martian years at 12°S.

The distinct latitudinal zones in the UR-CDS-B scenario can be clearly seen in the estimates of the number of years it would take for CO$_2$ ice to fully sublimate away (Figure 5.15a). The estimates in this figure also show that, in general, CO$_2$ ice takes less time to fully sublimate away when the subsurface structure contains a coarse dry sand to sandstone (CDS-SS) regolith unit than for an unconsolidated regolith to coarse dry sand (UR-CDS) regolith unit, regardless of the presence of the basement unit below 10 m (UR-CDS-B and CDS-SS-B scenarios). This difference is due to both the smaller initial amount of CO$_2$ ice that the CDS-SS regolith unit can hold and the faster sublimation rate caused by the higher total thermal conductivity (and therefore higher temperatures in the lowest model layers) of the CDS-SS-B subsurface structure. However, this difference is not the case at all latitudes for the scenarios with a basement unit. Between 30° and 80°N, CO$_2$ ice sublimates away slower in the CDS-SS-B scenario than in the UR-CDS-B scenario, which is unexpected based on the higher
Figure 5.14: Subsurface temperature with depth over time at 12°S for the UR-CDS-B scenario.

ermal conductivities. At these latitudes, surface temperatures are warmer in the UR-CDS-B scenario (Figure 5.12), due to the differing thermal properties discussed earlier, which leads to CO$_2$ ice sublimating at a faster rate in the UR-CDS-B scenario (Figure 5.15a). This effect emphasises the importance of considering different subsurface structures with differing thermal properties, as the different thermal properties have a large influence on the number of years either ice can survive in the subsurface.
Figure 5.15: Comparison of (a) the number of years it takes to fully sublimate CO$_2$ ice and (b) the annual average sublimation rate for the different subsurface structures with a basement unit (UR-CDS-B and CDS-SS-B) and the same subsurface structures without a basement unit (S06 and CDS-SS). The different subsurface structures are: unconsolidated regolith to coarse dry sand with a basalt basement (UR-CDS-B) and coarse dry sand to sandstone with a basalt basement (CDS-SS-B).
5.3 Simulations with Multiple Ice-Layers

Figure 5.16: Initial subsurface profiles showing the distribution of H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice for the (a) Alternate Layers (S33), (b) W-C-W (S35), (c) IF-W-C (S36) and (d) Mixed Layer (S48) scenarios. White represents an ice-free regolith, blue represents a H$_2$O ice-filled regolith and red represents a CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith. The dashed grey lines represent the boundary between model layers.

In the scenarios discussed so far, there are at most two ice-layers within the subsurface. This two-ice-layer structure is the simplest combination of the three different ice-layer types (ice-free regolith, H$_2$O ice-filled regolith, and CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith) that can be created. However, on Mars, a simple two-ice-layer structure is unlikely in many locations due to the cyclical nature of H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice deposition caused by cycles in the orbital parameters. Particularly in the polar regions, where obliquity cycles have been demonstrated to produce layers of H$_2$O ice, CO$_2$ ice and dust, known as the polar layered deposits (PLD; e.g., Hvidberg et al., 2012; Phillips et al., 2011). Therefore, several more combinations of the three-ice-layer types have been run to investigate the effect of a more complex ice-layer combination on the rate of sublimation of each ice.

Four different combinations were chosen: (i) Alternate Model layers of H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith (‘Alternate Layers’; S33); (ii) H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith Over H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith (‘W-C-W’; boundaries at 1 m and 10 m; S35); (iii) Ice-free Regolith Over H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith...
‘IF-W-C’; boundaries at 1 m and 4 m; (iii) H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith With A Mixed Layer between 1 and 4 m (‘Mixed Layer’; 50% of each ice in the mixed layer; S48). The initial H$_2$O ice (blue) and CO$_2$ ice (red) subsurface profiles for these scenarios are shown in Figure 5.16 and a summary of where these scenarios could be found on Mars is in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3: Locations on Mars where the multiple ice-layer configurations could be found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ice-layer configuration</th>
<th>Location on Mars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Model Layers of H$_2$O Ice and CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith</td>
<td>This scenario could occur throughout the year at low obliquity, when the seasonal deposition and sublimation of H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice occurs. H$_2$O ice will be deposited first due to its higher frost point temperature, followed by CO$_2$ ice later in the year. Each year the deposition of H$_2$O ice will occur before CO$_2$ ice forming alternating layers of varying thickness depending on the amount of sublimation that occurs during summer. These alternating layers will be smaller than the layers observed within the SPLD which are 10s-100s m thick (Phillips et al., 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith over H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith</td>
<td>This scenario has been observed within the SPLD, where there are multiple alternating layers of H$_2$O ice capping a CO$_2$ ice-layer which also overlies another H$_2$O ice-layer (Bierson et al., 2016; Phillips et al., 2011). The formation of these alternating layers is caused by variations in the orbital parameters. It has been suggested that H$_2$O ice forms over CO$_2$ ice either as obliquity cycles between high and low obliquity (Buhler et al., 2019) or from the longitude of perihelion shifting from northern winter to northern summer during a low obliquity period (Manning et al., 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice-layer configuration</td>
<td>Location on Mars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice-free Regolith Over</td>
<td>This scenario could have occurred within the PLD, after an H$_2$O ice-layer formed over the CO$_2$ ice-layer. During the summer season, the overlying H$_2$O ice-layer would sublimate away leaving a lag deposit of dust which protects the underlying H$_2$O ice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This scenario could also have occurred in the mid-latitudes during the Noachian. At this time, atmospheric pressures were higher and CO$_2$ ice could have deposited in the mid-latitudes due to the higher frost point temperature (~195 K). This CO$_2$ ice-layer could have then been covered by a H$_2$O ice-layer that remained stable for longer as atmospheric pressures decreased. When H$_2$O ice became unstable at the surface and started to sublimate away, a lag layer would form, protecting the H$_2$O ice from rapid sublimation as observed today. This may have protected the underlying CO$_2$ ice for a few hundred to thousand years, but not enough that CO$_2$ ice would survive to the present-day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith Over</td>
<td>This scenario could occur when a period of H$_2$O ice deposition follows CO$_2$ ice deposition, as has been proposed by Buhler et al. (2019) and Manning et al. (2019) when the orbital parameters change. There may be a period of co-deposition of H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice forming a mixed layer of both H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The column density of CO$_2$ ice results for the four multi-layer scenarios are shown in Figure 5.17. An important thing to note when comparing these results is the large differences in initial column densities of CO$_2$ ice, which have led to the different scales used for each figure. In all four scenarios, the three latitudinal zones (polar, mid-latitude and equatorial), and the behaviours within each latitudinal zone, follow the same pattern as surface temperature (Figures 3.16a and 4.23c). This latitudinal pattern can be seen in all scenarios where CO$_2$ ice takes longer than 20 martian years to fully sublimate in the equatorial region and has already been discussed in detail for the two layer scenarios in Chapter 4 so will not be discussed here.

In the Alternate Layers scenario (S33), there is one third less CO$_2$ ice at the beginning of the scenario than in the W-C scenario (S06), which suggests that the CO$_2$ ice would take less time to fully sublimate. However, between the two scenarios, the global average annual sublimation rate is reduced from 25.75 mm MY$^{-1}$ in S06 to 14.57 mm MY$^{-1}$ in S33, showing that CO$_2$ ice in the Alternate Layers scenario (S33) will actually take longer to sublimate away than in the W-C (S06) scenario. This is partially due to the low porosity of the entire subsurface which results in low CO$_2$ diffusion coefficients throughout the subsurface (Figure 5.18a). While the CO$_2$
Figure 5.17: Column density of CO$_2$ ice over time for the (a) Alternate Layers (S33), (b) W-C-W (S35), (c) IF-W-C (S36) and (d) Mixed Layer (S48) scenarios. The colour scales for each figure are different due to the large differences in the initial column density of CO$_2$ ice. Grey represents where the CO$_2$ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$. 
The $W-C-W$ scenario (S35) is initialised with the smallest CO$_2$ ice column density ($\sim 80$ kg m$^{-2}$), but a large portion of this initial amount remains after 200 martian years in both polar regions. This suggests that the CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layer being surrounded by H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layers does increase the stability of CO$_2$ ice. The rate of vapour diffusion does not appear to be the cause of the increased stability of CO$_2$ ice in the $W-C-W$ scenario (S35) compared with the $Alternate Layers$ scenario (S33). This is because the CO$_2$ diffusion coefficient is similar between the two scenarios (Figures 5.18a and 5.18b; S33 and S35) as both are initialised with ice filling the entire pore space and have very low porosities. This increased stability is more likely to be due to the thermal conductivity differences between the scenarios (Figure 5.19), since the average initial thermal conductivity is 3.21 W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$ for S35, whereas it is only 2.17 W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$ for S33. The higher average thermal conductivity results in cooler temperatures during summer and warmer temperatures during winter (as discussed previously), which reduces the seasonal fluctuations in the rate of sublimation. Overall, this has the effect of reducing the global average annual sublimation.
Figure 5.18: CO$_2$ diffusion coefficient at 77°S for the (a) Alternate Layers (S33), (b) W-C-W (S35), (c) IF-W-C (S36) and (d) Mixed Layer (S48) scenarios.

The rate (averaged across all latitudes when CO$_2$ ice is present) from 25.75 mm MY$^{-1}$ (S06) to 12.57 mm MY$^{-1}$ (S35). This sublimation rate is significantly smaller and since this scenario (S35) is close to that observed within the SPLD where CO$_2$ ice-layers have been detected between H$_2$O ice-layers (see Section 2.4.1; Phillips et al., 2011), it could explain the large volumes of CO$_2$ ice that have survived within the SPLD.

The IF-W-C scenario (S36) is the only multi-layer scenario that has no CO$_2$ ice remaining by the end of the 200 martian years simulation (Figure 5.17c), despite the fact this scenario contains over double the initial column density of CO$_2$ ice (∼520 kg m$^{-2}$) compared with the previous two scenarios discussed (∼200 kg m$^{-2}$ and ∼80 kg m$^{-2}$ in S33 and S35, respectively). The rapid sublimation of CO$_2$ ice in this scenario is due to the larger CO$_2$ diffusion coefficient across the entire ice-free regolith layer (Figure 5.18c). The CO$_2$ diffusion coefficient in the ice-free regolith layer is over two orders of magnitude larger than the diffusion coefficient at nearly all depths in the other scenarios (Figure 5.18). The large diffusion coefficient rapidly removes CO$_2$
vapour from the model layers containing CO₂ ice into the ice-free regolith layers and out into the atmosphere. Since CO₂ saturation vapour density can be up to two orders of magnitude higher than the atmospheric vapour density in the equatorial region of Mars, large amounts of CO₂ vapour will be removed from the CO₂ ice-filled regolith model layers into the ice-free model layers by diffusion, causing a similarly large amount of sublimation to occur in the CO₂ ice-filled regolith model layers in response. This process is reflected in the global average annual sublimation rate which is 1125.36 mm MY⁻¹ in this scenario (S36), significantly higher than the 25.75 mm MY⁻¹ global average annual sublimation rate of the W-C scenario (S06). However, the global average annual sublimation rate is still lower than that of the Ice-free Regolith over CO₂ Ice-filled Regolith (IF-C) scenario (1812 mm MY⁻¹; S09), showing that the presence of the overlying H₂O ice-filled regolith does increase the stability of the CO₂ ice. The results from this scenario show that the presence of an overlying porous layer will cause the rapid loss of CO₂ ice and that even the presence of an overlying H₂O ice-filled regolith layer to cap the CO₂ ice-filled regolith layer will not stabilise CO₂ ice enough for it to survive 200 martian years.

The final multiple layer scenario is similar to the W-C scenario (S06) discussed previously, but the boundary between the model layers with only H₂O ice filling the pore space and those with CO₂ ice filling the pore space is more diffuse. Instead of a
sharp boundary, there is a 4m region that contains 50% H_2O ice and 50% CO_2 ice within the pore space (Figure 5.16d). While it is unlikely that CO_2 ice and H_2O ice will be deposited in equal amounts at the same time, it has been suggested that an intermediate zone of CO_2 clathrate hydrates would form between a pure H_2O ice and a pure CO_2 ice-layer (e.g., Hoffman, 2000, see Section 2.1.4 for details on CO_2 clathrate hydrates).

The mixed layer used in this scenario is a proxy for a CO_2 clathrate hydrate layer as the equations for CO_2 clathrate hydrates are not included in the MSSM. The CO_2 ice column density results from this scenario (Figure 5.17d) have the largest portion of the initial CO_2 ice column density remaining after 200 martian years in the multiple-ice-layer scenarios. However, part of this is caused by the larger initial column density of CO_2 ice (∼560 kg m^{-2}), since the initial column density of this scenario is the closest to that of the W-C scenario (S06) and the largest of the four multiple-ice-layer scenarios. Therefore, looking at the annual average sublimation rate is needed to see if CO_2 ice is more or less stable in this scenario (S48). The annual average sublimation rate of S48 (32.25 mm MY^{-1}) is actually higher than that of the other multiple layer scenarios with CO_2 ice remaining after 200 martian years (14.57 mm MY^{-1} and 12.57 mm MY^{-1} for S33 and S35, respectively) implying that CO_2 ice is less stable in this scenario.

The rate of vapour diffusion through the subsurface is not the cause of the higher sublimation rate, since the porosity of the subsurface remains relatively low throughout the subsurface until CO_2 ice has begun to sublimate away, as in both the *Alternate Layers* (S33) and *W-C-W* (S35) scenarios. The higher sublimation rate is instead due to the lower thermal conductivity caused by the presence of the mixed layer instead of a H_2O ice-filled regolith as in S06. This results in warmer temperatures in summer and cooler temperatures in winter. The warmer summer temperatures result in higher saturation vapour densities and more sublimation, which can be seen in Figure 5.17d. Therefore, the presence of the mixed H_2O ice and CO_2 ice filled regolith layer actually acts to reduce the stability of CO_2 ice within the subsurface.

Estimates of the number of years it would take for each initial column density of CO_2 ice to fully sublimate for each of the multiple layer scenarios can be seen in Figure 5.20, showcasing the importance of layering on the amount of time CO_2 ice can survive within the subsurface. The estimates shown in this figure are calculated using the
average annual sublimation rate for each latitude and the initial CO\textsubscript{2} column density for the scenario, rather than the number of years to fully sublimate a fixed quantity of CO\textsubscript{2} ice. Based on the column density of CO\textsubscript{2} ice results (Figure 5.17), it would be expected that CO\textsubscript{2} ice survives the longest in the Mixed Layer scenario (S48). However, the estimates in Figure 5.20 show that while CO\textsubscript{2} ice takes longer to sublimate away in the Mixed Layer scenario (S48) for the southern hemisphere, CO\textsubscript{2} ice actually takes slightly longer to sublimate away in the Alternate Layers scenario (S33) for the northern hemisphere. This is especially interesting because the Mixed Layer scenario (S48) is initialised with over double the CO\textsubscript{2} column density that the Alternate Layers scenario (S33) is initialised with. This suggests that small alternating layers of pore space filled with each ice increases the stability of CO\textsubscript{2} ice more than a single large H\textsubscript{2}O ice-filled regolith layer overlying the CO\textsubscript{2} ice-filled regolith layer. This is supported by the decrease in global average sublimation rate between the two scenarios: 25.8 mm MY\textsuperscript{-1} in the W-C scenario (S06) and 14.5 mm MY\textsuperscript{-1} in the Alternate Layers scenario (S33).

**Figure 5.20:** Comparison of the number of years that CO\textsubscript{2} ice survives for the multi-layer scenarios and the baseline simulation (S06).

From the annual average sublimation rates discussed earlier, CO\textsubscript{2} ice would also be expected to take a similar number of years to fully sublimate in the W-C-W scenario (S35) as in the Alternate Layers (S33) and Mixed Layer scenarios (S48). However,
the drastically smaller initial column density of CO$_2$ ice (\(\sim 80 \text{ kg m}^{-2}\) compared with \(200 \text{ kg m}^{-2}\) and \(560 \text{ kg m}^{-2}\)) means the estimated number of years is not entirely comparable. Since the annual average sublimation rate is lowest for the W-C-W scenario (12.57 mm MY$^{-1}$), for the same initial column density as the other multi-layer scenarios, it would be expected for CO$_2$ ice to survive the longest in the W-C-W scenario (S35). However, this may not be the case due to the change in thermal properties that would occur with the increased column density of CO$_2$ ice.

CO$_2$ ice sublimates away the fastest in the final scenario (IF-W-C scenario; S36) as is expected from the earlier discussion and this configuration of ice-layers would therefore not allow any buried CO$_2$ ice to survive for long at the present obliquity. These results suggest that subsurface ice layering is one of the most important factors for CO$_2$ ice stability. They also imply that there needs to be no ice-free regolith and the presence of at least one H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer for CO$_2$ ice to survive more than 100 martian years in the mid-latitude and polar regions, for the column densities considered.

### 5.4 Summary

The simulations that use different initial ice porosities, subsurface structures, and ice-layer configurations all have a considerable influence on the rate of CO$_2$ ice sublimation. This influence is largest in the polar regions, where the number of years it takes for an initial column density to fully sublimate varies from 100 to 7000 martian years across the scenarios. The simulations using different subsurface structures and initial ice porosities were run using an initial ice-layer configuration of a W-C (boundary at 1 m) so the simulations could be compared directly with S06 from Chapter 4.

The scenarios with different initial ice porosities (ranging from 0 to 0.1) test the assumption that there is always a small amount of porosity remaining within the subsurface. This assumption is required for vapour equilibrium with the atmosphere to be maintained when the pore space of each model layer is filled with ice. Since the main effect of initial ice porosity is to limit the rate of vapour diffusion, which in turn limits the rate of sublimation, smaller initial ice porosities are expected to increase the
amount of time CO\textsubscript{2} ice can survive in the subsurface. The results show this expected outcome of CO\textsubscript{2} ice taking longer to fully sublimate away at all latitudes when the initial ice porosity is smaller (Figure 5.5). They also show that the porosity of the overlying ice-layer needs to be lower than 0.01 for CO\textsubscript{2} ice to survive longer than 1000 martian years in the polar regions.

Five different subsurface structures were also investigated to test the impact of the geological materials chosen for the baseline version of the MSSM on CO\textsubscript{2} ice sublimation. Each subsurface structure has a different porosity profile (Figure 5.6b) and the subsurface structures with larger porosities can hold more ice within their pore space. This leads to CO\textsubscript{2} ice surviving longer in the subsurface structures that can hold more CO\textsubscript{2} ice initially, as expected. The differing thermal properties of each subsurface structure (Figure 5.6c) also impact the rate of CO\textsubscript{2} ice sublimation, but are a secondary influence compared with the initial column density of CO\textsubscript{2} ice. However, the effect of the differing thermal conductivities cannot be easily separated from the effect of the differing initial CO\textsubscript{2} ice column densities in these simulations, so the thermal properties may have a larger influence than can be seen in these results.

The multiple-ice-layer scenarios were run to investigate how the layering of H\textsubscript{2}O ice-filled regolith, CO\textsubscript{2} ice-filled regolith, and ice-free regolith impacts the stability of CO\textsubscript{2} ice in the subsurface. The results show that the presence of an ice-free regolith layer causes CO\textsubscript{2} ice to sublimate faster than if the pore space of the entire subsurface is initially filled with ice (Figure 5.20) due to higher diffusion coefficients. This is consistent with the results from two layer scenarios with an ice-free regolith layer in Chapter 4. When all of the pore space is filled with one of the two ices, the diffusion coefficient remains consistently low across the entire subsurface, limiting the amount of sublimation by the rate of vapour removal from the subsurface. In these scenarios, the thermal conductivity of the subsurface is instead a greater influence on the sublimation rate. In the scenarios with higher thermal conductivities, sublimation rates are slower and CO\textsubscript{2} ice takes longer to sublimate away.

In summary, the number of years that CO\textsubscript{2} ice takes to fully sublimate away within the subsurface is highly dependent on the porosity, amount of each ice present, and
the thermal properties of the subsurface. All of these factors will be highly variable across the surface of Mars and a single scenario cannot be used to represent the expected behaviour at each latitude and longitude. Despite this, the simulations run can be used to indicate different locations where CO\textsubscript{2} ice is expected to remain stable for longer, provided deposition of CO\textsubscript{2} ice occurs in these locations under different atmospheric conditions (higher atmospheric pressure or different obliquity).
How does Mars’ orbital obliquity change the stability of CO$_2$ ice and H$_2$O ice within the subsurface?

The orbital obliquity of Mars has a large control on the distribution of subsurface ices, because it impacts the latitudinal distribution of solar insolation, which in turn affects temperatures and atmospheric circulation (discussed in Sections 2.7.1 and 2.8; e.g., Laskar et al., 2004; Levrard et al., 2004; Toon et al., 1980). As obliquity increases, solar insolation on the polar regions increases, while solar insolation on the equatorial region decreases. Figure 6.1 shows the position of the polar region (60-90°N/S) at each obliquity investigated in this thesis (15°, 25°, 35°, and 45°). The effect of this change on the distribution of surface carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) ice and water (H$_2$O) ice has been studied (e.g. Levrard et al., 2004; Mischna et al., 2003), alongside studies of the effect of obliquity on subsurface H$_2$O ice (e.g., Richardson et al., 2003; Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005).

At low obliquities (<20°), the equatorial regions receive the largest proportion of annual solar insolation and the polar regions are at their coldest. Under these conditions, large permanent CO$_2$ polar caps form that extend further equatorward than under present-day conditions (25° obliquity; Forget et al., 2017; Toon et al., 1980). Seasonal variations are also smaller than at moderate obliquities (~25°) and atmospheric circulation is weaker (Newman et al., 2005). At high obliquities, on the other hand, the polar regions experience the largest temperature variations and permanent polar caps are no longer stable (e.g. Mischna et al., 2003; Toon et al., 1980). Instead, large seasonal CO$_2$ polar caps form that extend even further equatorward than the permanent CO$_2$ polar caps that form at low obliquity (Jakosky and Carr, 1984). During the summer season, H$_2$O ice is exposed at the poles and sublimes away, migrating
towards the mid-latitudes at high obliquities (∼35°) and building up large deposits of H₂O ice, such as the Latitude Dependent Mantle (LDM) and the Lobate Debris Aprons (LDAs) that have been observed in the present-day (Holt et al., 2008; Mischena et al., 2003; Mustard et al., 2001). Under present-day atmospheric pressures, the stability of subsurface CO₂ ice is expected to follow a similar pattern to surface CO₂ ice: stable throughout the year at low obliquity and only seasonally stable at high obliquities. This chapter aims to investigate how the sublimation rate of CO₂ ice is impacted by each obliquity for the scenarios already discussed across the previous chapters.

![Figure 6.1: The effect of the tilt of Mars on northern summer and southern winter temperatures relative to 0° obliquity for four obliquities: 15°, 25°, 35°, and 45°. The red colour represents warmer temperatures and the blue colour represents colder temperatures than for the corresponding season at 0° obliquity, with the strength of the colour representing the magnitude of this difference.](image)

Section 6.1 summarises the initial atmospheric profiles for each obliquity (15°, 35° and 45°) and Section 6.2 summarises initial subsurface profiles used for the scenarios that are discussed for each obliquity in this chapter. The results for each obliquity (15°, 35°, and 45°) are then discussed separately (Sections 6.3, 6.4, and 6.5, respectively). These results are then all compared with each other and the previous present-day results in Section 6.6, alongside a discussion of the implications of these results.

## 6.1 Atmospheric Profiles

To investigate the role of obliquity, the atmospheric annual cycles that are used for the surface condition in the Martian Subsurface Model (MSSM) have to be updated to reflect the change in atmospheric conditions that occurs with obliquity. This was done using the same method as for the 25° obliquity atmospheric profiles (see Section
3.7.1), by taking the outputs from the final year of a 4 martian year LMD-UK Mars global circulation model (MGCM) simulation that was initialised using the restart files from a 20 martian year spin up run for each obliquity (15°, 35°, and 45°). The annual surface temperature, pressure, H₂O vapour density and CO₂ vapour density profiles for the three obliquities were then taken from the final year of their respective obliquity MGCM simulation. The MGCM outputs were zonally averaged and diurnally averaged to produce the final profiles. The profiles for each property show the expected annual patterns at each obliquity and these cycles are briefly summarised here. As discussed for the atmospheric profiles for the 25° obliquity (Section 3.7.1), the higher CO₂ vapour density values in northern winter at latitudes 55°–80°N are due to the higher surface pressures, which will have increased both the CO₂ frost point temperature and the saturation vapour density.

In the 15° obliquity atmospheric profiles (Figure 6.2), polar conditions (temperature and vapour densities) remain low enough for permanent CO₂ polar caps to persist throughout the year. Although there is a portion of the year (~550 to ~650 sols) when surface temperatures rise to above the CO₂ frost point (~145 K; Kasting, 1991), which will impact the survival of CO₂ ice in the subsurface. This can be seen in Figure 6.3a which shows the annual surface CO₂ ice cycle from the final year of the 15° obliquity simulation. In this figure, the surface CO₂ ice that remains throughout the year has built up over the 24 martian years of simulation rather than representing the thickness of the total CO₂ ice reservoir that would form over an obliquity cycle. CO₂ ice remains at the surface throughout the year at the highest northern polar latitudes, with a decrease in the column density over northern summer, reaching a minimum seasonal thickness of 1.6 m (assuming no porosity). In the southern polar region, surface CO₂ ice also persists throughout the year, but the amount that exists from sol 500 to sol 100 is significantly less than in the northern hemisphere. The minimum thickness of CO₂ ice at the southern pole is only 30 cm if the CO₂ ice exists as a solid slab with no porosity. However, this CO₂ ice is likely to contain some porosity and is unlikely to completely seal the underlying subsurface. The CO₂ ice thicknesses in both hemispheres are built up over the 24 martian years of the MGCM simulation and these thicknesses will therefore be smaller than would be expected on Mars since obliquity varies over
Figure 6.2: Longitudinal averages as a function of latitude over time for the surface (a) temperature, (b) pressure, (c) \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) vapour, and (d) CO\(_2\) vapour cycles from the MGCM simulation at an obliquity of 15°. The values are taken from the lowest atmospheric layer in the MGCM to represent the near-surface atmospheric values.
tens of thousands of years, so more CO$_2$ ice would have built up over that time.

Figure 6.3: Longitudinal averages as a function of latitude over time for the surface CO$_2$ ice and H$_2$O ice cycles from the obliquity $= (a)$ 15$^\circ$ and (b) 45$^\circ$ MGCM simulations.

In both the 35$^\circ$ (Figure 6.4) and 45$^\circ$ (Figure 6.5) obliquity atmospheric profiles, polar conditions (temperature and vapour densities) are too high during the summer seasons for permanent CO$_2$ ice caps to be stable. Instead, large seasonal CO$_2$ ice caps that can extend down to $\sim45^\circ$ N/S form during winter, as shown in Figure 6.3b (from the 45$^\circ$ obliquity MGCM simulation). The formation of large seasonal polar caps is consistent with the findings of previous high obliquity studies (see Section 2.7.1.1; e.g., Jakosky, 1985a; Richardson and Wilson, 2002) and will mean that any initial
Figure 6.4: Longitudinal averages as a function of latitude over time for the surface (a) temperature, (b) pressure, (c) H$_2$O vapour and (d) CO$_2$ vapour cycles from the MGCM simulation at an obliquity of 35°. The values are taken from the lowest atmospheric layer in the MGCM to represent the near-surface atmospheric values.
Figure 6.5: Longitudinal averages as a function of latitude over time for the surface (a) temperature, (b) pressure, (c) H$_2$O vapour and (d) CO$_2$ vapour cycles from the MGCM simulation at an obliquity of 45°. The values are taken from the lowest atmospheric layer in the MGCM to represent the near-surface atmospheric values.
subsurface CO\textsubscript{2} ice should be expected to sublimate away over time. Since CO\textsubscript{2} ice is unstable at both poles, rather than only at the northern pole as is the case when obliquity is 25°, CO\textsubscript{2} ice is expected to take less time to fully sublimate away in the polar regions for all scenarios when obliquity is high (35° or 45°). In the mid-latitude and equatorial regions, however, the changes in atmospheric conditions with increased obliquity are expected to increase the stability of CO\textsubscript{2} ice compared with when obliquity is 25°, such as the lower winter temperatures (which remain at or below the H\textsubscript{2}O frost point temperature) and pressures (since lower pressure reduces the difference between saturation vapour pressure and atmospheric pressure). This is based on the increased stability of H\textsubscript{2}O ice in these regions with increasing obliquity (see Section 2.7.1.1; e.g., Mischna et al., 2003). However, the increased stability with increasing obliquity is expected to be insufficient for subsurface CO\textsubscript{2} ice deposits to persist permanently, since surface temperatures remain above the CO\textsubscript{2} frost point for most of the year in the equatorial and mid-latitude regions (Figures 6.4a and 6.5a).

### 6.2 Subsurface Ice Profiles

The scenarios discussed throughout Chapters 4 and 5 were investigated using the atmospheric profiles for each of the three obliquities (15°, 35°, and 45°). These results can then be compared with the previously discussed results for the same scenarios run with the atmospheric profiles for the present-day obliquity (25°). Explanations for why each scenario is relevant to Mars can be found in Tables 4.2 and 5.3. As in the previous chapters, the scenarios are referred to by an acronym (a list of these acronyms can be found in Chapter VII) and each simulation has a short code (e.g. S01) with a prefix referring to the version of the MSSM used and the run number. This code can be used to look up the details of the simulation in Table VII.III (for the 25° obliquity simulations) and Table VII.V for all of the simulations at the other three obliquities (15°, 35°, and 45°). Sublimation rates from all scenarios can be found in Appendix C.

The influence of obliquity on the stability of CO\textsubscript{2} ice can be seen across all scenarios, with the expected higher CO\textsubscript{2} ice stability at low obliquity and lower CO\textsubscript{2} ice stability at high obliquity in the polar region. In the scenarios that are initialised with similar ice-layer configurations, the impact of the different obliquities is consistent between them.
An example is the H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith (W-C) and H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith With A Mixed Layer (Mixed Layer) scenarios, which are both initialised with a H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer over a CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layer. The influence of the H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer on temperature and porosity is similar for both scenarios at an obliquity of 25°, as discussed in Section 5.3. In the simulations with these initial scenarios at each obliquity, the influence of the different atmospheric conditions shows the same effects across both scenarios and, therefore, the simulations initialised with the W-C scenario for each obliquity can be used to represent the effect of obliquity on the Mixed Layer scenario as well. The same principle has been applied to the Ice-free Regolith over CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith (IF-C), Ice-free Regolith Over H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith (IF-W-C) and CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith Over H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith (C-W) scenarios, since all show rapid CO$_2$ ice loss at a 25° obliquity due to the lack of a protective ice-filled layer directly below the surface to reduce the rate of vapour diffusion. The IF-W-C scenario is, therefore, used to represent all three of these scenarios in this chapter, since CO$_2$ ice takes the longest to sublimate in this scenario (IF-W-C) out of the three. The final two initial ice-layer scenarios (H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith Over H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith, ‘W-C-W’, and Alternate Model layers of H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith, ‘Alternate Layers’) are also discussed for all obliquities, due to the differences in the stability of CO$_2$ ice across these and the W-C and IF-W-C scenarios. Figure 6.6 shows a schematic diagram of the four ice-layer scenarios discussed in this chapter: the W-C, IF-W-C, W-C-W, and Alternate Layers scenarios.

A simulation with ice-free regolith across the entire subsurface (IF) was also run for all obliquities to use as a baseline simulation for comparison, which was also done for the 25° obliquity atmospheric profiles. Similar to the results from the 25° IF simulation, at an obliquity of 15°, no H$_2$O or CO$_2$ ice forms at any latitude. At obliquities of 35° and 45°, CO$_2$ ice still does not form, but H$_2$O ice forms at nearly every latitude (see Figure 6.7). This is because of the fixed atmospheric cycle used as the surface condition of the MSSM. The atmospheric cycle (for all obliquities) is taken from one of the MGCM simulations (see Sections 3.7.1 and 6.1 for details). The surface H$_2$O and CO$_2$ vapour
Figure 6.6: Initial subsurface profile schematics showing the distribution of H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice for the four scenarios: (a) W-C, (b) IF-W-C, (c) W-C-W, and (d) Alternate Layers. White represents an ice-free regolith, blue represents a H$_2$O ice-filled regolith and red represents a CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith.

Densities taken from these runs, are the vapour densities after deposition has occurred. This means that in places where either ice is deposited, the vapour density will be at the saturation vapour density and when used as the surface boundary for the MSSM, there is no excess vapour for any ice to form. The small amounts of H$_2$O ice (<0.2 kg m$^{-3}$) that form in the high obliquity IF MSSM simulations are a consequence of the atmosphere behaving as a constant source when the H$_2$O vapour density in the uppermost subsurface layer is lower than the atmospheric vapour density. In the IF scenarios, the H$_2$O vapour density in the uppermost subsurface layer is likely to be lower than the atmospheric value since the vapour that is diffused from the surface into this uppermost layer is further diffused into the subsurface. This can increase the vapour density in the lower subsurface layers to above the saturation vapour density, while the vapour density in the uppermost layer remains close to the atmospheric vapour density.

The lack of deposition of CO$_2$ ice and the small amounts of H$_2$O ice deposition will likely reduce the survival time of both CO$_2$ ice and H$_2$O ice over time. Further work
Figure 6.7: Column density of H$_2$O ice at each latitude over time for the IF set of simulations at (a) 35° obliquity (S27) and (b) 45° obliquity (S28). Grey represents where the H$_2$O ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$. 
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will be needed using a full global circulation model (GCM) with the MSSM integrated into it to determine the extent of this impact.

6.3 Obliquity = 15°

Simulations using the four chosen initial subsurface scenarios (discussed in the previous section) were run using the 15° obliquity atmospheric profiles shown in Figure 6.2 and the results from these simulations are shown across Figures 6.8 and 6.9, alongside the results for the \( IF-C \) scenario. The differences in the column density of CO\(_2\) ice over time for these scenarios compared with those discussed in previous chapters for a 25° obliquity follow the expected patterns based on the differences in the atmospheric profiles. Sublimation in the equatorial regions occurs at roughly the same rate (or slightly faster), while in the polar regions, CO\(_2\) ice sublimates at a slower rate than in the equivalent 25° obliquity simulations for all scenarios. CO\(_2\) ice within the equatorial region is expected to sublimate at a similar rate because surface temperatures and pressures within this region are almost the same between the two obliquity scenarios throughout the year, whereas in the polar regions, surface temperatures are cold enough for CO\(_2\) ice to be stable for most of the year and, based on previous studies of surface CO\(_2\) ice, permanent polar caps are expected to build up.

The similar sublimation rate in the equatorial region (15°N to 35°S) can be seen in the \( W-C \) scenario results (S15; Figure 6.8a), with an equatorial sublimation rate of 43.7mm MY\(^{-1}\) at 25° obliquity (S06) and 44.4mm MY\(^{-1}\) at 15° obliquity (S15). Across this region, the column density of CO\(_2\) ice remaining after 200 martian years is nearly the same as from the 25° obliquity simulation (Figure 4.9b). The main difference between the two scenarios is that CO\(_2\) ice fully sublimates in 175 martian years at 25°S when the obliquity is 15° rather than in 199 martian years when obliquity is 25°. This difference is due to the redistribution of solar insolation that occurs as obliquity decreases (see Section 2.7.1.2), which causes minimum winter temperatures (Figure 6.2a) to be \( \sim 20 \) K higher than they are when obliquity is 25° (Figure 3.16a). The higher winter temperatures result in more sublimation throughout the year and are the cause of CO\(_2\) ice fully sublimating away faster at 20°S when obliquity is 15°.
The greater stability of CO$_2$ ice in the polar regions when obliquity is 15° can also be seen in the W-C (S15), Alternate Layers (S37), and Mixed Layer (S40) scenario results (Figure 6.8). In these scenarios, nearly all of the initial column density of CO$_2$ ice remains after 200 martian years in the polar regions. This is due to the very low annual sublimation rate (~3.26 mm MY$^{-1}$ on average) in the polar regions caused by the presence of H$_2$O ice within the subsurface. In the model layers containing H$_2$O ice, the pore space is low which results in a small diffusion coefficient and since any layers containing CO$_2$ ice are overlain by a H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer in these scenarios, CO$_2$ ice sublimation is then limited by the rate of diffusion through the H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layers (as previously discussed in Sections 4.3.2 and 5.3).

The increased stability of CO$_2$ ice in the polar regions can also be seen when comparing the results from the IF-C (S16) and IF-W-C (S43) simulations (Figure 6.9) with their equivalent 25° obliquity simulations (S09 and S36, respectively). In the IF-C simulation at an obliquity of 15°, CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate (81.5 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 88°N) is an order of magnitude smaller than when obliquity is 25° (262 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 88°N), resulting in CO$_2$ ice taking nearly three times as long to fully sublimate away in the polar regions (Figure 4.5a). While in the IF-W-C scenario, some CO$_2$ ice remains after 200 martian years when obliquity is 15°, whereas CO$_2$ ice fully sublimates within 110 martian years at an obliquity of 25° (S36; Figure 5.17c). This is due to the slower sublimation rate when obliquity is 15° (44.2 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 88°N) than when obliquity is 25° (131 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 88°N). While the increased stability of CO$_2$ ice as obliquity decreases can be observed in these results, CO$_2$ ice still sublimates at a faster rate in these scenarios than in those with a H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer near the surface (Figure 6.8). This is due to the ice-free regolith layer having a higher porosity (and therefore diffusion coefficient) than the layers containing ice. This allows CO$_2$ vapour from the model layers containing CO$_2$ ice to be transported away at a faster rate than if the ice-free regolith layers contained ice, therefore increasing the sublimation rate of CO$_2$ ice.

The average annual sublimation rate can be used to estimate the number of years that it will take for the initial amount of CO$_2$ ice to fully sublimate (Figure 6.10). As
Figure 6.8: Column density of CO$_2$ ice at each latitude over time for the (a) W-C (S15), (b) W-C-W (S40) and (c) Alternate Layers (S37) scenarios at an obliquity of 15°. Grey represents where the CO$_2$ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$. 
Figure 6.9: Column density of CO₂ ice at each latitude over time for the (a) IF-C (S16) and (b) IF-W-C (S43) scenarios at an obliquity of 15°. Grey represents where the CO₂ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m⁻².
expected from the 25° obliquity results (discussed in Chapters 4 and 5), CO₂ ice takes the longest to sublime away when covered by a H₂O ice-filled regolith layer than in any other scenario. In that scenario (W-C; S15), CO₂ ice takes over two thousand years longer to fully sublime away than in the equivalent 25° obliquity simulation (S06), showing the increased stability of CO₂ ice at lower obliquities. Despite the longer timescales for CO₂ ice to fully sublime, these results still suggest that CO₂ ice is unstable and any initial amount of CO₂ ice will be expected to continue sublimating until it has all sublimated away. However, all previous low obliquity studies indicate that CO₂ ice is stable at the highest latitudes and will form permanent polar caps over time (see Section 2.7.1.2; e.g., Forget et al., 2017; Toon et al., 1980). This means that the results discussed here do not accurately represent the behaviour of CO₂ ice when obliquity is 15°, since they show continuous annual sublimation at all latitudes.

![Figure 6.10: Comparison of the number of years that CO₂ ice takes to fully sublimate away for the 15° obliquity simulations (S15, S16, S37, S40 and S43).](image)

The continuous annual sublimation seen in these simulations is a consequence of using a one dimensional (1-D) model with a fixed atmospheric cycle for CO₂ and H₂O vapour rather than a full three dimensional (3-D) GCM. In the fixed atmospheric cycles used for the 15° obliquity scenarios (Figure 6.2), there is a period of nearly 200 sols when temperatures are above the CO₂ frost point and CO₂ ice will sublimate away. In a 3-D GCM simulation, surface CO₂ ice that was deposited from the atmosphere throughout the rest of the year will seal off the subsurface and would need to sublimate
away before any subsurface CO\(_2\) ice can begin to sublimate. Therefore, the surface CO\(_2\) ice would sublimate first and since CO\(_2\) ice deposition occurs for more of the year than sublimation, a net increase in surface CO\(_2\) ice is expected (if sublimation and deposition rates are similar). In the MSSM, however, the fixed representation of the atmosphere means that no CO\(_2\) ice deposition occurs when surface temperatures are low enough for CO\(_2\) ice to form (as discussed in Section 6.1). This in turn means that during the 200 sols of higher surface temperatures, the initial amount of CO\(_2\) ice will be slowly sublimated away until it has all sublimated rather than the seasonal surface CO\(_2\) ice sublimating away as is simulated in previous GCM studies (e.g., Kreslavsky and Head, 2005). Therefore, in order to properly simulate the stability of CO\(_2\) ice when obliquity is 15°, a full GCM simulation is needed, which will be the next steps for this work (Section 7.2.2).

6.4 Obliquity = 35°

The results from the scenarios run with the 35° obliquity atmospheric profiles (S19, S38, S41, and S44; Figure 6.11) have distinct differences to those run with the 15° and 25° obliquity atmospheric profiles (see Section 6.3 and Chapters 4 and 5). In all of the 35° obliquity results, the behaviour of CO\(_2\) ice can still be split into the broad latitudinal regions previously used: polar, mid-latitude and equatorial. However, the latitudinal ranges of these regions are different and the hemispherical differences are more extreme, due to the higher obliquity. The effect of a higher obliquity in all scenarios will therefore be discussed using these broad latitude ranges to cover the full range of changes that can be seen in the results.

The polar regions behave similarly in both the 25° and 35° obliquity simulations. The main difference between them is the increase in sublimation rate as obliquity increases. For example, at 88°N in the W-C scenario, sublimation rate increases from 3.56 mm MY\(^{-1}\) at 25° obliquity to 8.95 mm MY\(^{-1}\) at 35° obliquity. This is due to the increased amount of solar insolation received by the poles during summer as obliquity increases (see Figure 6.1). The increase in solar insolation results in warmer summer temperatures (by >40 K; Figure 6.4a), which makes CO\(_2\) ice unstable for more of the year and causes the permanent polar caps to become unstable. The large swings in
Figure 6.11: Column density of CO$_2$ ice at each latitude over time for the (a) W-C (S19), (b) IF-W-C (S44), (c) W-C-W (S41), and (d) Alternate Layers (S38) scenarios at an obliquity of 35°. Grey represents where the CO$_2$ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.
temperature throughout the year result in periods when subsurface CO\(_2\) ice is stable and periods when it is unstable. Since CO\(_2\) ice is unstable for more of the year in these simulations than when obliquity is 25\(^\circ\), the annual sublimation rate increases and a smaller column density of CO\(_2\) ice remains after 200 martian years. This can be seen by comparing the final column density of CO\(_2\) ice in the northern polar region for the W-C scenario for both obliquities. In the 25\(^\circ\) obliquity simulation (S06; Figure 4.9b), \(\sim\)560 kg m\(^{-2}\) remained after the 200 martian years, whereas only \(\sim\)500 kg m\(^{-2}\) of CO\(_2\) ice remains after 200 martian years in the 35\(^\circ\) obliquity simulation (S19; Figure 6.11a). A similar difference in the final column density of CO\(_2\) ice is seen between the 25\(^\circ\) obliquity and 35\(^\circ\) obliquity simulations for the northern polar region of the other three scenarios (S38, S41 and S44; Figure 6.11). The southern polar regions of all four scenarios also show the same increase in sublimation rate, but with even less CO\(_2\) ice remaining after 200 martian years. This is due to the higher summer temperatures (\(\sim\)40 K higher) in the southern polar region than in the northern polar region at 35\(^\circ\) obliquity (Figure 6.4a).

Alongside the higher annual sublimation rate, the higher obliquity increases the latitudinal extent of the seasonal polar caps, since the larger axial tilt means that more of the surface has winter temperatures around the CO\(_2\) frost point temperature (Figure 6.4a). Using surface temperature profiles, it can be seen that the latitudes that experience temperatures around the CO\(_2\) frost point temperature during winter extend from the pole to \(\sim\)50\(^\circ\)N in the northern hemisphere and from the pole to \(\sim\)45\(^\circ\)S in the southern hemisphere when obliquity is 25\(^\circ\) (Figure 3.16a). Whereas, when obliquity is 35\(^\circ\), this region extends to \(\sim\)35\(^\circ\)N in the north and to \(\sim\)30\(^\circ\)S in the south (Figure 6.4a). This increased latitudinal limit of the seasonal polar caps has been simulated in previous high obliquity studies (discussed in Section 2.7.1.1; e.g., Greve, 2000; Mischna et al., 2003). The extended latitudinal region of CO\(_2\) ice stability during winter results in a decreased CO\(_2\) ice sublimation rate between \(\sim\)60\(^\circ\) to 30\(^\circ\) N/S during winter compared with in the lower obliquity runs. This decreased sublimation rate is counteracted during summer by the increase in surface temperature caused by the higher obliquity (Figure 6.12), which increases both the saturation vapour densities and the rate of sublimation. This is shown by the similar annual sublimation rates at 52\(^\circ\)S in the W-C scenario for
the $25^\circ$ obliquity simulation (23.9 mm MY$^{-1}$) and the $35^\circ$ simulation (24.1 mm MY$^{-1}$). The increase in temperature during summer is greater than the decrease during winter, leading to higher annual sublimation rates in the mid-latitudes ($\sim 60^\circ$ to $30^\circ$ N/S) of both hemispheres in all scenarios.

Figure 6.12: Difference in diurnal average surface temperature between the $25^\circ$ and $35^\circ$ obliquity atmospheric profiles. Positive values mean that surface temperatures are higher at the $25^\circ$ obliquity, while negative values mean surface temperatures are higher at $35^\circ$ obliquity.

In the equatorial regions ($30^\circ$ N/S), the stability of CO$_2$ ice increases when obliquity is higher. This is due to the reduction in the amount of solar insolation that reaches the surface around the equator, which in turn results in colder temperatures throughout the year (Figure 6.12). The colder temperatures mean that the CO$_2$ saturation vapour density is lower and less CO$_2$ ice needs to sublimate during each sol for the vapour density in each model layer (containing CO$_2$ ice) to be kept at CO$_2$ saturation vapour density after CO$_2$ vapour has diffused through the subsurface. This increased stability is most obvious in the Alternate Layers scenario results (S38; Figure 6.11d), since $\sim 20$ kg m$^{-2}$ of CO$_2$ ice remains after 200 martian years between $10^\circ$N and $15^\circ$S when obliquity is $35^\circ$, whereas when obliquity is $25^\circ$, all of the initial column density of CO$_2$ ice had sublimated away within 160 martian years (Figure 5.17b).

For many latitudes in these scenarios, particularly in the polar regions, some CO$_2$ ice remains after 200 martian years. Therefore, the average annual sublimation rate
is used to estimate the number of years that it will take to fully sublimate the initial amount of CO₂ ice for each of the scenarios and the estimates are shown in Figure 6.13. These estimates show the same general pattern as when the obliquity is 25°, but the number of years it would take for an initial column density of CO₂ ice to fully sublimate away is shorter in the polar regions and longer in the equatorial regions, which is as expected based on the discussion above. The most unstable scenario for CO₂ ice at an obliquity of 35° is the IF-W-C scenario, since all CO₂ ice has sublimated away within 40 martian years. The most stable scenario is the W-C scenario: CO₂ ice survives ~1000 martian years in this ice-layer configuration. While 1000 martian years is a long time for CO₂ ice to survive when it is unstable, it takes 3000 martian years longer to fully sublimate at an obliquity of 25° for the same scenario. This is consistent with the expectation of no permanent surface CO₂ ice in the polar regions at high obliquities.

However, as in the 15° obliquity scenarios discussed earlier (Section 6.3), the lack of CO₂ ice deposition during the winter seasons will impact the results shown here. At an obliquity of 35°, the formation of large seasonal caps (see Section 2.7.1.1; e.g., Greve, 2000) will mean that any sublimation during the spring/summer seasons would first remove the seasonal caps before any subsurface CO₂ ice would begin to sublimate. In the MSSM simulations shown here, no overlying seasonal CO₂ ice cover forms during winter, which will result in a higher annual sublimation rate for the subsurface CO₂ ice than if the seasonal CO₂ ice cover was simulated. Therefore, the amount of CO₂ ice loss during the simulated 200 martian year period represents the maximum annual sublimation rate and further work with a full 3-D GCM is needed to constrain this value further (see Section 7.2.2).
The results from the scenarios run with the 45° obliquity atmospheric profiles are similar to those run with the 35° obliquity atmospheric profiles. This is because the changes that occur when obliquity increases from 25° to 35°, become more pronounced as obliquity is increased further (e.g., Forget et al., 2017; Jakosky et al., 1995).

At 45° obliquity (Figure 6.1), the annual solar insolation received by the polar regions increases and the amount received by the equatorial region decreases. This is reflected by the increase in annual average surface temperature in the polar regions, which increases from 162 K to 185 K in the northern polar region and from 155 K to 180 K in the southern polar region when obliquity increases from 25° to 45°. The increase in annual average temperature is due to the increase in the summer maximum temperature, since the winter minimum temperature is fixed at the frost point of CO$_2$ ice (Figure 6.5a). Higher summer temperatures result in higher annual sublimation
Figure 6.14: Column density of CO$_2$ ice at each latitude over time for the (a) W-C (S23), (b) IF-W-C (S45), (c) W-C-W (S42) and (d) Alternate Layers (S39) scenarios at an obliquity of 45°. Grey represents where the CO$_2$ ice column density is less than 0.0001 kg m$^{-2}$.
rates, which can be seen in the results of all four scenarios shown in Figure 6.14: the W-C (S23), IF-W-C (S45), W-C-W (S42) and Alternate Layers (S39) scenarios. The smaller increase in annual average temperature in the northern polar region means that CO$_2$ ice generally takes longer to sublimate away there than in the southern polar region. This is particularly clear in the Alternate Layers scenario (S39; Figure 6.14d), since around half of the initial column density of CO$_2$ ice remains after 200 martian years in the northern hemisphere, while it has almost entirely sublimated away within the same period of time in the southern hemisphere. This is due to the sublimation rate in the northern polar region (5.52 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 88°N in S39) being an order of magnitude smaller than in the southern polar region (16.7 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 88°S in S39).

Comparing the final column density from this 45° obliquity simulation (S39) with the final column density of the equivalent 25° obliquity simulation (S33; Figure 5.17a) shows that this hemispherical difference is enhanced by the increased obliquity, since CO$_2$ ice sublimates at almost the same rate between the two hemispheres when obliquity is 25° (at ~1.63 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 88°N/S in S33). This drastic hemispherical difference in the stability of CO$_2$ ice as obliquity increases will influence which hemisphere retains polar CO$_2$ ice deposits for longer (Laskar et al., 2004).

The increased obliquity also influences the stability of CO$_2$ ice in the equatorial and mid-latitude regions. As discussed for the 35° obliquity simulation results (Section 6.4), the mid-latitude regions experience larger seasonal temperature variations due to the seasonal polar caps extending further equatorward. However, while the seasonal temperature variations are larger, the effect of the lower winter temperatures is still mostly counteracted by the warmer summer temperatures, as is the case for the 35° obliquity. The final column density of CO$_2$ ice in the mid-latitudes is similar in the equivalent simulations for obliquities of 35° and 45°. The equatorial region, on the other hand, shows a further decrease in the annual CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate as obliquity increases from 35° (16.8 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 2°S in S38) to 45° (14.8 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 2°S in S39). This is due to the decrease in surface temperature mentioned earlier, since annual average surface temperature decreases from 218 K at the equator when obliquity is 25° to 207 K at 45° obliquity.
The combination of the increased sublimation rate at the poles and the decreased sublimation rate in the equatorial region causes the variation in CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate with latitude to decrease. This less pronounced latitudinal variation is clearly visible in Figure 6.15, which shows the estimated number of years it would take for the initial column density of CO$_2$ ice to fully sublimate away for the 45° obliquity simulations. The latitudinal variation in the number of years for CO$_2$ ice to fully sublimate is at most 300 martian years (for the W-C scenario; S23) when obliquity is 45°, whereas when obliquity is 35°, the latitudinal variation for the same scenario (S19) is 700 martian years. This corresponds to the reduction in CO$_2$ ice stability in the polar regions due to the polar regions receiving more solar insolation with increasing obliquity, and the increased stability in the equatorial region, which receives less solar insolation.

Figure 6.15: Comparison of the number of years that CO$_2$ ice takes to fully sublimate away for the 45° obliquity simulations: the W-C (S23), IF-W-C (S45), W-C-W (S42) and Alternate Layers (S39) scenarios.

6.6 Discussion

The effect of obliquity on subsurface CO$_2$ ice can be clearly seen when comparing the estimated number of years that CO$_2$ ice will take to fully sublimate for the W-C scenario at each obliquity (Figure 6.16). The estimates for the W-C scenario are used because CO$_2$ ice is more stable in this ice-layer configuration than in any other ice-layer
configuration investigated, so these estimates are the maximum values for all of the results. From these estimates, it can be seen that the largest differences in CO$_2$ ice stability as obliquity increases occur in the polar regions, while the smallest variations in stability are found in the mid-latitudes.
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Figure 6.16: Comparison of the number of years that CO$_2$ ice takes to fully sublimate away for the W-C scenario at each obliquity: 15°, 25°, 35° and 45°.

Across the mid-latitudes (~50-20°N and 50-30°S), the stability of CO$_2$ ice appears to be independent of obliquity, since the fixed initial amount of CO$_2$ ice sublimates away at nearly the same rate (~0.019 mm MY$^{-1}$) and takes roughly the same amount of time to fully sublimate (300-400 martian years) for all obliquities (Figure 6.16). As mentioned earlier, this is different from the behaviour of H$_2$O ice, as the region of H$_2$O ice stability moves further equatorward as obliquity increases due to the decrease in equatorial temperatures (see Figure 6.12; e.g., Jakosky and Carr, 1984; Levrard et al., 2004; Mischna et al., 2003). The lower equatorial temperatures at higher obliquity also act to increase the stability of CO$_2$ ice, which takes around 100 martian years longer to sublimate away at high obliquities (at a rate of ~0.028 mm MY$^{-1}$ for both 35° and 45° obliquity) than at low or moderate obliquities (at a rate of ~0.018 mm MY$^{-1}$ for both 15° and 25° obliquity; Figure 6.16). This timescale is similar to the timescale for CO$_2$ ice sublimation in the mid-latitudes at all obliquities and overall, CO$_2$ ice is not expected to survive longer than 500 martian years between 50° N/S at all obliquities. This matches the current understanding of surface CO$_2$ ice which shows that permanent
surface CO$_2$ ice is unstable outside of the polar regions for all obliquities. However, this only considers stability under current atmospheric conditions and under the current obliquity range.

Figure 6.17: Annual average surface temperature with latitude from the MGCM simulations at each obliquity (15°, 25°, 35° and 45°) and estimates of annual average surface temperature for obliquities 55° and 65°. The grey dashed line represents the CO$_2$ frost point temperature at 1 bar (195 K).

During the Noachian and early Hesperian, surface pressures are estimated to have been between 0.1 and 1 bar (Section 2.8; e.g., Forget et al., 2013; Haberle et al., 1994; Manning et al., 2006) and obliquity is estimated to have a higher maximum of around 60° (Figure 2.12; Laskar et al., 2004). At a 60° obliquity, the latitudes receiving the lowest amount of solar insolation shift even further equatorward (Mischna et al., 2003) and, similar to the behaviour of H$_2$O ice discussed, the regions of CO$_2$ ice deposition may shift to the mid-latitudes. Using the surface temperatures at each obliquity from the MGCM simulations (Sections 3.7.1 and 6.1), the change in average annual surface temperature as obliquity increases can be estimated. Figure 6.17 shows the annual average surface temperature with latitude from each MGCM obliquity simulation (15°, 25°, 35°, and 45°) and the estimated surface temperature with latitude for a 55° and 65° obliquity. Estimated surface temperatures at 55° obliquity were calculated by changing the surface temperatures at a 45° obliquity by the average change in surface temperature as obliquity increases by 10° across all four obliquities investigated (15°, 25°, 35°,
and 45°). The same change in surface temperature was applied to the 55° obliquity estimated temperatures to produce the 65° obliquity estimated surface temperatures. The pattern of increasing temperature at the poles and decreasing temperature in the equatorial and mid-latitude regions can be clearly seen in this figure. Although temperatures in the equatorial and mid-latitude regions do not fall to below 145 K (the CO₂ frost point in the present-day), temperatures in the southern mid-latitudes do fall below 195 K, which is the CO₂ frost point temperature at 1 bar. This suggests that at high obliquities and pressures, the regions of stability for CO₂ ice will shift towards the mid-latitudes. This has been simulated by Nakamura and Tajika (2003) using a 70% solar constant and pressures greater than 0.1 bar to represent the Noachian solar luminosity and pressure. Their results found that a ring of permanent CO₂ ice formed around the mid-latitudes. However, the simulations were done using a 1-D energy balance climate model, which cannot fully simulate the details of the martian climate. Another issue is that the state of the early martian climate is still largely unknown and is still heavily debated (see Section 2.8; Kahre et al., 2012; Wordsworth et al., 2015). This means that while there is a potential for CO₂ ice to have formed in the mid-latitudes at very high obliquity under high atmospheric pressures, it is an area that requires further research.

If a CO₂ ice-layer did form in the mid-latitudes during the Noachian under periods of high obliquity, it is unlikely that any remains in the present-day, especially under a shallow H₂O ice-layer (<2 m) where it would survive for a time period shorter than one modern-day obliquity cycle (~120 kyr; Laskar et al., 2002). Under thicker H₂O ice-layers, such as beneath LDAs, which are estimated to be 130 m thick (Section 2.3.3; Brough et al., 2019; Holt et al., 2008), an underlying CO₂ ice deposit might persist for far longer periods of time, particularly if the LDA porosity was low (discussed in Section 5.1). Again, further work would be needed to confirm this. The formation of CO₂ ice deposits during the Noachian could have implications for the formation of some geological features observed in the mid-latitudes of Noachian age, since CO₂ ice has been shown to flow more easily than H₂O ice at martian temperatures and pressure (Clark and Mullin, 1976; Smith et al., 2016). Sublimation of near-surface CO₂ ice has also been suggested as a potential formation mechanism for gullies in the present-day
(e.g., Conway et al., 2018) and a similar mechanism could have occurred throughout Mars’ history when subsurface CO$_2$ ice distribution was more extensive. However, more research would be needed to determine the likelihood of these features being formed from CO$_2$ ice processes rather than H$_2$O ice processes.

The polar regions show the largest variation of CO$_2$ ice persistence with obliquity: CO$_2$ ice can survive several thousands years longer at low obliquities than at high obliquities (Figure 6.16). This is as expected based on previous studies of surface CO$_2$ ice distribution with obliquity (e.g., Mischna et al., 2003; Soto et al., 2015), although the number of years for CO$_2$ ice to sublimate at low obliquity is probably underestimated in these results, as discussed earlier (Section 6.3). At high obliquities, on the other hand, the more rapid loss of CO$_2$ ice follows the expected scenario of ‘seasonal CO$_2$ polar caps and the continual loss of any permanent CO$_2$ ice over time’. Despite the differences in the plausibility of the low and high obliquity results, it is interesting to note that there is an order of magnitude difference in the rate of CO$_2$ ice sublimation between the low obliquity scenario (1.48 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 88°S at 15°; S15) and the high obliquity scenarios (19.9 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 88°S at 45°; S23) in the southern polar regions. This means that a 1 km CO$_2$ ice-layer that forms during a period of low obliquity would take between ~180 Myr (35° obliquity) and ~100 Myr (45° obliquity) to fully sublimate away when obliquity increases, if under a 1 m layer of H$_2$O ice-filled regolith. This mechanism forms one of the main processes that might have influenced the survival of the CO$_2$ ice deposits within the South Polar Layered Deposits (SPLD), and which will be discussed further in the next section.

6.6.1 Insights into the CO$_2$ Deposits within the SPLD

Recent observations of the SPLD led to the discovery of three layers of CO$_2$ ice deposits, each covered by an overlying H$_2$O ice-layer (Bierson et al., 2016; Phillips et al., 2011). These CO$_2$ ice-layers were determined to be between 10 and 1000 m thick and the bounding H$_2$O ice-layers were determined to be between 10 and 60 m thick (Bierson et al., 2016). This scenario of H$_2$O ice overlying CO$_2$ ice is similar to the W-C scenario which was run for the full range of obliquities, porosities and geological subsurface configurations discussed in this work. It is also similar to the W-C-W scenario, although
only the W-C scenario was run under all conditions (different obliquities, initial ice porosities and subsurface structures), so the results from that scenario allow for a more complete analysis to be made. While all of the results shown here are for ice-filled regolith rather than pure ice, the results from the simulations discussed throughout this thesis can be combined to form new insights into the presence of the CO$_2$ ice deposits within the SPLD (Bierson et al., 2016; Phillips et al., 2011). This is because the effects of an overlying porous layer on the rate of diffusion, and consequently on the sublimation rate are expected to be similar in magnitude whether the overlying layer is pure ice or an ice-filled regolith. The porosity of the overlying layer will be similar for both pure ice and ice-filled regolith which reduces the rate of diffusion by the same amount since the diffusion coefficient is dependent on the total porosity rather than the composition of the overlying layer. Another factor that will likely have an influence on the insights presented here is the fact that pure ice (H$_2$O or CO$_2$) will have a higher thermal conductivity than an ice-filled regolith, which will have an influence on subsurface temperature variations.

There are two main hypotheses for the presence of CO$_2$ ice deposits within the SPLD, both of which rely on different assumptions: (i) assumes that the H$_2$O ice is deposited in isolated events (Manning et al., 2019), while (ii) assumes that H$_2$O ice is continuously deposited onto the polar regions (Buhler et al., 2019).

The Manning et al. (2019) hypothesis suggests that during a period of low obliquity, there is a period of CO$_2$ ice deposition that is followed by a period of low-porosity H$_2$O ice deposition as the longitude of perihelion shifts to occur during northern summer. This low-porosity H$_2$O ice insulates the CO$_2$ ice deposits and seals the CO$_2$ ice from sublimation during the high obliquity periods that follow. This hypothesis requires the H$_2$O ice-layer to be thick enough to completely seal the underlying CO$_2$ ice, which will depend on both the accumulation rate and the densification rate of the deposited snow into low porosity ice. While the overlying H$_2$O ice-layer forms, CO$_2$ ice will be sublimating away and the results from the simulations in this thesis can be used to estimate the thickness of the CO$_2$ ice-layer that would sublimate in the time taken to form a 1 m thick H$_2$O ice-layer. The estimates are discussed in the following paragraphs.
The Manning et al. (2019) model uses an estimated deposition rate of $\sim 5 \text{ mm MY}^{-1}$ for H$_2$O ice in the south when perihelion occurs during northern winter. This implies that it would take only 200 martian years to accumulate 1 m of H$_2$O ice. Over this time period, only $\sim 1.4$ m of CO$_2$ ice would have sublimated away if the H$_2$O ice was deposited with a low porosity ($\sim 0.01$) and sublimates away at the average polar sublimation rate calculated for the 25$^\circ$ obliquity W-C scenario (S06; 6.76 mm MY$^{-1}$). This deposition rate is an order of magnitude faster than the present-day deposition rate, which has been estimated to be between 0.13 and 0.39 mm MY$^{-1}$ (Becerra et al., 2019). This higher deposition rate means that a CO$_2$ ice deposit is more likely to survive an obliquity cycle since 50 m of zero-porosity ice could accumulate in the $\sim 10$ kyr period that perihelion is expected to occur during northern summer.

The estimate for the amount of CO$_2$ ice that sublimates away while H$_2$O ice is accumulating assumes H$_2$O ice is deposited as low-porosity slab ice. However, H$_2$O ice is more likely to initially be deposited as snow that then compacts and becomes denser over time. Therefore, the thickness of the layer that sublimates away in the time it would take for a high porosity snow to compact into low-porosity H$_2$O ice can be estimated and combined with the accumulation estimate to give a total estimate. In their study, Manning et al. (2019) use a timescale of 14 thousand years (kyr) for the densification of a 70% porosity snow into a low porosity ice, which will be used as a minimum timescale in this work. While this initial porosity of snow is higher than the highest porosity used for the variable minimum porosity simulations (Section 5.1), the sublimation rate from the ‘$\phi_{\text{ice ini}} = 0.1$’ simulation (PM04) can be used to estimate the thickness of a CO$_2$ ice-layer that would have sublimated away during the time taken for this compaction to occur (14 kyr), assuming there was at least 1 m of porous H$_2$O ice overlying the CO$_2$ ice already. The CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate in the PM04 simulation ($\phi_{\text{ice ini}} = 0.1$) in the south polar region (latitude 88$^\circ$S) was found to be 49.0 mm MY$^{-1}$, so over 14 kyr, 686 m of CO$_2$ ice would sublimate away. However, this timescale is an order of magnitude smaller than the densification rate calculated by Arthern (2000), who calculated timescales of 300-550 kyr depending on
Table 6.1: The estimated thickness of CO\textsubscript{2} ice sublimated during the time taken for each process involved in the formation of a 1 m H\textsubscript{2}O ice-layer, including the different estimated timescales from different studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Time (years)</th>
<th>Time (years)</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of 1 m of low-porosity H\textsubscript{2}O ice</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PM04</td>
<td>Manning et al. (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Densification of snow to low-porosity H\textsubscript{2}O ice</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PM04</td>
<td>Manning et al. (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Densification of snow to low-porosity H\textsubscript{2}O ice</td>
<td>14.700</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PM04</td>
<td>Manning et al. (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Densification of snow to low-porosity H\textsubscript{2}O ice</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PM04</td>
<td>Manning et al. (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Densification of snow to low-porosity H\textsubscript{2}O ice</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PM04</td>
<td>Manning et al. (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Densification of snow to low-porosity H\textsubscript{2}O ice</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PM04</td>
<td>Manning et al. (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Densification of snow to low-porosity H\textsubscript{2}O ice</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PM04</td>
<td>Manning et al. (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Densification of snow to low-porosity H\textsubscript{2}O ice</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PM04</td>
<td>Manning et al. (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Densification of snow to low-porosity H\textsubscript{2}O ice</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PM04</td>
<td>Manning et al. (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Densification of snow to low-porosity H\textsubscript{2}O ice</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PM04</td>
<td>Manning et al. (2019)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Times are given in thousands of years (k.y.).
the accumulation rate and temperature of the northern polar region. At the upper end of this range (550 kyr; the maximum densification timescale), \( \sim 27 \text{ km} \) of CO\(_2\) ice would sublimate away before the overlying H\(_2\)O ice-layer porosity had reduced to 0.001.

Of course, both the accumulation and densification process will occur simultaneously, acting to further reduce the sublimation rate of the underlying CO\(_2\) ice over time, so the maximum thickness of CO\(_2\) ice that would sublimate away would be a combination of the values calculated for accumulation and densification, and therefore, \( \sim 0.7-27 \text{ km} \) of CO\(_2\) ice (depending on the densification timescale) is suggested to have sublimated away while the 1 m layer of H\(_2\)O ice was forming. This could explain why many CO\(_2\) ice deposits have not survived an obliquity cycle.

Once the low-porosity H\(_2\)O ice-layer has formed, CO\(_2\) sublimation rate drops to 2.66 mm MY\(^{-1}\), which is small enough that during the time it would take to build up the remaining 10-60 m of low-porosity H\(_2\)O ice that forms the observed bounding layers (140 kyr to 33 Myr, using the minimum and maximum timescales for accumulation and densification), another 372 m to 87 km more of CO\(_2\) ice would sublimate away, depending on the densification timescale used. If the smaller timescale is used (densification takes 14 kyr), around 1 km of CO\(_2\) ice would sublimate away while a 10 m H\(_2\)O ice-layer forms and before the remaining CO\(_2\) ice is protected from sublimation. This is a small enough amount that it is plausible that some CO\(_2\) ice could remain in the subsurface, whereas if the longer densification timescale is used, no CO\(_2\) ice could survive an obliquity cycle and the deposits observed within the SPLD could not exist.

The estimates provided so far assume present-day atmospheric conditions (obliquity of 25\(^{\circ}\)) in order to assess the impact of a variable ice porosity on the thickness of a CO\(_2\) ice-layer that would sublimate away, since the initial ice porosity simulations were only run at a 25\(^{\circ}\) obliquity. However, the hypothesis of Manning et al. (2019) assumes the H\(_2\)O ice-layer forms during a period of low obliquity. The low obliquity simulations discussed in this chapter (15\(^{\circ}\); Section 6.3) show that the CO\(_2\) sublimation rate for the W-C scenario (S15) is even smaller than for the present obliquity, being only 1.48 mm MY\(^{-1}\) for the baseline ice porosity (0.001). At this sublimation rate, a maximum of 824 m of CO\(_2\) ice would have sublimated away in the upper limit of the
time taken for a 1 m low-porosity H$_2$O ice-layer to form (557 kyr). However, the results from the low obliquity simulations do not account for the accumulation of CO$_2$ ice that occurs throughout the year in all previous studies (e.g., Forget et al., 2017; Mischna et al., 2003) and, therefore, the amount of CO$_2$ ice lost at low obliquity is likely to be even less. This implies that, alongside the GCM simulations of subsurface CO$_2$ ice at low obliquity, further work is also needed on the accumulation and densification rates under low obliquity conditions before the Manning et al. (2019) hypothesis can be used to develop a full accumulation and sublimation history of the SPLD.

The other hypothesis for the origin of the CO$_2$ ice deposits within the SPLD was proposed by Buhler et al. (2019), which assumes that H$_2$O ice is continuously deposited onto the polar regions at the same accumulation rate as observed at present (≈0.1 mm MY$^{-1}$) and that any H$_2$O ice that overlies CO$_2$ ice is permeable. In their model, a H$_2$O ice deposition rate of 0.1 mm MY$^{-1}$ is used (from Byrne et al., 2008), which is a similar rate to the estimates of Becerra et al. (2019). Using this deposition rate, Buhler et al. (2019) estimate that 10 m equivalent of H$_2$O ice would take 100 kyr to deposit, which would occur as obliquity decreases from its maximum to its minimum value within an obliquity cycle. Over this time, they also estimate that CO$_2$ ice is deposited at a rate of ≈a few mm MY$^{-1}$. In the opposite scenario, when obliquity is increasing from its minimum to maximum value, their model predicts that CO$_2$ ice sublimes at the same rate (≈a few mm MY$^{-1}$), while the H$_2$O ice deposits concentrate into a lag layer that overlies the remaining CO$_2$ ice. Over this time they estimate that a few hundred metres of CO$_2$ ice will sublimate away. When obliquity decreases again, this H$_2$O ice lag layer is buried by depositing CO$_2$ ice and then as obliquity increases again, the CO$_2$ ice sublimes away. If the entire CO$_2$ ice deposit sublimes away during a period of increasing obliquity, the H$_2$O ice lag deposit that forms will combine with the previous H$_2$O ice lag deposit and if some of the CO$_2$ ice deposit remains after a period of increasing obliquity, this becomes buried by the H$_2$O ice lag deposit and the newly depositing CO$_2$ ice. Buhler et al. (2019) suggest that the reason several CO$_2$ ice-layers have survived periods of increasing obliquity is due to the gradually decreasing obliquity maxima that have occurred over the last 510 kyr (Figure 2.12; Laskar et al., 2004). While this is a plausible explanation for why CO$_2$
ice deposits have been discovered within 2 km of the surface of the SPLD, their estimates for the rate of CO$_2$ ice sublimation are likely to be underestimates based on the simulations presented in this chapter.

The Buhler et al. (2019) model predicts CO$_2$ ice sublimation according to changes in saturation vapour pressure as surface temperatures respond to changes in insolation with obliquity. From this, their model estimates a CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate of $\sim$ a few mm MY$^{-1}$ for the period when obliquity increases. However, there are two issues with the sublimation rate used in the Buhler et al. (2019) model: (i) the sublimation rate does not change as obliquity increases and (ii) the sublimation rate is unaffected by the variable thickness of the overlying layer (H$_2$O ice lag deposit formation and sublimation), both of which would occur in reality.

From the simulations presented in this chapter, it is clear that the sublimation rate is highly dependent on the obliquity since this controls the time throughout the martian year that CO$_2$ ice is unstable. For the $W-C$ scenario, sublimation rates at 88°S (latitude of the SPLD) vary from 1.48 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 15° obliquity (S15) to 19.9 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 45° obliquity (S23). At 15° obliquity, the sublimation rate is similar to that predicted by Buhler et al. (2019) and the estimated thickness of CO$_2$ ice that would sublimate away during an obliquity cycle (100 kyr) is also similar (148 m). However, at 45° obliquity, the higher sublimation rate means that $\sim$1.9 km of CO$_2$ ice would sublimate away, making it more likely for the entire CO$_2$ ice deposit to sublimate away. This supports the Buhler et al. (2019) hypothesis that the gradually decreasing obliquity maxima is the reason why more CO$_2$ ice has survived recent obliquity cycles, even though their lower estimated sublimation rate at high obliquities is likely to have underestimated the amount of CO$_2$ ice that sublimated away during periods of high obliquity.

The other factor that might impact the results of Buhler et al. (2019) is the change in sublimation rate that would occur as the thickness of the H$_2$O ice lag deposit increases. The increased burial of the CO$_2$ ice-layer is expected to reduce the CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate, while the presence of a thicker overlying H$_2$O ice-layer is expected to increase subsurface temperatures and therefore increase sublimation rates. The presence of the overlying H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer decreases the CO$_2$ sublimation rate.
at 88°S from ∼167 mm MY\(^{-1}\) when the CO\(_2\) ice-filled regolith layer is overlain by only regolith to 2.66 mm MY\(^{-1}\). This demonstrates the large influence the overlying H\(_2\)O ice-filled regolith layer has on the survival of the CO\(_2\) ice and the further decrease to 1.63 mm MY\(^{-1}\) (in S33) when there are multiple small alternating layers of H\(_2\)O ice-filled regolith and CO\(_2\) ice-filled regolith also supports this. The other factor that needs to be considered is the reduced sublimation rate that occurs as the thickness of the overlying layer increases. In the MSSM, the CO\(_2\) sublimation rate is purely calculated from the difference between the CO\(_2\) vapour density and CO\(_2\) saturation vapour density, with a maximum sublimation rate that was experimentally determined for surface CO\(_2\) ice (Blackburn et al., 2010). It is expected that the sublimation rate in the MSSM will therefore be limited by the CO\(_2\) vapour diffusion rate, which is not well constrained in the literature (see Section 3.4.2). The results from the \(W\)-C simulations with boundary depths varying from 0.5 m (S05) to 2 m (S07) found that CO\(_2\) ice sublimation rate at 88°S increases from 2.65 mm MY\(^{-1}\) (S05) to 2.68 mm MY\(^{-1}\) (S07).

These simulations demonstrate that while the sublimation rate is impacted by the rate of diffusion of CO\(_2\) vapour out of the subsurface, the faster diffusion rate implies that this effect is smaller than for H\(_2\)O ice. However, as mentioned earlier, the diffusion coefficient of CO\(_2\) vapour is not well constrained and further experimental work is needed to constrain this value further before the full influence of an overlying layer on CO\(_2\) sublimation rate can be confirmed. Future simulations with H\(_2\)O ice-layers closer to the thicknesses of the observed H\(_2\)O ice boundary layers in the SPLD (10-60 m) are also needed before the extent of impact of an overlying H\(_2\)O ice-filled regolith on CO\(_2\) ice persistence can be fully understood.

Both hypotheses (Buhler et al., 2019; Manning et al., 2019) are plausible explanations for how the CO\(_2\) ice deposits within the SPLD formed. However, more work is needed before either can be determined to be the more likely formation mechanism. Both hypotheses do not yet account for the effect of an overlying H\(_2\)O ice-layer or of the orbital obliquity on the CO\(_2\) ice sublimation rate. The work in this thesis shows that both of these factors have a driving influence on the survival of CO\(_2\) ice within the SPLD and need to be accounted for in models of the formation of the SPLD.
6.7 Summary

Obliquity has a strong influence on the stability of CO$_2$ ice, which can be seen in all of the results discussed in this chapter. The lower the obliquity, the greater the stability of CO$_2$ ice and the longer it can remain in the subsurface of the polar regions. At the highest obliquities in the present-day obliquity cycle (35-45°; Laskar et al., 2004), CO$_2$ ice is not stable throughout the year at any latitude and sublimes continuously throughout the year. While this sublimation rate is dependent on latitude, the latitudinal dependence decreases as obliquity increases and at an obliquity of 45°, CO$_2$ ice sublimates at a similar rate across all latitudes. The sublimation rates determined from the simulations in this chapter are likely to be overestimates, since one of the limitations of the MSSM is that the seasonal deposition of CO$_2$ ice cannot be simulated, leading to sublimation rates higher than would be expected.

At the lowest obliquities in the present-day obliquity cycle (15°; Laskar et al., 2004), CO$_2$ ice sublimates up to an order of magnitude slower that at the present-day obliquity, and in the polar regions can take several thousand years longer to sublimate away than at high obliquities. However, previous studies have shown that CO$_2$ ice should form permanent polar caps at low obliquities (e.g., Jakosky et al., 1995; Mischner et al., 2003), disagreeing with the continual loss of CO$_2$ ice found in the results in this chapter. This is again due to the inability of the stand-alone MSSM to form seasonal CO$_2$ ice deposits and a full GCM simulation with the MSSM integrated into it is needed to simulate the behaviour of CO$_2$ ice at low obliquity fully.

Even with the limitations of the MSSM, the results presented here can be used to provide an insight into the two formation hypotheses that have been suggested for the CO$_2$ ice deposits that have been observed within the SPLD. The Manning et al. (2019) hypothesis assumes an overlying H$_2$O ice-layer is deposited directly after the CO$_2$ ice-layer due to changes in the orbital parameters. This H$_2$O ice-layer is likely to be deposited as snow that becomes compacted over time into low-porosity H$_2$O ice. The timescale of this compaction is critical for the survival of any underlying CO$_2$ ice deposits. If H$_2$O ice formation and compaction takes ~14 kyr as suggested by Manning et al. (2019), an estimated 750 m of CO$_2$ ice would sublimate away in the time it would
take for 1 m of compact H$_2$O ice to form. Whereas if H$_2$O ice formation and compaction takes 550 kyr as suggested by Arthern (2000), the thickness of CO$_2$ ice deposits that would sublimate away increases to 27 km and it is unlikely that any will survive an obliquity cycle.

In the other hypothesis, the overlying H$_2$O ice layer is instead assumed to form as a lag deposit when CO$_2$ ice sublimes away at high obliquity (Buhler et al., 2019). The thickness of this lag layer will therefore increase over time, gradually reducing the sublimation rate as the H$_2$O ice lag layer thickness increases. The results from the simulations in this chapter show that while the sublimation rate is expected to be influenced by the thickness of the H$_2$O ice lag layer, the obliquity has a larger influence on the sublimation rate. The Buhler et al. (2019) model uses the same sublimation rate for all obliquities, which is likely to have underestimated the thickness of CO$_2$ ice deposits that would have sublimated away during each obliquity cycle. The Buhler et al. (2019) hypothesis also does not account for the influence of the thickness of the H$_2$O ice lag layer on CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate, since the increase in H$_2$O ice will increase subsurface temperatures and the thicker overlying layer will decrease sublimation rate. Further work is needed on the influence of subsurface properties on subsurface CO$_2$ ice sublimation for both of the scenarios presented for the formation of CO$_2$ ice deposits within the SPLD before either can be confirmed.
7 | Conclusions and Future Work

7.1 Summary and Conclusions

This thesis presents the development of a new subsurface model (the Martian Subsurface Model, ‘MSSM’; Chapter 3) that accounts for the deposition and sublimation of both water (H\textsubscript{2}O) ice and carbon dioxide (CO\textsubscript{2}) ice within the subsurface for the first time. Previous martian subsurface models have only modelled the behaviour of H\textsubscript{2}O ice in detail and CO\textsubscript{2} ice has not been included in subsurface models (e.g., Leighton and Murray, 1966; Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005). The MSSM includes a thermal scheme that accounts for changes in thermal properties with depth (within a compacting regolith unit) and ice content (for both ices). Both H\textsubscript{2}O and CO\textsubscript{2} vapour are diffused through the pore space and the partition of each volatile (between vapour and ice) is recalculated at every time step using a saturation vapour density that is recalculated using the temperature in the current time step.

The MSSM is used to simulate different ice-layer configurations of ice-free regolith, H\textsubscript{2}O ice filled regolith and CO\textsubscript{2} ice filled regolith. These simulations were run to investigate the factors that influence subsurface CO\textsubscript{2} ice distribution, since previous research focused on subsurface H\textsubscript{2}O ice and since understanding the conditions required for CO\textsubscript{2} ice deposits to survive in the South Polar Layered Deposits (SPLD) for long time periods has been identified as a priority area for research (Banfield, 2020; Diniega and Putzig, 2019). The results of these simulations (discussed in Chapters 4, 5 and 6) suggest that the main factors influencing the stability of subsurface CO\textsubscript{2} ice across Mars are: the layering of H\textsubscript{2}O ice-filled regolith and CO\textsubscript{2} ice-filled regolith; the porosity; the geological properties of the regolith unit that ice forms within; and the obliquity.

CO\textsubscript{2} ice is unstable when exposed directly to the atmosphere, either at the surface or with only an ice-free regolith cover. However, the model outputs show that when there is an overlying H\textsubscript{2}O ice-filled regolith layer, the stability of CO\textsubscript{2} ice increases.
When this H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer extends to the surface, CO$_2$ ice can take several thousand years to sublimate away in the polar regions. In the equatorial region, on the other hand, CO$_2$ ice is unlikely to survive more than a few hundred years. The thickness of these H$_2$O ice-filled regolith and CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layers is also an important factor, which was demonstrated by the Alternate Model layers of H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith (Alternate Layers) and H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith Over H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith (W-C-W) scenarios which have global average sublimation rates of 14.6 mm MY$^{-1}$ and 12.6 mm MY$^{-1}$, respectively. The results from these scenarios suggest that the stability of CO$_2$ ice increases as the thickness of the CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith and H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layers increases. The increased stability with the thickness of the ice-layers can be used to infer that for the CO$_2$ ice deposits within the SPLD that have survived periods of high obliquity, they would have needed to be covered relatively quickly by a H$_2$O ice-layer thick enough to drastically reduce the CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate.

Another factor that has a large influence on stability is the initial porosity of the overlying H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer. If the initial porosity in the H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer is high (~0.1), CO$_2$ ice sublimes away rapidly at a global average rate of 848.93 mm MY$^{-1}$. Whereas when the overlying H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer has a lower initial porosity (~0.001), the average global sublimation rate drops by an order of magnitude to 25.75 mm MY$^{-1}$. When the overlying H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer has no initial porosity, sublimation of CO$_2$ ice is limited by the rate of H$_2$O ice sublimation and the global CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate falls by another order of magnitude to 1.82 mm MY$^{-1}$. This implies that the method of H$_2$O ice deposition (particularly for surface H$_2$O ice) will have a large influence on the stability of any CO$_2$ ice. If the H$_2$O ice-layer deposited onto the CO$_2$ ice deposits in the SPLD was deposited as snow, the layer’s high porosity would mean that the CO$_2$ ice deposit would rapidly sublimate away and remnant deposits are unlikely.

The geological properties of the regolith unit within which both ices form will also influence the stability of CO$_2$ ice deposits through changes in subsurface thermal conductivity. If the ice forms within a high thermal conductivity material, heat is con-
ducted faster to deeper regions, which causes any ice at these depths to become more unstable than when the thermal conductivity is lower. Six different subsurface structures were used in this thesis to explore this parameter space, including five different geological materials. The geological materials covered the range of thermal inertias expected on Mars, based on surface thermal inertia observations (Putzig et al., 2005), and the results matched those found in subsurface H₂O ice studies (e.g., Bandfield, 2007; Paige, 1992). In the H₂O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO₂ Ice-filled Regolith (W-C) scenario, CO₂ ice fills the pore space in the regolith below 1 m, which means that an increase in subsurface thermal conductivity is expected to reduce the stability of this CO₂ ice because subsurface temperatures in winter are warmer, resulting in more sublimation. This is demonstrated by the increase in global average sublimation rate from 25.8 mm MY⁻¹ (S06) to 35.6 mm MY⁻¹ (CDS-SS) when the average subsurface thermal conductivity is increased from 0.04 W m⁻¹ K⁻¹ to 1.12 W m⁻¹ K⁻¹. This will have a small influence on which regions are more likely to contain buried CO₂ ice over long timescales.

The obliquity has the largest influence on subsurface CO₂ ice of all the tested input parameters, due to its influence on surface solar insolation distribution. In the polar regions, the time needed for subsurface CO₂ ice to sublimate away is longest at the lowest obliquity (∼7000 martian years at 15°; Figure 6.16) and shortest at the highest obliquity (400 martian years at 45°). Whereas in the equatorial regions the reverse is seen, since CO₂ ice stability is lowest at low obliquity (takes ∼200 martian years to sublimate at 15° obliquity) and highest at high obliquities (∼300 martian years at 45° obliquity). These variations are as expected because they follow the change in insolation as obliquity increases: polar regions become warmer and the equatorial region becomes cooler (Mischna et al., 2003). Since the obliquity results follow the expected distribution from previous work on surface CO₂ ice, they can then be used to provide insights into the formation of the CO₂ ice deposits in the SPLD. The sublimation rates calculated for the W-C scenario at each obliquity are of a similar order of magnitude to those from Buhler et al. (2019) for the net CO₂ loss/gain rate of the SPLD, showing that the results presented here can be used to provide further insights into CO₂ ice in the SPLD. I combined the estimated accumulation rates (Manning et al., 2019) and the
time it would take for H$_2$O snow to compact into a low porosity ice (Arthern, 2000; Manning et al., 2019) with the results from the simulations presented in this thesis to estimate the thickness of the CO$_2$ ice-layer that sublimates away during the formation of the bounding H$_2$O ice-layers in the SPLD. As H$_2$O snow, the porosity is high (~0.7) and sublimation rates would be closer to those calculated for a high initial porosity (0.1; PM04), whereas when the snow has compacted into low porosity H$_2$O ice, the results from the baseline simulations (with a porosity of 0.001) can be used. From these results, 0.7–27 km of CO$_2$ ice could sublimate away during the time it would take for H$_2$O snow to compact and form a 1 m thick H$_2$O ice-layer, depending on the densification timescale used. However, these estimates are based on values for an icy regolith and use estimated ice compaction timescales that vary drastically. Therefore, further work with dust proportions closer to those in the SPLD using the detailed schemes for vapour diffusion and phase partitioning of CO$_2$ and H$_2$O that are used in the MSSM are needed before more accurate estimates can be made.

7.1.1 Responses to Research Questions

1. What is the impact of adding CO$_2$ ice physics on the H$_2$O ice distribution predicted by models that previously only took H$_2$O physics into account?

The distribution of subsurface H$_2$O ice is well understood from previous studies using observational (e.g., Feldman et al., 2004) and numerical methods (e.g., Boynton et al., 2002; Mellon and Jakosky, 1993). In general, subsurface H$_2$O ice is expected to be stable across the polar regions and below a metre-scale regolith cover in the mid-latitudes (e.g., Feldman et al., 2004). Any H$_2$O ice within the equatorial regions is expected to be unstable and to sublimate away over time. These regions of stability are replicated in the MSSM simulations that are initialised with only H$_2$O ice, after the model has equilibrated in the first martian year. In these simulations, the H$_2$O ice sublimation rate is highest in the equatorial regions between 10°N/S, with sublimation rates of around 1.7×10^{-5} mm MY^{-1} (S29). The only exception is in the H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith over Ice-free Regolith (W-IF) scenario, where H$_2$O ice starts to form in the lowest layers of the subsurface. However, this is a consequence of using a fixed annual
atmospheric cycle and a no-flux base boundary, and after 25 martian years, the H$_2$O ice column density starts to decrease as expected. In the polar and mid-latitude regions, sublimation rate drops to zero apart from at the highest latitudes, where small amounts of H$_2$O ice accumulate ($\sim$0.0004 mm MY$^{-1}$ in the polar regions of S12) when there is an ice-free regolith layer. The same accumulation rates were also found in the CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith Over H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith ($C-W$) scenario (S03) after the CO$_2$ ice had sublimated away within the first few martian years and in the Ice-free Regolith Over H$_2$O Ice-filled Regolith Over CO$_2$ Ice-filled Regolith ($IF-W-C$) scenario (S36) within the ice-free regolith layer.

The H$_2$O ice accumulation at the highest latitudes is due to the way the seasonal H$_2$O cycle is simulated by the MSSM. In the seasonal cycle, H$_2$O ice sublimates from the northern pole during northern summer, when the overlying CO$_2$ ice cover has sublimated away and vapour is transported away from the pole (e.g., Titov, 2002). Then, during northern winter, H$_2$O vapour is transported back to the northern pole and re-deposited at the surface, creating a closed system. This closed system is mostly simulated in the ice-free regolith across the entire subsurface ($IF$) scenario results, with the exception of a small build-up of H$_2$O ice ($<1$ mm) in the northern polar region over time. This build up occurs because the atmosphere acts as a constant source of H$_2$O vapour in the MSSM, due to the fixed annual atmospheric cycles that are used. This small build up will not occur when the MSSM is integrated into the full three dimensional (3-D) LMD-UK Mars global circulation model (MGCM) and the atmospheric vapour pressure can respond to changes in subsurface vapour pressure. The integration of the MSSM into the MGCM is part of the next steps for this work and is discussed further in Section 7.2.2. To summarise, the addition of CO$_2$ ice physics into subsurface modelling of H$_2$O ice does not influence the distribution of H$_2$O ice when no CO$_2$ ice is initially present and the results produced match the distributions produced by previous models and observations.

2. How do CO$_2$ ice and H$_2$O ice interact in the subsurface of Mars?

The interactions of the CO$_2$ and H$_2$O cycles during condensation and sublimation is an area of research that was identified by Diniega and Putzig (2019) and Banfield (2020) as
needing in depth examination, so that the factors controlling the mass balance of both ices can be understood. The results presented here contribute to this understanding: when only CO$_2$ ice is present within the regolith, CO$_2$ ice sublimates away rapidly (in <100 martian years) at all latitudes. Whereas when covered by a H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer, CO$_2$ ice stability increases drastically and the global average sublimation rate decreases by two orders of magnitude from 1810 mm MY$^{-1}$ in S09 to 25.8 mm MY$^{-1}$ in S06. This stability increases further when the CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layer lies between two H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layers, as in the W-C-W scenario (S35), where the global average sublimation rate is 12.6 mm MY$^{-1}$.

The effect of subsurface CO$_2$ ice on the stability of H$_2$O ice, on the other hand, is much smaller. From the simulations presented here, it can be seen that the presence of CO$_2$ ice instead of H$_2$O ice under a 1 m H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer causes a decrease in average subsurface temperatures (by $\sim$3 K; Figure 4.23) due to the lower thermal conductivity. CO$_2$ ice also keeps the diffusion coefficient low in the model layers containing no H$_2$O ice, which acts to limit the H$_2$O ice sublimation rate. This can be seen in the order of magnitude difference in H$_2$O ice sublimation rate between the W-IF scenario ($4.41\times10^{-06}$ mm MY$^{-1}$ in S31) and the W-C scenario ($2.98\times10^{-07}$ mm MY$^{-1}$ in S06).

The presence of a CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layer between two H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layers also reduces the H$_2$O ice sublimation rate further ($3.92\times10^{-08}$ mm MY$^{-1}$ in S35) through limiting diffusion of H$_2$O vapour out of the lowest H$_2$O ice-filled regolith layer into the overlying CO$_2$ ice-filled regolith layer.

To summarise, the presence of subsurface CO$_2$ ice only has a small influence on H$_2$O ice stability and this influence is mostly due to changes in the thermal conductivity and porosity of the model layers that do not contain H$_2$O ice, whereas, an overlying H$_2$O ice-layer has a large influence on subsurface CO$_2$ ice and can reduce CO$_2$ ice sublimation enough that CO$_2$ ice takes thousands of martian years to sublimate away.

3. What impact does layering have on the stability of both H$_2$O and CO$_2$ ice?

Based on my simulation results, the stability of subsurface H$_2$O ice remains mostly
unaffected by the order in which ice-layers are arranged, whereas CO₂ ice is heavily
dependent on the order of the ice-layers. An upper CO₂ ice-layer rapidly sublimes
away and a slower sublimation rate of CO₂ ice is dependent on the presence of H₂O
ice within the upper subsurface. The presence of an ice-free regolith layer causes rapid
sublimation of CO₂ ice due to the faster rate of CO₂ vapour diffusion throughout
the subsurface and into the atmosphere. The presence of an overlying H₂O ice-filled
regolith layer is shown to be required for CO₂ ice to survive hundreds to thousands
of martian years in the polar regions. However, this overlying H₂O ice-filled regolith
layer is still not sufficient to prevent rapid CO₂ ice loss (<100 martian years to fully
sublimate) if there is an overlying ice-free regolith layer, such as a debris cover. For
a subsurface containing multiple layers of H₂O ice-filled regolith and CO₂ ice-filled
regolith, the scenarios explored demonstrated that the thicknesses of these layers also
influence their stability. In the Alternate Layers scenario, the ice within the regolith
was alternated for every model layer, resulting in an global average sublimation rate of
14.6 mm MY⁻¹, whereas when there were only three larger layers (W-C-W scenario),
the global average sublimation rate decreased to 12.6 mm MY⁻¹, demonstrating the
increased stability that occurs with thicker ice-layers. This has obvious implications
for the SPLD since their thinnest CO₂ ice-layers are thought to be ∼10 m thick. These
results can be used to infer that thinner CO₂ ice-layers (<2 m) are unlikely to be
preserved over long timescales (>5 kyr). This investigation into the impact of layering
has contributed to the aim of understanding the CO₂ ice deposits within the SPLD
(identified as an area for future research by Diniega and Putzig, 2019) by demonstrating
that the presence of H₂O ice-layers on either side of the CO₂ ice deposits in the SPLD
are a key factor for allowing these CO₂ deposits to survive recent obliquity cycles.

4. How important are subsurface properties for the distribution of ices?

The results from the series of simulations run with different subsurface structures (Sec-
tion 5.2) demonstrate the importance of the subsurface properties used. A series of
four different regolith unit structures were investigated and the results showed that
the thermal conductivity is the subsurface property that has the largest influence on
CO₂ ice sublimation rate. The global average sublimation rate increases as average
subsurface thermal conductivity increases, which means that CO$_2$ ice is more likely to form and survive in regions of low thermal conductivity and therefore, low thermal inertia. However, the increase in thermal conductivity required to slightly increase the sublimation rate is large and the dependence of the distribution of CO$_2$ ice on thermal inertia, therefore, is likely to be smaller than the dependence of H$_2$O ice distribution on thermal inertia.

The porosity of the subsurface also influences the sublimation rate of each ice, but this is dependent on total porosity (regolith plus ice) rather than the intrinsic porosity of the regolith unit. This was also investigated through a series of initial ice porosity simulations (Section 5.1) that represented different initial total porosities. These results show the expected behaviour of CO$_2$ ice sublimating at a faster rate when initial porosity is higher: global average sublimation rate increases from 1.82 mm MY$^{-1}$ when the initial ice porosity is 0 (PM01) to 849 mm MY$^{-1}$ when the initial ice porosity is 0.1 (PM04).

In summary, variations in the total porosity are important to consider for the survival of CO$_2$ ice, whereas different subsurface structures will only have a small influence and do not need to be considered in detail. The total porosities used in this thesis assume a fixed permeability, which will also influence the time it takes for subsurface CO$_2$ ice to sublimate away and is an area for future investigation.

5. How do changes in the orbital obliquity of Mars change the stability of subsurface CO$_2$ ice?

The orbital obliquity has a large influence on subsurface CO$_2$ ice stability, with stability in the polar regions increasing as obliquity decreases and polar annual average sublimation rate decreases from 21.4 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 45° obliquity (S23) to 4.72 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 15° obliquity (S15) for the W-C scenario. In the equatorial regions, the opposite is the case as subsurface CO$_2$ ice stability decreases with decreasing obliquity and annual average sublimation rate increases from 30.1 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 45° obliquity (S23) to 44.4 mm MY$^{-1}$ at 15° obliquity (S15). Across the mid-latitudes, CO$_2$ ice stability appears to be mostly insensitive to the obliquity, with annual average sublimation rates remaining around
28 mm MY$^{-1}$ at all obliquities. Under present-day atmospheric conditions, these results suggest that CO$_2$ ice is only expected in the polar regions, confirming previous work on surface CO$_2$ ice. However, these results also suggest that as obliquity increases further, CO$_2$ ice in the equatorial region will become more stable and under the higher atmospheric pressures expected during the Noachian, the regions of CO$_2$ ice stability may have shifted towards the equator. This means that surface features on Noachian age terrains could also have formed due to CO$_2$ ice processes as well as H$_2$O ice processes and future investigations should explore this possibility further. In summary, the orbital obliquity is the most important of the ones explored in this thesis for the stability of CO$_2$ ice under present-day atmospheric conditions.

### 7.2 Future Work

The results presented in this thesis provide an initial investigation into the stability and behaviour of CO$_2$ ice within the subsurface using the MSSM. The ice-layer configurations, initial ice porosities and subsurface structures used only represent a small portion of the potential scenarios. Further work with the stand-alone MSSM should therefore focus on these other scenarios as well as on different features that would be useful to incorporate into the MSSM (Section 7.2.1).

Alongside further development of the MSSM, future work should include investigations using a version of the MGCM with the MSSM integrated into it. This is needed because the stand-alone MSSM uses fixed annual atmospheric cycles which do not fully capture the complexities of the surface-atmosphere boundary. The main way that this limitation causes issues is for CO$_2$ ice deposition. In the MSSM, the atmospheric CO$_2$ vapour density values are always at or below the CO$_2$ saturation vapour density, since the atmospheric CO$_2$ vapour density cycles are the final values after deposition has occurred in the initial MGCM simulations (see Section 3.7.1). This causes CO$_2$ ice to sublimate away over more of the year in the polar regions of the MSSM scenarios than would be expected for a full MGCM simulation because there is no seasonal CO$_2$ ice to protect the underlying CO$_2$ ice during spring when this seasonal cover would be sublimated away. Therefore, using the full MGCM for the atmospheric boundary will improve the accuracy of the results. Initial work has been done to integrate the
MSSM into the MGCM, which is discussed in Section 7.2.2 alongside potential scenarios that can be investigated with this combined model. A detailed description of this integration can be found in Appendix B.2.

The MSSM (both as a stand-alone and combined with the MGCM) will also be a useful tool for interpreting future observational data. Future missions, such as the international Mars Ice Mapper (i-MIM), are aiming to characterise the subsurface in more detail and models such as the MSSM are useful for investigating seasonal changes across the surface at times when observations are not taken. This is discussed in more detail in Section 7.2.3.

The final avenue for future work is experimental, rather than using the MSSM. During development of the MSSM it became clear that many of the equations for CO$_2$ properties, such as CO$_2$ adsorption and CO$_2$ sublimation under a regolith cover, have limited experimental results that are often contradictory. Future experiments would therefore be useful to clarify the current understanding and these are discussed in Section 7.2.4.

### 7.2.1 Future Work with the MSSM

Future work with the MSSM will include further investigations into what possible ice-layer configurations are required such that CO$_2$ ice could remain stable at different obliquities. In particular this should focus on obliquities higher than 45°, which is the limit used in this thesis, since CO$_2$ ice is expected to be stable at different locations as obliquity increases. The current version can also be integrated into either the 3-D MGCM to investigate global effects (discussed in Section 7.2.2) or into the one dimensional (1-D) version of the MGCM to investigate local effects. Integrating the MSSM into the 1-D MGCM would be particularly useful for investigating the formation of frost on slopes and for detailed modelling at individual locations, such as at the landing sites of rovers and landers. The MSSM could also be used alongside models of the formation of CO$_2$ ice deposits within the SPLD (Buhler et al., 2019; Manning et al., 2019) to estimate how the sublimation rates of CO$_2$ ice would be affected by the overlying H$_2$O ice-layer over time while the H$_2$O ice-layer increases in thickness. The MSSM can also be used to investigate the behaviour of H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice under
Noachian conditions if the atmospheric profiles were taken from the outputs of an early-Mars global circulation model (GCM), which takes into account the climatic changes that would occur under higher atmospheric pressures and lower solar luminosities.

The MSSM can also be adapted easily for a variety of different martian investigations by either altering the subsurface properties already incorporated or adding in new properties. One way to adapt the MSSM is to alter the subsurface structure (defined by thermal conductivity, density and porosity), which was shown in Section 5.2 for six potential subsurface structures. Mars is expected to host terrains with a wide variety of subsurface structures based on the diversity seen in surface thermal inertia (Putzig et al., 2005). New investigations using a wider variety of subsurface structures (including varying properties such as porosity, permeability, thermal conductivity) or under a variety of deposition scenarios (such as an advancing glacier or frozen water from outflow channels covering already deposited CO$_2$ ice) would further our understanding of the influence of the subsurface on both subsurface H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice.

One feature that would be useful to update is the adsorption of H$_2$O and CO$_2$. In the MSSM, a fixed value is used for both due to the conflicting measurements for both properties in the literature, where measurements using similar minerals have a wide range and a clear adsorption isotherm is hard to define (Figures 3.12 and 3.15). However, this fixed value is only appropriate for long time-scale studies (>30 martian years; Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005) and investigations of annual variations in the subsurface will require full adsorption isotherms for each volatile to be incorporated (Böttger et al., 2004). This will require experimental work to determine these isotherms, which is discussed further in Section 7.2.4.

The value of tortuosity used in the subsurface is another feature that would be useful to update in the future, since a constant value is only applicable for a limited number of subsurfaces. Ideally, a depth and ice-content dependent equation for tortuosity would be incorporated. In order for this to be added, experimental work constraining the relationship between tortuosity and porosity for a variety of materials and ice contents would be required.

A further feature that could be useful to add in is the ability to simulate excess ice
and clathrates. Excess ice will influence the stability of both ices, as well as the H$_2$O and CO$_2$ diffusion rates. The influence of excess H$_2$O ice has been modelled in several studies (e.g. Fisher, 2005; Schorghofer, 2010) and the methods used to incorporate excess H$_2$O ice can be adapted to be appropriate for excess CO$_2$ ice. The equations for the formation of clathrates would also be useful to include since it has been suggested that clathrates could form between a pure H$_2$O ice and pure CO$_2$ ice-layer (Hoffman, 2000). The impact of their presence on the stability of CO$_2$ ice and H$_2$O ice-layers is an area that needs further exploration, and the MSSM could be used for this.

7.2.2 Future Work with the Combined MGCM and MSSM Model

The MSSM has been designed to be easily integrated into the MGCM to allow for runs with a complex atmosphere. However, in this thesis, all of the simulations were run using the stand-alone version of the MSSM that uses a fixed annual atmospheric cycle for the surface boundary. This was done because of the computational time required and the fact that the integration of the MSSM into the MGCM is still in progress (a detailed description of this integration process can be found in Appendix B.2). One of the main features of the MSSM that needs updating before the combined version of the MGCM and MSSM can be used is the subsurface structure. In the combined version, the subsurface structure of the MSSM needs to be defined at every location to correspond with the surface thermal inertia values. This will ensure that surface temperature calculations are minimally affected by the addition of the MSSM. In the current combined version, a fixed subsurface structure is used at all locations, which creates mismatches with the surface temperature calculations already used in the MGCM. Future work will, therefore, involve improving the integration between the two schemes.

The use of a detailed climate model is expected to have a large impact on the stability of CO$_2$ ice in the mid-latitude and equatorial regions, where diurnal temperature cycles are the largest, and a smaller impact on the stability of CO$_2$ ice in the polar regions, where diurnal temperature changes are smaller. Therefore, future simulations with the combined model are necessary to more accurately investigate the stability of
subsurface CO$_2$ ice in different ice-layer configurations across Mars. However, the subsurface structure at each location needs to be updated to correspond with the surface thermal inertia and albedo before this can be done. Testing will also be required to ensure that the addition of the MSSM does not completely change the climate results of the MGCM when no ice is included. Alongside the stability of carbon dioxide ice under different ice-layer and obliquity configurations, the combined model can also be used in several other investigations to answer questions such as:

- Does the presence of subsurface CO$_2$ ice have an impact on climate dynamics?
- How do simulations of early Mars change with the inclusion of subsurface CO$_2$ ice?
- Could subsurface CO$_2$ ice deposits provide an explanation for some of the excess CO$_2$ from the Noachian that is unaccounted for by current CO$_2$ reservoirs?

7.2.3 Future Mars Missions and Observations

The results from this thesis and future work with the MSSM can also be used to inform and interpret future observations and missions of subsurface properties. The MSSM has been designed so that the subsurface structure is customisable and it can be initialised with any amounts of H$_2$O ice and CO$_2$ ice. This makes it an invaluable tool for interpreting observations of the subsurface, particularly for interpreting orbital observations, which can measure hydrogen content within the shallow subsurface (such as with Mars Odyssey Neutron Spectrometer (MONS) on Mars Odyssey) or the properties of subsurface layers (such as with Shallow Radar (SHARAD) on Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter (MRO) and the planned radar instrument on the i-MIM mission) and are spatially variable over time. The MSSM can therefore be used to model the behaviour of ice within the subsurface between times of observation.

The i-MIM orbital mission is a spacecraft concept that includes a radar-carrying orbiter that will map the distribution of H$_2$O ice within the upper 10 m of the subsurface and characterise the subsurface materials with depth (Ianson et al., 2021; Watzin and Haltigin, 2020). The eventual aim of these observations is to determine the furthest equatorward region of H$_2$O ice stability to inform future work towards human exploration. An accurate characterisation of these regions of H$_2$O ice stability, and
all of the factors that influence this stability, is therefore important to ensure that future human exploration missions are focused on areas containing accessible H\textsubscript{2}O ice. The results in this thesis and future work with the MSSM can be used to investigate the plausibility of the different subsurface structures found by the radar observations. Future work with the MSSM can also be used to characterise seasonal variations in H\textsubscript{2}O ice within these subsurface structures throughout the year; orbital observations are spatially variable due to the tracking of the spacecraft and year-long observations at individual locations are not possible. The MSSM can therefore be used to assimilate these low cadence observations into a coherent model of the subsurface.

### 7.2.4 Future Experimental Work

During development of the MSSM it became clear that several material properties needed for the model are not yet well constrained. Future work to constrain these values and relationships would, therefore, be worthwhile. One such property is H\textsubscript{2}O adsorption onto martian regolith. There have been many studies into H\textsubscript{2}O adsorption (e.g., Fanale and Cannon, 1971; Jächen et al., 2009; Zent et al., 1993), although the results of these studies show a wide range of results (Figure 3.12). This range is expected for different geological materials, since different materials have different adsorption capacities. However, some of the range that can be seen in Figure 3.12 occurs for the same materials, or those that are expected to have similar adsorption capacities (e.g. basalt and palagonite) depending on the study. Therefore, further work to determine the adsorption of H\textsubscript{2}O onto regolith grains for a variety of geological materials would be useful to constrain the adsorption isotherms appropriate for martian regolith. Alongside H\textsubscript{2}O adsorption, CO\textsubscript{2} adsorption under martian conditions is another area that would benefit from further experimental work. The experimental work to date has produced diverse results (Figure 3.15) and the relationship between CO\textsubscript{2} adsorption, temperature and pressure is not clear when all of the studies are compared with each other.

The final two areas that would benefit from further experimental work are other CO\textsubscript{2} properties. The first is the diffusion coefficient of CO\textsubscript{2} vapour in martian regolith. The equation used for this relationship in the MSSM (Equation 3.38) is the only equa-
tion available in the literature, but is derived from an Earth-based theoretical study (Barrer, 1967) and robust experimental confirmation that this equation is appropriate for CO₂ vapour diffusion under martian conditions is needed. The second property is the sublimation rate of CO₂ ice when under a regolith layer. Previous studies of CO₂ ice sublimation rate have only investigated the surface sublimation rate (e.g., Aylward et al., 2019; Blackburn et al., 2010; Cedillo-Flores et al., 2011). However, this sublimation rate is likely to be higher than the true CO₂ ice sublimation rate if the CO₂ ice is under a porous layer (of regolith, debris or H₂O ice). This has been proven in experimental studies of the sublimation rate of buried H₂O ice, which have shown that sublimation rate is inversely proportional to the depth of the layer (e.g., Bryson et al., 2008; Chevrier et al., 2007, 2008; Soare et al., 2008). Therefore, an experimental study of the effect of an overlying regolith or porous H₂O ice-layer on the CO₂ ice sublimation rate would be beneficial for both the MSSM and for future studies investigating the buried CO₂ ice within the SPLD.
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A | Detailed Description of Diffusion Methods

A.1 Derivation of the Discretisation of the Heat Conduction Equation

The one dimensional (1-D) heat conduction equation is:

\[ \rho(z)c_p \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( k(z) \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \right) , \]  

(A.1)

where \( T \) is the temperature [K] at a depth \( z \) [m] and time \( t \) [s], \( k \) is the thermal conductivity [W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\)], \( \rho \) is the density [kg m\(^{-3}\)] and \( c_p \) is the specific heat capacity [J K\(^{-1}\) kg\(^{-1}\)].

This is discretised using the finite control volume method, by integrating over the control volume, cv, and over the time interval from \( t \) to \( t + \delta t \):

\[ \rho c_p \int_{cv} \int_{t}^{t+\delta t} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} \, dt \, dz = \int_{t}^{t+\delta t} \int_{cv} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( k \frac{\partial n}{\partial z} \right) \, dz \, dt \]  

(A.2)

\[ \rho c_p \int_{i-1}^{i+1} \int_{t}^{t+\delta t} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} \, dt \, dz = \int_{t}^{t+\delta t} \int_{i-1}^{i+1} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( k \frac{\partial n}{\partial z} \right) \, dz \, dt \]  

(A.3)

where \( i-1 \) and \( i+1 \) represent the midpoint of the previous and next layers, with \( i-0.5 \) and \( i+0.5 \) being the interface between the layers and \( i \) is the midpoint of the current layer. Figure A.1 shows the relationships between the grid points. In the following equations, when the variable is for the current timestep, there is either a superscript of \( t \) or no superscript, and for the previous timestep, the superscript is 0.

The discretised form can then be written as:

\[ \rho c_p \Delta z (T_i - T_i^0) = \int_{t}^{t+\delta t} \left[ \frac{k_{i+0.5} (T_{i+1} - T_i)}{(\Delta z)_{i+0.5}} - \frac{k_{i-0.5} (T_i - T_{i-0.5})}{(\Delta z)_{i-0.5}} \right] \]  

(A.4)

where the superscript 0 represents the previous timestep. As we are assuming an implicit scheme, this can then be written as:

\[ \rho c_p \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} (T_i^1 - T_i^0) = \left[ \frac{k_{i+0.5} (T_{i+1} - T_i)}{(\Delta z)_{i+0.5}} - \frac{k_{i-0.5} (T_i - T_{i-1})}{(\Delta z)_{i-0.5}} \right] \]  

(A.5)

This can be rearranged into a form that can be used for a tri-diagonal matrix algorithm (TDMA) as follows:

\[ a_i T_i = b_i T_{i+1} + c_i T_{i-1} + d_i \]  

(A.6a)
Figure A.1: Grid used for the discretisation, where \( i \) is the mid-point of the layer at which the value is currently being calculated, \( i - 1 \) is the mid-point of the layer before and \( i + 1 \) is the mid-point of the layer after. \( \delta z_{i - 0.5} \) and \( \delta z_{i + 0.5} \) represent the distance between the midpoints of the layers before and after the current layer with the current layer’s midpoint, \( i \). \( \Delta z \) is the distance between the interface of layer \( i - 1 \) (interface \( i - 0.5 \)) and layer \( i + 1 \) (interface \( i + 0.5 \)), i.e. the thickness of layer \( i \). Figure is adapted from Patankar (1980).

where

\[
a^t_i = \frac{\rho c_p \Delta z}{\Delta t} + \frac{k_{i+0.5}}{(\delta z)_{i+0.5}} + \frac{k_{i-0.5}}{(\delta z)_{i-0.5}} \tag{A.6b}
\]
\[
b^t_i = \frac{k_{i+0.5}}{(\delta z)_{i+0.5}} \tag{A.6c}
\]
\[
c^t_i = \frac{k_{i-0.5}}{(\delta z)_{i-0.5}} \tag{A.6d}
\]
\[
d^t_i = \frac{\rho c_p \Delta z}{\Delta t} T_{i-0} \tag{A.6e}
\]

The TDMA method is then numerically solved by substituting Equation A.7 into Equation A.6a.

\[
T^t_{i-1} = P_{i-1} n^t_i + Q_{i-1} \tag{A.7}
\]

\[
a_i T^t_i = b_i T^t_{i+1} + c_i (P_{i-1} T^t_i + Q_{i-1}) + d_i \tag{A.8}
\]
\[
a_i T^t_i = b_i T^t_{i+1} + c_i P_{i-1} T^t_i + c_i Q_{i-1} + d_i \tag{A.9}
\]
\[
T^t_i (a_i - c_i P_{i-1}) = b_i T^t_{i+1} + c_i Q_{i-1} + d_i \tag{A.10}
\]
\[
T^t_i = \frac{b_i}{a_i - c_i P_{i-1}} T^t_{i+1} + \frac{c_i}{a_i - c_i P_{i-1}} Q_{i-1} + d_i \tag{A.11}
\]

This can then be solved using Equations A.12a-c. Equations A.12d-e are the initial conditions for this system.

\[
T^t_i = P_i T^t_{i+1} + Q_i \tag{A.12a}
\]
where

\[ P_i = \frac{b_i}{a_i - c_i P_{i-1}} \] (A.12b)

\[ Q_i = \frac{c_i Q_{i-1} + d_i}{a_i - c_i P_{i-1}} \] (A.12c)

\[ P_1 = \frac{b_1}{a_1} \] (A.12d)

\[ Q_1 = \frac{d_1}{a_1} \] (A.12e)

### A.1.1 Boundary Conditions

#### A.1.1.1 Surface

For the surface condition, the temperature in the atmosphere, \( T_{surf} \), is the 'fixed' temperature that is used, and the discretised equation for the first grid point, 1, is:

\[
\rho c_p \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} (T_1 - T_1^0) = \frac{k_{1.5} (T_2 - T_1)}{(\Delta z)_{1.5}} - \frac{k_1 (T_1 - T_{surf})}{(\Delta z)_{0.5}} \] (A.13)

This can be rearranged into the form for a TDMA as follows

\[ a_1^t T_1 = b_1^t T_2 + c_1^t T_0 + d_1^t \] (A.14a)

where

\[ a_1^t = \frac{\rho c_p \Delta z}{\Delta t} + \frac{k_{1.5}}{(\Delta z)_{1.5}} + \frac{k_1}{(\Delta z)_{0.5}} \] (A.14b)

\[ b_1^t = \frac{k_{1.5}}{(\Delta z)_{1.5}} \] (A.14c)

\[ c_1^t = 0. \] (A.14d)

\[ d_1^t = \frac{\rho c_p \Delta z}{\Delta t} T_1^0 + \frac{k_1}{(\Delta z)_{0.5}} T_{surf} \] (A.14e)

#### A.1.1.2 Base

The base boundary has a fixed temperature flux, \( B_{flux} \), and the final grid point is 33. The discretisation equation for the base boundary is:

\[
\rho c_p \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} (T_{33} - T_{33}^0) = B_{flux} - \frac{k_{32.5} (T_{33} - T_{32})}{(\Delta z)_{32.5}} \] (A.15)

This can be rearranged into the form for a TDMA as follows

\[ a_{33}^t T_{33} = b_{33}^t T_{34} + c_{33}^t T_{32} + d_{33}^t \] (A.16a)
where

\[ a_{33}^t = \frac{\rho c_p \Delta z}{\Delta t} + \frac{k_{32.5}}{(\delta z)_{32.5}} \quad (A.16b) \]

\[ b_{33}^t = 0. \quad (A.16c) \]

\[ c_{33}^t = \frac{k_{32.5}}{(\delta z)_{32.5}} \quad (A.16d) \]

\[ d_{33}^t = B_{\text{flux}} + \frac{\rho c_p \Delta z}{\Delta t} T_{33}^0 \quad (A.16e) \]

A.2 Derivation of the Finite Volume Method for Diffusion of Vapour

Vapour is transported through the regolith by the unsteady diffusion equation (Fick’s 1st law), which is expressed as follows in 1-D:

\[ f_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} = D_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} \frac{\partial n_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}{\partial z}, \quad (A.17) \]

\[ J = -D \frac{\partial n}{\partial z} \quad (A.18) \]

where \( J \) is the vapour flux [kg m\(^{-1}\)s\(^{-1}\)], \( D \) is the diffusion coefficient [m\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\)], and \( n \) the vapour concentration [kg m\(^{-3}\)]. This is combined with the relation \( \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial J}{\partial z} \) to form Equation A.19, which is the diffusion equation that needs to be solved.

\[ \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( D \frac{\partial n}{\partial z} \right) \quad (A.19) \]

The finite control volume discretisation of Equation A.19 is then carried out over a control volume, \( cv \) and over a finite time step \( \delta t \) in the following equations, where \( V \) is the volume of the control volume and \( A \) is the area. In the following equations \( i - 1 \) and \( i + 1 \) represent the midpoint of the previous and next layers, with \( i - 0.5 \) and \( i + 0.5 \) being the interface between the layers and \( i \) is the midpoint of the current layer. Figure A.1 shows the relationships between the grid points. When the variable is for the current timestep, there is either a superscript of \( t \) or no superscript, and for the previous timestep, the superscript is 0.

\[
\int_{cv} \int_{t}^{t-\delta t} \left( \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} dt \right) dV = \int_{cv} \int_{t}^{t-\delta t} \left( \frac{\partial D \frac{\partial n}{\partial z}}{\partial z} dV \right) dt \quad (A.20)
\]

\[
\int_{i+1}^{i} \int_{t}^{t-\delta t} \left( \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} dt \right) dV = \int_{t}^{t-\delta t} \left[ \left( DA \frac{\partial n}{\partial z} \right)_{i+1} - \left( DA \frac{\partial n}{\partial z} \right)_{i-1} \right] dt \quad (A.21)
\]

\[
(n_i - n_{i-\delta t}) \Delta V = \int_{t}^{t-\delta t} \left[ \left( DA \frac{\partial n}{\partial z} \right)_{i+1} - \left( DA \frac{\partial n}{\partial z} \right)_{i-1} \right] dt \quad (A.22)
\]
\[(n^t_i - n^{t-\delta t}_i) \Delta V = \int^t_{t-\delta t} \left[ D^t_{i+0.5} A_i \frac{n^t_{i+1} - n^t_i}{\delta z_i} - D^t_{i-0.5} A_{i-1} \frac{n^t_i - n^{t-1}_i}{\delta z_{i-1}} \right] dt \]

\[(n^t_i - n^{t-\delta t}_i) \Delta V = D^t_{i+0.5} A_i \left( \frac{n^t_{i+1} - n^t_i}{\delta z_i} \right) - D^t_{i-0.5} A_{i-1} \left( \frac{n^t_i - n^{t-1}_i}{\delta z_{i-1}} \right) \]

(A.23)

(A.24)

(A.25)

Then divide by \( A \Delta t \):

\[\left( \Delta V + \frac{D^t_{i+0.5} A_i \delta t}{\delta z_i} + \frac{D^t_{i-0.5} A_{i-1} \delta t}{\delta_{i-1}} \right) n^t_i = D^t_{i+0.5} A_i \frac{\Delta t}{\delta z_i} n^t_{i+1} + D^t_{i-0.5} A_{i-1} \frac{\Delta t}{\delta z_{i-1}} n^{t-1}_i \]

(A.29)

(A.30)

This can be rearranged into the correct form for a TDMA to be used:

\[a_i n_i = b_i n_{i+1} + c_i n_{i-1} + d_i\]

(A.31a)

where

\[a^t_i = \Delta V + \frac{D^t_{i+0.5} A_i \delta t}{\delta z_i} + \frac{D^t_{i-0.5} A_{i-1} \delta t}{\delta_{i-1}}\]

(A.31b)

\[b^t_i = \frac{D^t_{i+0.5} A_i \delta t}{\delta z_i}\]

(A.31c)

\[c^t_i = \frac{D^t_{i-0.5} A_{i-1} \delta t}{\delta_{i-1}}\]

(A.31d)

\[d^t_i = \Delta V n^t_i \delta t\]

(A.31e)

The TDMA is achieved by substituting Equation A.32 into Equation A.31a.

\[n^t_{i-1} = P_{i-1} n^t_i + Q_{i-1}\]

(A.32)
This substitution gives:

\[ a_i n_i^t = b_i n_{i+1}^t + c_i (P_{i-1} n_i^t + Q_{i-1}) + d_i \quad (A.33) \]

\[ a_i n_i^t = b_i n_{i+1}^t + c_i P_{i-1} n_i^t + c_i Q_{i-1} + d_i \quad (A.34) \]

\[ n_i^t (a_i - c_i P_{i-1}) = b_i n_{i+1}^t + c_i Q_{i-1} + d_i \quad (A.35) \]

\[ n_i^t = \frac{b_i}{a_i - c_i P_{i-1}} n_{i+1} + c_i Q_{i-1} + d_i \quad (A.36) \]

The final form of the TDMA is solved using Equations A.37a-c. Equations A.37d-e are the initial conditions for this system.

\[ n_i^t = P_i n_{i+1}^t + Q_i \quad (A.37a) \]

where:

\[ P_i = \frac{b_i}{a_i - c_i P_{i-1}} \quad (A.37b) \]

\[ Q_i = \frac{c_i Q_{i-1} + d_i}{a_i - c_i P_{i-1}} \quad (A.37c) \]

and the surface condition is:

\[ P_1 = \frac{b_1}{a_1} \quad (A.37d) \]

\[ Q_1 = \frac{d_1}{a_1} \quad (A.37e) \]

**A.2.1 Boundary Conditions**

**A.2.1.1 Surface**

The surface boundary is a vapour flux, \( S_{flux} \), that is calculated in Section 3.5, and the discretisation equation for the first grid point with a flux boundary is:

\[ \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} (n_1 - n_1^0) = \frac{D_{1.5} (n_2 - n_1)}{(\delta z)_{1.5}} - S_{flux} \quad (A.38) \]

This can be rearranged into the form for a TDMA as follows

\[ a_1^t n_1 = b_1^t n_2 + c_1^t n_0 + d_1^t \quad (A.39a) \]

where

\[ a_1^t = \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} + \frac{D_{1.5}}{(\delta z)_{1.5}} \quad (A.39b) \]

\[ b_1^t = \frac{D_{1.5}}{(\delta z)_{1.5}} \quad (A.39c) \]

\[ c_1^t = 0. \quad (A.39d) \]

\[ d_1^t = \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} n_1^0 - S_{flux} \quad (A.39e) \]
A.2.1.2 Base

The base boundary has a fixed vapour flux, $B_{flux}$, and the final grid point is 33. In the Martian Subsurface Model (MSSM), the base flux is 0 kg m$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$, but it has been set up to be able to handle other base fluxes if required. The discretisation equation for the last grid point, 33, with a flux boundary is:

$$\frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} \left( n_{33} - n_{033} \right) = B_{flux} - \frac{D_{32.5} \left( n_{33} - n_{32} \right)}{(\delta z)_{32.5}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.40)

This can be rearranged into the form for a TDMA as follows

$$a_{33}^t n_{33} = b_{33}^t n_{34} + c_{33}^t n_{32} + d_{33}^t$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.41a)

where

$$a_{33}^t = \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} + \frac{D_{32.5}}{(\delta z)_{32.5}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.41b)

$$b_{33}^t = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.41c)

$$c_{33}^t = \frac{D_{32.5}}{(\delta z)_{32.5}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.41d)

$$d_{33}^t = B_{flux} + \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} n_{033}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.41e)
The LMD-UK Mars global circulation model

B.1 Input Files

Once compiled the LMD-UK Mars global circulation model (MGCM) uses two input files to set the parameters for the simulation. The model.input file sets many of the input variables and callphys.def sets the physics schemes to be used in the simulation. This section provides an explanation of both files and the reasoning behind the variables used for them in the four MGCM simulations discussed in this thesis.

B.1.1 model.input

An example model.input file is shown in Figure B.1 and Tables B.1 and B.2 give an explanation of the variables, the range of values and the reasoning behind these values used for this thesis.

```
1 &INPB
2 RNTAPE=3351.300D0
3 ,KSTART=starttime
4 ,KTOTAL=endtime
5 ,TSPD=timestep.0D0
6 ,KOUNTP=0
7 ,KOUNTH=40
8 ,KOUNTR=0
9 ,BIDISS=0.1,0.2,0.5,1.0,2.0,20*0.0
10 ,TDISS=0.1D0,NDEL=6
11 ,LTOPOG=.TRUE.,LBINTP=.FALSE.,LSPONGE=.TRUE.,LTVEC=.FALSE.
12 ,LSPINUP=.FALSE.
13 &END
14 &PHYSIC
15 KPHYSIC = 10
16 ,KVIKING = 10
17 ,KMASBUD = 96
18 ,LMASBUD = .TRUE.
19 ,LMASCOR = .TRUE.
20 ,LVIKING = .FALSE.
21 ,LMARSNET = .FALSE.
22 ,LPMIRR = .FALSE.
23 ,PTOTAL = 732.0
24 ,RELIEF = 'MOL'
25 ,IECRI = -1
26 ,ECRITPHY = 0.08333333D0
27 &END
```

Figure B.1: An example of the model.input file
Table B.1: Description of the dynamics parameters in the model.input file for the MGCM and the range of values used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSTART</td>
<td>Starting timestep number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Starts at northern spring equinox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTOTAL</td>
<td>Final timestep number</td>
<td>642240</td>
<td>If running for 1 year with TSPD=960, KTOTAL = 642240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSPD</td>
<td>Number of timesteps per sol</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>Horizontal resolution needs to be considered when choosing TSPD. This often ranges from 48–960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOUNTP</td>
<td>Number of timesteps between printed output for the spectral and gridded fields</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No output is produced for any of the runs presented here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOUNTH</td>
<td>Number of timesteps between the output of history records</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOUNTR</td>
<td>Number of timesteps between restart records</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Default value is 0 which means no output is produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIDISS</td>
<td>Controls the timescale of diffusion in the atmosphere to prevent large accelerations in the upper atmosphere (&gt;80km)</td>
<td>&gt;80km: 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1.0, 2.0, 20*0. &lt;80km: 0.1</td>
<td>For these simulations, the height of the top of the atmosphere has been limited to &lt;80km for most runs (apart from the very initial) so BIDISS is not needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDISS</td>
<td>Controls the timescales for biharmonic diffusion of shorter wavelengths</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>These values are chosen because generally TDISS=1/6 and NDEL = 6 prevent build up for a moderate resolution. TDISS=1/8 and NDEL=8 works better because they do not affect large scales but can cause more issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDEL</td>
<td>The exponent used to apply diffusion to remove small scale build up of energy and entropy at the resolution limit of the model</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTOPOG</td>
<td>Sets whether topography is used</td>
<td>.true.</td>
<td>Always use Mars Orbiter Laser Altimeter (MOLA) topography because the near surface atmosphere is sensitive the topography used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBINTP</td>
<td>Applies a diffusive smoothing to the atmospheric pressure levels (instead of sigma levels)</td>
<td>.false.</td>
<td>Should be false simulations focusing on the lower atmosphere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuation of table B.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSPONGE</td>
<td>Sets a sponge layer so the Rayleigh friction acts only on eddies. Stops reflections from the upper two atmospheric layers reflecting back into the lower atmosphere due to the fixed upper boundary in the model, whereas in the atmosphere, a wave would continue travelling to space rather than reflecting back.</td>
<td>.true.</td>
<td>Interested in the near surface atmosphere so the upper limit of the atmosphere for most simulations has been limited to ~40 km.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTVEC</td>
<td>Controls which method is used to calculate Legendre transforms depending on the machine used.</td>
<td>.false.</td>
<td>The method used when LTVEC is set to False is more efficient on a serial processor which has been used in this thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPINUP</td>
<td>Is the run a spin up?</td>
<td>.false.</td>
<td>A spin up run resets the atmosphere and is only used in an initial simulation with no start files.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.2: Description of the physics parameters in the model.input file and the range of values used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPHYSIC</td>
<td>Number of dynamics timesteps before the physics schemes are run</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>Dependent on the resolution used for the model. For example, a value of 6 means the physics scheme is run once every 6 dynamics timesteps, so for a tpsd 96, the physics scheme is run 16 times each day (every 1 and a half hours).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVIKING</td>
<td>Number of timesteps between phoney Viking observations of the physics scheme</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Set as the same value as KPHYSIC because it is calculated in the same way. Only used if LVIKING=TRUE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMASBUD</td>
<td>Number of timesteps before the mass budget is checked against PTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensures the total mass is conserved and if it differs from PTOTAL, a correction is applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMASBUD</td>
<td>Output the mass budget</td>
<td>.true.</td>
<td>Allows one to keep track of how the mass budget changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuation of table B.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMSCOR</td>
<td>Perform a mass conservation correction if the mass budget is vastly different from PTO-TAL?</td>
<td>.true.</td>
<td>This ensures the total mass of the atmosphere and surface ice remains reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVIKING</td>
<td>Controls whether phoney observations as if from the Viking lander locations are output</td>
<td>.false.</td>
<td>This is only used if data that can be compared with Viking observations are needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMARSNET</td>
<td>Controls whether phoney observations as if from the MARSNET stations are output</td>
<td>.false.</td>
<td>This is only used if data that can be compared with MARSNET observations are needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPMIRR</td>
<td>Controls whether phoney observations as if from the PMIRR instrument on Mars Orbiter are output</td>
<td>.false.</td>
<td>This is only used if data that can be compared with PMIRR observations are needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTOTAL</td>
<td>Total CO2 equivalent pressure for the atmosphere and polar caps referenced at mola zero datum</td>
<td>732.0</td>
<td>A value of 732.0 is used for the present day atmosphere based on the best fit of the mass budget between the output of the MGCM and Viking lander data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIEF</td>
<td>Sets which topography data are used</td>
<td>'MOL'</td>
<td>The topography used in all simulations is based on MOLA data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IECRI ECRITPHY</td>
<td>Period of output to the diagfi record files in terms of number of times per day</td>
<td>0.0833 - 50.</td>
<td>A value of 0.0833 means that output is recorded every two hours which is frequent enough to show diurnal changes. For the low resolution runs (T10), a larger value is used because the simulation is run for 10s-100s martian years rather than a few martian years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B.1.2 callphys.def

The callphys.def file (Figure B.2) is used to define which physics schemes should be used in a specific run. These parameters remain the same between the runs shown in this thesis because the majority of parameters control changes in the atmosphere and the atmosphere has been kept consistent across runs so that comparisons can be easily made.

A brief description for each parameter is given in the script and they have all been grouped in smaller categories. In the General Options section, tracer, diurnal and season are set to .true. to run the model with tracers, a diurnal cycle and a seasonal cycle. The other general options control how often various values are output and are
all set to .false. for the purpose of the runs in this thesis.

The dust scenario parameters are also kept consistent between runs, using the Mars Year 26 (MY26) dust scenario (iaervar=26) because MY26 was the first martian year (without a dust storm) with Thermal Emission Spectrometer (TES) data for the entire martian year. MY24, which was the first year of TES data, only has data from \( L_s = 100^\circ \), the rest of the year uses an estimate for the dust scenario from Montabone et al. (2015). \( \tau_{vis} \) is only used if iaervar = 1, therefore the value in the script will not be used in the model for these runs. The Mars Global Surveyor (MGS) scenario (iddist=3) is used for the vertical dust profile because this is the most detailed vertical dust profile that has been implemented into the MGCM. The topdustref is another unused parameter because it only has an effect if iddist=1.

The physical parametrisations cover the radiative schemes as well as the thermal schemes for the atmosphere. The thermal schemes are all .true. because Colaïtis et al. (2013) demonstrated that turning these schemes off introduces a cooling bias to the planetary boundary layer (PBL). Since the largest effect of turning off the thermal schemes is shown to be in the PBL, which is the region of interest for this study, these parameters have all been turned on to ensure that the simulations are representative of the present day atmosphere. The radiative transfer is set to be computed for every physical timestep (iradia=1) because the physics and radiative schemes will affect each other.

When simulating the water (H\(_2\)O) cycle, the majority of tracer options are set to .true. to allow radiatively active H\(_2\)O ice and dust to work (apart from callddevil which is only used when investigating dust). Using radiatively active H\(_2\)O ice and dust improves the thermal structure so it is preferable that both are turned on. However, at low resolution (T10,10) both need to be turned off to keep the atmosphere stable. To turn radiatively active dust and H\(_2\)O ice off, only sedimentation, water and caps are .true. and the rest of the tracer true/false variables are set to .false.. The values used for the H\(_2\)O variables were all chosen based on the work of Navarro et al. (2014), who showed that these values produce the best representation of the present day atmosphere.

The photochemistry is turned off because this scheme adds a complexity to the H\(_2\)O simulation (as well as more chemical species) that are not required for these runs. The thermospheric options are all set to .false. because this work focuses on the lower atmosphere and the PBL and uses an upper atmospheric limit of 80 km which is much lower than the base of the thermospheric layer of the martian atmosphere (\( \sim 120 \) km; Zurek et al., 2017). The assimilation options have also all been turned off because this study is not assimilating any data into the MGCM. The regolith scheme is turned on because the focus of this thesis is on the distribution of subsurface ice and this flag turns on the integrated Martian Subsurface Model (MSSM) with the features described in Chapter 3.
## General options

### ~~~~~~~~~~~

# Run with or without tracer transport?
tracer = true.

directory where external input files are:
datadir = STEM/scratch-san/laf87/mgcm/datafile

diurnal cycle? if diurnal = False, diurnal averaged solar heating

# Directory where external input files are:
datadir = STEM/scratch-san/laf87/mgcm/datafile

diurnal = true.

# Save statistics in file "stats.nc"?
callstats = false.

# Save EOF profiles in file "profiles" for Climate Database?
calleofdump = false.

# Dust scenario. Used if the dust is prescribed (i.e. if tracer=F or active=F)
# ~~~~~~~~~~~~~

# Dust option. Read in startfi; =1 Viking scenario; =3 MGS scenario,
# =5 Mars Year 24 from TES assimilation (old version of MY24; dust_tes.nc file)
# =6 "cold" (low dust) scenario; =7 "warm" (high dust) scenario
# =24 Mars Year 24; =25 Mars Year 25 (year with a global dust storm); ...
# =30 Mars Year 30
if tracer = false, diurnal = True, diurnal averaged solar heating

# Write some more output on the screen?
lwrite = false.

# Seasonal cycle?
if season = False, Ls stays constant, to value set in "start"

# Dust opacity at 610 Pa (when constant, i.e. for the iaervar=1 case)
tauvis = 0.1

# Nylon vertical distribution:
# =1: old distrib. (Pollack90), =2: top set by "topdustref",
# =2: Viking scenario; =3 MGS scenario)
iddist = 3

dust top altitude (km). (Matters only if iddist=1)
topdustref = 55.

## Physical Parameterizations:

### ~~~~~~~~~~~~~

# Call radiative transfer?
callrad = true.

# Call NLTE radiative schemes? matters only if callrad=T
ncall = true.

# Call CO2 NIR absorption? matters only if callrad=T
callnirco2 = true.

# NIR NLTE correction? matters only if callnirco2=T
nircorr = 0

# Call turbulent vertical diffusion?
calldifv = true.

# Call convective adjustment?
calladj = true.

# Thermals
calltherm = true.

callrichsl = true.

# Call CO2 condensation?
callcond = true.

# Call thermal conduction in the soil?
calls = true.

# Call Lott's gravity wave/subgrid topography scheme?
calllott = true.

# Impose polar cap surface albedos as observed by TES?
TESicealbedo = true.

## Coefficient for Northern cap albedoes
TESice_Ncoeff = 1.4
## General options

### Run with or without tracer transport?

tracer = true.

### Directory where external input files are:

datatdir = STEM/scratch.san/laf87/mgcm/datafile

### Diurnal cycle?

if diurnal = False, diurnal averaged solar heating

### Seasonal cycle?

if season = False, Ls stays constant, to value set in "start"

### write some more output on the screen?

lwrite = false.

### Save statistics in file "stats.nc"?

callstats = false.

### Save EOF profiles in file "profiles" for Climate Database?

calleofdump = false.

## Dust scenario. Used if the dust is prescribed (i.e. if tracer=F or active=F)

### Dust opt.deph read in startfi; =2 Viking scenario; =3 MGS scenario,
### =4 Mars Year 24 from TES assimilation (old version of MY24; dust_tes.nc file)
### =6 "cold" (low dust) scenario / =7 "warm" (high dust) scenario
### =24 Mars Year 24 ; =25 Mars Year 25 (year with a global dust storm); ...
### =30 Mars Year 30

iaervar = 26

### Dust opacity at 610 Pa (when constant, i.e. for the iaervar=1 case)

tauvis = 0.1

### Dust vertical distribution:

(=0: old distrib. (Pollack90), =1: top set by "topdustref",
=2: Viking scenario; =3 MGS scenario)

iddist = 3

### Dust top altitude (km). (Matters only if iddist=1)

topdustref = 55.

## Physical Parameterizations:

### call radiative transfer?

callrad = true.

### call NLTE radiative schemes? matters only if callrad=T

callnlt = true.

### call CO2 NIR absorption? matters only if callrad=T

callnirco2 = true.

### NIR NLTE correction? matters only if callnirco2=T

nircorr = 0

### call turbulent vertical diffusion?

calldifv = true.

### call convective adjustment?

callad = true.

### Thermals

calltherm = true.

callrichsl = true.

### call CO2 condensation?

callcond = true.

### call thermal conduction in the soil?

callsoil = true.

### call Lott's gravity wave/subgrid topography scheme?

calllott = true.

### Impose polar cap surface albedos as observed by TES?

TESicealbedo = true.

### Coefficient for Northern cap albedoes

TESice_Ncoef = 1.6
## General options

Run with or without tracer transport?
tracer = true.

Directory where external input files are:
datafile = /STEM/scratch.san/laf87/mgcm/datafile

diurnal = false, diurnal averaged solar heating

diurnal = true.

# Seasonal cycle?
season = false, Ls stays constant, to value set in "start"
season = true.

# Write some more output on the screen?
lwrite = false.

# Save statistics in file "stats.nc"?
callstats = false.

# Save EOF profiles in file "profiles" for Climate Database?
calleofdump = false.

### Dust scenario. Used if the dust is prescribed (i.e. if tracer=F or active=F)

# Dust opt.deph read in startfi; =2 Viking scenario; =3 MGS scenario,
# =4 Mars Year 24 from TES assimilation (old version of MY24; dust_tes.nc file)
# =6 "cold" (low dust) scenario; =7 "warm" (high dust) scenario
# =24 Mars Year 24; =25 Mars Year 25 (year with a global dust storm); ...
# =30 Mars Year 30
iaervar = 26

tauvis = 0.1

# Dust opacity at 610 Pa (when constant, i.e. for the iaervar=1 case)

# Dust vertical distribution:
# =0: old distrib. (Pollack90), =1: top set by "topdustref",
# =2: Viking scenario; =3 MGS scenario
iddist = 3

topdustref = 55.

# Physical Parameterizations:

callrad = true.

callnlte = true.

callnirco2 = true.

# NIR NLTE correction?
nircorr = 0.

calldifv = true.

calladj = true.

calltherm = true.

callrichsl = true.

callcond = true.

# Call thermal conduction in the soil?
callsoil = true.

# Call Lott's gravity wave/subgrid topography scheme?
calllott = true.

# Impose polar cap surface albedos as observed by TES?
TESicealbedo = true.

# Coefficient for Northern cap albedoes
TESice_Ncoef = 1.6

---

Figure B.2: An example of a callphys.def file
B.2 Integration of the MSSM into the MGCM

The MSSM, described in Chapter 3, is a stand-alone model that can be used to investigate the annual cycle at individual locations. It has been designed so that simulations of >100 martian years can be run in a few hours, which is useful for the investigations into long term ice stability that are done in this thesis. To allow for future investigations using diurnal timescales or into global distribution, the MSSM has been integrated into version 6 of the MGCM.

To integrate the MSSM, the subsurface grid layering, subsurface temperature and volatile routine, and surface flux calculations had to be updated from the methods currently used (developed by Steele et al., 2017a, and described in Section B.3) to those described in this appendix. The calculation for surface flux was the only equation that could not be directly integrated into the MGCM and the equation used is described in Section B.2.1. Figure B.3 shows an overview of the files that were changed to fully integrate the MSSM. Although the MSSM has been integrated into the MGCM, the stand-alone MSSM was used for results presented in this thesis. Using the stand-alone MSSM allows for an initial detailed investigation into how carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) ice will behave at zonal latitudes and individual locations, which has not yet been investigated, without the complexities added by the use of a full climate on that behaviour.

Figure B.3: Flowchart showing the links between the files edited to integrate the MSSM into the MGCM.

B.2.1 Surface Flux in the MGCM

The atmosphere-to-regolith flux for H$_2$O and CO$_2$ vapour used in the MSSM is not appropriate for the MGCM because the method designed for the MSSM assumes the atmospheric variables at the surface have a prescribed annual cycle, which is not the case for the MGCM. To account for the more complex, and more accurate, description of the atmosphere in the MGCM, I decided to use the surface flux calculation that is already used in the MGCM for the Steele et al. (2017a) subsurface model. The flux from the atmosphere to the surface (Equation B.1a) is taken from Forget et al. (1999).

\[
F_{atm} = \rho_{atm} k_{atm} (q_{1a} - q_b), \quad \text{(B.1a)}
\]

\[
k_{atm} = C_d |u|, \quad \text{(B.1b)}
\]
where $\rho$ is the density of the atmosphere [kg m$^{-3}$], $k_{atm}$ is the coefficient for the atmosphere, $q$ is the mass mixing ratio, $C_d$ is the drag coefficient and $|u|$ is the magnitude of the near-surface wind. The subscripts 1a and b represent the lowest atmospheric layer and the boundary layer values respectively. The mass mixing ratio, $q$ can be converted to a vapour concentration, $n$, using $q = n/\rho$.

The equation for the flux from the surface to the regolith (Equation B.2a) is taken from Steele et al. (2017a) and follows a similar format to the atmospheric flux.

$$F_{reg} = k_{reg}(n_b - n_{1r}), \quad (B.2a)$$

$$k_{reg} = \frac{D}{z_{0.5}}, \quad (B.2b)$$

where $n$ is the vapour concentration, $D$ is the diffusion coefficient and $z_{0.5}$ is the depth to the midpoint of the first regolith layer. The fluxes are assumed to be equal at the boundary and rearranging $F_{atm} = F_{reg}$ gives the value at the boundary between the atmosphere and the regolith (Equation B.3). This value is calculated using the values from the previous time step.

$$n_b = \frac{k_{atm} \rho_{1a} q_{1a} + k_{reg} n_{1r}}{k_{reg} + k_{atm}} \quad (B.3)$$

Then the vapour concentration in the boundary layer, $n_b$, is divided by the density of the atmosphere, $\rho_{1a}$ to convert it back into a mass mixing ratio. This value is then input into Equation B.1a to calculate the atmospheric flux in the current time step.

### B.3 The Steele et al. (2017a) subsurface water scheme in the MGCM

The subsurface water scheme within the MGCM is based on the subsurface model of Zent et al. (1993), which was incorporated into the MGCM and updated by Böttger et al. (2005b) and Steele et al. (2017a). This water scheme was incorporated into the MSSM during the early development stages, since the initial aim was to develop and test the MSSM separately from the MGCM before re-integrating it back into the MGCM. This was done so the MSSM could be tested without some of the additional complexities added by using the detailed climate in the MGCM, as fixed annual or diurnal atmospheric profiles could be used. However, while testing the water scheme several issues were found with the method used for diffusion of H$_2$O, which resulted in the development of a new scheme to mitigate these issues (described in Section 3.3). The following sections provide a description of the Steele et al. (2017a) water scheme and the testing results that led to the development of a new water scheme for the MSSM.

#### B.3.1 Water Scheme Description

In the Steele et al. (2017a) scheme, H$_2$O is assumed to exist in one of three states: vapour ($n$), adsorbed H$_2$O ($\alpha$) and pore ice ($\zeta$). The method to determine the distribution between these phases is based on the models of Zent et al. (1993) and Böttger et al. (2005b). These models determine the total H$_2$O content using Equation B.4:

$$\sigma = \phi n + \alpha + \zeta, \quad (B.4)$$
where $\sigma$ is the total amount of $\text{H}_2\text{O}$, $\phi$ is the regolith porosity, $n$ is the mass of $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ vapour per unit volume of regolith $[\text{kg m}^{-3}]$, or density, $\alpha$ is the density of adsorbed $\text{H}_2\text{O} [\text{kg m}^{-3}]$, and $\zeta$ is the density of subsurface $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ice $[\text{kg m}^{-3}]$ (Böttger et al., 2005b; Zent et al., 1993). In the scheme, $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ vapour and adsorbed $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ are diffused through the subsurface in each time step before the density of $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ pore ice is calculated. A summary of the method used to develop the discretised diffusion equation used by Steele et al. (2017a) is provided here and for a more detailed derivation of the maths used in the Steele et al. (2017a) diffusion scheme, see Appendix B.3.3.

Vapour diffusion is calculated using a combination of the diffusion equation (Fick’s 1st law; Equation 3.17) and an adsorption isotherm. The adsorption isotherm was incorporated into the vapour diffusion scheme to account for the suggestion that adsorbed $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ will diffuse and equilibrate across time scales less than the time steps used in the MGCM (lower limit of 5 minutes) based on the results of Zent and Quinn (1995). However, adsorption lifetimes have since been estimated to be longer than those suggested by Zent and Quinn (1995) and adsorbed $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ may take longer than vapour to diffuse and equilibrate (Möhlmann, 2005).

The density of adsorbed $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ was incorporated into the vapour diffusion equation by using a combined mass of $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ vapour and adsorbed $\text{H}_2\text{O}$, $m = \phi n + \alpha$, instead of only $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ vapour, $n$. The density of adsorbed $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ was calculated using the experimental adsorption isotherm (Equation B.5) developed by Zent et al. (1993) from the results of Fanale and Cannon (1974):

$$\alpha = \rho_s \frac{\beta P^{\gamma_w}}{e^{\delta/T}},$$  

where $\rho_s$ is the density of the regolith $[\text{kg m}^{-3}]$, $\beta = 2.043 \times 10^{-8} \text{ Pa}^{-1}$, $\gamma_w = 0.51$, $\delta = -2679.8$ K, $P$ is the partial vapour pressure $[\text{Pa}]$ and $T$ is the soil temperature $[\text{K}]$. This isotherm was simplified using the ideal gas equation to:

$$\alpha = F \sqrt{n},$$

where $F = \frac{\rho_s \beta}{\gamma_w} \left( \frac{k_B T}{m_w} \right)^{0.51}$, where $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant $[\text{m}^2 \text{kg} \text{s}^{-2} \text{K}^{-1}]$ and $m_w$ is the mass of a $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ molecule $[\text{kg}]$. Then using Equation B.6, the combined equation for $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ vapour and adsorbed $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ becomes:

$$m = \phi n + F \sqrt{n},$$  

which can be rearranged and solved for $n$ to form:

$$n = \frac{m^2}{F^2} \left( 1 - \frac{2m\phi}{F^2} \right)$$

and to form the relation:

$$\frac{\delta m_i}{\delta t} = \frac{\delta n_i}{A_i \delta t} - B_i,$$

where the superscript $t$ represents the current time step, the subscript $i$ represents the
grid point, the superscript $dt$ represents the time between time steps and:

$$A_i^t = \frac{2 m_{i-1}^{t-\delta t}}{F_{i+1}^{t+1}} - \frac{6 m_i^{t-\delta t}}{F_i^{t+2}} \phi_i^t$$

$$B_i^t = m_{i-1}^{t-\delta t} \left( \frac{1}{F_{i+1}^{t+1}} - \frac{1}{F_i^{t+2}} \right) - 2 \phi_i^{t-\delta t} m_i^{t-\delta t} \left( \frac{1}{F_i^{t+2}} - \frac{1}{F_i^{t+4}} \right)$$

This relation can then be substituted into Equation B.12 (the diffusion equation) to form Equation B.13, which can then be numerically solved using the tri-diagonal matrix algorithm (TDMA) method. The detailed derivation is described in Appendix B.3.3.

$$\phi \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( D \frac{\partial n}{\partial z} \right)$$

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} n_i^t \delta t \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{c} d_{i+0.5}^t n_{i+1}^t - d_{i-0.5}^t n_{i-1}^t + C_i^t (n_i^{t-\delta t} + B_i^t) \end{array} \right]$$

where

$$C_i^t = \frac{z_{i+0.5} - z_{i-0.5}}{A_i^t \delta t}$$

$$d_{i+0.5}^t = \frac{D_{i+0.5}^t}{z_{i+1} - z_i}$$

$$d_{i-0.5}^t = \frac{D_{i-0.5}^t}{z_i - z_{i-1}}$$

where $D_i^t$ is the diffusion coefficient [m$^2$s$^{-1}$], calculated using the method of Hudson et al. (2007). This equation can then be numerically solved with a TDMA, using the method of Böttger et al. (2005b), by setting a zero flux boundary at the base and a positive flux towards the surface (see Appendix B.3.3). Once vapour has diffused through the regolith using Equation B.13, the density of adsorbed H$_2$O is recalculated using Equation B.6 and the density of H$_2$O ice is calculated with Equation B.4, assuming the total amount of H$_2$O is the same as for the previous time step.

### B.3.2 Testing of the Steele et al. (2017a) model

During development and testing of the MSSM after a replica of the Steele et al. (2017a) water scheme had been incorporated, several issues with the Steele et al. (2017a) water scheme were noticed. The main issue was the non-conservative nature of the Steele et al. (2017a) diffusion scheme (see Section B.3.2.2 for details). This would have caused issues when the MSSM was integrated into the MGCM because the MGCM has been designed to physically conserve all atmospheric components and, consequently, the subsurface also needs to conserve all of its components.

Another issue with the Steele et al. (2017a) water scheme was that the assumptions made to simplify the adsorption equation did not produce adsorption values similar to the original equation (see Section B.3.2.1 for details). The errors produced by this assumption propagate through the subsurface model, reducing the accuracy of the overall model. Therefore, a method for diffusion vapour through the subsurface without the inclusion of adsorbed H$_2$O would produce more accurate results than the method used by Steele et al. (2017a). Alongside this, the theory that H$_2$O adsorption would slow vapour diffusion through the regolith (Zent et al., 1993) has been shown by other studies to have an insignificant effect on ice formation over more than 30 martian years.
(e.g. Fanale and Jakošky, 1982b; Schorghofer and Aharonson, 2005; Toon et al., 1980), especially in basalts, which are common across the surface of Mars and are the material used for the adsorption experiments on which the adsorption isotherm is based. All of the reasons described above led to the decision to develop a new water scheme for the MSSM that is described in detail in Section 3.3.

### B.3.2.1 Vapour Diffusion Assumptions

The method for H$_2$O vapour diffusion used in the Steele et al. (2017a) water scheme uses an adapted version of the adsorption equation (Equation B.6) as one of the starting points for the derivation. However, the adapted version requires the use of several assumptions.

The first of these assumptions is that Equation B.17 can substitute for pressure, $P$, in Equation B.5.

$$ P = \frac{k_B T n}{m_w}, \quad \text{(B.17)} $$

where $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant [$m^2 kgs^{-2} K^{-1}$], $T$ is the temperature [K], $n$ is the amount of H$_2$O vapour [kg m$^{-3}$] and $m_w$ is the mass of a H$_2$O molecule [kg]. This is a reasonable assumption to make because Equation B.17 is derived from the ideal gas equation (Clapeyron, 1834). However, the next step is to approximate $\gamma_w$ for the vapour term, $n$, in Equation B.5 as 0.5 instead of 0.51 (Equation B.18a). This approximation makes it simpler to derive the final form of the diffusion equation (Equation B.13) that can be solved with a TDMA, but will impact the accuracy of the results.

$$ \alpha = \frac{\rho_s \beta}{e^{\delta/T}} \left( \frac{k_B T}{m_w} \right)^{\gamma_w} \sqrt{n} \quad \text{(B.18a)} $$

$$ = F_w \sqrt{n} \quad \text{(B.18b)} $$

where

$$ F_w = \frac{\rho_s \beta}{e^{\delta/T}} \left( \frac{k_B T}{m_w} \right)^{0.51} \quad \text{(B.18c)} $$

To test the effect of this assumption, the results of Equations B.5 and B.18a were compared (Table B.3) across the conditions expected within the model. In order to cover the entire range of conditions, the effects across all independent variables used in this equation are tested and these are: temperature, density and vapour concentration. On Mars, the expected temperature range is between 148 K and 315 K (Presley and Craddock, 2006) and density is expected to range between 1000 kg m$^{-3}$ and 1750 kg m$^{-3}$ within the model. The amount of H$_2$O vapour, $n$, is not well defined as this depends on a variety of conditions, but we can assume that the absolute minimum pressure is 0 and the maximum pressure is 10 MPa. The maximum assumption is from the region over which the equations of state for H$_2$O above the triple point are valid (Sanz et al., 2004). These maximum and minimum values are for pressure and must first be converted into vapour densities before being used in Equation B.5 or Equation B.18a. The vapour pressure is converted to vapour concentration using Equation B.19, which has been derived from the ideal gas equation (Clapeyron, 1834):

$$ n = \frac{P m_w}{k_B T}, \quad \text{(B.19)} $$
where $P$ is the pressure [Pa], $T$ is the temperature [K], $m_w$ is the mass of a H$_2$O molecule ($m_w = 2.993e-2$ kg) and $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant [m$^2$kg$s^{-2}K^{-1}$]. The results show a large variation between the two equations and this led to a further investigation into the adsorption equation used, which is discussed in detail in Section 3.3.2.3.

Table B.3: Testing the effect of using $\sqrt{n}$ instead of $n^{0.51}$ in Equation B.18a for the expected range of conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>$\rho_s$</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\gamma_w=0.51$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>1.46e-9</td>
<td>13.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1e7</td>
<td>146.39</td>
<td>5.545e6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>1.46e-9</td>
<td>23.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>1e7</td>
<td>146.39</td>
<td>9.704e6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>6.88e-10</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1e7</td>
<td>68.78</td>
<td>375.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>6.88e-10</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>1e7</td>
<td>68.78</td>
<td>657.620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another key assumption used in the diffusion scheme is that $\frac{4m\phi}{F_{w2}}$ is much smaller than unity. This was tested using different values for $m$, $\phi$ and $F_w$, in the expected range for the model, as well as for extreme cases. $F_w$ is determined by Equation B.18c, which is dependent on temperature, $T$, and density, $\rho_s$. The ranges for temperature, density and the amount diffused, $m$, are the same as those used for testing the adsorption assumptions earlier in this section. The range for $\phi$ is well defined as this can only range between 0 and 1. The results from these tests (Table B.4) show that across the majority of the expected conditions, $\frac{4m\phi}{F_{w2}}$ is less than 1 and the assumption is valid.

### B.3.2.2 Conservation Properties

The degree of conservation of the diffusion scheme was tested using a series of closed system top-hat tests which assume no flux at each boundary. These are the same tests that are used to test different grid structures and the details of the tests can be found in Section 3.1. The conservation was tested using the same top-hat experiment in Section 3.1 because it is important for the water scheme in the MGCM to conserve H$_2$O during a run. The results of these tests (See Table B.5) showed that this method is not conservative and as around half of the total amount of H$_2$O is destroyed during a run of the scheme in a closed system. This was an issue because the total amount of H$_2$O in the entire system (atmosphere and regolith) should not change throughout a single simulation. From both the tests on the assumptions used in the vapour diffusion method and the conservation tests, it was clear that another methods for calculating H$_2$O vapour diffusion was necessary and a new method was developed that is described in Section 3.3.1.
Table B.4: Checking whether $\frac{4\phi F}{T}$ is smaller than 1 for the expected range of conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$\rho_s$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$\phi$</th>
<th>$\frac{4\phi F}{T}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>1.46e-9</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>1.62e-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>1.46e-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.62e-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1e7</td>
<td>146.39</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>1.62e-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1e7</td>
<td>146.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.62e-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>1.46e-9</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>1.72e-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>1.46e-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.72e-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>1e7</td>
<td>146.39</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>1.72e-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>1e7</td>
<td>146.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.72e-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>6.88e-10</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>7.73e-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>6.88e-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.73e-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1e7</td>
<td>68.78</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>7.73e-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1e7</td>
<td>68.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.73e-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>6.88e-10</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>8.24e-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>6.88e-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.24e-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>1e7</td>
<td>68.78</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>8.24e-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>1e7</td>
<td>68.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.24e-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.5: Checking whether the scheme is conservative on the grid structures investigated in Section 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Steele et al. (2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial total</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final total</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.3.3 Derivation of the Finite Difference Method for Vapour Diffusion used in Steele et al. (2017a)

The Steele et al. (2017a) H$_2$O vapour diffusion scheme starts from the same equations as vapour diffusion in the MSSM:

$$\frac{\partial m}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial J}{\partial z}, \quad (B.20)$$

where

$$J = D \frac{\partial n}{\partial z} \quad (B.21)$$

Combining these equations produces the diffusion equation:

$$\frac{\partial m}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( D \frac{\partial n}{\partial z} \right) \quad (B.22)$$

where $J$ is the H$_2$O vapour flux [kg m$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$], $m$ is the concentration of H$_2$O [kg m$^{-3}$] that can be diffused at time $t$ [s] and depth $z$ [m], and $D$ is the diffusion coefficient [m$^{2}$s$^{-1}$]. In the following equations $i-1$ and $i+1$ represent the midpoint of the previous and next layers, with $i-0.5$ and $i+0.5$ being the interface between the layers and $i$ is
the midpoint of the current layer. Figure A.1 shows the relationships between the grid points. When the variable is for the current timestep, there is either a superscript of \( t \) or no superscript, and for the previous timestep, the superscript is 0. In the Steele et al. (2017a) scheme, adsorbed \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \), \( \alpha \left[ \text{kg m}^{-3} \right] \), is diffused alongside the \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) vapour, \( n \):

\[
m_i^t = \phi_i^t n_i^t + \alpha, \tag{B.23}
\]

where \( \phi \) is the porosity and \( \alpha \) is calculated using:

\[
\alpha(n,T) = \rho_s \frac{\beta P^{0.51}}{e^{\delta/T}} \tag{B.24}
\]

\[
= \rho_s \left( \frac{k_B T}{m_w} \right)^{0.51} e^{\delta/T} \tag{B.25}
\]

\[
= \rho_s \left( \frac{k_B T}{m_w} \right)^{0.51} n^{0.51} \tag{B.26}
\]

\[
= F(T) \sqrt{n} \tag{B.27}
\]

This differs from the scheme used in the MSSM which diffuses only \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) vapour. Equation B.27 can be inserted into Equation B.23 to form:

\[
m_i^t = \phi_i^t n_i^t + F_i^t \sqrt{n_i^t} \tag{B.28}
\]

This equation is then rearranged and solved to form an equation for \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) vapour that can be substituted into Equation B.20.

\[
F_i^t \sqrt{n_i^t} = m_i^t - \phi_i^t n_i^t \tag{B.29}
\]

\[
F_i^{t^2} n_i^t = m_i^{t^2} - 2m_i^t \phi_i^t n_i^t + \phi_i^{t^2} n_i^{t^2} \tag{B.30}
\]

\[
0 = \phi_i^{t^2} n_i^{t^2} - (F_i^{t^2} + 2m_i^t \phi_i^t) n_i^t + m_i^{t^2} \tag{B.31}
\]

This is of the same form as \( a n^2 + b n + c = 0 \), so can be solved using the quadratic formula

\[
n = \frac{-b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a}, \tag{B.32}
\]

where \( a = \phi_i^{t^2}, b = -(F_i^{t^2} + 2m_i^t \phi_i^t) \) and \( c = m_i^{t^2} \). To solve this, the most complex part is the square root, so considering that part only, we have:

\[
b^2 - 4ac = F_i^{t^4} + 4m_i^{t^2} \phi_i^t + 4F_i^t m_i^t \phi_i^t - 4\phi_i^{t^2} m_i^{t^2} \tag{B.33a}
\]

\[
= F_i^{t^4} + 4F_i^{t^2} m_i^t \phi_i^t \tag{B.33b}
\]

\[
= F_i^{t^4} + \frac{4F_i^{t^2} m_i^t \phi_i^t}{F_i^{t^2}} \tag{B.33c}
\]

\[
= F_i^{t^4} \left( 1 + \frac{4m_i^t \phi_i^t}{F_i^{t^2}} \right) \tag{B.33d}
\]
Therefore, $\sqrt{b^2 - 4ac} = F_t^2 \sqrt{1 + \frac{4m_i^4 \phi_i^4}{F_t^2}}$, and the quadratic formula can be written as:

$$n = \frac{F_t^2 + 2m_i^4 \phi_i^4 \pm F_t^2 \sqrt{1 + \frac{4m_i^4 \phi_i^4}{F_t^2}}}{2\phi_i^2}$$

(B.34)

$$= \frac{2m_i^4 \phi_i^4 + F_t^2 \left( 1 \pm \sqrt{1 + \frac{4m_i^4 \phi_i^4}{F_t^2}} \right)}{2\phi_i^2}$$

(B.35)

$$= \frac{m_i^4}{\phi_i^4} + \frac{F_t^2}{2\phi_i^2} \left( 1 \pm \sqrt{1 + \frac{4m_i^4 \phi_i^4}{F_t^2}} \right)$$

(B.36)

The next step is to decide what is taken from the $\pm$ term in Equation B.36. First, we rearrange Equation B.29 to give:

$$\frac{F_t^2}{\phi_i^4} \sqrt{n_i^4} = \frac{m_i^4}{\phi_i^4} - n_i^4$$

(B.38)

$$n_i^4 = \frac{m_i^4}{\phi_i^4} - \frac{F_t^2}{\phi_i^4} \sqrt{n_i^4}$$

(B.39)

Since $F_t^2$, $n_i^4$ and $\phi_i^4$ are all $> 0$, and are subtracted from $\frac{m_i^4}{\phi_i^4}$, we must have $n_i^4 < \frac{m_i^4}{\phi_i^4}$. Thus, in equation B.36 we need the last term to be negative, so we take the negative of the square root term, giving:

$$n_i^4 = \frac{m_i^4}{\phi_i^4} + \frac{F_t^2}{2\phi_i^2} \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 + \frac{4m_i^4 \phi_i^4}{F_t^2}} \right)$$

(B.40)

Evaluating a square root numerically will require a series of iterations to solve exactly. Therefore, approximating the square root term will reduce the number of operations that are needed to solve Equation B.40. This can be done by taking the binomial expansion of $\sqrt{1 + x}$ (Equation B.41), where $x = -\frac{4m_i^4 \phi_i^4}{F_t^2}$

$$\sqrt{1 + x} \approx 1 + \frac{x}{2} - \frac{x^2}{8} + \frac{x^3}{16} + ...$$

(B.41)

From this expansion, if we only use the first four terms, and substitute these into Equation B.40, we can produce:

$$n_i^4 = \frac{m_i^4}{\phi_i^4} + \frac{F_t^2}{2\phi_i^2} \left( 1 - 1 - \frac{x}{2} + \frac{x^2}{8} - \frac{x^3}{16} \right)$$

(B.42)

$$= \frac{m_i^4}{\phi_i^4} + \frac{F_t^2}{2\phi_i^2} \left( \frac{-2m_i^4 \phi_i^4}{F_t^4} + \frac{2m_i^4 \phi_i^4}{F_t^4} - \frac{4m_i^4 \phi_i^4}{F_t^4} \right)$$

(B.43)

$$= \frac{m_i^4}{\phi_i^4} - \frac{m_i^4}{\phi_i^4} + \frac{m_i^2 \phi_i^2}{F_t^2}$$

(B.44)

$$= \frac{m_i^2 \phi_i^2}{F_t^2}$$

(B.45)
The final form of this equation is:

\[ n_i^t = \frac{m_i^{t^2}}{F_i^{t^2}} \left( 1 - \frac{2 m_i^t \delta_i^t}{F_i^{t^2}} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.46)

Then as

\[ \delta n_i^t = n_i^t - n_{i-dt}^t \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.47)

\[ \delta n_i^t = \frac{m_i^{t^2}}{F_i^{t^2}} \left( 1 - \frac{2 m_i^t \delta_i^t}{F_i^{t^2}} \right) - \frac{m_i^{t-dt^2}}{F_i^{t-dt^2}} \left( 1 - \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt} \phi_i^{t-dt}}{F_i^{t-dt^2}} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.48)

The next step is to remove the dependence on \( m_i^t \) by substituting in \( m_i^t = m_i^{t-dt} + \delta m_i^t \)

\[ \delta n_i^t = \frac{m_i^{t-dt^2}}{F_i^{t^2}} \left( 1 - \frac{2 (m_i^{t-dt} + \delta m_i^t) \phi_i^t}{F_i^{t^2}} \right) - \frac{m_i^{t-dt^2}}{F_i^{t-dt^2}} \left( 1 - \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt} \phi_i^{t-dt}}{F_i^{t-dt^2}} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.49)

\[ \delta n_i^t = \left[ \frac{m_i^{t-dt^2} + 2 m_i^{t-dt} \delta m_i^t + \delta m_i^{t^2}}{F_i^{t^2}} \left( 1 - \frac{2 (m_i^{t-dt} + \delta m_i^t) \phi_i^t}{F_i^{t^2}} \right) \right] - \left[ \frac{m_i^{t-dt^2}}{F_i^{t-dt^2}} \left( 1 - \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt} \phi_i^{t-dt}}{F_i^{t-dt^2}} \right) \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.50)

Then assume \( \delta m_i^{t^2} \) is small enough that any terms including this can be ignored

\[ \delta n_i^t = \left[ \frac{m_i^{t-dt^2}}{F_i^{t^2}} \left( 1 - \frac{2 (m_i^{t-dt} + \delta m_i^t) \phi_i^t}{F_i^{t^2}} \right) \right] + \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt} \delta m_i^t}{F_i^{t^2}} \left[ \frac{1}{F_i^{t^2}} - \frac{2 (m_i^{t-dt} + \delta m_i^t) \phi_i^t}{F_i^{t^2}} \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.51)

\[ \delta n_i^t = \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt}}{F_i^{t^2}} \phi_i^t - \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt^2} \phi_i^t}{F_i^{t^2}} + \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt} \delta m_i^t}{F_i^{t^2}} - \frac{4 m_i^{t-dt^2} \delta m_i^t \phi_i^t}{F_i^{t^2}} - \frac{4 m_i^{t-dt^2} \delta m_i^{t^2} \phi_i^t}{F_i^{t^2}} - \frac{m_i^{t-dt^2}}{F_i^{t-dt^2}} + \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt^3} \phi_i^{t-dt}}{F_i^{t^4}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.52)

Again need to assume \( \delta m_i^{t^2} \) is small enough that any terms including this can be ignored
\[ \delta n_i^t = \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt} \delta m_i^t}{F_i^t} + \frac{m_i^{t-dt} 2}{F_i^t} - \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt} \delta m_i^t \phi_i^t}{F_i^t} - \frac{4 m_i^{t-dt} \delta m_i^t \phi_i^t}{F_i^t} - \frac{m_i^{t-dt} 2}{F_i^t} - \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt} 3 \phi_i^t}{F_i^t} \]  
\[ + \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt} 3 \phi_i^t - dt}{F_i^{t-dt}} \]  
\[ + \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt} 3 \phi_i^t + 2 m_i^{t-dt} 3 \phi_i^t - dt}{F_i^{t-dt}} \]  
\( (B.53) \)

This is then rearranged into the form  
\[ \delta n_i^t = A \delta m_i^t + B \]  
\[ \delta n_i = \left( \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt}}{F_i^t} - \frac{6 m_i^{t-dt} 2 \phi_i^t}{F_i^t} \right) \delta m_i^t + m_i^{t-dt} \left( \frac{1}{F_i^t} - \frac{1}{F_i^{t-dt}} \right) \]  
\[-2 \phi_i^{t-dt} m_i^{t-dt} 3 \left( \frac{1}{F_i^t} - \frac{1}{F_i^{t-dt}} \right) \]  
\( (B.55) \)

Therefore  
\[ \delta n_i^t = A \delta m_i^t + B, i \]  
\( (B.56) \)

where:  
\[ A = \frac{2 m_i^{t-dt}}{F_i^t} - \frac{6 m_i^{t-dt} 2 \phi_i^t}{F_i^t} \]  
\( (B.57) \)
\[ B = m_i^{t-dt} 2 \left( \frac{1}{F_i^t} - \frac{1}{F_i^{t-dt}} \right) - 2 \phi_i^{t-dt} m_i^{t-dt} 3 \left( \frac{1}{F_i^t} - \frac{1}{F_i^{t-dt}} \right) \]  
\( (B.58) \)

Therefore, we have  
\[ \frac{\delta m_i^t}{\delta t} = \frac{\delta n_i^t - B_i^t}{A_i^t \delta t} \]  
\( (B.59) \)

This can be substituted into Equation B.20 to give  
\[ \frac{\delta n_i^t - B_i^t}{A_i^t \delta t} = \frac{\delta J n_i^t - n_i^{t-dt} - B_i^t}{A_i^t \delta t} = \frac{J_{i+0.5}^t - J_{i-0.5}^t}{z_{i+0.5} - z_{i-0.5}} \]  
\( (B.60) \)

where  
\[ J_{i+0.5}^t = D_{i+0.5}^t \frac{n_i^{t+1} - n_i^t}{z_{i+1} - z_i} \]  
\( (B.61) \)

\( i \pm 1 \) subscript denotes terms evaluated at the midpoints of the layers either side of the
layer being considered, and \( i \pm 0.5 \) denotes terms evaluated at the boundaries of layers. Equation B.60 can then be simplified as follows:

\[
\frac{n_i^t - n_i^{t-\Delta t} - B_i^t}{A_i^t \delta t} = \left( D_{i+0.5}^t \frac{n_{i+1}^t - n_i^t}{z_{i+1} - z_i} \right) - \left( D_{i-0.5}^t \frac{n_i^t - n_{i-1}^t}{z_i - z_{i-1}} \right) \quad (B.62)
\]

If we set:

\[
g_i^{t+0.5} = \frac{D_{i+0.5}^t}{z_{i+1} - z_i} \quad (B.63)
\]

and

\[
g_i^{t-0.5} = \frac{D_{i-0.5}^t}{z_i - z_{i-1}} \quad (B.64)
\]

then, this further simplifies to:

\[
\frac{n_i^t - n_i^{t-\Delta t} - B_i^t}{A_i^t \delta t} = \frac{g_i^{t+0.5}(n_{i+1}^t - n_i^t) - g_i^{t-0.5}(n_i^t - n_{i-1}^t)}{z_{i+0.5} - z_{i-0.5}} \quad (B.65)
\]

\[
\frac{z_{i+0.5} - z_{i-0.5}}{A_i^t \delta t} (n_i^t - n_i^{t-\Delta t} - B_i^t) = g_i^{t+0.5}(n_{i+1}^t - n_i^t) - g_i^{t-0.5}(n_i^t - n_{i-1}^t) \quad (B.66)
\]

Then if:

\[
C_i^t = \frac{z_{i+0.5} - z_{i-0.5}}{A_i^t \delta t} \quad (B.67)
\]

\[
C_i^t (n_i^t - n_i^{t-\Delta t} - B_i^t) = g_i^{t+0.5}(n_{i+1}^t - n_i^t) - g_i^{t-0.5}(n_i^t - n_{i-1}^t) \quad (B.68)
\]

\[
C_i^t n_i^t - C_i^t n_i^{t-\Delta t} - C_i^t B_i^t = g_i^{t+0.5} n_{i+1}^t - g_i^{t+0.5} n_i^t - g_i^{t-0.5} n_i^t + g_i^{t-0.5} n_{i-1}^t \quad (B.69)
\]

\[
(C_i^t + d_i^{t+0.5} + g_i^{t-0.5}) n_i^t = g_i^{t+0.5} n_{i+1}^t + g_i^{t-0.5} n_{i-1}^t + C_i^t (n_i^{t-\Delta t} + B_i^t) \quad (B.70)
\]

Then if

\[
\Gamma_i^t = C_i^t + g_i^{t+0.5} + g_i^{t-0.5} \quad (B.71)
\]

\[
\Gamma_i^t n_i^t - g_i^{t+0.5} n_{i+1}^t - g_i^{t-0.5} n_{i-1}^t = C_i^t (n_i^{t-\Delta t} + B_i^t) \quad (B.72)
\]

Equation B.72 can finally be solved using a TDMA, because it is in the right form \((a_i n_i - b_i n_{i+1} - c_i n_{i-1} = d_i)\). This is achieved by substituting in Equations B.73a-e.

\[
n_{i-1}^t = P_{i-1} n_i^t + Q_{i-1} \quad (B.73a)
\]

\[
a_i^t = \Gamma_i^t \quad (B.73b)
\]

\[
b_i^t = g_i^{t+0.5} \quad (B.73c)
\]

\[
c_i^t = g_i^{t-0.5} \quad (B.73d)
\]

\[
d_i^t = C_i^t (n_i^{t-\Delta t} + B_i^t) \quad (B.73e)
\]

The substitution gives:
\[ a_i n_i^t = b_i n_{i+1}^t + c_i (P_{i-1}^t n_i^t + Q_{i-1}) + d_i \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.74)
\[ a_i n_i^t = b_i n_{i+1}^t + c_i P_{i-1}^t n_i^t + c_i Q_{i-1} + d_i \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.75)
\[ n_i^t (a_i - c_i P_{i-1}^t) = b_i n_{i+1}^t + c_i Q_{i-1} + d_i \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.76)
\[ n_i^t = \frac{b_i}{a_i - c_i P_{i-1}^t} n_{i+1}^t + \frac{c_i Q_{i-1} + d_i}{a_i - c_i P_{i-1}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.77)

This is in the right form to be numerically solved using Equations B.79a-c. Equations B.79d-e are the initial conditions for this system.

\[ n_i^t = P_i n_{i+1}^t + Q_i \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.79a)
\[ P_i = \frac{b_i}{a_i - c_i P_{i-1}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.79b)
\[ Q_i = \frac{c_i Q_{i-1} + d_i}{a_i - c_i P_{i-1}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.79c)
\[ P_1 = \frac{b_1}{a_1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.79d)
\[ Q_1 = \frac{d_1}{a_1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.79e)
### C.1 CO₂ Sublimation Rate at all latitudes

Table C.1: Annual average carbon dioxide (CO₂) ice sublimation rate [mm MY⁻¹] at all latitudes for scenarios S02 to S19 (Tables VII.III and VII.V). Scenarios S01, S11, S12, and S13 have been excluded because they are initialised with no CO₂ ice and, therefore, CO₂ ice sublimation rate is 0 mm MY⁻¹ at all latitudes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>S02</th>
<th>S03</th>
<th>S04</th>
<th>S05</th>
<th>S06</th>
<th>S07</th>
<th>S08</th>
<th>S09</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>S14</th>
<th>S15</th>
<th>S16</th>
<th>S18</th>
<th>S19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>44.64</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>255.56</td>
<td>262.26</td>
<td>271.25</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>81.54</td>
<td>76.52</td>
<td>8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td>53.57</td>
<td>37.26</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>293.14</td>
<td>294.05</td>
<td>306.26</td>
<td>23.29</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>107.82</td>
<td>76.52</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>54.45</td>
<td>66.96</td>
<td>49.68</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>415.29</td>
<td>441.07</td>
<td>452.09</td>
<td>38.26</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>194.07</td>
<td>89.28</td>
<td>12.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>54.45</td>
<td>76.52</td>
<td>62.10</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>498.35</td>
<td>510.71</td>
<td>558.47</td>
<td>48.70</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>294.05</td>
<td>89.28</td>
<td>12.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>68.06</td>
<td>89.28</td>
<td>74.53</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>664.46</td>
<td>693.11</td>
<td>678.14</td>
<td>66.96</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>510.71</td>
<td>107.13</td>
<td>15.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>68.06</td>
<td>107.13</td>
<td>93.16</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>830.58</td>
<td>882.14</td>
<td>863.08</td>
<td>178.56</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>882.14</td>
<td>107.13</td>
<td>20.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>90.75</td>
<td>178.56</td>
<td>149.05</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>1107.44</td>
<td>1078.17</td>
<td>1186.74</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>1386.21</td>
<td>133.92</td>
<td>26.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>178.56</td>
<td>248.42</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>23.48</td>
<td>23.04</td>
<td>1423.85</td>
<td>1386.21</td>
<td>1356.27</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>1617.25</td>
<td>178.56</td>
<td>27.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>248.42</td>
<td>24.69</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>1661.15</td>
<td>1617.25</td>
<td>1582.32</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>1940.70</td>
<td>178.56</td>
<td>27.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>31.21</td>
<td>31.11</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>2491.73</td>
<td>2425.88</td>
<td>2373.48</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>32.74</td>
<td>2425.88</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>28.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>30.61</td>
<td>32.30</td>
<td>2491.73</td>
<td>2425.88</td>
<td>2373.48</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>2425.88</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>29.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>33.07</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>32.68</td>
<td>2491.73</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>3164.64</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>33.92</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>32.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuation of table C.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>S02</th>
<th>S03</th>
<th>S04</th>
<th>S05</th>
<th>S06</th>
<th>S07</th>
<th>S08</th>
<th>S09</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>S14</th>
<th>S15</th>
<th>S16</th>
<th>S18</th>
<th>S19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>39.47</td>
<td>39.15</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td>3322.31</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>3164.64</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>45.21</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>29.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>45.51</td>
<td>45.44</td>
<td>45.23</td>
<td>3322.31</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>3164.64</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>45.21</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>30.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>46.12</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td>45.76</td>
<td>3322.31</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>3164.64</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>30.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>45.21</td>
<td>45.04</td>
<td>45.77</td>
<td>3322.31</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>3164.64</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>45.29</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>30.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>46.13</td>
<td>46.03</td>
<td>45.76</td>
<td>3322.31</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>3164.64</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>45.31</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>30.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>46.24</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td>45.79</td>
<td>3322.31</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>3164.64</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>46.82</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>31.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>47.63</td>
<td>47.85</td>
<td>46.93</td>
<td>3322.31</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>3164.64</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>47.75</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>36.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>48.15</td>
<td>48.06</td>
<td>47.95</td>
<td>3322.31</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>3164.64</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>48.26</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>38.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>48.52</td>
<td>48.52</td>
<td>50.77</td>
<td>3322.31</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>3164.64</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>54.82</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>38.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>48.21</td>
<td>48.20</td>
<td>49.45</td>
<td>3322.31</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>3164.64</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>37.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>36.33</td>
<td>36.88</td>
<td>36.69</td>
<td>2491.73</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>3164.64</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>36.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-37</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>35.86</td>
<td>35.94</td>
<td>2491.73</td>
<td>2425.88</td>
<td>2373.48</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>34.87</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>33.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>28.97</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>1993.38</td>
<td>1940.70</td>
<td>1898.78</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>2425.88</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>28.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>22.94</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>1245.86</td>
<td>1386.21</td>
<td>1356.27</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>1940.70</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>24.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>186.31</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>664.46</td>
<td>693.11</td>
<td>678.14</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>882.14</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>16.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-67</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>178.56</td>
<td>149.05</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>498.35</td>
<td>485.18</td>
<td>499.68</td>
<td>178.56</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>441.07</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>13.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-72</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>178.56</td>
<td>124.21</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>369.15</td>
<td>359.39</td>
<td>365.15</td>
<td>133.92</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>236.67</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-77</td>
<td>90.75</td>
<td>133.92</td>
<td>82.81</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>284.77</td>
<td>277.24</td>
<td>279.23</td>
<td>66.96</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>142.70</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>9.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-82</td>
<td>90.75</td>
<td>107.13</td>
<td>62.10</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>226.52</td>
<td>220.53</td>
<td>226.05</td>
<td>28.19</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>86.64</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>9.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-87</td>
<td>68.06</td>
<td>89.28</td>
<td>43.84</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>171.84</td>
<td>167.30</td>
<td>172.62</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>69.81</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>9.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C.2: Annual average CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate [mm MY$^{-1}$] at all latitudes for scenarios S20 to S42 (Tables VII.III and VII.V). Scenarios S26, S27, S28, S29 and S31 have been excluded because they are initialised with no CO$_2$ ice and, therefore, CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate is 0 mm MY$^{-1}$ at all latitudes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>570.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>606.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>693.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>746.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>882.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1078.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1212.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1386.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1617.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1940.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1940.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2425.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2425.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2425.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2425.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>3234.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuation of table C.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Simulations</th>
<th>S20</th>
<th>S22</th>
<th>S23</th>
<th>S24</th>
<th>S30</th>
<th>S33</th>
<th>S35</th>
<th>S36</th>
<th>S37</th>
<th>S38</th>
<th>S39</th>
<th>S40</th>
<th>S41</th>
<th>S42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-27</td>
<td>2425.88</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>33.97</td>
<td>2425.88</td>
<td>2559.79</td>
<td>34.75</td>
<td>30.27</td>
<td>1898.78</td>
<td>35.41</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>29.69</td>
<td>21.44</td>
<td>21.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32</td>
<td>2425.88</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>32.70</td>
<td>1940.70</td>
<td>2559.79</td>
<td>32.70</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>1356.27</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-37</td>
<td>1940.70</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>1617.25</td>
<td>2047.83</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>1356.27</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42</td>
<td>1617.25</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>27.67</td>
<td>1617.25</td>
<td>1706.53</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>17.34</td>
<td>1186.74</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>17.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-47</td>
<td>1617.25</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>28.68</td>
<td>1617.25</td>
<td>1462.74</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>949.39</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52</td>
<td>1386.21</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>27.22</td>
<td>1386.21</td>
<td>1279.90</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>730.30</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-57</td>
<td>1078.17</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>25.30</td>
<td>1212.94</td>
<td>930.83</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>527.44</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62</td>
<td>882.14</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>1078.17</td>
<td>639.95</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>351.63</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-72</td>
<td>606.47</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>882.14</td>
<td>319.97</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>189.88</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-77</td>
<td>539.08</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td>808.63</td>
<td>217.85</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>146.06</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-82</td>
<td>539.08</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>882.14</td>
<td>152.82</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>115.78</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-87</td>
<td>510.71</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>882.14</td>
<td>104.48</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>87.91</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C.3: Annual average CO₂ ice sublimation rate [mm MY⁻¹] at all latitudes for scenarios S43 to S51 (Tables VII.II and VII.V) .
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1356.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1356.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1582.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1582.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1898.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1898.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1898.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1898.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1898.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2373.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>2373.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>2373.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17</td>
<td>2373.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>2373.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27</td>
<td>2373.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32</td>
<td>1898.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-37</td>
<td>1582.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42</td>
<td>1582.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-47</td>
<td>1186.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52</td>
<td>1054.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-57</td>
<td>730.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62</td>
<td>452.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-67</td>
<td>231.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-72</td>
<td>123.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-77</td>
<td>75.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-82</td>
<td>36.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C.4: Annual average CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate [mm MY$^{-1}$] at all latitudes for the different initial ice porosity simulations (Table VII.IV).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-37</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuation of table C.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>PM01</th>
<th>PM02</th>
<th>S06</th>
<th>PM03</th>
<th>PM04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-42</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>107.82</td>
<td>808.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-47</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>86.64</td>
<td>646.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>68.33</td>
<td>539.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-57</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>48.51</td>
<td>404.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>41.81</td>
<td>285.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-67</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>35.59</td>
<td>202.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-72</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>144.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-77</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>103.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-82</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>69.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-87</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>49.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C.5: Annual average CO$_2$ ice sublimation rate [mm MY$^{-1}$] at all latitudes for the different subsurface structure simulations (Table VII.IV).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>S06</th>
<th>CDS-SS</th>
<th>CDS-SS-B</th>
<th>FDS-CDS</th>
<th>UR-CDS-B</th>
<th>UR-FDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>22.72</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>22.90</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>23.01</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>11.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>23.49</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>17.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>24.21</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>23.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>23.48</td>
<td>25.04</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>25.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>26.02</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>23.95</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>27.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>28.66</td>
<td>27.82</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>28.55</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>29.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.11</td>
<td>28.93</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>32.18</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>31.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>S06</td>
<td>CDS-SS</td>
<td>CDS-SS-B</td>
<td>FDS-CDS</td>
<td>UR-CDS-B</td>
<td>UR-FDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.61</td>
<td>30.39</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>33.21</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>30.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>33.01</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>34.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.15</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>37.97</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>36.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>45.44</td>
<td>35.48</td>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>42.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td>37.65</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>44.05</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>42.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45.04</td>
<td>39.82</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>44.18</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>40.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>46.03</td>
<td>42.17</td>
<td>27.23</td>
<td>44.53</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>42.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>35.01</td>
<td>44.65</td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td>43.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>47.85</td>
<td>53.43</td>
<td>42.01</td>
<td>53.43</td>
<td>27.06</td>
<td>45.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17</td>
<td>48.06</td>
<td>59.84</td>
<td>49.01</td>
<td>48.52</td>
<td>29.81</td>
<td>56.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>48.52</td>
<td>66.98</td>
<td>56.55</td>
<td>50.42</td>
<td>31.98</td>
<td>51.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27</td>
<td>48.20</td>
<td>68.52</td>
<td>58.81</td>
<td>44.81</td>
<td>31.41</td>
<td>44.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32</td>
<td>36.88</td>
<td>65.04</td>
<td>54.46</td>
<td>35.48</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>37.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-37</td>
<td>35.86</td>
<td>56.45</td>
<td>47.43</td>
<td>34.49</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>35.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>44.42</td>
<td>38.69</td>
<td>28.48</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>30.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-47</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>40.23</td>
<td>27.74</td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>27.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>37.01</td>
<td>20.71</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>25.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-57</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>18.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-67</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>29.18</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-72</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>27.43</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-77</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>26.04</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-82</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>24.90</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-87</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C.1.1 Regional Average CO₂ Sublimation Rates

Table C.6: Regional average CO₂ sublimation rates [mm MY⁻¹] for each baseline scenario (Tables VII.III and VII.V) across each latitude region (polar, mid-latitude and equatorial) in each hemisphere and averaged over both hemispheres. The final column is the global average sublimation rate for each scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>North polar average</th>
<th>South polar average</th>
<th>Total polar average</th>
<th>Southern mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Northern mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Total mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Equatorial average</th>
<th>Global average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02</td>
<td>54.88</td>
<td>109.66</td>
<td>82.27</td>
<td>128.56</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>132.35</td>
<td>136.13</td>
<td>116.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03</td>
<td>73.02</td>
<td>159.21</td>
<td>116.11</td>
<td>238.07</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>252.95</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>212.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>58.19</td>
<td>108.05</td>
<td>83.12</td>
<td>293.96</td>
<td>351.93</td>
<td>322.94</td>
<td>372.63</td>
<td>259.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>25.47</td>
<td>27.69</td>
<td>26.58</td>
<td>43.72</td>
<td>25.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>26.82</td>
<td>43.68</td>
<td>25.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>28.20</td>
<td>26.76</td>
<td>43.90</td>
<td>25.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>492.90</td>
<td>369.18</td>
<td>431.04</td>
<td>1778.49</td>
<td>1813.43</td>
<td>1793.96</td>
<td>3183.88</td>
<td>1803.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>513.89</td>
<td>367.13</td>
<td>440.51</td>
<td>1731.49</td>
<td>1929.15</td>
<td>1830.32</td>
<td>3167.12</td>
<td>1812.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>521.55</td>
<td>370.14</td>
<td>445.85</td>
<td>1795.18</td>
<td>1887.48</td>
<td>1841.33</td>
<td>3098.71</td>
<td>1795.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>62.27</td>
<td>115.76</td>
<td>89.02</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>208.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>26.46</td>
<td>31.59</td>
<td>29.02</td>
<td>44.38</td>
<td>26.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>345.05</td>
<td>309.84</td>
<td>327.45</td>
<td>2036.97</td>
<td>2360.42</td>
<td>2198.69</td>
<td>3167.12</td>
<td>1897.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>90.98</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>179.41</td>
<td>215.75</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>241.79</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>229.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>28.51</td>
<td>28.01</td>
<td>33.03</td>
<td>24.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>762.85</td>
<td>628.43</td>
<td>695.64</td>
<td>1619.18</td>
<td>1677.58</td>
<td>1648.38</td>
<td>2830.19</td>
<td>1724.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Continuation of table C.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>North polar average</th>
<th>South polar average</th>
<th>Total polar average</th>
<th>Southern mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Northern mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Total mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Equatorial average</th>
<th>Global average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>108.62</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>188.23</td>
<td>215.75</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>241.79</td>
<td>267.83</td>
<td>232.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>28.58</td>
<td>29.32</td>
<td>30.05</td>
<td>26.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>1035.29</td>
<td>917.26</td>
<td>976.27</td>
<td>1540.24</td>
<td>1565.27</td>
<td>1552.75</td>
<td>2345.01</td>
<td>1624.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>242.98</td>
<td>316.75</td>
<td>279.87</td>
<td>861.20</td>
<td>1664.60</td>
<td>1262.90</td>
<td>2118.94</td>
<td>1220.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S33</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>25.57</td>
<td>14.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S35</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36</td>
<td>264.34</td>
<td>191.31</td>
<td>227.82</td>
<td>995.23</td>
<td>1055.41</td>
<td>1025.32</td>
<td>2122.95</td>
<td>1125.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S37</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>24.89</td>
<td>14.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S38</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>13.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S39</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>14.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S40</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>11.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S41</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>12.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S43</td>
<td>181.29</td>
<td>161.03</td>
<td>171.16</td>
<td>1193.55</td>
<td>1339.22</td>
<td>1266.39</td>
<td>2109.76</td>
<td>1182.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S44</td>
<td>400.41</td>
<td>333.82</td>
<td>367.12</td>
<td>910.42</td>
<td>940.71</td>
<td>925.57</td>
<td>1676.51</td>
<td>989.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S45</td>
<td>581.57</td>
<td>499.50</td>
<td>540.54</td>
<td>897.45</td>
<td>888.60</td>
<td>893.02</td>
<td>1411.22</td>
<td>948.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S48</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>32.36</td>
<td>29.21</td>
<td>30.79</td>
<td>58.04</td>
<td>32.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S49</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>26.52</td>
<td>30.82</td>
<td>28.67</td>
<td>43.82</td>
<td>25.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S50</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>25.68</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>32.92</td>
<td>23.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C.7

Regional average CO$_2$ sublimation rates [mm MY$^{-1}$] for each scenario with a different initial ice porosity (Table VII.IV) across each latitude region (polar, mid-latitude and equatorial) in each hemisphere and averaged over both hemispheres. The final column is the global average sublimation rate for each scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>North polar average</th>
<th>South polar average</th>
<th>Total polar average</th>
<th>Southern mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Northern mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Total mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Equatorial average</th>
<th>Global average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S51</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>26.88</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>26.98</td>
<td>29.69</td>
<td>25.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM01</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM02</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>26.82</td>
<td>43.68</td>
<td>25.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM03</td>
<td>35.68</td>
<td>25.73</td>
<td>30.70</td>
<td>105.27</td>
<td>98.04</td>
<td>101.66</td>
<td>183.73</td>
<td>105.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM04</td>
<td>234.30</td>
<td>142.32</td>
<td>188.31</td>
<td>988.32</td>
<td>763.70</td>
<td>876.01</td>
<td>1482.48</td>
<td>848.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C.8: Regional average CO$_2$ sublimation rates [mm MY$^{-1}$] for each scenario with a different subsurface structure (Table VII.IV) across each latitude region (polar, mid-latitude and equatorial) in each hemisphere and averaged over both hemispheres. The final column is the global average sublimation rate for each scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>North polar average</th>
<th>South polar average</th>
<th>Total polar average</th>
<th>Southern mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Northern mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Total mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Equatorial average</th>
<th>Global average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>26.82</td>
<td>43.68</td>
<td>25.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS-SS</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>27.13</td>
<td>25.06</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>46.23</td>
<td>36.37</td>
<td>45.34</td>
<td>35.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS-SS-B</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>34.20</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>18.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDS-CDS</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>25.22</td>
<td>26.64</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>43.53</td>
<td>25.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR-FDS</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>27.68</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td>28.49</td>
<td>42.58</td>
<td>26.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C.2 H$_2$O Sublimation Rate

Table C.9: Annual average water (H$_2$O) ice sublimation rate [mm MY$^{-1}$] over the entire 200 martian year period at all latitudes for scenarios S01 to S14 (Tables VII.III and VII.V).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>S01</th>
<th>S02</th>
<th>S03</th>
<th>S04</th>
<th>S05</th>
<th>S06</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
<th>S07</th>
<th>S08</th>
<th>S09</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>S11</th>
<th>S12</th>
<th>S13</th>
<th>S14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>-0.00032</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-0.00035</td>
<td>-0.00035</td>
<td>-0.00035</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>-0.00029</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-0.00031</td>
<td>-0.00031</td>
<td>-0.00031</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>-0.00052</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-0.00053</td>
<td>-0.00053</td>
<td>-0.00052</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>-0.00039</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-0.00038</td>
<td>-0.00038</td>
<td>-0.00037</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-7.6E-08</td>
<td>-8.2E-08</td>
<td>-8.7E-08</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>-4.6E-09</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-1.4E-07</td>
<td>-1.5E-07</td>
<td>-6.6E-09</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>-2E-08</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.00231</td>
<td>0.00482</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-4.8E-08</td>
<td>-5.6E-08</td>
<td>-4.6E-08</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>-4.9E-08</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-1.3E-08</td>
<td>-1.1E-08</td>
<td>-6.2E-09</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>-1.2E-07</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.00648</td>
<td>0.0127</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-6.3E-08</td>
<td>-1E-08</td>
<td>-3.1E-08</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.00418</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
<td>0.0149</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>0.00545</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td>0.0384</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuation of Table C.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>S01</th>
<th>S02</th>
<th>S03</th>
<th>S04</th>
<th>S05</th>
<th>S06</th>
<th>S07</th>
<th>S08</th>
<th>S09</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>S11</th>
<th>S12</th>
<th>S13</th>
<th>S14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.0657</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.0657</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.0657</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.0767</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-6.9E⁻⁰⁹</td>
<td>-6.9E⁻⁰⁹</td>
<td>-3.4E⁻⁰⁹</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-7.7E⁻⁰⁹</td>
<td>-7.7E⁻⁰⁹</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-7.4E⁻⁰⁷</td>
<td>-7E⁻⁰⁷</td>
<td>-5.8E⁻⁰⁷</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-87</td>
<td>-8.9E⁻⁰⁷</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-3.1E⁻⁰⁶</td>
<td>-3E⁻⁰⁶</td>
<td>-2.7E⁻⁰⁶</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C.10: Annual average H₂O ice sublimation rate [mm MY⁻¹] over the entire 200 martian year period at all latitudes for scenarios S15 to S28 (Tables VII.III and VII.V).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>S15</th>
<th>S16</th>
<th>S17</th>
<th>S18</th>
<th>S19</th>
<th>S20</th>
<th>S21</th>
<th>S22</th>
<th>S23</th>
<th>S24</th>
<th>S25</th>
<th>S26</th>
<th>S27</th>
<th>S28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
<td>-0.0033</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00294</td>
<td>-0.00673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>0.00964</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00255</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.00497</td>
<td>-0.00475</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00223</td>
<td>-0.00412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.00489</td>
<td>-0.00212</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.00612</td>
<td>-0.00397</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00151</td>
<td>-0.00312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00221</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.00677</td>
<td>-0.00448</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00146</td>
<td>-0.00382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.0159</td>
<td>-0.00177</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.0177</td>
<td>-0.00595</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.0008</td>
<td>-0.00521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.00636</td>
<td>-0.00069</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00624</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.2E-06</td>
<td>-0.00518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00022</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.0217</td>
<td>-0.00693</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.7E-06</td>
<td>-0.00526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>-0.00013</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>-0.00903</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.1E-06</td>
<td>-0.00718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-2E-06</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00854</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.6E-06</td>
<td>-0.00673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-7.8E-07</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6.7E-07</td>
<td>-0.00962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-8.5E-07</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00897</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5.1E-07</td>
<td>-0.00664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>-1.4E-06</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>-0.00938</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7.6E-07</td>
<td>-0.0071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-9.8E-07</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00726</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5.2E-07</td>
<td>-0.0048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7.00</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>-8.8E-07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>-0.00664</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5.4E-07</td>
<td>-0.00388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12.00</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.00555</td>
<td>-0.00063</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>-0.0084</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.5E-06</td>
<td>-0.00547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17.00</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.0561</td>
<td>-1.8E-06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>-0.00298</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9.8E-07</td>
<td>-0.00014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22.00</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>-3.5E-07</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>-4.8E-06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8.4E-08</td>
<td>-1.6E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27.00</td>
<td>0.00477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>-5.3E-07</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>-9.6E-05</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.5E-07</td>
<td>-2.4E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32.00</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.0867</td>
<td>-5E-06</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>-0.00162</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.2E-06</td>
<td>-0.00073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-37.00</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>-0.00218</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>-0.00253</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00123</td>
<td>-0.00209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.00342</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00346</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00301</td>
<td>-0.00323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-47.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>-0.00351</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>-0.0032</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00313</td>
<td>-0.0029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>-0.00334</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>-0.00261</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00327</td>
<td>-0.00245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-57.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00333</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>-0.00246</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00335</td>
<td>-0.00242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.0032</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>-0.00217</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00322</td>
<td>-0.00226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-67.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.0031</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00201</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00309</td>
<td>-0.00208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-72.00</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00329</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>-0.00219</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00326</td>
<td>-0.00225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S15</td>
<td>S16</td>
<td>S17</td>
<td>S18</td>
<td>S19</td>
<td>S20</td>
<td>S21</td>
<td>S22</td>
<td>S23</td>
<td>S24</td>
<td>S25</td>
<td>S26</td>
<td>S27</td>
<td>S28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-77</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.0034</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00218</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00335</td>
<td>-0.00221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-82</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00297</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>-0.00185</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00293</td>
<td>-0.00191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-87</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00295</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-0.00165</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00292</td>
<td>-0.00173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C.11: Annual average H$_2$O ice sublimation rate [mm MY$^{-1}$] over the entire 200 martian year period at all latitudes for scenarios S29 to S43 (Tables VII.III and VII.V).
Table C.12: Annual average H$_2$O ice sublimation rate [mm MY$^{-1}$] over the entire 200 martian year period at all latitudes for scenarios S29 to S43 (Tables VII.III and VII.V).
### Continuation of table C.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>S44</th>
<th>S45</th>
<th>S48</th>
<th>S49</th>
<th>S50</th>
<th>S51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.00985</td>
<td>-0.0619</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.0364</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.00197</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.0331</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.0238</td>
<td>-0.00051</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.0346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.0281</td>
<td>0.0196</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.0297</td>
<td>0.0242</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.00712</td>
<td>0.00435</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>0.00558</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.00715</td>
<td>0.00474</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.00748</td>
<td>0.00308</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.00887</td>
<td>0.00303</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.0093</td>
<td>0.00238</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.00933</td>
<td>-0.00071</td>
<td>0.0559</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.0101</td>
<td>-0.00012</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0329</td>
<td>-0.00439</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.0895</td>
<td>0.0994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0329</td>
<td>-0.00054</td>
<td>0.0522</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0327</td>
<td>-0.00096</td>
<td>0.0497</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0.0328</td>
<td>0.00118</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>0.00133</td>
<td>0.0493</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.0704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>0.00777</td>
<td>-0.00085</td>
<td>0.0764</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>0.00522</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>0.0336</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.0545</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.0318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27</td>
<td>0.0334</td>
<td>0.0317</td>
<td>0.0608</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32</td>
<td>0.0331</td>
<td>0.00769</td>
<td>0.0591</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-37</td>
<td>0.00729</td>
<td>0.00684</td>
<td>0.0335</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42</td>
<td>0.00582</td>
<td>0.00595</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-47</td>
<td>0.00593</td>
<td>0.00617</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.0522</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C.13: Annual average H$_2$O ice sublimation rate [mm MY$^{-1}$] over a 199 martian year period (excluding the first year of simulation) at all latitudes for scenarios S01 to S11 (Tables VII.III and VII.V). The first year has been excluded from the annual averages because there is an initial rapid loss of H$_2$O ice as the system equilibrates and the annual changes after this year are orders of magnitude smaller.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>S01</th>
<th>S02</th>
<th>S03</th>
<th>S04</th>
<th>S05</th>
<th>S06</th>
<th>S07</th>
<th>S08</th>
<th>S09</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>S11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-0.00032</td>
<td>-0.00049</td>
<td>-0.0007</td>
<td>-0.00058</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00035</td>
<td>-0.00035</td>
<td>-0.00034</td>
<td>-0.00051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-83</td>
<td>-0.00029</td>
<td>-0.00046</td>
<td>-0.00066</td>
<td>-0.00055</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00035</td>
<td>-0.00035</td>
<td>-0.00035</td>
<td>-0.00035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-78</td>
<td>-0.00051</td>
<td>-0.00064</td>
<td>-0.00091</td>
<td>-0.00078</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00053</td>
<td>-0.00052</td>
<td>-0.00052</td>
<td>-0.00066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-0.00039</td>
<td>-0.00061</td>
<td>-0.00088</td>
<td>-0.00075</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00037</td>
<td>-0.00037</td>
<td>-0.00037</td>
<td>-0.00063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00033</td>
<td>-0.00047</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.05E-06</td>
<td>3.02E-06</td>
<td>4.71E-06</td>
<td>-0.00034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-63</td>
<td>3.08E-07</td>
<td>-0.00031</td>
<td>-0.00044</td>
<td>-0.00035</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.31E-06</td>
<td>8.28E-06</td>
<td>4.2E-07</td>
<td>-0.00029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-58</td>
<td>1.42E-06</td>
<td>-0.00031</td>
<td>-0.00043</td>
<td>-0.0003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5E-06</td>
<td>5.19E-06</td>
<td>4.15E-06</td>
<td>-0.00017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-53</td>
<td>3.83E-06</td>
<td>-0.00025</td>
<td>-0.00032</td>
<td>-0.00022</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.04E-06</td>
<td>6.95E-07</td>
<td>1.39E-07</td>
<td>-5.1E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-48</td>
<td>5.2E-07</td>
<td>-9.9E-05</td>
<td>-8E-05</td>
<td>-4.5E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.12E-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.1E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4.6E-07</td>
<td>-5.5E-08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.4E-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continuation of table C.12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>S01</th>
<th>S02</th>
<th>S03</th>
<th>S04</th>
<th>S05</th>
<th>S06</th>
<th>S07</th>
<th>S08</th>
<th>S09</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>S11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.8E-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.36E-05</td>
<td>2.08E-05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.00344</td>
<td>0.00237</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00722</td>
<td>0.00343</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.007724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00968</td>
<td>0.00408</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
<td>0.00445</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.06E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>0.0139</td>
<td>0.00575</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.44E-06</td>
<td>2.04E-06</td>
<td>2.21E-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>0.0146</td>
<td>0.00657</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.69E-07</td>
<td>1.4E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17</td>
<td>0.0153</td>
<td>0.00687</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000002</td>
<td>5.62E-06</td>
<td>1.36E-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>0.0156</td>
<td>0.00687</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.07E-06</td>
<td>6.05E-07</td>
<td>3.67E-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.00591</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.64E-07</td>
<td>8.44E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32</td>
<td>0.0126</td>
<td>0.00418</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.88E-07</td>
<td>-3.5E-07</td>
<td>-6.9E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-37</td>
<td>0.00602</td>
<td>0.00202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.48E-07</td>
<td>2.91E-07</td>
<td>4.07E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42</td>
<td>5.51E-05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.45E-07</td>
<td>4.07E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.77E-07</td>
<td>1.02E-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.65E-07</td>
<td>6.78E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.45E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4.4E-09</td>
<td>-1.9E-08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5.2E-07</td>
<td>-2.9E-06</td>
<td>-1E-05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6.6E-05</td>
<td>-8.6E-05</td>
<td>-5.2E-05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.97E-06</td>
<td>1.4E-06</td>
<td>7.01E-07</td>
<td>9.1E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7.8E-05</td>
<td>-0.00012</td>
<td>-5.6E-05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.13E-06</td>
<td>1.01E-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.4E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8.6E-05</td>
<td>-0.00013</td>
<td>-8.1E-05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5.8E-07</td>
<td>-5.4E-07</td>
<td>-4.3E-07</td>
<td>-8.7E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-87</td>
<td>-8.8E-07</td>
<td>-9.5E-05</td>
<td>-0.00014</td>
<td>-7.8E-05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.9E-06</td>
<td>-2.8E-06</td>
<td>-2.5E-06</td>
<td>-9.5E-05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C.14: Annual average H$_2$O ice sublimation rate [mm MY$^{-1}$] over a 199 martian year period (excluding the first year of simulation) at all latitudes for scenarios S12 to S22 (Tables VII.III and VII.V). The first year has been excluded from the annual averages because there is an initial rapid loss of H$_2$O ice as the system equilibrates and the annual changes after this year are orders of magnitude smaller.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>S12</th>
<th>S13</th>
<th>S14</th>
<th>S15</th>
<th>S16</th>
<th>S17</th>
<th>S18</th>
<th>S19</th>
<th>S20</th>
<th>S21</th>
<th>S22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>-0.00073</td>
<td>-0.00064</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.0208</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.0187</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>-0.0836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>-0.00069</td>
<td>-0.0006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.0215</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.0192</td>
<td>-0.0224</td>
<td>-0.0855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>-0.00094</td>
<td>-0.00083</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.0281</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.0251</td>
<td>-0.0293</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>-0.00091</td>
<td>-0.00078</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00911</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00798</td>
<td>-0.00948</td>
<td>-0.0306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>-0.00046</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00617</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.0064</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>-0.00038</td>
<td>-0.00029</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00526</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00429</td>
<td>-0.00537</td>
<td>-0.0131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>-0.0002</td>
<td>-0.00014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00406</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00328</td>
<td>-0.00392</td>
<td>-0.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>-4.9E-07</td>
<td>3.99E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00353</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00254</td>
<td>-0.00322</td>
<td>-0.00655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>-1.1E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00332</td>
<td>-1E-09</td>
<td>-0.00211</td>
<td>-0.00281</td>
<td>-0.00547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00407</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00219</td>
<td>-0.00337</td>
<td>-0.00619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00175</td>
<td>-0.00291</td>
<td>-0.00783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.0028</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00067</td>
<td>-0.00156</td>
<td>-0.00822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00245</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00021</td>
<td>-0.00106</td>
<td>-0.00928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000146</td>
<td>-0.00236</td>
<td>9.81E-08</td>
<td>-0.00011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.00101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>-0.00116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.31E-06</td>
<td>-0.00012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.00294</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00302</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
<td>-1.3E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.64E-06</td>
<td>0.000232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0036</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00368</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00331</td>
<td>5.78E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8E-06</td>
<td>0.000266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00385</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00403</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00345</td>
<td>-1.4E-06</td>
<td>4.37E-07</td>
<td>3.55E-06</td>
<td>3.32E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0.00418</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00438</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00413</td>
<td>6.12E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.84E-06</td>
<td>0.000239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>0.00455</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00595</td>
<td>6.06E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00485</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5E-06</td>
<td>0.000426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>0.00495</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00666</td>
<td>7.57E-07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00535</td>
<td>0.000736</td>
<td>6.61E-09</td>
<td>-0.00061</td>
<td>-0.0017</td>
<td>-0.00598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17</td>
<td>0.00475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00712</td>
<td>1.67E-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00559</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>1.27E-07</td>
<td>7.64E-06</td>
<td>0.000577</td>
<td>0.000273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>0.00418</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00843</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00604</td>
<td>0.00301</td>
<td>8.48E-07</td>
<td>2.34E-06</td>
<td>0.00101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C.15: Annual average $H_2O$ ice sublimation rate [mm MY$^{-1}$] over a 199 martian year period (excluding the first year of simulation) at all latitudes for scenarios S23 to S34 (Tables VII.III and VII.V). The first year has been excluded from the annual averages because there is an initial rapid loss of $H_2O$ ice as the system equilibrates and the annual changes after this year are orders of magnitude smaller.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>-1E-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>3.77E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17</td>
<td>2.26E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>1.13E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27</td>
<td>3.77E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32</td>
<td>7.54E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-37</td>
<td>1.13E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-47</td>
<td>2.83E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-57</td>
<td>5.09E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62</td>
<td>1.02E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-67</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-72</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C.16: Annual average \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice sublimation rate [mm MY\(^{-1}\)] over a 199 martian year period (excluding the first year of simulation) at all latitudes for scenarios S35 to S45 (Tables VII.III and VII.V). The first year has been excluded from the annual averages because there is an initial rapid loss of \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice as the system equilibrates and the annual changes after this year are orders of magnitude smaller.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-77</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-82</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-87</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>-1.9E-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-1.4E-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-1.3E-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-1.4E-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-2.2E-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Continuation of table C.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>S35</th>
<th>S36</th>
<th>S37</th>
<th>S38</th>
<th>S39</th>
<th>S40</th>
<th>S41</th>
<th>S42</th>
<th>S43</th>
<th>S44</th>
<th>S45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00369</td>
<td>-4.5E-06</td>
<td>-3.8E-09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1E-09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00319</td>
<td>0.000311</td>
<td>-0.0106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00417</td>
<td>-5.5E-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.6E-09</td>
<td>4.24E-08</td>
<td>0.00329</td>
<td>4.23E-05</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00455</td>
<td>-7.3E-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.99E-08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00429</td>
<td>0.00022</td>
<td>-0.0084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-5.4E-08</td>
<td>0.00523</td>
<td>-1.4E-05</td>
<td>9.34E-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.67E-07</td>
<td>2.34E-08</td>
<td>1.53E-07</td>
<td>0.00547</td>
<td>0.000365</td>
<td>-0.0087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-3.9E-07</td>
<td>0.00545</td>
<td>-1.4E-05</td>
<td>1.98E-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.01E-06</td>
<td>3.77E-08</td>
<td>1.53E-07</td>
<td>0.00586</td>
<td>-0.00228</td>
<td>-0.0109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17</td>
<td>1.87E-06</td>
<td>0.00513</td>
<td>-1.7E-05</td>
<td>-3.5E-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.52E-08</td>
<td>7.7E-08</td>
<td>3.39E-06</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.000312</td>
<td>-0.00484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>4.86E-07</td>
<td>0.00449</td>
<td>-3.2E-05</td>
<td>-6.7E-07</td>
<td>-9.5E-07</td>
<td>-3.8E-05</td>
<td>3.32E-07</td>
<td>1.36E-05</td>
<td>0.00642</td>
<td>0.000141</td>
<td>-0.00062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27</td>
<td>1.93E-08</td>
<td>0.00264</td>
<td>-1.9E-05</td>
<td>-2.3E-06</td>
<td>-3E-07</td>
<td>6.59E-06</td>
<td>6.78E-07</td>
<td>1.13E-06</td>
<td>0.00519</td>
<td>-3.5E-06</td>
<td>-0.00088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-5.5E-07</td>
<td>2.63E-05</td>
<td>-1.5E-05</td>
<td>-6.6E-07</td>
<td>-2.9E-08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.13E-06</td>
<td>0.00267</td>
<td>-0.00027</td>
<td>-0.00237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-37</td>
<td>2.99E-08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.9E-08</td>
<td>-8.8E-09</td>
<td>2.68E-08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.92E-08</td>
<td>5.65E-07</td>
<td>2.01E-06</td>
<td>-0.00278</td>
<td>-0.00322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.02E-06</td>
<td>6.78E-07</td>
<td>-9.9E-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00424</td>
<td>-0.00411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.02E-06</td>
<td>1.02E-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.02E-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00413</td>
<td>-0.00389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.78E-07</td>
<td>3.7E-08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00393</td>
<td>-0.00298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.9E-05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00388</td>
<td>-0.00294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2E-08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00374</td>
<td>-0.00275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00372</td>
<td>-0.00255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00414</td>
<td>-0.00278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00416</td>
<td>-0.0027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00379</td>
<td>-0.00237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00371</td>
<td>-0.0022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C.17: Annual average \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice sublimation rate \([\text{mm MY}^{-1}]\) over a 199 martian year period (excluding the first year of simulation) at all latitudes for scenarios S48 to S51 (Tables VII.11 and VII.15). The first year has been excluded from the annual averages because there is an initial rapid loss of \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice as the system equilibrates and the annual changes after this year are orders of magnitude smaller.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>6.98E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.88E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.45E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.74E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.18E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-3.1E-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.93E-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.39E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3.35E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1.23E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>3.45E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-9.9E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>1.4E-06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C.18: Annual average H$_2$O ice sublimation rate [mm MY$^{-1}$] over the entire 200 martian year period at all latitudes for the different initial ice porosity simulations (Table VII.IV).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>PM01</th>
<th>PM02</th>
<th>S06</th>
<th>PM03</th>
<th>PM04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.000014</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.000014</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.00482</td>
<td>0.0757</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>PM01</td>
<td>PM02</td>
<td>S06</td>
<td>PM03</td>
<td>PM04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.000014</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.000645</td>
<td>0.0127</td>
<td>0.0477</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.00115</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.0681</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.0973</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.000884</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.0575</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.0596</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.000478</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>2.55E-06</td>
<td>0.00113</td>
<td>0.0149</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>2.04E-05</td>
<td>0.00309</td>
<td>0.00545</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17</td>
<td>2.04E-05</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>3.11E-06</td>
<td>0.000478</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.0615</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27</td>
<td>7.01E-06</td>
<td>0.0239</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.0802</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0318</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.0575</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-37</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0318</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0239</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-47</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0239</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0318</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-57</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0239</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62</td>
<td>1.96E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-67</td>
<td>0.000014</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-72</td>
<td>1.96E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-77</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C.19: Annual average \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) ice sublimation rate \([\text{mm MY}^{-1}]\) over the entire 200 martian year period at all latitudes for the different subsurface structure simulations (Table VII.IV).

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-82</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-87</td>
<td>2.01E-05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

```
### Continuation of table C.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0.000159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1.49E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>5.45E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17</td>
<td>4.9E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>0.000119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27</td>
<td>0.000136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32</td>
<td>0.000136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-37</td>
<td>0.000119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42</td>
<td>0.000238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-47</td>
<td>0.000238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52</td>
<td>0.000318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-57</td>
<td>0.000238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-67</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-72</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-77</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-82</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-87</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C.2.1 Regional Average H$_2$O Sublimation Rates

Table C.20: Regional average H$_2$O sublimation rates [mm MY$^{-1}$] for each scenario (Tables VII.III and VII.V) across each latitude region (polar, mid-latitude and equatorial) in each hemisphere and averaged over both hemispheres. The final column is the global average sublimation rate for each scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>North polar average</th>
<th>South polar average</th>
<th>Total polar average</th>
<th>Southern mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Northern mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Total mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Equatorial average</th>
<th>Global average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S01</td>
<td>-2.527E-04</td>
<td>-1.500E-07</td>
<td>-1.264E-04</td>
<td>-1.250E-08</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>-6.250E-09</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>-4.214E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02</td>
<td>1.148E+00</td>
<td>1.212E+00</td>
<td>1.180E+00</td>
<td>5.799E+01</td>
<td>5.799E+01</td>
<td>5.799E+01</td>
<td>1.159E+00</td>
<td>2.327E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03</td>
<td>1.145E+00</td>
<td>1.421E+00</td>
<td>1.283E+00</td>
<td>5.801E+01</td>
<td>7.677E+01</td>
<td>6.739E+01</td>
<td>1.150E+00</td>
<td>2.643E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>1.112E+00</td>
<td>1.247E+00</td>
<td>1.179E+00</td>
<td>6.996E+01</td>
<td>1.112E+02</td>
<td>9.060E+01</td>
<td>1.112E+02</td>
<td>6.538E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>2.300E-01</td>
<td>2.300E-01</td>
<td>2.300E-01</td>
<td>6.200E-02</td>
<td>1.311E-01</td>
<td>9.654E-02</td>
<td>1.236E-01</td>
<td>1.482E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>3.818E+00</td>
<td>3.818E+00</td>
<td>3.818E+00</td>
<td>3.818E+00</td>
<td>1.944E+00</td>
<td>2.881E+00</td>
<td>2.154E+00</td>
<td>3.080E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>-2.610E-04</td>
<td>-6.333E-07</td>
<td>-1.308E-04</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>-2.595E-04</td>
<td>-6.167E-07</td>
<td>-1.301E-04</td>
<td>-1.250E-08</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>-6.250E-09</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>-2.582E-04</td>
<td>-5.500E-07</td>
<td>-1.294E-04</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>1.148E+00</td>
<td>1.135E+00</td>
<td>1.141E+00</td>
<td>5.944E+01</td>
<td>7.694E+01</td>
<td>6.819E+01</td>
<td>1.156E+00</td>
<td>2.673E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>1.145E+00</td>
<td>1.116E+00</td>
<td>1.130E+00</td>
<td>7.234E+01</td>
<td>7.677E+01</td>
<td>7.456E+01</td>
<td>1.149E+00</td>
<td>2.957E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>1.112E+00</td>
<td>1.081E+00</td>
<td>1.097E+00</td>
<td>8.372E+01</td>
<td>9.290E+01</td>
<td>8.831E+01</td>
<td>1.112E+02</td>
<td>6.535E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>1.146E+02</td>
<td>1.146E+02</td>
<td>1.146E+02</td>
<td>1.146E+02</td>
<td>5.787E+01</td>
<td>8.623E+01</td>
<td>1.151E+00</td>
<td>7.362E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run</td>
<td>North polar average</td>
<td>South polar average</td>
<td>Total polar average</td>
<td>Southern mid-latitude average</td>
<td>Northern mid-latitude average</td>
<td>Total mid-latitude average</td>
<td>Equatorial average</td>
<td>Global average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>1.146E+02</td>
<td>1.100E+02</td>
<td>1.123E+02</td>
<td>1.004E+02</td>
<td>7.677E+01</td>
<td>8.859E+01</td>
<td>1.150E+00</td>
<td>7.285E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>1.131E+00</td>
<td>1.142E+00</td>
<td>1.137E+00</td>
<td>1.143E+00</td>
<td>1.146E+00</td>
<td>1.144E+00</td>
<td>1.149E+00</td>
<td>1.143E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>1.130E+00</td>
<td>1.134E+00</td>
<td>1.132E+00</td>
<td>1.076E+00</td>
<td>1.074E+00</td>
<td>1.075E+00</td>
<td>1.115E+00</td>
<td>1.105E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>1.087E+00</td>
<td>1.146E+00</td>
<td>1.116E+00</td>
<td>1.138E+00</td>
<td>1.146E+00</td>
<td>1.142E+00</td>
<td>1.140E+00</td>
<td>1.132E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>-5.385E-02</td>
<td>-2.009E-02</td>
<td>-2.793E-02</td>
<td>-6.045E-03</td>
<td>-2.645E-03</td>
<td>-4.345E-03</td>
<td>-5.988E-03</td>
<td>-1.288E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>1.084E+00</td>
<td>1.143E+00</td>
<td>1.114E+00</td>
<td>1.070E+00</td>
<td>1.074E+00</td>
<td>1.072E+00</td>
<td>1.060E+00</td>
<td>1.082E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td>-1.342E-02</td>
<td>-3.127E-02</td>
<td>-8.273E-02</td>
<td>-1.120E-03</td>
<td>-2.331E-03</td>
<td>-1.725E-03</td>
<td>-9.727E-07</td>
<td>-3.395E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>-5.372E-02</td>
<td>-2.072E-02</td>
<td>-2.790E-02</td>
<td>-5.078E-03</td>
<td>-2.305E-03</td>
<td>-3.691E-03</td>
<td>-4.099E-03</td>
<td>-1.204E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>1.151E+02</td>
<td>1.151E+02</td>
<td>1.151E+02</td>
<td>1.115E+02</td>
<td>7.754E+01</td>
<td>9.630E+01</td>
<td>5.399E+01</td>
<td>9.325E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>-1.988E-04</td>
<td>-1.500E-04</td>
<td>-9.947E-04</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>0.000E+00</td>
<td>-3.316E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S33</td>
<td>6.686E+01</td>
<td>6.686E+01</td>
<td>6.686E+01</td>
<td>1.863E+00</td>
<td>4.108E+01</td>
<td>2.147E+01</td>
<td>6.686E+01</td>
<td>2.973E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S35</td>
<td>7.996E+01</td>
<td>7.996E+01</td>
<td>7.996E+01</td>
<td>1.620E+01</td>
<td>5.465E+01</td>
<td>3.542E+01</td>
<td>1.662E+00</td>
<td>3.971E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36</td>
<td>3.275E-02</td>
<td>2.537E-02</td>
<td>2.906E-02</td>
<td>2.121E+00</td>
<td>2.239E+00</td>
<td>2.180E+00</td>
<td>3.704E-02</td>
<td>8.645E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S37</td>
<td>6.686E+01</td>
<td>6.686E+01</td>
<td>6.686E+01</td>
<td>1.334E+00</td>
<td>3.922E+01</td>
<td>2.028E+01</td>
<td>6.686E-01</td>
<td>2.931E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S38</td>
<td>6.686E+01</td>
<td>5.943E+01</td>
<td>6.314E+01</td>
<td>1.503E+00</td>
<td>2.080E+01</td>
<td>1.115E+01</td>
<td>6.940E-01</td>
<td>2.504E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S39</td>
<td>1.181E+01</td>
<td>4.509E+01</td>
<td>2.845E+01</td>
<td>1.176E+00</td>
<td>2.494E+01</td>
<td>1.306E+01</td>
<td>7.169E+00</td>
<td>1.607E+01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuation of table C.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>North polar average</th>
<th>South polar average</th>
<th>Total polar average</th>
<th>Southern mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Northern mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Total mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Equatorial average</th>
<th>Global average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S40</td>
<td>7.996E+01</td>
<td>7.996E+01</td>
<td>7.996E+01</td>
<td>2.182E+01</td>
<td>2.896E+01</td>
<td>2.539E+01</td>
<td>1.200E+01</td>
<td>3.992E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S41</td>
<td>7.996E+01</td>
<td>7.996E+01</td>
<td>7.996E+01</td>
<td>2.183E+01</td>
<td>5.477E+01</td>
<td>3.830E+01</td>
<td>2.706E+01</td>
<td>4.668E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S42</td>
<td>6.681E+01</td>
<td>7.996E+01</td>
<td>7.338E+01</td>
<td>3.950E+00</td>
<td>6.663E+01</td>
<td>3.529E+01</td>
<td>2.761E+01</td>
<td>4.340E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S43</td>
<td>3.341E+00</td>
<td>1.786E+00</td>
<td>2.563E+00</td>
<td>2.928E+00</td>
<td>2.239E+00</td>
<td>2.583E+00</td>
<td>3.768E-02</td>
<td>1.889E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S44</td>
<td>1.686E-02</td>
<td>2.925E-02</td>
<td>2.305E-02</td>
<td>1.082E-02</td>
<td>1.826E-02</td>
<td>1.454E-02</td>
<td>2.456E-02</td>
<td>1.972E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S45</td>
<td>-3.247E-02</td>
<td>3.084E-02</td>
<td>-8.166E-02</td>
<td>5.837E-03</td>
<td>1.446E-02</td>
<td>1.015E-02</td>
<td>6.572E-03</td>
<td>5.229E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S48</td>
<td>2.073E+00</td>
<td>1.227E+00</td>
<td>1.650E+00</td>
<td>1.929E+00</td>
<td>4.490E+00</td>
<td>1.187E+00</td>
<td>8.064E-01</td>
<td>1.297E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S49</td>
<td>1.925E+00</td>
<td>1.682E+00</td>
<td>1.804E+00</td>
<td>3.131E+00</td>
<td>5.008E+00</td>
<td>1.816E+00</td>
<td>1.980E+00</td>
<td>1.970E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S50</td>
<td>2.818E+00</td>
<td>2.818E+00</td>
<td>2.818E+00</td>
<td>2.818E+00</td>
<td>3.184E-01</td>
<td>1.568E+00</td>
<td>4.958E-01</td>
<td>1.761E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S51</td>
<td>2.615E+00</td>
<td>1.154E+00</td>
<td>1.885E+00</td>
<td>2.081E+00</td>
<td>4.772E-01</td>
<td>1.279E+00</td>
<td>7.032E-01</td>
<td>1.374E+00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C.21: Regional average H$_2$O sublimation rates [mm MY$^{-1}$] for each different initial ice porosity scenario (Table VII.IV) across each latitude region (polar, mid-latitude and equatorial) in each hemisphere and averaged over both hemispheres. The final column is the global average sublimation rate for each scenario.
Table C.22: Regional average H$_2$O sublimation rates [mm MY$^{-1}$] for each different subsurface structure scenario (Table VII.IV) across each latitude region (polar, mid-latitude and equatorial) in each hemisphere and averaged over both hemispheres. The final column is the global average sublimation rate for each scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>North polar average</th>
<th>South polar average</th>
<th>Total polar average</th>
<th>Southern mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Northern mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Total mid-latitude average</th>
<th>Equatorial average</th>
<th>Global average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
<td>0.000215</td>
<td>0.000321</td>
<td>0.000268</td>
<td>0.000275</td>
<td>0.00034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS-SS</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.008239</td>
<td>0.005464</td>
<td>0.006851</td>
<td>0.010726</td>
<td>0.011193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS-SS-B</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.00822</td>
<td>0.005624</td>
<td>0.006922</td>
<td>0.012042</td>
<td>0.011655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDS-CDS</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
<td>0.000261</td>
<td>0.000322</td>
<td>0.000292</td>
<td>0.000341</td>
<td>0.00037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR-CDS-B</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
<td>0.000358</td>
<td>0.000412</td>
<td>0.000385</td>
<td>0.000163</td>
<td>0.000342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR-FDS</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
<td>0.000477</td>
<td>0.00028</td>
<td>0.00032</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.000268</td>
<td>0.000348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>