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MARSIS and SHARAD

- MARSIS and SHARAD are synthetic-aperture, orbital sounding radars, carried respectively by ESA’s Mars Express and NASA’s Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter. They work by transmitting a low-frequency radar pulse that is capable of penetrating below the surface, and is reflected by any dielectric discontinuity present in the subsurface.

- MARSIS is capable of transmitting at four different bands between 1.3 MHz and 5.5 MHz, with a 1 MHz bandwidth. SHARAD operates at a central frequency of 20 MHz transmitting a 10 MHz bandwidth.

- Whereas MARSIS is optimized for deep penetration, having detected echoes down to a depth of 3.7 km over the South Polar Layered Deposits, SHARAD is capable of a tenfold-finer vertical resolution, namely 15 m or less, depending on the dielectric constant of the material being sounded.
Getting to know the data

MARSIS and SHARAD data are affected by a number of artifacts:

• Clutter: lateral reflections reaching the radar after nadir echoes, can be taken for subsurface echoes

• Ionosphere dispersion: the echoes become blurred as different frequencies propagate at different speeds

• Multi-path propagation: changes in the refraction index of the ionosphere bend the ray in unexpected ways

• Variation of propagation velocity: within media with a dielectric permittivity greater than 1, it changes the apparent shape of subsurface features
Clutter or subsurface detection?
Data vs. simulations
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MARSIS coverage (cont’d)

• After four years of operations, MARSIS has achieved a 42% coverage of Mars.
• Considering only the night-side orbits, coverage decreases to 30%.
• It was found that 15% (or more) of the surface has characteristics unsuitable to obtain good radar performances.
• Moreover the night coverage of the Northern Hemisphere is very sparse.
MARSIS and SHARAD Subsurface Detections
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Data over the SPLD

- There are areas in the SPLD where subsurface echoes are brighter than surface echoes, in spite of the attenuation resulting from propagation within a dielectric medium.

From Plaut et al. (2007)
Model of surface and subsurface reflections

- We assume that the detected surface and subsurface echoes are specular reflections from plane parallel layers.
- We also assume that dielectric properties are uniform within the layers.
- The peak power of the specular return from the surface is then given by (Porcello et al., 1974) [Eq 1]
- The reflection coefficient at the surface/atmosphere boundary is [Eq 2]
Model of surface and subsurface reflections (2)

- The power reflected from a subsurface specular dielectric interface is given by [Eq 3]
- The subsurface interface reflection coefficient is given by [Eq 4]
- The time delay between echoes is related to the thickness and the relative dielectric constant of the surface layer [Eq 5]
Radar wave propagation in the subsurface

• An electromagnetic wave reflected from the bottom of the SPLD is attenuated and scattered in several ways:
  – Surface scattering from the random rough SPLD surface
  – Attenuation within the dielectric SPLD material
  – Weak reflections within the SPLD due to the variation of dust concentration in ice with depth
  – Volume scattering caused by random variations of dielectric properties of the SPLD
  – Surface scattering from the random rough SPLD bottom.
Values of dielectric permittivity for natural materials

- CO₂ ice \( \varepsilon \approx 2 \)
- H₂O ice \( \varepsilon \approx 3 \)
- H₂O ice mixed with dust \( \varepsilon > 3 \)
- Dry regolith \( \varepsilon > 3 \)
- Dry rock \( \varepsilon \approx 4-10 \)
- Water-bearing rocks or regolith \( \varepsilon > 10 \)
- Liquid water \( \varepsilon \approx 80 \)
Implications for the values of the dielectric permittivity at the base of the SPLD

• Strong echoes imply a large difference between the dielectric permittivity of the SPLD and that of the material beneath the SPLD.

• If the SPLD are mostly made of water ice, then $\varepsilon \approx 3$.

• In this case, to produce a reflection from the bottom of the SPLD that is as strong as the surface reflection, $\varepsilon \approx 10$ for the material beneath the SPLD.
Effects of attenuation and scattering within the SPLD

- Because of the weakening of the radar signal as it propagates through the SPLD, the real dielectric contrast between the SPLD and the underlying material is probably higher, requiring $\varepsilon > 10$ beneath the SPLD.
- Could this imply the presence of liquid water, or is there another explanation?
Summary

• Subsurface layers have been seen by the MARSIS and SHARAD radars only in limited areas of Mars.
• Determination of the composition of subsurface layers is based on the estimate of their dielectric properties.
• A rigorous determination of such properties requires the inversion of the radar signal.
• Many factors can affect the strength of subsurface echoes, and excluding the presence of subsurface liquid water on the basis of existing analyses seems premature.