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Abstract

The discovery of 248 dated impact sites known to have formed within the last few decades allows us to refine the current cratering rate and slope of the production function at Mars. We use a subset of 44 of these new craters that were imaged before and after impact by Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter’s Context Camera – a thoroughly searched data set that minimizes biases from variable image resolutions. We find the current impact rate is 1.65 × 10−6 craters with an effective diameter ≥3.9 m/km2/yr, with a differential slope (power-law exponent) of −2.45 ± 0.36. This results in model ages that are factors of three to five below the Hartmann (Hartmann, W.K. [2005]. Icarus 174, 294–320) and Neukum et al. (Neukum, G., Ivanov, B.A., Hartmann, W.K. [2001], Space Sci. Rev. 96, 55–86)/Ivanov (Ivanov, B.A. [2001], Space Sci. Rev. 96, 87–104) model production functions where they overlap in diameter. The best-fit production function we measure has a shallower slope than model functions at these sizes, but model function slopes are within the statistical errors. More than half of the impacts in this size range form clusters, which is another reason to use caution when estimating surface ages using craters smaller than ~50 m in diameter.
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1. Introduction

Nearly all planetary bodies show the scars of impact bombardment. The most visible cases are ancient, landscape-altering features, but the population of impacting material extends to the present day, and very small sizes. The relative abundances of craters have long been used to estimate crater retention ages for planetary surfaces, providing a minimum age for emplacement of major geologic units. This method assumes a spatially randomized impact flux, a calibrated size distribution of impactors, the preservation of every crater, and a temporally randomized flux over short timescales but a known (or modeled) temporal variation over long timescales. The return of dateable samples from the Moon (summary in Wilhelms et al. (1987)) led to the assignment of absolute ages to lunar crater counts (e.g. Baldwin, 1985; Neukum and Ivanov, 1994; Stöffler and Ryder, 2001). The dated samples probably correspond to the landscape’s crater retention ages in the case of the lunar maria, where voluminous lava outpourings reset the crater retention age and little has happened since, except cratering. These crater age models have in turn been extended to other planetary surfaces in the inner Solar System by applying dynamical models, observations of impacting populations, differences in resulting crater sizes based on gravity and impact velocity (e.g. Ivanov, 2001), and atmospheric corrections in the case of Mars and Venus (e.g. McKinnon et al., 1997; Popova et al., 2003; Hartmann, 2005). The result is a set of cratering chronology models used widely on Mars to obtain absolute ages for landscapes (e.g. Hartmann and Neukum, 2001; Ivanov, 2001; Neukum et al., 2001; Hartmann, 2005 and previous iterations). The comparison of the modern terrestrial impact rate and young (<100 My) martian cratering rate shows the plausibility of this approach (Ivanov, 2006). We lack dated rocks from known locations on Mars, and martian geologic history is much more complicated than that of the lunar maria. Nevertheless, dating landscapes using cratering models combined with superposition relations can provide useful constraints on interpreting the geologic history.

With the presence at Mars of higher-resolution cameras and availability of repeat imaging over time, the present-day martian bombardment rate can now be compared to these model predictions. Given the short time (geologically speaking) over which we have been observing Mars, only the smallest craters can be expected to have formed in statistically significant numbers.

Without absolute ages of rocks linked to specific locations on any Solar System bodies other than the Moon, crater counting is our only tool for measuring other surface ages. Quantifying historical bombardment can be problematic, even with dated samples (e.g. controversy over a possible ancient lunar cataclysm (e.g. Tera et al., 1974; Cohen et al., 2000; Hartmann, 1975, 2003). However,
we now have definitive data on the modern impact rate at Mars, which we present here.

In addition, there has been much debate over the relative contributions of secondary versus primary craters at small crater sizes (e.g., Shoemaker, 1965; McEwen et al., 2005; McEwen and Bierhaus, 2006; Hartmann, 2007; Werner et al., 2009; Robbins and Hynek, 2011; Xiao and Strom, 2012), but we now have data on a set of craters known to represent only primary impactors.

Malin et al. (2006) reported 20 new impact sites found in a campaign of images from the Mars Orbiter Camera (MOC) on the Mars Global Surveyor. A 21,506,629 km² area of Mars was imaged twice with the wide-angle camera at 230 m/pixel scale, ~7 years apart. The survey was restricted to dust-mantled regions, where new impacts create dark spots (“blast zones”) much larger than the crater and its ejecta. This survey found a set of 44 new dark spots; follow-up narrow-angle ~1.5 m/pixel MOC images led to the verification of 20 new impact sites that formed at various times within that period. Of those 20, the largest crater (their Site 17) was later discovered by HiRISE to contain aeolian bedforms, indicating that impact is unlikely to be as young as 7 years (Bridges et al., 2007; McEwen et al., 2007b; Golombek et al., 2010). Even excluding that site, the largest craters from that study still provided a fairly good comparison to the model isochrons of Hartmann (2005). The results indicated that the cratering rate over those 7 years roughly matched the Hartmann chronology model at ~20–30 m diameters (D) (Fig. 4). When a postulated correction to the scaled area was made to account for the statistically non-random distribution of those new impacts, the match at D ~ 20–30 m was even better (Kreslavsky, 2007). That non-random distribution could have been due to some areas within the dust-covered survey area being less likely to form dark spots. This analysis should be revisited with our new dataset with >100 x the number of craters, as some of the former voids now contain new dark spots with craters. Note that the slope of the observed size-frequency distribution (SFD) was much “shallower” than model predictions, with fewer craters at smaller sizes, thought to be due to incomplete discoveries at small sizes (Malin et al., 2006).

In the years since, we have the added benefit of continuing repeat coverage of much of Mars, in addition to much higher-resolution imagery with which to follow up on continuing discoveries. We can now extend that test to a larger data set and smaller craters. As of February 2012, a total of 248 new impact sites have been confirmed by the High Resolution Imaging Science Experiment (HiRISE) (McEwen et al., 2007a, 2010) following their discovery by the Context Camera (CTX) (Malin et al., 2007), both on the Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter (MRO). This includes confirmation of the apparent youth of 19 of the 20 impact sites on Mars detected by Malin et al. (2006).

These impact events have occurred within the last few decades, as indicated by the absence of associated dark spots in previous images. Some of these sites have been described elsewhere (McEwen et al., 2007b, 2007c; Ivanov et al., 2008, 2009, 2010; Byrne et al., 2009; Daubar et al., 2010, 2011; Daubar and McEwen, 2009; Kennedy and Malin, 2009). This work is a summary of the new impact findings through February 2012, with a new technique to directly measure the production function (PF). As discoveries (and impacts) are ongoing, we expect this work will continue to be refined in the coming years.

2. Detection of new impacts

In our current study, possible new impact sites are initially recognized by the presence of characteristic dark spots seen in CTX images (Fig. 1). If the dark spots are not present in previous imagery of sufficient quality and resolution (drawing from various data sets spanning 30 years of martian exploration), it is considered a candidate new impact site. HiRISE then follows up on these sites to confirm a very recent impact origin, using criteria of sharp craters present with no sign of modification by aeolian or other processes, except for wind streaks, which can plausibly form in a few years since the impact event. The blast zones used for the initial detection are one to two orders of magnitude larger in diameter than the crater itself (Ivanov et al., 2010). This is fortunate since searching for new meter-size craters in HiRISE images alone would be impractical due to the limited area that could possibly be covered repeatedly at high resolution.

We interpret the dark spots as being formed by removal or redistribution of surface dust in the impact blast. Because this process is key to the initial identification of candidate new impact sites, the data set has an obvious spatial bias toward the dustiest areas of Mars (Amazonis, Tharsis and Arabia regions) (Fig. 3). This bias is accounted for by scaling the results to only those areas with repeat coverage and a minimum amount of dust cover. Only a few of the new impact sites are outside of these especially dusty regions. Conceivably, impacts onto some bright dusty areas might not actually make dark spots, so it is possible we are undercounting new impacts in these areas. It is also possible that some deep dust deposits have an albedo at depth similar to that of the surface, so an impact blast would not create a detectable dark spot. However, it is unlikely that large numbers of new impacts are not creating dark spots in these regions: some bright areas might be indurated dust, but this leads to a higher thermal inertia, whereas these regions have uniformly low thermal inertia (Christensen et al., 2001).

3. Description of impact sites

Detailed information about all 248 sites is presented in Supplemental Table 1, including the 19 sites discovered by (Malin et al., 2006) and confirmed by HiRISE. A number of unconfirmed sites were unable to be verified either as definitely new or definitely impact-related (Supplemental Table 2). Although their locations are for the most part confined to the dustiest areas of Mars (Fig. 3), diverse types of target material within those areas contribute to the wide variations in crater and ejecta morphologies and albedo patterns (Fig. 2).

Of the 248 new impact sites, 56% of them comprise clusters of individual craters. Here the impactor probably fragmented in the martian atmosphere before impacting the surface. These can be distinguished from secondary craters by their circular planforms, higher depth/diameter ratios than typical for secondaries (Daubar and McEwen, 2009), and the fact that they are not located in rays or sub-clusters radially extending from a central impact. In comparison, Malin et al. (2006) found only ~35% of their new impacts to be clusters. The discrepancy is most likely due to improved statistics and resolution. HiRISE can resolve individual craters in cases where the MOC NA only detected dark spots, for example Site 2 in Malin et al. (2006). We are able to find smaller impact sites with CTX versus MOC WA, but smaller bouldies are not necessarily more likely to fragment (Popova et al., 2011). It is possible, although unlikely, that more recent impacts have differing source impactor populations with different bulk strengths or collisional histories, for example, which would affect their breakup in the atmosphere (e.g., Popova et al., 2007). Spikes in the impact flux on short timescales have been described in the lunar (Öberst and Nakamura, 1991) and terrestrial (Zappala et al., 1998) impact histories.

The smallest individual craters HiRISE can resolve are about 0.75 m (3 pixels) in diameter, but in practice, we find many craters <1 m diameter are too indistinct to reliably measure. Counts might be incomplete for craters up to several meters in diameter due to...
the detection technique (see Section 5.1). Golombek et al. (2008) considered HiRISE boulder counts to be complete above ~2 m diameter, so crater completeness might be similar due to image limitations (resolution, signal:noise ratio [SNR], background contrast, overlapping craters).

Several sites with newly-appearing dark spots lack visible craters in HiRISE follow-up images, although a blast zone pattern typical of other new impact sites is present (see Supplemental Table 2). We interpret these to be either aeolian redistribution and/or removal of surficial dust; or “airbursts” like the terrestrial Tunguska event (Kulik, 1927; translation Wiens and La Paz, 1935) or impact-related “radar-dark” spots on Venus (McKinnon et al., 1997), where the impactor was largely destroyed by its passage through the atmosphere, but the shock wave and small objects reached the surface and disturbed dust in a process similar to that which occurred at the sites with detected craters. There are several possible explanations for the lack of detected craters at these sites: the resulting fragments were so small that nothing large enough to form a detectable crater (>0.75 m diameter) survived to reach the surface; the individual fragments were decelerated to the point that craters did not form; or they did form, but the resulting craters are below the resolution limit of the data. There is also a possibility that these are older impact sites with unresolved craters and either “reactivated” dark spots, or with lower-quality or hazy “before” images that prevented older dark spots from being noticed. We consider it more likely that these are new airburst locations because the patterns in the dark spots are similar to our confirmed impact sites, not streaky like wind-blown patches. Regardless, we do not include these in our statistics since they have not been confirmed as impact-related in origin, and we have only an upper limit on the possible size of the craters.

In many cases, high-resolution images reveal intricate patterns in the blast zones that surround the new impact craters (Fig. 1). These patterns cannot be explained by normal ejecta dynamics, but might be described by the interaction of impact-related atmospheric shock waves (Malin et al., 2006; Ivanov et al., 2010;
This supports the hypothesis that the lowering of albedo forming the dark spots is due to removal or redistribution of a thin layer of bright dust (Malin et al., 2006). At some sites, meter-scale dust avalanches, presumably caused by the impact, surround the crater. These contribute to the decrease in overall albedo (Burleigh et al., 2012).

Several candidate sites, including one of the original twenty reported in Malin et al. (2006), have been found to contain aeolian bedforms or other signs of advanced age when examined at high resolution (Bridges et al., 2007; McEwen et al., 2007b). Although ripple and dune movement has been observed recently over timescales of months to years (e.g., Silvestro et al., 2010; Chojnacki et al., 2011; Bridges et al., 2012a, 2012b), the formation of new bedforms has not been observed over short timescales away from existing aeolian landforms. New ripples have been seen to form in less than 1 Mars year on fresh dune-gully aprons (Dundas et al., 2012), but they require strong winds and a large amount of unconsolidated sand-sized sediment. A new impact might produce some sand-sized material (although these new craters do not produce much ejecta in general) and act as a sink for loose material, but we have seen no evidence for this in monitoring the new impact sites over several martian years (Dubar et al., 2012). Thus craters containing well-developed bedforms are most likely older than a few decades and are not included in this study.

In contrast to the apparent emergence of dark spots in the few cases where aeolian bedforms are present, it is possible that these dark spots have been recently uncovered by aeolian activity, or that they might have been obscured by atmospheric dust or haze in the previous image. It would take as little as 40 μm of dust re-deposition to decrease the albedo to that of surrounding dust (Fischer and Pieters, 1993). A layer of dust that thin could take a short amount of time (a few martian years or decades) to deposit from airfall. Dust devil activity, the tracks of which are seen at some sites, might also contribute to changing surface albedos over short time scales. In comparison, erasure of tracks from the Mars Exploration Rovers Spirit and Opportunity has occurred over timescales of only one martian year (Geissler et al., 2010).

Fig. 2. Selected examples of new dated impact sites, showing a wide variety of crater and ejecta morphologies, color and albedo patterns. HiRISE observation IDs are indicated; scale bars are all 50 m. For coordinates and other details, see Supplemental information. Color images are enhanced RGB or IRB; black and white are RED filter. See McEwen et al. (2010) for more information on HiRISE data products. Images have been stretched for contrast, and north is up in all images. HiRISE images are available from the Planetary Data System or http://hirise.lpl.arizona.edu. Images: NASA/JPL/University of Arizona. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
because they formed at different times, in widespread locations across the planet. No new large craters have been found that could be the potential primary or primaries if these were secondaries; such a new crater would almost certainly have been detected by at least one of the eight cameras orbiting Mars on four spacecraft over the past decade. In addition, the statistical probability of enough new large impact events occurring within the last decade to explain these as secondaries is extremely low.

4. Methods

4.1. Constraining formation dates

The formation date of each confirmed impact site is constrained using previously-acquired images of Mars. The formation date of the latest image that clearly lacks a dark spot is the “before” image, and the earliest image that is bracketed by the dates of the latest image of sufficient resolution that lacks a dark spot (the “before” image) and the earliest image in which the spot is visible (the “after” image). The after image is not necessarily the discovery image, since after finding a dark spot, previous data are searched for the possibility of tighter time constraints. See Table 1 for constraining images and dates for the 44 impacts with CTX before- and after-images we use to measure the production function, and Supplemental information for data on the remaining new impacts.

4.2. Diameter measurements

Crater diameters were measured from rim to rim in the image processing software package ENVI for Visualization Images (ENVI, 1998). Airbursts and unresolved craters (<3 HiRISE pixels)
were not included. Diameters were measured three times and the results averaged to estimate measurement errors, which were less than a pixel (0.25 m). Craters in clusters were measured individually, down to the limit of the image’s resolution. To approximate the diameter of the crater that would have formed had the impactors not broken up in the atmosphere, effective diameters were calculated for clusters using (Malin et al., 2006; Ivanov et al., 2009):\[
D_{\text{eff}} = \left( \sum_i D_i^3 \right)^{1/3}
\]

This assumes pure “strength” scaling of the individual impacts. Fragmentation modeling indicates that this is a good approximation for \(D_{\text{eff}} \approx 10\) m and larger, while for smaller impactors \(\sim 1\) m, \(D_{\text{eff}}\) is underestimated by \(\sim 15\%\) (Williams et al., 2012).

4.3. Calculating the area–time factor

In order to find the most robust estimate of the current impact rate, we limited the data set to those 44 craters whose formations are constrained by CTX data for both before and after images. This ensures consistent data quality: results are not biased by lower detection limits of other data sets. It also provides some guarantee of completeness, since every CTX image in dusty regions has been examined for new dark spot features.

To understand the current rate of impacts in terms of a production function, an area to which to scale the size–frequency distribution of craters is required. Typically in crater counting, this would be the area over which all craters were counted. However, the CTX–CTX image overlaps vary in time as well as area, so a new approach is needed. Thus, we scale the number of craters in a given diameter size bin by a composite area–time factor (ATF):

\[
\text{ATF} = \sum_i a_i \Delta t_i
\]

The ATF was calculated by dividing the planet into small geographic elements. CTX coverage of each element was queried and the element area (a) was multiplied by the time elapsed between the earliest and most recent images (\(\Delta t\)) at that location. This method ensures that areas covered by more than two images are not double-counted. The sum of all of these area–time products is the effective area covered by every CTX image in a given area, divided by the number of years elapsed between the images, divided by the number of years elapsed between them, or \(1/\text{ATF}\).

5. Results and discussion

5.1. Measured current production function and comparison to models

Previously estimated rates of the number of impacts/km²/yr (Kennedy and Malin, 2009; Daubar et al., 2010, 2011) made several simplifying assumptions – most importantly that they were detecting every new impact (larger than some detection limit) that occurred over broadly defined dusty regions of Mars, which is certainly not the case. Our area–time scaling factor takes into account the actual area and time period over which detections were possible, yielding an accurate cratering rate. To compare the detailed size–frequency relationship with established production function models, the diameters (or effective diameters for clusters) of 44 new craters with CTX before- and after-images were binned in standard \(\sqrt{2}\) diameter bins and scaled to the area–time factor discussed above. Comparison with 1-year isochrons from model production functions (Hartmann, 2005; Neukum et al., 2001; Ivanov, 2001) is shown in Fig. 4. The measured production function has \(1.65 \times 10^{-8}\) cumulative craters with \(D \geq 3.9\) m forming per km²/yr. The PF from this method can then be directly compared to ours (Fig. 4).

Our measured cratering rate falls below both of the model production functions except at the largest size bin. (It should be noted the two largest size bins contain only one impact site each.) The least squares fit slope of our new impact differential PF for \(D \geq 3.9\) m is \(-2.45 \pm 0.36\). This is shallower than the best fit slope of either model (the Hartmann (2005) model has a differential slope of \(-3.2\) for \(3.9\) m \(\leq D \leq 31\) m; the Neukum et al. (2001) model has a differential slope of \(-4.2\) for \(16\) m \(\leq D \leq 31\) m). This preliminary result supports the hypothesis that the primary production function for small craters is significantly less “steep” (smaller negative power-law exponent) than that of secondary craters in this size range (e.g., Wilhelms et al., 1987; Xiao and Strom, 2012). However, the statistical error bars are large and we cannot reject the hypothesis that either of the model production functions match the slope in this size range, although it is unlikely.

The effective diameter calculation underestimates the diameter slightly for the smallest craters (\(~15\%\) at 1 m) (Williams et al., 2012). Correcting for this would yield a slightly steeper SFD for \(D \times 10\) m. For strength-dominated craters like these, target
Fig. 3. Locations of 248 new dated impact sites on Mars, shown on a map of the Thermal Emission Spectrometer dust cover index (Ruff and Christensen, 2002). The 19 sites previously reported in Malin et al. (2006) that have been confirmed are shown, as are the subset of 44 sites constrained by CTX before- and after-imaging. Areas considered in our study are outlined by a contour at a dust cover index of 0.96 and latitude limits of 60°N–60°S (dotted white lines).

Fig. 4. Current martian production function (PF): (a) differential and (b) cumulative size–frequency diagrams of 44 new dated impact sites constrained by CTX images, scaled to the area–time function (ATF) discussed in the text (circles). Models of the 1-year PF from Hartmann (2005) using the chronology function (CF) from Hartmann (2005) as derived by Werner and Tanaka (2011) (solid gray line) and the 1-year PF from Neukum et al. (2001) using the conversion to Mars and CF from Ivanov (2001) (dashed gray line) are shown for comparison. The Malin et al. (2006) sites are also shown (stars), with crater diameters remeasured using HiRISE images, and excluding their Site 17, which is most likely not new. Also shown is the least-squares power law fit for the new impacts for $D > 3.9$ m, which has a slope of $-2.45 \pm 0.36$. For all SFDs presented: Effective diameters were calculated for clusters as discussed in the text, and craters are in $\sqrt{2}$ diameter bins. All plots were created with the Craterstats2 program (Michael and Neukum, 2010; http://hrscview.fu-berlin.de/craterstats.html).
material properties also become important. All of these craters formed in dusty areas, but in some areas the dust is only present as a thin surface layer, while at other sites there might be a significant mantling layer of lower porosity that could be up to meters thick, for example, indurated dust or brecciated bedrock. An impact of a given energy into weaker material produces larger craters (Chapman et al., 1970), an effect that becomes more important for smaller craters (e.g., Dundas et al., 2010). However, target material with high porosity produces smaller craters (Housen and Holsapple, 2003). The potential variation in crater diameter from these uncertainties is ≈20%.

Applying the Hartmann (2005) model to craters with \( D > 3.9 \) m yields a model age of 0.21 ± 0.06 years (the error bars we cite are the standard errors; the actual uncertainties in model ages are much larger, as we hope to demonstrate). In other words, our measured production function differs from the Hartmann model by a factor of 0.21. We use the chronology function from Hartmann (2005) as derived in Werner and Tanaka (2011): \( N(D > 1 \text{ km}) = 4.4246 \times 10^{-14} T^{0.835} - 1 \) + 6.8158 \times 10^{-4} T (where \( T \) is in Gy). The Neukum/Ivanov model (Neukum’s lunar PF as scaled to Mars by Ivanov (2001)) yields 0.29 ± 0.29 years for this data set, using only the three bins \( D > 15.6 \) m where the model and our data overlap. This uses the Ivanov (2001) chronology function: \( N(D > 1 \text{ km}) = 2.68 \times 10^{-16} (e^{0.03T} - 1) + 4.13 \times 10^{-4} T \). Note that comparing even smaller diameters to an extrapolated Neukum/Ivanov model results in an even larger discrepancy. Unlike the Hartmann (2005) iteration, the Neukum PF was constructed for craters large enough not to be affected by the atmospheric passage of the projectile, so it does not include the “Popova correction” (Popova et al., 2003) that Hartmann made in 2005 for ablation during the projectile’s passage through the atmosphere. The Neukum/Ivanov PF thus presents a reasonable upper limit of lunar-derived production flux for a conditional atmosphere-less Mars, so it is unsurprising that it falls above the Hartmann PF at these sizes. Projectiles of the size we are discussing are likely to be affected by atmospheric loss, so the Neukum PF is less appropriate, although we include both for comparison.

5.2. Discussion

Considering the many assumptions needed to produce the model PFs, the agreement between these new impact data and previous model predictions is quite good. This has also been noted about the Malin et al. (2006) results by previous workers (Ivanov and Hartmann, 2007; Hartmann, 2007; Neukum et al., 2010), although our improved statistics and extended range of diameters reveal a divergence between the models and the current measured impact rate that increases at smaller diameter. From our results, one might conclude that model ages based on craters in the 10–50 m size range should be increased by a factor of ≈three (Ivanov/Neukum model) to ≈five (Hartmann model), and even larger factors at smaller diameters. However, the situation is probably not that simple. The difference could be due to several factors in addition to imperfect models:

1. For small craters in the strength regime, the uncertainties in crater scaling due to variations in target strength translate into surprisingly large differences in model crater retention ages (Dundas et al., 2010).

2. It is possible that we could be missing new impacts that do not form detectable dark spots, even in dusty areas. We are near the resolution limits for these sizes, especially below 4 m where the SFD turns over. The relevant limiting detection capability is not HiRISE’s, which would have no problem resolving a 4-m feature, but rather that of the lower-resolution and lower-signal-to-noise data used in the initial discovery of the sites. In this subset of the new craters, the relevant dataset is that of CTX (6 m/pixel) with a typical SNR ~100:1 over bright regions (Malin et al., 2007), but the SNR for surface features can be much lower when the atmospheric opacity is high. Identification is of the dark spot, however, not the crater itself, so a given resolution limit leads to a rollover at a much smaller crater diameter. The 4-m crater diameter rollover corresponds to ~40–400 m dark spots (Ivanov et al., 2010), which would be ~7–70 CTX pixels. Dark spots smaller than 7 pixels might be difficult to recognize in CTX images when the air is dusty or hazy. Also, it’s uncertain how long the dark spots persist, although the majority of non-polar impact sites show few changes when imaged repeatedly over several Mars years.

3. Another factor in the rollover might be atmospheric ablation and deceleration at small sizes. The rollover is close to that predicted by Popova et al. (2003), who calculated atmospheric effects would lead to a depletion of craters <0.3–5 m in diameter. Although the Hartmann, 2005 PF includes a correction for this, it might not be an adequate adjustment, especially for clusters of impacts, which are not considered in Popova et al. (2003). Chapelow and Sharpton (2005) found that even larger diameters are affected by the current martian atmosphere. Their model predicts a reduction in the SFD (mostly due to diameter “bin-hopping” as impactors are reduced in size) by an order of magnitude at \( D < 3 \) m. Atmospheric effects are less significant with increasing crater diameter, becoming negligible for \( D > 100 \) m. This is roughly the type of discrepancy we see between our observed PF and the Neukum/Ivanov model (Fig. 4), which is based on an airless lunar cratering record. However, Chapelow and Sharpton (2005) also predicted very little fragmentation in the current atmosphere, which is very different from the 56% fragmentation that we observe, so that model might not be describing all of the relevant processes. Ablation should affect clusters more strongly: all other things being equal, individual fragments would be expected to experience more relative ablation per unit volume than an unbroken impactor, since mass loss due to ablation is proportional to cross-sectional area (e.g. Allen and James, 1964). Small bodies would also be decelerated more since they have larger surface area to mass ratios. In addition, the vertical impact velocity is reduced by atmospheric breakup, due to the addition of some amount of transverse velocity (Artemieva and Shuvalov, 2001), although this is probably a very small effect. Lastly, if fragment sizes or velocities result in crater sizes below HiRISE resolution, we would expect to see reduced effective diameters due to the omission of the smallest craters. This is, however, a small effect due to the cubed contribution of individual diameters in a cluster, so there would need to be a very large number of unresolved craters to have a significant impact on the summed effective diameter. The SFD of individual craters within clusters varies significantly from cluster to cluster, but the overall differential slope of individual craters at all of the CTX–CTX sites is ~3.07 (Fig. 6). If that slope extends to smaller sizes, unresolved craters might make a significant contribution to the effective diameter. If any of these three effects were significant, the effect would be seen at the smallest-diameter end of the SFD, which would be deficient for clusters relative to single-crater sites. There is some indication of this at diameters less than 4 m (Fig. 5), but the statistics are not very robust. The SFDs for clusters’ effective crater diameters and single-crater site diameters are within the error bars of each other, indicating that there is not a strong reduction of effective diameters for clusters due to atmospheric or other...
effects. Differences between the two data sets are probably due to insufficient sampling. If the slightly lower number of cluster sites at the smallest diameters is real, however, it could be due to atmospheric or resolution effects affecting fragments more strongly than unbroken impactors.

(4) The discrepancy between measured and model production functions might also be due to the contribution of secondaries to models based on older surfaces. The Hartmann model explicitly includes “spatially random” secondaries, whereas the Neukenm model excludes “obvious” secondaries (hence, probably also includes spatially random secondaries). Our measured PF is based on a population of known primaries, so any secondary contamination is excluded. Distant secondaries are more spatially random and are difficult to identify as secondaries; we know that distant secondaries are abundant on the Moon, Mars (e.g., McEwen and Bierhaus, 2006), and Mercury (Strom et al., 2011). A close match to the model might suggest that the model isochrones do not in fact have significant unaccounted-for secondary contamination at these sizes, if the present cratering rate matches that over the past ~3 Gy. Thus the amount by which our measurements are below the model PFs could represent the contribution from distant secondaries.

Our best-fit SFD slope supports the hypothesis that small primary craters have a “flatter” (smaller negative power-law exponent) SFD than that of unrecognized secondaries and primaries combined. This idea was first presented (and rejected) by Shoemaker (1965), but has been championed by subsequent workers (e.g., Wilhelms et al., 1987; Xiao and Strom, 2012). Our primary SFD for Mars can also be compared to those on small bodies unlikely to be contaminated by secondaries due to their low escape velocities. The martian satellites both have slightly steeper differential slopes of ~2.9 for craters 44 m to 10 km (Phobos) and 31 m to 1.8 km (Deimos) (Thomas and Veverka, 1980). The main-belt asteroid Gaspra exhibits an even steeper fresh-crater SFD, with a differential slope of ~4.3 for 0.2–0.6 km diameter craters (Chapman et al., 1996). These differences could represent differing impact populations within the main belt, a greater level of atmospheric filtering on Mars than previously modeled, or just a difference in slope at the diameters we are studying, since no previous studies have included craters this small.

(5) Another possible explanation for misfit of models to the data is variation over relatively short timescales of the SFD of the primary population, which could vary as a function of asteroidal impacts, breakup, and subsequent orbital evolution including the Yarkovsky effect.

(6) Lastly, in our study, clusters of craters representing a single impact event are easily identifiable, whereas an examination of the same scene without the unifying dark spot surrounding the cluster might result in craters within a cluster being mistaken for individual primaries. This would steepen the slope of the SFD and mistakenly increase the resulting model age. Fig. 6 demonstrates the resulting SFD one might measure if the shared impact origins of clusters were unknown, for example if before/after images were not available, or if the dark spot surrounding the cluster had faded. The slope of the differential SFD is steepened from ~2.45 to ~3.07 ± 0.14 (including smaller diameters, 1.9 m < D < 12 m), and the resulting model age is increased by more than a factor of two, from to 0.21 to 0.48 ± 0.07 years (Hartmann, 2005, same model as discussed in Section 4.1). The rollover also occurs at smaller sizes, since the limiting resolution in that case is HiRISE’s 0.25-cm pixel scale rather than that of lower-resolution imaging used to initially identify new dark spots. This implies that craters of the size we are considering – smaller than ~30 m diameter – cannot be used for dating unless the error bars are adjusted accordingly.

In summary, our results do not disprove the model PFs of Neukenm et al. (2001) and Hartmann (2005), but they do show that order-of-magnitude uncertainties persist, especially at small diameters.

### 5.3. Is the current cratering rate representative of geologic time?

If the best-fit SFD slope we observe, which is shallower than model PFs, is extrapolated to larger craters, the conclusion would be that the current cratering rate is higher than model predictions for craters larger than D ~ 25 m – models which are based on long-term trends over geologic time. Whether or not the current rate is close to the long-term average is unknown. It could be, if the present-day PF (including secondaries) is actually as steep as the models from ~10 m to 1 km sizes, but we have no new kilometer-diameter craters with which to test that. If today’s production function is in fact shallower, then we must be in the midst of a higher-than-average cratering rate, perhaps a short-term spike related to recent asteroidal collisions. Improved statistics, expected over the next few years of continued observations by MRO, are needed to verify the present-day SFD slope.

Another problem with comparing the current impact rate with the historical one is the periodic cycling of Mars’s orbital eccentricity (Ivanov, 2001). This could affect the impact rate over time, as the amount of time the planet spends in proximity to the main asteroid belt changes. The current eccentricity of the martian orbit (e ~ 0.09) is large in comparison with the long-term (> a few My) average value of e ~ 0.05 (e.g., Armstrong et al., 2004; Laskar et al., 2004) (known because of the chaotic nature of the variation).
If one assumes the stable Mars-crossers’ orbital configurations, it means that the long-term averaged impact rate is a factor of about two less than the modern impact rate we measure (Ivanov, 2001; Ivanov and Hartmann, 2007). If this is the case, the discrepancy between ages derived from the present-day impact rate and model PFs increases by another factor of two, to about an order of magnitude for 4–50 m craters.

6. Conclusions

New meter- to decameter-sized craters on Mars are currently forming at a measurable rate: 1.65 × 10^6 craters with effective D > 3.9 m/km²/yr. The modern production function is lower than model production functions commonly used to estimate crater retention ages on Mars. The current PF results in model ages that are lower by a factor of ~three than the Neukum et al. (2001) model, and a factor of ~five lower than the Hartmann (2005) model. This is within the proposed error bars of a factor of 10 that Hartmann puts on model age estimates using craters smaller than ~100 m in diameter (Hartmann, 2005). When long-term variation in orbital eccentricity is taken into account, we estimate the discrepancy is an order of magnitude. It is surprising that we find even this close of a match, however, given the origins of the models – they have been extrapolated from the lunar cratering record for larger craters (much larger in the case of Hartmann) and extended to a different planet! The near-agreement might yet be an accident if the current impact rate is not close to typical of geologic time, i.e. we cannot rule out short-term fluctuations smaller than an order of magnitude. It is too early to say whether our new observations can be reliably compared with small crater populations on older surfaces. Future multi-decade observations of larger crater formation will improve our knowledge of the primary cratering SFD on Mars. Until then, the published martian isochrons should be used with great caution for small craters. Our current impact rate statistics provide the best empirical isochrons, but they still include uncertainties of at least an order of magnitude.

Acknowledgments

This study could not have been done without the help of the HiRISE and CTX operations teams who meticulously searched images for dark spots and carefully planned coordinated follow-up observations. We are grateful to Colin Dundas for helpful comments. Stephanie Werner and an anonymous reviewer provided constructive reviews. Many thanks to Greg Michael for answering numerous questions about the workings of the Craterstats program. This work was funded by the NASA Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter project.

Appendix A. Supplementary material

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2013.04.009.

References
