Aqueous alteration processes in Jezero crater, Mars—implications for organic geochemistry
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The Perseverance rover landed in Jezero crater, Mars in February 2021. We used the Scanning Habitable Environments with Raman and Luminescence for Organics and Chemicals (SHERLOC) instrument to perform deep ultraviolet Raman and fluorescence spectroscopy of three rocks within the crater. We identify evidence for two distinct ancient aqueous environments at different times. Reactions with liquid water formed carbonates in an olivine-rich igneous rock. A sulfate-perchlorate mixture is present in the rocks, probably formed by later modifications of the rocks by brine. Fluorescence signatures consistent with aromatic organic compounds occur throughout these rocks, preserved in minerals related to both aqueous environments.

The Perseverance rover landed in Jezero crater, Mars to investigate the geology of the crater, identify habitable environments, assess whether life ever existed on Mars, and to collect samples for potential return to Earth (1). Jezero hosted an open-basin lake during the Noachian era (~3.7 Ga) (1, 2), contains geologic units associated with the largest carbonate deposit identified on Mars (2–4), and contains a well-preserved delta with clay and carbonate-bearing sediments, which might contain organics (1). Organics have previously been detected on Mars (5, 6).
We investigated the spatial and mineralogical context of organics in Jezero crater using the rover’s SHERLOC instrument (Scanning Habitable Environments with Raman and Luminescence for Organics and Chemicals), a deep-ultraviolet fluorescence and Raman spectrometer capable of mapping organic and mineral composition with a spatial resolution of 100 μm (7). Complementary elemental chemistry analyses were performed using the PIXL (Planetary Instrument for X-ray Lithochemistry) (8–11) and SuperCam instruments (9).

We identify organics and aqueously formed minerals at Jezero crater in three rock targets (8) analyzed during the first 208 Martian days of the mission (Fig. 1) located in two different geological units within the floor of Jezero crater (9, 12). The Garde target is from the altered ultramafic Séítah Formation (FM), orbitally mapped as the Crater Floor Fractured 1 unit (CF-f1) (Fig. 1) (9, 12). The Guillaume and Bellegarde targets are from the overlying and therefore younger basaltic Máaz FM, orbitally mapped as the ~2.3-2.6 Ga (13) Crater Floor Fractured Rough unit (CF-fr) (9, 12). The Perseverance rover drilled four rock samples from the Séítah FM. Two drilled rock samples were obtained from the Bellegarde rock, while the Guillaume drilled rock sample attempt, Rouxion, failed (12). These six rock samples are planned to be returned to Earth.

All three Raman spectral scans (8) from Garde exhibit strong peaks at Raman shifts between 1080 and 1090 cm⁻¹ (investigated in 38 separate scan points) attributed to carbonate [spectrum 1 and region of interest (ROI) 1-4 in Fig. 2H], and peaks with a peak position range of 820 to 840 cm⁻¹ (n=60) attributed to olivine (ROI 1 and 4 in Fig. 2H) (8, 13, 14). Olivines were found to be more Fe-rich than laboratory measured olivines with forsterite numbers [defined as Mg/(Mg + Fe²⁺) × 100] of 80-90 (13), while carbonates are likely mixed Fe- and Mg-species based on 1080-1087 cm⁻¹ peak positions (8), and Ca-dominated species are excluded based on PIXL data (11). These spectral detections were overlaid on Wide-Angle Topographic Sensor for Operations and eNgineering (WATSON) camera images to compare spectral positions with textures (8). Olivine and carbonate are associated with μm- to mm-sized light-toned tan, reddish-brown, and dark-toned sub-angular grains as well as light-toned intergranular spaces (Fig. 2, B and E). Spectral features of olivines and carbonates often co-occur in a single spectrum; however, there are also areas where either olivine or carbonate occur independently. Spectral observations of a weak, broad Raman peak centered ~1060 cm⁻¹ (FWHM ~200 cm⁻¹) could indicate a disordered phase consistent with amorphous silicates, which is often difficult to detect given the low band intensity (Fig. 2). A peak at 960 ± 5 cm⁻¹ is likely phosphate, although perchlorates cannot be excluded (Fig. 2).

Garde detail scans (8) exhibit strong fluorescence signatures, centered at ~340 nm, that spatially correlate with carbonate, probable phosphate, and amorphous silicate spectra localized within narrow intergranular spaces (Fig. 2, E and F). A less intense fluorescence band centered at 285 nm typically accompanies the 340 nm fluorescence. Other areas exhibit no fluorescence (Fig. 2C).

Guillaume features white and reddish brown patches, 1-2 mm across, that do not have well-formed crystal faces (Fig. 3A and fig. S1). These are secondary minerals within a basaltic igneous rock (9), which we interpret as void fills, that correlate with sulfate and perchlorate spectra. Spectra with high intensity 950-955 cm⁻¹ peaks and minor 1090-1095 cm⁻¹ and 1150-1155 cm⁻¹ peaks match laboratory measurements of anhydrous Na-perchlorate (8) (Fig. 3G and fig. S4). Two strong Na-perchlorate detections correlate with centers of the brightest material within the anhedral patches (8). Guillaume spectra commonly contain a single low-intensity peak positioned at 950-955 cm⁻¹. We interpret these as low intensity Na-perchlorate peaks, although the cation species is uncertain due to a lack of resolvable minor peaks (8) (Fig. 3G). Other spectra exhibit both 950-955 cm⁻¹ peaks and equally strong 1010-1020 cm⁻¹ peaks, with low intensity broad features at 1120 ± 5 cm⁻¹, and occasional broad 3450 ± 5 cm⁻¹ hydration features, consistent with a mixture of sulfate and perchlorate that is minimally hydrated (Fig. 3G). A Ca-sulfate species best explains these spectra when coupled with elemental chemistry data from PIXL and SuperCam (8). Two detected 965 cm⁻¹ peaks are likely phosphates, although perchlorates cannot be excluded.

Bellegarde contains white 0.5-1 mm secondary crystals with well-formed and sharp crystal faces and reddish brown semi-isopachous rims (8) (fig. S2). We interpret these as void fills within a basaltic igneous rock. These crystals exhibit 1010-1020 cm⁻¹ peaks, similarly attributed to Ca-sulfate when coupled with elemental chemistry data (8). Several of the sulfate peaks are also associated with a narrow low-intensity hydration feature at 3560 ± 5 cm⁻¹, consistent with hydrated Ca-sulfates (fig. S3). The Bellegarde target contains a single 1080 ± 5 cm⁻¹ peak of possible Ca-carbonate (Fig. 4 and fig. S2). Narrow peaks at 975 cm⁻¹ peak could not definitively be identified and could be phosphate or perchlorate (8). The SHERLOC mineral detections within the Bellegarde and Guillaume targets are consistent with the results from other Perseverance instruments (8, 9, 11) (figs. S5 and S6).

Guillaume and Bellegarde targets commonly exhibit a weak, broad fluorescence feature with a maximum at ~340 nm (Figs. 3D and 4D) that appears to be widely distributed across each surface and is occasionally correlated with reddish-brown materials. Although this feature sometimes co-occurs with perchlorate, sulfate, and possibly phosphate, it occurs equally often in areas with unidentified mineralogy. Bellegarde has two other signatures at ~275 and ~305 nm.
(Fig. 4D), which are strong and localized on specific, light-toned features. The ~305 nm signature is associated with detected sulfate (Fig. 4, D to F, and fig. S2). In Guillaumes, a second fluorescence signature at ~275 nm (Fig. 3D) is observed in two locations, approximately 300 μm in diameter, coincident with previous SuperCam laser spots (8).

Observation of olivine and carbonate mixtures within the Garde target of the Séítah Fm is consistent with orbital infrared observations (2–4) and substantiated by multiple lines of evidence (9–11). Previously proposed hypotheses for the precipitation of these carbonates include low-temperature and high-temperature aqueous alteration of olivine-rich igneous materials, which we will subsequently refer to as ultramafic protolith (3, 15–17), or precipitation from lake or groundwater (4, 15–17). Our 10-100 μm-scale textural and spectroscopic evidence supports carbonate formation through aqueous alteration of an ultramafic protolith, known as carbonation. The supporting evidence includes: (i) Carbonation cation compositions consistent with those of olivines, suggesting mixed Fe- and Mg-olivine gave rise to mixed Fe- and Mg-carbonates, similar to on Earth and within Martian meteorites (16, 18, 19). (ii) The observed carbonates co-occur with hydrated materials (9) and potentially aqueously formed amorphous silicates and phosphate. (iii) The spectral and textural variation of olivine and carbonate dominated zones within both primary grains and intergranular spaces are expected for carbonated ultramafic protoliths on Earth (16) and within Martian meteorites (18, 19).

These observations suggest that the degree of aqueous alteration to the ultramafic protolith was not pervasive, because large olivine-rich domains remain intact. In contrast, the alteration of the primary lithology is pervasive and occurs throughout (not in specific spatial domains e.g., fractures). In ultramafic alteration environments on Earth (16) and in Martian meteorites (18, 19), carbonation can be associated with the formation of oxides, hydroxides, and/or Fe/Mg-rich phyllosilicates, which have not been observed (9). Carbonation can occur in a wide range of temperatures from low to ambient to hydrothermal/metamorphic (15–17). Other alteration minerals, such as serpentine, have not been definitively observed in the Séítah Fm to date, which could suggest time limited interactions, low water rock ratios, or ambient fluid temperatures during carbonation (3, 15–17).

The similarity between the mineralogy of the Garde target in the Séítah Fm to the surrounding widespread, regional olivine-carbonate-bearing unit with a similar orbital spectroscopic signature and geomorphological texture (3, 4, 15, 16) suggests that carbonation of olivine may have occurred throughout this extensive region on ancient Mars (~2.7–3.8 Ga). These observations parallel those made by the Spirit rover in Gusev Crater (20) and within (1.3–4 Ga) Martian meteorites (18, 19). Modeling has suggested that carbonate deposition could have played a role in the evolution of Mars’ atmosphere (3, 17, 21), but the geological nature of such a depositional mechanism had remained unexplained. Taken together, micron-scale SHERLOC observations of this phenomenon complements previous orbital and meteorite observations and demonstrates alteration of igneous materials resulting in geological deposition of carbonates.

Jezero crater perchlorate detections, like those found by the Phoenix lander (22), have been substantiated using three independent instruments (9). Previous evidence for Martian perchlorates includes observations by the Curiosity rover (23), proposed but later disputed orbital detections (24), and detection within the Tissint meteorite (25). The SHERLOC perchlorate detections differ from previous mission observations because they are observed within the interior of a rock and not on the surface, are related to aqueous processes, and are likely Na-perchlorate [not previously detected Ca-, Fe- or Mg-perchlorates (23)].

Previous hypotheses for perchlorate formation on Mars are (i) irradiation of chlorine-bearing parent minerals (26), (ii) atmospheric oxidation of chlorine species (27), or (iii) formation from brines (25). Perchlorates could also be mobilized in thin films of fluid (23). The Jezero perchlorates form white void-fills within rock interiors, and did not form directly on the surface as expected from materials formed by cosmic irradiation or atmospheric oxidation, indicating either formation or mobilization through briny fluids after basalt formation. The concomitant detection of sulfates and perchlorates within the Guillaumes target suggests that sulfate formed together with perchlorate or parent chlorine-bearing species, such as halite, within percolating briny waters that were then subsequently oxidized to perchlorate. Bellegarde exhibited sulfate without perchlorate, suggesting these brines did not precipitate chlorine-bearing parent species, that perchlorate formation was not pervasive, or that perchlorates were since dissolved. perchlorates are easily dissolved and therefore perchlorates likely formed when these rocks were last exposed to liquid water. Perchlorate and sulfate detections within the stratigraphically younger Máaz Fm (9) substantiates an aqueous environment on Mars that occurred separately from the stratigraphically older (9) Séítah Fm carbonation environment.

Deep ultraviolet (DUV) fluorescence is particularly sensitive to aromatic organic compounds, and the fluorescence signatures observed in all three targets are consistent with emission from aromatic organic compounds containing 1 or 2 fused aromatic rings and/or aromatic heterocycles (7, 8, 28) (fig. S7). Although fluorescence signatures cannot be assigned to specific organic compounds, the ∼340 nm fluorescence is consistent with a base structure of 2-ring aromatic organics like naphthalene, whereas ∼275–285 nm fluorescence is more consistent with 1-ring aromatic organics like benzene (8, 28).
The ~305 nm fluorescence could indicate either 1- or 2-ring aromatics, depending on functional groups. We interpret ~305 nm and ~275 nm fluorescence as organics that occurred with sulfates within the Bellegarde target (Fig. 4, D to F), while we interpret ~285 nm fluorescence as organics that occurred with carbonate-phosphate-amorphous silicate alteration zones within the Garde target (Fig. 2) (8). The ~340 nm fluorescence co-occurs with carbonate-phosphate-amorphous silicate alteration zones in Garde but is not associated with particular phases in Guillaume and Bellegarde (8). This phosphate-correlated 340 nm fluorescence could be explained by organics in the same alteration zone, and/or a minor component of fluorescent cerium present within the phosphate (8). In Guillaume and Bellegarde, 340 nm fluorescence is predominantly uncoupled from phosphate detections, suggesting part of this signal is best assigned to organics (8). However, that some or all of the ~340 nm fluorescence signal is from cerium cannot be excluded (8).

When combined with Curiosity observations of organic material in mudstones (29), the presence of organic material in igneous rocks implies a diverse relationship between geological processes and organic compounds on Mars. Several explanations for the presence of Martian organics are possible, e.g., infall of meteoritic material (6), in situ synthesis mechanisms (18, 19, 25), or a putative relic Martian biosphere. The association between organics and sulfate-, phosphate-, perchlorate-, carbonate-, and amorphous silicate-bearing mineralogy, as well as alteration textures, suggests that aqueous alteration of igneous rocks could have played a role in the preservation (or synthesis) of these organics, as seen for similar organics-mineral correlations in Martian meteorites (18, 19, 25). However, potentially organic, widespread ~340 nm fluorescence could suggest other processes, such as dust, contributed to detections. Some mineral phase associations might not be apparent due to instrumental limitations (8).

We did not detect Raman peaks consistent with aromatic organic compounds, such as the C=C stretching mode (or G band) around ~1600 cm⁻¹. However, Raman scattered light is several orders of magnitude weaker than fluorescence (8, 28). Organic concentrations were likely insufficient to produce detectable Raman scattering, either due to low original concentration or subsequent degradation. We estimate a range from 5 × 10⁻¹¹ to 3 × 10⁻¹⁰ grams of aromatic organics in localized scan points that encompass an estimated 6 × 10⁻⁷ grams of rock (8). Estimates from the average fluorescence maps suggest a bulk concentration of 0.1 to 10 ppm, with higher concentrations associated with more aqueously altered surfaces (8), consistent with known bulk concentrations of organics, containing one and two ring aromatic species, indigenous to Martian meteorites [11.2 ± 6.9 ppm (18)] and Curiosity rover detections in mudstones [-70 ppbw to 10.6 ± 8.9 ppm (6, 29)].

Collectively, the data show the drilled samples collected by Perseverance from the floor of Jezero crater are likely to contain evidence for carbonation and formation of sulfates and perchlorates. Fluorescence signatures consistent with organics present within these materials indicates an interplay between igneous rocks, aqueous alteration, and organic material on Mars.
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Fig. 1. Rover images of the three abraded targets and their orbital context. (A) Map of orbitally defined geological units within Jezero crater (12), including the Crater Floor Fractured Rough unit (CF-fr) equivalent to the Máaz Fm and the Crater Floor Fractured 1 (CF-f1) unit equivalent to the Séítah Fm. Star shows the landing site, while white circles show the position of the three abraded targets. The locations of (B) and (C) are outlined in black rectangles. [Adapted by permission from Springer Nature Customer Service Center GmbH, Springer Nature Space Sci. Rev. (12), copyright (2020)] (B) Orbital infrared spectroscopy map showing the location of pyroxene- or olivine-bearing materials in the study area from (4). Labels on white circles correspond to (G). (C) HiRISE view of study area (30). (D) Mastcam-Z image showing the Garde patch on the Bastide outcrop. (E) Hazcam image showing the Bellegarde patch on the Rochette rock. (F) Navcam image showing the Guillaumes patch on the Roubion outcrop. (G) WATSON images of abraded targets analyzed in this study. Greyscale images are available in figs. S9 to S11.
Fig. 2. SHERLOC Raman and fluorescence results for the Garde abraded patch. (A) WATSON image. (B) Context image and scan outlines. (C to G) Greyscale version of context image with data superimposed. (C) Fluorescence map showing the intensity of three main features centralized at 340 nm, 305 nm, and 285 nm in red, green, and blue respectively. (D) Raman mineral maps showing the location of detected olivine, carbonate, phosphate, and weak amorphous silicate features. Purple and green outlines indicate regions of interest (ROIs 1-2, numbered in white) were used for spectra shown in (H). (E) Zoom in on (B) shows fluorescence correlation with intergranular spaces (outlined in white lines). (F) Fluorescence map from detail scan. (G) Raman map from detail scan and ROI 3-4 outlines intergranular and mineral domain textures [same legend as in (D)] used in (H). (H) Average ROI and single point (1-2) SHERLOC spectra [positions in (D) and (G)] compared with laboratory measurements. Greyscale images are available in figs. S12 to S15.
Fig. 3. SHERLOC Raman and fluorescence results for the Guillaumes abraded patch. (A) WATSON image. Two SHERLOC scans (yellow outlines) and one PIXL scan (black outline) shown. (B) Context image and scan outlines. (C) Average Raman spectrum compared with laboratory measurements of amorphous silicate, Na-perchlorate, and anhydrite. Laboratory spectral features at 1500-1600 cm\(^{-1}\) are O\(_2\) (vertical, dotted line) and organic contaminants. (D to F) Greyscale version of context image with data superimposed. (D) Fluorescence map showing the intensity of three main features centralized at 340 nm, 305 nm, and 275 nm in red, green, and blue respectively. White circles indicate locations exposed to SuperCam laser shots (8). (E and F) Low and high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) (8) Raman mineral maps showing the locations of detected perchlorate, Ca-sulfate with and without hydration, and 965 cm\(^{-1}\) peaks. (G) Raman spectra [positions indicated with numbers in (E) and (F)] from SHERLOC (1-4) compared with laboratory measurements. Greyscale images are available in figs. S16 to S19.
Fig. 4. SHERLOC Raman and fluorescence results for the Bellegarde abraded patch. (A) WATSON image. (B) Context image and scan outlines. (C) Average Raman spectrum compared with laboratory measurements of amorphous silicate and obsidian. Laboratory spectral features at 1500-1600 cm$^{-1}$ are O$_2$ (vertical, dotted line) and trace organic contaminants. (D to F) Greyscale version of context image with data superimposed. (D) Fluorescence map showing the intensity of three main features centralized at 340 nm, 305 nm, and 275 nm in red, green, and blue respectively. (E and F) Low and high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) (8) Raman mineral maps showing the location of detected Ca-sulfate with and without hydration, carbonate, and 975 cm$^{-1}$ peaks. (G) Raman spectra [positions indicated with numbers in (E) and (F)] from SHERLOC (1-3) compared with laboratory measurements [full hydrated sulfate spectrum in fig. S3 (8)]. Greyscale images are available in figs. S20 to S23.
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