Studies of the 2018/Mars Year 34 Planet-Encircling Dust Storm

Scott D. Guzewich¹, Anna A. Fedorova², Melinda A Kahre³, and Anthony D. Toigo⁴

¹NASA Goddard Spaceflight Center
 ²Space Research Institute
 ³NASA Ames Research Center
 ⁴Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory

November 23, 2022

Abstract

Mars planet-encircling or global dust storms are an iconic and enigmatic feature of the Red Planet. Occurring every few Mars Years, on average, they are a stochastic process in the otherwise largely repeatable annual cycle of martian weather. In 2018 (Mars Year 34 in the calendar of Clancy et al. [2000]), an international fleet of spacecraft, 6 orbiters and 2 rovers, observed the most recent global dust storm. This introduction and the articles of this special collection describe the evolution and impacts of the storm from the surface to the exosphere, compare this storm to previous global dust storms, identify new phenomena never-before seen in such storms, and attempt to determine how and when global dust storms develop.

Studies of the 2018/Mars Year 34 Planet-Encircling Dust Storm

3 S.D. Guzewich¹, A.A. Fedorova², M.A. Kahre³, A.D. Toigo⁴

- ⁵ ¹NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, USA <u>scott.d.guzewich@nasa.gov</u>
- 6 ²Space Research Institute (IKI), Moscow, Russia
- 7 ³NASA Ames Research Center, Mountain View, CA, USA
- 8 ⁴Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, Laurel, MD, USA

10 ABSTRACT

11 Mars' planet-encircling or global dust storms are an iconic and enigmatic feature of the 12 Red Planet. Occurring every few Mars Years, on average, they are a stochastic process in the 13 otherwise largely repeatable annual cycle of martian weather. In 2018 (Mars Year 34 in the calendar of Clancy et al. [2000]), an international fleet of spacecraft, 6 orbiters and 2 rovers, 14 observed the most recent global dust storm. This introduction and the articles of this special 15 16 collection describe the evolution and impacts of the storm from the surface to the exosphere, 17 compare this storm to previous global dust storms, identify new phenomena never-before seen in 18 such storms, and attempt to determine how and when global dust storms develop.

19

4

9

20 PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

21 Mars' planet-encircling or global dust storms are an iconic and enigmatic feature of the 22 Red Planet. Occurring every few Mars Years, on average, they are a seemingly random process 23 in the otherwise largely repeatable annual cycle of martian weather. In 2018, an international 24 fleet of spacecraft, 6 orbiters and 2 rovers, observed the most recent global dust storm. This 25 introduction and the articles of this special collection describe the evolution and impacts of the 26 storm from the surface to the top of the atmosphere and beyond, compare this storm to previous 27 global dust storms, identify new phenomena never-before seen in such storms, and attempt to 28 determine how and when global dust storms develop.

29

31

30 KEY POINTS

- 6 orbiters and 2 rovers observed the 2018 Mars global dust storm
- The 27 papers of this special collection study the storm with observations, modeling, and
 theory
- 34
- The 2018 storm is the most comprehensively studied Mars global dust storm yet
- 35

36 1. INTRODUCTION

37 Spacecraft observations of martian "planet-encircling" or "global" dust storms extend
38 back to Mariner 9, which famously arrived during the 1971 (Mars Year 9) global dust storm and

watched the storm decay from orbit [Leovy et al., 1971; Conrath et al., 1973; Pang and Hord,
1973]. Later, global dust storms were studied by the Viking orbiters and landers in 1977 (Mars
Year 12) [Briggs et al., 1979; Ryan and Sharman, 1981], Mars Global Surveyor in 2001 (Mars
Year 25) [Smith, 2004], and Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter [Wang and Richardson, 2015;
Guzewich et al., 2017; Heavens et al., 2019a], Mars Odyssey [Smith, 2009], Mars Exploration
Rovers [Lemmon et al., 2015], and Mars Express [Fedorova et al., 2018; Wolkenberg et al., 2020] in 2007 (Mars Year 28).

The global dust storm of 2018 (Mars Year 34) presented an unprecedented opportunity to 46 47 study these rare and fascinating events that are unique in the Solar System. 8 spacecraft were on 48 the surface or in orbit around the planet at the start of the storm, before the fatal reduction in sunlight ended the Opportunity rover's mission more than 14 years after its landing. Prior to its 49 failure, Opportunity recorded the highest visible-band atmospheric dust opacity ever measured 50 51 on the surface of Mars (>10). This special collection reflects studies of this global dust storm 52 from 6 of the remaining 7 spacecraft and Earth-based telescopes that observed the growth, peak, 53 and decay of the storm, and related modeling and theoretical studies to this particular dust storm 54 and martian dust storms in general.

55 56

2. STORM EVOLUTION AND TIMELINE

57 The first confirmed global dust storm was observed by means of ground-based telescopes 58 in Mars Year 1 - 1956 [Martin and Zurek, 1993]. The 2018/Mars Year 34 global dust storm was 59 an equinoctial global dust storm, starting at approximately $L_s = 185^{\circ}$ [Sánchez-Lavega et al., 60 2019; Guzewich et al., 2019; Kass et al., 2019]. This was very nearly the same time of year that 61 the 2001/Mars Year 25 global dust storm began, which represent the two earliest-starting global 62 dust storms on record (Figure 1; Shirley et al., 2020). 63



Figure 1: Figure 3 from Sánchez-Lavega et al. (2019). Maps of the 2018 Global Dust 65 Storm (GDS) expansion and GDS occurrence. Upper: Lambert equal- area projection of 66 Mars, showing the expanding area of the storm from 30 May to 8 June superimposed 67 68 with different colors. The flat colors indicate the core of the storm, and the streaked 69 regions indicate the total area. The purple area on 27 May corresponds to a precursor 70 storm. The arrows indicate the directions followed by the expanding dust. Lower: Mean 71 daily insolation (W/m2) at the top of the atmosphere along a Martian year (adapted from 72 Sánchez- Lavega et al., 2018). The circles in both panels mark the onset location of the 73 confirmed GDSs given in Table S1 from Sánchez-Lavega et al. (2019).

74

75 However, the MY34 storm was unique in its initiation in the northern hemisphere. All 76 previous storms on record have been initiated in the southern hemisphere. This conforms with 77 our (limited) knowledge about how global dust storms develop, which have been generally centered on the peak insolation (and accordingly the warmest and most vigorous atmospheric 78 79 circulation) that Mars experiences each year (Figure 1b). Instead, the MY34 storm grew through 80 a series of precursor storms in the northern hemisphere storm tracks that expanded south slowly toward the equator. Despite this unique feature, there are similarities with the growth trajectory 81 of other global dust storms (such as 2007/Mars Year 28) which may have been initiated by 82 83 "flushing" dust storms that cross the equator from the Acidalia/Chryse Planitia corridor [Wang et al., 2003]. But, the MY34 precursor storms were never truly "flushing" storms in that they never 84 85 directly crossed the equator. Rather, (seemingly) independent southern polar cap edge dust lifting began and eventually merged with the northern hemisphere and equatorial storm region to 86

encircle the planet [Montabone et al., 2020]. This perhaps explains the comparatively
methodical growth and expansion of the MY34 storm relative to previously observed global dust
storms (particularly MY25 and MY28) which underwent explosive growth and expansion in the
period of a few sols. This first growth phase of the storm was centered near Chryse Planitia and
Meridiani Planum, which resulted in the eventual failure of the Opportunity rover.

92 This initial phase of the storm spread dust throughout the northern hemisphere and the growing southern polar cap edge dust lifting regions later sent dust over Gale Crater, where the 93 Mars Science Laboratory Curiosity rover was exploring the Vera Rubin Ridge [Guzewich et al., 94 2019]. It also strengthened the atmospheric circulation and enhanced atmospheric thermal tides, 95 96 which facilitated rapid spread of dust around the planet [Gillespie et al., 2020]. The strengthened Hadley circulation lofted dust to very high altitudes, ~70 km, and led to almost anvil-cloud like 97 distributions of dust in the middle and upper atmosphere. Additionally, this seasonally atypically 98 99 strong Hadley circulation produced dynamical heating of mid-altitude air at high latitudes in both hemispheres due to adiabatic warming in the descending branches of the equinoctial circulation 100 [Shirley et al., 2019]. Indeed, both observations [Kass et al., 2019] and modeling [Bertrand et 101 al., 2020] indicate that the northern hemisphere Hadley circulation remained strong, stronger 102 even than the southern hemisphere Hadley circulation, past the peak of the storm (after $L_s =$ 103 210°). Under typical seasonal evolution, the southern hemisphere circulation would have 104 105 become dominant by that time.

Following this first burst of activity ($\sim L_s = 185-192^\circ$), it seemed plausible that the dust in 106 the atmosphere would begin to settle out of the atmosphere and the MY34 storm would have 107 108 been better defined as a "large regional" dust storm. Heavens et al. [2019b] note that "The 109 altitude of significant dust transport almost declined to prestorm levels..." near $L_s = 194^{\circ}$. This 110 brief pause or reduction in dust lifting can be seen in globally-averaged dust opacity (e.g., figures 111 7 and 10 by Montabone et al. [2020]) as a "knee" or change in slope of the opacity growth curve. But, a secondary "storm within a storm" [Montabone et al., 2020] over Tharsis that began at $L_s =$ 112 113 197° injected massive amounts of dust into the atmosphere and made the storm truly "global" or 114 "planet-encircling." This pause and then secondary expansion from the Tharsis dust lifting can be seen in Figure 2 from Smith [2019] using Mars Odyssey Thermal Emission Spectrometer 115 retrievals of column dust optical depth. 116



Figure 2. Figure 7a from Smith [2019]. THEMIS retrieved dust optical depth 1075 cm⁻¹ scaled to an equivalent 6.1- mbar pressure surface to remove the effect of topography around the time of the MY 34 global dust storm. Shown is the zonal average as a function of time and latitude.

122

123 Bertrand et al. [2020] convincingly show that Hadley cell strengthening led to the Tharsis 124 dust being lifted to very high altitudes (60-80 km) over a broad region. This high altitude dust 125 injection was distinct in behavior from more mesoscale phenomena (e.g., "rocket dust storms"; 126 Spiga et al. [2013]) that may produce detached dust layers in the middle atmosphere under 127 normal dust conditions. Heavens et al. [2019b] and Bertrand et al. [2020] both note that this dust lifting was vigorously convective. This period of lifting after $L_s = 197^\circ$ also was distinct from 128 "dusty deep convection" that was seen over Tharsis prior to this dust lifting region expanding 129 130 and becoming the primary source of dust for the storm (see below; Heavens et al. [2019b]). The 131 storm peaked, as measured by global atmospheric dust loading and middle atmospheric temperature, around $L_s = 205-210^\circ$ [Kass et al., 2019; Smith, 2019; Bertrand et al., 2020; 132 Montabone et al., 2020]. After that point, it appears that dust sedimentation and deposition 133 dominated behavior globally, which continued until dust returned to climatologically typical 134 levels near $L_s = 250^\circ$. 135

The long decay phase of the storm, from $L_s = 210-250^\circ$, provides another point of comparison with previous global dust storms. Kass et al. [2019], Smith [2019], and Wolkenberg et al. [2020] all note that the MY34 storm decayed faster than either the MY25 or MY28 storms. However, the Curiosity rover observed a decay timescale of column dust opacity identical to that observed by the Spirit and Opportunity rovers during the MY28 storm [Guzewich et al., 2019]. Reconciling those disparate observations likely falls to regional vs. global perspectives, as Curiosity was never near the core of major dust lifting centers. The decay rate of global storms 143 is plausibly driven by a combination of atmospheric circulation structure and strength, height of 144 dust during the storm, and dust particle size distribution, all of which help determine the timescale for a dust particle to sediment out of the atmosphere to the surface. For MY34, we 145 know that dust was lifted to great altitudes (e.g., Heavens et al. [2019]) and we know that dust 146 147 particle sizes were very large (at least over Gale Crater; Lemmon et al. [2019]). Bertrand et al. [2020] noted that the storm's decay timescale was particularly sensitive to dust particle size in 148 their simulations. One factor that appears distinct for MY34 relative to the MY25 and MY28 149 storms (for which we have the most comprehensive data and modeling for comparison; e.g., see 150 151 Smith [2004] for the MY25 thermal structure) is the atmospheric circulation structure, with a 152 strong northern hemisphere Hadley cell well into southern hemisphere spring. Future work 153 should investigate whether the seasonally-driven collapse of this structure, coupled with the 154 decay of the global dust storm, could have resulted in a faster storm decay relative to the MY25 155 and MY28 storms which were centered in the seasonally-favored southern hemisphere Hadley 156 circulation. Similarly, globally heterogeneous dust populations, with different particle size 157 distributions lifted during different global dust storms, should be explored.

158 Mars Year 34 also provided an important control experiment for understanding how some 159 storms become global, while others remain regional. Soon after the InSight lander arrived at 160 Elysium Planitia, a strong regional dust storm developed at $L_s = 320^{\circ}$ [Banfield and Spiga et al., 161 2020]. This storm began in western Chryse Planitia, near where the global dust storm had begun 162 just months before [Montabone et al., 2020]. This is an important note, as surface dust source 163 exhaustion from dust storms and the "recharge" timescale from airfalling dust, is an ongoing 164 topic of study and speculation (Bertrand et al. [2020] also discusses this for the global dust 165 storm). This regional storm spread dust around the planet in both hemispheres, but the storm ceased dust lifting and decayed on a timescale of days to weeks rather than months. Some 166 167 observations of these storms have helped distinguish global from regional storms and perhaps provide criteria to anticipate global expansion of a storm in the future. Kass et al. [2019] note 168 169 that daytime 50 Pa temperatures exceed 235 K in global storms, more than 10 K higher than regional storms, and a temperature > 220 K in the tropics is even more discriminatory (observed 170 171 regional storms have never exceeded 205 K). Additionally, the rapid expansion of 50 Pa warmth (> 200 K from 45°S-45°N within 2° of solar longitude) is also unique to global storms in the 172 173 Mars Climate Sounder (MCS) record.

174

175

3. PERSPECTIVE FROM THE SURFACE

176 Curiosity's measurements in Gale Crater during the storm with the Rover Environmental 177 Monitoring System (REMS) were the first such meteorological measurements from the surface 178 since the Viking landers and the first ever near the equator during a global dust storm [Guzewich 179 et al., 2019; Viúdez-Moreiras et al., 2019]. The initial phase of storm growth near Opportunity's 180 location in Meridiani Planum did not substantively impact local conditions in Gale Crater. Dust 181 lifted in the southern hemisphere eventually reached Gale after $L_s = 192^\circ$, which eventually 182 resulted in a peak dust optical depth of ~8.5 [Guzewich et al., 2019]. This dust optical depth 183 reduced UV light at the surface by $\sim 90\%$, lowering the daytime air and ground temperatures. Nighttime temperatures warmed due to increased downwelling infrared radiation from the dust 184 (Figure 3, Viúdez-Moreiras et al. [2019]). This reduction in the diurnal surface temperature 185 range was also seen globally from orbit. Streeter et al. [2019] note that nighttime warming from 186 187 longwave dust emission more than compensated for daytime reductions in shortwave insolation, resulting in a general increase in diurnally averaged temperatures. This, however, is modulated 188 by the thermal inertia of an individual location. Comparing with the MY28 storm, Wolkenberg 189 et al. [2020] note that surface temperatures converge to near 250 K once 9 µm dust opacity 190 191 exceeds 1-2 and Streeter et al. [2019] also note asymptotic behavior of daytime surface 192 temperatures at increasing dust opacity.

193 Atmospheric pressure tides responded dramatically, with the semidiurnal tide (long 194 known to be responsive to globally-integrated dust loading [Wilson and Hamilton, 1996]) briefly 195 becoming stronger than the diurnal tide in Gale Crater. The global response of the martian water 196 cycle to such storms is becoming clearer (see below), but never before had humidity been 197 measured in situ during a global dust storm. In Gale Crater, the humidity decreased due to the 198 warmer nighttime temperatures, but the amount of water vapor itself increased sharply (by 199 almost a factor of 2) with the arrival of significant dust opacity before decreasing again to pre-200 storm levels after ~40 sols (Figure 3, Viúdez-Moreiras et al. [2019]). The mechanism behind 201 these fluctuations is unknown, but needs to be understood in the context of higher water vapor 202 mixing ratios seen by Curiosity in MY34 relative to previous years.



Figure 3. Figure 3 from Viúdez-Moreiras et al. [2019]. Evolution of REMS variables (sols 2060–2170) for the period encompassing the onset (sols 2075–2084), highly dusty (sols 2085–2100), and decay phases of the GDS. Daily mean, maximum, and minimum values are shown for pressure (top left) and temperatures (top and bottom middle), while the relative humidity (top right) and water mixing ratio (bottom left) values correspond to values where the relative humidity reaches its maximum (between

4:00 and 6:00 LTST) and their uncertainty is lower. Finally, the daily maximum
ultraviolet (UV) irradiance (f) is shown normalized to the value on sol 2070. A 20- sol
mobile average is also shown for each variable for a better visualization. As in Figure 2,
vertical lines show the start times of the GDS onset (sol 2075), highly dusty (sol 2085),
and decay (sol 2100) phases in Gale Crater.

215

216 The double-peaked structure seen in water vapor mixing ratio, air temperature, and even 217 pressure is reflective of two pulses of dust that entered Gale Crater. Smith et al. [2019] show 218 that in-crater dust extinction (extinction as measured along a line-of-sight from the Curiosity 219 rover to the Gale Crater rim) was an order of magnitude higher than anything measured prior to 220 the global dust storm. Horizontal visibility dropped to <3 km, whereas it normally equals or exceeds 30 km and sometimes 70 km or more. The peak in in-crater dust extinction was also 3-5 221 222 sols after the column dust opacity peak. And while the atmospheric column dust opacity showed 223 a generally steady decline of dust opacity after the initial peak [Guzewich et al., 2019], the in-224 crater dust extinction had a second peak approximately 25 sols after the initial wave of dust. In conjunction with the REMS variables, this points to dynamical behavior of dust moving above 225 226 the crater and then dust sedimenting to lower altitudes within the crater over time. This behavior 227 is further supported by analysis of dust particle sizes, which corroborate the two-peaked pattern 228 of in-crater dust extinction [Lemmon et al., 2019]. In combination, Lemmon et al. [2019], Smith 229 et al. [2019], Viúdez-Moreiras et al. [2019], and Guzewich et al. [2019] show that the first wave 230 of dust predominantly passed *above* Gale Crater with dust particle effective radii as high as 8 231 µm, the largest ever observed in Mars' atmosphere. These large dust particles sedimented 232 quickly to lower altitudes within the crater, producing a delayed peak in in-crater dust extinction. Then a second wave of dust arrived at Gale Crater approximately 25 sols later, but this wave 233 234 arrived at lower altitudes directly in the crater and did not make a clear change to the *column* dust opacity. Given Mars' thin atmosphere, dust particles with such large effective radii should 235 236 sediment to the surface on very short timescales (hours or sols) without compensating upward 237 vertical motion in the atmosphere. The lack of any clear signs of local dust lifting within Gale 238 Crater by wind stress or dust devil lifting [Guzewich et al., 2019] imply that these very large particles were transported aloft over hundreds to thousands of kilometers distance, emphasizing 239 240 the vigorous and highly anomalous dynamics that were likely ongoing within the storm.

241 242

4. UPPER ATMOSPHERE RESPONSE

Recent work prior to the MY34 global dust storm showed that dust storms likely have a disproportionate effect on Mars' loss of water to space in the modern climate epoch [Chaffin et al., 2014; 2017; Heavens et al., 2018; Fedorova et al., 2018]. The presence of the Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter (MRO), Mars Atmosphere and Volatile Evolution mission (MAVEN), and the ExoMars/Trace Gas Orbiter (TGO) simultaneously during a global dust storm provided an opportunity to watch this behavior through the entire atmospheric column and diagnose the 249 mechanisms that lift water to high altitude where it can be photodissociated to be a direct source

250 of hydrogen atoms in the thermosphere.

251



252

253 Figure 4. Figure 6 from Aoki et al. [2019]. Latitudinal variation of the water vapor vertical profiles retrieved from NOMAD data (the top panels of (a)–(e)), predicted by the 254 GEM- Mars for non- dust storm conditions (the bottom panels of (a)-(e)) in the 255 256 seasonal range between $Ls = 160^{\circ} - 195^{\circ}$ (Figure 6a, before the global dust storm), Ls =195°–202° (Figure 6b, during the growth phase of the storm), $Ls = 210^{\circ}-220^{\circ}$ (Figure 257 6c, during the mature phase of the storm), $Ls = 220^{\circ} - 240^{\circ}$ (Figure 6d, during the decay 258 phase of the storm), and $Ls = 240^{\circ} - 260^{\circ}$ (Figure 6e, during the decay phase of the 259 storm). The retrievals and GEM predictions are binned in 5° latitude × 1 km altitude grid 260 261 (averaged in season and longitude).

263 Aoki et al. [2019] show that great amounts of water were lifted to altitudes as high as 100 264 km during the storm. Using solar occultation, the Nadir and Occultation for Mars Discovery 265 (NOMAD) instrument onboard TGO can measure water vapor abundance with high precision 266 and vertical resolution. As seen in Figure 4, this change occurred rapidly after the storm began and persisted through its duration. Interestingly, similar, if less intense, behavior occurred 267 during the late winter large regional dust storm in MY34. The Atmospheric Chemistry Suite 268 (ACS) also onboard TGO similarly saw water ice clouds at exceptionally high altitudes, greater 269 270 than 90 km during the storm, with water ice particle effective radii ($\sim 1.5 \mu m$) typical of much 271 lower altitudes [Stcherbinine et al., 2020]. As in the case of Curiosity (see Section 3), these large 272 particle effective radii at high altitudes imply that strong upward motion was likely occurring 273 within the storm.

262

274 Neary et al. [2019] used a Mars general circulation model (GCM) to diagnose the 275 mechanisms behind the dramatic increase in high-altitude water vapor described by Aoki et al. 276 [2019]. They found that although the atmospheric circulation is deepened and strengthened 277 during the storm, it alone is not sufficient to transport water vapor to such high altitudes. More 278 directly, they find that the altitude of the hygropause (typically in Mars' atmosphere where water ice clouds occur and water vapor is scarce above) is driven by the vertical profile of dust. 279 280 Increased high-altitude dust during the storm warms the middle atmosphere and thus shifts the 281 hygropause to much higher altitudes, letting water vapor reach altitudes where it is 282 photodissociated.

The effects of the storm reached into the ionosphere and thermosphere. Heating of the lower atmosphere by the dust storm causes the entire atmosphere to expand, which raises ionospheric altitudes. This phenomena was noted back to Mariner 9 [Hantsch & Bauer, 1990].





Figure 5. Figure 4 from Felici et al. [2020]. MAVEN Radio Occultation Science Experiment egress electron density profiles from 22 June 2018 and 26 June 2018. Electron density uncertainties are 1.85×109 m-3 for each profile.

291 This increase in ionospheric peak altitude was again noted during the MY34 global dust storm by a variety of spacecraft and techniques. Felici et al. [2020] noted a 10-15 km increase in peak 292 293 ionospheric altitude using MAVEN radio occultation retrievals (Figure 5). Girazian et al. [2019] 294 saw similar behavior with the Mars Express Mars Advanced Radar for Subsurface and 295 Ionosphere Sounding and contextualized that change with the long observation history of Mars 296 Express through multiple large regional dust storms and two global dust storms. The ionospheric 297 peak altitude was also highly variable following the initial global expansion in late June 2018. This change in ionospheric altitude alters to chemical composition of the upper atmosphere 298 299 during the storm. While the upward shift in the ionosphere increases the production of hot oxygen ("hot O"), the expansion of the neutral atmosphere increases the collisional loss of hot 300 301 O. In combination, this reduced the oxygen escape rate during the storm by approximately 28% 302 [Lee et al., 2020].

Heating and expansion of the neutral martian atmosphere was also observed. This was manifested in a near-doubling of CO_2 density on the planet's nightside at thermospheric altitudes (110 km) seen by MAVEN [Chaufray et al., 2019]. MAVEN observed a near 20 K temperature increase in the thermosphere, while also seeing cooling at equatorial latitudes near the start of the storm due to adiabatic cooling in strong upward motion [Jain et al., 2020]. These density and temperature changes were used to diagnose the atmospheric circulation, and indicate that a twocell meridional circulation was still present during the storm (as was also seen in the lower
atmosphere, Section 2) which created dynamical effects in the northern hemisphere [Jain et al.,
2020; Girazian et al., 2019].

312 313

5. NEW PHENOMENA

314 The diversity of observations of the storm—diversity of location, instrument, and local time coverage—allowed a number of new phenomena to be discovered. Since the MY28 global 315 316 dust storm, the Mars Climate Sounder began a "cross-track" observation to expand the number of local times it observes. These observations helped identify a dramatic diurnal variation in dust 317 318 during the global storm, particularly at high southern latitudes. Kleinböhl et al. [2019] demonstrate 20-40 km changes of the effective dust "top" between morning and afternoon and 319 link this behavior to an enhanced diurnal tide during the storm. Indeed they show that the 320 remnant southern winter polar vortex rotated fully around the pole each day as the diurnal tide 321 propagated westward and replicated this behavior in a Mars GCM. This remnant polar vortex, 322 323 with high potential vorticity, was somewhat impervious to mixing with the exterior low potential 324 vorticity and dusty atmosphere. Hernández-Bernal et al. [2019] used Mars Express camera 325 images to show graceful dust streamers crossing the day-night terminator over the south pole, 326 illuminated later than the surface due to their high altitude (Figure 6). Their shape and movement, which could be tracked over multiple images to estimate wind speed, serve as tracers 327 328 of polar atmospheric dynamics during the storm. Hence, these arcs of dust may be structured by 329 filaments of potential vorticity within the polar vortex.



332 Figure 6. Figure 2 from Hernández-Bernal et al. [2019]. Images and structure of the arc bands around the south pole. (a, c) Polar projected images of the Southern Polar 333 334 Region on 1 July, 17:30 UT and 22 July, 16:40 UT, respectively. (b, d) Schematic 335 representations of previous images showing the nightside (dark gray), the morning 336 hazes (blue lilac), and the observed bands, with continuous orange lines indicating 337 visible parts and dotted sections indicating the potential location in the nightside, 338 Numbers in orange indicate the estimated length of arcs. Red and blue lines indicate 339 morning and evening terminators, and the brown line indicates the subsolar meridian. 340 Notice the absence of morning hazes and the presence of a fully visible band on 22 341 July. (e) Areographic distribution of measured bands over a gray topographic map made 342 from MOLA data (Smith et al., 1999) (different colors represent different observations). 343 (f) Graph showing the latitude- local time distribution of all the observed bands. Different 344 band colors indicate different periods starting on 18 June (blue), 1 July (green), and 18 345 July (red). Gray areas represent the night.

331

MAVEN also observed a new phenomena near the day-night terminator. Connour et al. [2020] discovered a persistent water ice cloud band along and just beyond the evening terminator that sometimes spanned 6000 km in latitude (Figure 7). GCM modeling indicated that altered atmospheric tides during the storm produced colder conditions near the dawn and dusk terminators, facilitating the formation of expansive water ice clouds. MAVEN's orbit precluded confirmation of corresponding morning terminator clouds.



354 Figure 7. Figure 1 from Connour et al. [2020]. Composite graphic describing the 355 observations, illuminated altitudes, and physical interpretation of a twilight cloud band. (a) Example projection of a latitudinally continuous twilight cloud band taken shortly 356 after the start of the mature phase of the GDS (orbit 7281; L_s 200°). This false- color 357 358 projection represents what each swath would have looked like when viewed from the 359 position of the spacecraft at apoapsis. The black dashed line denotes the location of the 360 terminator, and the gray box denotes the bounds of Figure 1b. (b) Minimum illuminated altitudes of the cloud band. Solar zenith angles were converted into minimum altitudes 361 362 at which these aerosols must be directly illuminated, which reveals that bands often 363 reached altitudes of at least 40 to 50 km. (c) A schematic, cross-sectional 364 representation of IUVS viewing geometry. Incoming ultraviolet solar radiation did not interact with water vapor and encountered few, if any, water- ice clouds before 365

illuminating this band from below. Some light was scattered through these cloudsdirectly to the spacecraft. Schematic not to scale.

368

In the upper atmosphere, MAVEN was able to also measure how the bulk composition of the atmosphere changed in response to the storm. As stated above, the thermosphere warmed and expanded during the storm, leading to higher atmospheric densities [Chaufray et al., 2019]. In conjunction, CO₂ and Ar densities increased in the thermosphere, but surprisingly, atomic O density *decreased* by 20% [Elrod et al., 2019]. Thus far, there is no explanation for this change but this implies that unknown dynamical and/or photochemical activities were occurring within the thermosphere as the storm expanded near the surface.

376 Atmospheric modeling helped expand and contextualize many of the results presented in 377 this special collection. The increasing sophistication of Mars atmospheric modeling, like the 378 expansion of spacecraft observations, has also led to new insights. Of particular note, Bertrand 379 et al. [2020] used tracer tagging to watch how dust particles are lifted, transported, sedimented, 380 and relifted during their simulation of the MY34 global dust storm. They show that transfer of 381 dust between the Tharsis region and Arabia Terra/Terra Sabeae may have helped precondition 382 the Tharsis region for the "storm within the storm" that Montabone et al. [2020] find expanded 383 the storm to global proportions. Understanding the dynamics of how dust is moved through 384 different surface reservoirs may be of critical importance to understanding why some storms 385 become global while most do not.

386

395

403

387 6. CONCLUSIONS

388 The 2018/Mars Year 34 planet-encircling dust storm provided a unique opportunity to 389 study these iconically martian events. The introduction and the works included in this special 390 collection serve as a foundation for future analysis of this storm, comparison with previous and 391 future storms, and critical data points to understand how global dust storms develop and shape 392 the modern climate. The upcoming arrival of new spacecraft, the continued advance of modeling 393 and theoretical understanding, and eventual human exploration will surely provide additional 394 insights to understanding Mars' modern climate and its unique planet-wide dust storms.

15

396
397
398
399
400
401
402 REFERENCES

- Aoki, S., Vandaele, A. C., Daerden, F., Villanueva, G. L., Liuzzi, G., Thomas, I. R., et al.
 (2019). Water vapor vertical profiles on Mars in dust storms observed by TGO/NOMAD. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, 124, 3482–3497. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JE006109
- Bertrand, T., Wilson, R. J., Kahre, M. A., Urata, R., & Kling, A. (2020). Simulation of the
 2018 global dust storm on Mars using the NASA Ames Mars GCM: A multitracer approach. *Journal*of Geophysical Research: Planets, 125, e2019JE006122. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JE006122
- 411
- 412 Briggs, G. A., Baum, W. A., and Barnes, J. (1979), Viking Orbiter imaging observations of 413 dust in the Martian atmosphere, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 84(B6), 2795–2820, 414 doi:10.1029/JB084iB06p02795.
- 415
- Chaffin, M. S., Deighan, J., Schneider, N. M., & Stewart, A. I. F. (2017). Elevated
 atmospheric escape of atomic hydrogen from Mars induced by high- altitude water. *Nature Geoscience*, 10, 174–178. https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2887
- 419

Chaufray, J.- Y., Chaffin, M., Deighan, J., Jain, S., Schneider, N., Mayyasi, M., &
Jakosky, B. (2020). Effect of the 2018 Martian global dust storm on the CO₂ density in the lower
nightside thermosphere observed from MAVEN/IUVS Lyman- alpha absorption. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47, e2019GL082889. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL082889

- 425 Connour, K., Schneider, N. M., Milby, Z., Forget, F., Alhosani, M., Spiga, A., et al. (2020).
 426 Mars's twilight cloud band: A new cloud feature seen during the Mars Year 34 global dust storm.
 427 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47, e2019GL084997. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL084997
- 428

Conrath, B., Curran, R., Hanel, R., Kunde, V., Maguire, W., Pearl, J., Pirraglia, J.,
Welker, J., and Burke, T.(1973), Atmospheric and surface properties of Mars obtained by infrared
spectroscopy on Mariner 9, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 78(20), 4267–4278, doi:10.1029/JB078i020p04267.

Clancy, R. T., Sandor, B. J., Wolff, M. J., Christensen, P. R., Smith, M. D., Pearl, J. C.,
Conrath, B. J., & Wilson, R. J. (2000). An intercomparison of ground- based millimeter, MGS TES,
and Viking atmospheric temperature measurements: Seasonal and interannual variability of
temperatures and dust loading in the global Mars atmosphere. *Journal of Geophysical Research*,
105(E4), 9553–9571. https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JE001089

- Elrod, M. K., Bougher, S. W., Roeten, K., Sharrar, R., & Murphy, J. (2020). Structural and
 Compositional Changes in the Upper Atmosphere Related to the PEDE- 2018 Dust Event on Mars
 as Observed by MAVEN NGIMS. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47, e2019GL084378.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL084378
- 443

438

Fedorova, A., Bertaux, J.- L., Betsis, D., Montmessin, F., Korablev, O., Maltagliati, L., &
Clarke, J.(2018). Water vapor in the middle atmosphere of Mars during the 2007 global dust storm. *Icarus*, 300, 440–457. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2017.09.025

Felici, M., Withers, P., Smith, M. D., González- Galindo, F., Oudrhiri, K., & Kahan, D.
(2020). MAVEN ROSE observations of the response of the Martian ionosphere to dust storms.

450 Journal Physics, 125, of Geophysical Research: Space e2019JA027083. 451 https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JA027083 452 453 Gillespie, H. E., Grevbush, S. J., & Wilson, R. J. (2020). An investigation of the 454 encirclement of Mars by dust in the 2018 global dust storm using EMARS. Journal of Geophysical 455 Research: Planets, 125, e2019JE006106, https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JE006106 456 457 Girazian, Z., Luppen, Z., Morgan, D. D., Chu, F., Montabone, L., Thiemann, E. M. B., et 458 al. (2020). Variations in the ionospheric peak altitude at Mars in response to dust storms: 13 years of 459 observations from the Mars Express Radar Sounder. Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 460 e2019JE006092 125, https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JE006092 461 462 Guzewich, S.D., A.D. Toigo, H. Wang (2017), An Investigation of Dust Storms Observed with 463 the Mars Color Imager, Icarus, 289, 199-213, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2017.02.020. 464 465 Guzewich, S. D., Lemmon, M., Smith, C. L., Martínez, G., de Vicente- Retortillo, Á., 466 Newman, C. E., et al. (2019). Mars Science Laboratory observations of the 2018/Mars year 34 467 79. dlobal dust storm. Geophysical Research Letters. 46, 71-468 https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL080839 469 470 Heavens, N. G., Kleinböhl, A., Chaffin, M. S., Halekas, J. S., Kass, D. M., Hayne, P. O., 471 McCleese, D. J., Piqueux, S., Shirley, J. H., & Schofield, J. T. (2018). Hydrogen escape from Mars 472 enhanced by deep convection in dust storms. Nature Astronomy, 2, 126-132. 473 474 Heavens, N. G., D. M. Kass, J. H. Shirley, S. Piqueux, and B. A. Cantor (2019a). An 475 Observational Overview of Dusty Deep Convection in Martian Dust Storms. J. Atmos. Sci., 76, 476 3299-3326, https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-19-0042.1. 477 478 Heavens, N. G., Kass, D. M., & Shirley, J. H. (2019b). Dusty deep convection in the Mars 479 Year 34 planet- encircling dust event. Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 124, 2863–2892. 480 https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JE006110 481 482 Hernández- Bernal, J., Sánchez- Lavega, A., del Río- Gaztelurrutia, T., Hueso, R., 483 Cardesín- Moinelo, A., Ravanis, E. M., et al. (2019). The 2018 Martian global dust storm over the 484 South Polar Region studied with MEx/VMC. Geophysical Research Letters, 46, 10330-10337. 485 https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL084266 486 487 Jain, S. K., Bougher, S. W., Deighan, J., Schneider, N. M., Gonzalez- Galindo, F., 488 Stewart, A. I. F., et al. (2020). Martian thermospheric warming associated with the Planet Encircling 489 Dust Event of 2018. Geophysical Research Letters, 47, e2019GL085302. 490 https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL085302 491 492 Kass, D. M., Schofield, J. T., Kleinböhl, A., McCleese, D. J., Heavens, N. G., Shirley, J. 493 H., & Steele, L. J.(2019). Mars Climate Sounder observation of Mars' 2018 global dust storm. 494 Geophysical Research Letters, 46. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL083931

- Kleinböhl, A., Spiga, A., Kass, D. M., Shirley, J. H., Millour, E., Montabone, L., & Forget,
 F. (2020). Diurnal variations of dust during the 2018 global dust storm observed by the Mars
 Climate Sounder. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, 125, e2019JE006115.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JE006115
- 500

510

515

522

527

532

535

501Lee, Y., Fang, X., Gacesa, M., Ma, Y., Tenishev, V., Mahaffy, P., et al. (2020). Effects of502global and regional dust storms on the Martian hot O corona and photochemical loss. Journal of503Geophysical Research: Space Physics,125, e2019JA027115.504https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JA027115

Lemmon, M. T., Wolff, M. J., Bell, J. F. III, Smith, M. D., Cantor, B., & Smith, P. H. (2015). Dust aerosol, clouds, and the atmospheric optical depth record over 5 Mars years of the Mars Exploration Rover mission. *Icarus*, 251, 96–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2014.03.029.

- Lemmon, M. T., Guzewich, S. D., McConnochie, T., de Vicente- Retortillo, A., Martínez,
 G., Smith, M. D., et al. (2019). Large dust aerosol sizes seen during the 2018 Martian global dust
 event by the Curiosity rover. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 46, 9448–9456.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL084407
- Leovy, C.B., G.A. Briggs, A.T. Young, B.A. Smith, J.B. Pollack, E.N. Shipley, and R.L. Wildey
 (1971). The martian atmosphere: Mariner 9 television experiment progress report. Icarus, 17(2),
 373-393. https://doi.org/10.1016/0019-1035(72)90006-1.
- Martin, L. J., and Zurek, R. W. (1993), An analysis of the history of dust activity on Mars, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98(E2), 3221–3246, doi:10.1029/92JE02937.
- 523 Montabone, L., Spiga, A., Kass, D. M., Kleinboehl, A., Forget, F., & Millour, E. (2020). 524 Martian year 34 column dust climatology from mars climate sounder observations: Reconstructed 525 maps and model simulations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, 125, e2019JE006111. 526 https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JE006111
- Neary, L., Daerden, F., Aoki, S., Whiteway, J., Clancy, R. T., Smith, M., et al. (2020).
 Explanation for the increase in high- altitude water on Mars observed by NOMAD during the 2018
 global dust storm. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47, e2019GL084354.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL084354
- 533 Pang, K. and C.W. Hord (1973), Mariner 9 ultraviolet spectrometer experiment: 1971 Mars
 534 dust storm. Icarus, 18(3), 481-488. https://doi.org/10.1016/0019-1035(73)90157-7.
- 536 Ryan, J. A., and Sharman, R. D. (1981), Two major dust storms, one Mars year apart: 537 Geophys. Comparison from Viking data, J. Res., 86(C4), 3247-3254, 538 doi:10.1029/JC086iC04p03247.
- 539

543 544 Shirley, J. H., Kleinböhl, A., Kass, D. M., Steele, L. J., Heavens, N. G., Suzuki, S., et al. 545 (2020). Rapid expansion and evolution of a regional dust storm in the Acidalia Corridor during the 546 initial growth phase of the Martian global dust storm of 2018. Geophysical Research Letters, 47, 547 e2019GL084317. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL084317 548 549 Shirley, J. H., McKim, R. J., Battalio, J. M., & Kass, D. M. (2020). Orbit- spin coupling and 550 the triggering of the Martian planet- encircling dust storm of 2018. Journal of Geophysical Research: 551 Planets, 125, e2019JE006077. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JE006077 552 553 Smith, C. L., Moores, J. E., Lemmon, M., Guzewich, S. D., Moore, C. A., Ellison, D., & 554 Khayat, A. S. J. (2019). Visibility and line- of- sight extinction estimates in Gale Crater during the 555 2018/MY34 global dust storm. Geophysical Research Letters, 46, 9414- 9421. 556 https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL083788 557 558 Smith, M.D. (2004). Interannual variability in TES atmospheric observations of Mars during 559 1999-2003. Icarus, 167(1), 148-165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2003.09.010. 560 561 Smith, M.D. (2009). THEMIS observations of Mars aerosol optical depth from 2002-2008. 562 Icarus, 202(2), 444-452. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2009.03.027 563 564 Smith, M. D. (2019). THEMIS Observations of the 2018 Mars Global Dust Storm. Journal of 565 Geophysical Research: Planets, 124, 2929–2944. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JE006107 566 567 Spiga, A., Faure, J., Madeleine, J. B., Määttänen, A., & Forget, F. (2013). Rocket dust 568 storms and detached dust layers in the Martian atmosphere. Journal of Geophysical Research: 569 Planets, 118, 746–767. https://doi.org/10.1002/jgre.20046 570 571 Stcherbinine, A., Vincendon, M., Montmessin, F., Wolff, M. J., Korablev, O., Fedorova, A., 572 et al. (2020). Martian water ice clouds during the 2018 global dust storm as observed by the ACS 573 mid- infrared channel onboard the Trace Gas Orbiter. Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 574 125, e2019JE006300. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JE006300

Sánchez- Lavega, A., del Río- Gaztelurrutia, T., Hernández- Bernal, J., & Delcroix, M.

(2019). The onset and growth of the 2018 Martian Global Dust Storm. Geophysical Research

Letters, 46, 6101–6108. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL083207

575

540

541

542

576 Streeter, P. M., Lewis, S. R., Patel, M. R., Holmes, J. A., & Kass, D. M. (2020). Surface 577 warming during the 2018/Mars Year 34 Global Dust Storm. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47, 578 e2019GL083936. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL083936

579

Viúdez- Moreiras, D., Newman, C. E., de la Torre, M., Martínez, G., Guzewich, S.,
Lemmon, M., et al. (2019). Effects of the MY34/2018 global dust storm as measured by MSL REMS
in Gale crater. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, 124, 1899–1912.
https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JE005985

- Wang, H., M.I. Richardson, R.J. Wilson, A.P. Ingersoll, A.D. Toigo, and R.W. Zurek
 (2003), Cyclones, tides, and the origin of a cross-equatorial dust storm on Mars, Geophysical
 Research Letters, 30 (9), doi:10.1029/2005JE002423.
- 589 Wang, H., and Richardson, M. I. (2015). The origin, evolution, and trajectory of large 590 dust storms on Mars during Mars Years 24-30 (1999-2011), Icarus, 251, 112-127, doi: 591 10.1016/j.icarus.2013.10.033.
- 593 Wilson, R. J., and K. Hamilton (1996), Comprehensive model simulation of thermal tides 594 in the Martian atmosphere, *Journal of Atmospheric Science*, 53, 1290–1326.
- Wolkenberg, P., M. Giuranna, D. Grassi, A. Aronica, S. Aoki, D. Scaccabarozzi, and B.
 Saggin (2018). Characterization of dust activity on Mars from MY27 to MY32 by PFS-MEX
 observations. Icarus, 310, 32-47, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2017.10.045
- Wolkenberg, P., Giuranna, M., Smith, M. D., Grassi, D., & Amoroso, M. (2020).
 Similarities and differences of global dust storms in MY 25, 28, and 34. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, 125, e2019JE006104. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JE006104
- 603

592

595