Isotopic evidence of sulfur photochemistry during lunar regolith formation
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Abstract

Lunar gardening results in volatile mobilisation and stable isotopic fractionations that are mass dependent. An unambiguous role for mass independent fractionation (MIF), such as that produced by photochemistry, has not been demonstrated on the Moon. We observe MIF for sulfur isotopes in lunar soil 75081, 690 while MIF is not observed in soil 74241, 204. The MIF is likely generated after sulfur is volatilised during soil maturation processes. The isotopic discrepancy between 75081, 690 and 74241, 204 may reflect differences in photochemistry, such as illumination or in generation of photochemically active volatile sulfur species, for instance, due to varying H contents from solar wind implantation.

Introduction

The earliest atmospheres on Earth and Mars were optically thin and contained sufficient sulfur-bearing gaseous molecules and penetration of ultraviolet (UV) light that generated mass independent fractionation of sulfur (MIF-S) isotopes (e.g., Farquhar et al., 2000; Franz et al., 2014). These sulfur isotope records shed light on the geochemical conditions involving sulfur and other elements and provide key information about the evolution of these planets’ fluid envelopes. The early evolution of the Moon (3.8–3.1 Ga) included pyroclastic and effusive volcanism, and large impact events that provided enough gas to produce optically thin transient atmospheres (e.g., Prem et al., 2015; Needham and Kring, 2017) where UV light can penetrate and produce MIF-S. To date, no unambiguous evidence of this process has been found on the Moon.

We present new analyses of the quadruple sulfur isotope compositions and sulfur concentrations for 9 and 10 size fractions (<10 to >500 μm and >1000 μm) from lunar basaltic regolith samples 74241, 204 (immature, L/FeO = 5.1) and 75081, 690 (sub-mature, L/FeO = 4.0) (Morris, 1978) (Table S-1). These analyses provide insight into the late stage lunar volatile cycle during surface gardening and the evolution of sulfur isotope compositions of soils of varying maturity.

Methods

74241, 204 and 75081, 690 were sieved into 9 and 10 grain size fractions, respectively. Sulfur from each sieve fraction was extracted using an HF + CrCl3 digestion method and analysed as SF6 using a ThermoFinnigan MAT253 Dual Inlet isotope ratio mass spectrometer (see Supplementary Information S-1 for details). Isotopic data are reported in per mil using the following notation:

\[
\delta^{34}S = \left( \frac{^{34}S}{^{32}S} \right)_{\text{sample}} / \left( \frac{^{34}S}{^{32}S} \right)_{\text{reference}} - 1
\]

\[
\Delta^{32}S = \left( \frac{^{32}S}{^{32}S} \right)_{\text{sample}} / \left( \frac{^{32}S}{^{32}S} \right)_{\text{reference}} - 1^{0.515}
\]

Uncertainties on \(\delta^{34}S\) and \(\Delta^{32}S\) (±0.3‰) reflect the long term uncertainty on repeated measurements of reference material IAEA-S1. Uncertainty on \(\Delta^{32}S\) reflects mass spectrometry uncertainty associated with counts on \(^{33}S\) and is similar to our long term uncertainty estimates (±0.016‰ and ±0.008‰, for short and long counting sessions, respectively; see Supplementary Information S-1).
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Results and Discussion

We observe non-zero $\Delta^{33S}$ and $\Delta^{36S}$ values in 75081, 690 (Fig. 1). The same non-zero variability is not observed in 74241, 204. The dichotomy in $\Delta^{33S}$ and $\Delta^{36S}$ among 74241, 204 and 75081, 690 is unclear, but indicates that there are processes operating on only some locations of the lunar surface.

75081, 690 preserves a MIF-S signature. Mass independent isotope effects most commonly arise in gas phase reactions in the presence of UV light because the lifetimes of excited state molecules allow for other isotopically selective factors to come into play (Okabe, 1978) and thus, could have occurred in the lunar atmosphere throughout its evolution. Global and local transient lunar atmospheres may have been produced early (prior to 3.0 Ga) in lunar history through volcanic eruptions and large impact events (Needham and Kring, 2017; Aleinov et al., 2019; Head et al., 2020). Due to the thin nature of these atmospheres that allows ultraviolet light to penetrate, one can hypothesise that MIF-S could occur in these environments and impact the sulfur isotope composition observed in the lunar soils. For large scale transient atmospheres produced by volcanism and impact events, one would expect MIF-S signatures to be ubiquitous among lunar surface materials; however, unambiguous evidence for photochemically derived MIF-S ($\Delta^{33S} \neq 0$) has not been observed in any other lunar materials (Thode and Rees, 1979; Wing and Farquhar, 2015). Furthermore, lunar soil production poses a problem for capturing MIF-S from large scale photochemical events: the isotopic composition should homogenise overtime as gardening occurs (i.e. micrometeorite bombardment and solar wind sputtering). Although both samples share the positive $\delta^{34S}$ signature associated with sulfur loss during gardening (Thode and Rees, 1976) (Fig. 1), the MIF signature in 75081, 690 overprints the gardening signature and requires MIF-S to have occurred after or during lunar gardening.

75081, 690 shows a relationship between $\delta^{34S}$ and $\Delta^{33S}$ that links the negative $\Delta^{33S}$ sulfur to the condensed outer layer material (e.g., Keller and McKay, 1997, and references within). Effects related to surface/volume ratios result in the strongest negative $\Delta^{33S}$ signal seen in the smallest grain size (Fig. 1). Therefore, our observed isotopic signatures are a mixture between the condensed sulfur layer and the indigenous sulfur of the soil grain.

Production of the strongly negative $\Delta^{33S}$ of the outer layer sulfur associated with 75081, 690 requires a process that does not
follow canonical mass dependence (i.e. mass independent). Thus, the associated process is separate from any process associated with sulfur loss during lunar volatilisation processes, which are thought to be strictly mass dependent and only produce variations in δ34S measurements (e.g., Thode and Rees, 1976). Evidence of such is seen in our analyses of 74241, 204 (immature) that preserve mass dependent (i.e. near-zero) Δ33S and Δ36S, but variable δ34S, supporting a strict mass dependent isotope fractionation associated with sulfur loss.

While the exact origin of the variations in Δ33S and Δ36S values in 75081, 690 is not clear, it appears to be different from the shared 33S enrichment with 74241, 204, and likely originates from photolytic reactions of S-bearing gaseous molecular species, such as S, SO, SO2, H2S, and HS. The components of the soils are ancient (Goswami and Lal, 1974), and based on 40Ar/36Ar trapped for 74241 (7.4) compared to 75081 (0.7), 74241 may have last been exposed to space weathering at 3.13 Ga compared to 0.25 Ga for 75081 (e.g., Curran et al., 2020) which suggests either MIF-S is not linked to processes occurring >3.0 Ga or length of exposure to space weathering is critical for MIF-S production. Although extra-lunar sulfur is thought to contribute to the total sulfur observed in soils (Kerridge et al., 1975; Thode and Rees, 1979), our data are not consistent with acquisition of the MIF-S signature from these sources: the sulfur isotope compositions observed in the meteorite record (Antonelli et al., 2014; Labidi et al., 2017; Dottin et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2018, and references within) do not match our observations. We also exclude MIF-S acquisition from large scale transient atmospheres and sputtering due to the ubiquitous lack of MIF-S signatures among lunar materials: spillation yields are low and require Fe and low sulfur contents of a metal phase to observe evidence for spillation reactions (Gao and Thiemens, 1991). Thus, we suggest the most parsimonious explanation for acquisition of MIF-S in 75081, 690 is linked to gardening events that volatilise sulfur that undergoes UV photochemistry while in the lunar atmosphere (Fig. 2).

Assuming the MIF-S observed in 75081, 690 is indeed linked to gardening events, the dichotomy in Δ33S and Δ36S between 75081, 690 and 74241, 204 may reflect (1) differences in the nature of the target relative to sample maturity (also related to timing of exposure at the lunar surface), and/or (2) the processing of volatilised sulfur species in regions with or without sunlight. Mature targets that have more implanted hydrogen from solar wind may have a greater chance for formation of H-bearing gaseous sulfur species that promote photochemical MIF-S. The production of H-bearing gaseous sulfur species would require a more local, rather than regional or global, process to generate the variation observed between sites, and the MIF-S likely represents an accumulated fractionation from consistent gardening events. This process would be widespread, and in future measurements of lunar soils, the MIF-S signature should be observed. Literature analyses by Thode and Rees (1979) of size fractions from sample 15021 may also show non-zero Δ33S (Fig. S-6) and be broadly consistent with our results. However, the data have been held up as an example of mass dependent isotope effects due to analytical uncertainty. Processing environment of the soils is important to consider because MIF-S via photochemistry requires sunlight. The difference in Δ33S and Δ36S between 75081, 690 and 74241, 204 may reflect processing in sunlit and shadowed parts of the Moon, but such a scenario is difficult to reconcile considering both of our studied sites are on the near side of the Moon and likely share a similar history of illumination.

**Missing sulfur reservoir.** Δ33S in 75081, 690 is consistently negative and presents an issue of mass balance (i.e. a reservoir of sulfur with positive Δ33S is missing). The sulfur with positive Δ33S may have been lost to space, trapped in Permanently Shadowed Regions (PSRs) (Watson et al., 1961), or trapped in micro cold traps of a nearby crater (Hayne et al., 2021). As volatile deposits are identified and explored in the upcoming Artemis missions, Δ33S measurements of returned samples can be potentially used (1) to better understand the volatile cycle on the Moon and the transport of volatiles across the lunar surface, and (2) as a fingerprint for identifying evolving PSRs, such as through measurements of Δ33S from a core collected from a PSR.

**Links among Δ33S, sulfur concentration,** and **grain size.** Successfully linking the observed MIF-S signature to UV photolysis of volatiles during lunar gardening events is contingent upon a model that can also explain the observed Δ33S and sulfur concentrations of various grain size fractions from 74241, 204 and 75081, 690.
The $^{34}$S values and sulfur concentrations of various grain size fractions could be explained by a grain margin subject to diffusive sulfur loss from the inner grain prior to addition of a condensed layer (Fig. S-7) (Saal et al., 2008). The diffusion model would, however, require diffusion times and/or temperatures that are too long/high to fit the standard understanding of micrometeorite gardening (see Supplementary Information S-2). The data can also be explained with a model involving a degassed melted layer with no isotope fractionation that sits between a homogenous inner grain and an outer isotopically fractionated condensed layer (see Supplementary Information S-2). This model satisfies our observations while relaxing the time/temperature constraints. While various explanations have been proposed to explain the $^{34}$S enrichments of the condensed outer layer sulfur (e.g., Clayton et al., 1974; Ding et al., 1983; Ker Kreide, and Kaplan, 1978), given the observed MIF-S in 75081, 690, the most parsimonious explanation is linked to condensed sulfur fractionated by atmospheric escape (e.g., Clayton et al., 1974; Switkowski et al., 1977; see Supplementary Information S-2).

## Conclusions

We present isotopic evidence that mass independently fractionated sulfur condensed onto lunar soil grains associated with 75081, 690. As illustrated in Figure 2, we hypothesise that sulfur from both soils underwent atmospheric escape to space, producing $^{34}$S enrichments. Although 75081, 690 and 74241, 204 share the same mass independent signal is not observed in 74241, 204. We suggest that sulfur with MIF that later condensed on 75081, 690 was produced during UV photochemistry in the tenuous lunar atmosphere after sulfur without MIF was volatilised during gardening events. The lack of MIF-S in 74241, 204 may be linked to (1) lower amounts of solar wind implanted hydrogen that can be readily available to form H-bearing sulfur species that undergo photochemistry, and/or (2) processing in a shaded environment.
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Supplementary Tables

Table S-1  Sulfur isotope compositions and sulfur concentrations of lunar soils and glasses. Abbreviation n.d. denotes not detected. Our uncertainties on δ^{34}S, Δ^{33}S, and Δ^{36}S are estimated as ±0.3, ±0.008, and ±0.3 ‰ respectively (all 2σ) from long-term reproducibilities on measurements of standards. †Our uncertainty on Δ^{33}S for the <10 µm size fraction in sample 75081, 690 is 0.016 ‰ (2σ) due to small sample size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Sieve size (µm)</th>
<th>Mass digested (g)</th>
<th>S (ppm)</th>
<th>δ^{34}S (‰)</th>
<th>Δ^{33}S (‰)</th>
<th>Δ^{36}S (‰)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74241, 204</td>
<td>0–10</td>
<td>0.4491</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10–20</td>
<td>0.4491</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20–45</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>−0.003</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45–75</td>
<td>0.3968</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75–90</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>−0.014</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90–150</td>
<td>0.3641</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>−0.006</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150–250</td>
<td>0.2776</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>−0.014</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250–500</td>
<td>0.2563</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>−0.011</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500–1000</td>
<td>0.1841</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>−0.017</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table S-1 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Sieve size (µm)</th>
<th>Mass digested (g)</th>
<th>S (ppm)</th>
<th>δ(^{34})S (‰)</th>
<th>Δ(^{33})S (‰)</th>
<th>Δ(^{36})S (‰)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75081, 690</td>
<td>0–10</td>
<td>0.0117</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>−0.163†</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10–20</td>
<td>0.1593</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>−0.089</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20–45</td>
<td>0.3525</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>−0.043</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45–75</td>
<td>0.4346</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>−0.047</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75–90</td>
<td>0.0992</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>−0.070</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90–150</td>
<td>0.4526</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>−0.029</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150–250</td>
<td>0.3825</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>−0.031</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250–500</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>−0.041</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500–1000</td>
<td>0.1654</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>−0.024</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;1000</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table S-2  Petrography of lunar soils analysed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>74241</th>
<th>75081</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agglutinates</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basalt</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breccia</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anorthosite</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norite</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabbro</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagioclase</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyroxene</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilmenite</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange glass</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass other</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All values are in wt. %. Data are from Heiken and McKay (1974).
Supplementary Text S-1. Detailed Methods

Samples 74241, 204 and 75081, 690 were sieved in 9 and 10 grain size fractions, respectively. The smallest grain sizes were sieved with HFE-7100 3M Novec fluid. All fluid was evaporated with sieved fraction. For 74241, 204 and 75081, 690, sulfur was extracted using an HF + CrCl$_2$ digestion method described in (Dottin et al., 2021). Each sieved sample was placed into a Teflon reaction vessel with a stir bar and attached to a water trap and an AgNO$_3$ trap. This set up was purged for 10–15 minutes prior to injection of 20 mL of an acidic chromium (II) chloride solution, 10 mL of hydrochloric acid, and 10 mL of hydrofluoric acid. The sample + acid bath was then heated to ~70 °C and stirred while allowing N$_2$ to continuously flow through the setup. Sulfur was released from the sample as H$_2$S and first carried through a water trap (to trap acid) and subsequently into an AgNO$_3$ trap, where sulfur was precipitated as Ag$_2$S. We allowed this reaction to run for ~2.5 to 3 hours.

After sitting in the dark for at least one week, precipitated Ag$_2$S was rinsed with Milli-Q water six times, dried at 70 °C for ~2 hours, and weighed to estimate sulfur concentration in the sample. Weighed Ag$_2$S was then placed into foil packets and reacted with ~10× excess fluorine to produce SF$_6$. The purification of product SF$_6$ follows the methods described in (Dottin et al., 2021) closely. Briefly, SF$_6$ is first frozen into a liquid nitrogen cooled trap and excess F$_2$ is passivated using a heated KBr salt. Following passivation, the remaining SF$_6$ is subjected to an ethanol slush at around −111 °C where it is separated from additional contaminants, such as HF (produced during the fluorination). The separated SF$_6$ is then injected into a gas chromatograph for a final purification and trapped using liquid nitrogen cooled coils. The purified SF$_6$ was lastly analysed using a ThermoFinnigan MAT 253 dual inlet isotope ratio mass spectrometer. Isotopic analyses of the purified SF$_6$ are performed by monitoring SF$_6^+$ ion beams at m/z of 127, 128, 129, and 131. Isotopic data are reported in per mil using the following notation:

$$\delta^{34}S = \left[ (^{34}S/^{32}S)_{\text{sample}} / (^{34}S/^{32}S)_{\text{CDT}} \right] - 1$$

$$\Delta^{33}S = \left[ ((^{33}S/^{32}S)_{\text{sample}} / (^{33}S/^{32}S)_{\text{CDT}}) - (^{34}S/^{32}S)_{\text{sample}} / (^{34}S/^{32}S)_{\text{CDT}} \right]^{0.515}$$

$$\Delta^{36}S = \left[ ((^{36}S/^{32}S)_{\text{sample}} / (^{36}S/^{32}S)_{\text{CDT}}) - (^{34}S/^{32}S)_{\text{sample}} / (^{34}S/^{32}S)_{\text{CDT}} \right]^{1.9}$$

All samples were bracketed by analyses of internal standard IAEA-S1. All data are first normalised to analyses of IAEA-S1 performed during the analytical sessions and subsequently to a value of IAEA-S1 relative to Canyon Diablo Troilite measurements performed at UMD ($\delta^{34}S = -0.401 \%_{\circ}, \Delta^{33}S = 0.116 \%_{\circ}, \Delta^{36}S = -0.796 \%_{\circ}$; Antonelli et al., 2014). Uncertainties on $\delta^{34}S$ and $\Delta^{36}S$ (±0.3 %) reflect the long-term uncertainty on repeated measurements of IAEA-S1. Uncertainty on $\Delta^{33}S$ reflects mass spectrometry uncertainty associated with counts on $^{33}S$ and is similar to our long-term uncertainty estimates. Samples analysed three times as 8–26 second cycles on the reference and sample have been attributed a 2σ uncertainty of ±0.016 % and samples analysed nine times as 8–26 second cycles on the reference and sample have been attributed a 2σ uncertainty of ±0.008 %. The ability to analyse a sample three or nine times depends on the sample size available for measurements.
Supplementary Text S-2. Sulfur Loss Models

Two models were examined to identify the potential origin for second-order variations in sulfur concentrations seen in the 50–100 μm size fractions.

I. Diffusion and condensation model description

Diffusion for a homogenous 3-D sphere starting at fixed temperature can be described by:

$$\frac{\partial \varphi(r, t)}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot [D(\varphi, r)\nabla \varphi(r, t)]$$

where $\varphi(r, t)$ is the concentration of diffusing element at position $r$ and time $t$, and $D(\varphi, r)$ is the diffusion coefficient for element concentration $\varphi$ at position $r$ (Crank, 1975). The equation can be simplified if $D$ is a constant to:

$$\frac{\partial \varphi(r, t)}{\partial t} = D\nabla^2 \varphi(r, t).$$

The relationship of $D$ and temperature $T$ for $^{32}$S in basalts can be demonstrated with the following equation (Zhang et al., 2010):

$$D_{^{32}S_{basalts}}^{TD} = \exp[-8.21 - \frac{27,692 - 651.6w}{T}]$$

where $w$ is wt. % H$_2$O and ‘TD’ refers to trace element diffusion.

Diffusion of $^{34}$S is evaluated assuming the arbitrary relationship (e.g., Richter et al., 2009):

$$D_{^{34}S_{basalts}}^{TD} = \frac{D_{^{32}S_{basalts}}^{TD}}{33.96787^{k}}$$

where $k$ is an exponent that varies from 0 to 0.5, which assumes a square root mass relationship. More physically realistic representations for diffusion that rely on diffusion hops through lattice force fields were not explored but should fit within the limits $k = 0 \rightarrow 0.5$.

With initial state conditions, together with a boundary condition that $\varphi(r = a, t)$, this system has an analytical solution of (after Eq. 3-68c in Zhang, 2008):

$$\bar{\varphi}(t, a) = \varphi_0 * \left(1 - \frac{M_t}{M_{\infty}}\right) = \varphi_0 * \frac{6}{\pi^2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{-Dn^2\pi^2t/a^2}$$

where $\bar{\varphi}(t, a)$ is the average concentration at radius $a$ after diffusing for time $t$. $\varphi_0$ is the initial concentration of the homogenous grain. $\frac{M_t}{M_{\infty}}$ is the proportion of mass loss due to diffusion at time $t$. Concentration (i.e., $\bar{\varphi}(t, a)$) profiles are calculated for each radius (1–250 μm) grain. A condensed layer added to the outside of each grain follows the model used by (Rees and Thode, 1974) and is used to account for the shift to positive $\Delta^{34}$S and higher concentrations of smaller size fractions. The thickness of this layer and the concentrations within this layer are adjusted as in prior studies. One weakness in the diffusion model includes the assumption
of constant temperature and uniform diffusivity since the regolith consists of various minerals, glass, and agglutinates produced by local heating, and the surfaces subject to space weathering. An additional weakness in the model is that it only accounts for isotope effects associated with diffusion and does not account for isotope effects occurring at the edge of the grain by the loss process. These effects could shift the direction of the isotope fractionation.

Adding loss of sulfur via the diffusion model produces a profile of concentrations moving from the grain interiors to the grain edges that scales with grain size and allows the model to reproduce the second order drop in concentration observed for the 50–100 μm size fractions. Inclusion of diffusive isotope fractionation produces a shift to lower δ₃⁴S for the rims but, given the relatively uniform variation in isotope ratios which can be explained by isotopic mixing between an outer layer and a second endmember, fractionations by diffusion and or loss processes are not ruled out by the data, but are not required to reproduce the significant isotopic variations that are seen.

The data reported in Table S-1 fit the t-T relationships shown in Figure S-1, which require times that are too long for temperatures that do not involve melting. The possibility of multiple events may exist but would need to compete with comminution by gardening for diffusion to be a viable explanation for the variations in concentration in the 50–100 μm size fractions.

![Figure S-1](https://example.com/figure.png)

**Figure S-1** Diffusivity times related to temperature.

## II. The three-layer onion model

The second model invoked a component in addition to the outer layer component and the grain component. For such a component to lead to the concentration deficits seen in the 50–100 μm size fractions, its proportion must increase as particle size decreases. One way to do this is to treat this increase as related to grain surface area and this can be modelled using a simple a three-layer onion model. The inner sphere (Layer 1) is assumed to be unaltered and represents the composition of materials that was hit by the micrometeorite. The depleted shell (Layer 2) is melted and has undergone some sulfur depletion and possible isotope fractionation. Lastly, a condensed outer layer (Layer 3) is added on the surface of the grain. The thickness of the grain follows the model by (Rees and Thode, 1974; Thode and Rees, 1976) that suggests the condensed
layer thickness is between 1 and 3 μm. Fits to this model that also fit the concentration data presented in Table S-1 are reported in Table S-3.

### Table S-3  
Model fits that match the concentration data presented in Table S-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Inner sphere</th>
<th>Depleted shell</th>
<th>Outer layer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thickness (µm)</td>
<td>S concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>S isotopes (δ³⁴S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74241, 204</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75081, 690</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While this result indicates that there is a component with lower sulfur concentration that is more represented in the 50–100 µm size fractions relative to the other grain size fractions, distributing the depleted sulfur component as a second layer around the grains is used just as a possible scaling rule.
Figure S-2  Example of how our three-layer onion model changes as the concentration of the melt layer is changed. The melt layer is the main factor controlling the behaviour observed among sulfur concentration, sulfur isotopes, and grain size.

III. Evaluating the effect of sulfur escape from the Moon

Our diffusion models suggest no isotopic fractionation during sulfur liberation from a soil grain melting event. Sulfur isotope fractionation associated with sputtering is not well constrained and is likely overprinted by the concomitant fractionation of sulfur loss to space. The process of sulfur loss has several elements. It starts with a process that introduces sulfur species into the atmosphere. Sputtering by solar wind and volatile release from micrometeorite impact melts at temperatures between limits of approximately 1700 K to 3776 K (Cintala, 1992) provide two ways to generate species with high enough energy to exceed the threshold for lunar escape (2380 m/s). In the case of impact melt produced volatiles, it is the higher energy part of the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution (see following section for details) for ground state atomic sulfur, HS, H$_2$S, SO, and SO$_2$ that can escape the lunar gravitational field because mean free paths are very large (hundreds to thousands of kilometers, see following section). The remaining sulfur is enriched in heavy isotopes, and this can be significant for the lightest of these species. The atoms and molecules that do not escape follow ballistic trajectories of hundreds of thousands of km before they return to the surface (see following section). Further, it is not certain whether they will immediately be deposited or ricochet back for
another ballistic arc. At a velocity of 1–2 km/s, these species remain in the atmosphere for hundreds to thousands of seconds on each arc, being distributed across large swaths of the lunar surface. The enhancement of δ³⁴S for the sulfur fraction that does not escape is calculated for several species as a function of the temperature of the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution and is shown in Figure S-3.

![Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution of SO used to calculated escape velocity on the lunar surface.](image)

**Figure S-3** Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution of SO used to calculated escape velocity on the lunar surface.

### IV. Details of atmospheric escape model

The isotopic fractionation associated with loss is calculated using an approach that is similar to that used by Switkowski *et al.* (1977) and Wang *et al.* (2012) (illustrated for loss of SO produced by vaporisation at 3776 K in Fig. S-3).

This approach rests on the assumption that volatile sulfur species acquire a Maxwell-Boltzmann speed distribution set by the temperature at which they are introduced into the lunar atmosphere and then effuse without collisions, either following ballistic trajectories that return them to the lunar surface or escape trajectories that remove them from the Moon. The mean free path of molecules under lunar atmospheric conditions 10⁹–10¹⁰ Pa (10⁻¹⁵ bar) are on the order of hundreds to thousands of km (Housley *et al.*, 1978). The ballistic trajectories that are calculated are also on this order, but a significant fraction of molecules, more for heavier molecules, are deposited closer to the site of impact because of the 360° × 180° sweep of initial trajectories radiating outward from the point of volatile generation (Fig. S-4).
Figure S-4  Calculation of ballistic trajectory of sulfur atoms following azimuthal trajectories at 3776 K.

The temperatures of this process likely fall between the temperature of agglutinate formation and agglutinate evaporation which is assumed to be between 1770 K and 3776 K (Cintala, 1992). The energies of sputtering, a loss process examined by Switkowski et al. (1977), are estimated as 1 eV (11,700 K). The volatile species that are produced from typical terrestrial silicate liquids at high temperatures favour formation of atomic sulfur, but also include SO, SO$_2$, and minor H$_2$S (Schaefer et al., 2012). Hydrogen-bearing species may be allowed or materials with significant implantation of solar wind. The isotopic fractionations associated with loss are largest for the lightest species. An illustration of the isotopic fractionation imparted on the sulfur that remains after escape is provided in Figure S-5 for temperatures spanning those from Cintala (1992) for vaporisation to those of Switkowski et al. (1977) for sputtering.

Figure S-5  Sulfur isotope composition of common gaseous sulfur species as a result of fractionation from sulfur escape from the Moon.
Other fractionation processes may also operate. These include isotopic fractionation of species with similar kinetic energy ($E = \frac{1}{2}mv^2$) and is approximated by the square root of the ratio of masses ($\left(\frac{m_a}{m_b}\right)^{1/2}$), yielding variations between $\delta^{33}$S, $\delta^{34}$S, and $\delta^{36}$S that scale approximately as 1:2:4 (known as mass-dependent fractionation) and with fractionation factors for $^{34}$S/$^{32}$S for species like FeS, SO$_2$ and SO between 10 and 20 ‰. For this to be effective, the separation of species must be maintained, and homogenisation must not be complete. Studies of diffusive loss and loss into hard vacuum produce $^{32}$S enriched residues. Studies of troilite decomposition by McEwing et al. (1980) demonstrate that large isotope fractionations can occur, and manifest as depletions in heavy isotopes of the volatilised phase rather than depletions in the light isotopes, as seen in the soils.

Supplementary Text S-3. Isotopic Discrepancy Between Lunar Soils and Basalts

The $\delta^{34}$S value inferred for grain interiors of our samples (excluding the condensed layer) is shifted to a slightly more positive value (1.2 ‰ to 1.7 ‰) than the average of mare basalts (0.58 ‰; Wing and Farquhar, 2015). Further, the $\delta^{34}$S value inferred for more mature lunar soils is even higher (Thode and Rees, 1976). These observations indicate that this component either carries a signature acquired during impact gardening or is simply derived from a lunar mantle component like that associated with high-Ti glasses (Saal and Hauri, 2021). If the signature is derived from a gardening event, the data would support reworking of $^{34}$S-enriched material as the gardening process continues. An original composition associated with high-Ti mantle melts would have implications for mantle materials that are most broadly distributed across that lunar surface that can be further explored with additional analyses of lunar materials.
Additional Supplementary Figures

**Figure S-6**  Sulfur isotope data for 75081, 690-submature (this study) and 15021-mature from (Thode and Rees, 1979) that illustrates potential relationship between $\Delta^{33}S$ and maturity. Uncertainties on data from (Thode and Rees, 1979) are estimated as 2 s.d. on mean of measurements of Canyon Diablo Troilite in (Thode and Rees, 1971). Uncertainties associated with data reported in this study are smaller than the size of the symbols.
**Figure S-7** Sulfur concentration and δ^{34}S vs. the outer layer function (F) and the corresponding grain radius. Data from this study are closed red and blue symbols. Data from Rees and Thode (1974) and Thode and Rees (1976) are shown as open symbols and indicated by * in the legend. $F = \frac{r^3 - (r-a)^3}{r^3}$, where $r$ is grain radius and $a$ is the average thickness of the condensed layer, which is set at 1.5 µm (Rees and Thode, 1974). We have also plotted exemplary models for sulfur diffusion (solid red and blue lines). These models are performed at 1200 °C and show the process of diffusion and condensation occurring on integrated timescales of 4 s for 74241, 204 (solid blue line) and 20 s for 75081, 690 (solid red line). We also plot our three-layer model results (dashed lines; see supplementary text for details on parameters). Dotted lines portray the model from Rees and Thode (1974).
Figure S-8  Sulfur isotope data for lunar soils (this study), lunar basalts (Wing and Farquhar, 2015; Gargano et al., 2022), main group Pallasites (Dottin et al., 2018), iron meteorites (Antonelli et al., 2014), and HED meteorites (Rai et al., 2005; Wu et al., 2018).
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