



Supplement of

The influence of detachment strength on the evolving deformational energy budget of physical accretionary prisms

Jessica McBeck et al.

Correspondence to: Jessica McBeck (j.a.mcbeck@geo.uio.no)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the CC BY 4.0 License.

Overview

This supplemental information contains one section of text, and six figures. Text S1 describes our calculation of the effective stiffness of the wedges. Figure S1 shows the calibration of the machine units of the strain gauges to normal force measurements. Figure S2 shows the results of the calculation of effective stiffness of the experimental wedges. Figure S3 shows the kinematic compatibility assessment used to determine the robustness of the DIC fields. Figure S4 shows the cumulative slip distribution along faults. Figure S5 shows the range of incremental work budget estimates using different assumptions. Figure S6 shows displacements fields from the top views of experiments with opposing configurations.

Supplemental Text S1: Effective stiffness

In order to calculate the internal work done within the wedge, we must estimate the stress state within the wedge. We used Hooke's laws to estimate 2D stress tensors from strain tensors. These laws assume linear elasticity. Although the rheology of the sandpack within the fault zones is closer to plastic than linear elastic, it is reasonable to assume that the sand aggregate between the faults has a linear relationship between stress and strain. Preceding fault development, the stress-strain curves are approximately linear, indicating the linearity of this relationship.

To estimate the effective stiffness of the sand wedges, we calculated the normal stress exerted on the load-bearing area of the backwall and the horizontal longitudinal strain within the sandpacks preceding thrust faulting. We used the normal force measured on the backwall (Fig. 3) and an effective height of the load-bearing area of 4 cm, equal to the height of the rectangular sandpack. Calculating the horizontal contraction requires the displacement of the edge of the box and the length of the contracting region. We measured the horizontal displacement of the backwall recorded in the DIC displacement fields. We considered the full length of the sandbox (90 cm) as the length of the compacting region. Selecting a load-bearing height of 4 cm and contraction region length of 90 cm reflects the goal of calculating the effective stiffness throughout the wedge, and not only near the backwall or sidewalls. Although high magnitudes of horizontal compression were localized into different volumes in the experiments with opposing apparatus configurations (Fig. 9), the force exerted on the backwall was a result of force networks that span the length of the sandpack from the backwall to the opposite wall. Below, we investigate the influence of using a smaller compacting length (20 cm) to estimate stiffness because we observe the highest contraction within a volume of this length prior to faulting. From the horizontal displacement of the backwall observed in the DIC fields from both sides, we found the average of the strains from the left and right sides as representative of the strain.

These estimates of the effective stiffness (\sim 1 MPa) (Fig. S2) exceed previous estimates (0.11-0.25 MPa) of the effective stiffness of wedges built with an UCP depositor (*Herbert*, 2014). The difference may arise because from the different areas over which the contraction is estimated. The calculation of 1 MPa uses the entire length of the sandpack whereas *Herbert* (2014) use only the region of compaction near the moving wall.

Here we assess the impact of using a smaller compacting length to estimate the effective stiffness. Gradients in the displacement fields observed at the top of the sandpack indicate that the largest magnitudes of contraction are localized within a minimum of 20 cm from the backwall, and spread to further distances from the backwall (Fig. S6). Estimating the effective stiffness of the sandpack with 20 cm as the length of the compacting region reduces the stiffness estimates to 0.13-0.26 MPa in agreement with *Herbert* (2014). Assuming 0.25 MPa as the

effective stiffness in the calculations of W_{int} decreases the average incremental W_{int} by 0.007 mJ from the average W_{int} calculated using 1 MPa (0.009 mJ) produced in experiment E376. Consequently, assuming a smaller effective stiffness results in smaller estimates of incremental W_{int} , and so does not change the general conclusion that W_{int} comprises the smallest portion of the energy budget.

Laboratory uniaxial compression tests of dry sand aggregates estimate stiffness that exceed the estimates from these UCP experiments. Dry sand in uniaxial compression tests with 50 loading-unloading cycles has apparent stiffness ranging from 100-400 MPa in the first cycle (*Klinkmuller et al.*, 2008, 2016). Geotechnical engineering studies provide additional constraints on the expected effective stiffness of aggregates of sand grains (e.g., *Roberston and Campanella*, 1983). Empirical relationships derived from normally consolidated sand produce estimates of effective stiffness at 50% failure stress from 10-50 MPa (*Baldi et al.*, 1981). However, the estimates of bulk stiffness from these tests will likely exceed the effective stiffness within experimental wedges, where the sandpack is unconfined and free to uplift. If the upward movement of the sand grains were restricted in the sandbox experiment, the applied backwall displacement would produce greater backwall force than in the present unconfined configuration, producing higher estimates of effective stiffness that would be closer to confined laboratory measurements.

Supplemental Figures

Figure S1

Calibration used to measure physical backwall force. A) Uniaxial strain sensors were mounted on four plaques that are fixed to a rigid board, which lay adjacent to the backwall in the experiments. Each plaque (blue) contained four uniaxial strain sensors (white rectangles) that are fixed to the two metal arms mounted on the plaque. B) Calibration of strain gauges to known weights resulted in a linear relationship of machine strain units to weight ($R^2=0.99$).



Estimates of effective stiffness of the physical accretionary wedges. A) Relationships between normal force exerted on backwall and backwall displacement measured from DIC fields from the top view camera. C) Resulting stress-strain relationships. Lines indicate tangent at 50% peak stress that determines the stiffness estimate. Linearity of the stress-strain curves suggest that using Hooke's laws provide a reasonable approximation of the stress state within the wedge outside of the fault zones.



Kinematic compatibility of displacement fields indicates the amount of artificial noise in incremental displacement fields. Net displacement fields (A), and corresponding kinematic compatibility field (B) for example incremental displacement fields of left (upper row) and right (lower row) side of experiment E375. High K was produced locally along faults in the left side displacement field, and in regions with higher artificial noise in right side displacement field. C) Histogram of kinematic compatibility, K, field for left and right sides reveal that the right side had higher magnitudes of K than the left side. To compare the kinematic compatibility of each displacement field to other fields, we considered the mean plus one standard deviation of the Kfield as the kinematic compatibility value representing that field, K^F , shown as red lines in (C). D) From each kinematic compatibility field, we identified K^F , and removed the fields from the analysis that had K^F above one standard deviation from the mean of all K^F from each incremental displacement field. Models within the gray region were thus considered reliable. Triangles pointing to the left (black triangle) and right (white triangle) show K^F of displacement fields derived from the left and right sides of the experimental apparatus, respectively. Most of the displacement fields from the right side of experiment E375 were considered unreliable due to inadequate focusing of the associated camera. Consequently, we excluded the incremental displacement fields calculated for the right side of experiment E375 from further analysis.



Cumulative slip distribution along detachment (black), backthrust (blue) and forethrust (red) in experiment with glass detachment (thicker lines) and sand detachment (thinner lines) at 6 mm of cumulative backwall displacement. Resulting contribution to W_{fric} listed near corresponding fault. The higher slip and higher frictional coefficient of the detachment and lower slip on the backthrust in the glass detachment compared to the sand detachment experiment produced the lower frictional work in the glass detachment experiment relative to the sand detachment experiment.



Influence of stress state and effective stiffness assumptions on the calculation of δW_{fric} (A) and δW_{int} (B). Top and bottom of red bars show the average incremental work budget component calculated on the left and right sides of experiment E376. A) Average δW_{fric} using different assumptions of the ratio of the horizontal normal compression, σ_1 , and lithostatic stress, σ_2 . We

assumed that $\sigma_1/\sigma_2 = 1$, but σ_1 may be $> \sigma_2$. However, this ratio will likely remain <3 preceding Coulomb shear failure at the deepest portion of the sandpack, 4 cm of 1700 kg/m³ density sandpack, $\sigma_2 = 0.6$ kPa. Thus, the potential difference in the reported and true δW_{fric} may be 20%, with 4 mJ when $\sigma_1/\sigma_2 = 1$, and 6 mJ when $\sigma_1/\sigma_2 = 3$. B) Average δW_{int} using different assumptions of effective elastic modulus used to estimate stresses from effective strains. Increasing the stiffness from the measured 1 MPa to 100 MPa does not increase δW_{int} sufficiently to make it exceed the contributions of the other components of the energy budget. Decreasing the effective stiffness from 1 MPa to 0.25 MPa (estimated using a smaller compacting length) reduces the average δW_{int} from 0.009 mJ to 0.002 mJ.



Net displacements from top views of experiment A) E374 (moving base), and B) E376 (moving backwall). Time (and displacement) backwall increase from top to bottom. The backwall is located at the bottom of each image. The motor is located at the top in the moving base (A) and at the bottom in the moving backwall experiment. (B) Following thrust fault development, the thrust fault strike is subperpendicular to the backwall in both experiments with differing configurations. apparatus Consequently, the impact of sidewall friction drag on thrust fault geometry is minimal after the thrusts have localized across the full width of the sandpack.

