

Interactive comment on “Domains of Archean mantle lithosphere deciphered by seismic anisotropy – initial results from the LAPNET array in northern Fennoscandia” by J. Plomerová et al.

M. Assumpcao (Referee)

marcelo@iag.usp.br

Received and published: 9 October 2011

General comments

Plomerova et al. present initial results of anisotropy measurements (P-wave and SKS) for northern Fennoscandian based on their well-known method of analysis of relative P-wave delay and 3D SKS-splitting. These initial results are very interesting and reveal a clear separation of distinct anisotropy domains in the northern Fennoscandia lithosphere.

These initial results seem robust enough and deserve publication before the full data set of the LAPNET array is analysed.

Specific comments

1. The P-wave anomalies and SKS-splitting indicate different lithospheric domains which are attributed to be separated by geological boundaries or suture zones. However, no example of such geological boundaries are given in the Figures. If possible, it would be nice to see some of these geological boundaries, such as in Fig. 4, for example.

The referee probably means the thick dashed lines in Fig. 3, which mark schematically boundaries of the mantle lithosphere domain, as we deduce from changes of the body-wave anisotropic parameters evaluated from two independent data sets and by different methods. The boundaries indicate margins of tectonic units at depth, i.e. the mantle lithosphere domains (blocks). To see some “geological boundaries and sutures” we added Figure 1b which shows crustal units and their boundaries. We also sketched in the boundaries in Figs. 2 and 4, though we consider the domain limitation by colours as sufficient. We complemented the text Section 5 and captions of the two Figures.

2. Page 665, Lines 20-25. The authors have argued that most of the anisotropy effects observed in Archean provinces come from frozen anisotropy in the lithosphere and cite Montagner, 1998; Pedersen et al., 2006; Assumpcao et al., 2011). However, Assumpcao et al.(2011) favor larger effects from present-day asthenospheric flow in South America. The data used by Assumpcao et al. were not analysed with detailed 3D techniques, such as done here by Plomerova et al. and so their conclusion may be disputed. However, given that the South American lithosphere (including the Amazon craton) is thinner than in Fennoscandian (see global lithospheric map of Conrad & Lithgow-Berteloni, 2006, based on Gung et al.,2003), and that the absolute velocity of S. America (~ 48 mm/y at HS3-NUVEL1A) is higher than Fennoscandian (16mm/y), there may be a real difference between anisotropy origin between northern Europe (mainly lithospheric) and South America (mainly asthenospheric flow).

Refs: Conrad, C. P., and C. Lithgow-Berteloni (2006), Influence of continental roots and asthenosphere on plate-mantle coupling, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 33, L05312, doi:10.1029/2005GL025621. Gung, Y., M. Panning, and B. Romanowicz (2003), Global anisotropy and the thickness of continents, *Nature*, 422, 707–711.

The authors mentioned above are quoted in a sense that the flow beneath cratons is low (page 665,lines24-25). Assumpcao et al (2011) explain variations in average splitting parameters beneath

the South America cratons by local variations of the sub-lithospheric flow due to lithosphere thickness variations. We agree that their different technique, i.e., calculating average splitting parameters at individual stations often from only few measurements of azimuthal anisotropy, does not allow to identify details in lateral variations of the mantle lithosphere fabric. We modified the text at last par. of the Discussion appropriately, and added a reference of Barruol et al., (2008) and Wuestefeld et al. (2010) who found several arguments supporting frozen lithospheric anisotropy in cratonic areas. We are aware of the great potential of vertical resolution of surface waves and exploited polarization and azimuthal anisotropy retrieved by Montagner and Tanimoto (1991) to derive a global model of lithosphere thickness as a transition between the frozen lithospheric and present-day related anisotropy in the sub-lithospheric mantle. We have published the model already in Plomerova et al. (2002). We extended slightly the text in the 1st par. of Section 4.

Minor technical corrections

1. Page 657, Lines 12-15: The paragraph implies that absolutely no progress has been made in imaging upper mantle velocity structure in Europe since Aki et al.(1977). That seems odd. The next sentence states that “significant” changes in LBA depth have been mapped. Perhaps the paragraph should be more explicit on which features have been improved since Aki et al.(1977) and which have remained about the same.

We never meant the paragraph should be read as stated and it was definitely misunderstood. We reformulated the text to be sure it is read properly. We want to emphasize that no one can expect large isotropic velocity variations within the Precambrian mantle lithosphere regardless of resolution of the standard isotropic velocity tomography (4th par of Section 1).

2. Page 659, 1st paragraph. The technique of detecting P-wave anisotropy by searching for the “bipolar pattern” has been used extensively by the authors. However, in the summary description of this technique, perhaps an extra sentence or two should be added to explain how the relative residuals from anisotropy effects are separated from those due to lateral variations.

We complemented the text of Section 2 by a short explanation as requested

3. Page 660, Line 13: “the convergently dipping high-velocity directions...” This is not too clear for me. Please expand the sentence.

We extended the text to be clear also to people who are used to think only in terms of azimuthal anisotropy, i.e., if anisotropy parameters are treated with the π -periodicity, or, that observations from opposite azimuth are the same (1st par. of Section 3).

4. Page 663, Line 8. The sentence seems to imply that delay times (dt) are also in Table 1.

We have corrected the misprint.

5. Table 1. Please add in the Table legend: phi= azimuth and theta= inclination from vertical downwards.

We complemente the table as requested.

6. Fig. 3 legend: the boundaries are marked by THICK dashed lines. Thin dashed lines are country limits.

We added the word ‘thick’ into the legend as requested.