Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

Solid Earth Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Channel flow, tectonic overpressure, and exhumation of high-pressure rocks in the Greater Himalayas

Fernando O. Marques[1*], Nibir Mandal[2], Subhajit Ghosh[3], Giorgio Ranalli[4], Santanu Bose[3]

[1]*Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal*

[2]*Jadavpur University, Kolkata, India*

[3]*University of Calcutta, Kolkata, India*

[4]*Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada*

Abstract

The Himalayas are the archetype of continental collision, where a number of long-standing fundamental problems persist in the Greater Himalayan Sequence (GHS): (1) contemporaneous reverse and normal faulting; (2) inversion of metamorphic grade; (3) origin of high- (HP) and ultra-high (UHP) pressure rocks; (4) mode of ductile extrusion and exhumation of HP and UHP rocks close to the GHS hanging wall; (5) flow kinematics in the subduction channel; and (6) tectonic overpressure, here defined as $TOP = P/P_L$ where P is total (dynamic) pressure and P_L is lithostatic pressure. In this study we couple Himalayan geodynamics to numerical simulations to show how one single model, upward-tapering channel (UTC) flow, can be used to find a unified explanation for the evidence. The UTC simulates a flat-ramp geometry of the main underthrust faults, as proposed for many sections across the Himalayan continental subduction. Based on the current knowledge of the Himalayan subduction channel geometry and geological/geophysical data, the simulations predict that a UTC can be responsible for high *TOP* (> 2). *TOP* increases exponentially with decrease in UTC's mouth width, and with increase in underthrusting velocity and channel viscosity. The highest overpressure occurs at depths < -60

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

km, which, combined with the flow configuration in the UTC, forces HP and UHP rocks to exhume along the channel's hanging wall, as in the Himalayas. By matching the computed velocities and pressures with geological data, we constrain the GHS's viscosity to be $\leq 10^{21}$ Pa s, and the effective convergence (transpression) to a value ≤ 10%. Variations in channel dip over time (> or < 15º) may promote or inhibit exhumation, respectively. Viscous deformable walls do not affect overpressure significantly for a viscosity contrast (viscosity walls/viscosity channel) in the order of 1000 or 100. *TOP* in a UTC, however, is only possible if the condition at the bottom boundary is no outlet pressure; otherwise it behaves as a leaking boundary that cannot retain dynamic pressure. However, the cold, thick and strong lithospheres forming the Indian and Eurasian plates are a good argument against a leaking bottom boundary in a flat-ramp geometry, and therefore it is possible for overpressure to reach high values in the GHS.

Keywords: Himalayan geodynamics; channel flow; Greater Himalayas; numerical modelling; tectonic overpressure; exhumation HP and UHP rocks

*Corresponding author. E-mail address: fomarques@fc.ul.pt

1. Introduction

Continental collision has brought together two continents, India and Eurasia, which were previously separated by thousands of kilometres of oceanic lithosphere that has been consumed by subduction. Understanding the mechanics of the collisional interface, known as the Greater Himalayas Sequence (GHS), has continuously stimulated geoscientists to search for new concepts/models. Most critically, high- (HP) and ultrahigh- (UHP) pressure rocks crop out along the Himalayan GHS, thus raising long-standing and lively debated questions regarding formation and exhumation of HP and UHP rocks, and the difference between lithostatic and dynamic

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

50 pressures (overpressure) in dynamic systems. The GHS appears therefore as a unique natural
51 prototype that can be modelled numerically in the search for answers to those critical questions.



52

53 *Figure 1. Geological setting of the eastern Himalayas, highlighting the architecture of its major tectonic*
54 *elements. A – Simplified geological map of the eastern Himalayas (adapted from Grujic et al., 2011;*
55 *Unsworth et al., 2005). White line along 90ºE marks the cross-section shown in B. B – Schematic section*
56 *across the Himalayas (adapted from Grujic et al., 2011), in which the UTC stands out (GHS in red). The*

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

GHS is bounded at the top by the South Tibet Detachment (STD) and at the bottom by the Main Central Thrust (MCT). MHT – Main Himalayan Thrust. C – Model setup of the UTC, with shape and dimensions similar to the natural prototype in B. The "foot wall" (moving wall) and the "hanging wall" (no slip wall) correspond to the MCT and the STD, respectively. Apart from the later folding of both MCT and STD, the similarity between nature and model setup is apparent.

1.1. Geological setting

Based on metamorphic grade and structural style, four units and the major faults separating them were distinguished by Gansser (1964), which are from bottom to top (Fig. 1): Sub-Himalayan Sequence (SHS – unmetamorphosed Tertiary rocks), Main Boundary Thrust (MBT), Lesser Himalayan Sequence (LHS – low-grade metamorphic rocks), Main Central Thrust (MCT), Greater Himalayan Sequence (GHS – high-grade metamorphic rocks), South Tibetan Detachment (STD), and Tethyan Sedimentary Sequence (TSS – unmetamorphosed to weakly metamorphosed rocks). All the main faults are N-dipping thrusts, except the STD that also dips to N but is a normal fault.

The GHS shows patchy occurrences of eclogites close to the STD (Grujic et al., 2011; Ganguly et al., 2000; O'Brien et al., 2001; Groppo et al., 2007; Corrie et al., 2010; Kellett et al., 2013; Sorcar et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2015) (Fig. 1A). Recent petrologic studies provide estimates for spatial-temporal variations of pressure (P) and temperature (T) in the GHS. The peak metamorphic conditions are $T \sim 760$ °C and $P \geq 1.5$ GPa for eclogitization in the Bhutan Himalayas (Grujic et a., 2011). Peak conditions with $T = 670$ °C and $P \geq 1.5$ GPa were reported for the Nepal Himalayas (Corrie et al., 2010). On the other hand, an estimate of the metamorphic peak at $P = 2.7$–2.9 GPa and $T = 690$–750 ºC from coesite-bearing eclogites in the western Himalayas was provided by O'Brien et al. (2001). The eclogites have been in part overprinted by regionally more extensive granulite facies conditions of 800 °C at ~ 1 GPa (Grujic et al., 2011; Ganguly et al., 2000; Groppo et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2015). *PT*-time paths suggest exhumation of these high-grade rocks under nearly isothermal decompression after peak metamorphic conditions (Ganguly et al., 2000; Groppo et al., 2007; Sorcar et al., 2014). Using cooling rates,

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

the exhumation history of the high-grade rocks was interpreted as a two-stage event by Ganguly et al. (2000), marked by exhumation at a rate of 15 mm/yr to a depth of 15 km, followed by slow exhumation at a rate of 2 mm/yr to a depth of at least 5 km, which occurred broadly in Miocene times (Grujic et al., 2011; Corrie et al., 2010; Kellett et al., 2013; Sorcar et al., 2014; Warren et al., 2011; Rubatto et al., 2013).

The exhumation mechanics of GHS rocks is one of the most debated issues in the Himalayas (and elsewhere where HP and UHP rocks outcrop), having led to a variety of tectonic models that postulate channel flow by topographic forcing (Wobus et al., 2005; Beaumont et al., 2001) or transpression (Grujic et al., 1996). Grujic et al. (1996) first proposed the GHS in the Bhutan Himalayas as deep crustal ductile rocks extruded between the MCT and the STD. Numerical models have integrated geological, tectonic, geophysical, metamorphic and rheological data to provide possible explanations for the exhumation process. The models postulate a channel flow of low-viscosity rocks in the middle to lower crust, driven by topographic pressure gradient, to account for the extrusion dynamics of high-grade metamorphic rocks in the GHS (Wobus et al., 2005; Beaumont et al., 2001). The channel flow model can also explain the coeval reverse and normal kinematics along the MCT and STD, respectively (Fig. 1B). However, as Grujic et al. (2011) pointed out, these models cannot "*predict the exhumation of lower orogenic (>50 km, i.e. >1.4 GPa) crustal material*" in their basic form. To overcome this limitation, an alternative exhumation mechanism was proposed by Grujic et al. (2011), with additional tectonic forcing (transpression) by the impingement of strong Indian crust into the already weak lower crustal granulitized eclogites below southern Tibet. However, previous models do not comprehensively address the mechanics of overpressure leading to the formation of eclogites (Schulte-Pelkum et al., 2005), and their focused exhumation close to the STD.

Given that the current models do not fully explain the observations in the GHS, in this study we couple eastern Himalayan geodynamics with numerical simulations to show how one

single model, upward-tapering channel (UTC) flow, as in the current eastern Himalayas (Fig. 1B), can be used to find a unified explanation for the following persisting problems: (1) contemporaneous reverse and normal faulting; (2) inversion of metamorphic grade; (3) origin of high- (HP) and ultrahigh- (UHP) pressure rocks; (4) mode of ductile extrusion and exhumation of HP and UHP rocks close to the GHS hanging wall (STD); (5) flow kinematics in the subduction channel; and (6) tectonic overpressure.

1.2. Premises

We model channel flow with a linear viscous fluid by the Navier-Stokes equation with body force (gravity), therefore pressure in the channel depends on viscosity and velocity configuration. Most critically, the velocity field depends on channel geometry and conditions applied at the boundaries (e.g. Marques et al., 2018). Ultimately, *TOP* can only exist if the channel walls are strong enough. Therefore, when investigating pressure in a viscous channel, one has to take into account four fundamental issues:

(1) *Viscosity* – the viscosity term in the Navier-Stokes equation depends on a number of parameters, all of which are incorporated in the Arrhenius term in a constitutive equation. Therefore, the modeller has two options when investigating the effects of viscosity on pressure: either use a full constitutive equation and test all the parameters in the Arrhenius term, or simply and directly vary the magnitude of the viscosity. We chose the second option in our numerical simulations, since our focus is the assessment of parameter variations on the development of overpressure and flow configuration.

(2) *Geometry of the channel* – given that flow configuration inside the channel plays a critical role in the pressure distribution, we tested three main shapes of the channel: parallel-sided (parallelepiped), and upward (similarly to Marques et al., 2018) or downward tapering channels.

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

(3) *Boundary conditions* – the conditions at the boundaries can either promote or inhibit *TOP*, because they control the flow pattern and the pressure retention inside the channel. Therefore, we tested different velocity configurations applied at the underthrusting (foot) wall (simple or simple+pure shears), and different conditions at the boundaries like slip, no-slip or outlet pressure.

(4) *How the walls of the pressure vessel react to internal pressure* – under particular applied boundary conditions, the Navier-Stokes equation produces *TOP* in an upward tapering channel that can reach values orders of magnitude greater than observed in nature; therefore we will discuss the theoretical values in view of the current knowledge on natural HP and UHP rocks. The discussion of channel flow is similar to discussing a pressure vessel with an overpressured fluid inside: one has to investigate the conditions to produce overpressure inside the vessel (the channel in the prototype), and simultaneously the strength of the vessel walls (the lithosphere in the prototype) to support the internal pressure without failure (by brittle or viscous yield). We will therefore discuss the strength of the channel walls in view of the current knowledge about the Indian (footwall) and Eurasian (hanging wall) lithospheres, especially in terms of thickness and strength.

This study builds on the conceptual work by Marques et al. (2018) on tectonic overpressure.

Given the above premises, we investigated the conditions under which overpressured rocks can form and be exhumed in a prototype like the Himalayas: geometry of the channel, conditions at the boundaries, applied velocities, and viscosity. Based on the numerical simulations and the current knowledge of the Himalayas, we discuss the theoretical values of overpressure, the obtained exhumation velocities, the most likely viscosity of the subducted rocks, and finally the effects of the strength of the channel walls on overpressure.

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

160

161 **2. Numerical modelling**

162 We modelled the subduction channel, as illustrated in Fig. 1C, with an incompressible
163 linearly viscous fluid, which has been accepted as a simple but effective approximation to the
164 behaviour of rocks undergoing ductile flow. The setup simulates a flat-ramp geometry of the
165 main underthrust faults, as shown in many cross-sections of the Himalayas, in particular the one
166 shown in Fig. 1B. For steady-state flow of a viscous incompressible Newtonian fluid at very low
167 Reynolds number, the dynamic Navier-Stokes equations reduce to the Stokes approximation,
168 which is the basis of the COMSOL code for computational fluid dynamics used here.

169

170 *2.1. Boundary conditions and model setup*

171 The boundary conditions were as follows (see Fig. 1C, and Methods in Appendix for
172 further details): (1) slab-parallel velocity (***U***) applied on the underthrusting (foot)wall (2 to 20
173 cm/yr) (Feldl and Bilham, 2006; DeMets et al., 2010), and fixed hanging wall; (2) viscosity (η)
174 between 10^{19} and 10^{22} Pa s (Beaumont et al., 2001; England and Houseman, 1989; Copley et al.,
175 2011); (3) channel dip α (15-30º); (4) channel mouth's width W_m = 25 to 100 km, and width at
176 the channel's base W_b = 150 or 200 km, from which we define $W_m^* = W_m/W_b$; (5) constant
177 density of the material in the channel (2800 kg/m^3). Given the viscosity contrast between
178 foot/hanging walls of the GHS and channel material, the channel walls were assumed
179 undeformable in the first simulations, except when testing the effects of non-rigid walls on
180 overpressure.

181 The metamorphic processes occur in response to the total isotropic stress, called *dynamic*
182 *pressure*, which is a sum of the tectonic (Stokes) and lithostatic pressures (ρgz, where ρ is
183 density, g is gravitational acceleration, and z is depth). We evaluate the dynamic pressure to
184 explain the occurrence of high-pressure rocks in the GHS, and we define an overpressure factor

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

(*TOP)* as the non-dimensional ratio between dynamic and lithostatic pressures (Figs. A1 and A2). For a better understanding of overpressure in a UTC, we carried out a parametric study of *TOP* as a function of η, W_m, α, $\boldsymbol{U}$, and effective convergence velocity (transpression) (see Methods in Appendix for details). The prime focus of our investigation concerned the simulations with $\boldsymbol{U}$ = 5 cm/yr, α = 20º, W_m = 100 km and W_b = 150 km, which represent the most common and conservative values. We then use the numerical results to constrain the viscosity, pressure and velocity in the channel, consistent with current geological data and estimates.

3. Model results

3.1. Flow patterns

The model UTC shows two main layers, one flowing downward due to applied underthrusting motion in the footwall, and another flowing upward and so inducing relative normal faulting on the hanging wall (Fig. 2). Two distinct flow cells exist, one as an open circuit in the shallow channel (< 30 km depth), and another as a closed circuit in the deeper channel. The line of flow reversal (dashed white line in Fig. 2B) acts as an internal large-scale shear zone with curved geometry and thrust motion. The upward flowing layer shows, at shallow depth, a maximum velocity ≈ 0.5×10^{-9} m/s, i.e. ~16 mm/year. The line of flow convergence separates crustal materials of contrasting pressures, one towards the footwall with P < 1.5 GPa, the other towards the hanging wall with P > 1.5 GPa (red curve in left hand panel in Fig. 2D), which is the pressure at which eclogite formation is possible at -30 km. Overall, the flow pattern shows that significantly overpressured rocks (*TOP* > 2.) can be exhumed rapidly through a narrow region close to the hanging wall of the channel, which corresponds to the STD in the Himalaya and where HP and UHP rocks have been found.

3.2. Dynamic pressure and overpressure

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

210 Model results are presented as colour maps (Fig. 2) and graphs (Fig. 3), the latter
211 showing the effects of several parameters on overpressure in the subduction channel.



212

213 *Figure 2. Pressure and velocity maps and graphs for a UTC with α=20º, W_m=100 km, W_b=150*
214 *km, **U** = 4 cm/yr, and η = 10^{21} Pa s. A – Velocity vectors and streamlines superimposed on*
215 *pressure map (background colour and colour bar), where two distinct flow circuits can be*
216 *recognized, one above and the other below -30 km. Also note asymmetry of flow relative to*
217 *channel, with upward return flow concentrated nearest the hanging wall. B – Zoom of the*
218 *topmost domain of the channel (marked by dashed rectangle in A). Note the convergence toward*
219 *the surface between a shallow flow (mostly on the footwall side and carrying lower pressure and*
220 *overpressure as seen in D) and a deep flow (mostly on the hanging wall side and carrying higher*

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

pressure and overpressure as seen in D). White dashed line separates downward and upward flows. C – Velocity vectors superimposed on velocity coloured map (colour bar for scale). Note the red stripe of lower velocity closer to the footwall, which corresponds to the line of flow reversal in the model. Inset in C showing a velocity profile across the channel (marked by white dashed line and X-X'). D – graphs showing P, PL and TOP = P/PL at -30, -60 and -90 km. Note that the highest overpressure occurs at the shallowest depth, and increases toward the hanging wall (except at -90 km).

Varying W_m with other parameters constant and $\eta = 10^{21}$ Pa s shows that the UTC develops overpressure in the entire range of $W_m/W_b = W_m^* = 25/150$ to 100/150 km (Fig. 3A). *TOP* is inversely proportional to W_m^*, and can be as high as 10 for $W_m^* = 0.17$ at depths between 20 and 60 km, with the highest *TOP* at 20 km depth.

TOP is sensitive to α in a UTC under a given set of values for W_m, η and $\boldsymbol{U}$ (Fig. 3B). The results plotted in Fig. 3B show $TOP > 1$ for $15^o < \alpha \leq 30^o$. *TOP* is maximal at α = 20-25°, reaching 1.7 at depths between 40 and 60 km.

The plot in Fig. 3C shows increase in *TOP* with increase in $\boldsymbol{U}$, from $TOP \approx 1.5$ at $\boldsymbol{U}$ = 2-5 cm/yr (current Indian velocity), to $TOP \approx 11$ when $\boldsymbol{U}$ = 20 cm/yr (Indian velocity at 60-70 Ma).

The simulations show a near-exponential variation of *TOP* with η (Fig. 3D), which we use to constrain the viscosity in the Himalayan collision zone.

Above we presented numerical simulations for $\eta = 10^{21}$ Pa s, typically applicable to the Himalayan tectonic setting. However, we ran additional simulations with different viscosities, and a set of results is presented for a viscosity of 10^{22} Pa s (Fig. 4). $\eta = 10^{22}$ Pa s induces much higher overpressure, especially when the mouth width decreases, and when the underthrusting velocity increases to velocities that have been estimated to exist at 60-70 Ma.

Taken together, the results shown in Figs. 3 and 4 place constraints on the factors affecting overpressure. Extremely high values of *TOP* are obtained for $\eta > 10^{21}$ Pa s, $U > 5$ cm/yr, and $W_m^* < 0.50$.

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018



Figure 3. Graphs showing the dependence of overpressure factor (TOP) on normalized width of channel mouth W_m (A), channel dip α (B), underthrusting velocity **U** (C), and viscosity in the channel η (D). For each tested variable, other values are kept constant: W_m* = 100/150 = 0.67 (except in A), $\alpha = 20^o$ (except in B), U = 5 cm/a (except in C), $\eta = 10^{21}$ Pa s (except in D).*

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018



Figure 4. Graphs showing overpressure factor TOP as a function of normalized channel's mouth width W_m (A), channel dip α (B), and convergence velocity **U** (C), for a viscosity $\eta = 10^{22}$ Pa s. For each tested variable, other values are kept constant: W_m* = 100/150 = 0.67 (except in A), $\alpha = 20^o$ (except in B), U = 5 cm/a (except in C). Comparison with Fig. 3 shows that $\eta = 10^{22}$ Pa s induces much higher overpressure, especially at smaller W_m* and higher **U**.*

Varying channel dip (α) involves significant changes in the flow pattern, as shown in Fig. 5. For $\alpha = 15^o$, the channel is dominated by downward flow, setting in a large-scale vortex in the deeper level, and does not show conspicuous zones of ductile extrusion, which only occurs when $\alpha > 15^o$.

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018



Figure 5. Simulations showing the effects of channel dip (α) on flow pattern.

Besides the results obtained for a channel base width of 150 km, and variable mouth

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

269 width, we also evaluated the effects of the channel base width on flow patterns and pressure
270 distribution, by running a set of numerical simulations with a base width of 200 km. The channel
271 flow shows similar patterns in the two cases, and small variations in pressure.



272

273 *Figure 6. Graphs showing the linear dependence of overpressure (TOP)(A) and extrusion*
274 *velocity (B) on transpression.*

275

276 *3.3. Effects of transpression on overpressure and flow*

277 We ran a set of simulations to investigate how much a transpressional movement across
278 the viscous channel might influence the magnitude of tectonic overpressure and, especially,
279 velocity at the channels mouth (extrusion velocity). Transpression in the numerical models was
280 introduced by setting the magnitude of horizontal velocity in excess of that corresponding to the

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

281 underthrusting movement. Fig. 6 shows a plot of *TOP* as a function of transpression, represented
282 as the ratio between horizontal velocity and non-transpressional horizontal component (ca.
283 1.49E-9 m/s). The numerical results indicate that: (1) transpression has appreciable effects on
284 overpressure, especially if transpression is large (> 20%); (2) transpression has great effects on
285 extrusion velocity, as shown in Figs. 6 and 7.



286

287 *Figure 7. A – Velocity map of a channel under transpression. X-X' marks the line along which*
288 *extrusion velocity was measured and plotted in B.*
289

290 *3.4. Viscous deformable walls*

291 We used a similar modelling approach to evaluate the magnitude of overpressure in
292 subduction channels confined by deformable walls, a model condition that closely replicates the
293 actual mechanical setting in the Himalayas. This model allows for both channel walls to deform
294 viscously, thus raising the question of how much overpressure they can retain inside the channel.
295 We developed the deformable wall models with a channel geometry similar to that in rigid wall

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

models, as shown in Figure 8A. The footwall and the hanging wall of the channel were rheologically modelled as a viscous material, which provides a good approximation for simulation of long term (millions of years) rheology of the lithosphere. Several earlier workers have used viscous rheology to model continental scale deformation during India-Tibet collision. The assumed viscosity values of the cold Indian craton range from 10^{23} to 10^{25} Pa s (e.g. Jiménez-Munt and Platt, 2006; Yang and Liu, 2013), whereas that of Himalayan subducted material ranges between 10^{20} and 10^{21} Pa s (e.g. Liu and Yang, 2003; Copley and Mckenzie, 2007). The viscosity ratio (viscosity walls/viscosity channel) is therefore in the order of 10^2 to 10^5. In our modelling we chose a conservative value of the viscosity ratio equal to 10^3, where the walls and channel viscosities are 10^{23} and 10^{20} Pa s, respectively. We constrained the model boundaries with kinematic conditions as in the reference model with rigid walls. The lateral and the top boundaries of the footwall were subjected to a velocity of 4 cm/yr sub-parallel to the channel, whereas the lateral vertical boundaries of the hanging wall were fixed with zero horizontal velocity components, leaving the vertical component unconstrained. Its top boundary was also left unconstrained, allowing the material to extrude upward freely. The wall-channel interfaces had a no-slip condition.

Model results show channel flow patterns quite similar to those observed in rigid wall models. The extrusion occurs along a region close to the hanging wall in the form of a Poiseuille flow (Fig. 8A). It is noteworthy that the footwall undergoes little or no deformation, although being deformable. The entire footwall underthrusts by translational motion parallel to the channel. We calculated both the dynamic and the static pressures along the channel axis, and plotted them as a function of depth (Fig. 8B). Similarly to rigid wall models, the dynamic pressure here exceeds the static pressure by nearly 1.5 GPa. For example, the static pressure at a depth of 60 km is about 1.5 GPa, whereas the corresponding dynamic pressure reaches 3 GPa. The pressure plots clearly suggest that subduction channels with deformable walls can also give

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

321 rise to large tectonic overpressures. For a viscosity ratio of 10^3, the deformable wall models are
322 found to be mechanically identical to rigid wall models.

323 We also used a lower viscosity contrast of 10^2, and found that even at this relatively low
324 contrast there is significant overpressure in the subduction channel.



325
326 *Figure 8. A – Crustal flow patterns in viscous subduction channel and its deformable walls with*
327 *a viscosity ratio of 10^3 (details of model boundary conditions in the text). B – Calculated plots of*
328 *pressure as a function of depth along the channel axis. Note that the dynamic pressure obtained*
329 *from deformable wall models with viscosity contrast 1000 closely follows that for channels with*
330 *rigid walls.*
331

332 *3.5. Condition at the bottom boundary*

333 This is a critical boundary condition because it is directly related to the retention of
334 overpressure. When we assign an outlet pressure (calculated lithostatic pressure at the depth of
335 the bottom wall) to the bottom wall, *TOP* does not develop in the whole channel.

336

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

4. Discussion

Given our incomplete knowledge of natural prototypes and the limitations of modelling very complex systems, we have to distinguish between the theoretically and naturally possible values of overpressure. The study here reported for a UTC shows that relevant parameters like channel mouth width (W_m*), subduction dip (α), underthrusting velocity ($\boldsymbol{U}$) and viscosity (η) can produce very high overpressure; however, these theoretically possible values have to be constrained by the current knowledge of the Himalayas, in particular exhumation velocities and spatial distribution, occurrence of HP and UHP rocks, and strength of the lithosphere bounding the subduction channel. Despite the natural constraints imposed by our knowledge of the current Himalayas, one cannot ignore that, under specific boundary conditions, geometrical configurations and parameter sets that could have existed in the past (e.g. much higher subduction velocity), high values of overpressure are theoretically possible, which should guide us in the search of new evidence in the natural prototype.

Previous models have used two of the three main possible configurations of a subduction channel: parallel-sided and downward tapering, which have been shown to produce relatively small overpressure ($TOP < 3$) (e.g. Li et al., 2010). Here we investigated a different channel geometry, the upward tapering channel. In fact, the parallel-sided geometry corresponds to W_m* = 1, and can thus be considered an end-member of the UTC. Therefore, we can compare numerical results of overpressure obtained for parallel-sided and UTC channels, by looking at the graph in Fig. 3A where we vary W_m*. Our best explanation for this effect is that the narrower the mouth the higher the flow confinement, which results in increased velocity gradient in the channel flow, and therefore the dynamic pressure.

Previous models can explain channel flow, but neither account for the exhumation of HP rocks (Rubatto et al., 2013), nor the exhumation velocities (Grujic et al., 2011) reported from the Himalayas. Our UTC model provides an alternative explanation for the pressure required for

eclogite metamorphism (Hetényi et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2014), and the process of rapid exhumation. For exhumation by extrusion to occur in the subduction channel, the flow pattern inside the channel must have a specific configuration, as in the UTC. In such a velocity configuration, underthrusting and exhumation on the channel's footwall add to produce enhanced overthrusting on the MCT, and above the MCT along the line of flow reversal. Conversely, exhumation (upward flow) on the hanging wall is greater than underthrusting and produces relative normal fault displacement on the STD, not because the block to the N of the STD (hanging wall) moves down, but because the rocks south of the STD (footwall) move up due to exhumation by extrusion.

Previous channel flow models can explain the exhumation mechanism, however they leave a number of problems unaddressed. Here we raise some of these issues, pointing to our UTC model as a unifying model to explain the GHS evolution:

(1) The classical channel flow model assumes that the entire GHS crustal mass thrusts up along the MCT, with concomitant normal motion on the STD (Poiseuille flow). However, recent studies have shown large-scale thrusts within the GHS (Grujic et al., 2011; Larson et al., 2015), suggesting a more complex kinematics of the extrusion process. The UTC model we propose here shows flow partitioning in the channel, leading to thrust-type shear localization within the model GHS.

(2) A typical channel flow model fails to explain the occurrence of HP rocks (> 1.5 GPa) close to the STD. Our UTC model yields an asymmetrical flow pattern in which HP or UHP materials extrude along a narrow zone located close to the STD.

(3) The assumption of lithostatic pressure raises two main problems: (i) a conceptual problem, because the subduction channel is dynamic, therefore the lithostatic and dynamic pressures are not identical; and (ii) a practical problem, because the exhumation velocities are calculated on the basis of depth estimated from ρgz (where z is depth), and not normalized

by the overpressure. For instance, conversion of 2 GPa to depth using a static assumption (ρgz) yields a depth of ca. 70 km for a rock density of 2900 kg/m^3. However, the UTC flow develops an overpressure in the order of 2 at much smaller depths, and thereby yields lower exhumation rates, as compared to those calculated from petrologic modelling. Estimated metamorphic paths should reflect the shape of the isotherms in the subduction channel, which must have a relationship with velocity in order to carry cold rocks to depth, and preserve the HP and UHP mineral parageneses during exhumation.

(4) Model velocities in the channel and at the channel's mouth must be consistent with the values reported in the literature. Assuming lithostatic pressure, an exhumation rate of ~ 15 mm/yr to a depth of at least 15 km was estimated by Ganguly et al. (2000). An estimate of 22–44 mm/yr, and increasing linearly with depth was provided by Grujic et al. (2011). According to the UTC dynamic model, the assumption of lithostatic pressure where *TOP* = 2 yields an overestimation of the exhumation velocity by a factor of 2. If this is the case, then the velocity estimates have to be divided by two (15/2 = 7.5 mm/yr, and 33/2 = 16.5 mm/yr). Our UTC model shows a high velocity layer with the materials flowing upward at a rate of 16 mm/yr at a depth of ca. 40 km, which is thus in agreement with the estimated average exhumation. The velocity map in Fig. 6 reveals variations of exhumation rates with depth, as predicted for the GHS in the Sikkim Himalaya by Ganguly et al. (2000), who showed that the exhumation was rapid (15 mm/yr) to a depth of 15 km, and then decreased to ca. 2 mm/yr until a depth of 5 km. These values estimated for exhumation in the GHS constrain the theoretical values of overpressure numerically obtained by varying the amount of transpression. Transpression values > 10% imply velocities at the mouth (exhumation) much larger than estimated for the GHS, therefore we conclude that transpression must be very limited (< 10%).

(5) A critical issue regarding overpressure in a subduction channel is the strength of the channel

walls to support high overpressure values. The most debatable point in our modelling is the use of rigid walls. For this discussion, we can compare the subduction channel to a pressure vessel, in which the resistance of the vessel to internal pressure depends on two main parameters: the strength of the vessel (the lithosphere hosting the subduction zone), and the thickness of the pressure vessel walls (hoop stress). In nature, if the walls of the pressure vessel (subducting and overlying lithospheres) are old and cold, which is the case in the Himalayan collision, then their mechanical strength can be very high. If, additionally, the cold and strong lithosphere is thick, then the walls of the subduction channel can support high overpressure, as indicated by the numerical results with viscous deformable walls. Given that the Indian plate and the TSS above the STD are almost undeformed (attesting to the rigidity contrast between foot and hanging walls of the GHS) and thick, the channel walls were assumed undeformable in the reference simulations. In order to investigate the effects of viscous deformable walls on tectonic overpressure, we used viscosity contrasts (viscosity of channel walls/viscosity of subduction channel) down to 100, which are well within the accepted values of lithosphere viscosity (up to 10^{23} Pa s) and subducted material (down to 10^{19} Pa s). These simulations indicate that viscosity contrasts of 1000 or 100 do not change significantly the overpressure obtained with rigid walls. Another critical issue in overpressure build-up is the condition at the bottom boundary: if an outlet pressure is assigned to the bottom wall, then this boundary behaves as a leaking boundary that cannot retain dynamic pressure. However, the cold, thick and strong lithospheres that comprise the Indian and Eurasian plates are a good argument against a leaking bottom boundary in a flat-ramp geometry such as the Himalayan collision zone.

(6) In order to explain the non-linear variation of overpressure with channel dip (α) we need to analyse the variations of channel flow patterns with increasing α (Fig. 5). For low α values (15º), the underthrusting motion drags materials to a larger extent into the downward flow,

and produces a large vortex in the deeper channel, where the curl dominates the flow field. Consequently, the dynamic pressure remains low. Note that flow divergence increases the dynamic pressure. With increasing α (20º) the flow pattern is characterized by the development of an extrusion channel on the hanging wall side, along which the material extrudes upward with flow convergence at the mouth. Such a negative divergence in the flow builds overpressure on the hanging wall side (Fig. 2D). With further increase in α the extrusion channel widens, and causes the overpressure to drop, as it happens in a pipe flow. This is the reason why the overpressure has a maximum at α around 20-25º.

(7) Inverted metamorphic grade has not been explained by previous models, but the UTC can provide an explanation if one considers the flow pattern shown in Fig. 2B. HP and UHP rocks can be exhumed by two flow cells, both inverting metamorphism because low-grade rocks go down close to the footwall, and high-grade rocks are exhumed close to the hanging wall.

We analysed the consistency between the numerical results and geological/geophysical data to constrain the most probable viscosity and pressure, at the same time satisfying a reasonable velocity at the channel's mouth (i.e. exhumation rates) (Fig. 7). On the one hand, the viscosity of rocks comprising the lithosphere can vary between 10^{19} and 10^{23} Pa s. On the other hand, overpressure is sensitive to the viscosity within the UTC, increasing exponentially with increase in viscosity. Additionally, from the values shown in Figs. 3 and 4, the formation of HP rocks can occur at very shallow levels if $\eta = 10^{21}$ Pa s. However, despite the relatively wide range of possible viscosity values, $\eta > 10^{21}$ Pa s in a Himalayan UTC yields overpressures > 8. This means that, for $\eta = 10^{22}$ Pa s, a rock metamorphosed at 50 km depth would record a total pressure equivalent to the lithostatic pressure at a depth of 400 km, which is not acceptable on the basis of our current knowledge of subduction zone dynamics. Therefore, we propose that the

viscosity in the subduction channel is probably in the range $10^{20} \leq \eta \leq 10^{21}$ Pa s.

Regarding the discrepancy between previous estimates of possible values of overpressure and ours, we call attention to two factors: (1) we use a subduction channel geometry, the UTC, not investigated previously; and (2) the values reported here are very large only for small W_m*, or $\boldsymbol{U} > 5$ cm/a, or $\eta > 10^{21}$ Pa s. In other words, for relatively small tapering (W_m*), average plate tectonics velocities, and reasonable viscosities, the numerical results reported here for overpressure are not excessive, but nevertheless still very important as a factor for depth overestimation. The values used for the controlling parameters, W_m*, α and η are conservative; in fact, the model channel in Fig. 1C shows rather small tapering as compared with the cross-section in Fig. 1B, but, nevertheless, the model overpressure is still quite high, especially at low depth.

The UTC simulations show that there is no need for gravitational collapse, buoyancy-controlled crustal exhumation, or orogen-perpendicular pressure gradient induced by a topographic gradient to explain simultaneous reverse and normal fault kinematics on MCT and STD, or inverse metamorphic grade, or exhumation of HP rocks. We conclude that flow in a UTC, without the need for topography or density contrasts, can be responsible for these three simultaneous and seemingly paradoxical processes in the Himalayas.

The formation and exhumation of high (HP) and ultra-high (UHP) pressure rocks is a persisting fundamental problem, especially regarding UHP rocks. The problem is even greater if one assumes that pressure estimated from paleopiezometry can be converted directly to depth, because then the UHP rocks must be exhumed from great depths. Several models have been proposed for the exhumation of HP and UHP rocks in several orogens (e.g. Hacker and Gerya, 2013; Warren, 2013; Burov et al., 2014a, 2014b): channel flow (e.g. England and Holland, 1979; Mancktelow, 1995; Grujic et al., 1996; Beaumont et al., 2001, 2009; Burov et al., 2001; Raimbourg et al., 2007; Gerya et al., 2008; Warren et al., 2008; Li and Gerya, 2009); eduction

(e.g. Andersen et al., 1991; Kylander-Clark et al., 2012); buoyancy-driven crustal delamination and stacking (e.g. Chemenda et al., 1995, 1996; Sizova et al., 2012); microplate rotation (e.g. Hacker et al., 2000; Webb et al., 2008); trans-mantle diapirism (e.g. Stöckhert and Gerya, 2005; Little et al., 2011; Gordon et al., 2012); and slab rollback (e.g. Brun and Faccenna, 2008; Faccenda et al., 2009; Vogt and Gerya, 2014; Malusà et al., 2015). No model has so far provided a complete and unique explanation. The UTC model presented here is a potentially unifying model, because it shows that it is possible to form rocks recording HP or UHP at depths < 60 km and to exhume them to the surface as a consequence of the flow configuration in the UTC.

5. Conclusion

The UTC model integrates and provides a robust physical explanation for a number of landmark features in the Greater Himalayan geodynamics, such as simultaneous reverse and normal faulting (channel flow), inversion of the metamorphic grade in the GHS, and exhumation of HP/UHP rocks along a narrow conduit close to the STD. Viscous flow in a UTC involves dynamic pressures in excess of lithostatic pressure, resulting in significant overpressure by a factor more than 1.5, even at depths as shallow as 40 km. The UTC model predicts high pressure (>1.5. GPa) metamorphism of underthrusted rocks, e.g. eclogitization, to occur above 60 km depth. The UTC model shows that the GHS is segmented broadly into two sub-terrains with contrasting pressures: wide southern and narrow northern terranes, with pressures less and greater than 1.5 GPa, respectively. It further shows that temporal variations in channel dip may promote ($\alpha > 15^{o}$) or inhibit ($\alpha < 15^{o}$) exhumation. Overpressure increases with increase in $\boldsymbol{U}$, from $TOP \approx 1.5$ for $\boldsymbol{U}$ = 2-5 cm/yr (current Indian velocity), to $TOP \approx 11$ when $\boldsymbol{U}$ = 20 cm/yr (Indian velocity at 60-70 Ma), which means that in the past all the dynamic processes discussed here may have been enhanced. We tested different model setups (e.g. parallel walls) and boundary conditions (e.g. slip or no-slip condition at bounding walls), but these do not reproduce

the prototype. The UTC model shows that tectonic pressure alone can drive the extrusion of HP rocks by channel flow. Viscous deformable walls do not affect overpressure significantly for viscosity contrasts (viscosity walls/viscosity channel) in the order of 1000 or 100. If, during the subduction process, the mouth width, or the dip, or the velocity, or the viscosity, or the conditions at the boundaries change in space and time, then *TOP* will change accordingly, and the exhumation mechanism (flow in the channel) and exhumation depth will also change.

TOP in a UTC is only possible if the condition at the bottom boundary is not outlet pressure; otherwise it behaves as a leaking boundary that cannot retain dynamic pressure. However, the cold, thick and strong lithospheres that comprise the Indian and Eurasian plates are a good argument against a leaking bottom boundary in a flat-ramp geometry, which means that overpressure can build up to high values in the GHS. The argument does not apply if the channel is "open" at the bottom, because overpressure cannot be retained. This could be the case in subduction zones where there is no evidence for return flow and exhumation concomitant with subduction.

The numerical results reported here show that, under specific boundary conditions, geometrical configurations, and parameter sets, high values of overpressure are theoretically possible, which should guide us in the search of new evidence in the natural prototype to prove or disprove the natural existence of high overpressure.

Acknowledgements

FOM benefited from a sabbatical fellowship awarded by FCT Portugal (SFRH/BSAB/1405/2014). NM acknowledges DST-SRB, India, for providing a J.C. Bose Fellowship. SG acknowledges funding for doctoral research from the University Grants Commission (UGC/275/Jr Fellow (Sc.)). GR thanks Carleton University for research support.

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

References

Andersen, T.B., Jamtveit, B., Dewey, J.F., Swensson, E., 1991. Subduction and eduction of continental crust: major mechanism during continent–continent collision and orogenic extensional collapse, a model based on the south Caledonides. Terra Nova 3, 303–310.

Beaumont, C., Jamieson, R.A., Butler, J.P., Warren, C.J., 2009. Crustal structure: a key constraint on the mechanism of ultra-high-pressure rock exhumation. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 287, 116–129.

Beaumont, C., Jamieson, R. A., Nguyen, M. H., Lee, B., 2001. Himalayan tectonics explained by extrusion of a low-viscosity crustal channel coupled to focused surface denudation. Nature 414, 738–742.

Brun, J.-P., Faccenna, C., 2008. Exhumation of high-pressure rocks driven by slab rollback. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 272, 1–7.

Burov, E., Jolivet, L., Le Pourhiet, L., Poliakov, A., 2001. A thermomechanical model of exhumation of high pressure (HP) and ultra-high pressure (UHP) metamorphic rocks in Alpine-type collision belts. Tectonophysics 342, 113–136.

Burov, E. et al, 2014a. Rheological and geodynamic controls on the mechanisms of subduction and HP/UHP exhumation of crustal rocks during continental collision: Insights from numerical models. Tectonophysics 631, 212-250.

Burov, E., François, T., Yamato, P., Wolf, S., 2014b. Mechanisms of continental subduction and exhumation of HP and UHP rocks. Gondwana Research 25, 464–493.

Chemenda, A.I., Mattauer, M., Malavieille, J., Bokun, A.N., 1995. A mechanism for syn-collisional rock exhumation and associated faulting: Results from physical modelling. Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 132, 225–232.

Chemenda, A.I., Mattauer, M., Bokun, A.N., 1996. Continental subduction and a mechanism for exhumation of high-pressure metamorphic rocks: new modeling and field data from Oman. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 143, 173–182.

Copley, A. & McKenzie, D. 2007.Models of crustal flow in the India-Asia collision zone. Geophysical Journal International, 169, 683–698.

Copley, A., Avouac, J. P., Wernicke, B. P., 2011. Evidence for mechanical coupling and strong Indian lower crust beneath southern Tibet. Nature 472, 79–81.

Corrie, S.L., Kohn, M.J., Vervoort, J.D., 2010. Young eclogite from the Greater Himalayan Sequence, Arun Valley, eastern Nepal: P–T–t path and tectonic implications. Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 289, 406–416.

570 DeMets, C., Gordon, R. G., Argus, D. F., 2010. Geologically current plate motions. Geophys. J.
571 Int. 181, 1–80.
572 England, P.C., Holland, T.J.B., 1979. Archimedes and the Tauern eclogites: the role of buoyancy
573 in the preservation of exotic eclogite blocks. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 44, 287–
574 294.
575 England, P. C., Houseman, G. A., 1989. Extension during continental convergence, with
576 application to the Tibetan Plateau. J. Geophys. Res. 94, 17,561 –17,579.
577 Faccenda, M., Minelli, G., Gerya, T.V., 2009. Coupled and decoupled regimes of continental
578 collision: numerical modeling. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 278, 337–349.
579 Feldl, N., Bilham, R., 2006. Great Himalayan earthquakes and the Tibetan plateau. Nature 444,
580 165–170.
581 Ganguly, J., Dasgupta, S., Cheng, W. J., Neogi, S., 2000. Exhumation history of a section of the
582 Sikkim Himalayas, India: records in the metamorphic mineral equilibria and compositional
583 zoning of garnet. Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 183, 471–486.
584 Gansser, A., 1964. Geology of the Himalayas. Wiley-Interscience, New York, pp. 289.
585 Gerya, T.V., Perchuk, L.L., Burg, J.-P., 2008. Transient hot channels: perpetrating and
586 regurgitating ultrahigh-pressure, high temperature crust–mantle associations in collision
587 belts. Lithos 103, 236–256.
588 Gordon, S.M. et al., 2012. Multi-stage exhumation of young UHP-HP rocks: timescales of melt
589 crystallization in the D'Entrecasteaux Islands, southeastern Papua New Guinea. Earth and
590 Planetary Science Letters 351–352, 237–246.
591 Groppo, C., Lombardo, B., Rolfo, F., Pertusati, P., 2007. Clockwise exhumation path of
592 granulitized eclogites from the Ama Drime range (Eastern Himalayas). J. Metamorph. Geol.
593 25, 51–75.
594 Grujic, D. et al., 1996. Ductile extrusion of the Higher Himalayan Crystalline in Bhutan:
595 evidence from quartz microfabrics. Tectonophysics 260, 21–43.
596 Grujic, D., Warren, C. J., Wooden, J. L., 2011. Rapid synconvergent exhumation of Miocene-
597 aged lower orogenic crust in the eastern Himalaya. Lithosphere 3, 346–366.
598 Hacker, B.R. et al., 2000. Exhumation of ultrahigh-pressure continental crust in east– central
599 China: Late Triassic–Early Jurassic tectonic unroofing. Journal of Geophysical Research
600 105, 13339–13364.
601 Hacker, B.R., Gerya, T.V., 2013. Paradigms, new and old, for ultrahigh-pressure tectonism.
602 Tectonophysics 603, 79-88.
603 Hetényi, G. et al., 2007. Density distribution of the India plate beneath the Tibetan plateau:

geophysical and petrological constraints on the kinetics of lower-crustal eclogitization. Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 264, 226-244.

Kellett, D. A., Grujic, D., Coutand, I., Cottle, J., Mukul, M., 2013. The South Tibetan detachment system facilitates ultra rapid cooling of granulite–facies rocks in Sikkim Himalaya. Tectonics 32, 252–270.

Kylander-Clark, A., Hacker, B., Mattinson, C., 2012. Size and exhumation rate of ultrahigh-pressure terranes linked to orogenic stage. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 321–322, 115–120.

Jiménez-Munt,I., Platt,J,P.,2006.Influence of mantle dynamics on the topographic evolution of the Tibetan Plateau: Results from numerical modeling. Tectonics, vol. 25, TC6002, doi:10.1029/2006TC001963

Larson, K. P., Ambrose, T. K., Webb, A. G., Cottle, J. M., Shrestha, S., 2015. Reconciling Himalayan midcrustal discontinuities: The Main Central thrust system. Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 429, 139-146.

Li, Z., Gerya, T.V., 2009. Polyphase formation and exhumation of high- to ultrahighpressure rocks in continental subduction zone; numerical modeling and application to the Sulu ultrahigh-pressure terrane in eastern China. Journal of Geophysical Research 114 (B9).

Little, T.A. et al., 2011. Diapiric exhumation of Earth's youngest (UHP) eclogites in the gneiss domes of the D'Entrecasteaux Islands, Papua New Guinea. Tectonophysics 510, 39–68.

Liu, M., Yang, Y., 2003. Extensional collapse of the Tibetan Plateau: results of three-dimensional finite element modeling. Journal of Geophysical Research 108, 2361.http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2002JB002248

Malusà, M.G. et al., 2015. Contrasting styles of (U)HP rock exhumation along the Cenozoic Adria-Europe plate boundary (Western Alps, Calabria, Corsica). Geochemistry Geophysics Geosystems 16, 1786-1824.

Mancktelow, N., 1995. Nonlithostatic pressure during sediment subduction and the development and exhumation of high pressure metamorphic rocks. J. Geophys. Res. 100, 571–583.

Marques, F.O., Ranalli, G., Mandal, N., 2018. Tectonic overpressure at shallow depth in the lithosphere: The effects of boundary conditions. Tectonophysics, in press.

Nábělek, J. et al., 2009. Underplating in the Himalaya-Tibet collision zone revealed by the Hi-CLIMB experiment. Science 325, 1371-1374.

O'Brien, P. J, Zotov, N, Law, R, Khan, M. A., Jan, M. Q., 2001. Coesite in Himalayan eclogite and implications for models of India-Asia collision. Geology 29, 435–38.

Raimbourg, H., Jolivet, L., Leroy, Y., 2007. Consequences of progressive eclogitization on

crustal exhumation, a mechanical study. Geophysical Journal International 168, 379–401.

Rubatto, D., Chakraborty, S., Dasgupta, S., 2013. Timescales of crustal melting in the Higher Himalayan Crystallines (Sikkim, Eastern Himalaya) inferred from trace element-constrained monazite and zircon chronology. Contrib. Mineral. Petrol. 165, 349–372.

Schulte-Pelkum, V. et al., 2005. Imaging the Indian subcontinent beneath the Himalaya. Nature 435, 1222-1225.

Sizova, E., Gerya, T.V., Brown, M., 2012. Exhumation mechanisms of melt-bearing ultrahigh pressure crustal rocks during collision of spontaneously moving plates. Journal of Metamorphic Geology 30, 927–955.

Sorcar, N., Hoppe, U., Dasgupta, S., Chakraborty, S., 2014. High-temperature cooling histories of migmatites from the High Himalayan Crystallines in Sikkim, India: rapid cooling unrelated to exhumation? Contrib. Mineral. Petrol. 167, 957.

Stöckhert, B., Gerya, T.V., 2005. Pre-collisional high pressure metamorphism and nappe tectonics at active continental margins: a numerical simulation. Terra Nova 17, 102–110.

Vogt, K., Gerya, T.V., 2014. From oceanic plateaus to allochthonous terranes: numerical modelling. Gondwana Research 25, 494-508.

Unsworth, M.J. et al., 2005. Crustal rheology of the Himalaya and Southern Tibet inferred from magnetotelluric data. Nature 438, 78-81.

Warren, C.J., 2013. Exhumation of (ultra-)high-pressure terranes: concepts and mechanisms. Solid Earth 4, 75–92.

Warren, C.J., Beaumont, C., Jamieson, R.A., 2008. Modelling tectonic styles and ultra-high pressure (UHP) rock exhumation during the transition from oceanic subduction to continental collision. Earth and Planetary Science Letters 267, 129–145.

Warren, C.J., Grujic, D., Kellett, D. A., Cottle, J., Jamieson, R. A., Ghalley, K. S., 2011. Probing the depths of the India–Asia collision: U–Th–Pb monazite chronology of granulites from NW Bhutan. Tectonics 30, TC2004.

Webb, L.E., Baldwin, S.L., Little, T.A., Fitzgerald, P.G., 2008. Can microplate rotation drive subduction inversion? Geology 36, 823–826.

Wobus, C. et al., 2005. Active out-of-sequence thrust faulting in the central Nepalese Himalaya. Nature 434, 1008–1011.

Yang, Y., Liu, M., The Indo-Asian continental collision: A 3-D viscous model, Tectonophysics (2013),http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2013.06.032

Zhang, Z. et al., 2015. Oligocene HP metamorphism and anatexis of the Higher Himalayan Crystalline Sequence in Yadong region, east-central Himalaya. Gondwana Research,

672 doi:10.1016/j.gr.2015.03.002.
673 Zhang, Z. et al., 2014. The Moho beneath western Tibet: Shear zones and eclogitization in the
674 lower crust. Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 408, 370-377.
675
676

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

677 **Appendix - Methods**

678 *Boundary conditions and model setup*

679 The boundary conditions needed to complete the mathematical formulation for numerical
680 simulations were as follows: (1) slab-parallel velocity applied on the underthrusting wall,
681 consistent with the horizontal velocity of the Indian plate (5 cm/yr, DeMets et al., 2010); (2) slip
682 condition on (parallel to) the bottom boundary (Nábělek et al., 2009); (3) no slip condition on the
683 hanging wall; (4) outlet condition with 1 atm pressure at the channel's mouth; (5) gravity applied
684 to the whole channel (~9.8 m/s^2); (6) constant density of the material in the channel = 2800
685 kg/m^3 (no phase changes in the models), representing the association felsic (mostly) and mafic
686 granulites carrying the eclogite pods. Given that the Indian plate and the TSS above the STD are
687 almost undeformed, attesting to the rigidity contrast between foot and hanging walls of the GHS,
688 the channel walls were assumed undeformable in the simulations, except those testing the effects
689 of viscous walls. In order to investigate flow kinematics and dynamic pressure in the channel, we
690 varied the following parameters: (1) channel viscosity (η), (2) underthrusting velocity ($\boldsymbol{U}$), (3)
691 channel dip (α), (4) channel mouth's width (W_m), and (5) viscosity of channel walls. The
692 viscosity in the channel was varied between 10^{19} and 10^{22} Pa s to cover a broad spectrum of
693 crustal viscosities, as reported in the literature (Beaumont et al., 2001; England and Houseman,
694 1989; Copley et al., 2011). The current convergence rate between India and Eurasia has been
695 estimated in the order of 5 cm/yr, however, given the wide range of estimated velocities (Feldl
696 and Bilham, 2006; DeMets et al., 2010), we ran numerical simulations varying $\boldsymbol{U}$ between 2 and
697 20 cm/yr (6.34E-10 to 6.34E-9 m/s in the model). Channel dip was varied between 15 and 30°,
698 which broadly covers the geometry of the GHS shown in different geological sections. We
699 assumed W_m = 25 to 100 km, and W_b (width at the channel's base) = 150 or 200 km, from which
700 we define $W_m^* = W_m/W_b$. We tested a viscosity contrast (viscosity of channel walls/viscosity in
701 the channel) of 1000 to investigate the effects of viscous deformable walls on overpressure.

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

Despite varying all these parameters, the prime focus of our investigation concerned the simulations with $\boldsymbol{U}$ = 5 cm/yr, α = 20°, W_m = 100 km and W_b = 150 km, as they represent the most common and conservative values regarding published data. We then use the numerical results to constrain the viscosity, pressure and velocity in the channel, consistent with current geological data and estimates.

The metamorphic processes occur in response to the total isotropic stress, called *dynamic pressure*, which is a sum of the tectonic (Stokes) and lithostatic pressures (ρgz, where ρ is density, g is gravitational acceleration, and z is depth) (Figs. A1 and A2). The dynamic pressure results from the viscous flow driven by tectonic stresses in the gravity field. Using the present mechanical model, we evaluate the dynamic pressure to explain the occurrence of high-pressure rocks in the GHS, as a consequence of dynamic pressure in excess of lithostatic pressure at a given crustal depth. We define an overpressure factor (*TOP*) as the non-dimensional ratio between dynamic and lithostatic pressures. For a better understanding of overpressure in a UTC, we carried out a parametric study of *TOP* as a function of η, W_m, α, $\boldsymbol{U}$, and effective convergence velocity (horizontal velocity component > $\boldsymbol{U}$).



Figure A1. Evolution of dynamic and lithostatic pressures in a UTC with $\eta = 10^{21}$ Pa s and ρ = 2800 kg/m^3. The ratio dynamic pressure/lithostatic pressure corresponds to the overpressure factor (TOP).

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018



Figure A2. Overpressure in the UTC under the velocity field shown in Fig. 3.

Mathematical formulation

The mathematical model used in the present work is based on the Navier-Stokes equations for two-dimensional steady-state incompressible viscous flows:

$$\rho\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t}+\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u}\right)=-\nabla p+\eta\nabla^2\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{F} \quad (1)$$

$$\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}=0 \quad (2)$$

where **u** is the velocity vector, p the pressure, ρ the density, η the dynamic viscosity and **F** the external body force (gravity). ρ and η are constant. Then, defining the scaled variables $\bar{x}=x/L$, $\bar{u}=u/U$, $\bar{p}=p/P$ and $\bar{t}=t/T$, in terms of the characteristic length L, velocity U, pressure P and time $T = L/U$, Eqs. (1) and (2) become:

$$\frac{\partial\bar{\mathbf{u}}}{\partial\bar{t}}+\bar{\mathbf{u}}\cdot\nabla\bar{\mathbf{u}}=-\mathrm{Eu}\bar{\nabla}\bar{p}+\frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}}\bar{\nabla}^2\bar{\mathbf{u}} \quad (3)$$

$$\bar{\nabla}\cdot\bar{\mathbf{u}}=0 \quad (4)$$

where $\mathrm{Re}=\rho UL/\eta$ and $\mathrm{Eu}=P/\rho U^2$ are, respectively, the Reynolds and Euler numbers. For flows at low characteristic velocity U and high viscosity η, inertial terms Eu and Re in Eq. (3) become negligible. We thus obtain the Stokes approximation of the momentum equation for quasi-static

Solid Earth Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-37
Manuscript under review for journal Solid Earth
Discussion started: 4 May 2018

738 (creeping) flows, which in dimensional form and under a gravity field reads:

739

740 $-\nabla p + \eta\,\nabla^2 u + \mathbf{F} = 0$ (5)

741 The Stokes equations were solved on the 2-D domain illustrated in Fig. 1C, which was
742 filled with an incompressible viscous linear fluid. The flow equations, with the boundary
743 conditions specified, were solved in the primitive variables $\mathbf{u}\equiv(u,v)$ and p over a finite element
744 mesh, using the algorithm for incompressible Stokes flows implemented in COMSOL.