

Interactive comment on “Deformation mechanisms in mafic amphibolites and granulites: record from the Semail metamorphic sole during subduction infancy” by Mathieu Soret et al.

Marco Herwegh (Referee)

marco.herwegh@geo.unibe.ch

Received and published: 13 March 2019

Dear authors, dear editor

This article deals with the microstructural evolution of the metamorphic sole of exhumed mantle in Oman using samples from three different sites. Based on vertical sample transects, the authors investigate microfabric changes as a function of increasing distance to the hanging wall peridotite and attribute these changes to changing deformation processes as a function of progressive exhumation. They excellently document changes in mineral assemblages, phase distributions, mineral chemistry and geometric microstructural (grain sizes, grain aspect ratios) aspects as well as CPOs.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Based on these data they come up with a generalized conceptual model where on the prograde metamorphic path dehydration reactions lead to the formation of amphibole, plag, cpx, grt aggregates where the latter two being rigid inclusions in a weak amphibol-plag matrix. Fluid assisted grain fracturing lead to grain size reduction, where then fine-grained mixed polymineralic aggregates deformed by diffusion creep processes (including grain boundary sliding and mass transfer processes). Cpx and grt clasts reduce their grain size further by fracturing and dynamic recrystallization, respectively. With reducing temperature cpx and grt are strongly altered and a matrix consisting of amphibole and plagioclase dominates. Seeing evidences for subgrain rotation formation in amphiboles, the authors claim a transition to dislocation creep, although still being in a polymineralic system. The formation of shear bands with precipitation of epidote as well as nucleation of new amphiboles indicate an important role of fluids down to these retrogressed conditions. Linking the microfabric evolution to qualitative rheological considerations, inferences about the stability and mechanical coupling across the plate interface are finally made.

The article is of great scientific interest for the subduction zone community particularly when interested in the mechanical coupling and the role of potential grain scale processes. The authors excellently document a nice suite of microfabric transitions giving important insights into the role of grain-scale processes in this environment. Using quantitative microstructural analysis, EBSD as well as microchemistry, they applied state of the art analytical techniques to achieve their aimed goals. The article is very well written and structured as well as excellently illustrated. Despite all these positive aspects, I have some major scientific points which are either not sufficiently presented or, in my opinion even wrongly interpreted, needing a careful re-examination during the revision of this manuscript.

These points are:

1) One of the major goals of this manuscript seems the link between microfabric and crustal-scale interplate mechanics. For me the already at the microscale important

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

gaps exist. Despite spreading bits and pieces of rheological terminology in a not very organized manner in results and discussion sections, a proper sequential description of arguments/hints on rheology at the different stages of microfabric evolution and a subsequent thorough discussion is currently missing. For example, already in the results terminology like 'load-bearing framework' etc. is used. Here the authors need first to describe which parts of the polymineralic aggregates show brittle and which ductile processes (what they in parts do well) not going further at that stage. In the discussion, these findings have then to be revisited and thoroughly treated in a rheological point of view. Which are the mechanically weak phases, which ones are strong? Please use for this argumentation the microstructural criteria presented before. See next point.

2) Currently the discussion dives right away into the deformation behavior of amphibole. This is a big step for a reader. Why not first revisiting the major aspects and goals, discussing then the general rheological aspects of the different aggregates and defining the rheological key players in the system? In this way, the authors could ideally set the scene for the subsequent treatment of the individual mineral phases.

3) My next concern is the way how the terms 'recrystallization' and 'dynamic recrystallization' are used or that the terms 'chemically-induced recrystallization' and 'nucleation of grains' (in the sense of precipitation out of a fluid) are missing. For readers experienced with these processes, which in my opinion all occur in the presented samples, the current use/not use of this terminology is somewhat confusing. Here a clear definition in the introduction on all these terms is mandatory. DYNAMIC RECRYSTALLIZATION is always associated to deformation and MUST be related to reorganization of dislocation structures. In case of cpx, the authors use undulose extinction apply this term to subgrain rotation and the formation of new recrystallized cpx grains in the mantle of cpx cores. These new CPX grains are surrounded by new amphibole grains clearly documenting a chemical reaction/mass transfer and not an individual dynamic recrystallization process. I am also wondering whether really subgrain rotation recrystallization is active or the grains either chemically nucleate completely new or present

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

host cpx fragments disintegrated along cleavage planes and being then subject of rotational reorientations. Since EBSD data were made it should be easy to detect the grain refinement/nucleation process and to document this also in the manuscript. Also the changes in the Ti content in the amphiboles make me suspicious. Dynamic recrystallization per se cannot produce chemical changes. Here you need chemical driving forces such as chemically-driven recrystallization or chemically-driven grain boundary migration etc. I listed in the attached document a bunch of literature to this subject one can look at and cite. Last but not least the nucleation of new phases is a very important process. I have the impression that the current version of the manuscript does not highlight this point strong enough, since this process provides the fabric with new, unstrained, chemically equilibrated grains. See next point.

4) The authors claim that pinning in the polymineralic fabric keeps the grain size small. I attached some references hoping to help the readers to find relevant references with this respect. Please note that pinning alone cannot keep a grain size small in nature since coupled grain coarsening would led the grains grow. In a dynamic system, such as present in the metamorphic sole of Oman, the presence of grain boundary sliding requests the formation of cavities at grain triple junctions to maintain strain compatibility. Such dilatational domains either are filled by growing neighbor grain (dissolution-precipitation) or new phases nucleate (note both processes are chemically driven, this is why the discriminations/definitions made above are so important). With the nucleation of new grains a steady supply of small grains helps to keep the average grain size small and supports the pinning behavior efficiently.

5) Transition from diffusion creep to dislocation creep towards lower temperature: dislocation creep is a deformation mechanism in monomineralic materials undergoing crystal plastic deformation. Hence a fabric needs subgrain (low angle) or grain boundaries (high angle) to be able to accommodate for such creep processes and recover them. If I interpret the microstructures and given statements correctly, there exist nothing in the present samples such as monomineralic layers but they are all polymineralic. Hence

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

you would need interface boundaries between grains to be able to recover dislocations, which in my opinion makes no sense. Hence, dislocation creep cannot be the dominant deformation mechanism in such a polymineralic aggregate. The only statement that can be made is that within a mineral phase, dislocation creep may become more important. This does not mean that the bulk aggregate is deforming by dislocation creep as a whole.

6) Last but not least, the attached PDF contains a list of further suggestions/corrections as well as few suggestions for adaptations in figures.

I hope these comments help during the revision.

With kind regards Marco Herwegh

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2019-28/se-2019-28-RC2-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2019-28>, 2019.

SED

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

