

Interactive comment on “A 2600-yr-long paleoseismic record for the Himalayan Main Frontal Thrust (Western Bhutan)” by Romain Le Roux-Mallouf et al.

Romain Le Roux-Mallouf et al.

romain.lerouxmallouf@geolithe.com

Received and published: 5 August 2020

Specific comments: I have not been convinced by the documentation of event E1 which affects the same units as E2. I cannot make the difference between one and the other and recommend either to find complementary observations or argument for the existence of two earthquakes at this site. -> We agree. Action: see next comment.

Without any additional arguments on the outcrop I would personally go for documenting a scenario with one earthquake E1 (unless finding two generations of abandoned terraces with ages consistent with the two earthquakes), further mentioning that two earthquakes were described at sites further east within the period post 940AD, sug-

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



gesting there is possibly more than one. -> We agree. We thank the Reviewer for this helpful suggestion and modify the text (sections 3.3 and 4) accordingly.

I had a really hard time in understanding how the retro-deformation constrained so precisely the cumulated slip on the fault (40.2 m over 1629+/-255 yr line 418 !) given the significant uncertainty on the dip of the faults associated to the fact that most of the observations control mainly the vertical offsets which needs to be translated in slip on the fault. An estimate of the uncertainties associated to the estimate of the total amount of slip could be more realist. -> We agree. Although we do not mention “40.2 m” but “~40.2 m”, we agree a more detailed assessment of uncertainties should be provided. Action: we added details on uncertainties on slip measurements, dip angles and inferred slip values.

I regret that the manuscript does not integrate at least a paragraph on the relations between paleo-earthquakes and alluvial terraces that might have been abandoned after tectonic events. Indeed, some of the events described in the manuscript accommodate enough to create more than 10 meters of vertical offsets and might have been followed by episodes of severe incision. -> We disagree. The distribution of terrace heights (~1 m, ~11 m, ~33 m, ~43 m, ~80 m, ~90 m, ~100 m and ~170 m) does not suggest clear systematic abandonment associated with repeated co-seismic uplift. Including them in our analysis without evidence for faulting and adequate determination of faulting ages would be model-driven.

I do not understand the reason why these terraces, were not dated in order to facilitate both the determination of the incremental incision. I suggest that section 4 incorporates a discussion on eventual relations between events and terrace abandonment. -> We disagree. Most terraces at this site were dated and we have accumulated a significant dataset on incision rates. However, presenting said dataset is a whole different study that will be written up and submitted at a later stage.

Additional remarks on text and figures: Line 22-25 : Far field convergence is estimated

at 17.0 ± 0.5 mm/yr (Marechal et al., 2016). The average slip rate @ “ 25.3 ± 4 mm/yr” is therefore significantly larger than the geodetic and geomorphological results. -> After implementation of a detailed analysis of uncertainties, our final slip rate is 24.9 ± 10.4 mm/yr, which largely encompasses geodetic and geomorphological results. Action: none.

Line 82-83 “This last event contributes to the debate about the possible deficit of seismic moment . . .”. I do not understand, please, rephrase. -> We agree. Our wording was not clear enough. Action: we rewrote that sentence.

Line 107: replace at low relative elevation by “ at low elevation above the present day river course”. -> We agree. Action: we implemented proposed modification.

Line 223 : Wedge W1 is described as affected by intense internal deformation. Is it true ? If true, it should be documented on Figure 8. -> We agree. This is a mistake, only W2 exhibits intense internal deformation. Action: we corrected the text accordingly.

Line 390: Need to downtune the paragraph on E1, provided that there are no additional informations than those described here. Indeed, this earthquake is not documented properly at this site and the constraints appear elusive to me. -> We agree. Action: see previous comments that address this point in detail.

Figure 1: Damak trench is not on the map (Wesnousky et al., 2016) nor Charnath trench (Rizza et al., 2019). Bagmati, Sir Bardibas, Kayarmara and Mahara are not at the right place. -> We agree. Action: we corrected Figure 1 following suggestions from R2.

Figure 2: I suggest reporting a few altitudes along the Wang Chu course (as well as in terrace T2 North and T5 so that the reader can estimate the elevation of the terraces above the river without going back to the text. -> We agree. Action: we modified Figure 2 following suggestions from R2.

I am surprised to see that the supposed trace of the Main Boundary Thrust and Main

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

Frontal Thrust are straight through the river, without drawing a small V in the valley toward the North, a likely feature despite the relatively steep fault dips. I recommend to check properly the shape of the trace of the fault provided it dips with the value mentioned in the text. -> We disagree. The MBT is very steep here (as shown in Fig. 2b) and the section of MFT mapped does not affect strong reliefs; alluvial fans exhibit shallow slopes and the floor of the Wang Chu plain is basically flat. There is no geometric reason to invoke a V-shaped trace.

Figure 8: The wedge W1 is given in the text as intensely deformed (“... exhibit little stratigraphy, intense internal deformation”) Line 223. Would it be possible to see that on this figure ? or with a zoom on W1 in supplementary data material ? -> We agree. As addressed in this Reviewer's comment on Line 223. Action: see comment on Line 223.

Figure 9: Scale is needed. The amount shortening or coseismic slip should be reported on this figure at every step, with their uncertainty. -> We disagree. Figure 9 is a schematic illustration of the retro-deformation process. Our analysis of co-seismic displacements is based on the direct analysis of the original log and inferences stated in the text. Thus, adding co-seismic values on Figure 9 would suggest said values were measured from the Figure and be misleading to the reader.

Figure 10: Add unit W2 ->We disagree. This is a chronostratigraphic model and there are no samples collected from W2 to be displayed here. W2 being a scarp-derived slump from unit U5, its age would be that of U5, anyway. The main text as well as Figure 9 do explain the place of W2 within the stratigraphic section and its relationship to event E4.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://se.copernicus.org/preprints/se-2020-59/se-2020-59-AC2-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2020-59>, 2020.




Figure 1

Fig. 1. Figure 1 corrected following suggestions from reviewer

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





Figure 2

Fig. 2. Figure 2 corrected following suggestions from reviewer

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

