Solid Earth Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2020-59-RC1, 2020

Solid Earth Discussions

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

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 2 June 2020

The manuscript presents some interesting results on the timing and recurrence intervals of the past earthquakes from Bhutan, Central Himalaya. The main contribution and originality of the study lie in the detailed paleoseismic investigation of a river cut section along the Main Frontal Thrust (MFT) to reconstruct the past earthquake chronology and the average slip rate. The authors have suggested five events and a slip rate of 25.3±4 mm/yr along the Piping Site. The MFT is one of the major plate convergence thrust fault accommodating substantial slip, the estimation of earthquake size, time, and recurrence interval is valuable towards the seismic hazard assessment. Thus I, think the manuscript is indeed important and would draw interest from a wide range of earth scientists and fits the scope of Solid Earth. The manuscript is well written

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

and organized. However, there are some inaccuracies with the interpretation which is discussed in the following section. I encourage the editor to request for a thoughtful revision to address these issues which will refine the manuscript before it is published.

Specific Comments:

Line 45: Comparing Strike-slip Fault and Thrust Fault systems does not seem probable. Kindly quote examples from thrust fault setting.

Line 102: Kindly mention the classification of terraces (youngest-oldest) for easy understanding.

Line 103: The author keeps switching between Siwalik and Siwaliks. In general, Siwaliks are used when you want to include Upper and Lower Siwalik, else use Siwalik.

Line 105: Remove 's' from 'covers'.

Line 107: Instead of 'low relative elevation' you can use 'relatively lower elevations'.

Line 259-261: Not clear. Please break it or re-write it.

Line 264: Because of the low resolution of the image file and non-uniform cleaning of the wall it is difficult to judge the deformation caused by F1. I recommend the author to add a blow-up image of the fault structure from grid 40-45.

Line 266: Along F6 and F5, no strong deformation is visible, instead U6 is rather horizontal with minor undulation which is quite common with fluvial deposits. Kindly check the validity of both the faults.

Line 269: In Fig. 6 what does the white dashed lines represent? Kindly mark and classify the faults in the figure. Also extend and mark F2 in Fig. 7b.

Line 281: With the present resolution of Fig. 5 it is difficult to see F5. Kindly mark F5 in Fig. 7a.

Line 313: I don't understand how retro-deformation of U0 and U2 is carried out and

compared with U1 because these two units are absent in the hanging-wall and the thickness may have varied. Thus, distinguishing E1 and E2 becomes difficult.

Line 325: Kindly clarify if 1.5 m is vertical offset or coseismic slip.

Line 335-336: How the slip along F4 is calculated using the dip of F3? The F3 has not deformed or cross-cut U3 and U4 which means they were deposited after the event on F3. The inference that the slip propagated along F3 seems improbable instead it looks it occurred along F4 and F5.

Line 347: It is not fully clear why U5 is recording $\sim$13.5 m of dip-slip whereas U6 is recording only $\sim$9 m of dip-slip. In fact, it should be the other way around as U6 is an older unit and should record more slip if there were two events.

Line 352: The author gives a detailed description of retro-deformation i.e., extracting elevation from the highest observable point of each unit to their corresponding point in the undeformed section in the footwall. However, my major concern lies in how the retro-deformation of U5 is carried out to evaluate two events. Either by restoring dip-slip of U5 along F2 or by restoring its highest point which is around the grid (38,12). With the current explanation and no visible cross-cutting structure in the section, it is difficult to distinguish E4 & E5.

Line: 414: It seems unlikely for an earthquake reaching magnitude 8.5 to have a slip of only 1.5 m. There is some evidence of earthquakes from Himalaya recording lesser slip for example Mw 7.8 1905 Kangra earthquake but there was slip partitioning reported between thrust and strike-slip faults (Szeliga and Bilham, 2017).

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2020-59/se-2020-59-RC1-supplement.pdf

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