



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Mechanisms of overburden deformation associated with the emplacement of the Tulipan sill, mid-Norwegian margin*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/137175/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Schmiedel, T, Kjoberg, S, Planke, S et al. (5 more authors) (2017) Mechanisms of overburden deformation associated with the emplacement of the Tulipan sill, mid-Norwegian margin. *Interpretation*, 5 (3). SK23-SK38. ISSN 2324-8858

<https://doi.org/10.1190/INT-2016-0155.1>

© 2017 Society of Exploration Geophysicists and American Association of Petroleum Geologists. This is an author produced version of a paper published in *Interpretation*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Interpretation®

MECHANISMS OF OVERBURDEN DEFORMATION ASSOCIATED WITH THE EMPLACEMENT OF THE TULIPAN SILL, MID-NORWEGIAN MARGIN

Journal:	<i>Interpretation</i>
Manuscript ID	INT-2016-0155
Manuscript Type:	2015-12 Subsurface expression of igneous systems and their impacts on petroleum systems
Date Submitted by the Author:	28-Sep-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Schmiedel, Tobias; Universitetet i Oslo Det Matematisk-naturvitenskapelige Fakultet, Department of Geosciences Kjoberg, Sigurd; Universitetet i Oslo Det Matematisk-naturvitenskapelige Fakultet, Department of Geosciences Planke, Sverre; Volcanic Basin Petroleum Research AS Magee, Craig; Imperial College, Earth Science and Engineering Galland, Olivier; Universitetet i Oslo Det Matematisk-naturvitenskapelige Fakultet, Department of Geosciences Schofield, Nick; University of Aberdeen, Department of Geology and Petroleum Geology Jackson, Christopher; Imperial College, Earth Science & Engineering
Keywords:	3D, interpretation, volcanics, Europe
Subject Areas:	Case studies

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**MECHANISMS OF OVERBURDEN DEFORMATION ASSOCIATED WITH THE
EMPLACEMENT OF THE TULIPAN SILL, MID-NORWEGIAN MARGIN**

Tobias Schmiedel¹, Sigurd Kjoberg², Sverre Planke^{2,3}, Craig Magee⁴, Olivier Galland¹,
Nick Schofield⁵, and Christopher A-L Jackson⁴

¹*Physics of Geological Processes (PGP), Department of Geosciences, University of Oslo,
Blindern, Postbox 1048, 0316 Oslo, NORWAY, tobias.schmiedel@geo.uio.no /
olivier.galland@geo.uio.no*

²*Centre for Earth Evolution and Dynamics (CEED), Department of Geosciences, Postbox
1028, Blindern, N-0315 Oslo, NORWAY, planke@vbpr.no / sigurd.kjoberg@geo.uio.no*

³*Volcanic Basin Petroleum Research AS (VBPR), 0349 Oslo, NORWAY*

⁴*Basins Research Group, Department of Earth Science and Engineering, Imperial
College London, London SW7 2BP, UK, c.magee@imperial.ac.uk / c.jackson@imperial.ac.uk*

⁵*Department of Geology and Petroleum Geology, School of Geosciences, University of
Aberdeen, Meston Building, Old Aberdeen, Aberdeen AB24 3UE, UK, n.schofield@abdn.ac.uk*

Original paper date of submission: 27.09.2016

Revised paper date of submission: ----

ABSTRACT

Accounting for igneous intrusions into sedimentary basins is important to the petroleum industry because magmatism deforms the host rock and affects the thermal evolution of a basin, thereby influencing hydrocarbon generation, migration, and accumulation. Presently, numerous mechanisms concerning the syn-emplacement (i.e. elastic bending related active uplift and aureole induced volume reduction) and post-emplacement (i.e. differential compaction) deformation of the host rock have been suggested. In this study, we investigate the relevance of the different existing syn- or post-emplacement related mechanical models of dome growth accommodating the emplacement of igneous sills. We use high-quality 3D seismic and well data located in the western part of the Møre Basin (mid-Norwegian margin) to analyze the deformation of Cretaceous – Paleogene overburden associated with the emplacement of the Tulipan saucer-shaped sill between 55.8 and 54.9 Ma. Horizon interpretations and various thickness and attribute maps show a clear correlation between the saucer-shaped Tulipan sill and an observed domed structure above. Additionally, we observe in the shallow parts of the dome structure hydrothermal vent complexes connected by fractures only along the periphery of the underlying sill. We show that the Tulipan sill is responsible for the dome structure in the overburden of the study area. At the same time we see that not solely one of the different mechanisms of overburden deformation can be responsible for the observed dome structure, but the combination of them.

Interpretation

INTRODUCTION

Volcanic basins contain significant volumes of igneous rocks (Planke et al., 2005) and are explored for hydrocarbons all over the world, both onshore and offshore; e.g., the Rockall Basin (e.g., Magee et al., 2014), the Faroe-Shetland Basin (e.g., Smallwood and Maresh, 2002), the Møre and Vøring basins (e.g., Planke et al., 2005; Cartwright and Hansen, 2006) the Karoo Basin (e.g., Svensen et al., 2012), and the Neuquén Basin (e.g., Kay et al., 2006). The magma plumbing systems in these basins are primarily dominated by interconnected networks of sill intrusions, the emplacement of which can significantly deform the host rock and potentially influence petroleum system development (Kontorovich et al., 1997; Thomson and Hutton, 2004; Cartwright and Hansen, 2006; de Saint-Blanquat et al., 2006; Morgan et al., 2008; Galerne et al., 2011; Schofield et al., 2015; Magee et al., 2016; Wilson et al., 2016). For example, numerous studies have demonstrated that sill intrusions can: (1) locally heat and mature organic matter within the host rock, generating oil and/or gas (e.g., Rodriguez Monreal et al., 2009); (2) be associated with dome structures, which can be described as four-way dip closures (Hansen and Cartwright, 2006; Jackson et al., 2013; Magee et al., 2014; Magee et al., 2015); and (3) promote the development of local intense fracture networks that increase the permeability of the host rock (Witte et al., 2012; Agirrezabala, 2015; Senger et al., 2015). A robust understanding of the mechanics of magma emplacement in volcanic basins is therefore required in order to de-risk hydrocarbon exploration in volcanic basins (Potter and Konnerup-Madsen, 2003; Schutter, 2003a, b).

In this study, we focus on the mechanisms that control the growth of domes associated with igneous sills. These dome structures can represent structural traps, i.e., four-way dip

Interpretation

4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

closures, or create and deform stratigraphic traps, i.e., onlap of reservoir rocks and deflection of channels influencing the distribution of reservoir rocks for hydrocarbons. In recent years, distinct mechanisms controlling the formation of sill-associated doming have been proposed. The most common mechanism involves syn-emplacement uplift accommodating sill emplacement (e.g., Pollard and Johnson, 1973; Roman-Berdiel et al., 1995; Malthe-Sørenssen et al., 2004; Hansen and Cartwright, 2006; Kavanagh et al., 2006; Menand, 2008; Bungler and Cruden, 2011; Galerne et al., 2011; Galland, 2012; Galland et al., 2014; Galland et al., 2015). These models typically assume that uplift occurred via elastic bending, and sometime failure, of the overburden. However, field observations, seismic studies, and recent 3D laboratory models show that substantial syn-emplacement inelastic (elasto-plastic) deformation, such as local compaction and fluidization, can also affect the growth of the dome (e.g., Cosgrove and Hillier, 1999; Hansen and Cartwright, 2006; Schofield et al., 2010; Schofield et al., 2012a; Magee et al., 2013; Schofield et al., 2014). In addition to the syn-emplacement mechanisms, seismic data indicates that post-emplacement differential compaction may also play a role in the formation of dome structures above sills (e.g., Einsele et al., 1980; Cosgrove and Hillier, 1999; Hansen and Cartwright, 2006; Agirrezabala, 2015). However, the extent to which the interplay of syn-emplacement mechanisms vs. post-emplacement mechanisms control the final shape and structure of domes associated with igneous intrusions is currently not well known. This uncertainty typically emanates from the methods applied to study these systems. For example, structural field observations can provide small, detailed snapshots of intrusion overlying dome structures and associated fault and fracture systems, but they cannot not provide a complete spatial understanding due to incomplete outcropping conditions (e.g., Henry Mts; Wilson et al., 2016 and references therein). 2D seismic reflection profiles are also too incomplete to fully

Interpretation

1
2
3 describe complex 3D structures (e.g., Planke et al., 2000; Berndt et al., 2001; Jackson et al.,
4
5 2013; Zhao et al., 2014). Therefore, high-quality 3D seismic data is essential to study intrusion
6
7 induced overburden deformation in 3D (Bell and Butcher, 2002; Smallwood and Maresh, 2002;
8
9 Trude et al., 2003; Polteau et al., 2008; Magee et al., 2015; Planke et al., 2015).

14 In this paper, we show how the detailed analysis of high-quality seismic data can be used
15
16 to test and constrain the relevance of mechanical models of dome growth accommodating the
17
18 emplacement of igneous sills. We highlight the contribution of syn- and post-emplacement
19
20 mechanisms of overburden deformation by using detailed mapped horizons from 3D seismic
21
22 reflections, thickness maps and the application of various seismic attributes.
23
24

27 MECHANISMS OF OVERBURDEN DEFORMATION

30 A range of different models derived from field observations and seismic imaging have
31
32 been proposed to explain overburden deformation above sills, dominantly dome-shaped
33
34 structures.
35
36

38 **Syn-emplacement processes**

41
42 Classic models of doming involve overburden uplift in response to elastic bending above
43
44 an intruding sill or laccolith (Figure 1A) (Gilbert, 1877; Pollard and Johnson, 1973; Dixon and
45
46 Simpson, 1987; Goultly and Schofield, 2008; Bungler and Cruden, 2011; Galland and Scheibert,
47
48 2013). In these models, doming occurs directly during the sill emplacement and the dome
49
50 geometry is directly controlled by that of the underlying intrusion (e.g., Gilbert, 1877; Pollard
51
52 and Johnson, 1973; Corry, 1988; Goultly and Schofield, 2008; Galland and Scheibert, 2013). The
53
54 dome amplitude f therefore equals the sill thickness t (Figure 1A) (Pollard and Johnson, 1973;
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interpretation

6

1
2
3 Dixon and Simpson, 1987; Goulty and Schofield, 2008; Bungler and Cruden, 2011; Galland and
4
5 Scheibert, 2013); both f and t can be used as a proxy for the volume of the dome and intrusion,
6
7 respectively. This active doming is often referred to as forced-folding (e.g., du Toit, 1920;
8
9 Stearns, 1978; Trude et al., 2003). Forced folding typically produces a positive topographic
10
11 structure at the paleo-surface, such that sediments deposited contemporaneous to sill
12
13 emplacement onlap onto the paleo-high (e.g., Trude et al., 2003; Schofield et al., 2015; Magee et
14
15 al., 2016). The observation of these onlap features in seismic data provides a method of dating
16
17 the intrusion emplacement (Trude et al., 2003).
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 Elastic bending produces complex stress distributions in the overburden, resulting in
25
26 outer-arc stretching and inner-arc compression (Timoshenko and Woinowsky-Krieger, 1959;
27
28 Ramsay, 1967; Pollard and Johnson, 1973). This outer-arc stretching can lead to thinning of the
29
30 uppermost layers of the dome (Ramsay, 1967). When the stresses generated in response to elastic
31
32 bending exceed the strength of the overburden rocks, failure occurs and characteristic fracture
33
34 patterns develop. These fracture pattern can be classified into four main types depending to their
35
36 location in the overburden (Figure 1B): (1) circumferential, tensile fractures at the surface
37
38 coincident with the area of the largest convex curvature above the sill edges (e.g., Pollard and
39
40 Johnson, 1973; Bungler and Cruden, 2011; Galland et al., 2016); (2) radial tensile fractures (mode
41
42 I) and/or normal faults (Mode II) due to an extensional regime (i.e. outer-arc stretching) in the
43
44 central part of the dome structure (Hansen and Cartwright, 2006; Magee et al., 2013; Galland et
45
46 al., 2016); (3) dilational fractures near the peripheral hinge of the dome close to the intrusion tips
47
48 progressing towards the surface (Pollard and Johnson, 1973; Menand, 2008; Thomson and
49
50 Schofield, 2008; Galland and Scheibert, 2013); and (4) shear fractures resulting from differential
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interpretation

uplift at the dome edge (de Saint-Blanquat et al., 2006; Hansen and Cartwright, 2006; Agirrezabala, 2015; Wilson et al., 2016).

Although elastic bending promotes roof uplift, other mechanisms can affect the overall geometry of the dome structure above the intrusion. For example, pore fluid expulsion within the thermal and/or structural aureole of the intrusion can lead to a significant volume reduction of the host rock (Figure 1C) (Einsele et al., 1980; Morgan et al., 2008; Schofield et al., 2010; Schofield et al., 2012a; Jackson et al., 2013; Magee et al., 2013; Schofield et al., 2014). This volume reduction resulting from a decreased porosity reduces the effect of active mechanical doming due to the emplacement of the intrusion. Therefore the amplitude of the dome f is expected to be less than the sill thickness t (Figure 1C) implying that the host rock above the intrusion is thinner than outside the intrusion (Figure 1C).

Post-emplacement process

Variations in the load of post-emplacement sedimentation can induce a variable subsidence of the overburden due to differential compaction (Figure 1D) (e.g., Cosgrove and Hillier, 1999; Hansen and Cartwright, 2006). In particular, following the emplacement of the intrusion, the load due to post-emplacement sedimentation triggers compaction of the underlying rocks. Because the intrusions are virtually incompressible with respect to the surrounding sedimentary rocks, and therefore do not compact, a dome structure may develop (Figure 1D) (e.g., Cosgrove and Hillier, 1999; Agirrezabala, 2015). In addition to generating new folds, this differential compaction process can enhance the amplitude f of a pre-existing dome due to the emplacement of the intrusion, such that f becomes larger than the sill thickness t (Figure 1D).

1 Interpretation

8

2
3 Another consequence is that the domed sequence is expected to be thicker above the sill than
4
5 outside the sill (Figure 1D).
6
7

8
9 To summarize, these models are associated with distinct characteristic structures and
10
11 features. To test the relevance of each model, we will test the occurrence, or not, of these
12
13 structures and features in the Tulipan prospect case study, Møre Basin, mid-Norwegian
14
15 continental margin.
16
17

18 19 20 GEOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK 21

22
23 Over the last three decades, massive sill complexes of at least 80000 km² have been
24
25 imaged in the Møre and Vøring basins, offshore Norway by 2D and 3D seismic reflection data
26
27 (e.g., Berndt et al., 2001; Planke et al., 2005). Positioned on the mid-Norwegian margin, the
28
29 Møre Basin represents a type example of a rifted volcanic margin (Planke et al., 2005). The
30
31 outline of the Møre Basin is defined by the base unconformity of the up to 6 km thick Cretaceous
32
33 sedimentary basin infill (Figure 2A) (Brekke, 2000; Faleide et al., 2010). The development of the
34
35 basin occurred during Late Jurassic – Early Cretaceous rifting of the Norwegian continental
36
37 margin (Brekke, 2000 and references therein). Late Paleocene – Early Eocene rifting associated
38
39 with the opening of the North Atlantic lead to the emplacement of a significant volume of
40
41 igneous material within the sedimentary infill, which is composed of mainly claystone, with
42
43 interbedded sandstone and sporadic carbonate intercalations (e.g., Dalland et al., 1988; Berndt et
44
45 al., 2001; Planke et al., 2005).
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 The oldest stratigraphic unit in the area of interest is the Late Cretaceous Springar
53
54 Formation, which consists mainly of claystone with carbonate intercalations. The uppermost
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interpretation

1
2
3 sequence of the Springar Formation contains a prominent carbonate-cemented layer, which
4
5 corresponds to the lowermost horizon interpreted in this study (Figure 3). The base of this
6
7 carbonate layer, subsequently referred to as Base Carbonate, corresponds to a high positive
8
9 reflection on the seismic data (Figures 3 & 5). Other horizons interpreted in this study include
10
11 the Top Danian, HV4, HV3, and HV1, which are all contained in the Early Paleogene Tang
12
13 Formation (Figure 3). The lower Tang Formation (Top Danian to Base Carbonate) is composed
14
15 of a sandstone succession, which proved to be a reservoir rock in the Tulipan prospect, as
16
17 highlighted by a gas discovery well (6302/6-1, abandoned) (Figure 2). The rest of the Tang
18
19 Formation consists of dark gray claystone successions (Figure 3). The complete stratigraphic
20
21 description of the Tulipan prospect can be found in Kjøberg et al. (this volume, submitted). The
22
23 area of interest is located beyond the eastern limit of Paleogene basalts that cover the
24
25 northwestern border of the Møre Basin (Figure 2) (e.g., Brekke, 2000; Berndt et al., 2001).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

DATA AND METHODS

33
34
35
36 This study uses a full-stack, time-migrated, zero-phase 3D seismic dataset (i.e. ST0105)
37
38 that was processed in 2001 and covers the Tulipan prospect in the western part of the Møre Basin
39
40 (Figure 2). The complete 3D survey covers an area of 1610 km², has a line spacing of 12.5 m,
41
42 and was recorded to a depth of 7 s TWT. We focus on the northern c. 450 km² of the area
43
44 containing the well 6302/6-1 (Figure 2). The 3D seismic data is displayed with a reverse polarity
45
46 (i.e. a downward increase in acoustic impedance correlates to negative or blue reflections). In the
47
48 time interval of interest (4.6-4.8 s TWT), the seismic data has an average frequency of 15-20 Hz.
49
50 The range for the thickness of the sill was calculated using the dominant frequency in the area of
51
52 the sill intrusion (15 Hz) and we used a value of velocity $V_p = 5500$ m/s (Planke et al., 2005;
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interpretation

10

1
2
3 Jackson et al., 2013) and the assumed error of about $\pm 10\%$ after Jackson et al. (2013). This
4
5 suggests a thickness within the limit of separability ($\lambda/4$) of ~ 92 m ($\pm 10\%$) and the limit of
6
7 detection ~ 12 m ($\pm 10\%$) for sills (Planke et al., 2005; Jackson et al., 2013).
8
9

10
11
12 Data from borehole 6302/6-1 was used to constrain the lithology, geophysical properties,
13
14 and age of the strata in the interval of interest (Kjoberg et al., this volume, submitted). The well
15
16 extends to a depth of 4234 m [m RKB], a total length of 15.7 m was cored between 3903 m and
17
18 3942 m in the Danian sandstone (Tang Formation) and cutting samples were taken in the interval
19
20 of 1975-4230 m. Conventional borehole wireline logs and a check-shot (VSP) time-depth curve
21
22 in combination with the core/cutting samples were used to develop a simple constant velocity
23
24 model based on the interval velocities ($V_{p_{int}}$) to depth-convert the key horizons (Figure 3). These
25
26 information combined with the 3D seismic data were used to interpret five key horizons (5 to 15
27
28 line interval inline/xline) in the sedimentary strata above the intrusion (Figure 3). 3D volume
29
30 visualization (i.e. opacity rendering), and different surface and volume attributes (i.e. RMS-
31
32 Amplitude, Coherence, spectral decomposition) were used to extract additional characteristics of
33
34 the interpreted reflections in the sedimentary overburden of the Tulipan sill (Planke et al., 2015).
35
36
37
38
39
40

41
42 The interpretation of sills in the seismic data was performed according to their reflection
43
44 properties, with laterally discontinuous, strata-discordant, high-amplitude anomalies considered
45
46 to represent intrusions (Smallwood and Maresh, 2002; Polteau et al., 2008; Thomson and
47
48 Schofield, 2008; Jackson et al., 2013; Magee et al., 2014; Planke et al., 2015). At the location of
49
50 the Tulipan sill, constrained by Polteau et al. (2008), the seismic data display a high-amplitude
51
52 reflection package (Figures 4 & 5). We define the top of the Tulipan sill as the uppermost trough
53
54 of this reflection package (Figure 4 & 5). We interpreted the top of the sill with 2 line interval
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interpretation

1
2
3 inline/xline resolution. The subsequent deeper peak reflection (Figure 4) was roughly picked (16
4
5 line interval inline/xline) as an estimate for the base of the Tulipan sill.
6
7
8
9

RESULTS

Structure of the sill

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 Figure 5 shows the 3D expression of the picked high-amplitude reflection of the top
19
20 Tulipan sill, which consists of: (1) a flat, starta-concordant inner base with a c. 10-12 km
21
22 diameter; and (2) flanking inclined outer sheets that transgress upwards and outwards (c. 200-
23
24 400 ms TWT). The Tulipan sill thus displays a typical saucer-shaped geometry. The inclined
25
26 sheets are laterally segmented radially, with the vertical offset between the segments increasing
27
28 towards the outer rim (Figure 5).
29
30
31
32

33 The base of the Tulipan sill was not clearly observable in the tuned reflection package.
34
35 The picked base shows lateral thickening of the reflection associated with a reduction in
36
37 amplitude strength and the interruption of the continuous reflection, in the central part of the sill
38
39 (Figure 4 & 5B). Because the sill is visible on the seismic data, the sill thickness is higher than
40
41 the limit of detection, i.e. 12 m ($\pm 10\%$). However, since we cannot clearly separate the two
42
43 reflections for the top and the bottom of the sill, the sill thickness is below the limit of
44
45 separability of i.e. 92 m ($\pm 10\%$). This estimate is in agreement with other sill observations in the
46
47 Møre and Vøring basins (e.g., Berndt et al., 2000).
48
49
50
51
52

Structure of the overburden

53
54
55
56
57 Time structure maps (TWT)
58
59
60

Interpretation

12

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

In this study, five key horizons were interpreted in the sedimentary overburden (Figure 4). From top to bottom, these are: (1) HV1, describes the top of the deformed overburden locally downlapped by overlying reflections; (2) HV3, prominent reflection above lavas in the Tang Formation; (3) HV4, a stratigraphic surface that displays a prominent polygonal fault pattern; (4) Top Danian, which corresponds to the top of the sandstone unit representing the reservoir rock in the area; (5) Base Carbonate, a prominent Mesozoic carbonate layer (in the Late Springar Formation; Figures 3 & 4).

HV1 shows a central dome structure that correlates with the periphery of the underlying Tulipan sill (Figure 6A). The maximum amplitude f of this dome structure was calculated, i.e. using a best fitting plane for the estimation of the dome base, to be approximately $f \approx 50 \pm 20$ m (Figure 6B) from the depth converted time structure map. Figure 6A shows four additional dome structures surrounding the central dome: (1) one overprinting the outline of the central dome in the northwest, and (2) three separate ones in the south and east. A north-south trending depression separates these three domes from the large central dome above the Tulipan. The underlying time structure maps of the HV3, HV4, Top Danian and Base Carbonate horizons similarly display a large central dome as in HV1 (Figure 6C & supplemental material). Note that for the HV3, Top Danian and Base Carbonate, the data coverage is limited, such that the smaller peripheral domes are not imaged. Additionally, the time structure maps of the different horizons show that the well 6302/6-1 was drilled right in the crest of the dome above the Tulipan sill.

Spectral decomposition attribute maps on sedimentary horizons

Interpretation

Spectral decomposition attribute maps were produced on the interpreted reflections in the sedimentary overburden of the sill to visualize possible host rock deformations (e.g. fractures, edges, etc., Figure 7).

The attribute map of the uppermost interpreted horizon, the HV1 shows 19 dark, circular features (white circles, Figure 7A), i.e. hydrothermal vent complexes that overlie the lateral termination of the underlying Tulipan sill. The majority of these vents are connected by thin, linear features. Similar circular and linear features were observed in the HV3 (yellow dashed line, Figure 7B) but they were too faint to be confidently described. A possible spatial correlation of those linear features between the different horizon maps cannot be evidenced with confidence (Figure 7A & B).

On the HV3 map (Figure 7B), dark circular features similar to those observed in HV4 (Figure 7C) also appear at the same locations as those observed in the HV4 map (black ovals, Figure 7B); note, however, that they are overall larger. Inside the Tulipan sill periphery, two separate areas can be distinguished: (1) a southern area (yellow dashed line, Figure 7B), which displays dark colors and a complex, but faint occurrence of circular features and linear features; and (2) a northern area characterized by bright colors with no observable features (Figure 7B). Outside the Tulipan sill periphery, two comprehensive dark areas in the northwest and northeast are visible (Figure 7B). We interpret these latter as the extruded Paleogene basalts (Berndt et al., 2001) according to their seismic character (Figure 2 & 3), the emplacement of which was not related to the emplacement of the Tulipan sill and associated doming. Therefore, we will not consider them in the following sections.

Interpretation

14

1
2
3 The HV4 map highlights an overall coverage with linear features (Figure 7C), which
4 correlate with discontinuities in the seismic reflection data (Figure 4). This polygonal pattern
5 does not display a change in its characteristics inside or outside of the Tulipan periphery (Figure
6 7C). Other observable features are the dark circular patches with diameters up to c. 1 km (e.g.,
7 black circles, Figure 7C). They are mainly located along the edge of Tulipan sill, and correspond
8 to vertical zones characterized by complex and weak seismic reflections cross-cutting the
9 horizon (Figure 3). Such features are characteristic of hydrothermal vent complexes (e.g.,
10 Svensen et al., 2004; Planke et al., 2005).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 The Top Danian horizon attribute map has a very limited spatial distribution inside the
24 periphery of the Tulipan sill (Figure 3 and 7D). The central part of the horizon map is
25 represented by an area of significantly bright colors, again highlighting lateral variations in rock
26 properties (Figure 7D). No significant feature is visible.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 The Base Carbonate horizon (Figure 7E) images the lowermost interpreted reflection in
35 the sedimentary sequence above the Tulipan sill (Figure 3). The spectral decomposition map
36 shows a distinct dark line-feature corresponding to the crossing of the Tulipan sill through the
37 horizon (Figure 7E). No other prominent feature is visible. Within the Tulipan sill periphery and
38 adjacent to it an overall bright color scheme is observed, highlighting lateral variations in rock
39 properties.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

Isochron maps

49
50
51
52 Isochron maps between different horizons were produced to quantify lateral thickness
53 variations of the intervals through the dome above the Tulipan sill (Figure 3 & 8). This
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interpretation

1
2
3 information is crucial for testing the different models listed in Figure 1. The 3D seismic data of
4
5 the Tulipan prospect images a regional thickening of the sedimentary strata towards the
6
7 west/northwest (Figure 8).
8
9

10
11 Figure 8A displays the isochron map of an interval (Top Tare – HV1) right above the
12
13 assumed paleo-surface during the emplacement of the Tulipan sill (i.e. HV1). The interpretation
14
15 of the Top Tare horizon used to produce this isochron map originates from the work of Kjoberg
16
17 et al. (this volume, submitted). This interval shows distinct, thick circular mound structures that
18
19 typically overlie the periphery of the underlying Tulipan sill at the same location as the
20
21 hydrothermal vent complexes observed before (Figure 7A-C). The Top Tare – HV1 interval
22
23 displays a thinning within the Tulipan periphery compared to the areas in the close vicinity of the
24
25 underlying sill outline. Additionally, we observe fracture pattern between the mound structures
26
27 and in the surrounding of the sill (Figure 8A) coinciding with the dark linear features observed in
28
29 Figure 7A.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 The HV1-Base Carbonate interval, i.e. the overall sequence analyzed in this study, shows
37
38 relatively constant thickness, except localized thinner areas that parallel to the outline of the
39
40 underlying sill (Figure 8B); these areas are likely related to hydrothermal vent complexes.
41
42 However, each subinterval displays more complex patterns.
43
44
45

46
47 The shallower HV1-HV4 interval exhibits a local ring feature, aligned along the
48
49 periphery of the underlying sill, which is thicker than the background thickness (Figure 8C). The
50
51 spatial positions of these local thick areas correspond to the observed dark circular patches in the
52
53 spectral decomposition attribute maps (Figure 7). These features are likely related to
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Interpretation

16

hydrothermal vent complexes (Kjoberg et al., this volume, submitted). The thickness of this interval is similar at the center of the underlying sill and outside the sill (Figure 8C).

In contrast to the HV1-HV4 interval, the deeper HV4-Base Carbonate interval exhibits a thickening constrained inside the outline of the Tulipan sill (Figure 8D). Note the prominent thin elongated features parallel to the periphery of the Tulipan sill. These features are not visible on the HV1-HV4 interval (Figure 8C), but they affect the whole studied interval, i.e. HV1-Base Carbonate (Figure 8B). Similarly to the HV4-Base Carbonate interval, the Top Danian-Base Carbonate subinterval also exhibits a thickening (supplementary material). The location of this thickening roughly correlates with that of the observed bright colors of the Top Danian spectral decomposition map (Figure 7D).

INTERPRETATION

Sill structure and relation with dome

Our 3D reconstruction of the top Tulipan sill exhibits a characteristic saucer-shape, with a flat inner sill, which connects to transgressive inclined sheets that exhibit radial offsets (Figure 5). Such a structure is in good agreement with the two stage model of shallow magma emplacement, whereby an initial flat sill intrudes along a stratigraphic weakness, followed by an, upward, outward transgressive emplacement of inclined sheets (e.g., Malthe-Sørenssen et al., 2004; Hansen and Cartwright, 2006; Polteau et al., 2008; Thomson and Schofield, 2008; Galland, 2012). The radial offsets visible along the inclined sheets are interpreted as radial flow indicators, i.e. intrusive step and bridge structures indicating upward and outward magma flow during the emplacement into a brittle host rock (e.g., Thomson and Schofield, 2008; Hutton,

Interpretation

2009; Schofield et al., 2010; Magee et al., 2016 and the references therein), also in agreement with the two-stage model of saucer-shaped sill emplacement.

The Tulipan sill exhibits an overall spatial correlation with the overlying dome structure (Figure 6). The well data does not evidence any other sill emplaced in the sill overburden. The seismic data only displays a small, shallower sill in the western edge of the dome, resulting only in a local, shallow positive topographic feature (Figure 6; supplementary material). We thus conclude that the dome displayed in our data is solely related to the underlying Tulipan sill.

The HV1 horizon has been identified as being the paleo-surface at the time of emplacement of the Tulipan sill, based on the detailed interpretation of the hydrothermal vent complexes associated with the Tulipan sill (Kjoberg et al., this volume, submitted). This implies that the Tulipan sill emplaced between 55.8 and 54.9 Ma (Kjoberg et al., this volume, submitted), consistent with the age of the North Atlantic Large Igneous Province emplaced at the Paleocene–Eocene transition (Berndt et al., 2001; Svensen et al., 2004; Faleide et al., 2010). Thus, the depth of emplacement is estimated to be not deeper than 1.5-2 km. The saucer-shaped geometry of the Tulipan sill is a consequence of such a shallow emplacement depth (e.g., Planke et al., 2005; Galland et al., 2009; Eide et al., 2016).

Dome growth mechanisms

Our detailed analyses of the borehole and 3D seismic data allow us to test the relevance of the distinct mechanisms of dome growth above igneous sills. Our results highlight the occurrence of both post-emplacement and syn-emplacement processes.

Post-emplacement differential compaction

Interpretation

18

1
2
3 The isochron maps of Figure 8B and D show that the HV1-Top Carbonate interval and
4 the HV4-Carbonate subinterval are thicker above the Tulipan sill than outside the sill. This
5 thickening is in good agreement with the differential compaction mechanism (Figure 1D). Thus,
6 we conclude that differential compaction must have, at least partly, contributed to the formation
7 of the dome structure above the Tulipan sill. A key question is thus whether parts of the dome
8 have resulted from syn-emplacement mechanisms or not.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

Syn-emplacement mechanisms

18
19
20 The direct evidence of syn-emplacement mechanisms of dome growth above the Tulipan
21 sill is limited. We observe fractures patterns located in the vicinity of, and parallel to, the Tulipan
22 sill periphery and dome edge, affecting the paleo-surface horizon HV1 (Figure 7 & 8A). These
23 surficial peripheral concentric tensile/extensional fractures are in good agreement with the
24 laboratory experiments of dome growth of Galland (2012). These experiments show that when a
25 dome associated with an intruding saucer-shaped sill exhibits a plateau shape, like that of the
26 Tulipan dome, the largest convex curvature of the paleo-surface occurs near the upper,
27 monoclonal hinges of the dome (see Figure 1). The resulting fractures are thus concentric,
28 parallel, and close to the dome edge (see also Galland et al., 2016). The close relation between
29 these tensile fractures and the hydrothermal vent complexes (Figures 7A & 8A) suggests that the
30 former might have channeled the over-pressurized fluids, and so controlled partly the locations
31 of the vents. Furthermore, the observed central thinning of the shallow interval (HV1-HV4) of
32 the domed sedimentary sequence above the Tulipan sill (Figure 8C) are in good agreement with
33 the observations of Ramsay (1967), who suggested that such thinning might result from outer-arc
34 stretching of the apex of a growing forced fold. The presence of both concentric fractures and
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interpretation

1
2
3 superficial thinning are the only evidence of forced-folding associated with the emplacement of
4
5 the Tulipan sill might have happened.
6
7

8
9 Nevertheless, other indicators of syn-emplacment dome growth are not visible. The
10
11 significant thickness variations of the sedimentary intervals affected by the doming do not
12
13 support the solely application of the elastic bending model, which assumes constant thickness of
14
15 the domed formations (e.g., Pollard and Johnson, 1973; Gouly and Schofield, 2008; Galland and
16
17 Scheibert, 2013). In addition, we do not observe onlap structures on the domed morphology of
18
19 the paleo-surface, which could confirm the short time scale of an intrusion-induced uplift of the
20
21 overburden (Figure 1A) (e.g., Trude et al., 2003; Hansen and Cartwright, 2006; Magee et al.,
22
23 2014). Finally, we do not observe tensile or extensional fractures at the apex of the dome,
24
25 expected from brittle outer-arc stretching, as observed for instance by Magee et al. (2013).
26
27 Nevertheless, we cannot rule out that such fractures, if present, are of sub-seismic scale and so
28
29 invisible. In addition, the observed polygonal fault pattern observable in the whole area (Figure
30
31 7C), which formed 57.9 Ma ago prior to the emplacement of the sill Kjoberg et al., (this volume,
32
33 submitted), do not show evidence of reactivation due to forced folding.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 In our results the range of the estimated thickness t of the Tulipan sill and the values of
42
43 dome amplitude f show a significant overlap. However, due the uncertainties on the sill
44
45 thickness, this dome amplitude/sill thickness ratio is not conclusive, such that it is not possible to
46
47 confidently constrain the ratio of contribution of the possible mechanisms for overburden
48
49 deformation, i.e. elastic bending, differential compaction, and aureole volume reduction.
50
51
52
53

54
55 Our data also highlights the occurrence of hydrothermal vents (Figure 6-8), which result
56
57 from local fluidization within the host rock (Einsele et al., 1980; Svensen et al., 2004; Schofield
58
59
60

Interpretation

20

1
2
3 et al., 2010; Schofield et al., 2012a; Jackson et al., 2013). Nevertheless, these authors show that
4
5 fluidization occurs dominantly close to the intrusions, and the resulting structures are likely of
6
7 sub-seismic scale and so invisible on our seismic data. In addition, the well within the study area
8
9 is not deep enough to reach the sedimentary rocks near the Tulipan sill, therefore it is not useful
10
11 to constrain the thickness of the fluidized rock formations (Figure 3 & 5B). Therefore, our data
12
13 cannot allow us constraining to which extent fluidization has accommodated the sill
14
15
16
17
18 emplacement, and so the dome growth dynamics.

CONCLUSION

21
22
23
24
25 Our study utilizes analysis of 3D seismic and well data to test the occurrence of dome
26
27 growth dynamics associated with the Tulipan sill. We highlight that a single mechanism cannot
28
29 explain development of the dome, but rather we show that a combination of different
30
31 mechanisms controlled the emplacement of the Tulipan sill and its associated deformation of the
32
33 sedimentary overburden in the Tulipan prospect. The main findings of our study are listed below.
34
35

- 36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- The dome displayed in our data is solely related to the underlying Tulipan sill.
 - Differential compaction must have, at least partly, contributed to the formation of the dome structure above the Tulipan sill.
 - Elastic bending had only a minor contribution to the accommodated deformation in the overburden of the Tulipan sill.
 - We infer the formation of dilational fractures in the vicinity and parallel to the Tulipan periphery connecting hydrothermal vents. However, we cannot exclude the fact, that some of the features might be: (1) circumferential tensile fractures at

Interpretation

1
2
3 the surface or (2) shear fractures resulting from differential uplift at the dome
4
5
6 edge.

- 7
8
9
- 10 • We cannot confidently observe the process of outer-arc stretching, due to missing
11 observations of associated fracture systems in the crest of the domed overburden.
 - 12 • Polygonal faults formed prior to the emplacement of the sill do not show evidence
13 of reactivation due to the doming.
14
15
16

17
18
19 Future studies should concentrate on the quantitative influence of compaction on the
20 amplitude of the domed overburden in relation to the underlying intrusion thickness. Therefore,
21
22 3D seismic data from directly drilled sills and the associated overburden would contribute to
23
24 essentially to better constrain the accommodated deformation induced by an intrusion.
25
26
27

28
29
30 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
31

32
33 We thank Statoil for providing us with the PL251 (Tulipan) geophysical and geological
34 reports for well 6302/6-1. Thanks to GeoTerric and Schlumberger (Petrel) for the free academic
35 use of seismic software. We further acknowledge the support from the Research Council of
36
37 Norway through its Centers of Excellence funding scheme, project 223272, and from the
38
39 MIMES project.
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 APPENDICES
47

48
49 -
50

51
52
53 REFERENCES
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interpretation

22

1
2
3 Agirrezabala, L. M., 2015, Syndepositional forced folding and related fluid plumbing
4 above a magmatic laccolith: Insights from outcrop (Lower Cretaceous, Basque-Cantabrian Basin,
5 western Pyrenees): Geological Society of America Bulletin, 982-1000, doi: 10.1130/b31192.1.
6
7

8
9
10 Bell, B., and Butcher, H., 2002, On the emplacement of sill complexes: evidence from
11 the Faroe-Shetland Basin: Geological Society, London, Special Publications: **197**, no. 1, 307-
12
13 329, doi: 10.1144/gsl.sp.2002.197.01.12.
14
15

16
17 Berndt, C., Planke, S., Alvestad, E., Tsikalas, F., and Rasmussen, T., 2001, Seismic
18 volcanostratigraphy of the Norwegian Margin: constraints on tectonomagmatic break-up
19 processes: Journal of the Geological Society: **158**, no. 3, 413-426, doi: 10.1144/jgs.158.3.413.
20
21

22
23 Berndt, C., Skogly, O. P., Planke, S., Eldholm, O., and Mjelde, R., 2000, High-velocity
24 breakup-related sills in the Vøring Basin, off Norway: Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid
25 Earth: **105**, no. B12, 28443-28454, doi: 10.1029/2000JB900217.
26
27

28
29 Brekke, H., 2000, The tectonic evolution of the Norwegian Sea Continental Margin with
30 emphasis on the Vøring and Møre Basins: Geological Society, London, Special Publications:
31
32 **167**, no. 1, 327-378, doi: 10.1144/gsl.sp.2000.167.01.13.
33
34

35
36
37 Bunger, A. P., and Cruden, A. R., 2011, Modeling the growth of laccoliths and large
38 mafic sills: Role of magma body forces: Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth: **116**, no.
39
40 B2, doi: 10.1029/2010JB007648.
41
42

43
44
45 Cartwright, J., and Hansen, D. M., 2006, Magma transport through the crust via
46 interconnected sill complexes: Geology: **34**, no. 11, 929-932, doi: 10.1130/g22758a.1.
47
48

49
50 Corry, C. E., 1988, Laccoliths: mechanics of emplacement and growth, Geological
51 Society of America Special Paper, v. 220, 110 p.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interpretation

23

1
2
3 Cosgrove, J. W., and Hillier, R. D., 1999, Forced-fold development within Tertiary
4 sediments of the Alba Field, UKCS: evidence of differential compaction and post-depositional
5 sandstone remobilization: Geological Society, London, Special Publications: **169**, no. 1, 61-71,
6
7
8 doi: 10.1144/gsl.sp.2000.169.01.05.
9
10

11
12 Dalland, A., Worsley, D., and Ofstad, K., 1988, A lithostratigraphic scheme for the
13 mesozoic and cenozoic and succession offshore mid-and northern norway, Oljedirektoratet.
14
15

16
17 de Saint-Blanquat, M., Habert, G., Horsman, E., Morgan, S. S., Tikoff, B., Launeau, P.,
18 and Gleizes, G., 2006, Mechanisms and duration of non-tectonically assisted magma
19 emplacement in the upper crust: The Black Mesa pluton, Henry Mountains, Utah:
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Tectonophysics: **428**, no. 1–4, 1-31, doi: 10.1016/j.tecto.2006.07.014.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Dixon, J. M., and Simpson, D. G., 1987, Centrifuge modelling of laccolith intrusion:
Journal of Structural Geology: **9**, no. 1, 87-103, doi: 10.1016/0191-8141(87)90046-0.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
du Toit, A., 1920, The Karoo dolerites of South Africa: a study in hypabyssal injection:
Transactions of the Geological Society of South Africa: **23**, 1-42,

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Eide, C. H., Schofield, N., Jerram, D. A., and Howell, J. A., 2016, Basin-scale
architecture of deeply emplaced sill complexes: Jameson Land, East Greenland: Journal of the
Geological Society, 10.1144/jgs2016-018.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Einsele, G., Gieskes, J. M., Curray, J., Moore, D. M., Aguayo, E., Aubry, M.-P., Fornari,
D., Guerrero, J., Kastner, M., Kelts, K., Lyle, M., Matoba, Y., Molina-Cruz, A., Niemitz, J.,
Rueda, J., Saunders, A., Schrader, H., Simoneit, B., and Vacquier, V., 1980, Intrusion of basaltic
sills into highly porous sediments, and resulting hydrothermal activity: Nature: **283**, no. 5746,
441-445, doi: 10.1038/283441a0.

Interpretation

24

1
2
3 Faleide, J. I., Bjørlykke, K., and Gabrielsen, R. H., 2010, Geology of the Norwegian
4 Continental Shelf, Petroleum Geoscience, Springer, 467-499, doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-34132-
5
6 8_25.
7
8

9
10 Galerne, C. Y., Galland, O., Neumann, E.-R., and Planke, S., 2011, 3D relationships
11 between sills and their feeders: evidence from the Golden Valley Sill Complex (Karoo Basin)
12 and experimental modelling: Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research: **202**, no. 3–4,
13 189-199, doi: 10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2011.02.006.
14
15
16
17

18
19 Galland, O., 2012, Experimental modelling of ground deformation associated with
20 shallow magma intrusions: Earth and Planetary Science Letters: **317–318**, no. 0, 145-156, doi:
21 10.1016/j.epsl.2011.10.017.
22
23
24
25

26
27 Galland, O., Bertelsen, H. S., Guldstrand, F., Girod, L., Johannessen, R. F., Bjugger, F.,
28 Burchardt, S., and Mair, K., 2016, Application of open-source photogrammetric software
29 MicMac for monitoring surface deformation in laboratory models: Journal of Geophysical
30 Research: Solid Earth, 21, doi: 10.1002/2015JB012564.
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 Galland, O., Burchardt, S., Hallot, E., Mourgues, R., and Bulois, C., 2014, Dynamics of
38 dikes versus cone sheets in volcanic systems: Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth: **119**,
39 no. 8, 6178-6192, doi: 10.1002/2014JB011059.
40
41
42
43

44
45 Galland, O., Holohan, E., van Wyk de Vries, B., and Burchardt, S., 2015, Laboratory
46 Modelling of Volcano Plumbing Systems: A Review, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1-68, doi:
47 10.1007/11157_2015_9.
48
49

50
51 Galland, O., Planke, S., Neumann, E.-R., and Malthe-Sørenssen, A., 2009, Experimental
52 modelling of shallow magma emplacement: Application to saucer-shaped intrusions: Earth and
53 Planetary Science Letters: **277**, no. 3–4, 373-383, doi: 10.1016/j.epsl.2008.11.003.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interpretation

1
2
3 Galland, O., and Scheibert, J., 2013, Analytical model of surface uplift above
4 axisymmetric flat-lying magma intrusions: Implications for sill emplacement and geodesy:
5
6 Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research: **253**, 114-130, doi:
7
8 10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2012.12.006.
9
10

11
12 Gilbert, G. K., 1877, Report on the Geology of the Henry Mountains, Washington, U. S.
13 Geographical Geological Survey of the Rocky Mountain, Region.
14

15
16 Gouly, N. R., and Schofield, N., 2008, Implications of simple flexure theory for the
17 formation of saucer-shaped sills: Journal of Structural Geology: **30**, no. 7, 812-817, doi:
18
19 10.1016/j.jsg.2008.04.002.
20
21

22
23 Hansen, D. M., and Cartwright, J., 2006, The three-dimensional geometry and growth of
24 forced folds above saucer-shaped igneous sills: Journal of Structural Geology: **28**, no. 8, 1520-
25
26 1535, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2006.04.004.
27
28

29
30 Hutton, D., 2009, Insights into magmatism in volcanic margins: bridge structures and a
31 new mechanism of basic sill emplacement—Theron Mountains, Antarctica: Petroleum
32
33 Geoscience: **15**, no. 3, 269-278, doi: 10.1144/1354-079309-841.
34
35

36
37 Jackson, C. A.-L., Schofield, N., and Golenkov, B., 2013, Geometry and controls on the
38 development of igneous sill-related forced folds: A 2-D seismic reflection case study from
39 offshore southern Australia: Geological Society of America Bulletin: **125**, no. 11-12, 1874-1890,
40
41 doi: 10.1130/b30833.1.
42
43

44
45 Kavanagh, J. L., Menand, T., and Sparks, R. S. J., 2006, An experimental investigation of
46 sill formation and propagation in layered elastic media: Earth and Planetary Science Letters: **245**,
47
48 no. 3-4, 799-813, doi: 10.1016/j.epsl.2006.03.025.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interpretation

26

1
2
3 Kay, S. M., Mancilla, O., and Copeland, P., 2006, Evolution of the late Miocene
4 Chachahuén volcanic complex at 37°S over a transient shallow subduction zone under the
5 Neuquén Andes: Geological Society of America Special Papers: **407**, 215-246,
6
7
8
9
10 10.1130/2006.2407(10).

11
12 Kontorovich, A. E., Khomenko, A. V., Burshtein, L. M., Likhanov, I. I., Pavlov, A. L.,
13 Staroseltsev, V. S., and Ten, A. A., 1997, Intense basic magmatism in the Tunguska petroleum
14 basin, eastern Siberia, Russia: *Petroleum Geoscience*: **3**, no. 4, 359-369, 10.1144/petgeo.3.4.359.
15
16
17

18
19 Magee, C., Briggs, F., and Jackson, C. A. L., 2013, Lithological controls on igneous
20 intrusion-induced ground deformation: *Journal of the Geological Society*: **170**, no. 6, 853-856,
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
doi: 10.1144/jgs2013-029.

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Magee, C., Jackson, C. A.-L., and Schofield, N., 2014, Diachronous sub-volcanic
intrusion along deep-water margins: insights from the Irish Rockall Basin: *Basin Research*: **26**,
no. 1, 85-105, doi: 10.1111/bre.12044.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Magee, C., Maharaj, S. M., Wrona, T., and Jackson, C. A.-L., 2015, Controls on the
expression of igneous intrusions in seismic reflection data: *Geosphere*: **11**, no. 4, 1024-1041, doi:
10.1130/ges01150.1.

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Magee, C., Muirhead, J. D., Karvelas, A., Holford, S. P., Jackson, C. A. L., Bastow, I. D.,
Schofield, N., Stevenson, C. T. E., McLean, C., and McCarthy, W., 2016, Lateral magma flow in
mafic sill complexes: *Geosphere*, 33,

48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Malthe-Sørenssen, A., Planke, S., Svensen, H., and Jamtveit, B., 2004, Formation of
saucer-shaped sills: Geological Society, London, Special Publications: **234**, no. 1, 215-227, doi:
10.1144/gsl.sp.2004.234.01.13.

Interpretation

27

1
2
3 Menand, T., 2008, The mechanics and dynamics of sills in layered elastic rocks and their
4 implications for the growth of laccoliths and other igneous complexes: Earth and Planetary
5 Science Letters: **267**, no. 1–2, 93-99, doi: 10.1016/j.epsl.2007.11.043.
6
7

8
9
10 Morgan, S., Stanik, A., Horsman, E., Tikoff, B., de Saint Blanquat, M., and Habert, G.,
11 2008, Emplacement of multiple magma sheets and wall rock deformation: Trachyte Mesa
12 intrusion, Henry Mountains, Utah: Journal of Structural Geology: **30**, no. 4, 491-512, doi:
13 10.1016/j.jsg.2008.01.005.
14
15

16
17
18 Planke, S., Rasmussen, T., Rey, S. S., and Myklebust, R., 2005, Seismic characteristics
19 and distribution of volcanic intrusions and hydrothermal vent complexes in the Vøring and Møre
20 basins: Geological Society, London, Petroleum Geology Conference series: **6**, 833-844, doi:
21 10.1144/0060833.
22
23

24
25
26 Planke, S., Svensen, H., Myklebust, R., Bannister, S., Manton, B., and Lorenz, L., 2015,
27 Geophysics and Remote Sensing: Berlin, Heidelberg, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1-16, doi:
28 10.1007/11157_2014_6.
29
30

31
32
33 Planke, S., Symonds, P. A., Alvestad, E., and Skogseid, J., 2000, Seismic
34 volcanostratigraphy of large-volume basaltic extrusive complexes on rifted margins: Journal of
35 Geophysical Research: Solid Earth: **105**, no. B8, 19335-19351, doi: 10.1029/1999JB900005.
36
37

38
39
40 Pollard, D. D., and Johnson, A. M., 1973, Mechanics of growth of some laccolithic
41 intrusions in the Henry mountains, Utah, II: Bending and failure of overburden layers and sill
42 formation: Tectonophysics: **18**, no. 3–4, 311-354, doi: 10.1016/0040-1951(73)90051-6.
43
44

45
46
47 Polteau, S., Mazzini, A., Galland, O., Planke, S., and Malthe-Sørenssen, A., 2008,
48 Saucer-shaped intrusions: Occurrences, emplacement and implications: Earth and Planetary
49 Science Letters: **266**, no. 1–2, 195-204, doi: 10.1016/j.epsl.2007.11.015.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interpretation

28

Potter, J., and Konnerup-Madsen, J., 2003, A review of the occurrence and origin of abiogenic hydrocarbons in igneous rocks: *Hydrocarbons in Crystalline Rocks*: **214**, no. 1, 151-173, doi 10.1144/Gsl.Sp.2003.214.01.10.

Ramsay, J. G., 1967, *Folding and fracturing of rocks*, McGraw-Hill Companies.

Rodriguez Monreal, F., Villar, H. J., Baudino, R., Delpino, D., and Zencich, S., 2009, Modeling an atypical petroleum system: A case study of hydrocarbon generation, migration and accumulation related to igneous intrusions in the Neuquen Basin, Argentina: *Marine and Petroleum Geology*: **26**, no. 4, 590-605, doi: 10.1016/j.marpetgeo.2009.01.005.

Roman-Berdiel, T., Gapais, D., and Brun, J. P., 1995, Analogue models of laccolith formation: *Journal of Structural Geology*: **17**, no. 9, 1337-1346, doi: 10.1016/0191-8141(95)00012-3.

Schofield, N., Alsop, I., Warren, J., Underhill, J. R., Lehné, R., Beer, W., and Lukas, V., 2014, Mobilizing salt: Magma-salt interactions: *Geology*: **42**, no. 7, 599-602, 10.1130/g35406.1.

Schofield, N., Brown, D. J., Magee, C., and Stevenson, C. T., 2012a, Sill morphology and comparison of brittle and non-brittle emplacement mechanisms: *Journal of the Geological Society*: **169**, no. 2, 127-141, doi: 10.1144/0016-76492011-078.

Schofield, N., Heaton, L., Holford, S. P., Archer, S. G., Jackson, C. A.-L., and Jolley, D. W., 2012b, Seismic imaging of 'broken bridges': linking seismic to outcrop-scale investigations of intrusive magma lobes: *Journal of the Geological Society*: **169**, no. 4, 421-426, 10.1144/0016-76492011-150.

Schofield, N., Holford, S., Millett, J., Brown, D., Jolley, D., Passey, S. R., Muirhead, D., Grove, C., Magee, C., Murray, J., Hole, M., Jackson, C. A.-L., and Stevenson, C., 2015, Regional magma plumbing and emplacement mechanisms of the Faroe-Shetland Sill Complex:

Interpretation

1
2
3 implications for magma transport and petroleum systems within sedimentary basins: Basin
4
5 Research, 1-23, doi: 10.1111/bre.12164.
6

7
8 Schofield, N., Stevenson, C., and Reston, T., 2010, Magma fingers and host rock
9
10 fluidization in the emplacement of sills: *Geology*: **38**, no. 1, 63-66, 10.1130/g30142.1.
11

12
13 Schutter, S. R., 2003a, Hydrocarbon occurrence and exploration in and around igneous
14
15 rocks: *Hydrocarbons in Crystalline Rocks*: **214**, no. 1, 7-33, doi 10.1144/Gsl.Sp.2003.214.01.02.
16

17
18 Schutter, S. R., 2003b, Occurrences of hydrocarbons in and around igneous rocks:
19
20 *Hydrocarbons in Crystalline Rocks*: **214**, no. 1, 35-68, doi 10.1144/Gsl.Sp.2003.214.01.03.
21

22
23 Senger, K., Buckley, S. J., Chevallier, L., Fagereng, Å., Galland, O., Kurz, T. H., Ogata,
24
25 K., Planke, S., and Tveranger, J., 2015, Fracturing of doleritic intrusions and associated contact
26
27 zones: Implications for fluid flow in volcanic basins: *Journal of African Earth Sciences*: **102**, no.
28
29 0, 70-85, doi: 10.1016/j.jafrearsci.2014.10.019.
30

31
32 Smallwood, J. R., and Maresh, J., 2002, The properties, morphology and distribution of
33
34 igneous sills: modelling, borehole data and 3D seismic from the Faroe-Shetland area: *Geological*
35
36 *Society, London, Special Publications*: **197**, no. 1, 271-306, doi: 10.1144/gsl.sp.2002.197.01.11.
37

38
39 Stearns, D. W., 1978, Faulting and forced folding in the Rocky Mountains foreland:
40
41 *Geological Society of America Memoirs*: **151**, 1-38, doi: 10.1130/MEM151-p1.
42

43
44 Svensen, H., Corfu, F., Polteau, S., Hammer, Ø., and Planke, S., 2012, Rapid magma
45
46 emplacement in the Karoo Large Igneous Province: *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*: **325–**
47
48 **326**, 1-9, doi: 10.1016/j.epsl.2012.01.015.
49

50
51 Svensen, H., Planke, S., Malthe-Sørenssen, A., Jamtveit, B., Myklebust, R., Rasmussen
52
53 Eidem, T., and Rey, S. S., 2004, Release of methane from a volcanic basin as a mechanism for
54
55 initial Eocene global warming: *Nature*: **429**, no. 6991, 542-545, doi: 10.1038/nature02566.
56
57
58
59
60

Interpretation

30

1
2
3 Thomson, K., and Hutton, D., 2004, Geometry and growth of sill complexes: insights
4 using 3D seismic from the North Rockall Trough: *Bulletin of Volcanology*: **66**, no. 4, 364-375,
5
6 doi: 10.1007/s00445-003-0320-z.
7
8

9
10 Thomson, K., and Schofield, N., 2008, Lithological and structural controls on the
11 emplacement and morphology of sills in sedimentary basins: Geological Society, London,
12
13 Special Publications: **302**, no. 1, 31-44, doi: 10.1144/SP302.3.
14
15

16
17 Timoshenko, S. P., and Woinowsky-Krieger, S., 1959, Theory of plates and shells,
18
19 McGraw-hill Book Company.
20
21

22 Trude, J., Cartwright, J., Davies, R. J., and Smallwood, J. R., 2003, New technique for
23
24 dating igneous sills: *Geology*: **31**, no. 9, 813-816, doi: 10.1130/g19559.1.
25
26

27 Wilson, P. I. R., McCaffrey, K. J. W., Wilson, R. W., Jarvis, I., and Holdsworth, R. E.,
28
29 2016, Deformation structures associated with the Trachyte Mesa intrusion, Henry Mountains,
30
31 Utah: Implications for sill and laccolith emplacement mechanisms: *Journal of Structural*
32
33 *Geology*: **87**, 30-46, doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2016.04.001.
34
35

36 Witte, J., Bonora, M., Carbone, C., and Oncken, O., 2012, Fracture evolution in oil-
37
38 producing sills of the Rio Grande Valley, northern Neuquen Basin, Argentina: *AAPG Bulletin*:
39
40 **96**, no. 7, 1253-1277, doi: 10.1306/10181110152.
41
42

43 Zhao, F., Wu, S., Sun, Q., Huuse, M., Li, W., and Wang, Z., 2014, Submarine volcanic
44
45 mounds in the Pearl River Mouth Basin, northern South China Sea: *Marine Geology*: **355**, 162-
46
47 172, doi: 10.1016/j.margeo.2014.05.018.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Schematic diagrams showing mechanisms of overburden deformation associated with intrusion emplacement. (A) Simple elastic model envisages the formation of a dome structure (forced fold) above an intrusion (e.g., Pollard and Johnson, 1973; Galland and Scheibert, 2013). (B) Four fracture types related to elastic overburden deformation: (1) circumferential, tensile fractures coincident with the area of the largest convex curvature of the dome (e.g., Pollard and Johnson, 1973; Bungler and Cruden, 2011; Galland et al., 2016); (2) radial tensile fractures (Mode I) and/or normal faults (Mode II) due to outer-arc stretching (Hansen and Cartwright, 2006; Magee et al., 2013; Galland et al., 2016); (3) dilational fractures progressing towards the surface (Pollard and Johnson, 1973; Menand, 2008; Thomson and Schofield, 2008; Galland and Scheibert, 2013); and (4) shear fractures resulting from differential uplift (de Saint-Blanquat et al., 2006; Hansen and Cartwright, 2006; Agirrezabala, 2015; Wilson et al., 2016). (C) Model of volume reduction, i.e. porosity decrease, affected by the aureole of the intrusion (e.g., Hansen and Cartwright, 2006; Jackson et al., 2013). (D) Differential compaction model envisages the formation and/or enhancement of a dome structure associated with an intrusion under the load of post-emplacement sedimentation (e.g., Cosgrove and Hillier, 1999; Hansen and Cartwright, 2006).

Figure 2: Location maps. (A) Position of the 3D seismic survey containing the Tulipan prospect in the Møre Basin on the Norwegian continental shelf with respect to the Norwegian mainland. Outline of the Paleogene basalts after (Berndt et al., 2001). (B) Seismic reflection time-slice showing the main igneous complexes identified in the study area. The Tulipan sill is indicated (*dashed line*) in addition to the location of well 6302/6-1.

Interpretation

32

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 3: Simplified stratigraphic column of the study area showing the principal lithology encountered in the well. The period (*Pd*), epoch (*Ep*), group (*Gp*), and formation (*Fm*) are based on the biostratigraphy from cutting samples of well 6302/6-1 (e.g., Kjoberg et al., this volume, submitted). Interval velocities ($V_{p_{int}}$) used in the study derived from the VSP checkshot data. The lithological column (*Litho*) is based on and described in detail in Kjoberg et al., (this volume, submitted). The lithology below the total depth (*TD*) of the well is an extrapolation. Overview for the interpreted horizons (*Horizons*) used in this study.

Figure 4: Seismic stratigraphic framework, including a description of the mapped seismic reflections and the seismic sequences they define.

Figure 5: Seismic expression of the Tulipan sill. (A) 3D visualization of the saucer-shaped geometry of the top Tulipan sill horizon. Radial magma flow indicators mark edges of reflection segments representing upward, outward transgressing, igneous inclined sheets (Schofield et al., 2012b; Magee et al., 2014). (B) Seismic profiles show the cross-sectional expressions of the Tulipan sill (see (A) for location). P1 – P1' highlights the picked Tulipan sill top and base, whereas P2 – P2' visualizes the segmented character of the Tulipan sill reflection and indicates an underlying sill (*S*) below the Tulipan sill (Tulipan top - *white dashed line*; *black dashed line* tentatively interpreted as the sill base).

Figure 6: Time structure maps (two way travel time, TWT) and dome amplitude *f*. (A) HV1 time structure map shows the paleo-surface and top of the domed overburden during the emplacement of the Tulipan sill. (B) The stack of altitude data points within the Tulipan periphery highlights the plateau in the domed overburden. A best fit plane was used to estimate the base of the dome and calculate the amplitude *f* (*red area*). (C) Base Carbonate time structure

Interpretation

1
2
3 map of the lowermost interpreted horizon above the Tulipan sill shows a good confined dome
4
5 structure inside the Tulipan sill periphery. Subset shows the stratigraphic location of the (A) and
6
7 (C).
8
9

10
11 Figure 7: Spectral decomposition attributes maps of key horizons. Subsets display the
12 same seismic section of Figure 3 (for location see Figure 2). The periphery of the Tulipan sill
13
14 (*red dashed line*) corresponds to the map contour at the level of c. 4400 ms (TWT). (A) HV1
15
16 (Top Tang Formation) defines the top of the dome structure, and highlights hydrothermal vent
17
18 complexes (HTVCs, *white circles*) and fractures in between (*black/white arrows*). (B) HTVCs on
19
20 HV3 are obscured by lava flow pattern (*outside the white lines*). (C) HV4 envisages a regional
21
22 polygonal fault system, and deeper parts of the HTVCs (*black circles*) identified in (A). (D) Top
23
24 Danian shows no fractures in the top of the reservoir sandstones of the Tulipan prospect. (E) The
25
26 Base Carbonate shows no evidence for central fractures, but highlights the crosscut of the
27
28 underlying Tulipan sill. (The crosscut itself is not visible in the seismic subset).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 Figure 8: Thickness maps of the sedimentary sequences above the Tulipan sill. (A) Top
38
39 Tare – HV1 isochron map shows the thickness anomalies (i.e. hydrothermal vent complex
40
41 related mounds) in sedimentary strata right above the dome structure. (B) Isochron map of the
42
43 complete strata interpreted (HV1 – Base Carbonate). *White line* shows the position of the seismic
44
45 subset. (C) The upper dome structure, i.e. HV1 – HV4 isochron map, shows patchy thickness
46
47 anomalies (thicker) in the close vicinity of the Tulipan sill periphery, whereas the central area is
48
49 thin. (D) Isochron map of HV4 to Base Carbonate displays a contrasting thickness variation
50
51 compared to (C) within the Tulipan sill periphery.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1: Schematic diagrams showing mechanisms of overburden deformation associated with intrusion emplacement. (A) Simple elastic model envisages the formation of a dome structure (forced fold) above an intrusion (e.g., Pollard and Johnson, 1973; Galland and Scheibert, 2013). (B) Four fracture types related to elastic overburden deformation: (1) circumferential, tensile fractures coincident with the area of the largest convex curvature of the dome (e.g., Pollard and Johnson, 1973; Bungler and Cruden, 2011; Galland et al., 2016); (2) radial tensile fractures (Mode I) and/or normal faults (Mode II) due to outer-arc stretching (Hansen and Cartwright, 2006; Magee et al., 2013; Galland et al., 2016); (3) dilational fractures progressing towards the surface (Pollard and Johnson, 1973; Menand, 2008; Thomson and Schofield, 2008; Galland and Scheibert, 2013; Agirrezabala, 2015); and (4) shear fractures resulting from differential uplift (de Saint-Blanquat et al., 2006; Hansen and Cartwright, 2006; Wilson et al., 2016). (C) Model of volume reduction, i.e. porosity decrease, affected by the aureole of the intrusion (e.g., Hansen and Cartwright, 2006; Jackson et al., 2013). (D) Differential compaction model envisages the formation and/or enhancement of a dome structure associated with an intrusion under the load of post-emplacement sedimentation (e.g., Cosgrove and Hillier, 1999; Hansen and Cartwright, 2006).

Figure 1

65x38mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 2: Location maps. (A) Position of the 3D seismic survey containing the Tulipan prospect in the Møre Basin on the Norwegian continental shelf with respect to the Norwegian mainland. Outline of the Paleogene basalts after (Berndt et al., 2001). (B) Seismic reflection time-slice showing the main igneous complexes identified in the study area. The Tulipan sill is indicated (dashed line) in addition to the location of well 6302/6-1.

Figure 2

89x45mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 3: Simplified stratigraphic column of the study area showing the principal lithology encountered in the well. The period (Pd), epoch (Ep), group (Gp), and formation (Fm) are based on the biostratigraphy from cutting samples of well 6302/6-1 (e.g., Kjoberg et al., this volume, submitted). Interval velocities (Vpint) used in the study derived from the VSP checkshot data. The lithological column (Litho) is based on and described in detail in Kjoberg et al., (this volume, submitted). The lithology below the total depth (TD) of the well is an extrapolation. Overview for the interpreted horizons (Horizons) used in this study.

Figure 3
75x32mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 4: Seismic stratigraphic framework, including a description of the mapped seismic reflections and the seismic sequences they define.

Figure 4
161x147mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 5: Seismic expression of the Tulipan sill. (A) 3D visualization of the saucer-shaped geometry of the top Tulipan sill horizon. Radial magma flow indicators mark edges of reflection segments representing upward, outward transgressing, igneous inclined sheets (Schofield et al., 2012b; Magee et al., 2014). (B) Seismic profiles show the cross-sectional expressions of the Tulipan sill (see (A) for location). P1 – P1' highlights the picked Tulipan sill top and base, whereas P2 – P2' visualizes the segmented character of the Tulipan sill reflection and indicates an underlying sill (S) below the Tulipan sill (Tulipan top - white dashed line; black dashed line tentatively interpreted as the sill base).

Figure 5

95x82mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 6: Time structure maps (two way travel time, TWT) and dome amplitude f . (A) HV1 time structure map shows the paleo-surface and top of the domed overburden during the emplacement of the Tulipan sill.

(B) The stack of altitude data points within the Tulipan periphery highlights the plateau in the domed overburden. A best fit plane was used to estimate the base of the dome and calculate the amplitude f (red area). (C) Base Carbonate time structure map of the lowermost interpreted horizon above the Tulipan sill shows a good confined dome structure inside the Tulipan sill periphery. Subset shows the stratigraphic location of the (A) and (C).

Figure 6

218x431mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 7: Spectral decomposition attributes maps of key horizons. Subsets display the same seismic section of Figure 3 (for location see Figure 2). The periphery of the Tulipan sill (red dashed line) corresponds to the map contour at the level of c. 4400 ms (TWT). (A) HV1 (Top Tang Formation) defines the top of the dome structure, and highlights hydrothermal vent complexes (HTVCs, white circles) and fractures in between (black/white arrows). (B) HTVCs on HV3 are obscured by lava flow pattern (outside the white lines). (C) HV4 envisages a regional polygonal fault system, and deeper parts of the HTVCs (black circles) identified in (A). (D) Top Danian shows no fractures in the top of the reservoir sandstones of the Tulipan prospect. (E) The Base Carbonate shows no evidence for central fractures, but highlights the crosscut of the underlying Tulipan sill. (The crosscut itself is not visible in the seismic subset).

Figure 7
240x678mm (300 x 300 DPI)





Figure 8: Thickness maps of the sedimentary sequences above the Tulipan sill. (A) Top Tare – HV1 isochron map shows the thickness anomalies (i.e. hydrothermal vent complex related mounds) in sedimentary strata right above the dome structure. (B) Isochron map of the complete strata interpreted (HV1 – Base Carbonate). White line shows the position of the seismic subset. (C) The upper dome structure, i.e. HV1 – HV4 isochron map, shows patchy thickness anomalies (thicker) in the close vicinity of the Tulipan sill periphery, whereas the central area is thin. (D) Isochron map of HV4 to Base Carbonate displays a contrasting thickness variation compared to (C) within the Tulipan sill periphery.

Figure 8


192x439mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Supplemental material: Additional time structure maps
supplemental material
231x485mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Supplemental material: Additional isochron map
supplemental material
66x39mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Review