

Reply to comments by Ana M. Negrodo on “The role of Edge-Driven Convection in the generation of volcanism – part 2: Interactions between Edge-Driven Convection and thermal plumes, application to the Eastern Atlantic”

Antonio Manjón-Cabeza Córdoba and Maxim D. Ballmer

We thank referee Ana M. Negrodo for her thorough review and her scientific input. Overall, we agree with the appreciations of the referee. Please, find the reply to your main comments below.

A more complete response, with the specific changes made and the relevant lines will be provided upon submission of the revised manuscript.

Main comments:

1. I think that the explanation of the model setup does not allow understanding fundamental aspects of the modelling as for example the implementation of the plume thermal anomaly and the initial phases of the model evolution. The authors should clearly explain how the ‘statistical steady-state’ (line 98) is achieved. For example, do the authors activate first EDC and later on force plume upwelling? Or both processes are activated simultaneously instead? How is plume upwelling forced? Is equation 1 a bottom boundary condition that forces the development of a plume? I guess this is the case, otherwise, how can r_{plume} change every 50 timesteps without artificially perturbing the thermal distribution? I find puzzling that this update with time of r_{plume} does not perturb the steady-state flow and thermal fields. Similarly, which is the radius of the opening at the bottom of the model mentioned in line 97? Also the approximations assumed (extended Boussinesq approximation, I guess, as in their former EDC study) are not mentioned. Overall, please clearly state which are the initial and boundary conditions, explain how plume upwelling is forced and the initial evolution previous to the statistical steady-state. Below there are additional specific comments related to model setting definition.

In general, all reviewers agree that the methods section should be better explained. Therefore, we rewrite it considering the suggestions by the referee. We explain better the boundary conditions and (also to address a question by reviewer 3) the development of the plume. In addition, a brief explanation of the statistical steady state is included. We emphasize that the radius of the plume thermal anomaly and of the opening at the bottom are fixed at a specific value once the statistical steady state is reached

2. I realize that illustrating the dynamics of 3D models can be very challenging, but I still consider that the quality of this fully-coupled 3D modeling is somehow obscured by the figures shown in the manuscript. Note that results are illustrated in only two type of figures, the style of figures 3, 5, 7 and the style of figures 4, 6, 8, 9. For example the interplay between EDC and plume upwelling could be better illustrated in vertical crosssections showing the temperature, melting and velocity fields, at least for the reference case. That would also be useful to distinguish between SSC and EDC. There are a number of statements (I list them in the comments below) that are not illustrated at all in any figure. For example, the authors mention that figures shown (Figures 3, 5, 7) refer to thermal anomalies, and that the melting areas may be

deflected even more than the thermal anomaly' (lines 334-335), but this is not illustrated nor quantified by any means, which makes it difficult the comparison with the Canaries. Similarly, the important sentence: 'plume pancake may not necessarily be parallel to the plate movement' (lines 336-337), which is crucial for the comparison with the Canaries, could be shown for example on a horizontal section at the surface. I suggest adding additional figures showing for example the horizontal geometry of melting anomalies.

This was also a comment by referee 3. We have therefore re-done several figures to better illustrate both, the model setting and the model results.

3. Regarding the comparison with the Canary Archipelago, the authors state that several models predict 'deflection of the plume pancake and the melting zones toward the continental margin, which would explain the shape of the whole archipelago and the geographic distribution of volcanism'. However, this deflection is of only 25-35 km, so I don't see in which sense the interaction between plume and EDC is required to explain the E-W extension of the archipelago. In this sense, perhaps a control test with a flat lithosphere would be helpful to see how the geometry of the plume pancake is affected by the mentioned interaction. This is important to support the last conclusion, which states that for the Canary Islands a plume may be rising at 200 km from the continental margin, being deflected and creating the complex age progression and widespread volcanism. I agree that the lateral deflection may explain the widespread volcanism (although the plume pancake is only deflected 25-35 km), but the age progression is not reproduced provided that this modelled deflection is towards de edge, while the Canarian volcanism becomes younger away from the edge.

We apologize for the misunderstanding. As the referee suggest, we did not want to imply that the deflection of EDC can, by itself, reproduce the temporal evolution of the Canaries, but the current state. As suggested by the referee, plume migration may be needed. In fact, a previous version of the paper included a section about potential plume migration. We have rephrased the current text to be more specific and expanded the discussion regarding this issue. Note however that the absolute values of the deflection may change with different mantle properties or vigor of EDC (to show this effect, we add a figure to the supplement). We are now also more specific regarding deflections.

Minor comments.

Lines 33-34. In the statement 'Besides, a cogenetic relation of these volcanoes with other volcanic fields has been suggested on the basis of geochemistry (Doblas et al., 2007; Duggen et al., 2009)', please, be more specific, which volcanic fields, which relation?

We add examples as per the reviewer suggestion.

Line 46. Please, mention here the similar results found in the recent 2D study by Negrodo et al. (2022; EPSL doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2022.117506>) which is

closely related to the present work and was probably published after submission of the manuscript by Manjón-Cabeza Córdoba and Ballmer.

While we were aware of this work, the referee is correct, we couldn't cite it because it was not published (we expected its publication during review). We gladly cite it now.

Line 83-84 please clarify in which sense the models are 'bottom heated': by means of a temperature increase or a heat flow increase...?

We are more specific now.

Line 84 better say 'thermal distribution' (it is a surface) instead of 'thermal profile'

We corrected the statement.

Line 88. Why is the plume located at $y=660$ km rather than being centered in the box, at $y=1980/2=990$ km. This would make sense to avoid artefacts related to the different distance to the y -normal boundaries.

We had to decide a place that was far away enough from the inflow boundary (to avoid the aforementioned artifacts), but where we could still control EDC flow (*i.e.* close enough from the inflow boundary) and allowed the pancake and PET to fully develop. We set for $y=660$ km, but ran a test with the plume at the middle of the model confirming that results were qualitatively the same.

Line 93. Is this temperature increase a bottom boundary condition?

That is correct. We now describe the plume boundary conditions better.

Lines 135-136. this sentence 'Plume Erosion Track (PET) that is observed in all models Ribe and Christensen (1994)' seems ambiguous to me. Do the authors mean all models in this study? All models on plume dynamics?

While the PET should appear in all models of plume dynamics including plate velocity, we now corrected the sentence to a more conservative 'in all our models'.

Lines 136-137. The authors say 'In the reference case (fig. 3), the PET is mostly parallel to the direction of plate motion', but I cannot see this at all, mainly because the figure shows a snapshot in a steady-state situation, so it is difficult to see the development of a track.

Because the models are in steady state, the PET does not change (except for the models with 'cyclic' behavior). We now try to explain better what the plume track is and hope that it is clearer, also with the new figures.

Line 170. The sentence 'Nonetheless, the base of the lithosphere is eroded more efficiently for large ΔT_{plume} ,' is not illustrated in any figure.

To better illustrate this, we add a supplementary figure where the lithospheric thickness of different models are compared.

Lines 220-221. The statement '...another notable phenomenon occurs: vigorous SSC occurs in the plume pancake with dominant transverse rolls (*i.e.*, perpendicular to the

edge..' as well as the description of two melting anomalies that separate and merge periodically are not illustrated in any figure.

We agree with the referee that it is difficult to see this for the untrained reader based on snapshots (as we do not explicitly visualize the velocity field), particularly in terms of the periodic behavior. We add an animation of one of these cases in the supplementary material, which should provide a good intuition of the flow dynamics as well as periodic behavior.

Line 273-274. I don't understand this sentence 'We also find that the symmetry of the PET is higher for the cases with lower viscosity than for the case with intermediate and with high viscosity'. Symmetry with respect to what? Can the authors add any figure to illustrate this?

We meant symmetric with respect to an axis through the hotspot and parallel to the plate velocity (or parallel to the edge, same direction). We add a clarification and hope that the new figures illustrate this phenomenon better.

Lines 283-286. The authors affirm 'On the other hand, plume pancake deflection commonly (but not always) occurs towards the edge. This prediction may explain why some hotspot tracks (such as the Canaries) do not strictly align with plate velocity, and volcanism is widespread with more activity far from the continental margin than near to it (e.g., La Palma vs. Gran Canaria)'. I agree, but this would not be consistent with volcanic islands age decreasing away from the edge in the Canaries. Can the authors explain this?

We agree completely with the reviewer and apologize for not being clearer in the text. Obviously, some plume migration (or some other anomalous phenomenon) is required for the Canaries. We now added some lines in the discussion to specify it better in the text.

Lines 295-298. Here the authors compare model results with previous work about the interaction between mantle plume and lithospheric instabilities. In this context, a comparison with the recent 2D transient modelling by Negredo et al., (EPSL, 2022) is pertinent. The results obtained from both studies are consistent and complementary, although the sense of migration of the plume 'pancake' is opposed, perhaps because of the different timesteps of the simulations chosen for interpretation purposes.

We agree and this links with the previous comment. We have added several lines in the discussion to compare and discuss both model settings. Unfortunately, comparison of 2D plumes and 3D plumes is not straightforward, but we have tried our best.

Figure 3. The authors mention: 'The purple contour outlines the region of active melting while the orange contour outlines the region of finite melt presence, including where active melt re-freezing occurs'. I don't see these as contours, but rather as surfaces. Perhaps a vertical cross section through the plume would be useful. Why are colors at the side boundaries different from colors at the back face? Please, add orientation axis (easily added in Paraview).

We correct "contours" for "isosurfaces" in the text. As said above, we hope that the new figures help to illustrate our results better.

List of typos:

Line 49. Say 'these archipelagos' instead of 'this archipelagos'

Line 114 extra parenthesis)

Line 122 remove cf.[

Line 146 say 'and another' instead of 'an another'

Line 201. ..'the dotted grey line in fig. 6' please, specify which panel.

Lines 254-256. The sentence 'Very likely, these predictions have implications for dynamic

topography and swell geometry' is repeated.

Line 303 replace pyroxenite. by pyroxenite, (comma instead of point)

Line 382, remove the word 'plue' (plume, I guess)

Line 385, use lowercase E in Edge.

Figure 2. Use lowercase k for km (not Km).

We correct the typos and thank again the reviewer for her thorough review.