A MATLAB program for 1D strain rate inversion
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A MATLAB program designed to invert 1D strain rate from subsidence data. In forward modeling, we use an implicit finite difference scheme to solve the heat conduction equation with an advective term. In the inversion, we adopt the Powell algorithm to continually search for the optimal values of strain rate until the fit, defined by the difference between the calculated subsidence and the observed subsidence, is satisfactory. Synthetic datasets are generated, and one of them is used to test the inversion algorithm. The results show that the calculated subsidence fit the theoretical subsidence quite well, and the inverted strain rate oscillates around the true value and is a good approximation to the original strain rate variation. The program is applied to the northern continental margin of the South China Sea, and the inverted strain rate from WC1411 well reveals the multiple rifting events that occurred in this region. The inverted strain rate can be used to evaluate the stretching factor and provides constraints for dynamic modeling of lithospheric deformation.

1. Introduction

Over the past 30 years, there has been considerable interest in the evolution of rifts and passive continental margins. Tectonically active rifts, palaeo-rifts and passive margins form an important group of genetically related extensional basins among different types of sedimentary basin (Bally and Snelson, 1980). Extensional basins cover large areas of the globe and contain important mineral deposits and energy resources. A large number of major hydrocarbon provinces are associated with rifts and passive margins (White et al., 2003; Ziegler and Cloetingh, 2004). In order to understand the evolution of rifted basins, several models have been developed (McKenzie, 1978; Royden and Keen, 1980; Hellinger and Scclater, 1983; Rowley and Sahagian, 1986). When modeling subsidence, extension is usually assumed to be instantaneous (McKenzie, 1978) or to occur at a constant rate for a finite period of time (Jarvis and McKenzie, 1980). White (1993, 1994) has developed a method for inverting subsidence data, which has now been applied to many different basins (Newman and White, 1999; Xie et al., 2006).

In this paper, we present a study that aims to improve important aspects of the existing models and provides a useful tool for researchers studying the evolution of rifted basins. The purpose of this work is to provide an open MATLAB code suitable for inverting strain rate from subsidence data and evaluating stretching factor.

2. Physical model

We consider the 2D physical model shown in Fig. 1 (see Jarvis and McKenzie (1980) for further details). Crust and lithospheric mantle are stretched at horizontal velocity \( u(x) \), and, at the same time, asthenospheric mantle flows upwards across the plane \( z=0 \) to replace the outflowing lithosphere. The upper surface, \( z=a \), where \( a \) is the thickness of the lithosphere, is maintained at \( T=0 \) °C and the surface \( z=0 \) is maintained at \( T=T_1 \), the asthenospheric temperature. This form of boundary condition is clearly an approximation because the top of the lithosphere must subside and sediment should be deposited as stretching continues. Deformation is constrained to occur by pure shear strain, and the vertical velocity at \( z=0 \) is \( G(t)a \), where \( G(t) \) is the vertical strain rate as a function of time, \( t \). The vertical velocity is required to vanish at \( z=a \) and is therefore given by

\[
\nu(z, t) = (a - z)G(t)
\]

The time-varying temperature structure of the lithosphere is obtained by solving the 1D heat flow equation with an additional advective term

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + G(t)(a - z) \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = k \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2}
\]
where $T$ is temperature, $t$ is time, and $\kappa$ is the thermal diffusivity. Conservation of material requires that

$$u(x, t) = \chi G(t)$$

(3)

Strain rate is not involved in the uniform stretching model, because it is assumed that stretching happens instantaneously in that model. In the finite stretching model (Jarvis and McKenzie, 1980), it is assumed that strain rate remains constant during lithosphere stretching (Woofer et al., 1992). In fact, strain rates vary with time.

Theoretical subsidence curves are normally generated as a function of $\beta$, the stretching factor (i.e., the total strain). These curves are fitted to the observed subsidence in order to determine $\beta$, which is related to vertical strain rate, $G(t)$, by

$$\beta = \exp\left(\int_0^\Delta G(t)dt\right)$$

(4)

where $\Delta t$ is the duration of stretching.

If $G(t)$ is constant, then evaluating the integral yields

$$\beta = \exp(G\Delta t)$$

(5)

The standard expression for theoretical water-loaded subsidence (White, 1994) is

$$S(t) = A\left(1 - \frac{1}{\beta}\right) - BQ(t)$$

(6)

where

$$A = t_c(\rho_m - \rho_w)/(\rho_a - \rho_w)$$

(7)

$$B = x\rho_m/(\rho_a - \rho_w)$$

(8)

$$Q(t) = \int_0^a \left[T(z, t) - T(z, \infty)\right] dz$$

(9)

$T(z, t)$ is the temperature of the lithosphere as a function of depth and time and $T(z, \infty)$ is the equilibrium temperature structure of the lithosphere. The symbols and values for other parameters are given in Table 1 (White, 1994). $Q(t)$ is a measure of the difference between the perturbed and equilibrium temperature structure and is a function of $G(t)$. $A$ and $B$ are crustal and lithospheric-mantle thinning factors, respectively.

The determination of subsidence as a function of time from knowledge of strain rate variation is defined as the forward problem.

The inverse problem can be solved directly by rearranging Eq. (6) (White, 1994)

$$G(t) = d/dt\left[\ln\left(\frac{A}{A - S(t) - BQ(t)}\right)\right]$$

(10)

Given $S(t)$, Eq. (10) can be solved iteratively to yield $G(t)$, using a starting distribution of $G(t)$ obtained by assuming $BQ(t) = 0$, which means that the variation in density with temperature is initially ignored. $Q(t)$ is recalculated with the finite difference method in all subsequent iterations.

Direct inversion necessitates numerical differentiation and is therefore susceptible to noise. For discrete and noisy data, the inverse problem is best solved by calculating a large number of forward models, varying only $G(t)$ each time until the difference between the calculated and the observed subsidences is minimized. We use Powell’s algorithm (Press et al., 1992) to vary $G(t)$ systematically to minimize a trial function $H$ (White, 1994)

$$H = \left[1 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{S_i^0 - S_i}{\sigma_i}\right)^2\right]^{1/2}$$

$$+ W_1 \left[\frac{1}{M-1} \sum_{k=2}^M \left(\frac{G_k - G_{k-1}}{\Delta t}\right)^2\right]^{1/2}$$

$$+ W_2 \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \left(G_k^0\right)^2\right]^{1/2} + W_3 \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \left|\log(G_k)\right|\right]$$

(11)

where $S_i^0$ and $S_i$ are the observed and calculated subsidences, respectively; $N$ is the number of observations of subsidence; $M$ is the number of discrete values of $G(t)$; $W_1$, $W_2$, and $W_3$ are weighting coefficients and $G_k^0$ is estimates of the second derivative of $G(t)$ generated by cubic spline interpolation. The first term on the right-hand side of Eq. (11) is 0 when calculated and observed subsidences agree for all values. Dividing the difference between them by $\sigma_i$ causes each term in the summation to have unit variance. The last three terms in Eq. (11) are added to attenuate the oscillation of inverted the results. The second and third terms cause $G(t)$ to be smooth, and the fourth term tends to infinity smoothly as any $G_k$ approaches 0. We found that reasonable results are obtained when the weighting coefficients are set to $W_1=0.5$, $W_2=0.5$ and $W_3=0.05$.

3. Numerical model

The procedure used by Jarvis and McKenzie (1980) to solve Eq. (2) is a pseudo-analytic method, which involves the technique of separation of variables, eigenfunction expansion and numerical integration method such as the fourth-order Runge-Kutta method. Although Jarvis et al. (1980) intended to solved Eq. (2) analytically, their solution is based on numerical methods. Since it is difficult to find an analytic solution to Eq. (2), we adopt the finite difference method for solving Eq. (2). Using Crank–Nicholson implicit finite difference scheme (Lu and Guan, 2004), Eq. (2) can be written as

$$T_{j+1}^{n+1} - T_j^n = \frac{G(n\tau)(a-jh)}{2h} \left(\frac{T_{j+1}^n - T_{j+1}^{n-1}}{2h} + \frac{T_{j+1}^{n+1} - T_{j+1}^{n-1}}{2h}\right)$$
\[
\frac{\kappa}{2} \left( \frac{T^n_{j+1} - 2T^n_j + T^n_{j-1}}{h^2} + \frac{T^{n+1}_{j+1} - 2T^{n+1}_j + T^{n+1}_{j-1}}{h^2} \right)
\]  

(12)

where \( \tau \) and \( h \) are the temporal and spatial steps, respectively.

Let \( l = \frac{k}{(\tau / h^2)} \) and \( r = (\tau / h) \), then Eq. (12) can be written as

\[
T^{n+1}_{j+1} = \left[ \frac{l}{2} G(n\tau)(a - jh) \right] T^n_j + 2(1 + \lambda) T^n_{j+1} + \frac{\lambda}{2} G(n\tau)(a - jh)
\]

(13)

Given the initial temperature structure \( T(z) = T_1(1 - z/a) \)

and boundary condition \( T(t, a) = 0 \)

\( T(t, 0) = T_1 \)

Eq. (13) can be solved with the Thomas’s algebraic scheme (Press et al., 1992).

For forward modeling, \( G(t) \) is given. Therefore, once \( T(t, z) \) is obtained, we can calculate subsidence with Eq. (6) and stretching factor with Eq. (4).

Given observed subsidence and guessed initial strain rate, \( g_0(t) \) (i.e. let \( Q(t) \) equal to zero and use Eq. (10) to determine \( g_0(t) \)), the inversion involves calculating a large number of forward models, varying only \( G(t) \) each time until the difference between the calculated and the observed subsidences is minimized. The inverse flow is shown in Fig. 2.

4. Synthetic data

The algorithm described above has been applied to a set of synthetic data generated by forward modeling. The following equation was used to generate a strain rate distribution that decreased exponentially with time (White, 1994)

\[
G(t) = G_0 \exp(-t/\tau)
\]

(16)
where $\tau$ governs how quickly $G(t)$ decreases with increase in time and $G_0$ is a constant. $G_0$ is determined by

$$G_0 = \frac{\ln \beta}{\pi [1 - \exp(-\Delta t/\tau)]}$$

(17)

where $\Delta t$ is the duration of stretching and $\beta$ is the stretching factor.

Similarly, if $G(t)$ increases exponentially with time, then

$$G(t) = G_0 \exp(t/\tau)$$

(18)

The forward modeling results of strain rate distributions shown in Fig. 3, 4 and 5 illustrate the effect that variations in $G(t)$ have on both subsidence and heat flow, given the total strain, $\beta$, is constant. We can see that if $G(t)$ is constant during the rift period, then the time derivatives of both the subsidence and the heat flow are approximately constant for the duration of rifting. When rifting ceases (i.e. $G=0$), subsidence and heat flow decay exponentially with time. In the second example, $G(t)$ decreases exponentially with time.

\[G_0 = \frac{\ln \beta}{\pi [\exp(\Delta t/\tau) - 1]}\]  

(19)

Fig. 4. Subsidence curves corresponding to strain rate distributions in Fig. 2.

Fig. 5. Surface heat flow variation corresponding to strain rate distributions in Fig. 2.
exponentially with time and the syn-rift subsidence gradient also decreases with time. However, at the end of the rift period, subsidence must be greater than it is for constant $G(t)$ if the total strain is fixed. Finally, if $G(t)$ increases with time, the syn-rift subsidence gradient also increases with time but the total syn-rift subsidence is smaller than in the previous two examples. The heat flow shown in Fig. 5 has similar results as subsidence. The difference in the subsidence and heat flow curves is a consequence of the different distribution of strain rate during rifting. Once the disturbed temperature has returned to equilibrium, the total subsidence rates in all three cases are identical.

The inversion algorithm described above has been applied to a synthetic dataset generated by forward modeling with $G(t)$ decreasing exponentially with time during the rifting period. As shown in Fig. 6, the inverted strain rate oscillates around the true value. The calculated subsidence fits quite well with the theoretical subsidence except at the boundary and interrupted points, as shown in Fig. 7, where the standard deviations are set to 25 m for all observed data points. Although there are minor oscillations around the true values, the predicted subsidence fits the observed subsidence quite well. If the duration of rifting is known, then the inverted strain rate can be used to evaluate the stretching factor with Eq. (16). The calculated and theoretical stretching factor variations from the synthetic data are shown in Fig. 8. The results indicate that the variation of the stretching factor during the rifting is time-dependent.
5. Application to the South China Sea

The South China Sea (SCS) is one of the largest marginal seas in the western Pacific, which is located at the junction of the Eurasian plate, the Pacific Plate and the Indian–Australian plate. It was formed by continent breakup and sea-floor spreading in the Cenozoic (Taylor and Hayes, 1980; Briais et al., 1993). The northern continental margin of the SCS experienced multiple rifting events
(Ru and Pigott, 1986; Clift and Lin, 2001; He et al., 2002). We apply our Matlab program to invert strain rate and estimate stretching factor of the northern continental margin of the SCS with tectonic subsidence data from a drilling well. The data is derived from Xie et al. (2006).

Fig. 9 shows the inverted strain rate of WC1411 well, which is located at the Pearl River Mouth Basin (PRMB) in the northern continental margin of the SCS. The subsidence data is derived from Xie et al. (2006). The standard deviation is assumed to be 25 m for all the observed data. Fig. 10 shows the accumulative stretching factor of the WC1411 well, which is the exponent of the integral of the strain rate. The strain rate distribution shown in Fig. 9(a) reveals the multiple rifting events in this region. The strain rate can help us understand the rifting process. During the inversion of the strain rate of the WC1411 well, the crustal and lithospheric thicknesses are set to 30 and 120 km, respectively according to Yao et al. (1994), and other used parameters are the same as Table 1.

6. Conclusions

A MATLAB program is designed to invert strain rate variation as a function of time by fitting observed subsidence curve from extensional sedimentary basins. As White (1994) pointed out, this method does not require prior information concerning either the duration of rifting or the total strain. A set of synthetic data is generated to test this method. The calculated subsidence fits the observed (or theoretical) subsidence quite well. Although the inverted strain rate oscillates around the true value, the inverted result reflects the original trend of the strain rate variation. Furthermore, the inverted strain rate can be used to evaluate stretching factor. The resultant information concerning the temporal strain rate variation provides constraints required for the dynamic modeling of lithospheric deformation. Strain rate does not only vary temporally but also spatially. Recently, White and Bellingham (2002) generalize 1D strain rate inversion to 2D case, and Shillington et al. (2008) describe a similar algorithm which inverts 2D depth-dependent strain rate. In order to deal with real-world problems, future development will involve implementing a 2D strain rate inversion program based on this program and White’s recent work.
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