Reply to comment by D. Aslanian and M. Moulin on ‘A new scheme for the opening of the South Atlantic Ocean and the dissection of an Aptian salt basin’
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SUMMARY
In their comment, Aslanian & Moulin argue that our model of South Atlantic opening is incompatible with several kinematic and geological constraints as recently evaluated in Moulin et al. They also claim that we have not appropriately referenced their work. We strongly disagree and in addressing their points will argue that our model is compatible with the most important constraints that have been assembled by the many scientists who have worked on the South Atlantic and that instead the interpretation by Moulin et al. suffers from serious flaws.
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1 INTRAPLATE DEFORMATION LIMITS
‘In the African Plate, Torsvik et al. (fig. 1) used, without the correct references, the intraplate boundaries given by Moulin (2003), Moulin et al. (2005a, 2010), Aslanian et al. (2009), which follow the model of Guiraud & Maurin (1992).’ Incidentally, fig. 1 in Torsvik et al. (2009) does not show any intraplate boundaries and we did not use the boundaries given by Moulin and coworkers in 2003, 2005 nor did we have access to the most recent versions of these boundaries as used by Aslanian et al. (2009) (but not shown in this paper) or Moulin et al. (2010). How can they claim that we ignored their work when they were not published? Like our critics, we followed the model of Guiraud & Maurin (1992) with additions taken from Guiraud et al. (2005) and Basile et al. (2005) and we find it reassuring that we proposed broadly similar intraplate boundaries for Africa. In South America our interpretations of intraplate deformation boundaries differ, mostly because of the lack of reliable constraints. We will answer some of the comments below, although we concur with this quote from their comment:

‘Both studies employ continental intraplate deformation in both South America and Africa Plates as suggested earlier by Curie (1984), Unternehr et al. (1988) and Nürnberg & Müller (1991). This deformation may be dispersed throughout large areas, diluted along several fault zones, but for geometrical purpose this deformation is represented in both articles by simple lines that must be regarded as symbolic.’

Just to exemplify that our critics do not follow their own philosophy, in remark 5 Aslanian & Moulin (2010) disagree with the boundary we draw through the General Levalle basin and argue that this basin cannot have accommodated 145 km of extension (Torsvik et al. 2009; fig. 5). However, as clearly discussed in our paper and references it is based on, there are several subparallel basins that were active between 150 and 126 Ma that could have accommodated the extension (Torsvik et al. 2009; fig. 8 and their appendix). On the other hand, we would argue that the 125 km of compression (Moulin et al. 2010) expected from the corner of the Bolivian orocline to the middle of the foreland basin of Bolivia and Brazil contradicts the geological evolution where the sedimentary fill is known to be coherent because the Palaeozoic and where a flexure of the Brazilian shield beneath the foreland is evident (Lyon-Caen et al. 1985). In addition, there is very little evidence of NW–SE compression reported for this time-window in the Andean part of South America and in the coastal areas (e.g. Jaillard 1994; Jaillard & Soler 1996; Ramos 2005).

2 KINEMATIC PROBLEMS AND CONSEQUENCES
When developing a ‘self-consistent’ model based on certain criteria, that particular model will inevitably differ in detail from any other models based on very different criteria. In the marine environs, the relative motions between tectonic plates are best determined by the matching of fracture zones and magnetic anomalies of the same age.
However, the South Atlantic went through a critical phase in its evolution during the Cretaceous Normal Superchron (CNS; 120.6–83.5 Ma) and the correct identification and age of pre-CNS magnetic anomalies claimed in the literature are at best uncertain; thus we are principally left with Euler poles determined from the fracture zone geometry and Euler angles that are estimated/interpolated or outright guessed from other geological/geophysical data. Thus, no quantitative criteria for goodness of fit or statistical uncertainties exist for the South Atlantic in contrast to the much better defined Central Atlantic opening story (Torsvik et al. 2008a, table 1). We and Moulin et al. (2010) and many others, invoke schematic intraplate boundaries in Africa and South America in order to obtain an opening story for the South Atlantic that makes geological ‘sense’—but our efforts resemble a jigsaw puzzle where we don’t know how many pieces (tectonic blocks) we need, how much displacement/extension/transstension took place along the boundaries and at what time these boundaries were active. These parameters differ in nearly all models.

Our South Atlantic model is based on realistic scenarios for intraplate deformation, pre-drift extension and seafloor spreading, which further serve as input for our global-scale reconstructions and geodynamics (Torsvik et al. 2010). There are no error-estimates in this model and we simply argue that the model is in reasonable agreement with the geological history of the region as well as palaeomagnetic data (not discussed; forthcoming paper). Critical constraining factors in our model include the location of continent–ocean boundaries (COBs), and the age and extent of salt basins. The COB is better described as a continental ocean transition (COT) zone between typical continental and oceanic crust, usually some tens of kilometres wide and perhaps as much as 50–100 km. Despite these limitations, establishing the location of the COB as a line on a large-scale map brings valuable insights into plate-reconstruction-derived estimates of pre-drift extension/lithospheric stretching and the location of the COB/COT is a first-order risk parameter in hydrocarbon exploration. Conversely, the model of Moulin et al. (2010) in the marine domain is not based on identifying and testing the COB by reconstructions but exclusively on the location of the hinge-line, that is, where the crust/lithosphere thickness is assumed to be ‘normal’ in their pre- rift positions. The hinge-line is commonly positioned near the shelf-break and is often associated with a pronounced-free air gravity anomaly. We assume (?) that Moulin et al. (2010) used seismic refraction and/or bathymetry/gravity (?) data to establish the hinge-line but we are not sure because the hinge-line on their map includes references to ‘interpretation of Unternehm (personal communication, 2006)’ In any case, the hinge-line (as for the COB) is not an exact line for plate tectonic testing since passive margin stretching can be accompanied by interior continental extension.

Given all the above, when comparing non-quantitative models that are based on different assumptions and data sets and have no associated error estimates, it becomes preposterous to discuss models that differ by 50–100 km (~0.5–1° in equatorial regions). Remarks 1–10, 13, 15 and 17 mostly fall in this category. No detailed response is required to these remarks and differences which are essentially below the resolution of plate tectonic reconstructions, mostly based on postulations by other workers (see the extensive reference list in Aslanian & Moulin 2010). Below we therefore focus our response on valid and more interesting remarks.

3 REMARK 11

‘The definition of their ‘robust’ continent–ocean boundary in the southern Santos Basin does not include the presence of the aborted oceanic ridge that is marked by a very large positive Bouguer anomaly just north of the Florianópolis Fracture Zone (FFZ), indenting the Aptian salt basin (Mohriak 2001; Gomes et al. 2002; Carminatti et al. 2008; Mohriak et al. 2008), neither the complicated kinematic history of the Santos Basin–Sao Paulo Plateau system (Aslanian et al. 2009; Moulin et al. 2010) and the probable presence of thickened oceanic crust in the southern Sao Paulo Plateau (Leyden et al. 1972, 1976; Cande et al. 1976, 1978; Kowsmann et al. 1977; Gondcalves 1991; Dermercian 1996; Karner 2000; Meising et al. 2001; Mohriak 2001; Aslanian et al. 2009). All these misfits have strong consequences on the understanding of the mechanism of Passive Margin formation (Aslanian et al. 2009) and clearly show the need of precise and detailed kinematic reconstructions.’

Aslanian & Moulin (2010) claim that we did ‘not include the presence of the aborted oceanic ridge that is marked by a very large positive Bouguer anomaly just north of the FFZ, indenting the Aptian salt basin’. As is clearly stated in our paper and further underlined by the question marks in our diagram (Fig. 1a) it is next to impossible to define the COB properly along the Santos Basin using gravity residuals. Based on (1) the assumption that salt deposition ended at 112 Ma (Aptian–Albian boundary); (2) that the Aptian salt basins where once conjugate basins that were not deposited on oceanic crust and (3) the well-defined COB on the African side, we have indicated the expected location of the COB based on our rotation model. A more complex model is hinted at in our manuscript and also shown in one of our earlier reconstructions (Fig. 1b, Torsvik et al. 2004), where we also indicate a possible aborted oceanic ridge. However, this is just speculation, not factual information and gravity anomalies in the Santos Basin could equally have resulted from younger hotspot-related volcanism, which we now favour. We therefore decided to make a simpler and more generalized model than our 2004 version. Fig. 1(b) shows, in essence, the main part of our South America story: (1) Early opening in the southernmost South Atlantic accommodated along the Parena–Etendeka-Fault Zone (PEFZ) and (2) lithospheric extension to the North of the PEFZ with eventual seafloor spreading at around 112 Ma. In fact our model show many similarities with the Moulin et al. (2010) model, including the introduction of a 112 Ma stage pole (all previous studies used linear interpolation between M0 and A30; 120.6–83.5 Ma). We are not aware of any other studies doing this guided by the shape and age of Aptian salt basins; we used this Aptian–Albian stage-pole in 2004 (Fig. 1b) and in Torsvik et al. (2008a, 2009). Moulin et al. (2010) has repeated our exercise (their pole differs by 1.8° in location and 0.9° in rotation angle), but there is no mention that we had already done this; the authors try to focus on differences and discrediting us, rather than the gross similarities between these models.

4 REMARK 12

‘Using this data set without implying intraplate deformation in the Salado Basin seems not coherent to us. Furthermore, since 1997, a lot of further data were acquired and published (Max et al. 1999; Corner et al. 2002; Zalan & Oliveira 2005; the BGR data set). Using these data sets and some industrial magnetic maps, Moulin et al. (2010) re-interpreted the magnetic anomalies (see this article for details). Fig. 3 presents the kinematic reconstructions of Torsvik et al. with these new isochrons ‘Large Magnetic Anomaly’ (LMA), M4 and M0. The three reconstructions present large gaps and overlaps.’

Because we did not have access to industrial maps or the Moulin et al. (2010) reinterpretation of magnetic data we could naturally
Figure 1. (a) Second vertical derivative of upward continued isostatic residual anomalies offshore Brazil along with continent–ocean boundary (COB) interpretations, Aptian salt outlines (white lines) and details in the faulted hinge-line (thin black line) on parts of the margin. Rotated COBs from the African margin (red lines) are also shown (112 Ma north of the FFZ and 131.7 south of the FFZ). COB interpretations along the Brazilian margin are thick orange transparent lines. The definition of the COB in the SW Santos basin is complex: originally, based on Torsvik et al. (2004), interpreted to follow the stippled orange line marked with question marks, but simplified in Torsvik et al. (2009) to match the conjugate African margin with a break-up age near the Aptian–Albian boundary (112 Ma). In Northern Santos and northwards and south of the FFZ, there is good match between the two conjugate COBs at 112 and 131.7 Ma, respectively. FFZ, Florianopolis Fracture Zone; PG, Ponta Gross dyke swarm; P, Parana. (b) Reconstruction of the Brazilian and Angolan margin at 112 Ma, that is, during the initial break-up and seafloor spreading north of the FFZ. This was shortly after salt deposition, which we argue once formed as a single basin that was split in two after break-up. On this map (Torsvik et al. 2004) we indicated the location of a possible incipient spreading centre (later aborted) in the southernmost Santos Basin from 126–112 Ma.

not use these data and we can only make some brief comments. LMA is not an isochron: it is most likely related to seaward dipping reflectors (known for decades). Its age is unknown but the authors assume that all this magmatism is 133 Ma (arbitrarily coinciding with the main peak of the Parana–Etendeka event and thus suggesting southward rather than northward propagation in the southern segment or both?). Thus with a preconceived notion that break-up in the southernmost Atlantic took place at 133 Ma and using our reconstruction poles that assume mostly younger ages for breakup will inevitably lead to overlaps. Concerning the timing of the opening one should also be aware that we do not use the Gradstein et al. (2004) timescale which will make all the M-anomalies too old; that implies that the Moulin et al. (2010) reconstructions are consistently older than ours. This was based on redefining M0 to 125 Ma, the appropriate age should be 120.6 Ma and the Gradstein et al. (2004) timescale is not recommended in the geomagnetic community (see e.g. Gee & Kent 2007; He et al. 2008). Concerning fig. 3 in Aslanian & Moulin (2010), their Chron M0 reconstruction and assuming that they used our 120.6 Ma and not 125 Ma (which is the age of their MO) the authors have developed a model that almost perfectly mimics ours. Mismatches of 25–60 km are below the resolution power of both studies and reflects the different methods and approaches.

5 REMARK 14

‘Torsvik et al. (2009) end the South American intraplate deformation at chron M4. The main dominant pulse of Paraná–Etendeka is indeed dated between 135 and 130 Ma. Nevertheless, geochemical analyses show that the magmatic activity lasted until the Barremian/Aptian limit or Late Aptian, implying further intraplate deformation in this area.’

We are somewhat puzzled how geochemistry can reveal the age of magmatic activity and if so, do the authors advocate that magmatism must cause or only be related to large-scale faulting? Furthermore, we terminate movements on the PEZF in South America at ~126 Myr because there is practically no evidence that this fault actually exists in nature (also mentioned in Moulin et al. 2010). However, in order to allow seafloor spreading south of the FFZ we must invoke a ‘diffuse’ plate boundary here to only allow stretching north of FFZ. In our model, the PEZF was active prior and during the eruption of the Paraná–Etendeka large igneous province (PE LIP). PE was sourced from a deep plume but the eruption site did not mark precisely the site where the plume impinged the base of the lithosphere, but the location of a weakness zone in the lithosphere. If the PEZF was active very long after the main PE LIP this should be seen in the geological record as massive offsets (which is not seen).
6 Remark 16

‘The second, south westwards movement given by the study of Torsvik et al. fails to describe exactly the Fracture Zones in the Equatorial Segment (white small circles; the pink small circles are given by Moulin et al. 2010, in comparison).’

This is a valid comment and was done deliberately to not break up South America into yet another plate. We have a very small mismatch between 100 and 83.5 Ma and then we have a perfect fit onwards using fracture zone geometries from Müller and coworkers. We note that Moulin et al. (2010) plot a few fracture zones based on a personal communication from Sandwell and Smith and thus
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**Figure 2.** (a) Permo-Triassic (~250 Ma) palaeomagnetic reconstruction of Torsvik et al. (2008a, fig. 19), at a time when Neotethys had opened and many peri-Gondwana terranes had separated from the Gondwana margin. Palaeotethyan and Mongol–Okhotsk oceanic lithosphere were being subducted beneath Eurasia and Siberia. Indochina (A), south China (SC) and north China (NC) were located in subtropical to equatorial latitudes in the eastern Palaeotethys and not part of Pangea. The Siberian Traps are shown in red shading in Siberia, but Siberia was not fully attached to Baltica and Kazakhstan at this time. Intracratonic boundaries in South America and Africa follows Torsvik et al. (2004) in this reconstruction. (b) Alternative reconstruction offered by Moulin et al. (2010). Note that the equator is misplaced ~30° to the south, Hercynian and the much older Caledonian fold belts are considered the same, most Pangea breakup times are erroneous, their Pangea incorrectly includes most of Asia (including the China Blocks) and there is no Neotethys in their reconstruction.
we have no way of testing our model against their unpublished data.

7 CONCLUSION

In this reply we defend our work against criticisms made by Aslanian & Moulin (2010). Our model is mostly born out of an industry report from 2004 and publications from 2008 (Torsvik et al. 2004, 2008a, b) and was published before much of the material quoted by Aslanian & Moulin (2010).

We cannot resist making one single remark on one of their own diagrams, that is, fig. 1 in Moulin et al. (2010). The authors claim this and other figures ‘constitutes the base canvas on which the problem of the continental margin genesis should be addressed’. However, their fig. 1 and the accompanying text suffer from several fundamental flaws. There is some debate about the geometry of Pangea around 250 Ma (Pangea A versus Pangea B) but all scientists agree that the northern margin of Africa and South America was located around the equator (Fig. 2a). In their reconstruction, the equator is located 30° wrong (Fig. 2b). Their discussion confuses Hercynian and Caledonian Orogeny, which they argue ‘forformed by collision of Laurussia (they use the term Laurasia although not formed at this time) with Gondwana during the Permio-Triassic’. The Caledonian Orogeny actually happened at around 420–430 Ma during the formation of Laurussia (e.g. Norway colliding with Greenland) while the peak of the Hercynian Orogeny took place in the Late Carboniferous (~320 Ma). Practically all their indicated Pangea break-up lines are erroneous, for example, 120 Ma break-up between Madagascar and India (should be 80–90 Ma) and 40 Ma break-up in the northeast Atlantic (should be ~53–55 Ma). Clearly, this is not a good starting point to gain faith in their model.
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