Science Bulletin 62 (2017) 456-461

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Science Bulletin

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/scib

News & Views Slab breakoff: a causal mechanism or pure convenience?

Yaoling Niu*

Department of Earth Sciences, Durham University, Durham DH1 3LE, UK Institute of Oceanology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Qingdao 266071, China Laboratory for Marine Geology, Qingdao National Laboratory for Marine Science and Technology, Qingdao 266061, China

The idea of lithosphere delamination has long been conceived as a mechanism to cause tectonic uplift, metamorphism and magmatism in active orogenic belts [1–3]. Since the publication of the two seminal papers by Davies and von Blanckenburg [4,5], the idea of slab breakoff has been more widely accepted over the last ~20 years as the favored mechanism to cause collision zone magmatism and exhumation of subduction-zone metamorphosed rocks. These two papers showed the physical probability of slab-breakoff during continental collision and illustrated possible geological consequences using the Alpine geology as an example. Currently, slab-breakoff seems to have been axiomatically accepted as the causal mechanism in studies of continental collision-related magmatism. In this short paper, I do not intend to deny the probability of slab breakoff nor to object the possible geological consequences, but emphasize that caution must be exercised when invoking "slab-breakoff" as a causal mechanism without physical and geological justifications or if evidence clearly indicates otherwise or contradictory.

Fig. 1 is a set of histograms using the data from the Web of Science. Fig. 1a shows the number of papers on "slab breakoff" published each year since 1995 (histogram) and the total number of papers published on the subject up to each of these years (cumulative curve). Fig. 1b shows the citations of these papers and reads accordingly. Fig. 1c and d gives the same type of the information on papers that invoke slab breakoff as the mechanism causing observed magmatism. Fig. 1e and f shows the similar on papers that consider slab breakoff as a possible or probable mechanism responsible for the exhumation of subduction-zone metamorphosed rocks (blueschist and eclogite facies rocks). From the increasing trend over the years, it is expected that the number of papers and citations both will continue to rise. It is possible that such increase and rise may indeed reflect more research with stronger support or verification of the breakoff related interpretations, but it could also be a bandwagon effect because of the increasing popularity and convenience. While slab breakoff may indeed take place [6], and this could in some way facilitate magmatism and ease tectonic exhumation [7-11], we can readily see,

* Corresponding author. E-mail address: yaoling.niu@durham.ac.uk however, that the effect of the "slab-breakoff" is likely overstretched in the current literature.

scibull.con

Fig. 2 shows a few examples from the literature that use slab-breakoff to explain geological observations. Fig. 2a invokes slab-breakoff to explain the exhumation of high- and ultra-highpressure eclogites produced from subducted passive margin crustal lithologies. But slab-breakoff may not be required because the eclogites are volumetrically minute (<10%) hosted in the volumetrically significant granitic gneisses (>90%), whose bulk density $(\sim 2.8 \text{ g cm}^{-3})$ is much smaller than that of the subducting/subducted mantle lithosphere (>3.2 g cm⁻³). The large buoyance contrast and the weak contact between the buoyant crust and dense mantle section of the slab can readily facilitate separation of the two. The straightforward point is that the eclogite-hosting granitic gneisses exhume, but the lithologies of mantle section of the slab do not. The latter will not exhume unless they are highly serpentinized with added buoyancy. The inference here is that serpentine diapirs can be, in some cases, important in the exhumation of some high- and ultrahigh-pressure metamorphic rocks [12]. Fig. 2b-d invokes slab-breakoff to allow hot asthenosphere to enter the mantle wedge, providing both materials and heat for magmatism, as if the mantle wedge is "vacuum" with below-slab asthenosphere freely flowing into the mantle wedge. This is physically unlikely (see below). Fig. 2e is a highly-exaggerated scenario, which is even more difficult unless there is rather significant overlaying plate extension that permits passive upwelling and decompression melting such as beneath extensional settings (e.g., ocean ridges, back-arc spreading centers and continental rifts). Fig. 2f invokes ridge subduction to explain the Mesozoic granitoid magmatism and associated mineralization in eastern China. Ridge subduction is known to take place at present (e.g., the Chilean Rise subducting beneath South America), but subducting ridges are at high angles with the trench to ensure well-maintained slab pull. If the ridge is parallel or sub-parallel to the trench, there would be no slab pull for continued subduction because the ridge lithosphere is the thinnest and weakest without cohesion. These are the few examples of many that seem to follow the crowd without analyzing the likelihood in terms of basic geology and physics. There are also many good examples of researchers who revise their thinking when they have discovered their original creative ideas, despite being popular, are no longer supported by the new observations. I discuss and illustrate the obvious problems as follows:



2095-9273/© 2017 Science China Press. Published by Elsevier B.V. and Science China Press. All rights reserved.



Fig. 1. (Color online) Histograms showing number of papers published each year since 1995 on slab breakoff (a) used to explain orogenic magmatism (c) and tectonic exhumation (e). Panels (b), (d) and (f), respectively, show number of citations of these papers up to each of these years as shown. The data are from Web of Science as of November 15, 2016.

1. Slab-breakoff is expected not to produce voluminous magmatism

Fig. 3a is an ideal scenario of seafloor subduction beneath active continental margins (e.g., the Andean-type), where subductingslab dehydration induced mantle wedge melting produces basaltic magmas parental to arc magmatic rocks. Mantle wedge corner flow as indicated by the arrowed lines is a consequence of down-going slab dragging. This corner flow convection cannot be directly observed, but must be true because of seismic anisotropy, dynamic modeling, and the required supply of fertile mantle material to maintain the longevity of subduction-zone magmatism. The latter is further supported by the fact that arc magmas are geochemically more depleted if the mantle-wedge material has been previously depleted beneath a back-arc basin (vs. settings without back-arc spreading). Subduction would stop (or stop shortly) upon continental collision [8,17]. It follows that mantle wedge corner flow would diminish and flux-melting would also diminish if they do not stop immediately. Slab-breakoff may happen, but if it does, the "gap" or "void" created (Fig. 3b) is *where* the only volume is made available to be filled by *adjacent* asthenospheric material from both *above* and *below*. There is no "vacuum" or free space available in the mantle wedge for voluminous hot asthenosphere to flow from beneath the slab and fill the wedge above the slab, contrary to the speculative scenarios in Fig. 2. Hence, it is physically unlikely to have the speculated voluminous asthenosphere decompression melting as the heat source to cause melting of the overlaying continental plate as popularly interpreted (Fig. 2). We should note, however, that the subducting/subducted upper ocean crust can melt, but this is not caused by slab breakoff [7].

2. Observations that do not support slab-breakoff

von Blanckenburg & Davies [5] made a classic case of slabbreakoff as the cause for syncollisional magmatism and tectonics in the Alps. However, a recent high-resolution P-wave tomography



Fig. 2. Selected cartoons from the literature that use slab breakoff to explain tectonic exhumation of ultrahigh pressure eclogites (a [12]), syncollisional magmatism (b [13], c [10], d [14], e [15]) and ridge subduction and mineralization (f [16]).

study [18] demonstrates that the Alpine slab is in fact continuous without breakoff, questioning the validity of previous interpretations of syncollisional magmatism as the result of successive slab breakoffs along the Alpine-Zagros-Himalaya orogenic belt, also ruling out slab-breakoff as a possible mechanism for Alpine topography. Kohn & Parkinson [19] and many others invoke slab-breakoff during India-Asia collision to explain the exhumation of eclogites and widespread syncollisional granitoid magmatism in southern Tibet. While the slab-breakoff model has gained wide acceptance, it remains unclear if slab-breakoff indeed took place during this collision because there is thus far no smoking-gun evidence in support of the breakoff interpretation. Existing tomographic studies (seismic Vp), as exemplified in Fig. 4a [20,21], seem to show that the Indian plate remains continuous beneath the Greater Tibetan Plateau, suggesting that complete slab breakoff may not happen (see below). Although the validity of this tomographic interpretation needs verifying, we should not ignore these studies in explaining the syncollisional granitoid magmatism in southern Tibet.

Fig. 4b shows the mantle seismic shear velocity (Vs) structure beneath the Greater Tibetan Plateau [22]. The high Vs layer of \sim 100 km thick at depth of \sim 100–200 km extends continuously from beneath India northward throughout the Tibetan plateau,



Fig. 3. (a) Cartoon showing the general perception on slab-dehydration induced mantle wedge melting and induced crustal magmatism at active continental margins (e.g., the Andean-Type), where slab-dragged mantle wedge corner flow is important. (b) Cartoon illustrating that if slab breakoff may indeed take place during continental collision, the breakoff related asthenospheric flow is restricted to the "gap" or "void" made available in space and volume because of the breakoff and it is not possible to have volumetrically significant hot asthenosphere to flow from below the slab into the mantle wedge above the slab and cause the claimed magmatism as shown in Fig. 2b-f.

which is most consistent with the underthrust of the Indian continental lithosphere beneath the Tibetan Plateau lithosphere [21]. This offers evidence against slab-breakoff model, suggesting that alternative interpretations need considering on the origin of the syncollisional magmatism preserved in southern Tibet [7]. Importantly, this recent study [22] also emphasizes that the lithospheric mantle beneath the Tibetan Plateau has not been thinned through the process of "delamination" or "convective removal" as popularly favored [1–3], but rather has been thickened, suggesting that continental collision zones may be potential sites of cratonic lithosphere nucleation [22]. This totally reversed interpretation, "thickened" [22] vs. "delaminated and thinned" [2] lithosphere beneath the Tibetan Plateau results from new seismic observations and the objective and open-minded thinking. We should also note the low Vs layer underneath the crust and atop the mantle lithosphere beneath the Tibetan Plateau (Fig. 4b) is consistent with radiogenic heat accumulation [22], which can effectively explain the volumetrically small but widespread Cenozoic high potassic volcanism on the Plateau [23].

A recent study on a gabbro (vs. basaltic melt composition) with ocean island basalt signature from southern Tibet is interpreted as solid evidence for slab breakoff at \sim 45 Ma [24], which, together with an earlier interpretation of tectonic exhumation at northwestern Himalaya [14], is used to argue for almost synchronous slab breakoff along the whole length (>2500 km) of the India-Asia collision zone. We should note that (1) this is *not* evidence, but an interesting speculation; (2) if slab breakoff is indeed a primary cause for volumetrically significant syncollisional magmatism, such "smoking-gun" evidence [24] should be widespread along the whole length of the >2500 km collisional zone, but this is not the case; (3) the interpreted synchronous breakoff time of ~45 Ma [24] in fact postdates the volumetrically significant syncollisional granitoid batholiths (\sim 51 ± 5 Ma) and volcanic rocks (>52 Ma) in southern Tibet [9], which are thought to have resulted from the slab breakoff [9]; (4) any attempt to invoke slab breakoff model for syncollisional magmatism should address the difficulties elaborated above (Fig. 3).

Indeed, the lack of tomographic evidence for slab breakoff at present in Fig. 4 cannot be used to argue against its possible happening some \sim 50 Myrs ago, but if it did happen, the broken slab fragments of volumetric significance should be seismically detected in mantle sections beneath the greater Indian-Tibetan



Fig. 4. (a) Topographic elevation and mantle seismic (*V*p) tomography of the Tibetan Plateau (modified from [20]). (b) Topographic elevation, crust and mantle seismic (*V*s) tomography of the Tibetan Plateau (modified form [22]).

region [20], but these are not observed [see 21]. In this context, it is necessary to emphasize the particularity of the India-Asia collision that took place \sim 55 Ma, yet the convergence has continued to this day. The subduction is expected to stop and slab pull as the driving force must disappear upon continental collision. The continued India-Asia convergence since the collision is actually a consequence of active subduction of different parts of the same giant "rigid" Indo-Australia plate [see 17]. The active subduction of the same "rigid" plate at the Sumatra-Indonesia trench drags the India-Asia convergence, thus the continued underthrusting of the Indian mantle lithosphere beneath the Tibetan lithosphere [17], which also explains why the position of the India-Asia suture has migrated northward from \sim 21°N at \sim 50 Ma to \sim 29°N at present [25]. The Indian + Tibetan mantle lithosphere doubling explains the thickened lithosphere beneath, and the high elevation of, the greater Tibetan Plateau (Fig. 4). The Himalayan mountain range is largely made of piles of scraped Indian crust in response to the continued convergence.

In summary, I do not take position for or against slab breakoff as a causal mechanism to explain the collisional processes, but I emphasize the importance of objective evaluation of existing observations and open-minded thinking, which will help us to make logical interpretations whether slab breakoff can indeed happen during continental collision and if so whether it is required or sufficient to cause the speculated tectonic exhumation and volumetrically significant syncollisional magmatism. If not, alternatives should be sought to truly advance our science and our scientific understanding on how the Earth works.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (41130314, 41630968), Knowledge Innovation Program of Chinese Academy of Sciences (Y42217101L), Grants from Qingdao National Laboratory for Marine Science and Technology (2015ASKJ03) and the NSFC-Shandong Joint Fund for Marine Science Research Centers (U1606401). I thank two anonymous reviewers for comments. Y. Niu/Science Bulletin 62 (2017) 456-461

References

- Bird P. Continental delamination and the Colorado Plateau. J Geophys Res 1979;84:7561–71.
- [2] Houseman GA, McKenzie DP, Molnar P. Convective instability of a thickened boundary layer and its relevance for the thermal evolution of continental convergent belts. J Geophys Res 1981;86:6115–32.
 [3] Kay RWK, Kay SM. Delamination and delamination magmatism.
- [3] Kay RWK, Kay SM. Delamination and delamination magmatism. Tectonophysics 1993;219:177–89.
- [4] Davies JH, von Blanckenburg F. Slab breakoff: a model of lithosphere detachment and its test in the magmatism and deformation of collisional orogens. Earth Planet Sci Lett 1995;129:85–102.
- [5] von Blanckenburg F, Davies JH. Slab-breakoff: a model for syncollisional magmatism and tectonics in the Alps. Tectonics 1995;14:120–31.
- [6] Van Hunen J, Allen MB. Continental collision and slab break-off: a comparison of 3-D numerical models with observations. Earth Planet Sci Lett 2011;302:27–37.
- [7] Niu YL, Zhao ZD, Zhu DC, et al. Continental collision zones are primary sites for net continental crust growth-a testable hypothesis. Earth Sci Rev 2013;127:96–110.
- [8] Niu YL, Liu Y, Xue QQ, et al. Exotic origin of the Chinese continental shelf: new insights into the tectonic evolution of the western Pacific and eastern China since the Mesozoic. Sci Bull 2015;60:1598–616.
- [9] Zhu DC, Wang Q, Zhao ZD, et al. Magmatic record of India-Asia collision. Sci Rep 2015;5:14289.
- [10] Huang H, Niu YL, Mo XX. Syn-collisional granitoids in the Qilian Block on the Northern Tibetan Plateau: a long-lasting magmatism since continental collision through slab steepening. Lithos 2016;246–247:99–109.
- [11] Song SG, Zhang LF, Niu YL, et al. Evolution from oceanic subduction to continental collision: a case study from the Northern Tibetan Plateau based on geochemical and geochronological data. J Petrol 2006;47:435–55.
- [12] Liou JG, Zhang RY, Ernst WG, et al. High-pressure minerals from deeply subducted metamorphic rocks. Rev Mineral 1998;37:33–96.
- [13] Sarifakioglu E, Dilek Y, Winchester JA. Late Creataceous subduction initiation and Paleocene-Eocene slab breakoff magmatism in South-Central Anatolia, Turkey. Int Geol Rev 2013;55:1–22.

- [14] Ma XX, Xu ZQ, Meert JG. Eocene slab breakoff of Neotethys as suggested by dioritic dykes in the Gangdes magmatic belt, southern Tibet. Lithos 2016;248– 251:55–65.
- [15] Neilson JC, Kolelaar BP, Crowley QG. Timing, relations and cause of plutonic and volcanic activity of the Sluro-Devonian post-collisional magmatic episode in the Grampian Terrane, Scotland. J Geol Soc, London 2009;166:545–61.
- [16] Yang QY, Santosh M. Early Cretaceous magma flare-up and its implications on gold mineralization in the Jiaodong Peninsula, China. Ore Geol Rev 2014;65:626–42.
- [17] Niu YL. Geological understanding of plate tectonics: basic concepts, illustrations, examples and new perspectives. Global Tectonics and Metallogeny 2014;10:23–46.
- [18] Zhao L, Paul A, Malusà MG, et al. Continuity of the Alpine slab unraveled by high-resolution P-wave tomography. J Geophys Res 2016;121:8720–37.
- [19] Kohn MJ, Parkinson CD. Petrologica case for Eocene slab breakoff during the Indo-Asian collision. Geology 2002;30:591–4.
- [20] Zhao DP, Ohtani E. Deep slab subduction and dehydration and their geodynamic consequences: evidence from seismology and mineral physics. Gondwana Res 2009;16:401–13.
- [21] Zhou HW, Murphy MA. Tomographic evidence for wholesale underthrusting of India beneath the entire Tibetan Plateau. J Asian Earth Sci 2005;25:445–57.
- [22] McKenzie D, Priestley K. Speculations on the formation of cratons and cratonic basins. Earth Planet Sci Lett 2016;435:94–104.
- [23] Zhao ZD, Mo XX, Dilek Y, et al. Geochemical and Sr-Nd-Pb-O isotopic compositions of the post-collisional ultrapotassic magmatism in SW Tibet: petrogenesis and implications for India intra-continental subduction beneath southern Tibet. Lithos 2009;113:190–212.
- [24] Ji WQ, Wu FY, Chung S, et al. Eocene Neo-Tethyan slab breakoff constrined by 45 Ma oceanic island basal-type magmatism in southern Tibet. Geology 2016;44:283–6.
- [25] Lippert PC, van Hinsbergen DJJ, Dupont-Nivet G. Early Cretaceous to present latitude of the central proto-Tibetan Plateau: a paleomagnetic synthesis with implications for Cenozoic tectonics, paleogeography, and climate of Asia. Geol Soc Am Spec Pap 2014;507:1–21.