Can flat-ramp-flat fault geometry be inferred from fold shape?:
A comparison of kinematic and mechanical folds
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Abstract

The inference of fault geometry from suprajacent fold shape relies on consistent and verified forward models of fault-cored folds, e.g. suites of models with differing fault boundary conditions demonstrate the range of possible folding. Results of kinematic (fault-parallel flow) and mechanical (boundary element method) models are compared to ascertain differences in the way the two methods simulate flexure associated with slip along flat-ramp-flat geometry. These differences are assessed by systematically altering fault parameters in each model and observing subsequent changes in the suprajacent fold shapes. Differences between the kinematic and mechanical fault-fold relationships highlight the differences between the methods. Additionally, a laboratory fold is simulated to determine which method might best predict fault parameters from fold shape. Although kinematic folds do not fully capture the three-dimensional nature of geologic folds, mechanical models have non-unique fold-fault relationships. Predicting fault geometry from fold shape is best accomplished by a combination of the two methods.
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1. Introduction

Constraining unexposed or poorly resolved subsurface fault geometry from observed fold shape has far-reaching importance, from assessment of seismic hazard to evaluation of hydrocarbon potential. Fault-bend folds have long been recognized as forming due to slip along subjacent faults with flat-ramp-flat geometry in areas of thin-skinned deformation (e.g. Rich, 1934; Mitra and Sussman, 1997) and past studies have shown that fault geometry has a systematic influence on aspects of fold shape such as axial trace orientation (Rowan and Linares, 2000), fold tightness (Allmendinger and Shaw, 2000) and fold terminations (Wilkerson et al., 2002). Within extensional environments fault depth and dip may be determined from the associated roll-over anticline, as long as the hanging wall stratigraphy is accurately determined (Williams and Vann, 1987; Kerr and White, 1992, 1994).

Both kinematic and mechanical models have been used to analyze fault-cored folds. Kinematic models, which balance the geometry of the deforming system without incorporating force or rheology, have been used extensively to study fault-bend folding (e.g. Suppe, 1983; Wilkerson et al., 1991; Salvini and Storti, 2001). Mechanical models utilize continuum mechanics to simulate deformation and have been used in the past to examine folding associated with fault ramp tips (e.g. Cooke and Pollard, 1997; Johnson and Johnson, 2001) and flat-ramp-flat geometry (e.g. Berger and Johnson, 1980; Kilsdonk and Fletcher, 1989; Strayer and Hudleston, 1997). A recent comparison of mechanical and kinematic trishear models of fault-tip folds (Johnson and Johnson, 2001) demonstrates the insights gained from comparative studies and exposes the dearth of such studies for fault-bend-folding. Within this study, two numerical models, one kinematic (fault parallel flow) and one mechanical (boundary element method), show how folds respond to changes in flat-ramp-flat fault geometry using these different methods. We perform a sensitivity analysis to ascertain which fault parameters are most influential over fold shape in each method. When kinematic and mechanical models with identical fault configurations produce similar
changes to a feature of the fold shape, the usefulness of that fold feature for inferring fault geometry is suggested. When the methods disagree, an attempt is made to determine if one set of generated fold shapes is more reasonable through comparison with field or laboratory models. Similar sensitivity analyses have focused on the effects of fault geometry (dip, ramp height, flat length, displacement) on fold shape in kinematic models (Rowan and Linares, 2000) and in mechanical models, along with the role of anisotropy, for fault propagation folds (Johnson and Johnson, 2001).

Finally, we perform kinematic and mechanical simulations of a laboratory fold with well-constrained fault geometry (Chester et al., 1991) in order to assess how accurately the models can predict a known fault geometry by matching the fold shape. The laboratory fold is simulated by iteratively altering fault geometry. The kinematic and mechanical best-fitting fault geometries are compared with the laboratory fault. Positive correlation of both fold and fault shapes supports use of the method for predicting subsurface fault geometry.

2. Modeling methods

2.1. Mechanical modeling

Mechanical modeling is based upon the three principles of continuum mechanics (e.g. Fung, 1969; Means, 1976; Timoshenko and Goodier, 1934). The first involves constitutive relationships, which relate the applied stress to the resulting strain in the rock (e.g. Means, 1976). The second principle of continuum mechanics states that the rock body must be in equilibrium; the body deforms but cannot translate or rotate (e.g. Means, 1976). The third principle, compatibility, requires that the displacement in each direction be continuous and single-valued to prevent gaps and overlaps from occurring (e.g. Means, 1976).

For this analysis we use POLY3D, a three-dimensional boundary element method (BEM) tool well suited for modeling faults (e.g. Crider and Pollard, 1998). BEMs discretize fault surfaces into a mesh of polygonal planar elements (Comninou and Dundurs, 1975; Thomas, 1994). POLY3D has been used to model normal fault interaction (Willemse et al., 1996; Crider and Pollard, 1998; Maerten et al., 1999), as well as to assess the effect of segmentation on normal fault slip (Kattenhorn and Pollard, 2001). The user designates either slip/opening or traction on each element as well as a remote stress or strain. POLY3D assumes that the rock surrounding a fault is homogenous, isotropic and linear-elastic. Within our model, the rock body deforms in response to slip along faults in a half-space representing the upper Earth’s crust (Fig. 1). Due to linear-elastic rheology, POLY3D evaluates stress most accurately under infinitesimal strain conditions (strain < 1%). However, the compatibility rules assure that displacements are single-valued even to large strains as long as the problem is set up as a displacement boundary value problem (Maerten, 1999; Maerten et al., 2000, 2001). In a displacement boundary value problem, the slip and opening are prescribed along fault elements rather than calculated from prescribed fault tractions and remote stress or strain. Furthermore, displacement boundary value problems require prescription of remote strains rather than stresses. To model large amplitude folds (i.e. > 1% strain) including simulation of laboratory folds, this study implements a displacement boundary value problem.

2.2. Kinematic modeling

Kinematic models use geometric constraints to analyze the progression of rock deformation. Such models are particularly beneficial for the geometric interpretation of faulted and folded terrains (e.g. Suppe, 1983; Williams and Vann, 1987; Geiser et al., 1988; Kerr and White, 1992). A variety of geometric rules can be applied to constrain the kinematics fault-cored folds including conservation of volume (e.g. Dahlstrom, 1990), fault parallel flow (Sander-son, 1982; Keeley and Hill, 2000), bed-parallel shear (e.g. Suppe, 1983) and inclined shear (Withjack and Peterson, 1993). Although flexural-slip based kinematic models are widely used to interpret deformation of sedimentary strata in contractional regimes (e.g. Suppe, 1983; Geiser et al., 1988), these algorithms are problematic for inferring fault geometry from fold shape without a priori knowledge of either fault shape or the axial surfaces of the fold. For this reason, the 3DMOVE kinematic analysis software (Midland Valley Ltd) implements fault-parallel flow (Kane et al., 2003) for reverse modeling and restorations of contractional folds. As suggested by the name, all points in the hanging wall displace parallel to the fault surface (Fig. 2). Bed area is conserved and, unless additional back-shear is applied to the hanging wall, beds thin along the forelimb of the fold. The computational robustness of the fault-parallel flow algorithm allows implementation of any fault shape in three-dimensions whereas bed-parallel slip algorithms are currently limited to two-dimensions. For our study, the
hanging wall moves up dip; however, the direction of transport can be oblique to fault dip (Fig. 2). As with mechanical methods, uniform or varied slip can be prescribed to fault surfaces. Unlike the mechanical methods, fault parallel flow and many other kinematic methods limit deformation to the hanging wall; the footwall remains fixed and undeformed.

3. Comparison of kinematic and mechanical methods

The analyses in this study outline the differences and similarities between mechanical and kinematic models of fault-bend folding. Fault parameters, including fault dip, depth, ramp length and amount of slip are systematically varied to assess their influence on anticline tightness, amplitude, length and width (Fig. 3). The three-dimensional fault surface consists of one rectangular ramp and lower and upper horizontal flat segments (Fig. 3). Within the fault parallel flow model, flats are considered to extend semi-infinipty. Within the BEM models, the flats extend 15 km so that their distal tips do not influence folding over the ramp (1 < ramp length < 10 km). Although flat depth is adjusted with variations in ramp length and depth, all other parameters of fault flats are constant. The flats and ramp extend 10 km in the strike directions in all models. Uniform reverse fault slip is prescribed directly to all fault segments. The ramp dips are varied to investigate a range of plausible fault geometries, which include those that may not have formed in contraction (dip > 35°).

The fault parallel flow and boundary element methods produce dramatically different shaped three-dimensional folds (Fig. 4). The kinematic anticline is boxy with a more steeply dipping backlimb than forelimb. The mechanical anticline is more domal than the kinematic fold and has an adjacent syncline. Deformation is more distributed in the mechanical fold as well, causing fold length to greatly exceed the length of the fault. For fault parallel flow models, fold length almost exactly corresponds to fault length.

For both fault parallel flow and BEM models the fold profiles along a dip-direction cross-section change with variation in fault geometry (Fig. 5). The model results are also graphed to detect trends in the fault-fold relations and highlight the differences between the kinematic and mechanical methods (Fig. A1). Understanding the relations between fault and fold parameters will facilitate inference of fault geometry from fold shape. For example, this will reduce the trial and error involved in estimating fault geometry from laboratory fold shape later in this paper.

3.1. Fold parameters

3.1.1. Fold tightness

The geometric nature of the kinematic method gives rise to a fold with a horizontal roof, with two sharp fold hinges where the roof and limbs meet (Fig. 4). Consequently, these folds have two interlimb angles to contribute to fold tightness (or openness), whereas the mechanical fold has a more rounded top and a single fold hinge. To facilitate comparison, fold tightness is here expressed in terms of difference between limb dips rather than interlimb angle.

All of the kinematic folds have more steeply dipping forelimbs and backlimbs than the mechanical folds; consequently, the kinematic folds generally have greater tightness (Fig. 5). Kinematic fold tightness positively correlates with fault dip (Fig. 5d); steeper ramps produce tighter folds.

The mechanical fold tightness is affected by all of the fault ramp parameters. Increase in ramp length slightly tightens folds (Figs. 5e and A1b). However, once the ramp length exceeds 5 km, further increases in ramp length have little effect on fold tightness (Fig. 5e). Similarly, increasing depth of the fault broadens the fold until the fault reaches 2–3 km depth, when the rate of change drops considerably (Fig. 5g). Mechanical fold tightness is most sensitive to fault depth, followed by fault slip. In this analysis of fold tightness, two differences between the BEM and fault parallel flow models emerge; while mechanical folds become tighter with increased fault slip and shallower fault depth, the kinematic fold tightness remains unchanged. Because tighter folds associated with increased slip are observed in laboratory experiments (Chester et al., 1991), we consider the mechanical method to more reliably incorporate this relationship than the kinematic method.

Increasing fault dip tightens folds in both fault parallel flow and BEM models (Fig. 5c and d) as well as other kinematic models (Rowan and Linares, 2000). However, the
forelimb and backlimb dips of the kinematic fold are constrained by ramp dip (Fig. 2; Kane et al., 2003), whereas the dips of both limbs change in the BEM model with slip amount and depth. The insensitivity of kinematic fold tightness to fault depth contradicts field observations of fault-bend folds where layers become more open away from the fault ramp (Rowan and Linares, 2000). Such tightening of folds near ramp tips has been frequently observed in fault-tip folds (e.g. Davis, 1978; Chester et al., 1988). However, using fold tightness to infer fault parameters based on the BEM model results are problematic and non-unique because all of the fault parameters have significant effects on fold tightness.

3.1.2. Fold amplitude

Fold amplitude is measured vertically between the crest of the fold and the surface far away from the fold. Fault slip magnitude has the greatest effect on fold amplitude in both fault parallel flow and BEM models; slip is directly proportional to amplitude (Figs. 5a and b and A1e). In the kinematic fold, this relationship results from the increased throw associated with increased slip vector. For instance, 2 km of slip along a 45° dipping fault produces 1.4 km of throw whereas 1 km of slip produces half as much throw. Consequently, steeper ramps also produce greater amplitude folds because they have greater throw, the upward component of slip (Fig. 5d). For the fault parallel flow
models these parameters are directly related by geometry; fold amplitude is equal to the sine of the fault dip multiplied by the prescribed slip. Because the sine function varies between zero and one, while the amount of slip can exceed one, variation in fault slip more strongly affects amplitude than fault dip (Fig. 5b and d). An increase in fold amplitude with increased slip also occurs in laboratory models of folding (Morse, 1977; Chester et al., 1991).

The mechanical fold amplitude is influenced by all fault parameters, although most significantly by slip amount. Mechanical fold amplitude is positively correlated with fault slip, dip and length while deeper fault ramps produces slightly smaller fold amplitudes (Fig. 5a, c, e and g). Whereas deeper ramps produce smaller surface folds, longer and steeper fault ramps produce greater amplitude folds. Although amplitude is positively correlated with slip for both models, the kinematic fold amplitude is more sensitive to slip amount than the mechanical fold. Because BEM models experience displacement along both sides of the fault, i.e. the hanging wall displaces up-dip as the footwall displaces down-dip, the hanging wall experiences approximately one half the slip movement in contrast to the fault parallel flow models, which only have displacement on the hanging wall side of the fault ramp. Therefore, the hanging wall of the BEM model experiences half the deformation of the kinematic hanging wall for the same amount of slip. The remaining deformation is accommodated within the foot-wall of the mechanical models.

Fig. 5. Change in fold profiles for mechanical (left column) and kinematic (right column) folds. While one fault parameter is varied, all other parameters are held constant. When slip is changing (row 1), the depth is held at 5 km, the ramp length at 5 km, the fault dip at 60°. While varying the dip of the fault (row 2), slip is held constant at 1 km, the ramp length at 5 km and the depth at 1 km. During variation in ramp length (row 3), the slip is held at 1 km, the dip at 60° and the depth at 1 km. Finally, while depth of the fault is varied (row 4), the slip is held at 1 km, the ramp length at 5 km and the dip at 60°.
The kinematic method may overestimate fold amplitude because amplitude depends only on the slip and dip of the fault and is independent of fault depth for these models. As mentioned earlier, we expect layers further away from a fault tip to have less deformation but the fault parallel flow models predict no such decrease. Therefore when using fold amplitude to infer fault slip, the kinematic result cannot be used unless the ramp depth is known.

The fold shape also responds to changes in fault dip (Fig. 5c and d; Rowan and Linares, 2000). Folds overlying steeper faults have greater amplitude in both fault parallel flow and BEM models due to the greater component of vertical displacement along these faults. However, for fault dip greater than 60°, the mechanical fold amplitude decreases (Fig. 5c). Because the BEM models incorporate displacement along both sides of the fault, downward displacement of the footwall creates a small syncline ahead of the forelimb (Fig. 5a, c, e and g). When the depth of the syncline is added to the height of the anticline, this aggregate fold amplitude has a similar correlation with fault ramp dip as the kinematic fold (see Fig. A1). This approach was not used as the standard to measure fold amplitude because the fault parallel flow models do not produce a syncline and the direct comparison would be compromised. While ramp dip affects fold amplitude, the fold tightness and width are more accurate constraints on this fault parameter.

Ramp length increases fold amplitude very slightly for both sets of models (Fig. 5g and h). The increase in fold amplitude becomes less discernible with increasing ramp length. This indicates that miscalculating an 8-km ramp as a
The laboratory study by Chester et al. (1991) shows that natural folds extend beyond fault terminations; the authors are unaware of such published data. However, when the length of the fault is not a major consideration, such as studies of cylindrical folds, this inherent difference in the models may not be important.

3.1.4. Fold width

Fold width is measured in the same manner as fold length, where the fold amplitude drops to zero or 1% of the maximum fold amplitude for the fault parallel flow and BEM models, respectively. An increase in the fault ramp length creates wider folds for both models of this (Fig. 5g and h) and other studies (Rowan and Linares, 2000). Fold width is most sensitive to ramp length and this is the only significant effect that ramp length has on kinematic fold geometry (Fig. 5). Fold width increases with increasing ramp length similarly for both models, except the BEM models are consistently 7 km wider, due to the more distributed nature of deformation in these models. Whereas deformation in the fault parallel flow models is limited to the hanging wall above and ahead of the ramp, in the BEM models, material below and behind the ramp also deforms. The laboratory study by Chester et al. (1991) shows that folds are wider than the length of the ramp, indicating that the mechanical folds are more consistent with laboratory folding.

Although fold width is most sensitive to ramp length in both sets of models, other parameters also affect fold width. While kinematic fold width is insensitive to fault dip, mechanical folds become narrower with increasing fault dip (Fig. 5c and d). Additionally, fold width is positively correlated with fault slip; however, kinematic fold width increases more dramatically with slip than mechanical folds (Fig. 5a and b). Laboratory fault-bend fold models that test different ramp dips are not prevalent in the literature. However, laboratory models that vary fault slip show that fold width increases with increased in fault slip (Chester et al., 1991).

3.2. Significant difference between kinematic and mechanical methods

The over-arching difference between the kinematic and mechanical methods is not a difference in resultant fold shapes but rather a difference in the way each method simulates deformation. In the kinematic method, each fold parameter is sensitive to only one or two fault ramp parameters (Table 1). In contrast, the BEM model results are more nuanced; fold aspects are sensitive to several fault ramp parameters. This leads to ambiguity and non-uniqueness when inferring fault geometry from fold shape using the mechanical results. An example of this is shown in Fig. 6 where similar fold shapes are formed from faults with different dips, depths, and horizontal placement of the ramp tip. Therefore, when using fold shape to infer fault shape, the kinematic method should be used to produce a non-unique first approximation, but will be unreliable for final results due to lack of out-of-transport plane movement and uniform fold shape with fault depth.

4. Comparison to laboratory fault-bend fold models

By simulating a laboratory experiment with well-constrained fold and fault shapes we can test how closely the kinematic and mechanical models predict the fault

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Kinematic</th>
<th>Mechanical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fold amplitude</td>
<td>M, K</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fold length</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fold width</td>
<td>M, K</td>
<td>M, K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fold tightness</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M, K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

Sensitivity of fold aspects to fault ramp parameters. K—kinematic: fault slip affects fold amplitude and width, ramp dip affects fold tightness, ramp length affects fold width, and ramp length affects fold length. M—mechanical: all fold parameters are affected by at least two fault ramp parameters.
Chester et al. (1991) produced fault-bend folds by compressing rock layers situated over a fault in a triaxial compressor (Fig. 7a). The folded layers were limestone interbedded with either mica or lead to promote interlayer slip. During interlayer slip, weak contacts in a stack of layered rock act as fault surfaces as the rock is folded, allowing greater bending than a homogenous body of the same thickness and creating a higher, tighter fold (Pollard and Johnson, 1973). Experimental interlayer slip along mica or lead layers simulates geologic slip along layers with low shear strength such as shale. A forcing block of sandstone with a pre-existing, lubricated fault surface was used to fold the limestone and mica layers. A rigid block of either granite or sandstone composed the footwall of the fault to simulate thin-skinned deformation. The fault ramp is approximately 0.57 cm deep, dipping 20°, 1.53 cm long and, in the particular experiment simulated here (Chester et al., 1991; Fig. 7a), the fault has approximately 0.71 cm of slip. The resultant fold is 0.32 cm in amplitude, 3.9 cm wide, with a forelimb angle of about 17° and a 17° dipping backlimb (Fig. 7a).

A series of fault parallel flow and BEM models were iteratively altered until the model fold shapes approximated the laboratory fold shape (Fig. 7a). The fault geometry of the laboratory experiment served as the initial model configuration in this iterative process. Once a match is made to the fold shape, the model faults are compared with the laboratory fault geometry to determine which method could more accurately determine fault geometry from fold shape. Although the mechanical models could yield multiple fault configurations that produce fold shapes matching the laboratory fold, we limit the chance of spurious matches by using the laboratory geometry as the initial model configuration. In the absence of data to constrain a hypothetical initial geometry, the iterative matching of fold shape can become time consuming and,
when using mechanical methods, can yield inaccurate fault configurations.

Slip along the laboratory fold exceeds 50% of the ramp length. Simulating such high ratios of slip to ramp length can be problematic for mechanical models that assume linear elasticity. To avoid this, the mechanical models that simulate Chester’s laboratory folding, are incremented so that the slip in any one step is much less than ramp length.

When simulating the laboratory fold, fault depth is the most difficult of the fault parameters to infer. The kinematic method is insensitive to fault depth, as fault depth only alters the effective depth of the fault (\( D_e \)). The effective depth is slightly steeper than the backlimb.

Both methods simulate the laboratory fold shape well and predict reasonable fault parameters. The kinematic model overpredicts slip in order to match fold amplitude, whereas the mechanical predicts slip accurately. Both methods overpredict ramp length in order to match fold width. This discrepancy could mean that the laboratory fold experiences deformation not incorporated in either of the models. For example, microcracking and associated dilation observed in the experiment (Chester et al., 1991) may produce more distributed deformation than that of the models, resulting in wider folding.

Another difference between the models and the laboratory test is the application of uniform slip along ramp and flats in both the mechanical and kinematic models. This assumption facilitates the inference of fault geometry by reducing the number of unknowns but does not accurately simulate the laboratory deformation. Within the laboratory and in natural folds, faulting and subsequent folding are driven by far-field (tectonic) contraction, which does not typically yield uniform slip. Variations in slip distribution are expected to produce variations in limb dip, fold width and other parameters. Furthermore, tectonic contraction may act to tighten folds produced by slip along underlying faults.

\[ D_e = (D_r^2)^{1/3} \]  

where \( D_e \) is effective fault depth, \( D_r \) is the actual fault depth and \( t \) is thickness of individual layers (Pollard and Johnson, 1973). This equation is only valid for free-slipping layers with approximately uniform elastic constants and thickness, such as those in the experiment of Chester et al. (1991). For this laboratory model, the effective depth of the upper ramp tip is 0.23 cm. We modeled a fault at this depth and iteratively altered other parameters until we arrived at the best-fitting fold shape. Interlayer slip can be incorporated within the BEM model by considering the effective depth of the fault but cannot be considered in the fault parallel flow model due to the insensitivity of this method’s fold shape to fault depth.

From this analysis, the two methods predict surprisingly similar fault geometry from fold width and amplitude and the discrepancy between the predicted and laboratory fault geometries is similar for kinematic and mechanical models. The kinematic model infers the fault ramp approximately 0.5 cm ahead of the laboratory upper ramp tip, but kinematic fault depth also influences inference of fault position. With increasing kinematic fault depth, the suprajacent fold position shifts to the right, which subsequently shifts the inferred fault position (Fig. 5h). In this simulation, we constrained fault depth from the laboratory experiment. This suggests that either fault depth or lateral position will need to be constrained to infer geologic faults.

Assessment of the overall shapes of the folds (Fig. 7) reveals that the kinematic fold approximates the Chester et al. (1991) fold slightly more accurately than the mechanical fold. The kinematic and laboratory folds are nearly symmetric while the forelimb of the mechanical fold is slightly steeper than the backlimb.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fault parameters</th>
<th>Laboratory</th>
<th>Mechanical</th>
<th>Kinematic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amplitude (cm)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (cm)*</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forelimb (°)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlimb (°)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip (cm)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip (°)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp length (cm)</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth (cm)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>Insensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective depth</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Discussion

Both the kinematic (fault parallel flow) and mechanical (BEM) models have similar levels of accuracy for inferring fault geometry from the shape of two-dimensional folds (Table 2). Either model could be used to infer the ramp geometry, but the mechanical model inferred slightly more accurate fault slip and is needed to constrain fault depth.
However, in the unlikely scenario that the lateral position of fault ramp is known and depth is unknown, the kinematic method can constrain ramp depth. Both models overestimate the ramp length needed to simulate the laboratory fold. For constraining fault length along fold axis, further three-dimensional laboratory analysis is needed.

The one-to-one relationship of fault and fold parameters for the kinematic method lent ease inferring fault geometry from the Chester et al. (1991) laboratory fold. In contrast, the interactive nature of the fault and fold parameters in the mechanical model leads to non-uniqueness of fold shape, i.e. more than one fault geometry may produce the same fold shape. Because the fault shape of the Chester et al. (1991) experiment was our first guess, the iterative matching converged on a fault geometry similar to the laboratory fault. A drastically different first-guess fault could have resulted in iterative convergence on a very different mechanical fault geometry that also matches the laboratory fold shape.

To resolve this non-uniqueness, more than one method can be used. When out-of-transport-plane deformation is not a significant factor, the fault parallel flow kinematic method would provide a good first approximation. However the suitability of this method decreases for plunging folds or in areas where multiple faults interact. In areas of significant three-dimensional deformation or in areas of multiple coeval faults, the kinematic model should not be taken as a final approximation. Furthermore, the limits of the kinematic method to constrain fault depth provides the need for an additional method in any circumstance.

A drawback to directly inferring fault geometry from the shape of folded sedimentary layers with the mechanical model is the lack of implicit interlayer slip. However, this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slip</th>
<th>Ramp Length</th>
<th>Fault Dip</th>
<th>Fault Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td><img src="image20" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. A1. Fold shape variation shown graphically (a–p). The kinematic models are shown in gray and the mechanical models in black. Fig. 4g shows a dark gray trend that signifies the effect of fault dip on fold amplitude when height of the fold and depth of the syncline are both considered.
can be remedied by implementing the effective thickness of the strata into the model.

6. Conclusions

Detailed comparison of kinematic and mechanical forward-modeled fold shapes highlight inherent differences between the two methods. Kinematic fold parameters generally respond to changes in one fault parameter while the interplay between mechanical fold and fault parameters renders non-unique inferences of fault geometry from fold shape. Consequently, a multi-proxy approach, incorporating field data and constraints from other types of models, is suggested. Both methods simulate fault/fold relationships relatively well and when used in conjunction, offer a powerful tool for predicting fault geometry from fold shape.
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