

Position of the study area in the High Folded Zone of the Zagros fold-and-thrust belt.

Stratigraphic column of the study area after Sissakian et al. (1997). Formations containing low-shear-strength layers are denoted by asterisks.







Balanced cross-section constructed from field and remote sensing data using the dip domain method. The loca-tion of the cross-section is shown in the geological map. The offset of the thrust fault in the NE part of the cross-section is unknown. The part of the cross-section used in the numerical simulations is highlighted in light blue.



Kinematical unfolding (constant arc length) of the part of the folded profile that is used for the dynamical unfolding simulations.

Kinematical shortening estimates: • Dip domain method using the whole cross-section: 15% • Constant arc length method using the part without fault: 11%

Drawback of kinematical reconstruction





Application to the Zagros HFZ



Geological section discretized with triangular finite-element mesh:

• T7/3-elements • *Mixed v-p-formulation* • Uzawa iteration to enforce incompressibility • Piccard iteration for power-law rheology Welded interfaces Interfacial slip conditions: thin weak layers • Viscosity ratio = 1:100 • BC's: base: free slip, top: free surface, left and right: constant horizontal strain rate

Dynamical unfolding simulations after a horizontal shortening of 11.0% (kinematical shortening estimate), Newtonian rheology, and no basement.

Upper: Welded interfaces Lower: Interfacial slip conditions: Unfolding is more effective! Mean Amplitude Decrease = 56.9%

- Interfacial slip is the most important factor for an efficient amplitude decrease during dynamical unfolding simulations.
- Various power-law exponents increase the efficiency, but only have a second-order effect.
- Detachment folding reduces efficiency of dynamical unfolding simulations.
- Dynamical unfolding helps identify dominant deformation processes.
- Interfacial slip is a key mechanism in the Zagros HFZ.
- Other factors have a small influence on dynamical unfolding results.

Why complete flattening is not (yet) possible Issues with the initial model

Quality control for cross-section constructions • Some natural processes not included in the model \rightarrow Identify areas of complex processes.

References

Frehner M., Reif D. and Grasemann B., 2012: Mechanical versus kinematical shortening reconstructions of the Zagros High Folded Zone (Kurdistan region of Iraq), Tectonics 31, TC3002.

Ghassemi M.R., Schmalholz S.M. and Ghassemi A.R., 2010: Kinematics of constant arc length folding for different fold shapes, Journal of Structural Geology 32, 755–765.

Lechmann S.M., Schmalholz S.M., Burg J.-P. and Marques F.O., 2010: Dynamic unfolding of multilayers: 2D numerical approach and application to turbidites in SW Portugal, Tectonophysics 494, 64–74.



Schmalholz S.M., 2008: 3D numerical modeling of forward folding and reverse unfolding of a viscous single-layer: Implications for the formation of folds and fold patterns, Tectonophysics 446, 31–41. Sissakian V.K., Ibrahim E.I. and Al-Waíly I.J., 1997: Geological map of Arbeel and Mahabad Quadrangles, sheets Nj-38-14 and Nj-38-15, State Establishment of Geological Survey and Mining, Baghdad, Iraq.

Acknowledgement **OMV Exploration and Production Company**