Determining continuous basins across conjugate margins: The East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins of the southern North Atlantic Ocean
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Abstract

The East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins are several of the most promising basins for hydrocarbon exploration along the rifted continental margins of the southern North Atlantic Ocean. Despite having formed at similar geological times, the basins exhibit fundamental differences in symmetry, crustal thickness, sedimentary cover thickness, and amount of extension. Interpretation of seismic reflection and well data was integrated with published 3D grids of depth-to-basement and Moho proxy depth to interpret and restore select seismic reflection lines. Publicly available kinematic evolution models were also integrated to evaluate and compare the restored seismic reflection lines in a more global regional context.

Interpretation of five seismo-stratigraphic units and three tectonostratigraphic megasequences along the East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins reveals similar seismic character for each unit and comparable tectonic history. The structural restoration of the selected lines indicates that evolution, sedimentary cover thickness, faulting style, crustal structure, and kinematic evolution of the East Orphan and Porcupine basins differ significantly. A variable and asymmetrical crustal structure is found in the East Orphan Basin contrasting with the elongated and symmetric Porcupine and Galicia Interior basins. Rift domain maps of the three basins reveal that they are each underlain by hyperextended crust, with possible exhumed mantle in the centre of the Porcupine Basin.

Based on a holistic analysis of the results obtained, the linkage between the East Orphan and the Porcupine basins seems implausible, but rather a contemporaneous relationship is interpreted. Moreover, a potential connection between the Galicia Interior Basin and the Porcupine Basin during the Early to Late Jurassic is proposed. Such scenarios imply an oblique and synchronous rifting evolution around the Bay of Biscay triple junction of the southern North Atlantic.

1. Introduction

The East Orphan Basin, offshore Newfoundland, the Porcupine Basin, offshore Ireland, and the Galicia Interior Basin, offshore Iberia, represent three key basins along the rifted continental margins of the southern North Atlantic Ocean with promising hydrocarbon potential. Considering these three basins together is crucial for understanding the evolution of the triple junction around which the southern North Atlantic Ocean opened.

Since the 1960s and 1970s these margins have been the focus of numerous studies (e.g., Department of Mines and Energy, 2000; Groupe Galice, 1979; Shannon et al., 2001). Previous authors have interpreted differences in the numbers and timing of rift phases (Enachescu et al., 2005; Gouiza et al., 2017; Norton, 2002; Shannon et al., 2007; Shannon and Naylor, 1998; Sibuet et al., 2007; Skogseid, 2010; Williams et al., 1999) and the style of rifting (Chian et al., 2001; Gouiza et al., 2017; Krawczyk et al., 1996; Lau et al., 2015; Murillas et al., 1990; Pérez-Gussinyé et al., 2003; Reston et al., 2004; Welford et al., 2012) along the Newfoundland, Irish Atlantic, and Iberian margins. However, in general, two main rifting phases occurred during the Late Triassic-Early Jurassic and Late Jurassic to Early Cretaceous, which affected the East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins. As a result of the rifting episodes, several rift branches were simultaneously developed along the three margins. Most of the previous studies have been based on seismic interpretation, gravity inversion, and/or refraction data modelling and focused on only one or two of the margins (e.g., East Orphan and/or Porcupine basins). Rigid kinematic plate reconstructions have also resulted in disagreements about the connectivity of these basins during
rifting (Fig. 2), although many suggest a link between the East Orphan and Porcupine basins (e.g., Louden et al., 2004; Matthews et al., 2016; Seton et al., 2012; Skogseid, 2010). These often-conflicting theories illustrate the complexity of these conjugate margins.

Integration of geophysical and geological data provides a general template for enhancing our understanding of the tectonic evolution of complex basins (e.g., Decaris et al., 2015; Peace et al., 2018b; Tugend et al., 2014; Welford et al., 2012). Previous studies have interpreted hyperextended crust for the East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins (Lundin and Döre, 2011; Welford et al., 2012). Using data from these three hyperextended basins and applying an integrated approach, we interpret and restore select seismic lines. We interpret crustal domains beneath each of the basins and we integrate them with the restored lines and kinematic evolution models. Here, we reconnect the conjugate margin basins that were possibly once linked and try to better understand their evolution, with particular emphasis placed on the analysis of the East Orphan and Porcupine basins due to their commonly accepted link in the published literature and their key role in the evolution of the southern North Atlantic Ocean.

Fig. 1. Location of the study area. (a) Newfoundland margin. (b) Irish margin. (c) Galicia margin. Structural features extracted from Edwards et al. (2003) and Sibuet et al. (2007) for the Newfoundland margin, Naylor et al. (2002) for the Irish margin, Murillas et al. (1990) for the Galicia margin, and Bouysse and coll. (2014) and Srivastava et al. (1990) for the southern North Atlantic.
2. Tectonic setting

The current tectonic framework comprising Atlantic Canada, Western Ireland, and the Iberian Peninsula (Fig. 3), was established with the three-way continental collision between Baltica, Avalonia, and Laurentia (Domeier, 2016; Sibuet and Collette, 1991), which followed multiple ocean opening-closing cycles (Thomas, 2006; Wilson, 1966). These cycles included the formation of the Uranus Ocean in the Neoproterozoic and its closure during the Grenville Orogeny (1300-950 Ma), followed by the development of the Iapetus Ocean during the Late Ediacaran/Early Cambrian, which closed during the Appalachian Orogeny (600-300 Ma), the creation of the Rheic Ocean during the Early Ordovician, and finally the suturing together of Pangaea (Domeier, 2016; Frizon De Lamotte et al., 2015; Harland and Gayer, 1972; Murphy et al., 2016; Murphy and Nance, 2008; Nance et al., 2012; Williams et al., 1999). Differences in the composition, rheology, temperature, and pre-existing structures around the triple junction are thought to have contributed to the variability in the evolution of each of the basins.

During the Late Triassic-Early Jurassic (Fig. 4), the rifting apart of Pangaea propagated from south to north and a triple junction formed at the junction between Baltica, Avalonia, and Laurentia (Peace et al., 2019a). Rifting around that triple junction ultimately led to the formation of the East Orphan and Porcupine basins and probably the Galicia Interior Basin (Enachescu et al., 2005; Murillas et al., 1990; Norton, 2002; Shannon et al., 2007; Shannon and Naylor, 1998; Sibuet et al., 2007, 2004; van der Pluijm and Marshak, 2004; Vissers and Meijer, 2012). A second rifting phase, associated with the opening of the Labrador Sea, took place during the Late Cretaceous (Abdelmalak et al., 2018, 2012; Keen et al., 2018; Larsen et al., 2009; Peace et al., 2018a), affecting at least the westernmost parts of the West Orphan Basin (Enachescu et al., 2005; Sibuet et al., 2007; Williams et al., 1999).
Based on sparse basement drilling and provenance studies, several pre-rift basement terranes have been proposed for the Newfoundland, Irish Atlantic (Tyrrell et al., 2007), and Galicia margins (Fig. 3). The highly stretched East Orphan Basin developed within the Avalon Zone based on its well-preserved upper Precambrian sedimentary and volcanic rocks, which evolved during the Grenvillian-Appalachian time gap, covering Cambrian-Ordovician shales and sandstones (King et al., 1985; Lilly, 1965; Williams, 1979; Williams et al., 1999).

On the Irish Atlantic margin, specific terrane boundaries within the Porcupine Basin are still the subject of active debate (Bluck et al., 1992; Chew and Stillman, 2009; Johnson et al., 2001; Roberts et al., 1999; Tate, 1992; Tyrrell et al., 2007). Nevertheless, terranes of Proterozoic, Avalonian, and Variscan origin have been identified based on geological provenance studies (Tyrrell et al., 2007), outcrops onshore Ireland...
(Chew, 2009; Chew and Stillman, 2009; Murphy et al., 1991), and seismic interpretation (Naylor et al., 2005). While the basement terranes of the Iberian Peninsula are generally related to the Variscan Orogeny (Matte, 2001), distinct zones have been defined (Arenas et al., 2004; Farias et al., 1987; Martínez-Catalán, 1990; Murphy et al., 2010) with the Galicia Interior Basin associated with the Galicia-Trás-os-Montes Zone.

The East Orphan Basin is located on the Eastern Canadian continental margin, north of the Grand Banks and southwest of the Orphan Knoll, a fragment of continental crust detached from North America during continental rifting (Keen and Piper, 1990). The Orphan Basin extends over an area of approximately 150,000 km² (Department of Mines and Energy, 2000) of which around 33,000 km² correspond to the East Orphan Basin. The full Orphan Basin is delimited to the north by the Dover transfer fault and the Charlie-Gibbs Fracture Zone (Keen et al., 1987); to the east by a high basement ridge that runs between Flemish Cap and the Orphan Knoll; to the south by the Cumberland Belt Transfer Zone (Enachescu, 1987), and to the west by the Bonavista Platform (Enachescu et al., 2005; Keen and Beaumont, 1990; Smeed et al., 2003). The Orphan Basin is divided into the East Orphan and West Orphan basins based on tectono-structural and petroleum potential analysis (Enachescu, 2006; Enachescu et al., 2005, 2004; Gouiza et al., 2017). The Late Triassic-Early Jurassic marks the beginning of the rifting of the East Orphan Basin whereas the rifting initiation of the West Orphan Basin occurred during the Late Jurassic-Early Cretaceous (Enachescu et al., 2005; Sibuet et al., 2007; Skogseid et al., 2004; Williams et al., 1999).

On the Irish Atlantic margin, the Porcupine Basin is a V-shape trough defined by Naylor et al. (2002) as a Mesozoic-Tertiary basin with a north-south orientation, extending from approximately 50°N northwards to the southern margin of the North Porcupine Basin, north of the Porcupine Arch (Fig. 1b). The basin extends over an area of approximately 44,000 km², is delimited to the north and west by the North Porcupine Basin and Porcupine High, respectively, and to the south by the Porcupine Fault and the Goban Spur (Fig. 1). The north and central parts of the Porcupine Basin are characterised by the presence of a deeply buried arch feature (Porcupine Arch) and the Porcupine Median Volcanic Ridge System, respectively (Naylor et al., 2002). The former is defined by Naylor et al. (2002) and described by Johnson et al. (2001) as a high-amplitude reflector which may mark the top of the crystalline crust, and by Gagnevin et al. (2017) as a mafic igneous intrusion situated below the sedimentary cover that could potentially have fed sills at a shallower level. The latter has been interpreted as an igneous complex of mainly Cretaceous age (Tate and Dobson, 1988), a serpentinite-mud volcano or diapir (Reston et al., 1997), a rotated fault block composed of sedimentary rocks (O’Sullivan et al., 2010a, 2010b), a hyaloclastite mound extruded and deposited close to sea level (Calvès et al., 2012), and a volcanic feature (Watremez et al., 2016).

Along the Iberian margin, the Galicia Interior Basin (GIB) is a U-shaped trough, delimited to the east by the Iberian continental shelf, to the west by the Galicia Bank and the Vigo Seamount, to the north by the Biscay Abyssal Plain, and to the south by the Aveiro Fault and the Porto Seamount (Murillas et al., 1990). Containing a thick sedimentary layer and diapiric structures (Boillot et al., 1979; Groupe Galice, 1979; Mauffret et al., 1978; Montadert et al., 1979, 1974), it is possible that the Galicia Interior Basin is the northward continuation of the onshore Lusitanian Basin (Boillot et al., 1979; Montenat et al., 1988; Wilson et al., 1989). Murillas et al. (1990) suggest that the basin formed during the Triassic with the main extension occurring during the Late Jurassic-Early Cretaceous, similar to the East Orphan and Porcupine basins. Different units have been described for this basin encompassing Jurassic to Cenozoic rocks (Mauffret et al., 1978; Réhault and Mauffret, 1979).

3. Data and methods

The data used in this study include ~22,800 km² of 2D pre-stack time-migrated (PSTM) seismic reflection profiles, and well logs and lithological data from 22 wells in the East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins (Fig. 1). Integration of seismic and well data was performed to define the syn- and post-rift sedimentary packages, and to interpret the large-scale rift- and basement-related faults and geological structures across the Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins.

Well data were provided by the Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board (CNLGBP), the Basin Database of Natural Resources Canada (2017), and the Department of Communications, Climate Action & Environment of Ireland (Fig. 1). No well data from the Galicia Interior Basin are publicly available. However, descriptions and correlations of adjacent wells from the Deep Sea Drilling Project (DSDP), the Ocean Drilling Program (ODP), the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program (IODP), and some industry wells, were made by Sibuet et al. (1979), Boillot et al. (1987), Murillas et al. (1990), and Mena et al. (2018), which are used in this study (Fig. 1).

Seismic lines (EO-1, EO-2, PP-1, PP-2) were provided by TGS NOPEC Geophysical Physical (TGS), the Geological Survey of Canada (GSC), and the Department of Communications, Climate Action & Environment of Ireland. The seismic line that crosses the GIB (GI-1) was digitised and converted into segy format from Pérez-Gussinyé et al. (2003).

Due to the different coordinate reference systems and units used in Canada (North American Datum and Metric system) and Europe (European Datum and Field units), the World Geodetic System 1984 (WGS-84) and the Metric system were used consistently in this study for all of the margins. For the seismic data, positive standard polarity (Sheriff and Geldart, 1995) was used.

3.1. Seismic interpretation

To carry out the seismic interpretation, seismic well ties were built to tie the lithological information from the wells to the seismic data. Having identified the seismic events near the wells, seismic interpretation was performed over the East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins, by defining five horizons (Cenozoic, Upper Cretaceous, Lower Cretaceous, Jurassic, and Basement) and, based on the seismic stratigraphic character of each layer (Fossen, 2010; Mitchum et al., 1977), three tectonostratigraphic megasequences (post-rift, syn-rift, and pre-rift).

For the East Orphan Basin, the identification of the main seismostratigraphic units is based on the integration of the stratigraphic tops from the wells, two computed well ties, and the seismic response of each unit (Fig. 5). Previously published interpretations of Gouiza et al. (2017) were also considered.

For the Porcupine Basin, due to the lack of well data near the seismic lines, the geoseismic sections X, Y, and Z published by Naylor et al. (2002) were digitised and used as a guide during the seismic interpretation stage. For the Galicia Interior Basin, no well data were publicly available, so the identification of the main seismo-stratigraphic units is based on the work of Murillas et al. (1990) and Pérez-Gussinyé et al. (2003). Since no wells penetrating the deep intervals have been drilled, the reliability of the seismic interpretation at depth is limited where different faulting, rifting, and erosional episodes increase the complexity and therefore the uncertainty.

3.2. Structural restoration

Seismic reflection lines from the East Orphan and Porcupine basins were chosen for structural restoration based on depth-to-basement trends (Divins, 2003; IOC et al., 2003; Oakey and Stark, 1995) and structural elements for the Orphan and Porcupine basins (Edwards et al., 2003; Naylor et al., 2002; Sibuet et al., 2007). The depth to
basement trends for the Porcupine Basin are based on the General Bathymetric Chart of the Oceans (GEBCO) global 30 arc-second gridded bathymetric dataset (IOC et al., 2003) and total sediment thickness from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric (NOAA) Satellite Information Service (Divins, 2003). For the East Orphan Basin, the depth to basement trends were obtained from the Geological Survey of Canada (Oakey and Stark, 1995). The seismic lines were selected for each basin to capture the maximum dip direction of the general fault trends (Woodward et al., 1989) while also covering the full lateral extent of the basins. The seismic line across the Galicia Interior Basin was not restored due to limited constraints.

Free-air gravity data from the Bureau Gravimétrique International (BGI) (Bonvalot et al., 2012) were also used to visually assess whether the orientations of the chosen seismic lines for restoration were appropriate given the orientations of the main rift features present in the East Orphan and Porcupine basins (Fig. 6). To estimate the depth to the base of the crust, the Mohorovičić discontinuity (Moho) proxy from Welford et al. (2012) and the interpreted Moho from Pérez-Gussinyé et al. (2003) were used.

The interpreted seismic lines for the East Orphan and Porcupine basins were depth-converted using the average interval velocities obtained from the stacking velocities from the Orphan lines (Table 1). The same average velocities were used to depth-convert the Porcupine Basin lines because the average interval velocities are in general agreement with the velocities previously modelled by Readman et al. (2005) and O’Reilly et al. (2006).

The general workflow used to carry out the structural restoration involved: (1) removal of the water layer to decompact the youngest stratigraphic unit, (2) estimation of the isostatic response, (3) for the post-rift units, removal of thermal subsidence effects following decompaction using the estimated beta factor of the crust (β) and rift age, (4) decompaction of the older layers through removal of the youngest stratigraphic unit, (5) for the syn-rift units, restoration of the faults (usually growth faults) to their approximate pre-rifting geometry, (6) if important folds or localised inversion structures are present, unfolding of the units may also be applied, and (7) repetition of this procedure for each interpreted stratigraphic unit. After the fault restoration step and due to the lack of paleo-water depth information for all of the basins, the sections were flattened to a zero datum to better visualise the overall structure and depocentres of the basins. This step does not significantly impact the restoration process since no petroleum system effects are predicted from these restorations. The structural restoration was performed using MOVE™ software by Petroleum Experts Ltd and Midland Valley. For the decompaction process, the porosity-depth function proposed by Sclater and Christie (1980) was used. Appropriate functions are calculated based on the type of lithology present in each layer. The lithological composition used for each unit was estimated by Gouiza et al. (2015) from lithology logs of wells in the Orphan basins (Table 2 and Fig. 7). It is known that the thinning of the crust depends on several factors (rheology, temperature, composition, pre-existing structures, etc.) and is usually modelled using a non-linear viscoelastic material (Lavier and Manatschal, 2006; Naliboff et al., 2017). However, for the pre-rift unit, very low initial porosity and depth coefficient were assumed due to the lack of constraints to define the correct porosity-depth curve for the crust. The difference between not using a decompaction curve for the pre-rift unit (assuming no changes due to removing the upper layers) and the parameters chosen, is on the order of 50 m; therefore, the decompaction of the Jurassic unit does not significantly affect the Basement (crust). Airy isostasy (Airy, 1855) was assumed for both the East Orphan and Porcupine basins to take into account the isostatic response of the lithosphere during decompaction of the sedimentary layers. Despite the three basins in this study being

![Fig. 5. Examples of seismic–well ties. DT: sonic log; AI: acoustic impedance log. CU: Cenozoic Unconformity. AU: Early Cretaceous Unconformity. See Fig. 1 for location.](image-url)
formed by polyphase rifting of a variable duration and intensity, two main rifting episodes are assumed for the restoration. The parameters used to remove the effects of thermal subsidence are shown in Tables 3 and 4. Rather than using a simple constant beta ($\beta$) factor for each line, a variable $\beta$ factor from Welford et al. (2012), derived from constrained 3D regional gravity inversions, was used to capture the highly variable stretching along both the East Orphan and Porcupine lines.

### 3.3. Kinematic models

The restored sections were spatially tracked through geologic time using the southern North Atlantic plate evolution model from Nirrengarten et al. (2018), constructed using the GPlates\(^1\) software (Bödien et al., 2011). Other published plate reconstruction models are available, such as Seton et al. (2012), Matthews et al. (2016), and Müller et al. (2016); however, the Nirrengarten et al. (2018) model explicitly considers the rotation of the Flemish Cap and the Porcupine High. This is achieved in Nirrengarten et al. (2018) by including independent micro-blocks for the Flemish Cap and Orphan Knoll on the Newfoundland margin and for the Porcupine High, Rockall and Hatton highs on the Irish margin.

The locations of seismic transects EO-1, EO-2, PP-1, PP-2, and GI-1 were imported into GPlates. Plate IDs were then assigned using the static polygons from Nirrengarten et al. (2018). This resulted in the seismic transects EO-1 and EO-2 being assigned to the Orphan Knoll plate (GPlates plate ID 1002), PP-1 and PP-2 to the Porcupine High plate (GPlates plate ID 3001), and GI-1 to the Iberian Peninsula (GPlates plate ID 304). As the plates move through time, the locations of the seismic transects follow the same pole of rotation of the plate they are assigned to. The main drawback of the chosen kinematic model is that it does not take into account the internal deformation of the tectonic plates (Peace et al., 2019b), which is a crucial factor when studying hyperextended basins such as the East Orphan and Porcupine basins. In addition, on rifted margins significant deformation of the continental lithosphere prior to, during, and after breakup is not accounted for in traditional rigid plate models (Peace et al., 2019b). The intensity and direction of stretching in hyperextended basins should be tackled with a non-linear approach that ultimately can reproduce deformation zones akin to the ones defined in the Crustal Architecture subsection of this work.

### 4. Results

#### 4.1. Seismo-stratigraphic units

The selected lines (EO-1, EO-2, PP-1, PP-2, GI-1) were interpreted in two-way travel time (TWT) and five seismo-stratigraphic units were mapped in each basin, namely, Basement, Jurassic, Lower Cretaceous, Upper Cretaceous, and Cenozoic (Figs. 8–11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Average Interval velocity (m/s) –</th>
<th>Average Interval velocity (m/s) –</th>
<th>Average Interval velocity (m/s) –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This study</td>
<td>Readman et al. (2005)</td>
<td>O’Reilly et al. (2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cenozoic</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>2100-2550</td>
<td>– 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cretaceous</td>
<td>3238</td>
<td>4000-4100</td>
<td>– 3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cretaceous</td>
<td>3896</td>
<td>4000-4100</td>
<td>– 4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic</td>
<td>4718</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>– 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement</td>
<td>6000-6900</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>– 6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moho</td>
<td>7200-8000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7200-8000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) GPlates web site: https://www.gplates.org/.

---

\[ Fig. 6. \] Free-air gravity anomaly map from Bonvalot et al. (2012). Structural elements adapted from Edwards et al. (2003), Srivastava et al. (1990), Sibuet et al. (2007), Naylor et al. (2002), and Murillas et al. (1990). Continuous white lines: normal faults. Dashed white lines: transfer faults. Dotted white lines: inverse faults. Continuous black lines: antiform structures. Solid red lines: synform structures. Solid red polygons: igneous bodies. Dotted red line: magnetic anomaly 34 from Srivastava et al. (1990). Green arrow: north. Green polygons: continent above sea level. Black dots: wells. Dashed yellow lines: available seismic lines. Continuous thick yellow lines: transects interpreted in this study. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the Web version of this article.)
and at the base by the Top of the Upper Cretaceous, which corresponds to an unconformity within the East Orphan and Galicia Interior basins. For the East Orphan Basin, the Cenozoic unit is characterised by a relatively continuous parallel to subparallel, sometimes wavy reflection configuration. Some intervals show a more hummocky to chaotic character that could be interpreted either as marine channelised sediments or as mass transport deposits (MTDs). An apparent inversion structure is identified at the southern limit of the basin, indicating that localised uplift occurred during this period. For the Porcupine Basin, this unit exhibits a variable reflection configuration going from subparallel, sometimes wavy, to chaotic. The intervals with the chaotic character may be interpreted either as marine channelised sediments or as MTDs. For the Galicia Interior Basin, the Cenozoic unit is characterised by a variable reflection configuration going from subparallel, sometimes wavy, to chaotic. The chaotic character may correspond to MTDs or marine channelised sediments. Again, an inversion structure is identified at the western end of the seismic line (Fig. 10).

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sandstone (%)</th>
<th>Shale (%)</th>
<th>Limestone (%)</th>
<th>Porosity at the surface</th>
<th>Depth Coefficient</th>
<th>Compaction Curve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cenozoic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Cretaceous</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Cretaceous</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters used to estimate thermal subsidence in the restoration models.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thickness of lithosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial thickness of continental crust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantle density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawater density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal expansion coeff. of the mantle and crust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature of the asthenosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal diffusivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithosphere thermal time constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension factor of the lithosphere (β)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rifting episodes for the East Orphan and Porcupine basins used to estimate thermal subsidence (Gouiza et al., 2017; Shannon et al., 2007; Shannon and Naylor, 1998; Sibuet et al., 2007; Skogseid et al., 2004).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rifting Age (Ma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cretaceous (K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Jurassic (J)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7. Generalised lithology based on the descriptions for the cuttings from the wells used in this study. Well locations shown on Fig. 1a.
Cenozoic, a high amplitude positive reflector, and the Early Cretaceous Unconformity at the base. For the East Orphan Basin, the Upper Cretaceous unit exhibits a parallel to subparallel, sometimes discontinuous and wavy reflection configuration. For the Porcupine Basin, the reflection configuration is mostly parallel to subparallel and becomes chaotic towards the flanks of the basin. For the Galicia Interior Basin, this unit exhibits a parallel to subparallel, sometimes discontinuous and wavy reflection configuration that becomes chaotic towards Iberia. The Upper Cretaceous is a post-rift unit that represents the transition from the proper syn-rift deposition during the Lower Cretaceous into a thermal subsidence phase.

4.1.3. Lower Cretaceous

The Lower Cretaceous unit is defined at the top by the Early Cretaceous Unconformity (AU), a positive high amplitude reflector that marks a change in the seismic facies, and at the base by the Late Jurassic Unconformity (TU). For the East Orphan Basin, the Upper Cretaceous unit exhibits a parallel to subparallel, sometimes divergent, reflection character. The section just below the AU, however, exhibits a more wavy to chaotic character. For the Porcupine Basin, the Lower Cretaceous unit is characterised by a variable to wavy subparallel reflection configuration that becomes chaotic on both flanks of the basin. Relatively continuous high amplitude events are evident in the centre of the basin and are interpreted as volcanic intrusions (sills, dykes, or lava flows). For the Galicia Interior Basin, this unit exhibits a highly variable to wavy subparallel, sometimes divergent, reflection configuration that becomes chaotic towards the flanks of the basin. This syn-rift unit shows sedimentary growth towards the normal faults, with apparent inversion structures within all three of the basins of this study (Figs. 8 and 10).

4.1.4. Jurassic

The top of the syn-rift Jurassic unit corresponds to the TU and its base is represented by top basement. Even though the reflection unit is characterised by laterally continuous, parallel to subparallel, sometimes divergent, reflection character. The section just below the AU, however, exhibits a more wavy to chaotic character. For the Porcupine Basin, the Lower Cretaceous unit is characterised by a variable to wavy subparallel reflection configuration that becomes chaotic on both flanks of the basin. Relatively continuous high amplitude events are evident in the centre of the basin and are interpreted as volcanic intrusions (sills, dykes, or lava flows). For the Galicia Interior Basin, this unit exhibits a highly variable to wavy subparallel, sometimes divergent, reflection configuration that becomes chaotic towards the flanks of the basin. This syn-rift unit shows sedimentary growth towards the normal faults, with apparent inversion structures within all three of the basins of this study (Figs. 8 and 10).

Fig. 8. Seismic line EO-1 with (a) the un-interpreted section and (b) the interpreted horizons. Dark blue line: Mean sea level. Yellow line: sea bed. Light green line: Cenozoic Unconformity. Dark green line: Early Cretaceous Unconformity. Light blue line: Late Jurassic Unconformity. Red lines: basement. Purple line: Moho? (derived from Welford et al., 2012, and seismic interpretation). Dashed boxes in (b) are enlarged below according to the colour of the box outline. See Fig. 1 for location. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the Web version of this article.)
configuration is highly variable, within the East Orphan Basin two main seismic facies could be defined. The first corresponds to a fairly continuous, parallel to subparallel wavy reflection configuration, with interleaved high amplitude events. The second dominant seismic facies, on the other hand, is composed of chaotic zones that sometimes show internal subparallel reflections. This syn-rift unit is present across the whole basin, except the western-most part of the basin, near the Bonavista platform where this unit seems to be absent. The thickest occurrence of this unit is located in a depocentre in the eastern part of the basin, towards the north of Flemish Cap. The Jurassic unit within the Porcupine Basin is characterised by chaotic reflections with a more subparallel and divergent response on the flanks of the basin. The reflection configuration of the Jurassic unit for the Galicia Interior Basin is variable and sometimes obscured by multiples. Nevertheless, the unit exhibits, overall, a chaotic to divergent reflection configuration. The main depocentre of this unit is located in the central part of the basin, approximately coinciding with the depocentre of the Lower Cretaceous unit.

The uncertainty in the interpretation of the Jurassic unit is moderate to high due to limited well data located on structural highs, the potential structural complexity of this unit, the lower seismic resolution with depth due to signal attenuation, the volcanic intrusions, and the prevalence of multiples. Normal and growth faults, conjugate faults, and rollovers are characteristic of this unit.

4.1.5. Basement

The basal limit of coherent reflections defines the top of the Basement unit. For the East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins, this seismo-stratigraphic unit is characterised by similar reflection configurations with a chaotic behaviour and virtually no laterally coherent reflections. The imaging of this unit seems to be highly affected by multiples produced by the overlying contrasting layers. Numerous normal and listric faults, tilted fault blocks, and half-grabens are present within this unit. Some of the listric faults sole out at the Moho level. The ages of the basement units have been interpreted to be late Paleozoic (Devonian-Carboniferous) for the Porcupine Basin (Naylor et al., 2002) and early Paleozoic (Ordovician?) for the East Orphan Basin (Koning et al., 1988). For the Galicia Interior Basin, late
Paleozoic is the assigned age for the basement (Groupe Galice, 1979).

4.2. Structural restoration

The structural restoration of the selected lines in the East Orphan and Porcupine basins (Figs. 12 and 13, respectively) shows that evolution, sedimentary cover thickness, and crustal structure of the basins differ significantly (Table 5). The East Orphan Basin shows a more variable and asymmetric crustal structure than the symmetric and elongated Porcupine Basin, with a thicker sedimentary cover found in the Porcupine Basin. The interpreted faulting also reflects these differences, with more variable fault dip direction in the East Orphan Basin compared with the Porcupine Basin. The variation in the fault orientations and dips are due to the different crustal zones experiencing differential extension. The faults closest to the main depocentres and zones with the thinnest crust in each basin, are listric and have shallower dips. Thus, they are likely also harder to detect using seismic methods. Similarly, where the crust is thickest, planar faults are more common. The Lower Cretaceous unit is less affected by faults in all of the basins, indicating either a less accentuated or more distributed rift period, with potentially slow extension rates (hyperextension?). The main Lower Cretaceous depocenters coincide with zones of hyper-extended crust (< 10 km).

4.3. Crustal characteristics

The East Orphan Basin, Porcupine Basin, and Galicia Interior Basin have previously been defined as basins with hyperextended crust and partially serpentinised mantle (Calvès et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2018; Lundin and Doré, 2011; O’Reilly et al., 2006; Prada et al., 2017; Reston, 2009; Watremez et al., 2016; Welford et al., 2012, 2010). Consequently, three domains and several subdomains are used to characterise their crustal architecture based on the morphological criteria first proposed by Péron-Pinvidic et al. (2013) and later complemented by Sutra et al. (2013), Chenin et al. (2015), and Chenin et al. (2017).

The different rift domains were interpreted along the same lines that were used for the structural restoration (Figs. 14 and 15). Using published depth-to-basement constraints (Divins, 2003; IOC et al., 2003; Oakey and Stark, 1995), Moho proxy (Welford et al., 2012), interpreted crustal domains (Lundin and Doré, 2011; Welford et al., 2010), and observations generated from this study, maps of the different crustal domains were constructed for the East Orphan and Porcupine basins (Fig. 16).

Along the Newfoundland margin (Figs. 14 and 16a), the proximal domain corresponds to the Bonavista Platform and discrete parts of the Flemish Cap, and is characterised by a crustal thickness from 20 km to more than 30 km and β factors lower than 1.5. Overall, the Flemish Cap is interpreted to be a continental ribbon. This term was first defined by Lister et al. (1986) and later complemented by Péron-Pinvidic and Manatschal (2010). A continental ribbon is a continental block, slightly
extended, surrounded by weaker zones and still attached to the un-rifted continent. Specifically, the Flemish Cap exhibits a crustal thickness of around 20 km and a $\beta$ factor ranging from 1 to 1.5 containing some localised less stretched areas with thicker crust. This variability in crustal thickness and $\beta$ factor within the Flemish Cap suggests that it should be modelled as a deformable continental ribbon rather than the classic rigid ribbon part of a larger rigid plate (e.g., Barnett-Moore et al., 2018; Matthews et al., 2016; Nirrengarten et al., 2018; Seton et al., 2012).

The necking subdomain is distributed across both the East and West Orphan sub-basins with a crustal thickness between 10 and 20 km and $\beta$ factors of 1.5–3.2. A further subdivision of the necking subdomain is used in this study to better delineate the deformation zones between the less stretched distal domain and the highly stretched hyperextended subdomain. These subdomains can be used as deformable zones in deformable kinematic evolution models (e.g., Peace et al., 2019b).

The 1st-degree necking subdomain is characterised by a crustal thickness of 15–20 km and $\beta$ factors of 1.5–2. This degree of stretching is mild, with no evident faulting present. The 2nd-degree necking subdomain exhibits a crustal thickness of 12–15 km and $\beta$ factors of 2–2.5. Polyphase faulting becomes important within this subdomain (Reston, 2007) and most of the seismically detectable faults are planar.

The 3rd-degree necking subdomain corresponds to a crustal thickness of 10–12 km and $\beta$ factors of 2.5–3.2. Here, planar faulting is still significant but listric faulting is increasingly more dominant. Based on this subdivision, the Orphan Knoll falls into the unique category of a continental ribbon with a relatively thin crust (< 20 km) that has been internally deformed.

Two main hyperextended zones are interpreted underneath the depocentres of the West and East Orphan sub-basins (Fig. 16a). A third hyperextended zone is interpreted in the northern part of the Jeanne d’Arc Basin. Based on the interpreted rift domains, at least part of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seismo-stratigraphic Unit</th>
<th>East Orphan Basin</th>
<th>Porcupine Basin</th>
<th>Galicia Interior Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cenozoic</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cretaceous</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Cretaceous</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 11.** Examples of seismo-stratigraphic units.
White Rose field oil discovery falls inside this hyperextended subdomain (Fig. 16a). With a highly thin crust (down to 4 km thick) and a β factor higher than 3.2 (Pérez-Gussinyé and Reston, 2001), this subdomain exhibits mostly listric faults affecting the Basement unit and planar faults affecting the overlying younger sedimentary units (see EO-1 and EO-2 in Fig. 14). In the West Orphan Basin, the hyperextended subdomain includes a section of the Charlie-Gibbs Fracture Zone (CGFZ) where volcanic intrusions (seamounts?) have been previously interpreted (BeicipFranlab et al., 2016; Keen et al., 2014). The exhumation subdomain on the Newfoundland margin is located just inboard of the oceanic domain and to the east of the Orphan Knoll, where some IODP wells (U1302 and U1303) have been drilled.

Along the Irish margin (Figs. 1, 14 and 156b), the proximal domain is present within some areas of the Porcupine High and the Rockall High, and similar to the configuration observed along the Newfoundland margin, it exhibits a crustal thickness from 20 km to more than 30 km and β factors lower than 1.5. Both the Porcupine High and the Rockall High are interpreted as continental ribbons (Péron-Pinvidic and Manatschal, 2010) with crustal thickness greater than 20 km and β factors of 1.2–1.5, surrounded by more stretched zones (Fig. 16b).

The 1st-degree necking subdomain surrounds the proximal domain in the Porcupine and Rockall basins and has a crustal thickness between 15 and 20 km and β factors of 1.5–2. Only shallow basement-involved planar faults are observed in this subdomain.
The 2nd-degree necking subdomain encompassing the Goban Spur Basin has a crustal thickness between 10 and 15 km and $\beta$ factors of 2–3.2. Basement-involved listric faults are found in this subdomain with some of them reaching depths close to the Moho. The 3rd-degree necking subdomain surrounds the hyperextended areas within the Porcupine and Rockall basins. It represents a crustal thickness between 10 and 12 km and $\beta$ factors of 2.5–3.2. Most of the faults are interpreted to be listric with some planar faults.

Two main hyperextended zones corresponding to the main depocentres are also interpreted within the Rockall and Porcupine basins. In the southern part of the Rockall Basin, volcanic intrusions have also been interpreted (Naylor et al., 2002). The exhumation domain is interpreted to correspond to part of the seaward limit of the Rockall Basin, extending towards the south, west of the Porcupine Basin (Fig. 16b). Based on the presence of volcanic intrusions (Naylor et al., 2002) and highly thin crust (down to 6 km thick) with possible serpentinised mantle (O’Reilly et al., 2006), an area of potential exhumed mantle in the central part of the Porcupine Basin is also interpreted.

Along the Galicia margin (Figs. 15 and 16c), the proximal domain is represented by the onshore Iberian Peninsula, the narrow bordering continental shelf, and a small section of the Galicia Bank. It is characterised by a crustal thickness from 20 km to more than 30 km and $\beta$ factors lower than 1.5. The Galicia Bank exhibits a crustal thickness of up to 20 km and a $\beta$ factor ranging from 1.2 to 2. Similar to the Orphan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present day</th>
<th>Late Cretaceous</th>
<th>Early Cretaceous</th>
<th>Jurassic</th>
<th>Pre-rift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 km</td>
<td>25 km</td>
<td>6.2 km</td>
<td>6.2 km</td>
<td>9.1 km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 13. Structural restoration of line PP-1 across the Porcupine Basin.](image-url)
The Nirrengarten et al. (2018) kinematic model shows an offset between the East Orphan Basin, the Porcupine Basin had started to form at this time. East Orphan Basin was partially formed at this time meaning that its subsequent rotation of the Flemish Cap, have yet to occur. However, the closed or at an incipient stage (Fig. 17). In other words, most of the Porcupine High out of the Porcupine Basin, events which are evidently Reykjanes Ridge has not yet started. To reiterate, by this time the Labrador sea rifting is at an incipient stage, and the development of the Rockall Basin appear to be, at least partially, connected (Fig. 17). The Labrador sea rifting is at an incipient stage, and the development of the Rockall Basin appear to be, at least partially, connected (Fig. 17). The Labrador Sea rifting is at an incipient stage, and the development of the Rockall Basin appear to be, at least partially, connected (Fig. 17). The Labrador Sea rifting is at an incipient stage, and the development of the Rockall Basin appear to be, at least partially, connected (Fig. 17).

Three hyperextended zones are interpreted beneath the Galicia Interior Basin, showing a slightly wider areal extent toward the northern end of the basin (Fig. 16c). Hyperextended zones are also interpreted oceanwards toward the exhumation domain to the west of the Galicia Bank (Fig. 16c).

4.4. Kinematic evolution

The present-day plate configuration (Fig. 17) exhibits the V-shape geometry of the Porcupine Basin and the U-shape configuration of the West and East Orphan basins and the Galicia Interior Basin. A more tabular geometry, however, is exhibited by the Rockall Basin, widening toward its southern limit, near the Charlie-Gibbs Fracture Zone (CGFZ).

Restoring the southern North Atlantic using the Nirrengarten et al. (2018) kinematic model back to the Late Cretaceous (66 Ma), the Labrador Sea was already at an advanced stage of development compared to the Reykjanes Ridge, east of Greenland, that was in an emergent stage. The rotation of the Flemish Cap out of the Orphan Basin and the Porcupine High out of the Porcupine Basin had already occurred. Both the East Orphan and the Porcupine basins are already isolated with no direct connection between them (Fig. 17).

By the Early Cretaceous (100 Ma), the West Orphan Basin and the Rockall Basin appear to be, at least partially, connected (Fig. 17). The Labrador sea rifting is at an incipient stage, and the development of the Reykjanes Ridge has not yet started. To reiterate, by this time the Flemish Cap had already rotated out of the Orphan Basin and the Porcupine High out of the Porcupine Basin, events which are evidently extremely significant to the regional development.

At the end of the Jurassic (145 Ma), the West Orphan Basin was still closed or at an incipient stage (Fig. 17). In other words, most of the extension, the opening of the West and East Orphan basins, and subsequent rotation of the Flemish Cap, have yet to occur. However, the East Orphan Basin was partially formed at this time meaning that its formation is associated with more than one rifting period. Similar to the East Orphan Basin, the Porcupine Basin had started to form at this time. The Nirrengarten et al. (2018) kinematic model shows an offset between the East Orphan and Porcupine basins at this time, while a more continuous and aligned geometry is evident between the Porcupine Basin and the Galicia Interior Basin (GIB).

At the beginning of the Jurassic (200 Ma), the East Orphan Basin was in an early stage of development with a narrower configuration than present. Meanwhile, the Rockall Basin remained wider than the East Orphan Basin. The Flemish Pass, Jeanne d’Arc, East Orphan, and Rockall basins may have formed a continuous system at this time (Peate et al., 2019b). The Porcupine Basin is also at an early stage of basin development, showing a possible connection with the GIB (Fig. 17).

To summarise, the kinematic evolution model of Nirrengarten et al. (2018) shows that the pre-rift connection between the East Orphan Basin and the Porcupine Basin is questionable. Additionally, it shows a potential alignment between the Porcupine and the Galicia Interior basins linking the Flemish Cap with the Porcupine High and the Orphan Knoll with the Rockall High.

5. Discussion

In this section the tectonostratigraphic megasequences, inversion structures, crustal architecture, kinematic evolution, and their inter-relation in the evolution of the East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins are discussed.

5.1. Tectonostratigraphic megasequences

Based on the seismo-stratigraphic characteristics, three tectonostratigraphic megasequences were interpreted. The characteristics of these tectonostratigraphic megasequences are discussed in this section.

5.1.1. Pre-rift

Due to the poorer quality of the seismic data with depth, no pre-rift sediments can be satisfactorily resolved. However, the thickness of the crust is estimated using the interpreted acoustic basement and the Moho proxy from gravity inversion (Welford et al., 2012). The ages for the basement underlying the three basins are similar with the exception of the East Orphan Basin for which an older basement is interpreted (Groupe Galice, 1979; Koning et al., 1988; Naylor et al., 2002). The average thickness of the pre-rift crust is 10 km and 12 km in the East Orphan and Porcupine basins, respectively (Table 5). Both basins contain regions where crust is locally as thin as 3.8 km in the East Orphan Basin and 3.2 km in the Porcupine Basin. Both thin crustal values coincide with highly stretched crust ($\beta$ = $\sim$ 5). The East Orphan Basin shows more localised thin crust, coinciding with the location of the two main depocentres, compared with the Porcupine Basin which exhibits one main area of highly thinned crust.

The restored pre-rift crustal section corresponds to the crustal architecture prior to rifting, assuming that all of the extension was due to brittle deformation and has been accounted for. The faulting style in both basins is similar, with normal faults dipping to the west and east on the eastern and western flanks of the basins, respectively. Nevertheless, the greater faulting complexity in the East Orphan Basin indicates either variability during the periods of extension (in magnitude and direction), or a variation in structural (pre-existing structures) and compositional (rheology) inheritance of the crust (more brittle deformation in some areas of the East Orphan Basin compared to the Porcupine Basin).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermal Subsidence (m)</th>
<th>Thickness (m)</th>
<th>Extension (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOB</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>EOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOB</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>EOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOB</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>EOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO-1</td>
<td>EO-2</td>
<td>PP-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cenozoic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Cretaceous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Cretaceous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-rift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2052</td>
<td>2125</td>
<td>2060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2052</td>
<td>2125</td>
<td>2060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2052</td>
<td>2125</td>
<td>2060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Summary of average parameters estimated from the restored sections. Totals are listed in the final row. EOB: East Orphan Basin. PB: Porcupine Basin.
5.1.2. Syn-rift

The syn-rift megasequence was deposited on the acoustic basement and consists of the Lower Cretaceous and Jurassic units. In the East Orphan Basin, the syn-rift exhibits an asymmetric structural and crustal geometry with several sub-basins (depocentres) defined by rotated fault blocks. The average thickness ranges from 4100 m to 3800 m along lines EO-1 and EO-2, respectively. This asymmetry may reflect variable rheology of the crust, the existence of pre-existing structures within the basin, and/or overprinted intermittent oblique rifting periods. The Porcupine Basin, in contrast, shows a more symmetric geometry with a thicker syn-rift megasequence. The average thickness ranges from 4800 m along line PP-1 to 4200 m along line PP-2 (Table 5). This suggests more continuous deposition of sediments as well as fewer interrupted rifting events.

The restored sections for the syn-rift megasequence reveal at least two main depocentres in the East Orphan Basin. The main depocentre coincides with an area on the eastern flank of the basin with β values higher than 3.5 (hyperextension?) defined by Welford et al. (2012). Whereas on the western flank, several sub-basins (depocentres) are defined by tilted fault blocks.

In the Porcupine Basin, one well-defined depocentre in the central part of the basin is identified along the lines PP-1 and PP-2. This depocentre also coincides with the zone of highest β values (> 3.5) defined by Welford et al. (2012).
Sills, interpreted in this work and in other contributions (Naylor et al., 2002), intrude the Lower Cretaceous unit (Fig. 9). They may be fed by the Porcupine Median Volcanic Ridge and the Porcupine Volcanic Ridge System located just underneath.

The overall structural geometries are also different in each basin. While in the East Orphan Basin, basement-related faults, rotated basement blocks, and syn-depositional tectonic structures are distributed throughout the basin, in the Porcupine Basin, the basement-related...
faults are more common on the basin flanks, rotated basement blocks are mostly associated with the structural basement high at the southern limit of the basin, and the syn-depositional tectonic structures are less pronounced. For the Jurassic unit, the crustal extension estimated from the restoration varies from 23.8 km (EO-1) in the East Orphan Basin to 9.3 km (PP-1) in the Porcupine Basin (Table 5). This indicates that most of the important extension occurred during the Jurassic, significantly affecting the East Orphan Basin. Furthermore, the estimated horizontal extension is approximately 10.6 km (line EO-1) in the East Orphan Basin and 6.5 km (line PP-1) in the Porcupine Basin. This suggests that the extension associated with the Lower Cretaceous was higher in the East Orphan Basin than in the Porcupine Basin. Based on the thickness variability of each sedimentary unit, the structural style, and the amount of extension, the possible connectivity between the East Orphan and the Porcupine basins during rifting is not evident.

5.1.3. Post-rift

The post-rift megasequence is represented by the Cenozoic and Upper Cretaceous units. The base of this megasequence (~100.5 Ma) marks the beginning of the break up between Europe and North America (Seton et al., 2012). During the deposition of this megasequence, the basins evolved from active rifts until the end of the Early Cretaceous, to a passive setting when rifting ceased in the Late Cretaceous and Cenozoic. Thick sedimentary packages were deposited during this period. In the East Orphan Basin, the average thickness of this megasequence is between 1300 m along line EO-1 and 2700 m along line EO-2. Whereas in the Porcupine Basin, the average thickness is between 1500 m and 1800 m along lines PP-2 and PP-1 (Table 5). The structural architecture of the basins is similar. The East Orphan and the Porcupine basins exhibit a symmetric geometry, with thicker post-rift in the East Orphan Basin. This difference in thickness may suggest two scenarios: (1) more sedimentary sources available to fill the basin, or (2) similar amounts of sediment availability but a narrower accommodation space to be filled in the East Orphan Basin. The second scenario seems to be more reasonable since the Porcupine Basin has a wider area (~70,000 km²) than the East Orphan Basin (~33,000 km²).

5.2. Inversion structures

Inversion structures are identified along the East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins. Despite their relatively small scale (20–30 km wide), they should be considered to better understand the formation and evolution of these three basins. In the East Orphan Basin, the inversion structures are localised in the central and northwestern parts of the basin. These inversion structures (up to 30 km wide) are observed in Early Cretaceous rocks. Early Cretaceous inversion has been identified in other places within the East Orphan Basin (Thompson, 2003), indicating a high variability of extension and deformation that is characteristic of oblique extensional regimes. For the Porcupine Basin, an apparent inversion structure (~20 km wide) embedded in Cenozoic (Late Cretaceous-Paleogene?) rocks is identified at the southern limit of the basin. Previous studies have interpreted this feature (Masson and Parson, 1983; Naylor et al., 2002) assigning a late Eocene age (Masson and Parson, 1983). In the Galicia Interior Basin, an inversion structure (~17 km wide) within Cenozoic rocks (Paleocene?) is identified at the western end of the basin. Inversion structures of Cenozoic age have been previously interpreted at the north-eastern end of the Galicia Interior Basin. However, they are associated with formation of underlying seamounts (Murillas et al., 1990).

The apparent timing difference in the formation of the inversion structures along the East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins could be explained by two scenarios: (1) for the East Orphan and Porcupine basins, different formation mechanisms (direction and timing of extension) led to the development of these basins, and (2) the
basins were formed in a regional oblique extensional regime with varied extension directions along each margin.

5.3. Crustal architecture

The interpreted crustal characteristics for the East Orphan, Porcupine and Galicia Interior basins seem to have some common characteristics. The rift domains seem to be controlled by the presence of pre-existing structures (Fig. 3). The limits of these potential pre-existing structures (e.g., a change from Variscan to Caledonian basement between the Porcupine and Rockall basins) are considered zones of localised rifting within the broader diffuse rifting zone (Bulolo et al., 2018), producing zones of hyperextension as seen in the East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins (Fig. 16).

The axial depocenters for the syn-rift units partially coincide with the overall depocenters of the basins. This suggests that while regional diffuse rifting was taking place, localised rifting was occurring due to local variations in crustal composition (rheology). This polyphase rifting scenario explains the apparently continuous and more intense stretching (hyperextension) in the areas affected by multiple diffuse rifting episodes.

Due to similar basin geometries and basement ages (Devonian-Carboniferous), we infer that the Porcupine and Galicia Interior basins were formed through a similar extension mechanism with a diffuse rift propagating from the Galicia Interior Basin into the Porcupine Basin. Their crustal structures also show similar axial and partially symmetrical hyperextended zones with the only difference being the igneous centres present in the Porcupine Basin (e.g., PMVR). The igneous centres in the Porcupine Basin are thought to have formed during the Early Cretaceous with a later intrusive phase during the Cenozoic (Naylor et al., 2002).

5.4. Conjugate or contemporaneous basins?

The evolution of the Atlantic margins of Newfoundland and Ireland has been the subject of numerous investigations (Burk and Drake, 1974; Doré et al., 1999; Kristoffersen, 1978; Lundin, 2002; Skogseid, 2010; Srivastava et al., 1990, 1998; Srivastava and Verhoef, 1992; Welford et al., 2012, 2010; Ziegler, 1988, 1982). Some paleoreconstructions of the North Atlantic Ocean show the East Orphan and Porcupine basins forming a continuous basin despite fundamental differences in their evolution, structural style, sedimentary thickness, and amount of volcanic intrusions (e.g., Knott et al., 1993; Skogseid, 2010).

Having restored the interpreted geological cross-sections of the East Orphan and Porcupine basins (Figs. 12 and 13), the overall results for both basins are summarised in Table 5. Thermal subsidence amounts are similar for both basins, with the exception of the β factors that vary within each basin.

Sedimentary thicknesses are different, with thicker sedimentary cover in the Porcupine Basin during the Cenozoic, and similar thicknesses in both basins during the Upper Cretaceous. The most significant thickness difference is observed for the Lower Cretaceous unit, which is ~1400 m thicker in the Porcupine Basin than in the East Orphan Basin. For the Jurassic unit, the opposite is observed, as the East Orphan Basin exhibits a thicker sedimentary layer than the Porcupine Basin.

Due to the differences in thickness, the Porcupine Basin, compared with the East Orphan Basin, can be defined as a nourished basin. In terms of crustal thickness, the average thickness is higher in the Porcupine Basin, but both basins contain areas with highly thinned crust of less than 6 km (O’Reilly et al., 2006; Welford et al., 2012).

The amounts of brittle extension are also different in both basins, with more extension (~34.5 km) observed in the East Orphan Basin (along the line EO-1) than in the Porcupine Basin (15.8 km along the line PP-1). The amounts of extension predicted by the Nirrengarten et al. (2018) kinematic evolution model (Table 6) are significantly higher. These amounts were estimated in GPlates by defining points at the end of each line, anchoring these points to their respective plate ID, and measuring the distance between the points as the model changes through time. Observed differences between the Orphan and Porcupine basins may be a consequence of several factors: (1) variable composition/rheology of the crust beneath both basins, (2) variable thinning factor of the lithosphere (β > 2) with seismically undetectable (polyphased faulting) listric subhorizontal faulting and depth-dependent stretching occurring in varying degrees across either basin, and (3) highly oblique extension that could have contributed to the formation of both basins (e.g., rotation of the Flemish Cap and Porcupine High out of the Orphan and Porcupine basins, respectively). The latter scenario would generate 3D stress and strain fields that would vary depending on the direction of measurement, resulting in significant obliquity, as already predicted for the margins (Brune et al., 2018). Thus, the extension estimated in this study would need to be used as a vector component to estimate the correct amount of extension in a required direction.

Based on the characteristics summarised above, the potential linkage between the East Orphan and the Porcupine basins seems implausible. Therefore, the East Orphan and Porcupine basins should be considered as contemporaneous basins located on conjugate margins rather than conjugate basins.

5.5. Galicia Interior basin: a continuation of the Porcupine Basin?

The kinematic evolution models of Nirrengarten et al. (2018) and Matthews et al. (2016) place the Porcupine Basin relatively aligned and continuous with the Galicia Interior Basin (Fig. 18). Due to this potential connectivity, the seismic line GI-1, located along the Galicia Interior Basin (Fig. 1), was compared with line PP-1 from the Porcupine Basin. The age of each sedimentary unit within the Galicia Interior Basin is based on the information published by Murillas et al. (1990) and Pérez-Gussinyé et al. (2003), and the interpretation followed the same methodology applied to the Orphan and Porcupine seismic lines (Fig. 15).

Line GI-1 across the Galicia Interior Basin has previously been interpreted by Pérez-Gussinyé et al. (2003). Despite differences in basin width, the Porcupine and Galicia Interior basins show similar basinal and crustal structures, with relatively symmetric geometries and well-defined depocentres located in the central parts of the basins. The average crustal thickness along line GI-1 is 13.3 km with a highly thinned crust (~4 km) in the central part of the basin and thicker crust (15–20 km) at the edges of the basin (Pérez-Gussinyé et al., 2003).

Along line GI-1, the sedimentary thickness is noticeably different, with thinner sedimentary layers for the Cenozoic and Lower Cretaceous units but thicker layers for the Lower Cretaceous and Jurassic units. The variation in sedimentary thickness could be associated with the different basin widths, with more accommodation space available in the Porcupine Basin, and/or different sediment sources.

Based on the kinematic evolution models of Nirrengarten et al.
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(2018), Peace et al. (2019b), and Matthews et al. (2016), the Galicia Interior Basin and the Porcupine Basin formed a continuous basin during the Jurassic period (Fig. 18). However, the only apparent similarity between the basins is their general structure. A rift propagation (Bulois et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2018) from the Galicia Interior Basin into the Porcupine Basin during the Jurassic would explain the structural similarities. Later, during the Early Cretaceous, the opening of the Bay of Biscay (Gong et al., 2008) interrupted the propagation of the rift, separating the Galicia Interior and Porcupine basins.

If the Galicia Interior Basin and the Porcupine Basin formed a continuous elongated basin during the Jurassic (Fig. 18), the direction and amount of extension, timing of rifting, micro-plates involved and their internal deformation, must all be taken into account in kinematic evolution models that incorporate deformation (e.g., Peace et al., 2019b). Such deformable models are required to reproduce and understand the relationship between the basins as well as the Bay of Biscay triple junction around which they all evolved simultaneously (Peace et al., 2019b; Sibuet and Collette, 1991).

5.6. Petroleum system implications

The potential connectivity of these basins has important implications for hydrocarbon exploration. Although the aim of this work was not to carry out a full petroleum system evolution analysis, implications in terms of source rock presence and thermal maturity can be extracted from the results of this study. Traditional basin evolution models are based on uniform beta factors and present-day topography of the basement. For the case of hyperextended basins, the authors suggest (1) incorporating variable beta factors (e.g., Welford et al., 2012) and (2) using estimates of paleotopography. These suggestions as applied to basin modelling will help to produce better estimates for heat flow, therefore reducing the uncertainty of the thermal history of sediments (Watremez et al., 2016), to better predict shale- and sand-prone zones, and to define potential hydrocarbon traps.

6. Conclusions

Interpretation of PSTM seismic reflection profiles along the East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins, and structural restoration of select lines, were integrated with crustal-scale geophysical datasets and kinematic evolution models to carry out an integrated comparison of the East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins. The key findings of this work include the following:

(1) The East Orphan Basin exhibits a complex distribution of sediments with several depocentres or sub-basins. By comparison, the Porcupine and Galicia Interior basins form more symmetric basins with only one, centrally located depocentre.

(2) Localised inversion structures were identified along the East Orphan (Early Cretaceous?), Porcupine (Late Cretaceous-Paleocene?), and Galicia Interior (Paleocene?) basins, potentially indicating localised zones of compression in a regional oblique extensional regime.

(3) Based on the similar estimated ages of the interpreted seismic stratigraphic units and the crustal architecture of each of the basins, the rifting events that affected the East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins are interpreted to be synchronous and similar.

(4) The variations in the crustal characteristics, the sedimentary cover thicknesses, and plate kinematic models suggest that highly oblique intermittent diffuse rifting events affected the East Orphan Basin whereas the Porcupine Basin could potentially have been affected by fewer interrupted, more localised rifting events.

(5) The different amount of extension, the distribution of rifting...
domains, and the broad crustal architecture of the East Orphan, Porcupine, and Galicia Interior basins, along with the evolution models of Nirrengarten et al. (2018) and Matthews et al. (2016) indicate that the connection between the East Orphan and the Porcupine basins is unlikely, but rather ancient connections between the Porcupine and Galicia Interior basins, and the East Orphan and Rockall basins during the Early to Late Jurassic, are proposed.

Building a kinematic evolution model that takes into account internal deformation of the crustal domains defined in this study as well as pre-existing structures associated with ancient orogenic events would provide a better estimate and understanding of the amount of extension and current structures present along and surrounding not only the Newfoundland, Irish, and Iberian conjugate margins but also any kinematic evolution studies around triple junctions.
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