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Abstract

In this review, we have digitized and georeferenced over 7000 Low-Temperature Thermochronology (LTT) data points and 750 Time-Temperature Modelling (TTM) results from 252 published works. The study area includes the continental crusts adjacent to the rifted margins (~Late Triassic to Early Jurassic) of the Central Atlantic Ocean and its direct neighbours.

Our main intention is to map out the thermal cooling events as recorded by LTT data and as illustrated by TTM results. The time interval targeted in this review is the Phanerozoic (i.e., 540 to 0Ma), which is possible thanks to LTT ages spanning this entire period in the study area. It allows us to investigate the thermal evolution of the continental rims of the Central Atlantic Ocean at an unprecedented scale. In rifted margins and their shoulders, a debate exists whether the LTT-recorded cooling is the results of post-rift erosional exhumation or post-heating thermal relaxation, especially for the area directly in the vicinity of the paleo-rift zone. We therefore devised a short workflow to examine these propositions by filtering out the LTT dataset and spatially plotting the LTT ages. Furthermore, we investigate the relationship between LTT ages and distance from the Continent-Ocean Boundary/Transition Zone.

LTT ages alone have often been described as bearing little geological meaning, thus requiring to run TTM in order to reconstruct the thermal/geological history, as several factors are to be taken into account in the thermal history reconstruction. Here, we examine whether a statistically significant LTT dataset can serve as a proxy in the reconstruction of cooling events. To this end, we compare peaks of LTT cooling ages and of TTM cooling event.

Our investigation reveals that i) generalised cooling occurred in the pre-, syn-, and post-rift phases of the Central Atlantic, ii) there is a clear LTT age oceanward younkening trend, iii) the lack of LTT age with a syn-rift signal within ~500km along the shorelines suggests erosional exhumation (i.e., vertical movements) as main driver of the cooling, and iv) large LTT datasets bear meaning on the cooling events and thus on vertical movements, at least in this case studies in the rims of the Central Atlantic Ocean.
1. Cooling and km-scale exhumation in passive margin shoulders

In the unstretched continental crusts adjacent to rifted passive margins (e.g., margins of the Atlantic, Indian, Southern, and Arctic Oceans), a wealth of Low-Temperature Thermochronology (LTT), sometimes associated with time-temperature modelling (TTM), have demonstrated the occurrence of substantial cooling in their pre-, syn- and early post-rift history, often accounted for in terms of km-scale vertical movements (i.e., exhumation and/or burial; e.g., Turner et al., 2008; Japsen et al., 2009; Japsen et al., 2012; Green and Machado, 2017; Leprêtre et al., 2017; Charton et al., 2021). LTT dating on apatite and zircon crystals potentially allows for the investigation of the cooling history of the upper part of the crust (e.g., Murray et al., 2018), which is the uppermost ~10km of the crust in regions characterised by a ‘normal’ geothermal gradient (Fig. 1a; when considering apatite & zircon thermochronological systems). This characteristic helps geoscientists to unravel some complex geological histories from the Precambrian to the Present-Day. This tool, routinely used for more than two decades now, evidenced that the timing of the “vertical” movements in the can be unexpected or at odds with regional geodynamic events (e.g., Barbarand et al., 2001; Withjack and Schlische, 2005; Ghorbal et al., 2008).

In the case of the passive margins, the precise temporal relationship(s) between exhumation/cooling events as evidenced via LTT and TTM studies and the syn-/post-rift phases is key for determining and constraining the responsible mechanism(s). This is important for their associated thermal signature and erosional pattern(s) at the millions of years temporal scale, otherwise only accessible through numerical modelling, and that in both the thinned rifted crust and the “stable” adjacent continental crusts (Fig. 1b and c). To date, these vertical movements remain largely debated and/or enigmatic in passive margin shoulders, as exemplified with the ‘anomalous’ and ‘unexpected’ km-scale vertical movements in Mauritania (Gouiza et al., 2019). Many hypotheses have already been submitted that account for large-scale (e.g., dynamic topography, far-field stresses with crustal to lithospheric wavelength, climate variations, and eustasy) and regional/local-scale (e.g., orogeny, fault movements, fluvial/marine incisions, localised thermal doming, uplifted-shoulder, etc...) processes (e.g., Green et al., 2018; Amidon et al., 2016; Oukassou et al., 2013; Bertotti and Gouiza, 2012). Regarding these processes, we thus lack consensus about both the triggering mechanism(s) for and consequently what are the conditions maintaining or shutting of these “anomalous” vertical movements. For instance, in the rifted margins and their continental shoulders, a debate exists whether the LTT-recorded post-rift cooling is the results of post-rift erosional exhumation or post-rift
thermal relaxation of the syn-rift heating signature (e.g., Green et al., 2018; Barbero et al., 2007, respectively).

A note on the terminology is necessary at this point. Exhumation is the removal of the rock column above any chosen buried surface (Ring et al., 1999). Denudation is the regional erosional process leading to the removal of rocks at the surface of the Earth. The investigation of exhumation includes tracking that surface (and its rocks) through their material path, typically until their present-day position at the surface of the Earth. It is therefore a relative vertical movement, as it only constraint the removal of overburden, and not an uplift of Earth’s surface for instance, and is recorded by LTT measurements as cooling. Erosional exhumation cannot directly be translated into rock nor surface uplift (e.g., Malùsa and Fitzgerald, 2019), without prior knowledge of one or the other (England and Molnar, 1990; equation 1).

\[
\text{Surface uplift} = \text{uplift of rock} - \text{[erosional] exhumation}
\]

**Equation 1** | Uplift and exhumation relationship, modified after (England and Molnar, 1990).

It is commonly accepted that uplift will lead to erosional exhumation because of the generated topography. Nevertheless, there are cases where erosional exhumation will occur without uplift such as marine regression exposing new surfaces to erosion, or in the case of the footwall of a normal fault (tectonic exhumation for rocks under the exposed fault plane and erosional exhumation away from the fault plane because of the created topography). In LTT studies, authors combine geological and radiometric evidences - which are considered as ‘constraints’ - to interpret the cooling events recorded by the LTT data as linked to thermal relaxation, erosional exhumation, or tectonic exhumation (Malùsa and Fitzgerald, 2019).

Because these not-fully-understood relative vertical movements occurred 1) in the vicinity of the future rift valley (pre-rift), 2) adjacent to the rift zone (syn-rift), and 3) in the passive margin (post-rift), many authors have speculated and sometimes tested the relationship between the exhumation events and the rifting/drifting tectonics (e.g., Leroy et al., 2008; Amidon et al., 2016; Leprêtre et al., 2017; Charton et al., 2018; Gouïza et al., 2019; Malùsa and Fitzgerald, 2019). For instance, using AFT datasets collected near margins elsewhere than around the Central Atlantic, Gallagher and Brown (1997, 1999) observed, 1) a differential erosion rates from the coastal plain to the hinterland, 2) a break-up signature is superimposed/removed because of long-lasting erosion, 3) variability between the erosion and morphology across studied margins, and 4) pre-/syn-rift regional structural features reactivated in the post-rift phase, linked to large scale processes. They concluded that there are no
simple models applicable to use directly these data in order to solve the problem of the erosional evolution of the margin from coastal plain to hinterland.

In the Central Atlantic Ocean (CAO) rims (Figs. 1C and 2), as is documented locally in LTT/TTM studies reviewed in this contribution and sometimes synthetized for large regions (e.g., Ye et al., 2017; Charton et al., 2021), there is no consensus on the evolution of the unstretched continental crusts adjacent to rifted margins that are characterised by minor to substantial differences from their recorded pre- to/and post-rift cooling history. Many LTT/TTM studies conducted around the CAO evidenced syn- to post-rift cooling. Two studies proposed to explain the syn-rift cooling in terms of erosional exhumation linked to rift shoulder uplift (Ruiz et al., 2011 on the African side; Tremblay et al., 2013 on the American side). For early post-rift LTT cooling ages, some authors have argued that the rift thermal signature outreached its rift zone (e.g., Barbero et al., 2007; Gouiza et al., 2017a). This out-of-bounds thermal perturbation would have affected the geothermal gradient of the continental crust, resulting in a reset of the LTT ages followed by a post-rift thermal relaxation (Malúsa and Fitzgerald, 2019). Some other authors have proposed large-scale mechanisms, with intervening far-field/intra-plate stresses (e.g., Gouiza et al., 2017a), enhanced erosion by base level change/climatic/landmass position change (e.g., Amidon et al., 2016, Shorten and Fitzgerald, 2019), and/or dynamic topography (e.g., Taylor and Fitzgerald, 2011; Leprêtre et al., 2017), either superimposed to rifting thermal perturbation or simply as the sole responsible process for recorded early post-rift cooling event.

This review focuses on the rims of the CAO (Fig. 2) for several fundamental and practical reasons: a) it is the ocean with the oldest oceanic crust that has not been subducted, meaning unravelling the exhumation history for this ocean passive margins can prove an example for more recent settings and predict their future evolution; b) the mechanism(s) behind the exhumation/burial events, their timing, amplitude and wavelength, as well as their precise expression at the surface (landscape evolution, source-to-sink system) have not been well-constrained there regionally, let alone at the scale of each bordering country and c) there are over 3000 LTT data points on each side of the CAO, and in both sides, they are interestingly distributed up to 2000 km from the coasts, amounting to a dataset of over 6000 LTT and over 700 TTM data points, compiled for this study. Note that both datasets compiled for this work (LTT and TTM) thus relate to cooling and not depth.

For this review, we have compiled a LTT dataset, encompassing zircon and apatite helium and fission-tracks dating methods (i.e., ZHe, AHe, ZFT, and ZHe, respectively) for the rims of the CAO. Examples of similar database constructions have been published for Canada (AFT; Kohn et al., 2005; Pinet et
This review treats first with the construction of this database and the way data are digitized when available, presented, and filtered. Second, with this wealth of data at hand, this review aims at 1) establishing the large-scale distribution of LTT ages in the continents that were joined prior to the Central Atlantic rifting (in early Triassic times), and were affected by the Triassic rift system, 2) evidencing potential relationships between LTT ages and the distance from the rift zone or the absence thereof, 3) answering whether LTT data alone (i.e., without TTM), when compiled in large datasets, can be used safely as a readable tool (qualitatively and/or quantitatively) for such long-lasting vertical motions around one main geodynamic event that is the CAO opening, and 4) illustrating the cooling events along the rims of the Central Atlantic Ocean through time starting in the pre-rift phase, for both LTT and TTM, in order to study their consistencies with geodynamic events at first order and then with higher precision for selected times and places.
Figure 1 | Highly simplified cross-sections illustrating the development of an ocean (after Gouiza, 2011) for the a) pre-, b) syn-, and c) early post-rift phases. Expected thermal events and vertical movements after Leeder (2006; subsidence), Watts (2012; thermal subsidence), Leroy et al. (2008; thermal uplift), Olsen (1995; flank uplift), and Teixell et al., (2009; tectonic uplift/subsidence). MOR = Mid-Oceanic Ridge; COB/COTZ = Continent-Ocean Boundary/Transition Zone.
Figure 2 | Bathymetric map of the Central Atlantic Ocean, its conjugate margins, and adjacent oceanic and continental domains (geological Atlantic Ocean limits after Biari et al., 2021; elevation data GEBCO_2014_1D). FZ = Fault zone; NEAO = North East Atlantic Ocean; SAO = South Atlantic Ocean. Insert: Sketch of the Plate reconstruction at c. 200Ma (after Müller et al., 2016). The Continent Ocean Boundary illustrate the location of the continent-ocean transition zone. E-NAM = Eastern North America; N-SAM = North South America; IB = Iberia; NWA = North West Africa.
2. Central Atlantic geological history

This section draws the main lines of the evolution of the Central Atlantic Ocean (CAO) domain, from the Palaeozoic to the Cenozoic. Strictly speaking, in the present-day configuration (Fig. 2), the CAO represents the oceanic domain located between the Gibraltar-Azores-New Foundland (Gloria) fault zone in the north and the Guinea/Fifteen-Twenty fault zone in the south (e.g., Biari et al., 2021). These fault zones separate the CAO from the North and Equatorial Atlantic branches, respectively.

On both passive margins of the CAO, remnants of various Palaeozoic orogenies are outcropping and complementary. They follow structural directions that are generally close to the main orientation of the oceanic ridge. Then, the Mesozoic witnessed the rifting and opening of the CAO, where the oldest oceanic rocks of a present-day existing ocean are recorded on earth.

2.1. Pre-rift: Variscan and older orogens

The building of the now stacked Palaeozoic orogenic system (Fig. 3) on both sides of the CAO is the consequence of two phenomena: the dismantling and subsequent squeezing of the extended Laurentian margin and the drifting away of Gondwana-related terranes that successively accreted to the Peri-Laurentian margin (van Staal et al., 2009; Hatcher et al., 2010). The interlocking of the different terranes along the US and Canadian passive margin thus reflects this succession of events.

From west to east, the different terranes are the Peri-Laurentian terranes (Humber and related margins) on one hand, and the Ganderia, Avalonia/Carolinia and Meguma terranes on the other hand, that derived from Gondwana. Each one is characterized by sedimentary, metamorphic, and magmatic events that gave them their own characteristics and enable the reconstruction of a chronology of the orogenies (van Staal et al., 2009; Hatcher et al., 2010; Michard et al., 2010; van Staal and Barr, 2012).

A succession of different orogenies thus happened, from the Ordovician to the Carboniferous, witnessing the growth of the Laurentian margin, at the expense of successive oceanic domains (e.g., Hibbard et al., 2010).

The westernmost collage along the Laurentia margin occurred during the Early to Middle Ordovician, with the closure of a narrow oceanic space between Laurentia and the ribbon-like microcontinent of Dashwoods, namely the Taconic seaway, thus developing the Taconic orogeny. After this first accretion event, the Gondwana-related terranes will collide against the Laurentia margin up to the Devono-Carboniferous and the final formation of the Pangaea. The two terranes of Ganderia and Avalonia were respectively accreted during the Early Silurian and Late Silurian-Early Devonian while consuming the Iapetus oceanic domain. The Meguma terrane was later incorporated within the
system, bounded by the Laurentia composite margin and the Variscan-Alleghenian system
developing at the time between Middle Devonian to Mississippian (i.e., to Early Carboniferous;
Hibbard et al., 2010; van Staal and Barr, 2012). The final closure of the Rheic ocean between Laurentia
and NW Gondwana (future Senegal-Mauritania-Morocco area) occurred later, probably during
Pennsylvanian times, according to the ages of the earliest contractional events recorded in Morocco
(e.g., Chopin et al., 2014; Wernert et al., 2016; Delchini et al., 2018; Martínez-Catalán et al., 2021).
Within the latest stages of the Alleghenian-Variscan orogeny, intense magmatic activity is recorded
within NW Africa and Western Europe (e.g., in Morocco: Mrini et al., 1992; Gasquet et al., 1996; El
Hadi et al., 2006; Chopin et al., minor revisions; e.g., in W. Europe: Gutierrez-Alonso et al., 2011;
Vanderhaeghe et al., 2020). There, the latest Permian orogenic pulses occurrences are dated at
c.265Ma in the Meseta domain (Leprêtre et al. 2022; Chopin et al., minor revisions), whereas slightly
more recent magmatism has been recognized in the Anti-Atlas domain at c.260 Ma (Najih et al.,
2019), attributed to indicative signs of Pangaea dislocation.
On the American side, a temporally widespread plutonic activity is recorded, spanning a similar time
range from post-330Ma up to the Permian (Sinha and Zietz, 1982; Hatcher, 1989). In any cases, these
magmatic activities ended well before the beginning of the Triassic rifting and long before the Central
Atlantic Magmatic Province (CAMP) emplacement around the Triassic to Jurassic transition (Fig. 4).
At present day, the Rheic suture position between N America and NW Africa is not known. Several
recent geochronological studies pointed out that the CAO opened in between different Gondwana-
derived terranes (Kuiper et al., 2017; 2021) and that the Variscan-Alleghenian suture lies westwards
of the Mazagan escarpment. So far, no Rheic suture could be find within the Late Palaeozoic belts
(Michard et al., 2010; Bea et al., 2020; Kuiper et al., 2021). Thus, the CAO probably opened while
reworking the Alleghenian suture. This structural inheritance is likely not directly associated to
thermal inheritance. As we wrote above, important plutonic activity on both future Atlantic sides
occurred until Mid-Late Permian (270-255 Ma) and no more important magmatic event occurred
before the volcanic CAMP event.
Figure 3 | Distribution of terranes around the Central Atlantic Ocean in the pre-rift phase after Martinez-Catalan et al. (2002), Simancas et al. (2005), Caby and Kienast (2009), Hibbard et al. (2010), Kuiper et al. (2017), and van Staal et al. (2020).
2.2. Syn-rift: Triassic to Early Jurassic

In short, the Mesozoic began first with a widespread and diffuse rifting event during the Triassic. This rifting event is topped by a short-lived mega-regional magmatic event before the occurrence of Pangaea break-up during the Early Jurassic.

2.2.1. Triassic rifting and CAMP

The overall Triassic rift system has been reviewed by Leleu et al. (2016) specifically for the Central Atlantic system. The Triassic rifting events, that allowed the development of continental fluvial to lacustrine paleo-environments, occurred through a protracted 35 Myr period, between the Ladinian to the Rhaetian. The final sedimentary sequences are showing significant salt deposition within restricted paleo-environments that will have important halokinetic activity later on (e.g., Tari and Jabour, 2013; Pichel et al., 2019; Uranga et al., 2022). The salt basins are widely developed in the northern CAO, offshore Nova Scotia and Morocco (Fig. 4). These rift basins extended from Florida (USA) to Newfoundland (Canada) with the segment between Nova Scotia (Canada) and north Morocco developing first as soon as the Anisian (Middle Triassic), whereas other branches developed from the Ladinian (Middle Triassic) onwards. They developed laterally to up to few hundred km-wide rifts across both North America and West Africa (e.g., in N. America: Schlische, 1993; Withjack et al., 1998; 2020; e.g., in NW. Africa: Hafid, 2000; Le Roy and Piquè, 2001; Escosa et al., 2021). The significant width of this rift system was only locally controlled by bounding faults, reactivating former structures, but is probably more the expression of a mega-regional subsidence that stems from lower crustal-flow within a high heat-flow regime at the time. This kind of wide rift architecture detailed by Leleu et al. (2016) is in agreement with models involving a weak crust, preventing the location of the deformation in narrow rifts (e.g., Huismans and Beaumont, 2014).

Around the CAO - across South America, Africa, North America and Western Europe - Triassic and older rocks are either cross-cut or capped by basalt flow, dykes or sills of the Central Atlantic Magmatic Province (CAMP; Fig. 4), which belongs to the LIPs (Large Igneous Provinces). This short-lived magmatic event occurred within a restricted time-window around 200 Ma (Marzoli et al., 1999; Nomade et al., 2007), with a peak activity around 200 ± 1 Ma and a time span that could last c.10 Myr (Marzoli et al., 2017). This magmatism event is showing geochemical characteristics close to the MORB-types, and points out toward an upper depleted mantle source (e.g., Callegaro et al., 2014; Marzoli et al., 2017; Gimeno-Vives et al., 2019), involving a low fusion rate and a subsequent relatively low crustal contamination (< 10%), while asthenosphereric contributions are expected for certain
regions (Merle et al., 2011). The CAMP magmatism occurred in the final stages of the rifting events and is either on top of the salt deposits or being interbedded with them (Tari and Jabour, 2013). Let us add here that, at a first order, the CAMP does not seem to follow a clear pattern along the different rims of the future CAO (Fig. 4). The CAMP appears widely distributed over a geographical area that exceeded the future CAO passive margins domains, which would make it unlikely to be explain assumed differential vertical motions along strike of the passive margins. Yet, Boscaini et al. (2022), who worked on the CAMP sub-province of West Africa, suggested that the cratonic keels could play a role in the localization of the magmatism, mainly along the cratonic borders. Following this observation, it could bear significant implications for the modifications it had on the crust and lithosphere compositions, and thus thermal structure, for the future passive margins of the CAO.

The occurrence of the CAMP at the end of the Central Atlantic Triassic rifting must be underlined here. Indeed, following Frizon de Lamotte et al. (2015) line of thoughts, the temporal relationship between the CAMP and the Triassic rifting could be suggestive of a passive rifting where the magmatism was initiated thanks to the long-protracted extension, in turns leading to a lithospheric thinning. The resulting CAMP-related regional doming, in places, could thus explain the erosional unconformity that developed in many Triassic basins (e.g., Withjack et al., 1998; Leleu et al., 2016).
2.2.2. Early Jurassic and the breakup of Pangaea

The uppermost rift-related deposits, together with the CAMP magmatic rocks, are overlain by an important unconformity that is recorded on both sides of the CAO, often put in relation with the CAO opening in regional studies (e.g., Frizon de Lamotte et al., 2008; Tari and Jabour, 2013; Withjack et al., 2020). While this surface has been recognised and studied, the precise timing of the onset for the CAO opening remains, to date, an open question.

The CAO opening age estimations range between 195 and 170 Ma (see review in Labails et al., 2010). The precise timing of the break-up is problematic because the age of the oldest magnetic isochron in the CAO is the M25 anomaly, which is dated at 154.5 Ma (Gradstein et al., 2004; Bird et al., 2007 and references therein). Toward the Eastern America passive margin, two additional magnetic lineaments are known for a long time, namely the Black Spur Magnetic Anomaly (BSMA; Fig. 4d) and the East Coast Magnetic Anomaly (ECMA). The age of the BSMA, of oceanic nature, is suggested to be c.170 Ma (Early Bajocian, Middle Jurassic) obtained from a time constraint down the DSDP 534 scientific well (Sheridan, 1974; 1983; Sheridan et al., 1993), whereas the ECMA is not dated. On the West African side, the precise recognition of time-equivalent magnetic anomalies that could be fit with the BSMA and ECMA have been debated for several decades already (reviewed in Labails et al., 2010). The tracking of African time-equivalent of BSMA and ECMA magnetic anomalies is crucial here since they could be used in plate tectonic reconstructions to determine the closure position of the continental masses at the time of break-up.

The changing interpretations of the magnetic anomalies on the African side conditioned the proposed kinematic models since the paper of Klitgord and Schouten (1986). There, the ECMA and West African Coast Magnetic Anomaly (WACMA) were modelled to, after a first low-spreading stage from 175 to 170 Ma, form a proto-Atlantic oceanic crust that is preserved between the ECMA and BSMA, and where a ridge jump occurred around 170 Ma. This view has been also defended by Schettino and Turco (2009) more recently. Criticisms on this model have been given by Sahabi et al. (2004) and Labails et al. (2010) who reinterpreted the geophysical record to propose the existence of a consistent WACMA anomaly and an equivalent to the BSMA on the African side, respectively. The use of these reinterpretations led them to suggest that break-up was much older, occurring at around 190 Ma, with a first stage of low-spreading rate and asymmetrical formation of oceanic crust up to the Early Bajocian (Middle Jurassic). Apart from geophysical arguments, geological observations from the two margins suggest that synrift activity was over by the end of Triassic-Early Jurassic (e.g., Klitgord et al., 1988; Welsink et al., 1989; Withjack et al., 1998; Hafid, 2000; Le Roy and Piqué, 2001;
suggesting that plate-distributed extensional stresses stopped, possibly due to break-up. The absence of good-quality and reliable borehole-calibrated seismic profiles in the deep offshore of the African and American margins at the Ocean-Continent Transition still impedes a precise conclusion on the age of the break-up. In the following, we will keep in mind the wide range of 190 to 175 Ma for break-up, although – for us – the interpretations of Labails et al. (2010), in addition to the geological field and seismic evidence are in favour of the “older” model with a 190-185 Ma break-up age.
2.3. Early Post-rift: Middle Jurassic to Early Cretaceous

The post-rift period is characterized on the offshore passive margin by important sedimentary accumulations whose nature changed in the end of Jurassic/Early Cretaceous in the northern CAO. Good syntheses of the compared offshore records of conjugate margins were realized by Jansa and Wiedmann (1982) or Sheridan and Grow (1988). An update on the African side can be found in Davison (2005) and on the American side in Miall et al. (2008). For the considered stratigraphic record on both passive margins, significant N-S sedimentary differences must be noted (e.g., Jansa and Wiedmann, 1982). For most of the post-break-up Jurassic series, the offshore margins are generally witnessing carbonate build-ups at least up to the end of Middles Jurassic. Some clastic influences can be detected in the northern segment of NE America, with proximal deposits on the margin being clastic and laterally evolving toward the carbonate platform (Jansa and Wiedmann, 1982). After more and more clastic influences during the Late Jurassic, the northern CAO passive margins (north of Blake Plateau and north of Senegal Basin) are showing a significant transition toward a clastic sedimentation on both sides that largely by-passed the former platform edge. It is exemplified by the setting of km-thick Lower Cretaceous deltaic systems on the northernmost parts (Morocco and Nova Scotia) as shown by Heyman (1989) or Wade and McLean (1990). By contrast, the southern CAO passive margins witnessed a generally continuous carbonate sedimentation up to the Aptian (e.g., in W. Africa: Davison, 2005; Brownfield and Charpentier, 2003; e.g., in E. America: Jansa, 1981; Poag, 1991).

In terms of tectonic setting, the CAO post-rift period witnessed some important geodynamic changes. To the north of the Gibraltar-Azores-Newfoundland Fault zone, kinematic studies suggest slow rates of extension since the Early Jurassic between Newfoundland and Iberia, accelerating at the Late Jurassic-Early Cretaceous transition (c.145 Ma; see Nirrengarten et al., 2018 for a review). At the time, the cessation of oceanic accretion in the Maghrebian Tethys between Iberia and north Africa made them move subsequently together eastward. At the same time, the CAO continue to open and the southern North Atlantic Ocean experienced a northward propagation of hyper-extension, mantle exhumation and beginning of oceanic accretion before Albian (Nirrengarten et al., 2018). To the south, toward the future site of the Equatorial Atlantic Ocean, Ye et al. (2017) proposed that rifting-related crustal thinning and normal faulting progressed eastward, from the Valanginian to the Aptian (Lower Cretaceous), before connexion with South Atlantic branch was made. Within this extensional context, several rifted branches opened through Equatorial Africa from the Neocomian to the Albian (Lower Cretaceous; Guiraud and Morin, 1992; Frizon de Lamotte et al., 2015). In western Africa, these
rifft branches often re-used former inherited structural directions, mainly from the Pan African cycle (Guiraud and Morin, 1992). Tectonic activities have been documented to reach as far as the Hoggar Mountains, re-using the West African Craton/Tuareg Shield limit and some Tuareg Shield fault zones.

During the Middle Jurassic-Early Cretaceous post-rift period, the onshore NW Africa and NE America are now known to have experienced post-rift uplifts (e.g., in NW Africa: Ghorbal et al., 2008; Saddiqi et al., 2009; Ruiz et al., 2011; Oukassou et al., 2013; Leprêtre et al., 2015, 2017; Sehrt et al., 2017, 2018; Charton et al., 2018; Gouiza et al., 2017a, b, 2019; e.g., in NE America: Wang et al., 1994; Roden-Tice et al., 2000; Spotila et al., 2004; Reed et al., 2005; McKeon et al., 2013; Shorten and Fitzgerald, 2019; Withjack et al., 2020). Post-rift cooling – generally attributed to erosional exhumation and/or uplift – occurred from the Mid-Late Jurassic to the Neocomian (Cretaceous), with varying rates, more or less at the time of sedimentation changes from a carbonate-dominated to siliciclastic-dominated type in the northern CAO. This is well-exemplified within the interior of the northern West African Craton (WAC)/Tuareg Shield where a general hiatus exists from the Late Palaeozoic up to the Early Cretaceous (Fabre, 2005; Leprêtre et al., 2017; Ye et al., 2017). By contrast, the southern WAC is mainly considered as having behaved as a paleohigh (Ye et al., 2017), characterised by very slow denudation since the onset of CAO rifting, enabling the continuous development of Jurassic-Early Cretaceous carbonate platforms on the African side.

North of the WAC, in Morocco, this uplift/erosional event is also well-recorded with a general sedimentary hiatus between the Middle to Late Jurassic and the Aptian-Turonian (Lower to Upper Cretaceous; Charrière and Haddoumi, 2016) and the establishment of deltaic system feeding both the Atlantic rifted margin but also the NE Maghreb (Delfaud, 1974; Vila, 1980). This N-S duality at the WAC scale is not so well-detailed on the eastern North American side in the onshore record, nor in the presently offshore one. Still, exposure of onshore geology shows unconformable mid-Late Cretaceous rocks, on top of the deformed Palaeozoic deposits overlain by remnants of Triassic rifted basins (Reed et al., 2004). Unfortunately, these rocks are mainly localized in the SE of the United States and does not extend northward where mainly Palaeozoic rocks are accessible as outcrops.

Precise paleo-environmental maps of the near offshore with relationship with the onshore record are crucially lacking along the eastern North America passive margin.
2.4. Post-rift: Late Cretaceous to Present-Day

The major event recorded in the Mid-Late Cretaceous times, while the CAO accretion continued, is the eustatic maximum of the Cenomanian-Turonian (early Late Cretaceous) that is well-expressed in NW Africa all along the margin (Jansa and Wiedmann, 1982; Davison, 2005) but also along East America (e.g., Jansa and Wiedmann, 1982; Poag and Valentine, 1988). In NW Africa, particularly north of the WAC and W Maghreb, the Cenomanian-Turonian transgression penetrated very far within the continent interior (Vila, 1980; Frizon de Lamotte et al., 2008; Leprêtre et al., 2015; Ye et al., 2017; Abioui et al., 2019). By contrast, in NE America, the transgression from CAO did not extend west to northwestward within the continent interior (e.g., Ford and Golonka, 2002), and was more expressed toward the south, in the future Gulf of Mexico (Snedden et al., 2016). In a general way, the sedimentation remained relatively shaly for the Late Cretaceous, with for instance some exceptional source rocks along the NW Africa margin (Davison, 2005). In Ye et al. (2017) maps, a net difference is visible and persisted between the north and the south African margins, with a more continental-dominated sedimentation in northern Mauritania throughout the Late Cretaceous. In NE America, by contrast, marine carbonate sedimentation expanded southwards, down to Florida, whereas along the northern segments, sedimentation remained generally siliciclastic (Poag & Valentine, 1988; Gradstein et al., 1994).

In general, the Late Cretaceous deposits on both passive margins were related to the high-stand sea-level during this period with different transgressive pulses (Miller et al., 2005). On the American side, an important unconformity is often recognised between the Paleogene and Cretaceous deposits and numerous hiatuses are present within the Cenozoic stratigraphy, generally related to the sea-level variations (Poag and Valentine, 1988). Along the NE America margin, a Miocene-onwards rejuvenation of the Appalachian Mountains is attested by geomorphology, low-temperature thermochronology, and the mass balance between offshore/onshore domains (Poag and Sevon, 1989; Pazzaglia & Brandon, 1996; Gallen et al., 2013; Miller et al., 2013; McKeon et al., 2013; Amidon et al., 2016; Shorten and Fitzgerald, 2019). The origin of this rejuvenation that fed the margin is still debated.

On the NW African side, in the offshore domain of northern Morocco, Hafid et al. (2006) showed truncated portions of the inverted Mesozoic structures through erosion from the Late Cretaceous to the Neogene, in relationship with the Atlas Orogeny. Offshore southern Morocco, an erosional episode cut through the Paleogene down to the Early Cretaceous (Wiedmann et al., 1982; Hafid et al., 2008) that might be assigned to far-field stress effects of the Atlas orogeny (Leprêtre et al., 2015).
Around Senegal and Guinea, a general unconformity is recorded at the Late Cretaceous/Paleogene transition mostly during the Maastrichtian, for its low-stand sea-level (Davison, 2005; Miller et al., 2005). Later on, the Oligocene-Miocene is generally observed resting unconformably on top of the older series, also because of low-stand sea-level, whereas transgressive trends during Palaeocene and Eocene times stimulated the deposition of sediments along the eastern CAO margin (Davison, 2005).
2.5. Alongshore crustal structure of the passive margin segments

The along strike evolution of the margin structure (Fig. 4) is relevant in the frame of this review. For instance, changes in the amount of stretching during rifting, the volcanic or non-volcanic character, presence of mantle bodies or volcanic accumulations in the crust/lithosphere could have had importance in the subsequent mechanical behaviour of the rifted and continental margins. As such, we considered it as one of the prime parameters to discuss.

Results of wide-angle seismic data along the northern CAO passive margins have been presented in Biari et al. (2021), and geophysical surveys are relatively well-distributed along the two conjugate passive margins of the CAO, with the exception of the southern eastern margin, from Mauritania to Senegal, where we lack such results. A cartographic summary is given in figure 4, picturing the main differences between both conjugate margins. The most striking difference is the largely volcanic character of the eastern North America passive margin (Fig. 2) showing many Seaward Dipping Reflectors (SDRs) down to the Florida offshore Bahamas Bank (Funck et al., 2004; Louden et al., 2010, 2013). Northward, the SDRs are disappearing along the Nova Scotia segment (Louden et al., 2013; Lau et al., 2018) where the ocean-continent transition zone would show serpentinized mantle on the American side, but not on the Moroccan one (Biari et al., 2015). Although we lack deep seismic imaging on the Mauritanian-Senegal segment of NW Africa, SDRs are not recognized on this portion (Davison, 2005), with the noticeable exception of southern Senegal and Guinea. There, conjugate Guinea and Demerara Plateaux (Fig. 4), in the eastern and western margins, respectively, are showing structures on seismic data that have been interpreted as SDRs by Reuber et al. (2016). These SDRs have been proposed to represent the expression of a hotspot volcanic activity during the Middle Jurassic (Basile et al., 2020 and references therein). The architecture of this southernmost part (Guinea and Demerara Plateaux) of the CAO is complex (e.g., Casson et al., 2020; 2021), given its position adjacent to the Equatorial Atlantic Ocean. This complexity, as observed on seismic data, is partly inherited from the successive drifting phases of the CAO in the Jurassic and of the Equatorial Atlantic in the Cretaceous, which likely induced a complex erosional pattern at the intersection (e.g., Labails et al., 2010; Reuber et al., 2016 and references therein).

In the Nova Scotia-north Morocco segment, the estimated amount of stretching is similar to its conjugate counterpart (Biari et al., 2021), thinning a 35-38 km-thick crust in along a 150-200 km distance. Southward, the North American and south Morocco segment are showing the volcanic/non-volcanic contrast between conjugate margins. The comparison between the DAKHLA (Klingelhoefer et al., 2009; Biari et al., 2017) and the LASE profiles on the US side (LASE Study Group, 1986) shows
i) an amount of stretching similar on both sides of the CAO, ii) a significant difference in crustal thickness (US part: 40 km; Dakhla part: 27-28 km), iii) the large SDRs presence on the US side against few magmatic intrusions in the Moroccan crust, and iv) the occurrence of an underplated dense body at the ocean-continent transition on the US side. From a crustal point of view, the rifting is generally considered as relatively symmetrical (Biari et al., 2021), with potential asymmetry between Nova Scotia and northern Morocco (Maillard et al., 2006). South of Western Sahara, no comparison could be realized between the margins of Mauritania-Senegal and southern United States (Biari et al., 2021). The passive margin of northwest Africa is a rifted, mature, fairly narrow, sediment-nourished margin (e.g., Michard et al., 2008). It is considered as non-volcanic, or magma-poor, as the continental margin lacks seaward dipping reflectors (e.g., Contrucci et al., 2004; Biari et al., 2017).

On both conjugate margins, remnants of the Palaeozoic orogenies have been reworked during the CAO rifting, with a more continuous Alleghenian system along the eastern American margin (Hatcher et al., 2010), whereas the Variscan front appears more sinuous along the NW Africa counterpart (Fig. 3). For instance, the cratonic Reguibat Shield (northern WAC) deviated the Variscan thrust fronts, which extend southward towards the Leo Shield (southern WAC), and where the front is following the WAC boundaries (Peucat et al., 2005; Villeneuve, 2008; Caby & Kienast, 2009; Villeneuve et al., 2015). As such, it illustrates how the lithospheric nature is significantly variable along strike on the NW African side. Instead, alongside on the NE American side, the Appalachian-Alleghenian orogeny consists in stacked crustal strips somehow parallel to the future CAO rift, where less variabilities is expected among the different stacked crustal domains compared to the duality cratonic vs. “classical” lithosphere of the African counterpart (e.g., Boscaini et al., 2022).
Figure 4 | Central Atlantic Oceanic floor age (data from Muller et al. 2008; MOR = Mid Oceanic Ridge), overlaid with Magnetic anomalies (after Biari et al., 2017) and selection of crustal profile locations after the review in the Central Atlantic from Biari et al. (2021; references therein), in the North Atlantic from Fernandez (2019; references therein), Kuznir et al. (2020; OCTek), Marzen et al. (2020; SUGAR), and Moulin et al. (2021; MAGIC), overlaid with of magmatism, volcanism, and evaporite occurrences (CAMP occurrences after Marzoli et al., 2017; PAAP/Late Cretaceous Alkaline event occurrences after Matton and Jébrak, 2009 and Merle et al., 2019, respectively; Cenozoic volcanism, see figure 11; Seaward Dipping Reflectors (SDRs) after Geoffroy, 2005; salt basins after Biari et al., 2017). DP = Demara Plateau; GP = Guinea Plateau; BB = Bahamas Banks; NS = Nova Scotia.
3. LTT and TTM datasets

3.1. LTT and TTM principles

LTT provides time and temperature constraints when apatite or zircon crystals cooled down through specific closure temperatures between c.300 and 40°C (equivalent with normal geotherm to 1 to 10 km of crustal depths). The methods are well established today and the number of LTT refereed articles has steadily increased the last two decades and has been extensively described (based Google Scholar search results of August 2022; e.g., Reiners and Ehlers, 2005; Malûsa and Fitzgerald, 2019).

It has several limitations, one of which is that rock samples must contain zircon and/or apatite crystals, limiting the investigations to crystalline basement, most magmatic/plutonic bodies, and their eroded products (e.g., conglomerates, sandstones). The dataset compiled for this review is composed of the results of four LTT methods (Table 1), from lowest to highest temperatures of application: i) (U-Th-Sm)/He on apatites (AHe; ~40-100°C; Shuster et al., 2006), ii) Fission tracks on apatites (AFT; ~60 to 120°C; Green et al., 1989); iii) (U-Th-Sm)/He on zircons (ZHe; ~160-200°C; Reiners et al., 2005; Guenthner et al., 2013), and iv) Fission tracks on zircons (ZFT; ~210 to 270°C; Brandon et al., 1998).

Furthermore, single LTT age alone generally does not hold geological meaning, as several other parameters need to be taken into account when deriving the thermal history in both forward and inverse modelling (e.g., Ketcham et al., 2005; Gallagher, 2012; Ketcham et al., 2018). In the vast majority of recent studies, elaborated thermal histories are described after the results of inverse Time-Temperature Modelling (TTM), which is achieved mostly using either HeFTy or QtQT programs (Ketcham et al., 2005 and Gallagher, 2012, respectively; other codes and programs are listed in the appendix). Such modelling has several advantages over qualitative interpretation of raw LTT data: 1) different geological constraints (time-temperature ‘boxes’) can be tested in short modelling time with statistical insights over the realisations, 2) it provides visual representation of the thermal history within a temperature range, and 3) it enables the comparison within and between geological domains (e.g., Charton et al., 2021).
Table 1 | LTT methods and their temperature of application (‘closure temperatures’), see references therein. *He-PRZ* = Partial Retention Zone; *APAZ, ZPAZ* = Apatite and Zircon Partial Annealing Zones. See also Guenthner et al. (2013) for the ZHe method.
3.2. LTT/TTM Datasets

The 252 references from which data was digitised, sometimes georeferenced, and organised into this database are listed in tables 2 to 5. In total, 2221 AHe, 3013 AFT, 888 ZHe, and 768 ZFT data point compose the LTT dataset, amounting to 6890 LTT data, spread over 15 countries. For the TTM dataset, cooling events were digitized from 749 time-temperature models or histories (Appendix), as exemplified for Morocco in Charton et al. (2021). Statistically representative ages for the AHe and ZHe replicates (or aliquots) are not always provided in the reviewed articles. Therein, the number of replicates varies between 1 (e.g., Ruiz et al., 2011) and 20 (e.g. Flowers and Kelley, 2011). In order to perform comparison and interpolation of the (U-Th)/He ages, we have calculated median ages (e.g., Vermeesh, 2008; Ketcham et al., 2018). This work dataset is divided into four regions (Fig. 2): eastern North America (henceforth referred to as E-NAM; Fig. 5; references in table 2), northern South America (henceforth referred to as N-SAM; Fig. 6; references in table 3), Iberia (referred to as IB in figures; Fig. 7; references in table 4), and Northwest Africa (henceforth referred to as NWA; Fig. 8; references in table 5).

The figures of maps illustrating the sample locations in articles without precise GPS coordinates were georeferenced using QGIS and a polynomial method of interpolation. Between 6 and 10 points visible on the figure and for which the GPS location was known (e.g., cities, villages, river bends, road intersections, shoreline, and country/state borders) were required as data input in the georeferencing interpolation.

The entire LTT dataset compiles ages between 0 Ma, from well samples, to several billion years for the Precambrian basement the USA. Figure 9 illustrate the raw temporal distribution of the LTT ages for the four methods in the four regions.
Figure 5 | Eastern North America geology and LTT/TTM studies carried out since 1980. Geological map after USGS and bathymetry data from GEBCO_2014_1D. Note that the pie diagrams depict the proportion of LTT ages from each method for each reference. The proportions between fission track and (U-Th)/He methods are established with 1 fission track data point equals 1 sample (i.e., all crystals measured for the fission track age) and 1 (U-Th)/He data point equals 1 replicate (or aliquot; i.e., 1 dated crystal), thus over-representing (U-Th)/He ages. See table 2 for references.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Doherty and Lyons, 1980</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eby et al., 1985*</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eby et al., 1985*</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Crowley et al., 1986</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Currie et al., 1986</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reynolds et al., 1987</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Crowley and Kuhlman, 1989*</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Miller and Duddy, 1989</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Renenhurst et al., 1989</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arne et al., 1990a</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mackillop, 1990</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NoData</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Renenhurst et al., 1990</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Roden, 1991</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Arne et al., 1990b</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Crowley, 1991</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Arne, 1992</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Blackmer, 1992</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NoData</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hendriks et al., 1993</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>John et al., 1993</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Roden et al., 1993</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ryan, 1993</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Steckler et al., 1993</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Boettcher and Millikan, 1994</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Wang et al., 1994</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Blackmer et al., 1994</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Grist et al., 1995</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Li et al., 1995</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hulver, 1997</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NoData</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Corrigan et al., 1998</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Winkler et al., 1999</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Roden-Tice et al., 2000</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Roden-Tice and Wintsch, 2002</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Grist and Zentilli, 2003</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Lorenzak, 2003</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NoData</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Lorenzak et al., 2004</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Spotila et al., 2004</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Kunk et al., 2005</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Reed et al., 2005</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Roden-Tice and Tice, 2005</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Weber et al., 2005</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Gentien, 2005</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NoData</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Spiegel et al., 2007*</td>
<td>Central Atlantic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Bernet, 2008</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NoData</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>West et al., 2008</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Feinstein et al., 2009</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Roden-Tice et al., 2009</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Littlefield, 2010</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Flowers and Kelley, 2011</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Taylor and Fitzgerald, 2011</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Roden-Tice et al., 2012</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>McKeon et al., 2013</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Tremblay et al., 2013</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Willner et al., 2015</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Amendon et al., 2016</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Emberley, 2016</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Hardie, 2016</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Naeser et al., 2016</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Chang, 2017</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>DeLucia et al., 2018</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>McDannell et al., 2018</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Pinet, 2018</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Willner et al., 2018</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Powell et al., 2018</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Fane et al., 2019</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Shorten and Fitzgerald, 2019</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>McDannell et al., 2019</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Vogler, 2021</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (previous page) | Eastern North America LTT/TTM references compiled in this review (Fig. 4).

Rows highlighted in grey: LTT data available but not the article itself ( compilation from Herman et al., 2013). * Same study with sampling in two countries. A*: Spiegel et al. (2007) have collected ages from wells in three of the four study areas from this work.
**Figure 6** | Northern South America geology and LTT/TTM studies carried out since 1984. Geological map of South America after CGMW and bathymetry data from GEBCO_2014_1D. See the notes on the proportion of LTT data in the caption of **figure 5**. See **table 3** for references.
Table 3 | Northern South America LTT/TTM references compiled in this review (Fig. 5). Rows highlighted in grey: LTT data available but not the article itself (compilation from Herman et al., 2013).

Rows highlighted in green: we compiled AFT ages from northern Brazil, just outside of the study area to provide constrain in the SE of N-SAM, as very few studies exist for the Guyana Shield. A*: Spiegel et al. (2007) have collected ages from wells in three of the four study areas from this work.
**Figure 7** | Iberia geology and LTT/TTM studies carried out since 1995. Geological map after Rodríguez Fernández et al. (2015; IGME geological map of Spain) and the geological map of Europe (BGR/CGMW; 2003) and bathymetry data from GEBCO_2014_1D. See the notes on the proportion of LTT data in the caption of figure 5. See table 4 for references.
Table 4 | Iberia LTT/TTM references compiled in this review (Fig. 6). Black reference: no TTM; White reference: TTM model(s) available; * Not all data were digitized (some ages <66Ma were excluded). ** Same study, different countries (original data from the world LTT compilation).
Figure 8 | North-West Africa geology and LTT/TTM studies carried out since 1982. Geological map after UNESCO, 1990 and bathymetry data from GEBCO_2014_1D. See the notes on the proportion of LTT data in the caption of figure 5. See table 5 for references.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Carpena, 1982</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NoData</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carpena et al., 1988</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mansour, 1991</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sabil, 1996</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Poupeau et al., 1996</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bouillin et al., 1997</td>
<td>Central Atlantic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Azlimoussa et al., 1998</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Giff et al., 1998</td>
<td>Central Atlantic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Glover, 1999</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hurford et al., 1999</td>
<td>Mediterranean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gunnell, 2003</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gavellec, 2006</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NoData</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Missenard, 2006</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Akkouch, 2007</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Barbero et al., 2007</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Maluza et al., 2007</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Underdown et al., 2007</td>
<td>Libya - Algeria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spiegel et al., 2007 *</td>
<td>Central Atlantic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ghorbal et al., 2008</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hayford et al., 2008</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Missenard et al., 2008</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ballestrieri et al., 2009</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ghorbal, 2009</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Siddiqi et al., 2009</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sibiti et al., 2009</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wilf et al., 2010</td>
<td>Canary Islands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Barbero et al., 2011</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ruiz et al., 2011</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sibiti, 2011</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Raguier, 2012</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Azlimoussa et al., 2013</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Leprêtre et al., 2013</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Oukassou et al., 2013</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bhamer, 2014</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Remagny et al., 2014</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sahrt, 2014 **</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Bradley et al., 2015</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Domenech Verdaguer, 2015 **</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Leprêtre, 2015 **</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Leprêtre, 2015 **</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Girard et al., 2015</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Martin-Monge et al., 2016</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ye, 2016 **</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Ye, 2016</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ye, 2016</td>
<td>Ivory coast</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Lafforgue, 2016</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>English et al., 2017</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Gouiza et al., 2017a</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Gouiza et al., 2017b</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Surveillance et al., 2018</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Charton et al., 2018</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Recanati et al., 2018</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Leprêtre et al., 2018</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Gouiza et al., 2019</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Lane et al., 2020</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Grimeno-Vives et al., 2020</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (previous page) | Northwest Africa LTT/TTM references compiled in this review (Fig. 8). Rows highlighted in grey: LTT data available but not the article itself (compilation from Herman et al., 2013). Rows highlighted in green: we compiled AFT ages from northern Libya, just outside of the study area to provide constrain in the NE of NWA. ** PhD thesis containing ages later presented in refereed articles (Sehrt et al., 2017; 2018; Domenech et al., 2016; Wildman et al., 2019; Leprêtre et al., 2015; 2017).
Figure 9 | Kernel Density Estimate (KDE) plots for the four investigated areas (a: E-NAM, b: N-SAM, c: IB, and d: NWA) and four LTT systems (1: AHe, 2: AFT, 3: ZHe, and 4: ZFT). The entire dataset is shown here (n=6890). Median ages are also shown for (U-Th)/He dating (the total amount of samples - and not of the single dated crystals - is given in brackets), representing the median age of all aliquots for each sample and were generated for this study. These plots were done using IsoplotR (isoplotr.es.ucl.ac.uk) with the following options enabled: ‘Auto kernel bandwidth’ and ‘Adaptive KDE’.
3.3. Filtering the LTT dataset – Cenozoic LTT ages

Given our main target for investigation is the CAO and its rifting/break-up/early post-rift evolution, the time range involved for this can be somehow restricted to the 100 Myrs after rifting, meaning that we encompass a large time range from Early Jurassic up to the Late Cretaceous. In addition, in the case of the LTT & TTM results that are evidencing clear Cenozoic events (Fig. 10), in general, the geoscience community has a clear idea of the responsible process(es). Hence, we have filtered out LTT ages with a Cenozoic signal (i.e., if LTT ages <66Ma then remove from dataset). The filtered datasets for the different areas are plotted in figure 11.

For instance, the recent orogens such as the Alpes, Atlas, Pyrenees, and Andes (depicted in Fig. 10a) will result in cooling because of erosional tectonic exhumation (higher topography leading to enhanced erosion) with rates of up to 1 km/Myr (e.g., Guerit et al., 2016; Gemignani et al., 2017). The same reasoning can be followed for known Cenozoic magmatism occurrences. It can lead to the warming up of host rocks, resetting the LTT ages, and thermal relaxation leading to a new start of the thermo-chronometers. C’est peut-être ici qu’il faudrait dire que cet effet depend du magmatisme entre manifestations regionales versus manifestations plus locales sans réelle modifications des structures thermiques de la croute et/ou de la lithosphere. Les exemples Canaries + Zguid l’illustreraient bien dans ce cas. The Canary Islands are a good example of this processes, with Cenozoic LTT cooling ages much younger than their sample stratigraphic ages, due to a significant regional thermal impact of the Canary plume on the very crustal thermal structure (Duggen et al., 2009). For the Cenozoic, however, recent magmatism/volcanism seems well-correlated with also younger LTT ages (Fig. 10b). These events clearly affected the post-rift history sensus stricto of the margin, and some cooling ages may have been rejuvenated by residing in the partial annealing/retention zones, thus also potentially impacting syn- and early post-rift signal.

In most cases of Cenozoic ages, the mechanisms can be ascribed to known processes and are unrelated, or at least indirectly related, to the passive margin evolution (e.g., the Hoggar Swell, the Andes orogens, etc…). In other areas unrelated to magmatic or known active tectonic processes at the time, (e.g., USA, West African Craton, Portugal), authors have argued, for instance, for exhumation linked to surface uplift and maintained by far field stresses (e.g., limit Morocco/Mauritania; Gouiza et al., 2017b), or climatic change leading to enhanced erosion (e.g., in Morocco, Westaway et al., 2009).
In the case of LTT ages with a Cenozoic signal but lacking a regional tectonic event such as an orogeny or magmatism, such as all the points in the USA and Canada (Fig. 10b), it is likely that the LTT ages are either a result of i) localised erosional exhumation, ii) tectonic exhumation by a fault, iii) “worldwide acceleration of mountain erosion under a cooling climate” (article title; Herman et al., 2013), and/or iv) an analytical error. Additionally, it is worth mentioning that part of the Cenozoic sub-dataset are the results of samples collected down boreholes at depth greater than ~2-3km where the LTT ages may have been reset or rejuvenated (e.g., Tarfaya Basin, Morocco; Sehrt et al., 2017).

Filtering the statistically representative Cenozoic LTT cooling ages (i.e., pooled and central fission track ages; median (U-Th)-He ages) results in removing some of the pre-Cenozoic signal. However, in most cases along the investigated margins the lost signal is that of Late Cretaceous and Paleogene cooling, and thus not linked to the syn-, and early post-rift signals and related unconstrained process(es) that we are reviewing here.
**Figure 10** | Cenozoic a) volcanic and orogenic events, and b) LTT ages in the study areas. LTT references are listed in tables 2 to 5.
Figure 11 | Kernel Density Estimate (KDE) plots for the four investigated areas. The dataset has been filtered out (n_{filtered}=4414) from LTT ages younger than 66Ma (i.e., Cenozoic; Fig. 10). See details in the caption of figure 9.
3.4. Filtering the LTT dataset – Detrital ages

Another filter is applied to the LTT dataset in order to discriminate between rock samples that were already in place (deposited/emplaced) at the onset of the syn-rift phase in the Triassic, and those which were not (for instance a Cretaceous magmatic intrusion). The LTT dataset is thus divided into three categories, labelled as ‘Basement’, ‘Cover’, and ‘Detrital’ (Fig. 12). The ‘Basement’ and ‘Cover’ labels are used for LTT ages that are younger than the absolute age of their sample (either absolute dating or stratigraphical age). In short, rock samples from Permian or older strata are ‘basement’ and Triassic or younger stratigraphic ages are ‘cover’. These two categories have in common that their LTT signal is that of the present-day geospatial position of the samples, meaning that the LTT age can be displayed on a map, while retaining geological meaning about its location.

In the case of sedimentary units, if the LTT age is older than the rock stratigraphic age, the LTT data are labelled as ‘detrital’. This is to reflect that such rock samples have kept a pre- or syn-depositional signal. This signal is that of the sedimentary source area for instance, and that we therefore cannot constrain spatially, at least in the absence of excellent coverage of sedimentary provenance analysis studies (e.g., Accotto et al., 2022). This should not be the case for plutonic and magmatic rock samples, yet very rare occurrences are present in the compiled dataset.

Stratigraphic ages attributed to each data point are based on the youngest possible age. For instance, a 175±10 Ma AFT age from a ‘Late Triassic’ sedimentary rock sample would be attributed with ‘201 Ma’ as its stratigraphic age. The LTT age is here younger than the youngest possible stratigraphic age, and is then categorised as ‘Cover’, as the LTT age likely records the cooling that occurred after the Permian/Triassic boundary and after the deposition of the Triassic sediments.

Finally, note that the distinction between ‘basement’ and ‘cover’ is relative to the scope of this study, as we consider here the pre-“Triassic rift” rocks as the ‘Basement’. The maps, issued from this filtering (Figs. 13 and 14), use two different circle symbols, one with a continuous black line for ‘Basement’ and dashed for ‘Cover’, for visualisation purposes (the ‘Detrital’ LTT data have been filtered out).
**Figure 12** | LTT data categories based on the stratigraphic age and the LTT age of each data point. This distinction is necessary in order to have the geographical coordinates reflecting the thermal history location as opposed to that of an unknown source location. Here, Permian-or-older and Triassic-or-younger rock samples bearing an LTT age younger than the stratigraphy are categorised as ‘Basement’ and ‘Cover’, respectively. Conversely, a sedimentary rock sample bearing an LTT age older than its stratigraphy is referred to as ‘Detrital’.
4. Recorded signal and patterns

4.1. LTT age temporal pattern: LTT peaks vs. geodynamics

The Kernel Density Estimate (KDE) plots presented in the previous part (Figs. 9 and 11) illustrate the importance of the Cenozoic cooling signal in all parts of the study area, except for North America. Overall, about 60% of the data remains after applying a filter for “Cenozoic” LTT ages. The most impacted region is North SAM with up to 85% of filtered data, whereas in the eastern North America datasets, only 0 to 9% of the data were removed. Once filtered (Fig. 11), we assume that of the KDE plots reveal the timing of the cooling of tectonic events unrelated to presently or recently occurring ones (for the most part, as the Andes and the Pyrenees orogenies had contractional events as early as the Late Cretaceous). Hence, for LTT ages that fall within the syn- to post-rifting time windows (of the CAO, North Atlantic, or Equatorial Atlantic rifts), the cooling signals will now be interpreted as either thermal relaxation and/or erosional exhumation following, and related to, the establishment of the different Atlantic rift branches. Here, in the case of the CAO (E-NAM and NWA regions), the KDE plots for the apatite systems show peaks in the early post-rift. For zircon-based systems, we observe that while north South America datasets are, on average, younger than the CAO syn-/post-rift transition, the KDE peaks for ZFT and ZHe datasets are compatible with the syn-rift stage of the Equatorial Atlantic. Moreover, a dominant syn-rift signal is present in North America, Africa, and Iberia for the zircon LTT systems.

Eastern North America Phanerozoic tectonics are characterised by the Caledonian (~450-420Ma) and Alleghenian (~320-260Ma) orogenies, the Central Atlantic rifting (~230-180Ma), the CAMP (~200-190Ma) and PAAP (~100MA) LIPs, and the North Atlantic rifting (~100-50Ma) for its northern part (see the geological setting of this review and references therein). There, KDE plots revealed peaks at ~110, 140, 190, 230-270, 300 and 500 Ma (Fig. 11a). It is likely that the ZHe and most of the ZFT records the syn- or post-Alleghenian orogenic tectonic/erosional exhumations at ~300 and ~230-270Ma. The ZFT peak at 190 Ma is somewhat puzzling, since it reveals a younger peak than the main ZHe KDE peak. This could be due to spatial bias and the over-representation with 3 studies that published an important number of LTT data (Kohn et al., 1993; Steckler et al., 1993; Roden-Tice & Wintsch, 2002). In these cases, the authors proposed this to be related to the post-CAMP thermal relaxation and/or to the Central Atlantic syn-rift thermal signature. Instead, AFT and AHe dataset peaks (at ~140 and 110 Ma) are unexpected and unrelated to any tectonic events. As already
submitted by several authors and investigated here, they may illustrate the thermal and/or surface
evolution of the margin during its post-rift period.

In the studied part of South America, the last 550 Myr were marked by the Alleghenian (c.f., previous
paragraph) and Andes (~90-0 Ma) orogenies, the Central and Equatorial (~150-100 Ma) Atlantic
riftings, and the CAMP and PAAP LIPs (200 Ma and 125-80 Ma, respectively). Filtered LTT age peaks
in northern South America (Fig. 11b) are centred at ~80, 90-110, 180, and 290 Ma. Thus, LTT datasets
may have recorded the Alleghenian collapse, the onset of Central Atlantic drifting, and, coinciding
around 100 Ma, i) the PAAP, ii) the end of syn-rift phase of the equatorial Atlantic, and iii) early
tectonic phase(s) of the Andes. The tectonic/erosional exhumation linked to the Andes orogeny
starting in the Late Cretaceous is well recorded in this region, with KDE peaks at ~90 and 80Ma and
50, 40, 10, and 5Ma for the filtered and unfiltered datasets.

Iberia known Phanerozoic tectonic events are the Variscan (~400-280Ma) and Alpine/Pyrenean
(~100-0 Ma) orogenies, the Neo-Tethys rifting (~220-150Ma), the Central and North Atlantic rifting,
and the CAMP and PAAP LIPs (200 Ma and 125-80 Ma, respectively). The KDE plots of the filtered LTT
data show peaks at ~80-120, 140, 180, and 230 Ma (Fig. 11c), which can then be compared to the
timing of tectonics events. While the peaks do not directly account for the syn- and post-Variscan
signals (orogenic building and collapse), a large part of the ‘spread’ encompass the 250 to 400 Ma
time range and is likely to illustrate the Iberian late Palaeozoic orogenic story. Given the complex
evolution of the Iberia plate since the start of the Mesozoic, it is not surprising to find a wide mixture
of ages with this initial ‘raw’ approach that does not take into account the spatial distribution of the
compiled datasets (Triassic rifting; 230-180 Ma; Maghrebian Tethys and Columbrets Basins openings;
180 to 130-125 Ma; southern North Atlantic opening; 145-110 Ma; Central Iberian and Pyrenees
basins opening, Early Cretaceous, and inversion, Late Cretaceous to Miocene, and West
Mediterranean opening; 30-18 Ma; e.g., Bessière et al., 2021; Ethève et al., 2018; Leprêtre et al.,
2018; Nirrengarten et al., 2018). Hence, it is difficult to discriminate between the Mesozoic signals
when looking at the global KDE peak signatures.

In NW Africa, Cambrian to Present tectonic events preserved by the geological records are the
Hirnantian Glaciation (~450-430 Ma), the Rheic Ocean rifting (~550-450 Ma), its subduction (~420-
300 Ma), the Variscan orogeny (between Late Carboniferous and Cisuralian, 320-280 Ma), the Central
Atlantic Ocean rifting (230-180 Ma), the CAMP and PAAP LIPs (200 Ma and 125-80 Ma, respectively),
the Equatorial Atlantic Ocean rifting (for the southernmost part of NW Africa, 150-100 Ma), the Atlas
orogeny (~80-0 Ma), and the Cenozoic magmatism and volcanism. Statistically significant LTT ages,
as illustrated by the KDE plots (Fig. 11d), are centred around peaks at 90-100, 140, 190, and 320 Ma. ZFT, ZHe, and AHe ages coincide with the Variscan orogeny, the late syn-rift/possible break-up and post-rift, and both the PAAP and the onset of the South/Equatorial Ocean drifting phase, respectively. Compiled AFT ages from the African continent show a marked peak at 140 Ma. Although this does not coincide with a known tectonic event, this discrepancy has been investigated in Morocco and Mauritania (e.g., Ghorbal et al., 2008; Leprêtre et al., 2014, 2017; Gouiza et al., 2019), and appears coeval to the deposition of detritic material in the passive margin. One can notice here that a similar 140 Ma LTT signal is nicely recorded on the conjugate American continental margin (see above). Finally, note that the Cenozoic events (Atlas systems and magmatism/volcanism occurrences) are well recorded in the complete datasets (Fig. 9d).

The main limitations of using such an approach are the mixture of ages at the scale of continental blocks that are considered here, which record various tectonic events at their different and possibly opposite boundaries. Therefore, a spatial deconvolution of the LTT signal is necessary, which we carry in the following section. A peculiar signal is nonetheless singular to E-NAM and NW-A areas where, seemingly unrelated to tectonic events, both record a significant cooling signal at ~140 Ma that calls for explanation(s).
4.2. LTT age spatial and temporal patterns

4.2.1. LTT ages vs. geographic maps

The spatial distribution of the LTT ages is presented here through a series of eight maps (Figs. 13 and 14), for which the simplified base layer consists of the outcrop maps categorised either into ‘Basement’ rocks and their ‘Cover’, as defined in the previous part (section 3.4). Our first observation gained from these maps is the striking difference in the spatial coverage of apatite and zircon datasets. Apatite-based LTT data show a relatively homogeneous coverage (Fig. 13), especially for the AFT, whereas zircon-based methods show results in concentrated and very localized areas, in the four considered areas (Fig. 14). As such, the use of compilation of zircon-based LTT methods alone to draw general conclusions on the CAO evolution is disputable. We consider three exceptions here: 1) the ZFT ages along the Appalachian-Alleghanian belt in E-NAM region that shows Late Paleozoic to Cretaceous ages, 2) the ZFT ages of N-SAM that appears restricted to samples from the Andes showing Palaeozoic to Cretaceous ages (explained by complex relationships with Variscan inheritance and Mesozoic ages mixtures difficult to discriminate at the investigated spatial scale), and 3) the ZFT ages recorded along the Moroccan Atlas system, accounting only for a portion of the African CAO margin, but that can be compared with E-NAM dataset.

In particular, the spatial distribution of AFT and AHe ages (Fig. 13) bears a striking and consistent first order trend, namely a youngening towards the CAO crust, which is exemplified by the northern NWA area and even more nicely in the E-NAM area. Indeed, not a single Precambrian apatite-based LTT cooling ages is reported along the coastline, and only a few Palaeozoic ages are, located near French Guyana (AHe), Ghana (AFT), and in the Canadian provinces of Newfoundland and Labrador (AFT). The vast majority of data are otherwise Cenozoic (Fig. 10), Cretaceous, and Jurassic in age. This trend however is not visible in north South America, most likely due to a lack of data in the cratonic domain and because of the rejuvenation linked to the Andes orogeny. Contrary to the northern NWA, this trend seems unexistent in southern NWA, with distributed Triassic-Cretaceous AFT ages, probably in relationship with the later Equatorial Atlantic opening, rather than the CAO one.

Within the cases of E-NAM and northern NWA, local trends are difficult to evidence at the presented scale, however there are regional exceptions to the above-mentioned youngening. For instance, the Hoggar Massif (south of Algeria, see Fig. 10), where a Cenozoic swell seem to have had an effect on the AHe and AFT ages, show younger ages than its western counterpart the Eastern Anti-Atlas. Indeed, in these maps, the Cenozoic LTT ages are not displayed, but the rejuvenating effect that the Cenozoic events may have had on older LTT ages was not accounted for and may still be
superimposed to some of the displayed, unfiltered, ages. Finally, AFT ages sampled along the Labrador Sea are not following this trend when compared to their distance with respect to the CAO oceanic crust (i.e., they should be older). This is probably explained by the influence of the opening of this oceanic branch younger than the CAO, as submitted by Vogler (2021), who published these ages. Additionally, the Andes and Pyrenees, which orogenic cycle started in the Cretaceous, are characterized by Cretaceous LTT cooling ages.

Unexpectedly, it is difficult to discuss the ‘patchy’ distributions of the E-NAM and NWA ZHe datasets (Fig. 14a). On both margins, they are strongly localized, showing in majority Paleozoic and some Mesozoic ages that are broadly consistent with the AFT datasets of the same areas. Instead, regarding the ZFT dataset, the E-NAM (Fig. 14b) shows a north-eastward youngening trend from Late Paleozoic to Cretaceous ages, that appears relatively oblique to the above-mentioned east to southeastward AFT/AHe youngening trend. Yet, the oldest ages are also the ones that are the farthest from the CAO oceanic crust in this dataset. The NWA ZFT dataset is less homogeneous and bears a consistent and dominantly Late Paleozoic cooling signal, which has been linked to the Variscan evolution (e.g., Sebti et al., 2009). Only few ZFT ages bear Jurassic and Cretaceous ages, namely 1) in the cratonic western Reguibat (Gouiza et al., 2017a) and 2) in the western Meseta (Sabil, 1995). Both datasets might thus confirm significant cooling events at the time, emphasizing the Mesozoic AFT and AHe results collected there.
Figure 13 (previous page) | Apatite LTT dating for a) median AHe and b) AFT datasets. Median ages younger than 66Ma were filtered out, not the aliquots. Number of samples is $n = \text{basement samples + cover samples}$. Cover and Basement as defined in figure 12. LTT references are listed in tables 2 to 5.
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Figure 14 (previous page) | Zircon LTT dating for a) Median ZHe and b) ZFT datasets. Median ages younger than 66Ma were filtered out, not the aliquots. Number of samples is n= basement samples + cover samples. Cover and Basement as defined in figure 12. LTT references are listed in tables 2 to 5.
4.2.2 LTT ages vs. distance to Continent Ocean Boundary

As abovementioned, E-NAM AFT dataset offers the clearest youngening trend, with Precambrian to Late Palaeozoic ages to the west (around 100ºW) toward Jurassic/Cretaceous ages along the Atlantic coast (Fig. 13b). The illustrated trend is covering a distance of c.2000 km, ruling out directly short wavelength processes such as local/regional faulting, folding, and rift flanks. Despite showing Jurassic and Early Cretaceous superimposed ages, the youngest AFT ages appear concentrated along the coast from Canada to the USA. Instead, this pattern is more difficult to identify in the opposite margin.

Bearing in mind this first order trend, we check the possible link between the COB and the distribution of LTT along the continental margins. The shortest distance between each point and the Continental Ocean Boundary (COB) was calculated using QGIS (fig. 15). The COB data used for the distance computations is from Müller et al. (2016) and is available as a shapefile at this URL: https://www.earthbyte.org/gplates-2-1-software-and-data-sets/. LTT data are then plotted as a function of the distance from the COB for the four studied regions (Figs. 16, 17, 18, and 19). The data compiled for this review is located between ~0 and 2000 km away from the COB.

Additionally, it has been demonstrated for the AFT system that Mean Track Length (MTL) vs. AFT age plots can potentially yield insights into the cooling history of the onshore domain of passive margins (e.g., Gallagher and Brown, 1997). There, cooling events evidenced with this method (cluster of long MTL) may display a temporal link to the rift ing (i.e., longer tracks for AFT ages coeval to rift ing period), as exemplified in the Brazilian and Indian rifted margins (Cogné et al., 2011; Campanile, 2007; respectively). Similar to the ‘boomerang plot’ present in MTL vs. AFT ages of some margin, the perturbations to the thermal field during the rift ing phase is expected to leave its mark on the LTT record (e.g., Moore et al., 1986; Rohrman et al., 1994). In the Moroccan dataset however (Charton, 2018), there is no apparent ‘boomerang’ curve nor a clear temporal link between long MTL (ca. 13-15 μm) and the timing of CAO rift ing.

In the case of important syn-rift thermal pertubations, the subsequent thermal relaxation (e.g., thermal subsidence) would likely result in a higher density of syn-rift or early post-rift LTT ages in the first 100s of kilometres away from the COB, i.e., in the rift zone, in the transition zone, and perhaps in the adjacent unstretch continental crust. While some of these ‘expected’ LTT age exist within the first 200 km (e.g., in America; Fig. 16a and b), this does not appear to be the general rule (Figs. 17, 18, and 19).
Far away from the fossil rift zone, one may expect to see the LTT age record unaffected by the rift thermal overprint. Here, we use distance of ~1000km from the COB to investigate the relation between the LTT ages and their approximate distance from the oceanic crust. The distance of 1000km corresponds to the ‘zoomed-in’ domain on *figures* 16, 17, 18, and 19, which corresponds to the apparition of Palaeozoic AFT ages for E-NAM, and is 7 to 1.5 times greater than what literature has shown as the potentially affected distance by rifting thermal signature; e.g., Moore et al., 1986, Gallagher et al., 1998; Hendriks et al., 2007; Burke and Gunnell, 2008; Malusà et al., 2016; Leprêtre et al., 2017; Malusà and Fitzgerald, 2019a, b).

For the four methods, across the four areas, the post-rift cooling ages constitute an important component of the dataset (*Figs* 16 to 19). By definition, post-rift periods are always closer to the Present-day than their related pre- and syn-rift ones. Thus, in any given geological area, the older the rifting, the more likely it is that a geological event, with a thermal expression, occurs and overprints the rifting signal. In that sense, a significant population of post-rift ages does not necessarily relate to a remarkable trans-continental geological event. What is clearly depicted for several regions, however, is that beyond ~1000km, LTT ages have retained an older cooling signal (*fig*. 16; exemplified in AFT and ZHE of North America datasets). The ZFT dataset for North America follows this trend already from 300-400km with more ages bearing a pre-rift (if related) cooling signal. There, the entire AHe dataset shows a rather flat age trend around 150Ma.

In South America (N-SAM), LTT data are scarce near the COB, and dense between one and two thousand kilometres, as this covers the northern Andes (*fig*. 17b). Overall, AHe, AFT, and ZHe ages decrease away from the COB and towards the Andes. The ZFT dataset, there, is composed of ages with an opposite trend, with Cenozoic cooling signal near the COB and older ones in the Andes.

In Iberia (*fig*. 18; note the x-axis has been inverted compared to *figures* 16 and 17), most LTT ages record a syn- and mainly post-rift (for the CAO) cooling signal, as far as ~1500km away from the North Atlantic COB (*fig*. 15; no compiled data further than the Eastern Pyrenees). Let us recall here that the two rifting events are here 1) Triassic (no break-up) and 2) Early Cretaceous (break-up) in age (Nirrengarten et al., 2018). In fact, no clear ages trends can be associated with the distance to the COB in the first thousand kilometres in Iberia (*fig*. 18a) and full mixture of Triassic to Cretaceous ages is observed with overlapping Triassic, Jurassic and Cretaceous ages. The age mixtures are resulting here from many superposed events, with many rifting events affecting the Central Iberian ranges (Angrand & Mouthereau, 2021) during the Mesozoic, the southern North Atlantic rifting during Early Cretaceous and inversions as soon as the Late Cretaceous. Furthermore, the Variscan structural
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Inheritance is expressed in a very faulted crust that enables individual block behaviour during the Meso-Cenozoic rifting and inversion story (e.g., Barbarand et al., 2021 for the Portuguese margin). Beyond 1500 km from the COB, the LTT ages get younger (fig. 18b), when reaching the Pyrenean domain.

In the first one thousand kilometres from the COB on the Africa continent (fig. 19), LTT ages decrease ocean-wards. In details, ages with recorded pre-rift cooling signals are statistically present beyond ~500-600km, syn-rift ones are well represented in the area between ~200 to 1200km (already evidenced in fig. 11d for the ZHe dataset) and early post-rift AFT ages show the strongest density and are present over all of the investigated crustal domain, and well over 1000km for the AHe and AFT datasets (fig. 19b). Given that the precise timing of both onset of rifting and continental break-up is approximative and debated, the distances of this paragraph are prone to a substantial error bar (of up to ~100km in NWA).

There is a lack of similar spatio-temporal recognizable pattern across all four LTT systems and four studied regions. However, we do observe one general trend: youngening towards the spatial occurrence of the most-recent and large-scale geological event. In the E-NAM and in the northern NWA LTT datasets, this event appears to be the post-rift phase located between the COB and ~600-800 km, while in South America and Iberia, this youngest event corresponds to the Andes and Pyrenees orogeneses, respectively.

One of our original questions thus remains: was the syn-rift thermal signature fully or partially recorded in the LTT located in the onshore continental margin and if so, how far in the interior of the plate? Zones on the plots characterised solely by pre-rift LTT ages are few. This is the case for the North American AFT and ZFT datasets after ~1700 and between ~600 and 1100km (no ZFT data further away from the COB), respectively, and for the NWA ZFT dataset beyond 1000km away from the COB. These areas have, a priori, not been affected by a syn-rift thermal signature hot enough to reset the ZFT system (~210-270°C). On the other hand, it is possible that a syn-rift thermal perturbation (increasing host rock temperature between 210 and 60°C) reached up to ~1700km, resetting some pre-rift AFT ages. As a last observation, the thermal perturbation of the African Hoggar swell (>90% of LTT ages beyond 1500km) has a clear impact on the apatite datasets with strong rejuvenation deep into the continent interior, unrelated to the CAO story.

The qualitative global distribution of the data has shown us that 1) the best datasets (spatial coverage, homogeneity) are the apatite-based ones, whereas zircon-based ones are generally very localized
and 2) these same apatite datasets are also tightly associated with the margins of the CAO *sensu stricto*, i.e. E-NAM and NWA. The study of the CAO margins *s.s.* (NWA and E-NAM) thus appears relatively favourable, for the purpose of this review.
Figure 15 | Filtered LTT data points (ages labelled ‘detrital’ have been removed) with distance to closest vector from the Continent-Ocean Boundary. Calculation is done using QGIS tool ‘Distance to Hub’, using the vertices of the COB data by Müller et al. (2016).
Figure 16 | LTT ages vs Distance to Continent-Ocean Boundary (COB on the right; data from Muller et al., 2016) for E. North America (E-NAM). a) is 1000kmx800Myr while the plots in b) are 2000kmx1000Myr. Calculation of distance to COB are detailed in the caption of figure 15. The box grey-white is the syn-rift period for the Central Atlantic (CA). LTT references are listed in table 2.
**Figure 17** | LTT ages vs Distance to Continent-Ocean Boundary (COB on the right; data from Muller et al., 2016) for N. South America (N-SAM). See details in the caption of **figure 16**. EA = Equatorial Atlantic rifting. LTT references are listed in **table 3**. * Includes AFT from NE Brazil (see references b1-b2-b3 from **figure 6**).
**Figure 18** | LTT ages vs Distance to Continent-Ocean Boundary (COB on the right; data from Muller et al., 2016) for Iberia (IB). See details in the caption of figure 16. LTT references are listed in table 4. NAO = North Atlantic Ocean souther segment rifting (~215-150Ma and break-up ebated between 150 and 110Ma; Barbarand et al., 2021).
**Figure 19** | LTT ages vs Distance to Continent-Ocean Boundary (COB on the right; data from Muller et al., 2016) for Northwest Africa (NWA). See details in the caption of **figure 16**. LTT references are listed in **tables 5**.
5. Phanerozoic cooling of the unstretched continental crust

5.1. Phanerozoic cooling events from Time-Temperature Modelling

Cooling events from available (i.e., published) Time-Temperature Models (TTM) have been digitized (see appendix) to investigate modelled cooling events in the reviewed regions. We digitized the time and temperature values of the start and the end of cooling event from models spanning between the Cambrian and the Quaternary. Thus, cooling events modelled for times before 541 and after 2.6Ma are not included in the presented dataset. This time window is to illustrate the thermal evolution of the Present-day continental rims of the Central Atlantic Ocean in the Phanerozoic, accounting for the time of the Variscan orogeny and collapse, CAO rifting, the continental break-up, the CAO drifting, the adjacent oceanic branches rifting and drifting phases, and the Cenozoic orogens and volcanisms.

The 749 TTM that serve as the basis for this discussion have been organised (c.f., appendix) and synthetized for several geological regions, as defined in figures 20 and 21. As mentioned, most studies reviewed here have worked at a local scale, and thus merging these results in order to investigate that at the scale of the margins and their adjacent continental crusts has numerous limitations. For instance, the age mixing with spread of over 10s to 100s Myr for the same geological object, that may be explain locally by heterogeneous thermal structure, fault activities, or successive erosional exhumation events.

To compare both the LTT ages and the time-temperature curves, we have added on our synthesis of the TTM the timing of the KDE peaks (Figs. 20 and 21). Furthermore, we have added the timing geological events typically associated with thermal perturbation, and/or tectonic/erosional exhumation such as orogenies, rifting phases, and volcanism/magmatism, as reviewed in the Geological context (part 2) of this contribution.

Slow cooling rates (<1°C/Myr) appear ubiquitous in most geological regions, spanning the entire Phanerozoic (Fig. 20a, b, c, and f, Fig. 21a, f, i, and j). This is without a doubt the results of merging the results of different group of workers, studies, and spatial variations of the geological context. This observation does not hold for the Andes (Fig. 20e), the Iberian Ranges and the Pyrenees (Figs. 21b and c), and the Betics (Fig. 21d), whereby recent cooling event (Cretaceous to Cenozoic) overprinted Palaeo-Mesozoic ones or was simply the focus of the studies.

At the regional scale, we observe the following clear correlations:
- In the Labrador/Nova Scotia (Fig. 20b) between the CAMP, fast cooling rates, and ZFT KDE peak;

- In the Guyana Shield (Fig. 20e) between the Equatorial Atlantic Ocean (EAO) rifting, the PAAP, medium cooling rates, and all four KDE peaks;

- In the Iberian Massif and Ranges (Figs. 21a and b) between the PAAP and CAMP LIPs, fast cooling rates, and AFT/AHe and ZHe KDE peaks, respectively; and between the onset of Variscan Collapse and CAO rifting, medium cooling rates, and ZFT/ZHe KDE peaks;

- In the Meseta/Atlas system (Figs. 21e and f) between the Variscan Orogeny, medium/fast cooling rates, and ZFT KDE peak,

- In the Anti-Atlas (Fig. 21f) between the CAMP, fast cooling rates, and ZHe KDE peak;

- In the Reguibat Shield and Mauritanides (Fig. 21g and h) where the CAO break-up coincides with the onset of medium cooling rates;

- In the Leo Shield (Fig. 21i) between the EAO rifting and PAAP, more opaque medium cooling rates, and AFT/AHe KDE peaks;

- In the Hoggar Massif (Fig. 21j) between the Western Central Africa Rift System, fast cooling, and AHe KDE peak; and there too, between the Variscan orogeny and medium cooling rates.

Overall, we observe an excellent match between the KDE peaks and medium cooling rates (1 to 10°C/Myr) for 4/5 of the incidences, whereas fast cooling rates are nearly always coeval to a tectonic event. While this means that LTT alone cannot replace thorough TTM studies, it shows that large LTT datasets bear thermal and potentially geological meaning.
Figure 20 | Time-Temperature Modelling (TTM) “cooling events” charts for Eastern North America (A, B, C, and D), Northern South America (E and F). All TTM for each area (Appendix B) are stacked with transparency percentage normalised to the number of models for the area (transparency [%] = 100÷n). In other words, if all models were to overlap at the same time with similar cooling rate, the related part would be opaque (see legend for opaque colour for reference). The KDE peaks are after figure 11. Tectonic events displayed alongside the charts are based on the references listed in the geological setting.
Figure 21 | Time-Temperature Modelling (TTM) “cooling events” charts for Iberia (A, B, C, and D) and Northwest Africa (D, E, F, G, H, I, and J). See caption of figure 20 for details.
5.2. The CAO evolution and predicted LTT distribution

The different compilations and comparisons of data hitherto gathered show that low-temperature thermochronology ages related to rifting, if ever present, have been largely overprinted by post-rift events. Several types of rifts and passive margins exists (e.g., Allen and Allen, 2013). These types may be categorised in several fashions, based on their geodynamic context, volcanic activity, width, or other aspects. We will focus on the tectonics expectedly involved in the case of the Central Atlantic rifting and drifiting.

The rifting of the Central Atlantic is considered as passive (e.g., Tankard and Welsink, 1989; Frizon de Lamotte et al., 2015) and depending on the investigated segment, overall symmetric (Biari et al., 2021) and locally asymmetric (e.g., Piqué and Laville, 1996; Gouiza, 2011). The early Mesozoic rifting was characterised by a wide rifted zone (Leleu et al., 2016), important terrigenous inputs, salt sedimentation, and by the CAMP (e.g., Michard et al., 2008).

Passive rifting develops in an extensional geodynamic context, with extension driven by horizontal plate movements (e.g., Michon and Merle, 2003). It has been established that passive rifting is characterised by lithospheric stretching, asthenosphere upwelling, high surface heat-flow, seismic activity, negative Bouguer anomalies, normal faults reaching deep within the continental crust, and thermal anomalies at depth (e.g., Huismans and Beaumont, 2011; Allen and Allen, 2013). As reviewed in Frizon de Lamotte et al. (2015), characteristic events for passive rifting are as follow: 1) rifting with the formation of wide rift system, 2) possible uplift, 3) post-rift unconformity, and 4) possible post-rift magmatic flows. Asymmetric rifts, which may lead to mantle exhumation along a detachment fault, are characterised by simple shear and high extension rates (Michon and Merle, 2003). It was also evidenced that asymmetric rifts (or segment of rift in this case) can result from the migration of the rift zone after its initiation (for details, see Brune et al., 2014). The adjacent unstretched continental lithosphere (rift flanks) may be affected by small scale convection, volcanism, and uplift (e.g., Olsen, 1995; Allen and Allen, 2013). Predicted syn-rift vertical movements are substantial and rapid subsidence in the rift zone (McKenzie, 1978) and uplift or no motions in the rift flanks (Olsen, 1995; Huismans and Beaumont, 2011).

Rifted magma-poor continental margins are characterised by seaward dipping normal faults and a break-up unconformity (e.g., Paton et al., 2017). The predicted post-rift vertical movement in rifted margins is a slow and continuous subsidence (McKenzie, 1978), linked to thermal cooling of the lithosphere (e.g., Bertotti, 2001; Watts, 2012). The adjacent unstretched continental lithosphere is
assumed as tectonically quiescent in most models of passive margins evolution (reviewed in Watts, 2012). However, at least two studies have shown that post-rift uplift and exhumation can be predicted in the unstretched lithosphere adjacent to rifted margins (Leroy et al., 2008; Yamato et al., 2013). The modelled vertical movements were explained as resulting from asthenosphere upwelling or thermal induced flexural response of the lithosphere.

The LTT ages produced in the rims of the CAO are perhaps related to cooling or heating events related to the rifting or drifting processes. Assuming that such signals were not superimposed by other processes, a clear pattern was expected to emerge in this review from spatial and temporal distributions of the LTT ages linking to the syn-rift period. If LTT age patterns were linked to post-breakup uplift in the unstretched lithosphere (e.g., Leroy et al., 2008), one would expect Middle/Late Jurassic to Early Cretaceous ages along the rifted continental margin of the Central Atlantic. Away from the margin, given the assumed tectonic inactivity in the models, no particular trend or pattern is expected. Thus, the rift-related age pattern should prevail.

From 6890 LTT ages compiled for this review, 50.5% belongs to the post-Alleghanian-Variscan orogeny (limit arbitrarily placed at 260Ma) and pre-Cenozoic events, characterised by the pre-, syn-, and post-rift stages of both the Central Atlantic and Atlas rifts. For the remaining data, 35.1% belongs to the Cenozoic (e.g., period of Atlas deformations; ca. 40-0Ma), 5.9% to the Alleghanian-Variscan orogeny (ca. 260-350 Ma) and 8.5% is older than the Late Palaeozoic orogeny. These cooling ages clearly show that widespread cooling events took place after the before, during, and after the rifting stages.

Based on numerical modelling and several passive margin case studies (outside of this contribution study area), Gallagher et al. (1994), Brown et al. (1994), and Gallagher and Brown (1997) established that the age distribution of compiled AFT datasets are the results of erosional exhumation, at least for their case studies. Indeed, the modelling shows that in the case of symmetrical break-up, the thermal perturbation linked to the rifting processes are present but not prevailing in the upper crust. Furthermore, the timing of erosional exhumation deduced from AFT data is not synchronous with that of rifting or break-up, either in the above-mentioned studies and this review. This, and the absence of spatial homogeneity within and across passive margins for large AFT datasets, was explained in terms of surface processes, tectonic reactivation of rift and pre-rift structures, and spatial distribution of drainage system, amongst others (Gallagher and Brown, 1997).
More recently, review of LTT studies and stratigraphic landscape analyses done in passive margins around the world (Green et al., 2018) shows that a series of positive and negative vertical km-scale crustal movements are controlled by plate-scale processes. There, they make the distinction between currently ‘elevated’ and ‘low-lying’ continental passive margins, where for both these vertical movements (e.g., Frizon de Lamotte et al., 2009; i.e., unpredicted km-scale exhumation and burial) occurred in the syn-, pre-, and post-rift periods, correlating with events/changes at plate tectonic boundaries.
5.3 Responsible processes: a review

Our observations show that the distribution of LTT ages, with basement rocks mostly characterised by ages younger than syn-rift ages, is at odds with most models of passive margin evolution (e.g., Allen and Allen, 2013). Unexpected vertical movements are labelled as such because our record of the geological history is not sufficiently detailed to provide concomitant and adequate geological processes supporting their occurrence. The proposed mechanisms must account for several observations about the km-scale burial and exhumation events, as they 1) affected a fairly large scale 2) occurred in multiple episodes, 3) are characterised by varying wavelengths landwards and along the coast, 4) affected the onshore domains of either side of the conjugate margins, and 5) were not restricted to the hinterlands directly adjacent to the rifted margins.

Studies have argued that these episodic exhumation and subsidence events can be explained in terms tectonic plate motions and driving forces (e.g., Green et al., 2013; 2018) or lithospheric folding of the continental margin (e.g., Japsen et al., 2012). Mantle-driven dynamic topography has also been proposed as a candidate for the initiation and preservation of these vertical movements (e.g., Hoggard et al., 2016; see Müller et al., 2018, for a review).

Numerical modelling studies show that post-rift changes in mantle convection (e.g., Yamato et al., 2013) or thermally induced flexural response of the lithosphere (Leroy et al., 2008) eventually lead to uplift in the rifted margin hinterlands. However, these modelled mechanisms only account for the post-rift tectonics along a rifted continental margin, and thus cannot be used to test the observed pre- and syn-rift movements observed in the unstretched continental margin.

Authors have tentatively associated the upward movements evidenced via time-Temperature Modelling (TTM) to the Alleghenian-Variscan chain erosion for the pre-rift exhumation (e.g., Ruiz et al., 2011), to the uplifted rift shoulders for the syn-rift exhumation (e.g., Oukassou et al., 2013), and to intra-plate horizontal crustal stresses related to the South Atlantic opening and drifting for the late post-rift exhumation (e.g., Gouiza et al., 2017a).

Gouiza (2011) however showed with lithospheric modelling that the rifting kinematics were not sufficient to explain km-scale vertical movements in the rift flanks during and after the rifting. Moreover, Ruiz et al. (2011; see references therein) demonstrated that the uppermost isotherms within the lithosphere of the Anti-Atlas (Morocco) are not much affected by thermal perturbations occurring close to the lithosphere-asthenosphere boundary or deeper. Domènech (2015) argues that
the post-riift thermal relaxation of the lithosphere could not entirely explain the observed cooling in
TTM results, and hence that exhumation must have occurred.

Based on a careful analysis of the terraces in the Anti-Atlas coastal area, Westaway et al. (2009)
concluded that the observed Neogene uplift was climate driven. In the interior of the Anti-Atlas and
High Atlas, other authors tentatively associated the uplift to a large mantle anomaly (Teixell et al.,
2003; Oukassou et al., 2013), resulting from the Moroccan Hot Line (Arboleya et al., 2004; Teixell
et al., 2005; Missenard, 2006; Babault et al., 2008; Frizon De Lamotte et al., 2009; Missenard and
Cadoux, 2011).

Downward movements, also obtained with TTM, were solely explained in terms of sedimentation, of
which deposits are now eroded from the sampled basement areas (e.g., Ghorbal et al., 2008; Leprêtre
et al., 2013). To evidence that modelled heating events can be described in terms of sedimentary
loading, Sehrt (2014) calculated subsidence rates from t-T models converted to depth. He then made
a comparison to rates obtained from seismic interpretations in the north Tarfaya Basin (in Morocco)
and observed that they were comparable.

Proposed mechanisms in NW Africa for the positive and negative vertical movements, as reviewed
here, are large-scale processes (see Teixell et al., 2009). These processes may act at wavelengths
from one to several hundreds of kilometres (e.g., Babault et al., 2008; Frizon de Lamotte et al., 2009).
The proposed processes for the exhumation episodes with matching half wavelengths are rift flank
uplifts (however discarded in the previous section), mantle driven doming, lithospheric flexure,
crustal-scale folding, and erosional unloading. For the subsidence episodes, while sedimentary
loading was the only process proposed, tectonic subsidence regimes have likely enhanced the
downward movements. These may be explained in terms of crustal thinning (rift zone), thermal
cooling (‘old rift’), lithospheric flexure, and crustal-scale folding (see Teixell et al., 2009). However,
not all of these proposed mechanisms account for the large-scale observations. On the other hand,
recent studies have submitted that mantle-driven dynamic topography should be considered as a
general underlying cause for both upward and downward movements observed in many places of
the world. However, this process does not take into account the local and regional observations. We
argue that a combination of large-scale crustal folding, mantle-driven dynamic topography, and
thermal subsidence, was instrumental to the exhumation and subsidence episodes illustrated in this
review. Moreover, these large-scale episodes were superimposed by changes in climates, sea level,
and erodibility of the exposed rocks (Flowers and Ehlers, 2018), overall contributing to the vertical
movement timings, patterns, and amplitudes observed in the rims of the Central Atlantic Ocean.
6. Conclusions: Uplift in the rims of the Central Atlantic Ocean

As illustrated in this contribution by the compilation of TTM from the rims of the Central Atlantic Ocean (summarized in figures 22 and 23), each of the four studied regions behaved differently at times. The LTT datasets records different thermal signals depending on the investigated area and on the tool used. This review illustrates that the Alleghenien-Variscan orogeny, the several rifting, and Late-Cretaceous Cenozoic magmatic and orogenic events are well recorded by the LTT. We also document at the ocean scale, the presence of a (or a combinaison of) geological event(s) in the early post-rift time (Jurassic to earliest Cretaceous) that affected the rims of the ocean up to several 100s of km inland. Our interpretation of this important component of the LTT datasets as well as the TTM, is that of erosional exhumation, and not thermal relaxation following a potential rifting thermal perturbation.

The exhumation recorded on the rims of the CAO are commonly recognised by previous works during the post-rift phase, as reviewed here. This seemingly widespread exhumation event interrupted the classical subsidence post-rift phase. Substantial erosion on the coastal plain is classically explained by primary controls such as the geometry of the rifting and the flexural. Here, the asymmetrical mechanism of rifting and the different crust–lithosphere geometries of the conjugate margins do not favor both margins behaving in such a similar way.

We propose a hypothesis that involves mantle-related dynamic processes to account for the symmetrical uplifts on both sides of the northern Central Atlantic. The geographical extent of the eroded area points to a large-scale process, which could be attributed to ascending hot mantle material below the northern Central Atlantic Ocean.

Furthermore, periods of erosional exhumation can be linked to sediment production, which, depending on the source has far reaching implications for the siliciclastics reservoirs (e.g., Wildman et al., 2019). Erosional exhumation impacted the past topography, paleo-drainage systems, and ultimately drove the lithology distribution in the basins (e.g., Gallagher et al., 1998).
Figure 22 (previous page) | Landmass reconstructions focused around the Central Atlantic Ocean rims with TTM cooling events as reviewed in this work at a) 300Ma (ca. end Alleghenian-Variscan orogeny), b) 220Ma (ca. Central Atlantic syn-rift), d) 180Ma (ca. Central Atlantic break-up). LTT data shown on each map corresponds to LTT with age similar to that of the reconstruction (±5Myr). The plate tectonic reconstruction model of Muller et al. (2016) was use for the orientation of the four study regions for b) to f) and the Earthbtyte Phanerozoic model (available on GPlates) was used for the position of the coastline at 300Ma (a). The paleoreconstructions were modified from that of the Deep time map project (Blakey, 2016; Mollweide geographical projection).
Figure 23 | Plate reconstruction of the Central Atlantic with cooling event as reviewed in this work at d) 150Ma (major clastic event), e) 120Ma (~PAAP South Atlantic rifting), and f) 80Ma (~onset of the Africa/Europe convergence).
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Appendix: time-Temperature curves
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference [-]</th>
<th>Zone [-]</th>
<th>TTM [count]</th>
<th>Software [-]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amidon et al., 2016</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackmer et al., 1994</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boettcher and Miliken, 1994</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emberley, 2016</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fame et al., 2019</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohn et al., 1993</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunk et al., 2005</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKoen et al., 2013</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller and Duddy, 1989</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed et al., 2005</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roden et al., 1993</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roden-Tice and Tice, 2005</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roden-Tice and Wintsch, 2002</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roden-Tice et al., 2000</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roden-Tice et al., 2009</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roden-Tice et al., 2012</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorten and Fitzgerald, 2019</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor and Fitzgerald, 2011</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West et al., 2008</td>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>AFTINV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiegel et al., 2007</td>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>AFTSolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowley, 1991</td>
<td>Canadian Shield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feinstein et al., 2009</td>
<td>Canadian Shield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardi, 2016</td>
<td>Canadian Shield</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzak et al., 2004</td>
<td>Canadian Shield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Forward modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDannell et al., 2018</td>
<td>Canadian Shield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinet, 2018</td>
<td>Canadian Shield</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremblay et al., 2013</td>
<td>Canadian Shield</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arne, 1992</td>
<td>Cratonic Platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corigan et al., 1998</td>
<td>Cratonic Platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corigan et al., 1999</td>
<td>Cratonic Platform</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLucia et al., 2018</td>
<td>Cratonic Platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowers and Kelley, 2011</td>
<td>Cratonic Platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardi, 2016</td>
<td>Cratonic Platform</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber et al., 2005</td>
<td>Cratonic Platform</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>AFTSolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winkler et al., 1999</td>
<td>Cratonic Platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang, 2017</td>
<td>NovaScotia/Labrador</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grist and Zentilli, 2003</td>
<td>NovaScotia/Labrador</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>AFTINV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grist et al., 1995</td>
<td>NovaScotia/Labrador</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AFTINV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendriks et al., 1993</td>
<td>NovaScotia/Labrador</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li et al., 1995</td>
<td>NovaScotia/Labrador</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inverse modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell et al., 2018</td>
<td>NovaScotia/Labrador</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenhurst et al., 1990</td>
<td>NovaScotia/Labrador</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan, 1993</td>
<td>NovaScotia/Labrador</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Inverse modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogler, 2021</td>
<td>NovaScotia/Labrador</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A1 | Time-Temperature Models from E-NAM**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference [-]</th>
<th>Zone [-]</th>
<th>TTM [count]</th>
<th>Software [-]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bermudez et al., 2009</td>
<td>Andes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caballero et al., 2013</td>
<td>Andes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mora et al., 2010b</td>
<td>Andes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mora et al., 2015</td>
<td>Andes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noriega-Londono et al., 2019</td>
<td>Andes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parra et al., 2009</td>
<td>Andes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parra et al., 2012</td>
<td>Andes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirauive, 2017</td>
<td>Andes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silva et al., 2013</td>
<td>Andes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spikings et al., 2004</td>
<td>Andes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van der Lelij et al., 2016</td>
<td>Andes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villagomez et al., 2011</td>
<td>Andes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villagomez et al., 2013</td>
<td>Andes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonilla et al., 2019</td>
<td>Guyana Shield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derycke et al., 2018</td>
<td>Guyana Shield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derycke et al., 2021</td>
<td>Guyana Shield</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harman et al., 1998</td>
<td>N Brazil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algar et al., 1998</td>
<td>SA-Caribbean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohn et al., 1984a</td>
<td>SA-Caribbean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez de Armas, 2005</td>
<td>SA-Caribbean</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AFTSolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisson et al., 2005</td>
<td>SA-Caribbean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiegel et al., 2007</td>
<td>SA-Caribbean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AFTSolve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table A2 | Time-Temperature Models from N-SAM*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference [-]</th>
<th>Zone [-]</th>
<th>TTM [count]</th>
<th>Software [-]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark and Dempster, 2009</td>
<td>Betics/Rf</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>AFTSolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janowski et al., 2016</td>
<td>Betics/Rf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonergan and Johnson, 1998</td>
<td>Betics/Rf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inverse modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sossan et al., 1998</td>
<td>Betics/Rf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Monte Trax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbero et al., 2005</td>
<td>Iberian Massif</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>AFTSolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botor and Anczkiewicz, 2015</td>
<td>Iberian Massif</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriere, 2006</td>
<td>Iberian Massif</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFTSolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Bruijn and Andriessen, 2001</td>
<td>Iberian Massif</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Monte Trax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grobe et al., 2010</td>
<td>Iberian Massif</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grobe et al., 2014</td>
<td>Iberian Massif</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin-Gonzalez et al., 2012</td>
<td>Iberian Massif</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pereira et al., 1998</td>
<td>Iberian Massif</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapel, 1999</td>
<td>Iberian Massif</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Inverse modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasquez-Vilchez et al., 2015</td>
<td>Iberian Massif</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbero and Lopez-Garrido, 2006</td>
<td>Iberian Range</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>AFTSolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rio et al., 2009</td>
<td>Iberian Range</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AFTSolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez-Larre and Andriessen, 2006</td>
<td>Iberian Range</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>AFTSolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat et al., 2019</td>
<td>Iberian Range</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeFelipe et al., 2019</td>
<td>Pyrenees</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillon et al., 2013</td>
<td>Pyrenees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson et al., 2007</td>
<td>Pyrenees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurel et al., 2008</td>
<td>Pyrenees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Monte Trax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metcalf et al., 2009</td>
<td>Pyrenees</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushlow et al., 2013</td>
<td>Pyrenees</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldner et al., 2021</td>
<td>Pyrenees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table A3* | Time-Temperature Models from IB
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference [-]</th>
<th>Zone [-]</th>
<th>TTM [count]</th>
<th>Software [-]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charton et al., 2018</td>
<td>Anti-Atlas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouiza et al., 2017a</td>
<td>Anti-Atlas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leprêtre, 2015</td>
<td>Anti-Atlas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malusa et al., 2007</td>
<td>Anti-Atlas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oukassou et al., 2013</td>
<td>Anti-Atlas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruiz et al., 2011</td>
<td>Anti-Atlas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebti, 2011</td>
<td>Anti-Atlas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sehrt et al., 2018 (in Sehrt, 2014)</td>
<td>Anti-Atlas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sehrt, 2014</td>
<td>Anti-Atlas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qift et al., 1998</td>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azdimousa et al., 2013</td>
<td>Betics/Rf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romagny et al., 2014</td>
<td>Betics/Rf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balestrieri et al., 2009</td>
<td>High Atlas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbero et al., 2007</td>
<td>High Atlas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AFTSolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domenech, 2015</td>
<td>High Atlas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domenech et al., 2016</td>
<td>High Atlas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Haimer, 2014</td>
<td>High Atlas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanari et al., 2020</td>
<td>High Atlas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leprêtre et al., 2018</td>
<td>High Atlas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recanati et al., 2018</td>
<td>High Atlas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English et al., 2017</td>
<td>Hoggar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover, 1999</td>
<td>Hoggar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Monte Trax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loggan and Duddy, 1998</td>
<td>Hoggar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rougier, 2012</td>
<td>Hoggar</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underdown et al., 2007</td>
<td>Hoggar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NoData</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernie et al., 2018</td>
<td>Leo Shield</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnell, 2003</td>
<td>Leo Shield</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Annealing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildman et al., 2019</td>
<td>Leo Shield</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ye, 2016</td>
<td>Leo Shield</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard et al., 2015</td>
<td>Mauritianides</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouiza et al., 2019</td>
<td>Mauritianides</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurford et al., 1999</td>
<td>Mediterranean Sea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Monte Trax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbero et al., 2011</td>
<td>Meseta</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghobral et al., 2008</td>
<td>Meseta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafforgue, 2016</td>
<td>Meseta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbil, 1995</td>
<td>Meseta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inverse modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddiqji et al., 2009</td>
<td>Meseta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AFTSolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouiza et al., 2017b</td>
<td>Reguibat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leprêtre et al., 2015 (in Leprêtre, 2015)</td>
<td>Reguibat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leprêtre et al., 2017 (in Leprêtre, 2015)</td>
<td>Reguibat</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>QtQT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charton et al., 2018</td>
<td>Tarfaya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sehrt et al., 2017 (in Sehrt, 2014)</td>
<td>Tarfaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HeFTy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A4 | Time-Temperature Models from NWA
Figure A1 | Digitised cooling events from published time-temperature histories, forward models, and inverse models from the literature (see tables 2 to 5 for references). APAZ, ZPAZ = Apatite and Zircon Partial Annealing Zones, respectively. Only up to five cooling events are been digitized here. If a model displayed 6 or more cooling events, then we digitized ones with smaller amplitude or shorter time span together with longer or more important one(s). Plots were digitized using the web tool ‘Web Plot Digitizer’ developed by Ankit Rohatgi and available at the following link: https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer/.
Figure A2 | Time-temperature “cooling events” charts for Eastern North America (A, B, C, and D), Northern South America (E and F). Rates are calculated based on the slope of each cooling event as presented in figure A1 and are arbitrarily colour-coded using 1 and 10°C/Myr as limits. Each model is depicted on one line separated by the other model evenly, depending on the total number of models for each area. Models are organised by ‘Longitude’, from low (left) to high (right), i.e., from W to E. Tectonic events displayed alongside the charts are based on the references listed in the geological setting.
**Figure A3** | Time-temperature “cooling events” charts for Iberia (A, B, C, and D) and Northwest Africa (D, E, F, G, H, I, and J). See caption of figure A2 for details.
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