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Abstract

Komatiites are ultra-hot ultramafic lavas, largely restricted to the Archaean. They represent an extreme endmember of terrestrial magmatism and challenge our understanding of how mantle melting operates. We briefly introduce this compositionally diverse group of lavas and critically evaluate constraints on their formation. Despite evidence for moderate water contents in some komatiites, the vast majority require an unusually hot mantle source and probably formed by critical melting in dry or ‘damp’ plumes. The low concentrations of incompatible trace elements in most komatiites cannot be explained by residual phases rich in these elements and instead reflect high degrees of partial melting. Constraining the melting pressures of komatiites is complicated by a lack of robust constraints. However, high MgO contents, high degrees of partial melting, and evidence of residual garnet in the formation of Al-depleted komatiites indicate that melting began at considerable depth in the upper mantle, if not within the lower mantle. We combine these constraints to present models for komatiite formation. Al-depleted komatiites are high pressure melts of fertile mantle; they segregated from sources containing residual garnet at pressures >7 GPa and possibly >10 GPa. Al-undepleted komatiites segregated at lower pressures and/or after reaching higher degrees of partial melting. They came from a depleted source that may have formed by low degrees of hydrous melting in the mantle transition zone. Al-enriched, or Ti-depleted komatiites originated from extremely depleted sources. Their melting pressures are difficult to ascertain, but evidence from the Commondale komatiites suggest at least some formed at pressures >10 GPa. Ti-enriched komatiites and post-Archaean komatiites were produced by smaller degrees of melting of variably enriched or depleted sources, with melting conditions comparable to those of modern picrites.
1 Introduction

1.1 Why the interest?

When Wilson (2019) described olivine in the 3.3 Ga Commondale komatiites with Fo contents up to 96.6, he built a case that these were Earth’s hottest lavas. Using olivine-melt Mg-Fe exchange, he calculated that the MgO content of the melt was a remarkably high 36.1 wt%, corresponding to a liquidus temperature of 1670°C. This is 450°C hotter than modern basalts.

Komatiites are the hottest lavas on Earth and an extreme example of partial melting in the Earth’s mantle. Their high temperatures influenced how they erupted and crystallized, raise intriguing questions about komatiite mantle sources, and allow komatiites to act as a geological thermometer tracing the hottest parts of the Earth’s mantle.

Despite decades of interest, numerous questions surround the formation of komatiites and what they tell us about the mantle’s thermal and compositional history. Although the existence of ultramafic magmas has been widely accepted ever since the discovery of komatiites (Viljoen and Viljoen, 1969; Nesbitt, 1971; Pyke et al., 1973; Green et al., 1975), debate has persisted about how they were generated, leading to a proliferation of formation models (e.g., Shimizu et al., 2001; Parman et al., 2004; Bédard, 2006; Serrano et al., 2011; Robin-Popieul et al., 2012; Herzberg, 2016; Sobolev et al., 2016; Sossi et al., 2016; McKenzie, 2020; Wyman, 2020).

Komatiite occurrences are highly heterogeneous in both space and time (Condie and O’Neill, 2010), leading to questions about the thermal structure and temporal evolution of the Earth’s mantle (Nisbet et al., 1993; Trela et al., 2017). Komatiites are increasingly used to trace the secular evolution of mantle chemistry (Campbell and Griffin, 1992; Maier et al., 2009; Amsellem et al., 2019; Nicklas et al., 2019; Puchtel et al., 2022), though the implications of using the compositions of magmas as diverse as komatiites for this purpose are just beginning to be explored (Waterton et al., 2021).

The main petrological and geochemical characteristics of komatiites, their field characteristics, and mode of eruption have been covered in several books and numerous papers, and will not be repeated in detail here. Instead, following a brief description of the rock type, we focus on the major advances in our understanding of the origin of komatiites made in the past two decades.

1.2 Komatiite definitions and flow morphologies

Komatiites were first recognised as ultramafic lavas by Viljoen and Viljoen (1969), who named them after the Komati River, which runs through the type-locality in the Barberton greenstone belt, South Africa. The first generally agreed upon definition (Arndt and Brooks, 1980), recognised komatiites as a rock type, the ultramafic equivalent (>18 wt% MgO) of basalt. More recent definitions describe komatiites as ultramafic rocks with textures or geological context indicating a volcanic origin (Kerr and Arndt, 2001; Arndt et al., 2008), <1 wt% TiO₂ (Le Bas, 2000; Hanski et al., 2001), and <52 wt% SiO₂ (Pearce and Reagan, 2019). Some definitions require that komatiites are derived from liquids with >18 wt% MgO. These criteria distinguish komatiites from other volcanic rocks, including: picrites, which may have >18 wt% MgO due accumulation of olivine in more evolved liquids (Francis, 1985; Hole and Natland, 2020); meimechites, high-TiO₂ alkaline ultramafic lavas formed by low degree, high pressure hydrous melting (Arndt et al., 1995; Ivanov et al., 2018); and boninites, high SiO₂ ultramafic magmas formed by flux melting of highly depleted sources, usually in subduction settings (Cameron et al., 1979). It is important to note that all known komatiites are metamorphosed or altered to some degree, though the prefix meta-komatiite is rarely used.
Komatiites display a variety of flow morphologies (Barnes, 2006; Arndt et al., 2008). Best known are differentiated lava flows (Figure 1), which are differentiated into a spinifex-textured upper part and an olivine cumulate lower part. Spinifex texture comprises centimetre- to metre-sized skeletal plates of olivine (Nesbitt, 1971) or pyroxene (Lowrey et al., 2017), or needles of pyroxene (Viljoen and Viljoen, 1969), arranged perpendicular to flow margins (platy spinifex) or randomly oriented (random spinifex). These skeletal crystals are surrounded by a matrix of finer-grained olivine, clinopyroxene and altered glass (Pyke et al., 1973; Figure 2a).

Not all komatiite flows are structured in this manner and the majority totally lack spinifex texture (Hill et al., 1995; Dann, 2000). Some komatiite flows are porphyritic throughout, containing variable amounts of mm-sized equant olivine phenocrysts in a matrix of fine-grained pyroxene and altered glass; others are composed largely or entirely of ortho- to adcumulates. More rarely, komatiites occur as pillow lavas (Pyke et al., 1973; Dann, 2000), or fragmental komatiites of hyaloclastic or pyroclastic origin (Arndt et al., 1977; Gélinas et al., 1977; Echeverría and Aitken, 1986; Révillon et al., 2000).

Flow thicknesses range from <50 cm to >100 m (Hill et al., 1995; Barnes and Lesher, 2008). Their lengths are difficult to define due to limited exposure, but some individual flows are continuous for 100s of metres and komatiite-dominated sequences can be traced for 100s of kilometres (Hill et al., 1995; Ayer et al., 2002).

### 1.2.1 Spinifex texture

Spinifex textures are best developed in smaller flows, on the flanks of large eruptions, or in lava lakes. This indicates that low flow rates or lava ponding are prerequisites for their formation (Arndt, 1986; Hill et al., 1995; Puchtel et al., 1996; Barnes, 2006). Thicknesses of spinifex zones can vary, or the texture can disappear altogether, within single flows (Arndt et al., 1977). Spinifex usually grows downwards from the top of komatiite flows. The lowest portion of the spinifex zone therefore has the most evolved compositions and, along with the top of the cumulative layer, is the last part of the flow to crystallise (Pyke et al., 1973; Arndt et al., 1977; Renner et al., 1994). Platy spinifex zones may contain a cumulus component of excess olivine or pyroxene (Campbell and Arndt, 1982; Arndt, 1986); their bulk-rock compositions shouldn’t be used as a proxy for komatiitic melts (Nisbet et al., 1993).

The origin of spinifex texture has long been debated (Viljoen and Viljoen, 1969; Nesbitt, 1971). Central to this debate is the so-called ‘spinifex paradox’: skeletal spinifex grains resemble crystals grown during rapid cooling, yet these crystals are found well below the flow top, where cooling rates are low (Donaldson, 1982). A resolution to this paradox was proposed by Faure et al. (2006), who demonstrated experimentally that platy spinifex textures form within thermal gradients in the upper parts of komatiite flows. Growth of olivine (or pyroxene) from the flow top forms a zone of melt depleted in olivine; crystallisation within this zone results in skeletal morphologies. Crystals are orientated perpendicular to the flow top because only vertically orientated crystals can grow without colliding with other crystals (Turner et al., 1986; Shore and Fowler, 1999). Cooling rates as low as 2 °C per hour can produce platy spinifex textures, providing thermal gradients are present, whereas random olivine spinifex forms at faster cooling rates nearer the flow tops (Faure et al., 2006).

The reason why spinifex textures are absent in most komatiites and similar ultramafic lavas, such as Phanerozoic picrites, remains unresolved despite numerous discussions (Pyke et al., 1973; Turner et al., 1986; Barnes and Lesher, 2008). In major komatiite flow channels, high flow rates or turbulent flow (Barnes and...
Lesher, 2008) may prevent the establishment of the thermal gradients or solidification of an upper flow crust required for spinifex growth. More generally, spinifex can only form in the absence of phenocrysts, which act as nuclei for crystal growth, suppressing the formation of skeletal habits (Lofgren, 1983). Spinifex formation may therefore require upstream deposition of phenocrysts (Barnes and Lesher, 2008), or deposition of cumulate layers when sufficiently low viscosity lavas slow or pond (Pyke et al., 1973), to allow formation of a crystal-free upper layers. Superheating during magmatic ascent could also achieve a similar effect by clearing the melt of crystal nuclei (Aitken and Echeverría, 1984; Arndt, 1994). Picrites or komatiites that do not produce a crystal-free layer upon ponding, either because the carrier melts are too viscous or the degree of crystallinity is too high (Marsh, 1981), may be unable to form spinifex textures.

1.2.2 When is spinifex not spinifex?

Two other textures in ultramafic rocks can be mistaken for spinifex and may be used to mistakenly identify komatiites (Figure 2b, c). The first is ‘microspinifex’ texture. While this term is correctly used for zones of fine-grained randomly oriented skeletal crystals of olivine or pyroxene in the upper parts of some komatiite flows, it is not appropriate for the dendritic pyroxenes found interstitial to olivine phenocrysts in many picrites. This type of texture is found in olivine-phyric rocks with diverse origins and is not diagnostic of komatiite (Cameron and Nisbet, 1982; Arndt et al., 2008). A simple criterion is that the term spinifex should be reserved for textures visible in hand samples and avoided for textures observed only in thin section.

The second texture consists of radiating bladed or lenticular olivine grains, up to 1 m long, in dunites that have undergone high-grade metamorphism (Collerson et al., 1976). These olivines can be distinguished from ‘true’ spinifex by the non-skeletal morphology of olivine grains, an elongation along the olivine b-axis (rather than a or c for magmatic spinifex), and association with secondary hydrous minerals that are commonly cross-cut by the olivine blades (Evans and Trommsdorff, 1974; Snoke and Calk, 1978).

1.2.3 Komatiitic and tholeiitic basalts

Komatiitic basalts are mafic volcanic rocks that contain olivine or pyroxene spinifex textures (Arndt, 1982; Lowrey et al., 2017), or are genetically related to komatiites (Nesbitt et al., 1982). In some areas a genetic association is evident because the rocks are interlayered with komatiite lava flows or form the mafic portions of layered mafic-ultramafic flows (Arndt et al., 1977). However, elsewhere genetic associations are harder to identify and a relationship to komatiites must be established through geochemical or isotopic data. The bulk-rock compositions of some komatiitic basalts may exceed 18 wt% MgO due to olivine accumulation, but these should not be classed as komatiites if it can be shown that their parental magmas had <18 wt% MgO (Hanski and Smolkin, 1995; Puchtel et al., 1996; Wilson and Riganti, 2022).

Tholeiitic basalts are the most common rock type associated with komatiites and the major constituent of most Archaean and Proterozoic greenstone belts. There is an ongoing debate over the relationship between these basalts and komatiites; whether they formed by differentiation of komatiitic parental melts or by independent melting of similar mantle sources (Arndt and Nesbitt, 1982; Campbell et al., 1989; Waterton et al., 2020), but this issue is not addressed further here.

2 Spatial and temporal distribution of komatiites

Komatiites are unevenly distributed in both space and time. They are primarily an Archaean phenomenon
(Nesbitt et al., 1982; Nisbet, 1982) and komatiite abundances decreased sharply after 2.7 Ga (Figure 3). Only a few komatiite localities are known from the Proterozoic, including those in the ~1.9 Ga Circum-Superior belt (Arndt, 1982; Waterton et al., 2017) and Baltic Shield (Puchtel et al., 1997; Hanski et al., 2001). There are no known komatiites from the period between 1.8 and 0.8 Ga. The only well-documented Phanerozoic example are the Cretaceous Gorgona komatiites (Echeverria, 1980); Permian Song-Da komatiites (Hanski et al., 2004) lack macrospinifex texture and are arguably picrites (Anh et al., 2011). Even within the Archaean, komatiite occurrences are highly heterogeneous. The oldest known komatiites are the ~3.53 Ga Co onterunah komatiites or ~3.55 Ga Schapenburg komatiites (Van Kranendonk et al., 2007; Maier et al., 2009; Puchtel et al., 2016). No convincing examples of Eoarchaean komatiites have been documented.

Komatiites also have a strongly uneven spatial distribution. Archaean komatiites are generally restricted to low-grade granite-greenstone terranes and are absent from high-grade metamorphic terranes, though this may be something of a tautology as it is doubtful that volcanic textures, including spinifex, would survive granulite-facies metamorphism (Nutman et al., 1996). Some high-grade metamorphosed ultramafic rocks have been claimed to be komatiites on the basis of geochemistry (Kalsbeek and Manatschal, 1999; Frank et al., 2016), but these have low MgO compared to most komatiites.

More broadly, komatiite abundances vary strongly between different Archaean cratons. Some, such as the Yilgarn and Superior Cratons, are home to abundant komatiites (Nesbitt et al., 1979; Hollings et al., 1999; Thurston et al., 2008; Mole et al., 2014), while the Slave and North Atlantic Cratons entirely lack komatiite. The reasons for this uneven spatial distribution remain unclear. Haphazard preservation is almost certainly a factor, supported by the presence of komatiitic chromite in detrital quartzites from Slave and Kaapvaal Cratons, which demonstrates that some komatiites were lost to erosion (Haugaard et al., 2021; Lowe et al., 2021). Varying erosional depths may also contribute; some deeply eroded cratons that lack komatiite lavas contain abundant intrusive peridotite or dunite bodies, which probably represent komatiitic cumulates (Chadwick and Crewe, 1986; Rollinson et al., 2002; Szilas et al., 2018). Finally, evidence that komatiite eruption is strongly localised along crustal boundaries or rifts suggests lithospheric controls on komatiite eruption (Mole et al., 2014, 2021). Early stabilisation of thick lithosphere (Pearson et al., 1995; Timmerman 2022) may have therefore impeded komatiite formation or eruption, either locally or at the craton scale.

3 Geochemistry and types of komatiite

Komatiites show a wide range of compositions. Early studies distinguished three main types, primarily on the basis of Al₂O₃/TiO₂ and heavy rare-earth element (HREE) patterns (Figure 4; Nesbitt et al., 1979; Jahn et al., 1982). Al-depleted (Barberton-type) komatiites have low Al₂O₃/TiO₂ and high Gd/Yb; Al-undepleted (Munro-type) komatiites have near-chondritic ratios of the two parameters; and Al-enriched komatiites have high Al₂O₃/TiO₂ and low Gd/Yb. The latter have also been referred to as 'Ti-depleted', because TiO₂ depletion exerts the main control on Al₂O₃/TiO₂ (Sproule et al., 2002; Kamber and Tomlinson, 2019). Later, Ti-enriched (Karasjok type) komatiites were recognised (Barnes and Often, 1990). These are typically lower in MgO and have low Al₂O₃/TiO₂, though this arises from Ti-enrichment, rather than Al-depletion. Al-undepleted and Al-enriched komatiites tend to be relatively depleted in more incompatible trace elements, such as the light rare-earth elements (LREE; i.e., La/Sm ratios are low); Al-depleted and some, but not all, Ti-enriched komatiites show elevated La/Sm (Figures 4, 5).

Ti-enriched and Al-depleted komatiites are not easily distinguished using element and oxide ratios alone.
Though alternative classifications have been proposed, these either do not identify Al-enriched komatiites (Hanski et al., 2001), or require knowledge of the parental melt composition (Sossi et al., 2016). We therefore propose a classification scheme using the absolute Al$_2$O$_3$ and TiO$_2$ contents normalised to a common MgO content to correct for fractional crystallisation or accumulation of olivine (Figures 4a, b). We use 25% MgO because it is close the modal MgO value in Archean komatiites (Barnes and Arndt, 2019; Kamber and Tomlinson, 2019); element concentrations are normalised to this value by interpolating along regressions of Al$_2$O$_3$ and TiO$_2$ against MgO. We adopt the Al$_2$O$_3$/TiO$_2$ values suggested by Kamber and Tomlinson (2019) as boundaries between the groups: Al-depleted <15, Al-undepleted 15–25, Al-enriched >25, and suggest that komatiites with >0.5 wt% (TiO$_2$)$_{25}$ (where the subscript indicates the TiO$_2$ content estimated for a melt containing 25 wt% MgO) should be considered Ti-enriched.

This (Al$_2$O$_3$)$_{25}$ vs (TiO$_2$)$_{25}$ diagram documents the concentrations of Al$_2$O$_3$ and TiO$_2$, which are important parameters that are not recorded by element ratios alone. For example, the high Al$_2$O$_3$/TiO$_2$ of Commondale komatiites is mainly due to low TiO$_2$, whereas the low Al$_2$O$_3$/TiO$_2$ in Barberton Al-depleted komatiites reflects both moderately high TiO$_2$ and low Al$_2$O$_3$. Furthermore, the diagram shows that although all the Al-undepleted komatiites share near-chondritic Al$_2$O$_3$/TiO$_2$ (close to 20), they have very different concentrations of both elements, from very high in Gorgona komatiites, to strikingly low in Barberton Al-undepleted komatiites. The concentrations of Al are indicative of conditions at the site of melting, whereas (TiO$_2$)$_{25}$ reflects the degree of melting and prior melt extraction (Section 4). This approach should only be applied to suites where there is a tight correlation between the concentration of the element and MgO, indicative of control by a single olivine population. Scattered plots of Al$_2$O$_3$ and TiO$_2$ against MgO may indicate mixed phenocryst populations, as in some picrites, or mobility of these elements during metamorphism.

In addition to the (Al$_2$O$_3$)$_{25}$ vs (TiO$_2$)$_{25}$ diagram, we use two further plots to illustrate the geochemical compositions of komatiites (Figures 4c, d). 1) The Al$_2$O$_3$/TiO$_2$ vs (Gd/Yb)$_N$ diagram (‘N’ indicates normalisation to primitive mantle of Hofmann, 1988) initially proposed by Jahn et al. (1982), distinguishes the three main types of komatiite: Al-depleted, Al-undepleted and Al-enriched and shows the effect of garnet fractionation during their petrogenesis. 2) The (La/Sm)$_N$ vs (Gd/Yb)$_N$ diagram, which reflects the degree of LREE and HREE depletion or enrichment.

## 4 Constraints on komatiite formation

Most komatiite formation models have invoked the presence of mantle plumes, following the early recognition that (dry) ultramafic liquids have extremely high liquidus temperatures and, by extension, elevated mantle temperatures (Green, 1975; Green et al., 1975). However, a wide range of alternatives have been proposed, either invoking the presence of water to lower the required temperatures, or invoking non-uniformitarian processes (Figure 6). Here we evaluate models of komatiite formation first by addressing questions relevant to the formation of all komatiites, before discussing models specific to the various komatiite types in Section 5.

### 4.1 Were komatiites, dry, wet or damp?

The amount of water in komatiite magmas has generated animated debate. Early studies proposed that the parent magmas formed by high-degree melting of their mantle source (Viljoen and Viljoen, 1969; Green et al., 1975; Arndt, 1977; Nisbet, 1982). Given that water behaves as an incompatible element during mantle melting, and without a priori evidence for hydrous mantle sources, most authors assumed that komatiites
were essentially anhydrous. Nonetheless, ‘wet’ models invoking high water contents (> 1 wt%) appeared soon after. Key arguments for a hydrous origin include: an association with rocks interpreted to be arc volcanics, the hypothesis that water is required to form spinifex texture (Brooks and Hart, 1974; de Wit et al., 1987), compositional similarities between komatiitic basalts and subduction zone magmas (Parman and Grove, 2005), and the compositions of certain komatiitic pyroxenes resemble those formed by water-saturated crystallisation (Parman et al., 1997). In these models, komatiites represent a high temperature equivalent of boninites (Grove and Parman, 2004). More recently, Herzberg (2016) proposed that komatiites were generated in ‘carbonated wetspots’ – mantle sources with elevated concentrations of both CO₂ and H₂O, either in plumes or ambient mantle.

As noted previously, the formation of spinifex texture does not require the presence of water. Subduction-like geochemical signatures in some komatiites probably resulted from crustal contamination (Barnes and Arndt, 2019). Other arguments for a hydrous origin have been contested elsewhere (Arndt et al., 1998, 2008). Two recent advances rule out high volatile contents in most komatiites. The first is the measurement of H₂O and CO₂ in melt inclusions in komatiitic olivine and spinel. These have consistently found low but significant H₂O contents between 0.2–1.0 wt% (Shimizu et al., 2001; Sobolev et al., 2016, 2019; Asafov et al., 2018, 2020). Concentrations of CO₂ range from ~200 ppm in Archaean komatiites, to ~1700 ppm in Gorgona komatiites (Kamenetsky et al., 2010; Gurenko et al., 2016). The second advance is the advent of geothermometers that are independent of melt H₂O content, such as olivine-melt Sc/Y (Mallmann and O’Neill, 2013) and Al-in-olivine (Wan et al., 2008; Coogan et al., 2014). Where applied to komatiites, they give temperatures close to the anhydrous liquidus. These have been interpreted to indicate water contents from 0.1–0.6 wt% (Sobolev et al., 2016; Waterton et al., 2017), though these are somewhat poorly constrained due to large uncertainties in both the measured temperatures and the effect of water content on temperature (Herzberg, 2022).

Herzberg (2016) argued that melt inclusions studies may strongly underestimate H₂O contents, due to degassing prior to formation of the inclusions. However, degassing during a komatiite’s ascent should trigger olivine crystallisation and trapping of melt inclusions, because the magma’s liquidus temperature increases as the water content falls. Melt inclusions from boninites and meimechites support this reasoning, recording H₂O contents of up to 2.9 and 3.9 wt%, respectively (Sobolev and Chausssidon, 1996; Ivanov et al., 2018); if komatiites had such high water contents, these should be observable.

We conclude that most komatiites contained <1 wt% H₂O. These water contents indicate mantle sources with a maximum of 0.5 wt% H₂O (Shimizu et al., 2001), significantly higher than in the MORB source (Sobolev et al., 2016), but not sufficiently hydrated to support models in which komatiites represent boninite-like flux melts (Parman et al., 1997; Grove and Parman, 2004). Furthermore, CO₂ contents lower than typical MORB (Hauri et al., 2018) are inconsistent with an origin from carbonated wetspots (Herzberg, 2016). The water in komatiites has been proposed to originate from the mantle transition zone (Shimizu et al., 2001; Sobolev et al., 2016, 2019; Asafov et al., 2018, 2020), which may contain up to a few percent of water in wadsleyite and ringwoodite (Smyth, 1994; Pearson et al., 2014).

Some komatiites probably had higher water contents, including igneous amphibole-bearing komatiites from the Abitibi belt (Stone et al., 1997). Other komatiites may have picked up water via assimilation of hydrous material at a late stage during their ascent. Examples include the Murphy Well flow (Siégel et al., 2014) and fragmental, arguably pyroclastic, komatiites from northern Sweden (Saverikko, 1985).
4.2 How hot were komatiites and their mantle sources?

4.2.1 Komatiite liquidus temperatures

Komatiite liquidus temperatures are most commonly estimated using the MgO content of the parental magma, which is proportional to the liquidus temperature for high MgO melts; a 1 wt% increase in MgO corresponds to around 20 °C increased liquidus temperature (Nisbet, 1982; Matzen et al., 2011; Herzberg and Asimow, 2015). One approach to calculating parental melt MgO is to use a composition inferred to represent a komatiitic liquid, typically that of chilled margins or fine-grained random olivine spinifex. Though this method is straightforward, care needs to be taken because the margins of komatiite flows are susceptible to alteration, and even random olivine spinifex compositions can show evidence of MgO gain (Arndt, 1986). Furthermore, small quantities of olivine phenocrysts can have significant effects on the bulk rock MgO; 5 vol% of olivine phenocrysts will increase the MgO by ~1.5% (Waterton et al., 2017), equivalent to a ~30 °C temperature overestimate. Parental melt compositions can also be calculated from olivine-melt Fe-Mg exchange (Roeder and Emslie, 1970; Toplis, 2005), either using measured olivine Mg#, or by extrapolating olivine control lines in plots of incompatible elements to the MgO axis, to identify the average crystallising olivine composition (Bickle, 1982; Puchtel et al., 2004). This process requires an estimate of the total Fe content of the parental magmas and, because only Fe$^{2+}$ is incorporated into olivine, an estimate of Fe$^{2+}$/ΣFe (Berry et al., 2008; Waterton et al., 2017).

For komatiites, melt MgO contents and liquidus temperatures are typically calculated at atmospheric pressure, under the assumption that olivine only began to crystallise near the surface (e.g., Nisbet et al., 1993; Puchtel et al., 2013; Sobolev et al., 2016; Sossi et al., 2016). However, evidence that some komatiites begin crystallising olivine at great depth (Wilson and Bolhar, 2022) can cause incorrect estimates of the melt MgO content from olivine-melt Fe-Mg exchange because the exchange coefficient is pressure dependent (Herzberg, 2022 and references therein). Ideally, several approaches to calculating parental melt MgO should be used (Bickle, 1982; Nisbet et al., 1993; Herzberg et al., 2007) before correcting the calculated dry liquidus temperatures for any water present (e.g., Sobolev et al., 2016).

Liquidus temperatures calculated for common Archaean komatiites with ~23–30 wt% MgO range from ~1450–1600 °C (Nisbet et al., 1993; Sossi et al., 2016), or up to 1670 °C in rare komatiites with higher MgO contents (Robin-Popieul et al., 2012; Wilson, 2019; Herzberg, 2022). The presence of small amounts of water in some Archaean komatiites lowered these by a maximum of 30–60 °C (Sobolev et al., 2016; Asafov et al., 2018), though the effect of water on liquidus temperatures could have been as small as 9–23 °C, depending on the calibration used (Herzberg, 2022). Proterozoic komatiites appear to have had lower MgO contents and liquidus temperatures; ~20–27 wt% MgO and 1450–1550 °C, respectively (Waterton et al., 2017; Nicklas et al., 2019; Puchtel et al., 2020; Herzberg, 2022). Phanerozoic Gorgona komatiites formed at liquidus temperatures between ~1330–1400 °C from melts with ~17–20 wt% MgO (Révillon et al., 2000; Kamenetsky et al., 2010), though several Phanerozoic picrites record higher liquidus temperatures, ranging up to 1570 °C (Trela et al., 2017).

4.2.2 Komatiite mantle source temperatures

Temperatures of komatiite mantle sources are typically compared using mantle potential temperatures, $T_p$, the extrapolation of the temperature at the source region to the surface along the solid mantle adiabat (McKenzie and Bickle, 1988). This allows comparison of the thermal anomaly required to produce komatiites sourced from different depths. These are closely related to the pressure of melting because higher...
temperature mantle begins to melt at higher pressures during decompression.

One method for calculating $T_p$ involves projecting the komatiite liquidus temperature to the melting region along the adiabatic gradient of komatiitic magma, correcting for the latent heat of melting (McKenzie and Bickle, 1988; Nisbet et al., 1993). The komatiite source $T_p$ is then calculated as the $T_p$ of the mantle adiabat required to intersect the solidus at that depth. This method is highly model dependent, relying on a number assumptions about the style of melting, where the melt separated from its solid mantle source, and whether the magmas lost heat to their wall rocks, or underwent viscous heating as gravitational potential energy is released during their ascent (Nisbet et al., 1993; Sossi et al., 2016). Large uncertainties are also introduced due to the similarity of adiabatic gradients to the solidus gradient at high pressure (Herzberg and O’Hara, 2002) and uncertainties surrounding the exact nature of the high pressure solidus (Andrault et al., 2018).

Alternatively, potential temperatures can be estimated from komatiite melt compositions. This approach uses relationships between the pressure of melting and melt composition, with higher pressures of melting requiring higher $T_p$ to intersect the solidus at greater depths. For example, melt MgO contents largely depend on the depth of melting initiation and, in turn, mantle potential temperature (Herzberg and O’Hara, 2002; Herzberg et al., 2007; Herzberg and Asimow, 2008). The $T_p$ calculated from a given pressure of melting depends on the nature of the solidus. Recent ‘low temperature’ solidus parameterisations (Andrault et al., 2018) imply relatively low $T_p$ of ~1530 °C for Archaean komatiites, with melting beginning at up to 25 GPa (Pierru et al., 2022). It is presently unclear how such low $T_p$ mantle can produce melts that arrive near the surface with the high liquidus temperatures observed for komatiites, and this merits further investigation. By contrast, more conventional ‘high temperature’ solidus parameterisations imply higher absolute $T_p$ of ~1700–1900 °C for Archaean komatiites (Herzberg, 2022), though melting begins at lower pressures (~10 GPa; Herzberg and Asimow, 2015).

### 4.2.3 Are plumes required to form komatiites?

Komatiite liquidus temperatures are mostly significantly higher than those from ambient mantle melts (e.g., Green et al., 1975; Herzberg, 2022). These provide minimum estimates for the komatiite source $T_p$, because melting always results in a fall in temperature. Notwithstanding the issues outlined above, mantle potential temperature estimates tell a similar story. Almost all komatiites require sources that are far hotter than ambient mantle, with $T_p$ estimates ranging up to 1900 °C (Nisbet et al., 1993; Herzberg et al., 2010). This means that komatiite formation requires the presence of thermally anomalous mantle, ruling out models in which komatiites form at ambient temperatures in mantle refertilised by delamination (Bédard, 2006) or in slab windows (Serrano et al., 2011). We conclude that thermally anomalous mantle plumes are required to form komatiites.

### 4.3 Are komatiite sources enriched or depleted?

Variations in incompatible trace element ratios and patterns indicate that some komatiites formed from sources that had been depleted by prior melt extraction and others from sources that had undergone some form of enrichment (metasomatism or incorporation of recycled material). Al-enriched, low TiO$_2$ komatiites are generally derived from the most depleted sources, as recorded in their extremely low concentrations of the more incompatible elements. The mantle-normalized trace element patterns of komatiites from the Commondale region, for example, show a continuous slope from a maximum at Lu to extremely low values for Th (Figure 5; Wilson, 2019). Their elevated Al$_2$O$_3$/TiO$_2$ ratios largely reflect depletions in Ti (Kamber and
Further evidence of depletion is provided by anomalously elevated concentrations of Ru relative to Pt and Pd, which require that the source had undergone significant (>10%) prior melt extraction (Waterton et al., 2021).

Most Al-depleted and Al-undepleted komatiites vary between primitive mantle-like (La/Sm)\text{N} and moderately depleted (La/Sm)\text{N}, consistent with fertile to moderately depleted mantle sources (Figure 4d). Interestingly, source depletion appears to be more dependent on the komatiite age rather than type (Figure 5). Komatiites older than 3 Ga generally have flat trace element patterns, regardless of whether they are Al-depleted or Al-undepleted, whereas komatiites formed at ~2.7 Ga (predominantly Al-undepleted) have depleted trace element patterns. Al-undepleted and Al-depleted komatiites with more enriched trace-element compositions do exist, though in many cases this results from crustal contamination (Barnes et al., 2021).

4.4 Degree of melting

The high temperatures inferred for komatiites have led to the suggestion that their mantle sources underwent large degrees of partial melting (Nesbitt et al., 1979; Nisbet, 1982; Herzberg, 1992; Nisbet et al., 1993). Concentrations of moderately incompatible elements, such as Ti, provide information on the percentage of partial melting, as these elements are little affected by source depletion or garnet fractionation. At high degrees of melting, Ti concentrations are inversely proportional to the degree of melting. Using measured TiO$_2$ contents (Figure 4a) and assuming a primitive mantle source with 0.18 wt% TiO$_2$ (Hofmann, 1988), we estimate that the degree of partial melting for Al-depleted komatiites was between 30–45%, similar to previous estimates (e.g., Herzberg, 1992; Sossi et al., 2016). If Al-undepleted komatiites formed by melting of a primitive mantle-like source, the estimated degree of melting ranges from ~30% to an unrealistic 80%. Use of a depleted mantle source with 0.13 wt% TiO$_2$ (Salters and Stracke, 2004) reduces the maximum degree of partial melting for these komatiites to a still-high 43% (Waterton et al., 2021). The enigmatic Barberton Al-undepleted komatiites show an unusual combination of extremely low trace element concentrations (~0.22 wt% TiO$_2$) with no evidence of source depletion, implying an implausible 80% partial melting of a primitive mantle source.

4.5 Depths and pressures of melting

Several lines of reasoning suggest that komatiites form at great depths in the mantle. The MgO contents of near-solidus melts increase with the depth of melting, and do not significantly change with continued adiabatic decompression melting (Herzberg and O’Hara, 2002). Melts with up to 30 wt% MgO require that melting started around 10 GPa unless their sources are considerably depleted. Similarly, projections of the liquidus temperatures of komatiites intersect the mantle solidus only at very high pressures in the upper mantle, if at all (Miller et al., 1991a; Nisbet et al., 1993). The high degrees of melting inferred for komatiites also imply deep melting initiation, because the amount of decompression melting is limited by the decrease in pressure after the source crosses the solidus. Finally, the presence of garnet signatures in Al-depleted
komatiites (Al- and HREE-depletion) places additional constraints on their pressure of melting, discussed below.

4.5.1 Physical constraints on melting depth

For adiabatic decompression melting to occur, the solidus must be steeper (in temperature/pressure) than the adiabatic temperature gradient. In the lower part of the upper mantle the solid adiabat may be slightly steeper or parallel to the fertile peridotite solidus (Miller et al., 1991a), leading McKenzie (2020) to argue that no decompression melting could occur in this region. This depends on the exact solidus used; recent analyses find it to be slightly steeper than the solid adiabat at all upper mantle depths, except for across major phase transitions (Andrault et al., 2018). Regardless, the adiabat and solidus are nearly parallel between ~13–24 GPa, or depths of ~400–670 km, and at most only small degrees of melt can be produced in this region (Nisbet, 1982; Sossi et al., 2016). For large quantities of melt to be present at these depths, it must have formed through melting deeper in the mantle. Furthermore, the major phase transitions bridgmanite to ringwoodite-majorite, ringwoodite to wadsleyite, and wadsleyite to olivine are all endothermic for rising mantle at the temperatures relevant to komatiite formation (Herzberg and Zhang, 1996; Hirose, 2002). These endothermic transitions may further restrict decompression melting in the transition zone, as rising mantle will cool more than predicted from adiabatic gradients alone. This does not preclude small degrees of hydrous melting in or above the mantle transition zone (Myhill et al., 2017; Drewitt et al., 2022), if water is released during these phase transitions (Sobolev et al., 2016; Wilson and Bolhar, 2022). However, high degrees of melting through adiabatic decompression can only be achieved at pressures <13 GPa, or within the lower mantle, where the solidus is significantly steeper than mantle adiabats (McKenzie, 2020).

4.5.2 Did komatiites form in the lower mantle?

McKenzie (2020) proposed that the low trace element contents and high MgO contents of komatiites could be a result of small degrees of melting with residual Ca-perovskite in the uppermost lower mantle. Although his model reproduces average komatiite REE compositions, the fit is poor for most other elements, notably the HFSE. Melts formed in equilibrium with Ca-perovskite should show large positive anomalies of Nb and Ta relative to the REE, because these elements are incompatible in both Ca-perovskite and bridgmanite. This is not observed in most komatiites; the mismatch in the McKenzie (2020) models is masked by the inclusion of some Nb and Ta rich Al-depleted Barberton komatiites in the average komatiite composition modelled (Sossi et al., 2016), that appear highly unusual (c.f., Robin-Popieul et al., 2012; Puchtel et al., 2013). Similarly, the compatibility of Hf and Zr in bridgmanite relative to the REE produces strong negative Zr and Hf anomalies in the McKenzie (2020) models. These features are also not observed in most komatiites. In a related model, Pierru et al. (2022) invoked preferential melting of Ca-perovskite in the lower mantle with residual bridgmanite to explain the high CaO/Al₂O₃ of Al-depleted komatiites, though at higher degrees of melting. Again, this does not appear to be compatible with the lack of HFSE/REE fractionation observed in most komatiites, and we note that CaO/Al₂O₃ comparable to typical Al-depleted komatiites (Robin-Popieul et al., 2012) have been experimentally produced at much lower pressures (Walter, 1998).

Another line of evidence against komatiite formation in the lower mantle comes from the highly siderophile elements (HSE; Re, Au, and the platinum-group elements). With increasing pressure, major mantle minerals preferentially incorporate Fe³⁺ over Fe²⁺, leading to stabilisation of metallic alloys at pressures > 8 GPa (O’Neill et al., 1993; Frost et al., 2004; Rohrbach et al., 2007, 2011). Small degree melts formed in the lower mantle should therefore be virtually devoid of HSE, due to their extremely high partition coefficients in metallic phases. By contrast, komatiites have the highest HSE contents of mantle derived melts (Barnes et al., 2015),
requiring high degrees of melting (Barnes et al., 1985; Waterton et al., 2021). We conclude that melts from the lower mantle did not significantly contribute to komatiite formation, or that the geochemical signatures of these melts were effaced during subsequent ascent of the magmas. Given the arguments that Ca-perovskite was not an important residual phase, high degrees of melting are indeed necessary to explain the low trace element contents of komatiites.

4.5.3 Melting pressures of different komatiite types

Major constraints on komatiite source pressures come from their MgO contents, their high degrees of partial melting, and the presence or absence of garnet signatures (Al- and HREE-depletion), which vary between different komatiite groups. In Al-depleted komatiites, the garnet signature provides a constraint on the pressure of melting (Green, 1975; Ohtani, 1990; Herzberg, 1992) but its application depends on phase relations, particularly the positions of the solidus and the garnet-out curve (Figure 7a). Garnet is only retained in residues of 30–45% melting for final pressures of melting >4.5 GPa (Walter, 1998) or >7 GPa (Herzberg and Zhang, 1996; Herzberg et al., 2000). However, higher pressures than these are required to retain enough garnet in the source to match the low Al$_2$O$_3$/TiO$_2$ (~10) of Al-depleted komatiites. Experimental batch melts at melt fractions >30% have Al$_2$O$_3$/TiO$_2$ ≈ 10 at pressures ≥7 GPa (Walter, 1998), suggesting the majority of melts contributing to the formation of Al-depleted komatiites are sourced from at least this pressure.

Alternatively, simple mass balance calculations show that Komati formation Al-depleted komatiites (4.5 wt% Al$_2$O$_3$; Figure 4) formed from primitive mantle (4.1 wt% Al$_2$O$_3$; Hofmann, 1988), with garnet (22 wt% Al$_2$O$_3$; Walter, 1998) as the sole aluminous phase in the residue, require the residue to comprise ~20% garnet. This condition is met for >30% melting at pressures ≳10 GPa using the phase relations shown (Figure 7a). These estimates are consistent with typical parental melt MgO contents of ~30 wt % (Robin-Popieul et al., 2012; Puchtel et al., 2013; Sossi et al., 2016), which indicate that the solidus was crossed at pressures ≥10 GPa (Herzberg and Asimow, 2015).

Al-undepleted komatiites lack garnet signatures. This could either reflect a large portion of the melt formed at low pressures, or melting continued beyond garnet exhaustion at higher pressures (Figure 7b; Heinonen et al., 2022). Typical Archaean Al-undepleted komatiites have parental melts with ~27–30 wt% MgO (Arndt et al., 2008; Sossi et al., 2016; Nicklas et al., 2018); for dry, fertile sources, this would also indicate pressures for the start of melting ≥8 GPa. The common evidence for minor source depletion and the presence of H$_2$O in some Al-undepleted komatiites (Shimizu et al., 2001; Sobolev et al., 2016) complicates this. Proterozoic and Phanerozoic Al-undepleted komatiites with lower MgO contents likely originate from lower pressures (<5 GPa; Révillon et al., 2000; Waterton et al., 2021; Herzberg, 2022).

The melting pressure of Al-enriched komatiites is not well constrained due to their highly depleted, refractory source compositions. Refractory mantle begins to melt at a shallower depth at a given potential temperature, and will have a higher MgO content at a given depth of melting initiation (Herzberg and O’Hara, 2002). However, Commondale komatiites contain olivine with exceptionally high Al$_2$O$_3$ contents (~0.3 wt%), requiring crystallisation pressures >6 GPa and possibly as high as 10 GPa (Agee and Walker, 1990; Wilson and Bolhar, 2022). If, as suggested by Wilson and Bolhar (2022), these are inverted wadsleyite grains, they may have initially crystallised at pressures >15 GPa.

Ti-enriched komatiites generally show garnet signatures (Barnes and Often, 1990; Stone et al., 1995; Hanski et al., 2001), indicating pressures at least some melt was derived from pressures >3 GPa. However, these generally have lower MgO contents and greater incompatible element enrichment than other komatiite types, likely indicating lower degrees of melting at lower pressures.
The depths at which komatiites segregate from their sources are poorly constrained. Al-depleted and some Ti-enriched komatiites are the exception here; to retain residual garnet signatures, they can only have mixed with a small proportion of low-pressure melts and had limited interaction with low-pressure mantle rocks. In modern plumes, melting ceases at the base of the lithosphere, though final pressures of melting may instead reflect the depths at which melts become channelised and effectively isolated from the surrounding upwelling mantle (Herzberg et al., 2023). For Al-depleted komatiites with final pressures of melting >7 GPa, the melts had to segregate well before reaching the base of the lithosphere, and a mechanism for isolating these melts during their ascent is required. For Al-undepleted or Al-enriched komatiites, which lack garnet signatures, melting will drastically slow as fusible components are exhausted from the mantle source (Bernstein et al., 2007). For these komatiites, crossing the garnet-out curve at >6 GPa (T_p ~1800 °C) leaves a dunite residue (Walter, 1998; Herzberg, 2004). Fractional melting would effectively cease at this point (Figure 7), though further melting is possible if some melt is retained in the source. However, a lack of unequivocal signatures of high pressure melt segregation means that Al-undepleted or Al-enriched komatiites may have undergone extensive melt-rock reaction during their ascent (Walsh et al., 2023), and formation of a dunite residue does not necessarily correspond to the segregation and isolation of these melts from the surrounding mantle. At lower pressures, melting past garnet-out leaves harzburgite or lherzolite residues (Walter, 1998; Herzberg, 2004), allowing melting to continue at a reduced rate (Asimow et al., 1997).

4.6 Did komatiites form by batch melting?

Batch melting refers to a process during which melts and residues remain in contact until a large melt fraction accumulates. Modern mantle melts do not form via batch melting because, in the shallow mantle, melts are less dense than their solid residues and the melts are interconnected at all melt fractions, meaning they can migrate freely. Picritic melts can be extracted at melt fractions as low as 1% (McKenzie, 1985), implying they form via critical melting (i.e., near-fractional melting with some melt retained with the mantle residue; Maaløe, 1982). However, it is possible that melt migration could be restricted at higher pressures either by low melt interconnectivity (Sossi et al., 2016), or small density differences between komatiite melts and mantle solids (Stolper et al., 1981), potentially permitting batch-like melting to occur.

High-pressure melting experiments show that melts are interconnected along grain boundaries at low melt fractions at pressures up to those of the mantle transition zone (Yoshino et al., 2007; Freitas et al., 2017; Andrault et al., 2018). Given extremely low melt viscosities of 0.005–0.1 Pa·s at conditions relevant to komatiite formation (Ohtani and Suzuki, 1996; Liebske et al., 2005; Xie et al., 2021), komatiites should be able to move freely throughout the upper mantle, providing they are sufficiently buoyant. However, silicate melts are more compressible than solid silicate minerals, leading to density inversions at depth (Stolper et al., 1981). Most importantly, komatiitic melts are denser than olivine in the window from ~8–15 GPa (Figure 8), though it is unclear whether they ever become denser than bulk peridotite (Agee and Walker, 1988, 1993; Miller et al., 1991b; Agee, 1998; Schmeling and Arndt, 2017).

These density inversions are the basis of models suggesting that Al-depleted komatiites form by critical melting with high melt-retention (Robin-Popieul et al., 2012), or that all komatiites form by batch melting (Sossi et al., 2016). The negative buoyancy of komatiite melt relative to olivine between 8–15 GPa can potentially cause melt to accumulate in the plume until it ascends to levels where the melt becomes less dense than all solid mantle phases. At this stage the melt escapes the source, departing in a single pulse to produce Al-depleted komatiites (Robin-Popieul et al., 2012; Schmeling and Arndt, 2017). Alternatively, Sossi et al. (2016) proposed that in the region where the melt has near-neutral buoyancy, it would migrate upwards.
within the plume at velocities significantly less than the plume ascent rate, allowing batch melting to occur. However, we note that measured melt viscosities (Ohtani and Suzuki, 1996; Liebske et al., 2005; Xie et al., 2021) are ~10 – 200 times lower than those used by Sossi et al. (2016). This means that komatiite ascent velocities should be faster than the plume ascent rate, except for a very small window around a putative level of neutral buoyancy at ~15 GPa (Figure 8).

Geochemical evidence for batch melting in the formation of komatiites is equivocal. Co-variations between incompatible trace elements and radiogenic isotopes (Sossi et al., 2016) only establish the timing of source depletion, and not the melting process that operated (i.e., batch or critical). The FeO concentrations of Al-undepleted komatiites are better matched by batch melting models than fractional, though the inverse is true for SiO$_2$ contents (Herzberg, 2016). Finally, for high degree melts, incompatible trace element concentrations for batch and pooled critical melts are similar, providing all melts within the melting column are able to effectively mix into the pooled melt (Plank and Langmuir, 1992). However, it is not easy to envisage how near-fractional melts formed over such large melting columns can mix without any loss of melt, and models invoking pooled critical melts must address this.

5 Komatiite formation models

The discussion above rules out the majority of komatiite formation models shown in Figure 6. Komatiites form by high degrees of melting in dry or damp, thermally anomalous mantle plumes (e.g., Green et al., 1975; Nesbitt et al., 1979; Herzberg, 1992; Arndt et al., 2008; Sobolev et al., 2016). The available data are unable to distinguish whether komatiites formed from plumes sourced at the core mantle boundary (e.g., Arndt et al., 2008) or in the transition zone (Wyman, 2020). Melting is likely to occur through critical melting, though some mechanism is needed to aggregate and mix critical melts formed over large depth ranges. The wide variations in komatiite geochemistry reflect formation from mantle sources that had undergone varying degrees of depletion and enrichment, combined with variable depths of melting, even within single plumes (Arndt et al., 1977; Révillon et al., 2000). This variability means that care must be taken when using komatiites to trace secular variations in mantle geochemistry (c.f., Maier et al., 2009; Amsellem et al., 2019; Nicklas et al., 2019).

5.1 Al-depleted komatiites

Models for the formation of Al-depleted komatiites must account for residual garnet signatures at high degrees (30–45%) of partial melting, and high parental melt MgO contents (~30 wt%). Two such models komatiites are shown in Figure 9. The pressure of melt segregation was ≥7 GPa, but could have been higher than ~10 GPa depending on the phase relations and solidus used (Herzberg and Zhang, 1996; Walter, 1998; Herzberg et al., 2000). As Al-depleted komatiites frequently show little evidence of prior melt depletion, melting initiation occurred at >10 GPa for melts with ~30 wt% MgO (Herzberg and O’Hara, 2002; Herzberg and Asimow, 2015; Sossi et al., 2016).

In model 1, melting begins at ~11 GPa (the approximate intersection of the 30 wt% MgO isopleth with the solidus; Figure 7), and melts become isolated by around ~7 GPa. Melts formed over this depth range aggregate and mix during melting and magma ascent (Gurenko and Chaussidon, 1995), either as shallow forming melts are added to upwards migrating deep-formed melts, or as the melts ascend through magma channels. Deep-sourced modern melts appear to be well-mixed relative to shallow-sourced melts (Rudge et al., 2013; Jennings et al., 2017), and it is likely that the long transport pathways of deep-sourced komatiites promotes mixing of melts formed over these large (~150 km) depth ranges.
In model 2, melting begins in a hotter plume with a $T_p$ around 1900°C at significantly greater depths, potentially in the lower mantle. High degrees of melting are reached below ~15 GPa, where wadsleyite with a density close to 3700 kg m$^{-3}$ replaces olivine with a density of about 3400 kg m$^{-3}$ (Figure 8). At this point, the melt has a density higher than olivine but less than that of solid peridotite. Schmeling and Arndt (2017) numerically modelled melt migration under these conditions, finding that the reduction in density contrast at ~15 GPa leads to a drop in the velocity of melt migration and accumulation of melt at this depth. The build-up of melt persists as the plume rises, until increasing buoyancy of the melt allows it to escape. These calculations were made using an unrealistically high melt viscosity of 40 Pa s, but new calculations made using 30 mPa s produce similar results (Harro Schmeling, personal communication).

### 5.2 Archaean Al-undepleted komatiites

Aside from their chondritic Al$_2$O$_3$/TiO$_2$ and Gd/Yb, key features of Archaean Al-undepleted komatiites are their commonly depleted trace element patterns (particularly in ~2.7 Ga komatiites; Section 4.3), and the observation that at least some contain appreciable water contents (Section 4.1). Al-undepleted komatiites also show consistently depleted Nd isotopic compositions. However, the range measured Sm/Nd ratios in Al-undepleted komatiites is greater than the time integrated Sm/Nd ratios implied by their isotopic compositions (Puchtel et al., 2022). This suggests that at least some of the variation in their source depletion immediately preceded their formation.

We suggest that these features can be explained if plumes rising through or from the mantle transition zone undergo a small amount of hydrous melting when wadsleyite converts to olivine at ~15 GPa (Sobolev et al., 2016; Wilson and Bolhar, 2022). Below this pressure, all mantle adiabats relevant to komatiite formation lie at higher temperatures than the wet solidus (Figure 7b). Any water released as wadsleyite, which has a high water storage capacity, coverts to nominally anhydrous olivine, will drive small degrees of flux melting. This early hydrous melting stage begins to deplete the rising mantle in incompatible trace elements and water, though not all water is exhausted from the residue. After this initial stage of melting, there is a hiatus before the onset of adiabatic decompression melting at shallower depths (<10 GPa, or 300 km), producing komatiitic melt. Final pressures of melt segregation are unclear, but must lie either on, or to the low-pressure side of, the garnet-out curve. This observation helps explain why Al-undepleted komatiites generally have lower absolute trace element concentrations and higher calculated degrees of melting than Al-depleted komatiites — for a given MgO content (pressure of melting initiation), higher degrees of melting are required to exhaust garnet in the residue.

The ~3.5 Ga Komati formation Al-undepleted komatiites have flat trace element patterns coupled with extremely low concentrations of these elements (Figure 5). They do not appear to have undergone an early stage of hydrous melt depletion. We speculate that this could reflect a drier transition zone at ~3.5 Ga, such that melting only began at the dry solidus. However, we are presently unable to explain formation of these komatiites, which could record the operation of a melting process unique to the Palaeoarchaean.

### 5.3 Al-enriched, Ti-depleted komatiites

The highly depleted sources of Al-enriched komatiites make it difficult to establish their exact melting depths, and in turn their mode of formation. Tomlinson and Holland (2021) demonstrated that these komatiites could form through melting of depleted, Si- and Al-enriched peridotite, similar to that found in the Kaapvaal mantle
lithosphere. This source may have been produced by melt-rock reactions with earlier komatiitic melts (Tomlinson and Kamber, 2021), or by extensive prior melt depletion (Wilson et al., 2003; Wilson, 2019; Waterton et al., 2021). The identification of olivine crystallised at pressures of ~10 GPa in the Al-enriched Commondale komatiites, indicates at least some Al-enriched komatiites formed through deep melting in mantle plume (Wilson and Bolhar, 2022), and that ultra-depleted mantle domains existed in the Archaean convecting mantle (Stracke et al., 2019).

5.4 Ti-enriched and post-Archaean komatiites

Al-undepleted komatiites younger than ~2 Ga formed by lower degrees of melting, at pressures and mantle temperatures comparable to some modern picrites (Trela et al., 2017; Waterton et al., 2021). Phanerozoic komatiites from Gorgona Island formed in a zoned plume in which various picrites and komatiites formed from variably depleted sources. The picrites may have formed through melting a depleted source residual to komatiite formation (Kerr et al., 1996; Révillon et al., 2000). Similar processes may have operated in the Archaean, explaining why some greenstone belts contain several types of komatiite formed in the same magmatic events (Sproule et al., 2002; Robin-Popieul et al., 2012).

Ti-enriched komatiites also formed at relatively low pressures and temperatures, with correspondingly lower degrees of melting than other komatiites. Those formed by low-degree partial melting of enriched sources may be more akin to ferropicrites than komatiites (Stone et al., 1995), with mantle metasomatism potentially explaining the high water contents inferred from igneous amphibole in some Ti-enriched komatiites (Stone et al., 1997).

6 Future directions

Despite the progress made in the past 20 years, a number of fundamental questions remain regarding the formation of komatiites. Many of these relate to the physical and chemical characteristics of deep melting, where even basic properties such as the location of the mantle solidus are debated (Walter, 1998; Herzberg et al., 2000; Andrault et al., 2018). How melts segregate and migrate to the surface is still under question (Sossi et al., 2016; Schmeling and Arndt, 2017; McKenzie, 2020), and the effects of melt-rock reactions on komatiites and the mantle they ascend through is only just beginning to be addressed (Tomlinson and Kamber, 2021; Walsh et al., 2023). The implications of a komatiite-forming mantle also remain up for debate; how do mantle dynamics and tectonics operate in mantle where the hottest parts are capable of producing melts with liquidus temperatures up to ~1600 °C (Fischer and Gerya, 2016)? Finally, questions remain around the occurrence of komatiites and their link to the thermal evolution of the mantle. While a first-order decrease in the abundance of komatiites throughout Earth history is consistent with secular mantle cooling, the apparent absence of komatiites in the Eoarchaean and much of the Proterozoic, and modern melts with temperatures approaching those of komatiites (Trela et al., 2017), complicate this simple view. Progress on these questions will ensure the next 20 years of komatiite research remains just as vibrant as the past 20.

Acknowledgements

This manuscript greatly benefitted from discussions with Igor Puchtel, Claude Herzberg, Allan Wilson, Stephane Labrosse, Denis Andrault, Edward Stolper, Paolo Sossi, Cinzia Farnetani, Eiji Ohtani, Tatsuya Sakamaki. We additionally thank Claude Herzberg for allowing us to modify his mantle phase diagrams for Figure 7 of this chapter, and Claude Herzberg and Rémy Pierru for constructive reviews. PW was supported
Figures

Figure 1: Morphology of komatiite flows and deposits, modified from Pyke et al. (1973), Arndt and Fleet (1979), and Arndt et al. (2008).

Figure 2: a) Transition between random olivine spinifex (top) and platy olivine spinifex (bottom) in a differentiated komatiite flow, Komati Formation, Barberton Greenstone Belt. b) Dendritic pyroxene and devitrified glass (sometimes misidentified as ‘microspinifex’) interstitial to olivine phenocrysts, from a massive flow, Winnipegosis komatiites, Canada. c) ‘Jackstraw textured’ metamorphic olivine (dark bladed mineral) from amphibolite facies olivine-talc-serpentine metamorphic rocks, Saglek Gneiss, northern Labrador.

Figure 3: Histograms showing the relative abundance of komatiite through Earth history. a) Raw frequency of komatiite analyses from the GEOROC database (n ≈ 3660, DIGIS Team, 2022). b) Same analyses normalised to a global database of detrital zircon analyses, to correct for periods of increased crustal production and/or preservation, for example at 2.7 Ga. Zircon data for normalisation are ‘best ages’ from Puetz and Condie (2019), filtered for <10% discordance (n ≈ 515,000). Some komatiite localities are overrepresented (e.g., the 3.5 Ga peak largely reflects intensive study of the Barberton komatiites), while other localities may only have approximate ages, or are questionably identified as komatiites. As such, these abundances are only intended to be illustrative. However, the zircon normalised plot shows that the abundance of 2.7 Ga komatiites is, in part, due to increased crustal production or preservation at that time.

Figure 4: a) Komatiite discrimination plot of (TiO$_2$)$_{25}$ against (Al$_2$O$_3$)$_{25}$. b) Calculation of (Al$_2$O$_3$)$_{25}$ by interpolating or extrapolating regressions of Al$_2$O$_3$ against MgO to 25 wt% MgO. c) Al$_2$O$_3$/TiO$_2$ vs (Gd/Yb)$_n$ diagram after Jahn et al. (1982). d) (Gd/Yb)$_n$ vs (La/Sm)$_n$ diagram, along with simplified REE patterns for some of the komatiites. Data sources: Komati ADK and Weltevreden (Puchtel et al., 2013); Ruth Well-Regal, Komati AUK, Belingwe, Munro, Yilgarn (Sossi et al., 2016), Winnipegosis (Waterton et al., 2017), Kambalda (Lesher and Arndt, 1995), Kostomuksha (Puchtel et al., 1998), Gorgona komatiites and picrites (Révillon et al., 2000), Commondale (Wilson, 2019), Jeesiörova (Hanski et al., 2001), Boston Creek (Puchtel et al., 2018).

Figure 5: Komatiite trace element patterns, normalised to primitive mantle (Hofmann, 1988) and grouped by age or type. Note different scale for Al- and Ti-enriched komatiites. Komati formation, Regal-Ruth Well, Coonterunah, Belingwe and Yilgarn patterns are parental melt compositions estimated by Sossi et al. (2016). Patterns for Alexo (Lahaye and Arndt, 1996), Commondale (Wilson, 2019), Weltevreden (Puchtel et al., 2013), Boston Creek (Puchtel et al., 2018), Jeesiörova (Hanski et al., 2001), Winnipegosis (Waterton et al., 2017) and Gorgona (Révillon et al., 2000), are representative samples that approximate liquid compositions. ADK = Al-depleted, AUK = Al-undepleted, AEK = Al-enriched, Ti = Ti-enriched.

Figure 6: Komatiite formation model ‘tree’ showing a hierarchy of major models proposed for komatiites, along with references for prominent advocates of each model (Green, 1972; Parman et al., 1997; Révillon et al., 2000; Shimizu et al., 2001; Bédard, 2006; Serrano et al., 2011; Herzberg, 2016; Sossi et al., 2016; McKenzie, 2020; Wyman, 2020).

Figure 7: Phase diagram of fertile peridotite KLB-1 showing schematic komatiite ascent and melting paths,
modified from a diagram supplied by Claude Herzberg (personal communication). Phase relations and nominally anhydrous solidus are from Herzberg and Zhang (1996) and Herzberg et al. (2000). Present day ambient mantle uses adiabatic gradients from Katsura et al. (2010) and McKenzie (2020). Schematic komatiite ascent paths and solid adiabat projections for potential temperature \( T_p \) are assumed to follow paths parallel to ambient mantle before crossing the solidus (dashed lines). Melting (solid lines) and liquid ascent paths (dotted lines) are assumed to be parallel to curves of constant MgO (MgO isopleths, grey lines; Herzberg and O’ Hara, 2002; Herzberg and Asimow, 2015).

**a)** Pressure of melt segregation for Al-depleted komatiites at two different \( T_p \) (coloured stars). To retain a garnet signature at >30% melting (black dashed curve), these must lie to the high-pressure side of the garnet-out curve. Locations of the solidus, liquidus, 30% melting, and garnet-out curve depend on the phase relations used (e.g., Herzberg and Zhang, 1996; Walter, 1998; Herzberg et al., 2000; Andrault et al., 2018); these pressures are necessarily approximate. Projections of the solid adiabat for \( T_p > 1870 \) °C intersect the olivine-wadsleyite transition before the solidus; mantle of this temperature would likely begin to melt at the top of the lower mantle (Miller et al., 1991a) and the pressure-temperature path it follows is unclear.

**b)** Comparison of komatiite ascent paths with hydrous solidus for 0.1 wt% H\(_2\)O (Litasov et al., 2014). At all \( T_p \) relevant for the formation of Al-undepleted komatiites, the ascent path is higher than the hydrous solidus. Any water released on breakdown of wadsleyite to olivine will therefore cause minor hydrous melting, before a hiatus once water is exhausted. Melting will then continue at lower pressures at the nominally anhydrous solidus, and final pressures of melt segregation, though poorly constrained, must be either on, or to the low-pressure side of, the garnet-out curve.

**Figure 8**: Relationship between the densities of solid mantle minerals (~Fo94, Py90 at 2000°C) and molten komatiite (Agee and Walker, 1988; Ohtani et al., 1995; Agee, 1998). The brown dashed line shows the estimated density of mantle peridotite undergoing high degree melting, which is essentially pure olivine at low pressure and 50% garnet, 50% olivine or wadsleyite at 15 GPa. Garnet mode and pressures of phase transitions at temperatures relevant to komatiite formation are from Ishii et al. (2018); ringwoodite is less abundant or absent at these temperatures. In the window from about 8 to 15 GPa, komatiite melt is denser than olivine but remains less dense than mantle peridotite.

**Figure 9**: Models for the formation of Al-depleted komatiites in a plume. In model 1, melting is relatively shallow (~11 – 7 GPa), and melts formed over this depth range accumulate and mix in channels during ascent. Melts become effectively isolated from addition of shallower melts once melt channels become large enough (Herzberg et al., 2023). In model 2, melting is relatively deep (>15 GPa). Melts formed over a wide depth range accumulate and mix at ~15 GPa, where a ‘traffic jam’ is formed due to slowing melt ascent velocities as wadsleyite converts to olivine. The melts escape in large pulses as they become increasingly buoyant with further decompression (Schmeling and Arndt, 2017).
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A. Spinifex-textured flow

- Chilled and polyhedrally jointed flow top
- Fine random spinifex
- Coarse oriented spinifex
- Foliated skeletal olivine
- Cumulus solid olivine
- Knobby peridotite
- Cumulus solid olivine

B. Massive flow

- Chilled flow top with fine polyhedral jointing
- Main part of flow: medium to fine grained komatiite with coarse polyhedral jointing

C. Thick cumulate-dominated flow

- Spinitex
- Gabbro
- Pyroxene cumulate
- Olivine mesocumulate
- Olivine adcumulate
- Olivine mesocumulate
- Olivine mesocumulate
- Olivine phyric lava

D. Volcanoclastic

- Thinly bedded tuffs
- Cyclic alternation in grain size and mineralogy
- Cross-bedded tuffs
- Graded bedding
- Coarse breccia containing angular fragments with spinifex or massive texture
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>3 Ga komatiites

Neoarchaean komatiites

Post-Archaean komatiites

Al-enriched
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Komatiite formation models

- Plume
  - Damp plume
    - Transition zone plume (Wyman, 2020)
    - Critical melting (Revillon et al., 2000)
  - Dry CMB plume
  - Carbonated Wetspots (Herzberg, 2016)
  - Subduction related
    - CapV (McKenzie, 2020)
    - Subduction zone (Parman et al., 1997)
- Non-plume
  - Non-uniformitarian
    - Slab window (Serrano et al., 2011)
    - Delamination-driven (Bedard, 2006)
  - Impact melts (Green, 1972)

- CMB damp plume (Shimizu et al., 2001)
- Batch melting (Sossi et al., 2016)
Figure 7

(a) and (b) are diagrams showing the relationship between depth, pressure, and temperature. The diagrams depict the transitions between solid and liquid phases at different depths and pressures. The solidus and liquidus lines indicate the temperatures at which solid phases begin to melt and liquid phases start to crystallize, respectively. The present-day ambient mantle temperature is marked as $T_p = 1327 \, ^\circ C$.

The diagrams also show the stability fields of various minerals such as olivine (Ol), wadsleyite, and ringwoodite. The presence of minor hydrous minerals is also indicated at specific depths and pressures.
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- olivine floats
- garnet at liquidus
- mantle peridotite
- wadsleyite, ringwoodite
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- komatiite melt
Model 1

- Deep-sourced melts
- Shallow melts
- Mixing
- Porous flow
- Increasing channelisation

Model 2

- Melt effectively isolated in large channels
- Melt escapes in large pulses as buoyancy increases
- Traffic jam due to slowing melt velocity at 15 GPa
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