This manuscript is a preprint and has been submitted for publication in **Basin Research**. If accepted, the final version of this manuscript will be available via the '*Peerreviewed Publication DOI*' link on the right-hand side of this webpage. Please feel free to contact any of the authors directly or to comment on the manuscript using **hypothes.is** (<u>https://web.hypothes.is/</u>). We welcome feedback!

Mass-transport complexes (MTCs) document subsidence patterns in a northern Gulf of Mexico salt minibasin

3 Nan Wu¹, Christopher A-L. Jackson¹, Howard D. Johnson¹, David M. Hodgson², Harya D. Nugraha¹

¹Basins Research Group (BRG), Department of Earth Science & Engineering, Imperial College, Prince
 Consort Road, London, SW7 2BP, UK

6 ²School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK

7 *Email: n.wu16@imperial.ac.uk

8 Abstract

9 Mass-transport complexes (MTCs) dominate the stratigraphic record of many salt-influenced 10 sedimentary basins. Commonly in such settings, halokinesis is invoked as a primary trigger for 11 MTC emplacement, although the link between specific phases of salt movement, and related 12 minibasin dynamics, remains unclear. Here, we use high-quality 3D seismic reflection and well data to constrain the composition, geometry, and distribution (in time and space) of six MTCs 13 preserved in a salt-confined, supra-canopy minibasin in the northern Gulf of Mexico, and to 14 15 assess how their emplacement relate to regional and local controls. We define three main tectono-sedimentary phases in the development of the minibasin: (1) initial minibasin 16 17 subsidence and passive diapirism, during which time deposition was dominated by relatively 18 large-volume MTCs (c. 25 km³) derived from the shelf-edge or upper slope; (2) minibasin margin uplift and steepening, during which time small-volume MTCs (c. 20 km³) derived from 19 the shelf-edge or upper slope were emplaced; and (3) active diapirism, during which time very 20 small volume MTCs (c. 1 km³) were emplaced, locally derived from the diapir flanks or roofs. 21 22 We present a generic model that emphasises the dynamic nature of minibasin evolution, and 23 how MTC emplacement relates to halokinetic sequence development. Although based on a single data-rich case study, our model may be applicable to other MTC-rich, salt-influenced 24 25 sedimentary basins.

26 Keywords: MTCs, salt mini-basins evolution, Gulf of Mexico.

27 Introduction

28 Mass-transport complexes (MTCs) are deposits of subaqueous mass flows, and comprise 29 slides, slumps, and debris-flows (Dott Jr, 1963; Nardin et al., 1979; Posamentier and Kolla, 30 2003). MTCs are found along all continental margins, and can play a major role in sediment 31 transfer from the continents to the deep ocean (e.g. Masson et al., 2006; Hjelstuen et al., 2007; Talling et al., 2007; Li et al., 2015; Kioka et al., 2019). Seismic surveys image extremely 32 large (c. 20-1100 km³), now-buried MTCs (e.g. Gee et al., 1999; Frey Martinez et al., 2005; 33 34 Moscardelli et al., 2006; Sawyer et al., 2007; Moscardelli and Wood, 2008; Sawyer et al., 2009; 35 Ortiz - Karpf et al., 2016; Wu et al., 2019), showing they can constitute >50% of any given deep-water stratigraphic succession (Posamentier and Walker, 2006). The failure process 36 leading to MTC emplacement can be externally preconditioned and triggered by earthquakes 37 and oversteepening of the slope (i.e. geometric preconditioning effects) (Nisbet and Piper, 38 39 1998; O'loughlin and Lander, 2003; Masson et al., 2010; Talling et al., 2014; Clare et al., 2016). 40 In additional to being stratigraphically important, the passage and emplacement of MTCs can damage seabed infrastructure and can trigger tsunami (Shipp, 2004; Harbitz et al., 2014). In 41 42 the petroleum industry, MTCs can serve as hydrocarbon seals and/or reservoirs (e.g. 43 Hampton et al., 1996; Locat and Lee, 2002; Weimer and Shipp, 2004; Wu et al., 2019). Therefore, understanding the origin and morphological characteristics of MTCs is important 44 for societal and industrial reasons. 45

In salt-influenced sedimentary basins, uplift and subsidence associated with the flow of salt 46 is widely considered to be the primary control on slope failure and MTC emplacement (e.g. 47 Cashman and Popenoe, 1985; Moscardelli and Wood, 2008; Madof et al., 2009; Twichell et 48 al., 2009; Omosanya and Alves, 2013; Yeakley et al., 2019). However, there are additional 49 mechanisms to consider, including (i) formation of overpressure formation can be driven by 50 fluctuations in sedimentation rate, which are influenced by the location of the minibasin 51 52 relative to shelf-edge deltas and upper slope canyons; (ii) accommodation available at the 53 time of slope failure will dictate the volume of MTC-related material that is trapped and 54 preserved within any one minibasin, and the potential for sediment to be bypassed to more distal depocentres; (iii) erosion, and ultimately undermining and failure of the depocentre 55 margins in response to the passage of near-bed currents (i.e. contour currents); (iv) failure of 56 57 contourite bodies; (iv) fluid migration and the generation of elevated pore pressures in 58 discrete sub-surface layers; this can reduce the vertical effective stress, thereby affecting 59 slope stability and potentially triggering slope failure; and (v) gas hydrate dissociation, which, like pore pressure changes, can reduce sediment strength and trigger slope failure (Canals et 60

al., 2004; Kvalstad et al., 2005; Strout and Tjelta, 2005; Masson et al., 2010; Talling et al.,
2014).

Despite being volumetrically important, and although they can represent stratigraphic 63 64 markers for a range of basin-related processes, MTCs are not explicitly accounted for in stratigraphic models for the salt-influenced slopes. Instead, turbidity current-fed systems 65 dominate in these models, presumably due to their association with reservoir-prone channels 66 and lobes, with the stratigraphic architecture and evolution of minibasins being primarily 67 68 described by the fill-and-spill model (Prather et al., 1998; Winker and Booth, 2000; Booth et al., 2003; Mallarino et al., 2006; Madof et al., 2009; Prather et al., 2012). According to this 69 model, underfilled minibasins initially trap or 'pond' sediments before being overfilled; at this 70 71 point, when no more accommodation is available, sediment is bypassed to more distal 72 depocentres (Beaubouef and Friedmann, 2000; Booth et al., 2000; Booth et al., 2003). Underlying this model are two major assumptions: (1) accommodation in the minibasin is 73 74 controlled by a steady-state, longitudinal bathymetric profile, and (2) the minibasin gradient does not vary spatially and temporally during its evolution (Prather et al., 1998; Winker and 75 Booth, 2000; Mallarino et al., 2006). However, Madof et al. (2009) and Madof et al. (2017) 76 77 argue that these assumptions are unrealistic, given that minibasins can be extremely dynamic, 78 with their geometry, subsidence rate, and accommodation changing in response to variations 79 in sediment accumulation rate and input direction, and the rate and location of salt expulsion 80 from beneath their subsiding depocentres.

Motivated by the above discussion, we here use 3D seismic reflection and well data from the 81 northern Gulf of Mexico to: (i) define the geometry and emplacement mechanics of 82 minibasin-confined MTCs; and (ii) link MTC emplacement to the development of halokinetic 83 sequences (see below) that characterise specific stages in the relationship between minibasin 84 85 subsidence and sedimentation, and diapir uplift. By doing this, we can: (i) explicitly account for MTCs in fill-and-spill models; (ii) characterise the longer-term, more dynamic interactions 86 87 occurring between deep-water sedimentary systems and salt-related slope topography; and 88 (iii) use MTCs as markers of salt-related structural deformation in deep-water. We focus on a 89 single upper slope minibasin in the northern Gulf of Mexico (Figure 1). However, the high-90 quality dataset, and the fact that salt-sediment interactions have been documented in many

other sedimentary basins (e.g. Gulf of Mexico, offshore Brazil, offshore West Africa and East
Mediterranean), mean our findings are likely to be more broadly applicable.

93 Geological setting

94 Tectonics

The Gulf of Mexico passive continental margin formed in response to Triassic-Early 95 Cretaceous rifting (Pindell and Dewey, 1982; Salvador, 1987; Kneller and Johnson, 2011). 96 97 Rifting initiated during the Late Triassic, followed by repeated episodes of marine flooding of 98 a confined embayment during the Middle Jurassic. This led to the accumulation of the several 99 kilometre-thick Louann Salt (Diegel et al., 1995; Salazar et al., 2014). During the Mesozoic and 100 Cenozoic, large volumes of sediments were shed from the North American continent. This, in 101 concert with regional shortening, expelled the autochthonous salt into diapirs that fed a large, 102 allochthonous salt-canopy (Galloway et al., 2000). Numerous intraslope minibasins then subsided into the canopy, in response to the differential loading by continent-derived 103 104 sediment, and kinematically linked extension and shortening of the supra-salt cover (Prather, 105 2000). Salt tectonics has thus been a major control on the stratigraphic evolution of the 106 northern Gulf of Mexico from the Miocene to Present (e.g. Madof et al., 2009).

107 Location of study area

108 The study area is located on the present northern Mississippi Slope, c. 60 km south-east of 109 the modern shelf-edge (Figure 1). This covers the upper slope, in a diapir- and minibasin-rich region forming part of the larger, Plio-Pleistocene Mississippi Canyon/Fan System (Galloway 110 et al., 2000). Present water depths range from 1150 m in the SE to 650 m in the NW. Five 111 112 upper Pliocene to Holocene minibasins are imaged in our study area; we focus on the 113 Pleistocene fill of Minibasin 5, a c. 21 km long (N-S) by c. 8 km wide (E-W) depocentre, whose 114 base is c. 3600 m below the present seabed (Figure 2). Four salt diapirs bound the lateral margins of Minibasin 5 (A-D; Figure 2), whereas a fifth diapir underlies it (E; Figure 3). 115

116 Dataset and methods

117 Seismic reflection data

118 The seismic reflection dataset used in this study covers an area of c. 550 km². The dataset was 119 acquired during 1995-1998 and reprocessed as a single survey in 2008. It contains a 3D zerophase, Kirchhoff pre-stack depth-migrated seismic reflection volume, with a vertical sample
rate of 10 m, record length of 15 km, and a final bin size of 25 m x 25 m. The vertical seismic
resolution is estimated to be c. 17-27 m (Wu et al., 2019).

123 We mapped nine key seismic horizons in a succession characterised by alternating packages of high-amplitude, continuous reflections, and low-amplitude, more chaotic reflections 124 (Figure 3, 4). The mapped seismic horizons were selected based on their high-amplitude 125 response and good lateral continuity, and the fact that they bound seismic-stratigraphically 126 127 important packages that define specific tectono-sedimentary phases of minibasin development (see below). We mapped eight additional horizons, each of which represented 128 129 the base or top surface of an MTC (e.g., H2.1, H5.1 in figure 3; see also Figures 4 and 5). We 130 used seismic attributes (i.e. variance and chaos), generated along or between these horizons, 131 to identify deep-water depositional elements. Variance and chaos attributes image spatial discontinuities in seismic reflection events, which could relate to important structural (e.g. 132 133 intra-MTC faults) and/or stratigraphic discontinuities (e.g. the abrupt seismic facies change from seismically chaotic MTCs to more continuous slope strata) (Chopra and Marfurt, 2007; 134 135 Brown, 2011).

136 Well data

A slightly deviated exploration well (AT-8 #1 ST) was drilled in 1997 in the east of the study 137 138 area (Figure 2), encountering a c. 3600 m-thick, Pleistocene, deep-water clastic succession 139 (Figure 3). The well-log dataset includes gamma-ray (GR) and sonic (DT) data; we used these 140 logs to infer the lithology of the MTCs and their bounding strata via construction of a seismicto-well tie (Figure 6) (Wu et al., 2019). Five MTC-bearing intervals were drilled and logged by 141 142 AT-8 #1 ST. MTCs tend to have higher acoustic velocities and are more resistive than bounding strata (i.e. pelagic/hemipelagic deposits, turbidites) at similar burial depths (Wu et al., 2019). 143 144 The MTCs are mudstone-rich, with the transported and remnant blocks they contain being relatively sandstone-rich (Wu et al., 2019). 145

146 Biostratigraphy data

Plio-Pleistocene biostratigraphic data constrain the age of strata within, above, or below the MTCs. Biostratigraphic data include planktonic foraminifera, and benthic regional and local markers, along with regional and local calcareous nannoplankton markers spanning the late Pliocene to Quaternary. Six biostratigraphic markers were identified by the contractors (see

Supplementary Material 1); we tied these to a biostratigraphic chart compiled for the Gulf of 151 Mexico (Witrock et al., 2003). The biostratigraphic framework is based on the last occurrence 152 or abundance acme of key biostratigraphic markers. These biostratigraphic data allow us to 153 154 provide a broad, temporal framework for the main tectono-sedimentary phases of minibasin 155 development, including the timing of MTC emplacement (see biostratigraphic data details in 156 caption of the Figure 3, see also Supplementary Material 1-2). We note that some uncertainties exist when tying ages derived from biostratigraphic data, which are typically 157 obtained from borehole cuttings, to seismic reflection data, for which the vertical scale is 158 159 based on a conversion of two-way travel time to metres based on an understanding of 160 subsurface velocity variations. For example, Madof et al. (2009) indicate that the real depth 161 (in metres) of biostratigraphic datums could be higher or lower than the position of the 162 related horizons imaged and picked in seismic reflection data. In addition, mapping of age-163 constrained seismic horizons away from the borehole AT-8 #1 ST across salt diapirs north and 164 south of Minibasin 5, and across salt-related normal faults (i.e., normal faults above salt diapir 165 E in Figure 3b), results in some uncertainties related to the local position of these horizons within the minibasin fill. 166

167 Results

168 Seismic facies framework

169 Based on reflection amplitude (e.g. high versus low) and continuity (e.g. stratified versus 170 chaotic), we identify two main seismic facies in Minibasin 5 (Figure 5). Depositional elements and processes are further interpreted based on lithology data provided by AT-8 #1 ST, 171 172 together with analogue information provided by seismic reflection- and well-based analysis of similar depositional systems in adjacent areas (e.g., Prather et al., 1998; Posamentier and 173 174 Kolla, 2003; Roesink et al., 2004; Sincavage et al., 2004; Madof et al., 2009; Perov and Bhattacharya, 2011; Madof et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2019). Stratified seismic facies are 175 characterised by good reflection continuity, and we further subdivide them based on 176 177 reflection amplitude and geometry (SFs1, SFs2 and SFs3; Figure 5). Overall, stratified seismic 178 facies document a range of non-MTC depositional elements (e.g. channels, lobes) deposited by a range of processes (e.g. turbidity currents, suspension fallout). Chaotic seismic facies are 179 characterised by discontinuous, low- to medium-amplitude reflections, and we further 180

subdivide them based on their internal reflection pattern (SFc1, SFc2 and SFc3; Figure 5).
Overall, chaotic seismic facies record deposition within MTCs, emplaced by a range of MTCrelated processes (e.g. slumps, slides, debris flows). The seismic facies defined here form the
'building blocks' for the stratigraphic fill of Minibasin 5 (see below).

185 Stratigraphic framework of Minibasin 5

We identified seven seismic units in Minibasin 5, comprised of the two main seismic facies 186 (and inferred depositional elements) described above (Figure 6). Seismic unit 1 (SU-1) is c. 187 460-580 m thick, and consists of sandstone-rich channels and lobes, interbedded with 188 189 mudstone-rich slope deposits. Seismic unit 2 (SU-2) is c. 520-600 m thick, and comprises 190 sandstone-rich turbidite channel complexes and mudstone-rich slope deposits (Figure 6). 191 Seismic unit 3 (SU-3) is c. 530-640 m thick, and comprises sandstone- and mudstone-rich MTCs, mudstone-rich slope sediments, and turbidite channel-fills (Figure 6). Seismic unit 4 192 193 (SU-4) is c. 210- 290 m thick and consists exclusively of mudstone-rich slope deposits. Seismic unit 5 (SU-5) is c. 470-560 m thick, and consists mudstone-rich MTCs, sandstone-rich channel 194 complexes, and mudstone-rich slope deposits (Figure 6). Seismic unit 6 (SU-6) is c. 320-380 m 195 thick, and contains mudstone-rich slope deposits and sandstone-rich turbidite channel 196 197 complexes. The uppermost unit, Seismic unit 7 (SU-7), is c. 520-630 m thick, and consists of sandstone- and mudstone-rich MTCs, mudstone-rich slope deposits, and sandstone-rich 198 199 turbidite channel complexes.

200 Tectono-stratigraphic development

201 We group the seven seismic units identified above into three age-constrained stages that 202 define the tectono-sedimentary development of Minibasin 5 (Figure 6). These stages are 203 defined by: (i) the geometrical characteristics of the main seismic packages (i.e. bowl-versus 204 wedge- versus layer-shaped; see Rowan & Weimer, 1999 and Jackson et al., 2019); (ii) the 205 way in which stratal units terminate against bounding salt diapirs, which we here describe 206 using the composite halokinetic sequence (CHS) terminological framework of Giles and 207 Rowan (2012); (iii) the types of depositional systems (e.g. channels, lobes, MTCs, etc.) they 208 contains; and (iv) changes in overall sediment accumulation rate derived from well and 209 biostratigraphic data.

210 Stage 1: Passive diapirism and minibasin downbuilding

211 Description:

Stage 1 consists of SU-1-3 and is early-middle Pleistocene. We identify two depocentres 212 during this stage (Figure 7a). The diapirs flanking these minibasins differ in that the western 213 214 one is relatively tall and has a steep margin, whereas the eastern one is of lower relief and has a more gently dipping flank (Figure 4b, 8a). The minibasin fill during this stage is bowl-215 shaped, with individual units progressively thinning towards and onlapping onto the flanking 216 diapirs (i.e. tapered CHSs of Giles and Rowan, 2012) (See figure 4b and 8a). Deposition of 217 218 slope channel-fills, lobes and slope sediments appear to characterise the early fill of this stage (SU-1, SU-2), although at least two seismic-scale MTCs, encased in very fine-grained slope 219 220 deposits (SU-3), are identified in the upper part of the succession (Figure 6). The average 221 sediment accumulation rate during the deposition of SU-2 was c. 844 m/Myr (Figure 9).

222 Interpretation:

The presence of symmetrical, bowl-shaped packages indicates Minibasin 5 initially subsided vertically and was flanked by passively rising diapirs during the early-middle Pleistocene. The presence of tapered CHSs indicates sediment accumulation rate exceeded the diapir rise rate at this time (Giles and Rowan, 2012). This high sediment accumulation rate may reflect a high sediment supply rate, which may itself reflect the proximity of the study area to the Mississippi River, which at this time delivered large volumes of sediment to upper slope minibasins (Galloway et al., 2000; Galloway, 2001) (Figure 8a).

230 Stage 2: Load-driven passive salt diapirism

231 Description:

232 Stage 2 comprises seismic units 4-6 and is middle-late Pleistocene. During this stage, the northern depocentre shifts eastwards, whereas the southern depocentre simply expands 233 234 areally (Figure 7b). The western diapir is flanked by tabular (SU-4-6) CHSs, whereas the eastern diapir is buried by the sediment (Figure 4b, 8b). The minibasin fill during this stage is 235 defined by broadly wedge-shaped package (See figure 3, 4, and 8b). Slope channel-fills are 236 deposited during the early part of this stage (SU-4), with an MTC, encased in slope mudstone 237 (SU-5), and ultimately, slope mudstone, intercalated with slope channel-fills (SU-6). The 238 239 average sediment accumulation rate increased to c. 1184 m/Myr during Stage 2 (Figure 9).

240 *Interpretation:*

241 During the middle-late Pleistocene, the paleo-Mississippi River continued to deliver sediments to the upper slope minibasins (Figure 8b). The presence of wedge-shaped packages 242 243 records asymmetrical minibasin subsidence, and eastwards tilting of the northern minibasin (Rowan and Weimer, 1998; Hudec et al., 2009; Jackson et al., 2019). The diapir flanking the 244 245 eastern side of minibasin was eventually covered by sediment, indicating an overall transition 246 to a time when sediment accumulation rate exceeded diapir rise rate. In contrast, the western 247 diapir continued to passively rise as the diapir rise rate exceeded sediment accumulation rate. This interpretation is supported by the observation that tabular CHSs are deposited along this 248 diapir flank at this time (Figure 4b, 8b) (see Giles and Rowan, 2012). 249

250 Stage 3: Diapir burial, shortening, and active diapirism

251 Description:

252 Stage 3 comprises SU-7 and is late Pleistocene. During this stage, broadly layer-shaped 253 packages were deposited (See figure 3, 4, and 8c). Overall, this package gradually thins 254 towards yet extends across flanking salt diapirs, being thickest in the minibasin centre. 255 However, in detail, only the lower package (containing MTC-4) extends across the diapir, with 256 this being onlapped by an overlying package that is restricted to the minibasin centre. The upper package extends across the diapir, showing only minimal thickness changes (See figure 257 258 4b and 8c). Fine-grained slope sediments, slope channel-fills, and two MTCs are deposited 259 during Stage 3. The average sediment accumulation rate at this time was the highest 260 documented during the post-early Pleistocene history of minibasin, reaching up to c. 10000 m/Myr (see Figure 9). 261

262 Interpretation:

During the late Pleistocene, large amounts of sediment continued to be delivered to the upper slope and Minibasin 5 by the Mississippi River (Winker and Booth, 2000) (Figure 8c). The thickness map indicates that much of the intra-slope accommodation formed by minibasin subsidence was healed and that the flanking diapirs were buried (Figure 7c). The prevalence of layer-like stratigraphic packages (i.e. which mainly record post-welding aggradation of sediment above Minibasin 5 and its flanking diapirs) during Stage 3 reflects the high sediment accumulation (and possibly supply) rate at this time. Rowan and Weimer (1998) also
interpreted that layer-shaped packages reflect relatively long-wavelength subsidence across
now-welded minibasins (see also the layer-shaped package from Jackson et al., 2019).

272 Characterisation of Minibasin 5 MTCs

273 MTC 1

274 Description:

MTC 1 (119 km² and 25 km³) is laterally and frontally confined by salt diapirs (Figure 10a, b). 275 It is 160-190 m thick, and its NW-SE-striking, south-western lateral margin defines a sharp 276 erosional contact between remobilised sediments (SFc3) and undeformed slope sediments 277 (SFs1 and SFs2) (Fig. 10c). The NW-SE-striking, north-eastern lateral margin of MTC 1 is 278 279 defined by the eastern salt diapir (Figure 10b). MTC 1 is sandstone-rich, containing large (130-280 160 m thick), internally deformed, sandstone-rich (60-80% sandstone) blocks, intercalated 281 with thin mudstone layers (Wu et al., 2019). The highly reflective blocks, which have long axes oriented NE-SW, are directly underlain by an interval of weakly reflective, more deformed 282 reflections (Figure 10d). NE-SW-striking, NW-dipping thrusts are observed within the blocks 283 (Figure 10b, c, d). 284

285 *Interpretation:*

Deformation at the base of the blocks suggests they were transported within MTC 1 (see for 286 287 example of transported blocks from Nardin et al., 1979; Bull et al., 2009a; Alves, 2015). The 288 orientation of the NE-SW-striking thrusts, and the NW-SE-striking lateral margins, suggest that MTC 1 was transported towards the SE. We interpret the thrusts formed due to 289 290 horizontal compression of the debris flow adjacent to transported blocks. An alternative interpretation is that the thrusts record shortening at the toe of the related mass movement. 291 292 The lithology of the large blocks suggests MTC 1 was derived from an up-dip, sand-rich source, such as upper slope lobes and/or channels, and/or shelf-edge delta front deposits (Wu et al., 293 294 2019). The sandstone-rich blocks may therefore have travelled c. 60 km from shelf-295 edge/upper slope. Unfortunately, benthic foraminifera, which might help confirm the original 296 depositional setting, or at least water depth of these sandstones, are lacking. We suggest, 297 however, that blocks within MTC 1 are unlikely to have been derived from the nearby salt diapirs because, at this time, the diapirs were capped by an intact sedimentary roofcomprising tapered CHS (see Figure 3 and 4).

300 MTC 2

301 Description:

MTC 2 (113.5 km² and 21.6 km³) is 110-150 m thick and has a similar external geometry to 302 303 MTC 1, being defined by: (i) a sharp, NW-SE-trending, erosional lateral margin on its south-304 western side, and (ii) a NW-trending diapir on its north-eastern side (Figure 11a, b). MTC 2 is 305 mudstone-rich and contains subordinate, relatively sandstone-rich (30-40% sand) blocks that are 20-40 m thick (Wu et al., 2019). In the centre of Minibasin 5, MTC 2 contains two large 306 307 (90-170 m) blocks, one of which contains mudstone-rich slope deposits at its base and sandstone-rich Slope channel deposits at its top (Figure 11c) (Wu et al., 2019). The long axes 308 of these blocks trend NW (Figure 11b). Smaller blocks are clustered towards the north-east 309 minibasin margin (Figure 11a, b). Unlike the transported blocks in MTC 1, blocks in MTC 2 310 311 have sharp contacts with debritic material (SFc2), are not deformed, and are not underlain by 312 seismic-scale zones of deformation (Figure 11c).

313 *Interpretation:*

314 Based on the orientations of its lateral margins, we suggest MTC 2 was transported to the SE. 315 Although there is no direct evidence indicating the source area of MTC 2 (i.e. benthic foraminifera), the presence of the subordinate sandstone-rich blocks, and similar kinematic 316 indicators to MTC 1 (i.e. the NW-SE-trending lateral margins), together suggest MTC 2 may 317 also have been derived from shelf-edge and/or upper slope. The seismic facies defining the 318 blocks (i.e. concordant, moderate-amplitude, continuous seismic reflections) are similar to 319 320 that of the underlying strata. The lack of deformation within these blocks implies they were not transported, with the absence of deformation beneath them also suggesting the substrate 321 322 was not subjected to shear-induced deformation. Together, these two observations suggests 323 the blocks represent undeformed substrate material that was not transported within, but is instead surrounded and capped by the MTC (i.e. 'remnant blocks'; (e.g. see examples of 324 remnant blocks from Frey Martinez et al., 2005; Lastras et al., 2005; Posamentier and Walker, 325 326 2006; Bull et al., 2009a; Gamboa et al., 2011).

327 MTC 3 & 4

328 Description:

MTC 3 (123.5 km² and 20.3 km³) is 110-160 m thick and has a similar external geometry to 329 330 MTC 1 and 2, being bounded by: (i) a NW-trending trending erosional margin on its south-331 western side, and (ii) NW-SE-striking diapir on its north-eastern side (Figure 12a, b). MTC 3 is 332 mudstone-dominated and contains sandstone-rich blocks (c. 20-40% sand) that are 30-60 m 333 thick (Wu et al., 2019). Biostratigraphic data indicate MTC 3 contains transported outer shelf 334 sediments (2377 m in well AT-8 #1 ST; Figure 13). Two biostratigraphic samples collected from a slightly deeper position (2487 m), give an age of 0.78 and 0.83 Ma (lower Pleistocene; Figure 335 336 12c, 13, see details of the biostratigraphic samples from supplementary material 1).

MTC 4 (98.4 km² and 18.1 km³) has a similar geometry to the underlying MTCs, being again defined by: (i) a NW-trending lateral margin on its south-western side, and (ii) NW-SE-striking diapir on its north-eastern side (Figure 14a, b). MTC 4 is mudstone-rich and 70-110 m thick (Figure 6), and contains remnant blocks, the long axes of which trend NW (Figure 14b).

341 *Interpretation:*

342 The orientations of their lateral margins suggest that MTC 3 and 4 were transported towards the SE (e.g. Frey Martinez et al., 2005; Bull et al., 2009a). MTC 3 contains direct 343 344 biostratigraphic evidence that it was derived from the paleo shelf-edge (i.e. transported outer shelf facies sample; Figure 13). The presence of two different age samples (0.78 and 0.85 Ma) 345 346 from the same depth (2478 m) within MTC 3 is intriguing. This might indicate that MTC 3, 347 emplaced at 0.78 Ma, entrained older (i.e. 0.83 Ma) substrate (i.e. seabed) material during 348 transport and emplacement (Figure 12d). An alternative interpretation is that the slightly old (i.e. 0.83 Ma) material was shed from the roof of a growing diapir flanking the minibasin, and 349 350 reworked into the younger (i.e. 0.78 Ma) MTC 3 (Figure 12e). Because MTC 4 is similar to older MTCs in terms of its geometry and kinematics, we infer it was also likely derived from the 351 352 upper slope or paleo shelf-edge.

353 MTC 5

354 Description:

MTC 5 (29.07 km² and 2.6 km³) is 110-180 m thick and was deposited in the centre of Minibasin 5, being bounded by diapirs on its NE and W side, and a salt-cored structure high on its SE side (Figure 15a, b). MTC 5 is sandstone-rich and is intercalated with thin mudstone

layers. Sandstone-rich blocks (c. 40-60% sand) that are 60-90 m thick occur within MTC 5. We 358 sub-divide MTC 5 into MTC 5.1 and MTC 5.2, based on cross-cutting relationships between 359 360 the lateral margins of the two units, with MTC 5.2 being slightly younger than MTC 5.1 (Figure 361 15b, d). MTC 5.1 is delineated by a set of NE-SW-striking normal faults and NE-SW-striking thrusts in its proximal and distal parts, respectively (Figure 15b, 15c). MTC 5.2 has a NE-362 trending headwall scarp, being bound by NW-SE-striking lateral margins. Well AT-8 #1 ST 363 364 intersected MTC 5.1, showing the deposit is sandstone-rich (Figure 6). However, well AT-8 #1 ST does not penetrate MTC 5.2, thus its lithology is unknown. 365

366 *Interpretation:*

The strike of the normal faults and thrusts suggest the bulk movement of MTC 5.1 was towards the E (e.g. Frey Martinez et al., 2005; Bull et al., 2009a). The orientation of the headwall scarp and lateral margins suggest that MTC 5.2 was transported to the SE (e.g. Bull et al., 2009a). The confined nature of MTC 5.1 and 5.2 suggest they were both sourced from locally positive topography generated by the growth of an underlying salt diapir.

372 MTC 6

373 Description:

374 MTC 6 (18.9 km² and 1.13 km³) is located just below the seabed along the south-eastern flank 375 of salt diapir A (Figure 16a, b). MTC 6 has well-defined, NW-trending lateral margins and is 376 50-70 m thick. In the up-dip part of MTC 6, N-S-striking normal faults occur on the flank of the diapir, with hanging wall strata thickening towards and documenting syn-sedimentary growth 377 of the normal faults (Figure 16c). N-S-striking thrusts are also developed near the north-378 379 eastern lateral margin of MTC 6; this margin is erosional, with the magnitude of erosion 380 increasing towards the northeast (Figure 16a, b). MTC 6 pinches-out to the southwest (Figure 16d). The N-S-striking normal faults and thrusts are present above the main body of MTC 6 381 382 (Fig. 16e). AT-8 #1 ST does not penetrate MTC 6, thus its lithology is unknown.

383 *Interpretation:*

The orientations of the normal faults and the lateral margins suggest MTC 6 was transported to the SE. These spatial relationships suggest that MTC 6 was triggered by gravity-driven instability of the seabed, driven by (relative) uplift of the seabed by diapir A. The emplacement of MTC 6 created an exposed and unstable lateral margin along its NE side (Figure 16d, 17 a). This margin thus collapsed, depositing material on top of the main body of
the MTC 6 (Figure 16e, 17b).

390 Discussion

391 Origin and classification of MTCs

Moscardelli and Wood (2008) classified MTCs as 'attached' (i.e. relatively far travelled, having 392 originated from the shelf-edge or upper slope) when the length: width ratio is >4; and 393 'detached' (i.e. having originated from and being still partly physically connected to, a local 394 395 source, such as a salt-cored structural high) when the length: width ratio is <4. Based on the degree of internal deformation and morphology, Gamboa and Alves (2016) further classify 396 detached MTCs into Type 1 (i.e. highly deformed, with the length of the headwall: distance to 397 toe <1, and with their long axes parallel to the transport direction) and Type 2 (i.e. less 398 deformed, with the length of the headwall: distance to toe >1, and with their long axes 399 perpendicular to the transport direction). Because our data do not image their full extent, the 400 401 maximum length and width of the extrabasinal MTCs (MTC 1-4), the headwall length and 402 distance to toe length of intrabasinal MTC 5 remain unknown. Therefore, we cannot apply 403 the schemes of Moscardelli and Wood (2008) and Gamboa and Alves (2016), and instead use 404 morphometric and biostratigraphic data to classify our MTCs and to deduce if they were 405 derived locally or from beyond the minibasin. We here provide additional guidelines on how to differentiate between attached and detached MTCs in salt-confined minibasin settings, 406 407 focusing on: (i) MTC morphometrics (i.e. external geometry, area, volume); (ii) the composition and age of the MTCs; and (iii) the geometrical relationship between the MTCs 408 409 and bounding salt diapirs. We classify MTCs in such salt-influenced settings into: (i) shelf-410 edge/upper slope derived MTCs and (ii) diapir-derived MTCs (Figure 18).

411 Shelf-edge/upper slope derived MTCs (MTC 1-4)

The shelf-edge-/upper slope-derived MTCs, sourced from the collapse of coeval shelf-edge deltas, and/or supplied by reworked upper slope channels and lobes, tend to be, overall, larger than the diapir-derived MTCs (i.e. 110-270 m thick; 113.5-123.5 km² in area; 20.3-25.1 km³ in volume). Shelf-edge-/upper slope-derived MTCs can be sandstone- or mudstone-rich, and typically contain sandstone-rich blocks. Emplacement of these types MTC appear most common during the initial phase of minibasin development, at a time when sediment

accumulation rate exceeded the rise rate of bounding passive diapirs (i.e. Stage 1 and 2; early 418 to middle Pleistocene) (Figure 19). In this salt-tectonic context, the lack of diapir-derived 419 420 MTCs is logical, given that at this time diapirs were unable to build sufficient differential relief 421 (i.e. topography) or steep slopes to trigger slope failure. The shelf-edge-/upper slope-derived 422 MTCs are thickest near the minibasin centre and were transported towards the SE, along a 423 bathymetric low laterally bound by salt diapirs; slope morphology controlled sediment 424 dispersal and ultimate preservation, even if it was not responsible for locally supplying sediment. The trigger for slope failure and MTC emplacement is unknown. 425

The shelf-edge/upper slope-derived MTCs in Minibasin 5 are similar in terms of their location, volume, and source area to so-called 'regional' or 'extra-basinal' MTCs described from other minibasins (Madof et al., 2009; Doughty-Jones et al., 2019). More specifically, these MTCs: (i) extend across the full width of the minibasin in which they are preserved, and occur in the lowermost (i.e. earliest) part of the minibasin fill; (ii) are large in terms of their area and volume when compared to diapir-derived or 'local' MTCs; and (iii) are sourced from the outershelf and can contain outer-shelf bio-facies.

433 Diapir-derived MTCs (MTC 5-6)

434 Diapir-derived MTCs tend to be smaller than shelf-edge-/upper slope-derived MTCs (i.e. 50-90 m thick; 18.9 to 29.7 km² in area; 1.13 to 2.6 km³ in volume). Diapir-derived MTCs were 435 436 emplaced during the latter stage of minibasin development, when the rate of diapir rise 437 appeared to have exceeded the rate of sediment accumulation (Stage 3; late Pleistocene) 438 (Figure 19). These MTCs are preserved on or immediately downdip of, the flanks of diapirs 439 (i.e. MTC 6), or on local topographic highs above buried diapirs (i.e. MTC 5). Diapir-derived 440 MTCs are thickest near diapir margins and thin downdip into the minibasin centres, indicating local derivation from above or the flanks of diapir-cored structural highs. It is likely that the 441 442 preconditioning and triggering of this type of MTC is linked to localised gravitational instability, 443 more specifically oversteepening of diapir flanks during passive or active diapirism (discussed 444 below).

The diapir-derived MTCs in Minibasin 5 are comparable to so-called 'intra-basinal' or 'local' MTCs described from other minibasins (Beaubouef et al., 2003; Owen et al., 2007; Madof et al., 2009; Gamboa and Alves, 2016; Doughty-Jones et al., 2019). More specifically, these types of MTC are: (i) preserved adjacent to the diapir from which they are sourced; (ii) are relatively small in terms of their volume and areal extent; and (iii) developed in the uppermost (i.e.
latest) part of the minibasin fill, because at this time significant diapir-related structural relief
was developing around the minibasin margins.

452 Preconditioning factors and triggers for emplacement of minibasin-constrained

453 MTCs

454 Eustasy

455 Eustasy controls depositional processes and stratal patterns occurring in sedimentary basins (e.g., Vail et al., 1977; Posamentier et al., 1988; Catuneanu, 2002; Posamentier and Kolla, 456 457 2003; Catuneanu et al., 2011). Eustacy was particularly important during the Pleistocene in the northern Gulf of Mexico, when rapid (c. 500 years), high-amplitude (>100 m) sea-level 458 459 fluctuations resulted in rapid margin progradation and retrogradation (Galloway, 2001). For example, Pleistocene sea level fluctuations are known to have caused major changes in the 460 461 position of the paleo-coastline (>100 km) during glacial intervals (Galloway et al., 2011). 462 During periods of sea-level fall, sediment supply was so high that deltas could reach the shelf-463 edge. Rapid progradation during periods of sea-level fall and lowstand could increase porefluid pressure within underlying, very fine-grained sediment, because these low intervals 464 465 could not efficiently expel their pore water when loaded by thick, shelf-edge deltas (Madof et al., 2017). This primed or preconditioned the shelf-edge or upper slope to fail, or could 466 467 even trigger failure, resulting in the emplacement of shelf-edge/upper slope-derived MTCs (Posamentier and Kolla, 2003). During periods of relatively rapid sea-level rise, transient 468 469 excess pore pressures could be generated in low-permeability sediment, decreasing slope 470 stability, and potentially triggering slope failure and the emplacement of upper slope-derived MTCs (Smith et al., 2013). 471

There were numerous and frequent, glacio-eustatic sea-level fluctuations during the Pleistocene in the Gulf of Mexico (Figure 20). It is thus be appealing to link MTC emplacement to periods of falling and lowstands of sea level, via the causal mechanism outlined above. However, we note there were many more sea-level falls and lowstands than there are seismically resolvable MTCs in Minibasin 5. Any MTCs generated during periods of sea-level fall may have: (i) been ponded in up-dip minibasins; (ii) transformed into turbidity currents and bypassed Minibasin 5, being instead preserved in downdip minibasins; and (iii) been emplaced in minibasins lateral to Minibasin 5. An alternative interpretation is that sea-level
variations and gravity-driven deep-water sedimentation are completely unrelated (Maslin et
al., 1998; Smith et al., 2013; Urlaub et al., 2013; Clare et al., 2014; Pope et al., 2015; Coussens
et al., 2016). In this case, other factors, such as sedimentation rate changes, fluid migration,
and salt diapirism, need to be considered.

484 Sedimentation

485 MTC emplacement may have been controlled by fluctuations in sediment supply; i.e. during 486 periods of high supply, which may have been climatically controlled, deltas may have reached the shelf-edge even during highstands, before collapsing to supply MTCs. In the northern Gulf 487 488 of Mexico, Pleistocene sedimentation rates were extremely high, and more than double 489 Pliocene rates (Molnar, 2004). This increase reflects entrenchment and greater discharge of 490 the Mississippi River, related to its capture of the Ohio and Missouri rivers (Galloway et al., 2011). The reorganisation of the Mississippi River System resulted in a significant sediment 491 492 supply increase and led to the development of submarine canyons that incised the shelf, especially during periods of glacial retreat (Galloway et al., 2000; Rittenour et al., 2007; 493 494 Galloway et al., 2011; Bentley Sr et al., 2016). High sediment input from the Mississippi River 495 also caused rapid shelf-edge delta progradation; this could have increased delta-front 496 instability, and triggered sediment gravity currents (e.g., Sydow et al., 2003; Moscardelli et al., 497 2006). We consider that the high sedimentation rates associated with paleo-Mississippi River 498 System were a key factor in preconditioning the shelf-edge/upper slope derived MTCs in the 499 study area.

500 *Geometric preconditioning (oversteepening)*

501 Minibasins are surrounded by diapirs that can rise and deform the overlying free surface. If the related slope becomes sufficiently steep it can fail, triggering the emplacement of diapir-502 503 derived MTCs (Cashman and Popenoe, 1985; Tripsanas et al., 2004; Madof et al., 2009; Hill et 504 al., 2011; Giles and Rowan, 2012). However, if the slope steepens relatively slowly, the 505 increase in steepness would take a long duration to passes a critical threshold and cause a 506 slope failure. In this case, the decomposition of gas hydrates or fluid migration (discussed 507 below) might accelerate the process, account for the preconditions and triggers of diapir 508 derived MTCs.

509 Fluid migration

The headwalls (i.e. where MTCs initiate, Bull et al., 2009a) of MTCs are most abundant on 510 slopes, in water depths of 1000-1500 m (or even deeper; e.g. Weaver et al., 2000; McHugh et 511 512 al., 2002; Hühnerbach and Masson, 2004), rather than close to the shelf-edge where the 513 sedimentation accumulation rates are highest. This suggests that sediment accumulation rate 514 (and perhaps related sea level fluctuations) are not the key control on the preconditioning and triggering of upper-slope and minibasin-derived MTCs. Instead, fluid migration may play 515 an important role. More specifically, fluid could migrate to the upper slope along permeable 516 517 horizons that extend updip from the lower slope, with this sudden influx of fluids generating 518 excess pore pressure, thereby decreasing sediment shear strength and slope stability (Dugan 519 and Flemings, 2000; Masson et al., 2010).

520 Gas hydrate dissociation

Gas hydrates are common in shallowly buried (0-600 m below seabed) sediments in the 521 522 northern Gulf of Mexico (MacDonald et al., 1994; Milkov and Sassen, 2001; Boswell et al., 2012). The dissociation of solid gas hydrate (the loss of free gas and water) may lead to rapid 523 524 sediment compaction and can generate excess pore pressures (Grozic, 2010). The process of hydrate dissociation can also generate freshwater, which could play a role in leaching mud-525 526 rich sediments, thereby increasing the quick clay behaviour of the mud-rich sediments (Bull 527 et al., 2009b). Gas hydrate dissociation could thus prime the slope to fail, and ultimately 528 trigger slope failure and MTC emplacement (e.g. the Storegga slide in Norway, Bryn et al., 2005). Gas hydrates can be structurally focused above supra-salt faults that act as conduits 529 for the upward migration of deeply generated thermogenic gas into the shallower, gas 530 hydrate stability zone. As unstable gas hydrates normally occur 300-900 m below the seafloor 531 (Mienert et al., 2005), diapir-derived (in addition to shelf-edge/upper slope-derived) MTCs 532 could also genetically related to the process of gas hydrate dissociation. 533

534 Seismicity

The study area is located along a relatively tectonically quiescent passive margin, in an area generally regarded as having low overall seismicity (Franco et al., 2013). However, significant seismic activity does locally and intermittently occur, with spatially variable peak ground accelerations due to differential amplification and/or attenuation by the basin-fill. For example, in 1978 a magnitude Mw=5.0 earthquake, triggered by an intraplate tectonic event,

occurred near central-northern Gulf of Mexico (Frohlich, 1982). A larger, magnitude Mw=5.9 540 event, which may have been triggered by the tectonic loading of the salt and its overburden, 541 took place in a nearby region in 2006 (Gangopadhyay and Sen, 2008). Smaller earthquakes 542 543 could also be triggered by increasing differential stresses related to the relatively high 544 sediment accumulation rates characterising the Pleistocene phase of Minibasin 5 (see 545 example from Lofoten and Norway Basins, Byrkjeland et al., 2000). Seismicity could therefore trigger emplacement of the shelf-edge/upper slope- and diapir-derived MTCs encountered in 546 547 the study area.

548 The link between composite halokinetic sequences and MTCs

Halokinetic sequences are defined as "unconformity-bound packages of thinned and 549 deformed strata adjacent to passive diapirs" (Rowan et al., 2003). Halokinetic sequences 550 record cycles of passive and minor active diapirism, when salt periodically rises and pierces 551 552 the diapir roof (Rowan et al., 2003). Halokinetic sequences form as the rate of net vertical diapiric rise varies relative to the local rate of sediment accumulation (Giles and Lawton, 2002; 553 Rowan et al., 2003). Within this conceptual framework, diapir-derived MTCs are most likely 554 to be emplaced in tabular composite halokinetic sequences, being generated by break-up of 555 the diapir roof, during a period when the diapir rise rate exceeds the sediment accumulation 556 rate (Giles and Rowan, 2012). Diapir-derived MTCs are thought to only extend a few hundred 557 metres away from their source diapirs (i.e. diapir-derived MTCs from Giles and Rowan, 2012; 558 559 Hearon et al., 2014).

560 Our observations are consistent with the outcrop--based model of Giles and Rowan (2012), 561 in that the intra-basinal MTCs (diapir-derived MTCs) are best-developed in Stage 3, when tabular CHSs were deposited. However, we show that diapir-derived MTCs (i.e. MTC 6) can 562 extend significant distances (> 8 km) away from their source diapir. During the initial stage of 563 subsidence of Minibasin 5, when sediment accumulation rate exceeded diapir rise rate and 564 565 diapir-derived MTCs were accordingly absent, salt diapirs only provided the physical bounding constraints for the distribution of extra-basinal MTCs (e.g. MTC 1 and 2); diapiric rise played 566 567 no role in triggering slope failure and MTC emplacement. Thus, during different stages of the 568 evolution of a minibasin, halokinetic sequences could have different relationships with their 569 associated MTCs.

570 Minibasin evolution; beyond the fill-and-spill model

571 The widely adopted fill-and-spill model has two key assumptions: (i) the longitudinal gradient 572 between two (or more) adjacent minibasins does not vary through time; and (ii) 573 sedimentation rate always exceeds the rate of minibasin subsidence (Beaubouef and 574 Friedmann, 2000; Booth et al., 2000; Booth et al., 2003). In fact, the fill-and-spill model 575 essentially views slope depocentres as being static.

Several studies show that the longitudinal gradients and the seabed bathymetry changes 576 577 through time because minibasins are dynamic not static, meaning the ratio of the rate of 578 accommodation creation to sediment supply/accumulation can be highly variable (e.g. Madof 579 et al., 2009; Sylvester et al., 2015; Madof et al., 2017). The original fill-and-spill model is thus 580 overly simplistic. Madof et al. (2017) propose a process-driven model of 'subsidence and margin failure' for minibasin evolution; this better accounts for the seismic-stratigraphic 581 architecture of minibasins compared to the fill-and-spill model. In their model, rising diapirs 582 pond sediments within minibasins (Stage 1). The ponded sediments then promote minibasin 583 subsidence (due to density-driven downbuilding) and basin margin uplift (due to passive 584 585 diapirism) (Stage 2). Margin uplift leads to slope oversteepening, failure, and generation of intra-basinal MTCs (Stage 3). Although this model is suitable for intra-basinal MTCs (i.e. 586 587 derived from salt minibasin margins), it does not address how extra-basinal, shelf-edge-588 /upper slope-derived MTCs are emplaced in minibasins. Thus, we here extend their model by 589 taking halokinesis, subsidence and sedimentation into consideration, using our observations from the northern Gulf of Mexico, in which MTCs constitute c. 60% of the minibasin fill. 590

We have identified three key stages during the evolution of Minibasin 5: (i) Stage 1 -this 591 stage was characterised by relatively low sediment accumulation rates (c. 844 m/Myr) (Figure 592 20), passive diapirism, and broadly vertical subsidence of the minibasin; although sediment 593 accumulation rates were relatively low, they were high relative to the rise rate of the 594 bounding diapirs, resulting in the deposition of tapered CHSs. Sand-rich slope channel 595 596 complexes and lobes, as well as sand-rich, shelf-edge/upper slope-derived MTCs, were 597 deposited in the minibasin at this time (Figure 19). These extra-basinal MTCs were relatively large (i.e. 25 km³) in relation to the minibasin size, and were deposited in the deepest, central 598 point of the minibasin. MTC emplacement was associated with substantial substrate 599 600 deformation; (ii) Stage 2 – this stage was characterised by relatively high sedimentation rates 601 (c. 1184 m/Myr) (Figure 20), during which time the rise rate of passive diapirs exceeded the sediment accumulation rate, resulting in the deposition of tabular CHSs. Mud-rich, shelf-edge-602 603 derived MTCs (i.e. MTC 3), sand-rich slope-channel fills, and mud-rich slope deposits were 604 deposited during Stage 2 (Figure 19). Stage 2 MTCs are geometrically similar to Stage 1 MTCs, but were smaller (i.e. 1.13km³); (iii) Stage 3 - this final stage was characterised by very high 605 606 sediment accumulation rates (c. 10000 m/Myr) (Figure 20) that exceeded the rate of diapir 607 rise, resulting in capping of the minibasin-bounding diapirs by a relatively thick roof. Stage 3 saw deposition of sand-rich slope-channel fills and lobes, and sand-rich, diapir-derived MTCs 608 (Figure 19). These relatively small (i.e. 1.13km³), intra-basinal MTCs were sourced from and 609 610 deposited proximal to, the flanks of rising salt diapirs.

Our model develops the model of Madof et al. (2009), showing that: (i) the interplay between the relative rate of salt diapir rise, minibasin subsidence, and sediment accumulation rate dictates minibasin seismic-stratigraphic or stratigraphic architecture; (ii) MTCs are a key stratigraphic element of marine minibasins; and (iii) the style of salt-related structural deformation can be determined by the volume and type of coeval MTCs.

616 Conclusions

617 1. We use seismic reflection and well data to identify six MTCs in a Pleistocene, supra-618 canopy minibasin in the northern Mississippi slope, northern Gulf of Mexico.

- We identify two types of MTC that differ in their geometry, volume, and source area:
 (i) relatively large (98.4-123 km² in area, 18.1-25 km³ in volume, 110-270 m in thickness), shelf-edge/upper slope-derived, extra-basinal MTCs; (ii) relatively small
 ((18.9-29.7 km² in area, 1.13-2.6 km³ in volume, 50-90 m in thickness), diapir-derived
 MTCs, intra-basinal MTCs.
- Shelf-edge/upper slope-derived MTCs were preferentially deposited during the earlier
 phase of minibasin development when sediment accumulation rates exceeded diapir
 rise rates. During this time, diapirs only constrained the distribution of shelfedge/upper slope-derived MTCs; they were not involved in the triggering of these
 deposits. Diapir-derived MTCs were mainly deposited during the late stage of
 minibasin development, at a time when salt diapir rise rate was lower than sediment
 accumulation rate.

4. We present a model for minibasin development that highlights the role of MTCs and develops the widely applied fill-and-spill model. More specifically, our models stresses:
(i) the interplay between the relative rate of salt diapir rise, minibasin subsidence, and sediment accumulation rate dictates minibasin seismic-stratigraphic or stratigraphic architecture; (ii) that MTCs are a key stratigraphic element of marine minibasins; and (iii) the style of salt-related structural deformation can be determined by the volume and type of coeval MTCs.

638 Figure Captions

Figure 1. Location map of the study area relative to the globe map (left) and the study area 639 640 (right), showing the position of the modern shelf-edge (black dotted line), paleo-shelf-edge 641 (white dotted line), and modern depositional systems. The location map is combined with bathymetry (coloured) and northern Gulf Coastal Plain topography (blue and white) of the 642 Gulf of Mexico region. The study area (see yellow box) is located in the upper continental 643 slope of the northern Gulf of Mexico along the SW distal edge of the Mississippi Canyon. The 644 location of the Pleistocene-shelf edge is from Galloway et al. (2011), the Northern Gulf of 645 646 Mexico Deepwater Bathymetry map is modified from The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM). 647

Figure 2. Depth map (Depth below seabed) for top salt, showing the overall salt-tectonic
structure of the study area. 1-5 and A-C refer to minibasins and salt structures, respectively,
described in the text. See location from Figure 1.

Figure 3. (a) N-trending un-interpreted seismic section. (b) Interpreted N-trending seismic section showing the overall salt-tectonic structure of the study area, the nine key seismic horizons (H0 to seabed) and main MTC-bearing intervals (MTC 1 to MTC 6). See location from figure 2. The biostratigraphic framework is based on the last occurrence or abundance acme of key biostratigraphic markers. The details of the biostratigraphic data colorations are as follows: the last occurrence of the early Pleistocene nannoplankton, *Scyphosphaera pulcherima* (~1.92 Ma; Siesser, 1998; Young, 1998), correlates with our seismic horizon H0.

The abundance acme of the early Pleistocene planktonic foraminifera, Sphaeroidinella 658 dehiscens acme B (~1.62 Ma; Waterman et al., 2015), correlates with our seismic horizon H1. 659 660 The last occurrence of the early Pleistocene planktonic foraminifera, Sphaeroidinella 661 dehiscens acme A (~0.85 Ma; Waterman et al., 2015), correlates with our seismic horizon H3. 662 The last occurrence of the early Pleistocene calcareous nannoplankton, Pseudoemiliania 663 lacunosa C (~0.83 Ma; Waterman et al., 2015), correlates with our seismic horizon H5. The last occurrence of the Late Pleistocene planktonic foraminifera, Globorotalia flexuosa (~0.07 664 Ma; Waterman et al., 2015), correlates with our seismic horizon H7. 665

Figure 4. (a) W-trending un-interpreted seismic section. (b) Interpreted W-trending seismic
section showing the overall salt-tectonic structure of the study area, the nine key seismic
horizons (H0 to seabed) and main MTC-bearing intervals (MTC 1 to MTC 5). See location from
Figure 2, and the details of the biostratigraphic data colorations from Figure 1 caption.

Figure 5. Main seismic facies summary, with seismic section of six seismic facies recognized in
the study area, a brief interpretation of the seismic facies, log facies, lithology, and facies
characteristics. See the text for detailed descriptions.

Figure 6. Correlation charts for the study area showing well logs (GR, Sonic, and ATR),
interpreted lithology, well correlated seismic section, key horizons, and geological age of each
episodes.

Figure 7. (a) Thickness map between horizon H0 and horizon H4, showing: (i) the thickness variation of minibasin evolution stage 1; and (ii) the southern and northern depocentres (labelled number 1 and 2). (b) Thickness map between horizon H4 and horizon H7, showing: (i) the thickness variation of minibasin evolution stage 2; and (ii) the southern and northern depocentres (labelled number 1 and 2). (c) Thickness map between horizon H7 and horizon seabed, showing the thickness variation of minibasin evolution stage 3.

Figure 8. Cartoons of Minibasin 5 evolution model: (a) Passive diapirism and minibasin downbuilding; (b) Load-driven passive salt diapirism; (c) Diapir burial, shortening, and active
diapirism.

Figure 9. Burial curve of Minibasin 5, the curve is plotted against the corresponding true vertical depth. The horizontal axis representing the age and the vertical axis representing the depth (sediment thickness), showing three stages of minibasin evolution. The average sedimentation rates are estimated by the total thickness of the sediments deposited in each stage divided by the time gap: (i) Stage 1 - c. 844 m/Myr; Stage 2 - c. 1184 m/Myr; Stage 3 - c. 10000 m/Myr.

Figure 10. (a) Variance attribute calculated for the interval between the H2 and H2.1 seismic
horizons, showing the plain view of MTC 1; (b) Sketch of MTC 1 indicating key kinematic
features associated with MTC 1; (c) E-W oriented seismic section of MTC 1, see location from
Figure 10a; (d) NW-SE trending seismic section of MTC 1, see location from Figure 10a.

Figure 11 (a) Variance attribute calculated for the interval between the H3 and H4 seismic horizons, showing the plain view of MTC 2; (b) Sketch of MTC 2 indicating key features associated with this MTC; (c) SE-NW oriented seismic section of MTC 2, see location from figure 11a.

Figure 12 (a) Chaos attribute calculated for the interval between the H5 and H5.1 seismic horizons, showing the plain view of MTC 3; (b) Sketch of MTC 3 indicating key features associated with this MTC; (c) SW-NE oriented seismic section of MTC 3, see location from Figure 12a; (d) Sketch of MTC 3 showing that the origin of this MTC is from the shelf-edge; (e) Sketch of MTC 3 showing that the emplacement process of MTC 3 is influenced by the uplift of salt diapirs.

Figure 13. Biostratigraphy data compilation showing the age of six MTCs bearing intervals inthe study area.

Figure 14 (a) Variance attribute calculated for the interval between the H7.1 and H7.2 seismic
horizons, showing the map view of MTC 4; (b) Sketch of MTC 4 indicating key features
associated with this MTC.

Figure 15 (a) Variance attribute calculated for the interval between H7.3, H7.4 seismic horizons, showing the map view of MTC 5; (b) Sketch of MTC 5 indicating key features associated with this MTC; (c) NE-SW trending seismic section of MTC 5, see location from Figure 15a; (d) SW-NW-NW trending seismic section of MTC 5, see location from Figure 15a.

Figure 16 (a) Variance attribute calculated for the interval between the H7.5 and H7.6 seismic
horizons, showing the map view of MTC 6; (b) Sketch of MTC 6 indicating key features

- associated with this MTC; (c) SE-NW trending seismic section of MTC 6, see location from
- 717 Figure 16a; (d) SW-NE trending seismic section of MTC 6, see location from Figure 16a; (e) S-
- 718 N trending seismic section of MTC 6, see location from Figure 16a.
- Figure 17 (a) Sketch of MTC 6 showing the first stage of the emplacement; (b) Sketch of MTC
- 720 6 showing the second stage of the emplacement.
- 721 Figure 18. Schematic 3D view of three different types of MTCs observed around the study
- area: (i) Shelf-edge derived MTCs (SED); (ii) Upper slope derived MTCs (USD); and (iii) Diapir-
- 723 derived MTCs (DD).
- 724 Figure 19. Conceptual model for extrabasinal MTCs, intrabasinal MTCs, slope channels, and
- 725 background slope sediments.
- 726 Figure 20. Eustatic sea level curve for Pleistocene and Holocene correlated with general age
- of the MTCs, modified from Imbrie et al. (1984); and the sedimentation rates curve through
- time during different stage of minibasin evolution.

729 Reference

- Alves, T. M., 2015, Submarine slide blocks and associated soft-sediment deformation in deep-water
 basins: a review: Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 67, p. 262-285.
- Beaubouef, R., V. Abreu, J. Van Wagoner, H. Roberts, N. Rosen, R. Fillon, and J. Anderson, 2003,
 Basin 4 of the Brazos–Trinity slope system, western Gulf of Mexico: the terminal portion of a
 late Pleistocene lowstand systems tract: Shelf margin deltas and linked down slope
 petroleum systems: Global significance and future exploration potential: Proceedings of the
- 736 23rd Annual Research Conference, Gulf Coast Section SEPM Foundation, p. 45-66.
- Beaubouef, R., and S. Friedmann, 2000, High resolution seismic/sequence stratigraphic framework
 for the evolution of Pleistocene intra slope basins, western Gulf of Mexico: depositional
 models and reservoir analogs: Deep-water reservoirs of the world: Gulf Coast Section SEPM
 20th Annual Research Conference, p. 40-60.
- Bentley Sr, S., M. Blum, J. Maloney, L. Pond, and R. Paulsell, 2016, The Mississippi River source-to sink system: Perspectives on tectonic, climatic, and anthropogenic influences, Miocene to
 Anthropocene: Earth-Science Reviews, v. 153, p. 139-174.
- Booth, J., A. DuVernay III, D. Pfeiffer, and M. Styzen, 2000, Sequence stratigraphic framework,
 depositional models, and stacking patterns of ponded and slope fan systems in the Auger
 Basin: Central Gulf of Mexico slope: Perkins Research Conference, p. 82-103.
- Booth, J. R., M. C. Dean, A. E. DuVernay III, and M. J. Styzen, 2003, Paleo-bathymetric controls on the
 stratigraphic architecture and reservoir development of confined fans in the Auger Basin:
 central Gulf of Mexico slope: Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 20, p. 563-586.
- Boswell, R., T. S. Collett, M. Frye, W. Shedd, D. R. McConnell, and D. Shelander, 2012, Subsurface gas
 hydrates in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 34, p. 4-30.
- Brown, A. R., 2011, Interpretation of three-dimensional seismic data, Society of Exploration
 Geophysicists and American Association of Petroleum Geologists.

- Bryn, P., K. Berg, C. F. Forsberg, A. Solheim, and T. J. Kvalstad, 2005, Explaining the Storegga slide:
 Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 22, p. 11-19.
- Bull, S., J. Cartwright, and M. Huuse, 2009a, A review of kinematic indicators from mass-transport
 complexes using 3D seismic data: Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 26, p. 1132-1151.
- Bull, S., J. Cartwright, and M. Huuse, 2009b, A subsurface evacuation model for submarine slope
 failure: Basin Research, v. 21, p. 433-443.
- Byrkjeland, U., H. Bungum, and O. Eldholm, 2000, Seismotectonics of the Norwegian continental
 margin: Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, v. 105, p. 6221-6236.
- Canals, M., G. Lastras, R. Urgeles, J. Casamor, J. Mienert, A. Cattaneo, M. De Batist, H. Haflidason, Y.
 Imbo, and J. Laberg, 2004, Slope failure dynamics and impacts from seafloor and shallow
 sub-seafloor geophysical data: case studies from the COSTA project: Marine Geology, v. 213,
 p. 9-72.
- Cashman, K., and P. Popenoe, 1985, Slumping and shallow faulting related to the presence of salt on
 the continental slope and rise off North Carolina: Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 2, p.
 260-271.
- Catuneanu, O., 2002, Sequence stratigraphy of clastic systems: concepts, merits, and pitfalls: Journal
 of African Earth Sciences, v. 35, p. 1-43.
- Catuneanu, O., W. E. Galloway, C. G. S. C. Kendall, A. D. Miall, H. W. Posamentier, A. Strasser, and M.
 E. Tucker, 2011, Sequence stratigraphy: methodology and nomenclature: Newsletters on
 stratigraphy, v. 44, p. 173-245.
- Chopra, S., and K. J. Marfurt, 2007, Seismic attributes for prospect identification and reservoir
 characterization, Society of Exploration Geophysicists and European Association of
 Geoscientists and Engineers.
- Clare, M. A., J. H. Clarke, P. J. Talling, M. J. Cartigny, and D. Pratomo, 2016, Preconditioning and
 triggering of offshore slope failures and turbidity currents revealed by most detailed
 monitoring yet at a fjord-head delta: Earth and Planetary Science Letters, v. 450, p. 208-220.
- Clare, M. A., P. J. Talling, P. Challenor, G. Malgesini, and J. Hunt, 2014, Distal turbidites reveal a
 common distribution for large (> 0.1 km3) submarine landslide recurrence: Geology, v. 42, p.
 263-266.
- Coussens, M., D. Wall Palmer, P. J. Talling, S. F. Watt, M. Cassidy, M. Jutzeler, M. A. Clare, J. E.
 Hunt, M. Manga, and T. M. Gernon, 2016, The relationship between eruptive activity, flank
 collapse, and sea level at volcanic islands: A long term (> 1 Ma) record offshore
 Montserrat, Lesser Antilles: Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems, v. 17, p. 2591-2611.
- 787 Diegel, F. A., J. Karlo, D. Schuster, R. Shoup, and P. Tauvers, 1995, Cenozoic structural evolution and
 788 tectono-stratigraphic framework of the northern Gulf Coast continental margin.
- Dott Jr, R., 1963, Dynamics of subaqueous gravity depositional processes: AAPG Bulletin, v. 47, p.
 104-128.
- Doughty-Jones, G., L. Lonergan, M. Mayall, and S. Dee, 2019, The role of structural growth in
 controlling the facies and distribution of mass transport deposits in a deep-water salt
 minibasin: Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 104, p. 106-124.
- Dugan, B., and P. B. Flemings, 2000, Overpressure and fluid flow in the New Jersey continental slope:
 Implications for slope failure and cold seeps: Science, v. 289, p. 288-291.
- Franco, S. I., C. Canet, A. Iglesias, and C. Valdés-González, 2013, Seismic activity in the Gulf of
 Mexico. A preliminary analysis: Boletín de la Sociedad Geologíca Mexicana, v. 65, p. 447-455.
- Frey Martinez, J., J. Cartwright, and B. Hall, 2005, 3D seismic interpretation of slump complexes:
- examples from the continental margin of Israel: Basin Research, v. 17, p. 83-108.
- 800 Frohlich, C., 1982, Seismicity of the central Gulf of Mexico: Geology, v. 10, p. 103-106.
- Galloway, W. E., 2001, Cenozoic evolution of sediment accumulation in deltaic and shore-zone
 depositional systems, northern Gulf of Mexico Basin: Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 18,
 p. 1031-1040.

- Galloway, W. E., P. E. Ganey-Curry, X. Li, and R. T. Buffler, 2000, Cenozoic depositional history of the
 Gulf of Mexico basin: AAPG bulletin, v. 84, p. 1743-1774.
- Galloway, W. E., T. L. Whiteaker, and P. Ganey-Curry, 2011, History of Cenozoic North American
 drainage basin evolution, sediment yield, and accumulation in the Gulf of Mexico basin:
 Geosphere, v. 7, p. 938-973.
- Gamboa, D., T. Alves, and J. Cartwright, 2011, Distribution and characterization of failed (mega)
 blocks along salt ridges, southeast Brazil: Implications for vertical fluid flow on continental
 margins: Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, v. 116.
- Gamboa, D., and T. M. Alves, 2016, Bi-modal deformation styles in confined mass-transport deposits:
 Examples from a salt minibasin in SE Brazil: Marine Geology, v. 379, p. 176-193.
- Gangopadhyay, A., and M. K. Sen, 2008, A possible mechanism for the spatial distribution of
 seismicity in northern Gulf of Mexico: Geophysical Journal International, v. 175, p. 1141 1153.
- Gee, M., D. Masson, A. Watts, and P. Allen, 1999, The Saharan debris£ ow: an insight into the
 mechanics of long runout submarine debris£ ows: Sedimentology, v. 46, p. 317-335.
- Giles, K. A., and T. F. Lawton, 2002, Halokinetic sequence stratigraphy adjacent to the El Papalote
 diapir, northeastern Mexico: AAPG bulletin, v. 86, p. 823-840.
- Giles, K. A., and M. G. Rowan, 2012, Concepts in halokinetic-sequence deformation and stratigraphy:
 Geological Society, London, Special Publications, v. 363, p. 7-31.
- Grozic, J., 2010, Interplay between gas hydrates and submarine slope failure, Submarine mass
 movements and their consequences, Springer, p. 11-30.
- Hampton, M. A., H. J. Lee, and J. Locat, 1996, Submarine landslides: Reviews of geophysics, v. 34, p.
 33-59.
- Harbitz, C. B., F. Løvholt, and H. Bungum, 2014, Submarine landslide tsunamis: how extreme and
 how likely?: Natural Hazards, v. 72, p. 1341-1374.
- Hearon, T. E., M. G. Rowan, K. A. Giles, and W. H. Hart, 2014, Halokinetic deformation adjacent to
 the deepwater Auger diapir, Garden Banks 470, northern Gulf of Mexico: Testing the
 applicability of an outcrop-based model using subsurface data: Interpretation, v. 2, p. SM57SM76.
- Hill, A., J. Southgate, P. Fish, and S. Thomas, 2011, Deepwater Angola part I: Geohazard mitigation:
 Frontiers in Offshore Geotechnics II, p. 209-214.
- Hjelstuen, B. O., O. Eldholm, and J. I. Faleide, 2007, Recurrent Pleistocene mega-failures on the SW
 Barents Sea margin: Earth and Planetary Science Letters, v. 258, p. 605-618.
- Hudec, M. R., M. P. Jackson, and D. D. Schultz-Ela, 2009, The paradox of minibasin subsidence into
 salt: Clues to the evolution of crustal basins: Geological Society of America Bulletin, v. 121, p.
 201-221.
- Hühnerbach, V., and D. Masson, 2004, Landslides in the North Atlantic and its adjacent seas: an
 analysis of their morphology, setting and behaviour: Marine Geology, v. 213, p. 343-362.
- Imbrie, J., J. D. Hays, D. G. Martinson, A. McIntyre, A. C. Mix, J. J. Morley, N. G. Pisias, W. L. Prell, and
 N. J. Shackleton, 1984, The orbital theory of Pleistocene climate: support from a revised
 chronology of the marine d180 record.
- Jackson, C. A.-L., O. B. Duffy, N. Fernandez, T. Dooley, M. Hudec, M. Jackson, and G. Burg, 2019, The
 Stratigraphic Record of Minibasin Subsidence.
- Kioka, A., T. Schwestermann, J. Moernaut, K. Ikehara, T. Kanamatsu, C. McHugh, C. dos Santos
 Ferreira, G. Wiemer, N. Haghipour, and A. Kopf, 2019, Megathrust earthquake drives drastic
 organic carbon supply to the hadal trench: Scientific reports, v. 9, p. 1553.
- Kneller, E. A., and C. A. Johnson, 2011, Plate kinematics of the Gulf of Mexico based on integrated
 observations from the Central and South Atlantic.

Kvalstad, T. J., L. Andresen, C. F. Forsberg, K. Berg, P. Bryn, and M. Wangen, 2005, The Storegga slide: evaluation of triggering sources and slide mechanics: Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 22, p. 245-256.

- Lastras, G., F. V. De Blasio, M. Canals, and A. Elverhøi, 2005, Conceptual and numerical modeling of
 the BIG'95 debris flow, western Mediterranean Sea: Journal of Sedimentary Research, v. 75,
 p. 784-797.
- Li, W., T. M. Alves, S. Wu, D. Völker, F. Zhao, L. Mi, and A. Kopf, 2015, Recurrent slope failure and
 submarine channel incision as key factors controlling reservoir potential in the South China
 Sea (Qiongdongnan Basin, South Hainan Island): Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 64, p. 1730.
- Locat, J., and H. J. Lee, 2002, Submarine landslides: advances and challenges: Canadian Geotechnical
 Journal, v. 39, p. 193-212.
- MacDonald, I., N. Guinasso Jr, R. Sassen, J. Brooks, L. Lee, and K. Scott, 1994, Gas hydrate that
 breaches the sea floor on the continental slope of the Gulf of Mexico: Geology, v. 22, p. 699702.
- Madof, A. S., N. Christie-Blick, and M. H. Anders, 2009, Stratigraphic controls on a salt-withdrawal
 intraslope minibasin, north-central Green Canyon, Gulf of Mexico: Implications for
 misinterpreting sea level change: AAPG bulletin, v. 93, p. 535-561.
- Madof, A. S., N. Christie-Blick, M. H. Anders, and L. A. Febo, 2017, Unreciprocated sedimentation
 along a mud-dominated continental margin, Gulf of Mexico, USA: Implications for sequence
 stratigraphy in muddy settings devoid of depositional sequences: Marine and Petroleum
 Geology, v. 80, p. 492-516.
- Mallarino, G., R. T. Beaubouef, A. W. Droxler, V. Abreu, and L. Labeyrie, 2006, Sea level influence on
 the nature and timing of a minibasin sedimentary fill (northwestern slope of the Gulf of
 Mexico): AAPG bulletin, v. 90, p. 1089-1119.
- Maslin, M., N. Mikkelsen, C. Vilela, and B. Haq, 1998, Sea-level–and gas-hydrate–controlled
 catastrophic sediment failures of the Amazon Fan: Geology, v. 26, p. 1107-1110.
- Masson, D., C. Harbitz, R. Wynn, G. Pedersen, and F. Løvholt, 2006, Submarine landslides: processes,
 triggers and hazard prediction: Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A:
 Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, v. 364, p. 2009-2039.
- Masson, D., R. Wynn, and P. Talling, 2010, Large landslides on passive continental margins:
 processes, hypotheses and outstanding questions, Submarine mass movements and their
 consequences, Springer, p. 153-165.
- McHugh, C. M., J. E. Damuth, and G. S. Mountain, 2002, Cenozoic mass-transport facies and their
 correlation with relative sea-level change, New Jersey continental margin: Marine Geology,
 v. 184, p. 295-334.
- Mienert, J., M. Vanneste, S. Bünz, K. Andreassen, H. Haflidason, and H. P. Sejrup, 2005, Ocean
 warming and gas hydrate stability on the mid-Norwegian margin at the Storegga Slide:
 Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 22, p. 233-244.
- Milkov, A. V., and R. Sassen, 2001, Estimate of gas hydrate resource, northwestern Gulf of Mexico
 continental slope: Marine Geology, v. 179, p. 71-83.
- Molnar, P., 2004, Late Cenozoic increase in accumulation rates of terrestrial sediment: How might
 climate change have affected erosion rates?: Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci., v. 32, p. 67-89.
- Moscardelli, L., and L. Wood, 2008, New classification system for mass transport complexes in
 offshore Trinidad: Basin Research, v. 20, p. 73-98.
- Moscardelli, L., L. Wood, and P. Mann, 2006, Mass-transport complexes and associated processes in
 the offshore area of Trinidad and Venezuela: AAPG bulletin, v. 90, p. 1059-1088.
- Nardin, T. R., F. Hein, D. S. Gorsline, and B. Edwards, 1979, A review of mass movement processes
 sediment and acoustic characteristics, and contrasts in slope and base-of-slope systems
 versus canyon-fan-basin floor systems.
- 902 Nisbet, E. G., and D. J. Piper, 1998, Giant submarine landslides: Nature, v. 392, p. 329-330.
- 903 O'loughlin, K. F., and J. F. Lander, 2003, Caribbean tsunamis: a 500-year history from 1498-1998, v.
 904 20, Springer Science & Business Media.

- 905 Omosanya, K. O., and T. M. Alves, 2013, A 3-dimensional seismic method to assess the provenance
 906 of Mass-Transport Deposits (MTDs) on salt-rich continental slopes (Espírito Santo Basin, SE
 907 Brazil): Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 44, p. 223-239.
- 908 Ortiz Karpf, A., D. M. Hodgson, C. A. L. Jackson, and W. D. McCaffrey, 2016, Mass Transport
 909 Complexes as Markers of Deep Water Fold and Thrust Belt Evolution: Insights from the
 910 Southern Magdalena Fan, Offshore Colombia: Basin Research.
- Owen, M., S. Day, and M. Maslin, 2007, Late Pleistocene submarine mass movements: occurrence
 and causes: Quaternary Science Reviews, v. 26, p. 958-978.
- Perov, G., and J. P. Bhattacharya, 2011, Pleistocene shelf-margin delta: Intradeltaic deformation and
 sediment bypass, northern Gulf of Mexico: AAPG bulletin, v. 95, p. 1617-1641.
- Pindell, J., and J. F. Dewey, 1982, Permo Triassic reconstruction of western Pangea and the
 evolution of the Gulf of Mexico/Caribbean region: Tectonics, v. 1, p. 179-211.
- Pope, E., P. Talling, M. Urlaub, J. Hunt, M. Clare, and P. Challenor, 2015, Are large submarine
 landslides temporally random or do uncertainties in available age constraints make it
 impossible to tell?: Marine Geology, v. 369, p. 19-33.
- Posamentier, H., M. Jervey, and P. Vail, 1988, Eustatic controls on clastic deposition I—conceptual
 framework.
- Posamentier, H., and R. Walker, 2006, Deep-water turbidites and submarine fans. Facies Models
 Revisited: Special Publication-Society for Sedimentary Geology, v. 84, p. 399-520.
- Posamentier, H. W., and V. Kolla, 2003, Seismic geomorphology and stratigraphy of depositional
 elements in deep-water settings: Journal of Sedimentary Research, v. 73, p. 367-388.
- Prather, B., 2000, Calibration and visualization of depositional process models for above-grade
 slopes: a case study from the Gulf of Mexico: Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 17, p. 619 638.
- Prather, B. E., J. R. Booth, G. S. Steffens, and P. A. Craig, 1998, Classification, lithologic calibration,
 and stratigraphic succession of seismic facies of intraslope basins, deep-water Gulf of
 Mexico: AAPG bulletin, v. 82, p. 701-728.
- Prather, B. E., C. Pirmez, C. D. Winker, M. Deptuck, and D. Mohrig, 2012, Stratigraphy of linked
 intraslope basins: Brazos-Trinity system western Gulf of Mexico: Application of the principles
 of seismic geomorphology to continental-slope and base-of-slope systems: Case studies
 from seafloor and near-seafloor analogues: SEPM, Special Publication, v. 99, p. 83-109.
- Rittenour, T. M., M. D. Blum, and R. J. Goble, 2007, Fluvial evolution of the lower Mississippi River
 valley during the last 100 ky glacial cycle: Response to glaciation and sea-level change: GSA
 Bulletin, v. 119, p. 586-608.
- Roesink, J. G., P. Weimer, and R. Bouroullec, 2004, Sequence stratigraphy of Miocene to Pleistocene
 sediments of east-central Mississippi canyon, northern Gulf of Mexico.
- Rowan, M. G., T. F. Lawton, K. A. Giles, and R. A. Ratliff, 2003, Near-salt deformation in La Popa
 basin, Mexico, and the northern Gulf of Mexico: A general model for passive diapirism: AAPG
 bulletin, v. 87, p. 733-756.
- Rowan, M. G., and P. Weimer, 1998, Salt-sediment interaction, northern Green Canyon and Ewing
 bank (offshore Louisiana), northern Gulf of Mexico: AAPG bulletin, v. 82, p. 1055-1082.
- Salazar, J. A., J. H. Knapp, C. C. Knapp, and D. R. Pyles, 2014, Salt tectonics and Pliocene stratigraphic
 framework at MC-118, Gulf of Mexico: An integrated approach with application to deep water confined structures in salt basins: Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 50, p. 51-67.
- Salvador, A., 1987, Late Triassic-Jurassic paleogeography and origin of Gulf of Mexico basin: AAPG
 Bulletin, v. 71, p. 419-451.
- Sawyer, D. E., P. B. Flemings, B. Dugan, and J. T. Germaine, 2009, Retrogressive failures recorded in
 mass transport deposits in the Ursa Basin, Northern Gulf of Mexico: Journal of Geophysical
 Research: Solid Earth, v. 114.

- Sawyer, D. E., P. B. Flemings, R. C. Shipp, and C. D. Winker, 2007, Seismic geomorphology, lithology,
 and evolution of the late Pleistocene Mars-Ursa turbidite region, Mississippi Canyon area,
 northern Gulf of Mexico: AAPG bulletin, v. 91, p. 215-234.
- Shipp, R. C., 2004, Physical Characteristics and Impact of Mass Transport Complexes on Deepwater
 Jetted Conductors and Suction Anchor Piles.
- Siesser, W. G., 1998, Calcareous nannofossil genus Scyphosphaera: structure, taxonomy,
 biostratigraphy, and phylogeny: Micropaleontology, p. 351-384.
- Sincavage, R., P. Weimer, and R. Bouroullec, 2004, Sequence Stratigraphy of Upper-Miocene to
 Pleistocene Sediments of Southwestern Mississippi Canyon and Northwestern Atwater
 Valley, Northern Gulf of Mexico.
- Smith, D., S. Harrison, and J. T. Jordan, 2013, Sea level rise and submarine mass failures on open
 continental margins: Quaternary Science Reviews, v. 82, p. 93-103.
- Strout, J. M., and T. I. Tjelta, 2005, In situ pore pressures: What is their significance and how can they
 be reliably measured?: Marine and Petroleum Geology, v. 22, p. 275-285.
- Sydow, J., J. Finneran, A. P. Bowman, H. Roberts, N. Rosen, R. Fillon, and J. Anderson, 2003, Stacked
 shelf-edge delta reservoirs of the Columbus Basin, Trinidad, West Indies: Shelf-Margin Deltas
 and Linked Downslope Petroleum Systems, p. 441-465.
- 971 Sylvester, Z., A. Cantelli, and C. Pirmez, 2015, Stratigraphic evolution of intraslope minibasins:
 972 Insights from surface-based model: AAPG Bulletin, v. 99, p. 1099-1129.
- Talling, P. J., L. A. Amy, and R. B. Wynn, 2007, New insight into the evolution of large volume
 turbidity currents: comparison of turbidite shape and previous modelling results:
 Sedimentology, v. 54, p. 737-769.
- Talling, P. J., M. L. CLARE, M. Urlaub, E. Pope, J. E. Hunt, and S. F. Watt, 2014, Large submarine
 landslides on continental slopes: geohazards, methane release, and climate change:
 Oceanography, v. 27, p. 32-45.
- Tripsanas, E. K., W. R. Bryant, and B. A. Phaneuf, 2004, Slope-instability processes caused by salt
 movements in a complex deep-water environment, Bryant Canyon area, northwest Gulf of
 Mexico: AAPG bulletin, v. 88, p. 801-823.
- Twichell, D. C., J. D. Chaytor, S. Uri, and B. Buczkowski, 2009, Morphology of late Quaternary
 submarine landslides along the US Atlantic continental margin: Marine Geology, v. 264, p. 4 15.
- 985 Urlaub, M., P. J. Talling, and D. G. Masson, 2013, Timing and frequency of large submarine
 986 landslides: implications for understanding triggers and future geohazard: Quaternary Science
 987 Reviews, v. 72, p. 63-82.
- Vail, P. R., R. Mitchum Jr, and S. Thompson III, 1977, Seismic Stratigraphy and Global Changes of Sea
 Level: Part 4. Global Cycles of Relative Changes of Sea Level.: Section 2. Application of
 Seismic Reflection Configuration to Stratigraphic Interpretation.
- Waterman, A., R. Weber, B. Brace, J. Edmunds, R. Fillon, R. George, Y. Lu, N. Myers, B. Parker, and T.
 Reilly, 2015, Biostratigraphic chart—Gulf Basin, USA: Quaternary and Neogene.
- Weaver, P. P., R. B. Wynn, N. H. Kenyon, and J. Evans, 2000, Continental margin sedimentation, with
 special reference to the north east Atlantic margin: Sedimentology, v. 47, p. 239-256.
- Weimer, P., and C. Shipp, 2004, Mass transport complex: musing on past uses and suggestions for
 future directions: Offshore Technology Conference.
- Winker, C. D., and J. R. Booth, 2000, Sedimentary dynamics of the salt-dominated continental slope,
 Gulf of Mexico: integration of observations from the seafloor, near-surface, and deep
 subsurface: GCSSEPM Foundation 20th Annual Research Conference, Deep-Water Reservoirs
 of the World, p. 1059-1086.
- Witrock, R., A. Friedmann, J. Galluzzo, L. Nixon, P. Post, and K. Ross, 2003, Biostratigraphic chart of
 the Gulf of Mexico offshore region: Jurassic to Quaternary, US Department of the Interior,
 Minerals Management Service, New Orleans.

- Wu, N., C. A. Jackson, H. Johnson, and D. M. Hodgson, 2019, Lithological, petrophysical and seal
 properties of mass-transport complexes (MTCs), northern Gulf of Mexico: EarthArXiv.
 February, v. 19.
- Yeakley, J. A., A. Shakoor, and W. Johnson, 2019, Influence of Salt Tectonics On Fault Displacements
 and Submarine Slope Failures from Algeria To Sardinia: Environmental & Engineering
 Geoscience, p. 1-13.
- 1010 Young, J. R., 1998, Neogene: Calcareous nannofossil biostratigraphy, p. 225-265.

1011

1012





Figure 2









Figure 3b



Figure 4b



Figure 5

Seismic facies template										
Types		Seismic sections		Sonic	Lithology	Schematic facies geometries	Seismic facies	Log facies	Lithology	Depositional element
Stratified facies	SFs1	SFF1 SFF1	and manufacture	man	30 m 20 m 10 m Bate Mano rate Sand	40m	Fair continuity, parallel, high amplitude seismic reflections, with slightly inclined, non-erosive planar base and top surface.	Fining upward trend with low GR response at the base and high GR response at the top.	Sandstone rich at the bottom and grading upward into mudstone rich deposits at the top	Heterogeneous gravity flow deposit: •Levees •Lobes •Channel systems.
	SFs2	5F-2 250 m	sound make from	minh	80 m	110m	Fair continuity, parallel, low- to medium amplitude seismic reflections, with flat base and top surfaces.	Constantly serrated high GR response from bottom to top.	Mudstone rich deposits from base to top.	Slope.
	SF₅3	SF.3 200 m	TTW/M2/where	man hannar	100 m	95 m	 Fair continuity, high- amplitude seismic reflections, with non- erosive, oblique top and base surfaces. 	•Box-shaped GR response at base and middle, bell-shaped with upward fining GR response at the top.	Sandstone rich deposi dominant interbedded with mudstone deposits.	: Lobes.
Chaotic facies	SFc1	SFc1 250 m	MALLA	assurance of them have been	150 m	170m	Locally disorganised, faulted and folded, high amplitude seismic reflections, with a tabular external form.	Bell-shaped GR response with a fining upward trend near the bottom, and a set of box-shaped low GR response at middle and top.	Mudstone-rich deposit at the bottom, sandstone-rich deposits interbedded with thinly bedded mudstone at the middle and upper parts.	MTCs containing large sandstone-rich blocks.
	SF₀2	SF-2 250 m	man have	An and a start and	200 m - 150 m - 100 m -		Mixture of low to medium amplitude seismic reflections with highly chaotic internal reflection pattern.	Serrated, overall high GR response that locally contains sharp- based, box-shaped, low GR intervals from base to top.	Mudstone-rich deposit interbedded with sandstone rich blocks.	Mudstone dominated MTCsSubordinate sandstones blocks (30-60 m).
	SFc3	SF:3 50 m			200 m 150 m 100 m 50 m	210 m	Chaotic, medium-high amplitude seismic reflections, 'bowl' shaped external form with an erosional base.		Sandstone rich deposits.	Sandstone dominant slope channel.

Figure 6



Figure 7a



Figure 7b

1500-

1250-

1000-

750-

500-

250-

0-

Ε

ness

2

1

5 km

Figure 7c









Figure 10a

Figure 10b



Figure 10c



Figure 10d



Figure 11a



Figure 11b







Figure 12a

Figure 12b





















Figure 14a



Figure 14b



Figure 15a











Figure 15d







Figure 16b



Figure 16c



Figure 16d



Figure 16e







Figure 17b







Figure 19





