

## GEOLOGY

## How is a turbidite actually deposited?

Zhiyuan Ge<sup>1,2,3\*</sup>, Wojciech Nemeč<sup>3</sup>, Age J. Vellinga<sup>4</sup>, Rob L. Gawthorpe<sup>3</sup>

The deposition of a classic turbidite by a surge-type turbidity current, as envisaged by conceptual models, is widely considered a discrete event of continuous sediment accumulation at a falling rate by the gradually waning density flow. Here, we demonstrate, on the basis of a high-resolution advanced numerical CFD (computational fluid dynamics) simulation and rock-record examples, that the depositional event in reality involves many brief episodes of nondeposition. The reason is inherent hydraulic fluctuations of turbidity current energy driven by interfacial Kelvin-Helmholtz waves. The experimental turbidity current, with realistic grain-size composition of a natural turbidite, used only 26 to 33% of its in-place flow time for deposition, while the remaining time went to the numerous episodes of sediment bypass and transient erosion. The general stratigraphic notion of a gross incompleteness of sedimentary record may then extend down to the deposition time scale of a single turbidite.

## INTRODUCTION

Turbidity currents are subaqueous turbulent sediment-gravity flows that deliver huge volumes of sand and other clastic sediment to the deep-sea floor (1–3). These flows are discrete events, with an estimated deep-water recurrence of 50 to 650 years and volumes ranging from less than  $10^5$  to more than  $10^9$  m<sup>3</sup>. Thus, at the upper end of this range, a single turbidity current is occasionally capable of transporting more sediment than the annual global output of all rivers combined (4, 5). The worldwide interest in turbidity currents and their deposits, the turbidites, is primarily for a geological understanding of deep-water turbiditic systems and their depositional facies tracts, palaeogeographic reconstruction of ancient deep-marine basins, hydrocarbon reservoir characterization, mass-flow geohazard assessment in modern deep-water environments, source-to-sink sediment budget modeling, and the modern-time delivery of plastic litter and other pollutants to the deep sea (6–13).

There is probably no other coarse-clastic depositional system on Earth that would accumulate hundreds to thousands of meters of sediment by a simple repetition of one and the same discrete rare event—a turbidity current. Yet, these systems vary enormously in their dimensions and morphodynamics (3, 14), partly because the turbidity currents differ considerably in their hydraulic properties and behavior (10, 15), hence the great interest in turbidites and their internal vertical succession of grain size and sedimentary structures, interpreted as the in-place record of flow behavior and evolving bed-form pattern (15–22).

Two main conceptual categories of turbidity current are the surge-type (single pulse) flows, generated by an abrupt release of a fixed flow volume, and the sustained (longer-duration) flows, possibly with multiple pulses, which can stream for weeks to months and are generally attributed to a multisource release or river hyperpycnal effluent (4, 22–25). The depositional product of surge-type flow is expected to be the classic, Bouma-type turbidite T(a)bcd accumulated with a uniformly decreasing flow power, reflected in the upward fining of grain size and similar transition from upper to lower flow-regime structure of deposited sediment (16, 18, 20, 26, 27).

<sup>1</sup>State Key Laboratory of Petroleum Resources and Prospecting, China University of Petroleum (Beijing), Beijing 102249, China. <sup>2</sup>College of Geosciences, China University of Petroleum (Beijing), Beijing 102249, China. <sup>3</sup>Department of Earth Science, University of Bergen, 5007 Bergen, Norway. <sup>4</sup>School of Ocean and Earth Science, University of Southampton, Southampton SO14 3ZH, UK.

\*Corresponding author. Email: gezhiyuan@cup.edu.cn

However, there are serious reasons to doubt whether this conceptual model of a uniformly decreasing flow energy is sufficiently realistic as a guide for turbidite research. First, considerable in-place velocity fluctuations, instead of a uniform decline, have been increasingly recognized in the higher-resolution monitoring studies of steady-input uniform turbidity currents (28–33). Second, episodes of syndepositional intra-turbidite transient erosion have become invoked in the recent interpretations of turbidity current deposition based on detailed outcrop observations (4, 20). Can the deposition of sediment by a uniformly fed continuous flow be in reality discontinuous?

We address this contentious issue by a high-resolution advanced computational fluid dynamics (CFD) simulation of a natural-scale, average surge-type turbidity current. Deep-sea turbidity currents are difficult to observe and monitor in nature (15), whereas the laboratory mini-flows of solute or extremely fine-grained dilute sediment suspension, although highly instructive, are unable to reveal the impact of some important hydraulic phenomena that depend on the flow natural-scale magnitude and sediment content (32, 34, 35). We use a natural-scale CFD simulation to obviate this insight problem and to answer the intriguing research issue.


## RESULTS

The experimental flow at its release had immediately regulated itself by dropping excess sediment load and adjusting its hydraulics to the seafloor slope. The flow accelerated from 1.8 to 5 m s<sup>−1</sup> and reduced its axial thickness from 30 to about 15 m over a travel distance of only 150 m. Vertical gradients of flow density and velocity developed, as the flow subsided by lateral expansion. Mean sediment concentration changed insignificantly, but the in-place bottom concentration considerably fluctuated (Fig. 1).


As the flow in this way stabilized itself, the well-known interfacial instability in the form of Kelvin-Helmholtz (K-H) waves (7, 18, 36) commenced along its top (Fig. 1), with a wavelength of 15 to 50 m and amplitude of 5 to 10 m. This phenomenon had a major impact on the flow instantaneous velocity, with near-bed maximum magnitude fluctuating between 3 and nearly 5 m s<sup>−1</sup> (Fig. 2A, inset diagram), and the bedload sediment concentration varying between 2 and 6 volume % (vol %; Fig. 1). The K-H waves were characteristically breaking and rolling upflow as billows, entraining ambient water. As the billows grew in size, they increasingly underwent random

Copyright © 2022 The Authors, some rights reserved; exclusive licensee American Association for the Advancement of Science. No claim to original U.S. Government Works. Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (CC BY).

Downloaded from https://www.science.org on January 24, 2022



**Fig. 1. Longitudinal section snapshot of the turbidity current showing interfacial K-H waves and related bedload fluctuations.** For location, see Fig. 2C.




**Fig. 2. Grain-size composition and axial longitudinal display of the experimental flow.** (A) Flow volumetric sediment concentration at 150 s after release from the gate. (B) Flow velocity magnitude at 150 s; the inset diagram shows in-place fluctuations of flow velocity magnitude and bed shear stress. (C) Flow volumetric sediment concentration at 250 s after release. (D) Flow volumetric sediment concentration at 500 s after release; the inset diagram shows in-place fluctuations of flow velocity magnitude and bed shear stress. Flow velocity magnitude is a geometric mean of three-dimensional velocity components and a measure of the flow in-place kinetic energy. Note in the inset diagrams that the bed shear-stress maxima follow closely the peaks of flow velocity magnitude. (E) Flow sediment load based on the grain-size composition of a typical turbidite from the Mount Messenger Formation, New Zealand (53).

interference (Figs. 1 and 2, C and D), and their impact on near-bed flow energy became less regular and somewhat chaotic (Fig. 2D, inset diagram).


An important direct hydraulic consequence of the K-H waves and energy fluctuations were the corresponding instantaneous changes of the flow bottom shear stress, which fluctuated between 0.19 and 22 Pa. The plots of sediment accumulation and bed shear stress show alternating brief episodes of sediment accretion, non-depositional bypass, and transient erosion (Fig. 2, insets). We have monitored the flow shear stress, Froude number, velocity magnitude, and sedimentary bed evolution with a time interval of 2 s (Figs. 2 to 4).

The repetitive energy fluctuations (Fig. 3) are comparable to those recognized with advanced instrumental methods of natural flow monitoring (28, 29, 33), although these techniques are still incapable of showing details revealed by the present study.

For the episodes of accretion, we have predicted the mode of sediment deposition (Fig. 5, turbidite profiles) from the bedform stability diagram (37) based on the bottom shear stress and sediment grain size. Episodes of sediment bypass occurred when flow conditions wandered briefly into the dune bedform stability field, with the bottom shear stress too high for ripples and too low for plane-bed configuration, but with the time window too short for dune formation.



**Fig. 3.** Time-series plots showing flow energy fluctuations along the axial longitudinal section of the experimental turbidity current. (A) Bed shear stress fluctuations of the flow head and body. (B) In-place fluctuations of the flow Froude number at location 190 m from inlet gate. (C) In-place fluctuations of the flow Froude number at location 220 m from inlet gate.



**Fig. 4. Time-series plots of Froude number and sediment thickness along the axial longitudinal section of the flow.** (A) The Froude number changes through time over the distance of 100 to 800 m out of the inlet. Note that the legend scale is optimized for visualization. (B) The accumulated sediment thickness changes through time over the same distance. Note the locations of Figs. 3 (B and C) and 5 (A and B) in the plots.

Dunes are known to have a considerable time lag to form (18). Sediment bypass occurred also when flow conditions were hydraulically suitable for ripple formation, but the fluctuating near-bed sediment concentration happened to be insufficient. Episodes of sediment cannibalization by erosion corresponded to brief flow excursions into the supercritical regime (Froude number  $> 1$ ), yet with no immediate bed defects and flowline disturbance, and with the time window too short for antidune formation (18, 31).

The experimental surge-type flow formed a deposit thinning downslope from 45 to 15 cm, with notable out-of-phase changes in sediment deposition, bypass, and erosion within the monitoring distance (Figs. 3, 4B, and 5). If the flow energy was not fluctuating and a continuous deposition occurred at a uniformly decreasing rate, the deposit at the monitoring stations would be expected to be 94 to 92 cm thick (Fig. 5). The experimental flow, with its energy fluctuations driven by the K-H waves, thus effectively resulted in a deposit of about 25% of the thickness of a turbidite theoretically expected from a uniformly depositional flow surge. Around 39 to 45 episodes of in-place deposition occurred and represented only 26 to 33% of the

flow time, while the remaining time went to the numerous brief non-depositional episodes of sediment bypass and erosion (Fig. 5). The deposition of sediment from a surge-type continuous flow was then highly discontinuous, and hence we conclude that the general stratigraphic notion of more gaps than depositional record (38) may extend down even to the deposition time scale of a single turbidite.

## DISCUSSION

### Autogenic energy fluctuations in turbidity current

The K-H waves in turbidity currents have long been considered as important for the interfacial entrainment of ambient water, but with no obvious direct impact predicted for the bedload transport (7, 27). Short-frequency velocity fluctuations have been increasingly recognized in high-resolution laboratory studies of both single-pulse and multipulse turbidity currents (25, 28, 30), putting into question the notion of a “steady” flow, but their influence on the bulk dynamics of laboratory flow was considered insignificant (25). However, recent upscaled CFD simulations (32) and assessment from natural-scale flows (33) have indicated that the brief energy fluctuations may have a major impact on sediment transport and deposition, and that this inherent spontaneous instability of a turbidity current is virtually unrelated to a hyperpycnal river effluent and its possible pulsing (25, 30). Our study confirms these important recent findings.

### Discontinuous deposition from continuous flow

The classic model of a single-pulse, surge-type turbidity current, widely invoked in textbooks, assumed a continuous deposition with no intervening episodes of sediment bypass or intrastratal erosion (16, 18, 26, 27). Only some longer-term phenomena of net sediment bypass were considered for the nondeposition zones in certain turbiditic systems (34, 39). Our study indicates that the role of intermittent bypass and erosion extends down to the internal scale of a single turbidite, with obvious important implications for the geological understanding of turbidites and the source-to-sink sediment transfer modeling studies.

The macroscopic record of flow energy fluctuations is recognizable in turbidites, both as an alternation of their structural divisions and as intra-division discontinuities (Fig. 6). However, the idealized concept of a uniformly declining surge flow (1, 27) had led to the original interpretation of every intrastratal erosional surface or upward change to higher-energy division as the base of successive turbidites. The Bouma classic sequence of turbidite divisions (16) was established on this premise, based on the Gres d’Annot outcrops, although many turbidites therein indicate fluctuating flows [figure 17B in (32)] and some even show sporadic dune cross-stratification unaccounted for in the Bouma sequence. The idealized Bouma sequence may thus not be a universal norm, but its divisions may still be useful elements for a descriptive portrayal of turbiditic deposits (19, 22).

Our experimental study demonstrates that not every intrastratal erosion surface must necessarily mean a new turbidity current event, and not every fluctuation in flow energy implies a river-generated hyperpycnal flow, especially if no fluvial feeder has been evidenced. The K-H waves scale with the flow and should be distinguished from externally imposed flow pulses (30, 33). Our study shows further that the flow energy fluctuations driven by K-H waves can be recorded without bedform change (Fig. 5), and may cause such a change of





reaching the monitored area of deposition. The uniform release of sediment-water mixture (total volume, 466,560 m<sup>3</sup>) from the inlet gate lasted 12 min. The flow monitoring along its axis was over a downslope distance of 800 m, spanning a bathymetric range of 80 to 150 m. With its tangential gradient and bathymetric range, the seafloor topography in the experiment resembled the slope of a large Gilbert-type delta or morphology of a large slump scar at shelf margin.

The sediment load carried by the current had the grain-size composition of a typical turbidite from the Miocene Mount Messenger Formation, Taranaki Basin, New Zealand (52), where river-derived hyperpycnal flows could be precluded and the noncemented deposits allowed for precise grain-size analyses (53). The unimodal and narrow-sized sediment (Fig. 2E), with a mean grain size of 0.14 mm, allowed for a high-precision predicting of sedimentary bed behavior from the diagrams of Shields threshold (54) and bedform stability (37) based on the bedload grain size and bottom shear stress. The negligible clay content avoided a high-efficiency (long runout) bypassing flow that would have to be numerically monitored for kilometers to identify its eventual switch to subcritical (depositional) mode.

To observe solely the net depositional effect of turbidity current, we assumed the seabed as nonerodible, with a surface roughness of 0.1 mm (fine sand). The assumption seemed reasonable because non-channelized turbidity currents have little propensity for substrate erosion (20, 27), and the experimental flow was dropping an excess sediment load directly outside the inlet gate, rather than attempting to erode the substrate. Furthermore, the experiment aim was to monitor the flow behavior after the onset of bedload deposition. Otherwise, the flow was fully capable of eroding and re-entraining its own deposited sediment.

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Supplementary material for this article is available at <https://science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.abl9124>

## REFERENCES AND NOTES

- S. Dzułyński, M. Książkiewicz, P. H. Kuenen, Turbidites in flysch of the Polish Carpathian Mountains. *Geol. Soc. Am. Bull.* **70**, 1089–1118 (1959).
- G. Sestini, Flysch facies and turbidite sedimentology. *Sediment. Geol.* **4**, 559–597 (1970).
- W. R. Normark, H. Posamentier, E. Mutti, Turbidite systems: State of the art and future directions. *Rev. Geophys.* **31**, 91–116 (1993).
- P. J. Talling, D. G. Masson, E. J. Sumner, G. Malgesini, Subaqueous sediment density flows: Depositional processes and deposit types. *Sedimentology* **59**, 1937–2003 (2012).
- Z. R. Jobe, N. Howes, B. W. Romans, J. A. Covault, Volume and recurrence of submarine-fan-building turbidity currents. *Depos. Rec.* **4**, 160–176 (2018).
- A. Hartley, J. Prosser, *Characterization of Deep Marine Clastic Systems* (Geological Society, London, Special Publication, 1995), vol. 94.
- J. E. Simpson, *Gravity Currents: In the Environment and the Laboratory* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999).
- W. D. McCaffrey, B. C. Kneller, J. Peakall, *Particulate Gravity Currents* (John Wiley & Sons, 2009).
- E. Mutti, D. Bernoulli, F. Ricci Lucchi, R. Tinterri, Turbidites and turbidity currents from Alpine 'flysch' to the exploration of continental margins. *Sedimentology* **56**, 267–318 (2009).
- E. Meiburg, B. Kneller, Turbidity currents and their deposits. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **42**, 135–156 (2010).
- P. J. Talling, J. Allin, D. A. Armitage, R. W. Arnott, M. J. Cartigny, M. A. Clare, F. Felletti, J. A. Covault, S. Girardclos, E. Hansen, P. R. Hill, R. N. Hiscott, A. J. Hogg, J. H. Clarke, Z. R. Jobe, G. Malgesini, A. Mozzato, H. Naruse, S. Parkinson, F. J. Peel, D. J. W. Piper, E. Pope, G. Postma, P. Rowley, A. Sguazzini, C. J. Stevenson, E. J. Sumner, Z. Sylvester, C. Watts, J. Xu, Key future directions for research on turbidity currents and their deposits. *J. Sediment. Res.* **85**, 153–169 (2015).
- I. Kane, A. Fildani, Anthropogenic pollution in deep-marine sedimentary systems—A geological perspective on the plastic problem. *Geology* **49**, 607–608 (2021).
- M. Haward, Plastic pollution of the world's seas and oceans as a contemporary challenge in ocean governance. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 667 (2018).
- A. H. Bouma, W. R. Normark, N. E. Barnes, *Submarine Fans and Related Turbidite Systems* (Springer-Verlag, 1985).
- P. J. Talling, C. K. Paull, D. J. Piper, How are subaqueous sediment density flows triggered, what is their internal structure and how does it evolve? Direct observations from monitoring of active flows. *Earth Sci. Rev.* **125**, 244–287 (2013).
- A. H. Bouma, *Sedimentology of Some Flysch Deposits: A Graphical Approach to Facies Classification* (Elsevier, 1962).
- R. G. Walker, The origin and significance of the internal sedimentary structures of turbidites. *Proc. Yorkshire Geol. Soc.* **35**, 1–32 (1965).
- J. R. L. Allen, *Sedimentary Structures, Their Character and Physical Basis Volume 1* (Elsevier, 1982).
- G. Ghibaudo, Subaqueous sediment gravity flow deposits: Practical criteria for their field description and classification. *Sedimentology* **39**, 423–454 (1992).
- E. Mutti, *Turbidite Sandstones* (AGIP, Istituto di geologia, Università di Parma, 1992).
- P. Haughton, C. Davis, W. McCaffrey, S. Barker, Hybrid sediment gravity flow deposits—Classification, origin and significance. *Mar. Pet. Geol.* **26**, 1900–1918 (2009).
- C. Zavala, M. Arcuri, M. Di Meglio, H. G. Diaz, C. Contreras, A genetic facies tract for the analysis of sustained hyperpycnal flow deposits, in *Sediment Transfer from Shelf to Deep Water—Revisiting the Delivery System*, R. M. Slatt, C. Zavala, Eds. (AAPG Studies in Geology, AAPG & SEPM, 2011), vol. 61.
- B. Kneller, Beyond the turbidite paradigm: Physical models for deposition of turbidites and their implications for reservoir prediction. *Geol. Soc. Lond. Special Publication* **94**, 31–49 (1995).
- T. Mulder, J. P. Syvitski, S. Migeon, J.-C. Fauget, B. Savoye, Marine hyperpycnal flows: Initiation, behavior and related deposits. A review. *Mar. Pet. Geol.* **20**, 861–882 (2003).
- V. L. Ho, R. M. Dorrell, G. M. Keevil, A. D. Burns, W. D. McCaffrey, Pulse propagation in turbidity currents. *Sedimentology* **65**, 620–637 (2018).
- J. R. L. Allen, The Bouma division A and the possible duration of turbidity currents. *J. Sediment. Res.* **61**, 291–295 (1991).
- G. V. Middleton, Sediment deposition from turbidity currents. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* **21**, 89–114 (1993).
- J. H. Baas, W. D. McCaffrey, P. D. Haughton, C. Choux, Coupling between suspended sediment distribution and turbulence structure in a laboratory turbidity current. *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans* **110**, C11015 (2005).
- J. L. Best, R. A. Kostaschuk, J. Peakall, P. V. Villard, M. Franklin, Whole flow field dynamics and velocity pulsing within natural sediment-laden underflows. *Geology* **33**, 765–768 (2005).
- M. P. Lamb, D. Mohrig, Do hyperpycnal-flow deposits record river-flood dynamics? *Geology* **37**, 1067–1070 (2009).
- G. Postma, M. J. Cartigny, Supercritical and subcritical turbidity currents and their deposits—A synthesis. *Geology* **42**, 987–990 (2014).
- Z. Ge, W. Nemeč, R. L. Gawthorpe, E. W. M. Hansen, Response of unconfined turbidity current to normal-fault topography. *Sedimentology* **64**, 932–959 (2017).
- R. Kostaschuk, M. M. Nasr-Azadani, E. Meiburg, T. Wei, Z. Chen, M. E. Negretti, J. Best, J. Peakall, D. Parsons, On the causes of pulsing in continuous turbidity currents. *Case Rep. Med.* **123**, 2827–2843 (2018).
- O. Al Ja'Aidi, "The influence of topography and flow efficiency on the deposition of turbidites," thesis, University of Leeds (2000).
- M. Janocko, M. Cartigny, W. Nemeč, E. W. M. Hansen, Turbidity current hydraulics and sediment deposition in erodible sinuous channels: Laboratory experiments and numerical simulations. *Mar. Pet. Geol.* **41**, 222–249 (2013).
- T. M. Özgökmen, P. F. Fischer, J. Duan, T. Iliescu, Three-dimensional turbulent bottom density currents from a high-order nonhydrostatic spectral element model. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* **34**, 2006–2026 (2004).
- J. B. Southard, Experimental determination of bed-form stability. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* **19**, 423–455 (1991).
- D. V. Ager, *The Nature of the Stratigraphical Record* (John Wiley & Sons, ed. 2, 1980).
- C. J. Stevenson, C. A.-L. Jackson, D. M. Hodgson, S. M. Hubbard, J. T. Eggenhuisen, Deep-water sediment bypass. *J. Sediment. Res.* **85**, 1058–1081 (2015).
- G. Shanmugam, *Deep-Water Processes and Facies Models: Implications for Sandstone Petroleum Reservoirs* (Elsevier, 2006).
- G. Shanmugam, The turbidite-contourite-tidalite-baroclinite-hybridite problem: Orthodoxy vs. empirical evidence behind the "Bouma Sequence". *J. Palaeogeogr.* **10**, 9 (2021).
- FlowScience, *Flow-3D Software Manual* (Flow Science, Inc., 2019).
- R. Basani, M. Janocko, M. J. Cartigny, E. W. M. Hansen, J. T. Eggenhuisen, MassFlow-3D™ as a simulation tool for turbidity current, in *From Depositional Systems to Sedimentary Successions on the Norwegian Continental Margin*, T. Stevens, A. W. Martinus, R. Ravnås, J. A. Howell, R. J. Steel, J. P. Wonham, Eds. (IAS Special Publication, 587–608, 2014), vol. 46.
- S. Heimsund, "Numerical simulation of turbidity currents: A new perspective for small-and large-scale sedimentological experiments," thesis, University of Bergen, Bergen (2007).

45. S. Heimsund, J. Xu, W. Nemeč, in *AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts*, OS33A-0996 (2007).
46. V. Yakhot, S. A. Orszag, Renormalization group analysis of turbulence. I. Basic theory. *J. Sci. Comput.* **1**, 3–51 (1986).
47. A. J. Vellinga, M. J. B. Cartigny, J. T. Eggenhuisen, E. W. M. Hansen, Morphodynamics and depositional signature of low-aggradation cyclic steps: New insights from a depth-resolved numerical model. *Sedimentology* **65**, 540–560 (2018).
48. D. R. Mastbergen, J. H. Van Den Berg, Breaching in fine sands and the generation of sustained turbidity currents in submarine canyons. *Sedimentology* **50**, 625–637 (2003).
49. B. Gomez, M. Church, An assessment of bed load sediment transport formulae for gravel bed rivers. *Water Resour. Res.* **25**, 1161–1186 (1989).
50. J. C. Winterwerp, W. T. Bakker, D. R. Mastbergen, H. van Rossum, Hyperconcentrated sand-water mixture flows over erodible bed. *J. Hydraul. Eng.* **118**, 1508–1525 (1992).
51. E. W. Adams, W. Schlager, Basic types of submarine slope curvature. *J. Sediment. Res.* **70**, 814–828 (2000).
52. G. H. Browne, P. R. King, M. J. Arnot, K. Helle, A complete middle-to-inner basin-floor-fan cycle, Mount Messenger Formation, Tongaporutu, New Zealand, in *Atlas of Deep-Water Outcrops*, T. H. Nilsen, R. D. Shew, G. S. Steffens, J. R. J. Studlick, Eds. (AAPG Studies in Geology, AAPG and Shell Exploration & Production, 2007), vol. 56.
53. H. O. Iversen, "Distal pinch-out characteristics of turbiditic fan lobes: The Mount Messenger Formation (Miocene), Taranaki Basin, New Zealand," thesis, University of Bergen, Bergen (2010).
54. M. S. Yalin, E. Karahan, Inception of sediment transport. *AACE J. Hydraulics Div.* **105**, 1433–1443 (1979).

**Acknowledgments:** We thank A. S. Equinor for supporting T<sup>3</sup> project and FlowScience Ltd. for software access. Special thanks to R. J. Steel, S. J. Porębski, and M. Wendorff for informal preliminary reviews, and to the two anonymous referees for formal reviews.

**Funding:** This work was supported by the National Science Foundation of China, grant no. 42102119 (Z.G.), the Science Foundation of the China University of Petroleum, Beijing, grant no. 2462020QNXZ002 (Z.G.), and the Research Council of Norway, project no. 308805 (R.L.G.). **Author contributions:** Conceptualization: Z.G. and W.N.; methodology: Z.G. and A.J.V.; investigation: Z.G., W.N., A.J.V., and R.L.G.; visualization: Z.G.; writing—original draft: Z.G. and W.N.; writing—review and editing: Z.G., W.N., A.J.V., and R.L.G. **Competing interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests. **Data and materials availability:** All data needed to evaluate the conclusions in the paper are present in the paper and/or the Supplementary Materials.

Submitted 16 August 2021  
Accepted 24 November 2021  
Published 19 January 2022  
10.1126/sciadv.abl9124

## How is a turbidite actually deposited?

Zhiyuan GeWojciech NemečAge J. VellingaRob L. Gawthorpe

*Sci. Adv.*, 8 (3), eabl9124. • DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.abl9124

### View the article online

<https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.abl9124>

### Permissions

<https://www.science.org/help/reprints-and-permissions>

Use of think article is subject to the [Terms of service](#)

---

*Science Advances* (ISSN ) is published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1200 New York Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005. The title *Science Advances* is a registered trademark of AAAS. Copyright © 2022 The Authors, some rights reserved; exclusive licensee American Association for the Advancement of Science. No claim to original U.S. Government Works. Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (CC BY).