Using Ambient Noise to Image the Northern East African Rift
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Abstract The northern East African Rift (EAR) is a unique location where we observe continental rifting in the Main Ethiopian Rift (MER) transitioning to incipient seafloor spreading in Afar. Here we present a 3-D absolute shear wave velocity model of the crust and uppermost mantle of the northern EAR generated from ambient noise tomography. We generate 4,820 station pair correlation functions, from 170 stations (present over 12 years), which were inverted for phase velocity from 8–33 s period and finally for 3-D absolute shear velocity structure to 60-km depth. Everywhere in the uppermost mantle, shear velocity is slower than expected for a mantle peridotite composition (<4.1 km/s). This suggests the presence of pervasive partial melt, with focused upwelling and melt storage beneath the MER, where the slowest velocities (3.20 km/s ± 0.03) are observed. Average crustal shear velocity is faster beneath Afar (3.83 km/s ± 0.04) than the MER (3.60 km/s ± 0.04), albeit Afar has localized slow velocities beneath active volcanic centers. We interpret these slow-velocity regions (including the MER) as magmatic intrusions and heating of the crust. Beneath the northwestern plateau, crustal velocities are laterally heterogeneous (3.3–3.65 ± 0.05 km/s at 10 km), suggesting a complex geological history and inhomogeneous magma distribution during rift development. Comparison between the MER and Afar allows us to draw conclusions between different stages of rifting. In particular, the MER has the slowest crustal velocities, consistent with longer magma residence times in the crust, early during the breakup process.

Plain Language Summary In Ethiopia, the African Continent is rifting apart to slowly form a new ocean basin, which will expand the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden. How and why this rifting is occurring remains an important unanswered question in earth science. We know tectonic forces are partly responsible, but magmatism also seems a key ingredient for breaking up Africa. Here we use seismic images obtained from signals pulled out of noise, to understand the crustal structure of the region; In particular, how and where magma is stored in the crust, and its relationship to the different stages of continental breakup visible in the region. We find evidence for long-term melt storage in places where rifting is just beginning in southern Ethiopia; whereas in regions where the crust is thinner due to extensive rifting, magma erupts more regularly. The long-term storage of magma in unriifted crust may help to heat and weaken it, allowing rifting to accelerate and propagate further south. We are also able to image regions with hydrothermal fluids in the shallow parts of the crust in inactive fault zones. These results provide insight into the breakup process and the role magma plays at different stages of rifting.

1. Introduction

Continents are thought to rift from a combination of tectonic and magmatic processes (Buck, 2004). Tectonic processes do not provide enough force to rift thick continental lithosphere, instead requiring emplacement of magma to rift with lower forces (Buck, 2006; Mackenzie et al., 2005). In areas of magma-assisted rifting there is debate as to the distribution of melt storage and migration pathways, and how these change through time during the rifting to breakup process (Hutchison et al., 2015; Magee et al., 2016; White et al., 2008). To better understand the processes responsible for rifting the upper lithosphere, knowledge of the crustal structure both on and off the rift is required. The rift flanks give an insight into the original crustal structure, while variations within the rift give clues to the importance of melt at different stages of rifting.

The Northern East African Rift (EAR) is the archetypal example of magma-assisted rifting where the transition from continental rifting to seafloor spreading is observed within Ethiopia. The early stages of rifting are observed in the Main Ethiopian Rift (MER), with rifting becoming more evolved from south to north (Ebinger & Casey, 2001; WoldeGabriel et al., 1990). Afar is the end member of the EAR, transitioning...
from continental rifting to oceanic spreading (Makris & Ginzburg, 1987). The EAR forms one arm of the Afar triple junction while the other two arms, the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden rifts, have progressed to full seafloor spreading (Bonatti, 1985; McKenzie et al., 1970).

In this paper we use ambient noise tomography (ANT) from Rayleigh waves (Bensen et al., 2007; Shapiro et al., 2005; Shapiro & Campillo, 2004) to image the uppermost mantle and crustal structure in the northern EAR. Previous studies have used a variety of methods to analyze the crustal structure within rift segments including applying ANT to the MER and Afar, two sections of our study region. One study in Afar produced phase velocity maps and not inverting for shear velocity (Korostelev et al., 2015), while a second study focused on the northern and central sections of the MER using group velocities before inverting for absolute shear velocity (Kim et al., 2012). These studies found slow velocities at all depths beneath the rift flanks suggesting protracted magmatic modification of the crust coupled with two magmatic zones beneath the MER, indicative of a complex magmatic plumbing system (Kim et al., 2012; Korostelev et al., 2015). However, to facilitate direct comparisons between regions and thereby interpret evolution of rifting processes in space and time, we require a complete and self-consistent model for the northern EAR. Here we utilize five additional seismic networks (Figure 1a) and produce a crustal model for areas of Ethiopia, Eritrea, Djibouti, and the southwest of Yemen, allowing direct comparison of regions at different stages of rifting. The absolute shear wave velocity model is used to interpret crustal structure and how rifting modifies the lithosphere by tectonic and magmatic processes. Shear wave velocities also allow us to infer areas containing fluids which will aid us in constraining where fluids, and potentially melt, reside within the crust and mantle.

2. Geological Background

Ethiopia is underlain by Precambrian basement formed during the Neoproterozoic Pan-African orogeny (Mège & Korme, 2004; Figure 1b). The basement is composed of magmatic, metamorphic, and sedimentary rocks (Berhe, 1990; Braathen et al., 2001; Kazmin et al., 1978; Merla et al., 1973), which have been crosscut
by northwest-southeast trending Precambrian fractures (Mège & Korme, 2004). During the late Paleozoic to Mesozoic these fractures were reactivated to form several failed rift basins (Corti, 2009; Ebinger et al., 2000; Mège & Korme, 2004).

Volcanism initiated 45 Ma beneath our study area and continues to recent times (e.g., Barnie et al., 2016; Rooney et al., 2014; Sieburg et al., 2018). The largest event was the emplacement of the ~2-km-thick flood basalt sequence 31–29 Ma (Hofmann et al., 1997; Ukstins et al., 2002), covering an area ~600,000 km² (Rooney, 2017; White & Mckenzie, 1989). The flood basals were later interspersed with shield volcanoes 22–11 Ma (e.g., Mount Choke, GunA, and Gugufu; Beccaluva et al., 2009; Kieffer et al., 2004). Present-day volcanic activity is largely focused in the ~70-km-long and 20-km-wide en echelon magmatic segments within the rift axis (Barnie et al., 2016; Ebinger & Casey, 2001; Hayward & Ebinger, 1996; Rooney et al., 2014; Sieburg et al., 2018; Wolfenden et al., 2004). Recent volcanism also occurs off-axis such as in the Yerer-Tullu Wellel Volcanotectonic Lineament (YTVL) and around Lake Tana (Keranen & Klemperer, 2008; Kieffer et al., 2004; Figure 1).

Approximately coeval with the main flood basalt emplacement 31–29 Ma was the onset of rifting (Bosworth et al., 2005; Wolfenden et al., 2004), subsequently forming the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Rifts (Hofmann et al., 1997; Pik et al., 1998). Rifting initiated later at 20 Ma in the Southern MER, and 18–11 Ma for the central and northern sections (Kazmin et al., 1978; Wolfenden et al., 2004). The three rifts form the Afar triple junction separating the Nubian Somalian and Arabian plates (Figure 1b; Ebinger et al., 1993; McKenzie et al., 1970; Wolfenden et al., 2004). On a smaller scale, Oligocene-Miocene border faults separate the plateaus (northwestern and southeastern) from the rift in the MER and Afar (Figure 1a; Corti et al., 2013). Within Afar, the locus of extension shifted from the border faults to smaller faults and volcanic segments at around 10 Ma (Wolfenden et al., 2005). In southernmost Afar and the MER, extension localized to the rift axis later at 6.6–3 Ma (Wolfenden et al., 2004). Geodetic constraints in the MER and Afar suggest that >80% of the present-day extension is focused within the magmatic segments (Bilham et al., 1999; Ebinger & Casey, 2001). The rifting rates vary between regions with full spreading rates of 18, 16, and 6 mm/year for the Red Sea Rift (McClusky et al., 2010; Vigny et al., 2006), Gulf of Aden Rift (Jestin et al., 1994; Vigny et al., 2006), and MER, respectively (Casey et al., 2006; Jestin et al., 1994; Saria et al., 2014; Figure 1b).

Rifting processes have modified the crust resulting in variations in crustal thicknesses throughout the region. The thickest crust is found beneath the plateaus with the southeastern plateau 35- to 40-km thick and the northwestern plateau 40- to 45-km thick (Hautot et al., 2006; Mackenzie et al., 2005; Stuart et al., 2006). The crust thins into the MER where the crust is 38-km thick in the south and 30 km beneath the northern MER (Hammond et al., 2011; Maguire et al., 2006; Stuart et al., 2006). In Afar, the crust is ~26-km thick, thinning to ~16 km beneath the Danakil depression, the thinnest crust in the region (Dugda et al., 2005; Dugda & Nyblad, 2006; Hammond et al., 2011; Lavayssiére et al., 2018).

The mantle beneath the region is thought to have elevated temperatures and pervasive melt based on seismic, geochemical, and geodynamic studies (Armitage et al., 2015; Bastow et al., 2005; Ferguson et al., 2013; Gallacher et al., 2016; Lavayssiére et al., 2018; Rooney et al., 2012; Rychert et al., 2012). Mantle seismic velocities are slower than the global average (Bastow et al., 2005, 2008; Fishwick, 2010; Gallacher et al., 2016; Stork et al., 2013), which complements geochemical and geodynamic studies of inferred elevated mantle temperatures of 100–170 °C above normal mantle temperatures (Armitage et al., 2015; Rooney et al., 2012). Beneath the rift, velocities are typically slow with an absence or low-amplitude lithosphere-asthenosphere boundary (Lavayssiére et al., 2018; Rychert et al., 2012), interpreted by some previous studies as evidence of decompression melting or dyke-induced lithospheric thinning (Havlin et al., 2013; Rychert et al., 2012; Stork et al., 2013). The MER axis also displays slow mantle velocities, which have previously been interpreted as evidence for partial melt generated by ongoing rifting processes (Bastow et al., 2005; Gallacher et al., 2016; Hammond et al., 2013).

3. Methods

We use data from continuous vertical component seismometers recorded by 10 temporary and 4 permanent networks (Figure 1a) between 1999 and 2012. The vertical component data from each of the 170 stations was split into 24-hr sections and resampled to 1 Hz. Instrument responses were removed and the waveforms were then normalized and whitened with a bandpass filter of 0.005–0.14 Hz (Bensen et al., 2007). Cross
Correlations and linear stacking were performed between all pairs of concurrently running stations with >10 days of continuous recording, using the methods of Bensen et al. (2007), Harmon et al. (2007, 2008), and Harmon and Rychert (2016), resulting in 4,820 noise correlation functions (NCF; Figure 2a).

We estimate the phase velocities from the NCF in the following way. We first estimate the average phase velocity dispersion across the region using a spatial domain technique using the entire array. We accomplish this by fitting a zeroth-order Bessel function of the first kind as a function of interstation distance, frequency, and phase velocity, to the real part of the fast Fourier transformed NCF by searching over phase velocities from 2.5–5 km/s in a 0.01-km/s step at each period of interest (Harmon et al., 2008, 2010). Then for each individual NCF the phase was measured at each period of interest by unwrapping the phase of the stacked NCF using the average phase velocity curve at the longest periods to resolve cycle ambiguity (Bensen et al., 2007; Harmon et al., 2008). We then used the phase delay from the phase estimates to calculate the phase velocity as the distance between the two stations divided by the phase delay time (Harmon et al., 2007).

We use a two-stage inversion to generate our 3-D shear velocity model. We first invert the measured phase for phase velocity maps using the method of Harmon et al. (2013) from 8- to 33-s period. We parameterize our model space for phase velocity using a 0.25° × 0.25° nodal grid (Figure 2b) and use the average phase velocity at each period as the starting model. The phase velocity inversion uses 2-D finite frequency kernels (Nishida, 2011; Tromp et al., 2010) and an iterative damped least squares approach (Tarantola & Valette, 1982). The sensitivity kernels for each NCF are averaged onto each node. We assign a nominal a priori standard error for each node of 0.2 km/s and fix the $V_p/V_s$ ratio to 1.8, based on averaged receiver function results (Hammond et al., 2011; Stuart et al., 2006). For a given period, we only invert phase data for NCFs with interstation distances greater than twice the wavelength and apply a smoothing factor of 40 km. In the second stage, we invert the phase velocity maps across all periods at each point in the map to generate a 3-D velocity structure, using the best fit shear velocity model from the 1-D dispersion curve as our starting model. For the shear velocity inversion, we use a damped least squares approach (Tarantola & Valette, 1982) and parameterize the shear velocity at every 5 km vertically with 0.1° × 0.1° pixel size. We calculate the partial derivatives that relate variations in shear velocity to changes in phase velocity using DISPER80 (Saito, 1988). Although our shear velocity models are discretized at 5-km intervals in depth, we interpolate the velocity structure in depth to 1-km depth for presentation purposes using a linear interpolation.

Across the study region there are variations in sediment thickness and large bodies of water which may bias shear velocity structure to slower velocities at depth if not properly accounted for. We tested the effects of large slow layers on our shear velocity model by imposing a water layer to a thickness of 3 and 5 km in the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden with velocity and density values a priori from CRUST1.0 (Laske et al., 2013).
also performed the same tests with a sediment layer in the rifts using sediment thickness from CRUST1.0 (Laske et al., 2013). After nine iterations, these tests produced shear velocity models that were within error of our preferred model, leading to confidence in our results.

4. Resolution and Errors

We assess the minimum interpretable length scales of our velocity anomalies by presenting checkerboard tests for 0.5° × 0.5° anomalies between 8- and 33-s period. The tests indicate we can resolve anomalies at the scale of 0.5° across most of the region (Figure 3), particularly in regions with good ray path coverage within the MER and northwestern Afar (Figure 2b). In areas of sparser ray coverage such as eastern Afar, the Red Sea, and Gulf of Aden we have poorer resolution and northeast-southwest smearing of checkerboard tests. Consequently, we do not interpret these regions. We mask results outside the standard error contour of 0.07 km/s, the approximate contour of the 2σ error, from the linearized phase velocity inversion.

We assess the vertical resolution of the shear velocity via the formal resolution matrix of the shear velocity inversion. Our model is not well resolved above 5 km and below 60 km depth with formal resolution values <0.10. Formal resolution values are typically around 0.37 for each 5-km thick layer in the 10- to 55-km depth range indicating we have independent constraints approximately every 10–15 km in depth. In other words, we can resolve average velocity variations over 10- to 15-km depth ranges.

5. Results

5.1. Phase Velocities

Our average 1-D phase velocity dispersion curve for the full study region ranges from 3.13 ± 0.03 km/s at 8-s period to 3.61 ± 0.05 km/s at 33-s period (Figure 4a). From our final velocity maps (Figures 5 and 6), we take 1-D phase velocity curves from individual pixels in the maps and their corresponding 1-D shear velocity profiles (Figure 7), allowing us to directly compare regions of interest labeled from “a–h.” The slowest phase velocities for all depths are located within the MER (Figures 7a and 7b, “a,” “g,” and “h”) ranging from 3.18 ± 0.03 km/s at 8-s period to 3.56 ± 0.05 km/s at 33-s period. The Danakil depression, “c,” has the fastest velocities from 3.21 ± 0.04 km/s at 8-s period to 3.60 ± 0.06 km/s at 33-s period. At short periods of 8 to 13 s we observe slow velocities at “e” beneath the northwestern plateau. In general, the plateau regions, “d–f,” have faster phase velocities at shorter periods than the MER and Afar averages, “a–c.”

Within our phase velocity maps (Figure 5), we observe variations across the region that correlate with surface geologic and tectonic features. For example, we observe slow velocities beneath the MER at all periods, with minimum velocities ranging from 2.95 ± 0.03 km/s at 8-s period, to 3.45 ± 0.05 km/s at 33-s period (Figures 5a–5d “a”). Beneath Afar we observe moderate velocities with maximum velocities ranging from

Figure 3. Checkerboard tests for 0.5° × 0.5°. Initial model shown in (a) with (b) and (c) showing the resultant output model at 8 and 33 s, the limits of our study. Results are cropped outside the 0.7 standard error contour. See text for details.
3.30 ± 0.04 km/s at 8-s period to 3.65 ± 0.06 km/s at 33-s period (Figures 5a–5d “b–c”). The northwestern plateau has the greatest lateral velocity variations, with minimum velocities ranging from 3.00 ± 0.05 km/s at 8-s period, to 3.55 ± 0.07 km/s at 33-s period (Figures 5a–5d “d”) and maximum velocities ranging from 3.35 ± 0.05 km/s at 8-s period, to 3.70 ± 0.07 km/s at 33-s period at “f”. In contrast, phase velocities for the southeastern plateau are more laterally homogenous, with phase velocities of 3.30 ± 0.05 km/s at 8-s period increasing to 3.60 ± 0.07 km/s at 33-s period (Figures 5a–5d “e”). Although at 8-s period, the phase velocity map exhibits the greatest lateral heterogeneity.

5.2. Shear Velocities

Our average 1-D shear velocity model across all nodes ranges from 3.36 ± 0.04 km/s at 5-km depth to 4.04 ± 0.05 km/s at 60-km depth (Figure 4b). Our best fit model does not have a fast lid or slow velocity zone visible at mantle depths, rather shear velocity monotonically increases with depth. One-dimensional profiles through our shear velocity volumes (Figure 7c and 7d) show similarities to the phase velocity maps. The slowest velocities for all depths are again located within the MER, “a,” ranging from 3.28 ± 0.03 km/s at 10-km depth to 3.83 ± 0.04 km/s at 40-km depth, with a broad velocity increase from 20- to 50-km depth. Within Afar, “b,” velocities increase from 3.45 ± 0.04 km/s at 10 km and increase to 3.86 ± 0.05 km/s at 40-km depth, with the sharpest gradient between 5- and 20-km depth. The Danakil depression, “c,” has the fastest velocities from 3.64 ± 0.04 km/s at 10-km depth to 3.98 ± 0.06 km/s at 40-km depth, again with the sharpest gradient between 5- and 20-km depth. The Danakil depression, in contrast to the starting model and most of our study region, requires a fast lid, with a slow velocity zone minimum at 45-km depth. Beneath the northwestern and southeastern plateaus, “e and f,” we observe fast shear velocities of 3.5 ± 0.05 km/s to 3.85 ± 0.07 km/s at 40-km depth. The exception to this is the slow-velocity zone beneath “d,” where velocities are slower at 3.3 ± 0.05 km/s at 10-km depth. Velocities become progressively faster until 40-km depth where they are similar to the overall plateau velocity structure.

Absolute shear wave velocity maps (Figure 6) show similarities to phase velocities, ranging from 3.20–4.10 ± 0.06 km/s. At 40–60 km, mantle depths, we observe velocities ranging from 3.60–4.10 ± 0.06 km/s beneath the region. These are all slower than the global model ak135 which has a velocity of 4.48 km/s.
for mantle beneath the continents (Kennett et al., 1995). We observe slow velocities beneath the MER at all depths, with minimum velocities ranging from $3.20 \pm 0.03$ km/s at 10-km depth to $3.75 \pm 0.04$ km/s at 40-km depth (Figure 6 "a"). The slow velocity anomaly is roughly 200-km long by 100-km wide trending along the rift valley. It is broad and distributed at depth, becoming focused to the rift valley in the crust. A smaller slow velocity region follows the surface trend of the YTVL (Figures 6a–6c “h”). The anomaly is approximately 50-km wide trending east–west with velocities of $3.20 \pm 0.03$ km/s at 10-km depth increase to $3.60 \pm 0.04$ km/s at 30-km depth. While most of the MER displays slow velocities, at "g" we observe a zone of faster velocity, relative to the surroundings, between the Aluto and Corbetti volcanoes with velocities of $3.65 \pm 0.03$ km/s above 20-km depth, approximately 40 km in diameter (Figures 6a, 6b, and 8a).

Beneath Afar, velocities are fast everywhere relative to the MER, with maximum velocities ranging from $3.75 \pm 0.04$ km/s at 10-km depth to $4.05 \pm 0.06$ km/s at 40-km depth (Figures 6a–6d “b” and “c”). Beneath most of the active magmatic segments (Figure 6, open red polygons and “b”) in Afar, we observe slower velocities down to $3.45 \pm 0.04$ km/s at 10-km depth and $3.85 \pm 0.06$ km/s at 40-km depth. The transition from the MER into Afar is also marked by a distinct 5% increase in velocity where the rift widens into Afar.

While the MER and Afar are broadly consistent within their regions, the plateaus display greater heterogeneity, with lateral variability of 0.5 km/s as compared to 0.3 km/s outside the plateaus. The velocities

**Figure 5.** (a–d) Phase velocity maps resulting from tomographic inversion of ambient noise dispersion data at 8, 18, 26, and 33 s respectively. Models have been cropped to the standard error contour. Red indicates slower velocities and blue faster velocities. Sections get, on average, progressively faster with depth. Colored symbols indicate the locations of profiles shown in Figure 7. Thick black lines indicate border faults. Letters a–h are regions referred to in the text.
beneath the majority of the plateaus are fast, typically around $3.65 \pm 0.05 \text{ km/s}$ at 10-km depth and $\sim 3.95 \pm 0.07 \text{ km/s}$ at 40-km depth (Figures 6 and 7). However, in localized regions, velocities are in some cases as slow as the MER. For example, near “d” on the northwestern plateau (Figures 6a–6c and 8b), velocities are as slow as $3.25 \pm 0.05 \text{ km/s}$ at 10-km increasing to $3.65 \pm 0.07 \text{ km/s}$ at 30-km depth. In addition, on the Yemen Plateau the velocity is $3.30 \pm 0.05 \text{ km/s}$ at 10 km, and this slow velocity continues down to 20-km depth (Figures 6a, 6b, and 8a).

5.3. The Lower Crust and Moho

Based on the studies of Keranen et al. (2009) the Moho beneath the MER can be approximated with an absolute shear velocity of 3.75 km/s. We produce two transects through our model, along the rift and across the MER, approximately coinciding with the EAGLE active source line (Figure 8) and use this 3.75 km/s contour as a proxy for Moho depth. We then compare to previous direct measures of crustal thickness from receiver function studies (Dugda et al., 2005; Hammond et al., 2011; Stuart et al., 2006). To do this we interpolate the model to every 1 km and take a velocity slice at 3.75 km/s and overlay crustal thickness from receiver function studies in Afar (Hammond et al., 2011), and the MER (Figure 9; Dugda et al., 2005; Stuart et al., 2006). Along the rift we see the 3.75-km/s contour shallowing from 40 km beneath the MER to 20 km in Afar. The crust is relatively thin beneath the Red Sea (17 km) and thickens to 29 km beneath Yemen (Figure 8a). There is some agreement between the 3.75-km/s contour and crustal thickness studies in the MER and Afar rifts;
Figure 7. One-dimensional phase and shear velocity profiles for key areas discussed in the text. (a) Phase velocities comparing the MER, Danakil, Afar, and southeastern plateau. Error bars are 3σ error. (b) One-dimensional profiles for the plateau and MER regions. Panels (c) and (d) are same as (a) and (b) but for shear velocities. See Figures 5 and 6 for 1-D profile locations. MER = Main Ethiopian Rift.

Figure 8. Cross sections of the shear velocity maps, interpolated to 1-km depth resolution. See Figure 6 for locations of cross sections. (a) Profile along the rift axis. (b) Profile across the MER and plateau. Receiver function Moho depths plotted as diamonds within 1° of the profile (Ayele et al., 2004; Dugda et al., 2005; Hammond et al., 2011; Stuart et al., 2006).
however, many points do not appear to correlate. Across the rift axis (Figures 8b and 9) and beneath the northwestern and southeastern plateaus, we no longer match the estimates of crustal thickness. Here we observe depths of \(20-37\) km compared to \(32-45\) ± \(3\) km on the northwestern plateau and \(20-38\) km compared to \(32-43\) ± \(3\) km for the southeastern plateau (Figure 9b). There are also some differences between the Moho and 3.75-km/s contour in regions where crustal thickness changes over short distances (e.g., from the plateau into Afar, and near the TGD in Afar). Our model laterally smooths across these short length scales and therefore does not fully recover sharp gradients in crustal thickness and the sharp increase in velocity at the Moho (Figure 9).

6. Discussion

Our velocity model constrains shear wave velocities of the crust and uppermost mantle. The key observations of our shear wave velocity model are: (1) Velocities in the uppermost mantle are everywhere slower than the global average for continents using ak135, in particular beneath the MER (3.75 ± 0.04 km/s); (2) the MER is significantly slower than Afar with a clear increase in velocity at all depths as the rift widens into Afar; and (3) the Ethiopian plateau displays heterogeneity in crustal velocity. In the following section, we use our velocity maps to interpret velocity variations and use these to answer key questions about the nature of the crust and mantle structure when rifting modifies the lithosphere during the rifting to breakup process. This will allow us to identify where fluids, and potentially melt, reside within the crust and mantle.

6.1. Mantle Velocities

Mantle velocities in our region are anomalously slow, when compared to global averages appropriate for continental regions such as iasp91, by up to 9–16% over the uppermost mantle. Previous studies in the region have found similarly slow velocities in the mantle, for example, Gallacher et al. (2016) and Keranen et al. (2009) found values of 3.8–4.0 km/s and 3.9–4.2 km/s, respectively. The low values are also similar to slow shear velocities observed in mid ocean ridge systems such as the southern East Pacific Rise (~3.9 km/s; Harmon et al., 2009), the Eastern Lau Back Arc Spreading Center (~3.6 km/s, Wei et al., 2015), and the Juan De Fuca/Gorda Ridges (~3.8 km/s Gao, 2016). Although there are significant differences in the tectonic environments the possible causes for these anomalously slow velocities are likely similar, mantle upwelling, and associated volcanism at the surface.

6.1.1. Possible Causes for Anomalously Slow Mantle Velocities

In this region shear velocities are everywhere slower than expected for a mantle peridotite composition (<4.1 ± 0.06 km/s including beneath the plateau) in the uppermost mantle down to 60-km depth (Hacker & Abers, 2004). Compositional variation in peridotites yields little shear velocity reduction (<1.5%) for the range of expected densities and compositions (Lee, 2003; Schutt & Lesher, 2006). Mantle composition in
the northern EAR has heterogeneity but is predominantly peridotite (Rooney et al., 2017). We therefore do not think that variation in composition across the region is the cause of the slow velocities we observe.

In the upper mantle, shear velocities are sensitive to variations in temperature and grain size (Faul & Jackson, 2005; Jackson & Faul, 2010). Mantle velocities of 3.60–4.10 km/s, a 9–16% reduction from the global average, are likely accommodated at least in part by an increase in mantle temperature and/or grain size changes. Petrological estimates and models suggest a mantle potential temperature for this region of between 1350 °C (Armitage et al., 2015; Pinzuti et al., 2013; Rychert et al., 2012) and 1490 °C (Armitage et al., 2015; Ferguson et al., 2013; Rooney et al., 2012) and therefore ranging from normal ambient mantle to ~140 °C hotter than average (Rooney et al., 2012). We use a Burgers model relating shear velocity and temperature (Jackson & Faul, 2010), for a peridotite mantle at grain sizes between 1–20 mm, (based on xenoliths in the MER; Rooney et al., 2005) with an estimate for the geotherm for the MER, to determine the mantle temperature required to match our observations. We require a temperature between 1650 °C and 1900 °C for grain sizes of 1–20 mm, respectively. This temperature is 160–550 °C hotter than predicted estimates, requiring additional explanations for the slow mantle velocities. At a given temperature grain size changes can also reduce velocity by up to 3% (Faul & Jackson, 2005; Jackson & Faul, 2010) when grain size is increased from 1–20 mm. However, grain size cannot in and of itself explain our observations again requiring an additional explanation.

We therefore require a fluid component, most likely partial melt, at greater depths and potentially hydrothermal fluids shallower. Assuming slower velocities in the upper mantle are from melt we can use the relationship of 1% melt slows shear velocities by 7.9% (Hammond & Humphreys, 2000). We find 1.1% melt beneath both plateaus and 2.0% melt beneath the slowest region of the MER. These values are similar to previous teleseismic tomography studies where partial melt of 0.6–4% are calculated (Bastow et al., 2011; Civiero et al., 2015, 2016; Ferguson et al., 2013; Gallacher et al., 2016). Forward modeling of the crust and mantle found similar values of <5% melt (Armitage et al., 2018). Variations in melt percentage within the mantle to previous tomography studies may arise from greater ray path density and broader frequency content, particularly the inclusion of high frequencies, compared to teleseismic techniques (Shapiro et al., 2005; Shapiro & Campillo, 2004). Vs studies will have more significant velocity reductions, relative to Vp, in the presence of melt (Karato, 2004).

We also observe slow mantle velocities, compared to global average velocities, at Moho depths (defined by receiver functions; Dugda et al., 2005; Hammond et al., 2011; Stuart et al., 2006). The Moho is an interface which previous modeling studies using magnetotelluric and seismic data propose to be an area of 2–7% melt accumulation (Armitage et al., 2015, 2018; Desissa et al., 2013). We therefore suggest that partial melt is more localized near the Moho than at depth.

### 6.1.2. The Moho and Lower Crustal Intrusions

Inferred crustal thickness beneath our study region using a 3.75 km/s contour, are broadly consistent with previous direct measures of crustal thickness particularly beneath the MER and Afar from receiver functions and active source studies (Ayele et al., 2004; Dugda et al., 2005; Hammond et al., 2011; Maguire et al., 2006; Stuart et al., 2006; Figure 9). Within the rift, the 3.75-km/s contour shallows from the MER to Afar which is likely an effect of crustal thinning with progressive rifting (Hammond et al., 2014; Tiberi et al., 2005). The shallowest inferred Moho depths are beneath the Red Sea and the Danakil depression, in good agreement with receiver function studies (Hammond et al., 2011). Beneath the plateaus the 3.75-km/s contour is shallower than the receiver function-derived Moho depth, implying faster velocities within the lower crust. Faster velocities in the lower crust suggest that the crustal composition has been modified, and we propose that the most likely change is from solidified lower crustal mafic intrusions. Solidified mafic intrusions in the lower crust increase velocity, thereby shallowing the depth of the 3.75-km/s contour and reducing the contrast between lower crustal and mantle seismic velocities (Hammond et al., 2011; Lavayssiere et al., 2018; Stuart et al., 2006; Thybo & Nielsen, 2009). The EAGLE active source experiment also observed a fast velocity Vp layer in the lower crust coupled with a dense lower crust beneath the northwestern plateau (Cornwell et al., 2006; Mackenzie et al., 2005; Maguire et al., 2006), while receiver functions observe a reverberation from the top and base of the underplate (Lavayssiere et al., 2018; Stuart et al., 2006). Our crustal thickness estimate based on the 3.75-km/s depth contour would probably select the top of the underplate, yielding apparent thinner crust, thus supporting widespread solidified lower crustal intrusions beneath the plateau.
In contrast to the fast velocities on most of the plateau, we observe a smaller slow velocity region that trends east–west following the surface trend of the YTVL (Figures 6a–6c “h”) a line of Quaternary-Recent volcanoes. This suggests we are imaging a thermal or fluid anomaly associated with ongoing magmatic processes. Beneath the eastern end of the YTVL, highly localized high conductivities are seen in magnetotelluric surveys (Whaler & Hautot, 2006) coupled with collocated clusters of lower crustal seismicity (Keir et al., 2009) suggest ongoing, but localized lower crustal melt emplacement within the solidified crust.

### 6.2. Crustal Velocities

#### 6.2.1. MER Axis

We define crustal velocities for our discussion here using the crustal thicknesses estimated by receiver functions across the region (Ayele et al., 2004; Dugda et al., 2005; Hammond et al., 2011; Stuart et al., 2006). The shear wave velocities range from 3.20 ± 0.03 km/s at 10-km depth to 3.55 ± 0.04 km/s at 30-km with a slow velocity anomaly roughly 200-km by 100-km wide positioned beneath the MER axis (Figure 6 “a”). The observation is in apparent contradiction to the elevated $V_p$ for the MER crust at 10- to 30-km depth, as determined by first arrival travel time tomography and the EAGLE-controlled source survey (Keranen et al., 2004; Mackenzie et al., 2005; Maguire et al., 2006). These studies interpreted fast $V_p$ values as continental crust intruded by now solidified mafic rock. The presence of solidified mafic rock predicts $V_s$ that is faster than what we observe. The slow $V_s$ is also not explained by widespread silicic or intermediate rock type. These typically have $V_s$ of 3.64 and 3.78 km/s (Birch, 1960; Simmons, 1964), faster than what we observe, but also contrary to the elevated $V_p$ from previous studies. We therefore conclude that rock composition does not broadly explain the slow $V_s$ in the MER.

Elevated temperatures would also produce slow velocities within the crust. If we assume that the crust within the rift axis is predominantly gabbroic intrusions (Mazzarini et al., 2013; Rooney et al., 2014), crustal temperatures of 600 °C generate velocities >3.81 km/s (Hacker & Abers, 2004), significantly faster than what we observe. Assuming a diorite composition, velocities reach 3.67 km/s under the same conditions. Therefore, temperature cannot solely account for the velocity reductions beneath the MER and we therefore appeal to a fluid component.

The MER is volcanically active, with geodetic evidence for melt input into crustal magma bodies and interaction with hydrothermal reservoirs (Biggs et al., 2011; Hutchison et al., 2016). Fluids may be present in the form of small volumes of partial melt or from the release of volatiles within cooling magmatic systems (Holtzman & Kendall, 2010; Korostelev et al., 2015). If we assume that the velocity reduction in the crust is solely from melt, we can estimate the amount of melt present using the experimental relationship of 0.1 km/s decrease in shear velocity requires 1% melt (Caricchi et al., 2008). We compare to the $V_s$ structure of the southeastern plateau, least modified by rifting. We estimate ~3% melt for the MER, within the range of ~0.5–5% from previous seismic studies (Gallacher et al., 2016; Guidarelli et al., 2011; Hammond, 2014). However, models from magnetotelluric and gravity studies yield higher melt fractions of 3–20% (Cornwell et al., 2010; Keranen et al., 2009; Whaler & Hautot, 2006).

Placing constraints on percent melt is complicated by anisotropy and the alignment and shape of melt (Hammond, 2014; Hammond & Kendall, 2016). Rayleigh waves show a velocity reduction for both horizontally and vertically aligned melt with greater sensitivity to horizontal melt in contrast to Love waves which are more sensitive to vertically aligned melt (Hammond & Kendall, 2016). Furthermore, melt stored as horizontal disks requires up to 10% less melt to generate a reduction in Rayleigh wave shear velocity than spherical melt bodies (Hammond & Kendall, 2016). Geochemical, seismic, and magnetotelluric studies provide evidence for a series of stacked sills at the base of the crust (Ferguson et al., 2013; Hammond, 2014; Johnson et al., 2015) and may suggest that our velocity estimates are biased toward higher quantities of melt due to anisotropy. Further work is required to assess the radial and azimuthal anisotropy across the region to understand the degree of bias.

Generally, our slow velocity anomalies within the crust are spatially correlated along-rift with the active volcanic segments (red polygons, Figures 6a–6d), though our velocities are commonly broader, in part due to the wide lateral sensitivity of Rayleigh waves. While we cannot rule out sediment infill to explain slow shear velocities near the surface (Christensen, 1996; Hacker & Abers, 2004; Mazzarini et al., 2013), it is more likely that the velocities are associated with the active magmatism in the rift axis. The slow velocities end at the southern extent of the visible magmatic segments where we observe a fast velocity of 3.65 ± 0.03 km/s.
above 20-km depth (Figures 6a, 6b and 8a “g”). Slower velocities are more widespread at depth near the Moho with the slowest velocities being beneath the rift. The slow velocities are present at all depths within the crust beneath the rift axis.

6.2.2. Afar

The Afar crust has relatively fast $V_s$ in our study (3.75 ± 0.04 km/s at 10-km depth to 4.05 ± 0.06 km/s at 40-km depth) excluding “b” at 10-km depth where velocities are as slow as 3.45 km/s (Figure 6a). This observation is consistent with fast $V_p$ imaged previously (Makris & Ginzburg, 1987; Prodehl et al., 1997) and supports the hypothesis that most of the Afar crust includes a significant component of solidified mafic rock (Furman et al., 2006). Afar also appears fast in depth sections that cut through the Afar mantle, consistent with faster velocities for mantle peridotite than crustal rocks. This is especially noticeable beneath the Danakil Depression, where particularly thin crust (~16 km thick; Berckhemer et al., 1975; Hammond et al., 2011), significantly reduces the depth of the mantle compared to other regions (Figure 6a “c”).

An exception to the fast Afar crust is a region of slower velocities broadly beneath the magmatic segments (Figures 6a−6d “b”), down to 3.45 ± 0.04 km/s at a depth of 10 km and 3.85 ± 0.06 km/s at a depth of 40 km. This is most clearly evident at the Dabbahu and Hararo magmatic segments, the location of the 2005–2010 Dabbahu dyking event (Ebinger et al., 2010; Grandin et al., 2012; Illsley-Kemp et al., 2018). Previous studies also find slow velocities (Korostelev et al., 2015; Stork et al., 2013) and high conductivities (Desissa et al., 2013; Johnson et al., 2015), which have been used to estimate a 500-km$^3$ melt body with 13% melt beneath this region associated with the dyking event (Desissa et al., 2013). Slow velocities coupled with the recent dyking event suggest we image melt associated with the event. We see a similar slow velocity zone beneath the Nabro volcanic chain which erupted in 2011 (Goitom et al., 2015) suggesting we are again imaging hotter crust and partial melt in the crust.

6.2.3. Comparison of the MER to Afar

The transition from the MER into Afar is marked by a distinct 5% increase in velocity where the rift widens into Afar. Both areas have had recent volcanic eruptions (Hutchison et al., 2016; Macgregor, 2015; Wadge et al., 2016) but Afar has more rapid melt extraction to the near surface (e.g., the Erta Ale lava lake, 2008 Alu-Dalafilla eruption, and the 2005 Dabbahu dyking event). Afar is extending 3–4 times faster than the MER (Keir et al., 2013), and we would therefore expect higher rates of melt production beneath Afar (Rooney, 2010; Rooney et al., 2005). We do not observe a correlation between slow $V_s$ and predicted total rates of melt production and volcanism. Instead, we observe slow $V_s$ in parts of the rift valley with the lowest surface expression of recent basaltic type volcanism, suggesting that time scales of melt storage plays an important role in controlling $V_s$. Petrological studies of the two regions find the most chemically evolved compositions are associated with volcanoes of the MER (Hutchison et al., 2018; Rooney et al., 2013). In Afar, the on-axis segments produce less evolved melts while at Erta Ale, the most advanced stage of rifting, there is little evidence for melt evolution and assimilation (Hutchison et al., 2018). Our observations of slow velocities in the MER is consistent with petrological constraints that the residence time of melts is longer during the earlier stages of rifting. Longer melt residence times would allow greater melt accumulation as more melt is added but not erupted and would heat the surrounding crust. Both effects would reduce seismic velocities.

Melt accumulation beneath the MER may also be aided by thicker crust and a narrow rift (Bastow et al., 2008; Debayle et al., 2001; Faccenna et al., 2008; Gallacher et al., 2016), coupled with significant changes in lithospheric structure which could act to focus melt beneath the rift (Dugda et al., 2005; Hammond et al., 2011; Stuart et al., 2006). We therefore propose 3-D melt focusing coupled with longer residence times of melt within the crust of the MER to explain the slowest velocities of our study.

6.2.4. The Northwestern and Southeastern Plateaus

The plateaus display greater heterogeneity than the MER and Afar. The velocities are predominantly fast beneath the plateaus, typically around 3.65 ± 0.05 km/s at 10-km depth and ~3.95 ± 0.07 km/s at 40-km depth (Figures 6a−6d and 8b “e” and “f”). The southeastern plateau has limited recent volcanism suggesting it has not been modified by melt. Therefore, the southeastern plateau may represent the background velocity of the region. Further evidence for limited melt is corroborated by $V_p/V_s$ ratios of ~1.78 and highly resistive crust (Hammond et al., 2011; Whaler & Hautot, 2006).

In contrast to the southeastern plateau, we observe localized regions with slow velocities of 3.25 ± 0.05 km/s at 10 km going down to 3.65 ± 0.07 km/s at 30-km depth beneath the northwestern plateau (Figures 6a−6c
and 8b “d”). At the surface, “d” underlies the Choke and Guguftu shield volcanoes which last erupted 22 Ma (Kieffer et al., 2004; Pik et al., 1998, 1999), timescales over which melt would no longer be present due to cooling. One anomaly follows the trend of the border faults and known geothermal activity (Figures 6a–6d), suggesting fluids and geothermal circulation in the fault system may be responsible for the slow Vs anomalies. This was also observed by Korostelev et al. (2015), who drew a link with geothermal activity and slow velocities.

The slow anomaly west of the border faults at “d” may have a similar origin. On either side of the flood basalts are northwest-southeast trending faults. On the southeastern plateau we have the Ogaden rift (Figure 1b) and on the northwestern plateau are the Blue Nile and Abarha Riffs (Mège & Korme, 2004). It is likely that these failed rifts underlie the Ethiopian flood basalts and could produce similar geothermal systems to those of the border faults. Surface evidence of fumaroles and geothermal activity is present in this region (Keir et al., 2009) particularly at the southeastern edge of lake Tana (Figures 6a–6d). These geothermal systems indicate that there are continuous intrusions beneath this region or ongoing conductive cooling leading to the release of volatiles. We therefore propose that slow velocities beneath the plateau at “d” are generated by geothermal systems with fluids migrating through large-scale fault structures (Keir et al., 2009). The slow velocity zones also correlate well with high conductivities from magnetotelluric studies (Hautot et al., 2006; Whaler & Hautot, 2006) and perhaps link to geothermal activity at the border faults (Korostelev et al., 2015). In contrast, the slow velocities of 3.30 ± 0.05 km/s beneath the Yemen plateau (Figures 6a, 6b, and 8a) correlate well with the active Harras of Dhamar volcanic field (Korostelev et al., 2015).

6.2.5. Implications for Magma Plumbing Systems During Continental Rifting

Our absolute shear velocity models provide evidence for more protracted melt storage in the crust during the earlier stages of rifting (e.g., the MER). Melt accumulation is particularly localized near the Moho but distributed spatially across a relatively broad region beneath the rift valley and surrounding plateaus. This contributes to the growing body of evidence that deep crustal magma complexes play an important role in the evolution of magma in continental rifts (Annen et al., 2006). Controlled source imaging of continental rifts (e.g., The Baikal rift; Thybo & Nielsen, 2009) and magmatic passive margins (e.g., the North Atlantic; White et al., 2008) suggest that melt is primarily arranged as complexes of stacked sills. The accumulation of melt is aided by strong density contrasts of the higher rigidity continental crust overlying weaker mantle (Bradley, 1965; Kavanagh et al., 2006).

In Afar, we observe faster crustal seismic velocities mostly consistent with a crust rich in frozen mafic rock, denser than continental crust. The ascent of melt through the crust primarily relies on its high buoyancy relative to the mantle and crust (Harmon & Rychert, 2015; Sawyer, 1994). The time accumulation of dense mafic intrusion during progressive rifting, coupled with ongoing crustal thinning likely aids melt ascent through the crust during continued continental breakup in contrast to the thicker crust of the Ethiopian plateau and MER. Such an interpretation satisfies our seismic images, as well as petrological constraints on magma residence times (Hutchison et al., 2018).

Our seismic images beneath the northwestern plateau suggest localized melt emplacement and related hydrothermal processes continuing outside of the rift valley to the present day. This interpretation is somewhat contrary to the widely held belief that all magmatism becomes localized to a rift valley during progressive rifting. New GPS constraints from Ethiopia showing the presence of ongoing extension of the plateau (Birhanu et al., 2016) provides a mechanism to explain recent magmatic processes here and supports the view that extension coupled with magmatism may remain distributed later into the breakup process than previously believed.

7. Conclusions

We have generated a 3-D absolute shear wave velocity map for the crust and uppermost mantle of the northern EAR. This unified model allows direct comparisons of shear velocity between the MER, Afar, and adjacent plateaus. We have used 170 seismic stations to produce 4,820 cross correlations which have been stacked and inverted for phase and shear velocity on a 0.25° × 0.25° nodal grid. Shear velocities range from 3.20–4.10 km/s with the slowest average velocities within the MER (3.60 ± 0.03 km/s) and fastest beneath the Danakil depression (3.83 ± 0.04 km/s). The key findings of our study are
1. Mantle velocities (3.60–4.10 km/s) are everywhere slower than the global average for a mantle peridotite composition and require moderate elevated temperatures combined with a fluid component and/or partial melt.

2. Average shear velocities for the MER (3.60 ± 0.03 km/s) are slower than Afar (3.83 ± 0.04 km/s). Slow velocities in the MER versus Afar are interpreted as melt focusing from dramatic changes in lithospheric topography coupled with longer residence times and complex magmatic pathways within the crust. Faster velocities within Afar are attributed to solidified crustal intrusions and isolated areas of melt too small to be imaged in this study.

3. The Ethiopian plateau displays heterogeneity in crustal velocity structure (3.25 ± 0.05 km/s at 10-km depth to 3.87 ± 0.07 km/s at 40-km depth at “d” and 3.65 ± 0.05 km/s at 10-km depth to 3.95 ± 0.065 km/s at 40-km depth at “e”), suggesting a complex geological history and an inhomogeneous magma distribution during evolution. Slower crustal velocities near the border fault regions and pre-existing failed rifts are interpreted as geothermal systems within the faults beneath the Ethiopian flood basalts.
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