Regional crustal architecture of Ellesmere Island, Arctic Canada
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Abstract: New deep seismological data from Ellesmere Island and the adjacent Arctic continental margin provide new information about the crustal structure of the region. These data were not available for previous regional crustal models. This paper combines and redisplays previously published results – a gravity-derived Moho map and seismological results – to produce new maps of the Moho depth, the depth to basement and the crystalline crustal thickness of Ellesmere Island and contiguous parts of the Arctic Ocean, Greenland and Axel Heiberg Island. Northern Ellesmere Island is underlain by a thick crustal block (Moho at 41 km, c. 35 km crust). This block is separated from the Canada–Greenland craton in the south by a WSW–ENE-trending channel of thinned crystalline crust (Moho at 30–35 km, <20 km thick crust), which is overlain by a thick succession of metasedimentary and younger sedimentary rocks (15–20 km). The Sverdrup Basin in the west and the Lincoln Sea in the east interrupt the crustal architecture of central Ellesmere Island, which is interpreted to be more representative of its initial post-Ellesmerian Orogen structure, but with a later Sverdrup Basin and Eurekan overprint.

The Ellesmere Island Lithosphere Experiment (ELLITE), carried out in the framework of the Circum Arctic Lithospheric Evolution (CALE) project, provided the first consistent deep seismological transect for the intra-crustal and Moho structure of the Eurekan Orogen on Ellesmere Island (Fig. 1). These data were published with full documentation in Schiffer et al. (2016). The two-dimensional velocity model interpolated by Schiffer et al. (2016) between the seven ELLITE stations can be seen in Stephenson et al. (2017), where it is integrated with a structural geological cross-section constructed by Piepjohn & von Gosen (2017).

In this paper, the new results, including the implications of the two-dimensional gravity modelling along the ELLITE profile reported by Stephenson et al. (2017), are extrapolated across the Eurekan Orogen as a whole, linked with receiver functions from two permanent seismological observatories on Ellesmere Island (Eureka and Alert) and controlled-source seismic observations from the near-offshore of Ellesmere Island. These data are used to construct new maps of the depth to the Moho, using kriging, as well as the depth to the crystalline basement (below what is interpreted as a metasedimentary layer), based on qualitative interpretation, on Ellesmere Island and parts of Axel Heiberg Island. These maps, and their derivative thickness of crystalline crust map, may illuminate the causes and processes of the intraplate crustal deformation in this region.

Tectonic setting

The crust and topography of Ellesmere Island and the surrounding areas were formed by two spatially overlapping, but temporally distinct, orogenic events in the Early Palaeozoic and Palaeogene, with intervening periods of post-Devonian extensional tectonics (Piepjohn et al. 2015). The Palaeozoic Ellesmerian orogeny was the Canada–Greenland Arctic equivalent of the Caledonian orogeny in the North Atlantic (Gasser 2013; Gee 2015). The Ellesmerian is characterized by the accretion of shelf-to-deep-water basins and terranes to the Franklinian passive margin of Laurentia under dominantly orthogonal compression (Trettin 1991; Beranek et al. 2010; Lawver et al. 2011; Lemieux et al. 2011; Anfinson et al. 2012).

The Sverdrup Basin (Fig. 2) subsided from the Permian until the Palaeogene as a result of extension and/or lithospheric relaxation and collapse of the Ellesmerian Orogen lithosphere (Embry 1991), followed by a period of gradual thermal subsidence (Stephenson et al. 1994). The basin is about 1300 km long (NE–SW) and 400 km wide and contains >2 km of Palaeozoic sediments (Davies & Nassichuk 1991) and between 9 and 13 km of Mesozoic–Palaeogene sediments (Embry 1991; Embry & Beauchamp 2008).

Some magmatic rocks were emplaced during the Palaeozoic Ellesmerian orogeny and during the onset of extension related to the opening of the Sverdrup Basin (Embry & Osadetz 1988; Estrada
Fig. 1. Maps of the study area. Left panel: location of the study area in a circum-Arctic overview, including bathymetric elements. Right panel: overview map of the study area showing topography (ETOPO1; Amante & Eakins 2009), the ELLITE temporary station positions (triangles), the locations of the Eureka (EUNU) and Alert (ALE) seismic observatories and geographical names.
The largest magmatic event was of Cretaceous–Paleocene age and was associated with the Alpha–Mendeleev Ridge in the adjacent Amerasian segment of the Arctic Ocean (Døssing et al. 2013; Pease et al. 2014). This onshore–offshore magmatic complex has been referred to as the High Arctic Large Igneous Province (HALIP) (Buchan & Ernst 2006).

Contemporaneous with the emplacement of the HALIP, and possibly linked to it, rifting led to the formation of the Amerasia Basin itself and the present Canadian polar continental margin (Embry 1991; Grantz et al. 2011; Døssing et al. 2013; Doré et al. 2015). The Labrador Sea and Baffin Bay also opened from south to north between Greenland and Canada during the Cretaceous and Palaeogene and into the Eocene (Srivastava 1985; Roest & Srivastava 1989; Oakey & Chalmers 2012; Hosseinpour et al. 2013), temporally coincident with a phase of rifting and magmatism in the Lincoln Sea (Døssing et al. 2010; Tegner et al. 2011). The simultaneous opening of the Labrador Sea–Baffin Bay, the North Atlantic and the Eurasia Basin has been explicitly linked to the anticlockwise rotation of Greenland and, consequently, compression between Ellesmere Island, Greenland and Spitsbergen: the Eurekan orogeny (Tessensohn & Piepjohn & Henjes-Kunst 2004; Tegner et al. 2011).

Fig. 2. Geological map of the study area (modified after Oakey & Stephenson 2008). Eurekan structural domains are from Okulitch & Trettin (1991). Faults: EFT, Eurekan Frontal Thrust; LHFZ, Lake Hazen Fault Zone; MRF, Mt Rawlinson Fault; VFT, Vesle Fiord Thrust. Black triangles, permanent stations; red triangles, ELLITE stations.
In the Central Ellesmerian Domain (Fig. 2), the structures and deformation are predominantly of Eurekan age, focused along the Eurekan Frontal Thrust, which defines the southern extent of the Eurekan Orogen (Harrison & de Freitas 2007; Piepjohn et al. 2015). The Lake Hazen Fault Zone and the Vesle Fiord Thrust are Eurekan-aged structures trending WSW–ENE. Ellesmerian structures were also reactivated during Eurekan orogenesis, particularly in the Northern Ellesmere Domain (Grist & Zentilli 2006; Tessensohn et al. 2006). Crustal or lithospheric buckling described in the Sverdrup Island Domain (Døssing et al. 1992. Teleseismic receiver functions were recovered at Alert (ALE; Figs 1 & 2) in the NW, installed in the year 2000, and another one in the Nares Strait (Funck et al. 2006) during the 1990s. Three further studies have since been published, one in the Nares Strait (Funck et al. 2006) and two across the Canadian Arctic shelf (Jackson et al. 2010; Funck et al. 2011). One permanent seismic observatory (EUNU; Figs 1 & 2) is located at Eureka in the west of Ellesmere Island, installed in the year 2000, and another at Alert (ALE; Figs 1 & 2) in the NW, installed in 1992. Teleseismic receiver functions were recovered and analysed from these observatories, providing estimates of the Moho depth and crustal structure (Dahl-Jensen et al. 2003; Darbyshire 2003). From June 2010 to August 2012, seven temporary broadband seismometers comprising the ELLITE array were deployed on a roughly north–south-oriented profile running c. 450 km from the Arctic Ocean to the western Kane Basin (Stephenson et al. 2013). Receiver functions were recovered and analysed from the ELLITE data as well as from the two permanent stations, adding important information to the crustal structure of previously unsampled areas in the interior of Ellesmere Island (Schiffer et al. 2016).

The gravity field of Ellesmere Island has been fully mapped since the late 1980s (Stephenson & Ricketts 1989, 1990; Oakey et al. 2001; Oakey & Stephenson 2008). Oakey & Stephenson (2008) published a Moho depth map based on inversion of the compiled gravity grids and topography. This gravity inversion was augmented with some two-dimensional forward modelling on a profile crossing the Eurekan fold–thrust belt in the Central Ellesmerian Domain (Fig. 2) and an analysis of isostatic admittance of the Eurekan Orogen area (Oakey & Stephenson 2008).

The new teleseismic ELLITE data and permanent stations, together with the post-2008 wide-angle seismic studies (Jackson et al. 2010; Funck et al. 2011), allow an update of the maps of the gravity-derived crustal structure of Ellesmere Island (Oakey & Stephenson 2008), including the Moho depth, the depth to crystalline basement and, from these, the thickness of the crystalline crust.

**Crustal cross-sections**

Three crustal lithological cross-sections were constructed from the published receiver function data (Schiffer et al. 2016) and extrapolated with wide-angle velocity models where feasible (Fig. 3). In these models, the crust is divided into upper, lower and high-velocity lower crust, and the sedimentary layers into soft and consolidated sediments, as well as metasediments. This was based purely on velocity ranges, which are shown in the legend of Figure 4 and described in detail in Schiffer et al. (2016). The relationship between lithologies and the seismic data is diffuse, rather than represented as rigidly defined boundaries. Different lithologies may well have similar seismic properties and would fall into the same category (Christensen & Mooney 1995; Christensen 1996; Anderson 2007). This overlap leads to uncertainty in the interpretation of lithology. The $V_p$ and $V_s$ scales in Figure 4 should, accordingly, only be used as a rough guideline. The unconstrained and interpolated areas between the seismic stations are indicated by reduced colour intensity in Figure 4.

Profile 1 (Fig. 4a) is a c. north–south-oriented section, including all the ELLITE stations combined with the c. 200 km westwards offset wide-angle profile of Funck et al. (2011). The topography (Fig. 4a; grey lines on top of the profile; Amante & Eakins 2009) was averaged over different radii (25, 50 and 100 km) on a crooked line following the station locations and then projected onto the section. Although the wide-angle profile is located at some distance, its structure conveniently transitions along-strike into the northern end of the ELLITE section (Fig. 4a; station WHI).
The lower crust has a similar thickness in both models (c. 10 km) and the continental upper-middle crust diminishes in the distal part of the margin, together interpreted as volcanic rocks that may represent oceanic crust. Thick, high-velocity lower crust (c. 10 km) is observed in the north of profile 1 on the wide-angle section, where it was interpreted by Funck et al. (2011) as magmatic underplating. No lower crustal body is evident to the south on the refraction model, but one does lie in the northern part of the ELLITE section beneath stations WHI and MCF (up to 10 km thick). In the north of the ELLITE profile (stations WHI and MCF), the lower crust is thin (c. 7–12 km) and the upper crust is thick (c. 15–20 km) beneath a thin (meta-)sedimentary layer (c. 5–8 km).

The crust at the southern end of profile 1 in the Greenland–Canada Craton (station AXF) has a similar structure to the northernmost part (thick crystalline crust, thin sedimentary layer). In the interior of Ellesmere Island, the crystalline crust becomes very thin (down to c. 18 km), giving way to a thick succession of metasediments (up to 12 km). In the north of the central part of the profile, the upper crust appears to be thicker (c. 15 km, although there is a rather large data gap) and in the southern part it appears to be thinner (c. 8 km) than the lower crust (6–7 and 10–15 km, respectively).

A greater thickness of unconsolidated sediments, including those of the Sverdrup Basin, are apparent in the Hazen Stable Block (stations TQF and IBE/IBF), where the topography is lowest (Hazen Trough). In the same area, high-velocity lower crust is inferred. Such a high-velocity lower crustal layer is in agreement with the regional gravity field, as shown by Stephenson et al. (2017). The highest topography is observed in the Northern Ellesmerian Domain (Grantland Mountains), coincident with the thick crust observed in the receiver functions. The topography is also high in the Central Ellesmerian Domain (Victoria and Albert Mountains), where the Moho is deepest (up to 48 km).

Profile 2 (Fig. 4b) was defined between stations EUNU and IBE/IBF and shows the transition from the edge of the Sverdrup Basin in the east (IBE/IBF) to a more central location in the west.

Fig. 3. Overview of the defined crustal cross-sections (profiles 1–3) and the locations of used receiver functions (indicated by three- and four-letter station labels) and wide-angle datasets. Roman numerals: I, Funck et al. (2011); II, Jackson et al. (2010); III, Forsyth et al. (1994); and IV, Argyle & Forsyth (1994).
Fig. 4. Schematic crustal cross-sections through Ellesmere Island combining receiver function and wide-angle seismic models. The interpretation of the receiver functions is based on the published velocity model (Schiffer et al. 2016, their fig. 10). The colour bar represents the lithological interpretations. Representative $V_p$ and $V_s$ values are shown, which formed the basis of this interpretation. The implied linear relation of $V_p$, $V_s$ and lithology is much more complex in reality, with overlapping velocity ranges as described in the text. Cross-section locations are shown in Figure 3. The crustal models were interpreted in terms of a sedimentary layer, a metasedimentary layer, upper and lower crust and high-velocity lower crust. (a) Profile 1 uses a crustal model from wide-angle seismic data (Funck et al. 2011) and all temporary ELLITE stations. The average topography from ETOPO1 (Amante & Eakins 2009) around different radii along the projection line between the stations is shown in the upper panel (dark grey, 25 km; middle grey, 50 km; light grey, 100 km radius). (b) Profile 2 is defined between the permanent station EUNU and the ELLITE stations IBE/IBF (west–east), illustrating the deepening Sverdrup Basin. (c) Profile 3 is a north–south-oriented section and shows the southern part of a wide-angle seismic model (Jackson et al. 2010) combined with the receiver function model at the permanent station ALE. CED, Central Ellesmerian Domain; EFT, Eurekan Frontal Thrust; HSB, Hazen Stable Block; LHFZ, Lake Hazen Fault Zone; M, Moho; MRF, Mount Rawlinson Fault; NED, Northern Ellesmerian Domain; VFT, Vesle Fault Zone. The faults (MRF, LHFZ, VFT, EFT) represent the locations of surface expressions; dip and depth are schematic and not representative.
The crystalline crust is rather uniform in thickness (18–22 km), but the metasedimentary layer thins from the east (c. 14 km) to the west (c. 5 km). Instead, the overlying sediments of the Sverdrup Basin thicken from <2 km at IBE/IBF to almost 10 km at EUNU.

Profile 3 (Fig. 4c) was defined between the permanent station, ALE, in the NE of Ellesmere Island and the wide-angle profile of Jackson et al. (2010), which has <100 km lateral offset to the east from ALE. The crustal structure at ALE and the southern section of the wide-angle model are similar. Upper crust and lower crust each represent c. 40–50% of the total depth to the Moho and the metasedimentary layer has a similar thickness in both models (4–6 km, c. 10% of the total thickness). The possible north-dipping low-velocity upper mantle structure beneath ALE described by Schiffer et al. (2016) is visible beneath ALE, although the robustness of this model element is low (i.e. the receiver function amplitudes are low).

**Crustal mapping**

The published data described in the preceding sections were collected and combined in new maps of the Moho depth, the depth to the basement and the thickness of the crystalline crust. For the Moho depth, all the seismic constraints presented here were available, as well as the gravity-derived Moho model (Oakey & Stephenson 2008), which allows extrapolation (using kriging) to areas with no seismic data coverage. The receiver function results were augmented by wide-angle data from Jackson et al. (2010) and Funck et al. (2011), which were sampled every 25 km within the mapping area. The seismic profiles from Argyle & Forsyth (1994) and Forsyth et al. (1994) are located just at the edge of the study area and are represented as one data point (III and IV in Fig. 3). The gravity-derived Moho depth (Oakey & Stephenson 2008) was sampled on a grid of 50 km, but not within a radius of 50 km of the seismic observations.

Figure 5a shows the Moho depth estimates of the seismic data on top of the gravity-derived Moho depth model in the study area. The MATLAB kriging toolbox DACE (Lophaven et al. 2002) was used to construct the map. For the other two maps, only the seismic constraints were available, why kriging was not used to create the maps, but the surface geology and the tectonic and geological setting allowed substantiated inferences and a qualitative interpretation of the maps. Because the information for the intra-crustal layers is very limited and subject to considerable uncertainty, the interpretation was reduced to only four coarse depth/thickness ranges, which nevertheless illustrates the regional tendencies and trends allowing for large-scale tectonic inferences only. Oakey & Stephenson (2008) presented sedimentary and crustal thickness maps, but the crust included the metasedimentary layer, which is included in the sedimentary package in this study.

**Moho depth**

A number of additional wide-angle seismic profiles outside the study area are available for comparison, but appear to be generally consistent with the gravity-derived Moho depth model used here (Forsyth et al. 1979; Reid & Jackson 1997; Funck et al. 2006).

A comparison between the gravity-derived Moho and the newly available seismic data shows the differences and illuminates the importance of the new studies (Fig. 5a), although the differences between the maps resulting from the gridding methodology and data distribution must be taken into consideration. The overall trends and amplitudes in Moho depth are not greatly dissimilar (Fig. 5b). The data show close to the same Moho depth estimates at one station in the north (station MCF) and two stations in the south of Ellesmere Island (stations CNF and AXF), whereas larger discrepancies between the two models are observed at the other locations with receiver functions. At the northernmost station (WHI) the Moho is 5–8 km deeper (c. 40–41.5 km) in the seismic estimates than in the gravity model (c. 33–35 km). Station ALE (Dahl-Jensen et al. 2003; Darbyshire 2003) and the eastern wide-angle profile (Jackson et al. 2010) in the Lincoln Sea coastal area show a 5–10 km shallower Moho (c. 25–31 km) than the gravity model (c. 33–36 km). A shallower Moho, although with a less extreme difference, (c. 5 km) is observed along the wide-angle profile in the NW of the study area (Funck et al. 2011). The Moho at station EUNU is only 2–4 km shallower in the receiver functions (c. 29–31 km) than the gravity model (c. 32–34 km). The receiver functions indicate a shallow Moho (c. 34–36 km) at station TQF and a deeper Moho (c. 38–43 km) at IBE/IBF, whereas the gravity model shows the opposite trend, with a shallower Moho at station TQF (c. 36–39 km) and a deeper Moho at station IBE/IBF (c. 32–34 km).

Thin crust estimated at station ENU in the Sverdrup Basin may form a contiguous area of shallow Moho extending northwards to the ocean–continent transition (Funck et al. 2011), geographically coincident with the location of Nansen Sound. The gravity model indicated a deep Moho feature (c. 35 km) along the northwestern coast of Ellesmere Island, which is not observed in the seismic data. The new data confirm the existence of a ‘channel’ of shallow Moho in the Hazen Stable Block, although the exact north–south extent
of this channel appears to be different at stations IBE/IBF and TQF. West of station EUNU, the gravity data indicate deepening of the Moho to >32 km, but west of Axel Heiberg Island (outside map boundaries), the Moho is estimated at 26–27 km (Argyle & Forsyth 1994), which could be an expression of crustal buckling or folding (Forsyth et al. 1990; Stephenson et al. 1990).
**Depth to basement**

There is little to no seismic constraint for this map on the Canada–Greenland craton, where the sedimentary successions are expected to be thin. One profile from Oakey & Stephenson (2008) includes (meta-)sedimentary layers and indicates a thick sedimentary layer in areas similar to those where the receiver function data suggest it exists, although considerably thinner (9–12 km compared to 16 km). The difference in thickness might be due to uncertainty in the gravity or receiver function modelling and interpretation.

The depth to basement map (Fig. 5c) shows a clear maximum in central Ellesmere Island, confined by the Eurekan Frontal Thrust to the south and the Lake Hazen Fault Zone (see Fig. 2 for location) to the north. The consequent thick sedimentary package mainly consists of metasediments in the central part (stations TCF, IBF/IBF and CNF; see Fig. 5a for locations) and is limited by the Lincoln Sea margin to the NE (station ALE and Jackson et al. 2010), where the basement is much shallower (<10 km), implying a thin sedimentary succession. A sedimentary basin of up to 15 km total thickness (up to c. 5 km of metasediments) is located in the Lincoln Sea (Jackson et al. 2010), where basement depths of c. 15 km are observed at shallow water depths. Its lateral extent is not constrained due to a lack of complementary data. To the SW, at station EUNU, the basement is deep at 14–16 km and the metasedimentary succession is inferred to be about 5 km thick (Fig. 4), overlain by younger sediments that make up the Sverdrup Basin succession. The total sedimentary package of the Sverdrup Basin reaches a thickness of >10 km (Embry 1991).

**Crystalline basement**

The crystalline thickness map (Fig. 5d) was constructed consistently from the difference between the Moho depth and the depth to basement maps and is therefore subject to uncertainties based on previous assumptions, interpretations and extrapolations.

Two areas of thick crystalline crust (>30 km) are observed on Ellesmere Island, one in the north (Pearya) and another in the Canada–Greenland craton south of the Eurekan Frontal Thrust. The thick crust in southern Ellesmere Island coincides with a deep Lithosphere-Asthenosphere-boundary associated with the Canada-Greenland Craton (Schiffer et al. 2017). The thick crystalline crust at the two northernmost ELLITE stations (stations WHI and MCF) is limited to the east by thinner crust estimated at station ALE (20–24 km) and the nearby wide-angle profile of Jackson et al. (2010) (<20 km); whether this is an abrupt or gradual change cannot be resolved. To the west of stations WHI and MCF, the crystalline crustal thickness decreases to c. 26 km at the wide-angle profile of Funck et al. (2011). To explain the deep Moho in the absence of any substantial sedimentary succession (<7 km), the area between the southern end of the Funck et al. (2011) wide-angle profile and the two northernmost ELLITE stations (WHI and MCF) should have a crustal thickness >30 km.

Thick crystalline crust is also reported at ELLITE station AXF (c. 36 km), which is situated at the northern limit of the Canada–Greenland craton. The sedimentary successions for the whole cratonic domain in the study area may be presumed to be absent or very thin. The Proterozoic Thule Supergroup (Dawes 1997) and some offshore basins are located at the southern edge of the study area, but are generally <6 km thick and <2 km thick in the study area (Oakey & Stephenson 2008); accordingly, the thickness of crystalline crust is essentially equivalent to the Moho depth. It follows that the crust must be thicker than 30 km south of the Eurekan Frontal Thrust. Reid & Jackson (1997) estimated a crystalline crustal thickness of 34 km in northern Baffin Bay, just south of the study area.

The Arctic Ocean domain shows a marked difference between the west and east in the study area. Wide-angle models were interpreted to show extremely thick crust (mostly lower crust, including high-velocity bodies) in the west (Funck et al. 2011), associated with igneous crust of the Alpha Ridge, whereas in the east the crystalline crust is as thin as c. 6–12 km and is covered by thick successions of sedimentary rocks (Jackson et al. 2010). The crystalline crust thickens considerably to >25 km further north, outside the study area, towards the Lomonosov Ridge (Jackson et al. 2010). Central Ellesmere Island has thin crystalline crust (<25 km) localized along a c. 100 km wide WSW–ENE-oriented zone, roughly bounded by the Lake Hazen Fault Zone and the Vesle Fiord Thrust and roughly coincident with the Hazen Stable Block structural domain of the Eurekan Orogen (see Fig. 2 for locations). The central part of this zone shows crystalline crustal thicknesses of <20 km, culminating in a clear minimum at EUNU in the Sverdrup Basin. Wide-angle seismic data west of Axel Heiberg Island (c. 200 km west of EUNU, not in the study area) indicate a crystalline crustal thickness of 22 km (Argyle & Forsyth 1994). This indicates a slight increase in crystalline crustal thickness from EUNU across Axel Heiberg Island, as also shown in the gravity model (Oakey & Stephenson 2008).

**Tectonic implications**

New geophysical data in and around Ellesmere Island add important information to the large-scale
crustal architecture of the region. Some of the most significant differences are seen in the Lincoln Sea region, where the new data indicate the Moho at a much shallower depth than the earlier gravity inversion estimates. The latter may reflect the low-velocity (and probably low-density) uppermost mantle structure observed in the receiver functions at station ALE. The opposite trend is observed in northern Ellesmere Island, where deeper Moho is suggested by the seismic data than by the gravity model. The shallower gravity model Moho may be explained by the very thick high-velocity lower crust observed in the receiver functions. In other regions, the misfit between the gravity and seismic models is smaller, but some minor details are revealed by the new data, allowing for local adjustments of the Moho depth map. The limit of the area revealed by the new data, allowing for local adjustments of the Moho depth map. The limit of the area of reasonably well-constrained shallow Moho (both by gravity modelling and seismic constraints) coincides with the geographical location of Nansen Sound (see Fig. 1 for location) and suggests a close to local isostatic compensation in the area. This area also approximates the centre of early Cretaceous–Palaeogene magmatism in the Canadian Arctic Islands (Anudu et al. 2016; Saumur et al. 2016) and it is speculated that the shallow Moho may be related to crustal extension in this area, which is, in turn, linked to the magmatism. It could also be asked whether this eventually had any control over the topographic evolution of Nansen Sound.

The long-wavelength part of the Moho depth map presented here is in general agreement with recent Moho depth models for the entire Arctic region (Lebedeva-Ivanova et al. 2015; Petrov et al. 2016) and for Greenland (Steffen et al. 2017). A slightly better agreement occurs with the Petrov et al. (2016) model, which shows two domains of deep Moho in the south and north of Ellesmere Island and the deepest Moho in the Central Ellesmerian Domain (up to c. 48 km). The model of Lebedeva-Ivanova et al. (2015) also indicates deeper Moho in these regions, but clearly shallower Moho in the latter (<40 km).

A thick (meta-)sedimentary layer is located in the Ellesmerian fold–thrust belt (inferred by the large basement depth), bounded to the north and west by the Lake Hazen Fault Zone and to the south and east by the Eurekan Frontal Thrust (Fig. 5c). These thick metasediments coincide with an elongated zone of thin crystalline crustal thickness, south of which the Canada–Greenland craton is evident, with thick crystalline crust (>35 km). North of the Lake Hazen Fault Zone, a rather well-confined, c. 300 × 100 km area of thick crystalline crust is inferred. This area has a close to two-dimensional crustal structure for c. 250 km in a WSW–ENE direction along-strike.

This rather uniform crustal architecture terminates at the Lincoln Sea in the NE and the Sverdrup Basin in the SW (Fig. 5). This section may reflect an architecture formed during the Ellesmerian Orogen, with additional crustal shortening and reactivation during the Eurekan orogeny, but less affected by post-Elenesmerian extensional tectonics. By contrast, subsequent extensional episodes have strongly overprinted this original structure to the west, where it is mainly related to Sverdrup Basin extension, and to the east, where it is mainly related to younger transtensional/extensional history related to the Baffin–Arctic–North Atlantic region. The possibility that these two areas of crustal thinning are indicative of ancestral (Ellesmerian) structurally or rheologically different basement types, compared to what is preserved on Ellesmere Island, could also be considered. There is indeed an implication that, if the crustal structure on Ellesmere Island is in part ancestral, then the topography of Ellesmere Island may also be at least partly ancestral.

The zone of shallow Moho in the region of Hazen Stable Block is consistent with a model in which this area was not strongly affected by crustal shortening during the Eurekan orogeny, which is in contrast with clear evidence of crustal thickening and reactivation of Ellesmerian structures in the south and north (Piepjohn et al. 2015). Numerical experiments suggest that a lithospheric block in the central part of Ellesmere Island – with a greater strength than in the north and south and the existence of orogenic weaknesses – is able to explain such a deformation and topographic patterns (deformation in the north and south, limited deformation in the centre: the Hazen Stable Block) (Heron et al. 2015).

Two areas featuring high-velocity lower crust have been identified. It is speculated that the high-velocity lower crust in Pearya (the Northern Ellesmere Domain) could be linked to the nearby thick, high-velocity lower crust imaged offshore Ellesmere Island by Funck et al. (2011), where it has been interpreted as related to Cretaceous–Cenozoic magmatism rather than being an ancestral crustal feature. High-velocity lower crust is also observed in central Ellesmere Island, geographically coincident and possibly related to the shallow Moho observed below the Hazen Stable Block. Two possibilities for its origin are: (1) it is ancestral to the Precambrian-aged Franklinian palaeo-passive continental margin; and (2) it represents a magmatic underplate emplaced during the opening of the Late Palaeozoic origins of the Sverdrup Basin.

Conclusions
We have combined geophysical data, including all the data published since 2008, and compiled new
maps of the Moho depth, the depth to basement and the crystalline crustal thickness for Ellesmere Island and contiguous regions (Fig. 5). Although the Moho generally shows similar patterns and trends to an earlier Moho depth model derived solely from gravity, there are clear local differences (Fig. 5a, b). Shallower Moho (<30 km) is observed close to the Labrador Sea and in the Sverdrup Basin. A WSW–ENE-oriented ‘channel’ of shallow Moho in the centre of Ellesmere Island (c. 81–82° N) is observed in both models, but the new data suggest a slightly different location for this feature. By contrast, the northernmost part of Ellesmere Island has deeper Moho than previously estimated (40–42 km). The depth to basement map (Fig. 5c) shows the deepest basement in the centre of Ellesmere Island (15–20 km), between the Lake Hazen Fault Zone and the Eurekan Frontal Thrust, which follows the general trends of Ellesmerian and subsequent Eurekan deformation. The crystalline crustal thickness map indicates a block of thick crust (30–35 km) in the north of Ellesmere Island, separated from the craton in the south by the elongated channel of thinned crust in the Hazen Stable Block (12–20 km) and partly coincident with the inferred thick metasedimentary succession.

The crustal structure (as defined by the Moho depth, the basement depth and the crustal thickness) of central Ellesmere Island probably retains much of what was established during the Palaeozoic Ellesmerian Orogen, but including Eurekan reactivation and deformation in the north and south. To the NE and SW, a substantial change is observed, which interrupts the Eurekan overprinted Ellesmerian orogenic domain (primarily) Ellesmere Island. In the SW, Late Palaeozoic extension formed the Sverdrup Basin, apparently strongly degrading the original crustal features of the Ellesmerian Orogen. Similarly, local rifting and crustal thinning in the Lincon Sea may have cut through the older Ellesmerian structure in the Late Cretaceous and early Palaeogene.

The paper was motivated and developed under the umbrella of the project Circum Arctic Lithospheric Evolution (CALE). Thanks are given to the project leaders and all active participants. The paper was produced during a postdoctoral research fellowship of C. Schiffer at Durham University funded by the Carlsberg Foundation. The comments of two anonymous reviewers are much appreciated and have led to a number of important clarifications to our results and interpretations.
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