The Managua Graben and Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex (Nicaragua); pull-apart localization by an intrusive complex: results from analogue modeling
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Abstract

There is a well-documented association between pull-apart basins in strike-slip zones and large volcanic caldera complexes. Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex, Nicaragua, is a large basaltic lava and ignimbrite shield with nested calderas. The widest caldera is partly underlain by a large and dense intrusive complex, evidenced by a positive gravity anomaly. The Las Sierras Caldera, relating to this cumulate complex, is less than 30,000 years old and is probably still hot and ductile. The inner Masaya Caldera hosts an active magmatic system. The volcanic complex is in a dextral transtensional tectonic context of the Nicaraguan Depression. The highly active Managua Graben is on the northern part of the volcano. We speculate that the graben and volcano are linked tectonically, with the graben initiating in response of a regional stress field modified around the dense, ductile intrusive complex. Previous field work and reappraisal of structures with digital elevation model morphological analysis show that the volcano is surrounded by a rhombic fault pattern that may form a nascent pull-apart basin. We have done scaled analogue models to test the effect of intrusion density and rheology anomalies on strike-slip fault geometries. The models show that intrusion density variations alone do not significantly change fault patterns. In contrast, ductile rocks (silicone in the models as analogue for hot mafic intrusive rocks) markedly alter strike-slip fault patterns. In transtension the presence of a ductile intrusion causes the formation of a pull-apart, while in pure strike-slip or transpression, uplift and thrusting is generated. Pull-apart and uplift structures are rhomb-shaped even when the ductile inclusion is circular. We conclude that a pull-apart is developing at Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex in response to the transtensive regional deformation regime and the dense, ductile
intrusive complex. We suggest that the volcano and graben are one dynamic system and should be monitored as one entity.
© 2005 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.
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1. Introduction

It is now widely accepted that volcano loading may partly control fault patterns. For example, loading by large shield volcanic complexes can alter regional fault directions (van Wyk de Vries and Merle, 1998). This phenomenon has been well reproduced in laboratory for a range of tectonic regimes (van Wyk de Vries and Merle, 1996, 1998; Branquet and van Wyk de Vries, 2001; Lavallée et al., 2004). Volcanoes and large intrusive bodies may also influence faulting on other planets (e.g. Cyr and Melosh, 1993; Watters and Janes, 1995). Exhumed intrusive bodies at some calderas are associated with sinking structures that may be due to density and rheological weaknesses (Walker, 1988; Glazner and Miller, 1997).

Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex, one of the largest volcanoes of the Pacific coast of Nicaragua, is underlain by a large and dense magmatic intrusion (Metaxian, 1994). The Managua Graben, one of the most active tectonic structures of Central America lies on the north flanks of the volcano. The volcano and graben have formed over the same time period and we suggest that the structural evolution of the two may be linked through an interplay between regional and volcano tectonic processes. At present, the origin of the recent faulting in the whole area is being vigorously debated. The debate is about the comparative effects of Caribbean Plate and Pacific Plate motions and the local effect of volcano-tectonics (Burkart and Self, 1985; van Wyk de Vries, 1993; van Wyk de Vries and Merle, 1996, 1998; La Femina et al., 2002). To contribute to the debate we propose a volcano-tectonic origin for the Managua Graben. We present a digital elevation model (DEM) morpho-structural-structural analysis, supported by previous field observations of the Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex and the Managua Graben. We model the effect of the dense, ductile intrusive body with analogue models and conclude that the formation of the graben is probably linked to the presence of the intrusion beneath Masaya Caldera.

2. Las Sierras-Masaya and the tectonics of Nicaragua

2.1. Tectonic context of western Nicaragua

Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex is related to subduction of the Cocos Plate beneath the Caribbean plate. Subduction beneath Central America is slightly oblique, from 0 to 15°, and movement on the northern boundary of the Caribbean Plate is strike-slip (the Montagua-Cayman fault). These obliquities result in an anti-clockwise rotation of the crustal blocks (Burkart and Self, 1985; Manton, 1987; La Femina et al., 2002). Owing to this rotation, and/or as a consequence of the oblique subduction, the Pacific margin of Central America in under a dextral strike-slip tectonic regime and small amounts of orthogonal extension. The average velocity of this lateral motion is about 14 mm/year (DeMets, 2001). Some dextral strike-slip faults are well developed along the margin, such as Jalpatagua fault in Guatemala (Burkart and Self, 1985), but there is no clear evidence of strike-slip trench-parallel faulting in Nicaragua. However, there is a large depression, the Nicaraguan Depression (Fig. 1). Almost all the Quaternary volcanoes of Nicaragua, including Las Sierras-Masaya, lie within this structure (McBirney and Williams, 1965).

Initially interpreted as a graben (McBirney and Williams, 1964, 1965), the Nicaraguan Depression was later redefined by van Wyk de Vries (1993) as a low-lying area bounded by a Tertiary volcanic Highland region and a Pliocene formed coastal fold belt. Faulting in the Nicaraguan Depression principally consists of perpendicular northeast-striking left-lateral faults possibly defining bookshelf faulting (La
Femina et al., 2002), instead of northwest-striking right-lateral faults. This fault pattern could be the immature expression of a dextral strike-slip tectonic regime where $R$ faults are favored, as suggested by the analogue experiments of Freund (1974). There may be an influence from earlier-formed northeast-striking faults north of the Nicaraguan Depression (Manton, 1987; Weinberg, 1992), and also volcanotectonic effects (van Wyk de Vries and Borgia, 1996; van Wyk de Vries and Merle, 1998). A right-lateral strike-slip stress pattern does exist at the scale of the Depression, to fit with regional plate tectonics, even if its surface expression and interpretation is still controversial.

2.2. Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex

Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex is the largest Quaternary volcano of Nicaragua. It consists of Las Sierras, a basaltic ignimbrite shield that surrounds a complex system of calderas, of which Masaya Caldera is the most recent one (Fig. 2; van Wyk de Vries, 1993; Šebesta, 1997). Masaya Caldera hosts Masaya Volcano, one of the most active of Nicaragua, well-known for its intense magmatic degassing. Studies have focused on the origin of Masaya Caldera from basaltic plinian eruptions (e.g.: McBirney, 1956; Bice, 1980; Williams, 1983) and on the present activity of Masaya
Fig. 2. Map of the studied area. (A) Topography of the studied area, with contours every 50 m. (B) 30m resolution DEM shaded relief image. (C) General structural maps, made from the DEM. The Managua Graben is the depression bounded by Punta Huete, Nejapa-Miraflorres/Mateare and Cofradías faults and unclearly bounded by Masaya Caldera and Las Sierras shield at South. Note that the city of Managua lies very close to Nejapa-Miraflorres and Masaya volcanoes and at the center of the Managua Graben.
Volcano (e.g. Rymer et al., 1998; Horrocks et al., 1999; Burton et al., 2000; Delmelle et al., 2002). The internal structure of the volcano has also been studied by Metaxian (1994), who, following a preliminary study by Connor and Williams (1989), used gravity data to show that there was a 6 km thick, 3–9 km deep and 10–15 km in diameter underlying intrusion, 600 kg/m³ denser than the surrounding rocks. Slightly reduced seismic velocity data indicates that although the intrusion may not contain any melt, but is still probably hot enough to be ductile (Metaxian, 1994).

The Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex initiated in the early Quaternary, or even Pliocene (McBirney and Williams, 1965). The first deposits are dacitic ignimbrites found on the north–east side of the Nicaraguan Depression (van Wyk de Vries, 1993). These are covered by a group of ignimbrites and associated lahars of basaltic composition that form the main relief of Las Sierras shield (Fig. 2). This shield was cut by the Mateare Fault to the northwest, while a caldera complex formed to the southeast (Fig. 1). The exact limits of the early calderas are not clear (Šebesta, 1997), but at 30,000 BP a large basaltic

![Fig. 3. (A) Structural map made from the DEM that shows, in addition to the clear Managua Graben bounding faults and the system of calderas (Šebesta, 1997), three families of faults (1) NNE-striking faults south of Masaya Caldera extending Cofradías fault, (2) numerous NE-striking faults between Masaya Caldera and Lake Managua, probably associated with the faults active during the recent earthquakes (Brown et al., 1973) and principally, (3) NNW-striking faults along the western side of the graben, extending Nejapa-Miraflores and Mateare faults. Those newly mapped structures draw a rhombic basin around Las Sierras-Masaya, allowing us to consider the Managua Graben as a pull-apart. (B) Schematic reconstruction of the main features of the Managua Graben and Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex.](image-url)
ignimbrite was erupted and a large caldera was formed, that is still a clear morpho-structural feature (Bice, 1980). This caldera is called Las Nubes by Šebesta (1997) and Las Sierras by van Wyk de Vries (1993). The ignimbrite deposit is found in the Managua region, where it is cut extensively by the Managua Graben faults. Some faults, such as the Cofradías join the caldera structure and may have moved during caldera formation (Fig. 2). The Cofradías fault and others in the graben have been active over historical times (Brown et al., 1973). After the formation of the Las Sierras Caldera, basalt lavas formed a shield, Masaya Volcano. This was partially destroyed by a group of plinian and ignimbrite-forming eruptions culminating in the Masaya surge at about 4000 BP (Bice, 1980; Williams, 1983). During this time (at about 20,000 years BP) the Apoyo Caldera (Fig. 2) formed during a major silicic ignimbrite eruption (Bice, 1980). The resulting caldera has been partially filled by a new basaltic lava shield that started to overflow into the Managua Graben in 1772 (McBirney and Williams, 1965).

As the ignimbrite that formed the Las Sierras Caldera blanketed the topography, the present faulted and eroded surface dates from less than 30,000 years, except for the larger features such as the Mateare Fault and the Nejapa-Miraflores fault (Figs. 2 and 3).

3. Managua Graben

The Managua Graben is the most active tectonic structure of the Nicaraguan Depression. The main faults are orientated north-northeast and north (Fig. 2). Damaging shallow earthquakes have occurred in 1931, 1968 and 1972 (Brown et al., 1973). While called a graben, it is only partially bounded by clearly visible normal fault scarps (Fig. 2). The Punta Huete Fault, on its northwestern side and the Cofradías Fault on the eastern side are the most evident ones, with scarps that reach more than 100 m high (Šebesta, 1997). The westernmost side of the basin is delimited by the Nejapa-Miraflores Fault (Fig. 2), along which lies an alignment of basaltic cinder cones and pit craters (Walker, 1984), and the Mateare Fault, the largest fault scarp in Nicaragua (van Wyk de Vries, 1993; Šebesta, 1997). The Graben’s southern boundary is the Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex. The graben has been interpreted as a pull-apart basin (Šebesta, 1997). Two main fault zones have been mapped in the graben (Fig. 2): (1) Aeropuerto Depression, a small graben bounded by Aeropuerto and Cofradías faults that extends south into the Las Sierra Caldera, and (2) a left-lateral strike-slip fault zone is located around Managua City (Šebesta, 1997). This zone is where recent seismicity is concentrated (Brown et al., 1973) and may be an extension of Punta Huete fault under Lake Managua (Fig. 2). The rest of the graben is occupied by Las Sierras-Masaya and Lake Managua, in which few faults have been mapped, but where seismic evidence indicates active faulting (Brown et al., 1973).

Using the previous field work (e.g. van Wyk de Vries, 1993; Šebesta, 1997) and a 30 m resolution Digital Elevation Model, a detailed morpho-structural and lineament has been done. The main known faults of the Managua Graben are well represented on the DEM (Fig. 2B), as well as erosion and depositional features. As there is a good correlation between the DEM features and previously mapped structures, so we could confidently extend the analysis to the whole of the Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex. Some lineaments are scarps with clear fault-related origin, others are surface features that may be faults. Some gully features may contain faults, as they hold consistent strikes, or are smooth curved features. Verification in the field of such features is difficult, as the gullies are typically sediment-filled, and structural features are masked. Trench digging in Managua on such features has usually exposed fractured rock and off-sets.

On the DEM illustrated morphology (Fig. 2B), we observed that there are numerous faults, lineaments and possible fault controlled erosion around Las Sierras-Masaya, defining three groups (Fig. 3A). (1) Some NNE-striking faults south of Masaya Caldera may be asouthward extension of Cofradías fault, while (2) numerous northeast-striking faults between Masaya Caldera and Lake Managua are probably associated with the faults active during the recent earthquakes (Brown et al., 1973). The most numerous are (3) north-northwest-striking faults along the western side of the graben. They can be considered a southward extension of Nejapa-Miraflores and Mateare Fault trends.

The Aeropuerto Depression changes as it approaches Las Sierras-Masaya and the bounding normal
faults evolve into a family of smaller faults that have fresher and sharper topography. This suggests that faulting is younger, or more active towards the volcanic complex center. This change in the surface expression of the faulting can be the consequence of one basement fault cutting recently deposited material and bifurcating. Otherwise it could be a consequence of the volcano load that causes fault densification (van Wyk de Vries and Merle, 1996). There is a set of faults between Masaya Volcano and Apoyo Volcano that closes the southern border of the Managua Graben, to complete a rhomb-shape (~50 km long in NNW direction and 20 km wide). There is a northern extension that progressively narrows to evolve into a triangular graben between the Cofradías Fault and the Punta Huete Fault (Fig. 3). Given that the faults near Managua City and the Cofradías Fault have a strong sinistral strike-slip component (Brown et al., 1973; van Wyk de Vries, 1993), and that the regional trend is dextral, the Managua Graben has been interpreted as a pull-apart basin (Šebesta, 1997). Our interpretation of its rhombic shape reinforces that interpretation. The graben morphology ($50 \times 20$ km) gives an aspect ratio of 2.5, close to the aspect ratio of 3, characteristic of most pull-apart basins (Aydin and Nur, 1982).

These above observations show a spatial link between the graben and the Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex. We also know that the two structures are contemporaneous: both began to form at about 1 Ma ago, and both are still active today (Weinberg, 1992; van Wyk de Vries, 1993; Šebesta, 1997). We suggest that the volcanic complex, and most specifically the dense pluton, have localized faulting and generated the pull-apart through density and rheological contrasts. To test this we ran a series of analogue models representing the magmatic system in the dextral strike-slip tectonic environment that characterizes the Nicaraguan Depression.

4. Analogue modeling

4.1. Experimental setup

The models represent Las Sierras-Masaya intrusive complex in the strike-slip tectonic context of the Nicaraguan Depression. To model this environment, we used sand and silicone putty, with an upper brittle layer made of sand representing the brittle upper crust and an underlying ductile layer made of silicone equivalent to the more ductile lower crust. The boundaries of the models were constrained by brittle sand so as to avoid any lateral spreading. We used a transparent silicone Silbione 70009; produced by Rhodia), the quoted viscosity of this silicone is approximately $10^5$ Pa s, at experimental conditions (room temperature). We constantly checked the viscosity of the silicone on a rotational viscometer (see scaling). Displacements were applied to one half of the model, by a thin basal sheet placed just below the base of the model and linked to a step motor (Fig. 4). The moving
part represents the northern side of the Nicaraguan Depression, which shows a dextral movement resulting from Chortis block rotation (Burkart and Self, 1985; Manton, 1987; Gordon and Muehlberger, 1994). The immobile second part represented the Pacific coastal plain southwest of the Depression. Movements are, of course, relative, so either side can be regarded as fixed, or in movement, or both can be considered to be mobile (van Wyk de Vries and Merle, 1996, 1998; see also Cobbold and Castro, 1999, for a review). For both economical and practical reasons, silicone was recycled from previous experiments and thus initially contained a small fraction of sand. The effect was increase in viscosity of about one order of magnitude that was monitored. The overall dimensions of the models were ~70×50 cm on average, for practical reasons. Heights were fixed by respecting geometric similarity (constant aspect ratio between models and nature). The length scale was determined using the depth of the brittle crust (assumed to be roughly 10 km) compared with the thickness of brittle sand in the model (3.5 cm).

(Fig. 4), while respecting geometric similarity of a brittle upper crust thickness (Tables 1–3).

### 4.2. Scaling

Choice of the analogue materials was made following previous experiments modeling tectonics in the crust and volcanic systems (e.g. Tron and Brun, 1991; McClay and Dooley, 1995; van Wyk de Vries and Merle, 1996, 1998; see also Cobbold and Castro, 1999, for a review). For both economical and practical reasons, silicone was recycled from previous experiments and thus initially contained a small fraction of sand. The effect was increase in viscosity of about one order of magnitude that was monitored. The overall dimensions of the models were ~70×50 cm on average, for practical reasons. Heights were fixed by respecting geometric similarity (constant aspect ratio between models and nature). The length scale was determined using the depth of the brittle crust (assumed to be roughly 10 km) compared with the thickness of brittle sand in the model (3.5 cm).

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Units (S.I.)</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Value Models</th>
<th>Ratio model/nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h_u$</td>
<td>Height of upper layer</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>$10^{3a}$</td>
<td>$3.5 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$h_u^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_l$</td>
<td>Height of lower layer</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>$10^{3-10^{4b}}$</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^{-2b}$</td>
<td>$h_l^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_i$</td>
<td>Height of intrusion</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>$6 \times 10^{3a}$</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$h_i^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_i$</td>
<td>Radius of intrusion</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>$7.5 \times 10^{3a}$</td>
<td>$3.7 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$r_i^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_u$</td>
<td>Density of upper layer</td>
<td>kg m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>$\rho_u^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_l$</td>
<td>Density of lower layer</td>
<td>kg m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>1550 (1080)</td>
<td>$\rho_l^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_i$</td>
<td>Density of intrusion</td>
<td>kg m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>1610 [2000]</td>
<td>$\rho_i^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_u$</td>
<td>Cohesion of upper layer</td>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>$10^{7-10^{8}}$</td>
<td>$10^{-12}$</td>
<td>$C_u^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[C_i]$</td>
<td>Cohesion of intrusion</td>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>$10^{7-10^{8}}$</td>
<td>$10^{-12}$</td>
<td>$[C_i]^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Phi$</td>
<td>Angle of internal friction</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30^{\circ}$</td>
<td>$30^{\circ}$</td>
<td>$\Phi^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_i$</td>
<td>Viscosity of lower layer</td>
<td>Pa s</td>
<td>$10^{20-10^{21c}}$</td>
<td>$10^{8} (6 \times 10^{8})$</td>
<td>$\eta_i^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_i$</td>
<td>Viscosity of intrusion</td>
<td>Pa s</td>
<td>$10^{17-10^{18c}}$</td>
<td>$10^{5}$</td>
<td>$\eta_i^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>Gravity</td>
<td>m s$^{-2}$</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>$g^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>Normal stress at the base of upper layer</td>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>$2.4 \times 10^{8}$</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>$\sigma^{*}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values in round brackets relate to some experiments in which lower viscosity silicone has been used (trade name: SGR 36, produced by Dow Corning, UK), values in square brackets are for experiments with a brittle intrusion. Sources: (a) Metaxian (1994). (b) A minimum height for the silicone lower layer relative to the height of the upper brittle layer is necessary to represent the ductile crust (van Wyk de Vries and Merle, 1996), but silicone layer cannot be thicker than 2 cm because of edge effects. (c) For a crust composed of sedimentary rocks and tufts (van Wyk de Vries, 1993). (d) Krantz (1991) and Schellart (2000) measured values of cohesion >10$^{7}$ Pa for sand. These values are open to debate and some authors sometimes consider no cohesion (e.g. Merle and Borgia, 1996). (e) Viscosity of the inner crust has to be $<3 \times 10^{11}$ Pa s as for stiff sedimentary rocks (Gratier et al., 1999) but >10$^{19}$ Pa s as for melting granites (Wickham, 1987). Intrusion is hotter, thus less viscous. Origin of the other values is either measurements made in this study (viscosities were measured with a rotational viscometer) or values generally accepted in literature.
Table 2
Dimensionless numbers used to verify dynamic similarity, and the forces that characterize the system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Pi_5 )</td>
<td>( \frac{F_g}{F_i} ), ( \frac{F_i}{F_g} )</td>
<td>( \frac{\rho_a g h_u}{t_{\eta_1}} )</td>
<td>( 1^a )</td>
<td>1^a</td>
<td>Equivalent in models and nature (( \Pi_5^{*}=1 ))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Pi_6 )</td>
<td>( \frac{F_i}{F_g} )</td>
<td>( C_u + \left( \frac{\rho_a g h_u - \frac{2 C_u \sqrt{3}}{3} + \eta_1}{t} \right) \tan \Phi \frac{t}{\eta_1} )</td>
<td>( 0.6-1.7^a )</td>
<td>1–1.3^a</td>
<td>Equivalent in models and nature (( \Pi_6^{*}=1 ))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Pi_7 )</td>
<td>(Reynolds number)</td>
<td>( \frac{\rho_i h_i^2}{\eta_1 t} )</td>
<td>( 10^{-23}-10^{-19a} )</td>
<td>10–10(^{-8a} )</td>
<td>Different in models and nature, but much smaller than ( \Pi_5 ) and ( \Pi_6 ): inertia forces are negligible and ( \Pi_7^{*}=1 ) is thus not required to respect dynamic similarity (Merle and Borgia, 1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- \( F_g \): Gravity force
- \( F_i \): Failure resistance force
- \( F_r \): Failure resistance force
- \( F_i\) \((\tau)\): Inertia force
- \( F_v \): Viscous force
- \( \sigma_1 \): Maximal stress (lithostatic pressure)
- \( \sigma_3 \): Minimal stress

\[ F_r = C_u + \left( \frac{\rho_a g h_u - \frac{2 C_u \sqrt{3}}{3} + \eta_1}{t} \right) \tan \Phi \frac{t}{\eta_1} \]

Coulomb–Navier failure criterion with cohesion (Hubbert and Rubey, 1959)

\[ \Phi_{\text{critical}} = 30^\circ \]

By considering \( t = \frac{\eta_1}{\rho_a g h_u} \).

For area unit, Merle and Borgia (1996).

With \( \Phi=30^\circ \) (Table 1).

See Hubbert and Rubey (1959) and Merle and Borgia (1996) for details.

\(^a\) By considering

\[ t = \frac{\eta_1}{\rho_a g h_u} \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ductile lower layer</th>
<th>Intrusion</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>Strike-slip motion velocity (mm h⁻¹)</th>
<th>Additive extension (and opening velocity) (mm h⁻¹)</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Static</td>
<td>Low-viscosity and density, 10 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-sand</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>No subsidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Static, without scaling</td>
<td>Low-viscosity and density, 10 cm thick</td>
<td>Pure iron powder</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Strong subsidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Static</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>No subsidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D212</td>
<td>No intrusion</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Pop-ups and Riedel shears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D213</td>
<td>As D212</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Dominating border effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D215</td>
<td>Ductile intrusion</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Pull-apart above the intrusion+border effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D219</td>
<td>Brittle intrusion</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-sand</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>As D212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D220</td>
<td>Topography effect</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Volcano+caldera</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>As D212 and no effect of topography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D221</td>
<td>As D215</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Thrusts above the intrusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D222</td>
<td>As D219</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>As D219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D225</td>
<td>As D215/D221+topography</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>Volcano+caldera</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>As D221 and no effect of topography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D227</td>
<td>Additive extensive motion</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4’ (0.22)</td>
<td>As D215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D228</td>
<td>Additive compressive motion</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>–4’ (–0.22)</td>
<td>Thrusts above the intrusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D301</td>
<td>As D227, with reduced velocity</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4’ (0.11)</td>
<td>Pull-apart above the intrusion without border effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D305</td>
<td>As D301, with increased extension</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8’ (0.22)</td>
<td>As D301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D306</td>
<td>As D301, with increased extension</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12’ (0.33)</td>
<td>As D301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D308</td>
<td>Transtension</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8’ (0.44)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Oblique rifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D313</td>
<td>As D306</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12’ (0.33)</td>
<td>As D301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D326</td>
<td>As D215, with reduced velocity and larger experimental setup for comparison</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Thrusts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D327</td>
<td>As D215, with reduced velocity</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Thrusts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D402</td>
<td>As D215, with low-viscous silicone layer</td>
<td>Low-viscosity and density, 2 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>16 *</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Thrusts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D403</td>
<td>As D215, with reduced velocity</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Thrusts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D418</td>
<td>As D402, with increased velocity</td>
<td>Low-viscosity and density, 2 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Thrusts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D513</td>
<td>As D402, with increased velocity</td>
<td>Low-viscosity and density, 2 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Thrusts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D514</td>
<td>As D215</td>
<td>1.5 cm thick</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Thrusts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D515</td>
<td>As D215, with increased ductile layer thickness</td>
<td>Thicker (1.8 cm)</td>
<td>Iron-silicone</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Pull-apart above the intrusion without border effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The thickness of the silicone layer was chosen thinner than 2 cm (equivalent to a 6 km ductile layer). This is less than the value probable for a 10 km thick Nicaragua lower crust. Properly scaled thicker ductile layer control experiments were not exploitable due to edge effects that destroyed the model at greater than a few mm displacement. We lowered the thickness of the silicone to avoid these effects. We assured that the structures produced showed closely similar results to the few successful thick models. Because the results were similar, we believe that the models should be applicable to cases where the lower crust ductile layer is thicker than used here (5–6 km). Table 1 lists all the physical parameters defining the system both in models and nature, and their ratios.

The speed applied to the experiments is ruled by kinematic similarity (Merle and Vendeville, 1995). Given that our silicone is Newtonian, 

$$\sigma = \frac{\eta^*}{t^*}$$  

(1)

implying

$$\sigma^* = \frac{\eta^*}{t^*}.$$  

(2)

Where $\sigma=$stress, $\eta=$viscosity of the ductile layer, and $t=$time. And

$$\sigma = \rho_u g h_u.$$  

(3)

(Table 1; Merle and Vendeville, 1995), where $\rho_u=$density of rock, $g=$gravity and $h_u=$height (we use the standard crustal thickness for reference). This implies that:

$$\sigma^* = \rho_u^* g^* h_u^*.$$  

(4)

So

$$t^* = \frac{\rho_u^* g^* h_u^*}{\eta^*}$$  

(5)

And

$$t^* = \frac{x^*}{v^*}$$  

(6)

with $x$ and $v$ displacement and velocity. So

$$v^* = \frac{\rho_u^* g^* h_u^*}{\eta^*}.$$  

(7)

because $x^*$ and $v^*$ are about $10^{-10}$ and $10^3$–10$^4$, respectively, so the velocity of strike-slip displacement to apply is about 1–10 mm/h, given that strike-slip displacement along the Nicaraguan Depression is 14 mm/year (DeMets, 2001).

A first approximation for dynamic similarity is respected if the ratio model/nature of cohesion and normal stress are equivalent (Merle and Borgia, 1996). This condition is fulfilled (Table 1). This also requires the ratios of the different forces being equivalent in models and nature. The forces, their expression, and their ratio are presented in Table 2. It appears that the force ratios defined as $H_5$ and $H_6$ have close values in models and nature. Thus dynamic similarity is also respected for forces.

5. Results

5.1. Preliminary experiments

We first tested the effect of an intrusive body without any tectonic motion. With correct scaling, no subsidence was observed at the surface even after 1 week (equivalent to 7 Ma in nature) (experiment S3, Table 3). Subsidence was only produced using a much denser intrusion, made of pure iron powder-$\rho=3200$ kg m$^{-3}$—and a silicone basal layer one order of magnitude less viscous than the silicone used in the other experiments (Table 3; experiment S2). The shape of the subsidence zone always strictly followed the shape of the intrusion. This
mechanism is thus not reasonable for probable density contrasts of magmatic intrusions in the upper crust and upper crustal thicknesses. The reason for no deformation is linked to the presence of the upper brittle layer. This provides a resistance to sinking that is not overcome except with very dense intrusions on thicker and less dense silicone layer layers (Table 3; experiment S2).

We also ran control experiments with strike-slip tectonic motion, but without any intrusion (Table 3; D212). No pull-apart basin formed at the surface. We only observed pop-ups and Riedel shears. Even with transtensive tectonics (Table 3; D308), no pull-apart basin formed. By adding a component of extension to the motion, we only formed oblique rifts running through the entire model, but no pull-apart basins (Fig. 5A), as previously modeled by Tron and Brun (1991).

We also considered the effect of topography (Table 3; D220), assuming that the volcano would represent an overload and influence faulting, as described by van Wyk de Vries and Merle (1998). However, Las Sierras is made of low density pyroclastic products (van Wyk de Vries, 1993; Metaxian, 1994), and it is only 934 m a.s.l. for 30,000 m radius. Even by exaggerating the height of the volcano or by making a circular volcano and caldera (as it might have been before caldera-forming eruptions and erosion), we did not observe any effect of the volcano on strike-slip faulting (Fig. 5).

In the experiments only a modeled intrusive body is able to cause surface subsidence structures like those seen at Las Sierras-Masaya.

5.2. The effect of an intrusion coupled with strike-slip faulting

The Las Sierras intrusion is believed to be almost completely solid gabbro (Metaxian, 1994). However, there is still an active plumbing system and active degassing at Masaya Volcano (Rymer et al., 1998), and the Las Sierras Caldera is possibly only 30,000 years old (Bice, 1980). So, the intrusion is probably much hotter than the surrounding rocks and can be considered as slightly ductile, with a very high viscosity (Table 1). That is why most of the experiments were made with a ductile intrusion.

We first considered the case of a brittle solidified intrusion. Experiments with a brittle intrusion made of a sand-iron powder mixture (Table 3; D219, D222) did not show any subsidence of the surface localized above the intrusion, Riedel shears formed first and...
then, grabens (Fig. 6). The faults were not confined to the intrusion and showed no deflection as they passed through it. Thus the brittle intrusion had no effect on the overall pattern of deformation.

By contrast, with a ductile intrusion (Table 3; D215) made of a silicone-iron powder mixture, the effect of the intrusion was immediately visible. Rapidly, a typical pull-apart rhomb-shaped subsidence basin formed above the intrusion (Fig. 7). First, a rhomb-shaped basin formed above the intrusion (A, displacement: 3.7 cm ↔ 10 km in nature, duration: 7 h ↔ 450 ka) to a longitudinal graben (B, displacement: 12 cm ↔ 35 km in nature, duration: 22.5 h ↔ 1.5 Ma). There is no fault deviation above the intrusion, suggesting that a dense but brittle intrusive body is not able to generate subsidence of a rhombic basin under the effect of the strike-slip motion. Dashed circles represent the location of the intrusion.

Fig. 6. Experiment D222, with pure strike-slip motion and a brittle and dense intrusion. The fault pattern above the intrusion evolves from a combination of small pop-ups and pull-aparts (A, displacement: 3.7 cm ↔ 10 km in nature, duration: 7 h ↔ 450 ka) to a longitudinal graben (B, displacement: 12 cm ↔ 35 km in nature, duration: 22.5 h ↔ 1.5 Ma). There is no fault deviation above the intrusion, suggesting that a dense but brittle intrusive body is not able to generate subsidence of a rhombic basin under the effect of the strike-slip motion. Dashed circles represent the location of the intrusion.
zone formed, directly above the intrusion (Fig. 7). Once the pull-apart basin was formed, left-lateral transtensive conjugate faults formed in the moving part of the model, as an extension of the pull-apart basin (Fig. 7). We termed this feature lateral graben, as it extends laterally out from the pull-apart structure. The final shape and size of the subsidence zone (scaled up to nature), were strikingly similar to the Managua Graben and Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex.

The experiment D215 illustrates the capacity of a dense and viscous intrusive body to create a pull-apart basin under the effect of strike-slip tectonics. A repeat experiment (Table 3; D221) was made, especially to see if the lateral graben was an artifact. In this experiment the rhomb shape appeared, but instead of producing a pull-apart it created an uplift structure bounded by thrusts (Fig. 8). This experiment indicated that results were not easily reproducible. The main problem appeared to be that very small deviations from pure strike-slip motion were occurring. As indicated above in the experimental procedure the accuracy of the set up is about ±1°. It is clear that very small components of orthogonal movement have a large effect on the system. This phenomenon has also been observed when studying fault controlled destabilization of volcanic edifices (Lagmay et al., 2000; Wooller et al., 2003). When the system was constrained to transtension with more than 1° either side of pure strike-slip, pull-apart were consistently produced. When the system was constrained with more than 1° into transpressional pop-up structures formed only.

The main questions (apart from reproducibility) raised by the repeat experiments were: (1) How could a pull-apart or reverse structure be formed? (2) How could the rhomb-shape be extended by a lateral graben?

5.3. Conditions for pull-apart/reverse structure formation

In the models the pull-apart structures have a classical form, while the uplifts are morphologically similar to the pressure ridges that are found along strike-slip faults (Aydin and Nur, 1982). A possible explanation for their formation is that a small degree of extension could have appeared in the first experiment, while a slight compression appeared in the second. This could be caused by a slight rotation of the basal sheet and the 1–2° error that exists in defining pure strike-slip in the apparatus. As mentioned above, such small initial rotations can cause major structural changes (Lagmay et al., 2000; Wooller et al., 2003).

We also checked if the rhomb-shaped subsidence/uplift effect were not a geometric effect, due to placing the intrusion at the center of the model. The intrusion was offset and the uplift, or pull-apart still occurred above it.

The effect of transpression/transtension was verified by experiments with transtensive and a transpressive motion (Table 3; D227 and D228). Transtension formed a pull-apart subsidence zone, while transpression formed a rhomb-shaped uplift zone bounded by symmetrical thrusts (Fig. 8). Experiments with greater extension (angle of 8°, experiment D305, angle of 12°, experiments D306 and D313) also showed a rhomb-shaped graben above the intrusion. Thus, transtension is necessary to generate a pull apart at the intrusion; otherwise a compressive pop-up structure is produced. It is clear from the experiments with near strike-slip motion that 1° or less of orthogonal component is enough to switch from pull-apart to pop-up structure.

5.4. Conditions of formation of lateral Graben

During the running of the initial experiment (D215), the lateral graben rapidly reached the model corner (Fig. 7), which could indicate a controlling border effect, even if the deformation rate was at the mid range of our permitted scaling. There is a crustal change at the Nicaraguan Depression northeast boundary, between thin ophiolitic crust and continental granitic crust of the Chortís Blocks (Weinberg, 1992; van Wyk de Vries and Borgia, 1996). The model set up therefore may represent this very particular case, applicable to Nicaragua, where the deformation is perturbed by a local boundary effect.

We tested the effect of deformation rate on the lateral graben formation. We observed that a speed change from 5.4 mm/h (D215) to 3.2 mm/h (D227) had no influence on the formation of this structure. However, at even slower rates (experiment D301: 1.6 mm/h) the lateral graben did not form (Fig. 9). Repeat
Fig. 8. Examples of thrusts that formed above the intrusion during some experiments. In many experiments such as D326—the one that provided the most typical results—the first structures observed are thrusts (A, B, displacement: 2.1 cm ≈ 6 km in nature, duration: 13 h ≈ 850 ka) instead of the subsidence observed in D215. Then, the uplift zone becomes symmetrical and rhombic and is joined in its extremities by the major strike-slip faults created by the strike-slip motion (C, D, displacement: 3.6 cm ≈ 10 km in nature, duration: 22.75 h ≈ 1.5 Ma). It describes a pressure ridge (Aydin and Nur, 1982). The uplift zone is depressed at its center and deviates the main strike-slip fault (C, D). But this is still uplift relative to the original elevation of the model. Later, the uplift zone became inactive and waned, cut directly by the main strike-slip faults (E, F, displacement: 6.1 cm ≈ 17.5 km in nature, duration: 38 h ≈ 2.5 Ma). The fault pattern inside the uplift zone was very variable from one experiment to another, without any depression and deviation of the main strike-slip faults (G, H, experiment D221, displacement: 10.5 cm ≈ 30 km in nature, duration: 19.5 h ≈ 1.25 Ma), or with very complex fault patterns probably resulting from folding (I, J, experiment D228, displacement: 3.6 cm ≈ 10 km in nature, duration: 11.25 h ≈ 750 ka). Nevertheless a common point between all the uplift structures formed is their rhombic shape, as it is the case for the experiments forming subsidence basins. Dashed circles represent the location of the intrusion.
experiments were also run at this slow rate with increasing extension component (Table 3; D305, D306 and D313) and no lateral graben formed (Fig. 9). Two experiments with near strike-slip motion were also run at that velocity (D327 and D403): no lateral structure formed, but only an uplift zone with thrusts.

From these results the lateral graben can be interpreted as resulting from an instability that occurs in the model at moderate—high deformation rates under small amounts of transtension. The instability may be caused by either strain build up at the interface between the cohesive brittle sand
layer and the silicone, or a strain rate related stiffening of the silicone. As the rate of motion in all experiments is very slow and the strain rate changes by just a small amount, we suggest that the strain rate build up at the interface may be dominantly responsible. Both processes strain rate related effect and viscous—brittle boundary effects will occur in nature.

Interestingly for this study, the Managua Graben has a pull-apart basin shape extended by a lateral graben and thus the specific formation conditions of the feature in the model may be applicable to Las Sierras-Masaya.

5.5. Role of density

We tested the role of density contrasts using experiments with increased and decreased density contrast between the intrusion and its ductile substratum. Whatever the density contrast, subsidence did not occur, but uplift did (experiments D402, D418, D513 with a silicone substratum 530 kg/m³ less dense than the intrusion, instead of 60 kg/m³ less dense in the other experiments). This observation is in accordance with the results of experiments D219 and D222 with brittle and denser intrusion of 2000 kg/m³ (hence a substratum 450 kg/m³ less dense than the intrusion) that did not produce subsidence and suggests that density could not be a controlling factor in creating subsidence.

5.6. Summary

Experiments show that pull-apart basin formation around large volcanic complexes in context of strike-slip tectonics can be a consequence of the presence of the underlying ductile intrusion. To generate a pull-apart basin in this context, both transtensional strike-slip motion and a ductile intrusion are required. Experiments without tectonic motion do not produce rhomb features, not surprisingly. However, strike-slip motion, even transtension, does not produce pull-aparts with no intrusion. A shield-like volcanic overload has no effect either. A brittle intrusion cannot generate a pull-apart basin above it, even if very dense. The intrusion must be ductile. Last, density contrasts have no detectable influence on the results.

Experiments with small amounts of transtension and a ductile intrusion form pull-apart basins above a circular intrusion (Fig. 7 and Fig. 9). However uplift zones can appear instead in transtension (Fig. 8). An important detail is that the structure is always rhomb-shaped, while the intrusion in our models is always circular.

The rate of strike-slip motion does not control the type of structure that forms, but at the highest reasonable displacement rates (equal to 4.7 mm per year) there are instabilities in the model and boundary effects can appear, generating an asymmetric pull-apart basin extended by a graben, similar to the Managua Graben (Fig. 7).

6. Discussion

6.1. Origin of the Managua Graben

This series of experiments provides numerous results. First, the only way we have found to create a pull-apart basin such as the Managua Graben is to associate a ductile intrusive complex and transtension. Indeed, experiments without intrusion (even in transtension) did not produce pull-apart basins (Table 3). We propose that the underlying magmatic complex is responsible for; (1) the location of pull-apart structure and (2) the opening of the Managua Graben, given that it is placed in the regional strike-slip tectonic motion that characterizes the Nicaraguan Depression. We note that a slight additional extensive motion is required for the pull-apart basins to form in this context. This extension exists in the Nicaraguan depression as a result of Chortís Block rotation (Cruden, 1988; Weinberg, 1992; van Wyk de Vries, 1993).

The Managua Graben does not have the typical rhombic shape of pull-apart basins: it is extended northward by two normal sinistral faults (Cofradías and Punta Huete Faults) that define a graben (Fig. 3) and reach the northeastern edge of the Nicaraguan Depression. They may also continue northward in the Nicaraguan Highlands. Indeed, some extensional structures have been mapped in this area. The Sebaco graben, for instance is located exactly north Managua Graben (van Wyk de Vries, 1993), and the Chortís block is cut by several old north- and northeast-
orientated faults such as Guayape fault (Fig. 1) (Gordon and Muehlberger, 1994). It is possible that two north-striking ancient faults were reactivated during the Pleistocene, while the Managua Graben was opening. In addition, the models show a pre-disposition to form such geometry. So the unusual shape of the Managua Graben is probably the consequence of the interaction between the volcanotectonic pull-apart pre-disposed to asymmetry and possibly inherited faults.

6.2. Generalization: natural pull-aparts and caldera complexes

The experiments were run to specifically model the Nicaraguan situation, but they can be generalized. Many large volcanic complexes and associated intrusions are present along strike-slip fault zones, and we note a close association between pull-apart basins and large volcanic systems with large calderas. For example, Deception Island, Antarctica may be a pull-apart related caldera. (Martí et al., 1996). Amatitlán Caldera, Guatemala, is also a caldera lying along a strike-slip fault, Jalpatagua Fault (Fig. 1). Its eastern and western bounding faults coincide with the Guatemala City Graben, a graben perpendicular to Jalpatagua Fault (Wunderman and Rose, 1984). Numerous striking examples exist along the Great Sumatran Fault Zone, one of the fastest strike-slip zones in the world. Many volcanic complexes lie along the fault, such as Suwoh, Ranau and Toba calderas. They have long been considered as volcanotectonic depressions (van Bemmelen, 1949).

Toba Caldera is thought to have developed first as a pull-apart basin. Then an intrusive-volcanic system developed. Lastly, several ignimbrite caldera-forming eruptions occurred, and caldera collapses finally followed the boundaries of the pull-apart (Detourbet et al., 1993). Suwoh and Ranau Calderas lie in active pull-apart basins as well, (Bellier and Sébrier, 1994). Ranau Caldera has partially collapsed along the pull-apart sides. Suwoh by contrast has not and Bellier and Sébrier (1994) suggest that Suwoh is a system comparable to Ranau or Toba, but that collapse into the intrusion has not yet involved the marginal faults.

The same pull-apart model can be used to explain the polygonal shape of Tondano Caldera, on Sulawesi Island, Indonesia, also located along a strike-slip zone. Evidence of a pre-caldera pull-apart basin has also been found (Lécuyer et al., 1997).

In the Central Volcanic Zone of the Andes (Bolivia/Chile/Argentina), many Tertiary calderas, now active resurgent domes, lie along the sinistral strike-slip Calama-Olacapato-El Toro and Archibarca faults (Matteini et al., 2002). The Aguas Calientes Caldera (Matteini et al., 2002), Cerro Galan Caldera (de Silva and Francis, 1991) and La Pacana Caldera (de Silva and Francis, 1991; Lindsay et al., 2001) also show evidence of subsidence along normal tectonic faults mostly perpendicular to the strike-slip faults. This is particularly marked along the Aguas Calientes Caldera (de Silva and Francis, 1991). These faults could have delimited former pull-apart basins or rhombic grabens similar to the Indonesian systems.

The 630 ka old Yellowstone Caldera, Wyoming, USA might have been emplaced in similar strike-slip conditions: it is elongated (Christiansen, 2001) and lies at the boundary of the extensional Basin and Range Province at South, and the Northern Rocky Mountains at North, where extension is much less developed. This results in a strike-slip tectonic regime (Hooper et al., 2002) for which no clear strike-slip fault is identifiable, similar to the Nicaragua Depression. The caldera is viewed as elliptical by Christiansen (2001) but its boundaries, extensively buried by more recent lava flows are not well constrained and may instead follow regional NNW- and NW-trending normal faults, defining a more rectangular caldera instead.

Interestingly, its underlying intrusive magmatic system does not follow the caldera boundaries but is rather made of two smaller magma intrusions (Miller and Smith, 1999; Husen et al., 2004). Similar observations have been made for Toba (Masturyono et al., 2001). This is in good accordance with our models, in which the faulting pattern formed at the surface does not have the shape of the intrusion.

The presence of pre-existing faults is one possible cause of pull-aparts (Lécuyer et al., 1997), though this has not been tested experimentally. The Managua Graben, as well as Tondano Caldera and Yellowstone Caldera, could be the result of an interaction between both phenomena.

Intrusion related density contrasts do not appear to be controlling factors, as experiments performed with
exaggerated density contrasts did not show more significant subsidence. In addition Amatitlán, Yellowstone, the Indonesian and Andean systems are silicic, which means that the magmatic chambers were not necessarily much denser than the surrounding rocks like at Las Sierras-Masaya.

6.3. Generalization: natural-pop-up structures related to intrusions

The experiments showed that rhomb-shaped uplift zones bounded by thrusts can form above intrusions. Examples of volcanic complexes bounded by thrusts are much less common than ones bounded by pull-apart basins. In general the same is true for pressure ridges relative to pull-apart basins in non-volcanic settings (Aydin and Nur, 1982). Possible examples are the Cerro de Coransoque and Cordon Puntas Negras Tertiary volcanic complexes (Atacama Desert, N Chile/Argentina). These are cut by strike-slip faults (Matteini et al., 2002) and are bordered on one side by thrust zones (van Wyk de Vries et al., 1996).

Magmatic complexes usually do not keep a constant volume as they erupt and originate caldera subsidence, whereas intrusions in the experiments kept a constant volume without erupting. The emptying of magmatic chambers and caldera formation are probably likely to enhance formation of subsidence zones instead of uplift zones.

7. Conclusions

A morpho-structural analysis has showed that the Managua Graben strictly encloses Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex and is a modified rhomb-shape with a northern extension. Its location in a strike-slip zone (the Nicaraguan Depression) allows us to consider it as a pull-apart basin. Our analogue experiments show that in transtension, a ductile intrusion can localize deformation and generate a pull-apart. We suggest that the Managua Graben has developed as a consequence of the weak magmatic intrusion under Las Sierras-Masaya Caldera. More generally, intrusions associated with large volcanic complexes may initiate pull-apart basin formation along strike-slip fault zones. Striking similarity between Las Sierras-Masaya and Suwoh Caldera is observed, and the long-term model of evolution proposed by Bellier and Sébrier (1994) for Suwoh may reasonably be applied to Las Sierras-Masaya. That would correspond to a partial collapse of the Managua Graben (a densely populated area hosting Managua City) if a great eruption did occur. However the basaltic nature of the magma involved at Masaya and the limitation of the active system to the Masaya Caldera could be a limiting factor for such a long-term evolution. Nevertheless, given that there is a probable genetic link between the Managua Graben and Las Sierras-Masaya volcanic complex (Brown et al., 1973; Rymer et al., 1998) a joint monitoring of volcano and graben is appropriate.
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