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Abstract
The use of Right dihedral method, Lisle graph, and Mohr diagram allows the analysis of the paleostress. Fault slip data were measured for eighteen data of two stations located within Chia Gara structure in Dohuk area in the High Folded Zone, Northern Iraq. Depending on Mohr diagram, Bott equation, and vertical thickness, the magnitudes of the paleostress at the time of the tectonic activity were determined. Firstly, Georient Software was used to estimate the orientation of the paleostresses (σ1, σ2, and σ3). Secondly, using the rupture – friction law, taking into account the depth of the overburden, the vertical stress (σv) was calculated to determine the magnitude of the paleostresses in the study area. The values in station one (hinge area, eight data) were σ1=7100, σ2=4121.5, and σ3=1143 bars, whereas the values in station two (the north limb of structure, ten data) were σ1=3740, σ2=1585, and σ3=570 bars. The high magnitudes of the principal stress axes may refer to the active tectonic events which led to the deformation of the area during the Mesozoic Era and the Tertiary period. The study area shows the existence of two types of the faults, the first type is the reactivated faults, the poles of which lie between the sliding line and Mohr envelope. The second type is the inactive faults, with poles lying on the great circle of Mohr diagram.
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保守的应力分析在奇亚加拉结构中
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摘要
使用右二面体方法，利斯尔图和摩尔图允许分析保守应力。根据摩尔图、博特方程和垂直厚度，确定了构造活动时的保守应力的大小。首先，Georient软件用于估计保守应力的方向（σ1, σ2, 和 σ3）。其次，使用破裂-摩擦定律，考虑到上覆的深度，计算了垂直应力（σv）来确定研究区的保守应力。第一站（褶皱中心，八个数据）的值为 σ1=7100, σ2=4121.5, σ3=1143 巴，第二站（结构北缘，十个数据）的值为 σ1=3740, σ2=1585, σ3=570 巴。主应力轴的高值可能表明了活跃的构造事件，这些事件导致了该区域的变形，这些事件发生在中生代和第三纪时期。研究区显示存在两种类型的断层，第一种是重新活化的断层，极向位于滑动线和摩尔内衬之间。第二种是不活动的断层，极向位于摩尔图的大圆上。

关键词：保守应力，摩尔图，右二面体方法，高褶皱区，伊拉克。

التحليل الاحتكاك القديم لتركيب جياكارا في منطقة دهوك شمال العراق
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الخلاصة
استخدمت طرق التعامد الثنائي، مخطط ليل وخطط مردوع لتحديد الاحتكاك القديم. حددت ضمن تركيب جياكارا في منطقة دهوك في نطاق الطيات العالية شمال العراق. حددت قيم الاحتكاك القديمة بواسطة مصادر طاقة موجهة مع دعم الاحتكاك والعمودي، اولاً، استخدم برنامج جيهاورينت لتحديد اتجاه الاحتكاك القديم (σ1 و σ2 و σ3). ثانياً، حددت قيم الاحتكاك القديمة في المحطات الأولى في منطقة مفصل التركيب بالاعتماد على قانون الاحتكاك. معدل الاحتكاك والاحتكاك العمودي، والتي كانت قيمة الاحتكاك الرئيسي الأعظم (σ1) هي (7100) بار، كانت قيمة الاحتكاك الرئيسي المتوسط (σ2) هي (4121.5) بار، وكانت قيمة الاحتكاك الرئيسي الأصغر (σ3) هي (1143) بار. أما في المحطة الثانية التي تقع في الجناح الشمالي-ператор، كانت قيمة الاحتكاك الرئيسي الأعظم (σ1) هي (3740) بار، كانت قيمة الاحتكاك الرئيسي المتوسط (σ2) هي (1585) بار، وكانت قيمة الاحتكاك الرئيسي الأصغر (σ3) هي (1152) بار.
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Introduction

Chia Gara Structure lies in Dohuk area of Northern Iraq. It runs approximately along the E-W direction forming a doubly plunging anticline located within the High Folded Zone of Iraq and extending parallel to the Taurus Belt in the south part of Turkey. The length of the structure is about 80 Km with a width of about 12 Km. It is located between latitudes (36° 56΄ - 37° 03΄ North) and longitudes (43° 02΄ - 43° 56΄ East) (Figure-1). There are several structural studies which were carried out on the High Folded Zone and Foothill Zone of Iraq and dealt with the orientation and magnitude of the paleostresses [1-6]. Generally, the state of paleostress in the rocks is anisotropic and is defined by stress ellipsoid axes, which characterizes the magnitudes of the principal stresses [7,8]. Most researches concerning fault slip data aimed to determine the principal stresses direction.

This study aims to determine the orientation and magnitudes of the paleostress, calculate the stress ratio (R) depending on Bott law, and understand the dynamics of the study area.

Figure 1- Satellite image showing the study area [9]
Geological Setting

Tectonically, the study area belongs to the unstable shelf represented by the High Folded Zone [10,11]. The exposed formations range in age from the Late Triassic (Kurma Chine Formation) to the Late Miocene (Injana Formation). A brief description of these formations from the oldest to the youngest is provided in the following section [12]:

**Kurma Chine Formation:** The age of the formation is Late Triassic. It consists of black limestone beds, thick dolomite beds and thin beds of shale. The thickness of the formation ranges between 118-834 m.

**Baluti Formation:** The age of the formation is Early Jurassic. It consists of grey shale, oolitic limestone and dolomite beds. The thickness of the formation is 60-67 m.

**Sarki Formation:** The age of the formation is Early- Middle Jurassic. It consists of dolomite limestone beds, shale and marls. The thickness of the formation is 50-60 m.

**Sehkanian Formation:** The age of the formation is Middle Jurassic. It comprises black bituminous dolomite beds and organic limestone. The thickness of the formation is 40-62 m.

**Naokelakan Formation:** The age of the formation is Late Jurassic. It consists of bituminous limestone and thin bedded fossiliferous dolomitic limestone. The thickness of the formation is 20 m.

**Barsarin Formation:** The age of the formation is Late Jurassic. It comprises limestone and dolomitic limestone. The thickness of the formation is 20 m.

**Chia Gara Formation:** The age of the formation is Late Jurassic. It comprises thinly bedded limestone, marly limestone beds, and shale. The thickness of the formation is 25 m.

**Garagu Formation:** The age of the formation is Late Jurassic – Early Cretaceous. It consists of oolitic sandy limestone. The thickness of the formation is 20-92 m.

**Sarmord Formation:** The age of the formation is Early Cretaceous. It comprises brown marls and beds of clayey limestone. The thickness of the formation is 20 m.

**Qamchuqa Formation:** The age of the formation is Early Cretaceous. It consists of dark grey, hard and bedded to massive limestone and dolomite. The thickness of the formation is 250-362 m.

**Akra- Bekhme Formation:** The age of the formation is Late Cretaceous. It consists of bituminous secondary dolomite and limestone. The thickness of the formation is 300-400 m.

**Shiranish Formation:** The age of the formation is Late Cretaceous. It comprises thinly bedded marly limestone. Limestone of this formation is hard jointed and fractured. The thickness of the formation is 202 m.

**Kolosh Formation:** The age of the formation is Paleocene- Early Eocene. It consists of fine clastic, which are sandstone, siltstone and claystone. The thickness of the formation is 100-400 m.

**Gercus Formation:** The age of the formation is Middle Eocene. It consists of red claystone and siltstone along with few sandstone and conglomerate. The thickness of the formation is 320-546 m.

**Pila Spi Formation:** The age of the formation is Middle- Late Eocene. It comprises claystone and marls with alternation of thick limestone. The thickness of the formation is 318-565 m.

**Fat'ha Formation:** The age of the formation is Middle Miocene. It consists of claystone and marls with alternation of thick limestone. The thickness of the formation is 219-497 m.

**Injana Formation:** The age of the formation is Late Miocene. It comprises thin bedded sandstone, siltstone, marls, and reddish brown and brownish grey claystone. The thickness of the formation is 400-900 m.

Methodology

1: Faults Orientation Analysis Using Right Dihedral Method

Many authors [2,3,4,5,13,14] used the fault slip data to calculate orientations of the paleostress field.

Right dihedral method was used to determine an orientation of principal stresses axes (σ1, σ2 and σ3) of the study area. The maximum principal stress (σ1) and the intermediate principal stress (σ2) were horizontal, whereas the minimum principal stress (σ3) was sub vertical. The dips of these faults were to the north and south directions in both stations of the study area (Plates 1 and 2, Figures- 2 and 3). The determination of the principal stress axis orientations were performed as previously described [15].
Plate 1- Thrust Fault in Pila Spi Formation in the north limb of Chia Gara Structure in the study area.

Plate 2- Striation on the fault plane in the hinge area of Chia Gara Structure in the study area.

Figure 2- Right dihedral method showing the distribution orientation of the principal stress axes in station one of the study areas.
2: Determination of the Paleostress Magnitudes Using Mohr Diagram

The value of the vertical stress (σv) can be determined by estimating the lithostatic load and one of the principal stress axes. At the time of the tectonic event, the depth can be determined as well as the average density of the overlying rocks. Additional information on the value of one principal stress can be obtained using the following equation:

\[ σv = ρgz \]

where \( ρ \) is the average density of the rocks (kg/m³), \( g \) is the acceleration of gravity (m/s²), and \( z \) is the depth (m).

Lisle graph and Mohr diagram were used to represent the state of stress (Figure – 4). Mohr Plotter Software was used to determine paleostress magnitudes. The angles (α, β, γ) were measured between the pole to the slip plane (N) and the orientation of the principal stress axes (σ1, σ2, and σ3, respectively) of each fault. To determine the stress ratio (R) value of all faults, Bott law was applied [19].

\[ R = \tan θ \frac{Im}{n - n^3} \]

where \( R \) is the ratio of the principal stress, \( θ \) is the pitch angle, and \( I, m, \) and \( n \) are the cosine values of the angles α, β, and γ, respectively, as shown in Tables -1 and 2.

Figure 3 - Right dihedral method showing the distribution orientation of the principal stress axes in station two of the study area.

Figure 4- Lisle graph of the stress states representation [20].
The magnitude of the stress ratios (R) for faults in station one of the study area.

| NO. | Fault plane D.D/D.A | Pitch (ο) | tan (ο) | (α) | (β) | (γ) | R= tanolm – F n / n³ |
|-----|---------------------|-----------|---------|-----|-----|-----|----------------------|
| 1   | 356/70°             | 70° NW    | 2.74°   | 58° | 59° | 63° | 1.7                  |
| 2   | 350/64°             | 66° NW    | 2.24°   | 59° | 62° | 59° | 1.1                  |
| 3   | 352/60°             | 80° NW    | 5.67°   | 32° | 84° | 64° | 2.5                  |
| 4   | 353/58°             | 75° NW    | 3.73°   | 33° | 83° | 64° | 1.4                  |
| 5   | 178/58°             | 78° SE    | 4.70°   | 55° | 89° | 36° | 0.3                  |
| 6   | 175/60°             | 80° SE    | 5.67°   | 69° | 71° | 41° | 0.6                  |
| 7   | 179/52°             | 69° SE    | 2.60°   | 45° | 80° | 55° | 0.2                  |
| 8   | 177/54°             | 72° SE    | 3.07°   | 50° | 70° | 60° | 0.2                  |

The magnitude of the stress ratios (R) for faults in station two of the study area.

| NO. | Fault plane D.D/D.A | Pitch (ο) | tan (ο) | (α) | (β) | (γ) | R= tanolm – F n / n³ |
|-----|---------------------|-----------|---------|-----|-----|-----|----------------------|
| 1   | 054/70°             | 70° NW    | 2.74°   | 79° | 82° | 19° | 0.36                 |
| 2   | 240/62°             | 65° SE    | 2.14°   | 66° | 58° | 56° | 0.92                 |
| 3   | 224/58°             | 70° SE    | 2.74°   | 71° | 60° | 49° | 0.84                 |
| 4   | 064/60°             | 54° NW    | 1.37°   | 87° | 71° | 22° | 0.12                 |
| 5   | 012/38°             | 75° SE    | 3.73°   | 85° | 62° | 33° | 0.48                 |
| 6   | 048/40°             | 60° NW    | 1.73°   | 82° | 84° | 14° | 0.01                 |
| 7   | 068/50°             | 70° NW    | 2.74°   | 80° | 87° | 13° | 0.16                 |
| 8   | 216/65°             | 80° NW    | 5.67°   | 67° | 85° | 28° | 0.2                  |
| 9   | 038/78°             | 70° SE    | 2.74°   | 79° | 79° | 22° | 0.41                 |
| 10  | 030/86°             | 80° SE    | 5.67°   | 83° | 82° | 11° | 1.7                  |

Results

Several authors studied cohesion strength of the sedimentary rocks and they showed that the range of the cohesion strength values range between zero (0) bars, indicating no stick between the two blocks of faults, and 100 bars [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [13], [14], [21], [22], [23] and [24]. Several authors used an internal friction angle (φ) for the rocks of 45° [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [13] and [14]. Two friction sliding line angles of thrust faults were measured experimentally by the author for fault surfaces. These measurements showed that the average of the minimum friction sliding line angle is 25° for the smooth fault surfaces, as limestone rocks, while the average of the maximum friction sliding line angle is 35° for the rough fault surfaces, as sandstone rocks.

Thrust faults measurements were obtained from the hinge area to the north limb of Chia Gara Structure of the study area. The depth of the rocks was measured at the field and it was equal 5072 m. The acceleration of gravity (g) was equal to 9.8 m/s², whereas the average density of the sedimentary rock was estimated to be 2300 kg/m³. Therefore, the stress can be estimated as vertical (σ v = σ 3). Mohr diagram was drawn depending on the stress ratio (R) magnitude (R=1 in station one and R=0.5 in station two), while the points (poles of the faults) were plotted depending on the angles (α, β, γ) on these circles. The plot points in Mohr diagram should be found above the sliding line and beneath the failure envelope. The result obtained by the application of this method is summarized in Figures- 5 and 6 and Table -3.
Figure 5- Mohr diagram to calculate the magnitudes of the principal stresses in station one of the study area. (a) The friction sliding line 35°. (b) The friction sliding line 25°.

Figure 6- Mohr diagram to calculate the magnitudes of the principal stresses in station two of the study area. (a) The friction sliding line 35°. (b) The friction sliding line 25°.

Table 3- The magnitudes of the principal stress (σ1, σ2 and σ3) of the study area.

| No of Station | σ1 bar | σ2 bar | σ3 = σv bar | Depth (m) | Density Kg/m³ | Hydrostatic Pressure bar = \( \frac{σ1 + σ2 + σ3}{3} \) | Cohesion Strength= \( \frac{σ1 - σ3}{2} \) bar | d2 bar = \( \frac{σ1 - σ2}{σ2 - σ3} \) | d1 bar = \( \frac{σ2 - σ1}{σ2 - σ3} \) |
|---------------|--------|--------|-------------|----------|---------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1             | 7100   | 4121.5 | 1143        | 5072     | 2300          | 4121.5                          | 5957                            | 2978.5         | 2978.5         |
| 2             | 3740   | 1585   | 570         | 2530     | 2300          | 1965                            | 3170                            | 2155           | 1015           |

Thrust faulting in Chia Gara structure involved a compression regime \( (σ1) \) which was almost horizontal, sub vertical extensional axes \( (σ3) \), and an intermediate axis \( (σ2) \) which was horizontal (Figure -7).
Discussion

The rocks of the Mesozoic -Cenozoic Eras (Kurra Chine Formation–Injana Formation) were studied to determine the magnitudes and orientations of the paleostresses based on field data, Right dihedral method, Mohr diagram, Bott Law and Lisle graph. Mohr diagram showed that the poles of the thrust faults lie between the sliding lines and the failure envelope. Mohr diagram reflects the relationship between the shear stress and the effective normal on the fault planes, with a proportional relationship between the reactivation on the faults and shear stress. The resulted diagram showed high magnitudes of normal stresses. The study results showed that the orientations of stress axes and their magnitudes are sufficient for the reactivated faults. Magnitudes of the stress were not constant and the stress ellipsoid was different. This difference may refer to the difference of the stress fields, the depth variation, and the stress magnitudes which have changed over the time. The high magnitudes of the normal stresses may refer to the active tectonic event which led to the deformation of the area during the Mesozoic Era and the Tertiary period.

Conclusions

The study area was affected by a compression stress regime during the Alpine Orogeny compression. Mohr diagrams showed two sets of poles of the thrust faults; the first set is reactivated faults, which lie between the sliding line and the failure envelope, while the second set is inactive faults with poles distributed along the boundaries of Mohr Circles. Generally, the poles of faults indicate low shear stress and high normal stress, indicating no slip under these conditions. The shear stress was sufficient to produce the slip along the fault surfaces, otherwise it cannot be attributed to another mechanism. If the \( \sigma_1 \) is not perpendicular to the fault surface and the value of \( \sigma_3 \) is higher than the frictional slide, then the slip will happen. The value of shear stress for the slip will increase with increasing the normal stress, as indicated from the correlation between Figures- 5 and 6. Distribution of the stress ratio magnitudes on Lisle graph showed stress ratio mean values (\( R=1 \) in station one and \( R= 0.5 \) in station two) which indicated that the states of the stress were plane.
deviatoric and flattening, respectively, or, in other words, an axial compression of stress ($\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \sigma_3$).
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