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Abstract

Submarine canyons with heads located close to shorelines, known as shore-connected canyons, provide a focussed pathway for basinward sediment transport. Placing greater constraints on the key parameters that control the formation of shore-connected canyons can help us predict the efficiency of sediment export to deep-water under different environmental conditions and through time. Using a numerical model incorporating geomorphic principles, we show that shore-connected canyons are most active when fluvial discharge is high, the continental shelf is steep and narrow, and the magnitude of relative sea-level change is high. The numerical model reproduces observed bathymetric distributions of shore-connected submarine canyons, indicating that the empirical relationships underlying these numerical models are accurate descriptions of shore-connected canyon formation in nature. Our study provides constraints on the key quantifiable parameters controlling shore-connected submarine canyon formation and maintenance, such as fluvial discharge and basin physiography, allowing for more accurate predictions of the efficiency and timing of sediment transfer to the deep sea under different conditions. The model results suggest that; 1) submarine canyons may form frequently on the slope due to submarine processes, but subaerial processes control which submarine canyons are most likely to connect to the shoreline, 2) margin physiography and sediment supply are more influential in driving submarine canyon incision across the shelf and sediment transfer than the exact nature of the gravity flow
triggering mechanism, and 3) the stratigraphic records of shore-connected submarine canyons and fans are more influenced by onshore climate and tectonics than eustasy.

1. Introduction

Submarine canyons are erosional conduits found globally on continental margins, and act as focal points for the transfer of terrigenous sediment from shallow to deep water (Fig. 1A) (e.g. Buchanan, 1887; Daly, 1936; Shepard, 1981; Harris and Whiteway, 2011; Puig et al., 2014; Fisher et al., 2021). Submarine canyons evolve through a combination of: 1) erosion by submarine gravity flows, often initiated by hyperpycnal flows from river mouths or failure of accumulated sediment near the canyon head, 2) erosion by rivers during subaerial exposure of the shelf, and 3) retrogressive erosion by canyon-wall failure (e.g. Farre, 1983; Pratson et al., 1994; Pratson and Coakley, 1996; Mountjoy et al., 2009; Allin et al., 2018). Therefore, many submarine canyons are incised across the continental shelf and connect directly to rivers and shorelines (Fig. 1A) (e.g. Khripounoff et al., 2009; Harris and Whiteway, 2011; Huang et al., 2014; Maier et al., 2018).

The distance between the canyon head and the shoreline plays a critical role in determining the calibre of sediment transported through the canyon, with analysis of Quaternary canyons revealing that the canyon head must come within 5 km of the shoreline in order to transfer sand-grade sediment to deeper water (Sweet and Blum, 2018). The prevalence of shore-connected canyons along continental margins is therefore a fundamental control on the transport efficacy of terrigenous sediment, organic matter, and pollutants, to submarine environments. Shore-connected canyons can form tsunami hazards for coastal communities via failure of the canyon walls (Casalbore et al., 2018), therefore, better constraints on the processes controlling canyon connection to the shoreline have implications for societal and infrastructure resilience.
Three key factors have been suggested to increase the prevalence of shore-connected canyons; 1) narrow shelves, 2) high supply of coarse-grained sediment, and 3) high magnitude relative sea-level change (Harris and Whiteway, 2011; Sweet and Blum, 2018; Smith et al., 2017; 2018). This is supported by analysis of present-day canyons, with canyons formed on narrow shelves, steep shelves, and subject to high subaerial discharge from relatively unerodible bedrock hinterlands more likely to remain connected to the shoreline (Bernhardt and Schwanghart, 2021), which is also reflected in the prevalence of river-associated canyons on active margins characterised by these factors (Fig. 1B) (Harris and Whiteway, 2011). The observed correlation between slope, discharge and submarine canyon erosion implies that submarine canyon formation may be described through heuristic geomorphic principles commonly applied to rivers, such as the stream power law (e.g. Whipple and Tucker, 1999; Braun and Willet, 2013). The stream power law describes
vertical incision of river channels into bedrock as a function of channel slope and discharge, and has been used extensively in numerical modelling of landscape and stratigraphic evolution (e.g. Ding et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020). Modifications of the stream-power law for the purpose of modelling submarine canyon erosion has been applied previously by Petit et al. (2015), who reconstructed canyon evolution in the NW Mediterranean, and by Thran et al. (2020), who showed how carbonate mounds control submarine erosion and canyonisation in the Great Barrier Reef.

In order to assess whether these geomorphic principles can replicate the observed distributions of shore-connected submarine canyons, we aim to generalise these more targeted case-studies within a synthetic continental margin. If replicable, then these principles may be more confidently applied to 1) model periods of geological time where canyon distribution cannot be directly measured, thus providing insights into the efficacy of sediment transport to deeper-water during past and future tectonic and climatic conditions, and 2) predict the rate at which present-day canyons may incise across the shelf, thus increasing the accuracy of coastal hazard forecasting and anthropogenic pollutant transport to the deep ocean.

2. Model

2.1 Description

This study utilises the open-source pyBadlands modelling package (Salles et al., 2018), which allows simulation of both subaerial and submarine erosional and depositional processes. Subaerial fluvial erosion ($\dot{e}$) is described by a detachment-limited stream power law (e.g. Braun and Willett, 2013):

$$\dot{e} = -k_d A^m S^n$$

where $k_d$ is a dimensional coefficient describing erodibility of the channel bed, $A$ is drainage area (a proxy for discharge and function of precipitation), $S$ is local slope, and $m$ and $n$ are dimensionless positive constants (Salles et al., 2018).
Submarine erosion corresponds to a hyperpycnal submarine extension of the subaerial fluvial network, with $A$ restricted to the subaerial drainage extent, and $S$ modified to $S_{\text{eff}}$ (Petit et al., 2015; Thran et al., 2020):

$$S_{\text{eff}} = S \frac{\rho_s - \rho_w}{\rho_s}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $\rho_s$ is the sediment density and $\rho_w$ is the water density. Submarine erosion and entrainment by turbidity currents is initiated when the sediment-water mixture within the hyperpycnal flow network reaches a pre-defined critical density (1000.04 kg/m$^3$). The critical density is required to be low as the model is unable to episodically trigger turbidity currents, therefore erosion by turbidity currents is modeled over longer timescales (Thran et al., 2020). Deposition ($d_{\text{prop}}$) from turbidity currents occurs as a function of the local slope and a dimensionless scaling parameter ($\alpha$) (Lowe, 1976):

$$d_{\text{prop}} = \frac{0.9}{1+ e^{-(S-0.005)^2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

This numerical description of turbidity current erosion and deposition has been used successfully to recreate the geomorphic evolution of canyons on the Great Barrier Reef slope, Australia (Thran et al. 2020). Creep and slope failure are accounted for in the model by a linear diffusion law (e.g. Sweeney et al., 2015):

$$\frac{dz}{dt} = k_{hl} \nabla^2 z$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where $z$ is topographic elevation and $k_{hl}$, a diffusion coefficient with different values for subaerial (Martin and Church, 1997) and submarine (Fagherazzi et al., 2004) environments (Supplementary Table 1). Instantaneous slope failure is accounted for by increasing $k_{hl}$ when a pre-defined critical slope threshold is reached ($> 10^\circ$). Compaction is accounted for by a negative exponential function (Athy et al., 1930), assuming a surface porosity of 42% (Beard and Weyl, 1973).

Wave-induced longshore drift is modelled according to linear wave theory (see Salles et al. 2018 for full numerical description), with the wave-field in these experiments orientated oblique to the coast (coming from the SE). Waves
entrain and transport sediment parallel to their breaking point once a critical shear stress at the seabed has been reached.

Once the critical shear stress drops below the threshold, or the seabed depth drops below the maximum wave base (set at 20 m), deposition occurs (Thran et al. 2020).

2.3 Configuration

The initial model configuration represents a generic continental margin (e.g. Harris et al., 2014) (Supplementary Fig. 1), with a source area supplying sediment to a 0.01° dipping fluvial transfer zone that terminates at sea-level (Fig. 2A). In order to test the influence of sediment supply on canyon formation, the source area was split into two segments, with the lower (southern) segment (0 – 150 km) having an initial slope angle of 0.1° and uplifting at 500 m/yr, representing a higher-supply source, and the upper (northern) segment (150 – 300 km) having an initial slope angle of 0.05° and not uplifting, representing a lower-supply source. Erosion was not measured within a transition zone between the two segments (125 – 175 km) in order to fully isolate the impact of sediment supply on canyon distribution. Below sea-level, the model comprises a shelf and a slope separated by a well-defined gradient change, with the slope logarithmically decreasing from ~4° at the shelf-break to horizontal on the basin floor (Fig. 2A). Each component of the subaerial and submarine margin is 300 km in length (Y-direction, or depositional strike), with the source area, and transfer zone held
at constant planform width of 50 km (X-direction, or depositional dip). In order to maintain a 300 x 300 km grid, the slope width varies from 150 to 200 km as the shelf width is varied (Fig. 2A).

Three groups of models were designed based on this initial configuration, with two of these groups varying a different shelf property six times (Fig. 2B). The first group tested the effect of shelf width on canyon connection (0 – 50 km in 10 km increments), and the second group tested the effect of shelf angle on canyon connection (0.01 – 0.5° in 0.1° increments) (Fig. 2B). Sea-level is varied through a sinusoidal sea-level curve, which drops to minimum of -60 m and repeats for five 100 (eccentricity) kyr cycles. The third group of models varied the magnitude of sea-level change from no sea-level change, to -15 m, -30 m, -60 m, -120 m and -240 m change, with the lower-magnitude changes (0 to -30 m) approximating greenhouse eustasy, and the higher-magnitude changes (-60 to -120 m) approximating icehouse eustasy (Miller et al. 2020), and relative sea-level change caused by tectonics (-240 m). Shelf angle and sea-level were
varied for a 30 km wide shelf and 0.1° dipping shelf, and each group of models ran for a period of 500 kyr, approximating five 100 kyr (eccentricity) cycles, at a time-step of 10 kyr. Reconstructed sea-level curves, such as those from the Quaternary, were not used in order to more fully control and isolate the influence of sea-level change.

Results are presented as: 1) maps of positive (deposition) and negative (erosion) elevation at model end, and 2) shore erosion through time in both the high supply and low supply segments of the margin (Fig. 3, 4, 5). The shore is defined as the median sea-level position plus a horizontal distance of 5 km, assuming that canyons that do not intersect this zone are much less able to transport sand-grade sediment down-slope (Sweet and Blum, 2018). In order to calculate the percentage of time canyons are connected to the shore (Fig. 6), canyon connection is inferred to occur when erosion in this zone meets a cut-off of 0.05 km$^3$/yr (Fig. 3, 4, 5).

2.3 Limitations

These models assume that the dominant force driving shore-connected canyon formation is erosion by hyperpycnal flows. Other factors known to control canyon formation, such as erosion beneath remobilised sediments (e.g. Puig et al. 2014), are not captured. This is less important for river-connected canyons, because any slope failures that occur from sediment accumulated at river mouths are likely to flow in the same general direction as the river that fed them, but later. This limitation may affect the incision of canyons connected by littoral currents instead of rivers directly, however, because the accumulated sediment could have been transported significant distances from the river mouth. Similarly, these models do not capture erosion beneath gravity flows derived from canyon-wall failure (e.g. Micallef et al. 2012), or erosion beneath more regional and unconfined gravity flows, such as dense shelf water (Puig et al. 2008, Canals et al., 2006). These factors will all act to increase the number of canyons present on the slope and increase the rate of canyon head propagation across the shelf, therefore the model outputs are likely more representative of erosive trends as opposed to absolute erosion rates.
3. Results

In all models, uplift of the source area results in subaerial erosion and marine deposition (Fig. 3, 4, 5). Once sediment reaches the marine environment it is either: 1) deposited and stored on the shelf, 2) deposited on the shelf and remobilised along- or down-slope by mass-movements or wave currents, or 3) bypassed across the shelf entirely and deposited beyond the shelf-break by turbidity currents. Deposition below the shelf-break is concentrated where slope angle drops below ~0.5° (Fig. 3, 4, 5). Submarine erosion occurs in all the models to varying degrees, with increased submarine erosion always correlated with increased deposition in submarine fans on the lower slope and basin floor, and decreased deposition in deltas on the shelf, i.e., sediment bypass to deeper water is positively correlated with submarine canyon erosion. Deposition in submarine canyons occurs due to submarine fan aggradation at the canyon-mouth. This aggradation increases the relief of the fan, which eventually results in back-filling of the submarine canyon as turbidity currents are progressively forced to deposit against the upstream facing slope of older deposits. Avulsion is inhibited by the canyon confinement, so back-filling tends to occur quickly once the canyon-mouth is choked.

When the shelf width is varied, slope canyon prevalence and shore erosion increase with decreasing shelf width. Coastal erosion is greatest on the high supply side of the model and during the fastest rate of sea-level fall in all cases. When no shelf is present, shore erosion continues to increase as sediment supply increases, resulting in canyons remaining connected to shoreline irrespective of the sea-level change. With the addition of a shelf, shore erosion drops to almost zero during highstand, but the drop occurs from a higher erosion rate when the shelf is narrower. Canyon connection therefore only occurs during lowstands, and at increasingly short durations of the lowstand as the shelf width increases.

When shelf angle is varied, canyons generally become more numerous and incise deeper into the slope as the shelf steepens. An exception to this trend occurs when the shelf is almost horizontal, and numerous canyons form on the slope. These canyons do not extend far down the slope, however. Shore erosion shows a more complicated pattern,
with erosion being greatest when the shelf is shallowest and when the shelf is steepest, and little erosion occurs between these end-member points. Shore erosion is therefore somewhat decoupled from slope canyon prevalence, i.e., when the shelf is steep, coastal erosion is more similar to the models with wide shelves, even though slope canyons are much more prevalent when the shelf is steep. Shore erosion and canyon prevalence is again reduced on the low-supply side of the model, although the trend of erosion through time is similar. Interestingly, shore erosion reaches a maximum when sea-levels are highest as the shelf angle increases.

When the magnitude and rate of sea-level change is varied, both slope canyon prevalence and shore erosion increases with increasing sea-level change, with the fastest rates of shore erosion associated with the fastest rates of sea-level fall. No shore erosion occurs with low-magnitudes of sea-level change (0 to -30 m), and the maximum coastal erosion recorded across the models occurs when the sea-level change is greatest (-240 m). A sea-level fall of 120 m produces similar erosional patterns as a 60 m sea-level fall on a narrow shelf. The evolution of shore erosion follows a similar pattern to that described previously; reaching a maximum when the rate of sea-level fall is fastest before rapidly decreasing to almost no erosion as the sea-level rises. This is the same on both low and high supply sides of the model, however canyon prevalence is reduced on the low-supply side, as seen in the other models.

4. Discussion

Controls on shore-connected canyon formation

These results show that shore-connected submarine canyons are most likely to form when; 1) shelves are narrow, 2) shelves are steep, 3) sediment supply is high, and 4) the magnitude of sea-level change is high. This is in agreement with observations from the Quaternary shore-connected canyons (Sweet and Blum, 2018; Bernhardt and Schwanghart, 2021), indicating that the physical principles underlying these models reflect shore-connected canyon evolution in the natural world. Since gravity flow triggering mechanisms are simplified in these models, this indicates that sediment supply and basin physiography are more important controls on submarine connection to the shoreline than the exact
triggering mechanism, e.g., hyperpycnal flows or delta-front failure, over millennial timescales. In other words, the frequency of gravity flow generation and the slope over which these flows travel are the dominant controls on submarine canyon incision, and both of these are best predicted by sediment supply and basin physiography. This also implies that while submarine canyons may form frequently on the slope through submarine processes, the conditions required for certain canyons to incise across the shelf are dictated by onshore processes.

Narrow shelves increase shore-connected canyon prevalence by increasing the likelihood of gravity flows bypassing the shelf and reaching the higher gradient slope before they dissipate by deposition and dilution, forming mouth bars (e.g. Melstrom and Birgenheier, 2021), highstand shelf fans (Steel et al., 2006), or more current-modified depositional bodies, such as spits (e.g. Nienhuis et al., 2016) (Fig. 7). Similarly, steep shelves increase the prevalence of submarine canyons by increasing the erosive potential of gravity flows. This is mediated by the increased accommodation associated with higher shelf angles, however, which allows for sediment to accumulate between adjacent rivers and between rivers and the shelf-break, thus shallowing the shelf gradient (Fig. 7).

High magnitude sea-level falls influence coastal erosion by increasing the duration of fluvial erosion on the shelf, forming incised valleys that are later exploited by submarine flows, forming deeper submarine canyons in a feedback loop (Fig. 7). Sea-level fall also increases shore-connected canyon prevalence by perching river mouths on the steep continental slope during lowstand, thus increasing the erosive potential of the hyperpycnal flows they produce (Fig. 7), and the erosive potential of flows derived from failure of accumulated sediment. If the shelf is wide these canyons are then mostly abandoned when the sea-level rises (Fig. 6).

All of these canyon-forming processes are enhanced when discharge is high enough to generate frequent hyperpycnal flows (e.g. Petit et al. 2015) or rapidly aggrade sediment to the point of failure and gravity flow generation. This is supported by observations from modern systems, which indicate that high discharge and supply of coarse-grained,
unerodible sediment predict shore-connected canyon formation (Smith et al. 2017; 2018; Bernhardt and Schwanghart, 2021).
Wider implications

These findings have implications for predicting the prevalence of shore-connected canyons through time, with submarine canyon incision fundamentally linked to the climate and physiography of the subaerial basin, the physiography of the shelf, and sea-level magnitude, all of which are approximately related through:

\[ W_s \sim \frac{\Delta SL}{S} \]  (5)

Where \( W_s \) is the width of the shelf, \( \Delta SL \) is the magnitude of sea-level change, \( S \) is the onshore river gradient (Sweet and Blum, 2018). Shelf margin positions are typically set by low sea-levels (Blum et al. 2013; Sweet and Blum, 2018). Therefore, on passive margins, low gradient rivers tend to produce wide shelves as rivers have to travel a further distance to reach the shelf margin. Conversely, high-gradient rivers typically produce narrow shelves, as rivers have to travel less distance to reach the shelf margin (Sweet and Blum, 2018). During periods of high-magnitude sea-level change, when shore-connected submarine canyons are expected to be prevalent, shelves tend to be wider, which reduces the likelihood of shore-connected canyons. This circular relationship forms a natural buffer on the prevalence of shore-connected submarine canyons, and therefore the efficiency of sediment transfer to deep-water. Any submarine canyons
that do form are only connected to the shoreline when sea-levels are low, resulting in punctuated coarse-grained supply to deep-water observed on many passive continental margins (Blum et al. 2013), and areally-restricted deposition due to reduced deltaic avulsion on incised shelves (Harris et al. 2020).

This circular relationship falls apart on active margins, where shelf widths are reduced by tectonically-elevated onshore river gradients. On these margins submarine canyon incision will be magnified by the combined influence of high sediment supplies, narrow shelves and high-magnitude sea-level changes, resulting in consistent connection of submarine canyons to the shoreline, and the efficient transfer of terrigenous sediment to deeper-waters. Stratigraphically, this would result in sustained delivery of coarse-grained sediment to submarine fans, with eustasy relatively uncoupled from their stratigraphic evolution. Sediment supply variation, driven by onshore climate or tectonics, would instead be the dominant allogenic processes driving periods of coarse- and fine-grained deposition in these fans. This has been observed in the shore-connected Congo canyon system, which formed during western African uplift in the Pliocene and has been maintained by gravity flows derived from the Congo River (Ferry et al. 2004), with deposition in Congo submarine fan principally controlled by onshore climate, irrespective of eustasy (Picot et al. 2019). The Congo example also indicates that shore-connected canyons can be maintained well after the environmental conditions that led to their inception, as long as the location of the fluvial system feeding the canyon is maintained.

In the case where sediment supplies are consistently high, such as during sustained hinterland uplift, slope erosion and submarine fan deposition will also be high (Fig. 3, 4, 5). This study suggests that this will result in rapid back-filling of the submarine canyon, as increasing submarine fan relief on the basin floor and increased erosional confinement on the slope prevent avulsion. Submarine canyons consistently connected to shorelines may therefore aggrade more quickly than canyons periodically disconnected from shorelines.
During greenhouse periods of earth history, characterised by lower-magnitude sea-level changes, shelf widths are naturally narrowed by higher sea-levels (Sweet and Blum, 2018). Submarine canyon incision is therefore balanced by the positive influence of narrow-shelves and the negative influence of lower-magnitude sea-level changes. On active margins with elevated river gradients, the relative impact of narrowed shelves will therefore be reduced when compared to icehouse climates, as the magnitudes of sea-level change are reduced. This indicates that shore-connected submarine canyons will be most prevalent on active margins during periods of high-magnitude sea-level change, such as during icehouse climates or periods of tectonically-induced relative-sea-level change, which is supported by the observed prevalence of river-associated canyons on active margins in the present (Fig. 1; Harris and Whiteway, 2011).

We therefore speculate that the inception and maintenance of shore-connected submarine canyons on active margins during icehouse climates may form an underappreciated component of the global carbon cycle, with shore-connected canyons along these margins enhancing bypass and burial of organic matter in deep-water (Galy et al. 2007), thus enhancing cooling, lowering sea-levels, and further increasing the likelihood of shore-connected canyon formation. Periods of widespread subaerial uplift during icehouse periods may therefore amplify cooling much more than the equivalent tectonic activity during greenhouse climates, increasing the stability of cool periods.
5. Conclusion

Shore-connected submarine canyons greatly enhance the potential for sediment bypass from shallow- to deep-water.

Numerical modelling has revealed that shore-connected canyons are most likely to form when fluvial discharge is high,
the shelf is narrow and steep, and the magnitude of sea-level change is great, in agreement with modern observations. This indicates that shore-connected canyon formation is fundamentally linked to quantifiable climatic and tectonic factors, such as precipitation, tectonic uplift and sea-level fall. Periods of Earth history when sediment bypass to deep-water was most efficient can therefore be estimated, with active margins during icehouse climates expected to be the most efficient configurations for sediment export from shallow- to deep-water. Tectonism and enhanced subaerial erosion may therefore have a much more pronounced impact on climate change during icehouse periods than greenhouse periods. This will also be reflected in the stratigraphy of deep-marine successions, with eustasy having a more muted influence than onshore climate and tectonics on active margins characterised by narrow and steep shelves.

Data availability

All code used for this study are open-source (https://badlands.readthedocs.io/en/latest/; Salles et al. 2018). Model parameters in the supplementary files will reproduce these results, and an example XML input file from the 20 km wide shelf simulation used is provided in the supplementary files.
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**Figures**

Figure 1: A) Example of a shore-connected canyon that has incised across the shelf, offshore Chile (source: GeoMapApp©). The canyon was able to incise across the shelf during recent sea-level rise as it is associated with a major river. B) Number of river-associated canyons in each geographic region at the present-day. The geographic region is coloured by whether it is tectonically-passive or tectonically-active margin (data from Harris and Whiteway 2011).

Figure 2: A) Planform configuration of the model grid. B) Dip configuration of the model grid. Steeper source (+) is the higher supply lower segment of the grid, shallower source (-) is the lower supply upper segment of the grid. Solid black lines represent the shelf-width variations, and dashed black lines represent the shelf angle variations. C) Sea-level curves used in these simulations. A -60 m curve is used for all of the shelf variations.

Figure 3: A) Planform elevation maps at the end of the models with no shelf to a 50 km wide shelf. Red indicates deposition, blue indicates erosion. B) Volume of eroded sediment in the coastal zone erosion and sea-level change through time. Grey shade is one standard deviation of all values, and grey vertical lines are modelled time-steps. For ease of comparison the y-axis is scaled to the maximum eroded volume seen across all models in this study.
Figure 4: A) Planform elevation maps at the end of the models with a 0.01° to a 0.5° dipping shelf. Red indicates deposition, blue indicates erosion. B) Volume of eroded sediment in the coastal zone erosion and sea-level change through time. Grey shade is one standard deviation of all values, and grey vertical lines are modelled time-steps. For ease of comparison the y-axis is scaled to the maximum eroded volume seen across all models in this study.

Figure 5: A) Planform elevation maps at the end of the models with no sea-level fall to a 240 m sea-level fall. Red indicates deposition, blue indicates erosion. B) Volume of eroded sediment in the coastal zone erosion and sea-level change through time. Grey shade is one standard deviation of all values, and grey vertical lines are modelled time-steps. For ease of comparison the y-axis is scaled to the maximum eroded volume seen across all models in this study.

Figure 6: Percentage of time canyons are connected to the shore on the high-supply and low-supply sides of the each numerical model.

Figure 7: Model for the formation of shore-connected submarine canyons along a continental margin with variable sediment supply and a variable shelf width. The model begins with initial highstand deposition ($t_1$) before following two separate futures; one where the sea-level is sustained at highstand ($t_{2A}$), and one where the sea-level falls to a lowstand ($t_{2B}$).

Supplementary information

Supplementary Table 1: Parameters used for each of the model iterations.
Supplementary Figure 1: Relationship between the parameters varied in this study. A. shelf width and average shelf gradient, B. shelf width and average slope gradient, and C. average shelf gradient and average slope gradient from modern systems (data from Nyberg et al. 2018). Relationship between the parameters varied in this study. A) shelf width and average shelf gradient, B) shelf width and average slope gradient, and C) average shelf gradient and average slope gradient from modern systems (data from Nyberg et al. 2018; randomly sub-sampled to 1000 points).
