

1 Case studies

2 In this section is briefly illustrated the application of Open Plot project in two case studies. The
3 procedures described in these examples can be followed in the relatives movies, provided in the
4 supplementary materials, named Sibillini.mp4 and Pobla.mp4, respectively.

5 The first example is from the Sibillini anticline, Northern Apennines (Italy). The “structural”
6 problem is that of evaluating the variability of pressure solution cleavage frequency in different
7 structural positions of an anticline characterised by a variable axis orientation. The input dataset is
8 from a spreadsheet including measurements collected in the field, like cleavage strike, dip, spacing
9 and, as in this anticline the cleavage is stratabound, the thickness of the hosting layer. Scatterplot of
10 cleavage spacing (S) vs host-layer thickness (H) shows that these parameters are related and,
11 accordingly, H/S should be used to quantify the cleavage frequency (e.g. Tavani et al., 2006). The
12 *.stv file is thus imported in a spreadsheet, a new column is added, named “./HvsS” (the “./”
13 characters will indicate the software that this is a numeric field), and the number of columns is
14 updated in the header. Now the entire file, including reserved fields (see user manual) and the
15 header, is copied. Import from clipboard procedure will recognise the header, and will load data
16 without passing through the “boring” import procedure. In the data selection window bedding
17 surfaces and pressure solution cleavages are selected and then plotted in the 3D window. To
18 evaluate the variability of cleavage HvsS across the fold strike, data have to be projected onto an
19 across-strike panel. However, as the anticline is characterised by a slightly variable axial trend, data
20 should be projected using the local axis orientation. To do this we manually select a region and send
21 the data included in this region (both bedding and cleavage data) to the stereoplot. Here a tensorial
22 analysis is performed only on bedding data. In the tensorial analysis results, we click “apply K3”,
23 this assigns to entire selected dataset (including cleavages) the orientation of the local best-fit
24 cylindrical axis. The same operations are performed for another region. We end up with two regions
25 with different cylindrical axes. Data now are projected onto the across-strike panel using
26 “eigenvector” option, such that, data are projected using the local axis orientation. A new 2D

27 scatterplot window will open up, including data that have been previously selected (i.e. bedding
28 surfaces and cleavages). Two new attributes are added to each datum, namely the X and Z
29 coordinates along the panel. In this scatterplot window we plot the “X-position along panel” versus
30 “HvsS”, result shows that cleavage frequency varies along the panel (i.e. across the fold) and, in
31 particular, it roughly decreases toward the central portion of the transect (i.e. in the crestal sector).

32 The second example is from La Pobla de Segur (Spanish Pyrenees). Here it is illustrated how
33 Open Plot can be used to create dip-domains. Traces have previously digitalised onto a
34 georeferenced orthophoto draped on a DEM. In the planar regression tab of the drawing options
35 window we define the parameters for the trace analysis procedure. This is a recursive procedure that
36 finds, for each selected polylines group, a set of best-fit dip-domains (see user manual). In this
37 window we also activate the dip-domains evaluation option, which will allow us to evaluate the
38 “quality” of the automatically extracted dip-domains. Once the dip-domains are extracted from
39 polylines, axial surfaces can be created. This allows constructing portions of a given layer surface,
40 which can be later exported as DXF 3D faces and then imported in CAD-like software.

41