THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

The 4D evolution of the Teutonic Bore Camp VHMS deposits, Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia

Citation for published version:

Barrote, VR, Mcnaughton, NJ, Tessalina, SG, Evans, NJ, Talavera, C, Zi, J & McDonald, BJ 2020, 'The 4D evolution of the Teutonic Bore Camp VHMS deposits, Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia', *Ore Geology Reviews*, vol. 120, pp. 103448. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oregeorev.2020.103448>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1016/j.oregeorev.2020.103448](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oregeorev.2020.103448)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Ore Geology Reviews

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Manuscript Details

Manuscript number	OR GEO_2019_778_R1
Title	The 4D evolution of the Teutonic Bore Camp VHMS deposits, Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia
Article type	Research paper

Abstract

The Teutonic Bore Camp, comprised of the Teutonic Bore, Jaguar and Bentley deposits, is one of the most significant volcanic-hosted massive sulphide (VHMS) camps in Western Australia. Despite being extensively studied, only recently there have been advances in the understanding of the mechanism that drove the formation of mineralisation. It has been recognized by recent studies that the volcanic-hosted deposits from the Teutonic Bore Camp represent replacement-type VHMS systems, with significant input of fluids and metals from a magmatic source. This paper tests the existing hypothesis that the nearby Penzance granite acted as the metals source and/or thermal engine driving the development of these ore deposits. New age constraints on the formation of the host volcanic sequence at the Bentley deposit and the crystallization of the Penzance granite allows for the construction of a 4D evolutionary model for the ore system. A new U-Pb SHRIMP monazite age of 2681.9 ± 4.5 Ma indicates that the Penzance granite post-dates the host stratigraphy at Bentley (ca. 2693 Ma) and is probably coeval with mineralisation. All zircons (Penzance, Bentley units I and III) have very similar $\epsilon\text{Hf}(i)$, with most values between -1 and +6, slightly higher than the $\epsilon\text{Hf}(i)$ of zircons from other granites and volcanics within the Kurnalpi Terrain, and indicative of juvenile sources. The mean Th/U ratios are ~ 0.7 and ~ 0.6 for the Penzance and Bentley zircons, respectively. All zircons have similar Ce/Nd(CN) ratios. The chemical similarities between the zircons from the granite and the volcanic rocks at Bentley support a shared magmatic source between the Penzance and the Teutonic Bore Camp sequence. The Penzance granite is the likely source of heat, and potentially metals, which drove the VHMS mineralisation at the Teutonic Bore Camp.

Keywords	Penzance; Teutonic Bore; Volcanic-hosted massive sulphide; Archean; Geochronology; 4D modelling
Corresponding Author	Vitor Rodrigues Barrote
Corresponding Author's Institution	Curtin University
Order of Authors	Vitor Rodrigues Barrote, Neal McNaughton, Svetlana Tessalina, Noreen Evans, Cristina Talavera, Jian-Wei Zi, Bradley McDonald
Suggested reviewers	Susan Belford, John Percival, Haoyang Zhou, Christopher Yeats

Submission Files Included in this PDF

File Name [File Type]

Cover letter.docx [Cover Letter]

Reply to reviewers.docx [Response to Reviewers]

MS with changes marked.docx [Revised Manuscript with Changes Marked]

Highlights.docx [Highlights]

GraphicAbstract.tif [Graphical Abstract]

MS with no changes marked.docx [Manuscript File]

Figure Captions.docx [Figure]

Fig1.jpg [Figure]

Fig2.jpg [Figure]

Fig3.jpg [Figure]

Fig4.jpg [Figure]

Fig5.jpg [Figure]

Fig6.jpg [Figure]

Fig7.jpg [Figure]

Fig8.jpg [Figure]

Fig9.jpg [Figure]

Fig10.jpg [Figure]

Fig11.jpg [Figure]

declaration-of-conflict of-interests.docx [Conflict of Interest]

Sup1_Methods.docx [e-Component]

Submission Files Not Included in this PDF

File Name [File Type]

Table 1.xlsx [Table]

Sup2_SHRIMP_Zircon.xlsx [e-Component]

Sup3_Hf_Zircon.xlsx [e-Component]

Sup4_TE_Zircon.xlsx [e-Component]

To view all the submission files, including those not included in the PDF, click on the manuscript title on your EVISE Homepage, then click 'Download zip file'.

Research Data Related to this Submission

Data set

<https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/jpwjnwcnv2/draft?a=97413372-af5a-4ce3-96d8-180bf090118b>

Data for: The magmatic 4D evolution of the Teutonic Bore Camp VHMS deposits, Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia

Electronic Supplementary Material for "The 4D evolution of the Teutonic Bore Camp VHMS deposits, Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia" The Teutonic Bore Camp, comprised of the Teutonic Bore, Jaguar and Bentley deposits, is one of the most significant volcanic-hosted massive sulphide (VHMS) camps in Western Australia. Despite being extensively studied, only recently there have been advances in the understanding of the mechanism that drove the formation of mineralisation. It has been recognized by recent studies that the volcanic-hosted deposits from the Teutonic Bore Camp represent replacement-type VHMS systems, with significant input of fluids and metals from a magmatic source. This paper tests the existing hypothesis that the nearby Penzance granite acted as the metals source and/or thermal engine driving the development of these ore deposits. New age constraints on the formation of the host volcanic sequence at the Bentley deposit and the crystallization of the Penzance granite allows for the construction of a 4D evolutionary model for the ore system. A new U-Pb SHRIMP monazite age of 2681.9 ± 4.5 Ma indicates that the Penzance granite post-dates the host stratigraphy at Bentley (ca. 2693 Ma) and is probably coeval with mineralisation. All zircons (Penzance, Bentley units I and III) have very similar $\epsilon_{\text{Hf}}(i)$, with most values between -1 and +6, slightly higher than the $\epsilon_{\text{Hf}}(i)$ of zircons from other granites and volcanics within the Kurnalpi Terrain, and indicative of juvenile sources. The mean Th/U ratios are ~ 0.7 and ~ 0.6 for the Penzance and Bentley zircons, respectively. All zircons have similar Ce/Nd(CN) ratios. The chemical similarities between the zircons from the granite and the volcanic rocks at Bentley support a shared magmatic source between the Penzance and the Teutonic Bore Camp sequence. The Penzance granite is the likely source of heat, and potentially metals, which drove the VHMS mineralisation at the Teutonic Bore Camp.

1 Vitor Barrote
2 School of Earth and Planetary Sciences
3 Curtin University
4 Kent St, Bentley WA 6102
5 Phone: +6145 1929556
6 Email: vitorbarrote@hotmail.com
7

8 28.01.2020
9

10 Dear Editor,
11

12 I am pleased to re-submit the manuscript "The magmatic 4D evolution of the Teutonic Bore Camp VHMS deposits,
13 Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia", on behalf of myself, Vitor Barrote and my co-authors.
14

15 We have greatly appreciated the helpful and constructive revisions to this important work and continue to appreciate
16 your consideration. We have addressed the concerns raised by the reviewers and editors and believe that the
17 manuscript should be now suitable for publication.
18

19 We attach a rebuttal letter that indicates how we have addressed the comments as well as a version of the manuscript
20 with tracked changes.
21

22 Sincerely,
23
24

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

Vitor Barrote

Authors' response to reviewers' comments

Manuscript title: –The 4D evolution of the Teutonic Bore Camp VHMS deposits, Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia

Authors: Vitor Barrote, Neal McNaughton, Svetlana Tessalina, Noreen Evans, Cristina Talavera, Jian-Wei Zi, Bradley McDonald

Manuscript number: ORGEO_2019_778

Date: 28th January 2020

Dear editor,

The authors would like to thank you for your positive reviews, advice, and critiques in how to further correct and improve this manuscript. We have addressed comments below; editor and reviewer's comments are indicated in red font, whereas our response is indicated in black font, for easy reading. In addition to the main comments presented below we have also accepted and appropriately modified the manuscript based on all the comments made by reviewer 1 in the tracked version of the revised manuscript. Our response to these comments can be seen in the tracked version that we have re-submitted.

Comments from the editors and reviewers:

-Editor

In addition to the reviewers comment, I think that you should try to frame your study within a broader context. As it stands your paper is very much a local study which should be better integrated within the broader context of VHMS in Precambrian time. Also you should limit the use of acronyms to the minimum.

We have attempted to better clarify the broader impact of our observations to VHMS systems in the Precambrian, as suggested. We have re-phrased the last paragraph of the introduction to present to the reader our intention to reflect upon this broader subject aided by the upcoming study presented. We have also re-shaped our final paragraph of section 5.5 where we expose how the observations presented in this study could potentially impact the exploration of Precambrian VHMS.

Apart from well established acronyms such as VHMS, HFSE and MSWD we have altered the text and limited our use of acronyms (e.g. Teutonic Bore and Eastern Goldfields Superterrane).

-Reviewer 1

This work reports original geochronological data on the volcanic stratigraphy of the Teutonic Bore Camp, it adds important constraints on the evolution of the associated VHMS deposits, and is therefore worthy of publication on Ore Geology Review.

I have attached a track change version of the manuscript with some recommendations, but, in particular, I'd like to emphasise some aspects that should be considered by the authors with care.

1- The first section of the geological background (paragraph 1.1) needs to be revised to improve its clarity. This is a pivotal part of the manuscript that should be crystal clear to the readers, otherwise the following parts will miss of a solid base of understanding.

We have addressed the Geological Background section and based on the additional comments from this reviewer we have modified it to improve its clarity. We believe that this modified version will be much easier for the readers to understand.

2- All the tables, apart from table 3, should be moved to the ESMs in a spreadsheet form, in order to be more accessible and to avoid large text gaps within the final manuscript.

We intend to do this, if agreed upon by the Editors and we submit the revised version of the manuscript with tables 1, 2, 4 and 5 as supplementary material. Also as suggested by the reviewer within the text we have re-shaped the Methods section and added much of the information to the ESM.

3- There is bold claim in the discussion that needs to be further discussed or modified. I am referring to the end of paragraph 4.4 where it is suggested that "the Penzance granite is a strong candidate to have acted as the probable magmatic source of sulphur to the mineralisation, and consequently, metals." Whereas the suggestion that the Penzance granite could have acted as a sulfur source is coherent with the isotopic data discussed in Chen et al. (2015), the assumption that metals were sourced from the granite magma is unsupported.

We have modified this part of the text as not to extrapolate on the proposed discussions and present to the reader unsupported arguments. We have limited ourselves to affirm that Chen et al. (2015) presents evidence for sulphur supply from magmatic sources only. The supply of metals remains a possibility, although there is no evidence at this point that this is the case.

-Reviewer 2

The manuscript provides geochronological constraints on the granite and host sequences for the Teutonic Bore (TB) camp. The authors suggest the involvement of granite in the VHMS mineralization. The topic of the study is suitable for Ore Geology Reviews. However, two important points require attention in preparing your revision so that the resulting manuscript can be evaluated for publication.

1. I am confused with the term “magmatic 4D evolution”. I read the manuscript several times and haven’t found it out. In my view, magmatic evolution should involve the geochemical evolution and dynamical processes, rather than solely providing age data. I think the authors should clarify what the 4D evolution really means.

We have refrained from using the term “magmatic 4D evolution” and instead consistently use “4D evolution”, including modification of the title. The concept of 4D evolution or 4D evolutionary model in this article refers to the addition of time constraints to previously known processes involving magmatism and volcanism, which include geochemical evolution, development of the stratigraphical sequence and development of mineralisation as a consequence of these processes. We have added our definition of the concept to the introduction in order to clarify to the reader the meaning of 4D evolutionary model in this context.

2. The authors also declare that they constructed a 4D evolutionary model for the ore system (lines 24-26 and section 5.4). I definitely do not see this point in the text. Actually, in this manuscript, the authors just conduct geochronological study on the host rock and a granite in the deposits. They even do not obtain the direct ages for mineralization. How do this reveal the 4D evolution of ore systems?

As addressed in the first comment, the 4D evolutionary model refers to the constrain of processes in time, which was achieved by combining extensive new original geochronological observations with previous studies that focused on geochemistry, stratigraphy and other techniques. We have added our definition of the concept to the introduction in order to clarify to the reader the meaning of 4D evolutionary model in this context. We have also added an explanation of the concept in section 5.4 in order not to confuse the reader and to clarify the outcome of the study.

Additionally, do not overstate the temporal association between granite intrusion and mineralization.

We understand the reviewers concern and share his view. We have replaced likely coeval to possibly coeval. We have evidence that the mineralisation is younger than the host rocks that are dated in this study based on stratigraphic observation presented in Belford et al. (2015). However the lack of a reliable age for the Teutonic Bore mineralisation prevents us from demonstrating the association between granite and ore formation.

Some minor comments are:

Q1 Lines 483-484: Why do similar Th/U ratios of zircon suggest a magma consanguinity? Any reference?

According to Kirkland et al. (2015), parental magma composition is one of four factors that may contribute to variations in the Th/U of a zircon crystal.

We have added that information to the main text and included the reference in our Bibliography.

Q2 Lines 499-506: The authors argue the possible involvement of granite in VHMS mineralization. What do you mean for “interaction” (line 499)? I do not see the speciality of granitoid veins within the volcanics as well as volcanic xenoliths within the granite. In my view, it just indicates that granite postdate the volcanics.

We have re-phrased this passage to clarify the ideas presented. The argument presented here absolutely indicates only that the granite postdates the volcanics. The reason why we demonstrate that these rocks interact is to refute the idea that granite and volcanics are part of separate systems that were tectonically placed in contact.

Q3 Conclusion section: “The age of the TB camp mineralisation is likely coeval to the intrusion of the Penzance granite at ca. 2682 Ma.” How do you draw the synchronicity for the mineralization and granite intrusion? Do not overstate their association before you can offer a reliable age for the TB mineralization.

We understand the reviewers concern and share his view. We have replaced likely coeval to possibly coeval. We have evidence that the mineralisation is younger than the host rocks that are dated in this study based on stratigraphic observation presented in Belford et al. (2015). However the lack of a reliable age for the Teutonic Bore mineralisation prevents us from demonstrating the association between granite and ore formation.

The ~~magmatic~~ 4D evolution of the Teutonic Bore Camp VHMS deposits, Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia

Vitor R. Barrote^{1,2,3}, Neal J. McNaughton¹, Svetlana G. Tessalina¹, Noreen J. Evans^{1,2}, Cristina Talavera^{1,4,5}, Jian-Wei Zi^{1,5,6}, Bradley J. McDonald^{1,2}

1- John de Laeter Centre and The Institute for Geoscience Research (TIGeR), Curtin University, Kent St, Bentley, WA 6102, Australia

2- School of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Curtin University, Kent St, Bentley, WA 6102, Australia

2-3- [School of Earth, Atmosphere and Environment, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria 3800, Australia](#)

3-4- School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, The King's Building, James Hutton Road, EH9 3FE, Edinburgh, UK

4-5- State Key Lab of Geological Processes and Mineral Resources, China University of Geosciences

Declarations of interest: none

ABSTRACT

The Teutonic Bore (TB) eCamp, comprised of the Teutonic Bore, Jaguar and Bentley deposits, is one of the most significant volcanic-hosted massive sulphide (VHMS) camps in Western Australia. Despite being extensively studied ~~in the past~~, only recently there have been advances in the understanding of the mechanism that drove the formation of mineralisation. It has been recognized by recent studies that the volcanic-hosted deposits from the TB Teutonic Bore Camp represent replacement-type VHMS systems, with significant input of fluids and metals from a magmatic source. This paper tests the existing hypothesis that the nearby

Commented [1]: Be consistent with the capital letter. Personally I do not have any preference, but keep it uniform throughout the text.

Commented [2R2]: We made sure to keep it consistently capital throughout the text.

Penzance granite acted as the metals source and/or thermal engine driving the development of these ore deposits.

New age constraints on the formation of the host volcanic sequence at the Bentley deposit and the crystallization of the Penzance granite allows for the construction of a 4D evolutionary model for the ore system. A new U-Pb SHRIMP monazite age of 2681.9 ± 4.5 Ma indicates that the Penzance granite post-dates the host stratigraphy at Bentley (ca. 2693 Ma) and is probably coeval with mineralisation. All zircons (Penzance, Bentley units I and III) have very similar $\delta\text{Hf}_{(i)}$, with most values between -1 and +6, slightly higher than the $\delta\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ of zircons from other granites and volcanics within the Kurnalpi Terrain, and indicative of juvenile sources. The mean Th/U ratios are ~ 0.7 and ~ 0.6 for the Penzance and Bentley zircons, respectively. All zircons have similar Ce/Nd_(CN) ratios. The chemical similarities between the zircons from the granite and the volcanic rocks at Bentley support a shared magmatic source between the Penzance and the [Teutonic Bore](#) Camp sequence. The Penzance granite is the likely source of heat, and potentially metals, which drove the VHMS mineralisation at the [Teutonic Bore](#) Camp.

Keywords: Penzance; Teutonic Bore; Volcanic-hosted massive sulphide; Archean; Geochronology; 4D modelling

1 INTRODUCTION

Using an extensive database of compiled whole-rock geochemistry and U-Pb geochronology, Hollis et al (2015) proposed a link between VHMS mineralisation and the emplacement of HFSE-enriched syn-volcanic intrusions, throughout the Archean Yilgarn Craton, including the Eastern Goldfield Superterrane ([EGS](#)). Despite the apparent geographical and broadly coeval association between VHMS ores and HFSE-enriched intrusions, [the identification of a genetic link link requires would benefit from further geochronological and isotopic evidencedemonstration by detailed geochronology and isotopic geochemistry.](#)

The number of significant VHMS occurrences in the Yilgarn Craton is small compared to other Archean terrains with similar characteristics such as the Superior Province of Canada (Hollis et al., 2015). Previous studies suggested that this ~~is~~ could be due to under-exploration and the use of techniques inappropriate for mineral prospecting in the Yilgarn Craton (Butt et al., 2017; Ellis, 2004; Hollis et al., 2017, 2015; McConachy et al., 2004). Unlike classic VHMS systems, replacement-type VHMS systems, such as those in the Eastern Goldfield Superterrane, do not precipitate onto the seafloor and, but rather replace slightly older host stratigraphy. As a consequence, although some stratigraphic control can be observed within replacement-type mineralisation, it is not an inevitable feature (Doyle and Allen, 2003).

Historically, the search exploration for VHMS occurrences within the Teutonic Bore (TB) area was focused on key stratigraphic horizons. However, the known deposits formed at different stratigraphic positions and show significant differences in the geometry of mineralisation, compared to TB Teutonic Bore (Chen et al., 2015; Parker et al., 2017). This led to a significant time gap between the discoveries of the TB Teutonic Bore deposit in 1976, and the Jaguar and Bentley deposits (in 2004 and 2008, respectively) (Ellis, 2004; Independence Group NL (IGO), 2015; Parker et al., 2017).

To better understand this inconsistent lack of stratigraphic control on the position of orebodies within the stratigraphy at the TB Teutonic Bore eCamp, and a possible link between high-field-strength-elements (HFSE)-enriched granite emplacement and ore precipitation, this work re-examines and expands the database of geochronology and isotopic/geochemical fingerprints for the igneous rock units. This includes re-assessment of the geochronological data from the nearby HFSE-enriched granite, the Penzance granite (Champion and Cassidy, 2002; Geoscience Australia (GA), 2019), and the volcanic sequence from the TB Teutonic Bore eCamp (Nelson, 1995), with additional U-Pb Sensitive High-Resolution Ion Microprobe (SHRIMP) dating of zircon and monazites.

Commented [3]: Such as... please mention an example.

Commented [4R4]: We have provided an example.

Commented [5]: I recommend to rephrase this sentence. The main clause depends on the subordinate, it should be the opposite. It might be difficult to understand to those readers which are not familiar with the topic.

Commented [6R6]: We have merged the information from the subordinate to the main clause.

Commented [7]: Brackets are not necessary

Commented [8R8]: Change accepted

Commented [9]: I recommend to minimise the use of unpublished references when it is not indispensable, as they are a not transparent means by nature.

Commented [10R10]: Reference removed

Commented [11]: I recommend to clarify to the reader the nature of the inconsistency. It is mentioned above that the VHMS being of a replacive nature are expected to form in the same stratigraphic position, but it is not clear enough, I believe this is an important point that should be emphasised more.

Commented [12R12]: We have modified the sentence to clarify the inconsistency (i.e. lack of stratigraphic control).

Commented [13]: This acronym is never utilised I the text, so it can be deleted.

Commented [14R14]: Ok

Commented [15]: The acronym needs to be resolved once at the beginning, but being a known technique it can be omitted in the abstract.

Commented [16R16]: Ok

Commented [17]: Mineral names are uncountable.

Commented [18R18]: We have modified the text to adhere to this rule.

These geochronological studies are complemented by zircon Hf-isotopie and trace element analyses on zircons from the Bentley volcanic sequence and Penzance granite, and compilation of detailed stratigraphy, whole-rock geochemistry and sulphur isotope data from previous studies (Belford et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2015; Das, 2018; Isaac, 2015; Sedgmen et al., 2007). [The present work combines the improved geochronological constraints presented here to the current 3D understanding of the geological processes at place, to develop a 4D evolutionary model of the deposits at the Teutonic Bore Camp.](#)

Reliable and precise ages for magmatism and ore-hosting volcanism, combined with traditional and isotopic geochemistry, allows testing of the hypothesis of a genetic relationship between the HFSE-rich Penzance granite and the [TBTeutonic Bore](#) Camp deposits. The results [could](#) have implications for future exploration for [Precambrian](#) VHMS deposits, not only in the well-established [TBTeutonic Bore eCamp](#), but also in *greenfields* throughout the [EGSEastern Goldfield Superterrane](#) and [potentially, other terranes elsewhere](#) in the Yilgarn Craton.

12 GEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

12.1 Geology of the Teutonic Bore Camp

The Teutonic Bore, Jaguar and Bentley VHMS deposits, along with several other smaller occurrences, form the [TBTeutonic Bore](#) Camp (Independence Group NL ([x](#)—IGO), 2015). The [TBTeutonic Bore](#) Camp is [located near the town of Leonora, within the Kurnalpi Terrane of the EGSEastern Goldfield Superterrane, Yilgarn Craton \(Figure 1\). The deposits from the TBTeutonic Bore eCamp are hosted by the TBTeutonic Bore volcanic complex, which comprises pillow basalt, overlain and interlayered with volcanoclastic units, coherent rhyolite, andesite and thin sedimentary units \(Belford et al., 2015; Parker et al., 2017 and references therein\).](#) [The prefix “meta” is assumed but omitted when addressing the Archean](#)

Commented [19]: Elsewhere in the Yilgarn or specifically in certain terranes? Please specify.

Commented [20R20]: The other Terranes within the Yilgarn are understudied, so studies similar to this if conducted in such regions could impact the understanding and consequently exploration strategies for these locations. Due to the unavailability of such constraints we refrain from specifying which Terranes.

“More data is required in the South West, Burtville and Yamarna terranes, and a number of greenstone belts of the Youanmi Terrane (e.g. Twin Peaks, Tallering) in order to clearly delineate regions of prospectivity and establish temporal, geochemical and stratigraphic associations to mineralization. Localized studies are required in order to establish volcanological settings for a number of deposits and their controlling factors.” Hollis et al 2015

Commented [21]: If you want to provide a geographical reference, the location of town of Leonora should be included in the geological map.

Commented [22R22]: We have included the town of Leonora in the geological map and have described the symbology in the caption.

237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295

98 ~~stratigraphic sequence of the Yilgarn Craton, because all rocks are metamorphosed to some~~
99 ~~extent (Czarnota et al., 2010).~~

100 The volcanic stratigraphy and the distribution of the three deposits, as well as other known
101 uneconomic ore bodies, have a NW-SE trend (Figure 1). ~~This trend coincides with the general~~
102 ~~alignment of regional structures, such as the fault that bounds the TBTeutonic Bore volcanic~~
103 ~~complex to the west (Hallberg and Thompson, 1985; Parker et al., 2017). The TB-voleanie~~
104 ~~sequence is bounded by a syenogranite to the east. Although the nature of the contact with the~~
105 ~~volcanics is unclear, its attitude follows the general trend of stratigraphy and orebody~~
106 ~~distribution. Additionally, this trend coincides with the general alignment of regional~~
107 ~~structures, such as the fault that bounds the TB-voleanic complex to the west (Hallberg and~~
108 ~~Thompson, 1985; Parker et al., 2017).~~

109 The stratigraphy at the TBTeutonic Bore eCamp comprises a predominantly laterally
110 continuous lithofacies association between the three deposits (Figure 2A). ~~Disruption of the~~
111 ~~stratigraphic sequence by later dolerite intrusions causes inconsistencies in the stratigraphic~~
112 ~~continuity between deposits (Belford et al., 2015; Das, 2018), although individual deposits can~~
113 ~~occur in locally restricted facies (Das, 2018). The prefix “meta” is assumed but omitted when~~
114 ~~addressing the Archean stratigraphic sequence of the Yilgarn Craton, because all rocks are~~
115 ~~metamorphosed to some extent (Czarnota et al., 2010).~~

116 ~~Disruption of the stratigraphic sequence by later dolerite intrusions causes inconsistencies~~
117 ~~in the stratigraphic continuity between deposits (Belford et al., 2015; Das, 2018).~~
118 NonethelessTherefore, the volcanic sequence that hosts the mineralisation can be broadly
119 subdivided ~~in six units as follow from bottom to top (Figure 2B; Belford et al., 2015; Parker et~~
120 ~~al., 2017), as depicted in Figure 2B, and comprises six units, from bottom to top:~~

121 I. Footwall Rhyolite: ~~from~~ 200 m to over 1 km thick. Mainly coherent, either massive
122 or flow-banded, with minor breccia (Parker et al., 2017), ~~and with calc-alkaline to~~

- Commented [23]:** I recommend to anticipate this at L91 when you first mention the rocks within the TB complex. Here this sentence creates a logic gap between the sentence that precedes and the one that follows.
- Commented [24R24]:** We repositioned the passage.
- Commented [25]:** This sentence continues the regional analysis started in L92-93. I recommend to avoid logic gaps and to keep this sentence close and connected with the one in L92-93.
- Commented [26R26]:** We have re-shaped the paragraph to satisfy that.
- Commented [27]:** This sentence is unclear. Please rephrase trying to be more specific and avoiding the use of generic terminology such as “the attitude of the contact”.
- Commented [28R28]:** We have erased this sentence and focused on describing the interaction between granite and volcanics further down. It was repetitive as well.
- Commented [29]:** This sentence continues the regional analysis started in L92-93. I recommend to avoid logic gaps and to keep this sentence close and connected with the one in L92-93.
- Commented [30R30]:** We have re-shaped the paragraph to satisfy that.
- Commented [31]:** This sentence is redundant, I recommend to simplify it.
- Commented [32R32]:** We removed this information from this section, we agree with the reviewer that it was unclear. Furthermore it was not necessary to the understanding of the stratigraphy.
- Commented [33]:** This part of the sentence is unclear. Please rephrase in a way in which the spatial relationships can be clearer, in particular in respect to the VHMS deposits.
- Commented [34R34]:** We removed this information from this section, we agree with the reviewer that it was unclear. Furthermore it was not necessary to the understanding of the stratigraphy and relationship between deposits.
- Commented [35]:** I recommend to anticipate this at L91 when you first mention the rocks within the TB complex. Here this sentence creates a logic gap between the sentence that precedes and the one that follows.
- Commented [36R36]:** We have moved this part to the first paragraph of this section.
- Commented [37]:** This sentence is redundant, I recommend to simplify it.
- Commented [38R38]:** We removed this information from this section, we agree with the reviewer that it was unclear. Furthermore it was not necessary to the understanding of the stratigraphy and relationship between deposits.
- Commented [39]:** Citation should always be located at the end of the sentence before punctuation.
- Commented [40R40]:** Ok
- Commented [41]:** Of the six units listed, for only the first is reported the thickness. I recommend to be consistent
- Commented [42R42]:** We have added the requested information to the text.

- ~~transitional~~. The magmatic affinity ~~is calc-alkaline to transitional~~ (Belford et al., 2015). This package is footwall to all three deposits.
- II. Sedimentary rocks partly derived from the rhyolite, locally coarse but grading to arenite, siltstone and shale. This is the host unit to ~~the~~ Bentley ~~deposit~~. The thickness range from 0 to 70 m according to Parker et al. (2017)
- III. Transitional to tholeiitic basalt/ transitional andesite with thickness between 30 and 170 m, ~~with display~~ massive or pillowed habit, commonly intercalated with shale rich sediments (Parker et al., 2017). This package is host to the ~~TB~~ Teutonic Bore deposit and upper lens at Bentley (e.g.: Flying Spur, Brooklands, Comet: Independence Group NL (IGO), 2015) and overlays the lower orebody at the Bentley deposit (Arnage: Independence Group NL (IGO), 2015). Belford et al. (2015) names this unit Footwall Andesite (FA) and Footwall Basalt (FB), relative to their position to the mineralised zone at Jaguar.
- IV. Upper sedimentary horizon (mineralised package from Belford et al., 2015): consistings of a ~~C~~ complex assemblage of intercalated dacite (called MPD by Belford et al., 2015), conglomerate, pumice-rich breccia, laminated sediment, laminated chert and massive sulphide (Belford et al., 2015). Unit IV marks a geochemical break in magmatic affinity, from tholeiitic/transitional of the underlying basalts/andesites to calc-alkaline in the overlying lavas. The thickness is typically within 20 to 40 m (Parker et al., 2017).
- V. Upper basalt and andesite of calc-alkaline affinity: consistings of massive and pillowed basalt and andesite lavas with minor volcanic breccias, and ~~I~~ intercalated with mostly carbonaceous shales (Belford et al., 2015). The total thickness of this unit ranges between about 200 to 700 m (Parker et al., 2017).

VI. Hangingwall rhyolite: uppermost stratigraphic unit, described by Belford et al. (2015) from a single drillhole. [The thickness of this unit is estimated to be between 100 to 500m according to Parker et al. \(2017\).](#)

~~VI.~~

[The Teutonic Bore volcanic sequence is bounded to the east](#) ~~The area east of TB is occupied~~

by a large composite batholith (Figure 1) named the Kent Complex by Champion and Cassidy (2002) and part of the Penzance Supersuite (Hollis et al., 2015). The Penzance Supersuite consists of HFSE-enriched granites with biotite and/or amphibole in quartz and feldspar rich rocks. These granites are characterised by variably elevated total Fe, MgO, Y, LREE, Zr, coupled with low to moderate Al₂O₃, K₂O, Rb, Sr and moderate Na₂O (Champion and Cassidy, 2002).

The relationship between the Penzance granite and the volcanic sequence in the ~~TB~~[Teutonic Bore](#) Camp area remains unclear. Earlier studies (e.g.: Hallberg and Thompson, 1985) suggest an irregular contact between the granite and the volcanic rocks, with anastomosing veins of granitoid extending into adjacent extrusive rocks and a number of xenoliths of volcanic rocks within the intrusive granite. The Penzance granite is one of several HFSE-enriched intrusions in the Yilgarn Craton that occurs in close proximity to VHMS deposits or occurrences hosted by equally HFSE-enriched volcanics (Hollis et al., 2015).

The Jaguar deposit was classified as a replacement-type VHMS deposit by Belford (2010). This classification relied on evidence including replacement front texture, absence of chimney structures, and rapid emplacement of the host volcanic sequence, according to the criteria proposed by Doyle and Allen (2003). Later studies (Chen et al., 2015; Das, 2018; Parker et al., 2017) have identified similar textures in Bentley and other smaller occurrences and, consequently, the replacement-type VHMS model is accepted within the [TBTeutonic Bore](#) Camp.

Despite the predominance of sub-seafloor replacement processes, Belford (2010) observed features that indicate possible above seafloor activity. The development of thin beds of translucent chert with colloform intergrowths of chert and sulphide is interpreted as products of a waning hydrothermal system that had vented fluid to the sediment–water interface and deposited precipitates onto the seafloor (Belford et al., 2015). Massive sulphides conformably overlain by, and gradational upwards into, ~~these~~ narrow beds of laminated chert intercalated with finely-bedded sulphide-rich mudstone, support the idea of a progressive disruption of the mineral activity and indicate that some sulphide precipitation might have taken place very near or at seafloor (Belford et al., 2015).

The occurrence of massive sulphide clasts in the surrounding breccias and conglomerates, which were the result of rapid erosion and mass flow, indicates that the sulphide body was formed contemporaneously with the deposition of the upper sedimentary horizon (IV) (Belford et al., 2015). Similar features have not been observed in either the Bentley or the [Teutonic Bore](#) deposits.

1.22.2 Geochronology of the [Teutonic Bore](#) sequence and the Penzance granite

The SHRIMP zircon age of 2692 ± 4 Ma (Nelson, 1995) is the only published age for the volcanic sequence at the [Teutonic Bore](#) eCamp and comes from a porphyritic dacite with unclear stratigraphic position (Belford et al., 2015). ~~Detailed geochronology was attempted by~~ Additionally, Das (2018), ~~reported an ID-TIMS U-Pb age of 2692 ± 1.5 Ma for a sample of coherent Footwall Rhyolite (unit IV) from Jaguar. These analysis remain unpublished and no data table or sample characterization is provided by Das (2018). in felsic rocks well-constrained within the stratigraphic sequence, however only one ID-TIMS U-Pb zircon age was reported. The age of 2692 ± 1.5 Ma for a sample of coherent Footwall Rhyolite (unit IV) from Jaguar remains unpublished.~~

Commented [43]: Here you are referring to the content of a Master's thesis not accessible to the readers. Please provide more details as its content is very relevant to this study. Also, I recommend to reword the sentences as it appears that Das has "attempted" (try??) to acquire detailed geochronology, but has managed to obtain a single analysis. Is this true? How is such information relevant to this study?

Commented [44R44]: We have reworded the sentence as suggested.

I wish I could provide more details. The only reference in the thesis to this data is "The rarity of dateable minerals in the mafic succession is a major difficulty in the process of lithostratigraphic correlation. Therefore, the best way to obtain the age of a mafic succession is by dating the crosscutting felsic rocks that have dateable minerals in abundance. Until now, the age of the Teutonic Bore Volcanic Complex was constrained from a porphyritic dacite from north of Teutonic Bore deposit at SHRIMP zircon age of 2962 ± 4 Ma (Nelson, 1995). The footwall rhyolite samples for dating were selected from the drill core at Teutonic Bore, Jaguar and Bentley after removing the weathered surface and inclusions. A sample of the coherent footwall rhyolite from Jaguar (Sample # 13JUDD002) was dated using the ID-TIMS U-Pb analysis of Zircon and gave the age of 2692.6 ± 1.5 Ma."

The reported ages for the Penzance granite are 2679 ± 8 Ma (Champion and Cassidy, 2002) and 2686 ± 9 Ma (Geoscience Australia (GA), 2019, sample ID 96969076). The two ages are derived from the same analyses and calculated from the same a single dataset from for sample ID 96969076. No explanation is provided by either references as to the reason behind the difference in age calculation from a single set of analysis.

Commented [45]: It is unclear whether these two ages are derived from the same analyses, or from distinct analyses from zircon extracted from the same sample. Please explain better. Also, include the sample ID in the citation as it as not been contextualised in the text.

Commented [46R46]: We have modified the text to clarify that the two ages were calculated from the same single dataset. How these two authors have obtained different ages is not clear and there is no detailed information available. That is one of the reasons why we have decided to attempt dating this rock from newly collected samples from the same location. We accepted the insertion of the sample number to the citation.

Commented [47]: Information regarding the sample is redundant as drillcore names and depths are repeated. The coordinate of the samples is available only for sample 96969076. I recommend to simplify this part by summarising the sample info in a table, it would be clearer and shorter.

Commented [48R48]: The description of the sampling procedure for the Penzance is necessary to understanding the significance of the new age determination and how it compared to the previous data available. We have moved the rest of the methods to the ESM

Commented [49]: The methods can be summarised within the manuscript and the full version moved into the ESM.

Commented [50R50]: We moved the methods to the ESM

Commented [51]: This is implied in the citation, it is not necessary to restate it.

Commented [52R52]: Ok

23 SAMPLES AND METHODS

2.23.1 Penzance samples

Samples from the Penzance granite were collected from three different positions within the same quarry (Lat. -28.264050, Long. 121.077888, Penzance Quarry in Figure 1). They were collected from the same quarry as sample ID 96969076 from the Geochron Delivery database of Geoscience Australia (2019), according to those records. Each one of the three samples was processed separately and treated as different samples, the analyses were combined only in the data processing phase of each technique.

2.23.2 Bentley samples

Two samples were collected from different positions within the footwall rhyolite (unit I) in the Bentley deposit. Sample 15BUDD78 – 111.60 m was collected from drillhole 15BUDD78 at 111.60 meters depth, from a distal position to the ore. Sample 15BUDD137 – 398.60 m was collected from a younger higher stratigraphic position within the sequence, a stringer zone to the lower massive sulphide lens (Arnage), from a different drillhole (15BUDD137).

Commented [53]: It is not clear what this is about. If it is the specific name of the lens provide the reader with a scheme that represents the locations of the different lenses. As it is, this name does not provide the reader with any useful information. Please contextualise

Commented [54R54]: We have removed that reference as it is not fundamental to the understanding of the ideas.

Two samples (15BUDD120 - 228.42 and 15BUDD120 - 226.04) of the transitional andesite (unit III), were collected from a single drillhole (15BUDD120), within two meters of each other. The transitional andesite at the sampled point is hangingwall to the lower lens (Arnage), but it is in the stringer zone for the upper lens, marked by the occurrence of disseminated sulphides.

3.3 Analytical techniques

Zircon and Monazites were analysed on the SHRIMP II at the John de Laeter Centre, Curtin University (JdLC). Additionally, Zircon Lu–Hf isotopes and rare earth element (REE) abundances were measured over two analytical sessions using laser ablation split stream inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (LA-SS-ICPMS). The analyses were conducted in zircons from the same samples that were analysed by SHRIMP, but not necessarily on the same grain or over the same spot as the SHRIMP analysis. Detailed description of the conditions and procedures are provided in Supplementary Material 1.

2.3—SHRIMP U–Pb dating of Zircon and Monazites

2.3.1—Mount preparation

~~Zircon and monazite grains were separated from crushed rock samples using a Frantz magnetic separator and heavy liquids (methylene iodide). Grains were handpicked, mounted in epoxy resin discs and polished to expose their interiors. The zircon crystals were characterized by cathodoluminescence (CL) imaging, and monazite crystals by back-scattered electron (BSE) microscopy using the Mira3, at the Microscopy and Microanalysis Facility, John de Laeter Centre, Curtin University. The epoxy mounts were carbon-coated for SEM imaging and Au-coated before each SHRIMP analytical session.~~

~~Polished thin sections prepared from samples of transitional andesite (unit III) were examined to identify suitable zircon grains for SHRIMP geochronology using the Tescan Integrated Mineral Analyzer (TIMA-GM) and back-scattered electron (BSE) microscopy using the Mira3, at the Microscopy and Microanalysis Facility, John de Laeter Centre, Curtin University. Portions of the thin sections containing grains large enough ($>15\ \mu\text{m}$) for ion microprobe analysis were drilled out, in $\sim 3\text{ mm}$ plugs, and cast in 25 mm epoxy mounts. The reference materials were in a separate mount that was cleaned and Au-coated with the sample mounts before each SHRIMP analytical session.~~

2.3.2 Zircon

Selected areas of the imaged zircon were analysed on the SHRIMP II at the John de Laeter Centre, Curtin University (JdLC). The analytical procedures for the Curtin consortium SHRIMP II have been described by de Laeter and Kennedy (1998) and Kennedy and de Laeter (1994) and are similar to those described by Compston et al. (1984) and Williams (1998). For the larger zircons in grain mounts, a 20–25 μm elliptical spot was used, with a mass-filtered O_2^- primary beam of ~ 2.8 – 3.0 nA, whereas a 10–12 μm spot of ~ 0.5 nA was used on the smaller zircons in polished thin sections. Data for each spot was collected in sets of six scans on the zircons through the mass range of $^{196}\text{Zr}_2\text{O}^+$, $^{204}\text{Pb}^+$, Background, $^{206}\text{Pb}^+$, $^{207}\text{Pb}^+$, $^{208}\text{Pb}^+$, $^{238}\text{U}^+$, $^{248}\text{ThO}^+$ and $^{254}\text{UO}^+$. The $^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{U}$ age standard and U-content standard used was M257 (561.3 Ma and 840 ppm U; Nasdala et al., 2008) while OGC zircon was utilized as the $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ standard, to monitor instrument induced mass fractionation (3465.4 ± 0.6 Ma; Stern et al., 2009). The $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ dates obtained on OGC zircons during the SHRIMP sessions matched the $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ standard age within uncertainty and no fractionation correction was warranted. The common Pb correction was based on the measured ^{204}Pb content (Compston et al., 1984). The correction formula for Pb/U fractionation is $^{206}\text{Pb}^+ / ^{238}\text{U}^+ = a (^{254}\text{UO}^+ / ^{238}\text{U}^+)^b$ (Claoué-Long et al., 1995) using the parameter values of Black et al. (2003). The constant “a” is determined empirically from analyses of the standard during each analytical session. The programs SQUID II and Isoplot (Ludwig, 2011, 2009) were used for data processing.

2.3.3 Monazite

The U–Th–Pb analyses were performed using the high spatial resolution capability of the SHRIMP II at the JdLC. Monazite was analysed in two analytical sessions. Grains were analysed using a 30 μm Köhler aperture, ~ 0.3 nA primary ion beam (O_2^-) and a ~ 10 μm analysis spot. Energy filtering was not applied, and the post-collector retardation lens was activated to reduce stray ion arrivals. The mass resolution ($M/\Delta M$ at 1% peak height) was

650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708

270 >5000. French ($^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{U}$ age 514 Ma) was used as the primary Pb/U reference material, and
271 Z2908 and Z2234 were the secondary reference materials used to monitor matrix effects
272 (Fletcher et al., 2010). Z2908 ($^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age 1796 Ma) was also analysed to monitor and
273 correct for instrumental mass fractionation of ^{207}Pb from ^{206}Pb . SQUID II software (Ludwig,
274 2009) was used for initial data reduction including ^{204}Pb correction. Matrix effects in $^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{U}$
275 were corrected following established protocols detailed by Fletcher et al. (2010). 9 analyses of
276 Z2908 yielded a mean $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age of 1796.7 ± 5.4 Ma (MSWD = 1.7). An insignificant
277 fractionation correction (0.02%) was applied to sample data, with no augmentation of sample
278 precision required based on the reproducibility of $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ in the reference materials.
279 $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ dates from individual analyses are presented with 1σ internal precision, whereas
280 weighted mean $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ dates are reported at 95% confidence limits.

281 **2.4 LA-SS-ICPMS of Zircon—Trace elements and Hf isotopes**

282 Zircon Lu–Hf isotopes and rare earth element (REE) abundances were measured over two
283 analytical sessions using laser ablation split stream inductively coupled plasma mass
284 spectrometry (LA-SS-ICPMS). The analyses were conducted in zircons from the same samples
285 that were analysed by SHRIMP, but not necessarily on the same grain or over the same spot as
286 the SHRIMP analysis. Isotopic and elemental data were collected simultaneously using a
287 Resonetics S-155-LR 193 nm excimer laser coupled to a Nu Plasma II multicollector and
288 Agilent 7700s quadrupole mass spectrometer in the GeoHistory Facility, JdLC at Curtin
289 University.

290 Samples 15BUDD120—228.42 and 15BUDD120—226.04 m, from the Transitional
291 andesite (unit III) were analysed with a laser spot diameter of 24 μm , with 2.7 J/cm² on-sample
292 laser energy, repetition rate of 10 Hz, ablation time of 25 seconds and ~30 seconds of
293 background capture before and after each analysis. Two cleaning pulse preceded analysis. The
294 spot size and ablation time in this case were limited by the smaller size of the zircons.

Commented [55]: This acronym should be open up once the first time it is mentioned.

Commented [56R56]: Ok

The remaining samples were analysed with a laser spot diameter of 50 μm , with 2.7 J/cm² on-sample laser energy, repetition rate of 10 Hz, ablation time of 40 seconds and ~45 seconds of total baseline acquisition.

Zircon standard P1 (Li et al., 2010; chips of Penglai zircon characterised in-house for trace element composition) was used as the primary standard to calculate element concentrations using ⁹¹Zr as the internal reference isotope and assuming 43.14% Zr in zircon, and to correct for instrument drift.

Lu–Hf isotopic data were measured simultaneously for ¹⁷²Yb, ¹⁷³Yb, ¹⁷⁵Lu, ¹⁷⁶Hf+Yb+Lu, ¹⁷⁷Hf, ¹⁷⁸Hf, ¹⁷⁹Hf and ¹⁸⁰Hf on the Faraday array. Time resolved data was baseline subtracted and reduced using Iolite3.5 (DRS after Woodhead et al., 2004), where ¹⁷⁶Yb and ¹⁷⁶Lu were removed from the 176 mass signal using $^{176}\text{Yb}/^{173}\text{Yb} = 0.7962$ (Chu et al., 2002) and $^{176}\text{Lu}/^{175}\text{Lu} = 0.02655$ (Chu et al., 2002) with an exponential law mass bias correction assuming $^{172}\text{Yb}/^{173}\text{Yb} = 1.35274$ (Chu et al., 2002). The interference corrected ¹⁷⁶Hf/¹⁷⁷Hf was normalized to $^{179}\text{Hf}/^{177}\text{Hf} = 0.7325$ (Patchett and Tatsumoto, 1980) for mass bias correction. Zircons from the Mud Tank carbonatite locality were analysed together with the samples in each session to determine corrected, standard referenced ¹⁷⁶Hf/¹⁷⁷Hf (Table 1). Zircon standards with a range of REE contents (FC1-91500, Plešovice and GJ-1; references and data in Table 1) were run to verify the method. All analysed standards fell within 2 σ error of reported ¹⁷⁶Hf/¹⁷⁷Hf values, although uncertainties on the 24 micron beam run were, understandably, significantly higher. In addition, the corrected ¹⁷⁸Hf/¹⁷⁷Hf and ¹⁸⁰Hf/¹⁷⁷Hf ratios (for the 50 micron beam run) were calculated to monitor the accuracy of the mass bias correction and yielded an average value of 1.467193 ± 12 and 1.886808 ± 11 (n=184), which is within the range of values reported by Thirlwall and Anezkievich (2004). Calculation of ϵ_{Hf} values employed the decay constant of Scherer et al. (2001) and the Chondritic Uniform Reservoir (CHUR) values of Blichert-Toft and Albarède (1997).

Table 1: Summary of the Hf isotope measurements of standard materials used interspersed with analyses of unknown zircons. Mean values were calculated using the built-in statistics from the Iolite software (Paton et al., 2011)

Standard Material	50 μm	24 μm	Reference Value
	Corrected $^{176}\text{Hf}/^{177}\text{Hf}$	Corrected $^{176}\text{Hf}/^{177}\text{Hf}$	
Mud-Tank	0.282505 ± 14 (MSWD = 0.70, n = 14)	0.282507 ± 64 (MSWD = 2.9, n = 6)	0.282505 ± 44 (Woodhead and Hergt, 2005)
FC1	0.282182 ± 9 (MSWD = 0.31, n = 9)	0.282229 ± 150 (MSWD = 3.9, n = 6)	0.282172 ± 42 (Woodhead and Hergt, 2005)
91500	0.282306 ± 11 (MSWD = 0.71, n = 14)	0.282235 ± 130 (MSWD = 2.4, n = 6)	0.282306 ± 40 (Woodhead et al., 2004)
Plešovice	0.282477 ± 8 (MSWD = 0.3, n = 10)	0.282470 ± 51 (MSWD = 0.49, n = 6)	0.282482 ± 13 (Sláma et al., 2008)
GJ-1	0.282016 ± 12 (MSWD = 0.69, n = 14)	0.281201 ± 110 (MSWD = 1.1, n = 6)	0.282000 ± 5 (Morel et al., 2008)

34 RESULTS

3.14.1 U-Pb SHRIMP Zircon dating

3.1.14.1.1 Footwall rhyolite (unit I) – Bentley Footwall

Fourteen analyses on 14 zircons from sample 15BUDD78 – 111.60 m were performed (Table 2 Supplementary Material 2). Using only analyses within 3% of concordant yields a mean $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age of 2696.5 ± 4.2 Ma (95% c.l., n=12; mean square weighted deviation, MSWD=1.04, Figure 3). The average and range of Th/U ratio from the most concordant SHRIMP analyses for this sample are 0.60 and 0.45-0.72, respectively.

A second sample from unit I was dated. Twenty-seven analyses from 27 zircons from sample 15BUDD137 – 398.60 m were collected (Table 2 Supplementary Material 2). The mean $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age obtained for analyses within 4% of concordant and with <0.3% common Pb was 2691.7 ± 2.5 Ma (95% c.l.; n=25; MSWD=0.95, Figure 3). The average and range of Th/U ratio from the most concordant SHRIMP analyses are 0.63 and 0.41-0.84, respectively.

The CL images of zircons from the two unit I, footwall rhyolite samples show grains with continuous oscillatory zoning and no discernible core and/or rims, as shown in Figure 4, and have with sizes that range from about 50 to 100 μm (Figure 4). Their morphologies, Th/U and ages are indistinguishable, and combining the most concordant data, the resulting age of

Commented [57]: I recommend to move Table 2 into the ESMs in a spreadsheet format, so that the data can be more easily accessible. We should save colleagues from wasting their time doing copy/pasting from tables within pdf.

Commented [58R58]: Ok

Commented [59]: This sentences should be better linked or combined.

Commented [60R60]: Ok

2692.9 ± 2.1 Ma (95% cl; n=37; MSWD=1.05) is our best estimate of the age of the footwall rhyolite at Bentley.

3.1.24.1.2 *Transitional andesite (unit III) – Bentley Hangingwall*

The samples from the transitional andesite were treated as two separate samples for the geochronology portion of this study. However, these samples were taken 2 meters apart, from the same drillcore (15BUDD120), and were within the same stratigraphic facies. The CL images show zircons with continuous oscillatory zoning, and ~~are ranging from~~ 15 to 30 µm in diameter (Figure 5).

Sample 15BUDD120 – 226.04 m yielded 24 dates from 20 zircons. Considering only the 13 results with <5% discordance ([Table 2Supplementary Material 2](#)), the MSWD is 2.7 and indicates an age spread not consistent with a single age population. Omitting the three youngest ages as statistical outliers probably influenced by diffusional Pb-loss, ~~yields a mean age for~~ the remaining population yields a mean age of 2693.2 ± 5.8 Ma (95% cl; n= 10; MSWD=0.88, Figure 3). The average and range of Th/U from the SHRIMP analyses of the more concordant zircons from this sample is 0.90 and 0.39-1.55, respectively.

Sample 15BUDD120 – 228.42 has 18 dates from 16 grains. The ages <5% discordant and <0.1% common Pb yield a mean ²⁰⁷Pb/²⁰⁶Pb age of 2693.6 ± 6.0 Ma (95% cl, n=9; MSWD=0.24, Figure 3; [Table 2Supplementary Material 2](#)). The average and range of Th/U of the more concordant zircons is 0.95 and 0.73-1.31, respectively.

The ages obtained for the two adjacent samples from the same stratigraphical facies agree within error. Hence, the data can be combined to obtain a mean ²⁰⁷Pb/²⁰⁶Pb age for the Transitional Andesite (unit III) of 2693.4 ± 4.1 Ma (95% c.l., n=19; MSWD=0.55). The average Th/U from the zircons used in this mean age calculation was 0.92.

Table 13: SHRIMP isotopic data for monazite from the Penzance granite (mounts N18-06, 16)

Penzance granite (mount N18-06, 16)																
Mount grain-spot	ppm U	ppm Th	$\frac{^{232}\text{Th}}{^{238}\text{U}}$	4f206 (%)	4f208 (%)	$\frac{^{207}\text{Pb}^*}{^{206}\text{Pb}^*}$	$\pm 1\sigma$ err	$\frac{^{206}\text{Pb}^*}{^{238}\text{U}}$	$\pm 1\sigma$ err	$\frac{^{207}\text{Pb}^*}{^{235}\text{U}}$	$\pm 1\sigma$ err	$\frac{^{208}\text{Pb}^*}{^{232}\text{Th}}$	$\pm 1\sigma$ err	$\frac{^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}}{\text{Age (Ma)}}$	1σ err	% Disc.
$\leq 5\%$ discordance and $< 0.5\%$ 4f206																
N18-06B.B-5	207	12986	63.00	-0.02	0.00	0.1865	0.0022	0.5074	0.0114	13.044	0.3320	0.137	0.0026	2711	19	+2
N18-16C.8-3	629	12531	20.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.1863	0.0010	0.5232	0.0101	13.435	0.2720	0.148	0.0032	2709	9	0
N18-16A.1-6	508	15332	30.00	-0.06	-0.02	0.1862	0.0014	0.5092	0.0069	13.075	0.2050	0.142	0.0030	2709	12	+2
N18-06B.G-2	215	14282	66.00	0.02	0.00	0.1855	0.0022	0.5170	0.0097	13.224	0.2950	0.141	0.0026	2703	19	+1
N18-06B.A-6	789	32172	41.00	0.00	0.00	0.1853	0.0015	0.5092	0.0090	13.010	0.2560	0.140	0.0029	2701	13	+2
N18-16A.1-1	448	11587	26.00	0.00	0.00	0.1852	0.0026	0.5288	0.0091	13.499	0.3020	0.152	0.0032	2700	23	-1
N18-06B.B-7	310	11884	38.00	-0.04	-0.01	0.1851	0.0018	0.5140	0.0088	13.119	0.2620	0.138	0.0028	2699	16	+1
N18-06B.G-5	345	16469	48.00	-0.06	-0.01	0.1847	0.0019	0.4933	0.0085	12.563	0.2540	0.136	0.0024	2696	17	+4
N18-06B.A-5	573	19934	35.00	0.43	0.11	0.1844	0.0017	0.5213	0.0094	13.257	0.2710	0.144	0.0028	2693	15	0
N18-06B.K-2	1134	74444	66.00	0.34	0.04	0.1842	0.0016	0.4894	0.0085	12.430	0.2430	0.136	0.0027	2691	14	+5
N18-16B.6-2	926	62647	68.00	0.05	0.01	0.1842	0.0010	0.4854	0.0078	12.327	0.2130	0.142	0.0030	2691	9	+5
N18-16D.15-1	602	14098	23.00	0.02	0.01	0.1841	0.0009	0.5092	0.0083	12.929	0.2250	0.147	0.0030	2690	8	+1
N18-16C.8-5	664	14242	21.00	-0.05	-0.02	0.1841	0.0012	0.5198	0.0080	13.193	0.2240	0.141	0.0030	2690	11	0
N18-16C.8-6	466	11320	24.00	0.01	0.00	0.1840	0.0013	0.4927	0.0118	12.502	0.3140	0.144	0.0029	2689	12	+4

<u>N18-16D.16-1</u>	<u>1039</u>	<u>19243</u>	<u>19.00</u>	<u>0.03</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.1839</u>	<u>0.0007</u>	<u>0.5021</u>	<u>0.0120</u>	<u>12.729</u>	<u>0.3110</u>	<u>0.147</u>	<u>0.0033</u>	<u>2688</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>+2</u>
<u>N18-16G.18-1</u>	<u>1002</u>	<u>69393</u>	<u>69.00</u>	<u>0.32</u>	<u>0.04</u>	<u>0.1838</u>	<u>0.0009</u>	<u>0.4905</u>	<u>0.0102</u>	<u>12.430</u>	<u>0.2690</u>	<u>0.149</u>	<u>0.0035</u>	<u>2687</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>+4</u>
<u>N18-06B.A-7</u>	<u>1097</u>	<u>38290</u>	<u>35.00</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.1835</u>	<u>0.0014</u>	<u>0.5314</u>	<u>0.0097</u>	<u>13.442</u>	<u>0.2700</u>	<u>0.146</u>	<u>0.0029</u>	<u>2685</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>-2</u>
<u>N18-06B.G-7</u>	<u>216</u>	<u>12340</u>	<u>57.00</u>	<u>0.07</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.1832</u>	<u>0.0020</u>	<u>0.5244</u>	<u>0.0095</u>	<u>13.249</u>	<u>0.2840</u>	<u>0.143</u>	<u>0.0028</u>	<u>2682</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>-1</u>
<u>N18-16D.14-1</u>	<u>129</u>	<u>6945</u>	<u>54.00</u>	<u>-0.03</u>	<u>-0.01</u>	<u>0.1832</u>	<u>0.0019</u>	<u>0.5022</u>	<u>0.0137</u>	<u>12.685</u>	<u>0.3700</u>	<u>0.152</u>	<u>0.0032</u>	<u>2682</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>+2</u>
<u>N18-16A.1-4</u>	<u>279</u>	<u>15220</u>	<u>54.00</u>	<u>-0.01</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.1831</u>	<u>0.0016</u>	<u>0.5303</u>	<u>0.0114</u>	<u>13.390</u>	<u>0.3120</u>	<u>0.152</u>	<u>0.0032</u>	<u>2681</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>-2</u>
<u>N18-06B.B-6</u>	<u>308</u>	<u>10496</u>	<u>34.00</u>	<u>0.03</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.1830</u>	<u>0.0018</u>	<u>0.4883</u>	<u>0.0107</u>	<u>12.323</u>	<u>0.2980</u>	<u>0.137</u>	<u>0.0028</u>	<u>2681</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>+4</u>
<u>N18-06B.G-4</u>	<u>178</u>	<u>11404</u>	<u>64.00</u>	<u>0.04</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.1828</u>	<u>0.0023</u>	<u>0.4965</u>	<u>0.0095</u>	<u>12.515</u>	<u>0.2870</u>	<u>0.139</u>	<u>0.0026</u>	<u>2679</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>+3</u>
<u>N18-06B.K-3</u>	<u>895</u>	<u>38759</u>	<u>43.00</u>	<u>0.02</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.1827</u>	<u>0.0015</u>	<u>0.4817</u>	<u>0.0083</u>	<u>12.135</u>	<u>0.2340</u>	<u>0.136</u>	<u>0.0026</u>	<u>2678</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>+5</u>
<u>N18-16A.1-3</u>	<u>515</u>	<u>14308</u>	<u>28.00</u>	<u>-0.01</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.1827</u>	<u>0.0010</u>	<u>0.5205</u>	<u>0.0105</u>	<u>13.111</u>	<u>0.2760</u>	<u>0.147</u>	<u>0.0032</u>	<u>2677</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>-1</u>
<u>N18-16C.8-1</u>	<u>638</u>	<u>13479</u>	<u>21.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.1824</u>	<u>0.0014</u>	<u>0.5182</u>	<u>0.0072</u>	<u>13.035</u>	<u>0.2110</u>	<u>0.147</u>	<u>0.0032</u>	<u>2675</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>-1</u>
<u>N18-06B.A-1</u>	<u>863</u>	<u>31292</u>	<u>36.00</u>	<u>-0.02</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.1824</u>	<u>0.0015</u>	<u>0.5070</u>	<u>0.0088</u>	<u>12.750</u>	<u>0.2490</u>	<u>0.149</u>	<u>0.0030</u>	<u>2675</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>+1</u>
<u>N18-06B.B-3</u>	<u>296</u>	<u>11665</u>	<u>39.00</u>	<u>-0.09</u>	<u>-0.02</u>	<u>0.1823</u>	<u>0.0020</u>	<u>0.5334</u>	<u>0.0095</u>	<u>13.405</u>	<u>0.2850</u>	<u>0.144</u>	<u>0.0029</u>	<u>2674</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>-3</u>
<u>N18-06B.B-1</u>	<u>188</u>	<u>10313</u>	<u>55.00</u>	<u>0.05</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.1821</u>	<u>0.0023</u>	<u>0.5124</u>	<u>0.0099</u>	<u>12.868</u>	<u>0.2980</u>	<u>0.144</u>	<u>0.0026</u>	<u>2672</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>N18-06B.G-3</u>	<u>475</u>	<u>24369</u>	<u>51.00</u>	<u>-0.03</u>	<u>-0.01</u>	<u>0.1821</u>	<u>0.0017</u>	<u>0.4923</u>	<u>0.0083</u>	<u>12.363</u>	<u>0.2420</u>	<u>0.136</u>	<u>0.0026</u>	<u>2672</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>+3</u>
<u>N18-16A.6-1</u>	<u>1052</u>	<u>69743</u>	<u>66.00</u>	<u>-0.01</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.1821</u>	<u>0.0007</u>	<u>0.5010</u>	<u>0.0077</u>	<u>12.581</u>	<u>0.2020</u>	<u>0.150</u>	<u>0.0033</u>	<u>2672</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>+2</u>
<u>N18-16C.8-2</u>	<u>605</u>	<u>11778</u>	<u>19.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.1821</u>	<u>0.0010</u>	<u>0.5212</u>	<u>0.0089</u>	<u>13.084</u>	<u>0.2390</u>	<u>0.149</u>	<u>0.0030</u>	<u>2672</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>-1</u>
<u>N18-16C.10-4</u>	<u>587</u>	<u>20801</u>	<u>35.00</u>	<u>0.02</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.1820</u>	<u>0.0011</u>	<u>0.5089</u>	<u>0.0096</u>	<u>12.772</u>	<u>0.2570</u>	<u>0.146</u>	<u>0.0033</u>	<u>2671</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>+1</u>
<u>N18-16C.10-1</u>	<u>466</u>	<u>14728</u>	<u>32.00</u>	<u>0.10</u>	<u>0.03</u>	<u>0.1819</u>	<u>0.0011</u>	<u>0.5268</u>	<u>0.0110</u>	<u>13.210</u>	<u>0.2900</u>	<u>0.153</u>	<u>0.0039</u>	<u>2670</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>-2</u>

N18-06B.B- 2	202	9808	49.00	0.22	0.04	0.1812	0.0022	0.5116	0.0094	12.779	0.2860	0.141	0.0027	2664	20	0
N18-16C.8- 4	636	13910	22.00	0.02	0.01	0.1810	0.0010	0.5352	0.0069	13.353	0.1920	0.144	0.0030	2662	9	-4
N18- 16D.13-1	389	6592	17.00	0.09	0.04	0.1808	0.0011	0.5403	0.0104	13.471	0.2760	0.155	0.0034	2661	10	-5
N18- 06B.D-1	362	26423	73.00	0.04	0.00	0.1808	0.0018	0.4927	0.0099	12.282	0.2780	0.139	0.0026	2660	16	+3
N18- 16C.10-3	557	15536	28.00	0.07	0.02	0.1805	0.0012	0.5212	0.0087	12.968	0.2360	0.142	0.0030	2657	11	-2
>5% discordance and/or >0.5% 4f206																
N18- 06A.N-3	115	12090	105.00	1.31	0.09	0.1942	0.0046	0.3399	0.0074	9.100	0.2920	0.120	0.0024	2778	38	+32
N18- 06B.A-4	484	26279	54.00	0.98	0.17	0.1903	0.0024	0.4979	0.0106	13.063	0.3280	0.134	0.0025	2745	21	+5
N18-06B.E- 1	142	5608	40.00	2.70	0.69	0.1879	0.0044	0.5326	0.0107	13.801	0.4280	0.132	0.0024	2724	39	-1
N18- 06B.K-1	440	31841	72.00	0.93	0.12	0.1852	0.0025	0.4438	0.0078	11.331	0.2530	0.120	0.0023	2700	22	+12
N18- 06B.G-1	173	10873	63.00	0.06	0.01	0.1843	0.0025	0.4764	0.0124	12.104	0.3560	0.133	0.0027	2692	22	+7
N18-06B.B- 8	245	13623	56.00	-0.03	-0.01	0.1831	0.0020	0.4666	0.0083	11.780	0.2490	0.123	0.0022	2681	18	+8
N18-16A.1- 2	288	14906	52.00	0.08	0.01	0.1819	0.0015	0.5669	0.0127	14.220	0.3420	0.160	0.0036	2670	14	-8
N18- 06B.A-8	349	26244	75.00	2.02	0.21	0.1818	0.0056	0.3843	0.0130	9.635	0.4430	0.122	0.0029	2670	51	+21
N18-06B.B- 4	143	9993	70.00	0.14	0.02	0.1816	0.0027	0.4682	0.0095	11.725	0.2960	0.128	0.0025	2668	24	+7
N18- 06B.G-8	220	14795	67.00	0.26	0.04	0.1814	0.0020	0.4741	0.0101	11.857	0.2890	0.128	0.0025	2666	18	+6
N18-16B.6- 3	843	59533	71.00	0.07	0.01	0.1812	0.0010	0.4463	0.0081	11.152	0.2140	0.140	0.0030	2664	9	+11
N18- 06A.N-1	76	9566	125.00	1.76	0.15	0.1811	0.0049	0.4884	0.0112	12.191	0.4330	0.110	0.0023	2663	45	+4
N18- 06B.G-6	281	13360	48.00	0.06	0.01	0.1810	0.0018	0.4676	0.0182	11.670	0.4720	0.137	0.0027	2662	17	+7

1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049

362
363

N18-16C.10-2	629	16612	26.00	0.12	0.03	0.1802	0.0019	0.4040	0.0213	10.040	0.5400	0.133	0.0031	2655	17	+18
N18-06B.A-2	814	29448	36.00	1.02	0.23	0.1763	0.0020	0.4132	0.0093	10.042	0.2560	0.124	0.0024	2618	19	+15
N18-06B.A-3	638	36168	57.00	1.50	0.23	0.1753	0.0038	0.4980	0.0173	12.034	0.4960	0.136	0.0027	2609	36	0
N18-16G.23-1	147	17544	120.00	0.89	0.04	0.1270	0.0034	0.2374	0.0127	4.155	0.2490	0.094	0.0021	2056	47	+33
N18-16G.23-2	456	36602	80.00	1.94	0.08	0.0971	0.0042	0.1036	0.0017	1.387	0.0640	0.067	0.0019	1569	81	+59

3.1.34.1.3 *Penzance granite*

The CL imaging of abundant zircons from all three samples collected from different locations in a single quarry of the Penzance granite displays textures typical of metamict zircons (Figure 6). These include cavities, fractures, disruption of the original zoning and development of dark CL areas (Corfu, 2003; Kılıç, 2016).

Even when targeting zircon grains seemingly less affected by metamictisation, twenty-seven analysis were aborted throughout ~~the~~ a single analytical session due to the unacceptably high ^{204}Pb content. Of the twenty-four analysis which were not aborted, only nine were <5% discordant and had less than 1% common Pb (Figure 6, [Table 2 Supplementary Material 2](#)). The U and Th contents of completed analyses (average of ~580 and ~400 ppm, respectively) were commensurate with the observed metamictisation. The nine near concordant analysis have scattered ages typical of metamict zircons, and only one of the ages is within error of the previously reported age (Geoscience Australia ~~(GA)~~, 2019). We conclude that no reliable age could be calculated from these zircon data. The average and range of Th/U from the completed SHRIMP analyses was 0.72 and 0.52-1.46, respectively.

3.24.2 **U-Pb SHRIMP monazite dating of the Penzance granite**

A significant number of the monazite grains were separated from the three Penzance granite samples. They have euhedral zoning textures on BSE images (Figure 7), which indicates magmatic crystallization. Recent studies (e.g.: Piechocka et al., 2017) have demonstrated the increased reliability of magmatic monazite as a geochronometer for igneous rocks with unreliable zircon age data, when subsequent metamorphic conditions remained under the Pb closure temperature of monazite. Monazite contains high U and Th and incorporates minor common Pb and, unlike zircon, is largely immune to metamictisation and radiogenic Pb loss at low temperatures (Piechocka et al., 2017).

A total of 38 of 56 analysis from 18 grains with low common Pb ($f_{206} < 0.5\%$) and low discordance ($\leq 5\%$) (Table 13) yield a mean $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age of 2681.9 ± 4.5 Ma (95% c1; MSWD = 1.4; Figure 3). The slightly high MSWD indicates the possibility of scatter from a single-age population. However, in the absence of any skewness in the age probability plot (not shown), anomalous Th-U chemistry or other evidence for either inheritance or Pb-loss, and given the amount of data collected ($n=56$) and used ($n=38$), this is considered to be the age of these igneous monazites.

3.3.4.3 HF-isotopes in zircon

3.3.4.3.1 Teutonic Bore volcanics

Twenty-five zircon grains from sample 15BUDD78 – 111.60 m of the footwall rhyolite (unit I) were analysed for Lu–Hf by LA-SS-ICP-MS (Table 4 Supplementary Material 3, mount N18-15D, sample B78.). The calculated $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$, based on the interpreted SHRIMP $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age (2692.9 Ma), plot in a homogeneous population with values ranging between +2.3 and +5.6 (Figure 8), and a mean of 3.7 ± 0.5 (MSWD = 0.47, $n = 25$). The low MSWD value partly reflects the relatively large $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ errors on individual analyses.

Twenty-nine Lu–Hf analysis (Table 4 Supplementary Material 3, mount N18-15C, sample B137) were conducted on zircons from sample 15BUDD137 – 398.60 m of the same footwall rhyolite (unit I), and, once again, the $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ is calculated based on the interpreted SHRIMP $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age for emplacement. $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ values range between -0.6 and +5.2 with a mean of 2.9 ± 0.5 (MSWD = 0.90, $n = 29$, Figure 8). Combining the $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ data for the both footwall rhyolite samples (unit I) yields a value of 3.27 ± 0.33 (MSWD = 0.79, $n = 54$).

Sixteen Lu–Hf analysis (Table 4 Supplementary Material 3, B37) were conducted on zircon from both samples of transitional andesite (unit III) and the mean age of the combined SHRIMP analyses of 2693.4 Ma was used to calculate $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ which showed considerable scatter and ranged between -11.7 and +8.6 with significant errors on individual analyses (Table

1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226

[4Supplementary Material 3](#)). The lower precision is a result of the smaller spot-size necessary for the small zircons from these samples. The mean $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(t)}$ for the transitional andesite (unit III) is 2.6 ± 1.8 (MSWD = 1.05, $n = 16$, Figure 8).

3.3.24.3.2 *Penzance granite*

Recent studies show that the Lu–Hf system remains relatively undisturbed within metamorphic zircon that do not undergo significant later alteration (Lenting et al., 2010). Thirty-four Lu–Hf analyses on zircon from the Penzance granite ([Table 4Supplementary Material 3](#), N18-06) show a range of $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(t)}$ between -1.5 to +4.7 with mean value of 2.17 ± 0.45 (MSWD = 1.15, $n = 34$). The $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(t)}$ values were calculated based on the SHRIMP monazite ages presented herein.

3.44.4 Trace elements in zircon

Selected trace elements were measured via LA-SS-ICP-MS ([Table 5Supplementary Material 4](#)). Figure 9 illustrates patterns for selected REEs normalized to chondrite (Anders and Grevesse, 1989) for the two samples from the footwall rhyolite (unit I), the combined samples of andesite (unit III) and the Penzance granite. ~~Despite being represented separately on Figure 9, both samples of footwall rhyolite (unit I) display consistent REE chemistry.~~

The zircons from the footwall rhyolite (unit I) and the andesite (unit III) have similar MREE and HREE content, ~~as showed on~~ (Figure 9). The mean Yb/Dy ratio is 4.15 ± 0.85 and 4.45 ± 0.68 (1σ) for the rhyolite and andesite, respectively. The Ce anomaly is estimated by the Ce/Nd_(CN) ratio (Loucks et al., 2018) to be positive in both rock types ([Tables 4Supplementary Material 4](#)), with mean Ce/Nd_(CN) of 1.04 ± 0.58 and 1.30 ± 0.75 (1σ) for the rhyolite and andesite, respectively. The zircons from the Penzance granite show a mean Ce/Nd_(CN) of 0.92 ± 0.23 (1δ), indicating a positive Ce anomaly, and Yb/Dy ratio of 2.5 ± 0.67 (1σ).

Commented [61]: If you believe that this graphical representation might be misleading provide an alternative version. To me it seems clear as it is, and I find this sentence not necessary.

Commented [62R62]: The unnecessary sentence was erased.

Table 5: Selected trace element contents (ppm) of zircons from the Penzance granite and the volcanic sequence at the Bentley deposit.

Commented [63]: As for Table 2 and 4, also Table 5 should be included in the ESMs. Raw data should have no place in the manuscript. If you think to be necessary provide a small summary-table of the analyses, but your figures already represent well your data.

Commented [64R64]: Ok

45 DISCUSSION

4.15.1 Age constrains on the Penzance granite

Hollis et al. (2015) proposed a link between VHMS mineralisation at the Teutonic Bore Camp and the emplacement of the HFSE-enriched Penzance granite, based on geochemical similarities, the proximity and broad synchronicity between the intrusive magmatic activity and the volcanism of the host sequence. These observations were underpinned by a U-Pb zircon age for the volcanism (2692 ± 4 Ma; Nelson, 1995) and the age reported by Champion and Cassidy (2002) of 2679 ± 8 Ma, for the Kent Complex of the Penzance Supersuite. This latter age was obtained by SHRIMP U-Pb zircon dating of sample ID 96969076 of Geoscience Australia's database, after L.Black, AGSO (unpublished) in Champion and Cassidy (2002).

Champion and Cassidy (2002) reported the age but not the data table. However, the geochronological data, as well as location and description for sample ID 96969076, are available from Geoscience Australia's Geochron Delivery database (Geoscience Australia (GA), 2019). The reported age for this sample is 2686 ± 9 Ma with MSWD = 1.6 and probability = 0.044 (Geoscience Australia (GA), 2019), which is within error of the age reported by Champion and Cassidy (2002), but not identical.

We have reprocessed the data available from Geochron Delivery for sample 96969076 and obtained an identical age of 2686 ± 9 Ma, MSWD = 1.6 from 21 analysis. However, given the scatter inferred by the high MSWD, we have filtered the data by only considering analysis with common Pb <0.3%, deriving a more statistically robust age of 2682 ± 9 Ma (n=12; MSWD = 1.3). More importantly, only four zircons were recovered from sample 96969076 and the 21 analyses and calculated age is based on analyses from only three grains, of which one was

a xenocryst. Each of ~~the~~our three samples ~~we~~ collected from the same quarry had hundreds of zircon grains, and after hand-picking the clearest (least metamict) zircons and analysing the best areas based on CL-SE imaging, we only detected one analysis in the relevant time interval, and it was 7% discordant. In view of this discrepancy, we searched for other datable minerals in the Penzance granite and identified igneous monazite. The monazite age of 2681.9 ± 4.5 Ma discussed above is considered to be a statistically valid age of magma crystallization for the Penzance granite, and supersedes the previous zircon age(s).

4.25.2 Geochronological associations

The relative timing of ore formation in the ~~FB~~Teutonic Bore ~~C~~camp is well constrained within the stratigraphic sequence at Jaguar, where substantial evidence of seafloor precipitation indicate coeval mineralisation to the development of the upper sedimentary package (unit IV). Such evidence is absent from Bentley and the ~~FB~~Teutonic Bore deposit, which indicates that they were formed at greater depths, probably by replacement of a slightly older stratigraphy (see Figure 2A).

The syn-ore nature of the upper sedimentary package (unit IV) at Jaguar, the deposit hosted within the youngest stratigraphic level in the ~~FB~~Teutonic Bore ~~C~~camp, indicates that the hangingwall sequence at Jaguar post-dates ore formation and could provide a potential minimum mineralisation age. Attempts to date this sequence have proven unsuccessful to date (Das, 2018). The footwall in all three deposits, as well as the hangingwall immediately above the orebodies of the Bentley and the ~~FB~~Teutonic Bore deposits, pre-date the mineralisation and represent a maximum age of ore formation.

The ages obtained in this study for the footwall rhyolite (unit I - 2691.7 ± 2.5 Ma and 2696.5 ± 4.3 Ma) and the transitional andesite (unit III - 2693.4 ± 4.1 Ma) suggest that mineralisation at the ~~FB~~Teutonic Bore ~~C~~camp is younger than c.a. ~~2694 Ma~~, ~~as indicated in~~ (Figure 10). The unpublished TIMS age for the footwall rhyolite sequence (unit I) of 2692.6 ± 1.5 Ma (Das,

2018) is indistinguishable from the SHRIMP age presented here for the pre-ore volcanic sequence at the [TBTeutonic Bore Ceamp](#). Similarly, the previous SHRIMP age for the [TBTeutonic Bore Ceamp](#) sequence (2692 ± 4 Ma; (Nelson, 1995) is similar to the age determined in this study (Figure 10). Therefore, although poorly constrained in the stratigraphy, it is likely that the porphyritic dacite dated by Nelson (1995) is part of the pre-ore stratigraphy (units I, II, or III).

The ages for the footwall rhyolite (unit I) of 2696.5 ± 4.3 Ma and 2691.7 ± 2.5 Ma are within error of each other, when considering a 95% confidence interval. However, considering the normal distribution tendency (Figure 10) of single-population ages obtained from multiple grains (Figure 10; Schoene et al., 2013), it is probable that these could also represent a long duration of volcanic activity during the development of this stratigraphic facies.

The ages for the footwall rhyolite (unit I) and the Penzance granite (2681.9 ± 4.5 Ma) do not overlap (Figure 10) at the 95% confidence interval and are not, therefore, coeval. Furthermore, the porphyritic dacite from Nelson (1995) and the transitional andesite (unit III) do not overlap the age of the Penzance (Figure 10) at a 95% confidence interval. We infer that these rocks pre-date the mineralisation and the syn-ore stratigraphy.

4.3.5.3 Geochemical correlations

4.3.5.3.1 Whole-rock geochemistry

Hollis et al. (2015) described similarities in whole-rock REE distribution between the Penzance granite (Kent Complex) and the felsic volcanics that host the mineralisation at Jaguar (footwall rhyolite – unit I). Based on these observations and the HFSE enrichment of both rock types they suggested a possible genetic link between these rocks, proposing that the footwall volcanic sequence at Jaguar would be the extrusive equivalent to the Penzance granite.

The geochronological results presented here indicate that the crystallization of the Penzance granite is not coeval to the formation of the footwall rhyolite (unit I) or the transitional andesite

(unit III) at Bentley. However, these processes occur within a ~12 M.y. interval. Given the chemical similarities between these rock types and their proximity in age it is conceivable that they are both the product of a single magmatic system or had a common source.

Additionally, based on whole-rock geochemistry observations, other stratigraphic facies within the younger, syn-ore, portion of the volcanic sequence at the [TBTeutonic Bore](#) [Ceamp](#) are alternative candidates to be the extrusive correspondent to the Penzance granite.

The dacite that can be observed at the sedimentary-volcanic package of the upper sedimentary horizon (unit IV) in the Jaguar deposit (MPD from Belford et al., 2015) has Y/Zr ratios that indicates a tholeiitic affinity (Belford et al., 2015), which is also the case for the Penzance granite (ID 96969076, sampled from the same locality of the geochronological study; Sedgmen et al., 2007) (Figure 11). Furthermore, the MPD dacite yields a La/Yb_{CN} ratio of 3.4 – 5.5 (Belford, 2010), which indicates a significant LREE/HREE enrichment, equal to what is indicated by whole-rock REE content for the Penzance granite (Hollis et al., 2015).

~~4.3.25.3.2~~ *Zircon geochemistry*

The Hf-isotopes corroborate Hollis et al. (2015)'s hypothesis of a genetic link between the [TBTeutonic Bore](#) Camp volcanic sequence and the Penzance granite. All zircons (Penzance, units I and III) have very similar $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$, with most values between -1 and +6 (Figure 8). The $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ values show little contribution from evolved sources ~~as shown in~~ (Figure 8). Indeed, Nd and Pb isotopes indicate that the [TBTeutonic Bore](#) [eCamp](#) is located within a more juvenile zone of the Yilgarn craton, the Teutonic zone (Huston et al., 2014). The $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ for the zircons from the Penzance granite and the volcanic rocks from the [TBTeutonic Bore](#) [Ceamp](#) plot above the CHUR line (Figure 8), indicating a juvenile depleted mantle source component. These $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ are slightly higher than the $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ of zircons from other granites and volcanics within the Kurnalpi Terrain (Isaac, 2015; Wyche et al., 2012).

According to Kirkland et al. (2015), parental magma composition is one of four factors that may contribute to variations in the Th/U of a zircon crystal. Therefore, the similar Th/U ratios (Table 2 Supplementary Material 2) of the Penzance (~0.7) and Bentley zircons (Unit I: ~0.6) also suggest they could have a shared magma source. Furthermore, all zircons have similar Ce/Nd_(CN) ratios (Table 5 Supplementary Material 4), which indicates comparable redox conditions, as this ratio is a proxy for the Ce anomaly (Loucks et al., 2018).

The zircons from the Penzance granite have higher overall REE content and MREE/HREE enrichment (indicated by the Yb/Dy ratio), when compared to the Bentley units I and III zircons (Table 5 Supplementary Material 4). These chemical differences indicate that the Penzance granite is more fractionated but do not resolve whether this is the result of igneous differentiation from a common magma or magma production from a common source. The ~12 M.y. interval between the units I and III volcanics, and the Penzance granite suggests the latter.

4.45.4 The Contribution to the 4D evolutionary model of the Teutonic Bore Camp ore

The 4D evolutionary model of the Teutonic Bore Camp is achieved by the addition of the time dimension to the current understanding of the geological evolution of the deposits, including stratigraphy and geochemistry (Figure 2; Belford, 2010; Belford et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2015; Das, 2018; Hallberg and Thompson, 1985; Macklin, 2010; Parker et al., 2017). The geochronology data presented in this study constrain in time several processes within the Teutonic Bore Camp, including the intrusion of the Penzance granite, which could be linked to the development of the mineral system.

Similarities in zircon chemistry (i.e.: $\square\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ and Th/U ratio; see section 5.3: Geochemical correlations) complemented by the geochemical correspondences between the Penzance granite and the Teutonic Bore volcanics (i.e.: HFSE-enrichment and REE pattern, see

section 5.3: Geochemical correlations), suggest a genetic association between the intrusive granite and the extrusive rocks that constitute the ~~Teutonic Bore~~ Camp host sequence.

~~Additionally, there is evidence of interaction between the Penzance and the volcanic rocks that are intruded by it, such as the irregular contact between the Penzance granite and the volcanic sequence, as well as, the recognition of intrusive veins of granitoid within the volcanics, and xenoliths of volcanic rocks within the intrusive granite (Hallberg and Thompson, 1985) indicate that the Penzance intrudes the volcanic Teutonic Bore sequence and that their proximity is not the result of subsequent tectonic processes.~~ Considering the close geographic position of the granite and the ore-bearing volcanic sequence (Figure_1), their shared geochemical features and broad synchronicity, it is ~~probable-possible~~ that the Penzance granite was involved in the process that generated the VHMS mineralisation at the ~~Teutonic Bore~~ Camp.

~~The role of granites in the development of VHMS systems has been the focus of numerous studies (1). Magmatic-hydrothermal contribution of metals is not necessary in the development of VHMS deposits (Huston et al., 2011) and syn-ore intrusions do not always directly supply metal to the system, but rather act as a heating source, driving hydrothermal circulation that leaches metals from the country host rock (Lode et al., 2017). However, in a number of cases there is evidence of a significant contribution of metals and/or volatiles from the magmatic source, in addition to the supply of heat (e.g.: Chen et al., 2015; Lode et al., 2017; e.g.: Yang and Scott, 1996).~~

Chen et al. (2015) used S-isotopes as a proxy for the hydrothermal fluid composition in the ~~Teutonic Bore~~ Camp and interpreted that the supply of sulphur to the hydrothermal ore fluid was the result of a mixture between seawater and a hydrothermal fluid of magmatic origin. These authors did not find compelling evidence for leaching of sulphur from the host sequence into the ore fluid in the ~~Teutonic Bore~~ Camp. Therefore, the Penzance granite is a strong

Commented [65]: References are required.

Commented [66R66]: I simply erased the sentence. It was not necessary to the understanding of the paragraph and the studies that would be referenced are presented through the rest of the text.

candidate to have acted as the probable magmatic source of sulphur to the mineralisation, and consequently possibly, metals.

4.5.5.5 Exploration strategies

Our observations show that the HFSE-enriched Penzance granite probably played a fundamental role in the supply of metals and heat that culminated in the development of the replacement-type VHMS deposits of the Teutonic Bore Camp. Therefore, future exploration efforts within the camp should focus on fluid pathways from the similar granites. The emphasis should be on mapping syn- or pre-intrusive structures that could facilitate fluid flow from the granite to the host sequence. Fertile zones are likely to be discovered where these fluid paths find the appropriate conditions for metal precipitation, which has been suggested by previous studies to be sediment-rich horizons (Parker et al., 2017) and/or depositional breaks (Belford et al., 2015).

This paper supports conclusions proposed by Hollis et al. (2015), of a connection between HFSE-enriched granites and VHMS ($\pm$ base metals) deposits within the Yilgarn Craton. Following the identification of fertile terrains, populated with HFSE-enriched granites, greenfield exploration campaigns should employ a multi-disciplinary approach to test the processes involved in the formation of an ore deposit. The development of 4D models (i.e. constrain in time of 3D geological processes) allows for a better understanding of the timing and nature of the magmatic and stratigraphical processes necessary for the development of such ore deposits. This is particular true in Archean replacement-type VHMS deposits, where the syn-volcanic timing of the mineralisation is not always clear (e.g. Barrote et al., 2019)

5.6 CONCLUSIONS

- Three mined VHMS orebodies in the Teutonic Bore Camp (Teutonic Bore deposit, Jaguar and Bentley) formed at different stratigraphic levels.

Commented [67]: Whereas the suggestion that the Penzance granite could have acted as a sulfur source is coherent with the isotopic data discussed in Chen et al. (2015), the assumption that metals were sourced from the granite magma needs to be supported from further evidence.

Commented [68R68]: We understand the reviewers concern and have re-phrased the text as to not point the reader towards unsupported affirmations.

- Jaguar formed coeval with its host sequence, whereas the ore in Teutonic Bore and Bentley replaces slightly older stratigraphy.
- The age of the host sequence at the stratigraphic level of the Bentley deposit is ca. 2693 Ma.
- The age of the ~~TB~~Teutonic Bore ~~e~~Camp mineralisation is ~~likely-possibly~~ coeval to the intrusion of the Penzance granite at ca. 2682 Ma.
- Monazite has been shown to be a more reliable chronometer than high-U-Th zircons in the HFSE-enriched Penzance granite.
- The Penzance granite possibly acted as the source of heat and potentially fluid/metals to the ore formation at the ~~TB~~Teutonic Bore ~~C~~camp.
- VHMS exploration in the Yilgarn Craton should focus in finding fluid pathways between HFSE-enriched intrusives and potential host sequences to orebodies.

67 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge: Dr Steve Bereford and Mr. Kyle Hodges from IGO for their wisdom, access to samples, drill core and internal data; Thermo Fisher, GSWA and MRIWA for financial support; and the John de Laeter Centre (JdLC) for the facilities, scientific and technical assistance. [We thank Dr. Haoyang Zhou, Dr. Nicolas Thebaud and an anonymous reviewer whose comments helped improve and clarify this manuscript.](#) JdLC facilities are supported by a university-government consortium, ARC and AuScope via NCRIS. GeoHistory Facility instruments in the John de Laeter Centre, Curtin University were funded via an Australian Geophysical Observing System grant provided to AuScope Pty Ltd. by the AQ44 Australian Education Investment Fund program. The NPII multi-collector was obtained via funding from the Australian Research Council LIEF program (LE150100013).

78 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anders, E., Grevesse, N., 1989. Abundances of the elements: Meteoritic and solar. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 53, 197–214. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037\(89\)90286-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037(89)90286-X)
- Barrett, T.J., MacLean, W.H., 1994. Chemostratigraphy and hydrothermal alteration in exploration for VHMS deposits in greenstones and younger volcanic rocks., in: Lentz, D.R. (Ed.), *Alteration and Alteration Processes Associated with Ore-Forming Systems*, Short Course Notes / Geological Association of Canada. Geological Assoc. of Canada, St. John's, Newfoundland, pp. 433–467.
- ~~Barrote, V., Tessalina, S., McNaughton, N., Jourdan, F., Hollis, S.P., Ware, B., Zi, J.-W., 2020. 4D history of the Nimbus VHMS ore deposit in the Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia. *Precambrian Research* 337, 105536. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.precamres.2019.105536>~~
- Belford, S.M., 2010. Genetic and chemical characterisation of the host succession to the archaean Jaguar VHMS deposit. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Tasmania, UTAS, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia.
- Belford, S.M., Davidson, G.J., McPhie, J., Large, R.R., 2015. Architecture of the Neoarchaean Jaguar VHMS deposit, Western Australia: Implications for prospectivity and the presence of depositional breaks. *Precambrian Res.* 260, 136–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.precamres.2014.12.019>
- ~~Black, L.P., Kamo, S.L., Allen, C.M., Aleinikoff, J.N., Davis, D.W., Korsch, R.J., Foudoulis, C., 2003. TEMORA 1: a new zircon standard for Phanerozoic U–Pb geochronology. *Chem. Geol.* 200, 155–170. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0009-2541\(03\)00165-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0009-2541(03)00165-7)~~
- ~~Blichert-Toft, J., Albarède, F., 1997. The Lu–Hf isotope geochemistry of chondrites and the evolution of the mantle–crust system. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 148, 243–258. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X\(97\)00040-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X(97)00040-X)~~
- Butt, C.R.M., Anand, R.R., Smith, R.E., 2017. Geology of the Australian regolith, in: Phillips, G.N. (Ed.), *Australian Ore Deposits*. The Australian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, Melbourne, pp. 27–34.
- Champion, D.C., Cassidy, K.F., 2002. Granites of the Northern Eastern Goldfields: their Distribution, Age, Geochemistry, Petrogenesis, Relationship with Mineralisation, and Implications for Tectonic Environment, AMIRA P482/MERIWAM281-Yilgarn Granitoids. AMIRA P482/MERIWAM281-Yilgarn Granitoids.
- Chen, M., Campbell, I.H., Xue, Y., Tian, W., Ireland, T.R., Holden, P., Cas, R.A.F., Hayman, P.C., Das, R., 2015. Multiple Sulfur Isotope Analyses Support a Magmatic Model for the Volcanogenic Massive Sulfide Deposits of the Teutonic Bore Volcanic Complex, Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia. *Econ. Geol.* 110, 1411–1423. <https://doi.org/10.2113/econgeo.110.6.1411>
- ~~Chu, N.-C., Taylor, R.N., Chavagnac, V., Nesbitt, R.W., Boella, R.M., Milton, J.A., German, C.R., Bayon, G., Burton, K., 2002. Hf isotope ratio analysis using multi-collector inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry: an evaluation of isobaric interference corrections. *J. Anal. At. Spectrom.* 17, 1567–1574. <https://doi.org/10.1039/b206707b>~~
- ~~Claoué-Long, J.C., Compston, W., Roberts, J., Fanning, C.M., 1995. Two Carboniferous Ages: A Comparison of Shrimp Zircon Dating with Conventional Zircon Ages and $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ Analysis, in: Berggren, W.A., Kent, D.V., Aubry, M. P., Hardenbol, J. (Eds.), *Geochronology, Time Scales, and Global Stratigraphic Correlation*, Society for Sedimentary Geology Special Publications. SEPM (Society for Sedimentary Geology), pp. 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.2110/pec.95.54>~~
- ~~Compston, W., Williams, I.S., Meyer, C., 1984. U–Pb geochronology of zircons from lunar breccia 73217 using a sensitive high-mass-resolution ion microprobe. *Proc. 14th Lunar*~~

- ~~Planet. Sci. Conf. J. Geophys. Res. Suppl 89, B525–B534.~~
~~<https://doi.org/10.1029/JB089iS02p0B525>~~
- Corfu, F., 2003. Atlas of Zircon Textures. *Rev. Mineral. Geochem.* 53, 469–500.
<https://doi.org/10.2113/0530469>
- Czarnota, K., Champion, D.C., Goscombe, B., Blewett, R.S., Cassidy, K.F., Henson, P.A., Groenewald, P.B., 2010. Geodynamics of the eastern Yilgarn Craton. *Precambrian Res.* 183, 175–202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.precamres.2010.08.004>
- Das, R., 2018. Understanding the Palaeovolcanological and Palaeoenvironmental setting of Archaean VMS Deposit: Stratigraphic Architecture and Volcanology of the Archaean VMS host rock succession of the Teutonic Bore, Jaguar and Bentley Mine corridor, Eastern Goldfields Province, Western Australia (Master thesis). Melbourne University, Melbourne.
- ~~De Laeter, J.R., Kennedy, A.K., 1998. A double focusing mass spectrometer for geochronology. *Int. J. Mass Spectrom.* 178, 43–50. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1387-3806\(98\)14092-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1387-3806(98)14092-7)~~
- Doyle, M.G., Allen, R.L., 2003. Subsea-floor replacement in volcanic-hosted massive sulfide deposits. *Ore Geol. Rev.* 23, 183–222. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-1368\(03\)00035-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-1368(03)00035-0)
- Ellis, P., 2004. Geology and mineralisation of the Jaguar copper-zinc deposit, Western Australia, in: McConachy, T.F., McInnes, B.I.A. (Eds.), *Copper-Zinc Massive Sulphide Deposits in Western Australia*. CSIRO Exploration and Mining, Melbourne, pp. 39–46.
- ~~Fletcher, I.R., McNaughton, N.J., Davis, W.J., Rasmussen, B., 2010. Matrix effects and calibration limitations in ion probe U–Pb and Th–Pb dating of monazite. *Chem. Geol.* 270, 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2009.11.003>~~
- Geoscience Australia–(GA), 2019. Geochron Delivery Database. Accessed June 2019. <http://www.ga.gov.au/geochron-sapub-web/geochronology/shrimp/search.htm>.
- GeoVIEW.WA, 2016. 1:500 000 State interpreted bedrock geology polygons, 2016.
- Hallberg, J.A., Thompson, J.F.H., 1985. Geologic setting of the Teutonic Bore massive sulfide deposit, Archean Yilgarn Block, Western Australia. *Econ. Geol.* 80, 1953–1964. <https://doi.org/10.2113/gsecongeo.80.7.1953>
- Hollis, S.P., Mole, D.R., Gillespie, P., Barnes, S.J., Tessalina, S., Cas, R.A.F., Hildrew, C., Pumphrey, A., Goodz, M.D., Caruso, S., Yeats, C.J., Verbeeten, A., Belford, S.M., Wyche, S., Martin, L.A.J., 2017. 2.7 Ga plume associated VHMS mineralization in the Eastern Goldfields Superterrane, Yilgarn Craton: Insights from the low temperature and shallow water, Ag–Zn–(Au) Nimbus deposit. *Precambrian Res.* 291, 119–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.precamres.2017.01.002>
- Hollis, S.P., Yeats, C.J., Wyche, S., Barnes, S.J., Ivanic, T.J., Belford, S.M., Davidson, G.J., Roache, A.J., Wingate, M.T.D., 2015. A review of volcanic-hosted massive sulfide (VHMS) mineralization in the Archaean Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia: Tectonic, stratigraphic and geochemical associations. *Precambrian Res.* 260, 113–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.precamres.2014.11.002>
- Huston, D.L., Champion, D.C., Cassidy, K.F., 2014. Tectonic Controls on the Endowment of Neoproterozoic Cratons in Volcanic-Hosted Massive Sulfide Deposits: Evidence from Lead and Neodymium Isotopes. *Econ. Geol.* 109, 11–26. <https://doi.org/10.2113/econgeo.109.1.11>
- Huston, D.L., Relvas, J.M.R.S., Gemmell, J.B., Driberg, S., 2011. The role of granites in volcanic-hosted massive sulphide ore-forming systems: an assessment of magmatic–hydrothermal contributions. *Miner. Deposita* 46, 473–507. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00126-010-0322-7>

- Independence Group NL (IGO), 2015. Annual Report 2015 (Unpublished Annual Report). Independence Group NL (IGO), Perth, W.A.
- Isaac, C., 2015. Geochemistry of the north Eastern Goldfields, Western Australia: examining the processes that produce nickel sulphide camps (Masters Thesis). The University of Western Australia, Perth, W.A.
- ~~Kennedy, A.K., De Laeter, J.R., 1994. The performance characteristics of the WA SHRIMP II ion microprobe., in: Abstracts Vol., U.S. Geological Survey Circular. Presented at the Eighth International Conference on Geochronology, Cosmochronology and Isotope Geology, Berkeley, USA, p. 166.~~
- ~~Kirkland, C.L., Smithies, R.H., Taylor, R.J.M., Evans, N., McDonald, B., 2015. Zircon Th/U ratios in magmatic environs. Lithos 212–215, 397–414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lithos.2014.11.021>~~
- Kılıç, A.D., 2016. Investigation of zircon by CL (Cathodoluminescence) and Raman Spectroscopy. IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci. 44, 042006. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/44/4/042006>
- Lenting, C., Geisler, T., Gerdes, A., Kooijman, E., Scherer, E.E., Zeh, A., 2010. The behavior of the Hf isotope system in radiation-damaged zircon during experimental hydrothermal alteration. Am. Mineral. 95, 1343–1348. <https://doi.org/10.2138/am.2010.3521>
- ~~Li, X.-H., Long, W.-G., Li, Q.-L., Liu, Y., Zheng, Y.-F., Yang, Y.-H., Chamberlain, K.R., Wan, D.-F., Guo, C.-H., Wang, X.-C., Tao, H., 2010. Penglai Zircon Megaocrysts: A Potential New Working Reference Material for Microbeam Determination of Hf-O Isotopes and U-Pb Age. Geostand. Geoanalytical Res. 34, 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-908X.2010.00036.x>~~
- Lode, S., Piercey, S.J., Layne, G.D., Piercey, G., Cloutier, J., 2017. Multiple sulphur and lead sources recorded in hydrothermal exhalites associated with the Lemarchant volcanogenic massive sulphide deposit, central Newfoundland, Canada. Miner. Deposita 52, 105–128. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00126-016-0652-1>
- Loucks, R.R., Fiorentini, M.L., Rohrlach, B.D., 2018. Divergent T–fO₂ paths during crystallisation of H₂O-rich and H₂O-poor magmas as recorded by Ce and U in zircon, with implications for TitaniQ and TitaniZ geothermometry. Contrib. Mineral. Petrol. 173. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00410-018-1529-3>
- ~~Ludwig, K.R., 2011. User's manual for Isoplot 4.15: a geochronological toolkit for Microsoft Excel, Berkeley Geochronology Center Special Publication.~~
- ~~Ludwig, K.R., 2009. Squid 2.50, A User's Manual, Berkeley Geochronology Centre Special Publication.~~
- Macklin, D., 2010. Alteration at the Teutonic Bore (VHMS) Deposit, Western Australia (B.Sc with honours thesis). University of Tasmania, UTAS.
- McConachy, T.F., McInnes, B.I.A., Carr, G.R., 2004. Is Western Australia intrinsically impoverished in volcanogenic massive sulphide deposits, or under explored?, in: McConachy, T.F., McInnes, B.I.A. (Eds.), Copper-Zinc Massive Sulphide Deposits in Western Australia. CSIRO Exploration and Mining, Melbourne, pp. 15–32.
- ~~Morel, M.L.A., Nebel, O., Nebel-Jacobsen, Y.J., Miller, J.S., Vroon, P.Z., 2008. Hafnium isotope characterization of the GJ-1 zircon reference material by solution and laser-ablation MC-ICPMS. Chem. Geol. 255, 231–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2008.06.040>~~
- ~~Nasdala, L., Hofmeister, W., Norberg, N., Martinson, J.M., Corfu, F., Dörr, W., Kamo, S.L., Kennedy, A.K., Kronz, A., Reiners, P.W., Frei, D., Kosler, J., Wan, Y., Götze, J., Häger, T., Kröner, A., Valley, J.W., 2008. Zircon M257—a Homogeneous Natural Reference Material for the Ion Microprobe U-Pb Analysis of Zircon. Geostand. Geoanalytical Res. 32, 247–265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-908X.2008.00914.x>~~

- Nelson, D.R., 1995. Compilation of SHIRMP U-Pb zircon geochronology data, 1994, Record / Geological Survey of Western Australia. Geological Survey of Western Australia, Perth.
- Parker, P., Belford, S.M., Maier, R., Lynn, S., Stewart, W., 2017. Teutonic Bore - Jaguar - Bentley volcanogenic massive sulfide field, in: Phillips, G.N. (Ed.), Australian Ore Deposits. The Australian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, Melbourne, pp. 167–172.
- ~~Patchett, P.J., Tatsumoto, M., 1980. Hafnium isotope variations in oceanic basalts. Geophys. Res. Lett. 7, 1077–1080. <https://doi.org/10.1029/GL007i012p01077>~~
- ~~Paton, C., Hellstrom, J., Paul, B., Woodhead, J., Hergt, J., 2011. Lolite: Freeware for the visualisation and processing of mass spectrometric data. J. Anal. At. Spectrom. 26, 2508. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c1ja10172b>~~
- Piechocka, A.M., Gregory, C.J., Zi, J.-W., Sheppard, S., Wingate, M.T.D., Rasmussen, B., 2017. Monazite trumps zircon: applying SHRIMP U-Pb geochronology to systematically evaluate emplacement ages of leucocratic, low-temperature granites in a complex Precambrian orogen. Contrib. Mineral. Petrol. 172. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00410-017-1386-5>
- ~~Scherer, E., 2001. Calibration of the Lutetium-Hafnium Clock. Science 293, 683–687. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1061372>~~
- Schoene, B., Condon, D.J., Morgan, L., McLean, N., 2013. Precision and Accuracy in Geochronology. Elements 9, 19–24. <https://doi.org/10.2113/gselements.9.1.19>
- Sedgmen, A., Hazell, M.S., Budd, A.R., Champion, D.C., 2007. OZCHEM National Whole Rock Geochemistry Dataset.
- ~~Sláma, J., Košler, J., Condon, D.J., Crowley, J.L., Gerdes, A., Hanchar, J.M., Horstwood, M.S.A., Morris, G.A., Nasdala, L., Norberg, N., Schaltegger, U., Schoene, B., Tubrett, M.N., Whitehouse, M.J., 2008. Plešovice zircon — A new natural reference material for U–Pb and Hf isotopic microanalysis. Chem. Geol. 249, 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2007.11.005>~~
- ~~Stern, R.A., Bodorkos, S., Kamo, S.L., Hickman, A.H., Corfu, F., 2009. Measurement of SIMS Instrumental Mass Fractionation of Pb Isotopes During Zircon Dating. Geostand. Geoanalytical Res. 33, 145–168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-908X.2009.00023.x>~~
- ~~Thirlwall, M.F., Anczkiewicz, R., 2004. Multidynamic isotope ratio analysis using MC-ICP-MS and the causes of secular drift in Hf, Nd and Pb isotope ratios. Int. J. Mass Spectrom. 235, 59–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijms.2004.04.002>~~
- ~~Williams, I.S., 1998. Geochronology by Ion Microprobe, in: McKibben, M.A., Shanks, W.C., Ridley, W.I. (Eds.), Applications of Microanalytical Techniques to Understanding Mineralizing Processes, Reviews in Economic Geology. pp. 1–35.~~
- ~~Woodhead, J., Hergt, J., Shelley, M., Eggins, S., Kemp, R., 2004. Zircon Hf isotope analysis with an excimer laser, depth profiling, ablation of complex geometries, and concomitant age estimation. Chem. Geol. 209, 121–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2004.04.026>~~
- ~~Woodhead, J.D., Hergt, J.M., 2005. A Preliminary Appraisal of Seven Natural Zircon Reference Materials for In Situ Hf Isotope Determination. Geostand. Geoanalytical Res. 29, 183–195. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-908X.2005.tb00891.x>~~
- Wyche, S., Kirkland, C.L., Riganti, A., Pawley, M.J., Belousova, E., Wingate, M.T.D., 2012. Isotopic constraints on stratigraphy in the central and eastern Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia. Aust. J. Earth Sci. 59, 657–670. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08120099.2012.697677>
- Yang, K., Scott, S.D., 1996. Possible contribution of a metal-rich magmatic fluid to a sea-floor hydrothermal system. Nature 383, 420–423. <https://doi.org/10.1038/383420a0https://doi.org/10.1038/383420a0>

1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975

1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975

1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016

Mount grain-spot	ppm U	ppm Th	²³² Th/ ²³⁸ U	%com 206Pb	²⁰⁷ Pb*/ ²⁰⁶ Pb*	% 1σ 1σ err	²⁰⁷ Pb*/ ²³⁵ U	% 1σ 1σ err	²⁰⁶ Pb*/ ²³⁸ U	% 1σ 1σ err	err corr	²⁰⁷ Pb/ ²⁰⁶ Pb Age (Ma)	1σ err	% Disc.
<5% discordance and <0.3% common Pb														
N18-15C.22-1	136	83	0.63	0.04	0.1857	0.37	13.15	3.0	0.513	2.9	0.992	2705	6	+2
N18-15C.26-1	174	128	0.76	0.04	0.1853	0.32	13.64	3.3	0.534	3.3	0.995	2701	5	-3
N18-15C.3-1	103	78	0.78	0.07	0.1851	0.44	13.27	3.5	0.520	3.5	0.992	2699	7	0
N18-15C.17-1	175	120	0.71	0.03	0.1849	0.34	13.44	3.2	0.527	3.2	0.994	2698	6	-1
N18-15C.6-1	250	173	0.71	0.02	0.1849	0.28	13.03	3.2	0.511	3.2	0.996	2697	5	+2
N18-15C.21-1	85	39	0.47	-0.03	0.1847	0.48	13.40	3.0	0.526	3.0	0.987	2696	8	-1
N18-15C.4-1	35	15	0.44	0.23	0.1846	0.85	12.77	3.5	0.502	3.4	0.969	2694	14	+3
N18-15C.7-1	189	113	0.61	0.08	0.1845	0.33	13.35	3.4	0.525	3.3	0.995	2694	5	-1
N18-15C.9-1	91	51	0.58	0.10	0.1845	0.49	13.92	3.3	0.547	3.3	0.989	2694	8	-5
N18-15C.10-1	89	48	0.55	0.02	0.1845	0.49	13.67	3.6	0.537	3.5	0.990	2694	8	-4
N18-15C.16-1	178	111	0.64	0.02	0.1843	0.35	12.64	3.6	0.498	3.6	0.995	2692	6	+4
N18-15C.14-1	181	123	0.70	0.03	0.1842	0.32	12.86	3.0	0.506	2.9	0.994	2691	5	+2
N18-15C.15-1	65	29	0.47	0.12	0.1841	0.57	13.08	3.3	0.515	3.2	0.99	2690	9	1
N18-15C.18-1	238	180	0.78	0.01	0.1840	0.28	13.16	3.1	0.519	3.0	0.996	2689	5	0
N18-15C.5-1	264	195	0.77	0.01	0.1840	0.27	13.10	3.1	0.516	3.0	0.996	2689	4	0
N18-15C.20-1	53	21	0.41	0.040	0.184	0.63	13.42	3	0.529	2.9	0.98	2689	10	-2
N18-15C.1-1	84	38	0.47	0.02	0.1839	0.46	13.08	2.9	0.516	2.8	0.987	2688	8	0
N18-15C.11-1	165	98	0.61	0.09	0.1839	0.36	13.30	3.4	0.525	3.4	0.994	2688	6	-1
N18-15C.8-1	169	98	0.60	0.05	0.1838	0.35	13.33	3.0	0.526	2.9	0.993	2688	6	-2
N18-15C.24-1	91	74	0.84	0.00	0.1838	0.42	13.17	3.0	0.520	3.0	0.990	2687	7	-1
N18-15C.12-1	102	59	0.60	0.04	0.1837	0.82	13.36	3.3	0.528	3.2	0.968	2686	14	-2
N18-15C.19-1	304	264	0.90	0.06	0.1836	0.27	12.95	3.2	0.511	3.2	0.997	2686	4	+1
N18-15C.23-1	60	24	0.42	0.09	0.1833	0.59	13.00	2.9	0.514	2.9	0.980	2683	10	0
N18-15C.25-1	94	66	0.73	0.12	0.1828	0.47	13.08	3.0	0.519	3.0	0.988	2678	8	-1
N18-15C.13-1	51	25	0.50	0.24	0.1822	0.68	12.82	3.0	0.510	2.9	0.973	2673	11	+1

2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057

>5% discordance or >0.3% common Pb														
N18-15C.2-1	52	21	0.43	1.77	0.1869	2.85	13.19	4.2	0.512	3.1	0.739	2715	47	±2
N18-15C.27-1	192	171	0.92	0.12	0.1826	0.36	12.12	3.6	0.481	3.6	0.995	2676	6	±6
15BUDD120-226.04 (mount N19-07, 08)														
Mount grain-spot	ppm U	ppm Th	$^{232}\text{Th}/^{238}\text{U}$	%com 206Pb	$^{207}\text{Pb}^*/^{206}\text{Pb}^*$	% 1σ err	$^{207}\text{Pb}^*/^{235}\text{U}$	% 1σ err	$^{206}\text{Pb}^*/^{238}\text{U}$	% 1σ err	err eorr	$^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ Age (Ma)	1σ err	% Disc.
<5% discordance														
N19-08.K.1-1	156	163	1.08	0.070	0.1859	0.51	13.25	2.8	0.517	2.7	0.98	2707	8	1
N19-07.G.1-1	107	85	0.82	0.09	0.1857	0.61	13.39	3.3	0.523	3.2	0.982	2704	10	0
N19-08.I.1-1	149	158	1.10	0.13	0.1853	0.57	12.86	2.7	0.504	2.7	0.978	2701	9	±3
N19-07.C.1-1	298	445	1.55	0.16	0.1844	0.36	12.80	2.4	0.504	2.4	0.989	2692	6	±3
N19-08.A.1-1	134	110	0.84	0.10	0.1843	0.58	12.66	4.0	0.498	3.9	0.989	2692	10	±4
N19-07.B.1-1	107	75	0.73	0.07	0.1841	0.65	13.05	2.5	0.514	2.4	0.965	2690	11	±1
N19-07.L.1-2	60	23	0.39	0.08	0.1840	0.79	12.87	3.3	0.507	3.2	0.971	2689	13	±2
N19-07.L.1-1	83	46	0.58	-0.04	0.1835	0.70	12.84	3.1	0.507	3.0	0.974	2685	12	±2
N19-07.H.1-1	115	85	0.76	0.09	0.1834	0.60	13.08	3.2	0.517	3.1	0.982	2684	10	0
N19-07.C.2-1	126	93	0.76	0.37	0.1828	0.65	12.91	2.6	0.512	2.5	0.968	2678	11	±1
N19-07.J.1-1#	153	156	1.05	0.19	0.1804	0.64	12.75	2.4	0.512	2.3	0.962	2657	11	0
N19-08.H.1-1#	177	205	1.20	0.11	0.1789	1.04	11.99	3.9	0.486	3.7	0.963	2643	17	±4
N19-07.C.2-2#	120	88	0.76	0.10	0.1779	1.29	11.87	2.7	0.484	2.3	0.875	2633	21	±4
>5% discordance														
N19-03B.1-1	497	1322	2.75	0.39	0.2230	0.72	7.37	4.9	0.240	4.9	0.989	3003	12	±60
N19-07.J.2-2	130	131	1.04	0.11	0.1848	0.62	10.74	5.0	0.422	5.0	0.992	2697	10	±19
N19-07.C.2-3	196	171	0.9	0.200	0.1839	0.57	11.96	2.9	0.472	2.8	0.98	2688	9	9
N19-08.G.1-1	124	113	0.94	0.09	0.1833	0.57	13.76	1.4	0.544	1.3	0.918	2683	9	-5
N19-07.A.1-2	107	98	0.95	0.14	0.1832	0.95	12.03	2.9	0.476	2.7	0.944	2682	16	±8
N19-07.K.1-1	128	115	0.93	0.26	0.1832	0.62	12.14	2.6	0.481	2.6	0.972	2682	10	±7
N19-08.C.1-1	344	359	1.08	0.03	0.1826	0.57	12.21	3.5	0.485	3.4	0.987	2676	9	±6

N19-08.J.1-1	113	77	0.70	0.23	0.1779	1.21	11.47	3.1	0.468	2.8	0.918	2633	20	+7
N19-07.A.1-1	430	422	1.01	0.18	0.1777	0.63	11.23	5.0	0.458	5.0	0.992	2632	10	+9
N19-08.E.1-1	186	148	0.82	0.17	0.1740	0.95	10.91	4.8	0.455	4.7	0.980	2597	16	+8
N19-07.J.2-1	136	134	1.01	0.41	0.1725	1.48	9.66	5.4	0.406	5.2	0.962	2582	25	+18

15BUDD120 – 228.42 (mount N19-09, 10)

Mount grain-spot	ppm U	ppm Th	²³² Th/ ²³⁸ U	%com 206Pb	²⁰⁷ Pb*/ ²⁰⁶ Pb*	% 1σ err	²⁰⁷ Pb*/ ²³⁵ U	% 1σ err	²⁰⁶ Pb*/ ²³⁸ U	% 1σ err	err corr	²⁰⁷ Pb/ ²⁰⁶ Pb Age (Ma)	1σ err	% Disc.
<5% discordant and common Pb <0.1%														
N19-09.C.1-1	107	76	0.73	0.00	0.1852	0.64	12.99	1.9	0.509	1.8	0.940	2700	11	+2
N19-09.G.2-1	178	184	1.06	0.01	0.1850	0.9	13.1	2.1	0.514	1.9	0.9	2698	15	1
N19-10.D.2-1	162	181	1.16	-0.03	0.1849	0.50	12.77	2.3	0.501	2.3	0.980	2697	8	+4
N19-10.I.1-3	252	210	0.86	-0.04	0.1849	0.50	12.76	1.3	0.501	1.2	0.920	2697	8	+4
N19-09.G.1-1	215	273	1.31	0.050	0.1846	0.47	12.96	2	0.509	1.9	0.97	2695	8	2
N19-10.I.1-1	226	181	0.83	0.05	0.1842	0.47	13.15	1.6	0.518	1.5	0.960	2691	8	0
N19-10.F.1-1	139	122	0.90	0.00	0.1842	0.60	12.92	1.8	0.509	1.7	0.940	2691	10	+2
N19-09.F.1-1	128	113	0.91	0.03	0.1840	0.62	13.35	2.8	0.526	2.8	0.980	2689	10	-2
N19-10.G.1-1	177	164	0.96	0.08	0.1836	0.56	12.93	1.7	0.511	1.6	0.940	2686	9	+1
>5% discordant or common Pb >0.1%														
N19-10.H.1-1	132	109	0.85	-0.03	0.1884	0.61	13.05	1.5	0.502	1.3	0.910	2728	10	+5
N19-10.D.1-1	49	33	0.70	-0.14	0.1875	1.06	12.36	2.3	0.478	2.0	0.890	2721	17	+9
N19-10.I.1-2	305	289	0.98	0.33	0.1868	1.39	12.66	2.8	0.491	2.4	0.870	2715	23	+6
N19-10.E.1-1	152	138	0.93	0.02	0.1854	0.59	12.55	2.7	0.491	2.6	0.980	2701	10	+6
N19-10.C.1-1	143	150	1.08	-0.02	0.1842	0.59	12.14	2.2	0.478	2.1	0.960	2691	10	+8
N19-09.H.1-1	146	133	0.94	0.09	0.1823	0.57	12.23	2.3	0.486	2.2	0.970	2674	9	+5
N19-10.A.1-1	108	86	0.82	0.61	0.1815	0.92	12.33	1.6	0.493	1.4	0.830	2666	15	+4
N19-10.B.1-1	115	86	0.77	0.07	0.1799	1.2	11.33	8.5	0.457	8.4	0.99	2652	20	10
N19-10.J.1-1	223	247	1.14	0.17	0.1789	0.46	12.01	2.5	0.487	2.4	0.980	2643	8	+4

Penzance granite (mount N18-06)

2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139

Mount grain-spot	ppm U	ppm Th	$^{232}\text{Th}/^{238}\text{U}$	%com 206Pb	$^{207}\text{Pb}^*/^{206}\text{Pb}^*$	% 1 σ err	$^{207}\text{Pb}^*/^{235}\text{U}$	% 1 σ err	$^{206}\text{Pb}^*/^{238}\text{U}$	% 1 σ err	err corr	$^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ Age (Ma)	1 σ err	% Disc.
N18-06B.16-1	476	378	0.82	0.43	0.1830	0.34	12.10	1.1	0.480	1.1	0.960	2676	6	+7
N18-06A.4-1	534	246	0.48	0.11	0.1790	0.25	13.20	1.1	0.536	1.1	0.970	2640	4	-6
N18-06C.9-1	462	381	0.85	0.75	0.1750	0.56	10.90	1.2	0.454	1.1	0.890	2602	9	+9
N18-06C.1-1	513	335	0.68	0.24	0.1750	0.29	12.20	1.1	0.509	1.1	0.970	2601	5	-2
N18-06A.7-1	475	250	0.54	0.46	0.1740	0.36	11.10	1.2	0.465	1.1	0.950	2593	6	+6
N18-06A.10-1	502	252	0.52	0.67	0.1730	0.37	11.30	1.1	0.475	1.1	0.950	2589	6	+4
N18-06C.12-1	542	451	0.86	0.28	0.1730	0.31	11.00	1.1	0.463	1.1	0.960	2583	5	+6
N18-06A.3-1	401	295	0.76	0.64	0.1700	0.61	11.00	1.3	0.469	1.1	0.870	2554	10	+3
N18-06B.8-1	641	350	0.56	0.31	0.1680	0.28	11.30	1.1	0.486	1.1	0.970	2541	5	-1
N18-06A.3-2	535	555	1.07	0.97	0.1610	0.43	9.50	1.3	0.429	1.2	0.940	2463	7	+8
N18-06C.5-1	594	344	0.60	0.20	0.1610	0.66	9.90	1.3	0.449	1.1	0.850	2463	11	+4
N18-06C.2-1	540	313	0.60	0.38	0.1550	0.85	8.80	1.6	0.414	1.3	0.840	2401	14	+8
N18-06B.2-1	556	356	0.66	0.38	0.1510	0.35	8.6	1.1	0.413	1.1	0.95	2352	6	6
N18-06A.19-1	601	363	0.62	0.95	0.1460	0.44	8.00	1.2	0.394	1.1	0.930	2304	8	+8
N18-06C.6-1	622	445	0.74	0.50	0.1410	0.41	7.50	1.2	0.383	1.1	0.930	2243	7	+8
N18-06A.8-1	568	354	0.64	1.910	0.141	0.58	8.1	1.2	0.416	1.1	0.88	2237	10	0
N18-06A.14-1	591	360	0.63	0.96	0.1410	0.48	7.70	1.2	0.395	1.1	0.910	2234	8	+5
N18-06B.12-1	605	339	0.58	0.54	0.1380	0.38	7.50	1.1	0.393	1.1	0.940	2198	7	+3
N18-06A.2-1	623	442	0.73	1.87	0.1370	1.43	6.70	1.8	0.357	1.0	0.580	2190	25	+12
N18-06B.11-1	601	850	1.46	0.94	0.1370	0.47	7.30	1.2	0.387	1.1	0.920	2185	8	+4
N18-06C.8-1	652	442	0.70	0.61	0.1330	0.42	6.80	1.1	0.369	1.1	0.930	2138	7	+6
N18-06B.9-1	676	514	0.79	0.86	0.1320	0.44	6.80	1.2	0.374	1.1	0.920	2127	8	+4
N18-06A.1-1	830	539	0.67	2.80	0.1200	1.62	5.70	1.9	0.347	1.0	0.530	1951	29	+2
N18-06B.13-1	801	567	0.73	0.74	0.1180	0.70	5.30	1.4	0.324	1.2	0.860	1934	12	+7

young outlier: omitted from age calculation

831
832
833

Table 3: SHRIMP isotopic data for monazite from the Penzance granite (mounts N18-06, 16)

Penzance granite (mount N18-06, 16)																
Mount grain-spot	ppm U	ppm Th	$\frac{^{232}\text{Th}}{^{238}\text{U}}$	4f206 (%)	4f208 (%)	$\frac{^{207}\text{Pb}^*}{^{206}\text{Pb}^*}$	$\pm 1\sigma$ err	$\frac{^{206}\text{Pb}^*}{^{238}\text{U}}$	$\pm 1\sigma$ err	$\frac{^{207}\text{Pb}^*}{^{235}\text{U}}$	$\pm 1\sigma$ err	$\frac{^{208}\text{Pb}^*}{^{232}\text{Th}}$	$\pm 1\sigma$ err	$\frac{^{207}\text{Pb}}{^{206}\text{Pb}}$ Age (Ma)	$\pm 1\sigma$ err	% Disc.
$\leq 5\%$ discordance and $< 0.5\%$ 4f206																
N18-06B-B-5	207	12986	63.00	-0.02	0.00	0.1865	0.0022	0.5074	0.0114	13.044	0.3320	0.137	0.0026	2711	19	+2
N18-16C-8-3	629	12531	20.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.1863	0.0010	0.5232	0.0101	13.435	0.2720	0.148	0.0032	2709	9	0
N18-16A-1-6	508	15332	30.00	-0.06	-0.02	0.1862	0.0014	0.5092	0.0069	13.075	0.2050	0.142	0.0030	2709	12	+2
N18-06B-G-2	215	14282	66.00	0.02	0.00	0.1855	0.0022	0.5170	0.0097	13.224	0.2950	0.141	0.0026	2703	19	+1
N18-06B-A-6	789	32172	41.00	0.00	0.00	0.1853	0.0015	0.5092	0.0090	13.010	0.2560	0.140	0.0029	2701	13	+2
N18-16A-1-1	448	11587	26.00	0.00	0.00	0.1852	0.0026	0.5288	0.0091	13.499	0.3020	0.152	0.0032	2700	23	-1
N18-06B-B-7	310	11884	38.00	-0.04	-0.01	0.1851	0.0018	0.5140	0.0088	13.119	0.2620	0.138	0.0028	2699	16	+1
N18-06B-G-5	345	16469	48.00	-0.06	-0.01	0.1847	0.0019	0.4933	0.0085	12.563	0.2540	0.136	0.0024	2696	17	+4
N18-06B-A-5	573	19934	35.00	0.43	0.11	0.1844	0.0017	0.5213	0.0094	13.257	0.2710	0.144	0.0028	2693	15	0
N18-06B-K-2	1134	74444	66.00	0.34	0.04	0.1842	0.0016	0.4894	0.0085	12.430	0.2430	0.136	0.0027	2691	14	+5
N18-16B-6-2	926	62647	68.00	0.05	0.01	0.1842	0.0010	0.4854	0.0078	12.327	0.2130	0.142	0.0030	2691	9	+5

2181
2182
2183
2184
2185
2186
2187
2188
2189
2190
2191
2192
2193
2194
2195
2196
2197
2198
2199
2200
2201
2202
2203
2204
2205
2206
2207
2208
2209
2210
2211
2212
2213
2214
2215
2216
2217
2218
2219
2220
2221

N18-16D.15-1	602	14098	23.00	0.02	0.01	0.1841	0.0009	0.5092	0.0083	12.929	0.2250	0.147	0.0030	2690	8	+1
N18-16C.8-5	664	14242	21.00	-0.05	-0.02	0.1841	0.0012	0.5198	0.0080	13.193	0.2240	0.141	0.0030	2690	11	0
N18-16C.8-6	466	11320	24.00	0.01	0.00	0.1840	0.0013	0.4927	0.0118	12.502	0.3140	0.144	0.0029	2689	12	+4
N18-16D.16-1	1039	19243	19.00	0.03	0.01	0.1839	0.0007	0.5021	0.0120	12.729	0.3110	0.147	0.0033	2688	6	+2
N18-16G.18-1	1002	69393	69.00	0.32	0.04	0.1838	0.0009	0.4905	0.0102	12.430	0.2690	0.149	0.0035	2687	8	+4
N18-06B.A-7	1097	38290	35.00	0.01	0.00	0.1835	0.0014	0.5314	0.0097	13.442	0.2700	0.146	0.0029	2685	13	-2
N18-06B.G-7	216	12340	57.00	0.07	0.01	0.1832	0.0020	0.5244	0.0095	13.249	0.2840	0.143	0.0028	2682	18	-1
N18-16D.14-1	129	6945	54.00	-0.03	-0.01	0.1832	0.0019	0.5022	0.0137	12.685	0.3700	0.152	0.0032	2682	17	+2
N18-16A.1-4	279	15220	54.00	-0.01	0.00	0.1831	0.0016	0.5303	0.0114	13.390	0.3120	0.152	0.0032	2681	14	-2
N18-06B.B-6	308	10496	34.00	0.03	0.01	0.1830	0.0018	0.4883	0.0107	12.323	0.2980	0.137	0.0028	2681	16	+4
N18-06B.G-4	178	11404	64.00	0.04	0.01	0.1828	0.0023	0.4965	0.0095	12.515	0.2870	0.139	0.0026	2679	20	+3
N18-06B.K-3	895	38759	43.00	0.02	0.00	0.1827	0.0015	0.4817	0.0083	12.135	0.2340	0.136	0.0026	2678	13	+5
N18-16A.1-3	515	14308	28.00	-0.01	0.00	0.1827	0.0010	0.5205	0.0105	13.111	0.2760	0.147	0.0032	2677	9	-1
N18-16C.8-1	638	13479	21.00	0.00	0.00	0.1824	0.0014	0.5182	0.0072	13.035	0.2110	0.147	0.0032	2675	13	-1
N18-06B.A-1	863	31292	36.00	-0.02	0.00	0.1824	0.0015	0.5070	0.0088	12.750	0.2490	0.149	0.0030	2675	14	+1
N18-06B.B-3	296	11665	39.00	-0.09	-0.02	0.1823	0.0020	0.5334	0.0095	13.405	0.2850	0.144	0.0029	2674	18	-3
N18-06B.B-1	188	10313	55.00	0.05	0.01	0.1821	0.0023	0.5124	0.0099	12.868	0.2980	0.144	0.0026	2672	21	0
N18-06B.G-3	475	24369	51.00	-0.03	-0.01	0.1821	0.0017	0.4923	0.0083	12.363	0.2420	0.136	0.0026	2672	15	+3
N18-16A.6-1	1052	69743	66.00	-0.01	0.00	0.1821	0.0007	0.5010	0.0077	12.581	0.2020	0.150	0.0033	2672	6	+2

2222
2223
2224
2225
2226
2227
2228
2229
2230
2231
2232
2233
2234
2235
2236
2237
2238
2239
2240
2241
2242
2243
2244
2245
2246
2247
2248
2249
2250
2251
2252
2253
2254
2255
2256
2257
2258
2259
2260
2261
2262

N18-16C-8-2	605	11778	19.00	0.00	0.00	0.1821	0.0010	0.5212	0.0089	13.084	0.2390	0.149	0.0030	2672	9	-1
N18-16C-10-4	587	20801	35.00	0.02	0.00	0.1820	0.0011	0.5089	0.0096	12.772	0.2570	0.146	0.0033	2671	10	+1
N18-16C-10-1	466	14728	32.00	0.10	0.03	0.1819	0.0011	0.5268	0.0110	13.210	0.2900	0.153	0.0039	2670	10	-2
N18-06B-B-2	202	9808	49.00	0.22	0.04	0.1812	0.0022	0.5116	0.0094	12.779	0.2860	0.141	0.0027	2664	20	0
N18-16C-8-4	636	13910	22.00	0.02	0.01	0.1810	0.0010	0.5352	0.0069	13.353	0.1920	0.144	0.0030	2662	9	-4
N18-16D-13-1	389	6592	17.00	0.09	0.04	0.1808	0.0011	0.5403	0.0104	13.471	0.2760	0.155	0.0034	2661	10	-5
N18-06B-D-1	362	26423	73.00	0.04	0.00	0.1808	0.0018	0.4927	0.0099	12.282	0.2780	0.139	0.0026	2660	16	+3
N18-16C-10-3	557	15536	28.00	0.07	0.02	0.1805	0.0012	0.5212	0.0087	12.968	0.2360	0.142	0.0030	2657	11	-2
≥5% discordance and/or ≥0.5% 4f206																
N18-06A-N-3	115	12090	105.00	1.31	0.09	0.1942	0.0046	0.3399	0.0074	9.100	0.2920	0.120	0.0024	2778	38	+32
N18-06B-A-4	484	26279	54.00	0.98	0.17	0.1903	0.0024	0.4979	0.0106	13.063	0.3280	0.134	0.0025	2745	21	+5
N18-06B-E-1	142	5608	40.00	2.70	0.69	0.1879	0.0044	0.5326	0.0107	13.801	0.4280	0.132	0.0024	2724	39	-1
N18-06B-K-1	440	31841	72.00	0.93	0.12	0.1852	0.0025	0.4438	0.0078	11.331	0.2530	0.120	0.0023	2700	22	+12
N18-06B-G-1	173	10873	63.00	0.06	0.01	0.1843	0.0025	0.4764	0.0124	12.104	0.3560	0.133	0.0027	2692	22	+7
N18-06B-B-8	245	13623	56.00	-0.03	-0.01	0.1831	0.0020	0.4666	0.0083	11.780	0.2490	0.123	0.0022	2681	18	+8
N18-16A-1-2	288	14906	52.00	0.08	0.01	0.1819	0.0015	0.5669	0.0127	14.220	0.3420	0.160	0.0036	2670	14	-8
N18-06B-A-8	349	26244	75.00	2.02	0.21	0.1818	0.0056	0.3843	0.0130	9.635	0.4430	0.122	0.0029	2670	51	+21
N18-06B-B-4	143	9993	70.00	0.14	0.02	0.1816	0.0027	0.4682	0.0095	11.725	0.2960	0.128	0.0025	2668	24	+7
N18-06B-G-8	220	14795	67.00	0.26	0.04	0.1814	0.0020	0.4741	0.0101	11.857	0.2890	0.128	0.0025	2666	18	+6

2263
2264
2265
2266
2267
2268
2269
2270
2271
2272
2273
2274
2275
2276
2277
2278
2279
2280
2281
2282
2283
2284
2285
2286
2287
2288
2289
2290
2291
2292
2293
2294
2295
2296
2297
2298
2299
2300
2301
2302
2303

N18-16B-6-3	843	59533	71.00	0.07	0.01	0.1812	0.0010	0.4463	0.0081	11.152	0.2140	0.140	0.0030	2664	9	+11
N18-06A-N-1	76	9566	125.00	1.76	0.15	0.1811	0.0049	0.4884	0.0112	12.191	0.4330	0.110	0.0023	2663	45	+4
N18-06B-G-6	281	13360	48.00	0.06	0.01	0.1810	0.0018	0.4676	0.0182	11.670	0.4720	0.137	0.0027	2662	17	+7
N18-16C-10-2	629	16612	26.00	0.12	0.03	0.1802	0.0019	0.4040	0.0213	10.040	0.5400	0.133	0.0031	2655	17	+18
N18-06B-A-2	814	29448	36.00	1.02	0.23	0.1763	0.0020	0.4132	0.0093	10.042	0.2560	0.124	0.0024	2618	19	+15
N18-06B-A-3	638	36168	57.00	1.50	0.23	0.1753	0.0038	0.4980	0.0173	12.034	0.4960	0.136	0.0027	2609	36	0
N18-16G-23-1	147	17544	120.00	0.89	0.04	0.1270	0.0034	0.2374	0.0127	4.155	0.2490	0.094	0.0021	2056	47	+33
N18-16G-23-2	456	36602	80.00	1.94	0.08	0.0971	0.0042	0.1036	0.0017	1.387	0.0640	0.067	0.0019	1569	81	+59

Figure 1: Location of the ~~TB~~Teutonic Bore Camp on a map showing the major subdivisions of the Eastern Goldfields Superterrane, Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia. The town of Leonora is indicated by a black diamond. ~~Also~~The inset map shows the location of the three deposits (Teutonic Bore, Jaguar and Bentley) and the sampled Penzance granite on the 1:500 000 State interpreted bedrock geological map from the GSWA online database GeoVIEW.WA (2016).

Figure 2: A) Schematic geological model for the [TB Teutonic Bore](#) Camp showing the position of each deposit within the stratigraphic sequence and illustrating the sub-seafloor replacement feature of the VHMS mineralisation and possible relationship of the host stratigraphy and the intrusive leucogranite described by Hallberg and Thompson (1985). B) Simplified stratigraphic sequence and stratigraphical subdivisions for each of the three deposits within the [TB Teutonic Bore](#) Camp (Belford, 2010; Belford et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2015; Das, 2018 and complemented by this study; stratigraphic sequence modified from Hallberg and Thompson, 1985; Macklin, 2010; Parker et al., 2017). The U-Pb zircon age, drillhole and depth for the dacite are from Nelson (1995).

Figure 3: U-Pb Concordia diagram showing the SHRIMP spot analyses and mean $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ ages for: A) Footwall rhyolite (unit I) – Bentley footwall zircons (sample 15BUDD78; mount N18-15D). B) Footwall rhyolite (unit I) – Bentley footwall zircons (sample 15BUDD138; mount N18-15C). C) Transitional andesite (unit III) – Bentley hangingwall zircons (sample 15BUDD120 - 226.04m; mount N19-07, 08). D) Transitional andesite (unit III) – Bentley hangingwall zircons (sample 15BUDD120 - 228.42m; mount N19-09, 10). E) Penzance granite zircons (mount N18-06, 16). F) Penzance granite monazites (mounts N18-06, N18-16). Error ellipses are $\pm 1\sigma$.

2481
2482
2483
2484
2485
2486
2487
2488
2489
2490
2491
2492
2493
2494
2495
2496
2497
2498
2499
2500
2501
2502
2503
2504
2505
2506
2507
2508
2509
2510
2511
2512
2513
2514
2515
2516
2517
2518
2519
2520
2521
2522
2523
2524
2525
2526
2527
2528
2529
2530
2531
2532
2533
2534
2535
2536
2537
2538
2539

861 Figure 4: Cathodoluminescence electron microscope images of zircon grains separated
862 from the footwall rhyolite (unit I) at the Bentley deposit, and analysed with SHRIMP and/or
863 LA-SS-ICPMS. The location of the spots are indicated within each grain as well as the name
864 (and $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age for SHRIMP spots).
865

2540
2541
2542
2543
2544
2545
2546
2547
2548
2549
2550
2551
2552
2553
2554
2555
2556
2557
2558
2559
2560
2561
2562
2563
2564
2565
2566
2567
2568
2569
2570
2571
2572
2573
2574
2575
2576
2577
2578
2579
2580
2581
2582
2583
2584
2585
2586
2587
2588
2589
2590
2591
2592
2593
2594
2595
2596
2597
2598

866 Figure 5: Cathodoluminescence electron microscope images of zircon grains separated
867 from the transitional andesite (unit III) at the Bentley deposit, and analysed with SHRIMP or
868 LA-SS-ICPMS. The location of the spots are indicated within each grain as well as the name
869 (and $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age and discordance for SHRIMP spots).
870

2599
2600
2601
2602
2603
2604
2605
2606
2607
2608
2609
2610
2611
2612
2613
2614
2615
2616
2617
2618
2619
2620
2621
2622
2623
2624
2625
2626
2627
2628
2629
2630
2631
2632
2633
2634
2635
2636
2637
2638
2639
2640
2641
2642
2643
2644
2645
2646
2647
2648
2649
2650
2651
2652
2653
2654
2655
2656
2657

871 Figure 6: Cathodoluminescence images of zircon grains separated from the Penzance
872 granite, and analysed with SHRIMP and/or LA-SS-ICPMS. The location of the spots are
873 indicated within each grain as well as the name (and $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age and discordance for
874 SHRIMP spots). The zircons exhibit cavities, fractures, disruption of the original zoning and/or
875 development of dark CL areas.
876

2658
2659
2660
2661
2662
2663
2664
2665
2666
2667
2668
2669
2670
2671
2672
2673
2674
2675
2676
2677
2678
2679
2680
2681
2682
2683
2684
2685
2686
2687
2688
2689
2690
2691
2692
2693
2694
2695
2696
2697
2698
2699
2700
2701
2702
2703
2704
2705
2706
2707
2708
2709
2710
2711
2712
2713
2714
2715
2716

877 Figure 7: Backscatter electron images of four monazite grains separated from the Penzance
878 granite, and analysed with SHRIMP. The location of the spots are indicated within each grain
879 as well as the name, $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ ages and discordance. Most crystals present visible regular
880 euhedral zoning, typical of magmatic monazite.

881

Figure 8: $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ (CHUR) vs. $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age (Ma) plot for zircon from the Penzance granite, the volcanic sequence at Bentley and zircons from other magmatic rocks within the Kurnalpi Terrane (Wyche et al., 2012). The errors for $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ are 1σ . The zircon data from this study are plotted with the interpreted $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ magmatic age for each sample, which is also used in the calculation of the $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$. The thick black line labelled DM represents ϵHf of depleted mantle over time.

2776
2777
2778
2779
2780
2781
2782
2783
2784
2785
2786
2787
2788
2789
2790
2791
2792
2793
2794
2795
2796
2797
2798
2799
2800
2801
2802
2803
2804
2805
2806
2807
2808
2809
2810
2811
2812
2813
2814
2815
2816
2817
2818
2819
2820
2821
2822
2823
2824
2825
2826
2827
2828
2829
2830
2831
2832
2833
2834

889 Figure 9: MREE and HREE patterns for zircon from the Penzance granite and the volcanic
890 sequence at Bentley, normalized to chondrite (Anders and Grevesse, 1989). The lower graph
891 is a compilation of the four results.

892

2835
2836
2837
2838
2839
2840
2841
2842
2843
2844
2845
2846
2847
2848
2849
2850
2851
2852
2853
2854
2855
2856
2857
2858
2859
2860
2861
2862
2863
2864
2865
2866
2867
2868
2869
2870
2871
2872
2873
2874
2875
2876
2877
2878
2879
2880
2881
2882
2883
2884
2885
2886
2887
2888
2889
2890
2891
2892
2893

893 Figure 10: Graph of probability density, assuming a normal distribution, for the zircon
894 $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ mean ages obtained in this study and the previous age from Nelson (1995), with the
895 mean age indicated by a dashed line for each sample. Each age is represented both by the
896 probability plot and by a graph bar. In both cases, the different shades represent 1σ or 2σ for
897 each age, as indicated in the legend. The thick red line marks the maximum age of the
898 mineralisation. The unpublished TIMS age of the footwall rhyolite (unit I) (Das, 2018) is
899 represented only in bar graph form.
900

Figure 11: Zr vs Y plot for the volcanic rocks that host the Jaguar deposit (Belford et al., 2015) and two samples from the Penzance granite from Geoscience Australia's OZCHEM database (Sedgmen et al., 2007). The filled square represents a sample collected from the same quarry that was sampled for the geochemical studies (Sample id 96969076). The roman numerals indicates the stratigraphical subdivisions from this study and their correspondence to the facies described by Belford et al. (2015). The boundaries and indicated Zr/Y ratios that define tholeiitic, transitional and calc-alkaline fields are from Barrett and MacLean (1994).

- The Teutonic Bore volcanics are broadly coeval to the Penzance granite
- The age of the Penzance granite is ca. 2682 Ma
- The Jaguar volcanics and the ore at the Teutonic Bore camp are $\leq$ ca. 2693 Ma
- The Penzance granite possibly supplied heat and metals to the mineralisation
- Exploration in the EGS should focus on fluid pathways of HFSE-enriched granites

The 4D evolution of the Teutonic Bore Camp VHMS deposits, Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia

Vitor R. Barrote^{1,2,3}, Neal J. McNaughton¹, Svetlana G. Tessalina¹, Noreen J. Evans^{1,2}, Cristina Talavera^{1,4}, Jian-Wei Zi^{1,5}, Bradley J. McDonald^{1,2}

1- John de Laeter Centre and The Institute for Geoscience Research (TIGeR), Curtin University, Kent St, Bentley, WA 6102, Australia

2- School of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Curtin University, Kent St, Bentley, WA 6102, Australia

3- School of Earth, Atmosphere and Environment, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria 3800, Australia

4- School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, The King's Building, James Hutton Road, EH9 3FE, Edinburgh, UK

5- State Key Lab of Geological Processes and Mineral Resources, China University of Geosciences

Declarations of interest: none

ABSTRACT

The Teutonic Bore Camp, comprised of the Teutonic Bore, Jaguar and Bentley deposits, is one of the most significant volcanic-hosted massive sulphide (VHMS) camps in Western Australia. Despite being extensively studied, only recently there have been advances in the understanding of the mechanism that drove the formation of mineralisation. It has been recognized by recent studies that the volcanic-hosted deposits from the Teutonic Bore Camp represent replacement-type VHMS systems, with significant input of fluids and metals from a magmatic source. This paper tests the existing hypothesis that the nearby Penzance granite acted as the metals source and/or thermal engine driving the development of these ore deposits.

New age constraints on the formation of the host volcanic sequence at the Bentley deposit and the crystallization of the Penzance granite allows for the construction of a 4D evolutionary model for the ore system. A new U-Pb SHRIMP monazite age of 2681.9 ± 4.5 Ma indicates that the Penzance granite post-dates the host stratigraphy at Bentley (ca. 2693 Ma) and is probably coeval with mineralisation. All zircons (Penzance, Bentley units I and III) have very similar $\epsilon_{\text{Hf}(i)}$, with most values between -1 and +6, slightly higher than the $\epsilon_{\text{Hf}(i)}$ of zircons from other granites and volcanics within the Kurnalpi Terrain, and indicative of juvenile sources. The mean Th/U ratios are ~ 0.7 and ~ 0.6 for the Penzance and Bentley zircons, respectively. All zircons have similar Ce/Nd_(CN) ratios. The chemical similarities between the zircons from the granite and the volcanic rocks at Bentley support a shared magmatic source between the Penzance and the Teutonic Bore Camp sequence. The Penzance granite is the likely source of heat, and potentially metals, which drove the VHMS mineralisation at the Teutonic Bore Camp.

Keywords: Penzance; Teutonic Bore; Volcanic-hosted massive sulphide; Archean; Geochronology; 4D modelling

1 INTRODUCTION

Using an extensive database of compiled whole-rock geochemistry and U-Pb geochronology, Hollis et al (2015) proposed a link between VHMS mineralisation and the emplacement of HFSE-enriched syn-volcanic intrusions, throughout the Archean Yilgarn Craton, including the Eastern Goldfield Superterrane. Despite the apparent geographical and broadly coeval association between VHMS ores and HFSE-enriched intrusions, the identification of a genetic link would benefit from further geochronological and isotopic evidence.

The number of significant VHMS occurrences in the Yilgarn Craton is small compared to other Archean terrains with similar characteristics such as the Superior Province of Canada

(Hollis et al., 2015). Previous studies suggested that this could be due to under-exploration and the use of techniques inappropriate for mineral prospecting in the Yilgarn Craton (Butt et al., 2017; Ellis, 2004; Hollis et al., 2017, 2015; McConachy et al., 2004). Unlike classic VHMS systems, replacement-type VHMS systems, such as those in the Eastern Goldfield Superterrane, do not precipitate onto the seafloor and although some stratigraphic control can be observed within replacement-type mineralisation, it is not an inevitable feature (Doyle and Allen, 2003).

Historically, exploration for VHMS occurrences within the Teutonic Bore area was focused on key stratigraphic horizons. However, the known deposits formed at different stratigraphic positions and show significant differences in the geometry of mineralisation, compared to Teutonic Bore (Chen et al., 2015; Parker et al., 2017). This led to a significant time gap between the discoveries of the Teutonic Bore deposit in 1976, and the Jaguar and Bentley deposits in 2004 and 2008, respectively (Ellis, 2004; Parker et al., 2017).

To better understand this lack of stratigraphic control on the position of orebodies at the Teutonic Bore Camp, and a possible link between high-field-strength-elements (HFSE)-enriched granite emplacement and ore precipitation, this work re-examines and expands the database of geochronology and isotopic/geochemical fingerprints for the igneous rock units. This includes re-assessment of the geochronological data from the nearby HFSE-enriched granite, the Penzance granite (Champion and Cassidy, 2002; Geoscience Australia, 2019), and the volcanic sequence from the Teutonic Bore Camp (Nelson, 1995), with additional U-Pb Sensitive High-Resolution Ion Microprobe (SHRIMP) dating of zircon and monazite.

These geochronological studies are complemented by zircon Hf-isotope and trace element analyses from the Bentley volcanic sequence and Penzance granite, and compilation of detailed stratigraphy, whole-rock geochemistry and sulphur isotope data from previous studies (Belford et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2015; Das, 2018; Isaac, 2015; Sedgmen et al., 2007). The present work combines the improved geochronological constraints presented here to the current 3D

understanding of the geological processes at place, to develop a 4D evolutionary model of the deposits at the Teutonic Bore Camp.

Reliable and precise ages for magmatism and ore-hosting volcanism, combined with traditional and isotopic geochemistry, allows testing of the hypothesis of a genetic relationship between the HFSE-rich Penzance granite and the Teutonic Bore Camp deposits. The results could have implications for future exploration for Precambrian VHMS deposits, not only in the well-established Teutonic Bore Camp, but also in *greenfields* throughout the Eastern Goldfield Superterrane and, potentially, elsewhere in the Yilgarn Craton.

2 GEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Geology of the Teutonic Bore Camp

The Teutonic Bore, Jaguar and Bentley VHMS deposits, along with several other smaller occurrences, form the Teutonic Bore Camp (Independence Group NL (IGO), 2015). The Teutonic Bore Camp is located near the town of Leonora, within the Kurnalpi Terrane of the Eastern Goldfield Superterrane, Yilgarn Craton (Figure 1). The deposits in the Teutonic Bore Camp are hosted by the Teutonic Bore volcanic complex, which comprises pillow basalt, overlain and interlayered with volcanoclastic units, coherent rhyolite, andesite and thin sedimentary units (Belford et al., 2015; Parker et al., 2017 and references therein). The prefix “meta” is assumed but omitted when addressing the Archean stratigraphic sequence of the Yilgarn Craton, because all rocks are metamorphosed to some extent (Czarnota et al., 2010).

The volcanic stratigraphy and the distribution of the three deposits, as well as other known uneconomic ore bodies, have a NW-SE trend (Figure 1). This trend coincides with the general alignment of regional structures, such as the fault that bounds the Teutonic Bore volcanic complex to the west (Hallberg and Thompson, 1985; Parker et al., 2017).

The stratigraphy at the Teutonic Bore Camp comprises a predominantly laterally continuous lithofacies association between the three deposits (Figure 2A). Therefore, the volcanic sequence that hosts the mineralisation can be broadly subdivided in six units as follow from bottom to top (Figure 2B; Belford et al., 2015; Parker et al., 2017):

- I. Footwall Rhyolite: from 200 m to over 1 km thick. Mainly coherent, either massive or flow-banded, with minor breccia (Parker et al., 2017), and with calc-alkaline to transitional magmatic affinity (Belford et al., 2015). This package is footwall to all three deposits.
- II. Sedimentary rocks partly derived from the rhyolite, locally coarse but grading to arenite, siltstone and shale. This is the host unit to the Bentley deposit. The thickness range from 0 to 70 m according to Parker et al. (2017)
- III. Transitional to tholeiitic basalt/ transitional andesite with thickness between 30 and 170 m, with massive or pillowed habit, commonly intercalated with shale rich sediments (Parker et al., 2017). This package is host to the Teutonic Bore deposit and upper lens at Bentley (e.g.: Flying Spur, Brooklands, Comet: Independence Group NL (IGO), 2015) and overlays the lower orebody at the Bentley deposit (Arnage: Independence Group NL (IGO), 2015). Belford et al. (2015) names this unit Footwall Andesite (FA) and Footwall Basalt (FB), relative to their position to the mineralised zone at Jaguar.
- IV. Upper sedimentary horizon (mineralised package from Belford et al., 2015) consists of a complex assemblage of intercalated dacite (called MPD by Belford et al., 2015), conglomerate, pumice-rich breccia, laminated sediment, laminated chert and massive sulphide (Belford et al., 2015). Unit IV marks a geochemical break in magmatic affinity, from tholeiitic/transitional of the underlying basalts/andesites to

calc-alkaline in the overlying lavas. The thickness is typically within 20 to 40 m (Parker et al., 2017).

V. Upper basalt and andesite of calc-alkaline affinity consists of massive and pillowed basalt and andesite lavas with minor volcanic breccias, and intercalated with mostly carbonaceous shales (Belford et al., 2015). The total thickness of this unit ranges between about 200 to 700 m (Parker et al., 2017).

VI. Hangingwall rhyolite: uppermost stratigraphic unit, described by Belford et al. (2015) from a single drillhole. The thickness of this unit is estimated to be between 100 to 500m according to Parker et al. (2017).

The Teutonic Bore volcanic sequence is bounded to the east by a large composite batholith (Figure 1) named the Kent Complex by Champion and Cassidy (2002) and part of the Penzance Supersuite (Hollis et al., 2015). The Penzance Supersuite consists of HFSE-enriched granites with biotite and/or amphibole in quartz and feldspar rich rocks. These granites are characterised by variably elevated total Fe, MgO, Y, LREE, Zr, coupled with low to moderate Al_2O_3 , K_2O , Rb, Sr and moderate Na_2O (Champion and Cassidy, 2002).

The relationship between the Penzance granite and the volcanic sequence in the Teutonic Bore Camp area remains unclear. Earlier studies (e.g.: Hallberg and Thompson, 1985) suggest an irregular contact between the granite and the volcanic rocks, with anastomosing veins of granitoid extending into adjacent extrusive rocks and a number of xenoliths of volcanic rocks within the intrusive granite. The Penzance granite is one of several HFSE-enriched intrusions in the Yilgarn Craton that occurs in close proximity to VHMS deposits or occurrences hosted by equally HFSE-enriched volcanics (Hollis et al., 2015).

The Jaguar deposit was classified as a replacement-type VHMS deposit by Belford (2010). This classification relied on evidence including replacement front texture, absence of chimney structures, and rapid emplacement of the host volcanic sequence, according to the criteria

proposed by Doyle and Allen (2003). Later studies (Chen et al., 2015; Das, 2018; Parker et al., 2017) have identified similar textures in Bentley and other smaller occurrences and consequently, the replacement-type VHMS model is accepted within the Teutonic Bore Camp.

Despite the predominance of sub-seafloor replacement processes, Belford (2010) observed features that indicate possible above seafloor activity. The development of thin beds of translucent chert with colloform intergrowths of chert and sulphide is interpreted as products of a waning hydrothermal system that had vented fluid to the sediment–water interface and deposited precipitates onto the seafloor (Belford et al., 2015). Massive sulphides conformably overlain by, and gradational upwards into, narrow beds of laminated chert intercalated with finely-bedded sulphide-rich mudstone, support the idea of a progressive disruption of the mineral activity and indicate that some sulphide precipitation might have taken place very near or at seafloor (Belford et al., 2015).

The occurrence of massive sulphide clasts in the surrounding breccias and conglomerates, which were the result of rapid erosion and mass flow, indicates that the sulphide body was formed contemporaneously with the deposition of the upper sedimentary horizon (IV) (Belford et al., 2015). Similar features have not been observed in either the Bentley or the Teutonic Bore deposits.

2.2 Geochronology of the Teutonic Bore sequence and the Penzance granite

The SHRIMP zircon age of 2692 ± 4 Ma (Nelson, 1995) is the only published age for the volcanic sequence at the Teutonic Bore Camp and comes from a porphyric dacite with unclear stratigraphic position (Belford et al., 2015). Additionally, Das (2018) reported an ID-TIMS U-Pb age of 2692 ± 1.5 Ma for a sample of coherent Footwall Rhyolite (unit IV) from Jaguar. These analysis remain unpublished and no data table or sample characterization is provided by Das (2018).

The reported ages for the Penzance granite are $2679 \pm 8\text{Ma}$ (Champion and Cassidy, 2002) and $2686 \pm 9\text{ Ma}$ (Geoscience Australia, 2019, sample ID 96969076). The two ages are derived from the same analyses and calculated from a single dataset for sample ID 96969076. No explanation is provided by either references as to the reason behind the difference in age calculation from a single set of analysis.

3 SAMPLES AND METHODS

3.1 Penzance samples

Samples from the Penzance granite were collected from three different positions within the same quarry (Lat. -28.264050, Long. 121.077888, Penzance Quarry in Figure 1). They were collected from the same quarry as sample ID 96969076 from the Geochron Delivery database of Geoscience Australia (2019). Each one of the three samples was processed separately and treated as different samples, the analyses were combined only in the data processing phase of each technique.

3.2 Bentley samples

Two samples were collected from different positions within the footwall rhyolite (unit I) in the Bentley deposit. Sample 15BUDD78 – 111.60 m was collected from drillhole 15BUDD78 at 111.60 meters depth, from a distal position to the ore. Sample 15BUDD137 – 398.60 m was collected from a higher stratigraphic position within the sequence, a stringer zone to the lower massive sulphide lens, from a different drillhole (15BUDD137).

Two samples (15BUDD120 - 228.42 and 15BUDD120 - 226.04) of the transitional andesite (unit III), were collected from a single drillhole (15BUDD120), within two meters of each other. The transitional andesite at the sampled point is hangingwall to the lower lens (Arnage), but it is in the stringer zone for the upper lens, marked by the occurrence of disseminated sulphides.

3.3 Analytical techniques

Zircon and Monazites were analysed on the SHRIMP II at the John de Laeter Centre, Curtin University (JdLC). Additionally, Zircon Lu–Hf isotopes and rare earth element (REE) abundances were measured over two analytical sessions using laser ablation split stream inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (LA-SS-ICPMS). The analyses were conducted in zircons from the same samples that were analysed by SHRIMP, but not necessarily on the same grain or over the same spot as the SHRIMP analysis. Detailed description of the conditions and procedures are provided in Supplementary Material 1.

4 RESULTS

4.1 U-Pb SHRIMP Zircon dating

4.1.1 Footwall rhyolite (unit I) – Bentley Footwall

Fourteen analyses on 14 zircons from sample 15BUDD78 – 111.60 m were performed (Supplementary Material 2). Using only analyses within 3% of concordant yields a mean $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age of 2696.5 ± 4.2 Ma (95% c.l., $n=12$; mean square weighted deviation, MSWD=1.04, Figure 3). The average and range of Th/U ratio from the most concordant SHRIMP analyses for this sample are 0.60 and 0.45-0.72, respectively.

A second sample from unit I was dated, twenty-seven analyses from 27 zircons from sample 15BUDD137 – 398.60 m were collected (Supplementary Material 2). The mean $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age obtained for analyses within 4% of concordant and with <0.3% common Pb was 2691.7 ± 2.5 Ma (95% c.l.; $n=25$; MSWD=0.95, Figure 3). The average and range of Th/U ratio from the most concordant SHRIMP analyses are 0.63 and 0.41-0.84, respectively.

The CL images of zircons from the two unit I, footwall rhyolite samples show grains with continuous oscillatory zoning and no discernible core and/or rims, with sizes ranging from about 50 to 100 μm (Figure 4). Their morphologies, Th/U and ages are indistinguishable, and

combining the most concordant data, the resulting age of 2692.9 ± 2.1 Ma (95% cl; n=37; MSWD=1.05) is our best estimate of the age of the footwall rhyolite at Bentley.

4.1.2 Transitional andesite (unit III) – Bentley Hangingwall

The samples from the transitional andesite were treated as two separate samples for the geochronology portion of this study. However, these samples were taken 2 meters apart, from the same drillcore (15BUDD120), and were within the same stratigraphic facies. The CL images show zircons with continuous oscillatory zoning, and ranging from 15 to 30 μm in diameter (Figure 5).

Sample 15BUDD120 – 226.04 m yielded 24 dates from 20 zircons. Considering only the 13 results with <5% discordance (Supplementary Material 2), the MSWD is 2.7 and indicates an age spread not consistent with a single age population. Omitting the three youngest ages as statistical outliers probably influenced by diffusional Pb-loss, the remaining population yields a mean age of 2693.2 ± 5.8 Ma (95% cl; n= 10; MSWD=0.88, Figure 3). The average and range of Th/U from the SHRIMP analyses of the more concordant zircons from this sample is 0.90 and 0.39-1.55, respectively.

Sample 15BUDD120 – 228.42 has 18 dates from 16 grains. The ages <5% discordant and <0.1% common Pb yield a mean $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age of 2693.6 ± 6.0 Ma (95% cl, n=9; MSWD=0.24, Figure 3; Supplementary Material 2). The average and range of Th/U of the more concordant zircons is 0.95 and 0.73-1.31, respectively.

The ages obtained for the two adjacent samples from the same stratigraphical facies agree within error. Hence, the data can be combined to obtain a mean $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age for the Transitional Andesite (unit III) of 2693.4 ± 4.1 Ma (95% c.l., n=19; MSWD=0.55). The average Th/U from the zircons used in this mean age calculation was 0.92.

4.1.3 Penzance granite

The CL imaging of abundant zircons from all three samples collected from different locations in a single quarry of the Penzance granite displays textures typical of metamict zircons (Figure 6). These include cavities, fractures, disruption of the original zoning and development of dark CL areas (Corfu, 2003; Kılıç, 2016).

Even when targeting zircon grains seemingly less affected by metamictisation, twenty-seven analysis were aborted throughout a single analytical session due to the unacceptably high ^{204}Pb content. Of the twenty-four analysis which were not aborted, only nine were $<5\%$ discordant and had less than 1% common Pb (Figure 6, Supplementary Material 2). The U and Th contents of completed analyses (average of ~ 580 and ~ 400 ppm, respectively) were commensurate with the observed metamictisation. The nine near concordant analysis have scattered ages typical of metamict zircons, and only one of the ages is within error of the previously reported age (Geoscience Australia, 2019). We conclude that no reliable age could be calculated from these zircon data. The average and range of Th/U from the completed SHRIMP analyses was 0.72 and 0.52-1.46, respectively.

4.2 U-Pb SHRIMP monazite dating of the Penzance granite

A significant number of the monazite grains were separated from the three Penzance granite samples. They have euhedral zoning textures on BSE images (Figure 7), which indicates magmatic crystallization. Recent studies (e.g.: Piechocka et al., 2017) have demonstrated the increased reliability of magmatic monazite as a geochronometer for igneous rocks with unreliable zircon age data, when subsequent metamorphic conditions remained under the Pb closure temperature of monazite. Monazite contains high U and Th and incorporates minor common Pb and, unlike zircon, is largely immune to metamictisation and radiogenic Pb loss at low temperatures (Piechocka et al., 2017).

A total of 38 of 56 analysis from 18 grains with low common Pb ($f_{206} < 0.5\%$) and low discordance ($\leq 5\%$) (Table 1) yield a mean $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age of 2681.9 ± 4.5 Ma (95% c1; MSWD = 1.4; Figure 3). The slightly high MSWD indicates the possibility of scatter from a single-age population. However, in the absence of any skewness in the age probability plot (not shown), anomalous Th-U chemistry or other evidence for either inheritance or Pb-loss, and given the amount of data collected ($n=56$) and used ($n=38$), this is considered to be the age of these igneous monazite.

4.3 HF-isotopes in zircon

4.3.1 Teutonic Bore volcanics

Twenty-five zircon grains from sample 15BUDD78 – 111.60 m of the footwall rhyolite (unit I) were analysed for Lu–Hf by LA-SS-ICP-MS (Supplementary Material 3, mount N18-15D, sample B78,). The calculated $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$, based on the interpreted SHRIMP $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age (2692.9Ma), plot in a homogeneous population with values ranging between +2.3 and +5.6 (Figure 8), and a mean of 3.7 ± 0.5 (MSWD = 0.47, $n = 25$). The low MSWD value partly reflects the relatively large $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ errors on individual analyses.

Twenty-nine Lu–Hf analysis (Supplementary Material 3, mount N18-15C, sample B137) were conducted on zircons from sample 15BUDD137 – 398.60 m of the same footwall rhyolite (unit I), and, once again, the $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ is calculated based on the interpreted SHRIMP $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age for emplacement. $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ values range between -0.6 and +5.2 with a mean of 2.9 ± 0.5 (MSWD = 0.90, $n = 29$, Figure 8). Combining the $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ data for the both footwall rhyolite samples (unit I) yields a value of 3.27 ± 0.33 (MSWD = 0.79, $n = 54$).

Sixteen Lu–Hf analysis (Supplementary Material 3, B37) were conducted on zircon from both samples of transitional andesite (unit III) and the mean age of the combined SHRIMP analyses of 2693.4 Ma was used to calculate $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ which showed considerable scatter and ranged between -11.7 and +8.6 with significant errors on individual analyses (Supplementary

Material 3). The lower precision is a result of the smaller spot-size necessary for the small zircons from these samples. The mean $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ for the transitional andesite (unit III) is 2.6 ± 1.8 (MSWD = 1.05, n = 16, Figure 8).

4.3.2 Penzance granite

Recent studies show that the Lu–Hf system remains relatively undisturbed within metamorphic zircon that do not undergo significant later alteration (Lenting et al., 2010). Thirty-four Lu–Hf analyses on zircon from the Penzance granite (Supplementary Material 3, N18-06) show a range of $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ between -1.5 to +4.7 with mean value of 2.17 ± 0.45 (MSWD = 1.15, n = 34). The $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ values were calculated based on the SHRIMP monazite ages presented herein.

4.4 Trace elements in zircon

Selected trace elements were measured via LA-SS-ICP-MS (Supplementary Material 4). Figure 9 illustrates patterns for selected REEs normalized to chondrite (Anders and Grevesse, 1989) for the two samples from the footwall rhyolite (unit I), the combined samples of andesite (unit III) and the Penzance granite.

The zircons from the footwall rhyolite (unit I) and the andesite (unit III) have similar MREE and HREE content (Figure 9). The mean Yb/Dy ratio is 4.15 ± 0.85 and 4.45 ± 0.68 (1σ) for the rhyolite and andesite, respectively. The Ce anomaly is estimated by the Ce/Nd_(CN) ratio (Loucks et al., 2018) to be positive in both rock types (Supplementary Material 4), with mean Ce/Nd_(CN) of 1.04 ± 0.58 and 1.30 ± 0.75 (1σ) for the rhyolite and andesite, respectively. The zircons from the Penzance granite show a mean Ce/Nd_(CN) of 0.92 ± 0.23 (1δ), indicating a positive Ce anomaly, and Yb/Dy ratio of 2.5 ± 0.67 (1σ).

5 DISCUSSION

5.1 Age constrains on the Penzance granite

Hollis et al. (2015) proposed a link between VHMS mineralisation at the Teutonic Bore Camp and the emplacement of the HFSE-enriched Penzance granite, based on geochemical similarities, the proximity and broad synchronicity between the intrusive magmatic activity and the volcanism of the host sequence. These observations were underpinned by a U-Pb zircon age for the volcanism (2692 ± 4 Ma; Nelson, 1995) and the age reported by Champion and Cassidy (2002) of 2679 ± 8 Ma, for the Kent Complex of the Penzance Supersuite. This latter age was obtained by SHRIMP U-Pb zircon dating of sample ID 96969076 of Geoscience Australia's database, after L.Black, AGSO (unpublished) in Champion and Cassidy (2002).

Champion and Cassidy (2002) reported the age but not the data table. However, the geochronological data, as well as location and description for sample ID 96969076, are available from Geoscience Australia's Geochron Delivery database (Geoscience Australia, 2019). The reported age for this sample is 2686 ± 9 Ma with MSWD = 1.6 and probability = 0.044 (Geoscience Australia, 2019), which is within error of the age reported by Champion and Cassidy (2002), but not identical.

We have reprocessed the data available from Geochron Delivery for sample 96969076 and obtained an identical age of 2686 ± 9 Ma, MSWD = 1.6 from 21 analysis. However, given the scatter inferred by the high MSWD, we have filtered the data by only considering analysis with common Pb <0.3%, deriving a more statistically robust age of 2682 ± 9 Ma ($n=12$; MSWD = 1.3). More importantly, only four zircons were recovered from sample 96969076 and the 21 analyses and calculated age is based on analyses from only three grains, of which one is a xenocryst. Each of our three samples collected from the same quarry had hundreds of zircon grains, and after hand-picking the clearest (least metamict) zircons and analysing the best areas based on CL-SE imaging, we only detected one analysis in the relevant time interval, and it

was 7% discordant. In view of this discrepancy, we searched for other datable minerals in the Penzance granite and identified igneous monazite. The monazite age of 2681.9 ± 4.5 Ma discussed above is considered to be a statistically valid age of magma crystallization for the Penzance granite, and supersedes the previous zircon age(s).

5.2 Geochronological associations

The relative timing of ore formation in the Teutonic Bore Camp is well constrained within the stratigraphic sequence at Jaguar, where substantial evidence of seafloor precipitation indicate coeval mineralisation to the development of the upper sedimentary package (unit IV). Such evidence is absent from Bentley and the Teutonic Bore deposit, which indicates that they were formed at greater depths, probably by replacement of a slightly older stratigraphy (see Figure 2A).

The syn-ore nature of the upper sedimentary package (unit IV) at Jaguar, the deposit hosted within the youngest stratigraphic level in the Teutonic Bore Camp, indicates that the hangingwall sequence at Jaguar post-dates ore formation and could provide a potential minimum mineralisation age. Attempts to date this sequence have proven unsuccessful to date (Das, 2018). The footwall in all three deposits, as well as the hangingwall immediately above the orebodies of the Bentley and the Teutonic Bore deposits, pre-date the mineralisation and represent a maximum age of ore formation.

The ages obtained in this study for the footwall rhyolite (unit I - 2691.7 ± 2.5 Ma and 2696.5 ± 4.3 Ma) and the transitional andesite (unit III - 2693.4 ± 4.1 Ma) suggest that mineralisation at the Teutonic Bore Camp is younger than c.a. 2694 Ma (Figure 10). The unpublished TIMS age for the footwall rhyolite sequence (unit I) of 2692.6 ± 1.5 Ma (Das, 2018) is indistinguishable from the SHRIMP age presented here for the pre-ore volcanic sequence at the Teutonic Bore Camp. Similarly, the previous SHRIMP age for the Teutonic Bore Camp sequence (2692 ± 4 Ma; (Nelson, 1995) is similar to the age determined in this study (Figure

10). Therefore, although poorly constrained in the stratigraphy, it is likely that the porphyritic dacite dated by Nelson (1995) is part of the pre-ore stratigraphy (units I, II, or III).

The ages for the footwall rhyolite (unit I) of 2696.5 ± 4.3 Ma and 2691.7 ± 2.5 Ma are within error of each other, when considering a 95% confidence interval. However, considering the normal distribution tendency of single-population ages obtained from multiple grains (Figure 10; Schoene et al., 2013), it is probable that these could also represent a long duration of volcanic activity during the development of this stratigraphic facies.

The ages for the footwall rhyolite (unit I) and the Penzance granite (2681.9 ± 4.5 Ma) do not overlap (Figure 10) at the 95% confidence interval and are not, therefore, coeval. Furthermore, the porphyritic dacite from Nelson (1995) and the transitional andesite (unit III) do not overlap the age of the Penzance (Figure 10) at a 95% confidence interval. We infer that these rocks pre-date the mineralisation and the syn-ore stratigraphy.

5.3 Geochemical correlations

5.3.1 Whole-rock geochemistry

Hollis et al. (2015) described similarities in whole-rock REE distribution between the Penzance granite (Kent Complex) and the felsic volcanics that host the mineralisation at Jaguar (footwall rhyolite – unit I). Based on these observations and the HFSE enrichment of both rock types they suggested a possible genetic link between these rocks, proposing that the footwall volcanic sequence at Jaguar would be the extrusive equivalent to the Penzance granite.

The geochronological results presented here indicate that the crystallization of the Penzance granite is not coeval to the formation of the footwall rhyolite (unit I) or the transitional andesite (unit III) at Bentley. However, these processes occur within a ~12 M.y. interval. Given the chemical similarities between these rock types and their proximity in age it is conceivable that they are both the product of a single magmatic system or had a common source.

945
946
947 389 Additionally, based on whole-rock geochemistry observations, other stratigraphic facies
948
949 390 within the younger, syn-ore, portion of the volcanic sequence at the Teutonic Bore Camp are
950
951 391 alternative candidates to be the extrusive correspondent to the Penzance granite.
952

953
954 392 The dacite that can be observed at the sedimentary-volcanic package of the upper
955
956 393 sedimentary horizon (unit IV) in the Jaguar deposit (MPD from Belford et al., 2015) has Y/Zr
957
958 394 ratios that indicates a tholeiitic affinity (Belford et al., 2015), which is also the case for the
959
960 395 Penzance granite (ID 96969076, sampled from the same locality of the geochronological study;
961
962 396 Sedgmen et al., 2007) (Figure 11). Furthermore, the MPD dacite yields a La/Yb_{CN} ratio of 3.4
963
964 397 – 5.5 (Belford, 2010), which indicates a significant LREE/HREE enrichment, equal to what is
965
966 398 indicated by whole-rock REE content for the Penzance granite (Hollis et al., 2015).
967

968 969 399 5.3.2 Zircon geochemistry 970

971 400 The Hf-isotopes corroborate Hollis et al. (2015)'s hypothesis of a genetic link between the
972
973 401 Teutonic Bore Camp volcanic sequence and the Penzance granite. All zircons (Penzance, units
974
975 402 I and III) have very similar $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$, with most values between -1 and +6 (Figure 8). The $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$
976
977 403 values show little contribution from evolved sources (Figure 8). Indeed, Nd and Pb isotopes
978
979 404 indicate that the Teutonic Bore Camp is located within a more juvenile zone of the Yilgarn
980
981 405 craton, the Teutonic zone (Huston et al., 2014). The $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ for the zircons from the Penzance
982
983 406 granite and the volcanic rocks from the Teutonic Bore Camp plot above the CHUR line (Figure
984
985 407 8), indicating a juvenile depleted mantle source component. These $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ are slightly higher
986
987 408 than the $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ of zircons from other granites and volcanics within the Kurnalpi Terrain (Isaac,
988
989 409 2015; Wyche et al., 2012).
990
991

992 410 According to Kirkland et al. (2015), parental magma composition is one of four factors that
993
994 411 may contribute to variations in the Th/U of a zircon crystal. Therefore, the similar Th/U ratios
995
996 412 (Supplementary Material 2) of the Penzance (~0.7) and Bentley zircons (Unit I: ~0.6) also
997
998 413 suggest they could have a shared magma source. Furthermore, all zircons have similar
999
1000
1001
1002
1003

Ce/Nd_(CN) ratios (Supplementary Material 4), which indicates comparable redox conditions, as this ratio is a proxy for the Ce anomaly (Loucks et al., 2018).

The zircons from the Penzance granite have higher overall REE content and MREE/HREE enrichment (indicated by the Yb/Dy ratio), when compared to the Bentley units I and III zircons (Supplementary Material 4). These chemical differences indicate that the Penzance granite is more fractionated but do not resolve whether this is the result of igneous differentiation from a common magma or magma production from a common source. The ~12 M.y. interval between the units I and III volcanics, and the Penzance granite suggests the latter.

5.4 Contribution to the 4D evolutionary model of the Teutonic Bore Camp ore

The 4D evolutionary model of the Teutonic Bore Camp is achieved by the addition of the time dimension to the current understanding of the geological evolution of the deposits, including stratigraphy and geochemistry (Figure 2; Belford, 2010; Belford et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2015; Das, 2018; Hallberg and Thompson, 1985; Macklin, 2010; Parker et al., 2017). The geochronology data presented in this study constrain in time several processes within the Teutonic Bore Camp, including the intrusion of the Penzance granite, which could be linked to the development of the mineral system.

Similarities in zircon chemistry (i.e.: $\square\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ and Th/U ratio; see section 5.3: Geochemical correlations) complemented by the geochemical correspondences between the Penzance granite and the Teutonic Bore volcanics (i.e.: HFSE-enrichment and REE pattern, see section 5.3: Geochemical correlations), suggest a genetic association between the intrusive granite and the extrusive rocks that constitute the Teutonic Bore Camp host sequence.

Irregular contact between the Penzance granite and the volcanic sequence, as well as, the recognition of intrusive veins of granitoid within the volcanics, and xenoliths of volcanic rocks within the granite (Hallberg and Thompson, 1985) indicate that the Penzance intrudes the volcanic Teutonic Bore sequence and that their proximity is not the result of subsequent

tectonic processes. Considering the close geographic position of the granite and the ore-bearing volcanic sequence (Figure 1), their shared geochemical features and broad synchronicity, it is possible that the Penzance granite was involved in the process that generated the VHMS mineralisation at the Teutonic Bore Camp.

Magmatic-hydrothermal contribution of metals is not necessary in the development of VHMS deposits (Huston et al., 2011) and syn-ore intrusions do not always directly supply metal to the system, but rather act as a heating source, driving hydrothermal circulation that leaches metals from the country host rock (Lode et al., 2017). However, in a number of cases there is evidence of a significant contribution of metals and/or volatiles from the magmatic source, in addition to the supply of heat (e.g.: Chen et al., 2015; Lode et al., 2017; Yang and Scott, 1996).

Chen et al. (2015) used S-isotopes as a proxy for the hydrothermal fluid composition in the Teutonic Bore Camp and interpreted that the supply of sulphur to the hydrothermal ore fluid was the result of a mixture between seawater and a hydrothermal fluid of magmatic origin. These authors did not find compelling evidence for leaching of sulphur from the host sequence into the ore fluid in the Teutonic Bore Camp. Therefore, the Penzance granite is a strong candidate to have acted as the probable magmatic source of sulphur to the mineralisation, and possibly, metals.

5.5 Exploration strategies

Our observations show that the HFSE-enriched Penzance granite probably played a fundamental role in the supply of metals and heat that culminated in the development of the replacement-type VHMS deposits of the Teutonic Bore Camp. Therefore, future exploration efforts within the camp should focus on fluid pathways from similar granites. The emphasis should be on mapping syn- or pre-intrusive structures that could facilitate fluid flow from the granite to the host sequence. Fertile zones are likely to be discovered where these fluid paths

find the appropriate conditions for metal precipitation, which has been suggested by previous studies to be sediment-rich horizons (Parker et al., 2017) and/or depositional breaks (Belford et al., 2015).

This paper supports conclusions proposed by Hollis et al. (2015), of a connection between HFSE-enriched granites and VHMS ($\pm$ base metals) deposits within the Yilgarn Craton. Following the identification of fertile terrains, populated with HFSE-enriched granites, *greenfield* exploration campaigns should employ a multi-disciplinary approach to test the processes involved in the formation of an ore deposit. The development of 4D models (i.e. constrain in time of 3D geological processes) allows for a better understanding of the timing and nature of the magmatic and stratigraphical processes necessary for the development of such ore deposits. This is particular true in Archean replacement-type VHMS deposits, where the syn-volcanic timing of the mineralisation is not always clear (e.g. Barrote et al., 2019)

6 CONCLUSIONS

- Three mined VHMS orebodies in the Teutonic Bore Camp (Teutonic Bore deposit, Jaguar and Bentley) formed at different stratigraphic levels.
- Jaguar formed coeval with its host sequence, whereas the ore in Teutonic Bore and Bentley replaces slightly older stratigraphy.
- The age of the host sequence at the stratigraphic level of the Bentley deposit is ca. 2693 Ma.
- The age of the Teutonic Bore Camp mineralisation is possibly coeval to the intrusion of the Penzance granite at ca. 2682 Ma.
- Monazite has been shown to be a more reliable chronometer than high-U-Th zircons in the HFSE-enriched Penzance granite.

- The Penzance granite possibly acted as the source of heat and potentially fluid/metals to the ore formation at the Teutonic Bore Camp.
- VHMS exploration in the Yilgarn Craton should focus in finding fluid pathways between HFSE-enriched intrusives and potential host sequences to orebodies.

7 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge: Dr Steve Bereford and Mr. Kyle Hodges from IGO for their wisdom, access to samples, drill core and internal data; Thermo Fisher, GSWA and MRIWA for financial support; and the John de Laeter Centre (JdLC) for the facilities, scientific and technical assistance. We thank Dr. Haoyang Zhou, Dr. Nicolas Thebaud and an anonymous reviewer whose comments helped improve and clarify this manuscript. JdLC facilities are supported by a university-government consortium, ARC and AuScope via NCRIS. GeoHistory Facility instruments in the John de Laeter Centre, Curtin University were funded via an Australian Geophysical Observing System grant provided to AuScope Pty Ltd. by the AQ44 Australian Education Investment Fund program. The NPII multi-collector was obtained via funding from the Australian Research Council LIEF program (LE150100013).

8 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anders, E., Grevesse, N., 1989. Abundances of the elements: Meteoritic and solar. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 53, 197–214. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037\(89\)90286-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037(89)90286-X)
- Barrett, T.J., MacLean, W.H., 1994. Chemostratigraphy and hydrothermal alteration in exploration for VHMS deposits in greenstones and younger volcanic rocks., in: Lentz, D.R. (Ed.), *Alteration and Alteration Processes Associated with Ore-Forming Systems*, Short Course Notes / Geological Association of Canada. Geological Assoc. of Canada, St. John's, Newfoundland, pp. 433–467.
- Barrote, V., Tessalina, S., McNaughton, N., Jourdan, F., Hollis, S.P., Ware, B., Zi, J.-W., 2020. 4D history of the Nimbus VHMS ore deposit in the Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia. *Precambrian Research* 337, 105536. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.precamres.2019.105536>
- Belford, S.M., 2010. Genetic and chemical characterisation of the host succession to the archaean Jaguar VHMS deposit. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Tasmania, UTAS, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia.
- Belford, S.M., Davidson, G.J., McPhie, J., Large, R.R., 2015. Architecture of the Neoarchaean Jaguar VHMS deposit, Western Australia: Implications for prospectivity and the

- presence of depositional breaks. *Precambrian Res.* 260, 136–160.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.precamres.2014.12.019>
- Butt, C.R.M., Anand, R.R., Smith, R.E., 2017. Geology of the Australian regolith, in: Phillips, G.N. (Ed.), *Australian Ore Deposits*. The Australian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, Melbourne, pp. 27–34.
- Champion, D.C., Cassidy, K.F., 2002. Granites of the Northern Eastern Goldfields: their Distribution, Age, Geochemistry, Petrogenesis, Relationship with Mineralisation, and Implications for Tectonic Environment, AMIRA P482/MERIWAM281-Yilgarn Granitoids. AMIRA P482/MERIWAM281-Yilgarn Granitoids.
- Chen, M., Campbell, I.H., Xue, Y., Tian, W., Ireland, T.R., Holden, P., Cas, R.A.F., Hayman, P.C., Das, R., 2015. Multiple Sulfur Isotope Analyses Support a Magmatic Model for the Volcanogenic Massive Sulfide Deposits of the Teutonic Bore Volcanic Complex, Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia. *Econ. Geol.* 110, 1411–1423.
<https://doi.org/10.2113/econgeo.110.6.1411>
- Corfu, F., 2003. Atlas of Zircon Textures. *Rev. Mineral. Geochem.* 53, 469–500.
<https://doi.org/10.2113/0530469>
- Czarnota, K., Champion, D.C., Goscombe, B., Blewett, R.S., Cassidy, K.F., Henson, P.A., Groenewald, P.B., 2010. Geodynamics of the eastern Yilgarn Craton. *Precambrian Res.* 183, 175–202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.precamres.2010.08.004>
- Das, R., 2018. Understanding the Palaeovolcanological and Palaeoenvironmental setting of Archaean VMS Deposit: Stratigraphic Architecture and Volcanology of the Archaean VMS host rock succession of the Teutonic Bore, Jaguar and Bentley Mine corridor, Eastern Goldfields Province, Western Australia (Master thesis). Melbourne University, Melbourne.
- Doyle, M.G., Allen, R.L., 2003. Subsea-floor replacement in volcanic-hosted massive sulfide deposits. *Ore Geol. Rev.* 23, 183–222. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-1368\(03\)00035-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-1368(03)00035-0)
- Ellis, P., 2004. Geology and mineralisation of the Jaguar copper-zinc deposit, Western Australia, in: McConachy, T.F., McInnes, B.I.A. (Eds.), *Copper-Zinc Massive Sulphide Deposits in Western Australia*. CSIRO Exploration and Mining, Melbourne, pp. 39–46.
- Geoscience Australia, 2019. Geochron Delivery Database. Accessed June 2019. <http://www.ga.gov.au/geochron-sapub-web/geochronology/shrimp/search.htm>.
- GeoVIEW.WA, 2016. 1:500 000 State interpreted bedrock geology polygons, 2016.
- Hallberg, J.A., Thompson, J.F.H., 1985. Geologic setting of the Teutonic Bore massive sulfide deposit, Archean Yilgarn Block, Western Australia. *Econ. Geol.* 80, 1953–1964.
<https://doi.org/10.2113/gsecongeo.80.7.1953>
- Hollis, S.P., Mole, D.R., Gillespie, P., Barnes, S.J., Tesselina, S., Cas, R.A.F., Hildrew, C., Pumphrey, A., Goodz, M.D., Caruso, S., Yeats, C.J., Verbeeten, A., Belford, S.M., Wyche, S., Martin, L.A.J., 2017. 2.7 Ga plume associated VHMS mineralization in the Eastern Goldfields Superterrane, Yilgarn Craton: Insights from the low temperature and shallow water, Ag-Zn-(Au) Nimbus deposit. *Precambrian Res.* 291, 119–142.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.precamres.2017.01.002>
- Hollis, S.P., Yeats, C.J., Wyche, S., Barnes, S.J., Ivanic, T.J., Belford, S.M., Davidson, G.J., Roache, A.J., Wingate, M.T.D., 2015. A review of volcanic-hosted massive sulfide (VHMS) mineralization in the Archaean Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia: Tectonic, stratigraphic and geochemical associations. *Precambrian Res.* 260, 113–135.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.precamres.2014.11.002>
- Huston, D.L., Champion, D.C., Cassidy, K.F., 2014. Tectonic Controls on the Endowment of Neoproterozoic Cratons in Volcanic-Hosted Massive Sulfide Deposits: Evidence from

- Lead and Neodymium Isotopes. *Econ. Geol.* 109, 11–26.
<https://doi.org/10.2113/econgeo.109.1.11>
- Huston, D.L., Relvas, J.M.R.S., Gemmell, J.B., Driberg, S., 2011. The role of granites in volcanic-hosted massive sulphide ore-forming systems: an assessment of magmatic–hydrothermal contributions. *Miner. Deposita* 46, 473–507.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00126-010-0322-7>
- Independence Group NL (IGO), 2015. Annual Report 2015 (Unpublished Annual Report). Independence Group NL (IGO), Perth, W.A.
- Isaac, C., 2015. Geochemistry of the north Eastern Goldfields, Western Australia: examining the processes that produce nickel sulphide camps (Masters Thesis). The University of Western Australia, Perth, W.A.
- Kirkland, C.L., Smithies, R.H., Taylor, R.J.M., Evans, N., McDonald, B., 2015. Zircon Th/U ratios in magmatic environs. *Lithos* 212–215, 397–414.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lithos.2014.11.021>
- Kılıç, A.D., 2016. Investigation of zircon by CL (Cathodoluminescence) and Raman Spectroscopy. *IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.* 44, 042006.
<https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/44/4/042006>
- Lenting, C., Geisler, T., Gerdes, A., Kooijman, E., Scherer, E.E., Zeh, A., 2010. The behavior of the Hf isotope system in radiation-damaged zircon during experimental hydrothermal alteration. *Am. Mineral.* 95, 1343–1348.
<https://doi.org/10.2138/am.2010.3521>
- Lode, S., Piercey, S.J., Layne, G.D., Piercey, G., Cloutier, J., 2017. Multiple sulphur and lead sources recorded in hydrothermal exhalites associated with the Lemarchant volcanogenic massive sulphide deposit, central Newfoundland, Canada. *Miner. Deposita* 52, 105–128. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00126-016-0652-1>
- Loucks, R.R., Fiorentini, M.L., Rohrlach, B.D., 2018. Divergent T–fO₂ paths during crystallisation of H₂O-rich and H₂O-poor magmas as recorded by Ce and U in zircon, with implications for TitaniQ and TitaniZ geothermometry. *Contrib. Mineral. Petrol.* 173. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00410-018-1529-3>
- Macklin, D., 2010. Alteration at the Teutonic Bore (VHMS) Deposit, Western Australia (B.Sc with honours thesis). University of Tasmania, UTAS.
- McConachy, T.F., McInnes, B.I.A., Carr, G.R., 2004. Is Western Australia intrinsically impoverished in volcanogenic massive sulphide deposits, or under explored?, in: McConachy, T.F., McInnes, B.I.A. (Eds.), *Copper-Zinc Massive Sulphide Deposits in Western Australia*. CSIRO Exploration and Mining, Melbourne, pp. 15–32.
- Nelson, D.R., 1995. Compilation of SHRIMP U–Pb zircon geochronology data, 1994, Record / Geological Survey of Western Australia. Geological Survey of Western Australia, Perth.
- Parker, P., Belford, S.M., Maier, R., Lynn, S., Stewart, W., 2017. Teutonic Bore - Jaguar - Bentley volcanogenic massive sulfide field, in: Phillips, G.N. (Ed.), *Australian Ore Deposits*. The Australian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, Melbourne, pp. 167–172.
- Piechocka, A.M., Gregory, C.J., Zi, J.-W., Sheppard, S., Wingate, M.T.D., Rasmussen, B., 2017. Monazite trumps zircon: applying SHRIMP U–Pb geochronology to systematically evaluate emplacement ages of leucocratic, low-temperature granites in a complex Precambrian orogen. *Contrib. Mineral. Petrol.* 172.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00410-017-1386-5>
- Schoene, B., Condon, D.J., Morgan, L., McLean, N., 2013. Precision and Accuracy in Geochronology. *Elements* 9, 19–24. <https://doi.org/10.2113/gselements.9.1.19>
- Sedgmen, A., Hazell, M.S., Budd, A.R., Champion, D.C., 2007. OZCHEM National Whole Rock Geochemistry Dataset.

- Wyche, S., Kirkland, C.L., Riganti, A., Pawley, M.J., Belousova, E., Wingate, M.T.D., 2012. Isotopic constraints on stratigraphy in the central and eastern Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia. *Aust. J. Earth Sci.* 59, 657–670. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08120099.2012.697677>
- Yang, K., Scott, S.D., 1996. Possible contribution of a metal-rich magmatic fluid to a sea-floor hydrothermal system. *Nature* 383, 420–423. <https://doi.org/10.1038/383420a>

Figure 1: Location of the Teutonic Bore Camp on a map showing the major subdivisions of the Eastern Goldfields Superterrane, Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia. The town of Leonora is indicated by a black diamond. The inset map shows the location of the three deposits (Teutonic Bore, Jaguar and Bentley) and the sampled Penzance granite on the 1:500 000 State interpreted bedrock geological map from the GSWA online database GeoVIEW.WA (2016).

Figure 2: A) Schematic geological model for the Teutonic Bore Camp showing the position of each deposit within the stratigraphic sequence and illustrating the sub-seafloor replacement feature of the VHMS mineralisation and possible relationship of the host stratigraphy and the intrusive leucogranite described by Hallberg and Thompson (1985). B) Simplified stratigraphic sequence and stratigraphical subdivisions for each of the three deposits within the Teutonic Bore Camp (Belford, 2010; Belford et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2015; Das, 2018 and complemented by this study; stratigraphic sequence modified from Hallberg and Thompson, 1985; Macklin, 2010; Parker et al., 2017). The U-Pb zircon age, drillhole and depth for the dacite are from Nelson (1995).

Figure 3: U-Pb Concordia diagram showing the SHRIMP spot analyses and mean $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ ages for: A) Footwall rhyolite (unit I) – Bentley footwall zircons (sample 15BUDD78; mount N18-15D). B) Footwall rhyolite (unit I) – Bentley footwall zircons (sample 15BUDD138; mount N18-15C). C) Transitional andesite (unit III) – Bentley hangingwall zircons (sample 15BUDD120 - 226.04m; mount N19-07, 08). D) Transitional andesite (unit III) – Bentley hangingwall zircons (sample 15BUDD120 - 228.42m; mount N19-09, 10). E) Penzance granite zircons (mount N18-06, 16). F) Penzance granite monazite (mounts N18-06, N18-16). Error ellipses are $\pm 1\sigma$.

Figure 4: Cathodoluminescence electron microscope images of zircon grains separated from the footwall rhyolite (unit I) at the Bentley deposit, and analysed with SHRIMP and/or LA-SS-ICPMS. The location of the spots are indicated within each grain as well as the name (and $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age for SHRIMP spots).

Figure 5: Cathodoluminescence electron microscope images of zircon grains separated from the transitional andesite (unit III) at the Bentley deposit, and analysed with SHRIMP or LA-SS-ICPMS. The location of the spots are indicated within each grain as well as the name (and $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age and discordance for SHRIMP spots).

Figure 6: Cathodoluminescence images of zircon grains separated from the Penzance granite, and analysed with SHRIMP and/or LA-SS-ICPMS. The location of the spots are indicated within each grain as well as the name (and $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age and discordance for SHRIMP spots). The zircons exhibit cavities, fractures, disruption of the original zoning and/or development of dark CL areas.

Figure 7: Backscatter electron images of four monazite grains separated from the Penzance granite, and analysed with SHRIMP. The location of the spots are indicated within each grain as well as the name, $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ ages and discordance. Most crystals present visible regular euhedral zoning, typical of magmatic monazite.

Figure 8: $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ (CHUR) vs. $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age (Ma) plot for zircon from the Penzance granite, the volcanic sequence at Bentley and zircons from other magmatic rocks within the Kurnalpi Terrane (Wyche et al., 2012). The errors for $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$ are 1σ . The zircon data from this study are plotted with the interpreted $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ magmatic age for each sample, which is also used in the calculation of the $\epsilon\text{Hf}_{(i)}$. The thick black line labelled DM represents ϵHf of depleted mantle over time.

Figure 9: MREE and HREE patterns for zircon from the Penzance granite and the volcanic sequence at Bentley, normalized to chondrite (Anders and Grevesse, 1989). The lower graph is a compilation of the four results.

Figure 10: Graph of probability density, assuming a normal distribution, for the zircon $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ mean ages obtained in this study and the previous age from Nelson (1995), with the mean age indicated by a dashed line for each sample. Each age is represented both by the probability plot and by a graph bar. In both cases, the different shades represent 1σ or 2σ for each age, as indicated in the legend. The thick red line marks the maximum age of the mineralisation. The unpublished TIMS age of the footwall rhyolite (unit I) (Das, 2018) is represented only in bar graph form.

Figure 11: Zr vs Y plot for the volcanic rocks that host the Jaguar deposit (Belford et al., 2015) and two samples from the Penzance granite from Geoscience Australia's OZCHEM database (Sedgmen et al., 2007). The filled square represents a sample collected from the same quarry that was sampled for the geochemical studies (Sample id 96969076). The roman numerals indicates the stratigraphical subdivisions from this study and their correspondence to the facies described by Belford et al. (2015). The boundaries and indicated Zr/Y ratios that define tholeiitic, transitional and calc-alkaline fields are from Barrett and MacLean (1994).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

Teutonic Bore camp

Legend

OZCHEM

■ Penzance (Kent) granite (96969076)* Zr/Y = 2.9

□ Penzance granite (92969084)* Zr/Y = 4.6

Belford et al. (2015)

△ hangingwall upper rhyolite

△ hangingwall upper andesite

△ hangingwall basalt

△ hangingwall andesite 3

△ hangingwall andesite 2

△ hangingwall andesite 1

● mineralized package felsics (thol)

◻ mineralized package felsics (trans)

○ mineralized package felsics (calc-alk)

★ footwall basalts

★ footwall andesites

★ footwall felsics

★ deep footwall andesite

} unit VI

} unit V

} unit IV

} unit III

} unit I

Declaration of conflict of interests

☐ The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

☐ The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Vitor Rodrigues Barrote

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL 1

1.1 SHRIMP U-Pb dating of Zircon and Monazite

1.1.1 Mount preparation

Zircon and monazite grains were separated from crushed rock samples using a Frantz magnetic separator and heavy liquids (methylene iodide). Grains were handpicked, mounted in epoxy resin discs and polished to expose their interiors. The zircon crystals were characterized by cathodoluminescence (CL) imaging, and monazite crystals by back-scattered electron (BSE) microscopy using the Mira3, at the Microscopy and Microanalysis Facility, John de Laeter Centre, Curtin University. The epoxy mounts were carbon coated for SEM imaging and Au-coated before each SHRIMP analytical session.

Polished thin sections prepared from samples of transitional andesite (unit III) were examined to identify suitable zircon grains for SHRIMP geochronology using the Tescan Integrated Mineral Analyzer (TIMA GM) and back-scattered electron (BSE) microscopy using the Mira3, at the Microscopy and Microanalysis Facility, John de Laeter Centre, Curtin University. Portions of the thin sections containing grains large enough ($>15\text{ }\mu\text{m}$) for ion microprobe analysis were drilled out, in $\sim 3\text{ mm}$ plugs, and cast in 25 mm epoxy mounts. The reference materials were in a separate mount that was cleaned and Au-coated with the sample mounts before each SHRIMP analytical session.

1.1.2 Zircon

Selected areas of the imaged zircon were analysed on the SHRIMP II at the John de Laeter Centre, Curtin University (JdLC). The analytical procedures for the Curtin consortium SHRIMP II have been described by de Laeter and Kennedy (1998) and Kennedy and de Laeter (1994) and are similar to those described by Compston et al. (1984) and Williams (1998). For the larger zircons in grain mounts, a 20-25 μm elliptical spot was used, with a mass-filtered O_2^- -

primary beam of ~2.8-3.0 nA, whereas a 10-12 μm spot of ~0.5 nA was used on the smaller zircons in polished thin sections. Data for each spot was collected in sets of six scans on the zircons through the mass range of $^{196}\text{Zr}^{20+}$, $^{204}\text{Pb}^{+}$, Background, $^{206}\text{Pb}^{+}$, $^{207}\text{Pb}^{+}$, $^{208}\text{Pb}^{+}$, $^{238}\text{U}^{+}$, $^{248}\text{ThO}^{+}$ and $^{254}\text{UO}^{+}$. The $^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{U}$ age standard and U-content standard used was M257 (561.3 Ma and 840 ppm U; Nasdala et al., 2008) while OGC zircon was utilized as the $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ standard, to monitor instrument induced mass fractionation (3465.4 ± 0.6 Ma; Stern et al., 2009). The $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ dates obtained on OGC zircons during the SHRIMP sessions matched the $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ standard age within uncertainty and no fractionation correction was warranted. The common Pb correction was based on the measured ^{204}Pb -content (Compston et al., 1984). The correction formula for Pb/U fractionation is $^{206}\text{Pb}^{+}/^{238}\text{U}^{+} = a (^{254}\text{UO}^{+}/^{238}\text{U}^{+})^b$ (Claoué-Long et al., 1995) using the parameter values of Black et al. (2003). The constant “a” is determined empirically from analyses of the standard during each analytical session. The programs SQUID II and Isoplot (Ludwig, 2011, 2009) were used for data processing.

1.1.3 Monazite

The U–Th–Pb analyses were performed using the high spatial-resolution capability of the SHRIMP II at the JdLC. Monazite was analysed in two analytical sessions. Grains were analysed using a 30 μm Köhler aperture, ~0.3 nA primary ion beam (O_2^{-}) and a ~10 μm analysis spot. Energy filtering was not applied, and the post-collector retardation lens was activated to reduce stray ion arrivals. The mass resolution ($M/\Delta M$ at 1% peak height) was >5000. French ($^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{U}$ age 514 Ma) was used as the primary Pb/U reference material, and Z2908 and Z2234 were the secondary reference materials used to monitor matrix effects (Fletcher et al., 2010). Z2908 ($^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age 1796 Ma) was also analysed to monitor and correct for instrumental mass fractionation of ^{207}Pb from ^{206}Pb . SQUID II software (Ludwig, 2009) was used for initial data reduction including ^{204}Pb correction. Matrix effects in $^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{U}$ were corrected following established protocols detailed by Fletcher et al. (2010). 9 analyses of

Z2908 yielded a mean $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ age of 1796.7 ± 5.4 Ma (mean square weighted deviation, MSWD = 1.7). An insignificant fractionation correction (0.02%) was applied to sample data, with no augmentation of sample precision required based on the reproducibility of $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ in the reference materials. $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ dates from individual analyses are presented with 1σ internal precision, whereas weighted mean $^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ dates are reported at 95% confidence limits.

1.2 LA-SS-ICPMS of Zircon – Trace elements and Hf isotopes

Zircon Lu–Hf isotopes and rare earth element (REE) abundances were measured over two analytical sessions using laser ablation split stream inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (LA-SS-ICPMS). The analyses were conducted in zircons from the same samples that were analysed by SHRIMP, but not necessarily on the same grain or over the same spot as the SHRIMP analysis. Isotopic and elemental data were collected simultaneously using a Resonetics S-155-LR 193 nm excimer laser coupled to a Nu Plasma II multicollector and Agilent 7700s quadrupole mass spectrometer in the GeoHistory Facility, JdLC at Curtin University.

Samples 15BUDD120 – 228.42 and 15BUDD120 – 226.04 m, from the Transitional andesite (unit III) were analysed with a laser spot diameter of 24 μm , with 2.7 J/cm² on-sample laser energy, repetition rate of 10 Hz, ablation time of 25 seconds and ~30 seconds of background capture before and after each analysis. Two cleaning pulse preceded analysis. The spot size and ablation time in this case were limited by the smaller size of the zircons.

The remaining samples were analysed with a laser spot diameter of 50 μm , with 2.7 J/cm² on-sample laser energy, repetition rate of 10 Hz, ablation time of 40 seconds and ~45 seconds of total baseline acquisition.

Zircon standard P1 (Li et al., 2010; chips of Penglai zircon characterised in-house for trace element composition) was used as the primary standard to calculate element concentrations

using ^{91}Zr as the internal reference isotope and assuming 43.14% Zr in zircon, and to correct for instrument drift.

Lu–Hf isotopic data were measured simultaneously for ^{172}Yb , ^{173}Yb , ^{175}Lu , $^{176}\text{Hf}+\text{Yb}+\text{Lu}$, ^{177}Hf , ^{178}Hf , ^{179}Hf and ^{180}Hf on the Faraday array. Time resolved data was baseline subtracted and reduced using Iolite3.5 (DRS after Woodhead et al., 2004), where ^{176}Yb and ^{176}Lu were removed from the 176 mass signal using $^{176}\text{Yb}/^{173}\text{Yb} = 0.7962$ (Chu et al., 2002) and $^{176}\text{Lu}/^{175}\text{Lu} = 0.02655$ (Chu et al., 2002) with an exponential law mass bias correction assuming $^{172}\text{Yb}/^{173}\text{Yb} = 1.35274$ (Chu et al., 2002). The interference corrected $^{176}\text{Hf}/^{177}\text{Hf}$ was normalized to $^{179}\text{Hf}/^{177}\text{Hf} = 0.7325$ (Patchett and Tatsumoto, 1980) for mass bias correction. Zircons from the Mud Tank carbonatite locality were analysed together with the samples in each session to determine corrected, standard referenced $^{176}\text{Hf}/^{177}\text{Hf}$ (Table 1). Zircon standards with a range of REE contents (FC1 91500, Plešovice and GJ-1; references and data in Table 1) were run to verify the method. All analysed standards fell within 2σ error of reported $^{176}\text{Hf}/^{177}\text{Hf}$ values, although uncertainties on the 24 micron beam run were, understandably, significantly higher. In addition, the corrected $^{178}\text{Hf}/^{177}\text{Hf}$ and $^{180}\text{Hf}/^{177}\text{Hf}$ ratios (for the 50 micron beam run) were calculated to monitor the accuracy of the mass bias correction and yielded an average value of 1.467193 ± 12 and 1.886808 ± 11 ($n=184$), which is within the range of values reported by Thirlwall and Anczkiewicz (2004). Calculation of ϵHf values employed the decay constant of Scherer et al. (2001) and the Chondritic Uniform Reservoir (CHUR) values of Blichert-Toft and Albarède (1997).

Table 1: Summary of the Hf isotope measurements of standard materials used interspersed with analyses of unknown zircons. Mean values were calculated using the built-in statistics from the Iolite software (Paton et al., 2011)

Standard Material	50 μm	24 μm	Reference Value
	Corrected $^{176}\text{Hf}/^{177}\text{Hf}$	Corrected $^{176}\text{Hf}/^{177}\text{Hf}$	
Mud Tank	0.282505 ± 14 (MSWD = 0.70, $n = 14$)	0.282507 ± 64 (MSWD = 2.9, $n = 6$)	0.282505 ± 44 (Woodhead and Hergt, 2005)
FC1	0.282182 ± 9 (MSWD = 0.31, $n = 9$)	0.282229 ± 150 (MSWD = 3.9, $n = 6$)	0.282172 ± 42 (Woodhead and Hergt, 2005)

91500	0.282306 ± 11 (MSWD = 0.71, n = 14)	0.282235 ± 130 (MSWD = 2.4, n = 6)	0.282306 ± 40 (Woodhead et al., 2004)
Plešovice	0.282477 ± 8 (MSWD = 0.3, n = 10)	0.282470 ± 51 (MSWD = 0.49, n = 6)	0.282482 ± 13 (Sláma et al., 2008)
GJ-1	0.282016 ± 12 (MSWD = 0.69, n = 14)	0.281201 ± 110 (MSWD = 1.1, n = 6)	0.282000 ± 5 (Morel et al., 2008)

1.3 References

- Black, L.P., Kamo, S.L., Allen, C.M., Aleinikoff, J.N., Davis, D.W., Korsch, R.J., Foudoulis, C., 2003. TEMORA 1: a new zircon standard for Phanerozoic U–Pb geochronology. *Chem. Geol.* 200, 155–170. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0009-2541\(03\)00165-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0009-2541(03)00165-7)
- Blichert-Toft, J., Albarède, F., 1997. The Lu–Hf isotope geochemistry of chondrites and the evolution of the mantle-crust system. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 148, 243–258. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X\(97\)00040-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X(97)00040-X)
- Claoué-Long, J.C., Compston, W., Roberts, J., Fanning, C.M., 1995. Two Carboniferous Ages: A Comparison of Shrimp Zircon Dating with Conventional Zircon Ages and ⁴⁰Ar/³⁹Ar Analysis, in: Berggren, W.A., Kent, D.V., Aubry, M.-P., Hardenbol, J. (Eds.), *Geochronology, Time Scales, and Global Stratigraphic Correlation*, Society for Sedimentary Geology Special Publications. SEPM (Society for Sedimentary Geology), pp. 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.2110/pec.95.54>
- Compston, W., Williams, I.S., Meyer, C., 1984. U–Pb geochronology of zircons from lunar breccia 73217 using a sensitive high mass-resolution ion microprobe. *Proc. 14th Lunar Planet. Sci. Conf. J. Geophys. Res. Suppl.* 89, B525–B534. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JB089iS02p0B525>
- Chu, N.-C., Taylor, R.N., Chavagnac, V., Nesbitt, R.W., Boella, R.M., Milton, J.A., German, C.R., Bayon, G., Burton, K., 2002. Hf isotope ratio analysis using multi-collector inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry: an evaluation of isobaric interference corrections. *J. Anal. At. Spectrom.* 17, 1567–1574. <https://doi.org/10.1039/b206707b>
- de Laeter, J.R., Kennedy, A.K., 1998. A double focusing mass spectrometer for geochronology. *Int. J. Mass Spectrom.* 178, 43–50. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1387-3806\(98\)14092-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1387-3806(98)14092-7)
- Fletcher, I.R., McNaughton, N.J., Davis, W.J., Rasmussen, B., 2010. Matrix effects and calibration limitations in ion probe U–Pb and Th–Pb dating of monazite. *Chem. Geol.* 270, 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2009.11.003>
- Kennedy, A.K., De Laeter, J.R., 1994. The performance characteristics of the WA SHRIMP II ion microprobe., in: *Abstracts Vol., U.S. Geological Survey Circular*. Presented at the Eighth International Conference on Geochronology, Cosmochronology and Isotope Geology, Berkeley, USA, p. 166.
- Li, X.-H., Long, W.-G., Li, Q.-L., Liu, Y., Zheng, Y.-F., Yang, Y.-H., Chamberlain, K.R., Wan, D.-F., Guo, C.-H., Wang, X.-C., Tao, H., 2010. Penglai Zircon Megacrysts: A Potential New Working Reference Material for Microbeam Determination of Hf–O Isotopes and U–Pb Age. *Geostand. Geoanalytical Res.* 34, 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-908X.2010.00036.x>
- Ludwig, K.R., 2011. User’s manual for Isoplot 4.15: a geochronological toolkit for Microsoft Excel, Berkeley Geochronology Center Special Publication.
- Ludwig, K.R., 2009. Squid 2.50, A User’s Manual, Berkeley Geochronology Centre Special Publication.
- Morel, M.L.A., Nebel, O., Nebel-Jacobsen, Y.J., Miller, J.S., Vroon, P.Z., 2008. Hafnium isotope characterization of the GJ-1 zircon reference material by solution and laser-

- ablation MC-ICPMS. *Chem. Geol.* 255, 231–235.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2008.06.040>
- Nasdala, L., Hofmeister, W., Norberg, N., Martinson, J.M., Corfu, F., Dörr, W., Kamo, S.L., Kennedy, A.K., Kronz, A., Reiners, P.W., Frei, D., Kosler, J., Wan, Y., Götze, J., Häger, T., Kröner, A., Valley, J.W., 2008. Zircon M257 - a Homogeneous Natural Reference Material for the Ion Microprobe U-Pb Analysis of Zircon. *Geostand. Geoanalytical Res.* 32, 247–265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-908X.2008.00914.x>
- Patchett, P.J., Tatsumoto, M., 1980. Hafnium isotope variations in oceanic basalts. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 7, 1077–1080. <https://doi.org/10.1029/GL007i012p01077>
- Paton, C., Hellstrom, J., Paul, B., Woodhead, J., Hergt, J., 2011. Iolite: Freeware for the visualisation and processing of mass spectrometric data. *J. Anal. At. Spectrom.* 26, 2508. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c1ja10172b>
- Scherer, E., 2001. Calibration of the Lutetium-Hafnium Clock. *Science* 293, 683–687. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1061372>
- Sláma, J., Košler, J., Condon, D.J., Crowley, J.L., Gerdes, A., Hanchar, J.M., Horstwood, M.S.A., Morris, G.A., Nasdala, L., Norberg, N., Schaltegger, U., Schoene, B., Tubrett, M.N., Whitehouse, M.J., 2008. Plešovice zircon — A new natural reference material for U–Pb and Hf isotopic microanalysis. *Chem. Geol.* 249, 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2007.11.005>
- Stern, R.A., Bodorkos, S., Kamo, S.L., Hickman, A.H., Corfu, F., 2009. Measurement of SIMS Instrumental Mass Fractionation of Pb Isotopes During Zircon Dating. *Geostand. Geoanalytical Res.* 33, 145–168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-908X.2009.00023.x>
- Thirlwall, M.F., Anczkiewicz, R., 2004. Multidynamic isotope ratio analysis using MC–ICP–MS and the causes of secular drift in Hf, Nd and Pb isotope ratios. *Int. J. Mass Spectrom.* 235, 59–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijms.2004.04.002>
- Williams, I.S., 1998. Geochronology by Ion Microprobe, in: McKibben, M.A., Shanks, W.C., Ridley, W.I. (Eds.), *Applications of Microanalytical Techniques to Understanding Mineralizing Processes*, Reviews in Economic Geology. pp. 1–35.
- Woodhead, J., Hergt, J., Shelley, M., Eggins, S., Kemp, R., 2004. Zircon Hf-isotope analysis with an excimer laser, depth profiling, ablation of complex geometries, and concomitant age estimation. *Chem. Geol.* 209, 121–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2004.04.026>
- Woodhead, J.D., Hergt, J.M., 2005. A Preliminary Appraisal of Seven Natural Zircon Reference Materials for In Situ Hf Isotope Determination. *Geostand. Geoanalytical Res.* 29, 183–195. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-908X.2005.tb00891.x>