Using seafloor heat flow as a tracer to map subseafloor fluid flow in the ocean crust
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ABSTRACT

We describe how seafloor heat flow is determined, review current understanding of advective heat loss from oceanic lithosphere, and present results from three field areas to illustrate how heat flow measurements are used (along with complementary data) to resolve fluid flow rates and patterns. Conductive heat flow through much of the seafloor is lower than predicted by lithospheric cooling models as a result of hydrothermal circulation; this discrepancy is the basis for global estimates of the magnitude of advective cooling of oceanic lithosphere. Hydrothermal circulation also redistributes heat within the ocean crustal aquifer, leading to local variability. Heat flow studies in Middle Valley, a sedimented spreading center in the northeastern Pacific Ocean, indicate multiple scales of fluid circulation, delineate conditions at the top of a hydrothermal reservoir, and show the influence of primary and secondary convection. Heat flow studies on the eastern flank of the Juan de Fuca Ridge document the thermal influence of isolated basement outcrops surrounded by thick, low-permeability sediments. Warm hydrothermal fluids seep from the crust through a small volcanic edifice, having flowed into the crust through a larger outcrop ~50 km to the south. These fluids generate a local geothermal anomaly, but have little influence on regional heat loss from the plate. In contrast, heat flow surveys on part of the Cocos Plate, eastern Equatorial Pacific Ocean, indicate that regional conductive heat loss is just 10–40% of predictions from lithospheric cooling models. Basement outcrops in this area focus massive discharge of cool, hydrothermal fluid and associated heat (4–80 x 10^3 l s^-1 of fluid, 0.8–1.4 GW of heat). Seafloor heat flow studies will be increasingly important in coming years for understanding marine hydrogeologic regimes and the role of fluids in a variety of Earth processes and settings.
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INTRODUCTION

Soon after collection of the first oceanographic heat flow data (Bullard 1954; Revelle & Maxwell 1952), it was recognized that seafloor heat flow was generally highest and most variable near mid-ocean ridges, areas of elevated basement rocks that lacked thick and continuous sediment cover. At the time when initial heat flow data were collected, theories of seafloor spreading and plate tectonics were not fully developed or widely accepted, and there was considerable debate as to how heat flow measurements should be interpreted (Elder 1965; Langseth et al. 1966; Sclater 2004). Once convincing evidence for seafloor spreading became apparent, heat flow data presented a conundrum. It was expected that the oceanic lithosphere should release the most heat near spreading centers where the seafloor is youngest (McKenzie 1967; Lister 1972; Parker & Oldenberg 1973), but the variable heat flow seen at young sites commonly included low heat flow values. The difference between theory and observation was resolved by the realization that seafloor heat flow measurements, which document the conductive portion of lithospheric heat loss, generally do not measure the heat that is removed advectively by hydrothermal circulation. In addition,
hydrothermal circulation helps to explain the variability commonly observed in regional heat flow surveys, which can result in local redistribution of heat within the crust (whether or not there is net advective heat loss).

Theoretical seafloor cooling curves were developed initially in the late 1960s, and have been refined and extended in decades hence, using bathymetric and heat flow data to constrain the physical properties and evolution of oceanic lithosphere as plates age (Davis & Lister 1974; Parsons & Sclater 1977; Stein & Stein 1992). These cooling curves are important for quantifying the magnitude of the conductive heat flow deficit associated with advective heat loss, the extent of local heat redistribution within the lithosphere, the suppression of seafloor heat flow by rapid sedimentation, and other geologic and hydrologic processes (e.g., Anderson & Hobart 1976; Sclater et al. 1980; Davis et al. 1989; Wang & Davis 1992).

The last 10–15 years has seen renewed interest in using seafloor heat flow to resolve marine hydrogeologic processes, contemporaneous with increasing application of heat as a tracer in surface water and ground water studies on land (e.g., Anderson 2005; Burrow et al. 2005; Constantin et al. 2001). Heat offers many advantages as a tracer of fluid flow. Variations in fluid temperature and heat flow occur naturally within many hydrogeologic systems and at a range of spatial and temporal time scales. Water has a high heat capacity, so relatively small rates of fluid flow can result in significant thermal perturbations. The long-term consistency of bottom water temperatures in the deep ocean imposes a stable boundary condition at the seafloor in many areas, simplifying the application of coupled fluid-thermal flow models. Recent technical advances have made collection of seafloor thermal data easier, cheaper, and more reliable, accurate and precise. Finally, improvements and standardization in ship and instrument navigation allow co-location of complementary mapping, seismic, and chemical data, providing a broader geological context for interpretation of thermal data.

In this paper, we review the basis for marine heat flow data collection and processing, and discuss how these data are used to quantify rates and patterns of fluid flow. We discuss thermal data and interpretations based on global data summaries and regional studies of three geologic settings to illustrate key concepts. There are many hydrogeologic settings where researchers have used heat to quantify fluid flow using water column, seafloor, and subseafloor tools, including studies based on transient variations in shallow heat flow (e.g., Becker et al. 1983, 1995; Kinoshita et al. 1996; Veirs et al. 1999; Goto et al. 2005; Hamamoto et al. 2005). Space limitations preclude a comprehensive presentation of these topics; instead, we highlight studies of rapid lateral fluid flow in permeable volcanic rocks of the upper oceanic crust using shallow heat flow measurement surveys.

**METHODS**

**Theoretical basis**

Seafloor heat flow measurements are based on application of a simplified form of Fourier’s first law for vertical heat transport:

\[
g = -\lambda \frac{dT}{dz} \tag{1}
\]

where \( g \) = heat flow (W m\(^{-2}\)), \( \lambda \) = thermal conductivity (W m\(^{-1}\) °C\(^{-1}\)), and \( \frac{dT}{dz} \) = thermal gradient (°C m\(^{-1}\)). Thus determining the conductive seafloor heat flow requires measurements of both the thermal conductivity and the thermal gradient. The negative sign on the right-hand side of Eq. (1) indicates that heat flows in a direction opposite to the thermal gradient.

In fact, Fourier’s first law is a special case of a more general, one-dimensional transient, conduction equation:

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \kappa \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \right) = \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} \tag{2}
\]

where \( \kappa \) is the thermal diffusivity, the ratio of thermal conductivity to heat capacity. It is often assumed that heat flow through the top of a thermal boundary layer (such as most marine sediments) occurs at steady state, so that the right-hand side of Eq. (2) is set to zero. However, the thermal diffusivity can change with depth, leading to variations in the thermal gradient, even when heat flow is purely conductive (as discussed later).

If there is also heat advection by fluid, the one-dimensional transient equation becomes:

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \kappa \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \right) - \frac{\nu_f}{\gamma} \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} \tag{3}
\]

where \( n \) = layer porosity, \( \nu_f \) = fluid velocity (\( \nu_f n_v \) is volume flux/area = specific discharge), and \( \gamma \) = the ratio of fluid and saturated formation heat capacities. As a practical matter, it is difficult to resolve the fluid velocity through seafloor materials independent of Eq. (3), so a form of this equation is sometimes used to estimate the fluid flow rate from thermal observations.

Equation (3) is one-dimensional, vertical, and based on a constant fluid flow rate. Fluid and heat transport in many seafloor hydrogeologic systems are transient, occur in two or three dimensions, and are fully coupled. Modeling of systems having these complexities may require more sophisticated analytical or numerical approaches, especially if there are spatial or temporal changes in fluid and formation.

properties, reactive transport, or other non-linear links between fluid and heat flow.

**Data collection**

Seafloor heat flow measurements are made in marine sediments with two primary kinds of tools: (i) instruments that penetrate the seafloor and determine temperatures within shallow sediments (generally <10 m) and (ii) instruments deployed within sediments while drilling to greater depths (∼30–400 m). Examples of these tools and their use are summarized briefly in this section.

Multipenetration probes comprise a weight stand and data logger, a lance that holds thermal sensors, and a telemetry system that sends data from the seafloor to the surface (Fig. 1A) (Langseth *et al.* 1965; Davis 1988). Most

---

Fig. 1. Examples of seafloor heat flow instrumentation used in marine sediments above a basement aquifer. Arrows labeled “Insert” in panels A–D indicate orientation of instruments when pushed into the seafloor. See text for description and citations for more information on tool design, use, and limitations. (A) Violin-bow, multipenetration heat flow probe used to determine shallow gradients and in-situ thermal conductivity. (B) Autonomous outrigger probes showing construction of logger (top, sketch) and two styles of probes as deployed (bottom, photograph). Probe with fin and long-style thermistor tube (left), and probe with short sensor (right) mounted on a piston core barrel. In both cases the data logger and battery are housed inside a protective pressure case that also functions as a serial connector for programming and data download. (C) Davis–Villinger Temperature Probe used for measurement of sediment temperature at the base of a borehole. Tool (silver) is mounted inside a core barrel (dark gray) for deployment, then pushed into the sediment using the drillstring. (D) Third generation of advanced piston coring temperature tool (APCT-3) used to measure sediment temperature while piston coring with a drillship. Tool frame with thermistor probe (center bottom) is placed inside annular cavity in piston coring shoe (upper right) prior to deployment. (E) Needle probes inserted through core liner to determine the thermal conductivity of recovered sediments.
modern multipenetration systems have thermistors mounted on outrigger probes attached to a central strength member, or within a single, long ‘violin bow’ outrigger that positions the thermal sensors away from the central strength member (Hyndman et al. 1979). The precision of individual thermistor sensors is typically ±0.001°C, and probes commonly have 11 or more thermistors distributed along a 2–5 m lance. Shorter versions of these tools, often with a narrow strength member that houses the thermal sensors, are used with submersibles and remotely operated vehicles.

A multipenetration heat flow station begins with the lowering of the instrument towards the seafloor from a ship using a trawl wire and winch. The probe is driven by gravity into sediments and allowed to achieve partial equilibration with ambient formation temperatures. If the instrument has the capability to measure in situ thermal conductivity, a calibrated heat pulse is generated using a wire that extends along the length of the sensor tube. The temperature decay of the heat pulse provides a measure of sediment thermal conductivity at multiple depths. With the completion of a measurement, the instrument is pulled from the seafloor and hoisted 100–500 m (depending on intended measurement spacing), the ship is maneuvered to a new position, and the process is repeated. In this manner a transect of heat flow measurements can be obtained relatively quickly.

Multipenetration surveys are typically run along carefully navigated transects, often with collocated swath map and seismic data, during a deployment of 12–48 h. With some systems there is complete data telemetry, and processing can be completed in near real time. But many systems send back just enough information to evaluate tool performance and battery power, and to make a rough estimate of thermal gradients during a survey. More complete and accurate data analysis is completed after the tool is returned to the surface and data are downloaded from logger memory.

Some of the earliest oceanographic heat flow measurements were made with temperature probes attached to sediment core barrels, so that a thermal gradient could be determined at the same place and time that sediment was sampled. The technique is similar to that involving multipenetration systems, except that only one gradient is determined during each instrument lowering. Modern outrigger probes used on core barrels are robust, accurate (±0.002–0.003°C), and autonomous, recording and storing data without telemetry (Fig. 1B) (Pfender & Villinger 2002). These systems are ideal for making reconnaissance or supplemental measurements in conjunction with coring operations, which is particularly useful where sediment cover is thin or patchy. Outrigger probe systems on core barrels generally do not provide determinations of sediment thermal conductivity, so the latter measurements must be made in the laboratory using material recovered during coring (as described below). There is also a system for measuring heat flow through bare rock (Johnson & Hutnak 1996), but this tool is not widely used at present, and the vast majority of seafloor heat flow surveys are conducted on sedimented seafloor.

There are two main classes of sediment temperature probes used during scientific ocean drilling (Fisher & Becker 1993): push in tools that require a dedicated tool run, independent of coring operations (Fig. 1C) (Uyeda & Horai 1980; Davis et al. 1997a); and tools that are integrated with piston coring operations (Fig. 1D) (Horai & Von 1985; Fisher et al. 2007). These instruments are generally deployed 1–10 m beyond the drilled depth of a borehole within a few hours of drilling, avoiding the thermal (cooling) influence of pumping cold seawater as a drilling fluid.

Additional subseafloor measurements have been made during logging operations in open boreholes, either using sediment instruments on a wireline or using open hole logging instruments made specifically for this purpose (Hyndman et al. 1976; Becker et al. 1983; Fisher et al. 1997; Larson et al. 1993). Strings of thermal sensors have been deployed in subseafloor borehole observatories as part of long-term monitoring installations (e.g., Davis & Becker 1994, 2002; Foucher et al. 1997). Tools used during scientific ocean drilling and in boreholes are not discussed in the rest of this review, which focuses on measurements made in shallow sediments.

Thermal gradient measurements are commonly augmented with thermal conductivity measurements made in the laboratory. Even if there is in situ conductivity capability (as with most modern, multipenetration probes), lab measurements can be helpful because they allow more comprehensive assessment of sediment properties at a scale finer than the spacing between adjacent thermistors in a multipenetration probe or outriggers on a core barrel. The needle probe method (Fig. 1E) is most commonly used for determining the thermal conductivity of marine sediments (Von Herzen & Maxwell 1959). Marine sediments are recovered in a plastic core liner. After the core equilibrates to room temperature, a small hole is drilled in the side of the liner, and a needle probe is inserted. The probe contains a wire loop with known heating characteristics, and a thermistor is positioned near the middle of the probe. The temperature response of the probe during continuous or pulse heating through the wire allows thermal conductivity to be determined by fitting observational data to an analytical solution to a radial heat conduction equation. A modified version of this experiment can be conducted on lithified sediments or igneous rock using cut pieces of hard rock pressed against a needle that is backed with a low-conductivity substrate such as acrylic or epoxy.
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Most marine heat flow tools are not kept in the formation long enough for thermistors to fully equilibrate. Full equilibration would require more time that is commonly available, and it can be difficult to recover an instrument pushed into seafloor sediments if the formation around the tool is allowed to ‘settle in’ for an extended time. Instead, equilibration temperatures are computed based on model fits to 6–8 min of temperature data, with the model response extrapolated to infinite time (Bullard & Maxwell 1956; Villinger & Davis 1987; Hartmann & Villinger 2002). Equilibration models are designed based on tool geometry and tool and formation properties. Applying these models requires some understanding of thermal conductivity because statistically equivalent fits of observations and model calculations can be achieved in many cases using a range of plausible thermal conductivity values. If in situ thermal conductivity data are collected, appropriate values can be assigned to individual thermistors. If no thermal conductivity data are available, values are estimated based on earlier surveys in the same (or a similar) area. In either case, Monte Carlo analysis of possible thermal conductivity variations and boundaries between layers allows assessment of uncertainties in equilibrium temperatures associated with these parameters (Stein & Fisher 2001; Hartmann & Villinger 2002).

If thermal conductivity is constant with depth, conductive vertical heat flow is calculated with Eq. (1). This equation is modified to account for changes in thermal conductivity with depth (negative sign dropped for convenience) (e.g., Bullard 1939; Louden & Wright 1989):

\[ T = q \sum \frac{\Delta z}{\lambda} \]

where \( \sum \Delta z \) is the cumulative thermal resistance, and \( \Delta z \) is the depth interval represented by each value of \( \lambda \). Conductive heat flow is calculated as the slope of a line fit through points on a plot of \( T \) versus \( \sum \frac{\Delta z}{\lambda} \).

ERRORS AND UNCERTAINTIES

Inexpensive thermistor sensors can be calibrated to provide resolution and absolute accuracy of 0.001°C across a useful working range of 0–40°C (appropriate for thermal gradient determinations in the upper 5 m of sediment in most locations). Accurate measurements at higher temperatures are sometimes desired, especially in borehole applications, and this can be achieved through selection of thermistors having the appropriate dynamic range. Sensors are commonly calibrated in the lab using a controlled bath, or cross-calibrated in the field by holding the probe stationary in bottom water during a survey. Widely used analog-digital logger components have 16 bits of resolution and are extremely quiet. Thus analytical errors associated with sensors and data loggers tend to be small.

Extrapolation of partial cooling records for the sensors, and estimation of in situ thermal conductivity values, can lead to errors in individual temperature values of 0.01–0.05°C, even for high-quality data. The main difficulty is that equilibration records can be made to fit a variety of cooling curves depending on the assumed physical properties, which are rarely known with confidence. However, heat flow determinations are more dependent on the thermal gradient than individual temperatures, so measurement and extrapolation errors for individual sensors are likely to be greater than those for calculated thermal gradients in many cases.

When thermal conductivity is measured in situ, the nature and properties of materials between sensor depths may be poorly known. This is a particular problem when making measurements in thin layers of sediments having large differences in thermal properties, such as turbidites. Finally, thermal conductivity is generally not measured with a geometry that is fully consistent with vertical heat flow. In situ measurements determine the horizontal (radial) conductivity, whereas needle probe measurements made on sediment cores determine the geometric mean of horizontal and vertical values (Prinbow et al. 2000). Fortunately, anisotropy in thermal conductivity tends to be small in shallow sediments.

Although it is possible to quantify fit statistics when cross-plotting temperature and depth (or cumulative thermal resistance), this approach does not provide a conservative estimate of uncertainty in heat flow measurements. Repeated measurements made during a single instrument lowering suggest that precision is often on the order of 3–5% (Harris et al. 2000), but there may be additional uncertainties associated with undocumented lithologic variations, thermal refraction, or transient processes such as slumping or recent changes in bottom water temperatures. Fortunately for many applications and settings, the hydrologic processes inferred from thermal data often involve large differences between measured values and deviations from standard lithospheric reference curves.

The best way to avoid or resolve complexities associated with shallow and transient processes is to collect closely spaced heat flow data co-located with seismic reflection and swath map data, so that areas of recent mass movement can be avoided, and to verify the consistency of results through a combination of regional and local measurement campaigns. There may be a nearby oceanographic buoy, or long-term temperature loggers can be left on the seafloor in advance to provide a baseline record from months or years prior to heat flow surveys (Hamamoto et al. 2005). Bottom water temperature variations tend to be small at water depths 2–3 km (Davis et al. 2003), but some deep marine environments remain susceptible to
changes in seafloor temperature (e.g., Barker & Lawver 2000; Fukasawa et al. 2003).

GLOBAL CONSIDERATIONS

Lithospheric cooling models simulate how the lithosphere cools, contracts, and subsides as it ages. Lithospheric cooling rates are estimated from bathymetry (related to the lithospheric heat content) and heat flow measurements from older seafloor, from which heat transfer is thought to be dominantly conductive. These models comprise a reference against which heat flow observations are compared, providing the basis for quantifying anomalies and calculating the extent of advective plate cooling. The two main types of cooling models (constant thickness plate, thickening half space) make similar predictions for young to mid-aged seafloor heat flow as a function of lithospheric age (Parker & Oldenberg 1973; Parsons & Sclater 1977; Davis & Lister 1974; McNutt 1995; Harris & Chapman 2004). Both classes of model predict seafloor heat flow to vary as $C/\text{age}$ initially. The dependence continues to great age for the half space model, whereas there is an asymptotic heat flow value for old seafloor predicted by the plate model. When heat flow is in mW m$^{-2}$ and \text{age} is in millions of years, the magnitude of the best-fitting value of $C$ is $\sim 475$–$510$, depending on the data and methods used.

The plate model is based on constant plate thickness at all ages, even at spreading centers where new seafloor is created. With time the plate cools until equilibrium is achieved between heating from below and heat loss at the top. In contrast, the half space model is based on the lithosphere having zero thickness at the ridge, then cooling and thickening with age. This model predicts heat flow less (and depths greater) than commonly observed on old seafloor. Some differences between the two models can be reconciled if there are additional inputs of heat into the base of older lithosphere. There has been limited recent discussion about the theoretical basis for lithospheric cooling models, but the fundamental issues and the global extent of hydrothermal cooling of the ocean basins are well-established, heavily documented by observational data, and considered reliable by the vast majority of active practitioners (e.g., Von Herzen et al. 2005).

Analysis of the global marine heat flow data set shows that the conductive heat flow from young lithosphere is generally lower than predicted by standard cooling models (Fig. 2A). The heat flow deficit is greatest when the seafloor is young, and extends on average to $\sim 65$ Ma. However, there are numerous older seafloor sites that appear to lose some heat advectively, and additional regions of old seafloor where heat may be redistributed locally by vigorous convection within basement, even if there is no net advective heat loss from the plate (Von Herzen 2004).

When the marine heat flow deficit is integrated across the area of the seafloor as a function of age, the global advective heat loss from the ocean crust is $\sim 10$ TW, $\sim 25\%$ of Earth’s current geothermal heat output, and $\sim 35\%$ of the heat lost through the seafloor by conduction and advection combined (Sclater et al. 1980; Stein & Stein 1994; Mottl 2003) (Fig. 2B). Of this advective heat loss, 2–3 TW occurs at or near seafloor spreading centers, and the remaining 7–8 TW occurs on ridge flanks, far from the magmatic influence of lithospheric creation.

The total fluid flux ($F$) implied by the global advective heat output ($Q_{\text{adv}}$) is calculated as:

$$F = \frac{Q_{\text{adv}}}{(pc)T}\Delta T$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where $(pc)T$ is the heat capacity of hydrothermal fluid, and $\Delta T$ is the difference in temperature between oceanic bottom water and hydrothermal discharge. Thus the calculated fluid flux scales linearly with the characteristic temperature of fluid circulation. Field studies of ridge flank areas from which a significant fraction of lithospheric heat loss is advective show that typical basement temperatures are on the order of 5–40°C, which implies that $F = 10^{15}$–$10^{16}$ kg year$^{-1}$ (Stein & Stein 1994; Mottl 2003), a flow rate approaching that of all of rivers and streams into the ocean.
The comparison of thousands of seafloor heat flow observations to well-established models of lithospheric cooling provides a robust estimate of the total amount of water that must flow between the crust and ocean. This information can be combined with highly idealized models to estimate bulk crustal properties on a global or time-dependent basis (e.g., Fisher & Becker 2000). However, the comparison of age-binned data to models tells us little about specific processes or properties at individual field sites. Resolving these characteristics requires application of regional and local models. This is especially important for understanding the variability in heat flow values observed in many surveys, once considered to be noise but now understood to result from fundamental physical processes, as described in the following section.

REGIONAL AND LOCAL CONSIDERATIONS

Regional and local models

Multiple processes can contribute to anomalous seafloor heat flow (Fig. 3). In locations where there is relatively flat seafloor and buried basement relief, conductive refraction tends to increase heat flow immediately above an elevated basement area, because basalt of the upper ocean crust tends to have a thermal conductivity that is greater than that of typical marine sediments (Fig. 3A). Heat flow can be further elevated above a buried basement high if there is vigorous local convection in the shallow crust, making uppermost basement isothermal (Davis et al. 1989; Fisher et al. 1990). In practice, it can be difficult to distinguish between these two processes based on the general pattern of seafloor heat flow, but modeling can quantify the extent of the necessary thermal conductivity contrast or homogeneity in basement temperatures (Davis et al. 1997b).

Recharge of bottom seawater though areas of basement exposure, followed by rapid lateral flow and mixing within the crust, can suppress seafloor heat flow on a regional basis (Fig. 3B). The extent of suppression can be calculated through application of the ‘well-mixed aquifer’ (WMA) model, a one-dimensional representation of vertical heat flow through a horizontal flow system (Langseth & Herman 1981). The upper oceanic crust is idealized as having a conductive boundary layer (sediments), underlain by an aquifer (shallow basement), within which there is thermally significant lateral transport. Recharge to the aquifer occurs at the temperature of bottom water, and heat is exchanged with the crust during lateral flow. The aquifer is assumed to be well mixed vertically, having a temperature determined by the balance between heat entering from below and leaving through the conductive upper boundary. Key information required to compare observations to predictions based on the WMA model includes: measured seafloor heat flow, the distance from the measurement points to the site of recharge, the thicknesses of the conductive layer and the permeable rock layer through which fluid flows laterally, estimated heat input from below the aquifer (often assumed to be lithospheric), and thermal properties of the sediment and rock/fluid system. The WMA model can be extended to include a second conductive boundary layer below sediments and above permeable basement (e.g., Rosenberg et al. 2000).

The influence of basement relief, local convection, and regional advection may be combined if there is outcrop-to-outcrop circulation (Fig. 3C). Seawater entering the crust, circulating laterally, then existing the crust can carry a significant fraction of lithospheric heat if fluid fluxes are sufficiently large, leaving the conductive seafloor heat flow suppressed between recharge and discharge sites (Davis et al. 1992; Villinger et al. 2002; Fisher et al. 2003b). This process can lead to very low heat flow adjacent to areas where hydrothermal recharge occurs, and locally elevated values adjacent to locations where warmed fluids rise rapidly and exit the crust, even when the rate of fluid flow is insufficient to mine heat from the lithosphere regionally (Fisher et al. 2003a).

For each of the situations described above, the sediments overlying basement were assumed to act as a conductive boundary layer, with the most vigorous circulation occurring within underlying basement. Most marine sediments have a permeability orders of magnitude less than that of volcanic rocks from the upper oceanic crust (Spinelli et al. 2004). Because of this, and because driving forces for hydrothermal circulation are limited, there is little fluid flow through sediments that extracts significant quantities of lithospheric heat. The vast majority of seafloor heat flow measurements indicate conductive conditions within shallow sediments.

Where there is a component of vertical flow through sediments that perturbs the local geothermal gradient, deviations from conductive conditions can be used to estimate the seepage rate. One model used for interpretation of vertical seepage is based on flow through a layer having constant temperature boundaries at the top and bottom (Fig. 3D) (Bredehoeft & Papadopoulos 1965). The assumption that upper and lower boundaries have fixed temperatures is most appropriate when the flow through the layer is modest relative to the size of overlying and underlying reservoirs. In the case of seafloor hydrologic systems, this model has been applied most commonly to marine sediments, bounded at the top by the ocean (essentially an infinite sink for heat), and at the base by a large hydrothermal reservoir. The minimum seepage rate necessary for detection of deviations from conductive conditions depends on the thickness of the boundary layer and the depth extent of measurements. For conductive heat flow of 2 W m⁻² across a layer 20-m thick, a flow rate...
Heat flow measurements made with shorter probes require greater advective transport in order to be detected.

An alternative application involves a case when the heat input to the base of the sediment layer is limited, rather than being infinite (Fig. 3E) (Wolery & Sleep 1975). In
In this case, the conductive gradient is reduced as upward seepage (and heat advection) increases. Conditions in many marine hydrologic systems are likely to be somewhere between these two endmembers. The seafloor boundary condition can reasonably be assumed constant, but the lower boundary condition may be neither constant temperature nor constant heat flow.

In practice, interpretations of thermally significant seepage through sediments should be applied cautiously, because the forces available to drive fluids through marine sediments are limited in many settings, and because systematic changes in thermal conductivity can lead to curvature in thermal gradients under conditions of conductive heat flow (Fig. 3F). Vertical analytical models of coupled fluid-heat flow have been modified to account for lateral flow (e.g., Lu & Ge 1996), but this is rare in shallow sediments, because the sedimented seafloor is usually flat or gently sloped and lateral pressure gradients tend to be small. An exception to this latter generalization is presented in the following section, and subsequent sections show how arrays of heat flow measurements can be used to resolve lateral flow rates in basement.

Multiple scales of fluid circulation: Middle Valley, northern Juan de Fuca Ridge

There are few heat flow studies of active seafloor spreading centers based on measurements of shallow thermal conditions because most such areas are characterized by large regions of basement exposure and limited sediment cover. The most common means for assessing hydrothermal output on young seafloor is through measurement of the heat content of chronic plumes formed by discharge hot, highly altered hydrothermal fluids (Baker & Hammond 1992; Veirs et al. 1999). Plume studies have shown that the advective heat output associated with seafloor spreading scales with spreading rate, and that the advective heat output of these areas is generally consistent with crystallization and cooling of the upper 1–2 km of oceanic crust (Baker 2007).

There are three very young (essentially 0–0.1 Ma) sites where seafloor heat flow surveys have been conducted: Guaymas Basin in the Gulf of California, Escanaba Trough on the Gorda Ridge, and Middle Valley at the northern end of the Juan de Fuca Ridge (Lonsdale & Becker 1985; Abbott et al. 1986; Davis & Villinger 1992). All three are sedimented spreading centers, located adjacent to continental areas where thick sediments trap heat within the subsurface, compressing thermal and chemical gradients near the seafloor, focusing hydrothermal recharge and discharge, and allowing thermal and fluid flow regimes to be characterized through coring, drilling, and heat flow surveys (Davis & Villinger 1992; Gieskes et al. 1982; Kastner 1982; Stein & Fisher 2001; Wheat & Fisher 2007). Studies from these areas provide unique insights on coupled fluid–thermal processes within very young seafloor.

Middle Valley (Figs 4A and 5A) is bordered by ridge-parallel, high-angle normal faults and filled with Pleistocene turbidites and hemipelagic clay deposited when sea level was lower and terrigeneous sediments were transported down the continental slope and into Cascadia Basin (Davis & Villinger 1992). As at other sedimented spreading centers, basaltic magma rises from depth and intrudes laterally as sills within thick sediments rather than erupting at the seafloor. Upper lithologic “basement” in this setting comprises alternating sills and indurated sediments having bulk permeability much greater than that of overlying sediments (Becker et al. 1994; Fisher et al. 1994; Langseth & Becker 1994). This sediment–sill sequence hosts vigorous hydrothermal circulation that leads to essentially isothermal (280°C) conditions in uppermost basement (Davis & Fisher 1994; Davis & Villinger 1992; Davis & Wang 1994). Although Middle Valley remains tectonically and hydrothermally active, it appears that the primary focus of seafloor spreading is currently shifting to the adjacent West Valley.

The total heat flux from a 260 km² area of Middle Valley suggests heat output at a spatial rate of 16 MW km⁻¹ of ridge (Stein & Fisher 2001), a value consistent with estimated heat output from other (unsedimented) parts of the ridge.
the Juan de Fuca Ridge (Baker 2007). But in contrast to more normal seafloor spreading centers, conductive and advective heat outputs from Middle Valley are about equal in magnitude. Bare rock spreading centers are thought to release the vast majority of their heat advectively.

The Dead Dog vent field within Middle Valley has been explored with numerous instruments, including a side-scan survey that defined the area of active venting (AAV) based on high acoustic backscatter (Davis & Villinger 1992) (Fig. 5B). Within the AAV there are ~20 vents discharging hydrothermal fluid at temperatures up to 280°C. A scientific drill hole placed near the center of this AAV cored extrusive basaltic rocks below ~260 m of turbidites and hemipelagic clay. Repeated heat flow surveys (including data from multipenetration probes and outriggers probes attached to core barrels) show that the highest values are found immediately adjacent to active vents (Fig. 5B). Interestingly, some of the lowest heat flow values were also measured close to active vents.

The mean heat flow of ~10 W m⁻² within the Dead Dog AAV has been interpreted to result from formation of a diagenetic and hydrologic cap above a shallow hydrothermal reservoir (Davis & Villinger 1992; Davis & Fisher 1994; Stein et al. 1998; Stein & Fisher 2001). Fluid conveys vigorously below the cap, helping to maintain isothermal conditions near 280°C at ~30 m below the seafloor. There may be additional focusing of conductive heat flow because of refraction related to the buried basement edifice and shallow sulfide deposits, both of which have greater thermal conductivity than typical marine sediments (Fig. 3A).

The scattering of heat flow values both above and below the mean of ~10 W m⁻² within the AAV can be explained by proximity to active vents, as demonstrated with coupled numerical modeling (Fig. 5C and D). The vents act as conductive heat sources as hydrothermal fluid rises to the seafloor, warming shallow sediments around the vents, and elevating heat flow to values ≥50 W m⁻². In addition, local recharge associated with secondary convection can suppress heat flow to <1 W m⁻² close to vents. This secondary convection cannot be a significant mechanism for recharging the main hydrothermal system because fluid samples collected from the vents show no indication of mixing between hydrothermal fluid and ambient seawater, and there is little evidence for water–sediment interaction prior to fluid discharge (Butterfield et al. 1994). Instead, it is likely that recharge of fluids supporting high-temperature discharge in Middle Valley occurs mainly along faults and

**Fig. 5.** Diagrams showing data and model results from Middle Valley, northern Juan de Fuca Ridge. Figures modified from Davis & Villinger (1992) and Stein & Fisher (2001). (A) Regional view of Middle Valley, showing valley bounding normal faults (thin lines with ticks) and area of the most complete coverage of seafloor heat flow measurements (within thicker dashed line). Contours show typical heat flow values (units of W m⁻²), and grey areas show where heat flow is <0 W m⁻². Dotted box shows area of Fig. 5B. (B) Area of active venting (AAV) including the Dead Dog vent field. Edge of AAV identified by side scan sonar surveys (Davis & Villinger 1992). Open circles indicate location and magnitude of heat flow values, as labeled. Solid squares are individual hydrothermal vents. Crosses indicate at least one thermistor exceeded maximum temperature range of instrument (40°C). Stars indicate locations where the heat flow probe fell over without penetrating. (C) Schematic of radial cross-section used in simulations of secondary circulation around a hydrothermal vent. Horizontal (10 and 20 mbsf) and vertical (20 m from vent) 1-m thick channels were used in some simulations, labeled to show flow paths A and B, respectively. (D) Surface heat flow versus distance from vent for simulations with secondary hydrothermal convection. Background heat flow is 10 W m⁻². Conductive case is shown for reference with no connection to vent. Cases A and B have a shallower and deeper connection to the hydrothermal vent, respectively, and each is run with connection permeability of 10⁻¹² m² and 10⁻¹³ m² as shown. The deeper the horizontal layer and the higher its permeability, the more efficient the local heat flow reduction associated with secondary convection.
other isolated conduits along the edges of the valley (Davis & Villinger 1992; Stein & Fisher 2001; Wheat & Fisher 2007). In summary, heat flow and other data from Middle Valley resolve multiple scales of fluid circulation, delineate conditions and the depth to the top of a hydrothermal reservoir, and help to define the regional geometry of fluid flow, including the importance of basement outcrops in guiding hydrothermal recharge. The extent to which these results can be applied to more normal (bare rock) seafloor spreading centers remains to be determined.

FLUID FLOW THROUGH OUTCROPS: EASTERN FLANK OF THE JUAN DE FUCA RIDGE

Numerous physical and chemical surveys have been completed on 0.7–3.6 Ma seafloor on the eastern flank of the Juan de Fuca Ridge (Davis et al. 1992, 1999; Wheat & Mottl 1994, 2000; Thomson et al. 1995; Elderfield et al. 1999; Fisher et al. 2003a; Hutnak et al. 2006; Wheat et al. 2004). Oceanic basement rocks in this area were formed at the unsedimented Endeavour segment of the Juan de Fuca Ridge, but were subsequently covered at a young age by hemipelagic clay and turbidites. Basement rocks remain exposed close to the active spreading center and where seamounts and other basement outcrops are found up to 100 km to the east. Three basement outcrops were identified initially in this area: Papa Bare, Mama Bare, and Baby Bare (Fig. 6A) (Davis et al. 1992; Thomson et al. 1995; Mottl et al. 1998). These outcrops are volcanic cones cretated off-axis on top of preexisting abyssal hill topography.

Baby Bare outcrop is the smallest and most extensively surveyed of the three outcrops, rising 70 m above the surrounding seafloor and covering an area of 0.5 km². Although the elevated area of this feature is small, the buried Baby Bare edifice rises ~600 m above the top of regional volcanic crustal rocks. Analysis of altered rocks, sediment pore fluids, and shallow thermal gradients on Baby Bare outcrop indicate that this feature discharges 5–20 L s⁻¹ of hydrothermal fluid (Thomson et al. 1995; Mottl et al. 1998; Becker et al. 2000; Wheat et al. 2004).

Mama and Papa Bare outcrops (Fig. 6A) are also sites of ridge-flank hydrothermal discharge, although these features have not been surveyed as completely as Baby Bare. Mama Bare outcrop is located 14 km northeast of Baby Bare outcrop on the same basement ridge, covers an area of 0.9 km², and rises 140 m above the surrounding seafloor. Papa Bare outcrop is located on an adjacent buried

Fig. 6. Maps of field area on the eastern flank of the Juan de Fuca Ridge (index map shown in Fig. 4A). (A) Regional map showing locations of basement outcrops on 3.5–3.6 Ma seafloor (modified from Hutnak et al. 2006). Baby Bare, Mama Bare, and Papa Bare outcrops are sites of hydrothermal discharge, whereas Grizzly Bare is a site of hydrothermal recharge (Fisher et al. 2003a). (B) Fine scale topographic map of Baby Bare outcrop, with locations of heat flow measurements made with the submersible, Alvin (Wheat et al. 2004). Highest heat flow values are associated with a normal fault on the eastern side of the outcrop. Several of these heat flow values are based on curved gradients, as shown in the inset diagram. Numbers in the inset indicate apparent seepage rates, in m year⁻¹, based on application of the model shown in Fig. 3D.
basement ridge to the east, covers an area of 2.6 km², and rises 240 m above the surrounding seafloor. As with Baby Bare outcrop, most of the Papa and Mama Bare edifices are buried by thick sediments. Interestingly, no hydrothermal recharge sites have been identified on any of these three features.

Consideration of ridge-flank hydrothermal driving forces, basement fluid chemistry, and sediment properties precludes recharge of Baby Bare outcrop through the seafloor surrounding the basement edifice; instead, fluids recharge through Grizzly Bare outcrop 52 km to the south (Fig. 6A) (Fisher et al. 2003a). Grizzly Bare outcrop is conical in shape, 3.5 km in diameter, and rises 450 m above the surrounding seafloor. The consistency of their alignment and strike with regional basement topography (Wilson 1993; Zühlke et al. 2005) suggests that the Grizzly, Baby, and Mama Bare outcrops may have formed along the same buried abyssal hill. Fluid flow in basement between Grizzly Bare and Baby Bare outcrops may be facilitated by enhanced permeability in a direction parallel to the abyssal hill topography (Fisher et al. 2003a, 2008; Wheat et al. 2000). Grizzly Bare outcrop was identified as a site of hydrothermal recharge based initially on patterns of seafloor heat flow immediately adjacent to the edifice. Seafloor heat flow is depressed within a few kilometers of the edge of basement exposure along several transects of measurements (Fisher et al. 2003a; Hutnak et al. 2006). Seismic reflection data allow determination of sediment thicknesses at heat flow measurement locations, and downward continuation of thermal data through the sediment shows that isotherms are swept downwards by cold, recharging fluid in the sediments and shallow basement adjacent to the outcrop edge. In contrast, warm fluid discharge from Baby Bare outcrop causes extremely high seafloor heat flow, and an upward sweeping of isotherms, adjacent to the area of exposed basement (Davis et al. 1992; Fisher et al. 2003a).

Baby Bare outcrop was surveyed repeatedly using the submersible Alvin, including high-resolution bathymetric mapping, geological and pore fluid sampling, and heat flow measurements (Wheat et al. 2004) (Fig. 6B). The Alvin heat flow probes used on these surveys were ~0.60 m long and contained three or five thermistors. A constant thermal conductivity of 0.89 W (m °C)⁻¹ was assumed for all Baby Bare heat flow measurements (Wheat et al. 2004), based on in situ and needle probe measurements of material recovered nearby during subsequent surveys (Fisher et al. 2003a; Hutnak et al. 2006). Most heat flow values measured on Baby Bare outcrop were >1 W m⁻², well above values measured on the adjacent flat seafloor, and the highest Baby Bare values were >100 W m⁻². There is an area of elevated heat flow aligned along a linear trend on the southwest side of the outcrop, adjacent to a normal fault scarp near the outcrop summit (Fig. 6B). Sediment thickness is not well mapped across Baby Bare outcrop because of irregular topography, but the depth to the 64°C isotherm (consistent with regional basement temperatures and fluid chemistry) is generally ≤50 m (Davis et al. 1992; Elderfield et al. 1999; Hutnak et al. 2006; Wheat & Fisher 2007).

Several thermal profiles from Baby Bare outcrop display significant curvature with depth. These thermal profiles were interpreted to indicate fluid flow, through application of the Bredehoeft & Papadopulos (1965) model (Fig. 3D), only if curvature could not be accounted for by reasonable variations in thermal conductivity, and only if the apparent seepage rate exceeded 6.5 m year⁻¹ (Fig. 6B, inset, Wheat et al. 2004). Other profiles, indicating apparently conductive thermal conditions, were evaluated based on nearby geochemical data from push cores. Geochemical data were fit to an advection–diffusion model similar to that used for assessing curvature in thermal data. But because chemical diffusivity for solutes is about three orders of magnitude smaller than thermal diffusivity, chemical data are much more sensitive to fluid flow. Chemical data were used to estimate seepage rates between 0.005 and 2 m year⁻¹, above which chemical concentrations are essentially constant with depth in the upper 0.5 m of sediment. Total heat flow values were calculated as the sum of conductive and advective components (Wheat et al. 2004).

Thermal and chemical data were combined to estimate point and total seepage rates, and integrated heat output, from Baby Bare outcrop. These data suggest heat output of ~2 MW for Baby Bare and the immediately surrounding seafloor, a value similar to that estimated in earlier seafloor studies (Mottl et al. 1998), and at the lower end of estimates made from thermal anomalies in the overlying water column (Thomson et al. 1995). Estimated Baby Bare heat output is about the same as that from a single high-temperature (350°C) hydrothermal vent. The mean heat flow from Baby Bare outcrop is an order of magnitude greater than that estimated from lithospheric cooling models for 3.5 Ma seafloor like that upon which Baby Bare is located. Although there are small areas on Baby Bare outcrop where shimmering water can be seen rising from the seafloor, the thin drape of sediment overlying much of the basement edifice functions effectively as a thermal boundary layer, with vigorous convection in the underlying basement redistributing heat laterally and enhancing the rate of conduction through the top of the edifice. Advection heat loss from Baby Bare outcrop is limited, and the present day circulation system has virtually no influence on regional heat flow (Davis et al. 1999; Hutnak et al. 2006), although it is likely that advective heat loss was considerably greater in the past, before many other outcrops were covered by thick, low-permeability sediments (Hutnak & Fisher 2007).
Massive fluid fluxes resolved with thermal data: Eastern Cocos Plate

The 18–24 Ma seafloor of the Cocos Plate offshore the Nicoya Peninsula, Costa Rica (Fig. 4B), comprises a northern region formed at the East Pacific Rise (EPR), and a southern region formed at the Cocos-Nazca Spreading Center (CNS) (Fig. 7) (Meschede et al. 1998; Ranero & von Huene 2000; von Huene et al. 2000; Barckhausen et al. 2001). The boundary between EPR- and CNS-generated seafloor is a combination of a triple junction trace and a fracture zone trace, collectively comprising a ‘plate suture.’ Pre-2000 studies in this area revealed variable thermal conditions (e.g., Langseth & Silver 1996; Vacquier et al. 1967; Von Herzen & Uyeda 1963), but the spatial distribution of warmer and cooler seafloor was incomplete, and the extent and nature of hydrothermal activity was unclear. Later surveys included swath-mapping to identify basement outcrops, and multi-channel seismic reflection data to delineate regional tectonic features, sediment thickness, and basement relief (Fisher et al. 2003b; Hutnak et al. 2007). Multipenetration heat flow data were co-located on seismic reflection profiles to assess heat transport and determine upper basement temperatures; additional heat flow measurements were made with autonomous temperature probes attached to core barrels (Pfender & Villinger 2002; Hutnak et al. 2007).

Heat flow surveys documented a thermal transition between warm and cool areas of the Cocos Plate (Fisher et al. 2003b; Hutnak et al. 2007) (Fig. 7). The mean heat flow through CNS- and EPR-generated seafloor on the warm part of the plate is consistent with lithospheric thermal reference models, 95–120 mW m\(^{-2}\) (Parsons & Sclater 1977; Stein & Stein 1994). In contrast, the seafloor heat flow through EPR-generated seafloor northwest of the thermal transition is typically 10–40 mW m\(^{-2}\), just 10–40% of lithospheric values. The thermal transition between warm and cool areas of the plate is only a few kilometers wide (Fig. 8), consistent with advective heat extraction from the shallow crust on the cool side of the plate (Fisher et al. 2003b; Hutnak et al. 2007). The thermal transition coincides with the plate suture near where the Cocos Plate begins to subduct in the Middle America Trench. But through most of the survey area, the boundary between warmer and cooler parts of the plate is spatially associated with the occurrence of seamounts and other basement outcrops that penetrate regionally extensive sediments (Fig. 7).

Fig. 7. A. Bathymetric map of field area on 18–24 Ma seafloor of the Cocos Plate, eastern Pacific Ocean (index map shown in Fig. 4B) (modified from Hutnak et al. 2008). Dorado outcrop is a site of hydrothermal discharge, whereas Tengosed Seamount is a site of hydrothermal recharge. Gray line demarcates thermal boundary between cooler and warmer parts of the plate. (B) Major tectonic features and results of heat flow surveys. Gray area is cool part of Cocos Plate. Black circles and ovals are seamounts and other basement outcrops apparent on satellite and swath data. EPR = East Pacific Rise. CNS = Cocos-Nazca Spreading Center.

Heat flow and seismic surveys oriented radially away from outcrops indicate that some allow hydrothermal recharge whereas others allow hydrothermal discharge (Hutnak et al. 2007, 2008), a pattern similar to that seen on younger seafloor east of the Juan de Fuca Ridge (Davis et al. 1992; Fisher et al. 2003a; Hutnak et al. 2006). Seismic and heat flow data across Tengosed Seamount and Dorado outcrop, areas of basement exposure separated by 20 km, illustrate characteristic features of this circulation pattern (Figs 7 and 9). Cold fluid recharge is indicated by...
a decrease in seafloor heat flow and a downward sweeping of isotherms where sediment thins in proximity to an outcrop. In contrast, warm fluid discharge results in locally elevated seafloor heat flow, and an upward sweeping of isotherms adjacent to an area of exposed basement. In the latter case, the temperature of the sediment–basement contact often remains nearly isothermal as the contact shallows towards the seafloor.

Regional advective power and fluid fluxes from the cold part of the Cocos Plate were quantified using the conductive heat flow deficit (Hutnak et al. 2008). There is a 14,500 km² area of cool lithosphere on the EPR side of the Cocos Plate. The mean heat flow in this area, away from the local conductive influence of a few outcrops and basaltic crust, is 29 ± 13 mW m⁻² (±1 SD), comprising a regional power deficit of 0.8–1.4 GW. Heat flow profiles adjacent to five of the ten mapped basement outcrops in this area indicate recharge through two, discharge through one (Dorado outcrop), one that both recharges and discharges, and one that shows evidence for neither recharge nor discharge (Hutnak et al. 2008).

The mean advective power output of individual discharging outcrops on cooler TicoFlux seafloor is 200–350 MW, a range similar to that determined from plume and point studies of high-temperature vent fields on the southern Cleft segment of the Juan de Fuca Ridge (JdFR) and 21°N on the EPR (at the low end) and the Endavour Main Field on the JdFR and 9°50’N on the EPR (at the high end) (Baker 2007). But in contrast to these ridge-crest systems, the enormous advection of heat from a few outcrops on the Cocos Plate is conveyed by fluids having temperatures only 5–40°C warmer than bottom water (Hutnak et al. 2008). Thermal data from the cool side of the Cocos Plate indicate 4–80 × 10⁵ L s⁻¹ of fluid enters and exits the seafloor in this area. If this fluid flow were distributed across the discharging outcrops, consistent with interpretations from the heat flow surveys, then each discharging outcrop vents 1–20 × 10⁵ L s⁻¹ of cool hydrothermal fluid (Hutnak et al. 2008).

**SUMMARY, LESSONS LEARNED, AND PROSPECTS FOR FUTURE WORK**

Marine heat flow measurements have helped to quantify fluid flow patterns and rates within the seafloor for more than 30 years. Even before the discovery of seafloor hydrothermal vents, researchers used variations in oceanic heat flow to quantify the extent and nature of hydrogeologic processes in the deep sea. Heat flow data are most useful for this purpose when they are carefully navigated and colocated with reflection seismic and mapping data, so that thermal measurements can be placed in a broader context. It is also helpful to combine thermal studies with coring and chemical analyses, and to obtain high-resolution images or direct observations of seafloor conditions, so that the significance of small-scale variations in heat output can be understood. This has become the standard mode of operation for modern seafloor heat flow studies.

Although the studies described in this review were completed in different hydrogeologic settings, they share several common themes. Marine sediments generally function as a conductive boundary layer separating the volcanic crustal aquifer from the overlying ocean. This is a benefit for using seafloor heat flow to map fluid flow, because the (sedimentary) conductive boundary layer provides a relatively continuous medium in which measurements can be made, and across which thermal conditions can be determined. There may be thermally significant fluid flow through marine sediments in some locations, but demonstrating this requires that curvature in thermal gradients cannot be explained by reasonable differences in thermal conductivity.

In fact, thermally significant fluid seepage through seafloor sediments is relatively rare, being restricted to locations where sediments are thin or unusually permeable, or where driving forces are unusually high. Patterns of conductive heat flow through marine sediments can be used to map out directions and assess rates of fluid circulation within the underlying crust, and are particularly helpful in identifying locations of fluid recharge and discharge near where basement rocks are exposed. Seafloor heat flow measurements are less helpful in resolving the nature of fluid pathways at depth within the crust, but this issue is being addressed to some extent with analysis of core samples and single-hole and multi-hole measurements and experiments (e.g., Becker et al. 1983; Anderson et al. 1985; Bartetzko et al. 2001; Alt & Teagle 2003; Becker & Davis 2005; Fisher et al. 2008).

The continued interest in using heat as a tracer to map fluid flow; more common acquisition of complementary data such as high-resolution digital maps and seismic reflection profiles; and the development of new instruments, analytical techniques, and models, is bringing new attention and new practitioners to the field. Most of the seafloor remains poorly mapped and virtually unexplored with regard to thermal and hydrogeologic conditions. Seafloor heat flow remains an important tool for researchers studying coupled fluid, thermal, chemical, tectonic, magmatic, and biological processes. Heat flow measurements are particularly helpful for quantifying local and regional heat and fluid flow rates, and for mapping the plumbing of subseafloor hydrogeologic systems.
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