Lowermost mantle thermal conductivity constrained from experimental data and tomographic models

Frédéric Deschamps¹ and Wen-Pin Hsieh¹,²

¹Institute of Earth Sciences, Academia Sinica, 128 Academia Road Sec. 2, Nangang, Taipei 11529, Taiwan. E-mail: frederic@earth.sinica.edu.tw
²Department of Geosciences, National Taiwan University, Taipei 10617, Taiwan

Accepted 2019 May 16. Received 2019 May 2; in original form 2018 September 17

SUMMARY

Heat transfer through Earth’s mantle is sensitive to mantle thermal conductivity and its variations. Thermal conductivities of lower mantle minerals, bridgmanite (Bm) and ferropericlase (Fp), depend on pressure, temperature, and composition. Because temperature and composition are expected to strongly vary in the deep mantle, thermal conductivity may also vary laterally. Here, we compile self-consistent data on lattice thermal conductivities of Bm and Fp at high pressure to model lower mantle thermal conductivity and map its possible lateral variations. Importantly, our data set allows us to quantify the influence of iron content on mantle conductivity. At the bottom of the mantle, the thermal conductivity for a pyrolitic mantle calculated along an adiabat with potential temperature 2000 K is equal 8.6 W m⁻¹ K⁻¹. Using 3-D thermochemical models from probabilistic tomography, which include variations in temperature, iron content, and bridgmanite fraction, we then calculate possible maps of conductivity anomalies at the bottom of the mantle. In regions known as low shear-wave velocity provinces, thermal conductivity is reduced by up to 26 per cent compared to average mantle, which may impact mantle dynamics in these regions. A simple analysis of threshold and saturation effects related to the iron content shows that our estimates of thermal conductivity may be considered as upper bounds. Quantifying these effects more precisely however requires additional mineral physics measurements. Finally, we estimate variations in core–mantle boundary heat flux, and find that that these variations are dominated by lateral temperature anomalies and are only partly affected by changes in thermal conductivity.

Key words: Composition and structure of the mantle; High-pressure behaviour; Heat flow; Mantle processes.

1 INTRODUCTION

Lattice thermal conductivities of mantle minerals typically increase with pressure but decrease with increasing temperature (e.g. Klemens et al. 1962). In Earth’s mantle temperature regularly increases with depth, such that these two effects are partially balancing each other. Based on ambient condition data and thermodynamic modeling, Hofmeister (1999) calculated radial profiles along mantle adiabat and found that conductivity increases by about a factor 2.5 from top to bottom of Earth’s mantle. At a given depth (pressure), temperature is very likely to vary laterally, thus inducing lateral changes in thermal conductivity, which may, in turn, impact mantle dynamics. Such variations could, in particular, stabilize and thicken thermal plumes (Dubuffet & Yuen 2000) and thin downwellings (Dubuffet et al. 2000).

Earth’s mantle thermal conductivity further depends on mantle’s mineralogical composition, that is in the lower mantle, the relative fractions of dominant minerals, bridgmanite [(Mg,Fe)SiO₃] and ferropericlase [(Mg,Fe)O], and on the amount of iron within these minerals. At ambient pressure, periclase (MgO) is thermally more conductive than pure magnesium bridgmanite (MgSiO₃) by about a factor 5 (Dalton et al. 2013; Hsieh et al. 2017), a difference that increases with pressure. Recently, several experimental studies have measured the influence of iron on the lattice thermal conductivities of bridgmanite (Hsieh et al. 2017) and ferropericlase (Goncharov et al. 2015; Ohta et al. 2017; Hsieh et al. 2018). Interestingly, at lowermost mantle pressure, conductivities of iron and iron-aluminum bearing bridgmanite [Fe-Bm and (Fe,Al)-Bm] are approximately two times smaller than that of pure MgSiO₃ (Hsieh et al. 2017). The conductivity of ferropericlase (Fp) is
also substantially lower than that of periclase. At 120 GPa and ambient temperature, for instance, the conductivity of ferropericlase with 10 per cent iron is around 50 W m⁻¹ K⁻¹ (Hsieh et al. 2018), much lower than the extrapolated value for MgO, around 280 W m⁻¹ K⁻¹ (Dalton et al. 2013).

Lateral variations in temperature and composition thus potentially induce strong variations in mantle thermal conductivity. Lower mantle seismic structure provides key information about the thermochemical variations in these regions. In the lowermost mantle (z ≥ 2400 km), this structure is dominated by two large low shear-wave velocity provinces (LLSVPs) below Africa and the Pacific, where shear-wave speed is reduced by a few per cent compared to its horizontal average (for a comparison of tomographic models published between 2005 and 2010, see Ritsema et al. 2011). The nature of the LLSVPs is still debated. Several observations, however, suggest that they are chemically distinct from the rest of the mantle (e.g. van der Hilst and Kárason 1999; Masters et al. 2000; Deschamps & Trampert 2003; Trampert et al. 2004). In addition, recent density estimates from solid Earth tide measurements and modelling (Lau et al. 2017) indicate that they may be denser than average mantle by ~0.5 per cent, a conclusion previously reached by normal mode seismology (Ishii & Tromp 1999; Trampert et al. 2004; Mosca et al. 2012). A likely explanation for density excess and low shear-wave velocity is that LLSVPs are enriched in iron oxide by up to a few per cent compared to average mantle (Trampert et al. 2004; Deschamps et al. 2012; Mosca et al. 2012). LLSVPs are further believed to be hotter than average mantle, typically by up to 400 K (Trampert et al. 2004; Mosca et al. 2012), the thermal decrease in density being overcompensated by the intrinsic chemical increase due to iron enrichment.

Here, we develop a method to model lower mantle thermal conductivity from a self-consistent mineral physics data set (Dalton et al. 2013; Hsieh et al. 2017, 2018). We then apply this method to infer possible maps of anomalies in lower mantle thermal conductivity and core–mantle boundary (CMB) heat flux using available thermochemical models of lower mantle (Trampert et al. 2004; Mosca et al. 2012).

2 EXPERIMENTAL DATA

Our modelling of Earth’s lower mantle thermal conductivity is based on a compilation of recent measurements of lattice thermal conductivities of single crystals of bridgmanite (Hsieh et al. 2017), periclase (Dalton et al. 2013) and ferropericlase (Hsieh et al. 2018) at room temperature and high pressure (Fig. 1). Bridgmanite (Bm) data include measurements for pure magnesium bridgmanite, MgSiO₃, iron-bearing bridgmanite with fraction of iron, x_Bm, equal to 0.072 (Bm7.2) and iron–aluminum-bearing bridgmanite with x_Bm = 0.129 (Al-Bm12.9). Ferropericlase data include three different samples with fraction of iron, x_Fp, of 0.08, 0.10 and 0.56 (Fp8, Fp10 and Fp56), respectively. Except for MgO, measurements have been performed up to pressure of approximately 120 GPa. All measurements were performed at room temperature. The detailed influence of temperature on thermal conductivity is still unclear, but several experiments indicate that iron bearing materials may follow a 1/T¹/² trend (Klemens et al. 1962; Xu et al. 2004; Dalton et al. 2013; Chang et al. 2017; Section 3.2). Importantly, all measurements have been obtained using the same experimental setup and method, resulting in a self-consistent data set. These experiments combine ultrafast optical pump-probe technique with diamond anvil cell, which allows high precision measurements of thermal conductivity at lowermost mantle pressure. Details of experimental procedures and techniques may be found in Dalton et al. (2013) and Hsieh et al. (2017).

For all samples, lattice thermal conductivity increases with pressure. Note that for pressures larger than 45 GPa and within error bars, conductivity for Bm7.2 remains approximately constant at about 12.9 W m⁻¹ K⁻¹. At ambient pressure MgO is thermally more conductive than MgSiO₃ by about an order of magnitude. As pressure increases, the absolute difference between the conductivities of these two minerals increases, but the relative difference remains constant at about one order of magnitude. Up to a pressure of 50 GPa, and within measurements error bars, iron has no or very small effects on the conductivity of bridgmanite. At larger pressure, the presence of iron reduces the conductivity of bridgmanite, in response to pressure-induced lattice distortion on iron sites (Hsieh et al. 2017). As a result, at 120 GPa, the conductivity for Bm7.2 is reduced by a factor 2 compared to that of MgSiO₃. Interestingly, the presence of aluminum strongly moderate this decrease. For instance, the conductivity measured for Al-Bm12.9 is slightly larger than that of Bm7.2. Iron also strongly reduces the thermal conductivity of ferropericlase. For instance, the thermal conductivity for Fp8 is around 5 W m⁻¹ K⁻¹ at ambient pressure, and about 50 W m⁻¹ K⁻¹ at 120 GPa. Compared to these values, the conductivity of pure MgO is one order of magnitude larger at ambient pressure, and the linear extrapolation of Dalton et al. (2013) data to 120 GPa is larger by about a factor 5.5. In addition, for Fp56 conductivity sharply decreases by ~10 W m⁻¹ K⁻¹ around 55 GPa, a drop due to the spin transition of iron (Hsieh et al. 2018).

To date, only few additional experimental measurements of thermal conductivities of lower mantle minerals are available. The data we use for pure MgSiO₃ (Hsieh et al. 2017) are in good agreement with the measurements of the Ohta et al. (2012), which were performed up to 140 GPa, and with ab initio calculations of Dekura et al. (2013) at 300 K. Goncharov et al. (2015) measured thermal conductivity for Fp10 up to 47 GPa. Below 20 GPa, these data are in very good agreement with those of Hsieh et al. (2018), which we use here, but at larger pressure they predicted substantially higher conductivities. Recently, Ohta et al. (2017) performed experiments for Fp19, and observed a sharp reduction in conductivity between 20 and 40 GPa. This decrease was attributed to iron spin transition, despite the fact that this transition is usually reported at higher pressure, typically in the range 40–60 GPa. As a result, Ohta et al. (2017) measurements for Fp19 are consistent with the experimental data of Hsieh et al. (2018) up to 20 GPa, but at pressure larger than 40 GPa they are systematically lower than the conductivity obtained by Hsieh et al. (2018) for Fp56.
Figure 1. Data set used for the modelling of lower mantle thermal conductivity. All measurements are performed at room temperature. Dashed lines denote the best fitting linear parametrizations for each sample (Table 1).

3 DATA MODELLING

Our modelling of lower mantle thermal conductivity includes three steps. First, we perform high pressure extrapolations individually for each mineral composing the aggregate (here, bridgmanite and ferropericlase) following parametrizations built from our experimental data set. We then correct these high pressure values for the effects of iron and temperature. Finally, we calculate the thermal conductivity of the aggregate by averaging the individual conductivities of bridgmanite and ferropericlase following an appropriate averaging scheme. These operations are detailed below.

3.1 Pressure parametrization

For each sample in our data set, measurements allow us to reconstruct the pressure dependence of lattice thermal conductivity, $\Lambda$. Interestingly, experimental data fit well along linear relationships,

$$\Lambda(P) = a_0 + a_1 P. \quad (1)$$

For each sample, the best fitting parameters of eq. (1) are listed in Table 1, and the best-fitting parametrization is represented by dashed lines in Fig. 1. To determine the radial profile of thermal conductivity as a function of depth, we then use the pressure-to-depth function of PREM (Dziewonski & Anderson 1981). Note that for MgO, data are available only up to 60 GPa. To model thermal conductivity of MgO at lowermost mantle pressure, we thus assume that the parametrization built from these data can be extrapolated to higher pressure. Departure from this extrapolation may bias the estimated thermal conductivity of ferropericlase samples with $x_{F_p}$ lower than 0.08, and thus the mantle aggregate conductivity. In practise, however, this case never occurs, since for values of iron partitioning relevant to the lower mantle $x_{F_p}$ never falls below 0.1 (Section 3.3 and Fig. 2).
Table 1. Pressure dependence of thermal conductivity. Experimental data at ambient temperature from various samples are parametrized following $\Lambda(P) = a_0 + a_1 P$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Pressure (GPa)</th>
<th>$a_0$ (W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$a_1$ (W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$ GPa$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridgmanite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgSiO$_3$</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>0–120</td>
<td>5.873</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>Hsieh et al. (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mg$<em>{0.928}$Fe$</em>{0.072}$)SiO$_3$</td>
<td>Bm7.2</td>
<td>0–45</td>
<td>2.721</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>Hsieh et al. (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mg$<em>{0.886}$Fe$</em>{0.129}$)(Al$<em>{0.115}$Si$</em>{0.906}$)O$_3$</td>
<td>Al-Bm12.9</td>
<td>45–120</td>
<td>12.906</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Hsieh et al. (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferropericlase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgO</td>
<td>Per</td>
<td>0–60</td>
<td>50.645</td>
<td>1.878</td>
<td>Dalton et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mg$<em>{0.92}$Fe$</em>{0.08}$)O</td>
<td>Fp8</td>
<td>0–120</td>
<td>5.033</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>Hsieh et al. (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mg$<em>{0.90}$Fe$</em>{0.10}$)O</td>
<td>Fp10</td>
<td>0–120</td>
<td>4.959</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>Hsieh et al. (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mg$<em>{0.44}$Fe$</em>{0.56}$)O</td>
<td>Fp56</td>
<td>0–55</td>
<td>2.732</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>Hsieh et al. (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55–120</td>
<td>–11.189</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Fractions of iron in bridgmanite, $x_{Fe}^{Bm}$ (left-hand column), and ferroperriclase, $x_{Fe}^{Fp}$ (right-hand column), as a function of the iron partitioning, $K_D$, and for several values of the global iron content, $X_{Fe}$ (top row, with $X_{Bm}$ fixed to 0.8), and fraction of bridgmanite, $X_{Bm}$ (bottom row, with $X_{Fe}$ fixed to 0.09). The grey areas denote the range of possible values of $K_D$ in the lower mantle (Badro 2014; Piet et al. 2016). For mantle aggregate, $X_{Bm}$ and $X_{Fe}$ are typically in the ranges 0.7–0.9 and 0.06–0.13, respectively.

3.2 Effect of temperature

Lattice thermal conductivities of lower mantle mineral decrease with increasing temperature following

$$\Lambda(T) \propto K \frac{T^n}{T},$$

where $K$ is a function of pressure that depends on the material and its iron content. The exponent $n$ depends on the mechanisms controlling the lattice heat transport and is typically between $n = 0.5$ for (Fe,Al)-bearing minerals, in which heat transport is dominated by three-phonon scattering at low phonon frequency, and $n = 1.0$ for MgSiO$_3$, in which heat transport is mostly operated through anharmonic three-phonon scattering (Klemens et al. 1962; Xu et al. 2004; Dalton et al. 2013). Based on experiments at pressures and temperatures up to 26 GPa and 1250 K, respectively, Manthilake et al. (2011) found that the conductivities of iron bearing bridgmanite and periclase depend only weakly on temperature, with $n$ around 0.1–0.2. Recent ab initio calculations (Stackhouse et al. 2015) suggest that, due to saturation effects, the temperature dependence of MgSiO$_3$ at lowermost mantle conditions may be weaker than $1/T$. Here, since the lower mantle minerals are
(Fe,Al)-borne, we modeled lowermost mantle thermal conductivity assuming that the temperature-dependence of thermal conductivities of individual mineral follows eq. (2) with \( n = 0.5 \). Larger values of \( n \) would increase the thermal contribution to variations in thermal conductivity, while smaller values would reduce it. Note, however, that when compositional effects are also taken into account, thermal conductivity anomalies and the corresponding CMB heat flux obtained for \( n = 0.5 \) and \( n = 1.0 \) are very similar (Hsieh et al. 2017, Sections 5.2 and 5.3).

### 3.3 Effect of composition

In our modeling, compositional changes in thermal conductivity include two sources: variations due to changes in the mineralogical composition of the aggregate, here the relative fractions of bridgmanite and ferropericlase, \( X_{Bm} \) and \( X_{Fp} = (1 - X_{Bm}) \); and variations due to changes in the iron fraction of each of these two minerals, \( x_{Bm}^{F_{Bm}} \) and \( x_{Fp}^{F_{Fp}} \), which can be estimated from our experimental data set. In the Earth’s mantle, variations in iron are usually parametrized in terms of the global volume fraction of iron oxide (FeO), \( X_{Fe} \), defined as

\[
X_{Fe} = X_{Bm} x_{Fp} + (1 - X_{Bm}) x_{Fp}^{F_{Fp}}.
\]

In addition, iron is distributed between bridgmanite and ferropericlase according to the iron partitioning coefficient,

\[
K_D = \frac{x_{Fp}^{F_{Bm}} / (1 - x_{Fp}^{F_{Fp}})}{x_{Fp}^{F_{Bm}} / (1 - x_{Fp}^{F_{Fp}})}.
\]

Individual fractions of iron in bridgmanite and ferropericlase can be calculated by solving simultaneously eqs (3) and (4) with prescribed values of \( X_{Fe}, X_{Bm} \) and \( K_D \). Full expressions of these fractions are given in the Appendix (eqs A1 and A2), and Fig. 2 plots them as a function of \( K_D \) and for several values of \( X_{Fe} \) and \( X_{Bm} \). In the Earth’s lower mantle, iron preferentially partitions into ferropericlase, implying \( K_D < 1 \). High pressure mineral physics experiments and \textit{ab initio} calculations further indicate that \( K_D \) ranges between 0.1 and 0.5 depending on depth and Fe\(^{3+}\) content (Badro 2014). Irifune et al. (2010) reported values of \( K_D \) up to 0.8 at the top of the lower mantle, but at pressure larger than 60 GPa (i.e. deeper than \( \sim 1400 \) km) they found that \( K_D \) remains constant around 0.4. In addition, recent experiments for aluminum-bearing minerals (Piet et al. 2016) obtained \( K_D \) in the range 0.4–0.6 throughout the lower mantle. For a pyrolitic mantle, in which \( X_{Fe} = 0.09 \) and \( X_{Bm} = 0.8 \), and assuming \( K_D = 0.4 \), Fig. 2 indicates that \( x_{Bm}^{F_{Bm}} = 0.072 \) and \( x_{Fp}^{F_{Fp}} = 0.162 \). In the lowermost mantle, LLSVPs may be enriched in iron and in bridgmanite by a few per cent (Trampert et al. 2004; Deschamps et al. 2012; Mosca et al. 2012). Taking \( X_{Fe} = 0.12 \) and \( X_{Bm} = 0.9 \), the individual fractions of iron in bridgmanite and ferropericlase rise to \( x_{Bm}^{F_{Bm}} = 0.108 \) and \( x_{Fp}^{F_{Fp}} = 0.232 \), respectively. Overall, for conservative ranges of lower mantle values of compositional parameters, \( 0.1 \leq K_D \leq 0.6, 0.06 \leq X_{Fe} \leq 0.13 \) and \( 0.7 \leq X_{Bm} \leq 0.9 \), which also account for their possible lateral variations, the iron fractions in bridgmanite and ferropericlase should fit in the ranges \( 0.02 \leq x_{Bm}^{F_{Bm}} \leq 0.12 \) and \( 0.1 \leq x_{Fp}^{F_{Fp}} \leq 0.4 \).

To calculate the thermal conductivities of bridgmanite and ferropericlase at a fixed depth and for given values of \( x_{Bm}^{F_{Bm}} \) and \( x_{Fp}^{F_{Fp}} \), we performed simple linear interpolations between the parametrizations listed in Table 1.

\[
\Lambda_i \left( x_{Fp}^{F_{Bm}} \right) = \Lambda_{0i} + a_i x_{Fp}^{F_{Bm}},
\]

where subscripts and superscripts \( i \) stand either for bridgmanite or ferropericlase, and parameters \( \Lambda_{0i} \) and \( a_i \) depend on the pressure and are different for different iron fractions. For instance, in the case of ferropericlase with iron fraction between 0.1 and 0.56, \( \Lambda_{0Fp} \) is given by the parametrization for Fp10, \( \Lambda_{Fp10} \), and \( a_{Fp} \) is equal to \((\Lambda_{Fp56} - \Lambda_{Fp10})/0.46\), where \( \Lambda_{Fp56} \) is obtained from the parametrization for Fp56. A potential problem with this approach is that calculating conductivities for aggregates with \( x_{Fp}^{F_{Bm}} > 0.13 \) and/or \( x_{Fp}^{F_{Fp}} > 0.56 \) would require extrapolating experimental data, which may bias the results. Practically, however, such high values of \( x_{Fp}^{F_{Bm}} \) and \( x_{Fp}^{F_{Fp}} \) never happen for lower mantle values of compositional parameters \( X_{Bm}, X_{Fe} \) and \( K_D \) (Fig. 2), expect, maybe, in ultra-low seismic velocity zones (ULVZs, Mao et al. 2006; Wicks et al. 2010; Hsieh et al. 2018). Another potential problem is that eq. (5) does not account for potential saturation and threshold effects. We discuss this issue more in details in Section 4.

### 3.4 Estimators for mantle aggregate thermal conductivity

A difficulty in estimating physical and thermochemical properties of a multiphase system is to choose an appropriate averaging scheme to calculate the bulk properties from the individual properties of the phases composing this system. Different schemes may lead to significant differences in estimated properties, in particular when the individual properties of each phase differ by one order of magnitude or more. In addition, the distribution of phases within the aggregate may strongly influence the properties of the aggregate, and most particularly transport properties. If, for instance, grains of one specific phase are interconnected to form a network, the properties of this phase may dominate the properties of the aggregate. In the case of viscosity, interconnected weak phases may lead to weak layers that dominate the deformation of the aggregate. Similarly, thermal conductivity may be dominated by the most conductive phase if the grains of this phase form a network. While an accurate determination of aggregate properties requires additional knowledge on the grains distribution, upper and lower bounds of these properties may be estimated. Hashin–Shtrikman (HS) bounds are based on variational principles and represent the narrowest possible bounds.
for a multiphase system (Hashin & Shtriktman 1962). Importantly, HS bounds were specifically calculated to estimate magnetic permeabilities of a multiphase aggregate, but the mathematical treatment used to derive them also applies to other properties, including thermal conductivity.

To identify the best averaging scheme, we calculated five estimators based, respectively, on the arithmetic, geometric, harmonic and Voigt-Reuss-Hill (VRH) averages of the conductivities of bridgmanite and ferropericlase, and on the geometric average of the HS bounds of the conductivities of these minerals. We then compared these estimators with the lower (HS−) and upper (HS+) HS bounds. Averaging schemes that do not fit within HS bounds should be rejected. The geometric average of HS bounds automatically fits within these bounds. By contrast, other schemes may be biased towards HS− or HS+ or fall outside these bounds, as in the case of electrical conductivity (Khan & Shankland 2012; Deschamps & Khan 2016). For a two-phase aggregate composed of bridgmanite and ferropericlase, and noting that ferropericlase is more thermally conductive than bridgmanite, the lower and upper HS bounds in thermal conductivity are given by,

\[ \Lambda_{HS-} = \Lambda_{Bm} \left[ 1 + \frac{(1 - X_{Bm}) (\Lambda_{Fp} - \Lambda_{Bm})}{\Lambda_{Bm} + X_{Bm} (\Lambda_{Fp} - \Lambda_{Bm})/3} \right] \]

and

\[ \Lambda_{HS+} = \Lambda_{Fp} \left[ 1 - \frac{X_{Bm} (\Lambda_{Fp} - \Lambda_{Bm})}{\Lambda_{Fp} - (1 - X_{Bm}) (\Lambda_{Fp} - \Lambda_{Bm})/3} \right], \]

where \( \Lambda_{Bm} \) and \( \Lambda_{Fp} \) are the individual conductivities of bridgmanite and ferropericlase, and \( X_{Bm} \) the fraction of bridgmanite. Note that because the thermal conductivities of bridgmanite and ferropericlase differ by less than one order of magnitude, one expects the range encompassed by \( \Lambda_{HS-} \) and \( \Lambda_{HS+} \) to be rather narrow, thus reducing the uncertainty related to averaging. The geometric average of HS bounds in mantle thermal conductivity is then simply given by

\[ \Lambda_{\text{HSm}} = \sqrt{\Lambda_{HS-} \Lambda_{HS+}}. \]

The VRH scheme is defined as the average of arithmetic and harmonic means (Hill 1963). For an aggregate of bridgmanite and ferropericlase, the VRH averaging in thermal conductivity is

\[ \Lambda_{VRH} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ X_{Bm} \Lambda_{Bm} + (1 - X_{Bm}) \Lambda_{Fp} + \frac{\Lambda_{Bm} \Lambda_{Fp}}{(1 - X_{Bm}) \Lambda_{Bm} + X_{Bm} \Lambda_{Fp}} \right]. \]

VRH averaging is commonly used to calculate the thermo-elastic properties of mantle minerals. For the electrical conductivity, by contrast, VRH average has been shown to be biased towards the lower HS bound (e.g. Khan & Shankland 2012; Deschamps & Khan 2016).

Fig. 3 shows profiles of thermal conductivity for a pyrolitic composition \( (X_{Fe} = 0.09 \) and \( X_{Bm} = 0.8) \) and \( K_D = 0.4 \) for all the five estimators we considered. Conductivities are calculated along an adiabatic temperature profile with potential (i.e. ambient pressure) temperature \( T_p = 2000 \text{ K} \) and adiabatic depth-gradient \( \alpha = 0.35 \text{ K km}^{-1} \). Fig. 4 plots variations in thermal conductivities with temperature, composition and iron partitioning for the geometric average of HS bounds, at pressure and real (i.e. adiabatically corrected) reference temperature of \( P = 120 \text{ GPa} \) and \( T = 3000 \text{ K} \), respectively. In both Figs 3 and 4, the ranges covered by HS bounds are indicated by coloured areas. As expected, these range are narrow, around 0.4 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1} for the aggregate of Fe-bridgmanite and ferropericlase, and less than 0.2 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1} for the aggregate of (Fe, Al)-bridgmanite and ferropericlase. Several conclusions may be drawn from Figs 3 and 4. First, none of the estimators we tested provide values of aggregate conductivity within HS bounds, except the geometric average of these bounds, which naturally satisfies this requirement (Fig. 3). Geometric and VRH average conductivities are slightly lower than HS−, while harmonic and arithmetic averages lead to conductivities that are respectively smaller than HS− and larger than HS+ by about 0.3 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1} at the bottom of the mantle. These differences remain modest compared to uncertainties in the measurements, or to the changes induced by temperature or composition. In other words, the mode of averaging affects only slightly estimates of lower mantle thermal conductivity in comparison to other sources of uncertainties and errors. For consistency, we chose to use the geometric average of HS bounds, \( \Lambda_{\text{HSm}}, \) to model lower mantle thermal conductivity. With this averaging scheme, mantle conductivity for a pyrolitic model along an adiabat with \( T_p = 2000 \text{ K} \), leading to a real temperature of about 3000 K at the bottom of the mantle, is equal to \( \sim 8.6 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1} \).

Secondly, Fig. 4 allows us to estimate changes in thermal conductivity in the lowermost mantle triggered by variations in temperature and composition expected therein. For lateral temperature anomalies around 500 K, thermal conductivity changes by \( \sim 1 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1} \) (Fig. 4a). Variations in \( X_{Fe} \) of 3–4 per cent and in \( X_{Bm} \) of 10 per cent trigger changes in thermal conductivity of 1 and 0.8 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}, respectively (Figs 4b and c), i.e. similar to the effects of temperature. By contrast, the iron partitioning \( K_D \) has a small to moderate influence on conductivity (Fig. 4d). Increasing \( K_D \) from 0.1 to 0.6 decreases conductivity by 0.5 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}. As \( K_D \) further increases to 0.8, conductivity changes by another 0.2 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}. Our modelling further shows that, compared to temperature and composition, the iron spin transition in ferropericlase has only a minor influence on mantle thermal conductivity. More precisely, the red dashed curve in Fig. 3 and orange curves in Fig. 4, which were calculated by switching off the iron spin transition, indicate that in the mid-lower mantle, around 1400 km, neglecting this transition results in a slight increase in conductivity, by about 0.1 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}, while in the lowermost mantle, the difference between the cases with and without the iron spin transition is even smaller, around 0.05 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}. This difference increases with increasing \( X_{Fe} \) and decreasing \( X_{Bm} \) and \( K_D \), but remains limited, up to 0.15 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1} at 120 GPa and low \( K_D \) (Fig. 4d).
Figure 3. Horizontally average profiles of thermal conductivity in the lower mantle for aggregates of (Fe,Al)-bridgmanite and ferropericlase [(Fe,Al)-Bm + Fp, red and orange curves], and Fe-bridgmanite and ferropericlase (Fe-Bm + Fp, blue curves). All calculations are made along an adiabat with surface (potential) temperature \( T_p = 2000 \) K and adiabatic gradient 0.35 K km\(^{-1}\). Global iron fraction and volume fraction of bridgmanite are \( X_{Fe} = 0.09 \) and \( X_{Bm} = 0.8 \), respectively, and the iron partitioning is \( K_D = 0.4 \). For each aggregate, colored areas cover values of conductivity within Hashin–Shtrikman (HS) bounds. For the (Fe,Al)-Bm + Fp aggregate, five estimators are shown, and the dark red dashed curve is built by neglecting the spin transition in ferropericlase. For the Fe-Bm + Fp aggregate, only the Voigt–Reuss–Hill average and geometric average of HS bounds are plotted. Plots (a) and (b) in insert show zooms of the conductivity for each aggregate in the depth range 2500–2890 km.

Figure 4. Variations of thermal conductivity with (a) ‘real’ temperature \( T_r \), (b) global iron fraction \( X_{Fe} \), (c) volume fraction of bridgmanite \( X_{Bm} \) and (d) iron partitioning \( K_D \). Two aggregates are considered, (Fe,Al)-bridgmanite plus ferropericlase (red curves and areas), and Fe-bridgmanite plus ferropericlase (blue curves and areas). Curves plot geometric average of Hashin–Shtrikman (HS) lower and upper bounds, and coloured areas denote the area encompassed by these bounds. The orange curves show a case without the spin transition in the ferropericlase and using (Fe,Al)-bridgmanite and ferropericlase data. Default parameters are \( T_r = 3000 \) K, \( X_{Fe} = 0.09 \), \( X_{Bm} = 0.8 \) and \( K_D = 0.4 \), and all calculations are done at pressure \( P = 120 \) GPa.
Finally, Figs 3 and 4 indicate that conductivities obtained with Fe-bridgmanite and (Fe-Al)-bridgmanite data strongly differ. At pressure smaller than 45 GPa (depths shallower than 1100 km), both estimates are similar. At larger pressures, however, conductivities obtained with Fe-bridgmanite are substantially smaller than those inferred from (Fe-Al)-bridgmanite data. The difference between these two estimates increases with depth and reaches 3 W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$ at the bottom of the mantle. Note that when using Fe-bridgmanite, the HS bounds of the aggregate conductivity are wider, and that the VRH average now fits within these bounds (Fig. 3). Furthermore, the influences of compositional parameters ($X_{Fe}$ and $X_{Bm}$) and iron partitioning are stronger (blue curves in Figs 4b-d). For instance, conductivity decreases by 2.2 W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$ if $X_{Fe}$ rises by 4 per cent, and by 2.0 W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$ if $K_D$ changes from 0.1 to 0.6. To estimate mantle thermal conductivity, we chose to use only data for (Fe,Al)-bridgmanite data. This choice is motivated by the observations that Al-bearing bridgmanite is present in mantle aggregate and may influence the iron partitioning (Piet et al. 2016).

3.5 Relative anomalies in thermal conductivity

Variations of temperature and composition (parametrized here with the fraction of bridgmanite, $X_{Bm}$, and the global fraction of iron, $X_{Fe}$) at a given depth result in lateral variations in thermal conductivity. These anomalies may be measured relatively to a reference conductivity defined at a reference thermochemical state, which may be defined as the horizontally averaged mantle temperature, $T_{ref}$, and composition, $X_{Bm,ref}$ and $X_{Fe,ref}$, at this depth.

The relative variations of thermal conductivity with respect to temperature can be easily calculated by deriving eq. (2), leading to

$$\frac{d \ln \Lambda}{\Lambda_{ref}} = \frac{1}{\Lambda_{ref}} \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial T} dT = -\frac{1}{T} d\ln T,$$

(10)

where $dT = (T−T_{ref})$ is the lateral temperature anomaly compared to a reference temperature $T_{ref}$, and $\Lambda_{ref}$ the conductivity at temperature $T_{ref}$. At the bottom of the mantle, this average temperature may range between 3000 and 4000 K (e.g. Tackley 2012), while probabilistic tomography (Trampert et al. 2004; Mosca et al. 2012) suggests temperature anomalies up to 400 K in amplitude. Taking $n = 0.5$ and $dT = 400$ K, thermal conductivity should vary by up to 5–7 per cent, compared to its horizontal average.

The aggregate conductivity depends explicitly on $X_{Bm}$, as indicated by eqs (6)–(8), and implicitly on both $X_{Bm}$ and $X_{Fe}$ through the expressions of $x_{Fe,Bm}$ and $x_{Fe,Fp}$ (eqs A1 and A2). The detailed expression of relative anomalies in aggregate conductivity with respect to $X_{Bm}$ and $X_{Fe}$ further depends on the assumed averaging scheme. For instance, Hsieh et al. (2017) inferred relative anomalies for the VRH average from eq. (9). Relative anomalies in the geometric average of HS bounds, $d \ln \Lambda_{HSm,Bm}$ and $d \ln \Lambda_{HSm,Fe}$, can be derived from eqs (6) to (8) and are detailed in Appendix (eqs A3 and A4). The total compositional effect is then simply given by the sum of these anomalies, that is

$$d \ln \Lambda_{HSm}^{ref} = d \ln \Lambda_{HSm,Bm} + d \ln \Lambda_{HSm,Fe}.$$

(11)

Fig. 5 plots relative anomalies in thermal conductivity due to variations in composition at $P = 120$ GPa, and for $K_D = 0.4$ and a pyrolitic reference composition, that is $X_{Bm,ref} = 0.8$ and $X_{Fe,ref} = 0.09$. Note that because $x_{Fe,Bm}^{ref}$ and $x_{Fe,Fp}^{ref}$ depend on both $X_{Bm}$ and $X_{Fe}$, relative anomalies in aggregate conductivity with respect to iron, $d \ln \Lambda_{HSm,Bm}$ (eq. A3), and bridgmanite, $d \ln \Lambda_{HSm,Fe}$ (eq. A4), also depend on both $X_{Bm}$ and $X_{Fe}$ (plots a and b in Fig. 5). For instance, an excess of iron of 4 per cent triggers a decrease in aggregate conductivity of $\sim 10$ per cent at $X_{Bm} = X_{Bm,ref}$, and this reduction is slightly enhanced as the aggregate gets enriched in bridgmanite. Similarly, an enrichment in bridgmanite by 10 per cent reduces the aggregate conductivity by $\sim 10$ per cent. Combined enrichments in iron by 4 per cent and bridgmanite by 10 per cent thus induce a decrease in thermal conductivity by 20 per cent compared to its reference value (Fig. 5c). Similar results are obtained using a VRH averaging scheme (Fig. 5d).

4 SATURATION AND THRESHOLD EFFECTS

To model the impact of iron on mantle thermal conductivity, we interpolated individual conductivities of bridgmanite and ferropericlase between available measurements with different iron fractions. A potential bias of this approach is that it does not account for possible saturation and threshold effects. To date, available experimental data do not allow fixing the iron content at which saturation and threshold occur, if they occur at all. However, general trends can be outlined.

Saturation effects alter the thermal conductivity estimated from linear interpolation (or extrapolation) differently depending on the iron fraction $x_{Fe,ref}$ at which saturation starts operating. If $x_{Fe,ref}$ fits between two experimentally measured points, $x_1$ and $x_2$ (Fig. 6a), the conductivity measured at $x_2$ is the saturated value of thermal conductivity. Accounting for saturation effects would then lead to values of the conductivity lower or equal to those obtained by linear interpolation of experimental data if $x_{Fe} \leq x_2$, and larger than the extrapolated values in the opposite case. If $x_{Fe,ref}$ is larger than the highest iron content at which experiments were performed (Fig. 6b), saturation has more complex consequences, leading to conductivity values either lower or larger than the value extrapolated from experimental data, depending on the exact value of $x_{Fe,ref}$. This case is, however, unlikely, since in the lower mantle $x_{Fe,Bm}^{ref}$ and $x_{Fe,Fp}^{ref}$ are expected to remain lower than 0.12 and 0.4, respectively (Fig. 2), that is lower than the iron fractions of experimental samples of our data set. Exceptions may occur locally in ULVZs, if these regions are strongly enriched in iron (Mao et al. 2006; Wicks et al. 2010). Thermal conductivity within ULVZs would then be strongly reduced by an amount that decreases with decreasing $x_{Fe,ref}$ (Hsieh et al. 2018). Here, we focus on the case $x_1 \leq x_{Fe,ref} \leq x_2$ (Fig. 6a), which is a priori representative of the regular mantle and LLSVPs.
Figure 5. Relative anomalies in thermal conductivity of an aggregate of bridgmanite and ferropericlase induced by anomalies in the global iron fraction, \( \Delta X_{\text{Fe}} \), and in the volume fraction of bridgmanite, \( \Delta X_{\text{Bm}} \). All calculations are done at \( P = 120 \) GPa, real temperature \( T_r = 3000 \) K and iron partitioning \( K_0 = 0.4 \). The reference composition is \( X_{\text{Bm,ref}} = 0.8 \) and \( X_{\text{Fe,ref}} = 0.09 \). In plots (a) to (c), the aggregate conductivity is estimated from the geometric average of Hashin–Shtrikman bounds. (a) Relative anomalies with respect to fraction of bridgmanite (eq. A3). (b) Relative anomalies with respect to iron content (eq. A4). (c) Cumulated relative anomalies with respect to iron and bridgmanite fractions (eq. 11). (d) Cumulated relative anomalies with respect to iron and bridgmanite fractions assuming a VRH average for the aggregate conductivity [see Hsieh et al. (2017) for relationships equivalent to eqs (A3) and (A4)].

Fig. 7(a) shows saturation effects as a function of the global iron fraction \( X_{\text{Fe}} \) for several cases. Saturation in the conductivity of ferropericlase (blue curves in Fig. 7a) induces a moderate reduction in mantle thermal conductivity, compared to the values inferred from linear interpolation of experimental data (red curve in Fig. 7a). For \( x_{\text{Fe,sat}}^{\text{Fp}} = 0.1 \), which is the lowest possible value of \( x_{\text{Fe,sat}}^{\text{Fp}} \), this reduction is about 0.6 W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\) at \( X_{\text{Fe}} = 0.06 \), and it decreases to 0.4 W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\) at \( X_{\text{Fe}} = 0.14 \). Saturation in the conductivity of bridgmanite (green curves in Fig. 7a) triggers more substantial changes. Fixing \( x_{\text{Fe,sat}}^{\text{Bm}} = 0.05 \), for instance, reduces mantle conductivity by 1.6 W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\) at \( X_{\text{Fe}} = 0.06 \), and 0.4 W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\) at \( X_{\text{Fe}} = 0.14 \). Accounting for saturation in both bridgmanite and ferropericlase with \( x_{\text{Fe,sat}}^{\text{Fp}} = 0.1 \) and \( x_{\text{Fe,sat}}^{\text{Bm}} = 0.15 \), leads to a constant mantle conductivity at 6.3 W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\) for all values of \( X_{\text{Fe}} \) between 0.08 and 0.15. Compared to the value deduced from experimental data, this corresponds to a reduction by 24 and 8 per cent, respectively. Relative changes in thermal conductivity with composition are also affected by saturation effects (Fig. 8). Saturation effects in both bridgmanite and ferropericlase trigger larger relative anomalies in aggregates depleted in iron (\( \Delta X_{\text{Fe}} < 0 \)), but slightly smaller anomalies in aggregates enriched in iron (\( \Delta X_{\text{Fe}} > 0 \)). For instance, assuming \( x_{\text{Fe,sat}}^{\text{Bm}} = 0.1 \) and \( x_{\text{Fe,sat}}^{\text{Fp}} = 0.15 \), a combined enrichment in iron by 4 per cent and in bridgmanite by 10 per cent leads to a thermal conductivity anomaly of \( -18 \) per cent, instead of \( -21 \) per cent in absence of saturation effects. Saturation, depending on the iron content at which it starts operating, may thus slightly reduce our estimates of thermal conductivity anomalies within LLSVPs (Section 5). It should be noted, however, that these changes would be limited, reducing the amplitude of relative anomalies in conductivity, typically by only a few per cent.

Lower mantle minerals may also be subject to threshold effects, where the conductivity initially decreases rapidly and then, upon reaching a threshold value, continues to decrease at a slower rate. Accounting for threshold effects would result in values of the conductivity lower than the value interpolated from experimental data (Fig. 6a). Such reduction is equivalent to a decrease in the slope of the linear regression \( a_i \) estimated from experimental data (eq. 5), and can be parametrized by fixing the ratio between the slopes accounting for and neglecting the threshold effects, \( \xi = a_{\text{threshold}} / a_i \). Experimental data for ferropericlase (Hsieh et al. 2018) indicate that any possible threshold effect with this mineral would occur at \( x_{\text{Fe}}^{\text{Fp}} \) less than 0.08. However, since in the lower mantle \( x_{\text{Fe}}^{\text{Fp}} \) is likely greater than this value (Fig. 2), the consequences of such threshold on the aggregate conductivity would be minimal. By contrast, because the lowest value of \( x_{\text{Fe}}^{\text{Bm}} \) in our experimental data set is equal to 0.129, threshold effects in bridgmanite may affect our calculations. Fig. 7(d) plots conductivity as a function of \( X_{\text{Fe}} \) for several values of the threshold values, modelled by a reduction in the slope of the linear regression \( a_{\text{Bm}} \) (eq. 5) between MgSiO\(_3\) and (Al,Fe)-bridgmanite.
Figure 6. Saturation and threshold effects. (a) Saturation occurs at an iron content $x_{\text{sat}}$ intermediate between two experimental samples, $x_1$ and $x_2$, and results in values of the conductivity lower than the values interpolated from experimental data if $x_{\text{Fe}} \leq x_2$, and larger in the opposite case. Threshold effects also result in values of the conductivity lower than those deduced from experiments. (b) Saturation occurs at an iron content $x_{\text{sat}}$ higher than those explored in experiments and results in values of the conductivity either lower or larger than the values extrapolated from experiments, depending on the value of $x_{\text{sat}}$.

The reduction in conductivity increases as the threshold conductivity decreases, but this reduction is less pronounced as $X_{\text{Fe}}$ increases. For instance, compared to the value predicted by experimental data and assuming a threshold conductivity corresponding to $\zeta = 0.1$, the aggregate conductivity is reduced by 15 and 5 per cent for $X_{\text{Fe}} = 0.08$ and $X_{\text{Fe}} = 0.14$, respectively. Accounting for threshold effects further reduces the relative changes in thermal conductivity (Fig. 8d). For $\zeta = 0.5$, the relative anomaly in conductivity triggered by a joint enrichment in iron and bridgmanite of 4 and 10 per cent, respectively, is around –15 per cent, compared to –20 per cent if threshold effects are absent.

Interestingly, both threshold and saturation effects, if operating in lower mantle minerals, would result in a reduction of the aggregate conductivity (Fig. 7) and of its relative variations with compositional parameters (Fig. 8). The lower mantle conductivity and its relative variations with composition we inferred in Section 5.2 may thus be considered as upper bounds. Unfortunately, in absence of constraints from mineral physics experiments, the impact of saturation and threshold effects on mantle thermal conductivity cannot be quantified with precision. Detailed estimates will require additional experiments for bridgmanite with low iron fractions, around 0.05 or less, and ferropericlase with iron fractions between 0.15 and 0.40.

5 APPLICATIONS TO THE LOWERMOST MANTLE

Seismic tomography indicates that the lowermost mantle is strongly heterogeneous at large scale. Several hints suggest that observed seismic features require a combination of lateral variations in both temperature and composition (e.g. Ishii & Tromp 1999; van der Hilst and Kárason 1999; Deschamps & Trampert 2003; Trampert et al. 2004; Hernlund & Houser 2008), the compositional contribution being well explained by changes in the iron content, $X_{\text{Fe}}$, and in the fraction of bridgmanite, $X_{\text{Bm}}$ (Trampert et al. 2004; Deschamps et al. 2012; Mosca et al. 2012). If present in the deep mantle, lateral variations in iron and bridgmanite, together with temperature anomalies, may trigger lateral variations in thermal conductivity that may, in turn, influence the dynamics of the lowermost mantle and the heat transfer at the CMB.

5.1 Thermochemical structure

Inferring maps of the lowermost thermochemical structure from observed seismic structure requires appropriate sensitivities of seismic observables to temperature and composition (e.g. Trampert et al. 2001). Maps of density anomalies, inferred from normal modes data (Ishii &
Figure 7. Saturation and threshold effects as a function of the global iron fraction, $X_{Fe}$. For comparison, coloured areas and red curves represent the unsaturated case (Hashin–Shtrikman bounds and geometric average of these bounds). (a) Saturation effects. Labels on curves indicate the iron fraction in bridgmanite (Bm) and/or ferropericlase (Fp) at which saturation occurs. (b) Threshold effect in bridgmanite, parametrized as a function of the reduction in the slope of the linear regression $a_{Bm}$ (eq. 5) between MgSiO$_3$ and (Al,Fe)-bridgmanite samples. Labels on curve indicate the ratio between the reduced and regular slopes, $\zeta = a_{\text{threshold}}/a_{Bm}$. All calculations are made at $P = 120$ GPa, $T_r = 3000$ K, $K_D = 0.4$. The reference composition is $X_{Bm,\text{ref}} = 0.8$ and $X_{Fe,\text{ref}} = 0.09$, and the aggregate conductivity is estimated from the geometric average of Hashin–Shtrikman bounds.

Tromp 1999; Trampert et al. 2004; Mosca et al. 2012), provide essential information that complements shear-wave and compressional-wave (or bulk-sound velocity) anomalies. Following Trampert et al. (2004), we assumed that compositional changes in the lowermost mantle are dominated by variations in iron and bridgmanite ($dX_{Fe}$ and $dX_{Bm}$). We considered two possible thermochemical models of the lowermost mantle, hereafter referred to as models TC1 and TC2 (Fig. 9). Model TC1 is obtained by solving the system

$$\begin{align*}
\frac{d\ln V_S}{dT} &= \frac{\partial \ln V_S}{\partial T}dT + \frac{\partial \ln V_S}{\partial X_{Fe}}dX_{Fe} + \frac{\partial \ln V_S}{\partial X_{Bm}}dX_{Bm} \\
\frac{d\ln V_\phi}{dT} &= \frac{\partial \ln V_\phi}{\partial T}dT + \frac{\partial \ln V_\phi}{\partial X_{Fe}}dX_{Fe} + \frac{\partial \ln V_\phi}{\partial X_{Bm}}dX_{Bm} \\
\frac{d\ln \rho}{dT} &= \frac{\partial \ln \rho}{\partial T}dT + \frac{\partial \ln \rho}{\partial X_{Fe}}dX_{Fe} + \frac{\partial \ln \rho}{\partial X_{Bm}}dX_{Bm},
\end{align*}$$

where $d\ln V_S$, $d\ln V_\phi$, and $d\ln \rho$ are the anomalies in shear-wave velocity, bulk-sound velocity and density inferred by Trampert et al. (2004), and the functions $\partial \ln X/\partial Y$ are the partial derivatives (sensitivities) of each seismic parameters with respect to temperature, iron, and bridgmanite. Here, we used the sensitivities calculated by Deschamps et al. (2012). Due to the radial parametrization used in Trampert et al. (2004), model TC1 samples the layer 2000–2891 km. Note that because of restrictions in the measurements of normal modes, both models are limited to even spherical harmonic degrees up to $l = 6$. Compared to the original thermo-chemical model of Trampert et al. (2004), thermal anomalies are slightly lower in model TC1, with root-mean-square (rms) around 132 K (Table 2) instead of 183 K, whereas compositional anomalies are stronger, with rms in $dX_{Fe}$ and $dX_{Bm}$ around 1.4 and 7.2 per cent, respectively, instead of 0.9 and 4.3 per cent in Trampert et al. (2004). Model TC2 is directly taken from the thermochemical distributions obtained by Mosca et al. (2012). It accounts for the possible presence of post-perovskite (pPv) at the bottom of the mantle, and samples a thinner layer, 2750–2891 km, than model TC1.

Due to different vertical parametrizations, models TC1 and TC2 are substantially different in pattern (Fig. 9). Note, however, that both models predict strong enrichment in iron in regions corresponding to LLSVPs. In addition, amplitude of thermal anomalies are slightly larger in model TC2, but still comparable to those of model TC1 (Table 2). A striking difference is that, because it accounts for the presence of
Figure 8. Influence of saturation and threshold effects on relative anomalies in thermal conductivity. (a) (Fe,Al)-bridgmanite saturated at \(x_{Fe}^{Bm} = 0.1\). (b) Ferropericlase saturated at \(x_{Fe}^{Fp} = 0.15\). (c) (Fe,Al)-bridgmanite and ferropericlase saturated at \(x_{Fe}^{Bm} = 0.1\) and \(x_{Fe}^{Fp} = 0.15\), respectively. (d) Threshold effect in bridgmanite. The threshold effect is parametrized by a reduction in the linear regression slope \(a_{Bm}\) (eq. 5) between MgSiO\(_3\) and (Al,Fe)-bridgmanite, with a ratio between the reduced and regular slopes, \(\zeta = a_{\text{threshold}}/a_{Bm}\), fixed to 0.5. Results are plotted as a function of anomalies in the global iron fraction, \(dX_{Fe}\), and in the volume fraction of bridgmanite, \(dX_{Bm}\). All calculations are made at \(P = 120\) GPa, \(T = 3000\) K and \(K_D = 0.4\). The reference composition is \(X_{Bm,ref} = 0.8\) and \(X_{Fe,ref} = 0.09\), and the aggregate conductivity is estimated from the geometric average of Hashin–Shtrikman bounds.

pPv, model TC2 predicts very small values of \(dX_{Bm}\), with rms of 0.5 per cent (Table 2). A depletion in pPv, as expected in LLSVPs, and an excess in bridgmanite have similar effects on seismic velocities, that is decreasing shear-wave velocity and increasing bulk-sound velocity. As a result, if lateral variations in the fraction of pPv are accounted for, explaining observed seismic velocity anomalies requires smaller variations in bridgmanite.

5.2 Thermal conductivity maps and implications for deep mantle dynamics

Fig. 10 plots relative variations in thermal conductivity associated with thermochemical models TC1 and TC2 and calculated according to eqs (10), (A3) and (A4). Anomalies inferred from model TC1 are dominated by compositional effects. The rms of relative conductivity anomalies due to changes in \(X_{Fe}\) and \(X_{Bm}\), \(d\ln\Lambda^{Fe}_{HSm}\) and \(d\ln\Lambda^{Bm}_{HSm}\), are equal to 3.5 and 6.4 per cent (Table 2), respectively, and strongest variations are found in LLSVPs, where iron and bridgmanite excesses reduce thermal conductivity by up to 11 and 15 per cent. Relative anomalies triggered by variations in temperature, \(d\ln\Lambda^{T}_{HSm}\), are smaller in amplitude, with an rms of 2.2 per cent. As a result, the total conductivity anomalies, \(d\ln\Lambda_{HSm}\), predicted by model TC1 are large, with rms around 10 per cent. Again, the strongest changes, corresponding to a reduction in conductivity of 26 per cent, are found within LLSVPs. By contrast, compared to the variations obtained with model TC1, the \(d\ln\Lambda^{Bm}_{HSm}\) inferred from model TC2 are very small, whereas \(d\ln\Lambda^{Fe}_{HSm}\) and \(d\ln\Lambda^{T}_{HSm}\) are comparable, with rms of 3.8 and 2.6 per cent, respectively. This results in much smaller \(d\ln\Lambda_{HSm}\) with rms of only 2.6 per cent (Table 2). Interestingly, while it reaches only 4.2 per cent, the maximum reduction in thermal conductivity is still located within the LLSVPs (Fig. 10b). Differences in the variations in conductivity predicted by models TC1 and TC2 reflect the structural differences between these models. Differences between patterns of conductivity (Fig. 10) mimic the differences of patterns in temperature, iron and bridgmanite anomalies (Fig. 9), which are partly related to the radial parametrization of models TC1 and TC2. Differences in amplitude mostly result from differences in the distribution of bridgmanite (section 5.1). Because it accounts for possible variations in the stability field of post-perovskite, model TC2 predicts very small variations in bridgmanite. We further explored the effect of the temperature exponent \(n\), controlling the amplitude of conductivity changes with temperature (eq. 2). Reducing \(n\), moderates the influence of temperature changes on conductivity. As one would expect, conductivity changes due to temperature anomalies \((d\ln\Lambda^{T})\) are strongly reduced as \(n\) decreases (Table 3). However, the value of \(n\) has only a small influence on the total conductivity changes.
Figure 9. Thermochemical distributions in the lowermost mantle modified from Trampert et al. (2004) (model TC1, left-hand column) and from Mosca et al. (2012) (model TC2, right-hand column). Thermo-chemical models include anomalies in temperature (a and d), global fraction of iron (b and e), and fraction of bridgmanite (c and f). Model TC1 was built from the seismic distributions of Trampert et al. (2004) and seismic sensitivities of Deschamps et al. (2012). Model TC2 is directly taken from Mosca et al. (2012) and accounts for the presence of post-perovskite at the bottom of the mantle. Both models are horizontally parametrized on a $15^\circ \times 15^\circ$ grid. Vertical resolution is 2000–2891 km for model TC1 and 2750–2891 km for model TC2. Contour levels are 100 K for $dT$, 1 per cent for $dX_{Fe}$ and 5 per cent for $dX_{Bm}$.

Table 2. Root mean square (rms), minimum and maximum in thermochemical anomalies from thermochemical models TC1 and TC2 (Fig. 9) and related anomalies in thermal conductivity (Fig. 10) and CMB heat flux (Fig. 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Model TC1</th>
<th>Model TC2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thermochemical anomalies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$dT$ (K)</td>
<td>131.9</td>
<td>153.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$dX_{Fe}$ (%)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$dX_{Bm}$ (%)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity anomalies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{dln}/\Lambda_{1}^T$</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{dln}/\Lambda_{1}^{Fe}$</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{dln}/\Lambda_{1}^{Bm}$</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{dln}/\Lambda_{1}^{HSm}$</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB heat flux anomalies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{dln}/\Phi_{dT}$</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{dln}/\Phi_{d\Lambda}$</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{dln}/\Phi$</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10. Relative variations in thermal conductivity in the lowermost mantle inferred from thermo-chemical models TC1 (left-hand column) and TC2 (right-hand column). First, second, and third rows plot relative anomalies due to variations in temperature ($\text{dln}\Lambda T$, Fig. 10), iron content ($\text{dln}\Lambda^\text{Fe}_{\text{HSm}}$, Fig. A4), and fraction of bridgmanite ($\text{dln}\Lambda^\text{Bm}_{\text{HSm}}$, Fig. A3), respectively. The last row plots the total relative anomalies, $\text{dln}\Lambda_{\text{HSm}}$. All calculations are made at $P = 120$ GPa, $T_r = 3000$ K and $K_D = 0.4$. The reference composition is $X^\text{Bm,ref} = 0.8$ and $X^\text{Fe,ref} = 0.09$, and the aggregate conductivity is estimated from the geometric average of Hashin–Shtrikman bounds. Horizontal and vertical parametrizations are the same as in Fig. 9. Contour levels are 5 per cent on all plots.

Table 3. Effect of the temperature exponent $n$ (eq. 2) on the variations in lower mantle thermal conductivity (Fig. 10) and CMB heat flux (Fig. 11) estimated from thermochemical model TC1 (Fig. 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{dln}\Lambda^T$</td>
<td>rms</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>min</td>
<td>−0.014</td>
<td>−0.034</td>
<td>−0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>max</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rms</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{dln}\Lambda_{\text{HSm}}$</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>−0.249</td>
<td>−0.257</td>
<td>−0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>max</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rms</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{dln}\Phi$</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>−0.404</td>
<td>−0.416</td>
<td>−0.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>max</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q^*$</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(dln\Delta). For instance, in the case of model TC1, rms in dln\Delta decreases very slightly, from 0.105 to 0.098, when n is varied between 1.0 and 0.2.

An interesting result is that despite their differences, models TC1 and TC2 predict a reduction of thermal conductivity within LLSVPs (Fig. 10). This may, in turn, impact the dynamics of these regions, since a lower conductivity decreases heat transfer by conduction and promotes convection. A reduction by 25 per cent, as expected by model TC1, may reduce heat exchange between LLSVPs and the surrounding mantle and favor internal flow within these structures. However, numerical simulations of thermochemical convection accounting explicitly for variations of conductivity with temperature and composition should, be conducted to quantify this effect. Note that a depth-dependent thermal conductivity is already included in models of thermochemical convection, and helps stabilizing reservoirs of dense material (Tackley 1998). Recent simulations further indicate that it reduces the number of thermal plumes generated outside thermochemical reservoirs and increases their spacing (Li & Zhong 2017).

5.3 Implications for heat flux at CMB

The powering and strength of geodynamo strongly depend on the amount of heat that can be extracted from the core, and thus on the CMB heat flux. The amplitude and lateral variations in this flux may be used as a boundary condition for models of outer core dynamics, influencing in turn the outer core flow and the geomagnetic field it generates. Lateral distribution in CMB heat flux depends on the distribution in thermal conductivity, \Lambda (\phi, \theta), and is given by

$$\Phi_{\text{CMB}} (\phi, \theta) = \Lambda (\phi, \theta) \frac{[T_{\text{CMB}} - T (\phi, \theta, D)]}{D},$$

where \phi and \theta are the longitude and latitude, \(T_{\text{CMB}}\) the temperature at CMB, which is assumed constant everywhere on the CMB and \(T(\phi, \theta, D)\) the temperature at location \(\phi, \theta\) and altitude \(D\) above the CMB. A difficulty is to choose a relevant value for \(D\). Ideally, since eq. (19) is representing the heat flux right above the CMB, \(D\) should be chosen as small as possible, typically a few tens of kilometres. However, tomographic models, from which variations in temperature in the lowermost mantle are deduced, have a limited vertical resolution, typically a few hundreds of kilometres, and temperature anomalies inferred from these models represent a vertical average within this layer. A possible solution to this problem is to fix the value of \(D\) to the thickness of the thermal boundary layer at the bottom of the mantle, that is the region where the depth-increase of temperature is superadiabatic. This value is not well constrained, but may reach a few hundred kilometres, allowing self-consistency with the radial parametrization of temperature anomalies inferred from seismic tomography. It is important to note that the value of \(D\) does not alter the relative lateral variations in CMB heat flux (eq. 23 below). By contrast, it obviously affects the reference (horizontally averaged) heat flux, and thus the peak-to-peak amplitude of heat flux variations. Taken at reference temperature (defined by the mantle geotherm) and thermal conductivity, \(T_{\text{ref}}\) and \(\Lambda_{\text{ref}}, \text{eq. (19)}\) defines a reference heat flux,

$$\Phi_{\text{ref}} = \Lambda_{\text{ref}} \frac{[T_{\text{CMB}} - T_{\text{ref}}]}{D}.$$  

Because CMB heat flux controls the heat that can be extracted from the core, it has a strong influence on the outer core dynamics and therefore on the properties of the geodynamo. In particular, the total extracted power should not be too low for geodynamo to operate, around 4 TW if the thermal conductivity of the outer core is equal to 20 W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\) (Labrosse 2016), equivalent to a heat flux (on the core side) of about 26 mW m\(^{-2}\). It is interesting to note that, despite the strong uncertainties in the parameters of eq. (20), defining the horizontally averaged CMB heat flux, our estimate of the average lowermost mantle thermal conductivity, \(\Lambda_{\text{ref}} = 8.6 \text{ W m}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}\), together with possible values of the thickness and temperature jump of the thermal boundary layer, \(D = 200 \text{ km}\) and \(\Delta T_{\text{ref}} = 750 \text{ K}\), leads to a reference CMB heat flux (on mantle side) of 32 mW m\(^{-2}\). In other words, our modelling is consistent with an efficient powering of the geodynamo.

The amplitude and pattern of CMB heat flux anomalies may influence details of outer core dynamics and alter dynamo actions (e.g. Olson & Christensen 2002; Aubert et al. 2007). On mantle side, lateral variations in CMB heat flux are controlled by lateral variations in temperature and thermal conductivity. As temperature increases, the vertical thermal gradient decreases, reducing the CMB heat flux. In addition, thermal conductivity varies locally with temperature and composition (Section 3). Temperature has thus both a direct and an indirect (by changing thermal conductivity) effect on CMB heat flux. Relative variations in CMB heat flux with respect to reference heat flux \(\Phi_{\text{ref}}\) (eq. 20) may be decomposed into variations due to anomalies in the radial temperature jump, \(\Delta T\), and anomalies in thermal conductivity, \(\Lambda\), following

$$\text{dln}\Phi_{\text{CMB}} (\phi, \theta) = \frac{[\Delta T (\phi, \theta) - \Delta T_{\text{ref}}]}{\Delta T_{\text{ref}}} + \text{dln}\Lambda (\phi, \theta),$$

where \(\Delta T (\phi, \theta) = [T_{\text{CMB}} - T(\phi, \theta)]\) and \(\Delta T_{\text{ref}} = (T_{\text{CMB}} - T_{\text{ref}})\) are the radial temperature jump at local and reference temperature, respectively, and \(\text{dln}\Lambda (\phi, \theta)\) is the relative variation in thermal conductivity at longitude \(\phi\) and latitude \(\theta\). A more practical expression of \(\text{dln}\Phi_{\text{CMB}}\) can be obtained by decomposing \(\text{dln}\Lambda\) into its thermal, \(\text{dln}\Lambda^T\), and compositional contributions, and by noting that \(\Delta T\) can be split as

$$\Delta T (\phi, \theta) = \Delta T_{\text{ref}} - dT (\phi, \theta),$$

where
Figure 11. Relative variations in core–mantle boundary (CMB) heat flux inferred from thermochemical models TC1 (left-hand column) and TC2 (right-hand column). First and second rows plot relative anomalies due to explicit variations in temperature (first term of the right-hand-side of eq. 23) and to variations in thermal conductivity (second, third and fourth terms of the right-hand-side of eq. 23), respectively. The last row show the total variation (eq. 23). The reference temperature and temperature jump are $T_r = 3000$ K and $\Delta T_{\text{ref}} = 750$ K, respectively. The reference composition is $X_{\text{Bm,ref}} = 0.8$ and $X_{\text{Fe,ref}} = 0.09$, and the iron partitioning $K_F = 0.4$. Aggregate thermal conductivity is estimated from the geometric average of Hashin–Shtrikman bounds. Horizontal parametrization are the same as in Fig. 9. Contour levels are 10 per cent on all plots.

where $dT(\phi, \theta) = [T(\phi, \theta) - T_{\text{ref}}]$ is the lateral variation in temperature with respect to $T_{\text{ref}}$ at location $(\phi, \theta)$. Relative variations in heat flux can then be written

$$\ln \Phi_{\text{CMB}}(\phi, \theta) = -\frac{dT(\phi, \theta)}{\Delta T_{\text{ref}}} + \ln \Lambda^T + \ln \Lambda^{Bm} + \ln \Lambda^{Fe}.$$  

(23)

The first term in the right-hand-side of eq. (23), $-dT/\Delta T_{\text{ref}}$, quantifies the heat flux anomalies directly related to temperature anomalies, while the three other terms describe the heat flux anomalies due to changes in thermal conductivity (section 3.5). eq. (23) further requires the knowledge of the CMB temperature ($T_{\text{CMB}}$), and of the reference mantle geotherm ($T_{\text{ref}}$), which are both not well constrained. These values, or equivalently the value of $\Delta T_{\text{ref}}$, are controlling the relative influence of the thermal and compositional contributions to heat flux anomalies.

Fig. 11 shows maps of CMB heat flux anomalies, $\ln \Phi_{\text{CMB}}$, inferred from models TC1 and TC2 following eq. (23) and for $\Delta T_{\text{ref}} = 750$ K. For both models, $\ln \Phi_{\text{CMB}}$ are clearly dominated by lateral temperature anomalies [first term in the right-hand-side of eq. (23), $\text{dln} \Phi_{\text{CMB}}^{dT} = -dT/\Delta T_{\text{ref}}$]. Variations in thermal conductivity triggered by thermal and compositional changes, given by the sum $\text{dln} \Phi_{\text{CMB}}^{d\Lambda} = \text{dln} \Lambda^T + \text{dln} \Lambda^{Bm} + \text{dln} \Lambda^{Fe}$, only have a small to moderate influence on $\ln \Phi_{\text{CMB}}$. For model TC1, the rms in $\text{dln} \Phi_{\text{CMB}}^{dT}$ and $\text{dln} \Phi_{\text{CMB}}^{d\Lambda}$ are equal to 17.6 and 9.9 per cent, respectively (Table 2). In model model TC2 heat flux anomalies related to thermal conductivity changes are even smaller, with rms in $\text{dln} \Phi_{\text{CMB}}^{d\Lambda}$ of only 2.6 per cent (compared to 20.4 per cent for $\text{dln} \Phi_{\text{CMB}}^{dT}$; Table 2). Amplitude in $\text{dln} \Phi_{\text{CMB}}$ reaches $\pm 40$ per cent for model TC2, and slightly more for model TC1. eq. (23) indicates that this amplitude depends on $\Delta T_{\text{ref}}$. More specifically, increasing $\Delta T_{\text{ref}}$ reduces $\text{dln} \Phi_{\text{CMB}}^{dT}$ but leaves $\text{dln} \Phi_{\text{CMB}}^{d\Lambda}$ unchanged. As a result, the amplitude of heat flux anomalies decrease with increasing $\Delta T_{\text{ref}}$ (Fig. 12a) and the relative contribution of $\text{dln} \Phi_{\text{CMB}}^{d\Lambda}$ to $\text{dln} \Phi_{\text{CMB}}$ gets stronger. Due to structural differences in the
thermal, and to a lesser extent compositional, distributions of models TC1 and TC2, heat flux patterns inferred from models TC1 and TC2 are substantially different. Both models are dominated by spherical harmonic degree \( l = 2 \) anomalies, and contain smaller scale anomalies. Smaller scale anomalies are, however, more pronounced in model TC2 than in model TC1. As a result, high heat flux regions are located beneath Japan, Katchamka and the southern tip of South America in model TC1, and beneath Indonesia, Australia and mid-Atlantic in model TC2. It is further interesting to note that, like the variations in thermal conductivity, the lateral variations in CMB heat flux are only slightly affected by the temperature-dependence of thermal conductivity (exponent \( n \) in eq. (2)). As \( n \) decreases from 1.0 to 0.2, and in the case of model TC1, the rms in dln\( \Phi_{\text{CMB}} \) is reduced by 0.03, from 0.235 to 0.203 (Table 3).

To date, there is no consensus on the level of heat flux heterogeneity required to substantially affect geodynamo. The level of heat flux heterogeneity is usually measured with the \( q^* \) parameter,

\[
q^* = \frac{(\Phi_{\text{max}} - \Phi_{\text{min}})}{2\Phi_{\text{ref}}},
\]

where \( \Phi_{\text{max}} \) and \( \Phi_{\text{min}} \) are the maximum and minimum in CMB heat flux, and \( \Phi_{\text{ref}} \) is its horizontally average. Olson & Christensen (2002) noted that dynamo actions are lost if \( q^* > 1 \), but more recent studies reported successful dynamos with \( q^* > 1 \) (Dietrich & Wicht 2013). At lower values of \( q^* \), CMB heat flux heterogeneities may still influence the outer core flow. For instance, Aubert et al. (2007) pointed out that even modest CMB heat flux heterogeneities, with \( q^* \) around 0.2, could influence this flow in such a way that it would induce observable signatures in geomagnetic data. In our modelling, \( q^* \) slightly depends on the exponent \( n \) controlling the effect of temperature on thermal conductivity (Table 3), and decreases more strongly with increasing \( \Delta T_{\text{ref}} \), from about 1.1 at \( \Delta T_{\text{ref}} = 250 \) K, to 0.4 and 0.3 (for models TC1 and TC2, respectively) at \( \Delta T_{\text{ref}} = 1000 \) K (Fig. 12b). For \( \Delta T_{\text{ref}} = 750 \) K, it is equal to 0.47 and 0.40 for models TC1 and TC2, respectively. Values of \( q^* \) are larger than 1 only if \( \Delta T_{\text{ref}} < 300 \) K, and remains larger than 0.2 for the range of \( \Delta T_{\text{ref}} \) we explored. Therefore, if real CMB heat flux resembles that predicted by models TC1 and TC2, outer core flow may experience significant mantle control through heat flux variations on mantle side. It is worth noting that neglecting compositional anomalies would require much larger temperature anomalies to explain observed seismic tomography (e.g. Deschamps et al. 2012), around 2000–3000 K peak-to-peak for shear-velocity anomalies of ±2.5 per cent. This, in turn, implies that \( q^* \) much larger than 1. If, as suggested by Olson & Christensen (2002), dynamo effects are lost for \( q^* > 1 \), the existence of a geodynamo on Earth invalidates a purely thermal lower mantle.

Finally, details of the heat flux distribution may also influence the outer core flow and the geodynamo. A key observation that is often used for comparison is the geomagnetic flux at the CMB (Jackson et al. 2000). High heat flux regions focus magnetic field lines and lead to local highs in the CMB geomagnetic flux. Gubbins et al. (2007) suggested that spherical harmonic degree and order \( l = 2 \) and \( m = 2 \) (\( Y^2_2 \)) heat flux patterns recover the observed geomagnetic flux at CMB well, and that this pattern may be imposed by lower mantle heterogeneities. More precisely, lower mantle heterogeneities may control the longitudinal distribution of the intense flux patches observed at high latitude (the latitude of these patches being constrained by the inner core tangent cylinder). Geomagnetic flux patches are also observed at low latitudes, but their existence is less well understood, in particular because the outer core equatorial upwelling predicted by numerical dynamos disperse magnetic field lines at low latitudes (Amit & Olson 2006). It has been suggested that the location of low latitude patches may be controlled by small scale (\( l > 2 \)) thermochemical heterogeneities at the bottom of the mantle (Amit & Choblet 2012). In particular, Amit et al. (2017) run numerical simulations of geodynamo in which they imposed distributions of CMB heat flux derived from the thermochemical model of Mosca et al. (2012), and found that these simulations reproduce the latitudinal distribution of geomagnetic flux patches better than simulations using heat flux maps built from purely thermal \( Y^2_2 \) patterns. Heat flux patterns inferred from models TC1 and TC2 are both dominated by spherical harmonic \( l = 2 \), but also contain smaller scale complexities that differ for each model (Fig. 11). Heat flux inferred from model TC2 is very
similar to that used by Amit et al. (2017), the main difference being that it takes into account heat flux variations related to changes in thermal conductivity. Numerical simulations of geodynamo using this heat flux map as boundary condition may thus be very similar to those obtained by Amit et al. (2017), and should thus include low latitude patches. In the heat flux map derived from model TC1, by contrast, the \( Y_2^2 \) term is more pronounced, and geodynamo simulations using this pattern as boundary condition may have no or few low latitude patches. Assessing the detailed influence of heat flux patterns inferred from models TC1 and TC2 on CMB geomagnetic flux, however, requires running specific simulations for each of these two models.

6 CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

Using a self-consistent mineral physics data set for thermal conductivities of lower mantle minerals at high pressure, we quantified variations in mantle thermal conductivity induced by changes in temperature and iron and bridgmanite fractions at lowermost mantle conditions. An interesting result is that LLSVPs, if hotter than average mantle and enriched in iron and bridgmanite, should be less thermally conductive than the surrounding mantle, which may in turn alter the dynamics of these structures. By contrast, compared to the direct effect of temperature variations, thermal conductivity anomalies have only a limited impact on lateral variations in CMB heat flux and may not substantially alter outer core dynamics. Saturation and threshold effects, if occurring, are likely to decrease the aggregate conductivity and its relative anomalies. However, quantifying these effects requires new measurements of the thermal conductivities of bridgmanite with iron fraction around 0.05 or less, and ferropericlase with iron fraction in the range 0.15–0.40.

Our modelling is based on lattice thermal conductivities of lower mantle minerals. Lattice thermal conductivity controls heat transfer through lattice vibrations (i.e. phonons), and is usually considered to be the dominant contribution to the thermal conductivity of Earth’s mantle. Heat transfer may also be operated by migrations of electrons (electronic conductivity) or photons (radiative heat transfer), the total (effective) thermal conductivity being the sum of lattice, electronic, and radiative conductivities. Electronic conductivity is important in metals, but is negligible in mantle minerals. By contrast, the contribution of radiative heat transfer is still a matter of debate (Hofmeister & Yuen 2007; Goncharov et al. 2008; Keppler et al. 2008; Kavner & Rainey 2016). Radiative conductivity of lower mantle minerals is strongly reduced by the presence of iron, and is left mostly unaffected by iron spin transitions (Goncharov et al. 2010). Effects of temperature and pressure on radiative conductivity are opposite to those on lattice thermal conductivity, i.e. radiative conductivity increases with temperature but decreases with increasing pressure, due to larger optical absorption. Therefore, heat transfer may be influenced by radiative transport at high temperatures, but in the lowermost mantle this contribution might be compensated or attenuated by high pressure. For instance, it is interesting to note that, along a geotherm, the increase in pressure compensates the effect due to adiabatic temperature increase with depth (Kavner & Rainey 2016). Experimentally, radiative conductivity is estimated from optical properties of mineral, but differences in methods and mineral structures lead to large discrepancies in the estimated values of the radiative conductivity. Yet, available data overall indicate that at lower mantle conditions, radiative conductivity remains much smaller than lattice thermal conductivity. Keppler et al. (2008) found that the radiative conductivity of bridgmanite with \( x_{Fe}^{Bm} = 0.1 \) at \( T_l = 3000 \text{ K} \) and 125 GPa is about 3.0 W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\). Hofmeister and Yuen (2007) calculated mantle radiative conductivity along possible mantle geotherms, and found 2.0 W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\) for an aggregate with 12 per cent iron. The upper estimate is in the range 0.7–5.0 W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\) throughout the lower mantle. In comparison, the lattice conductivity for a pyrolitic mantle (\( x_{Fe}^{Bm} = 0.8 \) and \( x_{Fe}^{Si} = 0.09 \)) at \( T_l = 3000 \text{ K} \) and 134 GPa deduced from the measurements of Hsieh et al. (2017, 2018) is around 8.6 W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\). Clearly, describing heat transfer in Earth’s lower mantle with only lattice thermal conductivity is a good approximation.

More importantly, lowermost mantle thermal conductivity may be affected by structural and compositional changes that are not accounted for in our models, in particular the presence at the bottom of the mantle of post-perovskite (pPv) and of recycled oceanic crust (MORB). Because pPv is not stable at high temperature, it may not be present within LLSVPs. The presence of pPv outside LLSVPs is accounted for in models TC2, resulting in a strong decrease in the amplitude of anomalies in bridgmanite and in the variations in thermal conductivity. However, in absence of experimental constraints on the thermal conductivity of this mineral, the direct impact of pPv on mantle conductivity cannot be assessed. If, for instance, pPv is more conductive than bridgmanite, relative anomalies in thermal conductivity would increase in amplitude compared to the anomalies mapped in Fig. 10(h). Subducted oceanic crust may reach the bottom of the mantle (van der Hilst et al. 1997) and accumulate there, in which case they may contribute to observed seismic anomalies. Numerical simulations indicate that small amounts of recycled MORB may be incorporated in LLSVPs (Tackley 2012; Li et al. 2014). LLSVPs are, however, unlikely composed only of recycled MORB, as it would require exaggerated temperature excess, around 1500 K, to explain observed seismic anomalies (Deschamps et al. 2012). Because MORB are enriched in iron and free of ferropericlase, one would expect the thermal conductivity of MORB to be lower than that of surrounding mantle. However, MORB may also be colder than average, which would balance a potential intrinsic (chemical) reduction of conductivity. Again, in absence of constraints on the thermal conductivity of MORB at high pressure, it is not possible to estimate their impact on lower mantle thermal conductivity. Finally, ULVZs, if hotter than average mantle and strongly enriched in iron (Mao et al. 2006; Wicks et al. 2010), may locally affect thermal conductivity and CMB heat flux. Hsieh et al. (2018) estimated that thermal conductivity within these regions may be reduced down to about 2 W m\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\) if ULVZs are enriched in iron by 20
per cent. While such low conductivities may impact the evolution of ULVZs, their influence on the lower mantle and outer core dynamics may be limited, as ULVZs are small and local structures, typically a few hundreds of kilometres across (for a recent review, see Yu & Garnero 2018).

Despite these limitations, our mapping of lowermost mantle thermal conductivity indicates that this parameter may substantially vary in the deep mantle, possibly influencing lower mantle dynamics. Additional experimental studies for lower mantle minerals, including post-perovskite, together with numerical simulations of thermochemical convection accounting for lateral variations in conductivity will help refining lowermost mantle thermal conductivity maps and assessing the influence of these variations on mantle dynamics.
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APPENDIX

The individual fractions of iron in bridgmanite and ferropericlase, \( x_{BF} \) and \( x_{FP} \), can be obtained by solving eqs (3) and (4), which give the global fraction iron, \( X_{Fe} \), and iron partitioning, \( K_D \), respectively, as a function of the volume fraction of bridgmanite in the aggregate, \( X_{Bm} \), and of \( x_{BF} \) and \( x_{FP} \). Combining these equations, one gets two 2nd order polynomials, one in \( x_{BF} \) and one in \( x_{FP} \). Each of these two polynomials has only one positive solution, which gives the expression of \( x_{BF} \) and \( x_{FP} \):

\[
x_{BF} = \frac{1 + (X_{Bm} + X_{Fe})(K_D - 1) - \sqrt{1 + (X_{Bm} + X_{Fe})(K_D - 1)^2 - 4X_{Bm}(K_D - 1)K_D X_{Fe}}}{2X_{Bm}(K_D - 1)}
\]

(A1)

and

\[
x_{FP} = \frac{1 + (X_{Bm} - X_{Fe})(K_D - 1) - \sqrt{1 + (X_{Bm} - X_{Fe})(K_D - 1)^2 + 4(1 - X_{Bm})(K_D - 1)X_{Fe}}}{2(1 - X_{Bm})(K_D - 1)}.
\]

(A2)

The thermal conductivity of an aggregate of bridgmanite and ferropericlase depends on both the global fraction in iron of the aggregate, \( X_{Fe} \), and its volume fraction of bridgmanite, \( X_{Bm} \). If the aggregate conductivity is defined by the geometric average of the lower and upper HS bounds, \( \Lambda_{HS} \) and \( \Lambda_{HS+} \), relative anomalies in the aggregate conductivity are given by

\[
d\ln \frac{\Lambda_{HS}}{\Lambda_{HS+}} = \frac{1}{\Lambda_{ref}} \frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS}}{\partial X_{Bm}} dX_{Bm} = \frac{1}{2 \Lambda_{ref}} \left( \frac{\Lambda_{HS} \cdot \partial \Lambda_{HS-}}{\Lambda_{HS+}} \frac{\partial X_{Bm}}{\Lambda_{HS+}} + \frac{\Lambda_{HS+} \cdot \partial \Lambda_{HS+}}{\Lambda_{HS-}} \frac{\partial X_{Bm}}{\partial X_{Bm}} \right) dX_{Bm},
\]

(A3)

and

\[
d\ln \frac{\Lambda_{HS}}{\Lambda_{HS+}} = \frac{1}{\Lambda_{ref}} \frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS}}{\partial X_{Fe}} dX_{Fe} = \frac{1}{2 \Lambda_{ref}} \left( \frac{\Lambda_{HS} \cdot \partial \Lambda_{HS-}}{\Lambda_{HS+}} \frac{\partial X_{Fe}}{\Lambda_{HS+}} + \frac{\Lambda_{HS+} \cdot \partial \Lambda_{HS+}}{\Lambda_{HS-}} \frac{\partial X_{Fe}}{\partial X_{Fe}} \right) dX_{Fe}.
\]

(A4)
where \( \Lambda_{\text{ref}} \) is the conductivity at reference composition \( X_{Bm,\text{ref}} \) and \( X_{Fe,\text{ref}} \). Partial derivatives of \( \Lambda_{HS-} \) and \( \Lambda_{HS+} \) with respect to \( X_{Bm} \) and \( X_{Fe} \) can be written

\[
\frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS-}}{\partial X_{Bm}} = -\frac{1}{3} \left[ \Lambda_{Bm} + X_{Bm} (\Lambda_{FP} - \Lambda_{Bm}) / 3 \right]^2 \frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS-}}{\partial \Lambda_{Bm}} + \frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS-}}{\partial \Lambda_{FP}} \frac{\partial \Lambda_{FP}}{\partial X_{Bm}}.
\]

(A5)

\[
\frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS+}}{\partial X_{Bm}} = \frac{1}{3} \left[ \Lambda_{Bm} + X_{Bm} (\Lambda_{FP} - \Lambda_{Bm}) / 3 \right]^2 \frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS+}}{\partial \Lambda_{Bm}} + \frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS+}}{\partial \Lambda_{FP}} \frac{\partial \Lambda_{FP}}{\partial X_{Bm}}.
\]

(A6)

\[
\frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS-}}{\partial X_{Fe}} = \frac{1}{\Lambda_{Bm}} \left[ \Lambda_{Bm} - X_{Bm} (\Lambda_{FP} - \Lambda_{Bm}) / 3 \right]^2 \frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS-}}{\partial \Lambda_{Bm}} + \frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS-}}{\partial \Lambda_{FP}} \frac{\partial \Lambda_{FP}}{\partial X_{Fe}}.
\]

(A7)

\[
\frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS+}}{\partial X_{Fe}} = \frac{1}{\Lambda_{Bm}} \left[ \Lambda_{Bm} - X_{Bm} (\Lambda_{FP} - \Lambda_{Bm}) / 3 \right]^2 \frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS+}}{\partial \Lambda_{Bm}} + \frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS+}}{\partial \Lambda_{FP}} \frac{\partial \Lambda_{FP}}{\partial X_{Fe}}.
\]

(A8)

Eqs (A5)–(A8) involve partial derivatives of HS bounds with respect to the individual conductivities of bridmanite and ferropericlase, \( \Lambda_{Bm} \) and \( \Lambda_{FP} \), which are given by

\[
\frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS-}}{\partial \Lambda_{Bm}} = \frac{1}{\Lambda_{Bm}} \left[ \Lambda_{Bm} - X_{Bm} (\Lambda_{FP} - \Lambda_{Bm}) / 3 \right]^2.
\]

(A9)

\[
\frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS-}}{\partial \Lambda_{FP}} = \frac{(1 - X_{Bm}) \Lambda_{FP}^2}{\Lambda_{Bm} + X_{Bm} (\Lambda_{FP} - \Lambda_{Bm}) / 3}.
\]

(A10)

\[
\frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS+}}{\partial \Lambda_{Bm}} = \frac{X_{Bm} \Lambda_{FP}^2}{\Lambda_{FP} - (1 - X_{Bm}) (\Lambda_{FP} - \Lambda_{Bm}) / 3}.
\]

(A11)

\[
\frac{\partial \Lambda_{HS+}}{\partial \Lambda_{FP}} = \frac{1}{\Lambda_{FP} - (1 - X_{Bm}) (\Lambda_{FP} - \Lambda_{Bm}) / 3}.
\]

(A12)

Derivatives of \( \Lambda_{Bm} \) and \( \Lambda_{FP} \), with respect to \( X_{Fe} \) and \( X_{Bm} \), which also appear in derivatives of \( \Lambda_{HS-} \) and \( \Lambda_{HS+} \) (eqs A5–A8), may be rewritten as a function of derivatives with respect to individual fractions of iron \( x_{Fe}^{Bm} \) and \( x_{Fe}^{FP} \) following:

\[
\frac{\partial \Lambda_{i}}{\partial X_{Bm}} = \frac{\partial \Lambda_{i}}{\partial x_{Fe}^{Bm}} \frac{\partial x_{Fe}^{Bm}}{\partial X_{Bm}}
\]

(A13)

and

\[
\frac{\partial \Lambda_{i}}{\partial X_{Fe}} = \frac{\partial \Lambda_{i}}{\partial x_{Fe}^{FP}} \frac{\partial x_{Fe}^{FP}}{\partial X_{Fe}}
\]

(A14)

where subscripts and superscripts \( i \) stand either for bridmanite, Bm, or ferropericlase, Fp. Derivatives of \( x_{Fe}^{Bm} \) and \( x_{Fe}^{FP} \) with respect to \( X_{Fe} \) and \( X_{Bm} \) can then be calculated from eqs (A1) and (A2), leading to

\[
\frac{\partial x_{Fe}^{Bm}}{\partial X_{Bm}} = \frac{1}{2 X_{Bm}} \left[ 1 - 2 x_{Fe}^{Bm} \left( \frac{(1 - X_{Bm}) + K_D X_{Bm} - X_{Fe} (K_D + 1)}{\sqrt{1 + (X_{Bm} + X_{Fe}) (K_D - 1)}^2 - 4 X_{Bm} (K_D - 1) K_D X_{Fe}} \right) \right] \frac{\partial \Lambda_{Bm}}{\partial X_{Bm}}
\]

(A15)

\[
\frac{\partial x_{Fe}^{FP}}{\partial X_{Bm}} = \frac{1}{2 X_{Bm}} \left[ 1 - 2 x_{Fe}^{FP} \left( \frac{(1 - X_{Bm}) + K_D X_{Bm} - X_{Fe} (K_D + 1)}{\sqrt{1 + (X_{Bm} + X_{Fe}) (K_D - 1)}^2 - 4 X_{Bm} (K_D - 1) K_D X_{Fe}} \right) \right] \frac{\partial \Lambda_{FP}}{\partial X_{Bm}}
\]

(A16)

\[
\frac{\partial x_{Fe}^{Bm}}{\partial X_{Fe}} = \frac{1}{2 X_{Bm}} \left[ 1 - \frac{(1 - X_{Bm}) - K_D X_{Bm} + X_{Fe} (K_D - 1)}{\sqrt{1 + (X_{Bm} + X_{Fe}) (K_D - 1)}^2 - 4 X_{Bm} (K_D - 1) K_D X_{Fe}} \right] \frac{\partial \Lambda_{Bm}}{\partial X_{Fe}}
\]

(A17)

\[
\frac{\partial x_{Fe}^{FP}}{\partial X_{Fe}} = \frac{1}{2 X_{Bm}} \left[ 1 + \frac{(1 - X_{Bm}) - K_D X_{Bm} + X_{Fe} (K_D - 1)}{\sqrt{1 + (X_{Bm} + X_{Fe}) (K_D - 1)}^2 - 4 X_{Bm} (K_D - 1) K_D X_{Fe}} \right] \frac{\partial \Lambda_{FP}}{\partial X_{Fe}}
\]

(A18)
Finally, because we defined conductivity anomalies relatively to a reference conductivity at a reference composition $X_{\text{Bm,ref}}$ and $X_{\text{Fe,ref}}$, the derivatives of $\Lambda_{\text{Bm}}$ with respect to $x_{\text{Bm,Fe}}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{Fp}}$ with respect to $x_{\text{Fp,Fe}}$ may be written

$$
\frac{\partial \Lambda_{\text{Bm}}}{\partial x_{\text{Bm,Fe}}} = \frac{(\Lambda_{\text{Bm}} - \Lambda_{\text{Bm,ref}})}{(x_{\text{Bm,Fe}} - x_{\text{Bm,ref}})}
$$

and

$$
\frac{\partial \Lambda_{\text{Fp}}}{\partial x_{\text{Fp,Fe}}} = \frac{(\Lambda_{\text{Fp}} - \Lambda_{\text{Fp,ref}})}{(x_{\text{Fp,Fe}} - x_{\text{Fp,ref}})}
$$

(A19)

(A20)

where $\Lambda_{\text{Bm,ref}}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{Fp,ref}}$ are the conductivities of bridgmanite and ferroperriclase at reference iron fractions, $x_{\text{Bm,Fe,ref}}$ and $x_{\text{Fp,Fe,ref}}$, that is, calculated by solving eqs (3) and (4) with the prescribed $X_{\text{Bm,ref}}$ and $X_{\text{Fe,ref}}$. 