Kilometer-scale structure on the core-mantle boundary at the source of the Hawaiian mantle plume

Zhi Li (✉ zl382@cam.ac.uk)

University of Cambridge <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5657-655X>

Kuangdai Leng

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory

Jennifer Jenkins

Durham University

Sanne Cottaar

Cambridge University

Article

Keywords: Ultra-Low Velocity Zones, mantle plumes, shear wave velocity, core-mantle interaction

Posted Date: November 17th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-118686/v2>

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Nature Communications on May 19th, 2022. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-30502-5>.

Title: Kilometer-scale structure on the core-mantle boundary at the source of the Hawaiian mantle plume

Authors: Zhi Li^{1*}, Kuangdai Leng^{2,3}, Jennifer Jenkins¹, Sanne Cottaar¹.

Affiliations:

¹Bullard Laboratory, Department of Earth Sciences, University of Cambridge, CB3 0EZ, UK.

²Department of Earth Science, University of Oxford, OX1 3AN, UK.

³Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Science and Technology Facilities Council, Didcot OX11 0QX, UK.

*Correspondence to: zl382@cam.ac.uk.

Abstract

The lowermost mantle right above the core-mantle boundary is highly heterogeneous containing multiple poorly understood seismic features visible across a wide range of length scales. The smallest but most extreme heterogeneities yet observed are 'Ultra-Low Velocity Zones' (ULVZ), several of which have recently been linked to the base of mantle plumes. We exploit seismic shear waves that diffract along the core-mantle boundary to provide new insight into these enigmatic structures. We demonstrate that these waves have a strong frequency-dependent sensitivity to structure at different length scales above the core-mantle boundary. We measure a rare core-diffracted signal refracted by a ULVZ at the base of the Hawaiian mantle plume at unprecedentedly high frequencies. This signal shows remarkably longer time delays at higher compared to lower frequencies, indicating extreme internal variability within the Hawaiian ULVZ. Utilizing the latest computational advances in 3D synthetic waveform modeling, we are able to model this high frequency signal and constrain high-resolution structure on the scale of kilometers at the core-mantle boundary, for the first time. Results reveal that the lowermost part of the Hawaiian ULVZ is extremely reduced in shear wave velocity, by up to -40%. This new observation suggests a chemically distinct ULVZ with increasing iron content towards the core-mantle boundary, which has implications for Earth's early evolutionary history and core-mantle interaction.

Introduction

The core-mantle boundary separates the Earth's liquid iron-nickel outer core from the solid silicate mantle. Heat from the core powers convection in the mantle, driving hot buoyant upwellings known as mantle plumes, that rise from the core-mantle boundary to the Earth's surface where they form hotspots and volcanoes. Over the past few decades, seismology has revealed that the mantle immediately above the core-mantle boundary is highly heterogeneous, potentially analogous to the level of variability seen at lithospheric and crustal levels near the Earth's surface¹.

Ultra-Low Velocity Zones (ULVZs) represent the most extreme core-mantle boundary features yet observed, generally showing shear-wave velocity reductions of 10% to 30%². However, the small height of these structures - only tens of kilometers high - means they are below the resolution limit of tomographic models, requiring higher frequency seismic waves to image them. Currently available seismic data have limited earthquake-station geometries that can be used to image these structures and therefore only a fraction of the core-mantle boundary is illuminated. Despite this, a number of ULVZs varying in size, shape and velocity reduction have been reported^{2,3}. Early studies interpreted ULVZs as sporadic and localized structures, but found little constraint on their lateral extent⁴⁻⁶. More recently four unusually large ULVZs linked to areas of hotspot volcanism have been mapped near Hawaii⁷, Iceland⁸, Samoa⁹ and the Marquesas¹⁰. Unlike earlier studies, which suggested ULVZs represented small-scale structures, these new observations indicate the presence of thin but wide ULVZs, on the order of 600-900 km across. These have been dubbed 'mega-ULVZs' in some literature. The large aspect ratio of mega-ULVZs suggest they are very dense compared to their surroundings¹¹, which could be explained by iron enrichment^{12,13}. Increasing evidence suggests that the correlation between the geographic location of mega-ULVZs and surface hotspots may not be a coincidence, i.e. the isotopic tungsten anomalies collected in various ocean island basalts indicate a primordial material or signatures from core infiltration in the mantle plume^{14,15}.

Three of the recently observed mega-ULVZs, beneath Hawaii, Iceland and the Marquesas, have been discovered using core diffracted shear-waves known as S_{diff} ^{7,8,10}. S_{diff} phases are observed at epicentral distances over 100°, and sometimes extending to up 140° after a long refraction path along the core-mantle boundary (Fig. 1B). Higher frequency S_{diff} energy gets trapped in thin mega-ULVZs, becoming delayed and refracted. On a seismogram these guided waves appear tens of seconds after the main S_{diff} phase, and for a cylindrical ULVZ show a hyperbolic delayed move-out as a function of azimuth⁷. We refer to these as S_{diff} postcursors. The travel time delays of S_{diff} postcursors hold information on the size, shape, and average velocity reduction of the ULVZ they sample⁷. Here we demonstrate that the frequency content and dispersive properties of these phases also contain information on the vertical internal velocity structure of ULVZs. Although S_{diff} waves sample a reasonably large area of the core-mantle boundary, the observation of S_{diff} postcursor waves is still quite rare. This is partly due to the requirement of a continuous and dense array of recording seismic stations. The previous observations of mega-ULVZs can all be attributed to the deployment of the large-scale US Transportable Array¹⁶.

Location of the Hawaiian ULVZ

When S_{diff} postcursors illuminate a ULVZ from a specific direction, the exact location can be anywhere along the diffracted path, and there are trade-offs between location, size, and velocity reduction in the modelling of these structures. The Hawaiian ULVZ was initially identified using S_{diff} waves from deep earthquakes in Papua New Guinea recorded at the transportable array and other stations in the central United States⁷ (Fig. S2). This left uncertainty as to the exact location of the ULVZ in the NE-SW direction along the S_{diff} path, and calls into question the reliability of the simplified cylindrical model proposed to fit the data. With the redeployment of the transportable array to Alaska starting in 2014, increased data coverage of S_{diff} waves that highlight the Hawaiian ULVZ in the N-S direction is now available. Four deep earthquakes from the Kermadec trench recorded in Alaska show postcursor energy caused by the Hawaiian ULVZ

(Fig S3). Using this new data, we are now able to pinpoint the precise location of the Hawaiian ULVZ (Fig. 1A). The hyperbolic travel times of postcursors across this data set suggest the ULVZ is centered at 172.3°W and 15.4°N - offset further southwest from the Hawaiian Islands than previously thought⁷. Although the exact shape of the ULVZ is not well-constrained given the current data coverage, synthetic modellings of the waveforms from two directions indicate a cylindrical shape is a good first approximation of the Hawaiian ULVZ (Fig. S2 and S3), similar to that proposed for the Icelandic ULVZ⁸.

High-frequency S_{diff} Postcursors

Previously, S_{diff} postcursors have been observed down to periods of 10s (frequencies ≤ 0.1 Hz), which corresponds to a 500km wide horizontal resolution (based on Fresnel zone half width) and limits the vertical resolution of imaged ULVZs to tens of kilometers (Fig. S4). This is insufficient to unravel the details of internal ULVZ velocity gradients, which requires the exploitation of higher-frequency observations. However, pushing S_{diff} observations to higher frequencies is challenging: arrival amplitudes are weaker, background noise from ocean waves is louder (peaking at 0.14 Hz), and the computational costs for modeling full 3D synthetic data increases as power of frequency^{17,18}. In this study, we make the first high-frequency observations of S_{diff} postcursors down to 3s (≤ 0.3 Hz), allowing us to infer internal ULVZ structure on the order of kilometers.

We focus on the high-quality S_{diff} data from a 2010 earthquake in the Papua New-Guinea area recorded in the contiguous United States (Fig. 1A in yellow). The S_{diff} observations are filtered into two frequency bands for comparison, one from 10 to 20 s ('long-period'), and one from 3 to 6 s ('short-period'). The energy of the short-period phase is very weak; it is barely observable in the raw data (Fig. S1). To enhance the signal-to-noise ratio, we apply a sub-array phase-weighted beamforming technique for each station and its nearest 20 neighbors, which stacks the signals based on phase and directional coherency (Methods). Figure 2 shows the results of this phase-weighted stacking in separate time windows for the main S_{diff} arrivals and postcursors, each of which is stacked along their respective incoming directions (Fig. 2C and 2F). The long-period S_{diff} stacked signals (Fig. 2A) look similar to unstacked waveforms (Fig. S1), while the short-period postcursor stacked signals (Fig. 2D) emerge from what appears to be mainly background noise in the raw data (Fig. S1).

We observe that at long-periods the postcursor arrives at around 35 to 50s, varying with azimuth (Fig. 2B). Strikingly, at short-periods the postcursors are significantly more delayed, arriving at 50 to 70s (Fig. 2E). Frequency-dependent travel times with differences on the order of tens of seconds between long and short-period S_{diff} postcursor waves have never been documented before, though weak frequency-dependent dispersion of core-diffracted waves has been suggested based on global statistical analysis of ray parameters¹⁹. The main S_{diff} phase and the postcursor have different incoming directions due to 3D out-of-path effects (Fig. S5). While the incoming backazimuth direction of S_{diff} phases are slightly scattered (Fig. 2C and 2F), they remain reasonably consistent across both long- and short-period measurements. Gradual deviation from 0° to 15° away from the epicenter backazimuth (Fig. 2C and 2F) implies a strong

bending effect that can only be explained by interaction with a structure of strong velocity contrast⁷. Combining observations of postcursor travel time delays and backazimuth deviations, suggests that while waves at the two periods sample similar geographical regions, the seismic velocities at the different length scales above the core-mantle boundary they are sensitive to, differ significantly.

Modeling of the ULVZ's internal structure

Detailed waveform modelling of the Hawaiian ULVZ based on long-period postcursor data has been shown in the previous study⁷. We refine their preferred model of a 20km tall cylindrical ULVZ of radius 455km with a shear velocity reduction of 20%, to include details of finer internal structure based on our short-period observations and updated location. Initially we explore the model space of a simplified cylindrical ULVZ using computationally cheap ray-based modelling (Fig. S10, S11), followed by 2.5D modelling¹⁸ down to 3s (Methods). This reveals that the short-period postcursor observations can be explained by an ~2km thick layer with extreme velocity reduction (40%) at the base of the ULVZ, or by the presence of a less anomalous, but wider spread, basal layer (Fig. S12).

While it is still very challenging to simulate full 3D ULVZ synthetics at the high frequencies we explore here, a recent method development combining wavefield injection with AxiSEM3D makes full 3D global ULVZ synthetics down to 1s achievable for the first time²⁰. We compute 3D synthetics using a 20km thick ULVZ model with an extreme 2km basal layer of 40% shear velocity reduction, based on our 2.5D modeling. We also compute three additional models for comparison (Fig. 3C): a uniform ULVZ with a shear velocity reduction of 20%, a gradient ULVZ varying from a shear velocity reduction of 10% at the top to 30% at the bottom, and a two-layered ULVZ with an upper layer of 10 km reduced by 10% in velocity and a bottom layer of 10 km reduced by 30% (Fig. 3C). The latter three models have an equivalent velocity reduction when integrated vertically across the ULVZ. Long-period data are unable to discriminate between these four models (Fig. 3A). Short-period data however, show strong differences in the travel times of the modeled S_{diff} postcursors (Fig. 3B), with the uniform ULVZ model showing the weakest delay times and the two-layered model showing the strongest delay times. Both the gradient ULVZ and the ULVZ with a 2km extreme basal layer show good fits to the observed dispersion across both frequency bands. While not presenting a unique solution, these 3D high-frequency synthetics demonstrate that an extreme velocity reduced, kilometer-scale basal ULVZ layer above the core-mantle boundary is required to explain the observed waveform dispersion.

Implications for Earth's early evolution history and core-mantle interaction

This unprecedented record of extreme seismic velocity reduction in the basal layer of the Hawaiian mega-ULVZ sheds new light on the nature of these features and the complex processes happening at the core-mantle boundary. The steep thermal boundary just above the core is likely to explain some of the change in velocity with depth, but thermal effects can, at most, only explain several percent velocity reduction. The approximately axisymmetric shape of the ULVZ suggests a natural dynamical link between a cylindrical plume upwelling and the partial melting that might occur at its base⁸. However, the extreme shear velocity reductions of up to 40% that

we observe would require a melt fraction likely to be above the percolation threshold²¹. Additionally, these melts would likely be iron-rich and denser than the solid²², causing them to drain out²¹.

Our velocity constraints instead suggest a compositionally distinct mega-ULVZ containing increasing iron content with depth. Iron-rich post-perovskite²³ or iron-rich magnesiowüstite¹³ have been proposed as candidate minerals that could form significant proportions of solid-state ULVZs. Mixing iron-rich magnesiowüstite with bridgmanite would suggest a model with ~20% magnesiowüstite at the top to ~70% magnesiowüstite in the extreme basal layer¹³.

ULVZs have been hypothesised to represent remnants of an ancient global basal magma ocean²⁴. If this is the case, the vertical varying ULVZ structure observed holds clues to changing levels of iron fractionation at different stages of magma ocean crystallisation. Alternatively, strongly iron-enriched compositions in the lowermost mantle may trace Earth's early impact history, when iron-rich impactor cores mixed with the silicate mantle and accumulated at the core-mantle boundary²⁵. An alternative source of iron enrichment is through interactions with the Earth's core. The extreme anomalous composition on the CMB might allow compositional mass transfer from the core²⁶. It is possible that the extreme basal layer in our model represents the first observation of crystallisation products formed by core exsolution – a process that is suggested to have driven the early dynamo^{27–29}. Core products infiltrating the mantle is supported by observations of anomalous, potentially core-related, isotopic signals in hotspot lavas^{14,15,30}, which imply the Hawaiian ULVZ is not a closed reservoir, but is likely to be entrained in small amounts into the plume³¹.

The observation of this extreme anomaly in the deepest mantle, not only pushes the boundary on the degree of chemical heterogeneity present, but also implies a strong variation in heat flux across the CMB, suggesting greater potential for mechanical and electromagnetic coupling²⁶. These are important boundary conditions needed to understand the convective flows generating the geodynamo and mantle plumes^{32–35}.

References

1. Rost, S. Deep earth: Core-mantle boundary landscapes. *Nature Geoscience* vol. 6 89–90 (2013).
2. Yu, S. & Garnero, E. J. Ultralow Velocity Zone Locations: A Global Assessment. *Geochemistry, Geophys. Geosystems* **19**, 396–414 (2018).
3. Thorne, M. S. *et al.* The Most Parsimonious Ultralow-Velocity Zone Distribution From Highly Anomalous SPdKS Waveforms. *Geochemistry, Geophys. Geosystems* **22**, e2020GC009467 (2021).
4. Garnero, E. J., Revenaugh, J., Williams, Q., Lay, T. & Kellogg, L. H. Ultralow velocity zone at the core-mantle boundary. in *The Core-Mantle Boundary Region* (eds. Gurnis, M., Wyssession, M. E., Knittle, E. & Buffett, B. A.) vol. 28 319–334 (American Geophysical Union, 1998).
5. Thorne, M. S. & Garnero, E. J. Inferences on ultralow-velocity zone structure from a

- global analysis of SPdKS waves. *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth* **109**, (2004).
6. Garnero, E. J. Heterogeneity of the lowermost mantle. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* **28**, 509–537 (2000).
 7. Cottaar, S. & Romanowicz, B. An unusually large ULVZ at the base of the mantle near Hawaii. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **355–356**, 213–222 (2012).
 8. Yuan, K. & Romanowicz, B. Seismic evidence for partial melting at the root of major hot spot plumes. *Science (80-.)*. **357**, (2017).
 9. Thorne, M. S., Garnero, E. J., Jahnke, G., Igel, H. & McNamara, A. K. Mega ultra low velocity zone and mantle flow. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **364**, 59–67 (2013).
 10. Kim, D., Lekić, V., Ménard, B., Baron, D. & Taghizadeh-Popp, M. Sequencing seismograms: A panoptic view of scattering in the core-mantle boundary region. *Science (80-.)*. **368**, 1223–1228 (2020).
 11. Bower, D. J., Wicks, J. K., Gurnis, M. & Jackson, J. M. A geodynamic and mineral physics model of a solid-state ultralow-velocity zone. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **303**, 193–202 (2011).
 12. Wicks, J. K., Jackson, J. M. & Sturhahn, W. Very low sound velocities in iron-rich (Mg,Fe)O: Implications for the core-mantle boundary region. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **37**, (2010).
 13. Wicks, J. K., Jackson, J. M., Sturhahn, W. & Zhang, D. Sound velocity and density of magnesiowüstites: Implications for ultralow-velocity zone topography. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **44**, 2148–2158 (2017).
 14. Mundl, A. *et al.* Tungsten-182 heterogeneity in modern ocean island basalts. *Science (80-.)*. **356**, 66–69 (2017).
 15. Mundl-Petermeier, A. *et al.* Anomalous 182W in high 3He/4He ocean island basalts: Fingerprints of Earth’s core? *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **271**, 194–211 (2020).
 16. IRIS Transportable Array. USArray Transportable Array. (2003) doi:10.7914/SN/TA.
 17. Nissen-Meyer, T. *et al.* AxiSEM: Broadband 3-D seismic wavefields in axisymmetric media. *Solid Earth* **5**, 425–445 (2014).
 18. Leng, K., Nissen-Meyer, T., Van Driel, M., Hosseini, K. & Al-Attar, D. AxiSEM3D: Broad-band seismic wavefields in 3-D global earth models with undulating discontinuities. *Geophys. J. Int.* **217**, 2125–2146 (2019).
 19. Euler, G. G. & Wyssession, M. E. Geographic variations in lowermost mantle structure from the ray parameters and decay constants of core-diffracted waves. *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth* **122**, 5369–5394 (2017).
 20. Leng, K., Korenaga, J. & Nissen-Meyer, T. 3-D scattering of elastic waves by small-scale heterogeneities in the Earth’s mantle. *Geophys. J. Int.* **223**, 502–525 (2020).
 21. Hernlund, J. W. & Jellinek, A. M. Dynamics and structure of a stirred partially molten ultralow-velocity zone. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **296**, 1–8 (2010).
 22. Nomura, R. *et al.* Spin crossover and iron-rich silicate melt in the Earth’s deep mantle.

- Nature* **473**, 199–202 (2011).
23. Mao, W. L. *et al.* Iron-rich post-perovskite and the origin of ultralow-velocity zones. *Science* (80-.). **312**, 564–565 (2006).
 24. Labrosse, S., Hernlund, J. W. & Coltice, N. A crystallizing dense magma ocean at the base of the Earth’s mantle. *Nature* **450**, 866–869 (2007).
 25. Jackson, C. R. M., Bennett, N. R., Du, Z., Cottrell, E. & Fei, Y. Early episodes of high-pressure core formation preserved in plume mantle. *Nature* **553**, 491–495 (2018).
 26. Buffett, B. A. Core-Mantle Interactions. in *Treatise on Geophysics: Second Edition* vol. 8 213–224 (Elsevier Inc., 2015).
 27. Badro, J., Siebert, J. & Nimmo, F. An early geodynamo driven by exsolution of mantle components from Earth’s core. *Nature* **536**, 326–328 (2016).
 28. O’Rourke, J. G. & Stevenson, D. J. Powering Earth’s dynamo with magnesium precipitation from the core. *Nature* **529**, 387–389 (2016).
 29. Hirose, K. *et al.* Crystallization of silicon dioxide and compositional evolution of the Earth’s core. *Nature* **543**, 99–102 (2017).
 30. Brandon, A. D. & Walker, R. J. The debate over core-mantle interaction. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **232**, 211–225 (2005).
 31. Jones, T. D., Davies, D. R. & Sossi, P. A. Tungsten isotopes in mantle plumes: Heads it’s positive, tails it’s negative. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **506**, 255–267 (2019).
 32. Mound, J., Davies, C., Rost, S. & Aurnou, J. Regional stratification at the top of Earth’s core due to core–mantle boundary heat flux variations. *Nat. Geosci.* **12**, 575–580 (2019).
 33. Li, M., McNamara, A. K., Garnero, E. J. & Yu, S. Compositionally-distinct ultra-low velocity zones on Earth’s core-mantle boundary. *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 1–9 (2017).
 34. Amit, H. & Choblet, G. Mantle-driven geodynamo features - Effects of compositional and narrow D’ anomalies. *Phys. Earth Planet. Inter.* **190–191**, 34–43 (2012).
 35. Koppers, A. A. P. *et al.* Mantle plumes and their role in Earth processes. *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.* **2**, 382–401 (2021).
 36. French, S. W. & Romanowicz, B. A. Whole-mantle radially anisotropic shear velocity structure from spectral-element waveform tomography. *Geophys. J. Int.* **199**, 1303–1327 (2014).
 37. Dziewonski, A. M. & Anderson, D. L. Preliminary reference Earth model. *Phys. Earth Planet. Inter.* **25**, 297–356 (1981).
 38. Krischer, L. *et al.* ObsPy: A bridge for seismology into the scientific Python ecosystem. *Comput. Sci. Discov.* **8**, 14003 (2015).
 39. Capdeville, Y., Chaljub, E., Vilotte, J. P. & Montagner, J. P. Coupling the spectral element method with a modal solution for elastic wave propagation in global earth models. *Geophys. J. Int.* **152**, 34–67 (2003).
 40. Dziewonski, A. M., Chou, T. A. & Woodhouse, J. H. Determination of earthquake source parameters from waveform data for studies of global and regional seismicity. *J. Geophys.*

Res. **86**, 2825–2852 (1981).

41. Komatitsch, D. & Tromp, J. Spectral-element simulations of global seismic wave propagation - I. Validation. *Geophys. J. Int.* **149**, 390–412 (2002).
42. Tromp, J., Tape, C. & Liu, Q. Seismic tomography, adjoint methods, time reversal and banana-doughnut kernels. *Geophys. J. Int.* **160**, 195–216 (2005).
43. Aki, K. & Richards, P. G. *Quantitative seismology*. (2002).
44. Rost, S. Array seismology: Methods and applications. *Rev. Geophys.* **40**, 1008 (2002).
45. Kennett, B. L. N. & Engdahl, E. R. Traveltimes for global earthquake location and phase identification. *Geophys. J. Int.* **105**, 429–465 (1991).
46. Crotwell, H. P., Owens, T. J. & Ritsema, J. The TauP Toolkit: Flexible Seismic Travel-time and Ray-path Utilities. *Seismol. Res. Lett.* **70**, 154–160 (1999).
47. Koch, K. & Kradolfer, U. Determination of Mislocation Vectors to Evaluate bias at GSETT-3 primary stations. *J. Seismol.* **1999** *32* **3**, 139–151 (1999).
48. Schimmel, M. & Paulssen, H. Noise reduction and detection of weak, coherent signals through phase-weighted stacks. *Geophys. J. Int.* **130**, 497–505 (1997).

Acknowledgments We acknowledge the IRIS (Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology) data center for providing all the data. This work was performed using resources provided by the Cambridge Service for Data Driven Discovery (CSD3) operated by the University of Cambridge Research Computing Service. We thank D. Al-Attar for input on the kernel calculation and W. Liu for discussions on our interpretation. This work is supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No.804071-ZoomDeep). K.L is supported by US-NSF and UK-NERC under joint grant NE/R012199/1 and by US-NSF under grant EAR-1610612.

Author contributions Z.L.: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Formal Analysis, Writing - Original Draft, K.L.: Methodology, Software. J.J.: Visualization, Writing- Review & Editing, Supervision. S.C. Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing- Review & Editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition.

Competing interests Authors declare no competing interests.

Data availability The data used in this study are available from the IRIS (Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology) data center (<https://www.iris.edu/>). We also make our synthetics and processed data available on <https://zenodo.org/record/4911586>.

Code availability Computer codes used to produce these results will be made available upon request to the corresponding author.

Fig. 1. Events and S_{diff} ray paths used in this study. (A) Events and S_{diff} ray paths on the Background tomography model SEMUCB_WM1 at 2800 km depth³⁶. Beachballs of events plotted in different colors including 20100320 (yellow), 20111214 (green), 20120417 (red), 20180910 (purple), 20180518 (brown), 20181030 (pink), 20161122 (grey), stations (triangles), and raypaths of S_{diff} waves at pierce depth 2791km in the lowermost mantle used in this study. The event used in short-period analysis are highlighted in yellow. Proposed ULVZ location shown with black circle. (B) Cross section along the black dashed line in A slicing the center of Hawaiian ULVZ, showing raypaths of S_{diff} waves at 96°, 100°, 110° and 120° for 1D Earth model PREM³⁷. The dashed lines from top to bottom mark the 410km, 660km discontinuity, and 2791km (100km above the CMB). Ray paths below 2791km are highlighted in yellow.

Fig. 2. Stacked data and beamforming results for the main S_{diff} phases and postcursors arrivals of the Event 20100320. Time axis is aligned by the predicted S_{diff} traveltime. The beamforming is performed by the predicted S_{diff} slowness at 8.32 s° . (A) Phase weighted stacks for 10-20s filtered data. Data stacks before 20s (black dashed line) use the incoming direction of the main arrival (blue), post 20s stacks use the incoming direction of postcursor energy (red). (B) Travel time measurements from the maxima of stacked waveform envelopes in A. (C) Backazimuth deviations, i.e. the incoming directions used in the stacks. Error bars represent the max variance of the measurement when the value of S_{diff} slowness is varied by $\pm 5\%$. (D-F) as for A-C but for 3-6s filtered data. Yellow dashed lines show the azimuth through the center of the proposed ULVZ.

Fig. 3. 3D Synthetic waveforms of four different ULVZ models computed down to period of 3 s. Synthetics are made for a uniform ULVZ model of 20km with -20% $d\ln V_S$ (orange), a two-layer ULVZ model of 10km -10% $d\ln V_S$ layer on top plus a 10km -30% $d\ln V_S$ layer at bottom (red), a 20km gradient model changing gradually with ULVZ height from -10% to -30% $d\ln V_S$ (blue), and an extreme 2km -40% $d\ln V_S$ basal layer (purple) within a ULVZ of 20km thickness with -20% $d\ln V_S$. Synthetic waveforms filtered into the (A) long-period range (10s - 20s) and (B) short-period range (3s - 6s). The source depth and the distance to the ULVZ are the same as for Event 20100320. The ULVZ model is located at 0° azimuth and 39.7° distance from the source. The synthetics are shown for epicentral distances of 105° as a function of azimuth with time axis aligned by the predicted S_{diff} traveltime. The waveforms of the short-period postcursor are filled to emphasize them. Note that the gradient model (blue) and 2 km extreme basal model (purple) nearly overlap. The faded yellow shading indicates the time delay ranges for the long- and short-period postcursors as observed in the real data. (C) Cartoons of four different ULVZ models tested in the synthetics.

Fig. 4. Conceptual cartoons of the Hawaiian ULVZ. (A) ULVZ on the core-mantle boundary at the base of the Hawaiian plume (height is not to scale), (B) sketch of wavefront refraction for the long-period (black) and short-period (green) S_{diff} postcursors, and (C) a zoom in of modeled ULVZ structure, showing interpreted trapped postcursor waves (note that the waves analysed have horizontal displacement).

Methods

Data Processing

All the data for this study are obtained from the IRIS Data Management Center. We select seven events with depths from 12 to 413km and seismic moment magnitude from 5.9 to 7.8 that sample the Hawaiian ULVZ. The detailed source information is shown in the Table S1. We remove the instrument response by convolving the original data with the inverted instrument spectrum using ObsPy³⁸. Horizontal components are rotated to the radial and tangential orientations. In this study we analyze the tangential component of the seismogram, because the SH component of the S_{diff} wave propagates further and attenuates less than the SV component and thus has stronger energy. Low-quality noisy traces are manually identified and removed. We use a zero-phase fourth-order Butterworth band-pass filter for filtering. Examples of the tangential component S_{diff} data for the 2010 event filtered in 10-20s and 3-6s period bands are presented as a function of azimuth are shown in Figure S1.

Update on Location of Hawaiian ULVZ

The previous modeled location of show Hawaiian ULVZ sits just southwest of the surface hotspot, centered roughly between 172.5W and 162.5W⁷. With the diffracted data from events in Papua New Guinea recorded at the transportable array in the central USA, which propagate mainly from west to east, the ULVZ location was well constrained latitudinally (Figure S2), but a degree of uncertainty remained as to the exact longitudinal location due to lack of crossing data at the time of publication. The recent deployment of the Alaska transportable array provides a new direction to illuminate the Hawaiian ULVZ using diffracted phases propagating from south to north. We identify four new events from the Kermadec Islands that are recorded in Alaska which show similar hyperbolic S_{diff} postcursors to the previous events recorded in the central USA (Figure S3). The symmetry of the postcursors suggests the Hawaiian ULVZ has an axisymmetric structure likely quasi-cylindrical in shape. In this case, the least delayed postcursors represent waves that have propagated through the center of the cylinder have not been refracted out of plane and thus show no additional travel-time delay due to extra path length. Based on the intersection of the minimally-delayed S_{diff} paths in two almost orthogonal directions, the ULVZ is located further to the southwest than previously thought, centered around 172.3°W and 15.4°N. Long-period synthetics for this new location are computed using the coupled spectral-element method CSEM³⁹ and compared to data from all events, as shown in Figure S2 and S3. Results show a good fit to the delay time and move-out of postcursors, although there is some variations between the observed and modeled amplitudes. These are likely due to inaccuracies in the CMT sources⁴⁰ and the S_{diff} radiation patterns.

Sensitivity Kernel for S_{diff} Wave at CMB

The sensitivity kernel of a wave illustrates which part of the Earth affects the observed waveform. Some numerical software packages (i.e. SPECFEM3D_GLOBE^{41,42}) can now calculate the finite-frequency sensitivity kernels for specific phases. However, calculations for kernels at higher frequencies (i.e. up to 0.33 Hz) are still very challenging given current computational resources. Here we approach the high-frequency sensitivity kernels with a more heuristic analytical method. We note that the tangential component of the guided postcursor shear waves we observe near the CMB are analogous to surface Love waves, as both have free stress boundaries in the SH system. We apply the theory previously developed for Love waves in a vertically heterogeneous medium⁴³ to velocity profiles at the CMB to provide an estimate of the

S_{diff} sensitivity kernel at different frequencies. We assume the wave coming from the mantle side is a quasi-plane wave of a specific frequency and wavenumber. We then extend the wave propagation from the lower 200km to the CMB using the propagator matrix method. Making use of the boundary condition at the CMB, we obtain the eigen wavenumber for each specific frequency and then transform them into a sensitivity kernel. Figure S4 shows the eigensolutions of displacement and traction for 3s-, 10s-, and 20s-period waves. From the plot, we see that shorter periods have sensitivity closer to the CMB, with the 3s-period showing significant sensitivity to the lowermost 5 km. These kernels have guided our proposed velocity models used to fit our multi-frequency observations.

We also estimate the first Fresnel zone widths by computing the width at the core-mantle boundary for which arrivals at the stations will constructively interfere (i.e. arrive within *wave period/4*). For a 10s-20s period we estimate the half width to be 200km-300 km, and for a 3-6 s wave 100km -200 km. Note that these widths are less than the radius of the ULVZ.

Beamforming Analysis

Beamforming is an array method used to measure the incoming direction and slowness of a signal as it passes through an array⁴⁴. We use beamforming not only to determine the direction of the incident wave, but also to enhance the energy of the original signal by stacking data using the measured incident direction to align specific phases. The beamforming stack (B) is given by:

$$B(t, \theta) = \text{abs}[H(\sum_{i=1}^N s_i(t - u(\theta) \bullet \mathbf{x}_i))]$$

where H represents the Hilbert transform on the stacked original data time series $s_i(t)$, u is the slowness vector as function of the incoming angle θ , and $\mathbf{x}_i$ is the distance vector to the reference station.

First, we apply this beamforming stacking on the original array data in order to determine the most likely incoming angle. Unlike other body waves, the S_{diff} phase has a fairly constant slowness value for the grazing distances as long as the velocity variations are negligible at the diffraction exit points at the core-mantle boundary. We fix the absolute value of S_{diff} slowness u at 8.323 s/deg, calculated in the IASP91 model⁴⁵, and search the incident direction in a range of -50 to 50 degrees with respect to the incoming angle of the great circle path from the event epicenter provided by the TauP software⁴⁶. We apply this procedure for each station by forming a sub-array consisting of the nearest 20 stations, or all stations within 4 degrees epicentral distance.

Figure S5 shows examples of the resulting beamforming phase stacks. We apply an objective automatic picking procedure, which finds the coherent energy peak in the time range for main arrival and postcursor respectively. The pick is kept only if we observe one and only one dominant local maximum in the estimated arrival time window. The backazimuth directions and travel times for the maxima in our beamforming stacks are shown in Figure 2BC and EF in the main text.

We note that 3D out-of-path effects and velocity variations at the turning point of the seismic ray have the potential to cause slowness variations leading to significant mislocation in plotted

slowness vectors. To test whether this has an impact on our beamforming results we perform a sliding-window F-K analysis of the S_{diff} main arrival and postcursor allowing slowness to vary from predicted values. An example of this test using a subarray of multiple stations surrounding seismic station TA.T33A is shown in Fig. S6. We find that although the absolute slowness value of phases is slightly off the predicted 8.3 s/deg, almost all the values lie within a range of $\pm 5\%$ (± 0.4 s/deg). Thus we repeat the procedure with slowness values varied by $\pm 5\%$ to estimate the uncertainty of our fixed slowness. The differences in measured backazimuth and travel time are shown as error bars on our measurements in Fig. 2BC and EF.

We also retested our beamforming result allowing for greater variation in slowness of $\pm 10\%$ (slowness differences 0.8 s/deg), and compared this with our initial $\pm 5\%$ slowness variance calculations, as shown in Figure S7. Although we miss some data points when using a $\pm 10\%$ variance (this might due to the multiple arrivals or failure to locate the peak in automatic scripts), we see the backazimuth beamforming of the S_{diff} signal returns highly similar results, compared to our original $\pm 5\%$ variance analysis. We find that while there is some small trade-off between the backazimuth, arrival time, and the absolute slowness value, the influence of absolute slowness has a minimal influence on results.

Waveform Stacking

We produce final waveform stacks by multiplying the linear stack with a weighted phase stack using the observed incidence angle measurements of the main phase and postcursor, such that:

$$g(t) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i(t - u \cdot \mathbf{x}_i) \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \exp[i\Phi_k(t - u \cdot \mathbf{x}_i)] \right\|^\nu$$

where s_i represents the time series of i -th station of an array, $\mathbf{x}_i$ is the distance vector for i -th station with respect to the reference station, u is the measured directional slowness vector for the reference station obtained from beamforming, and Φ_k denotes the instantaneous phase obtained from Hilbert transform of the original data time series $s_i(t)$. Weighting factor ν governs the sharpness of the noise reduction. To balance data distortion and signal coherency, we use $\nu = 2$ in our processing, as recommended in⁴⁸. We again stack over sub-arrays where $N=20$ nearest stations, or all the stations within four degrees epicentral distance.

Because of the differences between our main arrival and postcursor phases, we have to split our stacked seismogram into two parts: the first window uses the measured main arrival incoming direction and the second window uses the measured postcursor incoming direction. The final stacked waveforms for all stations are shown in Figure 2A and C in the main text, with the two parts split by a dashed line. This procedure is applied for the two different frequency ranges explored, and significantly aids in bringing out a coherent postcursor signal in the 3-6s period range. For comparison to the stacked waveforms shown in Figure 2, the raw data of event 20100320 are shown in Figure S1.

Wavelet Spectrum of the Stacked Seismograms

The dispersive nature of the observed postcursors is difficult to observe in seismograms in the time domain. Here we use the wavelet spectrum, which is well-suited for non-stationary seismic data, to show the energy distribution of signals in both the frequency domain and the time domain. These spectra illustrate the stronger phase dispersion in the postcursor compared to the

main S_{diff} arrival. We perform a continuous wavelet transform using the complex Morlet wavelet on the stacked time series from 20s before to 120s after the predicted S_{diff} arrival time. Spectra of linear stacks and phase-weighted stacks based on main S_{diff} and postcursor incoming angles are compared in Figure S8. The phase-weighted stacks have a better signal-noise-ratio. The spectra show that most of the signal energy is distributed above 3s. We also observe a gap in energy near the period of 6s in the data from event 20100320. It is based on these observations, that we define the two frequency ranges used in this study to demonstrate the dispersive nature of these phases: short-period at 3-6s, and long-period at 10-20s.

First Estimate of Basal ULVZ Properties

Although calculating wave propagation through a 3D ULVZ model is a complicated process, we first estimate the basic properties of the base of the ULVZ using simple calculations of postcursor time delay. Along profile that samples the ULVZ center, multi-pathing effects are negligible. This provides us with a simple geometrical relationship that links the properties of the ULVZ with the arrival time delays:

$$\delta t \sim \frac{2r}{v} \frac{dv}{1-dv}$$

where r is the radius of the structure, dv is the fractional velocity reduction, and v is the background velocity at the CMB. This relationship is plotted in Figure S9 for the least delayed long-period and short-period postcursors. Results reveal that either extremely slow material at the base of the ULVZ or a ULVZ that is much wider at its base could explain the arrival times of delayed postcursors. If the bottom part of the ULVZ remains the same radius at 455 km, the velocity reduction would be up to 30%. If we otherwise assume the velocity reduction to remain constant at 20%, then the material should be spread much more widely with a radius of 700 km.

Ray-based Modeling of the ULVZ

Next, we use a ray-approximated method and the travel-time and backazimuth constraints from the refracted short-period postcursors to further estimate the properties of the lowermost part of the ULVZ structure. We only predict the horizontal wave propagation using the horizontal slowness and assume a full decoupling of the vertical propagation. The transmission of the wave is considered only where the ray enters and exits the ULVZ boundary. Figure S10 shows the refraction pattern caused by the cylindrical ULVZ and the predicted travel-times and backazimuths as a function of azimuth from the event.

With this computationally efficient tool, we are able to explore a large parameter space of radius and velocity reductions for the ULVZ, before computing more expensive full waveform synthetics. We implement a grid search varying the ULVZ velocity reduction from 15% to 50% in steps of 5%, and its radius from 355km to 855km in 50km steps. Figure S11 shows how well different combinations of ULVZ properties fit the short-period postcursor observations. Misfits are calculated based on the arrival times, the backazimuths, and a combination of the two. We choose to use the L1 norm in the misfit calculation, as it is more robust and resistant to outliers for a small number of samples.

In the travel-time misfit plot (Figure S11A), we see the expected tradeoff between the velocity reduction and the ULVZ radius. The travel-time misfit suggests the cylindrical ULVZ to be either small, with an extreme velocity reduction (radius 405km, -50% $d\ln V_S$), or to be larger,

with a more modest velocity reduction (radius 855km, -20% $d\ln V_S$). The backazimuth misfit also shows a tradeoff, but with the opposite orientation (Figure S11B): requiring the ULVZ to be either small with slight velocity reduction (radius 455km, -15% $d\ln V_S$) or to be widespread and extremely reduced (radius 855km, -45% $d\ln V_S$). The combination of these two misfits normalized by each minimum value, creates a joint misfit which employs the two opposing trade-offs. This misfit identifies the best-fitting intermediate model with a radius between 605km to 755km and a velocity reduction between 25% to 30% (Figure S11C). The best-fit result peaks at radius 655km and velocity reduction at 30%. Misfits for a ULVZ of constant radius of 455 km are less good, but would predict a velocity reduction of 40-45%.

2.5D Synthetic Exploration of Basal Layer Thickness

We build on initial ray-tracing based results to further explore the causative effect of the ULVZ lateral structure using AxiSEM 2.5D synthetics down to 3s¹⁷. These synthetics allow us to capture the full finite-frequency sensitivity of the diffracted phases but are more computationally feasible in terms of exploring the model space than full 3D simulations. 2.5D models assume azimuthal symmetry and are only accurate in the event-station plane, such that out-of-plane effects cannot be captured. Thus we compare our synthetic results to the waves that have propagated through the center of the ULVZ without refracting, i.e. the postcursors waves with minimal delay times. These waves show a travel-time deviation of 12 s between the long- and short-period postcursors. We construct two end-member models for the mega-ULVZ structure: 1) a 455km radius mega-ULVZ model with an extremely reduced basal-layer of -40% $d\ln V_S$, referred to as R455; 2) a similar sized ULVZ including a 655 km wide and -30% $d\ln V_S$ basal-layer reflecting the lateral spreading of the mega-ULVZ material, referred to as R655. We analyze how the height of the basal-layer in both models interacts with S_{diff} waves by varying its thickness from 0 to 5km (Figure S12). We find that for model R455 the best fitting solution suggests a 2 km thick extreme basal-layer, while for model R655 a basal-layer thickness slightly above 2 km is suggested.

Full 3D S_{diff} Synthetics

Using our estimates of ULVZ properties from the above analyses, we create models for full 3D waveform modeling. A new hybrid method has recently been developed using a combination of wavefield injection and AxiSEM3D, which allows computation of the global wavefield with a small-scale 3D internal heterogeneity down to periods of 1s²⁰. This method stores the wavefield information at the injection boundary and then uses AxiSEM3D to compute the wavefield inside and outside the boundary (for detailed mesh information see Figure S13). As demonstrated in the 2.5D synthetics, our S_{diff} observations are more sensitive to the vertical rather than lateral structure. Thus we explore several variations of the R455 model with internal vertical structure. With a dense vertical mesh to capture our input model on the kilometer scale, each of such synthetics takes 128 nodes, with 64 CPU per node, 96 hours to finish on the Cambridge HPC cluster. Testing the wider R655 ULVZ scenario would require a larger injection boundary, and thus even more computing resources.

In Figure S13, we show a detailed AxiSEM3D mesh implemented in the 3D waveform modeling. The mesh is created for PREM model at a 3s period. The mesh consists of 731,418 spectral elements, with each formed by 25 GLL points at a polynomial order of 4. At the bottom 20km of the mantle, the mesh density is doubled to accommodate any shear velocity reduction up to 50%,

and a vertical discontinuity at 2 km, 6 km, 10 km or 15 km above CMB can be accurately honoured (because the 20 km height contains five element layers).

We construct four different ULVZ models for comparison: a uniform ULVZ of -20% $d\ln V_S$, a gradient ULVZ varying from -10% $d\ln V_S$ at the top to -30% $d\ln V_S$ at the bottom, and a two-layered ULVZ with an upper 10 km at -10% $d\ln V_S$ and a bottom 10 km at -30% $d\ln V_S$, and a 20km thick ULVZ model with an extreme 2km basal layer of -40% $d\ln V_S$ based on our 2.5D modeling. Figure 3 in the main paper shows the waveform filtered into the two period bands of interest. The 10s-20s waveforms (Figure 3A) are highly similar for all models, demonstrating that waves at these periods are unable to differentiate between models containing different kilometer-scale internal structure. Data filtered for the 3s-6s band (Figure 3B) show strong differences between the modeled waveforms. The uniform model has a postcursor around 40s after the main S_{diff} phase. The postcursor for the two-layer model arrives much later at roughly 60-70s. The postcursor of the gradient model and the 2km extreme model overlap at arrival times around 50s-60s - similar to arrivals seen in our high-frequency observations. All postcursors in these four models show a dispersive nature, to varying extents, between 3s to 10s (Figure S14). The uniform and two-layer models show the weakest and strongest dispersion respectively, while the gradient and 2km extreme model show moderate dispersion, comparable to our observations. It should be noted that the main S_{diff} phase, unlike its associated postcursor, is not dispersive.

Fig. S1. Original data before stacking. Original data of Event 20100320 at S_{diff} distance (100° - 110°) plotted as a function of azimuth, with time axis relative to predicted S_{diff} arrival time. (A) Filtered into long-period range (10s - 20s) and (B) short-period range (3s - 6s). Yellow colored bands highlight the S_{diff} postcursor.

Fig. S2. Events used in this study recorded by the central USarray. For events: (A)20100320 (B)20111214 (C)20120417. On the left we show event radiation patterns (blue) with azimuth range for which data is shown highlighted (yellow). Next is the ray-path geometry shown between the entry (purple) and exit (green) points to the lowermost 100 km of the mantle, the event location (yellow star) and station locations (white triangles). Background shows tomography model SEMUCB_WM1 at 2800 km³⁶. The right panels show the observed waveform data (black, left) and CSEM synthetics of a 20km -20% $d\ln V_S$ ULVZ at the updated location (red, right) filtered from 10s to 20s. The time axis is aligned by the predicted S_{diff} traveltimes. Yellow colored bands highlight the S_{diff} postcursor.

A

★

B

★

C

★

Fig. S3. As for Fig. S2 but for events recorded by the Alaska transportable array. For events:
 (A)20180518 (B)20181030 (C)20161122 (D)20180910

D **Fig. S3. (cont.)**

648

649

650 **Fig. S4. Estimated sensitivity kernels for S_{diff} wave traveltime above the CMB.** From left to
 651 right: shear wave velocity profile, normalized eigen displacement, traction, and shear wave
 652 velocity kernels for a 3s (green), 10s (orange) and 20s (blue) period S_{diff} wave in the bottom 100
 653 km of the mantle.

Fig. S5. Beamforming analysis of S_{diff} main arrivals and postcursors in event A from four example sub-arrays. (A) Station TUL1 in the transportable array at distance 109.66° and azimuth 52.93° (B) Station U34A in the transportable array at distance 108.19° and azimuth 52.64° (C) Station Q28A in transportable array at distance 104.44° and azimuth 50.46° (D) Station 232A in transportable array at distance 107.10° and azimuth 57.62° . Colors represent the beamforming energy. The yellow dashed line shows the predicted incoming direction. The picked incoming backazimuths and arrival times for the main phase and postcursor are marked with the yellow stars. Top panels show the result for long-period data, bottom panels show the result for short-period data.

665

667

668

669

670

671

672

Figure S6. Sliding-window FK-plot of the Sdiff signal for the subarray around TA.T33A station. (A) Main Arrival in low frequency (Window: -10s - 20s) (B) Postcursor in low frequency (Window: 34s - 64s) (C) Main Arrival in high frequency (Window: -5s - 15s) (D) Postcursor in high frequency (Window: 54s - 74s).

Figure S7. Comparison of the beamforming result with 5% slowness variance (left) and 10% slowness variance (right).

Fig. S8. Stacked wavelet spectrum for the four sample sub-array stacks in Fig.S5 for the 20100320 event. (A) Linear stacked wavelet spectrum using the main arrival incoming direction (B) Linear stacked wavelet spectrum using the postcursor incoming direction (C) Phase-weighted stacked wavelet spectrum using the main arrival incoming direction (D) Phase-weighted stacked wavelet spectrum using the postcursor incoming direction

Fig. S9. Trade-offs between velocity reduction and ULVZ radius. This calculation is based on a simple cylindrical ULVZ structure and ray-theoretical assumptions. The green line indicates the tradeoff based on the observed short-period postcursor arrival time, while the gray line shows the long-period tradeoff. The thin line marks an uncertainty of $\pm 3\%$. The vertical yellow dashed line shows the radius of the favored ULVZ model in the study of ⁷.

Fig. S10. Ray-based modelling of travel-time and backazimuth. The left shows the ray geometry focused by a cylindrical ULVZ. The upper right shows the travel-times of the rays as a function of the azimuth at the receiving station. The lower right shows the backazimuth deviation of the rays concentrated by the ULVZ structure of a 655km radius and 30% vs reduction.

Fig. S11. Misfit colormap of the short-period data for ULVZ models of varying radius and velocity reduction calculated using raytracing. For misfits based on: (A) postcursor arrival time (B) postcursor backazimuth (C) joint misfit for arrival time and backazimuth.

Fig. S12. Observed travel-times for postcursors 2.5D AxiSEM synthetics for two-layered ULVZ models with different basal layer thickness. The faded color bands show the observed arrival time of long-period (orange) and short-period (red) postcursors (A) Two-layered models with constant 455km radius. The bottom - 40% $d\ln V_S$ -layer varies from 0 to 5km thick below a total thickness 20km -20% $d\ln V_S$ layer. (B) Same as (A) but with a wider bottom layer of 655km radius.

Fig. S13. AxiSEM3D mesh used in the modeling. On the right, we show the 2D AxiSEM3D mesh (gridlines and southern half hidden) created using the PREM model³⁷ at a 3 s period. On the left, we zoom into the blue box atop CMB (gridlines revealed), which includes the half-width ULVZ (7.5° on CMB) with a height of 20 km. This mesh is centred at the ULVZ, rotating which by 360° about the left axis will generate the 3D ULVZ structure, spanning 15° on CMB. The 3D scattered wavefield is excited by injecting an incident wavefield simulated with a PREM mesh (no ULVZ) centred at the earthquake source and recorded at the “injection elements” around the ULVZ (the elements coloured in magenta in the mesh)²⁰

Fig. S14. Wavelet spectra of single synthetic waveforms for four 3D ULVZ models sampling the center of the ULVZ. (A) the uniform model (B) the two-layer model (C) the gradient model (D) the extreme 2km model. These spectra can be compared to the real data stacks in Fig. S6.

Table S1.

Events used in this study. Source information is obtained from the global CMT catalog. (<http://www.globalcmt.org/>). Event 20100320 shows the strong dispersion in the postcursor presented in the main paper.

Event	Region	Date and time (UTC)	Latitude (°)	Longitude (°)	Depth (km)	Magnitude (M _w)
20100320	New Ireland Region, P.N.G.	2010-03-20 14:00:50	-3.32	152.33	413	6.6
20111214	Eastern New Guinea Reg., P.N.G.	2011-12-14 05:04:59	-7.49	146.83	133	7.1
20120417	Eastern New Guinea Reg., P.N.G.	2012-04-17 07:13:49	-5.66	147.16	209	6.8
20180518	South Of Kermadec Islands	2018-05-18 01:45:31	-34.67	-178.21	14.3	6.1
20181030	North Island, New Zealand	2018-10-30 02:13:39	-39.07	174.94	226	6.1
20161122	North Island, New Zealand	2016-11-22 00:19:43	-40.79	177.58	12.0	5.9
20180910	Kermadec Islands Region	2018-09-10 04:19:02	-31.91	-179.13	119	6.9

References

1. Rost, S. Deep earth: Core-mantle boundary landscapes. *Nature Geoscience* vol. 6 89–90 (2013).
2. Yu, S. & Garnero, E. J. Ultralow Velocity Zone Locations: A Global Assessment. *Geochemistry, Geophys. Geosystems* **19**, 396–414 (2018).
3. Thorne, M. S. *et al.* The Most Parsimonious Ultralow-Velocity Zone Distribution From Highly Anomalous SPdKS Waveforms. *Geochemistry, Geophys. Geosystems* **22**, e2020GC009467 (2021).
4. Garnero, E. J., Revenaugh, J., Williams, Q., Lay, T. & Kellogg, L. H. Ultralow velocity zone at the core-mantle boundary. in *The Core-Mantle Boundary Region* (eds. Gurnis, M., Wyssession, M. E., Knittle, E. & Buffett, B. A.) vol. 28 319–334 (American Geophysical Union, 1998).
5. Thorne, M. S. & Garnero, E. J. Inferences on ultralow-velocity zone structure from a global analysis of SPdKS waves. *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth* **109**, (2004).
6. Garnero, E. J. Heterogeneity of the lowermost mantle. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* **28**, 509–537 (2000).
7. Cottaar, S. & Romanowicz, B. An unusually large ULVZ at the base of the mantle near Hawaii. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **355–356**, 213–222 (2012).
8. Yuan, K. & Romanowicz, B. Seismic evidence for partial melting at the root of major hot spot plumes. *Science (80-.)*. **357**, (2017).
9. Thorne, M. S., Garnero, E. J., Jahnke, G., Igel, H. & McNamara, A. K. Mega ultra low velocity zone and mantle flow. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **364**, 59–67 (2013).
10. Kim, D., Lekić, V., Ménard, B., Baron, D. & Taghizadeh-Popp, M. Sequencing seismograms: A panoptic view of scattering in the core-mantle boundary region. *Science (80-.)*. **368**, 1223–1228 (2020).
11. Bower, D. J., Wicks, J. K., Gurnis, M. & Jackson, J. M. A geodynamic and mineral physics model of a solid-state ultralow-velocity zone. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **303**, 193–202 (2011).
12. Wicks, J. K., Jackson, J. M. & Sturhahn, W. Very low sound velocities in iron-rich (Mg,Fe)O: Implications for the core-mantle boundary region. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **37**, (2010).
13. Wicks, J. K., Jackson, J. M., Sturhahn, W. & Zhang, D. Sound velocity and density of magnesiowüstites: Implications for ultralow-velocity zone topography. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **44**, 2148–2158 (2017).
14. Mundl, A. *et al.* Tungsten-182 heterogeneity in modern ocean island basalts. *Science (80-.)*. **356**, 66–69 (2017).
15. Mundl-Petermeier, A. *et al.* Anomalous 182W in high 3He/4He ocean island basalts: Fingerprints of Earth’s core? *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **271**, 194–211 (2020).
16. IRIS Transportable Array. USArray Transportable Array. (2003) doi:10.7914/SN/TA.
17. Nissen-Meyer, T. *et al.* AxiSEM: Broadband 3-D seismic wavefields in axisymmetric media. *Solid Earth* **5**, 425–445 (2014).
18. Leng, K., Nissen-Meyer, T., Van Driel, M., Hosseini, K. & Al-Attar, D. AxiSEM3D: Broad-band seismic wavefields in 3-D global earth models with undulating discontinuities. *Geophys. J. Int.* **217**, 2125–2146 (2019).
19. Euler, G. G. & Wyssession, M. E. Geographic variations in lowermost mantle structure

- from the ray parameters and decay constants of core-diffracted waves. *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth* **122**, 5369–5394 (2017).
20. Leng, K., Korenaga, J. & Nissen-Meyer, T. 3-D scattering of elastic waves by small-scale heterogeneities in the Earth's mantle. *Geophys. J. Int.* **223**, 502–525 (2020).
 21. Hernlund, J. W. & Jellinek, A. M. Dynamics and structure of a stirred partially molten ultralow-velocity zone. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **296**, 1–8 (2010).
 22. Nomura, R. *et al.* Spin crossover and iron-rich silicate melt in the Earth's deep mantle. *Nature* **473**, 199–202 (2011).
 23. Mao, W. L. *et al.* Iron-rich post-perovskite and the origin of ultralow-velocity zones. *Science* (80-.). **312**, 564–565 (2006).
 24. Labrosse, S., Hernlund, J. W. & Coltice, N. A crystallizing dense magma ocean at the base of the Earth's mantle. *Nature* **450**, 866–869 (2007).
 25. Jackson, C. R. M., Bennett, N. R., Du, Z., Cottrell, E. & Fei, Y. Early episodes of high-pressure core formation preserved in plume mantle. *Nature* **553**, 491–495 (2018).
 26. Buffett, B. A. Core-Mantle Interactions. in *Treatise on Geophysics: Second Edition* vol. 8 213–224 (Elsevier Inc., 2015).
 27. Badro, J., Siebert, J. & Nimmo, F. An early geodynamo driven by exsolution of mantle components from Earth's core. *Nature* **536**, 326–328 (2016).
 28. O'Rourke, J. G. & Stevenson, D. J. Powering Earth's dynamo with magnesium precipitation from the core. *Nature* **529**, 387–389 (2016).
 29. Hirose, K. *et al.* Crystallization of silicon dioxide and compositional evolution of the Earth's core. *Nature* **543**, 99–102 (2017).
 30. Brandon, A. D. & Walker, R. J. The debate over core-mantle interaction. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **232**, 211–225 (2005).
 31. Jones, T. D., Davies, D. R. & Sossi, P. A. Tungsten isotopes in mantle plumes: Heads it's positive, tails it's negative. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **506**, 255–267 (2019).
 32. Mound, J., Davies, C., Rost, S. & Aurnou, J. Regional stratification at the top of Earth's core due to core–mantle boundary heat flux variations. *Nat. Geosci.* **12**, 575–580 (2019).
 33. Li, M., McNamara, A. K., Garnero, E. J. & Yu, S. Compositionally-distinct ultra-low velocity zones on Earth's core-mantle boundary. *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 1–9 (2017).
 34. Amit, H. & Choblet, G. Mantle-driven geodynamo features - Effects of compositional and narrow D' anomalies. *Phys. Earth Planet. Inter.* **190–191**, 34–43 (2012).
 35. Koppers, A. A. P. *et al.* Mantle plumes and their role in Earth processes. *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.* **2**, 382–401 (2021).
 36. French, S. W. & Romanowicz, B. A. Whole-mantle radially anisotropic shear velocity structure from spectral-element waveform tomography. *Geophys. J. Int.* **199**, 1303–1327 (2014).
 37. Dziewonski, A. M. & Anderson, D. L. Preliminary reference Earth model. *Phys. Earth Planet. Inter.* **25**, 297–356 (1981).
 38. Krischer, L. *et al.* ObsPy: A bridge for seismology into the scientific Python ecosystem. *Comput. Sci. Discov.* **8**, 14003 (2015).
 39. Capdeville, Y., Chaljub, E., Vilotte, J. P. & Montagner, J. P. Coupling the spectral element method with a modal solution for elastic wave propagation in global earth models. *Geophys. J. Int.* **152**, 34–67 (2003).
 40. Dziewonski, A. M., Chou, T. A. & Woodhouse, J. H. Determination of earthquake source parameters from waveform data for studies of global and regional seismicity. *J. Geophys.*

- 830 *Res.* **86**, 2825–2852 (1981).
- 831 41. Komatitsch, D. & Tromp, J. Spectral-element simulations of global seismic wave
832 propagation - I. Validation. *Geophys. J. Int.* **149**, 390–412 (2002).
- 833 42. Tromp, J., Tape, C. & Liu, Q. Seismic tomography, adjoint methods, time reversal and
834 banana-doughnut kernels. *Geophys. J. Int.* **160**, 195–216 (2005).
- 835 43. Aki, K. & Richards, P. G. *Quantitative seismology*. (2002).
- 836 44. Rost, S. Array seismology: Methods and applications. *Rev. Geophys.* **40**, 1008 (2002).
- 837 45. Kennett, B. L. N. & Engdahl, E. R. Traveltimes for global earthquake location and phase
838 identification. *Geophys. J. Int.* **105**, 429–465 (1991).
- 839 46. Crotwell, H. P., Owens, T. J. & Ritsema, J. The TauP Toolkit: Flexible Seismic Travel-
840 time and Ray-path Utilities. *Seismol. Res. Lett.* **70**, 154–160 (1999).
- 841 47. Koch, K. & Kradolfer, U. Determination of Mislocation Vectors to Evaluate bias at
842 GSETT-3 primary stations. *J. Seismol.* **1999** 32 **3**, 139–151 (1999).
- 843 48. Schimmel, M. & Paulssen, H. Noise reduction and detection of weak, coherent signals
844 through phase-weighted stacks. *Geophys. J. Int.* **130**, 497–505 (1997).
- 845