



The top of residual 2 suggests two sources, however the shape here is very dependant upon the presence (and subtraction) of the shallow source (?) and I have used a single ^(deep seated) source. For the interpretation of residual 2, I have assumed that the western side is relatively unaffected (apart from the, hopefully subtracted, effect of the ultrabasics) and have matched that side using a deep-seated tabular body (Figure 4).

Residual 3 is the left over response from the modelling: it could be substantially reduced by reiterating the steps described above, slightly altering the models, etc to reduce the end error.

The interpreted, deep seated body (magnetic body 'B', Figure 4) is dipping at 80° to the SW, is 400m deep (below the flight height, assumed constant at around 550m); and for a susceptibility of 0.1 cgs units, it has a width of 200m. It strikes 140° (AMG). Beneath Profile AA', it is centred at 5,371,550 N; 375,160 E.

Comment

The position, shape, depth, etc of the final interpreted body ('B'), was dependant upon several steps, some of which were quite subjective: assumptions such as constant sensor height and infinitely long tabular sources were clearly not true. Also the interpreted width of 200m is perhaps geologically unlikely (?). Nevertheless the interpretation is not too dissimilar, particularly with respect to location and strike, to that of Bishop (1980b).