

# **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

#### GRANULOMETRIC ANALYSIS AND PALAEOENVIRONMENTAL RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PALAEOGENE DISANG –BARAIL TRANSITIONAL SEQUENCE IN PARTS OF KOHIMA SYNCLINORIUM, NAGA HILLS, NE INDIA.

#### Lily Sema<sup>1</sup> and <sup>\*</sup>Nagendra Pandey<sup>2</sup>.

1. Department of Geology, Kohima Science College (Aut), Jotsoma, Nagaland.

2. Department of Earth Science, Assam University, Silchar.

### Manuscript Info

# Manuscript History

Received: 03 August 2017 Final Accepted: 05 September 2017 Published: October 2017

#### Key words:-

Disang-Barail Transitional Sequence (DBTS), Kohima Synclinorium, Naga Hills, Granulometric analysis, Palaeoenvironmental reconstruction.

#### Abstract

The Palaeogene Disang – Barail Transitional Sequence (DBTS) cropping at the tip of the Kohima Synclinorium, Naga Hills has been analyzed for its grain – size characteristics and their interpretations in terms of environmental processes. Besides graphical and statistical parameters; attempts have also been made to analyze the size – data using multigroup discriminant function after Sahu (1983). The grainsize frequency distribution, descriptive statistical parameters, nature of Cummulative curves and the multigroup discriminant function analyses including V1 – V2 plot, all indicate that the DBTS correspond approximately to turbidity deposits.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2017,. All rights reserved.

.....

## Introduction:-

The Kohima Synclinorium, a part of which constitutes the present area of investigation, is one of the most prominent structural units in the inner fold belt of Naga Hills (Evans, 1964; Chakrabarti and Banerjee, 1988). Its western and eastern limits are defined by Halflong-Disang thrust and Changrung-Zungki-Lainye thrust respectively (Naik, 1998). The northern limb of Kohima synclinorium forming the Barail ranges of North Cachar extends south-westward below Halflong and then westward, fringing the eastern extension of Meghalaya plateau. The southern limb extends into west Manipur, East Cachar and East Mizoram, both the limbs being lithologically dissimilar. The Surma basin forms the core of Kohima synclinorium. While the Barail Group of rocks of the Barail range is dominantly sandstone, shale becomes predominant in the southern limbs. The underlying Disang rocks constitute the outer most ring of Kohima Synclinorium south of Haflong and display a sequence of splintery shale with minor sandstone (Rao, 1983). It needs to be pointed out here that problems concerning lithostratigraphic intricacy and regional correlation of Disang – Barail sequences are yet to be resolved. Since fossil records of the region are equivocal, a careful and detailed lithostratigraphic mapping may be the only way out to understand and solve the stratigraphic problems (Chakrabarti and Banerjee, 1988).

In order to understand lithologic intricacies of Kohima Synclinorium, an area bounded between Latitudes  $25^0 32^{\circ} N - 25^0 36^{\circ} N$ , and Longitudes  $94^0 05^{\circ}E - 94^0 10^{\circ}E$  of the topographic sheet no. 83 K/2 of Survey of India has been targeted. It covers nearly 100 sq. km. and includes areas lying near Phesema, Kigwema, Jakhama, Viswema and Khuzama villages. The study area (Fig.1) is unique in the sense that the lithology here neither matches with the argillaceous Disangs nor the arenaceous Barails; rather it exhibits a gradational blending of the two lithologies. Shales with subordinate sandstone units dominate the eastern half of the area; which in turn passes into a succession

**Corresponding Author:-** *Nagendra Pandey*. Address:- Department of Earth Science, Assam University, Silchar. having higher increments of sandstone interbeds towards the western half of the area. At places multistoried sandstone units having similar lithological attributes as those of the Barails are found to be overlain by thick succession of shales resembling Disangs. Following Pandey and Srivastava (1998), the lithologic unit exposed in the study area has been designated as Disang - Barail Transitional Sequence (DBTS).

#### Lithofacies:-

Based on the five diagnostic parameters of sedimentary facies, viz. bed geometry, lithology (including grain-size), primary sedimentary structures, palaeocurrent patterns and biogenic remains; if any (Selley, 1970, & 1976); the entire assemblage of Disang – Barail Transitional lithology was studied along six vertical profile sections measured at different locations across the study area. A total number of six litho-facies – A: Sand – Conglomerate facies, B: Sand facies, C: Sand – Mud facies, D: Mud – Sand facies-i, E: Mud – Sand facies-ii & F: Debrite facies have been identified following Mutti and Ricci Lucchi (1972) & McCaffrey and Kneller (2001).

## Methodology:-

Since all the rock samples are hard and compact, thin-section method of grain-size analysis has been employed following the method suggested by Krumbein (1935). Further improvements to this method has been proposed by several workers including Friedman (1962), Stauffer (1966), Connor and Ferm (1966), Smith (1966) and Textoris (1971). Grain-size measurements of thirty-four fresh and representative rock samples were carried out in thin-section using the Leitz Laborlux 12 polarizing microscope. About 500 grains were measured in each thin section. During the course of size measurement, care has been taken to measure the apparent maximum dimension of the grains. The measured grain-size values were grouped into half-phi intervals in order to represent the size-distribution graphically. Graphic measures of size-distributions were obtained by reading the values of different percentiles ( $P_5$ ,

 $P_{16}$ ,  $P_{25}$ ,  $P_{50}$ ,  $P_{75}$ ,  $P_{84}$ ,  $P_{95}$ ) from cumulative curves and placing them into the formulae suggested by Folk (1974) and later modified by Friedman and Sanders (1978). The grain-size frequency distribution data and their interpretation in terms of processes for different lithofacies are shown in Table 1 and 2 respectively.

#### **Cumulative Curve Analysis:-**

It has long been recognized that the shape of a cumulative curve is a function of relative proportions of two or more log normally distributed grain-size sub-populations (Tanner, 1964; Visher, 1969, 1970; Lambiase, 1982). Many workers suggested that each sub-population signifies a specific sediment transport mechanism operative during deposition, e.g. bed-load or 'surface creep' (coarsest sub-population), saltation (intermediate sub-population) and the suspension (finest sub-population) (Visher, 1970; Moss, 1972; Sagoe and Visher, 1977; Middleton, 1976). However, Shea (1974) attributed the shape of a cumulative curve to grain-size distribution of the source material.

There is varied opinion about the exact nature of boundary between different sub-populations. According to Visher (1969) and Sagoe and Visher (1977), grain populations are truncated at their boundaries as a result of differing transport mechanisms. However, Tanner (1964), Middleton (1976), Walton et al., (1980), Lambiase (1982) are of the opinion that grain populations are overlapping or mixed. What so ever may be the case; results obtained from cumulative curve analysis must be interpreted with caution due to the following possibilities of error as suggested by James and Oaks (1977).

- 1. Preferential losses from finer grain-sizes during diagenesis.
- 2. Statistical errors due to population size (200 grains or more should be counted).
- 3. Sampling error of the different laminae in the rock.

The representative cumulative curves for different lithofacies, as shown in Fig. 2 may be grouped into two types. Type I curves, characterized by initial steep; straight lines with little convexity in the middle and again a steep straight end part, are common in lithofacies A, B and F. The lithofacies C, D and E are characterized by type II curves which are moderately steep, straight initial curves with prominent convexity in the middle and steep, straight end part. All the cumulative curves consist of two populations only, i.e. saltation and suspension (Table.4). The saltation population shows good to moderate sorting and constitutes 88 % to 99.9 % of the total population in type I and II respectively. In type I curves this population is truncated on the finer side between the limits of 1.0 and 7.5, whereas the same varies between 2.0 to 6.5 in case of type II. The suspension population is fairly to moderately sorted in type I curves, whereas the same is generally moderately sorted in type II. Almost all curves show a major slope break separating transportation by suspension from saltation. This break (FT) lays around 5.20 defining approximately the silt- clay boundary. The break at fine truncation may be co-related in terms of current velocities,

flow separation, flow regimes, velocity gradients, grain shape and densities and fluid density (Sagoe and Visher, 1977). The saltation population (A) is actually transported by intermittent suspension or turbulence caused by velocity fluctuations in water (Lambiase, 1982). The observed shift at A-B (saltation to suspension population) boundaries from A, B and F facies to C, D and E facies, and the gentle nature of curve segments reflects that the transport mechanism was gradually changing from primarily intermittent suspension to suspension in response to greater flow strength. A comparison with the pattern of curves for various types of environments, as suggested by Visher (1969), indicates that the rocks of the present area correspond approximately to turbidity current deposited sandstones.

#### C-M Pattern:-

Passega (1957, 1964) suggested the use of C-M pattern for environmental analysis. C is the one percentile diameter in microns, an approximation of maximum grain-size and M, the fifty percentile diameter in microns, is the median. The position of points in a C-M diagram depends upon the mode of deposition of sediments. Deposits of various environments give characteristic patterns. Passega (1957) states the significance of C and M in the interpretation of the depositional agencies. M, the median grain-size is the size such that 50% of the sample is coarser than this size, which is the approximation of the maximum grain-size present in the population. He states that the loads of coarse and fine sediments in hydrodynamic equilibrium are largely dependent of each other. The coarser fraction is almost invariably more representative of the depositional agent than the finer fraction. Advantage is taken of this observation in representing texture in the C-M diagram. The only parameter of the overall texture used in the C-M diagram is the median which expresses the average coarseness of the sediments. C, the one percentile, is the parameter which measures the competency of the depositing agent to transport. The one percentile value is selected for a parameter as an approximation of the maximum grain-size because some coarser grains may have been introduced by extraneous agents. On the C-M diagram, the limit of the area in which points can fall is restricted by line C=M. It is designated as the limit of the diagram. Points situated on this line represent samples in which the median approximately equals the coarsest grain-size. C, the one percentile, and the median, in case of the sediments under question, range from 71.8 to 353.6 and > 0.3 to 220.7 respectively (Fig.3). On plotting C against M following Passega (1957, 1964), Passega and Byramjee (1969) and Reineck and Singh (1980) the sediments are found to be an admixture of sand, silt and clay which are transported mostly in saltation and also to some extent in suspension and then deposited by turbidity currents. Long and rectilinear turbidity pattern is indicative of fine to coarse grain particles which are carried in saltation and suspension with very little or no rolling (Passega, 1957). On losing velocity, turbidity current first deposits sand and then coarse and medium silt (Passega, 1977).

#### **Multigroup Discrimination Function Analysis:-**

Although, the linear discriminant function (Sahu, 1964; Sevon, 1966) is an effective method for discrimination among two groups, somehow it could not yield optimal result for the sediments of the study area. It may be due to the approach to the alternative hypothesis which is restricted to two groups only; whereas the sample may not belong to any of the two environments. The effectiveness of discriminant functions in environmental interpretation has also been questioned by Tucker and Vacher 1980). To overcome this problem, a multigroup discrimination method after Sahu (1983) was employed, as it considers for,

- 1. The alternative hypothesis which may belong to anyone of the several groups
- 2. The ratio of among group to within group quadratic forms to be maximized
- 3. Only significant number of co-ordinates are to be retained for the discriminating space and,
- 4. A simple Euclidean distance for purposes of classification in the discrimination space.

Sahu's empirically retained discriminating Eigen's vectors  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  were used to distinguish the depositional environments for the sediments under question. The discriminant functions  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are expressed as

$$V_{I} = 0.48048 M_{Z} + 0.62301 \sigma_{I}^{2} + 0.40602 Sk_{I} + 0.44413 K_{G}$$
$$V_{2} = 0.24523 M_{Z} + (-0.45905) \sigma_{I}^{2} + 0.15715 Sk_{I} + 0.83931 K_{G}$$

Where,  $M_{Z_i} \sigma_I^2$ ,  $S_{K_I}$  and  $K_{G_i}$  represent the mean size, the size variance, graphic skewness and graphic kurtosis, respectively.

The average values for  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  thus obtained ( $V_1 = 2.40$ ,  $V_2 = 1.40$ ) were plotted in the diagram of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  with  $V_1 \wedge V_2 = 74.4^\circ$ , after Sahu (1983). The position of the point in the diagram (Fig.4) falls well within the range of turbidite deposits.



Fig. 1:-Location and Geological map of the study area







Fig. 4: Discrimination of Depositional Environment for Palaeogene DBTS, Naga Hills using V1 - V2 Plot after Sahu (1983)

L10			Sample numbers of Lithofacies 'A'								
	L29	L31	L33	L34	Average						
-	5	-	-	1.64	1.64						
-	-	-	1.00	14.84	3.16						
1.27		-	3.50	35.25	8.00						
16.81	1.28	0.54	24.66	21.85	13.02						
32.35	19.42	5.12	43.66	12.16	21.34						
24.68	24.00	24.90	21.00	4.53	19.82						
12.79	29.71	33.51	4.50	4.53	17.00						
6.94	18.28	17.76	1.13	3.09	9.42						
3.65	7.14	9.89	0.50	2.06	4.64						
0.36	3.28	5.86	-	53	4.90						
1.09	1.85	1.64		53	0.91						
-	1.00	0.74		2	0.34						
	- 1.27 16.81 32.35 24.68 12.79 6.94 3.65 0.36 1.09 -	-  -    1.27  -    16.81  1.28    32.35  19.42    24.68  24.00    12.79  29.71    6.94  18.28    3.65  7.14    0.36  3.28    1.09  1.85    -  1.00	-  -  -    1.27  -  -    16.81  1.28  0.54    32.35  19.42  5.12    24.68  24.00  24.90    12.79  29.71  33.51    6.94  18.28  17.76    3.65  7.14  9.89    0.36  3.28  5.86    1.09  1.85  1.64    -  1.00  0.74	-  -  -  -    -  -  1.00  1.00    1.27  -  -  3.50    16.81  1.28  0.54  24.66    32.35  19.42  5.12  43.66    24.68  24.00  24.90  21.00    12.79  29.71  33.51  4.50    6.94  18.28  17.76  1.13    3.65  7.14  9.89  0.50    0.36  3.28  5.86  -    1.09  1.85  1.64  -    -  1.00  0.74  -	-  -  -  1.64    -  -  1.00  14.84    1.27  -  -  3.50  35.25    16.81  1.28  0.54  24.66  21.85    32.35  19.42  5.12  43.66  12.16    24.68  24.00  24.90  21.00  4.53    12.79  29.71  33.51  4.50  4.53    6.94  18.28  17.76  1.13  3.09    3.65  7.14  9.89  0.50  2.06    0.36  3.28  5.86  -  -    1.09  1.85  1.64  -  -    -  1.00  0.74  -  -						

## Table 1 Grain-size frequency ( in percent ) distribution of six Lithofacies of the Palaeogene Disang-Barail Transitional Sequence

Class interval	Sample numbers of Lithofacies 'B'									
(Phi units)	L24	L26	L27	L28	Average					
2.00-2.50	-	-	-	1.12	1.12					
2.50-3.00	1.63	2.89	-	7.10	2.90					
3.00-3.50	8.18	8.69	3.55	23.92	11.08					
3.50-4.00	19.63	33.62	11.40	31.40	24.01					
4.00-4.50	27.81	28.84	31.77	15.14	25.89					
4.50-5.00	20.36	14.49	27.10	12.14	18.52					
5.00-5.50	12.36	7.82	15.32	6.16	10.41					
5.50-6.00	5.81	1.44	4.85	1.49	3.39					
6.00-6.50	3.09	1.44	4.29	1.30	2.53					
6.50-7.00	1.09	0.72	1.65	-	0.86					

Table-1 contd.

Class interval	Sample numbers of Lithofacies 'C'									
(Phi units)	L9	L12	L13	L17	L19	L36	Average			
2.00-2.50	0.84	-	2.00	-	-	1.15	0.66			
2.50-3.00	11.01	-	11.00	0.58	2.08	14.61	6.54			
3.00-3.50	36.77	14.28	21.20	5.08	29.16	28.46	22.49			
3.50-4.00	33.88	35.04	31.40	30.52	41.86	32.69	34.23			
4.00-4.50	10.84	30.85	20.80	40.50	19.39	13.46	22.64			
4.50-5.00	4.91	12.38	8.20	17.61	6.08	6.53	9.28			
5.00-5.50	1.35	5.52	3.00	3.71	2.08	1.92	2.93			
5.50-6.00	0.84	1.90	2.40	2.95	0.32	1.15	1.59			

Class interval	Sample numbers of Lithofacies 'D'							
(Phi units)	L2	L6	L7	L8	L18	L25	L32	Average
1.50-2.00	-	1.09	0.54	-	-	-	10.09	1.67
2.00-2.50	-	16.00	9.09	6.03	20.00	1.58	32.33	12.14
2.50-3.00	-	27.63	33.81	26.66	46.07	10.19	40.56	26.41
3.00-3.50	2.31	21.45	32.18	35.07	21.07	31.56	10.46	22.01
3.50-4.00	18.00	18.18	15.45	20.95	8.03	40.39	3.17	17.73
4.00-4.50	35.65	10.54	6.36	7.61	3.03	12.15	1.49	10.97
4.50-5.00	25.13	4.18	2.18	3.49	0.89	4.11	1.12	5.87
5.00-5.50	11.76	0.90	0.36	0.15	0.89	1.98	0.74	2.39
5.50-6.00	4.63	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.66
6.00-6.50	1.60	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.22

Table-1 contd.

Class interval	Sample numbers of Lithofacies 'E'								
(Phi units)	LI	L3	L11	L15	L16	L20	L21	Average	
2.50-3.00	-	2.68	-	0.18	1.23	-	12.23	2.33	
3.00-3.50	-	17.11	6.35	14.00	11.13	3.40	24.27	10.89	
3.50-4.00	2.73	36.24	32.66	42.18	35.05	27.20	30.67	29.53	
4.00-4.50	14.15	25.67	40.10	32.18	31.95	40.60	18.83	29.06	
4.50-5.00	28.76	11.91	14.33	8.72	12.37	19.20	9.70	14.99	
5.00-5.50	27.98	3.69	4.71	1.45	5.15	7.29	2.91	7.58	
5.50-6.00	18.00	1.84	1.81	0.54	32.68	1.80	1.35	8.28	
6.00-6.50	5.28	0.83	-	-	1.41	0.68	-	1.17	
6.50-7.00	2.93	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.41	

Class interval	Sample numbers of Lithofacies 'F'									
(Phi units)	L4	L14	L22	L23	L35	Average				
1.00-1.50	-	-	1.20	-	0.55	0.35				
1.50-2.00	-	0.50	16.66	-	11.00	5.63				
2.00-2.50	-	5.50	47.80	5.50	31.00	17.96				
2.50-3.00	-	22.00	24.60	19.41	31.19	19.44				
3.00-3.50	0.55	30.00	6.80	26.97	13.21	15.50				
3.50-4.00	6.42	19.33	1.80	22.38	7.70	11.52				
4.00-4.50	26.67	12.00	0.20	13.76	3.30	11.18				
4.50-5.00	27.23	6.50	-	6.42	1.46	8.32				
5.00-5.50	27.93	1.66	-	3.66	0.55	6.76				
5.50-6.00	7.82	1.50	-	1.83	-	2.23				
6.00-6.50	1.95	1.00	-	-	-	0.59				
6.50-7.00	0.55	-	-	-	-	0.11				
7.00-7.50	0.41	-	-	-	-	0.08				
7.50-8.00	0.41	-	-	-	-	0.08				

# Table 2: Probable Depositional Environments for different Lithofacies of the DBTS (after Visher, 1969)

S.No  Percent  Sorting (ph)  C.T (ph)  F.T (ph)  Perce (ph)  Suting nt  Niking (ph)  F.T (A+B)  Depositional Everinement    Litbofacies 'A'  0  5.5  1%  good  average  6.0    L20  99%  moderate  2.5  5.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L31  99%  moderate  1.5  4.5  1%  good  much  6.5    L33  99%  moderate  1.0  4.5  2%  good  much  5.7    L43  98%  moderate  1.0  4.5  2%  good  much  5.7    L104  99%  good  2.5  5.9  1%  good  average  6.5    L24  99%  good  2.0  5.5  1%  good  average  6.5    L24  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  6%  good  average  6.0    L213  99.2%  <	Lithofacies &	Sal	Itation Popu	lation (A)	)	Su	spension Po	3)	Probable	
Lithofacles 'A'  modernit  2.0  5.5  1%  good  average  6.0    L20  99%  modernit  2.5  6.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L31  99%  modernit  1.5  4.5  1%  good  much  6.5    L33  99%  modernit  1.0  4.5  2%  good  much  5.7    L34  98%  modernit  1.0  4.5  2%  good  much  5.7    Lithofacies 'B'  -	S.No	Percent	Sorting	C.T (phi)	F.T (phi)	Perce	Sorting	Mixing (A+B)	F.T (phi)	Depositional Environment
L10  99%  moderate  2.0  5.5  1%  good  average  6.0    L31  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L34  98%  moderate  1.0  4.5  1%  good  much  5.7    L34  98%  moderate  1.0  4.5  2%  good  much  5.7    L34  98%  moderate  1.9  5.2  1.2%  good  much  5.5    L26  98%  moderate  2.5  5.9  1%  good  average  6.5    L26  98%  moderate  2.5  5.8  1.5%  good  average  6.5    L219  98%  moderate  2.0  5.5  1%  good  average  6.5    L121  98%  moderate  2.0  5.5  6%  good  much  6.5    L13  98%  moderate  2.0	Lithofacies 'A'									
L20  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L33  99%  moderate  1.5  4.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L34  98%  moderate  1.9  5.2  1.2%  good  much  5.5    Average  98%  moderate  1.9  5.2  1.2%  good  much  6.5    L24  99%  good  2.5  5.9  1%  good  average  6.5    L27  98%  good  2.5  5.9  1%  good  average  6.5    L28  99%  moderate  2.0  5.5  1%  good  average  6.5    L18  99.5%  moderate  2.5  5.5  6%  good  much  6.5    L18  99.5%  moderate  2.5  5.5  6%  good  much  6.0    L19  98.5%  moderate  2.5	L10	99%	moderate	2.0	5.5	1%	good	average	6.0	21
Li31  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.7    L34  98%  moderate  1.0  4.5  2%  good  much  5.7    Average  98.8%  moderate  1.9  5.2  1.2%  good  much  5.7    Lithofacies 'B'  -	L20	99%	moderate	2.5	6.0	1%	good	much	6.5	
L33  99%  moderate  1.5  4.5  1%  good  much  4.7    L34  98%  moderate  1.9  5.2  1.2%  good  much  5.7    Lithofacies 'B'  -<	L31	99%	moderate	2.5	5.5	1%	good	much	6.0	Colores Con
L34  98%  moderate  1.0  4.5  2%  good  much  5.5    Average  98.8%  moderate  1.9  5.2  1.2%  good  much  5.7    Lithofacies 'B'  good  2.5  5.9  1%  good  average  6.5    L26  98%  good  3.0  6.0  2%  good  average  6.5    L27  98%  moderate  2.0  5.8  1.5%  good  average  6.5    Average  98.5%  moderate  2.0  5.5  1%  good  average  6.5    L12  97%  moderate  2.5  5.5  6%  good  average  6.0    L13  98%  moderate  3.0  4.5  1.5%  good  much  6.0    L13  98%  moderate  2.7  5.5  2.5%  good  much  5.0    L26  97%  moderate  2.0	L33	99%	moderate	1.5	4.5	1%	good	much	4.7	Sub sea ran
Average  98.8%  moderate  1.9  5.2  1.2%  good  much  5.7    Lithofacies 'B'	L34	98%	moderate	1.0	4.5	2%	good	much	5.5	
Lithofacies 'B'  good  2.5  5.9  1%  good  much  6.5    L26  95%  moderate  2.5  5.9  2%  good  average  6.5    L27  95%  moderate  2.0  5.3  1%  good  average  6.5    L28  95%  moderate  2.0  5.3  1%  good  average  6.5    Litbofacies'C'      average  6.0    L12  97%  moderate  2.5  5.5  0%  good  much  6.5    L13  95%  moderate  2.5  5.5  2%  good  much  6.5    L13  95%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L17  98%  moderate  2.7  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L19  98.5%  moderate  2.0  4.5  3%  good	Average	98.8%	moderate	1.9	5.2	1.2%	good	much	5.7	
L24  99%  good  2.5  5.9  1%  good  much  6.5    L26  98%  good  3.0  6.0  2%  good  average  6.5    L28  99%  moderate  2.0  5.5  1%  good  average  6.5    Average  98.5%  moderate  2.0  5.5  1%  good  average  6.5    L10  99.5%  moderate  2.5  5.8  1.5%  good  average  6.5    L12  97%  moderate  2.5  5.5  6%  good  much  6.0    L17  98%  good  3.0  6.5  2%  good  much  6.0    L13  985%  moderate  2.7  5.5  2.5%  good  much  6.0    L14bdscies*D     moderate  2.7  5.5  2.5%  good  much  5.0    L2  98% <td< td=""><td>Lithofacies 'B'</td><td>-</td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td></td></td<>	Lithofacies 'B'	-			-				-	
L26  98%  moderate  2.5  5.9  2%  good  average  6.5    L27  98%  good  3.0  6.0  2%  good  average  6.5    L28  99%  moderate  2.0  5.8  1.5%  good  average  6.5    Average  98.5%  moderate  2.5  5.8  1.5%  good  average  6.5    L10  99.2%  moderate  2.5  5.5  6%  good  average  6.0    L12  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  2%  good  much  6.0    L17  98%  moderate  2.5  5.1  1%  good  much  5.0    L3  98%  moderate  2.7  5.5  2.5%  good  much  5.0    L2  98%  moderate  2.0  4.5  3%  good  much  5.0    L18  97%  moderate  2.0 <td>L24</td> <td>99%</td> <td>good</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>5.9</td> <td>1%</td> <td>good</td> <td>much</td> <td>6.5</td> <td></td>	L24	99%	good	2.5	5.9	1%	good	much	6.5	
L27  98%  good  3.0  6.0  2%  good  average  6.5    L28  99%  moderate  2.0  5.5  1%  good  average  6.5    Average  98.5%  moderate  2.5  5.8  1.5%  good  average  6.5    Lithofacies 'C'       average  6.0    L12  97%  moderate  2.5  5.5  2%  good  much  6.5    L13  98%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L19  98.5%  moderate  2.0  4.5  1.5%  good  much  5.0    L36  99%  moderate  2.7  5.5  2.5%  good  much  5.0    L12  98%  moderate  2.0  4.5  1%  good  much  5.0    L12  98%  moderate  2.5  5.0	L26	98%	moderate	2.5	5.9	2%	good	average	6.5	
L28  99%  moderate  2.0  5.5  1%  good  average  6.5    Average  98.5%  moderate  2.5  5.8  1.5%  good  average  6.5    Lithofacies *C*  noderate  2.5  5.5  6%  good  average  6.0    L12  97%  moderate  2.5  5.5  2%  good  average  6.0    L13  98%  moderate  2.5  5.5  2%  good  much  6.0    L14  98%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L36  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    Average  98.2%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  5.0    L2  98%  moderate  2.0  4.5  1%  good  much  5.0    L12  99%  moderate  2.0	L27	98%	good	3.0	6.0	2%	good	average	6.5	Sub sea fan
Average  98.5%  moderate  2.5  5.8  1.5%  good  average  6.3    Litbofacles *C*  - <t< td=""><td>L28</td><td>99%</td><td>moderate</td><td>2.0</td><td>5.5</td><td>1%</td><td>pood</td><td>average</td><td>6.5</td><td>0525530533700</td></t<>	L28	99%	moderate	2.0	5.5	1%	pood	average	6.5	0525530533700
Lithofacies 'C'  noderate  2.5  5.5  6%  good  average  6.0    L12  97%  moderate  3.0  5.5  3%  moderate  much  6.5    L13  98%  moderate  2.5  5.5  2%  good  much  6.0    L17  98%  moderate  2.5  5.5  2%  good  much  6.0    L19  98.5%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L36  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    Average  98.2%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L1thofacies 'D'	Average	98.5%	moderate	2.5	5.8	1.5%	good	average	6.5	
L9  99.2%  moderate  2.5  5.5  6%  good  average  6.0    L12  97%  moderate  3.0  5.5  3%  moderate  much  6.5    L13  98%  moderate  2.5  5.5  2%  good  much  6.0    L17  98%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L19  98.5%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    Average  98.2%  moderate  2.7  5.5  2.5%  good  much  6.0    L12  98%  moderate  2.0  4.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L12  98%  moderate  2.0  4.5  1%  good  much  5.0    L18  80%  moderate  2.5  4.5  1%  good  much  5.0    L25  99%  moderate  2.5	Lithofacies 'C'		-	-	-	-	-	-		
L12  97%  moderate  3.0  5.5  3%  moderate  much  6.5    L13  98%  moderate  2.5  5.5  2%  good  much  6.0    L17  98%  good  3.0  6.5  2%  good  much  6.0    L19  98.5%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L36  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    Average  98.2%  moderate  2.7  5.5  2.5%  good  much  6.0    L1  98%  moderate  2.0  4.5  3%  good  much  5.0    L18  97%  moderate  2.5  4.5  3%  good  much  5.5    L18  80%  moderate  2.5  5.0  20%  moderate  much  5.5    L118  80%  moderate  2.0	1.9	99.2%	moderate	2.5	5.5	6%	pood	average	6.0	
L13  98%  moderate  2.5  5.5  2%  good  much  6.0    L17  98%  good  3.0  6.5  2%  good  much  6.0    L19  98.5%  moderate  3.0  4.5  1.5%  good  much  6.0    L136  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1.5%  good  much  6.0    Average  98.2%  moderate  2.7  5.5  2.5%  good  much  6.0    Lithofacies 'D'  -  <	L12	97%	moderate	3.0	5.5	3%	moderate	much	6.5	
Lif  98%  good  3.0  6.5  2%  good  much  6.0    L19  98.5%  moderate  3.0  4.5  1.5%  good  much  6.0    Average  98.2%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    Average  98.2%  moderate  2.7  5.5  2.5%  good  much  6.0    Lithofacies 'D'             L2  98%  moderate  2.0  4.5  3%  good  much  5.0    L18  97%  moderate  2.0  4.5  1%  good  much  5.0    L25  99%  moderate  2.5  5.0  20%  moderate  much  5.5    L25  99%  moderate  2.0  3.1  8%  fair  much  5.5    L125  99%  moderate  3.0	113	98%	moderate	25	55	2%	good	much	60	Turbidity current
Li19  98.5%  moderate  3.0  4.5  1.5%  good  much  5.5    L36  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    Average  98.2%  moderate  2.7  5.5  2.5%  good  much  6.0    Average  98.2%  moderate  2.7  5.5  2.5%  good  much  6.0    Lithofacies 'D'      good  much  5.0    L17  99%  moderate  2.0  4.5  3%  good  much  5.0    L18  97%  moderate  2.5  4.5  3%  good  much  5.0    L25  99%  moderate  2.5  5.0  20%  moderate  much  5.5    L25  99%  moderate  2.0  3.1  8%  much  5.5    L25  99%  moderate  2.0  3.1  %	117	98%	good	3.0	65	2%	boog	much	6.0	
L36  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    Average  98.2%  moderate  2.7  5.5  2.5%  good  much  6.0    Lithofacies 'D'  -	L19	98.5%	moderate	3.0	4.5	1.5%	pood	much	55	
Average  98.2%  moderate  2.7  5.5  2.5%  good  much  6.0    Lithofacies'D'  -<	136	00%	moderate	25	55	196	bood	much	60	
Lithofacies "D'  Image: constraint of the second secon	Average	98.2%	moderate	2.7	5.5	2.5%	good	much	6.0	
Litofactor b'  Litofactor b'  moderate  3.5  4.4  2%  moderate  much  7.0    L6  97%  moderate  2.0  4.5  3%  good  much  5.0    L7  99%  moderate  2.0  4.5  1%  good  much  5.0    L8  97%  moderate  2.5  4.5  3%  good  much  5.0    L12  99%  moderate  2.5  5.0  20%  moderate  much  5.5    L125  99%  moderate  2.0  3.1  8%  fair  much  5.5    Average  94.4%  moderate  2.0  3.1  8%  fair  much  5.7    Litbofacies 'E'	Lithofacies 'D'	-	-		-				-	
L6  97%  moderate  2.0  4.5  2%  moderate  1.0    L7  99%  moderate  2.0  4.5  1%  good  much  5.0    L8  97%  moderate  2.5  4.5  3%  good  much  5.0    L18  97%  moderate  2.5  4.5  3%  good  much  5.0    L25  99%  moderate  2.5  5.0  20%  moderate  much  5.5    L25  99%  moderate  2.0  3.1  8%  fair  much  5.5    L32  91%  moderate  2.4  4.3  5.4%  good  much  5.7    Litbofacies 'E'  moderate  2.0  3.1  8%  moderate  much  6.4    13  99%  moderate  3.0  4.5  1%  moderate  much  6.5    L11  91%  moderate  3.0  5.5  1%<	12	98%	moderate	3.5	44	2%	moderate	much	70	
Lito  97%  Indefate  2.0  4.5  3%  good  Indefate  3.0    L7  99%  moderate  2.0  4.5  1%  good  much  5.0    L8  97%  moderate  2.5  4.5  1%  good  much  5.0    L25  99%  moderate  2.5  4.5  1%  good  much  5.5    L32  91%  moderate  2.0  3.1  8%  fair  much  5.5    Average  94.4%  moderate  2.4  4.3  5.4%  good  much  5.7    Litbofacies 'E'        5.0  9%  moderate  much  6.4    L3  99%  moderate  3.0  4.5  1%  moderate  much  6.5    L11  91%  moderate  3.0  5.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L11  91% <td>16</td> <td>07%</td> <td>moderate</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>38/</td> <td>anod</td> <td>much</td> <td>50</td> <td></td>	16	07%	moderate	2.0	4.5	38/	anod	much	50	
L8  97%  moderate  2.5  4.5  3%  good  much  5.0    L18  80%  moderate  2.5  4.5  3%  good  much  6.0    L25  99%  moderate  2.5  4.5  1%  good  much  5.5    L25  99%  moderate  2.0  3.1  8%  fair  much  5.5    Average  94.4%  moderate  2.0  3.1  8%  fair  much  5.7    Lithofacies 'E'            L11  97%  moderate  3.0  5.4  3%  moderate  much  6.4    L11  97%  moderate  3.0  5.0  9%  moderate  much  6.5    L11  91%  moderate  3.0  5.5  12%  moderate  much  6.5    L20  88%  moderate  3.0  5.5	1.7	00%	moderate	2.0	4.5	194	good	much	5.0	
L18  80%  moderate  2.5  5.0  20%  moderate  much  5.5    L25  99%  moderate  2.5  5.0  20%  moderate  much  5.5    L32  91%  moderate  2.0  3.1  8%  fair  much  5.5    Average  94.4%  moderate  2.4  4.3  5.4%  good  much  5.7    Litbofacies'E'      moderate  3.0  4.5  1%  moderate  much  6.4    L3  99%  moderate  3.0  4.5  1%  moderate  much  6.5    L11  91%  moderate  3.0  5.0  1%  moderate  much  6.5    L15  99%  moderate  3.0  5.5  1%  moderate  much  6.5    L20  88%  moderate  3.0  5.5  1%  moderate  much  6.1 <t< td=""><td>1.8</td><td>07%</td><td>moderate</td><td>2.0</td><td>4.5</td><td>30%</td><td>good</td><td>much</td><td>6.0</td><td>Turbidity</td></t<>	1.8	07%	moderate	2.0	4.5	30%	good	much	6.0	Turbidity
Lito  BOYA  Indefault  2.5  3.0  2074  Indefault  3.5  Current  Indefault  3.5  Current  Sol  Sol <th< td=""><td>118</td><td>80%</td><td>moderate</td><td>25</td><td>50</td><td>20%</td><td>moderate</td><td>much</td><td>5.5</td><td>current</td></th<>	118	80%	moderate	25	50	20%	moderate	much	5.5	current
L23  97%  Indecrate  2.3  4.3  1%  good  Intell  5.0    L32  91%  moderate  2.0  3.1  8%  fair  much  5.5    Average  94.4%  moderate  2.4  4.3  5.4%  good  much  5.7    Litbofacies 'E'  moderate  2.4  4.3  5.4%  good  much  5.7    L1  97%  moderate  3.0  5.4  3%  moderate  much  6.4    L3  99%  moderate  3.0  4.5  1%  moderate  much  6.5    L11  91%  moderate  3.0  5.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L115  99%  moderate  3.0  5.5  12%  moderate  much  6.5    L20  88%  moderate  3.0  5.5  12%  moderate  much  6.1    L21  99%  moderate  3.2	1.25	000/	moderate	25	4.5	196	moderate	much	50	Curten
Litbofacies 'E'  Inductate  2.0  3.1  6.%  Iair  Intern  5.3    Litbofacies 'E'  Image  P1%  moderate  2.4  4.3  5.4%  good  much  5.7    Litbofacies 'E'  Image  P1%  moderate  4.0  5.4  3%  moderate  much  6.4    L3  99%  moderate  3.0  4.5  1%  moderate  much  6.5    L11  91%  moderate  3.0  5.0  9%  moderate  much  6.5    L15  99%  moderate  3.0  5.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L20  88%  moderate  3.0  5.5  12%  moderate  much  6.5    L21  99%  moderate  3.2  5.0  4.4%  moderate  much  6.1    Litbofacies 'F'  Image  Image  Image  Much  6.5  Image  6.1    L14	1.22	018/	moderate	2.0	21	170	good	much	5.5	
Lithofacies 'E'  noderate  2.4  4.5  3.4%  good  nate  5.7    Lithofacies 'E'  noderate  4.0  5.4  3%  moderate  much  6.4    L3  99%  moderate  3.0  4.5  1%  moderate  much  6.4    L1  91%  moderate  3.0  4.5  1%  moderate  much  6.5    L11  91%  moderate  3.0  5.0  9%  moderate  much  6.5    L15  99%  moderate  3.0  5.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L20  88%  moderate  3.0  5.5  1%  moderate  much  6.5    L21  99%  moderate  3.0  5.5  1%  moderate  much  6.1    Lithofacies 'F'          1%  good  much  6.1    L14  96.	Average	94.4%	moderate	2.0	43	5 4%	rau	much	57	
Lithofacies 'E'  moderate  4.0  5.4  3%  moderate  much  6.4    L3  99%  moderate  3.0  4.5  1%  moderate  much  6.5    L11  91%  moderate  3.5  5.0  9%  moderate  much  6.5    L11  91%  moderate  3.0  5.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L15  99%  moderate  3.0  5.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L20  88%  moderate  3.0  5.5  12%  moderate  much  6.5    L21  99%  moderate  3.0  5.5  1%  moderate  much  6.1    Average  95.2%  moderate  3.2  5.0  4.4%  moderate  much  6.1    Lithofacies 'F'	Arringe	71.170	Incurrent		1.4	2.474	5000		2.1	
L1  97%  moderate  4.0  5.4  3%  moderate  much  6.4    L3  99%  moderate  3.0  4.5  1%  moderate  much  6.5    L11  91%  moderate  3.5  5.0  9%  moderate  much  6.5    L15  99%  moderate  3.0  5.0  1%  good  much  6.0    L16  96%  moderate  3.0  5.5  12%  moderate  much  6.5    L20  88%  moderate  3.0  5.5  12%  moderate  much  6.5    L21  99%  moderate  3.0  5.5  1%  moderate  much  6.1    Average  95.2%  moderate  3.2  5.0  4.4%  moderate  much  6.1    Lithofacies 'F'	Lithofacies 'E'									
L3  99%  moderate  3.0  4.5  1%  moderate  much  6.5    L11  91%  moderate  3.5  5.0  9%  moderate  much  7.0    L15  99%  moderate  3.0  5.0  1%  good  much  6.0    L16  96%  moderate  3.0  4.7  4%  moderate  much  6.5    L20  88%  moderate  3.0  5.5  12%  moderate  much  6.5    L21  99%  moderate  3.0  5.5  1%  moderate  much  6.1    Average  95.2%  moderate  3.2  5.0  4.4%  moderate  much  6.1    Lithofacies 'F'	LI	97%	moderate	4.0	5.4	3%	moderate	much	6.4	
L11  91%  moderate  3.5  5.0  9%  moderate  much  7.0    L15  99%  moderate  3.0  5.0  1%  good  much  6.0    L16  96%  moderate  3.0  4.7  4%  moderate  much  6.5    L20  88%  moderate  3.0  5.5  12%  moderate  much  6.5    L21  99%  moderate  3.0  5.5  1%  moderate  much  6.1    Average  95.2%  moderate  3.2  5.0  4.4%  moderate  much  6.1    Lithofacles 'F'           L14  96.4%  good  3.5  7.5  4%  good  much  6.5    L22  99%  moderate  1.5  4.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L22  99%  moderate  1.5  5.6	L3	99%	moderate	3.0	4.5	1%	moderate	much	6.5	
L15  99%  moderate  3.0  5.0  1%  good  much  6.0    L16  96%  moderate  3.0  4.7  4%  moderate  much  6.5    L20  88%  moderate  3.0  5.5  12%  moderate  much  6.5    L21  99%  moderate  3.0  5.5  1%  moderate  much  6.0    Average  95.2%  moderate  3.2  5.0  4.4%  moderate  much  6.1    Lithofacies 'F'	LII	91%	moderate	3.5	5.0	9%	moderate	much	7.0	
L16  96%  moderate  3.0  4.7  4%  moderate  much  6.5    L20  88%  moderate  3.0  5.5  12%  moderate  much  6.5    L21  99%  moderate  3.0  5.5  1%  moderate  much  6.0    Average  95.2%  moderate  3.2  5.0  4.4%  moderate  much  6.1    Lithofacies 'F'	L15	99%	moderate	3.0	5.0	1%	good	much	6.0	-
L20  88%  moderate  3.0  5.5  12%  moderate  much  6.5    L21  99%  moderate  3.0  5.5  1%  moderate  much  6.0    Average  95.2%  moderate  3.2  5.0  4.4%  moderate  much  6.1    Lithofacies 'F'  moderate  good  3.5  7.5  4%  good  much  6.1    L14  96.4%  good  3.5  7.5  4%  good  much  6.5    L14  98%  good  2.5  6.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L22  99%  moderate  1.5  4.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L23  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L35  99%  moderate  1.5  5.6  1%  good  much  5.5    Averace  98.2%  moderate	L16	96%	moderate	3.0	4.7	4%	moderate	much	6.5	Sub sca fan
L21  99%  moderate  3.0  5.5  1%  moderate  much  6.0    Average  95.2%  moderate  3.2  5.0  4.4%  moderate  much  6.1    Lithofacies 'F'     moderate  good  much  6.1    L14  96.4%  good  3.5  7.5  4%  good  much  6.5    L14  98%  good  2.5  6.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L22  99%  moderate  1.5  4.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L23  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L35  99%  moderate  1.5  5.6  1%  good  much  5.5    Average  98.2%  moderate  2.3  5.6  1.6%  good  much  6.1	L20	88%	moderate	3.0	5.5	12%	moderate	much	6.5	
Average  95.2%  moderate  3.2  5.0  4.4%  moderate  much  6.1    Lithofacies 'F'	L21	99%	moderate	3.0	5.5	1%	moderate	much	6.0	
Lithofacies 'F'  moderate  3.5  7.5  4%  good  much  8.0    L14  96.4%  good  3.5  7.5  4%  good  much  8.0    L14  98%  good  2.5  6.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L22  99%  moderate  1.5  4.0  1%  good  much  4.5    L23  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L35  99%  moderate  1.5  5.6  1%  good  much  5.5    Average  98.2%  moderate  2.3  5.6  1.6%  good  much  6.1	Average	95.2%	moderate	3.2	5.0	4.4%	moderate	much	6.1	
L4  96.4%  good  3.5  7.5  4%  good  much  8.0    L14  98%  good  2.5  6.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L22  99%  moderate  1.5  4.0  1%  good  much  4.5    L23  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L35  99%  moderate  1.5  5.6  1%  good  much  5.5    Averace  98.2%  moderate  2.3  5.6  1.6%  good  much  6.1	Lithofacies 'F'				-					
L14  98%  good  2.5  6.0  1%  good  much  6.5    L22  99%  moderate  1.5  4.0  1%  good  much  4.5    L23  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L35  99%  moderate  1.5  5.6  1%  good  much  6.0    L35  99%  moderate  1.5  5.6  1%  good  much  5.5    Averace  98.2%  moderate  2.3  5.6  1.6%  good  much  6.1	L4	96.4%	good	3.5	7.5	4%	good	much	8.0	
L22  99%  moderate  1.5  4.0  1%  good  much  4.5  Turbidity    L23  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0    L35  99%  moderate  1.5  5.6  1%  good  much  5.5    Average  98.2%  moderate  2.3  5.6  1.6%  good  much  6.1	L14	98%	good	2.5	6.0	1%	good	much	6.5	
L23  99%  moderate  2.5  5.5  1%  good  much  6.0  current    L35  99%  moderate  1.5  5.6  1%  good  much  5.5    Average  98.2%  moderate  2.3  5.6  1.6%  good  much  6.1	L22	99%	moderate	1.5	4.0	1%	good	much	4.5	Turbidity
L35 99% moderate 1.5 5.6 1% good much 5.5 Average 98.2% moderate 2.3 5.6 1.6% good much 6.1	L23	99%	moderate	2.5	5.5	1%	good	much	6.0	current
Average 98.2% moderate 2.3 5.6 1.6% good much 6.1	L35	99%	moderate	1.5	5.6	1%	good	much	5.5	
the second	Average	98.2%	moderate	2.3	5.6	1.6%	good	much	6.1	

C.T = coarse truncation point

# F.T= fine truncation point

#### **Discussion and Conclusion:-**

The study of grain-size characteristics of the different lithofacies of the Palaeogene Disang - Barail Transitional Sequence in parts of Kohima synclinorium suited best in understanding the lithologic intricacies and reconstructing

the broader aspects of the depositional environment. A comparison with the pattern of cumulative curves for various types of environments, as suggested by Visher (1969), indicates that the rocks of the present area correspond approximately to turbidity current deposited sandstones. A long and rectilinear C-M pattern which is indicative of transportation of fine to coarse grain particles under saltation and suspension modes with very little or no rolling (Passega, 1957) characterizes sediments of the study area. In addition, the position of point in  $V_1 - V_2$  diagram after Sahu (1983) clearly depict a turbidite environment for the deposition of DBTS. The sedimentary basin receiving detritus for the deposition of the Palaeogene sequence appears to have passed through different stages of tectonic regime leading to the development of deep sea channelized fan systems. The deposition seems to have progressed largely under the influence of turbidity currents causing superimposition of submarine fans that ultimately resulted into the heterogeneous Palaeogene Disang – Barail Transitional Sequence of the Naga Hills.

## Acknowledgement:-

Authors are thankful to the authorities of the Nagaland University as well as Government of Nagaland for extending necessary facilities for carrying out the research work. In addition, thanks are also due to the Department of Geological Sciences, Gauhati University, Guwahati for granting necessary permission to use the Leitz Laborlux 12 polarizing microscope.

## **References:-**

- 1. Chakrabarti, D.K. and Banerjee, R.M., 1988: Evolution of Kohima Synclinorium A reappraisal. G.S.I. Rec.115pts. 3 & 4.
- 2. Connor, C.W. and Fern, J.C., 1966: Precision of linear and aerial measurements in estimating grain size. *Jour. Sed. Petrol. V36, pp. 397-402.*
- 3. Evans, P., 1964: The tectonic framework of Assam. Jour. Geol. Soc. Ind., V5, pp. 80-96.
- 4. Friedman, G.M., 1962: On sorting, sorting coefficient and the log normality of the grain-size distribution of sandstones. *Jour. Geol. V70, pp. 737-753.*
- 5. Friedman, G.M. and Sanders, J.E., 1978: Principles of sedimentology, New York, Wiley and sons Inc, Canada, p.792.
- 6. James, W.C. and Oaks, R.Q. Jr., 1977: Petrology of the Kinnikinic quartzite (Middle- Ordovician) East-Central Idaho. *Jour. Sediment. Petrol. V4, pp. 1491-1511.*
- 7. Krumbein, W.C., 1935: Thin section mechanical analysis of indurated sediments. *Jour.Geol.*, V43, p. 482-496.
- 8. Lambiase, J.J., 1982: Turbulance and the generation of grain-size distribution. (Abst), 11th Int. Congr. Sed, Hamilton, pp.80-81.
- 9. McCaffrey, W. and Kneller, B., 2001: Process controls on the development of stratigraphic trap potential on the margins of confined turbidite systems and aids to reservoir evaluation, *Am. Assoc. Petrol. Geol. Bull.*, V85, No.6, pp.1-18.
- 10. Middleton, G.V., 1976: Hydraulic interpretation of sand size distributions. Jour. Geol, V84. pp. 405-426.
- 11. Moss, A.J., 1972: Bed load sediments. Sedimentology, V18, pp. 159-219.
- 12. Mutti, E., and Ricci Lucchi, F., 1972: Le torbiditi dell'Appennino Settentrionale: Introdizuone all'Analisi di Facies. Mem Soc.Geol.It. V11, pp.161-199.
- 13. Naik, G.C.1998: Tectonostratigraphic evolution and palaeogeographic reconstruction of Northeast India.Proc.Indo-German *Workshop on Border Strandlogy magnetostratigraphy pilot project, Calcutta*.
- 14. Pandey, N and Srivastava, S.K., 1998: A preliminary report on Disang-Barail Transition, NW of Kohima, Nagaland. (*Abst.*) Workshop on Geodynamics and natural resources of NE India, Dibrugarh. p24.
- 15. Passega, R., 1957: Texture as a characteristic of clastic deposits. Am. Assso. Petrol. Geol. Bull. V41, pp. 1952-1984.
- 16. Passega, R, 1964: Grain size representation by CM patterns as geological tool. Jour. Sed. Pet., V. 34, pp. 830-847.
- 17. Passega, R., 1977: Significance of CM diagrams of sediments deposited by suspension. *Sedimentology*, V.24, *pp. 723-733*.
- 18. Passega, R., and Byramjee, R., 1969: Grain size image of clastic deposits. Sedimentology, V13, pp. 223-252.
- 19. Rao, R., 1983: Geology and hydrocarbon potential of a part of Assam-Arakan Basin and adjacent regions. *Petroleum Asia Journal. pp. 127-158.*
- 20. Reineck, H.E., and Singh, I.B., 1980: Depositional sedimentary environments, 549p. Springer -Verlag: New York.

- 21. Sagoe, K.O., and Visher, G.S., 1977 : Population breaks in grain size distribution of sand- A theoritical model . Jour. Sed. Petrol., V47, p. 285-310.
- 22. Sahu, B.K., 1964: Depositional mechanisms from the size analysis of clastic sediments. *Jour. Sed. Pet., V.34, pp. 73-83.*
- 23. Sahu, B.K., 1983: Multigroup discrimination of depositional environments using size discrimination statistics. *Ind.Jour. Earth Sci.*, V10, p. 20-29.
- 24. Selley, R.C., 1970: Ancient sedimentary environments. 237p. Chapman and Hall: London.
- 25. Selley, R.C., 1976: Subsurface environmental analysis of North Sea sediments. Bull. Am. Assoc. Petrol. Geol., V.60, pp.184-195.
- 26. Sevon, W.D., 1966: Distinction of New Zealand beach, dune and river sands by their grain size distribution characteristics, New Zealand, *Jour.Geol. and Geophys.V.19*, *pp212-*223.
- 27. Shea, J.H., 1974: Deficiencies of clastic particles of certain sizes. Jour. Sed. Petrol, V44, pp. 985-1003.
- 28. Smith, R., 1966: Grain size measurement in thin section and in grain mount. Jour. Sed. Petrol., V36, p. 841-843.
- 29. Stauffer, P.H.1966: Thin section analysis: A further note. Sedimentology, V7, p. 261-263.
- 30. Tanner, W. F.1964: Modification of sediments size distributions. Jour. Sed. Petrol., V. 34, pp. 156-164.
- 31. Textoris, D.A.1971: Grain-size measurement in thin section. In.: carver, R.E., (ed), Procedures in sedimentary petrology, p.95-108.Wiley; New York.
- 32. Tucker, R.W., and Vacher, H.L., 1980: Effectiveness of discriminating beach, dune and river sands by movements and cummulative percentages. *Jour. Sed. Petrol.*, *V.50*, *p. 165-172*.
- 33. Visher, G.S., 1969: Grain size distributions and depositional processes. Jour.Sed.Pet.39, 1074-1106.
- 34. Visher, G.S., 1970: Fluvial processes as interpreted from ancient and recent fluvial deposits. Soc. Econ. Palaeont. Mineral., Spec. Pub. V12, p.116-132.
- 35. Walton, E.K., Stephens, W.E., and Shawa, M.S., 1980: Reading segmented grain-size curves. *Geol. Mag.*, *V117*, *p. 517-524*.