

Plan-form evolution of drainage basins in response to tectonic changes: Insights from experimental and numerical landscapes

K. Habousha¹, L. Goren¹, R. Nativ^{1,2,3} and C. Gruber⁴.

¹Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva 84105, Israel.

²Helmholtz Centre Potsdam, GFZ German Research Centre for Geosciences, Potsdam, Germany

³Institute of Earth and Environmental Science, University of Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany

⁴Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37215, USA.

Corresponding author: Kobi Habousha (kobihavu@gmail.com)

Key points

- A new experimental apparatus is used to study plan-form changes of drainage basins in response to tectonic tilting.
- Regularity in basin geometrical scaling is a fundamental feature of juvenile basins and is preserved during reorganization.
- Tectonic tilting triggers reorganization that changes basin size but maintains geometrical scaling relations within a narrow range.

Abstract

Spatial gradients in rock uplift control the relief and slope distribution in uplifted terrains. Relief and slopes, in turn, promote channelization and fluvial incision. Consequently, the geometry of drainage

basins is linked to the spatial pattern of uplift. When the uplift pattern changes basin geometry is expected to change via migrating water divides. However, the relations between drainage pattern and changing uplift patterns remain elusive. The current study investigates the plan-view evolution of drainage basins and the reorganization of drainage networks in response to changes in the spatial pattern of uplift, focusing on basin interactions that produce globally observed geometrical scaling relations. We combine landscape evolution experiment and simulations to explore a double-stage scenario: emergence of a fluvial network under block uplift conditions, followed by tilting that forces drainage reorganization. We find that the globally observed basin spacing ratio and Hack's parameters emerge early in basin formation and are maintained by differential basin growth. In response to tilting, main divide migration induces basins' size changes. However, basins' scaling relations are mostly preserved within a narrow range of values, assisted by incorporation and disconnection of basins to and from the migrating main divide. Lastly, owing to similarities in landscape dynamics and response rate to uplift pattern changes between experiment and simulations, we conclude that the stream power incision model can represent fluvial erosion processes operating in experimental settings.

Plain Language Summary

Mountainous landscapes develop in response to rock uplift that generates high slopes and promotes erosion in river channels. Channels are organized in drainage basins, whose geometry is defined by water divides surrounding them. A surprising feature of drainage basins is that in many cases they show similar geometric properties despite the significant variability in rock uplift pattern that drives basin evolution. The relation between this regularity and changing rock uplift settings remains little explored. In the current study, we explore trends and processes of changes in basin geometry in response to changes in uplift patterns. We use a novel approach for landscape evolution experiments capable of inducing spatial gradients in uplift rate, combined with landscape evolution simulations. We explore a scenario in which

basins form under uniform uplift conditions and then respond to a change in uplift pattern. We find that the globally observed geometric features are fundamental in juvenile basins. Basins' geometry is largely preserved during changes in uplift patterns, assisted by incorporation and disconnection of basins to and from the main water divide. Moreover, similarities between basin evolution in physical and numerical models indicate that simple river erosion models can well represent processes acting on experimental fluvial landscapes.

1. Introduction

Rock uplift emerging from tectonic, isostatic, and mantle dynamic processes is a fundamental force that acts on the Earth's surface and generates topographic gradients that promote fluvial erosion (e.g., Burbank et al., 1996; Howard et al., 1994). The spatial patterns of rock uplift control the magnitude and orientation of topographic gradients, which in turn, dictate the direction of water flow and the organization of fluvial channels in drainage basins (e.g., Forte et al., 2015; Beeson & McCoy, 2020). Consequently, to maintain the links between uplift pattern and drainage pattern, changes in uplift gradients are expected to induce changes in basins' shape and size via fluvial reorganization processes (Davis, 1899; Bishop, 1995). Over geological timescales, uplifted terrains experience spatially and temporally variable patterns of rock uplift, significant changes in the planform geometry of drainage networks and basins should be expected during their evolution (e.g., Willett et al., 2014).

Contrary to this expectation, global analysis of fluvial landscapes show that drainage basins commonly share geometric properties regardless of their tectonic setting and history (e.g., Hack, 1957; Montgomery & Dietrich, 1992; Hovius, 1996; Talling et al. 1997; Willemin, 2000; Walcott & Summerfield, 2009; Purdie & Brook, 2006; Densmore et al., 2005). These geometric properties can be quantitatively described using geometrical and topological scaling relations (Horton, 1945; Hack, 1957; Strahler, 1964; Shreve, 1966; Hovius, 1996; Walcott & Summerfield, 2009). For example, Hack's law (Hack, 1957) predicts

that the relationship between the mainstream length (L) and its corresponding drainage area (A) follows a power-law relation, $L = cA^h$ where c and h are referred to as Hack's coefficient and exponent, respectively. These two parameters are commonly reported in natural landscapes to be within a relatively narrow range of $1.1 \leq c \leq 4.5$ and $0.45 \leq h \leq 0.67$ (e.g., Montgomery & Dietrich, 1992; Mueller, 1973; Willemin, 2000; Dodds & Rothman, 2000; Castelltort et al., 2009; Shen et al., 2017; Sassolas-Serrayat et al., 2018). In addition, in linear mountain ranges and faulted blocks, the distance between drainage basins' outlets (S) has been shown to scale linearly with the distance between the main divide and the mountain front (W), such that $R = \frac{W}{S}$, referred to as the spacing ratio (Hovius, 1996; Talling et al., 1997), is approximately constant. In linear converging mountain ranges, R was found to be $1.91 \leq R \leq 2.23$ with an average value of 2.1 (Hovius, 1996). In fault-bounded blocks, R was found to have a slightly broader range of $1.4 \leq R \leq 4.1$ with an average value of 2.5 (Talling, 1997; Purdie & Brook, 2006). Notably, in some rare cases, measured scaling relations are found to deviate from these ranges. For example, Beeson et al. (2016) showed that in the High Plains, located to the east of the Rocky Mountains, and in the Northern Sierra Nevada, United States, nested basins that do not drain the main divide are characterized by anomalous Hack's parameters that fall out of the globally observed range. Walcott and Summerfield (2009) showed that several main basins in the Western and Central Himalayas that likely experienced localized tectonic deformation do not preserve the regular spacing ratio.

The documented regularity of the geometrical scaling relations across various landscapes is surprising since high elevation terrains across the globe experience variable tectonic histories, and because different terrains represent different evolutionary stages. Particularly, some basins dissect recently uplifted regions, while others drain old and tectonically inactive mountain ranges (Montgomery & Brandon, 2002; Matmon et al., 2003; Cox et al., 2010). Presumably, this means that geometric regularity is maintained during, and in spite of, dynamic planform landscape evolution. We therefore hypothesize that

90 reorganization processes arising from changing rock uplift patterns and resulting in changing basin
 91 geometry also act in a way that mostly preserves basins' geometrical scaling relations.

92 Previous studies of landscape evolution explored processes by which geometric regularity, reflected by
 93 the spacing ratio, is dynamically maintained under different tectonic, lithologic, and climatic conditions.
 94 For example, Talling et al. (1997) proposed that in the early evolutionary stages of uplifted blocks, the
 95 scaling relations are preserved via sideways expansion by stream captures in parallel to gradual extension
 96 toward the center of the domain. This process was also documented numerically by Giachetta et al.
 97 (2014). Based on numerical simulations, Castelltort and Simpson (2006) and Capolongo et al. (2011)
 98 showed that in a widening mountain front, basins' geometrical scaling relations are preserved by
 99 incorporating new sections of the drainage network that emerged on an initially undissected surface.
 100 Giachetta et al. (2014) further explored numerical landscape response to an application of erodibility
 101 gradient, and found that during main divide migration toward the lower erodibility side, the geometrical
 102 scaling relations were maintained by lateral growth of nested basins on the lower erodibility side, and
 103 growth of main basins on the higher erodibility side. Bonnet (2009) demonstrated experimentally that
 104 basins' geometrical scaling relations are maintained during main divide migration induced by climatic
 105 gradients via shrinking and splitting of basins on the drier side of the landscape.

106 In this study we explore the dynamic links between changing patterns of rock uplift, the resultant changes
 107 in basins shape and size by reorganization processes, and the associated evolution of basins' geometrical
 108 scaling relations. A combination of landscape evolution laboratory experiment and numerical simulations
 109 was performed to study two dynamical settings: terrains emerging from a subdued topography in
 110 response to uniform uplift, followed by an uplift gradient in the form of tilting. We focus on tectonic
 111 tilting because (i) tilting is widely-documented in various tectonic settings (e.g., Farías et al., 2005;
 112 Jackson et al., 1998; Shikakura et al., 2011; Whittaker et al., 2008; Castelltort et al., 2012; He et al., 2019;

113 Su et al., 2020; Stewart, 1980; Densmore et al., 2005; Ellis et al., 1999; Stockli et al., 2003), and (ii)
 114 previous studies have shown that tectonic tilting induces main divide migration that changes basins'
 115 geometry (e.g., Willett et al., 2014; Goren et al., 2014; Whipple et al., 2017; Forte et al., 2015; He et al.,
 116 2019, 2021; Shi et al., 2021; Shikakura et al., 2012).

117 **2. Methods**

118 To study drainage basins' geometric evolution under changing uplift patterns, we combined landscape
 119 evolution experiments, using a landscape evolution physical apparatus (DULAB; see below) and
 120 landscape evolution simulations, using a landscape evolution numerical model (DAC; see below) (e.g.,
 121 Goren et al., 2014).

122 2.1. DULAB (Differential Uplift Landscape-evolution Box)

123 DULAB is an experimental apparatus for landscape evolution at the mountain-range scale. It is designed
 124 to explore the evolution of fluvial systems in response to precipitation-induced surface runoff and uplift
 125 with respect to fixed base-level edges (e.g., Crave et al., 2000; Hasbargen & Paola, 2000; Bonnet &
 126 Crave, 2003). DULAB is unique in its ability to impose time-variable spatial gradients in uplift rate,
 127 allowing it to simulate fluvial system response to changing tectonic gradients.

128 2.1.1 Experimental setup

129 DULAB is made of a plexiglass frame with dimensions of 90 (length) x 50 (width) x 35 (height) cm³, in
 130 which the experimental material is initially placed (Figure 1a). The base of the frame consists of six
 131 prisms covered by a rubber sheet (by "Four D Rubber Co. Ltd.") sustaining extensional strains as high
 132 as 800%. The prisms are mounted on six electrical car jacks connected to power supply units (by "Aim
 133 and Thurlby Thandar Instruments") and monitored by a programable controller. Each car jack can be
 134 uplifted independently at a time-dependent rate. The car jacks do not uplift continuously but in discrete
 135 pulses (0.2 to 0.4 mm per pulse), producing the target uplift rate of each prism as a time average. During


136 an experiment, the experimental material is uplifted and eroded, while the upper edge of the stationary
 137 plexiglass frame acts as the base level of the evolving drainage system. The duration of an experiment is
 138 limited by the maximum height of the jacks, which is 28 cm.

139 When spatially uniform uplift is applied, the car jacks are set to uplift at the same rate, and the prisms
 140 are uplifted as if they are a single unit. When the car jacks are programmed to uplift differentially, the
 141 prisms are uplifted to form a step-like geometry, smoothened by the overlying rubber (Figure 1b).
 142 Consequently, the differential uplift pattern is transmitted to the surface of the experimental material
 143 according to the 3D geometry of the rubber, as depicted in the side-view section in Figure 1b. The
 144 particular geometry for the differential uplift experiment reported here was verified in an earlier
 145 calibration stage in which differential uplift was imposed without applying precipitation. Under these
 146 conditions, the surface topography, that did not erode by runoff and only slightly deformed by
 147 gravitational processes, was observed to be sub-parallel to the topography of the rubber (Figure 1b). To
 148 prevent downward deflection of the rubber by the weight of the experimental material and to ensure a
 149 linear uplift gradient, three free-to-rotate rigid plates were placed upon the rubber (Figure 1b).

150 The experimental material constitutes a mixture of 80.5% crushed silica grains (“silica powder”), with a
 151 median grain diameter of 75 μm and 19.5% water. The choice of material and specific mixture
 152 percentages was informed by previous studies (Crave et al., 2000; Hasbargen & Paola, 2000; Reitano et
 153 al., 2020; Bata et al., 2006). These studies demonstrated that saturated ground silica requires only small
 154 shear stresses to experience surface erosion, and at the same time is capable of sustaining high slopes for
 155 long periods, overall producing realistic landscape features (Reitano et al., 2020; Graveleau et al., 2011;
 156 Paola et al., 2009; Bonnet et al., 2006; Crave et al., 2000; Hasbargen & Paola 2000).

157 For the precipitation system, we used 24 equally spaced sprinklers connected to a pressure valve,
 158 mounted approximately one meter above the plexiglass frame. The sprinklers generate precipitation in

the form of fine drizzle (with a droplet size of approximately $100\mu\text{m}$). The small droplets generate a dense mist that descends upon the experimental surface, leading to surface erosion by water runoff. Material detachment due to droplet impacts (“rain-splash” effect) (e.g., Sweeney et al., 2015) was not detected, and hillslope-like processes were not observed as channelization reached very close to the water divides.



164

Figure 1: (a) The uplift system of DULAB. Six independent prisms mounted on electrical car jacks under a flexible rubber and enclosed in a plexiglass frame. (b) Schematic side-view section of DULAB showing (from bottom to top) the car jacks’ differential uplift configuration used in the experiment reported here, the step-like topography of the prisms, the stretching rubber, rigid plates, and the measured topography of the surface (red profile). The topographic profile was measured following a calibration stage


170 *conducted without precipitation and erosion by surface runoff. The spatial uplift gradient shown in (a)*
 171 *does not reflect the gradient used in the experiment and simulations. Rigid plates are not shown in (a) to*
 172 *highlight the behavior of the rubber.*

173 2.1.2 Experimental protocol

174 We explored a double-stage tectonic scenario. First, we imposed uniform uplift (Figure 2a) until a
 175 topological quasi steady state was achieved, whereby the drainage network topology experienced only
 176 minor changes (Hasbargen & Paola, 2000; Reinhardt et al., 2015; Goren et al., 2014). Second, we
 177 imposed a differential uplift in the form of tilting, as shown in Figure 2b. Notably, the prisms' geometry
 178 allows tilting across 2/3 of the domain width, with uniform uplift across the remaining 1/3, as shown in
 179 Figure 1b.

180 In preparation for the experiment, the plexiglass frame was filled with the experimental material, which
 181 was left to settle for approximately 24 hours, allowing the material to compact by a few millimeters, and
 182 release excess water and air. The experiment began when we simultaneously applied uplift and
 183 precipitation. The average precipitation rate we induced was $65 \frac{\text{mm}}{\text{hour}}$ with a standard deviation to average
 184 ratio of 15%.

185 To document the evolving experimental landscape, precipitation was paused every 30 minutes for a
 186 duration of three minutes. During this pause, 17 photographs were taken from different locations and
 187 angles using a Nikon B500 (16MP) digital camera. Each set of 17 photographs was used to generate a
 188 3D model of the landscape and a 0.5 mm/pixel Digital Elevation Model (DEM) using the commercial
 189 “Agisoft Metashape Professional” software. With this approach, we analyzed the evolution of the
 190 experimental landscape based on a time series of DEMs.



191

192 *Figure 2: Perspective-view photos of DULAB's plexiglass frame filled with the experimental material*
 193 *and schematics of the spatial trend of uplift set by the uplift rate of the six jacks. (a) Initial conditions of*
 194 *zero topography for the first stage of uniform uplift. In this stage, all six car jacks uplifted at the same*
 195 *rate. (b) Initial conditions for the second, differential uplift, tilting stage that began with a developed*
 196 *topography and a stable main water divide at the center of the domain. In this stage, the car jacks were*
 197 *uplifted in pairs, resulting in three uplift bands.*

198 2.2 DAC – Divide and Capture

199 2.2.1 Model setup

200 The landscape evolution model, DAC (Goren et al., 2014), combines a numerical solver for fluvial
 201 incision over a triangular, irregular, and sparse grid, with analytical solutions for the fluvial and hillslope
 202 topography at the sub-grid scale. The numerical solver implements the stream power incision model (e.g.,
 203 Howard et al., 1994; Whipple & Tucker, 1999):

204 $(1) E = K(PA)^m S^n$

205 Where $E [\frac{L}{T}]$ is erosion rate, $K [\frac{L^{1-3m}}{T^{1-m}}]$ is erodibility coefficient, $P [\frac{L}{T}]$ is precipitation rate, $A [L^2]$ is
 206 drainage area, $S [\frac{L}{L}]$ is channel gradient, and m and n are positive exponents. Hillslope topography is
 207 modeled as a steady-state diffusion profile with respect to the incision rate of the proximal channel node.
 208 A cutoff threshold slope truncates the diffusive profile. With this approach, DAC locates the position and
 209 elevation of all water divides through time, identifies capture events based on a divide breaching
 210 algorithm, and resolves continuous sub-grid changes in basin geometry and drainage area. In the current
 211 study, DAC simulations were performed on a rectangular domain with four equal-elevation base levels
 212 (e.g., Goren et al., 2014; Willett et al., 2014). Like the DULAB experiment (Section 2.1), we utilized
 213 DAC to examine a double-stage tectonic scenario. We applied constant and uniform uplift and
 214 precipitation rates on a subdued random topography until the mean and maximum topographic relief
 215 stabilized and topological quasi steady state was achieved (Hasbargen & Paola, 2000; Reinhardt et al.,
 216 2015; Goren et al., 2014). Then, we applied tectonic tilting, in a pattern similar to the rubber geometry
 217 in Figure 1b, in which the uplift rate is given by $U(\tilde{x}) = U_1 + \lambda\tilde{x}$, for $0 < \tilde{x} < \frac{2M}{3}$ and $U = U_1 +$
 218 $\lambda(\frac{2M}{3})$ for $\frac{2M}{3} \leq \tilde{x} < M$, where U_1 is the uplift rate ($\frac{L}{T}$) on the lower uplift rate edge, λ is the linear uplift
 219 rate gradient ($\frac{L}{T}$ per L), M is the width of the domain, and \tilde{x} is the distance measured from the lower uplift
 220 rate edge (see Table 1 for simulation parameters). Tilting was applied until a new quasi steady state was
 221 achieved. In order to apply the same morphometric analysis over DAC numerical surfaces as done over
 222 DULAB experimental surfaces, we interpolated DAC's topography from its original triangular grid into
 223 a structured grid (DEM) with a spatial resolution of 20 m/pixel.

224 2.2.2 DAC simulation parameters

225 We performed two DAC simulations that differ in their model parameters. The first simulation was
 226 designed to facilitate comparison between numerical and experimental landscapes. Comparison was
 227 achieved by ensuring that the scale factors for converting between the experiment and simulation
 228 parameters and outcomes were internally consistent. The channel profile in the experimental landscape
 229 was measured to have a relatively low concavity, ($\theta = \frac{m}{n} \sim 0.15$), typical of experimental landscapes
 230 produced with similar experimental material (e.g., Crave et al., 2000; Lague et al., 2003; Bonnet & Crave,
 231 2006). This concavity was implemented in the first DAC simulation by using $n = 1.8$ and $m = 0.28$. In
 232 relation to the length scale, the experimental maximum relief at the end of the uniform uplift stage was
 233 approximately 6 cm. Given that DAC domain width ($M_{simulation}$) was chosen to be 50 km (defining an
 234 experiment-to-simulation length scale factor of $L_0 = \frac{M_{experiment}}{M_{simulation}} = 10^{-5}$), the target numerical
 235 maximum relief at the end of the uniform uplift stage was 6 km in this simulation. To achieve this target
 236 relief, we estimated the fluvial relief at the channel head, $z(x_c)$ using a 1D approximation (Willett, 2010):

$$237 \quad (2) \quad z(x_c) = \left(\frac{U}{K P^m k_a^m} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{Hm}{n}} \left(\left(\frac{M}{2} \right)^{1 - \frac{Hm}{n}} - x_c^{1 - \frac{Hm}{n}} \right)$$

238 Where U is uplift rate, k_a is inverse Hack's scaling coefficient, H is inverse Hack's exponent (Hack,
 239 1957), and x_c is hillslope length. Equation 2 constrains the relation between the parameters U , K and P
 240 that would satisfy the target elevation given m and n . We therefore chose U , K , and P such that the
 241 vertical velocity scale factor (defined by the ratio of the experiment-to-simulation uplift rate) was
 242 consistent with the horizontal velocity scale factor (defined by the experiment-to-simulation ratio of
 243 basins elongation rate, V_h ; see section 0). We found that defining a velocity scale factor of $U_0 = 8.76 * 10^4$,
 244 such that 1 cm/hour in the experiment corresponds to 1 km/Myr in the simulation was consistent
 245 for both applied vertical uplift rate ratio and the emerged horizontal basin growth rate ratio.

246 Consequently, the time scale factor is $T_0 = \frac{L_0}{U_0} = 1.14 * 10^{-10}$, indicating that a duration of one hour in
 247 the experiment is approximately equivalent to 1 Myr of DAC simulation. This simulation is referred to
 248 as “low concavity”.

249 Since the concavities measured in the experiment and incorporated in the low concavity simulation are
 250 lower than those measured in most natural landscapes (e.g., Tucker & Whipple, 2002), we performed an
 251 additional simulation with a higher concavity ($\theta = 0.45$). In this simulation, the erodibility coefficient
 252 was chosen such that the quasi steady state relief with the same uniform uplift rate as in the low concavity
 253 simulation was approximately 3 km, to better simulate the relief of a natural terrain.

254 Both simulations were performed in a $200 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ domain. The high concavity simulation was repeated
 255 also in a shorter domain ($90 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$), with scaled dimensions similar to the DULAB domain, and a
 256 longer domain ($1000 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$) in order to increase the number of basins in the emerging landscape,
 257 improve statistical inferences, and ensure observations of rare basin dynamics. The full list of parameters
 258 for the simulations and experiment is shown in Table 1.

259 *Table 1: Parameters used in the experiment and simulations. Additional model parameters used in the*
 260 *DAC simulations are the same as Goren et al. 2014; Table 1.*

Input parameters	Experiment	Low concavity simulation	High concavity simulation
$L \times M$	$90 \times 50 \text{ cm}^2$	$200 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$	$90 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$
(Domain size)			$200 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$
			$1000 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$

U_1 (Uniform uplift rate)	$0.8 \frac{cm}{hour}$	$0.8 \frac{km}{Myr}$	$0.8 \frac{km}{Myr}$
$U(\tilde{x})$ (Differential uplift rate)	$0.8 - 1.6 - 2.1 \frac{cm}{hour}$	$0.8 - 1.6 - 2.1 \frac{km}{Myr}$	$0.8 - 1.6 - 2.1 \frac{km}{Myr}$
λ (Uplift gradient)	$0.039 \frac{cm}{hour} \text{ per km}$	$0.039 \frac{km}{Myr} \text{ per km}$	$0.039 \frac{km}{Myr} \text{ per km}$
P (Precipitation rate)	$65 \frac{mm}{hour}$ $\pm 10\% \text{ to } 15\%$	$1 \frac{m}{yr}$	$1 \frac{m}{yr}$
K Erodibility	-	$1.48 * 10^{-4} [m^{0.16} yr^{-0.72}]$	$10^{-5} [m^{-0.35} yr^{-0.55}]$
m Discharge exponent	-	0.28	0.45
n Slope exponent	-	1.8	1
x_c^a Critical	γ^b	0.7 [km]	0.7 [km]

hillslope length			
H^a	-	1.67	1.67
Inverse Hack's exponent			
$k_a(H)^a$	-	$0.73 [km^{2-H}]$	$0.73 [km^{2-H}]$
Inverse Hack's coefficient			

261 ^aParameters that affect the analytical sub-grid solver in DAC (Goren et al., 2014).

262 ^bIn the experiment, channelization reached very close to the divide (Sweeny et al., 2015; Turowski et al.,
263 2006), hence x_c is negligible.


264 2.3. Geomorphic Analysis

265 Using the DEMs generated for the experiments and simulations, we applied standard flow routing
266 procedures using ArcGIS to identify and extract the boundaries of drainage basins. The drainage network
267 was defined based on a threshold drainage area of 2.5 cm^2 in the experiment and 0.5 km^2 in the
268 simulations. Note that this threshold area was chosen for convenience, and it does not reflect initiation
269 of channelization. During the uniform uplift rate stage, the drainage network evolved by incising into a
270 transient, uplifting plateau. The plateau boundaries were manually delineated and removed from this
271 analysis. Delineation was based on a combination of slope and aspect rasters.

272 Drainage basins were categorized based on their association with the main divide or plateau edges and
273 based on their outlet location (Figure 3). Basins with boundaries that reached the main water divide or

the boundaries of the uplifting plateau and drained to the long edges of the domain are referred to as “main basins”. Basins that are positioned between main basins are referred to here as “nested basins” (Shelef, 2018) (“interstitial basins,” Walcott & Summerfield, 2009). Other basins were not analyzed in this work. To quantify the evolution of basins’ geometrical scaling relations, we calculated time series of Hack’s coefficient and exponent (Dodds & Rothman, 2000; Mueller, 1973; Sassolas-Serrayet et al., 2018; Cheraghi et al., 2018; Bennet et al., 2016) and the spacing ratio, R , (Hovius, 1996; Talling et al., 1997) for basins in the experimental and numerical landscapes.

Hack’s parameters were extracted based on a nonlinear, power-law regression through the data of the drainage area and mainstream length along confluence pixels. To define an error on the measured Hack’s parameters, we performed 5000 bootstrapping iterations, where in each iteration, Hack’s parameters were computed based on randomly sampled 50% of the L and A data. We report the mean and standard deviation of the sampled populations. This analysis was performed on main and nested basins, based on their position at the time of main divide formation. The spacing ratio, however, was calculated only for main basins as $R = \frac{\bar{D}}{\bar{S}}$, where \bar{D} was computed by averaging main basins’ maximal diameter, measured as the length of the long axis of the minimum-bounding convex polygon (based on ArcGIS Minimum Bounding Geometry tool), and \bar{S} measured as the average outlet spacing, namely, the average distance between a basin’s outlet and the outlets of its neighboring main basins (Figure 3). In section 3.1, geometrical scaling relations in the higher and lower uplift rate sides are depicted with different symbols.



292

293 *Figure 3: Orthophoto of DULAB landscape at the end of the uniform uplift rate stage, showing the main*
 294 *geometric features referred to in the experimental and numerical landscapes analysis. Shaded green and*
 295 *pink areas show main and nested basins, respectively. Only nested basins that were successfully*
 296 *delineated across sequential time-steps are shown in this figure. Grey and red lines mark the oblique*
 297 *and main water divides, respectively. Purple arrow marks basin diameter, D , measured as the long axis*
 298 *of the minimum bounding convex polygon (blue). Black arrow marks basin spacing, S .*

299 2.3.2. Main divide geometry and evolution

300 The drainage divide network was extracted using TopoToolBox (Schwanghart & Scherler, 2014). To
 301 focus on the main drainage divide, the divide network was truncated based on a threshold distance to a

divide endpoint calculated over a tree-like sorted divide network (Scherler & Schwanghart, 2020a). The threshold distance was 55 km in the numerical landscapes, and it ranged between 60 cm – 70 cm in the experimental landscape. ‘Main divide asymmetry’ (Bonnet, 2009; He et al., 2021; Shi et al., 2021) is defined as the ratio of main divide average position relative to the lower uplift rate edge ($\tilde{x} = 0$) to the domain width (M). Time series of main divide asymmetry allows the estimation of the main divide’s migration rate.

2.3.3. Main divide stability and drainage reorganization

Two metrics were used to map divide stability and explore the consistency of this mapping with the observed trends of divide migration and network reorganization (e.g., Guerit et al., 2018). The first metric, χ -analysis (Willett et al., 2014), accounts for the topology of the whole drainage network and is therefore considered a measure of long-term stability (Forte et al., 2018). Under steady-state conditions, when erosion rate, E , and tectonic uplift rate, U , are balanced ($\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} = 0$), the stream power incision model, Equation (1) predicts:

$$(3) \ S = \frac{dz}{dx} = \left(\frac{U}{K P^m}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} A^{-\frac{m}{n}}$$

Equation (3) can be integrated to yield (e.g., Perron & Royden, 2013):

$$(4) \ z(x) = z_b + \left(\frac{U}{K P^m A_0^m}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \chi,$$

with:

$$(5) \ \chi = \int_{x_b}^x \left(\frac{A_0}{A(x)}\right)^{\frac{m}{n}} dx,$$

where z_b is the channel elevation at the base level, and A_0 is a reference drainage area that sets χ units to length. Based on Equation (4), the parameter χ is used as a proxy for the steady-state elevation of river channels (Willett et al., 2014; Perron & Royden, 2013). Differences in the χ value of opposite equal-

elevation channel heads, could indicate that the drainage topology is not stable. Namely, the relationship between slope and drainage area do not obey Equation (3). Hence, to regain topological stability and bring the system toward equilibrium, a divide is expected to migrate toward the basin with the higher χ channel head (Willett et al., 2014). When uplift rate is uniform, χ takes the form presented in Equation (5). Otherwise, in the case where U is non-uniform, a different steady-state elevation proxy (χ') can be obtained by incorporating the known spatial uplift gradient (Willett et al., 2014):

$$(6) \chi' = \int_{x_b}^x \left(\frac{U(x)A_0^m}{A(x)^m} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} dx$$

Analysis based on χ and χ' was performed over both numerical and experimental landscapes.

The second metric is the relief gradient across divide that characterizes a shorter time scale stability (Forte et al., 2018), and is applied only to the main divide. This metric calculates the local relief (LR) adjacent to the divide, quantified as the elevation difference between a pixel on the main divide and the nearest pixel whose drainage area is equal to the threshold drainage area used to define the drainage network. Divide stability is quantified as the across-divide difference in local relief normalized by the sum of across divide relief, also referred to as Divide Asymmetry Index (after Scherler & Schwanghart, 2020a, 2020b): $DAI = \left| \frac{\Delta LR}{\Sigma LR} \right|$. This index is computed for main divide segments in both stages of the experiment and simulations from the point a main divide is fully established.

3. Results

3.1. Plan-view landscape evolution

In this section we describe changes in quantity, area, the associated divide migration and the observed modes of reorganization during the double-stage tectonic scenario.

At the beginning of the experiment and simulations, drainage basins emerged at the periphery of the rectangular domain and grew toward the center by incising an uplifting plateau. As basins grew in size,

345 they elongated and widened until channels completely dissected the landscape and a system of drainage
 346 divides formed, consisting of a long edge-parallel main divide and four oblique divides (Figure 3). During
 347 this stage, the number of main basins gradually decreased as a subset of basins gained drainage area,
 348 while others stopped growing or shrank.

349 Several fluvial reorganization processes were observed to contribute to this differential growth effect (for
 350 detailed statistics see table S1 ,Supplementary material). We categorize these processes into (1)
 351 beheading via stream capture that preserves the drainage pattern of the captured area, and (2) gradual
 352 beheading, in which gradual divide migration at the headwaters erases the drainage pattern of the
 353 shrinking basin. In some cases, these modes induce triple divide junction migration (Figure 5). χ analysis
 354 of the numerical landscapes revealed across divide χ gradients prior to documented reorganization events,
 355 consistent with the orientation of the observed divide migration (Figure 5a, c). In the experiment, across
 356 divide χ gradients were mostly consistent with the occurrence and sense of drainage reorganization
 357 (Figure 5b,d), and the few cases where χ gradients were not consistent appear to be related to topographic
 358 and topological changes that occurred in between time steps (Guerit et al., 2018). These reorganization
 359 processes persisted until the main drainage divide formed and quasi steady state was achieved.

360 Similar to previous studies (Hasbargen & Paola, 2000, 2003; Bonnet & Crave, 2003, 2006; Lague et al.,
 361 2003; Goren et al., 2014, Willett et al., 2014; Reinhardt et al., 2015), we observed that even after the
 362 main divide formed, ongoing reorganization continued, with minor changes to basins boundaries.

363 At the second stage of the experiment and simulations, as the tectonic conditions changed from uniform
 364 uplift to tilting, the landscape responded by main divide migration towards the higher uplift rate side,
 365 consistent with theory, previous simulations, and field observations (Goren et al., 2014; Willett et al.,
 366 2014; Forte et al., 2015; He et al., 2019, 2021; Shi et al., 2021; Shikakura et al., 2012). As a consequence,
 367 basins that drained to the higher uplift rate edge (Figure 2b) underwent continuous area reduction as the


368 migrating main divide gradually beheaded their headwaters. Basins draining to the lower uplift rate edge
 369 increased their size by elongating, overall generating an asymmetric topography. In particular, main
 370 divide segments migrated a distance of 2 to 5 cm in the experiment, 2 to 4 km in the low concavity
 371 simulation, and 1 to 7 km in the high concavity simulation. Figure 6 shows the evolution of the main
 372 divide asymmetry in the experiment and simulations (200 x 50 km²).

373 Upon the application of tilting and during the onset of main divide migration, χ' gradients across the
 374 main divide were measured to be high (Figure 7c) and thus predict migration toward the higher uplift
 375 rate side, while DAI values were measured to be low (Figure 8c) and thus their predicted migration
 376 directions are variable. By the end of this stage χ' gradients have decreased significantly (Figure 7d),
 377 meaning that the landscapes reached a stable configuration with respect to the applied uplift rate gradient
 378 (Willett et al., 2014). Despite that, DAI values have increased and consistently point toward the higher
 379 uplift rate side (Figure 8d).

380 In addition to main basins' area change during main divide migration, the number of main basins changed
 381 as well. Results from the high concavity simulation (1000 x 50 km²) reveal that along the higher uplift
 382 rate side, the number of main basins increased as the migrating main divide intersected the waterheads
 383 of nested basins that did not reach it before the application of tilting (Figure 9), merging their triple divide
 384 junction with the main divide. An opposite behavior was observed on the lower uplift rate side, where
 385 relatively narrow main basins were disconnected from the main divide and became nested basins. This
 386 occurred in parallel to elongation and widening of their neighboring main basins that kept pace with the
 387 migrating divide, generating new triple divide junctions. In some cases, the disconnected basins
 388 maintained a stable size, but in others, they were beheaded by both gradual divide migration and abrupt
 389 stream captures, causing the recently generated triple divide junction to migrate toward the outlet of the
 390 basins. Furthermore, we observed that the channel heads of the narrow, disconnected basins in this


simulation were characterized by higher χ values relative to their neighboring main basins before the tilting stage (Figure 9, inset). Overall, in this simulation four new basins were incorporated to the main divide on the higher uplift rate side following the tilting, increasing the number of main basins on this side by 5%. On the lower uplift rate side, ten basins were disconnected from the main divide, decreasing the number of main basins on this side by 12%.

In the experiment, where the domain length to width ratio was relatively small ($90 \times 50 \text{ cm}^2$), as well as the number of main basins, we observed that upon divide migration, a single main basin was incorporated to the main divide along the higher uplift rate side, increasing the number of main basins on this side by 20% (from 5 to 6). We did not observe disconnected basins on the lower uplift rate side in the experiment and the low concavity simulation, and the number of main basins remained constant on this side. Similar behavior was observed in the $90 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ high concavity simulation.



402


403 Figure 4: Number of main basins normalized to the length of the long edge of the domain as a function
 404 of time normalized to the timing of main divide formation in DULAB experiment and DAC simulations.
 405 Vertical dashed line indicates the timing of main divide formation ($T / T_{\text{MainDivideFormation}} = 1$). Simulation
 406 results presented here were conducted on a $200 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ domain. Inset shows the number of main basins
 407 as a function of time in the experiment (in hours) and the simulations (in Myr) with colored vertical
 408 dashed lines indicating the relevant timing of main divide formation.



409

410 Figure 5: Modes of reorganization observed in the high concavity simulation ($1000 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$) (a and c)
 411 and in the experiment (b and d) during the uniform uplift stage. (a) and (b) show examples of beheading
 412 by stream capture and (c) and (d) show examples of gradual beheading. Both processes may induce
 413 triple divide junction migration toward the outlet of the nested basin (a, b, d) or lateral divide shift
 414 between two basins (c). The insets focus on the area of interest. The drainage network is color-coded by

415 χ values, and the color bar is rescaled to highlight across-divide χ differences in the insets. χ differences
 416 across divide before the migration are consistent with the direction of divide motion. Red stars mark
 417 triple divide junctions. In the calculation of χ a reference drainage area of $A_0 = 10^{-2} \text{ km}^2$ in the simulation
 418 and $A_0 = 10^{-6} \text{ cm}^2$, in the experiment were used.



419

420 Figure 6: Main divide asymmetry computed using the average divide position relative to the domain
 421 width in the experiment and simulations ($200 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$). This figure shows the temporal change in
 422 asymmetry before (for reference) and during tilting. The vertical dashed line at $T/T_{\text{Tilting}} = 1$ marks the

onset of tilting). Error bars and colored bars represent standard deviation of the average location of segments of the main divide in the experiment and simulations, respectively.






Figure 7: Hill-shade maps showing the drainage divide network colored by the cross-divide difference in χ' before and after the tilting stage in the experiment (a, b), and the high concavity simulation (90 x 50 km²) (c, d). Red arrows along the main divide point toward the direction of higher χ' values, which is also the theoretically expected direction of divide migration toward the higher uplift rate side (Goren et al., 2014; Willett et al., 2014; Forte et al., 2015), as depicted by the side black arrow heads. Red arrows lengths reflect the magnitude of χ' gradient. This analysis is based on Scherler and Schwanghart (2020a, 2020b) and was executed in TopoToolBox with $A_0 = 2 \text{ cm}^2$ or 2 km^2 . χ' is calculated based on eq. (6) with the applied $U(x)$. Note how χ' gradients across the main divide decrease from the onset of tilting application (a and c) to the end of the simulation and experiment (b and d). This difference indicates that with main divide migration, the landscape achieves a topologically more stable configuration with respect to the applied uplift rate gradient.



437

438 Figure 8: Hill-shade map showing the drainage divide network colored by DAI (“Divide Asymmetry
 439 Index”, Scherler and Schwanghart (2020a, 2020b)) before and after the tilting stage in the experiment
 440 (a, b), and the high concavity simulation ($90 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$) (c, d). Red arrows point toward the direction of the
 441 lower local relief. Arrows lengths reflect the magnitude of the DAI. Upon the application of tilting and
 442 during the onset of divide migration (a and c) the magnitude of the DAI is small, and its predicted
 443 orientation is variable. At the end of the experiment and simulation, after the landscapes have achieved
 444 a more stable configuration and the main divide is relatively stationary (b and d), the magnitude of the
 445 DAI is high, and it consistently points in the direction of the higher uplift rate side

446



447

448 *Figure 9: Sections from a high concavity simulation (1000 x 50 km²) showing drainage basins*
 449 *incorporated (orange) and disconnected (green) from the main divide as an outcome of main divide*
 450 *migration in response to tilting. The red line depicts the main drainage divide. The inset focuses on a*
 451 *disconnected basin's headwaters and shows the χ map of the drainage network in the surrounding*
 452 *basins'. Before disconnection, the disconnected main basins' headwaters are characterized by relatively*
 453 *high χ values.*

454 3.2. Geometrical scaling relations during landscape change

455 3.2.1. Spacing ratio

456 Changes in basin spacing ratio reflect the evolution of basin diameter and changes in outlet spacing.


457 Figure 10a shows that in both the experiment and the 200 x 50 km² simulations, main basins exhibited a

linear trend of basin elongation (diameter increase) with time during the plateau incision stage and until the main divide was formed, indicating a constant and uniform rate of plateau shrinkage. The rate of inward plateau shrinkage, corresponding to the rate of main basin elongation (Figure 10a) was observed to be fastest in the high concavity simulation ($V_h = 7.72 \frac{km}{Myr}$) compared to the low concavity simulation ($V_h = 3.59 \frac{km}{Myr}$) and to the experiment ($V_h = 3.51 \frac{cm}{hour}$, which corresponds to $3.51 \frac{km}{Myr}$ when using the time scale factor, T_0).

Similar to basins' diameter increase, we observed that during the same stage, before the main divide formed, basins' average spacing (S) also increased linearly (Figure 10b), assisted by fewer basins that reached the plateau and drained it through time. Once the main divide formed, D and S remained relatively constant. The relative rates of D and S increase during the plateau incision stage, initially led to an increase in the spacing ratio, R by up to 50% in the experiment and low concavity simulation and by up to 30% high concavity simulation. Eventually, R stabilized with a mean value between 2.1 to 3.3 at the end of the uniform uplift stage (Figure 10c). We emphasize that from the earliest stages of basins' evolution, despite the increase of experimental and numerical R values, it remained within the reported range for natural uplifted blocks and linear mountain ranges (Hovius, 1996; Talling et al., 1997; Walcott & Summerfield, 2009).

After the application of tilting, we observed that R remained within the same narrow range, despite main divide migration that led to basin elongation (D increase) on the lower uplift rate side and basin shortening (D decrease) on the higher uplift rate side (Figure 10, $T/T_{Tilt} > 1$). The incorporation of nested basins to the main divide on the higher uplift rate side, acting to decrease S, and the disconnection of main basins from the main divide on the lower uplift rate side, acting to increase S, assisted in maintaining approximately constant R values on both sides of the main divide in the high concavity simulation (1000

480 $\times 50 \text{ km}^2$). Importantly, in the experiment and in the $200 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ simulations, we did not observe this
 481 effect on the lower uplift rate side as the divide migrated, hence R slightly increased due to basins
 482 elongation. Despite that, R remained within the same narrow range of values.



484 *Figure 10: Temporal evolution of main basins' geometrical parameters on the higher (squares) and*
 485 *lower (triangles) uplift rate sides of the landscapes during uniform ($T/T_{\text{Tilting}} < 1$) and differential*


486 *($T/T_{\text{Tilting}} > 1$) uplift in the experiment (black) and simulations (blue and red). Panels show the evolution*
 487 *of (a) basin diameter (D), (b) outlet spacing (S), and (c) spacing ratio (R), the ratio between D and S .*
 488 *Green rectangle and dashed line in (c) show the range of values and average of naturally observed R*
 489 *values in fault-bounded blocks, respectively, as reported by Talling et al. (1997). Linear regression lines*
 490 *and equations in (a) refer to data from the onset of the experiment/simulation until the main divide*
 491 *formed. In all panels, error bars and colored bars represent the corresponding geometric parameter's*
 492 *standard deviation.*

493 3.2.2. Hack's parameters

494 During the uniform uplift stage, the Hack's exponent of the numerical main basins ($200 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$)
 495 initially decreased steadily and then increased before reaching a stable value approximately at the time
 496 of main divide formation (Figure 11a). An opposite trend was observed for the evolution of Hack's
 497 coefficient (Figure 11b). The temporal signal of Hack's parameters in the experimental main basins was
 498 too noisy to detect a similar trend. During the tilting stage, numerical main basins showed no significant
 499 change in Hack's exponent (Figure 11a), despite the drainage area change inflicted by the migrating
 500 divide. Only a small decrease was observed in the Hack's coefficient of the basins on the higher uplift
 501 rate side (Figure 11b). Throughout most of their evolution, main basins' Hack's parameters remained
 502 within the natural range of values reported in previous studies (e.g., Hack, 1957; Montgomery & Dietrich,
 503 1992; Sassolas-Serrayat et al., 2018; Dodds & Rothman, 2000).

504 The average drainage area of nested, space-filling basins stopped growing at a relatively early stage
 505 ($T/T_{\text{main divide formation}} \sim 0.6$) of the experiment and simulations ($200 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$) and then it decreased (Figure
 506 12a). Nested basins Hack's exponent and coefficient was observed to be approximately constant through
 507 time, with mostly anomalous values, beyond the range of reported natural values (Hack, 1957;

508 Montgomery & Dietrich, 1992; Sassolas-Serrayat et al., 2018; Dodds & Rothman, 2000) (Figure 12b and
 509 c).




Legend	Higher uplift rate side	Lower uplift rate side
Experiment	■	▲
Low concavity simulation	■	▲
High concavity simulation	■	▲

510

511 *Figure 11: Temporal evolution of (a) Hack's exponent and (b) Hack's coefficient of main basins on the*
 512 *higher (squares) and lower (triangles) uplift rate sides of the landscapes during uniform and differential*

513 *uplift in the experiment and simulations (200x50 km²). Time axes are normalized to the timing of tilting*
514 *initiation, depicted by the vertical dashed line ($T / T_{\text{Tilting}} = 1$). Green rectangle represents the range of*
515 *naturally observed h and c values reported by previous studies (Hack, 1957; Sassolas-Serrayat et al.,*
516 *2018; Dodds & Rothman, 2000). In both panels, error bars and colored bars represent the corresponding*
517 *Hack's parameter's standard deviation of the population produced by bootstrapping.*



518

519 Figure 12: Temporal evolution of (a) average drainage area (b) Hack's exponent and (c) Hack's
 520 coefficient of nested basins formed during uniform uplift in the experiment and simulations (200×50
 521 km^2). Time axes are normalized to the timing of main divide formation, depicted by the vertical dashed
 522 black line ($T / T_{\text{MainDivideFormation}} = 1$). Green rectangles represent the ranges of naturally inferred h and

523 *c values reported by previous studies (Hack, 1957; Sassolas-Serrayat et al., 2018; Dodds & Rothman,*
 524 *2000). Error bars and colored bars in (a) represent the standard error (SE) on drainage area and in (b)*
 525 *and (c) the corresponding Hack's parameter's standard deviation of the population produced by*
 526 *bootstrapping.*

527 **4. Discussion**

528 4.1. Geometry preserving mechanisms

529 We performed experiment and simulations to explore the regularity of basins geometry during the
 530 evolution of an uplifted terrain in two settings – (1) the emergence of topography and development of a
 531 drainage network under uniform uplift, and (2) basin size changes caused by main divide migration due
 532 to tilting. In the first setting, the globally consistent spacing ratio and Hack's law parameters of main
 533 basins (Hack, 1957; Montgomery & Dietrich, 1992; Sassolas-Serrayat et al., 2018; Dodds & Rothman,
 534 2000; Hovius, 1996; Talling et al., 1997) formed at the onset of drainage development. The preservation
 535 of the spacing ratio was achieved by basins' simultaneous sideways expansion and elongation as channels
 536 incised the uplifting plateau, in resemblance to the hypothesis proposed by Talling et al. (1997). Sideways
 537 expansion truncated the growth of neighboring basins, preventing them from growing and occasionally
 538 shrinking their area by processes of beheading. This differential growth decreased the number of main
 539 basins (Figure 4) and increased basin spacing (Figure 10b). Consequently, together with basin elongation
 540 (Figure 10a), the spacing ratio changed only slightly and remained within the reported range for natural
 541 uplifted blocks (Figure 10c).

542 The rates at which D and S increased were constant during the plateau incision stage in both the
 543 experiment and simulations. Essentially, the spacing between basins outlets can be viewed as the width
 544 of basins (Hovius, 1996; Talling et al., 1997; Shelef, 2018), so the spacing ratio can also be referred to
 545 as the aspect ratio of basins (Shelef, 2018). Therefore, basins must elongate and widen by the same

546 proportion in order to maintain a steady spacing ratio during drainage evolution. Since R in the initial
 547 stages of drainage evolution was found to be around two, in order to maintain a value roughly between
 548 two and three, the rate of basins widening should equal approximately $1/3$ to $1/2$ of the rate of basins
 549 elongation (Hovius, 1996). These ratios were achieved in both the experiment and simulations: the rates
 550 of basin widening were ~ 0.30 to ~ 0.46 of the rate of basin elongation.

551 In the second, tectonic tilting stage, the tectonically induced main divide migration caused basins' size
 552 changes. Yet, the geometrical scaling relations remained within the reported narrow range of natural
 553 landscapes values. In the experiment and simulations, we did not observe the splitting of basins on the
 554 shrinking side that would contribute to maintaining a relatively constant R , as was reported by Bonnet
 555 (2009). Instead, along the shrinking side, the average spacing between basins decreased due to the
 556 merging of triple divide junctions with the main divide, increasing the number of main basins and
 557 decreasing their spacing. On the opposite, elongating side, we observed a counter behavior where main
 558 basins disconnected from the main divide, forming new triple divide junctions and causing the average
 559 spacing to increase. Similar dynamics were observed in numerical landscapes following main divide
 560 migration inflicted by an erodibility gradient (Giachetta et al., 2014). The disconnected main basins were
 561 initially narrow and showed relatively high channel head χ values (Figure 9), making them vulnerable to
 562 capture and beheading. Following their disconnection, triple divide junction migration continued, and
 563 most of these basins shrank via the same processes described above (Figure 11b). Ultimately, these
 564 processes assisted in preserving a relatively narrow range of spacing ratios on both sides of the main
 565 divide.

566 To explore the applicability of these processes in a natural setting, we examine the Wula-Shan horst in
 567 northern China. This terrain experiences relatively uniform climatic and lithologic conditions (He et al.,
 568 2019). A spatial uplift gradient has been suggested to generate a topographically asymmetric block with

the main drainage divide positioned closer to the higher uplift rate side, at the southern flank (Figure 13) (He et al., 2019, 2020). Recent studies have argued that the uplift rate gradient between the two flanks decreased, resulting in main divide migration back toward the center of the domain (He et al., 2019, 2021). An analysis of Wula-Shan basins reveals that a few nested basins on the higher uplift rate side appear to have possibly been disconnected from the main divide (Figure 13) as it migrated back toward the center of the domain, and main basins that are susceptible to disconnection if main divide migration persists. χ' analysis that incorporates the currently suggested spatial uplift gradient (He et al., 2019) shows the vulnerability of these basins to reorganization by beheading and capture (Figure 13). On the lower uplift rate side of the Wula-Shan, nested basins whose headwaters are relatively close to the main divide could become incorporated into the main divide if main divide migration persists northward (Figure 13).


The nested basins in our numerical and experimental landscapes are basins that lost in the competition for drainage area at a relatively early stage of drainage network evolution. Being so, they are confined between main basins that managed to grow toward a potentially stable shape (Rigon et al., 1998; Hunt, 2016), indicated by their Hack's parameters that are well within the documented range in nature. Hack's parameters of these nested basins have been shown to be anomalous in natural landscapes, and the shapes of these basins were shown to be relatively narrow (Beeson et al., 2016) and thus prone to losing drainage area to their larger neighboring basins. The anomalous values of nested basins' Hack's parameters computed here (Figure 12a) and in Beeson et al. (2016) indicate that the nested basins probably do not obey the same geometrical scaling relations as the main basins. The ongoing variability in nested basins Hack's parameters observed, may indicate that these basins, which passively fill the space between main basins, act as "drainage area repositories". I.e., when main basins have enough erosive power to grow and increase their area, the nested basins supply the demand with "easy to capture" drainage area.

592 4.2. Possible relation between R , θ , and Hack's parameters

593 Although the spacing ratios of the experimental and numerical landscapes remained within the narrow
 594 range of naturally observed values, consistent differences between the measured values in the simulations
 595 are apparent, which could be related to differences in channel concavity. A geometric model proposed
 596 by Shelef (2018) referred to this correlation and revealed that in a similar geometric domain, basins'
 597 spacing ratio (R), channel concavity (θ), and Hack's exponent (h) are inter-dependent despite them often
 598 being measured independently. According to Shelef's model, higher concavities produce lower spacing
 599 ratios, as supported also by the simulations presented here (Figure 10c). Essentially, lower concavity
 600 channels generate simpler-looking, narrower basin shapes (Shelef & Hilley, 2014), which directly affect
 601 the spacing ratio.

602 Despite the link between Hack's law and spacing ratio (Hovius, 1996; Walcott & Summerfield, 2009),
 603 our simulation results show that different channel concavities (θ) share approximately the same Hack's
 604 exponent (Figure 11a). This observation indicates that in the numerical landscapes, R likely co-varies
 605 with θ , while h remains more consistent (Shelef, 2018). Hack's coefficient, however, appears more
 606 sensitive to the spacing ratio. We observed that a relatively high R (and low θ) corresponds to a higher
 607 average c , as can be seen in Figure 10c and Figure 11b. The same effect is observed in response to tilting,
 608 where R slightly decreased on the higher uplift rate side (Figure 10c), corresponding to a slight decrease
 609 in c (Figure 13c) within the same basin group. R and c co-variance is consistent with the inferences that
 610 under the assumption of rectangular basins and a very low channel sinuosity, c would be equivalent to
 611 the square root of R (Hovius, 1996). Further, In accordance with attempts to relate geometrical scaling
 612 relations, e.g., Hack's law, to the shape of basins (Sassolas-Serrayat et al., 2018), an increase in c of a
 613 basin correlates to a basin's elongation, and a decrease correlates to a basin becoming more circular. In

614 agreement with this hypothesis, a co-variant decrease of c and R is reflected in the observation that basins
 615 become more circular as they shorten on the higher uplift rate side.



616

617 *Figure 13: Hill-shade map with delineated drainage basins in the Wula-Shan horst, Northern China.*
 618 *Grey lines depict the bounding faults. The southern fault is uplifting faster than the northern fault,*
 619 *resulting in an asymmetric topography (He et al., 2019, 2021), with the main divide (red line) closer to*
 620 *the south, higher uplift rate edge. He et al. (2019) suggested a recent decrease in uplift gradient between*
 621 *the two faults, causing the main divide to migrate northward. Green-colored basins depict possibly*
 622 *disconnected basins, and the orange-colored basin depicts a basin that could be incorporated into the*
 623 *main divide if its northward migration continues. The inset shows χ' map in the vicinity of a suggested*

624 *disconnected basin, assuming the uplift gradient suggested in He et al. (2019). The observed across*
 625 *divide χ' differences could indicate local divide instability and a potentially ongoing beheading or*
 626 *capture that will further shrink the disconnected basin.*

627 4.3. Main drainage divide migration

628 When climatic, lithologic, and tectonic conditions are uniform and constant during the evolution of an
 629 uplifted block, the main divide is expected to emerge at the center of the domain, as has been also
 630 observed in experiments (Crave et al., 2000; Lague et al., 2003; Reinhardt & Ellis, 2015) and numerical
 631 simulations (Goren et al., 2014; Whipple et al., 2017; He et al., 2021; Shi et al., 2021). However, external
 632 perturbations, such as tilting (e.g., Figure 2b), perturb the system. Channels experiencing a greater uplift
 633 gradient become steeper, and steady state elevation will be achieved over shorter distances in the higher
 634 uplift rate side compared to the lower uplift rate side, resulting in main divide migration toward the higher
 635 uplift rate side, overall generating an asymmetric topography (Goren et al., 2014; He et al., 2021).
 636 Tectonically induced main divide migration has been observed in numerical simulations (Goren et al.,
 637 2014; Whipple et al., 2017; He et al., 2021; Shi et al., 2021) and inferred in natural landscapes (He et al.,
 638 2019; Su et al., 2020; Shikakura et al., 2012; Forte et al., 2015), yet, to the best of our knowledge, this
 639 work is the first to show this process in an experimental landscape.

640 4.4. Simulating experimental landscapes

641 The parameters of the low concavity simulation were chosen to facilitate comparison with the
 642 experiment, and the parameters of the high concavity simulation were chosen to simulate a more natural
 643 topography. Qualitatively, we observed that basin dynamics in response to the double-stage tectonic
 644 scenario were similar in the experiment and simulations. These dynamics include the reorganization
 645 associated with differential growth during the uniform uplift stage and the reorganization and main divide
 646 migration in response to tilting. Quantitatively, considering the scaling factors presented in Section 2.2.2.

647 (L_0 , T_0 and U_0), we can compare process rates between the experimental and numerical landscapes. For
 648 example, the experiment and low concavity simulation displayed similar rates of drainage basins growth
 649 by elongation and widening (Figure 10a, 10b). In addition, the timing of main divide formation and the
 650 average distance of tectonically induced main divide migration appear to be similar between these
 651 landscapes (Figure 6). However, the high concavity simulation, displayed a slightly higher rate of basins'
 652 growth. Hence, the main divide formed faster.

653 The substantial similarities in basin-scale processes and rates of landscape response to tectonic
 654 perturbations between experimental and numerical landscapes could be interpreted in two ways. First,
 655 the observed processes are universal and independent of the dominant erosional mechanism. Therefore,
 656 they are likely to occur also in natural landscapes. Second, the dominant emergent fluvial erosion process
 657 that acts on the experimental landscapes produced by DULAB could be represented by the stream power
 658 incision model that is implemented into the numerical landscapes in DAC. Regardless of the exact
 659 interpretation, the observation that channelization reached very close to the water divides in the
 660 experiment could indicate that fluvial processes are essential and possibly dominate in controlling the
 661 mountain range-scale reorganizational response to changing boundary conditions.

662 **5. Conclusions**

663 The dynamic, plan-view response of drainage basins to changes in tectonic gradients are explored using
 664 a newly designed experimental landscape evolution apparatus (DULAB) and a landscape evolution
 665 numerical model (DAC). We explored two forms of tectonic changes. First, from a subdued topography
 666 to a mature mountain range in response to uniform uplift. Second, from uniform to spatial gradients in
 667 uplift in the form of tilting. Our findings derived from the analysis presented here indicate that:

- 668 1. The globally observed regularity in drainage basins geometry is a fundamental characteristic of
 669 juvenile basins and is maintained as basins grow differentially via processes of beheading and stream
 670 capture.
- 671 2. Differential uplift in the form of tilting exerted on a well-developed landscape triggers drainage
 672 reorganization that changes basins' size but preserves their geometry as their geometrical scaling
 673 relations remain constricted within a narrow range. An important process that facilitates this
 674 preservation during main divide migration is incorporation of new basins to the main divide along
 675 the shrinking side of the domain and disconnection of basins along the elongating side.
- 676 3. Predictions of the χ' metric, which incorporates information about the spatial gradients of uplift are
 677 consistent with observed changes in drainage topology and divide migration directions.
- 678 4. The dynamic response to changes in rock uplift shows significant similarities between the experiment
 679 and simulations, providing support that either such a response is process-independent or that
 680 experimental landscapes generated using the DULAB apparatus erode with accordance to the stream
 681 power incision model. Finally, we found that numerical models, such as DAC, can properly represent
 682 landscape evolution at the laboratory scale.

683 **Acknowledgements**

684 Chris Ellis, Chris Paola, Efi Foufoula-Georgiou, and Stephane Bonnet are thanked for valuable
 685 discussions and advice that helped us design DULAB. Aharon Tabibian and the BGU Faculty of Natural
 686 Sciences workshop are thanked for constructing the DULAB apparatus. Raz Edut is thanked for his
 687 invaluable contribution in assembling and maintaining DULAB. Omri Ofri, Yuval Eshet, Tom Kaholi,
 688 Hagar Tevet, Guy Fisch and Asher Perry Kellum are thanked for their dedication and hard work in the
 689 lab and for their assistance in performing data analyses. We thank Eitan Shelef for providing insightful
 690 comments on an earlier version of the manuscript. This research was funded by the Israel Science

691 Foundation (ISF grant No. 562/19). Kobi Havusha received support from the Fay and Bert Harbour
692 scholarship. Ron Nativ received support from the Ben-Gurion University of the Negev “high-tech, bio-
693 tech and chemo-tech” scholarship.

694 **Data availability statement**

695 The raw data used in the analysis of the experiment and simulations referred to in this paper, containing
 696 DEMs and MATLAB scripts, can be found in the Zenodo data repository with the DOI:
 697 10.5281/zenodo.6890372.

698 **6. References**

699 Bata, A. (2006). “Substrate Control on the Geometry of an Experimental Bedrock Channel.” *University*
 700 *of Cambridge*, Cambridge, United Kingdom. Part III Research Project.

701 Beeson, H. W., & McCoy, S. W. (2020). Geomorphic signatures of the transient fluvial response to
 702 tilting. *Earth Surface Dynamics*, 8(1), 123-159. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-8-123-2020>

703 Beeson, H. W., McCoy, S. W., & Willett, S. D., (2016). From shoestring rills to dendritic river networks:
 704 Documenting the evolution of river basins towards geometric similarity through divide migration, stream
 705 capture and lateral branching: Abstract EP52A-04. Oral session presented at AGU Fall Meeting, San
 706 Francisco, CA, 12-16 December.

707 Bonnet, S. (2009). Shrinking and splitting of drainage basins in orogenic landscapes from the migration
 708 of the main drainage divide. *Nature Geoscience*, 2(11), 766-771. [https://doi-](https://doi-org.ezproxy.bgu.ac.il/10.1038/ngeo700)
 709 [org.ezproxy.bgu.ac.il/10.1038/ngeo700](https://doi-org.ezproxy.bgu.ac.il/10.1038/ngeo700)

710 Bonnet, S., & Crave, A. (2003). Landscape response to climate change: Insights from experimental
 711 modeling and implications for tectonic versus climatic uplift of topography. *Geology*, 31(2), 123-126.
 712 [https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613\(2003\)031<0123:LRTCCI>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613(2003)031<0123:LRTCCI>2.0.CO;2)

713 Bonnet, S., & Crave, A. (2006). Macroscale dynamics of experimental landscapes. *Geological Society,*
 714 *London, Special Publications*, 253(1), 327-339. <https://doi.org/10.1144/GSL.SP.2006.253.01.17>

- 715 Burbank, D. W., Leland, J., Fielding, E., Anderson, R. S., Brozovic, N., Reid, M. R., & Duncan, C.
 716 (1996). Bedrock incision, rock uplift and threshold hillslopes in the northwestern
 717 Himalayas. *Nature*, 379(6565), 505-510. <https://doi.org/10.1038/379505a0>
- 718 Capolongo, D., Giachetta, E., & Refice, A. (2011). Numerical framework for geomorphological
 719 experiments. *Geografia Fisica e Dinamica Quaternaria*, 34, 75-80.
 720 <https://doi.org/10.4461/GFDQ.2011.34.8>
- 721 Castelltort, S., & Simpson, G. (2006). River spacing and drainage network growth in widening mountain
 722 ranges. *Basin Research*, 18(3), 267-276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2117.2006.00293.x>
- 723 Castelltort, S., Simpson, G., & Darrioulat, A. (2009). Slope-control on the aspect ratio of river
 724 basins. *Terra Nova*, 21(4), 265-270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3121.2009.00880.x>
- 725 Castelltort, S., Goren, L., Willett, S. D., Champagnac, J. D., Herman, F., & Braun, J. (2012). River
 726 drainage patterns in the New Zealand Alps primarily controlled by plate tectonic strain. *Nature*
 727 *Geoscience*, 5(10), 744-748. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1582>
- 728 Cheraghi, M., Rinaldo, A., Sander, G. C., Perona, P., & Barry, D. A. (2018). Catchment drainage network
 729 scaling laws found experimentally in overland flow morphologies. *Geophysical Research*
 730 *Letters*, 45(18), 9614-9622. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL078351>
- 731 Cox, S. E., Thomson, S. N., Reiners, P. W., Hemming, S. R., & Van De Flierdt, T. (2010). Extremely
 732 low long-term erosion rates around the Gamburtsev Mountains in interior East Antarctica. *Geophysical*
 733 *Research Letters*, 37(22). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GL045106>

- 734 Crave, A., Lague, D., Davy, P., Kermarrec, J., Sokoutis, D., Bodet, L., & Compagnon, R. (2000).
 735 Analogue modelling of relief dynamics. *Physics and chemistry of the Earth, part A: Solid Earth and*
 736 *Geodesy*, 25(6-7), 549-553. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1464-1895\(00\)00084-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1464-1895(00)00084-3)
- 737 Densmore, A. L., Dawers, N. H., Gupta, S., & Guidon, R. (2005). What sets topographic relief in
 738 extensional footwalls?. *Geology*, 33(6), 453-456. <https://doi.org/10.1130/G21440.1>
- 739 Dodds, P. S., & Rothman, D. H. (2000). Scaling, universality, and geomorphology. *Annual Review of*
 740 *Earth and Planetary Sciences*, 28(1), 571-610. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.earth.28.1.571>
- 741 Ellis, M. A., Densmore, A. L., & Anderson, R. S. (1999). Development of mountainous topography in
 742 the Basin Ranges, USA. *Basin Research*, 11(1), 21-42. [https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2117.1999.00087.x)
 743 [2117.1999.00087.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2117.1999.00087.x)
- 744 Farías, M., Charrier, R., Comte, D., Martinod, J., & Hérail, G. (2005). Late Cenozoic deformation and
 745 uplift of the western flank of the Altiplano: Evidence from the depositional, tectonic, and
 746 geomorphologic evolution and shallow seismic activity (northern Chile at 19° 30' S). *Tectonics*, 24(4).
 747 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004TC001667>
- 748 Forte, A. M., & Whipple, K. X. (2018). Criteria and tools for determining drainage divide stability. *Earth*
 749 *and Planetary Science Letters*, 493, 102-117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2018.04.026>
- 750 Forte, A. M., Whipple, K. X., & Cowgill, E. (2015). Drainage network reveals patterns and history of
 751 active deformation in the eastern Greater Caucasus. *Geosphere*, 11(5), 1343-1364.
 752 <https://doi.org/10.1130/GES01121.1>

- 753 Goren, L., Willett, S. D., Herman, F., & Braun, J. (2014). Coupled numerical–analytical approach to
 754 landscape evolution modeling. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 39(4), 522-545.
 755 <https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.3514>
- 756 Graveleau, F., Hurtrez, J. E., Dominguez, S., & Malavieille, J. (2011). A new experimental material for
 757 modeling relief dynamics and interactions between tectonics and surface
 758 processes. *Tectonophysics*, 513(1-4), 68-87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2011.09.029>
- 759 Guerit, L., Goren, L., Dominguez, S., Malavieille, J., & Castelltort, S. (2018). Landscape ‘stress’ and
 760 reorganization from χ -maps: Insights from experimental drainage networks in oblique collision
 761 setting. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 43(15), 3152-3163. <https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.4477>
- 762 Hack, J. T. (1957). *Studies of longitudinal stream profiles in Virginia and Maryland* (Vol. 294). US
 763 Government Printing Office. <https://doi.org/10.3133/pp294B>
- 764 Hasbargen, L. E., & Paola, C. (2000). Landscape instability in an experimental drainage
 765 basin. *Geology*, 28(12), 1067-1070. [https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-](https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613(2000)28<1067:LIIAED>2.0.CO;2)
 766 [7613\(2000\)28<1067:LIIAED>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613(2000)28<1067:LIIAED>2.0.CO;2)
- 767 Hasbargen, L. E., & Paola, C. (2003). How predictable is local erosion rate in eroding
 768 landscapes?. *GEOPHYSICAL MONOGRAPH-AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION*, 135, 231-240.
 769 <https://doi.org/10.1029/135GM16>
- 770 He, C., Rao, G., Yang, R., Hu, J., Yao, Q., & Yang, C. J. (2019). Divide migration in response to
 771 asymmetric uplift: Insights from the Wula Shan horst, North China. *Geomorphology*, 339, 44-57.
 772 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2019.04.024>

- 773 He, C., Yang, C. J., Turowski, J. M., Rao, G., Roda-Boluda, D. C., & Yuan, X. P. (2021). Constraining
 774 tectonic uplift and advection from the main drainage divide of a mountain belt. *Nature*
 775 *communications*, 12(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-20748-2>
- 776 Horton, R. E. (1945). Erosional development of streams and their drainage basins; hydrophysical
 777 approach to quantitative morphology. *Geological society of America bulletin*, 56(3), 275-370.
 778 [https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606\(1945\)56\[275:EDOSAT\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606(1945)56[275:EDOSAT]2.0.CO;2)
- 779 Hovius, N. (1996). Regular spacing of drainage outlets from linear mountain belts. *Basin Research*, 8(1),
 780 29-44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2117.1996.tb00113.x>
- 781 Howard, A. D., Dietrich, W. E., & Seidl, M. A. (1994). Modeling fluvial erosion on regional to
 782 continental scales. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 99(B7), 13971-13986.
 783 <https://doi.org/10.1029/94JB00744>
- 784 Hunt, A. G. (2016). Brief communication: Possible explanation of the values of Hack's drainage basin,
 785 river length scaling exponent. *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics*, 23(2), 91-93.
 786 <https://doi.org/10.5194/npg-23-91-2016>
- 787 Jackson, J., Van Dissen, R., & Berryman, K. (1998). Tilting of active folds and faults in the Manawatu
 788 region, New Zealand: evidence from surface drainage patterns. *New Zealand Journal of Geology and*
 789 *Geophysics*, 41(4), 377-385. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00288306.1998.9514817>
- 790 Lague, D., Crave, A., & Davy, P. (2003). Laboratory experiments simulating the geomorphic response
 791 to tectonic uplift. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 108(B1), ETG-3.
 792 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JB001785>
- 793 Liu, L., & Gurnis, M. (2010). Dynamic subsidence and uplift of the Colorado Plateau. *Geology*, 38(7),
 794 663-666. <https://doi.org/10.1130/G30624.1>

- 795 Matmon, A., Bierman, P. R., Larsen, J., Southworth, S., Pavich, M., Finkel, R., & Caffee, M. (2003).
 796 Erosion of an ancient mountain range, the Great Smoky Mountains, North Carolina and
 797 Tennessee. *American Journal of Science*, 303(9), 817-855. <https://doi.org/10.2475/ajs.303.9.817>
- 798 McMillan, M. E., Angevine, C. L., & Heller, P. L. (2002). Postdepositional tilt of the Miocene-Pliocene
 799 Ogallala Group on the western Great Plains: Evidence of late Cenozoic uplift of the Rocky Mountains.
 800 *Geology*, 30(1), 63-66. [https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613\(2002\)030<0063:PTOTMP>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613(2002)030<0063:PTOTMP>2.0.CO;2)
- 801 Montgomery, D. R., & Brandon, M. T. (2002). Topographic controls on erosion rates in tectonically
 802 active mountain ranges. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 201(3-4), 481-489.
 803 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X\(02\)00725-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X(02)00725-2)
- 804 Montgomery, D. R., & Dietrich, W. E. (1992). Channel initiation and the problem of landscape
 805 scale. *Science*, 255(5046), 826-830. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.255.5046.826>
- 806 Mueller, J. E. (1973). Re-evaluation of the relationship of master streams and drainage basins:
 807 Reply. *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, 84(9), 3127-3130. [https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-](https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606(1973)84<3127:ROTROM>2.0.CO;2)
 808 [7606\(1973\)84<3127:ROTROM>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606(1973)84<3127:ROTROM>2.0.CO;2)
- 809 Paola, C., Straub, K., Mohrig, D., & Reinhardt, L. (2009). The “unreasonable effectiveness” of
 810 stratigraphic and geomorphic experiments. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 97(1-4), 1-43.
 811 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2009.05.003>
- 812 Perron, J. T., & Royden, L. (2013). An integral approach to bedrock river profile analysis. *Earth Surface*
 813 *Processes and Landforms*, 38(6), 570-576. <https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.3302>

- 814 Purdie, H., & Brook, M. (2006). Drainage spacing regularity on a fault-block: A case study from the
 815 eastern Ruahine Range. *New Zealand Geographer*, 62(2), 97-104. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-7939.2006.00034.x)
 816 7939.2006.00034.x
- 817 Reinhardt, L., & Ellis, M. A. (2015). The emergence of topographic steady state in a perpetually dynamic
 818 self-organized critical landscape. *Water Resources Research*, 51(7), 4986-5003.
 819 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014WR016223>
- 820 Reitano, R., Faccenna, C., Funiciello, F., Corbi, F., & Willett, S. D. (2020). Erosional response of
 821 granular material in landscape models. *Earth Surface Dynamics*, 8(4), 973-993.
 822 <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-8-973-2020>
- 823 Rigon, R., Rodriguez-Iturbe, I., & Rinaldo, A. (1998). Feasible optimality implies Hack's law. *Water*
 824 *resources research*, 34(11), 3181-3189. <https://doi.org/10.1029/98WR02287>
- 825 Sassolas-Serrayet, T., Cattin, R., & Ferry, M. (2018). The shape of watersheds. *Nature*
 826 *communications*, 9(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-06210-4>
- 827 Scherler, D., & Schwanghart, W. (2020a). Drainage divide networks—Part 1: Identification and ordering
 828 in digital elevation models. *Earth Surface Dynamics*, 8(2), 245-259. [https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-8-245-](https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-8-245-2020)
 829 2020
- 830 Scherler, D., & Schwanghart, W. (2020b). Drainage divide networks—Part 2: Response to
 831 perturbations. *Earth Surface Dynamics*, 8(2), 261-274. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-8-261-2020>
- 832 Schwanghart, W., & Scherler, D. (2014). TopoToolbox 2—MATLAB-based software for topographic
 833 analysis and modeling in Earth surface sciences. *Earth Surface Dynamics*, 2(1), 1-7.
 834 <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-2-1-2014>

- 835 Shelef, E. (2018). Channel Profile and Plan-View Controls on the Aspect Ratio of River
836 Basins. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 45(21), 11-712. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL080172>
- 837 Shelef, E., & Hilley, G. E. (2014). Symmetry, randomness, and process in the structure of branched
838 channel networks. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41(10), 3485-3493.
839 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL059816>
- 840 Shi, F., Tan, X., Zhou, C., & Liu, Y. (2021). Impact of asymmetric uplift on mountain asymmetry:
841 Analytical solution, numerical modeling, and natural examples. *Geomorphology*, 107862.
842 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2021.107862>
- 843 Shikakura, Y., Fukahata, Y., & Matsu'ura, M. (2012). Spatial relationship between topography and rock
844 uplift patterns in asymmetric mountain ranges based on a stream erosion model. *Geomorphology*, 138(1),
845 162-170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2011.09.002>
- 846 Shreve, R. L. (1966). Statistical law of stream numbers. *The Journal of Geology*, 74(1), 17-37.
847 <https://doi.org/10.1086/627137>
- 848 Stockli, D. F., Dumitru, T. A., McWilliams, M. O., & Farley, K. A. (2003). Cenozoic tectonic evolution
849 of the White Mountains, California and Nevada. *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, 115(7), 788-
850 816. [https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606\(2003\)115<0788:CTEOTW>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606(2003)115<0788:CTEOTW>2.0.CO;2)
- 851 Strahler, A. (1964). Quantitative Geomorphology of Drainage Basins and Channel Networks. In: Chow,
852 V., Ed., *Handbook of Applied Hydrology*, McGraw Hill, New York, 439-476.
- 853 Su, Q., Wang, X., Lu, H., & Xie, H. (2020). Dynamic Divide Migration as a Response to Asymmetric
854 Uplift: An Example from the Zhongtiao Shan, North China. *Remote Sensing*, 12(24), 4188.
855 <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12244188>

- 856 Sweeney, K. E., Roering, J. J., & Ellis, C. (2015). Experimental evidence for hillslope control of
857 landscape scale. *Science*, 349(6243), 51-53. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab0017>
- 858 Talling, P. J., Stewart, M. D., Stark, C. P., Gupta, S., & Vincent, S. J. (1997). Regular spacing of drainage
859 outlets from linear fault blocks. *Basin research*, 9(4), 275-302. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2117.1997.00048.x>
- 861 Tucker, G. E., & Whipple, K. X. (2002). Topographic outcomes predicted by stream erosion models:
862 Sensitivity analysis and intermodel comparison. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 107(B9),
863 ETG-1. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JB000044>
- 864 Walcott, R. C., & Summerfield, M. A. (2009). "Universality and variability in basin outlet spacing:
865 implications for the two-dimensional form of drainage basins." *Basin Research* 21.2: 147-155.
866 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2117.2008.00379.x>
- 867 Whipple, K. X., & Tucker, G. E. (1999). Dynamics of the stream-power river incision model:
868 Implications for height limits of mountain ranges, landscape response timescales, and research
869 needs. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 104(B8), 17661-17674.
870 <https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JB900120>
- 871 Whipple, K. X., Forte, A. M., DiBiase, R. A., Gasparini, N. M., & Ouimet, W. B. (2017). Timescales of
872 landscape response to divide migration and drainage capture: Implications for the role of divide mobility
873 in landscape evolution. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 122(1), 248-273.
874 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JF003973>
- 875 Whittaker, A. C., Attal, M., Cowie, P. A., Tucker, G. E., & Roberts, G. (2008). Decoding temporal and
876 spatial patterns of fault uplift using transient river long profiles. *Geomorphology*, 100(3-4), 506-526.
877 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2008.01.018>

- 878 Willemin, J. H. (2000). Hack's law: Sinuosity, convexity, elongation. *Water Resources Research*, 36(11),
879 3365-3374. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000WR900229>
- 880 Willett, S. D. (2010). Erosion on a line. *Tectonophysics*, 484(1-4), 168-180.
881 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2009.09.011>
- 882 Willett, S. D., McCoy, S. W., Perron, J. T., Goren, L., & Chen, C. Y. (2014). Dynamic reorganization of
883 river basins. *Science*, 343(6175). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1248765>