An exceptional 47-m-thick succession of Maastrichtian to Paleocene inner-platform carbonates is exposed in the Dalmatian island of Hvar (Adriatic Sea, Croatia) in a seaside locality called Majerovica. The middle part of this succession comprises a ~5 m thick intraformational massive deposit, which is underlain by well-bedded peritidal inner-platform limestones containing latest Maastrichtian rudists and shallow water benthic foraminifera. This deposit includes a polygenic, matrix-supported carbonate breccia characterized by ripped-up platform limestone lithoclasts, up to boulder sized, and polygenic microbreccia in a muddy matrix. The microbreccia contains rare small intraclasts of pelagic mudstone containing terminal Maastrichtian planktonic foraminifera. The deposit is overlain in turn by mudstone containing a planktonic foraminiferal association belonging to the P0 and P Zones of the basal Paleogene, and by shallow-water muddy limestones containing planktonic foraminifera belonging to the P1 Zone. While facies suggest that the deposit was emplaced over the inner platform by a single large tsunami, the biostratigraphic assessment of this section and the presence of enhanced concentrations of platinum group elements, such as iridium in the topmost part of the massive deposit, lend support to the hypothesis that this tsunamiite is related to the K-Pg event, triggered by the Chixculub impact in Yucatán. This is potentially the first case of a tropical carbonate platform sedimentary succession recording the K-Pg event, which provides a new constraint for modeling both the western Tethyan paleogeography and the catastrophic aftermaths of the Chixculub impact at the Cretaceous-Paleogene boundary.
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RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF THE AE:

We have reorganized the Discussion and Conclusion chapter, and left just the “Results” in a separate section.

New Discussion chapter is reorganized into sections according to a more logical order.

We discussed in more details possible alternative interpretations, especially tsunami vs strom mechanism, and highlight the relevance of the depositional setting for the interpretation. Considering that issue, we would like to note that the underlying and overlaying succession (as shown on Fig. 2B and discussed in the text), but also the lateral outcrops of the Sumartin Formation on Hvar (it is not possible to provide a reference to these data, as these are personal observations in the field by the first author), lack any extraordinary flow deposit that could be interpreted as tsunamiite or tempestite within this very inner-platform environment. We did not discuss a possible shaking origin of the breccia, as we do not think that such a mechanism was responsible, because of the presence of various lithotypes and size of the lithoclasts in the breccia (including unusual pelagic microintraclasts in the bottom), and an erosion of the underlying sediments, as well as a lack of soft sediment deformation of the underlying microbial laminites.

We replaced some peculiar terms by more common ones, as suggested.

We added several references of some other (the most important) K-Pg sections in the region, along with the latest paper updating the western Mediterranean paleogeography.

The starting explanation of the tsunami origin is now endogenic. However, although the tectonism of course didn't stop during K-Pg boundary time, there was probably a quiescent period, as recorded within the well-constrained pelagic successions in the Adriatic region (i.e., Marche-Umbrian basin).

Considering the AE's comment regarding the western Mediterranean latest Cretaceous plate configuration, we would like to highlight that according to the updated geotectonic reconstructions, the western Mediterranean has been open for the potential tsunami propagation, in contrast to what was suggested by some previous models. Therefore, the adopted latest Cretaceous plate configuration supports a suggested model of the transatlantic tsunami. However, according to our knowledge, there are no published reports on any section recording K-Pg boundary in shallow-water setting facing the western Tethys. Thus, any possible signature in other localities cannot be evaluated, but we hope that our paper would stimulate similar investigations at other locations.

In the revised text, the Conclusion section comprises just a few the most important issues of the research.

We hope that we were able to successfully answer the remaining open questions, as all the other suggestions of the AE were included in the revised text. The revised version of our ms (text and the updated Figs. 1 and 3, and Table 1) is submitted on the GSAB online system. All the changes can be followed in the Track Changes text file uploaded also to the online system.
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ABSTRACT

An exceptional 47-m-thick succession of Maastrichtian to Paleocene inner-platform carbonates is exposed in the Dalmatian island of Hvar (Adriatic Sea, Croatia) in a seaside locality called Majerovica. The middle part of this succession comprises a ~5 m thick intraformational massive deposit, which is underlain by well-bedded peritidal inner-platform limestones containing latest Maastrichtian rudists and shallow water benthic foraminifera. This deposit includes a polygenic, matrix-supported carbonate breccia characterized by ripped-up platform limestone lithoclasts, up to boulder sized, and polygenic microbreccia in a muddy matrix. The microbreccia contains rare small intraclasts of pelagic mudstone containing terminal Maastrichtian planktonic foraminifera. The deposit is overlain in turn by mudstone containing a planktonic foraminiferal association belonging to the P0 and Pα Zones of the basal Paleogene, and by shallow-water muddy limestones containing planktonic foraminifera belonging to the P1 Zone. While facies suggest that the deposit was emplaced over the inner platform by a single large tsunami, the biostratigraphic assessment of this section and the presence of enhanced concentrations of platinum group elements, such as iridium in the topmost part of the massive deposit, lend support to the hypothesis that this tsunamite is related to the K–Pg event, triggered by the Chicxulub impact in Yucatán. This is potentially the first case of a tropical carbonate platform sedimentary succession recording the K–Pg event, which provides a new constraint for modeling both the western Tethyan paleogeography and the
INTRODUCTION

The giant Chicxulub impact in the Yucatán Peninsula of Mexico, which triggered a global mass extinction and extraordinary sedimentary perturbations around the Gulf of Mexico region at the Cretaceous–Paleogene (K–Pg) boundary some 66 million years ago (Renne et al., 2013), is probably the most debated global catastrophic event in Earth’s history (e.g., Schulte et al., 2010). The event caused the complete extinction of the dinosaurs, non-turtle marine reptiles, ammonites, and the shallow-water rudists, as well as almost all calcareous nannoplankton and planktonic foraminifera, among which only four dwarf foraminiferal species survived the catastrophe (e.g., Smit, 1982; Olsson et al., 1999; Huber et al., 2002; Arenillas et al., 2006). In continuous deep-marine sections, the K–Pg boundary is also marked by a thin horizon containing anomalous concentrations of platinum group elements (PGE), along with shocked mineral grains and impact-derived spherules from the impact fallout (e.g., Smit and Hertogen, 1980; Alvarez et al., 1980; Alvarez et al., 1990; Alvarez et al., 1995; Claeys et al., 2002; Montanari and Koeberl, 2000; Goderis et al., 2013). Evidence for major sedimentary perturbations directly related to the impact are reported from the impact site and the surrounding basins of the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean regions (Bralower et al., 1998), while disturbances such as slumps, slope failures, and related tsunami and/or turbidite deposits have been identified in a few proximal deep-marine facies in the Atlantic domain (Klaus et al. 2000; Norris et al., 2000; Norris and Firth, 2002; Claeys et al., 2002). Considering a relatively enclosed end-Cretaceous central Atlantic basin and distance from the impact site, significant sedimentary perturbations are not expected in more distal basins. A limiting factor is probably attenuation of intensity of earthquakes and/or tsunami(s) triggered by the impact (Bralower et al., 1998; Norris and Firth, 2002). However, it must be pointed out that a detailed record of the K–Pg event is not preserved in shallow-water carbonate platform environments situated on the predictable trajectory of tsunami(s), although it is intuitive that the impact must have severely affected these environments causing the extinction of many benthic taxa (e.g., Vecsei and Moussavian, 1997; Norris et al., 2001; Steuber et al., 2002).

In areas immediately surrounding the 180-km-diameter Chicxulub structure, carbonate platforms were likely destroyed by the earthquake and the gigantic tsunami generated by the impact. For example, the Cuban platform, which was located some 800 km east of Chicxulub in Late Cretaceous time (Dercourt et al., 1993), was buried under a 500-m-thick breccia known as Cacarajicara Formation (Kiyokawa et al., 2002). Globally, many tropical carbonate platform-building organisms were probably killed in the immediate aftermath of the impact due to the abrupt and drastic short-term climate change caused by the impact (Schulte et al., 2010; Vellekoop et al., 2014). Nonetheless, even though they record a complex and sensitive ecosystem, carbonate platforms in the Tethyan realm did survive the K–Pg boundary crisis (Schlüter et al., 2008). Cretaceous–Paleogene carbonate platform successions in the peri-Adriatic region exhibit a more or less extended hiatus which includes the K–Pg boundary (e.g., Eberli et al., 1993; Bosellini et al., 1999). The Adriatic–Dinaric carbonate platform domain (Fig. 1) was mostly emergent during the latest Cretaceous because of a regional tectonic phase, although in some areas of the Adriatic carbonate platform
sensu stricto, shallow-water sedimentation, interrupted by periods of subaerial exposure, lasted until the Paleocene (Drobne et al., 1989; Korbar, 2009). A short K–Pg hiatus is present locally in the Karst plateau (Slovenia) and the northwestern part of the platform, areas hitherto considered to be complete (Ogorelec et al., 2007). A succession of the uppermost Maastrichtian and possibly younger inner-platform carbonates is reported also from the island of Brač (Gušić and Jelaska, 1990; Steuber et al., 2005), although there is no biostratigraphic evidence for a Paleocene age of the topmost part of the succession, nor any obvious sedimentary record of the impact event.

In this paper, we present results of an integrated sedimentological, biostratigraphic, and geochemical study of a new section through the Adriatic carbonate platform spanning the K–Pg boundary, situated on the island of Hvar (Croatia). We focus on the middle part of the succession that is characterized by an anomalous massive intraformational deposit and records the last appearances of Cretaceous fossils.

**GEOLOGICAL SETTING**

The K–Pg Majerovica section in the island of Hvar of the Dalmatian archipelago (Adriatic Sea, Croatia, Figs. 1A and 1B), is located in the central part of the broader peri-Adriatic area, which was part of a microplate of African continental crust, the so-called Adriatic Promontory or Adria (Channell et al., 1979). This north-pointing Mesozoic promontory was in many ways similar to the present day south-pointing promontory of North America, which forms Florida and the Bahamas (D'Argenio, 1970). With the inception of the Pangea breakup at the end of the Permian, and consequent divergence between Africa and Europe, Adria entered in a long lasting passive margin phase of extension, crustal thinning, and consequent subsidence, leading to the formation of epeiric marine basins such as the Umbria-Marche, the Adriatic, and the Lagonegro-Molise basins, and the opening of a small Ligurian Ocean, which represented the westernmost extension of the Tethys Ocean separating this African promontory from the southern European continent (Fig. 1C).

In this evolving paleotectonic scenario, extensive Bahamas-type carbonate banks developed (i.e., Abruzzo, Apulia, Adriatic, and Dinaric, along with a few smaller satellite platforms), with the maximum development in the Cretaceous Period. Starting in the late Cretaceous, the switch to a convergence between Africa and Europe and consequent reversal of the regional tectonic regime from extensional to compressional, lead to the Alpine orogenic phase of the Adriatic region and the building of peri-Adriatic fold-and-thrust belts, such as the Apennines, the Southern Alps, and the Dinarides (Fig. 1A).

The Adriatic carbonate platform (ACP) is characterized by a succession of Jurassic to Paleocene carbonates several kilometers thick (Zappaterra, 1994; Vlahović et al., 2005). The Cretaceous succession is normally interrupted by a K–Pg regional unconformity (Vlahović et al., 2005), which is overlain by a Paleocene (Drobne et al., 1989) or Eocene succession of brackish-water limestones (the Kozina beds) and/or an open ramp Foraminiferal Limestones unit passing upward to a siliciclastic flysch (Ćosović et al., 2004). Such a sedimentary succession reflects the development of the Alpine orogenic deformations in the Adriatic region, when the platform was progressively deformed from the NE, and ultimately incorporated into the External Dinarides fold-and-thrust belt. As a consequence of that, the SW part of the ACP is mostly buried under thick Tertiary sediments deposited within the Adriatic foreland
The Majerovica section at Hvar represents a fortuitous case in the whole ACP, where a 30-m-thick succession of biostratigraphically defined basal Paleocene limestones rest on top of latest Maastrichtian inner-platform limestones. These strata were spared by the Paleocene-Eocene erosional unconformity which arose as a consequence of a major subaerial exposure, and is characterized by paleokarst and pedogenic features (Brlek et al., 2014; Korbar, 2009).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The Majerovica section is well exposed along the rocky shoreline of Hvar, stretching below the pedestrian path along the western coast of the Majerovica Cove in the western outskirts of the town of Hvar (43°10'21.73" N - 16°25'41.45" E; detailed location map in Korbar et al., 2010). The section was logged and analyzed in the field and samples were collected for petrographic, micropaleontological, and geochemical analyses. Standard thin sections were used for petrographic and micropaleontological assessments, following—the species concepts summarized by Olsson et al. (1999) and Huber and Leckie (2011), and the CHRONOS online Mesozoic taxonomic dictionary (http://portal.chronos.org), as well as the planktonic foraminiferal biozonation model of Berggren and Pearson (2005) and Wade et al. (2011). For each sample, two or more thin sections were analyzed. Later, samples were taken at closely spaced intervals between 20.30 m and 20.80 m, and more than 80 thin sections were prepared for further study of planktonic index-species.

Unfortunately, cold acetolysis treatment following the method of Lirer (2000) proved not to be effective in separating these rare and very small foraminiferal tests from the strongly cemented micritic matrix.

Samples of primary low-Mg calcite were obtained from the outer layers of requeniid rudist valves (three valves per level) collected at two horizons at 2 m and 13 m. These were analyzed for Sr, Mg, Fe, Mn, and for Sr-isotope ratios (Table 1), at Ruhr University (Bochum, Germany), following the method described by Steuber et al. (2005).

A suite of nine samples covering the interval between 15.35 m and 25.60 m were analyzed for the contents of the PGEs and gold at Cardiff University (UK) using nickel sulfide fire assay followed by Te coprecipitation and inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS). The full methodology is outlined in Huber et al. (2001) and McDonald and Viljoen (2006). A summary of the PGE concentrations in the unknown samples (samples were analyzed in a blindfold test mode) and the certified reference materials (WITS-1, TDB1 and WPR1) are given in Table 2.

Eight of these samples were analyzed, also in a blindfold test mode, at the University of Vienna (Austria) for $^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}$ ratios and isotope dilution generated Os and Re concentrations. For this analysis the samples were broken into centimeter-sized chips with an agate mortar and pestle before grinding into a fine powder using a ceramic almina shatterbox. About 0.5 g of each sample was spiked with a mixed $^{185}\text{Re}-^{190}\text{Os}$ tracer before successive addition of inverse aqua regia until the reaction came to an end. The sample aliquots were then treated in an Anton Paar HP-Asher at 100 bars and 170°C over night. Osmium was purified using a carbon tetrachloride solvent extraction technique (Cohen and Waters, 1996), back extracted into concentrated HBr followed by microdistillation (Birck et al., 1997). The samples were finally loaded in HBr for measurement on baked 99.99% Materion Pt filaments and covered with a Ba(OH)$_2$-NaOH activator solution. Osmium isotope ratios were
measured as OsO$_3^-$ using thermal ionization mass spectrometry at the Department of Lithospheric Research at the University Vienna using a Finnigan Triton. Signals were detected with an scanning electron microscope in pulse counting mode. All measured ratios were corrected for interferences from isobaric ReO$_3^-$ and OsO$_3^-$ molecules (Re corrections were negligible in most cases). Oxide corrected ratios were mass fractionation corrected to a $^{192}$Os/$^{188}$Os ratio of 3.08271 (Shirey and Walker, 1998) using an exponential correction law. A DROsS Os reference solution was measured along with every batch of samples analyzed. Measurements over the course of several months yielded 0.1609 for the $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os ratio at intensities of up to 50000 counts on $^{192}$Os. Total procedural blanks for Os averaged at 0.3 ± 0.2 pg with an $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os ratio of 0.22. The aqua regia fraction with the remaining Re was dried down, redissolved and chromatographically separated on columns loaded with 2ml AG 1x8 anion exchange resin (100-200 mesh). Rhenium isotope ratios were measured by inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry at the University Bonn (Germany). Rhenium blanks averaged at 4 ± 3 pg. Measurements of the certified reference material TDB1 yielded a value of 0.615 (6) for the $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os ratio, 0.76 ppb Re and 0.098 ppb Os, in agreement with literature data (Table 2).

RESULTS

Lithostratigraphy, chronostratigraphy, and sedimentary facies

The lower part of the 47.5 m thick Majerovica section (Fig. 2) is characterized by typical peritidal inner-platform carbonates of the Sumartin Formation (Gušić and Jelaska, 1990; Steuber et al., 2005), which crop out also in the town of Hvar (Korbar et al., 2010). This upper part of Sumartin Formation is predominantly made up of locally dolomitized peritidal limestones: mostly fenestral mudstones, microbial laminites, skeletal wackestone-packstone with ostracodes and miliolids, and floatstones containing late Maastrichtian requieniid rudists, rare radiolitids (Bournonia adriatica), and benthonic foraminifera (Fig. 4A). Mean $^{87}$Sr/$^{86}$Sr values of 0.7078450 and 0.7078446 from the requieniid rudists (Table 1) indicate a terminal Maastrichtian age of this part of the section according to the numerical strontium isotope time scales of Howarth and McArthur (1997) and McArthur et al. (2001).

The most noticeable atypical sedimentological feature in the middle part of the Majerovica section is a ~5 m thick, massive, polygenic, matrix-supported, lithoclastic carbonate breccia, which fill at least 0.5 m deep channels, displaying a distinct erosional contact with underlying reddish microbial laminites and ostracode wackestones (Figs. 2B, 3A, 3B, and 4B). The breccia consists mostly of unsorted, predominantly 1-3 cm long lithoclasts, including ripped-up boulders of the directly underlying and eroded limestones, along with various bioclastic floatstones containing radiolitid and requieniid rudists. The clasts are characterized by plastic deformation and diffused margins. The matrix is polygenic microbreccia characterized by chaotically mixed lime mud, peloidal silt and millimeter- to centimeter-sized bioclasts including miliolids, mollusk fragments, and benthonic foraminifera (Fig. 4C). There are also clasts of various limestone types including rare small fragments of pelagic mudstones containing Maastrichtian planktonic foraminifera (Fig. 4D). It is not easy to distinguish between the matrix of this deposit and the clasts, since it is a mixture of comminuted and partially recrystallized skeletal-bioclastic-peloidal-intraclastic wackestones (Fig. 4E), packstones,
grainstones, and floatstones. The same breccia horizon is found at two coastal outcrops laterally, ~200 m west and east (Fig. 3C) from the section, respectively, but further logging and mapping is not possible since the area is covered either by sea or by artificial objects. Thus, it is inferred that the breccia has a lateral extent of at least 400 m.

The uneven upper surface of the massive deposit is overlain by 0.3–1.0 m thick, fine-grained, microbioclastic-peloidal-intraclastic packstone-grainstone, containing small miliolids and ostracodes. This limestone includes intercalations of laterally discontinuous lenticular or abruptly truncated laminae of wackestones containing small planktonic foraminifera (Fig. 4F). Rare, up to 5 cm long mollusk bioclasts and clasts of various limestone types are found sparsely within the deposit (Fig. 3E). The uppermost part of the deposit (at 20.30 m) is characterized by a ~2 cm thick, red-stained horizon of microbioclastic and intraclastic wackestone (Figs. 3E and 3F) containing Maastrichtian planktonic foraminifera, intercalated by irregularly undulating laminoid calcite-filled fenestrae (Fig. 4G). This red-stained horizon is immediately overlain by a ~20 cm thick mudstone layer (Fig. 4G), which contains rare dwarf globigerinids typical of the basal Paleocene (see next section). Above this is a package a few meters thick made up of bioturbated mudstone-wackestone and intraclastic breccia in the lower part, and mudstone-wackestone beds above. These contain rare ostracodes, tiny miliolid and discorbid benthonic foraminifera (Fig. 4H), very rare characean calcareous algae, and planktonic foraminifera typical of the lowermost Paleocene. The section terminates in a series of thick-bedded, recrystallized fenestral limestones characterized by distinct and deeply penetrating paleokarstic features, pedogenic carbonates (calcretes), and some bauxites, which underlie a subaerial exposure surface representing a well known regional unconformity (Brlek et al., 2014). The unconformity, located at 46.5 m above the base of the section (Fig. 2B), is overlain by a middle Eocene succession of brackish-water limestones of the Kozina Member containing gastropods, which passes upward to open-ramp limestones with nummulitids making up the Foraminiferal Limestones unit, which is eventually overlain by a succession of the Dalmatian Flysch (Marjanac et al., 1998).

**K–Pg planktonic foraminiferal biostratigraphy**

The rare planktonic foraminifera contained in the complex massive deposit through the interval 15.50–20.32 m, and in the overlying muddy limestones are an unusual occurrence for an inner carbonate platform environment, which, however, are biostratigraphically useful (Fig. 2C). The presence of Globotruncanella minuta (Fig. 5A), Gl. havanensis (Fig. 5B), Rugoglobigerina rugosa (Fig. 5C), rare Plummerita cf. Pl. hantkeninoides (Fig. 5E), and Muricohedbergella monmouthensis indicates a terminal Maastrichtian age, i.e. the Plummerita hantkeninoides Zone (Li and Keller, 1998), which is here assigned to the Barren Interzone (cf. Arenillas et al., 2006, 2011), considering the occurrence of all these as reworked taxa within an event deposit. The overlaying red horizon from 20.30 to 20.32 m contains several Cretaceous forms such as R. rugosa, frequent M. monmouthensis (Fig. 5F), and very rare Guembelitria cf. Gu. cretacea (Fig. 5D). Very rare specimens of Parvularugoglobigerina eugubina syn. longiapertura (Fig. 5G), indicating a basal Paleocene Pα Zone, have been observed at 20.32 m. Co-occurrence of M. monmouthensis, Pa. eugubina syn. longiapertura, Chiloguembelina midwayensis (Fig. 5H), Eoglobigerina eobulloides (Fig. 5I), Globanomalina planocompressa (Fig. 5K), Praemurica taurica (Figs. 5L
and 5M), and Subbotina cf. S. trivialis within the 50 cm interval above the red horizon indicates that this interval also belongs to the Pa Zone. However, considering the fact that it is difficult to distinguish between Pa. longiapertura and Pa. eugubina in thin section, the former defining the P0 Zone, and the first occurrence of the latter defining the Pa Zone (e.g., Premoli Silva et al., 2003), we assigned the interval 20.32–20.80 m to an indistinct P0–Pa Zones.

According to the biostratigraphic scheme of Premoli Silva et al. (2003), the last occurrence of P. eugubina 20.80 m marks the base of the P1 Zone, which is defined by the co-occurrence of Ga. planocompressa, S. cf. S. trivialis (Fig. 5N), and E. eobulloides up to 22.20 m. Planktonic foraminifera are present in six successive samples up to 28.35 m (Figs. 2B and 2C) but their rarity and poor preservation makes it impossible to make species-level identification, except for S. cf. S. triloculinoides (Fig. 5O) found in sample 28.35 m. Therefore, considering that S. triloculinoides spans the whole biostratigraphic zonal sequence from P1b to P3b (Premoli Silva et al., 2003), we place this interval provisionally in Zone P2, possibly extending to Zone P3.

Platinum group element composition and Re-Os isotope data

We have analyzed the platinum group element (PGE) contents in 9 horizons spanning the K–Pg interval (from meter level 15.30 to 25.26) at Majerovica, with particular attention to the interval across the red horizon at 20.30 m level, in search of possible K–Pg event geochemical signature. The results of our analysis are shown in Table 2, and Figs. 2D and 6.

A complete set of Re-Os data for samples from the Majerovica section (HMA) are listed in Table 3. Measured \(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}\) ratios were found to be extremely radiogenic, ranging from \(-5.6\) to \(-6.8\). Osmium concentrations range from 0.184 ppb (sample HMA13-18.00) to 0.571 ppb (sample HMA13-20.29A), roughly correlating with the Re contents, which are lowest in samples HMA13-18.00 and HMA13-20.10 (~3 ppb) and highest in sample HMA13-20.29 (~35 ppb). Re/Os ratios range from \(-7\) to \(-62\). Notably, there are some Os abundance differences between the analyses performed at Cardiff and Vienna (obtained by differing techniques, see Method section). Whereas Os concentrations from Vienna for most samples are consistently higher compared to the data obtained at Cardiff, we obtained comparable results for sample HMA13-20.10 (including the replicates A and B). Potentially, incomplete sample-spike equilibration of the vigorously reacting carbonate samples during initial acid treatment of the samples prior to solvent extraction may explain some of the differing results, but sample heterogeneity within the deposit samples may have contributed as well. The well-known nugget effect is particularly problematic for the PGE in sediments where only small sample masses are available (McDonald, 1998). However, in any case our results indicate extreme Re and Os compositional variations between the different limestone layers. Using the Re and Os concentrations, measured \(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}\) ratios and the known decay constant of \(^{187}\text{Re}\) (see caption to Table 3 for details) we calculated the initial \(^{187}\text{Os}/^{188}\text{Os}\) values at the time of the K–Pg boundary (66.0 Ma; Renne et al., 2013, and references therein).

**DISCUSSION**

**Depositional mechanism of the massive deposit at Majerovica**
The ~5 m thick breccia unit bears some general characteristics of a tsunami deposit (Morton et al., 2007) i.e., a tsunamite (e.g., Shiki et al., 2008). The presence of pelagic mudstone intraclasts containing terminal Cretaceous planktonic foraminifera suggests that the tsunami breached through and inundated the western margin of the carbonate platform, which was then located close to the present day island of Vis, some 40 km to the west of Hvar. In fact, the southwestern margin of the ACP was probably emergent during the Maastrichtian (Korbar, 2009). However, Maastrichtian slope to basinal facies recognized within the central Adriatic offshore of Croatia suggest a deep, east-striking embayment situated west of the island of Vis (Tari, 2002; Fig. 7B). The absence of any extraordinary sedimentary record within the supposed K–Pg boundary succession exposed on the northwestern coast of the island of Brač (Fig. 7B; Steuber et al., 2005), suggests that the tsunami did not come from a northeastern source.

It must have been a tsunami of such an amplitude that it was able to mobilize pelagic mudstone from the slope off the platform margin, mix it with platform-top mud-rich sediments, rip boulder-size blocks off the innermost platform, and redeposit all this chaotic sedimentary load (and probably associated organic material) over the flat inner platform after an eastward rush of tens of kilometers (Figs. 7A and 7B). The uneven upper surface of the breccia deposit suggests rapid deposition of the chaotic mixture of various carbonate platform sediments and sedimentary rocks in a highly viscous sediment flow (cf. cohesive flow of Mulder and Alexander, 2001). Assuming subtidal depths of 5-10 m (similar to the present-day Bahamas), such a flow in a shallow-water platform could be generated only by a large tsunami (Morton et al., 2007).

There has been debate on distinguishing between paleo-tsunami deposits and paleo-cyclone deposits using sedimentological criteria, but the ‘context’ (i.e., depositional setting) is of direct relevance for interpreting paleo-tsunami deposits (Shanmugam, 2012). Although most of the tsunami-related sedimentary signatures that have been observed within the Majerovica deposit (i.e., basal erosional surface, boulders, chaotic bedding, rip-up mud clasts) can be produced by other mechanism(s), it can also be argued that by considering the depositional setting for such an anomalous deposit, the evidence for a paleo-tsunami event becomes compelling.

It must be pointed out that the anomalous deposit at the K–Pg boundary at Majerovica is intercalated within typical innermost platform succession that yield neither a record of any tsunami nor of extraordinary storm event, as the section was probably situated tens of kilometers from the platform margin (Fig. 7B). An estimate of the extent of the Vis embayment would be at least 5 km from Majerovica, since there are no outcrops of the ACP deposits (i.e., the area between Vis and Hvar that is today covered by the Adriatic Sea). On the other hand, some coastal morphological features (e.g., deep embayments) may have helped to increase the amplitude of any tsunami (Gelfenbaum et al., 2011; Stefanakis et al., 2013). Thus, the embayment of Vis could have channelized and amplified a tsunami approaching from the west (Fig. 7B).

The lack of data on tsunami deposits from modern carbonate platform subtidal environments (Shiki et al., 2008) hampers comparison, but large quantities of suspended carbonate mud could have been an important factor in supporting such a far-travelling, erosive sediment flow. Apart from a possible role of the mud in this paleo-tsunami on Hvar, another crucial factor for such an anomalous deposit was probably the flow depth. Modern storm flow depths are commonly <3 m (3.7 m during the strongest modern cyclones; Hawkes and Horton, 2012), while the
sedimentary load is deposited within a zone relatively close to the beach (up to a few hundreds of meters). By contrast, even millennium-scale modern tsunamis have flow depths greater than 10 m, and distribute the load over a broad region (Morton et al., 2007; Shiki et al., 2008). This observation also supports the interpretation that an unusually large tsunami (much larger than geologically frequent millennium-scale events) produced the anomalous deposit at Majerovica.

The truncations of laminae in the fine-grained sediment, making the upper part of the complex tsunami deposit (Fig. 2B), suggest synsedimentary consolidation of the underlying breccia deposit, seafloor turbulence, and wave action as the tsunami waves decrease in size. Envisioning a relatively flat platform top and probable lack of any significant backwash on this isolated carbonate platform, this fine-grained limestone was probably deposited under the influence of weak multidirectional currents produced by seiching after the tsunami surge within the subtidal environment. The unusually coarse clasts within this very fine-grained deposit may represent dropstones which could have fallen down to the seafloor from floating organic debris (cf. Doublet and Garcia, 2004), that must have been abundant after such a tsunami surge. The red-stained wackestone at the top, containing small intraclasts, and terminal Maastrichtian planktonic foraminifera is interpreted as an integral deposit of the tsunami event, possibly a late fall-out of the finest sediment particles from suspension, along with possible organic matter that could be diagenetically replaced by a sparite filling the undulating tiny laminae. The presence of species from a greater shelf depth (i.e., below the stormwave base) has often been observed in tsunami deposits and may represent a key diagnostic criterion to rule out storm wave deposition (Mamo et al. 2009). Moreover, the presence of pelagic microintraclasts containing planktonic foraminifera in the polygenic breccia at Majerovica is even better argument for a large tsunami that was able to mobilize off platform sediments deposited below the storm-weather wave-base, since rare planktonic specimens are found even in sand sheets deposited landward during modern tropical storm events (Hawkes and Horton, 2012).

The entire ACP has been thoroughly surveyed, especially during the production of the new Basic Geologic Map of Croatia (Vlahović et al., 2005; Korbar, 2009), but a similar deposit has not been recognized elsewhere. It is internally complex but still clearly intraformational, and thus differs from other breccias found within the ACP domain. For example, slump-related inner-platform breccias can form on when local tectonics coincides with a major drowning event, as reported from Cenomanian–Turonian successions in the nearby island of Brač (Korbar et al., 2012). Although there was impact-related cooling that lasted up to a few decades after the K–Pg boundary (Vellekoop et al., 2014), possible platform drowning would have been too short-lived to produce significant accommodation space for intra-platform redeposition of a 5 m thick polygenic breccia. Moreover, it does not contain any Paleocene planktonic foraminifera.

The earliest Danian "neoautochthon"

The contact at 20.32 m between this complex deposit and the overlying "neoautochthonous" mudstone is undulating but sharp and conformable (Figs. 3E and 4G). Some rare Cretaceous forms found in the lowermost part of the neoautochthon (Figs. 5C and 5D) may originate from locally redeposited tsunami sediment. Beside surviving Cretaceous species such as Muricohedbergella monmouthensis and rare
Guembelitria cf. cretacea, the mudstone at 20.32 m contains the first, rare basal
Paleocene planktonic foraminifera Parvularugoglobigerina eugubina syn
longiapertura (Figs. 2C and 5G), which define the indistinct P0-Pα zones up to 20.80
m (Fig. 2C). It must be pointed out, however, that the P0 Zone is rarely preserved
even in pelagic successions due to the fact that it would be extremely thin in
sedimentary settings with low accumulation rates in the order of mm/kyr, and subject
to vertical mixing, reworking, and homogenization with overlying Pa sediment. At
Gubbio for instance, where the K–Pg boundary was first defined on the basis of
foraminiferal biostratigraphy by Luterbacher and Premoli Silva (1964), the P0 Zone is
not recognizable, and the very first sediments of the basal Paleocene immediately
overlying the Ir-rich K–Pg boundary clay layer are clumped into a unique P0-Pα
Zones. P0-Pα condensation at Gubbio and in the nearby Ceselli section have also
been reported (Arenillas, 1998; Arenillas and Arz, 2000).

According to recent time scales (e. g., Wade et al., 2011), the P0-Pα Zones
spans some 200 kyr after the K–Pg boundary. However, high-resolution 3He
chemostratigraphic analysis across the K–Pg boundary interval at Gubbio
(Mukhopadhay et al., 2001) indicates a mean accumulation rate for the 55 cm thick
P0-Pα Zones (i.e., the Eugubina Limestone; Coccioni et al., 2010) similar to that of
the underlying terminal Maastrichtian pelagic limestone (about 10 mm/kyr); i.e., a
duration for this zone of about 55 kyr. Moreover, preliminary results from a super-
high-resolution (1 cm sampling), multiproxy cyclostratigraphic analysis of the
Paleocene at Gubbio by Sinnesael et al. (2013) indicates a mean sedimentation rate
for the first 1 m interval above the K–Pg boundary of 8.5 mm/kyr, thus a duration for
the P0-Pα Zone of about 65 kyr. Similarly, on the basis of the high resolution
planktonic foraminiferal biostratigraphy from the Mexican sections of Bochil and
Guayal, Arenillas at al. (2006) estimated a duration for the P0-Pα Zones of about 60
to 70 kyr.

The muddy limestones overlaying this basal neoautochthon, contain inner-
platform biota typical for the depauperate “Danian desert” (Gušić and Jelaska, 1990),
along with some planktonic foraminifera, which define the successive early Paleocene
biozones P1, and possibly P2. Such an unusual occurrence of planktonic foraminifera
within a tropical inner-platform environment suggests that the shoals/reefs at the ACP
margin were breached by a tsunami surge(s), allowing inflow from the open sea, prior
to the recovery of a normal carbonate production and reef building biota during the
earliest Paleocene (Vecsei and Moussavian, 1997).

Geochemical evidence /signature of the K–Pg event

In the Umbria-Marche basin of Italy, elevated concentrations of Ir within the
1-2 cm thick K–Pg boundary clay range from 1.2 ppb to 10.3 ppb among some 18
sections analyzed in the region (Montanari, 1991), compared to a background of
about 0.02 ppb found in the pelagic limestones above and below the boundary
(Alvarez et al., 1990). Through the lower 40 cm of the P0-Pα Zones at Gubbio, Ir
concentrations drop to about 0.06 ppb, still a factor of 3 higher than background, but
probably resulting from remobilization and vertical mixing caused by bioturbation
(Montanari, 1991). According to the high-resolution 3He chemostratigraphic analysis
of Mukhopadhay et al. (2001), the Ir-rich K–Pg boundary clay at Gubbio represents
a duration of about 7 kyr.

At Majerovica (Hvar), the mean concentration of Ir from two replicated
analyses is 0.55 ±0.06 ppb. This is not a strong anomaly compared with most K–Pg pelagic boundary sites around the world (e.g., Goderis et al., 2013) but considering the high-energy environment represented by this packstone, we suggest that this anomaly is sufficiently clear to be consistent with the impact signature. In fact, in all the known sections around the world where the K–Pg is associated with a tsunami or a mass wasting deposit, Ir abundance does not exceed 1.0 ppb (Goderis et al., 2013). Here, however, that Pd, Pt, and Au abundances peak immediately above the red horizon at 20.32 m, some 20 cm above the Ir, Ru, Rh, and Os abundance peaks. This can be explained by different mobilities these elements may have experienced during diagenesis. Palladium, Pt, and Au are all more mobile than the other PGEs (e.g., Evans et al., 1993; Koeberl et al., 2012) and they just need to be mobilized a short distance and redeposited in a zone with contrasting pH/Eh conditions (i.e., the red-stained horizon) leading to the apparent discrepancy that present at Majerovica. Features like this have been observed in a number of different settings from other ejecta horizons to sediment-hosted mineral deposits and modern marine sediments (e.g., Colodner et al., 1992; Evans et al., 1993; De Vos et al., 2002; Simonson et al., 2009; Jowitt and Keays 2011 and references therein). Despite this possible influence of mobilization, PGE abundance ratios in the packstone layer (sample HMA 13-20.10) seem to be dominated by a meteoritic component. PGE ratios within this sample are consistently closer to the proposed chondritic component compared to all other samples in the interval between 18.00 and 20.32 m (Fig. 6). This, together with the Ir anomaly described above, provides strong evidence for an impact signature within the packstone.

The $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os values (Table 3) are extremely radiogenic, with a spread between 5.4 and 6.7, resulting in unrealistic and contrasting values compared to any hypothetical Cretaceous and Paleogene sea water compositions (~0.4 to ~0.6; Peucker-Ehrenbrinck et al., 1995). Such $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os ratios may point toward a significant modification of the sea water chemistry, possible due to local and enhanced influx of crustal material (typically exhibiting radiogenic $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os ratios). For this reason, no definite statement about the presence of a meteoritic component can be made based on Os isotopic compositions, as the crustal input obscures any extraterrestrial contribution. The Re concentrations and $^{187}$Re/$^{188}$Os ratios of the entire profile, although lowest in the packstone (sample HMA 13-20.10), both exceed values typical for the upper continental crust (~0.2 ppb Re and between ~20 to ~50 for $^{187}$Re/$^{188}$Os; Peucker-Ehrenbrinck and Jahn, 2001), demonstrating that the Re budget is unrelated to the impact event (chondrites usually exhibit $^{187}$Re/$^{188}$Os ratios of ~0.4; e.g., Shirey and Walker, 1998). Instead, the observed concentrations require significant Re addition. The potential for authigenic enrichment of Re above crustal concentrations is greater than for many other elements (e.g., Crusius et al., 1996), especially under reducing conditions. Suboxic sediments, therefore, provide a sink for Re, making this element a useful tracer for redox conditions in continental margin sediments (e.g., Crusius et al., 1996).

Similar results were obtained in other studies as well. Brauns et al. (2001) measured extreme Re and Os compositional variations between different limestones of the upper Devonian "Kellwasser" horizon at the Frasnian/Famennian boundary (~367 Myr), which is assumed to record one of the most severe biological crises that occurred in the Phanerozoic. Re concentrations of up to 40 ppb and Os concentrations of up to 830 ppt, are comparable to our results, and very radiogenic $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os ratios between ~1.2 and ~46 (corresponding to published $^{187}$Os/$^{186}$Os ratios between 9.865 and 388.35) were also measured. These values were interpreted in favor of an absence
of a meteoritic component at the Frasnian/Famennian boundary and the probable
existence of a suboxic environment (Brauns et al., 2001). Moreover, Gordon et al.
(2009) similarly concluded that highly radiogenic initial $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os ratios calculated
from measured Os isotope signatures of shales of the Frasnian/Famennian boundary at
the La Serre section point toward secondary disturbance, masking any small
meteoritic contributions.

In summary, the PGE interelement ratios support an impact signature within
this relatively high-energy deposit (Figs. 2D and 6; Table 2), whereas Os isotopes and
Re/Os ratios for samples from the Hvar K–Pg boundary (Table 3) neither support nor
disprove the possible existence of an extraterrestrial component. Radiogenic
$^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os and elevated Re/Os ratios within the packstone and across the whole
profile are dominated by an enhanced clastic input into the sea water, as well as
significant Re addition to the sediments in an anoxic milieu. Therefore, these results
provide evidence for another interesting locality of enhanced input of crustal material
to local and suboxic marine environments, which (besides the evidence found in
limestones from the F-F boundary layer described above) are related to a global
catastrophe.

**Tsunami origin and possible link with the Chicxulub impact in Yucatan**

Evidence of endogenic seismic activity and synsedimentary disturbances in
Late Cretaceous–Paleocene time is found throughout the Umbria–Marche basin, and
related eastern (Cônero) and southern (Abruzzo) carbonate platform margins (see Fig.
1C for location; Alvarez et al., 1985; Montanari, 1988; Montanari et al., 1989). In the
Furlo and Genga depocenters of the Umbria-Marche basin, the Santonian to Danian
succession of the pelagic Scaglia Rossa Formation is characterized by a sequence of
calcareous seismo-turbidites made up of remobilized intrabasinal pelagic mud (Bice
et al., 2007). In the Cônero and Montagna dei Fiori transitional facies of the basin,
similar calcareous turbidites and massive calciruditic grain flows are made up of
debris derived from carbonate aprons, which were festooning the margins of a small
carbonate platform located at a short distance to the east of Monte Cônero, and the
large Abruzzo carbonate platform to the south of the Montagna dei Fiori (Montanari
et al., 1989). Yet, none of these localities preserves evidence of disturbances or
seismic activity coincident with the K–Pg event. The Ir-rich K–Pg boundary clay
layer is everywhere sandwiched between the undisturbed pelagic limestone of the
*Abathomphalus majoeroensis* Zone, and that of the overlying P0-Pα Zones (Montanari
and Koeberl, 2000). Amalgamated turbidites at Furlo and Monte Cônero are found
within the P1 Zone, some 60-80 cm above the K–Pg boundary. A similar situation is
found in a Scaglia Rossa succession in western Sicily (Catalano et al., 1973).
Therefore, whatever triggered those turbidites, a seismic event and/or a tsunami, must
have happened tens of thousands of years after the impact event.

If the Majerovica tsunami is a direct consequence of the Chicxulub impact in
Yucatan, there are two possible scenarios for where the megawave(s) originated from:
1) the tsunami was generated by a western Tethys shelf/platform failure caused by
earthquakes which were activated by an attenuated seismic wave triggered by the
impact; or 2) the tsunami was generated on the eastern sides of the Cuban and/or
Caribbean platforms (or the Florida promontory) and propagated eastward across the
Atlantic Ocean, funneled into the western Tethys, and struck the western margin of
the large Adriatic carbonate platform (Fig. 7A). In both scenarios, the tsunami would
have reached the ACP within 24 hours after the impact, which a much shorter time
than the settling of the finest-grained, non-ballistic impact fallout in such a distant region (Artemieva and Morgan, 2009). It follows that the PGE-enriched impact fallout would be found in the sediments above the K–Pg tsunamite, in the suspension fallout deposit and/or diluted in the neoautochthonous P0-Pα biomicrite due to vertical mixing. On the other hand, coarser-grained impact ejecta reaching the Adriatic region ballistically would have fallen out before the tsunami struck the ACP, and would be distributed sparsely within the massive tsunami deposit.

The first scenario requires that an attenuated seismic wave reached the western Tethys region with enough residual energy to trigger major earthquakes, causing mass-wasting of the margins of platforms or shorelines. Considering the possibility that the unusual deep-sea slumps at the K–Pg boundary from the offshore of Portugal (DSDP Site 398D; Norris et al., 2000; Norris and Firth, 2002) may have been caused by a seismically-induced collapse of the southwestern European continental margin, southeast-bound tsunamis may also have been triggered in the southeastern margins of the continental microplates of Corsica, Sardinia, Calabria, Kabilia, and Alboran, which were still attached to the southern margins of Europe (Rosenbaum et al., 2002, Advokaat et al., 2014; Figs. 1C and 7A). However, no evidence of any seismic or tsunami event is found in the complete and continuous outer-neritic GSSP section of El Kef, in Tunisia (Molina et al., 2006), nor in other marine sites in the region, most of which represent deeper-marine deposits (Smit, 1999). Most of the outer neritic successions of Tunisia, which faced the southern European margins, were probably protected from any direct (westerly) Atlantic tsunami by a region of exposed land, and lack sedimentary evidence for an incoming tsunami from the north (Adatte et al., 2002; Figs. 1C and 7A). On the other hand, the unusually coarse-grained deposit overlying the erosional surface at the tentatively placed K–Pg boundary within the inner neritic Seldja section (Fig. 1C, Adatte et al., 2002) suggests that evidence of tsunami deposition may still be present in shallow-water successions in the region.

Thus, the scenario of a tsunami that was generated in the margins of the western Atlantic, as a direct consequence of the Chicxulub impact event (Klaus et al., 2000; Norris et al., 2000; Norris and Firth, 2002; Claeys et al., 2002), which then propagated across the Atlantic Ocean (Fig. 7A), seems the more plausible. It may have entered the western Tethys through the then at least ~400 km wide Gibraltar strait, continuing its east-bound run across the unobstructed western Tethys ocean, passing by the north side of the Abruzzo carbonate platform, and finally striking the western margin of the Adriatic carbonate platform. Small carbonate banks located offshore of the Bahamas-type ACP, such as the small carbonate platform of Monte Cònero at the eastern margin of the Umbria–Marche basin (see Fig. 1C; Montanari et al., 1989; Montanari and Koeberl, 2000), and some others north of it, close to the western margin of the Adriatic platform (Korbar, 2009), were probably completely inundated. These small platforms were situated northwest of the deep embayment of Vis (Fig. 1C) which was on the predicted direct trajectory of the tsunami (Fig. 7B) and thus may have increased the run-up hight and the tsunami surge (cf. Gelfenbaum et al., 2011; Stefanakis et al., 2013) on that part of the ACP.

This finding on Hvar should stimulate further research of the Majerovica locality in more details, as well as possible re-investigation of the other successions in the region with special emphasis on potential tsunami evidence. If confirmed, this finding provides a new constraint for further modeling of the catastrophic aftermaths of the Chicxulub impact at the Cretaceous–Paleogene boundary. The modeling could be important also for the debated western Tethyan paleogeographic and geodynamic reconstructions.
CONCLUSIONS

The Majerovica section at Hvar, Croatia, represents the first-recognized case of a sedimentary record across the K–Pg boundary, constrained by multiple, independent stratigraphical methods, in a tropical carbonate platform setting. We hypothesize that the unusual massive intraformational deposit and the overlying finer-grained sediment localized to this area represent a complex tsunamite deposited around the K–Pg boundary.

The elevated PGE abundances, including the Ir peak measured in the topmost part of the tsunamite, suggest a causal link with the Chicxulub impact event in Yucatan. The Os isotopic composition of the boundary samples is dominated, however, by an unusually high Re content, which, in turn, results in highly radiogenic Os isotope ratios that mask any possible extraterrestrial signature.

There is the lack of reported evidence for any major seismic and/or synsedimentary disturbance within slope and basinal successions during the K–Pg boundary interval in the peri-Adriatic region. Thus, the unusual sedimentary record at Hvar is interpreted to be the consequence of a major tsunami that was generated by the collapse(s) of the western Atlantic margins induced by the Chicxulub impact event.
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**FIGURE CAPTIONS**

Figure 1 - A) Geographic map and main orogenic fronts of the western Mediterranean region, and B) location of the Majerovica section (HMA) in the southwestern side of the island of Hvar in the Dalmatian archipelago. C) Maastrichtian paleogeography of the western Mediterranean region, simplified and redrawn from Dercourt et al. (1993), Rosenbaum et al. (2002), and Adatte et al. (2002).

Figure 2 - Integrated stratigraphy of the K–Pg section at Majerovica: A) Panoramic view of the key outcrop; B) Chronostratigraphy, lithostratigraphy, and sedimentary facies; C) Diagnostic planktonic foraminifera taxa occurrences as identified in thin section, and relative biostratigraphic assessment; D) Stratigraphic distribution of PGE and gold abundances.

Figure 3 – Macrofacies of the K–Pg section of Majerovica. A) Erosional contact between the inner platform reddish microbial laminit/wackestone and the overlying polygenic breccia at meter level 15.50; B) Texture of the polygenic, matrix-supported carbonate breccia exposed at meter level 17.5; C) Texture of the polygenic, matrix-supported carbonate breccia that includes a >50 cm long ripped-up boulder of the underlying ostracode wackestone, well exposed at eastern coast of the Majerovica cove; D) Intraclast, possibly a dropstone, in the fine grained sediment immediately overlying the breccia unit at about meter level 20; E) The fine grained packstone underlying a ~2 cm thick red-stained laminated wackestone at meter level 20.30, which separates it from the overlying mudstone containing rare basal Danian planktonic foraminifera; F) Polished slab of the uppermost part of the packstone and the underlying red-stained laminated wackestone (the contact at meter level 20.30 - topmost part of the tsunami deposit).

Figure 4 - Microfacies of the Majerovica K–Pg peritidal limestones (thin section
micro-photographs): A) Peloidal packstone with *Rhapsydonina liburnica* and miliolid tests (0.90 m); B) Ostracod wackestone underlaying the lower erosional boundary of the K–Pg deposit (15.35 m); C) Lowermost part of the tsunamiite characterized by a chaotic mixture of lithified lime mud, peloidal silt and mm to cm sized bioclasts in intraclastic-bioclastic-packstone-grainstone containing various limestone lithotypes, bioclasts, miliolids etc. (15.50 m); D) Small intraclast (dark area in the central-lower part of the microphotograph) of a biomicrite containing Maastrichian planktonic foraminifera (magnification in Fig. 5A) within the tsunami deposit (15.50 m); E) Bioclastic wackestone containing fragments of various thin-shelled bivalves, miliolids, ostracods, calcispheres, and planktonic foraminifera (17.50 m); F) mm thick laminae of peloidal-bioclastic-packstone-grainstone (left) and peloidal-microbioclastic wackestone-packstone (right), characterized by lateral truncations (20.00 m); G) The meter level 20.32 at the contact of the underlaying red-stained laminated wackestone (top tsunamiite) and the overlying mudstone "neautochthon". In the lower part, microbioclastic and intraclastic wackestone containing Maastrichtian planktonic foraminifera in the matrix (see Fig. 5), alternates with irregular and undulating laminoid sparite; H) Microbioclastic mudstone-wackestone and a burrow infill with peloidal-skeletal wackestone-packstone containing tiny miliolids, discorbids, other benthic foraminifera, ostracods, and rare planktonic foraminifera (20.50 m).

All bars = 1000 µm;

Figure 5 - Thin section micro-photographs of diagnostic planktonic foraminifera of the Majerovica K–Pg limestones (stratigraphic distribution in Fig. 2C): A) *Globotruncanella minuta* (15.50 m); B) *Globotruncanella havanensis* (20.30 m); C) *Rugoglobigerina rugosa* (20.32 m); D) *Guembelitria cf. cretacea* (20.32 m); E) *Plummerita cf. hantkeninoides* (20.30 m); F) *Muricohedbergella monmouthensis* (20.32 m); G) *Parvularugoglobigerina eugubina syn. longiapertura* (20.32 m); H) *Chiloguembelina midwayensis* (20.80 m); I) *Eoglobigerina eobulloides* (20.50 m); J) *Parasubbotina cf. pseudobulloides* (20.50 m); K) *Globanomalina planocompressa* (20,80 m); L, M) *Praemurica taurica* (20.50 m); N) *Subbotina cf. trivialis* (21.50 m); O) *Subbotina cf. triloculinoides* (28.35 m).

Figures: A, N bar = 50 µm, all others bar = 100 µm.

Figure 6 - CI chondrite normalized platinum group from the Majerovica samples, exemplifying the meteoritic contamination of the packstone (sample HMA 13-20.10) CI chondrite normalization values are from Lodders (2003).

Figure 7  Simplified Maastrichtian paleogeography of: A) the Caribbeans, Atlantic, and Western Tethys regions, simplified and redrawn from Dercourt et al. (1993), Rosenbaum et al. (2002), and Adatte et al. (2002), showing the location of sites with evidences for tsunamiites, turbidites, seismites, or mass waste deposits related to the Chicxulub impact event (after Claeys et al., 2002), the location of the K–Pg tsunami site at Hvar (star), and the hypothetical traces of the east-propagating tsunami triggered by the impact; B) the central Adriatic offshore of Croatia (cf. Tari, 2002; Korbar, 2009, and references therein), showing also the contours of the present day central Dalmatian islands (dotted lines).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>87Sr/86Sr ±2σ</th>
<th>Sr</th>
<th>Mg</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Mn</th>
<th>87Sr/86Sr ±2σ</th>
<th>Age range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMA-1</td>
<td>0.707846 7 66.0-66.4</td>
<td>1069.0</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>bdl</td>
<td>bdl</td>
<td>0.707846 7 66.0-66.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA-1/1</td>
<td>0.707849 7 66.0-66.4</td>
<td>7955.7</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>6.637</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA-1/2</td>
<td>0.707843 7 66.0-66.4</td>
<td>1090.0</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>bdl</td>
<td>bdl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA-1/3</td>
<td>0.707845 7 66.0-66.4</td>
<td>1070.0</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>bdl</td>
<td>bdl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Samples are stored at the Croatian Geological Survey in Zagreb; All samples are from low-Mg calcite of rudist shells from Hvar-Majerovica (HMA) section (see Fig. 2B); Numerical ages are from Howarth and McArthur (1997, version 3:10/99, McArthur et al., 2001) corrected for the Geological TimeScale 2012, which places the K-Pg boundary at 66.04 ± 0.05 Ma; bdl = below detection limit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>m level</th>
<th>Os ppb</th>
<th>Ir ppb</th>
<th>Ru ppb</th>
<th>Rh ppb</th>
<th>Pt ppb</th>
<th>Pd ppb</th>
<th>Au ppb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-15.30</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-15.40</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-18.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-20.10A</td>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-20.10B</td>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-20.29A</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-20.29B</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-20.30A</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-20.30B</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-20.32A</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-20.32B</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-20.80</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-25.60A</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-25.60B</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standards

- WITS-1: 1.38 1.45 4.07 1.12 7.07 5.59 6.11
- TDB1: 0.10 0.08 0.22 0.45 5.09 24.1 6.30
- WPR1: 12.3 14.1 21.7 13.6 298.2 233.0 39.9

Expected Values

- WITS-1 (1): 1.5 1.4 ± 0.3 3.9 ± 0.8 1.1 ± 0.2 5.7 ± 1.6 5.0 ± 1.2 1.4 ± 0.3
- WITS-1 (2): 1.23 1.58 4.41 1.20 8.8 5.64 No data
- TDB1 (2): 0.117 0.075 0.198 0.47 5.01 24.3 No data
- TDB1 (3): no data 0.15 0.3 0.7 5.8 22.4 6.3
- WPR1 (3): 13 13.5 22 13.4 285 235 42

Note: Analyses carried out by NiS fire assay with ICP-MS (see method description). Suffixes A and B refer to splits of crushed chips from the same sample. These were crushed to powder and analysed separately. Heterogeneity in these cases is expected to be worse than if they were true duplicates from the same volume of crushed powder. Sources for expected values as follows (1) Tredoux and McDonald, 1996; (2) Meisel and Moser, 2004; and (3) Govindaraju, 1994.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os</th>
<th>Os (ppb)</th>
<th>Re (ppb)</th>
<th>Re/Os</th>
<th>$^{187}$Re/$^{188}$Os</th>
<th>$^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os (t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-15.30</td>
<td>6.72 (2)</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>169.4</td>
<td>6.53 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-15.40</td>
<td>6.57 (9)</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>541.9</td>
<td>5.92 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-18.00</td>
<td>5.55 (2)</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>133.6</td>
<td>5.40 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-20.10A</td>
<td>6.79 (3)</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>6.72 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-20.10B</td>
<td>6.07 (1)</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>5.99 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-20.29A</td>
<td>6.43 (4)</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>541.1</td>
<td>5.81 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13-20.30A</td>
<td>6.68 (4)</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA13A-20.80</td>
<td>5.49 (8)</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>122.8</td>
<td>5.36 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Initial $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os ratios were calculated given the $^{187}$Re decay constant ($1.666 \times 10^{-11}$ yr$^{-1}$) from Smoliar et al. (1996), and an age of 65.5 Myr for the K-Pg boundary (Schulte et al., 2010, and references therein). The highly radiogenic initial $^{187}$Os/$^{188}$Os ratios point towards enhanced crustal input into the marine environment from which these rocks formed, masking any possible small meteoritic signals. Rhenium concentrations most likely provide evidence for enrichments in an anoxic milieu.