

B03: Earthquake Rupture Modelling of a Rough Fault in Laboratory Experiments Paul A. Selvadurai^{*(2)}, Percy Gálvez Barrón^{*(1,3)}, D. Peter⁽³⁾ & P. M. Mai⁽³⁾

Preamble

In this study, we analyse results from a concerted laboratory study [aa1, aa2]. During a suite of direct shear friction experiments we found that:

- **A. (Seismicity)** Small impulsive events were located and found to release energy along the weaker frictional fault plane [aa1].
- **B. (Precursory slow slip)** These events appeared in an accelerated preslip phase moments before full fault failure.
- **C. (Seismogenic region**) These events were located and found to exist in a specific region of the fault that had large strain gradients.
- **D. (Interfacial wear**) The fault displayed large amounts of wear within the seismogenic region [aa2].

***Presenter (1)** ETH Zurich, Institute for Geophysics, Seismology and Wave Physics, Switzerland, **(3)** King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, Thuwal, Saudi Arabia, **(2)** ETH Zurich, Institute for Geophysics, SED, Switzerland.

We investigate possible mechanisms leading to concurrent slow and fast slip, along a worn section of our fault analog prior to global stick-slip failure. Our modelling attempts to reconcile inferred seismic source parameters using a dynamic 1D RS friction model with rheologically heterogeneous properties.

(Above) Height profile along transect in the seismogenic region. Measured at two length-scales using two devices. **(Right)** Locally, wear produced smooth sections of the fault, conversely longer lengthscales retained higher levels of h_{rms} . (Q: h_{rms}/L was similar at both length scale?)

Motivation:

1 Introduction

(Above) Spatio-temporal evolution of slip rate of the sequence. An image detection algorithm was used to calculate the length of the rupture L_{run} . (Bottom right) Total slip during the event allowed us to calculate the seismic moment M_0 (= $\mu A\delta$). This event in Detail B has a moment magnitude of M_{ν} ~ -8.4.

Previous studies have successfully shown that RS friction can explain nucleation proesses leading up to stick-slip failure in the lab [mm1, mm2]. We attempt to **prescribe frictional heterogeneity that explains complex frictional behaviour, where both slow and (locally) fast slip were recorded prior to stick-slip.** We compute seismic catalogs using the RS model and compare these results to source-extent properties inferred from the seismicity.

> Spatial heterogeneity in *D_c*. was justified since length-scale dependent wear has made locally polished asperities. While the micromechanical mechanism offered here might only be valid for dry interfaces, it appears to explain how localized event might have persited in the presence of a macroscopic slow slip front. Future simulations will estimate the effect of increased reference loading rate (V_0) believed to be analogous to the accelerated preslip phase.

Yoshioka and Iwasa (1996, PAGEOPH) numerically investigated the characteristic displacement (D_c) in a micromechanical point of view for *dry, unlubricated interfaces*. They found that *D_c* is related to the distance where real contact is fully replaced with new contacts after a velocity step. They showed that D_c is larger on rougher **faults than on smoother ones.**

Model heterogeneity (above right): From this we used a "cutting plane" method that creates binary description of Dc that varies spatially in accordance to the natural wear on the interface.

Micromechanical basis:

*Nucleation theory [aa2] **Pressure sensitive film measurements [aa2]

4 Example result: localized seismic sequence

(Left) Along-strike slip with a total of five local events were recorded.

(Left) Average slip on the fault during 200 seconds of simulation. Enumerated events correspond to the events above.

-
-
-

RS parameter *b* in

RS parameter *a*

Length of (VW) d

5 Catalogue development

Catalogues were generated using the analysis described above for three types of Dc heterogeneity (coloured points) mentioned in Part 2.

(right top) Source radii versus seismic moment appeared to follow estimates made using kinematic models from analyzing the seismic waves (gray).

(right bottom) Average static stress drop was in the typical range for natural seismicity (0.1 to 1 MPa) but remained (relatively) constant in comparision to inferred estimates of stress drop made kinematically.

6 Summary

[aa2] Selvadurai and Glaser, *Geophys J Int*, 2017. [mm1] Kaneko and Ampeuro, *Geophys Res Lett* , 2010. [mm2] Kaneko et al., *J Geophys Res*, 2016. [mm3] Luo et al., *QDY*, 2017. [zz1] Selvadurai, in review