ECGS Workshop 2012: Earthquake source physics on various scales Oct. 4, 2012 14:40–15:00 Alvisse Parc Hotel, Luxembourg

#### Modeling Scale-invariant Heterogeneity of Earthquakes

#### 1: Fractal Patch Dynamic Rupture Model 2: The 2011 Tohoku-Oki Earthquake

Satoshi Ide (Univ. Tokyo) Joint research with Hideo Aochi (BRGM, France)



Dept. Earth Planetary Science

### Scale invariance of earthquakes

Between macroscopic parameters: Seismic energy vs. seismic moment



after Ide and Beroza (2001, GRL)

### Scaling complexity of rupture



Self-similarity in spatio-temporal slip pattern Small earthquakes are not simple

3

#### Scaling initial & main processes



Scaling of "nucleation phase"

Ellsworth and Beroza (1995, Science)

### Scaling heterogeneity of EQ

- Self-similarity between various macroscopic parameters
  - $\circ$  Length  $\propto$  Width  $\propto$  Final Slip  $\propto$  Duration
  - $\circ$  Moment  $\propto$  Energy
- Scale invariant properties
  - Stress (initial, maximum, dynamic, etc.) ~ MPa
  - Average rupture propagation velocity < Vs</li>
- Complexity
  - Subevents, directivity, acceleration & delay of rupture
  - $^\circ$  Initial (nucleation) phase  $\propto$  source linear dimension

Fractal Patch Dynamic Rupture Model (Ide and Aochi, 2005)

### 3D Fractal Patch Model (Ide and Aochi, 2005)



- A few large patches & many small patches (fractal)
- Statistically self-similar
- Slip-weakening friction law
  - Dc  $\propto$  patch radius
  - Homogeneous stress state

Rupture starts from

negligible nucleus



current values

past effects

# S Dept. Earth Planetary Science - Earthquake Science Lab. Monthly Science - Earthquake Science Lab. Monthly Science Lab. Example of dynamic rupture





Dc/slip (mm)

M6.0-

M4.3-4.5

M3.7-3.9

M3.1-3.3

M2.5-2.7

#### Seismic Waves (Moment rate functions)



### Fractal patch model Explains ...

- Self-similarity between various macroscopic parameters
  - $\circ$  Length  $\propto$  Width  $\propto$  Final Slip  $\propto$  Duration
  - Moment  $\propto$  Energy
- Scale invariant properties

assumed

- Stress (initial, maximum, dynamic, etc.) ~ MPa
- Average rupture propagation velocity < Vs</li>
- Complexity
  - Subevents, directivity, acceleration & delay of rupture
  - $\circ$  Initial (nucleation) phase  $\propto$  source linear dimension

#### Tohoku-Oki earthquake





### Tohoku–Oki Slip model



#### Questions

#### • What are responsible for:

- Switchback rupture propagation
- Delayed large slip near the trench (apparently slow rupture propagation)
- Delayed slip in the southern region





Slip Model vs. Seismicity Catalog





13

#### Hypocenters $\rightarrow$ Segments



Level 1: 130 x 75 km<sup>2</sup> 1 patch Level 2: 100 km ~M8.0 3 patches Level 3: 50 km ~M7.4 13 patches Level 4: 25 km ~M6.8 30 patches

Assuming 4MPa stress drop with 10 MPa strength drop

#### Dynamic rupture process

#### Stress concentration due to the foreshock





## Fractal patch model with

- Tohoku-Oki earthquake
  - Circular patch distribution assumed based on historical seismicity
    - 4 levels of patches (M6.8, M7.4, M8.0 + Main Slip)
    - Fracture energy & Dc proportional to patch radius
    - Uniform stress state with foreshock stress accumulation
  - Features reproduced
    - Downward propagation up to 40 s
    - Large slip near the trench ~ 70 s
    - Delayed ruptures in the southern part
    - Aftershock patches remain unbroken
  - Some problems

#### Conclusions

- Scaling of heterogeneity of earthquake source is well explained by a fractal patch dynamic rupture model
- A fractal patch model constructed based on historical seismicity can explain apparently strange rupture process of the 2011 Tohoku-Oki earthquake
- One possible way to realize the scenarios of future earthquakes





#### GR b-value & patches



