Photo credit: Jiannan Meng

# Synthetic earthquakes in a 3D numerical sandbox

Adélaïde Allemand<sup>1</sup>, Yann Klinger<sup>2</sup>, Luc Scholtès<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institut de Physique du Globe de Paris - Université Paris Cité <sup>2</sup>Institut de Physique du Globe de Paris - CNRS <sup>3</sup>Laboratoire Magmas et Volcans - Université Clermont Auvergne



Introduction Method Results Conclusion

Surface rupture after the 2023 Kahramanmaraş earthquakes (Turkey)

Photo credit: Jiannan Meng

Introduction Method Results Conclusion

Surface rupture after the 2023 Kahramanmaraş earthquakes (Turkey)

Photo credit: Jiannan Meng

Introduction Method Results Conclusion

Surface rupture after the 2023 Kahramanmaraş earthquakes (Turkey)

Photo credit: Jiannan Meng

Context: continental strike-slip faults



#### Model a continental strike-slip fault and the mutual interaction between fault geometry and earthquake rupturing





# This approach



Introduction

Conclusion

## This approach: Discrete Element Modelling (DEM)



### Principles of the DEM

#### Nature



## Principles of the DEM

#### Nature





## Principles of the DEM

Nature



#### Sub-volume





#### Principles of the DEM

#### Nature







## Principles of the DEM



Introduction

#### Method

Results

Conclusion

## Principles of the DEM





## Model setup

















#### Long term fault evolution **Displacement parallel** to the fault (m) Shear stress (MPa) 14 m 75 km 100 Displacement parallel to the fault (m) Distance along the fault (km) 80 60 40 20 0 40 km 0 km 1000 2000 3000 4000 -14 m 0 Distance across the fault (km) Fault cumulated displacement (m) ( $\Leftrightarrow$ Elapsed time)

#### Long term fault evolution **Displacement parallel** to the fault (m) Shear stress (MPa) 14 m 75 km 100 Distance along the fault (km) 80 60 40 20 *Riedel shears* 0-40 km 0 km 1000 2000 3000 4000 0 Distance across the fault (km)

Fault cumulated displacement (m) ( $\Leftrightarrow$  Elapsed time)

Displacement parallel to the fault (m) -14 m

**Displacement parallel** to the fault (m)

#### Long term fault evolution





-14 m

14 m

Fault cumulated displacement (m) ( $\Leftrightarrow$  Elapsed time)

Conclusion

#### Long term fault evolution **Displacement parallel** to the fault (m) Shear stress (MPa) 75 km 100 Distance along the fault (km) 80 Interaction between Riedel shears 60 40 20 0 40 km 0 km 1000 2000 3000 4000 0

Distance across the fault (km)

14 m

Displacement

parallel to

the fault (m)

-14 m

#### Long term fault evolution **Displacement parallel** to the fault (m) Shear stress (MPa) 14 m 75 km 100 Displacement parallel to the fault (m) Distance along the fault (km) 80 60 40 20 0 0 km 40 km 1000 2000 3000 -14 m 4000 0 Distance across the fault (km) Fault cumulated displacement (m) ( $\Leftrightarrow$ Elapsed time)

#### Long term fault evolution **Displacement parallel** to the fault (m) Shear stress (MPa) 14 m 75 km 100 Displacement parallel to the fault (m) Distance along the fault (km) Mature strike-slip fault 80 60 40 20 0 40 km 0 km 1000 -14 m 2000 3000 4000 0 Distance across the fault (km) Fault cumulated displacement (m) ( $\Leftrightarrow$ Elapsed time)

Introduction

Low gradient

Conclusion

Gradient of displacement in the

# Long term fault evolution

Comparison with analogue experiments

















# Seismic cycling








## Seismic cycling



Fault cumulated displacement (m) (⇔ Elapsed time)





# Seismic cycling



Fault cumulated displacement (m) (⇔ Elapsed time)

## Seismic cycling



Fault cumulated displacement (m) (⇔ Elapsed time)



# Seismic cycling



Fault cumulated displacement (m) (⇔ Elapsed time)

# Seismic cycling



Fault cumulated displacement (m) (⇔ Elapsed time)

#### Method

Results

Conclusion



#### Method

Results

Conclusion





#### Method

Results

Conclusion



#### Method

Results

Conclusion



#### Method

Results

Conclusion









#### Method

Results

Conclusion

## Seismic cycling



• Alternation between seismic and interseismic phases

#### Method

Results

Conclusion



- Alternation between seismic and interseismic phases
- Variations among the rupture lengths

#### Method

Results

Conclusion



- Alternation between seismic and interseismic phases
- Variations among the rupture lengths
- Variations in the amount of slip released

#### Method

Results

Conclusion



- Alternation between seismic and interseismic phases
- Variations among the rupture lengths
- Variations in the amount of slip released
- Variations in the duration of interseismic periods

#### Method

Results

Conclusion

## Seismic cycling



- Alternation between seismic and interseismic phases
- Variations among the rupture lengths
- Variations in the amount of slip released
- Variations in the duration of interseismic periods

⇒ Variations in the magnitude of events

# Magnitude distribution

1. Look at the displacement in one time interval



# Magnitude distribution

- 1. Look at the displacement in one time interval
- 2. Filter out the particles below a given displacement threshold



Distance across the fault (km)

### Magnitude distribution

- 1. Look at the displacement in one time interval
- 2. Filter out the particles below a given displacement threshold
- 3. Spatially cluster the particles



Distance across the fault (km)

- 1. Look at the displacement in one time interval
- 2. Filter out the particles below a given displacement threshold
- 3. Spatially cluster the particles
- 4. Compute the magnitude of each cluster









#### Conclusion







Study the 3D deformation pattern during interseismic and coseismic periods



Study the 3D deformation pattern during interseismic and coseismic periods
 Increase the time resolution during coseismic phase



- Study the 3D deformation pattern during interseismic and coseismic periods
  Increase the time resolution during coseismic phase
- Increase the time resolution during coseismic phase

# Thank you!
Introduction

Results

Conclusion

# Supplementary slides

#### Conclusion

# Classical modelling approaches: numerical modelling

Main limitations:



Zielke, Olaf & Mai, M.. (2023)

Main limitations:

• Fixed fault geometry, size and strength



Zielke, Olaf & Mai, M.. (2023)

Main limitations:

- Fixed fault geometry, size and strength
- Need of the stress history



Zielke, Olaf & Mai, M. (2023)

Main limitations:

- Fixed fault geometry, size and strength
- Need of the stress history
- Constitutive law of the modeled rock / Artificial nucleation of earthquake



Zielke, Olaf & Mai, M.. (2023)

Main limitations:

- Fixed fault geometry, size and strength
- Need of the stress history
- Constitutive law of the modeled rock / Artificial nucleation of earthquake



Zielke, Olaf & Mai, M.. (2023)

⇒ Non-evolving fault

Conclusion

#### Classical modelling approaches: analogue modelling



Preuss, S. (2020) and Caniven et al. (2015)

Conclusion

#### Classical modelling approaches: analogue modelling

• Need for scaling laws



Preuss, S. (2020) and Caniven et al. (2015)

## Classical modelling approaches: analogue modelling

- Need for scaling laws
- Physical limitations





Preuss, S. (2020) and Caniven et al. (2015)

#### Classical modelling approaches: analogue modelling

- Need for scaling laws
- Physical limitations
- No 3D observations





Preuss, S. (2020) and Caniven et al. (2015)