Localized water reverberation phases and its impact on back-projection images

Han Yue1*, Jorge C. Castellanos2, Chunquan Yu2, Lingsen Meng3 and Zhongwen Zhan2

1. Department of Geophysics, School of Earth and Space Sciences, Beijing University, Beijing, China, 100871
2. Seismological Laboratory, Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Caltech, Pasadena, CA, U.S., 91125

Abstract

Coherent radiators imaged by back-projections (BP) are commonly interpreted as part of the rupture process. Nevertheless, artifacts introduced by structure related phases are rarely discriminated from the rupture process. In this study, we use a calibration event to discriminate between rupture and structure effects. We re-examine the waveforms and BP images of the 2012 Mw 7.2 Indian Ocean earthquake and a calibration event (Mw 6.2). The P wave codas of both events present similar shape with characteristic period of approximately 10 s, which are back-projected as coherent radiators near the trench. S wave BP doesn’t image energy radiation near the trench. We interpret those coda waves as localized water reverberation phases excited near the trench. We perform a 2D waveform modeling using realistic bathymetry model, and find that the steep near-trench bathymetry traps the acoustic water waves forming localized reverberation phases. These waves can be imaged as coherent near-trench radiators with similar features as that in the observations. We present a set of methodologies to discriminate between the rupture and propagation effects in BP images, which can serve as a criterion of subevent identification.
Introduction

Back-projection (BP) techniques are broadly used in imaging great earthquakes, yielding pictures of spatial-temporal evolution of kinematic ruptures. Energy bursts imaged by BP techniques are commonly identified as part of a continuous [Ishii et al., 2005; Xu et al., 2009; Yagi et al., 2012; Yao et al., 2013] or segmented ruptures process [Meng et al., 2012; Yue et al., 2012]. BP can also be used to identify early triggered aftershocks, short term aftershocks and local seismicity [Fan and Shearer, 2016a; b; Inbal et al., 2015; Kiser and Ishii, 2013], which detect substantial events missed in the catalog. Since earthquakes can be beamformed as coherent radiators in BP images, a reverse logic is commonly, but not rigorously, adopted to interpret coherent radiators as subevents or aftershocks. Nevertheless, other phases that are not directly related to a rupture process, e.g. scattered and focused/defocused phases, may also present spatial coherency and be misidentified as rupture processes. Analysis to discriminate between the structure and rupture related phases are rarely performed in BP result analysis, which lead to uncertainty in the event identification.

Most great earthquakes occur in the subduction zones beneath oceans. Reflected and reverberated water phases are often of substantial amplitude in their teleseismic P wave codas, which is not negligible in related waveform modeling and source inversion studies. Wiens [1989] investigated the bathymetry effect on body waves and demonstrated the dipping bathymetry introduce significant water-phase complexity. Okamoto and Takenaka [2009] applied 2.5D numerical modeling in finite source inversion and demonstrated that bathymetry effect is non-negligible and smears the pattern of the slip distribution. An et al. [2016] adopted path calibration analysis in the 2015 Illapel earthquake study and indicated that prolonged P wave codas can be excited by near trench ruptures. Inadequate modeling of those phases may produce artificially long source rupture [Lee et al., 2016]. Most previous studies about water phases are related to the effect on earthquake modeling and inversion, and the effect on BP imaging studies are rarely discussed. In this study, we adopt waveform analysis, back-projection and modeling techniques, and use the 2012 M_w = 7.2 Indian Ocean strike-slip event as an example to demonstrate localized water phase can generate strong coherent radiators and leads to misinterpretation of BP results.
The 2012 $M_w = 7.2$ Indian Ocean earthquake

In 2012, a series of great earthquakes shocked the floor of the Indian Ocean, with a $M_w$ 8.6 strike slip event preceded by a $M_w$ 7.2 (Jan 10th 2012) foreshock and followed by a $M_w$ 8.2 aftershock (figure 1) [Duputel et al., 2012; Hill et al., 2015; Meng et al., 2012; Wei et al., 2013; Yue et al., 2012]. The regional seismicity can be grouped as thrusting events located near the subduction zone and strike-slip events located seaward of the trench (figure 1). Fan and Shearer [2016a] applied back-projection technique to the $M_w$=7.2 event and imaged coherent sources near the trench, close to a cluster of background seismicity (figure 1). These coherent radiators were attributed to a series of early dynamically triggered aftershocks. As discussed above, the early triggered sequence can be mis-identified from propagation effects. To discriminate between the source and propagation effects, we selected a $M_w$=6.2 earthquake (Oct 4th 2007) as a reference event to calibrate the propagation effect (figure 1). For simplicity, from this point we call the $M_w$=7.2 event as the mainshock and the $M_w$=6.2 event as the calibration event. We assume a logic that is commonly used in empirical Green’s function analysis: because the mainshock and calibration event shares similar ray paths, similar patterns identified in both the mainshock and calibration waveforms are attributed to the propagation effect; waveform and BP image discrepancies are attributed to differences in the rupture process, e.g. source duration and early triggered aftershocks. Waveform comparison between these two events can discriminate between the propagation and the source effect.

Waveform analysis

From the Global Seismographic Networks (GSN), we selected 71 stations, by which both the mainshock and calibration P waves are clearly recorded. The stations are selected to ensure a good azimuth coverage. Waveforms are aligned at the calibration P wave initial arrival using a Matlab GUI-based package (CrazySeismic [Yu et al., 2017]). P waves of both the mainshock and calibration waveforms are band-passed filtered with corner frequencies at 0.02 and 0.5 Hz. As shown in figure 2, at least 4 phases with sinusoidal moveout can be identified in both the mainshock and calibration waveforms. Those phases present similar shapes and generally constant intervals, which indicate they are generated within a compact area with recurrence time of approximately 10 s. Assuming those radiators are point sources, we invert for their loci with the arrival time of peaks. Details of the relocation technique are described in the supplementary materials. For both the mainshock and the calibration event, the coherent
sources are relocated near the trench within a compact area (figure 3). Figure 2 shows the arrival time of those peaks are well predicted by these coherent sources with interval of 10-12 s. Both the mainshock and calibration event present similar coda, which indicates the codas are associated with the propagation effect. We plotted the tangential component of the mainshock SH waves recorded at 64 global teleseismic stations (figure 2c). No clear sinusoidal waveforms are identified in the S wave codas, which indicates the SH waves are not efficiently radiated from those radiators. We perform the same waveform analysis and BP techniques to another calibration event and similar features are also resolved for that event (figure S1).

**Temporal-spectral analysis**

With temporal-spectral analysis, we can identify the resonance frequency of particular waveform segments [An et al. 2017, Ihmlé and Madariaga 1996]. Examples of teleseismic P waves of both the mainshock and calibration event are plotted in figure 4. For both events, the initial 50 s are characterized with a source spectrum [Brune, 1970] that the spectrum is flat at low frequency and drops beyond the corner frequency. The spectra of the P wave codas (after 50 s) present a characteristic frequency peaked around 0.1 Hz, which appears to be a non-earthquake signal. A flat water-layer with thickness of 3.75 km generates resonance period of 10 s [An et al. 2017], assuming 1.5 km/s P wave velocity in water. Depth contour of 3.75 km cuts close to the near trench radiators (figure 3) and the associated resonance frequency is consistent with the recurrence intervals of those radiators (10-12s). The resonance frequency shows slight change over time which may reflect lateral migration of reverberation waves in a none-flat water layer. The trench area presents significant bathymetry slopes that its resonance feature cannot be completely explained by 1D water layer resonance, however, the first order consistency between the 1D layer prediction and the observations indicates the observed P wave coda can be interpreted as water reverberation phases.

**Back-projection**

To test if the identified phases can be beamformed as coherent radiators, we back-project the teleseismic P waves of both the mainshock and the calibration event to the source region. We adopted a 4th order root stacking technique using global P wave recordings [Xu et al., 2009]. We use the same band-pass filter as described in the last session, thus relatively low frequency (0.01-0.2 Hz) energy are stacked by this technique. Details of BP techniques are described in
the supplementary materials. In both the mainshock and calibration BP results, two areas with high time integrated beam amplitude are imaged near the epicenters and the trench, respectively. The near-trench radiator is close to the relocated point sources (figure 3). The near trench radiator of the mainshock presents a stronger stacked beam amplitude than that near the epicenter, which is also shifted (~15 km) to the SW from the relocated point sources, these effects are not observed in the calibration BP results. The calibration BP image presents two peaks near the trench and the northern one co-locates with the peak of the mainshock. It indicates two localized radiators may exist near the trench and the northern one is more efficiently excited by the mainshock. The rupture directivity, source duration and hypocentral depths are different between the mainshock and the calibration event, which may lead to different excitation amplitude to the near trench radiators. The first order consistency between the mainshock and calibration BP images demonstrates that the coherent sources near the trench are introduced by the propagation effect. The same back-projection technique is adopted to teleseismic SH waves and plotted in figure 3c. Strong integrated beam amplitude are only imaged near the epicenter indicating those near trench radiators do not radiate SH waves. Similar waveform analysis and BP technique are adopted to another calibration event and similar features are found in those results (Figure S1).

Regional array based BP are performed using European and Japanese (F-net) array recordings. We adopted a band-pass filter with higher corner frequency (0.1-2 Hz), thus relatively high frequency (HF) energy is imaged in the array BP technique. A MUSIC (Multiple Signal Classification) BP technique [Meng et al., 2011] is adopted to the array data. The detailed BP techniques are described in the supplementary materials. Radiators near the epicenter and the trench region are both observed in the array HF BP images (figure 3). The near trench radiators appear to be excited after 30 s and are most significant after 60 s, which is consistent with the P and S wave arrivals at trench. This phenomenon is also revealed in the animated global BP results (Movie S1-2).

2D simulation

The phases related to the near trench radiator present resonance frequency in consistency with water reverberation phases and are evident only in P wave codas. We attribute the near trench radiators as a result of localized water P wave reverberations; thus, the geometry of the ocean floor appears to be the key attribute generating those phases. Meanwhile, both events excite
such radiators in the trench normal projection, thus the wavefield is approximately symmetric in the trench parallel direction. We assume the first order characteristic of the water reverberation phases can be modeled as a two-dimensional wave-propagation problem along the trench normal direction. We perform a 2D finite difference (FD) simulation [Li et al., 2014] with a simplified two-domain (i.e. fluid and solid) velocity model to simulate the bathymetry effect. The bathymetry (boundary) profile is cut along the trench normal direction from ETOPO1 global relief model (https://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/mgg/global/global.html) along profile AB in figure 3. This model captures the bathymetry effect, while still keeps a relatively simple wavefield, thus wavefronts can be clearly identified and calculated. Details of simulation and visualization techniques are described in supplementary materials.

The 2D simulation is performed to validate if the water reverberation phases can be imaged as coherent radiators near the trench. BP technique assume point sources at each imaging point and stack waveforms over theoretical wavefronts, which are simply concentric circles in the simulated wavefield. Therefore, curved wavefronts can be beamformed as coherent radiators. Wavefield snapshots are plotted in figure 5, which reveals water reverberation phases can be excited by both S and P waves showing wavefronts with different slopes in the water layer, i.e. pw, and sw, phases (figure 5a). Here “n” denotes phases related to the n time water surface reflection. Water phases refracted at the flat ocean floor presents linear wavefront, which cannot be back-projected as coherent sources (figure 5a). P waves are scattered from the bathymetry roughness throughout the ocean bottom and generate curved wavefronts. These waves can be imaged as coherent radiators which are significant in HF BP images (figure S3). Water phases reflected and refracted near the trench are modified with curved wavefronts, i.e. pw, and pw,1P (figure 5b). After second reflection near the trench, wavefront is modified to vertical propagation, which forms a standing wave near the trench (pw,3 in figure 5c). This explains why localized radiators are trapped near the trench. The water reverberations are also evident in the sw,n wavefield, which emit sw,nP phases showing in P wave codas (figure S2).

To verify if the 2D synthetics can be beamformed as coherent radiators, we perform a 1D back-projection using waveforms recorded at 700 km depth. The beamforming technique used in the synthetic data is the same as that used in global BP (figure 5e). We interpolate the global BP image along profile AB (figure 3), which converts the observational 2D BP image to 1D cross-sections. Both observed and synthetic 1D BP images are visualized in the distance vs.
time domain in figure 5d and e for comparison. As shown clearly by such comparison, the time integrated beam amplitude of both images present a peak near the trench. Those are associated with a chain of radiators excited near the trench between 20-70 s. Both images show that the radiators are excited after P wave arrival and most significantly after S wave arrival, indicating an efficient S wave excitation. Near trench radiators of both images present peak interval of ~5s associated with the amplitude of both peaks and troughs, which is consistent with a resonance frequency of ~10 s. The 2D modeling recover the main features shown in the observational BP images, with the bathymetry geometry as the only non-homogeneous attribute in the velocity model. This indicates that the bathymetry is the key factor generating the near trench coherent radiators and dynamically triggered aftershocks are not required to produce those radiators. BP is also performed with HF synthetic waveforms, which presents higher beam amplitude at small scale bathymetry structures indicating HF BP is more sensitive to small scale bathymetry structures. This may be related to the discrepancy between the observed HF and LF BP images, that the HF BP image present broadly distributed radiators in the trench area.

The 2D modeling is performed to understand how localized water phases are generated, which demonstrates the interaction between wavefront and bathymetry gradient produce point radiators within the trench normal plane (modeling plane). Meanwhile, the tangential point is the first and only point when the wavefront reach the trench, which produce point sources in the trench parallel direction. Therefore, the coherent radiators in the 2D modeling are also point sources in 3D, which produce azimuth dependent moveout (figure 2). The BP of 2D synthetics recovered the main features of the near trench radiators, e.g. time interval, initial/end time and locations, which demonstrates the excitation mechanism of localized water reverberation phases. To fully recover the details of observed BP images, 3D modeling with a realistic velocity structure and real station distributions are required. Sedimentary layers near trench can amplify the coda waves [Okamoto 1993], as also influence the transmission between the liquid and solid layers. The 2D modeling cannot capture such effects nor 3D geometric spreading, thus the beam amplitude of the synthetic test is not discussed. Detailed comparison with 3D synthetics need to be performed and discussed in more detailed studies.
**Discussion and Conclusion**

In this study, we applied waveform analysis and BP imaging technique to both the 2012 $M_w$ 7.2 earthquake and a $M_w$ 6.2 calibration event. We detect similar P wave codas at 10 s characteristic period in both events, with similar shapes and time intervals. Those phases are beamformed as coherent radiators near the trench. We adopt the logic of path calibration and attribute those phases as structure effects and interpret these phases as localized water reverberation phases. We performed 2D synthetic tests with realistic bathymetry model, which demonstrates that the bathymetry slope distorts the wavefront and produce localized water reverberation phases. Back-projection with the synthetic waveforms produce coherent radiators near the trench, similar to those observed in the BP images of real observations. Ringing P waves was initially discovered and discussed by Ward [1979]. Localized water reverberation phases excited by megathrust earthquakes were reported by An et al. [2017] and Ihmlé and Madariaga [1996]. An et al. [2017] demonstrates that such phases are more efficiently excited by near trench ruptures. Ihmlé and Madariaga [1996] used spectrogram and slant-stack techniques to analyze the P wave codas of the 1995 Chile $M_w$=8.1 event and 1994 Kurile Island $M_w$=8.3 event. They attribute the monochromatic P wave codas (14 s period) to localized water reverberation phases, which is identical to the conclusion of this study.

BP technique provides first order estimation of rupture process and from this perspective it is valid in great earthquake studies. However, when interpreting secondary features in the BP images, discrimination between source and propagation effects need to be made. As demonstrated in this study coherent radiators can be generated from near trench reverberation phases and ocean bottom scattering. From a global perspective, trench areas commonly present substantial curvatures in bathymetry, thus it may be a common effect that an under-ocean earthquake can excite localized water reverberation phases. Particularly but not exclusively, for events seaward of the trench, such discrimination need to be performed. For example, Fan and Shearer [2016b] reported that normal events ($M_w$>7) seaward of the trench appear to have 76.9% triggering rate near the trench, indicating coherent radiators are broadly observed. This study provides a strategy to discriminate between structure and source related signals using spectrogram analysis and path calibration techniques, which can serve as criteria of discrimination. Other propagation effects, e.g. structure scattering and focusing effect, may also generate such coherent radiators and their effect need to be discussed in future studies.
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Figure 1. The GCMT solution of the 2012 $M_w=7.2$ mainshock and the 2007 $M_w=6.2$ EGF are plotted with red and magenta filled focal mechanisms, respectively. Their associated epicenter locations (PDE) are marked by red and magenta filled stars, respectively. Background seismicity (2005-2016) for $4.5<M_w<8.0$ earthquakes (GCMT catalog) are plotted with gray filled focal mechanisms. The trench line [Bassett and Watts 2015] is plotted with a black barbed curve. The location of reported early triggered aftershocks [Fan and Shearer 2016a] are marked by a dashed ellipse. An insert map is plotted on the top-right with the study area marked with a rectangle.
Figure 2. a, teleseismic P waves of the mainshock are aligned at 0 s (red dashed line) and sorted by azimuth. Predicted arrival times from the coherent radiators are marked with color coded “+”. The same colors are used to mark the inverted point source locations in figure 3a. The P wave polarities are calculated from the mainshock focal mechanism and marked above the waveforms. b, the same as figure 2a, but for teleseismic P waves of the calibration event. c, the same as figure 2a, but for teleseismic SH waves of the mainshock. d, stations recording teleseismic P and S waves are marked with green and red filled triangles respectively. European and Japanese (F-net) network stations, used for array back-projections, are plotted with black filled triangles.
Figure 3. a, Spectra of the source waveforms (0-50s at station BJT) of the mainshock and calibration event are plotted in red and blue, respectively. b, Spectra of the codas (50-100s at station BJT) of the mainshock and calibration event are plotted in red and blue curves, respectively. c-d, Spectrogram of the mainshock and calibration teleseismic P waves recorded at station BJT are plotted in a and b, respectively. For each subplot, the waveforms are plotted in the lower panel, the spectrum are plotted in the right panel. Spectra associated with the source and reverberation phases are separated by a black dashed line.
Figure 4. a, Time integrated P wave beam amplitude are plotted with a white-black color scale as the background map. Epicenter locations of the mainshock and calibration event are marked with red and green filled stars. Coherent radiators are marked with color coded “+”. The same colors are used to mark the associated predicted arrival times in figure 2a. The focal mechanisms used to calculate the stacking polarity are indicated with red filled beach balls in two domains with the boundary indicated by a red dashed curve. HF radiators imaged by European and Japanese arrays are marked with color coded diamonds and circles, respectively. The imaging time are indicated by their filling color. The trench is marked by a black barbed curve. The bathymetry counter (along 3.75 km depth) are plotted with a black dashed curve. The profile AB is marked as a gray line, which is used to cut the bathymetry profile for modeling and interpolate 1D BP image in figure 5. b, the same as a, but for the calibration event. c, the same as a, but for the BP of mainshock SH wave.
Figure 5. a-c Snapshots of 2D wave field (vertical displacement) are imaged at different time shots. a, 16.4 s wavefield snapshot near the source region. The wavefield is imaged with a red-blue color scale. The ocean floor is plotted as a black curve. The hypocenter is marked with a green filled star. The initial P and S wavefronts are marked with green and orange dashed curves, respectively. Secondary phases are labeled, including the scattered P waves, water reverberations and refracted water waves (pw1P). b, c, wavefield snapshots at 26 and 30 seconds near the trench area. Curved wavefronts generated by refracted and reflected water phases near the trench (pw1P, pw2P and pw3) are labeled. The plotting area is marked as a black box in figure 5a. d, 1D beam amplitude profile interpolated along profile AB (figure 3a) from the mainshock global BP image. Time integrated beam amplitude is plotted in red in the
top-panel, with the associated bathymetry profile plotted as a black curve. Time vs distance image of the log beam amplitude is imaged with a white-black color scale in the lower panel. Wavefronts calculated by 5.8 km/s and 3.2 km/s wave velocity is marked as green and orange dashed lines, respectively. e, The same as figure 5d, but plotted for the 1D BP image using synthetic data.