Rupture speed and slip velocity: What can we learn from simulated earthquakes?
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A B S T R A C T

In this paper we consider a wide catalog of synthetic earthquakes, numerically modeled as spontaneous, fully dynamic, 3-D ruptures on extended faults, governed by different friction laws, including slip-dependent and rate- and state-dependent equations. We analyze the spatial correlations between the peak of fault slip velocity (v_{peak}) and the rupture speed (v_r) at which the earthquake spreads over the fault. We found that v_{peak} positively correlates with v_r and that the increase of v_{peak} is roughly quadratic. We found that near the transition between sub- and supershear regimes v_{peak} signiﬁcantly diminishes and then starts to increase again with the square of v_r. This holds for all the governing models we consider and for both homogeneous and heterogeneous conﬁgurations. Moreover, we found that, on average, v_{peak} increases with the magnitude of the event (M_{0}^{0.18}). Our results can be incorporated as constraints in the inverse modeling of faults.

© 2011 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Understanding the physical and chemical dissipative processes taking place during an earthquake is of pivotal importance in the mechanics of faulting. Fully dynamic models of spontaneously spreading ruptures give us the extraordinary chance to investigate the features of the constitutive law assumed to govern the fault surface, under conditions that are very often far of being properly reproduced in laboratory experiments.

One of the goals of modern-days seismology is to design robust and computationally efﬁcient numerical codes able to generate a catalog of synthetic events and to simulate the synthetic motions recorded on the ground (i.e., on the free surface). The physics-based earthquake (forward) source models appear to be crucial for realistic ground motion simulation and seismic hazard analysis; when seismological data (forward) source models appear to be crucial for realistic ground motion simulation and seismic hazard analysis; when seismological data are rare (or even non-existent), numerical experiments can be used in order to predict ground motions caused by future earthquakes. At the same time, it is not obvious what is the most appropriated governing model to describe the breakdown mechanism occurring during slip failures (see Bizzarri, 2011b and references cited therein for a discussion).

Investigations of possible spatial correlations between the various dynamic variables, such as fracture energy density, stress drop, total developed slip, peak fault slip velocity (v_{peak}) and rupture speed (v_r) are important because they could be inserted as constraints in kinematic modeling of faults, on which current practice in seismic engineering relies.

By performing laboratory experiments of a mode II crack expanding in a granite sample, the following direct dependence between v_{peak} and v_r has been proposed (Ohnaka et al., 1987):

\[ v_{peak} = \frac{v_r \Delta \tau_b}{G} \]  

(1)

where \( \Delta \tau_b \) is the breakdown stress drop (expressing the difference between the upper and residual stress levels) and \( G \) is the rigidity of the elastic medium. Notably, in laboratory only fracture on intact rocks experiments give the rupture speed, contrarily to friction experiments, both rotary shear and sandwich-like, where two pre-existing surfaces slide against each other (and thus without the existence of a crack tip).

In their pseudodynamic earthquake source modeling Guatteri et al. (2004) try to understand the spatial interdependency of the earthquake source parameters, such as \( v_r \) and the total slip (\( u_{tot} \)). Schmedes et al. (2010a) analyze a series of dynamic models obeying the linear slip-weakening friction to ﬁnd correlations between various source parameters. On the other hand, Song et al. (2009) explore the spatial coherence between \( u_{tot} \) and \( v_r \), and between \( u_{tot} \) and \( v_{peak} \) by analyzing kinematic rupture models of two large strike–slip events (this analysis has then extended to dynamic models by Song and Sommerville, 2010). Bizzarri (2010c) thoroughly discusses the relations between the fracture energy and different physical observables, such as \( v_r \), \( u_{tot} \) and the dynamic stress drop, by analyzing spontaneous dynamic earthquake models obeying different governing models.

Given the above-mentioned results, with this study we aim to understand whether, and how, \( v_{peak} \) and \( v_r \) correlate. Both of these two source parameters have a fundamental role in ground motion...
prediction and hazard assessment, in that the fault slip velocity is linearly related to the ground velocity (through the representation theorem; Aki and Richards, 2002) and the rupture speed controls the frequency content of the recorded particle velocity (Bizzarri et al., 2010). Moreover, \( v_{\text{peak}} \) (and its time occurrence) has received much attention because it has been proposed as a way to infer the characteristic distance over which the stress release is accomplished (Mikumo et al., 2003; see also Tinti et al., 2004).

2. Methodology

In this paper we consider synthetic earthquakes that represent the solution of the fundamental elastodynamic equation for planar faults, where 3-D spontaneous (i.e., without prior imposed slip) rupture expand bilaterally, starting from an imposed hypocenter. The solution is obtained numerically (Bizzarri and Cocco, 2005), while the nucleation procedure is the same as in previous papers (Bizzarri, 2009, 2010c).

We consider a large number of governing models, including the linear–slip weakening (SW henceforth) function, the rate- and state-dependent (RS) friction laws, the flash heating (FH) law and a version of RS laws (referred to as CH law), where an explicit dependence on the temperature \( T' \) developed by frictional heat is incorporated (Chester and Higgs, 1992). All the equations are recalled in Table 1; readers can refer to Bizzarri (2011b) for a thorough review of these constitutive models. We also consider a set of simulations where a viscous rheology is assumed when melting is occurring, following the physical model recently proposed (Bizzarri, 2011a). In this case the elastic parameters are different with respect to those listed in Table 2; we have \( V_s = 3.464 \text{ km/s} \) and \( V_p = 6.0 \text{ km/s} \). Finally, we report results pertaining to fault structures where the lubrication process is active (Bizzarri, submitted for publication); this is formally a non linear SW law, which can be in some sense physically associated to the melting rheology.

Both homogeneous and heterogeneous conditions are considered in the present study; the former have all the parameters spatially identical over the whole fault, while the latter are characterized by a heterogeneous initial shear stress having a magnitude \( \tau_0 \) which follows a \( k^{-1} \) behavior at high radial wavenumbers \( k \), which corresponds in the static limit to the “k-square” model of slip at high wavenumbers. This approach, which namely follows equation (21) in Bizzarri (2010c), is very similar to that recently proposed by Andrews and Barral (2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constitutive model</th>
<th>Equations</th>
<th>Reference equation in Bizzarri (2011b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear slip-weakening law (SW)</td>
<td>( \tau = \begin{cases} \mu_0 - (\mu_0 - \mu) \frac{d}{d \xi} \sigma_{r,\theta}^\theta \frac{d \sigma_{r,\theta}^\theta}{d \xi} \text{ \ for \ } \tau \geq \tau_0 \ \mu_0 \sigma_{r,\theta}^\theta \end{cases} )</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruina–Dieterich law (RD)</td>
<td>( \begin{cases} \tau = \mu_0 + \ln \frac{\tau'}{\tau_0} \end{cases} )</td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieterich–Ruina law (RD)</td>
<td>( \begin{cases} \tau = \frac{d}{d \xi} \left( \mu_0 + \ln \frac{\tau'}{\tau_0} + b \ln \frac{\tau'}{L} \right) \end{cases} )</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester–Higgs law (CH)</td>
<td>( \begin{cases} \tau = \mu_0 + \ln \frac{\tau'}{\tau_0} + D \frac{Q_0}{R} \left( \frac{1}{T'} - \frac{1}{T} \right) \sigma_{r,\theta}^\theta \end{cases} )</td>
<td>(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash heating law (FH)</td>
<td>( \begin{cases} \tau = \mu_0 + \ln \frac{\tau'}{\tau_0} \end{cases} )</td>
<td>(46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-weakening law (TW)</td>
<td>( \begin{cases} \mu_0 - (\mu_0 - \mu) \frac{d}{d \xi} \sigma_{r,\theta}^\theta \frac{d \sigma_{r,\theta}^\theta}{d \xi} \text{ \ for \ } \tau \geq \tau_0 \ \mu_0 \sigma_{r,\theta}^\theta \end{cases} )</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of $v$ as a function of the strike coordinate and at the hypocentral depth for the RD case in Fig. 1 is reported in Fig. 3b of Bizzarri (2010c).

Further complications arise when a supershear rupture propagation regime is considered, where the ruptures eventually reach the compressional wave speed (as theoretically first demonstrated by Burridge, 1973, for cohesionless cracks). In the configurations reported in Fig. 2a the parameters of the SW and RD laws and the inclusion of the flash heating of the asperity contacts allow for a sustained supershear dynamic propagation. We remark that flash heating is known to produce very high values of $v_{\text{peak}}$, even in 3-D (Bizzarri, 2009) and that the SW simulation presented in Fig. 2a is very unstable (the strength parameter is 0.13) and thus it produces huge values of $v_{\text{peak}}$. It should be also noted that, in general, once the transition to supershear regime is realized, the rupture is energetically favored (Bhat et al., 2007; Freund, 1979). We can appreciate, for all the models, an abrupt drop of $v_{\text{peak}}$ in correspondence to the transition from sub- to supershear regimes; slightly after the S wave speed $v_S$, $v_{\text{peak}}$ significantly decreases and then it continues to increase again in the supershear regime. The same holds also in the case when melting or rocks is considered (see Fig. 2b), as in Bizzarri (2011a). Also in this case, due to the dramatic stress drop experienced by the fault, the rupture is very unstable and also in this case significant values of $v_{\text{peak}}$ are attained locally.

Fig. 3 reports the comparison of two heterogeneous configurations, where the parameters are the same as in Fig. 1 for both SW and RD laws, but now the initial shear stress has a $k^{-1}$ falloff at high wavenumbers. For these models the transition from sub- to supershear speeds is more complicated than that occurring in models of Fig. 2a; in this case, depending on the fluctuations of the heterogeneous initial stress field, there is a complex mixture of patches of the fault experiencing $v_r > v_s$ and other, larger patches where the opposite holds. The spatial distributions of the rupture velocity resulting from these two synthetic earthquakes are reported in Fig. 10c and d of Bizzarri (2010c) for the RD and SW laws, respectively. Notably, we can see from Fig. 3 that also in this case $v_{\text{peak}}$ goes like $v_s^2$ for rupture velocities up to $v_s$. Then $v_{\text{peak}}$ diminishes and it starts to increase again, roughly in a quadratic manner, as previously observed for homogeneous models (see Fig. 2a). We note that the drop in $v_{\text{peak}}$ for the RD case is less evident, since this simulation has small supershear patches, so that $<v_{\text{peak}}>$ remains below $v_S$ (see Fig. 4a).

The behavior around $v_s$ is interesting; the significant reduction of peak slip velocities corresponding to the transition from sub- to supershear regime is connected to the loss of high frequencies at
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Fig. 1. Behavior of the peak slip velocity $v_{\text{peak}}$ as a function of the rupture velocity $v_r$ for different governing models (the equations are reported in Table 1) in the case of subshear earthquakes; for the CH law the temperature evolution is computed as described in Bizzarri (2010b). For comparison we plot as solid gray line the theoretical prediction of $v_{\text{peak}} = v_r (\text{Eq. (1)})$. Table 2 lists the adopted parameters.

In the remainder of the paper we will consider as $v_{\text{peak}}$ the absolute maximum of the fault slip velocity time series, while $v_r$ is computed as the inverse of the slowness (see equation (12) of Bizzarri and Spudich, 2008). Both of these two quantities are local dynamic variables, in that they are defined at each fault node.

3. Numerical results

We report in Fig. 1 the comparison between the results pertaining to three different friction models, the SW law, the Ruina-Dieterich (RD) law and the CH law. Both of these representative models have the same initial conditions and are energetically comparable, in that they have the same fracture energy density, and are characterized by governing parameters guaranteeing a subshear rupture propagation (see Table 2). The resulting behavior is very similar in all the cases; it is clear that $v_{\text{peak}}$ does not increase linearly with $v_r$, as predicted by the theoretical relation (1), but a quadratic increase of peak slip velocity with the rupture speed emerges. For comparison, we superimpose in Fig. 1 a linear relation $v_{\text{peak}} \propto v_r$ (solid gray line) to emphasize the general disagreement with Eq. (1). The evolution of $v$ as a function of the strike coordinate and at the hypocentral depth for the RD case in Fig. 1 is reported in Fig. 3b of Bizzarri (2010c).

Fig. 2. Results for supershear ruptures (in this case, for the RD law $a = 0.010$ and $b = 0.022$). Results for a case with melting is reported in panel (b); parameters are the same as in Bizzarri (2011a; his Fig. 6, yellow line).
the crack tip in supershear ruptures. Moreover, we can also see that the patches of the fault experiencing supershear rupture propagation exhibit values of \( v_{\text{peak}} \) that are in general smaller than those pertaining to subshear regimes, in agreement with previous findings (Bizzarri and Spudich, 2008; Schmedes et al., 2010b). This issue is also discussed in more details in Appendix A.

By looking at Figs. 2 and 3 we can note that there is no a clear evidence of a forbidden region of rupture speeds between the Rayleigh velocity (\( v_R \)) and the \( v_S \). Indeed, energetic arguments demonstrated that for purely 2-D, steady-state, non spontaneous cracks the above mentioned range of rupture speeds is inadmissible (Broberg, 1989, 1994, 1999). In the case of 3-D spontaneous ruptures, as those considered here, the coupling of mode II and mode III can allow the rupture speed to extend above \( v_S \) slightly, as occurs in the well known elliptical crack solution with mode II velocity of \( v_R \) and mode III velocity of \( v_S \) (Richards, 1973). Moreover, when the rupture front is not smooth (i.e., it has a kink, due for instance to stress heterogeneities) the nature of the crack tip is markedly different from a 2-D rupture; for this reason is not surprising that Fig. 3 does not exhibits a forbidden range of \( v_S \). We also mention that the difference between \( v_R \) and \( v_S \) is so small that it is difficult to resolve the rupture velocity with sufficient accuracy to see a forbidden range of rupture speeds. From an observational point of view, it should be also noted that the resolution that is possible to obtain today from recorded seismograms cannot exclude that real-world earthquakes actually pass through these speed regimes while going from subshear to supershear or compressional wave speeds (Das, 2010).

To analyze the data we have adopted a zero-offset spatial correlation analysis, in that we have considered the values of \( v_{\text{peak}} \) and \( v_t \) attained in the same fault node. We will discuss in Appendix B the effects of a non zero-offset correlation analysis method (Song et al., 2009), where these quantities are compared in different points of the rupture plane (i.e., we introduce some spatial offset).

4. Event by event statistics

In the present section we consider the whole ensemble of the performed numerical experiments and we compute the spatial averages for each event. In particular, we spatially average the values \( v_{\text{peak}} \) and \( v_t \) over the fault nodes experiencing the rupture (namely, for points where the fault slip velocity exceeds the threshold value \( v_t = 0.01 \text{ m/s} \)). We also exclude points within the initialization patch, where possible effects of the imposed nucleation can affect the data. Since we consider 3-D ruptures, which is a mixture of inplane (mode II) and antiplane (mode III) modes of propagation are coupled, when we compute the spatial average of \( v_t \) we consider both the faults nodes when eventually the rupture speed is supershear (portions of the rupture front experiencing predominantly mode II conditions) and those when it remains subshear.

Our catalog is composed of 76 simulated earthquakes, which cover a range of magnitudes roughly between 5.5 and 7.0 (namely, they span a range of seismic moment between \( 1.06 \times 10^{17} \text{ Nm} \) and \( 3.66 \times 10^{19} \text{ Nm} \)). Overall, our statistics are based upon the analysis of about 200 million fault nodes. This kind of analysis does not consider the details of each individual rupture, such as the transition between the sub- to the supershear regime, local effects of the heterogeneous fault patches, etc., which, on the contrary, are considered in the analysis of each individual event, as that presented in the previous figures. Here, we consider the average behavior of all the synthetic earthquakes.

Fig. 4a confirms that also the averaged \( v_{\text{peak}} \) and \( v_t \) positively correlate. In particular, we can see that \( \langle v_{\text{peak}} \rangle \) increases more than linearly with \( \langle v_t \rangle \); we can extrapolate the following relation

\[
\langle v_{\text{peak}} \rangle = A e^{B \frac{v_t}{10}}
\]

where \( A = 0.67 \text{ m/s}, B = 2.89 \). To make our statistic more robust we have also considered some SW cases where the fault is 110 km long and has a high aspect ratio (\( L/W = 11 \), instead of 0.52 as in the reference simulations). These numerical experiments are denoted by light blue symbols in Fig. 4a and comes from Bizzarri et al. (2010) (as such they have been obtained with a different numerical code). In these cases the rupture accelerates and finally propagates at nearly constant speeds when the fault properties are homogeneous (see Fig. 2 of Bizzarri et al., 2010), in agreement with the findings of Schmedes et al. (2010b). At the same time, we also have that \( v_{\text{peak}} \) tends to saturate (see Animations S1 and S2 of the auxiliary material of Bizzarri et al., 2010) at moderate to large distance from the hypocenter, when the rupture has fully developed. By considering these saturations values in the averaging procedure we still obtain a good agreement with the prediction of the empirical relation (2), as shown in Fig. 4a.

The maximum variations of \( v_{\text{peak}} \) are expected to take place during the accelerating stage of the rupture (where \( v_t \) changes significantly, too). In this phase it has been found for 2-D SW ruptures that the cohesive zone (where the stress is released) progressively shrinks (Andrews, 1976). In homogeneous conditions this implies that, when the rupture is accelerating, also the peak slip velocity increases as the rupture develops (Bizzarri et al., 2001; their Equation (A5)).

Moreover, our results indicate that the average \( v_{\text{peak}} \) increases with the magnitude of the event (see Fig. 4b). If we exclude the compression simulations (symbols in magenta in Fig. 4a) – which are known to give an overestimate of the fault slip velocities (Bizzarri, 2009; Noda et al., 2009) – although there is considerable scatter, we can tentatively fit the data with a curve of the type \( \langle v_{\text{peak}} \rangle \sim M_0^{0.18} \).

5. Discussion and concluding remarks

In addition to the fracture energy density, the stress drop, and the total developed slip, very important dynamic variables which characterize the earthquake source physics are the rupture speed (\( v_t \)) and the peaks in fault slip velocity (\( v_{\text{peak}} \)). While the fault slip velocity is related to the ground motions (Aki and Richards, 2002), the rupture speed is known to affect the high frequency signature of the ground velocity time histories (Bizzarri et al., 2010). Moreover, a pivotal question in seismic hazard assessment is to clarify how the peak ground velocity scales with the earthquake magnitude (Abrahamson and Silva, 2008).

Hitherto, a systematic analysis of the spatial correlation existing between \( v_{\text{peak}} \) and \( v_t \) for different constitutive models and stress conditions was lacking. The present work fill this gap, through the analysis of a synthetic catalog composed by 76 earthquakes which cover a
wide magnitude interval (\(M_0\) from \(1.06 \times 10^{17}\) Nm to \(3.66 \times 10^{19}\) Nm) and propagate spontaneously on planar faults, obeying a large number of governing models.

One conclusion emerging from our study is that \(v_{\text{peak}}\) and \(v_t\) correlate for all the governing equations we consider, confirming the results obtained with the linear slip-weakening law (Schmedes et al., 2010a). In particular, we found here that the peak fault slip velocity increases as the rupture speed increases. Interestingly, the direct dependence between \(v_{\text{peak}}\) and \(v_t\) is more than linear, as previously suggested by laboratory fracture experiments performed at relatively low velocities and for the purely in-plane geometry (Ohnaka et al., 1987; see Eq. (1)). Indeed, the event by event statistics over all the 3-D spontaneous rupture models we consider indicate that peak slip velocity averaged over the fault surface increases exponentially with the average rupture speed (Fig. 4a), as stated by Eq. (2). This conclusion is robust, in that it holds for both sub- and supershear ruptures, both in homogeneous and heterogeneous conditions. Moreover, this result is confirmed for a large class of constitutive equations, conceptually different and based upon different physical frameworks (Bizzarri, 2011b); the linear slip-weakening, the classical (or canonical) formulations of the rate and state laws with memory effects, the flash heating of micro-asperity contacts model and the Chester and Higgs model (a compendious summary of the equations is reported in Table 1). This result is important, in that we can extract consistent correlation patterns irrespective of the assumed friction law.

Our numerical experiments also suggest a direct dependence of \(v_{\text{peak}}\) on \(M_0\); this is reported in Fig. 4b, which indicates that the average peak slip velocity roughly goes like \(M_0^{0.18}\). This relation holds by excluding FH simulations which predict very high values, perhaps overestimates, of the fault slip velocity, as previously noted (Bizzarri, 2009; Noda et al., 2009). In other words, we found that the more destructive the earthquake is, the more relevant peaks in
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**Fig. 4.** Results for the event by event statistics where we spatially average the values of \(v_{\text{peak}}\) and \(v_t\) for all the considered synthetic earthquake of our catalog. Blue indicates SW law (light blue identifies SW simulations with the elastic parameters and fault dimension as in Bizzarri et al., 2010). We also include a model with a non-linear SW law (see Bizzarri, 2010a; his Fig. 4). Red denotes the RS laws (in addition to the Ruina–Dieterich law we also consider the Dieterich–Ruina ageing model), green indicates CH law, magenta indicates FH law and brown indicates SW law with melting effects. Finally, black identifies the simulations with a prior-imposed and constant rupture speed. All the equations are summarized in Table 1. Open and full symbols refer to sub- and supershear ruptures, respectively. Circles represent heterogeneous configurations. (a) Average \(v_{\text{peak}}\) as a function of the average \(v_t\). Labels emphasize the numerical experiments presented in the previous three figures. (b) Average \(v_{\text{peak}}\) as a function of the size of the event. \(M_0\) and \(M_w\) refer to the whole fault length on which the bilateral ruptures develop.
fault slip velocity are attained. This has also consequences on the heat dissipated during sliding, which is directly controlled by the values of the slip velocity (Richards, 1976).

Several empirical studies (Abrahamson and Silva, 2008; Boore and Atkinson, 2008) suggest that peak ground velocity (PGV) increases with the magnitude of the event and saturates for moments greater than roughly $4 \times 10^{19}$ Nm. It is difficult to relate the peak fault slip velocity to PGV; if the peaks on the fault occur during a very short duration, they might be destroyed by anelastic attenuation during the propagation in the medium surrounding the fault surface, or they might not add constructively at a receiver site. On the other hand, the longer period components would survive and add constructively to make the PGV. Finally, we note that if peak slip velocities are largest away from the hypocenter, then they occur in an area where the isochrones velocities are smaller (see Schmedes and Archuleta, 2008), counteracting the effect of large $v_{\text{peak}}$.

Moreover, we found that significant peaks in slip velocity can be realized (see Fig. 4); there is a large debate in the literature concerning the existence of extreme ground motions (Harris et al., 2011). We conclude by emphasizing that the spatial interdependencies between the dynamic variables we found can be implemented as constraints in kinematic modeling of faults. A further development of this work is to explore whether the above conclusions are also preserved for more complex geometries, which account for fault bending and non planarity of the fault surfaces.
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Appendix A. Distribution of the peak slip velocity on the fault surface

In Fig. A1 we report the spatial distribution over the fault plane of the peak slip velocity ($v_{\text{peak}}$) for homogeneous supershear ruptures. Panel (a) refers to a slip-weakening case (which corresponds to the blue circles in Fig. 2a of the main text), while panel (b) refers to a Ruina–Dieterich model (which corresponds to the red circles in Fig. 2a of the main text). Due to the symmetry exploitation (see Bizzarri, 2009 for the numerical details) we plot only one half of the fault in the strike direction.

In both the panels we also superimpose the contours defining the transition between the sub- and the supershear regimes, where the local rupture speed ($v_r$) is below and above the $S$ wave speed ($v_S$), respectively.

It is apparent from Fig. A1 that the fault patches where the rupture remains subshock (which are in the direction of the mode III propagation, i.e., perpendicular with respect to the direction of the initial stress, aligned along the strike direction) exhibit higher peaks in fault slip velocity, on average, with respect to the supershear regions (which are in the direction of the mode II propagation, i.e., on the strike direction). This is in agreement with the findings of Bizzarri and Spudich (2008).

The fact that $v_{\text{peak}}$ tends to be higher in the mode III (i.e., anti-plane) direction than in the mode II (i.e., inplane) direction is a feature which is preserved also for subshear rupture events; this is evident from Fig. A2, where we plot the spatial distribution of $v_{\text{peak}}$ for the Ruina–Dieterich model (panel (a)) and for the Chester–

**Fig. A1.** Spatial distribution of the peak fault slip velocity for the slip-weakening law (panel (a)) and for the Ruina–Dieterich model (panel (b)). The two configurations correspond to blue and red circles of Fig. 2a of the main text, respectively. In both panels purple regions identify the unfractured parts of the fault. Patches experiencing the sub- and supershear rupture propagation are also indicated. Since the rupture is bilateral we plot only one half of the fault length.
Higgs model (panel (b)), presented in Fig. 1 of the main text (red and green circles, respectively). This is the reason why it is a common practice to examine the fault slip velocity time histories in the anti-plane direction when the modeler wants to analyze the quality of its solutions, in term of numerical oscillations.

**Appendix B. The nonzero-offset correlation analysis method**

In the grid by grid analysis presented in Section 3 we have considered a zero-offset distance correlation analysis (i.e., we have considered the values of the peak fault slip velocity and of the rupture speed in the same fault node). We will consider here a nonzero-offset distance correlation, in which these quantities are defined in different points of the fault plane.

To this goal we follow the approach discussed in Bizzarri (2010c); in particular, we consider the normalized covariance as it follows (e.g., Goovaerts, 1997):

$$C_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{\sum_{i_{\text{end}}-\alpha+1}^{i_{\text{end}}-\alpha+1} \sum_{k_{\text{end}}-\beta+1}^{k_{\text{end}}-\beta+1} (x_{i,k} - \langle X \rangle)(y_{i+\alpha-1,k+\beta-1} - \langle Y \rangle)}{(i_{\text{end}} - \alpha + 1) (k_{\text{end}} - \beta + 1) \sigma_x \sigma_y}$$

(\text{B.1})

where the 2-D arrays $X$ and $Y$ denote the arrays $v_{\text{peak}}$ and $v_r$, respectively, and $\langle X \rangle = \frac{1}{i_{\text{end}} - \alpha + 1} \sum_{i=1}^{i_{\text{end}}-\alpha+1} x_{i,k}$ and $\sigma_x = \sqrt{\frac{1}{i_{\text{end}} - \alpha + 1} \sum_{i=1}^{i_{\text{end}}-\alpha+1} (x_{i,k} - \langle X \rangle)^2}$ (and analogous expressions for $Y$). In Eq. (B.1) the operator $\langle \cdot \rangle$ represents the average value of the array and $\sigma$ its standard deviation. The integers $i_{\text{end}}$ and $k_{\text{end}}$ define the size of the arrays in the $x_1$ (strike) and $x_2$ (depth) directions, respectively, while the integers $\alpha$ and $\beta$ define the translation vector $h = ((\alpha - 1)\Delta x, (\beta - 1)\Delta y) = ((\alpha - 1),(\beta - 1))\Delta x$ ($\Delta x$ being the spatial discretization; see Table 2) it is associated to the spatial offset distance $h = \sqrt{(\alpha - 1)^2 + (\beta - 1)^2} \Delta x$ and an azimuth angle $\phi = \arctan((\beta - 1)/(\alpha - 1))$.

The pair $(\alpha\beta) = (1,1)$ corresponds to a zero-offset distance, so that $C_{\alpha\beta}$ becomes the autocorrelation function. $C_{\alpha\beta}$, which is also known as correlogram (Goovaerts, 1997), represents the linear dependency between the two variables $X$ and $Y$, and it varies between $-1$ and $1$ (see also Song et al., 2009). The evaluation of $C_{\alpha\beta}$ for different values of $h$ (i.e., for different values of $\alpha$ and $\beta$) quantifies the potential spatial coherence between the spatially varying variables $X$ and $Y$.

We have considered two rather different datasets, one pertaining to a SW law leading to a supershear rupture and one pertaining to a RS simulation where the rupture remains subshear. The results are reported in Fig. B1a and b, respectively, where we report the values of $C_{\alpha\beta}$ as a function of the spatial offset $h$. It is clear that the maximum spatial correlation exists at zero-offset distance for both the models. Remarkably, this feature is not peculiar of these numerical simulations, but it emerges for the whole ensemble of models we have considered. We can also see from Fig. B1 that for increasing spatial offset $C_{\alpha\beta}$ decreases, reaching a minimum for a value of $h$ value nearly equal to 2.3 km for both the models, while the slopes of the three curves reported in Fig. B1a and b is slightly different.

We can conclude that the maximum spatial correlation existing at zero-offset distance corroborates the same point, grid by grid analysis presented in Section 3.


