



**Rupture propagation in
2 – D fault models**

Numerical Method: BIE 2 - D


We solve the fundamental elastodynamic equation, neglecting body forces \mathbf{f}

$$\rho \ddot{U}_i = \sigma_{ij,j} + f_i$$


Source integral representation (*Betti*' s theorem, Integration in time limit in fault surface, Lamb' s problem):

$$u_n(\mathbf{x}, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt' \int_{S(t')} d\xi G_{n\alpha}(\mathbf{x} - \xi, t - t') \sigma_{\alpha\beta}^P(\xi, t'); n=1,2,3; \alpha=1,2; \mathbf{x}, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$$

First neighbours decoupling (in the case of a 2 - D, pure in - plane rupture):




Numerical Method: FD 2 - D




BIE vs. FD with SW #1


BIE




(a)




(b)




(c)



(d)









(e)




(f)

FD




SW vs. DR law #2



The cohesive zone

Time snapshot
($t = 0.8 \text{ s}$) - SW law





In the target location we can estimate:

$$X_b = 105 \text{ m} \quad T_b = 0.04 \text{ s}$$




From these quantities:

$$v_{rupt} = X_b / T_b = 2625 \text{ m/s}$$


Local estimate



The dynamic propagation. The cohesive zone and the breakdown




Dependence on L parameter




Dependence on a and b

Slip – weakening curves



Phase portraits



Limitation for modeling dynamic Rupture and seismic wave generation

- Because the initial slip velocity is totally arbitrary, it is difficult in the framework of R&S formulation to **prescribe** the traction evolution and the **SW** behavior within the cohesive zone.
- We can only infer an approximated value of the equivalent slip – weakening distance from the proposed scaling law. Moreover, the difference between d_0^{eq} and L depends on the adoption of a slowness (ageing) evolution equation.

Theoretical interpretations

➤ We derived analytical expressions that relate the yield and the kinetic frictional stresses to the constitutive parameters and to slip:

$$\tau = \left[\mu_* + a \ln\left(\frac{v}{v_*}\right) + b \ln\left(\frac{v_*}{v_{init}}\right) - b \frac{u}{L} \right] \sigma_n^{eff}$$

$$\tau_f^{eq} = \left[\mu_* + (b - a) \ln\left(\frac{v_*}{v_2}\right) \right] \sigma_n^{eff}$$


$$D_0^{eq} = L \ln\left(\frac{V_0}{V_i}\right) \approx \frac{\tau_u^{eq} - \tau_f^{eq}}{b \sigma_n} L$$

➤ These relations hold under the assumptions that and that slip velocity is large enough to neglect the term $1/v$. This yields

$$\phi(u) = \frac{L}{v_{init}} e^{-\frac{u}{L}}$$

Numerical estimates of characteristic length

- Laboratory experiments:

Laboratory scale  fault dimension $\sim 20 \text{ m}$ $\Delta x \sim 0.01 \text{ m}$ $L \sim 10^{-5} \text{ m}$
 $L \sim 10^{-5} \text{ m}$ $d_0^{\text{eq}} \sim 10^{-4} - 10^{-3} \text{ m}$

- Extending our calculations to real faults

✓ Estimates of D_0 from ground motions or kinematic source models range within $0.5 \leq d_0 \leq 1 \text{ m}$.


[*Ide and Takeo, 1997; Olsen et al., 1997; Guatteri and Spudich, 2000*]

✓ There is a trade - off between strength - excess and the slip weakening distance d_0 [$d_0 < 0.3 \text{ m}$ are not resolved]


✓ Estimate of d_0 inferred from kinematic inversion models are biased due to smoothing constraints used in the inverse - problems formulation [*Guatteri and Spudich, 2000*]

Fault scale  fault dimension $\sim 20 \text{ km}$ $\Delta x \sim 10 \text{ m}$ $L \sim 10^{-2} \text{ m}$
 $L \sim 10^{-2} \text{ m} = 1 \text{ cm}$ $d_0^{\text{eq}} \sim 10^{-1} \text{ m}$

Differences between DR and RD



This slide is empty intentionally.



Support Slides: Parameters, Notes, etc.

To not be displayed directly. Referenced above.

Remembering constitutive law...



LINEAR SLIP – WEAKENING LAW

$$\tau = \begin{cases} \left[\mu_u - (\mu_u - \mu_f) \frac{u}{d_0} \right] \sigma_n^{eff} & , u < d_0 \\ \mu_f \sigma_n^{eff} & , u \geq d_0 \end{cases}$$

Remembering constitutive law...



DIETERICH IN REDUCED FORMULATION

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tau = \left[\mu_* - a \ln \left(\frac{v_*}{v} + 1 \right) + b \ln \left(\frac{\Psi v_*}{L} + 1 \right) \right] \sigma_n^{eff} \\ \frac{d}{dt} \Psi = 1 - \frac{\Psi v}{L} \end{array} \right.$$

Remembering constitutive law...



RUINA – DIETERICH

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tau = \left[\mu_* - a \ln\left(\frac{v_*}{v}\right) + b \ln\left(\frac{\Psi v_*}{L}\right) \right] \sigma_n^{eff} \\ \frac{d}{dt} \Psi = -\frac{\Psi v}{L} \ln\left(\frac{\Psi v}{L}\right) \end{array} \right.$$