

## Notations and symbols



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \tau=\mathrm{T}+\Sigma \\
& \tau_{j}=n_{i} \sigma_{i j}^{e f f}
\end{aligned}
$$

total traction (acting on the fault surface).

Cauchy's formula, where $\tau=\left(\tau_{1}, \tau_{2}, \tau_{3}\right), \mathbf{n}=\left(n_{1}, n_{2}, n_{3}\right)$ and

$$
\sigma_{i j}^{e f f}=\sigma_{i j}-p_{\text {fluid }} \delta_{i j}=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
\sigma_{11}-p_{\text {fluid }} & \sigma_{12} & \sigma_{13} \\
\sigma_{12} & \sigma_{22}-p_{\text {fluid }} & \sigma_{23} \\
\sigma_{13} & \sigma_{23} & \sigma_{33}-p_{f l u i d}
\end{array}\right]
$$

$T_{j}=n_{i} \sigma_{i j}^{\text {eff }}-n_{j}\left(n_{i} \sigma_{i j}^{\text {eff }} n_{j}^{\top}\right)$
$\Sigma_{j}=n_{j}\left(n_{i} \sigma_{i j}{ }^{\text {eff }} n_{j}^{\top}\right)$
shear traction
normal traction

## 1. FRACTURE CRITERION

Comellion that spacty, ak a glyon faule point amel at al glyen lime, fif there is a rugure or not

- It can be expressed in terms of energy, in terms of maximun frictional resistence, and so on.
- It is based on (i) the Benioff ( 1951 ) hypothesis: The fracture occours when the stress in a volume reaches the rock strength or, analogoulsy,
(ii) the Reid ( 1910 ) statement: The fracture takes place when the stress attains a value greater than the rock can endure.


## 2. CONSTHTUTIVE LAWV

Anelyifel relelion existing bewesh the comeonents of the siress ierisor and priysiotl obstryble(s), [1ke the sllp, the shp yslocity, ins stale yarla iols elc.

- From a mathematical point of view it is a Fault Boundary Condfion ( FBC ) that controls earthquake dynamics and its complexity in space and in time.
- Its simplest form consider only two firictional levels, $\tau_{u}$ and $\tau_{f}$; it accounts for stress drop (or stress realease ), but the process is instantaneous: there is a singularity at crack tip.
- Cohesive zone models: Barenblatt ( 1959a, 1959b ), Ida ( 1972 ), Andrews (1976a, 1976b ). In these models the singularity is removed and the sress release occours over a breakdown zone distance $X_{b}$ and in a breakdown zone time $T_{b}$.
- Friction laws ( Rate and State dependent f. I. ): Dieterich ( 1976 ), Ruina ( 1980, 1983 ). They accounts for fault spoptaneous nucleation, re - strengthening, healing, etc..


## CONSTJTUTIVE LAW (continues )

- "The central issue is whether faults obey simple friction laws, and if so, what is the friction coefficient associated with fault slip " ( Scholz and Hanks, 2004 ).


## CONSTJTUTIVE LAW (continues )

- In full of generality we can express the constitutive ( or governing ) as:

$$
\tau=\mu\left(u, v, \Psi, T, H, \lambda_{c}, h, g, C_{e}\right) \sigma_{n}^{e f f}\left(\sigma_{n}, p_{f}\right)
$$

where:
1st - order dependencies
$u$ is the Slip ( i. e. displ. disc. ) modulus,
$v$ is the Slip Velocity modulus ( its time der. ), $\Psi=\left(\Psi_{1}, \ldots, \Psi_{N}\right)$ is the State Variable vector,
$T$ is the Temperature ( accounting for Ductility, Plastic Flow, Melting and Vaporization ),
$H$ is the Humidity,
$\lambda_{c}$ is the Characteristic Length of surface ( accounting for Roughness and Topography of asperity contacts ),
$h$ is the Hardness,
$g$ is the Gouge ( accounting for Surface Consumption and Gouge formation ),
$\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{e}}$ is the Chemical Environment

## Strength \& Constitutive Laws

1. THE STRENGTH PARAMETER

- Hystorically introduced by Das and Akil (1977/a, $1977(6)$ to have a quantitative extimate of the ability to fracture for a fault
- Its expression can be generalized as:

$$
S=\left(\mu_{u} \sigma_{n}^{\text {eff }}-\tau_{0}\right) /\left(\tau_{0}-\mu_{f} \sigma_{n}^{\text {eff }}\right)
$$

where $\mu$ are the friction coefficient.

- We can also define


## 2. THE FAULJ STRENGTH

- Is the parameter that quantify the stirenght in the more general case, in which a fault is described by a rhealistic firiction laws

$$
S^{\text {fault }}=\mu\left(u, v, \Psi, T, H, \lambda_{c}, h, g, C_{e}\right) \sigma_{n}^{\text {eff }}\left(\sigma_{n}, p_{\text {fluid }}\right)
$$

## Time-weakening Friction Law

$$
\tau= \begin{cases}{\left[\mu_{u}-\left(\mu_{u}-\mu_{f}\right) \frac{\left(t-t_{r}\right)}{t_{0}}\right] \sigma_{n}^{e f f}} & , t-t_{r}<t_{0} \\ \mu_{f} \sigma_{n}^{e f f} & , t-t_{r} \geq t_{0}\end{cases}
$$

```
ilaw = 11
```

$t_{r}=t_{r}(\xi)$ is the rupture onset time in every fault point $\xi$ (when $u>0$ ).

Andrews ( 1985 ), Bizzarri et al. ( 2001 ) and other following Bizzarri' s papers
$t_{0}$ is the characteristic time weakening duration.

## Position - weakening Friction Law

$$
\tau= \begin{cases}{\left[\mu_{u}-\left(\mu_{u}-\mu_{f}\right) \frac{x}{R_{0}}\right] \sigma_{n}^{e f f}} & ,-R_{0}<x<0 \\ \mu_{f} \sigma_{n}^{e f f} & ,-L<x<-R_{0}\end{cases}
$$

$x$ is the position on the fault Palmer and Rice (1973)
( extending up to $-L$ ).
$R_{0}$ is the characteristic position weakening distance.

## Slip - Dependent Friction Laws

1. $L I N E A R S L I P-W I A K E I N G L A W$

$$
\tau= \begin{cases}{\left[\mu_{u}-\left(\mu_{u}-\mu_{f}\right) \frac{u}{d_{0}}\right] \sigma_{n}^{e f f}} & , u<d_{0} \\ \mu_{f} \sigma_{n}^{e f f} & , u \geq d_{0}\end{cases}
$$

```
                                    ilaw = 21
```

2. $N O N$ - $L$ NEAR S $S$ S $P$ - W

$$
\tau= \begin{cases}{\left[\mu_{u}-\frac{\mu_{u}-\mu_{f}}{d_{0}}\left(u-\frac{\left(1-p_{I W}\right) d_{0}}{2 \pi} \sin \left(\frac{2 \pi u}{d_{0}}\right)\right)\right] \sigma_{n}^{e f f}} & , u<d_{0} \\ \mu_{f} \sigma_{n}^{\text {eff }} & , u \geq d_{0}\end{cases}
$$

## Ionescu and Campillo (1999)

 HARDENJNG

$$
\tau=\left\{\left[\left(\frac{\tau_{0}}{\sigma_{n}^{\text {eff }}}-\mu_{f}\right)\left(1+\alpha_{O W} \ln \left(1+\frac{u}{\beta_{O W}}\right)\right)\right] \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{u}{d_{0}}}+\mu_{f}\right\} \sigma_{n}^{\text {eff }}
$$

$$
u_{h}:\left.\frac{\mathrm{d} \tau}{\mathrm{~d} u}\right|_{u_{h}}=0 ; \quad\left\{\begin{aligned}
u_{h} & =r d_{0} \quad(\text { e.g. } r=0.1) \\
\tau\left(u_{h}\right) & =\tau_{u}
\end{aligned}\right.
$$



Ohnaka and Yamashita (1989) and the following papers by Ohnaka and coworkers
$u_{h}$ is associated with the preparatory phase of the imminent macroscopic failure in the cohesive zone. It accounts for micro-cracking

## Rate - and State - Dependent

## Friction Laws

1. DJEJERTMH IN REDUCED FORJUUATJION

$$
\left\{\begin{aligned}
\tau & =\left[\mu_{*}-a \ln \left(\frac{v_{*}}{v} \bigcirc\right)+b \ln \left(\frac{\Psi v_{*}}{L} \bigcirc\right)\right] \sigma_{n}^{e f f} \\
\frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \Psi & =1-\frac{\Psi v}{L}
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

```
ilaw = 31
```

However, while in velocity stepping experiments the traction response following the velocity variation is directly controlled by the parameter $L$, its effects are much less evident during the dynamic rupture propagation.

## Bizzarri and Cocco ( 2005 )

Response to an abrupt jump in load

2. RUUNAA - DJETERJ/CH

$$
\left\{\begin{aligned}
\tau & =\left[\mu_{*}-a \ln \left(\frac{v_{*}}{v}\right)+b \ln \left(\frac{\Psi v_{*}}{L}\right)\right] \sigma_{n}^{\text {eff }} \\
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \Psi & =-\frac{\Psi v}{L} \ln \left(\frac{\Psi v}{L}\right)
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

Ruina (1980, 1983 ), Beeler et al. ( 1984 ), Roy and Marone (1996)
3. DJETERNGH-RUJNA WIJH VARYING NORNAL STR

$$
\left\{\begin{aligned}
\tau & =\left[\mu_{*}-a \ln \left(\frac{v_{*}}{v}\right)+b \ln \left(\frac{\Psi v_{*}}{L}\right)\right] \sigma_{n}^{e f f} \\
\frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \Psi & =1-\frac{\Psi v}{L}-\left(\frac{\alpha_{L D} \Psi}{b \sigma_{n}^{e f f}}\right) \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \sigma_{n}^{e f f}
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

```
ilaw = 31
decis10=T
    DR
```

Linker and Dieterich (1992), Dieterich and Linker ( 1992), Bizzarri and Cocco (2006b, 2006c )
4. RUJNA - DJETERICH WIJH VARYING NORNAL STR

$$
\left\{\begin{aligned}
\tau & =\left[\mu_{*}-a \ln \left(\frac{v_{*}}{v}\right)+b \ln \left(\frac{\Psi v_{*}}{L}\right)\right] \sigma_{n}^{e f f} \\
\frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \Psi & =-\frac{\Psi v}{L} \ln \left(\frac{\Psi v}{L}\right)-\left(\frac{\alpha_{L D} \Psi}{b \sigma_{n}^{e f f}}\right) \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \sigma_{n}^{e f f}
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

$$
\text { ilaw = } 32
$$

decis10=T
RD

Linker and Dieterich (1992) , Bizzarri and Cocco (2006b, 2006c )

## 5. DJEJERTCH IN REDUCED FORJM REGULARIZED

$$
\left\{\begin{aligned}
\tau & =\left[\mu_{*}-a \ln \left(\frac{v+v_{*}}{v \sqrt{+v_{*}}}\right)+b \ln \left(\frac{\Psi\left(v \sqrt{-v_{n}}\right)}{L}+1\right)\right] \sigma_{n}^{e f f} \\
\frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \Psi & =1-\frac{\Psi\left(v \sqrt{\left(U_{i}\right)}\right)}{L}
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

Perrin et al. ( 1995 ), Cocco et al. (2004)

## 6. RUJNA RJEGULARIZED

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4 \\
& \frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \Psi=-\frac{v+\varepsilon_{i}}{L}\left(\Psi+b \ln \left(\frac{v-v_{i}}{v_{*}-v_{i}}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## 7. DJETERNGH NN REDUCED FORNM MJJH HEALING

$$
\left\{\begin{aligned}
\tau & =\left[\mu_{*}-a \ln \left(\frac{v_{*}}{v}+1\right)+b \ln \left(\frac{\Psi v_{*}}{L}+1\right)\right] \sigma_{n}^{e f f} \\
\frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \Psi & =\frac{\gamma_{f h}-\Psi}{v_{\text {en }}}-\frac{\Psi v}{L}
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

$$
\text { ilaw }=35
$$

$$
\mathrm{DH}
$$

## $\gamma_{f h}=1 \mathrm{~s}$

$t_{f h}$ is the time for healing (slip duration)

Evolution law proposed by Nielsen et al. (2000) and by Nielsen and Carlson ( 2000 ). Used in this form by Cocco et al. (2004)
9. PRAKKASH-CLJFION

$$
\left\{\begin{aligned}
\tau & =\left[\mu_{*}-a \ln \left(\frac{v_{*}}{v}\right)+b \ln \left(\frac{\Psi v_{*}}{L}\right)\right]\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \Psi_{1}+\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \Psi_{2}\right) \\
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \Psi & =1-\frac{\Psi v}{L} \\
\frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \Psi_{1} & =-\frac{v}{L_{1}}\left(\Psi_{1}-\alpha_{P C_{1}} \sigma_{n}^{e f f}\right) \\
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} \Psi_{2} & =-\frac{v}{L_{2}}\left(\Psi_{2}-\alpha_{P C_{2}} \sigma_{n}^{e f f}\right)
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

$\Psi_{1}$ and $\Psi_{2}$ are additional state variables accountinf for the coupling with effective normal stress. The formulation of friction law is not based on the Amonton - Coulamb law.

Coupling with effective normal stress proposed by Prakash and Clifton (1993) and Prakash (1998). Used in this form by Bizzarri ( 2005, unpublished work)
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## Support Slides: Parameters, Notes, etc.

To not be displayed directly. Referenced above.

## Silinglest ficiction nnodels

At a particular fault point $\xi$ ( following Savage and Wood, 1971; Scholz, 1990 )

## Maximum ( or upper, or yield ) stress <br> Kinetic ( or frictional ) stress




Strength excess:

$$
\tau_{u}-\tau_{0}=0
$$

Dynamic stress drop: $\Delta \tau_{d}=\tau_{0}-\tau_{f}$


Rupture arrest

## Sinnolest ficiction noodels

At a particular fault point $\xi$ ( following Savage and Wood, 1971; Scholz, 1990 )

Maximum ( or upper, or yield ) stress
Initial stress
Kinetic ( or frictional ) stress
Residual stress


Strength excess:

$$
\tau_{u}-\tau_{0}
$$

Dynamic stress drop: $\Delta \tau_{d}=\tau_{0}-\tau_{f}$
Static stress drop: $\quad \Delta \tau_{s}=\tau_{0}-\tau_{2}$
Breakdown str. drop: $\Delta \tau_{b}=\tau_{u}-\tau_{f}$


- Savage and Wood (1971) also define:

Mean stress: $\quad<\tau>=1 / 2\left(\tau_{u}+\tau_{2}\right)$
Seismic efficiency: $\quad \eta=E_{s} / E$, where:
$E_{s}$ is the seismic energy $E$ is the total available energy

Apparent stress: $\quad \tau_{a}=\eta\langle\tau\rangle$

- Direct observation of the absolute stress near an earthquake is not feasible, but it is possible ( Wyss and Brune, 1968 ) calculate $\tau_{a}$ and stress drop from physical observables.


## The conlesive zone



In the target location we can extimate:

$$
X_{b}=105 \mathrm{~m} \quad T_{b}=0.04 \mathrm{~s}
$$

From these quantities:
$v_{\text {rupt }}=X_{b} / T_{b}=2625 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$



## Slj $\rho$ - fascolerifug efitct




 1997).

