



Title	Slow earthquake in Afghanistan detected by InSAR
Author(s)	Furuya, M.; Satyabala, S. P.
Citation	Geophysical Research Letters, 35(6), L06309 <a href="https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GL033049">https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GL033049</a>
Issue Date	2008-03-26
Doc URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2115/52803">http://hdl.handle.net/2115/52803</a>
Type	article (author version)
File Information	2007gl033049-ms-1.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

# 1 **Slow earthquake in Afghanistan detected by InSAR**

M. Furuya,<sup>1</sup> and S. P. Satyabala<sup>2</sup>

---

M. Furuya, Department of Natural History Sciences, Hokkaido University, N10W8, Kita, Sapporo, 060-0810, JAPAN. (furuya@mail.sci.hokudai.ac.jp)

S. P. Satyabala, National Geophysical Research Institute, Hyderabad, INDIA. (satyabala1978@yahoo.com)

<sup>1</sup>Department of Natural History Sciences,  
Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan

<sup>2</sup>National Geophysical Research Institute,  
Hyderabad, India.

2 The Chaman fault system forms a prominent  $\sim 900$ -km-long left-lateral trans-  
3 form plate boundary between the Indian and Eurasian plates in Afghanistan  
4 and Pakistan. Here we show satellite radar interferometry data that revealed  
5 an afterslip (or slow earthquake) signal following an earthquake of magni-  
6 tude 5.0. This slow slip episode lasted for more than a year, and accompa-  
7 nied a widespread creep signal that occurred at least  $\sim 50$  km along the fault.  
8 We detected no surface slip before the earthquake during the 1.5 years sam-  
9 pled by our data. This finding of long-lasting widespread afterslip demon-  
10 strates that the plate motion along the Chaman Fault is accommodated by  
11 slow slip episodes following moderate earthquakes, and suggests that a po-  
12 tential for magnitude 7-class earthquakes was significantly reduced. The du-  
13 ration and moment release of the detected afterslip do not fit the recently  
14 proposed scaling law for slow earthquakes.

## 1. Introduction

15 Crustal deformation measurements around plate boundaries by modern geodetic tech-  
16 niques have important implications for crustal rheology, fault mechanics, and seismic haz-  
17 ard assessment [*Sagiya, 1999; Bürgmann et al., 2000; Fialko, 2006*]. Over the past decade,  
18 they revealed a variety of slow fault movements undetectable by seismometers not only  
19 in transform fault zones [*Linde et al., 1996*] but also in subduction zones [*Kawasaki et*  
20 *al., 1995; Heki et al., 1997; Dragert et al., 2001; Lowry et al., 2001; Ozawa et al., 2002*].  
21 Following *Ide et al. [2007]*, we call all these events slow earthquakes. Although slow move-  
22 ment (creep) has been known for decades in the San Andreas transform fault system, they  
23 have been regarded as exceptional because no similar phenomena have been reported in  
24 other continental strike slip faults [*Scholtz, 1998; Fialko et al., 2005*].

25 While the relative slip velocity at the Chaman Fault, a major strike-slip fault in south-  
26 west Asia (Figure 1), has been geologically estimated to be 2–4 cm/yr [*DeMets et al., 1991;*  
27 *Lawrence et al., 1992*], historical records show an absence of large earthquakes at a 300–  
28 400 km segment of the Chaman Fault, suggesting that this segment of the fault is either  
29 locked or slipping aseismically [*Ambraseys and Bilham, 2003*]. Since modern ground-based  
30 geodetic measurements are infeasible now around this area, we employed space-borne In-  
31 terferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (InSAR) technique, using Envisat ASAR acquired  
32 by European Space Agency (Table S1), and detected postseismic deformation signal as-  
33 sociated with the moment-magnitude ( $M_w$ ) 5.0 earthquake on 21 October 2005 (Harvard  
34 CMT project).

## 2. Data Analysis and Results

35 Seven observed interferograms in Figure 1 are enlargements of the spatio-temporal evo-  
36 lution of the radar line-of-sight (LOS) changes. In order to reduce atmospheric artefact,  
37 each interferogram was generated by averaging two interferograms derived from two pre-  
38 earthquake images and one post-earthquake image acquired on (a) 17 days, (b) 52 days,  
39 (c) 122 days, (d) 192 days, (e) 332 days, (f) 367 days, (g) 543 days after the earthquake  
40 (Table S1). The signal pattern is consistent with left-lateral strike slip mechanism of  
41 the earthquake. Also, there are steps in the LOS changes across the fault and coher-  
42 ence losses around the epicenter (Figure S2), suggesting that the fault slip breached the  
43 surface at least within 17 days after the M5.0 earthquake; otherwise, they will change  
44 smoothly around the epicenter. Furthermore, not only the signal amplitude but also  
45 the spatial extent of deforming area clearly gets larger over time, thus demonstrating  
46 significant post-seismic deformation. The exact spatial extent and duration of surface  
47 deformation cannot be constrained because atmospheric effects are not completely cor-  
48 rected for. However, the clipped-out areas in Figure 1 should not seriously suffer from  
49 those noises, because as the spatial scale gets smaller, atmospheric signature becomes  
50 smaller in general [*Hanssen*, 2001]. Moreover, in full-scene interferograms, the jumps in  
51 the LOS changes show up more clearly over time, and do not localize around the epicenter  
52 but expand over at least 50 km along the fault even a year after the M5 event (Figure S1).  
53 To our knowledge, year-long postseismic deformation from a M5 earthquake has never  
54 been reported. The spatio-temporal coverage of the postseismic deformation in Figure 1  
55 is thus unexpectedly long for M5.0 determined by seismic observation.

56 Three processes, visco-elasticity [*Pollitz et al.*, 2001; *Gourmelen and Amelung*, 2005],  
57 poro-elasticity [*Jónsson et al.*, 2003], and afterslip [*Heki et al.*, 1997; *Marone et al.*, 1991;  
58 *Freed*, 2007], are now widely known as the mechanisms for postseismic deformation [*Feigl*  
59 *and Thatcher*, 2006]. Since the earthquake we now encounter is M5 and its hypocenter is  
60 as shallow as  $\sim 3$  km as discussed below, and even the stress changes due to the 2004 M6  
61 Parkfield event are shown to be too small to generate visco-elastic relaxation [*Freed*, 2007],  
62 it is unlikely for viscous relaxation from lower crust to upper mantle revealed on the sur-  
63 face. If poro-elasticity were significant, the spatial pattern of the postseismic deformation  
64 should be in inverse sense to the coseismic one, which is not the case in Figure 1, and  
65 suggests that poro-elastic processes were not playing a measurable role. This observation  
66 implies that afterslip is dominant, and model the observed postseismic deformation to  
67 infer the fault slip distribution, using dislocation Green function in an elastic, isotropic  
68 and homogeneous half space [*Okada*, 1992].

69 Figure 2 shows cumulative slip distribution of the optimum fault source model at each  
70 epoch. The maximum slip amplitude was initially about 6 cm at a depth of 2-3 km  
71 (Figure 2a). Whereas the afterslip propagated upward in the two cases in California, the  
72 1987 Superstition Hills (Mw 6.6) and the 2004 Parkfield (Mw 6.0) events [*Bilham*, 1989;  
73 *Freed*, 2007], Figure 2 demonstrates that the afterslip area expanded downward over time,  
74 which is rather similar to the deep afterslip following the 1992 Landers [*Fialko*, 2004;  
75 *Perfettini and Avouac*, 2007] and the 1999 Izmit earthquake [*Bürgmann et al.*, 2002]. The  
76 estimated fault model allows us to compute cumulative moment released by each epoch  
77 (Figure 3). The moment magnitude released after the M5 event is estimated to be 5.5,

78 significantly larger than the coseismic one. Logarithmic changes have been observed in  
79 a variety of tectonic settings [*Heki et al.*, 1997; *Marone et al.*, 1991], and it seems to  
80 fit reasonably well to this strike-slip earthquake as well, despite the orders-of-magnitude  
81 difference in the released moment.

82 To see if there was any steady creep motion before the earthquake, we generated three  
83 groups of stacked interferograms with different mean temporal coverage, each of which  
84 was generated by stacking three independent interferograms (Figure 4 and Table S2); no  
85 data after 21 Oct 2005 were used. If creep motion took place steadily with a constant rate,  
86 the deformation signal would be proportional to the temporal coverage. While we could  
87 identify such signals in the northwest near Qalat, that is presumably ground subsidence  
88 due to water pumping, the observed size of the phase jumps across the fault does not  
89 increase proportionally with time (Figure 4; see also Figure S6). We thus conclude that  
90 steady creep on the surface does not exist, at least, along the analyzed period and area.

### 3. Discussion

91 Of the seven data acquisitions after the earthquake, six allowed us to generate three  
92 independent postseismic interferograms (Table S2 and Figure S7). What should be noted  
93 is that the jumps across the fault in the radar LOS changes do not reveal any lobes around  
94 the epicenter but rather spread over a wide area along the fault. The LOS changes across  
95 the fault are observed not only around the epicenter but also, at least  $\sim 50$  kilometers-  
96 long portion along the fault, demonstrating that slip occurred over a broad area after the  
97 M5 earthquake. The slipped area in Figure 2 is therefore significantly under-estimated,  
98 suggesting that the total moment release would be much larger. Nevertheless, if considered

99 as a single event with a duration of  $\sim 1$  year, the observed deformation does not fit the  
100 recently proposed scaling-law for slow earthquake, in which total moment is predicted to  
101 be  $\sim 10^{19-20}$  Nm [*Ide et al.*, 2007]. The smaller moment release despite  $\sim 1$  year duration  
102 may be due to a strike-slip environment. Since the brittle-ductile transition depth is  
103 shallower than that in cold subduction zones [*Scholtz*, 1998], the depth extent of the fault  
104 would be at most 15 km. Unless the fault length extends hundreds of kilometers or more,  
105 it is unlikely for the total moment to reach  $\sim 10^{19-20}$  Nm.

106 The previously estimated relative plate boundary velocity 2-4 cm/yr suggests that M  
107  $> 7$  events could occur with  $< 200$  years intervals [*Ambraseys and Bilham*, 2003] or M  $>$   
108 5 earthquakes with  $< 2$  years intervals. The earthquake catalogues tell us, however, that  
109 the 2005 M5 event was the second largest earthquake over the past three decades in this  
110 area (2 degree  $\times$  2 degree), and that the largest one was the 1992 M5.5 event  $> 100$  km  
111 to the south (USGS catalogue). More than 10 earthquakes with M  $> 5$  have been missing  
112 in the recent three decades. As we argued, however, the M5 earthquake appears to have  
113 triggered a widespread afterslip which lasted for more than a year at an average rate of  
114  $\sim 0.8$  cm/yr along  $\sim 50$  km long portion of the fault (Figure S8). If the depth extent of the  
115 widespread afterslip is supposed to be 10 km, the moment release could reach as much as  
116  $3 \times 10^{17}$  Nm, which is equivalent to about eight Mw 5.0 earthquakes. We can speculate  
117 that the 1992 M5.5 event generated similar postseismic deformation. Consequently, these  
118 M5-class events and their significant afterslip would be enough to account for the moment  
119 deficit, and should have significantly reduced the potential of M7 events.



120 Why did such a significant afterslip follow this small (M5) earthquake? Afterslip pro-  
121 cesses have been successfully interpreted within a framework of Dieterich-Ruina rate-and-  
122 state dependent friction (RSF) law [*Dieterich, 1979; Ruina, 1983; Scholtz, 1998*]. Our  
123 speculation is that, unlike a simplified layered friction rate parameter ( $A - B$ ) structure  
124 [*Scholtz, 1998*], velocity-weakening zones ( $A - B < 0$ ) are heterogeneously distributed in  
125 a spotty fashion over some depth interval, while velocity-strengthening zones ( $A - B > 0$ )  
126 are widely distributed on the fault interface. We think that the M5 earthquake nucleated  
127 in a region congested with negative  $A - B$  patches, although our fault source inversion  
128 cannot resolve such fine structure. The local lithology is quaternary sediment and tertiary  
129 flysch [*Lawrence et al., 1992*], which are presumably unconsolidated and will make  $A - B$   
130 more positive [*Scholtz, 1998; Marone et al., 1991*]. Recent simulation study successfully  
131 illustrated an evolution of afterslip and aftershocks on a fault surface with heterogeneously  
132 distributed negative  $A - B$  patches over a positive  $A - B$  background [*Liu and Rice, 2005;*  
133 *Kato, 2007*].

134 Our InSAR data implies that plate motion around the Chaman Fault is accommodated  
135 by infrequent moderate earthquakes accompanied by significant afterslip, and that, instead  
136 of great earthquakes as large as M7, numerous small earthquakes undetectable by global  
137 seismic network are taking place which probably accompany quiescent earthquakes at  
138 depth [*Rubin et al., 1999*]. While many slow earthquakes have been reported in subduction  
139 zones, the present finding of a long-lasting afterslip at another matured strike slip fault  
140 demonstrates that the San Andreas Fault is no longer an exception.

141 **Acknowledgments.** We thank K. Feigl and I. Johanson for critical reviews. We also  
142 thank R. Bilham, N. Kato, M. Nakatani and K. Heki for discussion. Original Envisat  
143 data are copyright of European Space Agency. This work was mostly done while MF was  
144 at Univ. of Tokyo, and was supported from the 21st Century COE program at Univ.  
145 of Tokyo, "Multi-Sphere Earth System Evolution and Variation Predictability", and the  
146 Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research, Japan Society for Promotion of Science (19340123).  
147 This work was initiated when both authors were CIRES visiting fellows at University of  
148 Colorado at Boulder.


## References

- 149 Ambraseys, N., and R. Bilham (2003), Earthquakes in Afghanistan, *Seismo. Res. Lett.*,  
150 *74*, 107–123.
- 151 Bilham, R. (1989), Surface slip subsequent to the 24 November 1987 Superstition Hills,  
152 California, earthquake monitored by digital creepmeters, *Bull. Seismo. Soc. America*,  
153 *79*, 424–450.
- 154 Bürgmann, R., Schmidt, D., Nadeau, R. M., d'Alessio, M., Fielding, E., Manaker, D.,  
155 McEvelly, T. V., and M. H. Murray (2000), Earthquake potential along the northern  
156 Hayward fault, California, *Science*, *289*, doi: 10.1126/science.289.5482.1178.
- 157 Bürgmann, R., Ergintav, S., Segall, P., Hearn, E. H., McClusky, S., Reilinger, R. E.,  
158 Woith, H., and J. Zschau (2002), Time-space variable afterslip on and deep below the  
159 Izmit earthquake rupture, *Bull. Seismo. Soc. America*, *92*, 126–137.
- 160 DeMets, C., Gordon, R. G., Argus, D. F., and S. Stein (1990), Current plate motions,  
161 *Geophys. J. Int.*, *101*, 425–478.


- 162 Dieterich, J. H. (1979), Modelling of rock friction: 1 Experimental results and constitutive  
163 equations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *84*, 2161–2168.
- 164 Dragert, H., Wang, K. and T. S. James (2001), A silent slip event on the Cascadia  
165 subduction interface, *Science*, *292*, 1525–1528.
- 166 Fialko, Y. (2004), Evidence of fluid-filled upper crust from observations of postseismic  
167 deformation due to the 1992 Mw 7.3 Landers earthquake, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *109*,  
168 doi:10.1029/2004JB002985.
- 169 Fialko, Y., Sandwell, D., Simons, M. and P. Rosen (2005), Three-dimensional deformation  
170 caused by the Bam, Iran, earthquake and the origin of shallow slip deficit, *Nature*, *435*,  
171 doi:10.1038/nature03425.
- 172 Fialko, Y (2006), Interseismic strain accumulation and the earthquake potential on the  
173 southern San Andreas fault system, *Nature*, *441*, doi:10.1038/nature04797.
- 174 Feigl, K. L. and W. Thatcher (2006), Geodetic observations of post-seismic tran-  
175 sients in the context of the earthquake deformation cycle, *C. R. Geosci.*, *338*,  
176 doi:10.1016/j.crte.2006.06.006
- 177 Freed, A. M. (2007), Afterslip (and only afterslip) following the 2004 Parkfield, California,  
178 earthquake, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *34*, doi:10.1029/2006GL029155.
- 179 Gourmelen, N. and F. Amelung (2005), Postseismic Mantle Relaxation in the Central  
180 Nevada Seismic Belt, *Science*, *310*, doi:10.1126/science.1119798.
- 181 Hanssen, R. F. (2001), Radar interferometry -Data Interpretation and Error Analysis-,  
182 308 pp., Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

- 183 Heki, K., Miyazaki, S. and H. Tsuji (1997), Silent fault slip following an interplate thrust  
184 earthquake at the Japan Trench, *Nature*, *386*, 595–597.
- 185 Ide, S., Beroza, G. C., Shelly, D. R. and T. Uchide (2007), A scaling law for slow earth-  
186 quakes, *Nature*, *447*, doi:10.1038/nature05780.
- 187 Jónsson, S., Segall, P., Pedersen, R. and G. Björnsson (2003), Post-earthquake ground  
188 movements correlated to pore-pressure transients, *Nature*, *424*, 179–183.
- 189 Kato, N. (2007), Expansion of aftershock areas caused by propagating post-seismic sliding,  
190 *Geophys. J. Int.*, *168*, 797–808.
- 191 Kawasaki, I., Asai, Y., Tamura, Y., Sagiya, T., Mikami, N., Okada, Y., Sakata, M., and  
192 M. Kasahara (1995), The 1992 Sanriku-Oki, Japan, ultra-slow earthquake, *J. Phys.*  
193 *Earth*, *43*, 105–116.
- 194 Lawrence, R. D., Hasan Khan, S. and T. Nakata (1992), Chaman Fault, Pakistan-  
195 Afghanistan. *Ann. Tectonicae*, *6*, 196–223.
- 196 Linde, A. T., Gladwin, M. T., Johnson, M. J. S., Gwyther, R. L., and R. G. Bilham  
197 (1996), A slow earthquake sequence on the San Andreas fault, *Nature*, *383*, 65–68.
- 198 Liu, Y. and J. R. Rice (2005), Aseismic slip transients emerge spontaneously in three-  
199 dimensional rate and state modeling of subduction earthquake sequences, *J. Geophys.*  
200 *Res.*, *110*, doi:10.1029/2004JB003424.
- 201 Lowry, A. R., Larson, K. M., Kostoglodov, V. and R. Bilham (2001), Transient fault slip  
202 in Guerrero, southern Mexico, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *28*(19), 3753–3756.
- 203 Marone, C. J., Scholtz, C. H. and R. Bilham (1991), On the Mechanics of Earthquake  
204 Afterslip, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *96*, 8441–8452.


- 205 Okada, Y. (1992), Internal deformation due to the shear and tensile faults in a half-space,  
206 *Bull. Seismo. Soc. America*, *82*, 1018–1042.
- 207 Ozawa, S., Murakami, M., Kaidzu, M., Tada, T., Sagiya, T., Hatanaka, Y., Yarai, H. and  
208 T. Nishimura (2002), Detection and monitoring of ongoing aseismic slip in the Tokai  
209 region, central Japan, *Science*, *298*, doi: 10.1126/science.1076780.
- 210 Perfettini, H. and J.-P. Avouac (2007), Modeling afterslip and aftershocks following the  
211 1992 Landers earthquake, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *112*, doi:10.1029/2006JB004309.
- 212 Pollitz, F., Wicks, C. and W. Thatcher (2001), Mantle Flow Beneath a Continental Strike-  
213 Slip Fault: Postseismic Deformation After the 1999 Hector Mine Earthquake, *Science*,  
214 *293*, doi:10.1126/science.1061361.
- 215 Rubin, A. M., Gillard, D., and J. L. Got (1999), Streaks of microearthquakes along the  
216 creeping faults, *Nature*, *400*, 635–641.
- 217 Ruina, A. L. (1983), Slip instability and state variable friction laws, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *88*,  
218 10359–10370.
- 219 Sagiya, T (1999), Interplate coupling in the Tokai district, Central Japan, deduced from  
220 continuous GPS data, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *26*(15), 2315–2318.
- 221 Scholtz, C. H. (1998), Earthquakes and friction laws, *Nature*, *391*, 37–42.




**Figure 1.** (Lower Left) Location map of the Chaman Fault (red line) and the analyzed full scene (red rectangle). Black solid lines are nations' boundary, and Afg, Pak, and Ind stand for Afghanistan, Pakistan, and India, respectively. (Upper Left) Full-scene InSAR data: see Figure S1 for all seven pairs. (Right) Expanded views of InSAR data (a-g) around the epicenter as a function of time after the earthquake: (a) 17 days, (b) 52 days, (c) 122 days, (d) 192 days, (e) 332 days, (f) 367 days, (g) 543 days. Shaded relief map in the same area is shown in (h). Positive (negative) change represents increase (decrease) in radar LOS. A coherence map for Figure 1a is shown in Figure S2. Details of interferometric pairs are shown in Table S1.



**Figure 2.** Each panel represents fault size with its uncertainty estimate and estimated slip distribution accumulated by (a) 8-Nov-2005, (b) 13-Dec-2005, (c) 21-Feb-2006, (d) 2-May-2006, (e) 19-Sep-2006, (f) 24-Oct-2006, and (g) 17-Apr-2007. Upper left panel shows the relative position of each fault model. The methods of error analyses are shown in auxiliary materials, Figures S3, S4 and S5.



**Figure 3.** Temporal changes in the released moment (blue dots) estimated from the fault source models in Figure 2. Error bars represent 95 % confidence interval, which are estimated by the method described in auxiliary materials, Figures S3, S4 and S5. The post-seismic curve (red) is a logarithmic function whose temporal dependence is  $\ln(pt + 1)$  [Marone *et al.*, 1991], where  $p$  is optimized to be  $3.6 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ . Mw stands for moment magnitude.



**Figure 4.** Three groups of pre-earthquake stacked interferograms; no data after 21 October 2005 are used. Three independent interferograms are stacked to generate each result (Table S2), but the average temporal separation is different in each stacked interferogram. In the actual stacking process, we have re-scaled the temporal separation in order to match it up with the average separation in Figure 4a. LOS changes of each interferogram along the profile A-A' are shown in Figure S6; A-A' crosses the epicenter of the M5 event.