

Multifractal Scaling of Thermally-Activated Rupture Processes

D. Sornette^{1,2,3} and G. Ouillon^{1,3}

¹*Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095*

²*Department of Earth and Space Sciences, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095*

³*Laboratoire de Physique de la Matière Condensée,*

*CNRS UMR 6622 and Université de Nice-Sophia Antipolis, 06108 Nice Cedex 2, France**

(Dated: October 13, 2018)

We propose a “multifractal stress activation” model combining thermally activated rupture and long memory stress relaxation, which predicts that seismic decay rates after mainshocks follow the Omori law $\sim 1/t^p$ with exponents p linearly increasing with the magnitude M_L of the mainshock and the inverse temperature. We carefully test this prediction on earthquake sequences in the Southern California Earthquake catalog: we find power law relaxations of seismic sequences triggered by mainshocks with exponents p increasing with the mainshock magnitude by approximately 0.1–0.15 for each magnitude unit increase, from $p(M_L = 3) \approx 0.6$ to $p(M_L = 7) \approx 1.1$, in good agreement with the prediction of the multifractal model.

PACS numbers: 91.30.Px ; 89.75.Da; 05.40.-a

Parisi and Frisch [1] and Halsey et al. [2] have introduced the extended concept of scale invariance, called multifractality, motivated by hydrodynamic turbulence and fractal growth aggregates respectively. Use of the multifractal spectrum as a metric to characterize complex systems is now routinely used in many fields, including seismology to describe the hierarchical structure in space and time of earthquakes and faults (see for instance [3, 4, 5]). However, the origin of multifractality is rarely identified. This is certainly true for earthquakes for which the possible existence of multifractality is under scrutiny due to limited and corrupted data sets leading to biases [6] and its origin a matter of debate: fractal growth processes [7], self-organized criticality [4] or hierarchical cascades of stresses [8] are among the physical scenarios proposed to lead to multifractality in fault and earthquake patterns. Here, we propose a physically-based “multifractal stress activation” model of earthquake interaction and triggering based on two simple ingredients: (i) a seismic rupture results from thermally activated processes giving an exponential dependence on the local stress; (ii) the stress relaxation has a long memory. The interplay between these two physical processes are shown to lead to a multifractal organization of seismicity, which we observe quantitatively in real catalogs.

Thermal activation is relevant in all previously proposed physical processes underlying earthquakes: creep rupture, stress corrosion and state-and-velocity dependent friction. We model seismic activity $\lambda(\vec{r}, t)$ at position \vec{r} and time t as the occurrence of frictional sliding events and/or fault ruptures that are thermally activated processes facilitated by the applied stress field: $\lambda(\vec{r}, t) \sim \exp[-\beta E(\vec{r}, t)]$, where β is the inverse temperature and the energy barrier $E(\vec{r}, t)$ for rupture can be written as the sum of a contribution $E_0(\vec{r})$ characterizing the material and of a term linearly decreasing with the

locally applied stress $\Sigma(\vec{r}, t)$: $E(\vec{r}, t) = E_0(\vec{r}) - V\Sigma(\vec{r}, t)$. V is a constant which has the dimension of a volume and $\Sigma(\vec{r}, t)$ is the total stress at position \vec{r} and time t . The decrease of the energy barrier $E(\vec{r}, t)$ as a function of the applied stress $\Sigma(\vec{r}, t)$ embodies the various physical processes aiding rupture activation under stress. In addition, there are many evidences for a stress-controlled earthquake activation process, suggesting that earthquakes trigger earthquakes directly and indirectly via dynamical and static stress transfers. Visco-elastic models of stress relaxation can account for the short-term relaxation processes of the strain measured by geodetic methods but, over long time scales, it is necessary to take into account the presence and geometry of lower crustal and mantle shear zones, which lead to slower decaying relaxation rates. We thus write the stress $\Sigma(\vec{r}, t)$ at position \vec{r} and time t as the sum of contributions from all past events at earlier times $\tau < t$ and positions \vec{r}' : $\Sigma(\vec{r}, t) = \Sigma_{\text{far field}}(\vec{r}, t) + \int_{-\infty}^t \int dN[d\vec{r}' \times d\tau] \Delta\sigma(\vec{r}', \tau) g(\vec{r} - \vec{r}', t - \tau)$. A given past event at (\vec{r}', τ) contributes to the stress at (\vec{r}, t) by its stress drop amplitude $\Delta\sigma(\vec{r}', \tau)$ which is transferred in space and time via the stress kernel (or Green function) $g(\vec{r} - \vec{r}', t - \tau)$, taking into account both time relaxation and spatial geometrical decay. The term $dN[d\vec{r}' \times d\tau]$ is the number of events in the volume $d\vec{r}'$ that occurred between τ and $\tau + d\tau$.

In this letter, we restrict our analysis to the time domain. For this, we assume for simplicity that $g(\vec{r}, t)$ is separable as $g(\vec{r}, t) = f(\vec{r}) \times h(t)$. This obtains

$$\lambda(\vec{r}, t) = \lambda_{\text{tec}}(\vec{r}, t) \exp \left[\beta \int_{-\infty}^t d\tau s(\vec{r}, \tau) h(t - \tau) \right], \quad (1)$$

where $s(\vec{r}, \tau) = \int d\vec{r}' \Delta\sigma(\vec{r}', \tau) f(\vec{r} - \vec{r}')$ is the effective source at time τ at point \vec{r} resulting from all events occurring in the spatial domain at the same time τ . $\lambda_{\text{tec}}(\vec{r}, t)$ is the spontaneous seismicity rate in absence of stress

triggering by other earthquakes and accounts for the tectonic loading (far field stress), which may in general be non-homogeneous in space and perhaps depends on time. Since expression (1) is defined for any \vec{r} , we drop the reference to \vec{r} without loss of generality.

To go further, we specify the distribution $P(s)$ of stress sources and the memory kernel $h(t)$. On the basis of theoretical calculations, simulations and measurements of rotations of earthquake focal mechanisms, Kagan [9] has suggested that $P(s)$ should follow a symmetric Cauchy distribution. To capture in a phenomenological way the extended nature and complexity of earthquake ruptures, we use a more general power law distribution $P(s) \sim C/|\Delta s|^{1+\mu}$, which generalizes the Cauchy case $\mu = 1$. To account for the slower-than-exponential stress relaxation processes discussed above, we postulate that $h(t) = \frac{c^{1+\theta}}{(t+c)^{1+\theta}}$ for $0 < t \leq T$, which is of the Omori form with the usual small time-scale cut-off c . To ensure convergence of the correlation function of deterministic processes with memory governed by $h(t)$ for any possible values of θ , we truncate the power law at some large time T , which we call the ‘‘integral time scale:’’ it is the largest time scale up to which the memory of a past event survives. T can thus be interpreted as the effective Maxwell time of the relaxation process. The time dependence of $h(t)$ is an effective description of the relaxation of stress due to microscopic processes such as dislocation motion, stress corrosion and hydrolytic weakening which obeys an Omori-like power law.

In summary, our model reads (in discretized form)

$$\lambda(t) = \lambda_{\text{tec}} e^{\beta\omega(t)}, \quad \omega(t) = \sum_{i | t_i \leq t} s(t_i) h(t - t_i) \quad (2)$$

with the stress sources $s(t_i)$ distributed according to a power law $P(s)$ with exponent μ and $h(t)$ having a power law memory.

We now derive our novel prediction for Omori’s law quantifying the decay of seismic activity after a ‘‘mainshock’’ occurring at the origin of time. This amounts to determining the typical time dependence of the seismic rate $\lambda(t)$ conditioned on a value λ_M realized at $t = 0$ which is larger than average. This formulation is due to the fact that a mainshock of magnitude M induces a local burst of seismic activity proportional to $K 10^{\alpha M}$, where K and α are two positive constants [10]. Since the stress sources are non-Gaussian but power law distributed, their average and variance may not be defined. Rather than calculating the conditional expectation of $\lambda(t)$, a typical measure of conditional seismicity rate can be defined at any quantile level q by the probability $\Pr[\lambda(t) > \lambda_q | \lambda_M]$ that the rate $\lambda(t)$ be larger than the quantile λ_q conditioned on the fact that the seismic rate was at some given value λ_M at time 0: $\Pr[\lambda(t) > \lambda_q | \lambda_M] = \Pr[e^{\beta\omega(t)} > \frac{\lambda_q}{\lambda_{\text{tec}}} | \omega_M] = \Pr[\omega(t) > (1/\beta) \ln \left(\frac{\lambda_q}{\lambda_{\text{tec}}} \right) | \omega_M]$. For Gaussian sources, ω is normally distributed and we

$$\text{get } E[e^{\omega(t)} | \omega_M] = \exp \left[\beta E[\omega(t) | \omega_M] + \frac{\beta^2}{2} \text{Var}[\omega(t) | \omega_M] \right],$$

where $E[\omega(t) | \omega_M] = \omega_M \frac{\text{Cov}[\omega(t), \omega_M]}{\text{Var}[\omega_M]}$. Using (2), this would provide a closed formed expression for the Omori law describing the relaxation of the conditional rate $E[\lambda(t) | \lambda_M]$. The physical meaning of this result is that one can write a linear regression $\omega(t) = \gamma(t)\omega_M + \epsilon$, where $\gamma(t)$ is a non-random factor and ϵ is a centered Gaussian noise with zero correlation with ω_M . This equation writes that the best predictor of ω given ω_M is $\gamma\omega_M$, i.e., $E[\omega(t) | \omega_M] = \gamma\omega_M$ with $\gamma = \frac{\text{Cov}[\omega(t), \omega_M]}{\text{Var}[\omega_M]}$. For power law stress sources, we use the insight that the natural generalization of the variance for power laws $p(x) \approx C/x^{1+\mu}$ with infinite variance (i.e., with $\mu < 2$) is the scale parameter C (see Chap. 4 of [11]). In the power law case, due to the linear form of ω in (2), we can still write $\omega(t) = \gamma(t)\omega_M + \epsilon$ but with $\omega(t), \omega_M$ and ϵ being power law distributed random variables with the same exponent μ and with scale factors equal respectively to C_ω (for ω and ω_M) and C_ϵ . The key idea is that γ can be determined by forming the random variable defined as the product $\omega\omega_M = \gamma\omega_M^2 + \epsilon\omega_M$. It is straightforward to show that the distribution of $\omega\omega_M$ consists of two main contributions, (i) a dominant power law with exponent $\mu/2$ and scale factor $C_{\omega\omega_M} = \gamma^{\mu/2} C_\omega$, and (ii) a sub-dominant power law with exponent μ (with a logarithmic correction) and scale factor $C_\omega C_\epsilon$. This has the following practical implication: if one measures or calculates the leading power law decay of $\omega \times \omega_M$, the measure of its scale factor gives access to the parameter γ through the expression $\gamma(t) = (C_{\omega\omega_M}/C_\omega)^{\frac{2}{\mu}}$, where the time dependence of $\gamma(t)$ comes from that of $C_{\omega\omega_M}$. For $\mu = 2$, we recover the Gaussian result with the correspondence $C_\omega = \text{Var}[\omega]$ and $C_{\omega\omega_M} = \text{Cov}[\omega(t), \omega_M]$. Using (2), we then form the product $\omega(t)\omega_M = \sum_{i | t_i \leq t} \sum_{j | t_j \leq 0} s(t_i) s(t_j) h(t - t_i) h(-t_j)$, where the s ’s are random variables with power law tail with exponent μ . Then, using standard calculations (see Chap. 4 of [11]), the terms in the double sum that contribute to the leading asymptotic power law tail with exponent $\mu/2$ correspond to the diagonal terms $i = j$, while all the other terms contribute to the sub-leading power law tail with exponent μ with logarithmic corrections. This gives the expression of the scale factor $C_{\omega\omega_M}^{\{\mu/2\}}$ of the dominating power law with exponent $\mu/2$ and finally yields $\gamma = \left(\sum_{i | t_i \leq 0} [h(t - t_i)h(-t_i)]^{\frac{\mu}{2}} \right)^{\frac{2}{\mu}}$, in discrete form and

$$\gamma(t) = \frac{c^{2(1+\theta)}}{\Delta t^{2/\mu}} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2m-1}} \int_{c/t}^{T+c-1} dy \frac{1}{(y+1)^m} \frac{1}{y^m} \right)^{\frac{2}{\mu}}, \quad (3)$$

in continuous form where $m = (1 + \theta)\mu/2$. The discrete time step Δt converting the discrete into the continuous sum is the average time interval between two events before a mainshock.

We thus obtain $\Pr[\omega(t) > y|\omega_M] = \Pr[\gamma\omega_M + \epsilon > y|\omega_M] = \Pr[\epsilon > y - \gamma\omega_M|\omega_M] = \bar{F}(y - \gamma(t)\omega_M)$, where $\bar{F}(\epsilon)$ is the complementary cumulative distribution of ϵ . Putting these results in (2), this leads to $\Pr[\lambda(t) > \lambda_q|\lambda_M] = \bar{F}\left(\frac{1}{\beta}\ln\left(\frac{\lambda_q}{\lambda_{\text{tec}}}\right) - \gamma(t)\omega_M\right)$. The typical time evolution of the seismicity rate $\lambda(t)$ conditioned on the rate λ_M at time 0 is thus given by fixing the quantile probability to some level $\Pr[\lambda(t) > \lambda_q|\lambda_M] = q$, leading to

$$\lambda_q(t) = A_q \lambda_{\text{tec}} e^{\beta\gamma(t)\omega_M}, \quad (4)$$

where $A_q = \exp(\beta\bar{F}^{-1}(q))$. The time-dependence of the seismic decay rate requires the determination of the time-dependence of $\gamma(t)$ given by (3). We now show that, for a rather broad range of values of the exponents μ and θ defining the model, $\lambda_q(t)$ is approximately given by

$$\lambda_q(t) \sim \frac{1}{tp(M)}, \quad p(M) = a\beta M + b\beta, \quad (5)$$

where $a > 0$ and M is the mainshock magnitude.

Consider first the case $2m = \mu(1 + \theta) = 1$, such that the exponent $m = (1 + \theta)\mu/2$ defined in (3) equal to $1/2$. Then, $\frac{d\gamma^{\mu/2}}{dt} = -\frac{(h_0^2/\Delta t^{2/\mu})}{t} \left[\frac{(T+c)^{1/2}}{(T+c-t)^{1/2}} - \frac{c^{1/2}}{(t+c)^{1/2}} \right]$, showing that $\frac{d\gamma^{\mu/2}}{dt}$ is close to $-1/t$, and thus $\gamma^{\mu/2}(t) \approx \text{constant}_1 - \text{constant}_2 \ln(t/T)$ which, for not too small nor too large t 's and for $\text{constant}_1 < \text{constant}_2$, gives $\gamma(t) \approx \text{constant}'_1 - \text{constant}'_2 \times \ln(t/T)$. This yields (5). Typically, the power law behavior is observed over more than two decades in time, which is comparable to empirical observations, as verified by direct numerical integration of (3). Then, expression (4) leads to (5) using the fact that $\omega_M \propto \ln(\lambda_M) \propto \ln(K 10^{\alpha M}) = \alpha \ln 10 M + \ln K$, i.e., ω_M is linearly related to the magnitude M . The fact that $\gamma(t)$ is asymptotically exactly logarithmic in time for $2m = \mu(1 + \theta) = 1$ and thus that the seismic rate $\lambda(t)$ is an Omori power law can be recovered from a different construction motivated by multiplicative cascades introduced in turbulence [12]. This case covers the exact multifractal random walk model [13], which corresponds asymptotically to $\theta = -1/2$ and $\mu = 2$. This continuous dependence of the exponent $p(M)$ has actually been documented empirically in this case in another context of aftershock decay following shocks in financial markets [14]. For $2m = \mu(1 + \theta) \neq 1$, one can often observe an approximate linear decay of $\gamma(t)$ as a function of $\ln t$, over two to three order of magnitudes in time in the decaying part, all the more so, the closer m is to $1/2$, also leading to (5).

We now show that this prediction is verified in the Southern Californian earthquakes catalog with revised magnitudes (available from the Southern California Earthquake Center). The details of our analysis is given elsewhere [15] and we summarize the main results. In order to improve the statistical significance and to test

for the stability of our analysis, we analyzed four different sub-catalogs: 1932 – 2003 for magnitude $M_L > 3$ (17,934 events), 1975 – 2003 for $M_L > 2.5$ (36,614 events), 1992 – 2003 for $M_L > 2$ (54,990 events), and 1994 – 2003 for $M_L > 1.5$ (86,228 events). We consider all events in a given sub-catalog and discriminate between mainshocks and triggered events (“aftershocks”). Mainshocks are determined by using two different declustering methods described below. Once the mainshocks are determined, triggered events are defined as those events following a mainshock, which belong to a certain space-time neighborhood of it. In order to test for the predicted dependence of the p -value as a function of magnitude, we bin the mainshock magnitudes in intervals $[1.5; 2]$, $[2; 2.5]$, $[2.5; 3]$, and so on up to $[7; 7.5]$. In each mainshock magnitude interval $[M_1; M_2]$, we consider all triggered sequences emanating from mainshocks with magnitude in this interval and stacked them to a common origin of time. The resulting function is fitted using the modified Omori law $N(t) = B + \frac{a}{(t+c)^p}$, where B is a positive parameter introduced to account for the background seismicity assumed to be superimposed over the genuine triggered sequences. The time shift c ensures the regularization of the seismic rate at $t = 0$.

The first declustering method is essentially the same as defined in [10]: every event in the catalog is defined as a mainshock if it has not been preceded by an event with larger magnitude within a fixed space-time window $T \times d$, with $T = 1$ year and $d = 50$ km. Looking for events triggered by this mainshock, we define another space-time window following it. The time dimension of the window is also set to 1 year, whereas the space dimension depends on the rupture length of the main event. This spatial window is chosen as a circle of radius equal to the mainshock rupture length $L = 10^{-2.57+0.6M_L}$, which is the average relationship between L and magnitude M_L for California [16]. If any event falls within this space-time window, it is considered as triggered by the main event. We have also checked the stability of the results by considering a spatial neighborhood of radius $2L$ rather than L for the triggered events. The second declustering method is the same as the first one, except for one element: the space window used for qualifying a mainshock is not fixed to $d = 50$ km but is chosen to adapt to the size of the rupture lengths $L(M_i)$ given by $L = 10^{-2.57+0.6M_L}$ of all events of all possible magnitudes $M_L(i)$ preceding this potential mainshock.

Figure 1 shows sets of typical seismic decay rates of stacked sequences for several magnitude intervals of the mainshocks, for the period from 1932 to 2003 when using the first declustering technique, with mainshock magnitudes above $M_L = 1.5$. Very similar plots are obtained for different time periods, with the second declustering method and by varying the size from L to $2L$ of the spatial domain over which the triggered sequences are selected [15]. For large mainshock magnitudes, the roll-off




FIG. 1: Normalized seismic decay rates of stacked sequences for several magnitude intervals of the mainshocks, for the period from 1932 to 2003 when using the second declustering technique.

at small times is due to the observational saturation and short-time lack of completeness of triggered sequences.




FIG. 2: p -values of the Omori law $\sim 1/t^p$ obtained by the procedure described in the text for mainshocks (defined using the second declustering algorithm) as a function of the main events' magnitude, for the different sub-catalogs of lifespans given in the inset.

Figure 2 shows the fitted p -values as a function of the magnitude of the mainshocks for each of the four sub-catalogs. We use a standard least-square fit of the seismic rate as a function of time with a weight proportional to t for each bin to balance their relative importance. We also take into account the possible presence of a background term. We have also performed maximum likelihood estimations of the exponent p , confirming the results shown in Fig. 2 [15]. To test the reliability and robustness of our results, we have simulated synthetic catalogs with the ETAS model with known statistical properties following exactly the same procedure as for the real catalogs. The

ETAS model provides a particular strong null hypothesis as it rationalizes most of the phenomenological statistical properties of earthquake catalogs [17]. By construction, synthetic catalogs generated with the ETAS model should exhibit Omori laws with magnitude-independent exponents. Applying our procedure to such synthetic catalogs allows us to investigate whether the magnitude-dependence of the p -value reported above could result from some bias introduced by our analysis rather than being a genuine property of earthquake catalogs. We verify that $p(M)$ obtained by our procedure is a constant independent of M equal to the input value used in the generation of the synthetic catalog [15].

Let us conclude by offering an intuitive explanation of (5) using the properties of multifractal spectra. The temporal evolution of seismicity in a fixed spatial domain defines a statistically stationary measure on the temporal axis, the measure determining the rate of earthquakes at any possible instant. An Omori sequence with exponent p corresponds to a singularity (to the right) equal to $1 - p$ (logarithmic for $p = 1$). A large earthquake triggers a strong burst of seismicity, giving rise to a strong singularity. For the relation $\alpha = 1 - p$ to be consistent with the multifractal description, a large earthquake must be associated with a strong singularity, a small α , hence a large p . Reciprocally, small moment orders q select weak seismic sequences, which are thus associated with small local mainshocks. Small q 's are associated with large α 's, hence small p 's. By a similar argument in the space domain, the exponent of the spatial decay of the seismic rate induced by a mainshock of magnitude M_L should increase with M_L . Thus, in this view, the ETAS model is nothing but the mono-fractal approximation of a more general multifractal description of seismicity.

This work was partially supported by NSF-EAR02-30429 and by the Southern California Earthquake Center (SCEC).

* Electronic address: sornette@moho.ess.ucla.edu

- [1] Parisi, G. and Frisch, U., in Proc. Int. School Enrico Fermi, eds. M. Ghil et al. (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1985).
- [2] Halsey, T.C. et al., Phys. Rev. A 33, 1141 (1986).
- [3] Godano C. et al., Geophys. J. Int. 136, 99 (1999).
- [4] Main, I., Rev. Geophys. 34, 433 (1996).
- [5] Ouillon G. et al., J. Geophys. Res. 101, 5477 (1996).
- [6] Ouillon, G. and Sornette D., Geophys. Res. Lett. 23, 3409 (1996).
- [7] Sornette, A. et al., J. Geophys. res. 98, 12111 (1993).
- [8] Rodkin, M.V., Izvestiya-Physics Sol. Earth. 37, 663 (2001).
- [9] Kagan, Y.Y., Nonlinear Proc. Geophys. 1, 171 (1994).
- [10] Helmstetter, A., Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 058501 (2003).
- [11] Sornette, D., Critical Phenomena in Natural Sciences, 2nd ed. (Springer, Heidelberg, 2004).
- [12] Schmitt, F. and Marsan, D., Eur. Phys. J. B 20, 3 (2001).
- [13] Muzy, J.-F. and E. Bacri, Phys. Rev. E 66, 056121 (2002).
- [14] Sornette, D. et al., Risk 16, 67 (2003).

- [15] Ouillon, G. and D. Sornette, cond-mat/0407208
- [16] Wells, D.L. and Coppersmith, K.J., Bull. Seism. Soc. Am. 84, 974 (1994).
- [17] Helmstetter, A. and D. Sornette, J. Geophys. Res. 108, 10.1029, 2003.