Transient poroelastic response to megathrust earthquakes: a look at the 2015 $M_w$ 8.3 Illapel, Chile, event
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SUMMARY

Large earthquakes can alter regional groundwater pressure, resulting in fluid flow, and the process of restoring hydrostatic equilibrium would in turn lead to observable surface deformation, termed poroelastic rebound, which is one of the most important post-seismic mechanisms for stress transfer and triggering. To constrain the poroelastic contributions to the early post-seismic deformation, we model the hydrologic response within 1.5 months following the 2015 $M_w$ 8.3 Illapel earthquake and remove its effects from the observed geodetic signals. Results demonstrate the post-seismic fluid-flow patterns from the co-seismic high-slip region to the north and south sides, and the northern poroelastic effects are remarkably stronger than those on the south side, verified by northern liquefaction phenomena. Therefore, previous pure afterslip models overestimate the asperities on both flanks of the co-seismic rupture zone and underestimate the middle region, with local errors of more than 50 per cent. It highlights the importance of considering the poroelastic effects, when modelling the transient post-seismic deformation.
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1 INTRODUCTION

After large earthquakes, crustal deformation is accommodated by multiple post-seismic processes with different temporal and spatial scales, such as afterslip, poroelastic rebound, and viscoelastic relaxation or fault relocking (e.g. Bürgmann & Dresen 2008; Freed et al. 2017). Although co-seismic ruptures release the accumulated strain on the fault plane, they could increase stresses in the surrounding regions. These stresses may be transmitted to the velocity-strengthening regions on the fault, causing afterslip (e.g. Marone et al. 1991). They could also alter the pore pressure gradients in the surrounding rock, leading to fluid flow in the crust and gradually returning to the hydrostatic equilibrium, termed poroelastic rebound (e.g. Peltzer et al. 1996). Besides, ductile lower crust and mantle may relax and flow due to ‘viscoelastic relaxation’, which gradually transfers these stresses to the elastic upper crust, resulting in a wider range of stress increases (e.g. Freed & Lin 2001; Guo et al. 2019a). The combined effects of these different mechanisms produce surface deformation that was observed through geodetic measurements (Malservisi et al. 2015). However, distinguishing the contribution from different post-seismic mechanisms is difficult because of the similarities in their induced deformation.

When geodetic observations are used to decipher post-seismic mechanisms, viscoelasticity is considered to be only important for the long-term deformation (e.g. Shrivastava et al. 2016; Huang et al. 2017; Klein et al. 2017; Guo et al. 2019b). For transient post-seismic deformation, it is commonly assumed that afterslip plays the dominant role, and the effects of poroelasticity are ignored (e.g. Shrivastava et al. 2016; Freed et al. 2017; Huang et al. 2017; Guo et al. 2019a). However, poroelastic relaxation caused by shallow subsurface fluid plays an important role in the early post-seismic deformation (McCormack & Hesse 2018; McCormack et al. 2020). It is usually thought to occur within a few days or weeks after an earthquake and is concentrated in the crust (Perfettini & Avouac 2004; Barbot et al. 2009; Freed et al. 2017), yet little is known about its specific spatial and temporal distribution.

The near-field post-seismic transients in pore pressure, fluid flux and surface deformation, consistent with poroelastic behaviour, have been observed widely (Peltzer et al. 1996; Jonsson et al. 2003), which are conducive to simulate the poroelastic deformation. McCormack et al. (2020) analysed the post-seismic mechanisms during the first 40 d following the 2012 $M_w$ 7.6 Nicoya earthquake and suggested that a pure afterslip model ignoring the poroelastic effects may introduce errors up to 50 per cent. By investigating the 2-yr
fluid-related process of the 2011 $M_w$ 9.0 Tohoku earthquake, Hu et al. (2014) found that the poroelastic rebound produced surface displacements up to dozens of centimetres in both horizontal and vertical components, promoting a better interpretation of the heterogeneity of post-seismic deformation following large subduction zone earthquakes. Therefore, separating the poroelastic components and afterslip in the post-seismic deformation is helpful to better understand the characteristics of post-seismic mechanisms, which is of great significance for early post-seismic hazard assessment, as they were often accompanied by repeated earthquakes and aftershock swarms (Poli et al. 2017).

Here, we focus on modelling the poroelastic effects in the post-seismic phase of subduction zone earthquakes, with application in the 2015 $M_w$ 8.3 Illapel earthquake. This event struck central Chile along the megathrust interface between the Nazca Plate and the South American Plate, where the Nazca Plate is subducting beneath the South American Plate with a rapid convergence rate of $\sim$66 mm yr$^{-1}$, resulting in frequent earthquakes (e.g. Angermann et al. 1999). Co-seismic rupture characteristics have been characterized by different data and methods (e.g. Barnhart et al. 2016; Shrivastava et al. 2016; Tilmann et al. 2016; Yin et al. 2016; Klein et al. 2017; Guo et al. 2019a). Several studies used GPS (global positioning system)/InSAR data to explore the early post-seismic deformation, mostly relying on pure elastic afterslip models (Shrivastava et al. 2016; Huang et al. 2017; Klein et al. 2017). However, obvious liquefaction phenomena have been reported near two GPS stations, BTON and LSCH, in the northern source region after the Illapel earthquake (Gregory et al. 2015; Candia et al. 2017). Candia et al. (2017) suggested that the post-seismic reconnaissance is polluted by the tsunami, indicating that the actual occurrence of liquefaction may be more widespread. In addition, Poli et al. (2017) outlined three areas with high pore fluid pressure in the Illapel seismic area based on the geological interpretation of the magnetic intensity anomaly, the free-air gravity anomaly, the swath bathymetric data and aftershock distribution (Fig. 1). These observations reveal that fluids may play an important role in the transient post-seismic process. Fortunately, there is a continuous GPS (cGPS) observation network with good azimuth around the source region, providing an unprecedented opportunity for us to unravel the regional post-seismic pore fluid effects. Herein, we probe the 1.5-month post-seismic deformation following the 2015 Illapel earthquake by using the pure afterslip model and the combined model involving poroelastic effects.

### 2 DATA AND METHODS

We collect the post-seismic displacements of 13 permanent cGPS stations from the work of Shrivastava et al. (2016). In this work, we systematically investigate the physical mechanisms of early post-seismic deformation after the Illapel earthquake. Specifically, we construct two different models: (i) pure afterslip only and (ii) the combined model of afterslip and poroelasticity. All make use of an inversion routine to minimize the discrepancies between the model predictions and data observations. In the following, we will briefly introduce the theories and methods. Given that the observed horizontal displacements are consistent in sense to the co-seismic surface deformation, indicating afterslip indeed makes great contributions to the transient post-seismic deformation (Barnhart et al. 2016; Shrivastava et al. 2016), so herein we do not consider the individual poroelastic model.

#### 2.1 Pure afterslip model

Afterslip is generally confined within velocity-strengthening regions, updip or downdip of the rupture zone (e.g. Marone et al. 1991; Guo et al. 2019b). Afterslip mainly controls the near-field deformation and can last for several months or even years, which plays a crucial role in deciphering fault friction behaviours (Helmstetter & Shaw 2009). In our work, the steepest descent method, a high-efficiency gradient method (Wang et al. 2009; Guo et al. 2019b; Tang et al. 2021), is used to derive the afterslip distribution. To obtain the high-resolution slip distribution, the fault plane is usually discretized into many rectangular or triangle subfaults. When the fault geometry is fixed, the relationship between surface observations and fault slip can be written as

$$y = Gm + \varepsilon,$$

where $G$ is the Green’s function, which can be calculated by the dislocation theory in elastic half-space or layered earth model; $m$ represents the slip vector of the subfaults, including the components of strike and dip; $\varepsilon$ indicates the errors, which are composed of the observation errors and theoretical errors caused by model simplification; and $y$ represents the surface deformation. To obtain stable and reliable results, prior constraints should be introduced. Bouchon (1997) proposed that the stress drop is positively correlated with the slip magnitude, meaning high slip occurs in areas with large stress drop. To restrict slip models to those with an appropriate stress drop distribution or slip roughness, we define the objective function by (Wang et al. 2009)

$$F(m) = \|Gm - y\|^2 + \beta^2\|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{r}\|^2.$$  

(2)

Here, $H$ represents the product of the finite-difference approximation of the Laplace operator and the weighted factor of slip amplitude; $r$ indicates the stress drop associated with slip; and $\beta$ is the smoothing factor, which could be determined by a trade-off between model roughness and data misfit.

#### 2.2 Combined model

To construct a combined model of afterslip and poroelasticity, we first need to estimate the poroelastic effects. Some studies evaluated the post-seismic poroelastic effects by the difference between two co-seismic solutions based on the drained and undrained Poisson’s ratio (e.g. Peltzer et al. 1996; Jonsson et al. 2003; Wang et al. 2019), but the complexity is missed and uncertainties are great (McCormack et al. 2020). Given that the poroelastic effects related to the local geological structure are complex and elusive (Roeloffs 1996; Cheng 2016), it is difficult to carry out inversion directly. We thus use forward modelling to analyse the surface deformation caused by poroelastic relaxation. In this work, we adopt the linear poroelastic theory (Biot 1941), which describes the coupling of pore fluid flow and rock deformation (Biot 1941; Wang 2000; Wang & Kumpel 2003; McCormack et al. 2020):

$$\begin{align*}
(\lambda + 2\mu) \nabla (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}) - \mu \nabla \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) - \alpha \nabla p &= \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, t) \\
\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} - \chi \nabla^2 p &= q(\mathbf{x}, t),
\end{align*}$$

(3-4)

where $\mathbf{u}$ represents the displacement vector; $\lambda$ and $\mu$ are the Lamé parameters; $p$ is the pore pressure; and $\mathbf{f}$ is the force per unit volume acting on the solid matrix, which is the function of time $t$ and spatial position $\mathbf{x}$. The parameter $q$ is the fluid volume injection rate, which is set as 0 here; $\alpha$ indicates the Biot–Willis parameter; $\chi$ is the
Figure 1. (a) Tectonic background of the 2015 Illapel earthquake. Black ellipses and red ellipse refer to the distribution of the rupture zone of the great historic earthquakes since 1900 and the Illapel earthquake, respectively (Vigny et al. 2011). Blue triangles represent the GPS sites and yellow triangles represent the GPS sites where liquefaction was observed (Gregory et al. 2015; Candia et al. 2017). Red star indicates the epicentre of the Illapel earthquake. The grey dot indicates the Illapel city. The black arrow indicates the convergence rate of the Nazca Plate against the South American Plate. The white bands are the Juan Fernandez Ridge (JFR) and the Challenger Fracture Zone (CFZ). The lower right illustration shows the location of the study region in the South American Plate. (b) The green contour shows the co-seismic slip distribution from Shrivastava et al. (2016). The purple dots represent the distribution of aftershocks (Mw > 4.5) within the first 2 yr following the Illapel event from the USGS catalogue (www.earthquake.usgs.gov). The blue, black and green boxes are the three areas with high pore fluid pressure delineated by Poli et al. (2017).

Darcy conductivity; and $Q^{-1}$ represents the bulk compressibility. In practice, it is commodious to express parameters $\alpha$, $\chi$, $Q^{-1}$ by the drained and undrained Poisson’s ratio ($v$ and $v_u$) and the Skempton parameter $B$ (Skempton 1954; Rice & Cleary 1976):

$$\alpha = \frac{3(v_u - v)}{(1 - 2v)(1 + v_u)B}$$
$$\chi = \frac{9}{2} \frac{(1 - v_u)(v_u - v)}{(1 - v)(1 + v_u)^2 \mu B^2}$$
$$Q^{-1} = \frac{9}{2} \frac{(1 - 2v)(v_u - v)}{(1 - 2v)(1 + v_u)^2 \mu B^2}$$

where $D$ is the hydraulic diffusivity. The overview on poroelastic parameters could refer to the studies of Kumpel (1991) and Wang (2000). Solving eqs (3) and (4), we could obtain the time-dependent displacements due to poroelastic rebound. Then we use the residual displacements (observed minus poroelastic relaxation) to invert for afterslip of the combined model (referred to here as residual afterslip) using the same strategies as above.

3 Model Configuration

For the pure afterslip model, we construct a seismogenic fault geometry with a dip of $19^\circ$ and strike of N6°E, similar to previous studies (Shrivastava et al. 2016; Guo et al. 2019a). It has a spatial scale of approximately 300 km × 150 km, and is divided into 527 subfaults with a grid size of 10 km × 10 km. In addition, the rake angle is constrained within the range of $0^\circ$∼$180^\circ$, and the maximum slip is set as 1 m. During the inversion, the horizontal and vertical displacements have the same weight, and the smoothing factor $\beta$ is set as 0.25 based on the trade-off curve (Supporting Information Fig. S1). Green's functions are calculated based on a layered velocity model (Supporting Information Fig. S2).

During the poroelastic forward simulation of the combined model, the co-seismic slip model obtained by Shrivastava et al. (2016) is used as the driving model. Since the transient poroelastic effects are mainly controlled by the shallow geological structure, underground properties below 5 km have little impact on the poroelastic effects (Fielding et al. 2009; Nespoli et al. 2018; Wang et al. 2019). To improve the simulation resolution, we thus divide the crust above 5 km into three layers. Each layer considers a set of typical hydrologic parameters including the Skempton coefficient.
Because of the typical lack of sufficient observational constraints for hydrogeological conditions in the subduction zone, the model parameter space would be explored ideally with analyses of all possible combinations in reasonable ranges. The Biot-Willis parameter $\alpha$ is allowed to decrease from 0.9 to 0.3 with depth, reflecting its reduction with confining pressure (Wang 1993). For the Skempton coefficient $B$, a first-order assumption is $B = 1$ in many studies, considering fully saturated rocks in the entire domain and obtaining the maximum limit of the poroelastic effects. It is noted that some rocks may have $B < 1$ even if they are fully saturated (Makhnenko & Labuz 2013). Skempton (1954) noted that the value $Bi$ increases with saturation, depending on the dryness of the surface and the deep fluid presence. In our model, $B$ increases with depth, and the change is mainly concentrated in the shallow crust. In addition, the hydraulic diffusivity $D$ shows a rapid decay with depth, consistent with the theoretical model (e.g. Ingebritsen & Manning 2010; Kuang & Jiao 2014). The number of parameters combined with the run time of each layer is beyond our computing power, we thus consider a set of model parameters typical of previous post-seismic studies for each layer (e.g. Nespoli et al. 2018; McCormack et al. 2020).

After we obtain the poroelastic displacements, we subtract them from the GPS data. Then, we use the residual displacements to invert the residual afterslip based on the same fault geometry and model space as the pure afterslip model. Here we utilize a guided trial and error approach, and systematically march through a range of each model parameter ($\alpha, B$ and $D$) to arrive at an initial combination that provides the minimum misfit (Fig. 2). Misfit is derived based on the root mean square of all horizontal and vertical GPS displacements. In the fine-tuning stage, we not only find the optimal value for each model parameter, but also get the best-fitting, depth-dependent structure. The optimal model parameters are shown in Supporting Information Table S1. Compared with the pure afterslip model, the combined model with a three-layered shallow crust has a smaller error and is more physically reasonable, which is considered our preferred model (Supporting Information Table S2).

4 RESULTS

4.1 Pure afterslip distribution

Fig. 3(a) illustrates our optimal pure afterslip distribution, and Fig. 3(b) shows the comparison between GPS observations and predictions. Model results show that the peak slip is 0.51 m, similar to the results of Shrivastava et al. (2016) (0.50 m) and Barnhart et al. (2016) (0.52 m). The seismic moment is $2.6 \times 10^{20}$ N m, equivalent to an $M_w$ 7.54 event, consistent with the results of Barnhart et al. (2016). Similar to previous studies (Barnhart et al. 2016; Shrivastava et al. 2016; Guo et al. 2019a), there are two asperities distributed on the north and south sides of the co-seismic high-slip region. These two patches begin to form about 10 d after the Illapel earthquake (Shrivastava et al. 2016; Guo et al. 2019a). By 1.5 months after this event, the maximum slip reaches ~0.5 m at a depth of 20–40 km. In contrast, the northern large slip patch is shallower than the southern one. Through the pure afterslip model, the first-order simulation of the transient post-seismic deformation can be obtained (Wang et al. 2019). However, for some GPS stations, there are significant differences between observations and predictions in the horizontal (OVLL, TOLO, PEDR) and vertical (CNBA, CMBA, SLMC) components, which is hard to explain in the pure afterslip model.

4.2 Residual afterslip and poroelastic deformation

Fig. 4(a) shows the residual afterslip distribution, which is still composed of two large slip patches. So considering the poroelasticity does not change the basic afterslip pattern for the Illapel earthquake. However, the slip scope and magnitude in the northern asperity are significantly shrunk, and the southern asperity becomes larger (Fig. 4a). The peak afterslip of the combined model is 0.71 m, remarkably different from the pure afterslip model. Therefore, the crust deformation produced by poroelastic rebound may be misinterpreted as afterslip. Differentiating the pure afterslip and residual afterslip generates the surface deformation due to poroelasticity, as shown in Fig. 4(b). Therefore, we propose that the pure afterslip model overestimates the afterslip of the northern and southern segments and underestimates the middle slip (Fig. 4b), with local errors of up to 50 per cent or more (Fig. 4c). In addition, we find that the co-seismic high-slip region, afterslip, and poroelastic effects present a complementary pattern, even if there is a partial overlap (Fig. 4b). Afterslip and high pore pressure areas together constitute a velocity-strengthening region, hindering the co-seismic rupture.

A comparison of all displacements for the assumed poroelastic structure (Supporting Information Table S1) and inferred residual afterslip is demonstrated in Figs 5(a) and (b), respectively. Predicted displacements associated with the combined afterslip and poroelastic relaxation models are compared to the observed displacements in Fig. 5(c). The combined model could explain all observed horizontal and vertical displacements satisfactorily. Results show that poroelastic effects have a significant influence on the early post-seismic process, especially for the vertical displacements, and the local deformation could reach the magnitude of centimetres (Fig. 5a). Most vertical poroelastic displacements appear to be opposite in sense to the co-seismic vertical deformation (Fig. 5a, Supporting Information Fig. S3). The horizontal poroelastic deformation is lower than the vertical deformation (Fig. 5a), as it does not depend on the regional fluid enrichment degree, but on the change of fluid gradient (Albano et al. 2017; Nespoli et al. 2018; McCormack et al. 2020). Similar phenomena have been observed in previous studies (e.g. Peltzer et al. 1996; Jonsson et al. 2003).

5 DISCUSSION

Our preferred model reveals the concurrent occurrence of poroelastic relaxation and afterslip within the first 1.5 months after the 2015 $M_w$ 8.3 Illapel earthquake. At this time, the question of what is the timescale of total poroelastic rebound arises, which is of great significance to improve the understanding of post-seismic mechanisms and infer the continued asceismic slip on the fault plane. In general, timescales of days to months are associated with the poroelastic rebound (Jonsson et al. 2003; Fialko 2004; Hetland & Hager 2006), which could be defined as $t = L^2 / D$, where $L$ represents the characteristic distance for fluid diffusion and $D$ denotes the hydraulic diffusivity as mentioned earlier. In the shallowest crust, given that $L$ is of the order of 10 km (e.g. McCormack & Hesse 2018; Fialko et al. 2021) and the optimal hydraulic diffusivity is $8 \text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ (Fig. 2), $t$ is estimated to be larger than $\sim 140$ d. A longer diffusion distance would imply a larger value of diffusive relaxation timescale. Therefore, poroelasticity plays a non-negligible role for a
Figure 2. Misfits of test models considering variations in the pore parameters $B$, $\alpha$ and $D$ for (a) the first layer (0–0.19 km), (b) the second layer (0.19–2.5 km) and (c) the third layer (2.5–5.32 km). The black line cube is the optimal model for each layer.

Figure 3. Afterslip distribution and data fitting from the optimal pure afterslip model. (a) Afterslip distribution. Red star is the epicentre of the 2015 Illapel event. Grey dots are the aftershocks ($M_w > 4.5$) within 1.5 months after the earthquake from the USGS catalogue (www.earthquake.usgs.gov). Black arrows show the slip direction. (b) Comparison of observed and calculated displacements. The purple contour is the co-seismic slip from Shrivastava et al. (2016) (slip $> 3$ m).

The geological conditions of different regions may vary a lot, so the poroelastic effects have different responses in different seismic events. Compared with the viscoelastic relaxation related to the deep structure, the poroelastic effects may be more variable and irregular. Poroelastic components of the 2012 $M_w$ 7.6 Nicoya earthquake are distributed in a patch 25–90 km away from the trench (McCormack et al. 2020), overlapping most of the co-seismic high-slip areas (Yue et al. 2013). For the 2011 $M_w$ 9.0 Tohoku earthquake, poroelastic rebound produces surface displacements mostly in a narrow zone close to the trench in the oceanic crust while producing displacements across a broader zone in the continental upper plate (Hu et al. 2014). As for the Illapel earthquake, the post-seismic slip caused by poroelastic effects is mainly concentrated on the north and south sides of the co-seismic rupture area.

Finally, there are still some limitations in the simulation of poroelastic effects. The GPS observations used here are less sensitive to slip at depth, which may lead to larger uncertainties in deeper slip. The assumption of linear poroelasticity means that the model cannot...
consider the influence of dynamic stress changes nor the consolidation processes occurring during and after the earthquake. For the early post-seismic phase, the poroelastic effects are mainly related to the shallow crust structure rich in loose sediment, where the consolidation process may affect the pore pressure response to the earthquake (Fielding et al. 2009; Nespoli et al. 2018; Wang et al. 2019). In addition, earthquakes themselves can even cause a single order of magnitude change in the permeability of near-surface areas (Rojstaczer et al. 1995; Manga et al. 2012), and fractures generally increase permeability below the shallow crust, reducing the time for poroelastic relaxation. Moreover, subduction zone earthquakes could cause pressure on coastal areas and discharge large amounts of pore water through the seafloor, commonly known as subsea groundwater exchange (McCormack & Hesse 2018), which is also ignored here. These all put forward higher requirements on the model and data accuracy. Besides that, Guo et al. (2019a) suggested that the pure afterslip model ignoring the viscoelastic relaxation underestimated afterslip updip and overestimated afterslip downdip of the rupture zone. Therefore, although our results indicate that the poroelastic effects have significant contributions to the transient post-seismic deformation, it should be more reasonable to consider the influence of poroelastic rebound, afterslip and viscoelastic relaxation simultaneously, which may further improve our understanding of post-seismic mechanisms after large earthquakes (King et al. 1994; Tung & Masterlark 2018; Tung et al. 2018; Albano et al. 2019).

Even so, the influence of limitations from different sources on our model is mainly transformed into the variability of poroelastic
parameters. Regarding the typical values of poroelastic coefficients $\alpha$, $B$ and $D$, we test the reliability of our result with the variation of parameters over multiple ranges and scales (Fig. 2), and the root-mean-square misfits of combined models are always better than that of the pure afterslip model, confirming that the variability of parameters would not significantly change our conclusions of poroelastic effects associated with the post-seismic deformation. We thus argue that poroelasticity indeed plays an important role in the early post-seismic deformation and our result is robust.

6 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we use the cGPS observations within the first 1.5 months after the 2015 $M_{w} 8.3$ Illapel earthquake to study the influence of poroelastic effects on the early post-seismic deformation. Model results show the widespread distribution of fluid flow in seismic fault areas and the significant influence of poroelastic rebound on the early post-seismic process. Previous pure afterslip models introduce errors of $\sim 20$ and $\sim 50$ per cent locally. Therefore, the poroelastic effects with regional characteristics cannot be ignored in the transient post-seismic deformation, which can either amplify or mute post-seismic signals.
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