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Abstract The 2010 $M_w$ 7.8 Mentawai tsunami earthquake marks one of the first tsunami earthquakes to have postseismic deformation observed by geodetic instruments. The Sumatran GPS Array has recorded the postseismic deformation following this event continuously for >5 years. The spatiotemporal evolution of the postseismic deformation is well explained by velocity-strengthening frictional sliding on the Sunda megathrust. Our results show that the 2010 afterslip progressed downdip relative to the 2010 coseismic rupture. The southeastern portion of the afterslip region overlaps the area that slipped during the main shock and afterslip of the 2007 $M_w$ 8.4 Bengkulu earthquake, while the northwestern portion slipped an area without recent large earthquakes. By incorporating pre-earthquake stress conditions into quasi-dynamic models, we demonstrate that the preceding cumulative slip from the 2007 sequence might have caused a ~0.1 MPa difference in pre-earthquake Coulomb stress between the southeastern and northwestern portions of the afterslip region.

1. Introduction

Tsunami earthquakes are a special class of earthquakes that generate a tsunami larger than one might expect for their measured seismic magnitude [Kanamori, 1972]. Since Kanamori [1972] first identified two tsunami earthquakes, only a handful of tsunami earthquakes have been identified by seismological methods in the modern instrumental period [Okal and Newman, 2001; Lay and Bilek, 2007]. Most of the identified tsunami earthquakes were shallow-dipping thrust events that occurred at shallow depths near the trench [Lay and Bilek, 2007], making it difficult to record them with land-based geodetic networks. However, due to the relatively close distance of the Sumatran GPS Array (SuGAr), the 2010 $M_w$ 7.8 Mentawai tsunami earthquake [Newman et al., 2011; Lay et al., 2011; Bilek et al., 2011; Satake et al., 2013] became the first tsunami earthquake to be captured in great detail by continuous geodetic networks [Hill et al., 2012]. The SuGAr recorded not only coseismic deformation but also rapid and substantial afterslip associated with the 2010 Mentawai event.

Afterslip following a tsunami earthquake has been rarely, if ever, documented by geodetic instruments, so this Mentawai event perhaps marks the first such observation and provides an unprecedented opportunity to study afterslip at shallow regions of subduction zones. Thus, one goal of this paper is to document the long-term postseismic deformation following the 2010 Mentawai event, derive a detailed spatiotemporal evolution history of the 2010 afterslip using quasi-dynamic afterslip models, and investigate fault frictional properties on the Sunda megathrust, as has been done in many other regions [e.g., Johnson et al., 2006; Perfettini and Avouac, 2007; Barbot et al., 2009].

The 2010 Mentawai earthquake was not a stand-alone event, unlike most other tsunami earthquakes. Instead, this 2010 event occurred as part of the uncompleted most recent cycle of large earthquakes on the Mentawai segment of the Sunda megathrust [Sieh et al., 2008], closely related to several preceding large events in space and time (Figure 1). These preceding events include the 2007 $M_w$ 8.4 Bengkulu earthquake and its $M_w$ 7.9 and 7.0 aftershocks [e.g., Konca et al., 2008; Lubis et al., 2013; Tsang, 2016] and the 2008 $M_w$ 7.2 North Pagai earthquake [Collings et al., 2012]. They broke primarily the central portion of the Sunda megathrust at depths from 15 to 35 km [Konca et al., 2008], while the 2010 coseismic slip was concentrated along a near-trench
Figure 1. Map of recent $M_w > 7$ earthquakes in the Mentawai segment. Closed contours indicate areas of coseismic slip $\geq 1$ m for the 2007 Bengkulu earthquake sequence [Konca et al., 2008] and the 2010 Mentawai earthquake [Hill et al., 2012]. Stars represent corresponding epicenters from the Advanced National Seismic System (ANSS) catalog. Black dashed line divides the Mentawai segment into two regions with a lot of slip released by the 2007 sequence in the southeast and no recent slip in the northwest.

portion of the Sunda megathrust at depths of $< 6$ km, with peak slip of $\sim 15$ m [Hill et al., 2012; Yue et al., 2014, 2015]. Although the individual coseismic ruptures do not seem to overlap each other (Figure 1), their ensuing afterslip may well have invaded their own or neighboring coseismic rupture zones. Tsang [2016] show that the shallow afterslip of the 2007 main shock borders and overlaps the 2010 rupture zone and suggest that the cumulative stress changes from the main shock and afterslip may have advanced in time the shallow 2010 rupture.

If the preceding large events and their afterslip indeed impacted the 2010 coseismic rupture, it is natural to ask whether they also impacted the 2010 afterslip. Therefore, the other goal of this paper is to investigate the impact of past earthquakes on the 2010 afterslip. To achieve this goal, we compare two scenarios of stress-driven afterslip models: one without and the other with pre-earthquake stress conditions considered. Based on our results, we propose that the preceding large events may have left footprints in the stress field that influenced the afterslip evolution of the 2010 Mentawai earthquake.

2. Postseismic GPS Time Series

The postseismic deformation following the 2010 Mentawai earthquake was captured by 14 SuGAr stations on the Mentawai islands (Siberut, Sipora, North Pagai, and South Pagai) and west coast of Sumatra (Figures 2 and 3). In addition to the 2010 postseismic signal, the 14 stations were distracted by a panoply of other signals that included linear rates, seasonal signals, coseismic offsets, and postseismic decays associated with other earthquakes. In order to isolate the postseismic signal associated with the 2010 earthquake, we followed the
Figure 2. Postseismic time series of daily positions in the Sunda reference frame [Altamimi et al., 2012] for the 2010 Mentawai earthquake. Dashed lines are modeled time series based on the best fit model of Scenario 1 (red star in Figure S7 in the supporting information). Solid lines are modeled time series based on the best fit model of Scenario 2 (red star in Figure 4). Time zero indicates the day of the 2010 event.

Figure 3. Observed (green) and modeled (blue and red) cumulative postseismic displacements of the 2010 Mentawai earthquake for the first 5 years. Note that two different vector scales are used. Error ellipses show 95% confidence level for the observed displacements. Contours indicate areas of 5 year cumulative afterslip ≥0.5 m for the best fit model of the two scenarios, respectively.
data processing and time series fitting procedures described in detail by Feng et al. [2015]. Simply speaking, we simultaneously fit all the known signals on the north, east, and vertical components of each station and then removed the distracting ones to obtain the 2010 postseismic signal alone.

The postseismic time series we obtained extend, with some data gaps, from immediately after the earthquake to mid-2014 for SMGY and PSKI, and to late 2015 or early 2016 for the remaining 12 stations (Figures 2 and S1 and Data Set S1). In the 5 year period from 25 October 2010 to 25 October 2015, the cumulative horizontal postseismic displacements at all stations either equaled or greatly exceeded horizontal coseismic displacements (Figure S2). The ratio of 5 year cumulative horizontal postseismic displacements to daily static coseismic estimates averages 1.4, while the ratio increases to 1.8 when compared to 1 s kinematic coseismic estimates. Note that kinematic horizontal coseismic estimates for this event are on average 30% smaller than static estimates [Hill et al., 2012]. This discrepancy indicates that a significant fraction of postseismic deformation occurred rapidly within a day of the earthquake, which means we had to exclude the first-day postseismic deformation from the total postseismic estimation because the daily positions we used cannot capture motion happening within a day. Such exclusion likely causes the total postseismic deformation to be underestimated but should not affect its spatial pattern substantially. We can infer this because the horizontal postseismic motions continued mostly in the same trenchward direction as the coseismic motions, with the average change in azimuth less than 5° (Figure S2). Though small, the azimuth changes seem to indicate that the centroid of afterslip moment release is shifted slightly northwestward along strike relative to the centroid of coseismic moment release. This northwestward shift coincides with the northwestward propagation of the coseismic rupture [Lay et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2012].

The vertical postseismic motions also continued generally in the same direction as the coseismic verticals (Figure S2). Most coastal stations rose a little after the small (≈5 mm) coseismic uplift, while most island stations switched from negligible coseismic vertical motion or small coseismic subsidence (up to ≈6 cm at BSAT) to notably larger postseismic subsidence (up to ≈16 cm in 5 years at SLBU). Interestingly, BSAT recorded the largest coseismic deformation, while SLBU recorded the largest postseismic deformation, which further confirms the northwestward along-strike shift of the slip centroid. The four closest stations on the Pagai islands (BSAT, SLBU, PRKB, and SMGY) experienced not only dramatically increased subsidence but also a decreased ratio of horizontal to vertical postseismic displacements, both suggesting the afterslip must have progressed downdip relative to the coseismic patch.

In sum, postseismic deformation in the first to fifth years (Data Set S2) contributes on average 60%, 16%, 11%, 7%, and 6% of the 5 year total. The postseismic velocities of the farthest stations (TLLU, NGNG, and all coastal stations) were reduced to less than 2 mm/yr within 1 – 3 years after the event, reaching a plateau when postseismic motion became trivial, while stations on the island of Sipora (PKRT, PPNJ, and KTET) have just reached or are close to reaching this plateau (Figure S3). In contrast, the four closest Pagai stations are still moving at 1.5 – 2.5 cm/yr trenchward and subsiding at 0.5 – 1 cm/yr, showing no sign of reaching the plateau yet (Figure S3).

3. Quasi-Dynamic Models of Stress-Driven Afterslip

Since the 2010 Mentawai earthquake was so shallow that the postseismic effect from viscoelastic relaxation is considered to be small, we model the postseismic evolution purely as a result of frictional afterslip on the Sunda megathrust. Such quasi-dynamic models reduce the large number of free parameters in kinematic models to only a few that have physical meanings and meanwhile avoid the spatial resolution issue of the shallow megathrust. This spatial resolution issue has been demonstrated by Hill et al. [2012] in kinematic coseismic models of this 2010 earthquake and further confirmed in our kinematic afterslip inversions using the principal component analysis-based inversion method (PCAIM) [Kositsky and Avouac, 2010] (Text S1). To illustrate the impact of past slip on the 2010 afterslip, we develop two scenarios of stress-driven afterslip models.

3.1. Scenario 1: Coseismic Stress-Driven Models

In the first scenario, afterslip is triggered by stress changes from coseismic slip and then evolves following a rate-strengthening friction law. Rate-strengthening friction laws simplify rate-and-state friction laws to steady-state cases, where the evolution of the state variable is neglected and friction depends only on rate, so that slip rate can be directly related to stress change. Such a direct link can be expressed as equation (1)
[Rousset et al., 2012] in the form of a generalized version of the rate-strengthening friction law [Rice et al., 2001; Barbot et al., 2009].

\[
V = 2V_0 \sinh \left( \frac{\Delta \tau}{(a - b)\bar{\sigma}} \right)
\]

(1)

Here the slip rate of afterslip \(V\) is controlled by the shear-stress-related numerator \(\Delta \tau\) and normal-stress-related denominator \((a - b)\bar{\sigma}\). \(\Delta \tau\) is shear stress change. \(\bar{\sigma}\) is effective normal stress with its change assumed to be negligible compared to \(\bar{\sigma}\) itself, while \(a\) and \(b\) are frictional parameters. Because \((a - b)\) and \(\bar{\sigma}\) cannot be separately determined, we fix \(\bar{\sigma}\) to be 200 MPa (a representative value for 10 km depth [Lapusta and Barbot, 2012]), and explore the range of \((a - b)\). We also explore the range of \(V_0\), which is the reference slip rate that controls the timescale of afterslip. Both \((a - b)\) and \(V_0\) may vary spatially and temporally when local environments (such as sliding velocities, temperatures, and fluid pressures) change, but for the sake of simplicity, we assume \((a - b)\) and \(V_0\) to be constant over time and uniform everywhere on the fault.

The initial value of \(\Delta \tau\) is shear stress change induced by coseismic slip. The coseismic source model we use was derived from high-rate GPS coseismic offsets and tsunami data and established on a planar interface [Hill et al., 2012]. The planar geometry is suitable for modeling shallow coseismic ruptures; however, a more realistic geometry is needed for modeling afterslip along deeper portions of the slab. Thus, we combine the shallow geometry in Hill et al. [2012] with the geometry of Slab1.0 [Hayes et al., 2012], which controls slab geometry at \(\geq 20\) km depth, and discretize the combined interface into 912 rectangular patches that have an along-strike length of \(\sim 11\) km and an along-dip width varying from 4 to 10 km. On each patch, the coseismic stress change is calculated using the Okada dislocation model [Okada, 1992] by summing up each patch’s individual contribution. While afterslip evolves, it induces additional postseismic stress that changes \(\Delta \tau\). Slip evolution due to changing \(\Delta \tau\) is simulated using an explicit time step procedure with a fifth-order accurate scheme. The rake direction of afterslip is parallel to the direction of instantaneous shear stress acting on each patch, with the exception that unrealistic landward slip is not allowed.

The implicit assumption of equation (1) is that the change in normal stress \(\Delta \sigma\) from either coseismic slip or afterslip is negligible so that effective normal stress \(\bar{\sigma}\) can be fixed to a constant value throughout the afterslip process, and \(\Delta \tau\) alone represents the Coulomb stress change \(\Delta \text{CFF} = \Delta \tau - \mu_0 \Delta \sigma\), where \(\mu_0\) is the friction coefficient at \(V_0\).

3.2. Scenario 2: Preseismic and Coseismic Stress-Driven Models

Scenario 2 is similar to Scenario 1 in almost all aspects except that afterslip is related to not only coseismic stress change but also pre-earthquake stress conditions. The pre-earthquake stress conditions, often ignored in previous afterslip studies [e.g., Barbot et al., 2009], can be incorporated using pre-earthquake Coulomb stress \(\text{CFF}_0\) that is defined as \((\tau_0 - \mu_0 \bar{\sigma})\), where \(\tau_0\) is the pre-earthquake shear stress and \(\bar{\sigma}\) is fixed at 200 MPa as in Scenario 1. We do not determine individual values for \(\tau_0\) and \(\mu_0\); instead, we explore the possible values for \(\text{CFF}_0\). Therefore, equation (1) is modified to equation (2) following the derivation in Chang et al. [2013].

\[
V = 2V_0 \left[ \frac{\Delta \tau + \text{CFF}_0}{(a - b)\bar{\sigma}} \right] \sinh \frac{\text{CFF}_0}{(a - b)\bar{\sigma}} - \sinh \frac{\text{CFF}_0}{(a - b)\bar{\sigma}}
\]

(2)

To investigate the impact of past slip, we divide our slab interface into two portions with the southeastern portion that slipped during past events and the northwestern portion that has not recently generated a large earthquake (dashed line in Figure 1). We use \(\text{CFF}_0\)(SE) and \(\text{CFF}_0\)(NW) to represent uniform \(\text{CFF}_0\) for the southeastern and northwestern portions, respectively.

4. Results

In order to find the combination of parameters that best explains the postseismic time series, we used a simple grid search to explore a physically possible range of model parameters. For each set of parameters, we computed forward models and calculated the cost function, which is the root-mean-square (RMS) of the misfit between the observed and modeled daily time series for all three components.

For Scenario 1, we tested \((a - b)\) in a wide range from \(5 \times 10^{-5}\) to 10 and \(V_0\) from \(5 \times 10^{-4}\) to 50 m/yr. Although the lowest misfit (3.44 m) was reached when \((a - b) = 5.0 \times 10^{-4}\) and \(V_0 = 3.0 \times 10^{-3}\) m/yr, a strong trade-off existed between \((a - b)\) and \(V_0\). Any \((a - b)\) from \(4 \times 10^{-4}\) to \(8 \times 10^{-4}\) could be paired with a \(V_0\) between \(1 \times 10^{-3}\) and...
Figure 4. Contours of the RMS misfit for CFF₀(SE) and CFF₀(NW) in Scenario 2. \((a - b)\bar{\sigma}\) is fixed at 0.12 MPa and a \(V_0\) that produces the lowest misfit is found for each CFF₀ pair (Figure S8). Red dots indicate models with misfit \(\leq 3\) m, while blue dots indicate models with misfit larger than the lowest misfit of Scenario 1 (3.44 m). Black star represents the model with zero CFF₀, equivalent to Scenario 1. Dashed line marks models for CFF₀(SE) = CFF₀(NW). Solid lines outline the low-misfit region. Red star represents the best fit model with its parameters summarized in Table S1.

and \(1.3 \times 10^{-2}\) to produce similarly small (<4 m) RMS misfits (Figure S7). Recall that we fixed \(\bar{\sigma}\) at 200 MPa, so the range of \((a - b)\) corresponds to \((a - b)\bar{\sigma}\) ranging from 0.08 to 0.16 MPa. Although this range is an order of magnitude smaller than typical values of \(\sim 1\) MPa derived from other studies [Rollins et al., 2015], it is comparable to \((a - b)\bar{\sigma}\) derived for shallow depths [Chang et al., 2013; Johnson et al., 2006].

Despite the fact that Scenario 1 is oversimplified with only two free parameters, the best fit model can explain reasonably well the amplitude of GPS postseismic displacements (Figure 3a) and the postseismic time series of far-field stations (Figure 2). However, this model cannot fully explain the azimuth of the near-field postseismic displacements or the shape of the near-field postseismic time series.

For Scenario 2, to reduce the computation time, we fixed \((a - b)\bar{\sigma}\) at three values (0.10, 0.12, and 0.14 MPa) according to our results from Scenario 1 and then varied \(V_0\) to search for the lowest misfit for every pair of CFF₀(SE) and CFF₀(NW). Figure 4 shows the lowest misfit contours when \((a - b)\bar{\sigma}\) is fixed at 0.12 MPa. Models that produced a low misfit of <3 m all fall within the CFF₀(NW) > CFF₀(SE) quadrant, while models in the CFF₀(NW) \(\leq\) CFF₀(SE) quadrant produced a misfit even worse than the model without adding any CFF₀ (black star in Figure 4). Interestingly, the low-misfit contours (pink areas in Figure 4) indicate a constant difference (0.105 MPa) between CFF₀(SE) and CFF₀(NW) (solid lines in Figure 4). A similar constant difference of either 0.10 MPa or 0.11 MPa can be found in the misfit contours for \((a - b)\bar{\sigma} = 0.10\) MPa and \((a - b)\bar{\sigma} = 0.14\) MPa (Figures S9 and S10), but the location of the low-misfit region clearly shifts in the CFF₀ space for different \((a - b)\bar{\sigma}\) values. This shift means we cannot determine the absolute values of CFF₀(SE) and CFF₀(NW)
Figure 5. Five year cumulative afterslip of the 2010 Mentawai earthquake based on the best fit model shown in Figure 4. Gray circles indicate earthquakes recorded in the ANSS catalog during the 5 year afterslip period. Focal mechanisms for the 5 years are from the global centroid moment tensor catalog [Ekström et al., 2012]. See Figure 1 for other features.

separately; however, the \( \sim 0.1 \text{MPa} \) less CFF\(_0\) required for the southeastern portion seems to be robust for all the three \((a - b)\bar{\sigma}\) values.

In order to test if the constant difference is an artifact from the input coseismic model, we switched the preferred model in Hill et al. [2012] to a much rougher model and conducted the same procedures from Scenario 1 to Scenario 2. For Scenario 2, \((a - b)\bar{\sigma}\) was fixed at the best fit value \((0.12 \text{ MPa})\) in Scenario 1. Even though using this rougher model in Scenario 2 increases misfits, the pattern of misfits in the CFF\(_0\) space is similar to that derived from the preferred model, indicating a constant difference \((0.07 \text{ MPa})\) between CFF\(_0\) (SE) and CFF\(_0\) (NW) (Figure S11). Hence, the constant difference seems to be a robust feature that stays when the coseismic model is changed.

We propose that the \( \sim 0.1 \) MPa difference is likely caused by the collective stress release from the main shock and afterslip of the 2007 Bengkulu earthquake and its numerous aftershocks before the 2010 Mentawai earthquake. Although we cannot completely exclude the possibility that the \( \sim 0.1 \) MPa difference is due to pre-2007 heterogeneous background stress, the pre-2007 interseismic coupling models seem to suggest the same degree of coupling for the two portions [Pravirodirdjo et al., 2010] or less coupling in the northwestern portion [Chlieh et al., 2008]. Either case could not explain the higher pre-earthquake stress required for the northwestern portion in our models. Furthermore, our additional tests show that the postseismic data do not favor strong along-strike variations in \((a - b)\bar{\sigma}\); thus, along-strike variations of frictional properties could not explain the constant difference either (Figure S14).
Figures were made using the Generic SugarData with a latency of 3 months.
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**5. Discussion**

Our results indicate that the 2010 afterslip occurred downdip of the 2010 coseismic rupture, with the main afterslip region in the depth range of 6 to 12 km (Figure 5 and Movie S1). The southeastern portion of the afterslip region partially overlaps the area that slipped during the main shock and afterslip of the 2007 $M_w$ 8.4 Bengkulu earthquake [Konca et al., 2008; Tsang, 2016]. The fact that the same area slipped during both the 2007 coseismic rupture and 2010 afterslip appears to contradict with the traditional asperity model in which persistent coseismic velocity-weakening asperities are surrounded by aseismic velocity-strengthening creep regions [Lay and Kanamori, 1980]. A similar contradiction was found in the afterslip following the 2011 Tohoku-oki earthquake [Johnson et al., 2012]. However, the apparent contradiction could be reconciled if the overlapping area represents a conditionally-stable region so that it could participate in both the 2007 coseismic slip and 2010 afterslip processes [e.g., Lay et al., 2012].

Over the 5 years following the 2010 Mentawai earthquake, afterslip reached a maximum slip of $\sim$2.2 m and released postseismic moment of $\sim$3 x $10^{20}$ N m. The postseismic moment release is equivalent to a $M_w$ 7.6 earthquake and 40% of the coseismic moment release.

Aftershocks following the 2010 Mentawai earthquake occurred in two main clusters (Figure 5). The shallower cluster features normal faulting in the subducting slab, while the deeper cluster comprises mainly thrust faulting along the margins of the 2007 and 2010 coseismic ruptures [Yue et al., 2014]. According to the Advanced National Seismic System (ANSS) composite catalog, $\sim$100 aftershocks ($4.0 \leq M_0 \leq 6.3$) occurred within the afterslip region during the 5 year afterslip period. Their summed seismic moment amounts to $\sim$1 x $10^{19}$ N m, equivalent to a $M_w$ 6.6 earthquake. Thus, the seismic moment release accounts for only $\sim$3% of the moment release by the 2010 afterslip, suggesting that the 2010 afterslip is mainly aseismic, similar to the 2005 $M_w$ 8.6 Nias-Simeulue [Hsu et al., 2006] and 2007 $M_w$ 8.4 Bengkulu earthquakes [Lubis et al., 2013].

**6. Conclusions**

With our quasi-dynamic models, we show that the southeastern portion of the 2010 afterslip region has $\sim$0.1 MPa less pre-earthquake Coulomb stress than the northwestern portion. We propose that this difference in pre-earthquake Coulomb stress may have been caused by the main shock, aftershocks, and afterslip of the 2007 Bengkulu sequence.
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