Random kinematics of unbounded earthquake rupture propagation simulated using a cellular model
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SUMMARY
Spectra of high-frequency (HF) waves radiated by earthquake sources have specific features: above the common corner frequency $f_{c1}$ they manifest second corner frequency, $f_{c2}$; and beyond, a plateau in acceleration spectrum. To explain these features, convoluted, ‘lacy’ geometry of earthquake rupture front was recently proposed. In order to realize such geometry, random space–time functions were used; this simple approach permitted to reproduce both the mentioned spectral properties. However, the random structure of the front was introduced in that earlier study in an a priori manner. Presently, stochastic evolution of a rupture is described in a less formal way, employing a continuous-time cellular model. Each cell of a model geological fault is occupied by an automaton, with three possible states: intact, failing, or broken. A failing cell can ‘ignite’, after certain delay time $\Delta t$, failures in neighbour cells. Local values of $\Delta t$ are fixed in advance and represent a realization of self-similar random 2-D field. A local $\Delta t$ value is believed to reflect local resistance to failure: the stronger a cell is, the larger is its $\Delta t$. Through a succession of local failures, a convoluted or even multiply connected rupture front is formed. Viewed at low resolution, such front occupies a certain strip of finite width. Numerically, this width can be described through the rms width parameter, $w$. As was shown in earlier simulations, there exists a close relationship between $w$ and $f_{c2}$: $f_{c2} \propto 1/w$. Using this relationship one can verify a stochastic fault model through comparison of the predicted scaling behaviour of $f_{c2}$ against the observed one. For the relationships of the kind $\log f_{ck} = -\beta_k \log M_0 + \text{const}$, observations give values of $\beta_2$ in the range 0.16–0.27, against $\beta_1 \approx 1/3$ for the common corner frequency, $f_{c1}$. Thus, the behavior of $f_{c1}$ agrees with the similarity assumption, whereas that of $f_{c2}$ does not. Through comparison of calculated estimates for $\beta_2$ and for rupture velocity with their observed values, realistic ranges of parameters of the developed model were obtained. With appropriate parameter ranges selected, the current model successively reproduces both the observed range of $\beta_2$ and the observed range of average earthquake rupture velocity, $(0.5–0.8)c_S$. When a simulated rupture front history is combined with a plausible 2-D field of local stress drop, broad-band time histories can be generated, with verisimilar spectra. These have two corner frequencies and a plateau in acceleration source spectrum. It was found that permissible variation of model parameters can significantly modify, at given $M_0$ and stress drop, the relative levels of HF radiation from a source; this may give better insight into causes of variability of strong motion amplitudes.
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1. INTRODUCTION
The property of incoherence of high-frequency (HF) radiation from an earthquake source has been noted by Kostrov (1975). Boore & Joyner (1978) and Israel & Nur (1979) saw the cause of incoherence in two random fields over the fault area: first, of random final slip, and, second, of random local/instant rupture velocity. Joyner (1991) noticed that within such a model, one should observe the specific variation of body wave pulse shapes and their spectra at different angular positions on focal sphere: pulses are compressed...
or expanded with preserved overall shape, and their spectra, accordingly, are expanded or compressed. At realistic rupture velocities, $v_r$, comparable to shear wave velocity, $c_s$, this would result in expressed angular dependence of acceleration amplitudes: ‘forward’ radiation, that is along rupture propagation direction, must be much more powerful than ‘backward’ radiation. Whereas such directivity does exist for velocity (or displacement) amplitudes, it is almost inconspicuous for acceleration amplitudes or macroseismic intensity. Thus, the initial idea—to associate incoherence directly with random slip or random local rupture velocity—did not work. Negligible directivity of HF strong motion amplitudes with respect to rupture direction was a standard view of engineering seismology prior to the beginning of 1990s, both for velocities and accelerations. After observation of expressed directivity of peak velocity in records of Landers 1992 earthquake, ‘forward directivity’ became a standard concept in modern engineering seismology (Somerville et al. 1997; and later work). However, with respect to peak accelerations no directivity corrections were found necessary. In spectral domain, clear dependence of directivity on the considered frequency range was discussed by Bernard & Herrero (1994).

The simplest way to explain radiation incoherence is to distribute over the fault surface many independent point subpatches of dislocation kind or to cover this surface with random radiating patches; the key property is statistically independent random time histories of subpatches (Hanks 1979; Gusev 1983; Koyama & Shimada 1985). For a particular frequency band $\Delta f$, this independence is equivalent to random phase shifts between patch contributions at a receiver. As a result, radiation from patches is combined at the receiver in terms of energy, not amplitude, and angular directivity is greatly reduced. In these studies, the question of rupture kinematics was ignored. As a next step, Gusev & Pavlov (1991) introduced space–time (HF luminosity), that is time-dependent energy flux from unit fault element, within the frequency band $\Delta f$. Making a fault patch to radiate energy, not amplitude, results in incoherence automatically. Whereas such an approach works well for synthesizing scenario earthquake time functions (Gusev & Pavlov 2009; Gusev 2011), it, being phenomenological, sheds no light onto the physical origins of incoherence.

In this context the note of Boore & Joyner (1978) should be mentioned, that to form incoherence, non-monotonous growth of rupture front in space–time might be relevant. Day et al. (2008) further developed this idea. To implement it in sufficient detail is the main intention of this paper. This is far from trivial, as traditionally an earthquake source is treated as a brittle shear crack with smooth front geometry. In uniform elastic medium, after nucleation, dynamically growing crack accelerates and, in the realistic case of planar crack, approaches some limiting velocity close to (or even in excess of) shear wave velocity $c_s$. Despite the existence of limiting velocity, local variations of rupture velocity, and related disturbances of the shape of front can be expected, caused, for example, by local variations of friction energy.

Perrin & Rice (1994) performed a linearized perturbation analysis of propagation of planar crack (with initially straight front, and with uniform velocity) after entering into a zone of non-uniform fracture energy in the crack plane. They found that ‘the front of a crack that can run forever in a random unbounded medium grows overwhelmingly wavy’. Perturbed behaviour is predicted also for front velocity. Although these results were developed for Mode I crack, generalization of their qualitative aspects to shear cracks seems permissible. Also, Fineberg & Marder (1999) note that fracture energy depends on front velocity and that inverse statement is also true. These results support the accepted concept of randomly varying local rupture velocity depending on variable resistance to crack tip propagation.

The analytical approach, being accurate, does not permit to follow up the developed stages of random rupture. Convoluted space–time geometry of rupture front was proposed qualitatively in Gusev (2013) and was then illustrated by kinematic simulation in Gusev (2014; further abbreviated to G14). Gusev (2013) looked for a model that would explain low HF directivity, and assumed that real earthquake rupture has ‘lacy’ geometry and, in general, represents a multiply connected fractal line (polyline).

To clarify the point let us introduce a convenient analogy of an instant rupture front in the form of a coastline of a land mass gradually flooded by raising sea level. Assume the land ground to be permeable for sea water, so the surface of any lake is at sea level. Increasing the degree of irregularity of land relief, various kinds of coastline can be formed: from simple continuous beach to tortuous cape-and-bay forms, to, finally, multiply connected coasts (‘skerries’). In the last case, islands, left in the rear, correspond to high-strength/low stress unbroken patches of a fault, whereas isolated lakes appear landward from the main coast, representing distanty excited fault patches. Generally, such a complex front occupies a strip of finite width, further called ‘front strip’. The simplest case of an even beach corresponds to the common concept of smooth shape of rupture front. Lake-like features of rupture growth were found in theoretical modelling (Day 1982) and in real earthquakes. For instance, Archuleta (1984) and Spudich & Cranwick (1984), using different input data sets, revealed a real jump of rupture front when performing inversion of near-source records of Imperial Valley 1979 earthquake. As for island-like features, I know no direct evidence regarding them, but they must be common in the form of immediate or short-delayed aftershocks; these are not well observarble but highly probable.

Based on this ‘geographical’ analogy, in G14 a simple model of geometry of a ‘lacy rupture front’ was proposed. Initial step of its construction is a regular smooth line moving in space–time, which described evolution of the average front. This space–time construct was then perturbed by adding extra delay at each point. This perturbation was conceived, and then simulated, as random field with certain rms amplitude. Through controlling the perturbation amplitude, all described coastline variants could be reproduced. From smooth to convoluted single-connected to multiply connected, evidently fractal. Simultaneously, the width of front strip, $w$, defined through rms deviation of the front from its unperturbed shape increased, following the increase of perturbation amplitude. Random front geometry was combined with random field of local stress drop. With these two independent and interacting random components combined, this model was labelled ‘doubly stochastic source model’ or DSSM. This model permitted to reproduce successfully the three key qualitative properties of the high-frequency (HF) earthquake radiation: flat acceleration source spectrum, distinct second corner frequency at $f = f_c$, and the diminution of directivity at HF. A significant property of the G14 model was the linear relationship between $w^{-1}$ and $f_c$. This concept departed from the notion of ‘slip patch’ (Boatwright 1988), or a free-slipping patch on the fault adjacent to a failed fault element. Over this patch, the fault-guided waves, mostly Rayleigh waves, can propagate, and the distance of their propagation defines the duration of elementary displacement pulse radiated as body wave by a fault element, in a certain generalization of Das & Kostrov (1986). Two assumptions were made in G14: first, that the mentioned propagation distance is defined by the front width $w_p$ (with its value on the order of 3 $w$), and that the duration of the mentioned wave pulse, proportional to $w_p$, defines...
the value of $f_{c2}$. The approach of G14 will be substantially used in the following, in particular for numerical estimates. Still, the success of this approach was only limited as ‘lacy’ fronts arose within it in an a priori manner. Of evident interest are physical processes that may form the lace-like geometry.

It should be mentioned that notwithstanding the fact that the close connection between $w$ and $f_{c2}$ claimed in G14 is in essence a plausible hypothesis, this hypothesis finds a quite good support in otherwise enigmatic anomalous scaling of $f_{c2}$. This anomaly is evident when one compares scaling of the common corner frequency, $f_{c1}$, and of $f_{c2}$. Both mainly follow the rule of the kind $f_{ck} \propto M_0^{\beta_k}$; however $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$ differ. Whereas for $f_{c1}$, $\beta_1 \approx 1/3$, as could be expected from the assumption of similarity of earthquake ruptures, the increase of $f_{c2}$ with magnitude is much slower (Gusev 1983); observations give values of $\beta_2$ in the range 0.16–0.27 (see Gusev 2013, for a review; for fresh well-established results see Archuleta & Ji 2016 and DeNolle & Shearer 2016). This phenomenon was qualitatively explained in Gusev & Guseva (2016) by the analogy with well-known scaling of front width in random growth phenomena. Denote source length as $L$; then the front propagation distance $R$ is $(0.5–1)\,L$. In the simplest, 1-D, case, evolution of front width is described by the classical theory of ‘random walk with drift’ (Feller 1957) which predicts simply $w \propto R^{2/3}$; thus $\beta_2 = 1/6$. The 2-D case is more complicated, still the values of $\beta_2$ significantly below 1/3 can be expected.

Generally, I know no solid explanation both for formation of $f_{c2}$ and for plateau in acceleration spectrum at frequencies above $f_{c2}$. Modem textbooks (Shearer 1999; Stein & Wysession 2003) relate $f_{c1}$ and $f_{c2}$ to durations of two box-car time functions describing, one, propagation of dislocation at a constant speed, and another, time history of dislocation growth at a point. The plateau in an acceleration spectrum (i.e. the $\omega^{-2}$ type of displacement spectrum) is then formed through convolution of the two boxcars, each with $\omega^{-2}$ HF asymptotes, and, conceptually, this is reasonable. When taken at the face value however, such a model is unsatisfactory, predicting unrealistic acceleration time histories consisting of only four delta-like singularities. One can try to smooth such time history, but this will immediately destroy the target asymptotic behaviour of $\omega^{-2}$ type. Dynamic models of a crack, either brittle (Madariaga 1977) or with cohesive zone (Kaneko & Shearer 2014) provide more consistent explanation. The cases of crack-like and slip-pulse–like propagation were recently analysed in more detail by Wang & Day (2017). However, in all these models, slip terminates abruptly or nearly abruptly along the crack border, whereas seismogeological data (Scholtz & Lawler 2004; Manighetti et al. 2005; Wilkins & Schultz 2005) as well as most slip inversions collected in SRC-MOD (Mai & Thingbaijam 2014) suggest smooth termination of slip function along periphery of a real earthquake fault. Including this feature into the crack model would again add supplementary smoothing of source time functions, undesirable when one pursues explanation of $\omega^{-2}$. To put this other way, the HF behaviour of source spectra seem to be formed rather during perturbed propagation of rupture, caused by fault heterogeneity (Madariaga 1977) and not at its stopping; corresponding ‘stopping phases’ are practically not discernible at HF.

There are two main approaches to description of this fault heterogeneity: either through individual features—barriers and asperities—or, more adequate for our aims, through a random field. Andrews (1980) proposed to treat fault heterogeneity as random self-affine (generalized self-similar) random field, that is one with power-law mean power spectrum $S(k) \propto k^{- \delta}$, where $k = (k_x^2 + k_y^2)^{1/2}$ is the length of wavenumber vector. If $S(k)$ describes stress drop, and $\delta = 1$, then the stress drop field is self-similar (narrow sense); at other values of $\delta$ it is self-affine. At $\delta = 0$ the field is 2-D white noise, that is uncorrelated. Andrews’ guess regarding self-similar stress drop field was confirmed to a large degree by the study of inverted slip distributions (Tsai 1997; Somerville et al. 1999; Mai & Beroza 2002). Boatwright & Quin (1986) incorporated this concept into elastodynamic rupture simulation; they assumed power law 2-D spectra both for initial stress and for strength. They found important features of such models like sub and super-sonic local rupture velocities, and irregular rupture fronts. This line of study was further developed for more complicated models (see e.g. Dunham et al. 2011). Also, computationally faster techniques of pseudo-dynamic simulations of heterogeneous ruptures has been developed (Guatieri et al. 2004; Song et al. 2014; Crempien & Archuleta 2015). Unfortunately, the problem of high-frequency directivity are not discussed in these papers. As regards relationship between random fault and random radiation, Herrero & Bernard (1994) noted that a jump-like dislocation sweeping a fault with self-similar stress drop field produces $\omega^{-2}$ spectrum, a highly instructive property.

An important point is whether functions, which represent slip, stress, etc. over a fault, should be assumed to contain energy at all scales, or some characteristic length, and specifically lowermost intrinsic scale of the fault, should be introduced, larger than the spatial step prescribed within a numerical simulation. In their instructive paper, Ben-Zion & Rice (1993) introduced a consistent model of quasistatic rupture in elastic body, with numerical cell size much smaller than that of possible physical cell size (‘segmentation length’ or ‘coherent slip patch size’). Similarly, Madariaga & Olsen (2002) speak of a ‘minimum slip patch’. In mechanics, this viewpoint was originated by Novozhilov (1969); also Morozov & Petrov (2002) speak of ‘quantum nature of fracture dynamics’. Observations, which suggested a characteristic small size of seismic active crust, were presented by Chouet et al. (1978). They worked with three data sets of small earthquakes from different locations, and, analysing their source spectra, found indication of a well-expressed minimum source size of such an earthquake; this size occurred to be specific for each of the three zones. A good independent example of this kind was given in Sacks & Rydelek (1995) and Rydelek & Sacks (1996; further both referred as SR95) who developed on this basis their concept of ‘earthquake quaanta’ which form a network of cells over fault area. For a particular earthquake fault, there exists also the uppermost intrinsic scale, somewhat smaller than earthquake size (Somerville et al. 1999; Mai & Beroza ); this point, being important in general, is of low relevance here, and is not accounted for while simulating random fields over a fault.

Another manifestation of finite size of fault inner structure was perceived by Papageorgiou & Aki (1983) and Gusev (1983) in the existence of the upper cut-off of source acceleration spectrum of a large earthquake, commonly called ‘source-controlled $f_{max}$’ and denoted here for brevity as $f_{c3}$, for ‘third corner frequency.’ Despite long controversy, its existence (despite masking effect of ‘site-controlled $f_{max}$’), at present often discussed in terms of $\delta_0$, is supported by increasing amount of evidence; see review in Gusev (2013). The typical range for $f_{c3}$ is 4–15 Hz, with slow decrease with magnitude, suggesting characteristic size of 100–300 m. Aki & Jin (2000) call this parameter ‘inner fault scale’. Perrin & Rice (1994), in essence, also introduce characteristic length of fault surface, which corresponds to their characteristic distance between multiple small asperities.

The model developed further has some properties common to the approach of SR95. In their model, following Burridge & Knopoff (1967), failure of a cell loads a neighbour cell, and may initiate its
failure. Cells interact through elastic field; failure is ruled by dry friction; cell strengths are random uncorrelated (white 2-D noise). Slip of a failed cell is local, ruled by local stress. To permit slip at a point of the fault to grow with fault size (and magnitude), a cell can fail repeatedly if reloaded by stress redistribution caused by failures of neighbour cells. Example rupture simulated in SR95 shows, on a snapshot, a front-like feature, of relatively narrow width, which consists of multiple failing cells. Still, no picture is given in SR95 of a front line (single or multiply connected); examples are given only of instantly failing cell clusters but do not represent a distinct boundary. Radiation formed by this model was not considered.

Another cellular model, particularly aimed at explaining HF radiation, is one after Lomnitz-Adler & Lund (1992). They depart from the notion of percolation. A sequence of failures propagates over a grid of cells. Consider a particular unbroken cell A. If a cell breaks in its neighbourhood, cell A can be ‘infect ed’, and break, with certain probability $P < 1$, or alternatively can be converted into the barrier state, with probability $1 - P$. In such a process, permanent lacy geometrical structure (‘lacy cloth’) is formed, in difference with G14 where only short-lived ‘lace fringes’ appear. Over the completed ‘lacy cloth’, a constant-slip circular dislocation line propagates, and HF radiation is formed when the intermittent random sequence of active and barrier cells is crossed by the front. The model is instructive but doubtful, as it is in contradiction with seismogeology: along a continuous fault (with no stepovers), the observed fault slip never abruptly stops and appears again within a short distance.

To summarize, one can believe that an attempt to apply cellular model for the description of formation of ‘a lace’ at rupture front may be meaningful, and eventually may permit to simulate HF radiation. Note that cellular models are conceptually very simple: each cell is a simple automaton ruled by the same algorithm. A complicated behaviour of a grid of automata, and of random fronts in particular, can appear by supplying automata with non-identical numerical parameters.

Last decades, formation of random fronts in various non-stationary natural and engineering processes was widely discussed and modelled, comprising a considerable research field (see e.g. Halpin-Healy & Zhang 1995; Gouyet 1996; Bonamy 2009, for reviews). These studies can provide useful analogies for rupture fronts in an earthquake source. The following study objects can be listed, among others:

1. Single-connected fronts with random geometry: surface growth; sedimentation; surface etching; imbibition of liquids into a porous material, growth of bacterial colonies and of tumours; porous material, growth of bacterial colonies and of tumours;
2. Multiply-connected fronts: slow crack front propagation, non-detonation explosion of a gas cloud (deflagration), solid propellant burning in a rocket motor, evolution of a (real) forest fire.

The latter process provides most direct analogy to propagation of earthquake rupture; it was often analysed using cellular models. For a forest fire, formation of ‘islands’ (slowly burning or unburned patches in the rear of the front) is common. Also jumps of front forward (‘lakes’) are often formed, by brands blown downwind.

Important is testing the model against observations. There are earthquake parameters that can be used for this aim. First, it is the width of rupture front. The hypothesis of linear relationship between $1/\eta w$ and $f_2$ was already mentioned above. SR95 and G14 associated rupture front width $\eta w$ of their models with slip pulse width $L$ of Heaton’s (1990) fault model. Still, this is far from being certain that it is $L$ that manifests itself in $f_2$, and not directly $\eta w$. At any rate, these views differ from those of Papageorgiou & Aki (1983, 1985) and Aki & Jin (2000) who associate $f_2$ with the second, larger inner fault scale, which they relate to the characteristic between-barrier distance. A useful dimensionless parameter related to $\eta w$ is the rate $\lambda$ of its growth with earthquake size $L$. Assuming plain similarity of earthquake sources, $\eta w$ must be proportional to $L$: $\lambda L = d \log w / d \log L$. For sets of observed spectra, $\lambda L$ is significantly below unity (Gusev 1983), with typical $d \log w / d \log L$ in the range (-0.5–0.8). (Atkinson 1993; Gusev 2013; DeNolle & Shearer 2016). Scaling of the kind $d \log w / d \log L < 1$ is a good indicator of random growth (Gusev & Guseva 2016). Another, more common, parameter, which can be used for comparing real and simulated ruptures, is average rupture velocity.

In the present work, a cellular model of formation of propagating ‘lacy fringe’ is developed that hopefully catches the physics of earthquake rupture formation better than a priori construction of G14, though the model is again of the double-stochastic kind. A mechanism for formation of random front will be discussed, and properties of synthesized fronts will be compared to those of real faults. Generally, such comparison might yield some estimates of parameters of the developed cellular model. However, the number of possible significant parameters of the model is larger than the number of observational constraints. This prevents constructing any complete description. The goal of this study is mostly the demonstration of a concept. Although the entire presented numerical analysis uses some fixed guesses, I hope that at least the order-of-magnitude estimates of model parameter can be obtained.

The general organization of the paper is as follows: (1) description of algorithms and parameters comprising the cellular model; (2) illustrations of properties of the cellular model by examples, observing how variations of numerical parameters affect the behaviour of the model; (3) systematic scanning of parameter space and determination of verisimilar intervals of parameters and (4) running the procedure for synthesis of (uncalibrated) accelerograms, with front kinematics simulated by means of the cellular model. The front history obtained in this way is combined with the random field of local stress drop, like in G14. In this manner, waveforms and their spectra are obtained. These spectra indeed manifest the above-described characteristic features, of second corner frequency and of acceleration spectrum plateau. Also, the finiteness of cell size results in formation of $f_3$.

2. A KINEMATIC CELLULAR MODEL OF EVOLUTION OF EARTHQUAKE RUPTURE

2.1. The background of the suggested model and requirements it should fulfil

The classical dynamic model of an earthquake source rupture is a shear crack in brittle elastic body, which propagates spontaneously under the effect of shear stress. In difference with the general case, fault-crack is channelized and mostly follows a certain weak plane defined by a geological fault. The crack tip plays the role of rupture front. The following properties of crack formation are especially important.

(1) Crack tip propagates spontaneously when the critical (Griffith’s)’ size of a crack is exceeded. See theoretical results reviewed for this case in Rice (1980) whom I mostly follow. After initial acceleration, asymptotic velocity of a model crack is $c_S$ for Mode III and $\eta w \approx 0.9 c_S$ for Mode II. Also, the theory (Andrews 1976 and later work) describes the possibility of propagation of Mode...
front velocity, assumed equal to $c_S$. The possibility of larger velocities is ignored. In the present simulation, rupture velocities $v_r$ are normalized to the upper limit, $c_S$, giving normalized velocity, or (S-) Mach number $m = v_r/c_S$, always below unity here. In the following, $m$ will be called velocity for brevity. The key check for the developed model is its capability to reproduce properties of fronts of real earthquake ruptures. In particular, as mentioned in Introduction, I try to reproduce scaling of rms width $w$ with earthquake size, and rupture velocity. Also, it is interesting to check the capability to reproduce the HF features of real sources already emulated in G14.

2.2. The general structure of the model

The present model is constructed taking into account the listed requirements. It consists of a $N \times N$ grid of square cells filling a part of a plane. In each cell, an elementary automaton is located. All automata are qualitatively identical, but their parameters vary from cell to cell. An automaton has three states. The transition between states occurs in continuous time. (The well-known ‘cellular automaton’ class of models is different—within it, time is assumed discrete, not continuous.)

Let us consider the rules that control an automaton. Traditionally, input variables for choosing a transition of an automaton are the states of neighbour cells. An equivalent approach, more convenient here, is to describe automaton in a cell through its eight outputs or commands sent to each neighbour. Which command to choose depends on states of the automaton and its neighbours. Generally, a random element can be used in formation of a command; however, the variant of the model with random commands is only tried here; this line is not developed in any depth. In the main part of this work, the model rupture develops spontaneously in deterministic mode. However, this evolution occurs over a random landscape: properties of each individual cell are random, and are preset before evolution begins (‘quenched heterogeneity’).

2.3. Grid of cells and time count

On a plane $(x, y)$, a grid of square cells is located with centres at 
$\{i\Delta x, j\Delta y\}; i = 1, 2, \ldots, N; j = 1, 2, \ldots, N.$ Let $\Delta x = 1$ and $\Delta y = 1$; and let us use as the time unit the time for an unperturbed rupture to propagate along a side of a cell. Consider a cell and its eight neighbours (Fig. 1a): four side neighbours at locations $(i, j \pm 1)$ and $(i \pm 1, j)$, and four diagonal neighbours at $(i \pm 1, j \pm 1)$. Denote full rupture delay between failures of the central and any of the neighbour cells, $\Delta t^{ij}_{\text{fr}}$ as

$$\Delta t^{ij}_{\text{fr}} = \Delta t_o + \Delta t_d$$

where $\Delta t_o$ is pure propagation delay, fixed; and $\Delta t_d$ is random additional delay. $\Delta t_o$ equals 1 for a side neighbour and 1.414 for a diagonal neighbour. The set of $\Delta t_d$ is a 2-D discrete random field over the grid; its construction to be specified. It reflects local fault resistance to rupture propagation. In terms of velocity $m$, in the ideal case of $\Delta t_o = 0$, the value of $m$ equals unity along any row/column or diagonal of the grid.

2.4. States of an automaton and the permitted transitions

A cell can be in any of the following states: intact (I), failing (F) and broken (B). The key property of a cell is the value of lifetime for its F state, or delay $\Delta t_f$; it is a preset random number. The complete $N \times N$ set of delays is defined by a random seed, unique for each

---

**Figure 1.** (a) A cartoon showing a cell and its neighbours. Filled arrows are from cells, which tried to initiate the I→F event in the current cell (to ‘ignite’ it). In any of neighbour cells, this attempt occurs at the moment of F→B event in this neighbour cell. Among these, the successful is one with the earliest time of its F→B event. Empty arrows are from other cells, which can also ignite the current one, but only potentially. (b) A sketch illustrating definition of rms front width, $w$. Positive and negative individual deflections of the actual front line (corrupted brown) from the ideal, no-resistance front line (blue arc) are depicted as solid or dashed arrows. Deflections are measured along local normal to unperturbed front. To find $w$, root mean square deviation of deflections is calculated; the $\pm w$ strip is schematically shown. The assumed actual front width is $w_f = 2.5 w$. II crack at velocities above $c_S$. In this mode, separate (‘lake-like’ in terms of Introduction) secondary cracks with high ‘intersonic’ ($c_p > v_r > c_S$) velocities nucleate under the effect of the dynamic stress field formed by running ‘subsonic’ ($v_r < c_S$) rupture. In agreement with the theory, average velocities of rupture propagation observed in earthquakes are usually in the range (0.5–0.9)$c_S$, and cases are systematically found when local velocity exceeds $c_S$.

(2) Local random variations of resistance to fracture propagation can be expected. These variations can reflect: non-uniform material parameters, like fracture energy; wavy profile of fault walls and of entire fault; fault bifurcations or small kinks, etc. Such variations of resistance cause deviations of local rupture front velocity from a constant. As a result, the front shape is distorted, and rupture velocity varies. To formally describe distortions of front shape, one can introduce the notion of rms width $w$ of the front, defined as standard deviation of actual instant front position from its unperturbed or mean position, with deviations measured across the unperturbed front (Fig. 1). See Introduction for short presentation of the work of Perrin & Rice (1994), who accurately treated the linearized case of small perturbations of resistance.

(3) Front of a crack has no inertia (Madariaga 1977; Rice 1980, eq. 5.39 and further) and is therefore capable to bend sharply around obstacles.

Justification for introducing a cellular model of rupture front is given in Introduction. Such a model should reproduce the listed properties whenever possible; but some simplifications will be made. In particular, the difference between velocity limits for Modes III and II is neglected, and a fixed isotropic upper bound is set for...
run of rupture evolution, and by two parameters of the model, to be described. Let us describe each state in more detail.

(1) State I. At the start of evolution of the grid, all cells, except the nucleation cell, are in state I. Its lifetime is unlimited. A cell in state I does not issue commands. State I changes: (I → F) on command from a neighbour in state F, at the moment of its (neighbour’s) transition (F → B).

(2) State F. At a particular cell (i, j), state F arises through the transition I → F by a command received from one of its neighbours. Consider a neighbour of the (i, j) cell which undergoes transition F → B at a certain moment \(t_i\). After delay \(\Delta t_i\), a timer is launched at the (i, j) cell (‘moment of ignition’). Each neighbour which undergoes the F → B transition tries to launch the timer; but this occurs only once, at the earliest attempt. Later attempts do not work as the cell is already in the F state, and only single I → F transition is permitted. The timer is controlled by the preset lifetime of state F, set to \(\Delta t_f\). At the moment when the timer runs out, the transition F → B occurs in the (i, j) cell. This moment is \(t_i + \Delta t_i^{\text{F}} = t_i + \Delta t_{ij} + \Delta t_0\). At this moment commands are issued that control the evolution of each of the eight neighbours. A command issued to a particular neighbour respects its state. For a state I neighbour, the transition I → F is caused. For a state F or B neighbour no command is issued. There is a special option of the simulator, when the I → F transition can be caused in non-deterministic mode, with probability \(p_{\text{IF}}\), below unity. This case is intended to illustrate percolation–style rupture models, soon found to be unrealistic. In the main part of the work, \(p_{\text{IF}} = 1\). To initialize model evolution, state F is ascribed to a preselected nucleation cell.

(3) State B. Dead-end state, with no outputs. Its lifetime is unlimited. Borders of the modelling area are created setting them to B state.

Note that despite discreteness of events, model time is continuous; it advances only at the moments of I → F and F → B events.

What is the meaning of \(\Delta t_f\)? Madariaga (1983) classified conceptual models of heterogeneity which determines HF radiation into two groups. There is the ‘barrier’ group when external stress field does not vary much, whereas fault strength is expressed non-uniform. In this case, \(\Delta t_f\) may be controlled by this strength: the stronger the cell (i, j), the larger is \(\Delta t_f\), and the longer is the failure process needed for a rupture to cross it. Another kind of inhomogeneity is the ‘asperity’ one, when strength variation is less significant whereas local stress is expressedly non-uniform, caused for example by self-stress from previous fault motion (seismic or creep), or by specific external stress field. In this case, high-strength cell may be loaded near to its bearing capacity, and will break with minimum delay; whereas for weaker cells, relative stress may be lower and \(\Delta t_f\) may increase. To describe joint effect of all these irregularity factors, the term ‘effective strength’ may be used.

2.5. Simulating the field of heterogeneity

The preset table of \(\Delta t_f\) is formed as a realization of discrete random field, which is assumed isotropic and self-affine. Such a realization is easy to generate in the case of Gaussian statistics of \(\Delta t_f\) values. However, a special technique is needed to generate fields with other statistics. The approach I use is ‘quantile-to-quantile transform’ which is a modification of the Van der Waerden’s classical ‘normal score’ technique. Its common variant, called ‘normal quantile transform’, is often used in many fields like hydrology, geostatistics and more including seismology (Goda et al. 2014), to convert non-Gaussian data into Gaussian quasi-data preserving their rank (often to permit further use of statistical tests developed for Gaussian data). The same approach can be used in the opposite direction converting Gaussian values to non-Gaussian ones, in particular for simulation of self-similar slip map over a fault (Gusev & Pavlov; Goda et al. 2014).

I use this technique to transform a Gaussian field into non-Gaussian field with approximately the same correlation properties. This is done in steps. First, Gaussian random field \(z_0\) is generated:

\[
 z_i = z(x_i, y_i) = DFT \left[ z_{pq}(k_x, k_y, q) \right] = DFT \left[ k^{-\eta} \zeta_{pq} \right] \tag{2}
\]

where \(\{x_i, y_i\}, i = 1, 2, \ldots N_i; j = 1, 2, \ldots N_j\) is a position of a cell, \(DFT\) denotes discrete Fourier transform, \(k = (k_x, k_y)\) is a wavenumber vector, \(\eta = \alpha\), and \(\zeta_{pq}\) is standard Gaussian random, uncorrelated (delta-correlated). Correlation properties (along \(x\) and \(y\)) are imposed through the \(k^{-\alpha}\) factor; at \(\eta = 0\) the result is 2-D white noise. Then \(z_0\) are sorted, forming variational series \(\{z_m\}, m = 1, 2, \ldots N^2\). For each member of this series, its quantile value \(\{Q_m\}, m = N^2\) is found. Consider another, target, distribution law. I particularly used the standard exponential law with cumulative distribution function \(E(q) = 1 - \exp(-q)\). Consider inverse function \(E^{-1}(Q) = -\log(1-Q)\). It can be applied to \(\{Q_m\}, m = N^2\) producing an ordered sequence whose members have standard exponential distribution. As the mean of this law is unity, the desired mean value, \(\tau\), of the target distribution is introduced by the additional \(\tau\) factor. In this way, the set \(\{\Delta t_f\} = \{\log^{-1}(Q_m)\}\) is determined; its values are then sent to their proper positions \((i, j)\), forming the sought for \(\Delta t_f\) table. Its correlation properties are approximately the same as those of the \(z_0\) field; that is \(\Delta t_f\) is close to a sample (realization) of self-affine random field with mean value \(\tau\) and power spectrum of the \(k^{-2\alpha}\) kind. (In the particular exponential law case, the quantile-to-quantile transform is excessive; but the procedure is standard, and is ready for eventual use with other laws.)

The choice of the particular exponential distribution law for \(\Delta t_f\) is a guess. It has single parameter, mean \(\tau\); its variance \(\sigma^2(\Delta t_f) = \tau^2\). Therefore, a particular realization of the \(\Delta t_f\) field is determined by the two parameters \(\{\eta, \tau\}\), and by a particular random seed used to generate the \(\zeta_{pq}\) set. The exponential law for \(\Delta t_f\) was chosen because properties of this law are appropriate: (1) random values are non-negative, therefore a model rupture can only lag behind the ideal unperturbed front (this property permits ‘islands’ only, no ‘lakes’; it eventually can be rejected to increase realism); (2) probability density function is monotonously decreasing: the larger is \(\Delta t_f\), the less probable it is and (3) it has no mode (peak), that is a characteristic value, whose meaning would be difficult to explain. Note that for the most common—Gaussian—law, each of these properties is violated. The choice of the exponential law is also partly justified by the fact that the results of simulation based on this assumption show no evident contradictions.

2.6. Effects of inhomogeneity

Random terms added to ideal rupture delays distort the shape of rupture fronts (Fig. 2). Also the order of ignition of cells is perturbed. On Fig. 2, ignition sequences are back traced starting from an arbitrary point on the front. One can see that the larger perturbations are, the more convoluted are ignition traces: they stay more intensively and become longer. Both these factors affect average
2.8. Parameters to be monitored during rupture evolution

To characterize a particular style of evolution, the following parameters were selected for monitoring.

1. Front leader propagation distance, $r_p$, measured in cell units, is the distance from the nucleation point to the most distant point of the front.

2. Effective instant radius of the source, $r_{eff}$, is the average distance from the nucleation point to a point of the front. It is calculated as $r_{eff} = (N_B/\pi)^{0.5}$ where $N_B$ is the instant area of rupture defined as the current number of cells in state B.

3. Rupture velocity, $m$. Two variants of this parameter are used: $m_c$, and $m_\sigma$. $m_c$ is defined as $m_c = dr_{eff}/dt$, and determined by linear regression over $(t, r_{eff}(t))$ pairs. This parameter gives the average rate of spreading of the front. If the ratio $m_c/m_\sigma$ is close to unity, the front grows isotropically, like a distorted circle; otherwise, if $m_c/m_\sigma$ is much below unity, this may signalize that the front forms significant individual ‘tongues’ (e.g. as in the case of Fig. 5e).

4. Root mean square (rms) width of front, $w$ (Perrin & Rice 1994; G14). As explained above, $w$ is standard deviation of deflection of a point of front from its mean or unperturbed position (see sketch, Fig. 1b). The current front is assumed to consist of all state F cells; both single connected and multiply connected fronts are processed in the same manner. To determine the value of $w$ at a particular moment of simulation time, one can use the set of distances of the current random realization of front with respect to its reference position on the octagon. Actual distances are calculated along a ray from the origin to each point of the front. The reference distance, for each value of actual distance, is defined as product of two factors: azimuth-dependent, defined by the known standard octagonal shape, and time-dependent effective rupture radius. To analyse evolution of $w$, it can be considered as a function either of time, or of distance. For tracking evolution of an individual simulated source at fixed parameters $\tau$ and $\eta$, using $w(t)$ is most appropriate. However for general understanding and for comparison with observations it is also useful to consider $w(r_{eff})$ and $w(r_p)$, estimated indirectly as $w(t(r_{eff}))$ and $w(t(r_p))$. For the aims of comparison, the values $w_{100} = w(t(t = 100))$, $w_{100} = w(t_{eff} | r_{eff} = 100)$ and $w_{100} = w(t_{eff} | r_p = 100)$ are estimated, in the following way. First, $(t, r_{eff})$ triples are accumulated during evolution. Then linear regression of $w$ versus $t$, versus $r_{eff}$ or versus $r_p$ is done in log-log scale, and the required values are picked using approximating trends.

5. Logarithmic growth rate of $w$. It was studied in two variants: $\lambda_i = d \log w / d \log t$ and $\lambda_r = d \log w / d \log r_{eff}$. These are estimated during the same linear regression as described in previous paragraph. Parameters $\lambda_i$ and $\lambda_r$ serve as exponents in the growth laws $w \propto t^\lambda_i$ or $w \propto t^\lambda_r$.

6. Fractal dimension of front, $D$, specifies how complexity of the front increases along with its growth; in other words, how increases its deviation from a smooth ‘Euclidean’ line. $D$ is determined from the relationship $L_p$ versus $L_c$ where $L_p$ is the actual length of the possibly fractal front, and $L_c$ is (imaginary) Euclidean length calculated as $L_c = 2\pi r_{eff}$. The value of $L_p$ is equated to the number of cells in state F; a correction factor is added in order to guarantee $D = 1$ for non-perturbed front. As follows from (Mandelbrot 1982), $D \approx \frac{d \log L_p}{d \log L_c}$. In such calculation, it is supposed that the set of instant states of the growing area of simulated source can be
treated as the set of fractal islands of various sizes, each of them representing possible source contour. Technically, it is convenient to determine \( D - 1 \approx \frac{2 \log \left( \frac{L_f}{L_c} \right)}{\log L_c} \); this is done through linear regression.

3. EXPERIMENTS WITH SIMULATOR: STYLES OF BEHAVIOUR OF THE MODEL

Let's consider examples of behaviour of the above-described model at some characteristic sets of parameters. All experiments were initiated at the grid centre.

3.1. Introductory examples

The deterministic closed shape of unperturbed front is illustrated on Fig. 3(a). In this reference case of negligible \( \tau \), numerical front is octagonal. It grows symmetrically and at a constant velocity. It represents discrete approximation of a spontaneously growing crack of circular shape; its velocity along eight fast directions in this case is close to 0.97.

An example continuous perturbed front is shown on Fig. 3(b). In its generation, the following parameters were used: \( \eta = 0.5, p_{\text{fr}} = 1 \), \( \tau = 4 \). Rare ‘islands’ are seen that are formed by abrupt turns of front, which sometimes result in pincer movement. Such islands are transient features; all of these eventually disappear if the time margin permits.

Ring-like, isometric fronts are typical for most simulations with self-similar \( \Delta t_f \) field. However, through admixing extra spectral energy at low wavenumbers, formation of unilateral asymmetric ruptures is easily attained (Fig. 3c). The particular direction of the fast-propagation ‘tongue’ is random and varies from run to run.

Self-similar \( \Delta t_f \) field combined with ‘probability of ignition’ \( p_{\text{fr}} < 1 \) results in percolation-style cases (Figs 3d and e). Now when the front propagates it leaves permanent barriers (‘islands’) in its rear. Two examples are given for \( p_{\text{fr}} = 0.30 \) and 0.25. At \( p_{\text{fr}} = 0.30 \) many small and a few big ‘islands’ appear in the rear of the front. The degree of irregularity of the instant perimeter is comparable to that of the case of Fig. 3(b). At \( p_{\text{fr}} = 0.25 \) the front loses clear contour and becomes strongly cut up. Instead of a well-formed sponge-like structure of Fig. 3(d), a shapeless seaweed-like structure appears. Islands in the rear close up, forming a ‘lacy cloth’. At \( p_{\text{fr}} = 0.25 \), in a sequence of Monte Carlo runs, cases are frequent when the growth completely stops; the plotted ‘successful’ variant was selected after a few attempts. With the further decrease of \( p_{\text{fr}} \), down to 0.24–0.23, the growth of front aborts practically always. The critical value of \( p_{\text{fr}} \), defined as one which gives 50 per cent chances for front to propagate to infinity at the given set of parameters, is close to \( p_{\text{fr}} = 0.27 \) in this case; it is the so-called percolation threshold for the considered problem.

The last two cases remind the percolation cluster model after Lomnitz-Adler & Lund (1992), mentioned in Introduction. Pertinent criticism of percolation cluster model was given above from a seismogeological viewpoint. Also, within our model, front propagation velocity for percolation cluster sources are unacceptable low (below \( m = 0.25 \)). For these reasons, ‘lace cloth’ cellular source models with \( p_{\text{fr}} < 1 \) are not considered further, the value of \( p_{\text{fr}} = 1 \) is fixed hereinafter, and only ‘lace fringe’ models like Fig. 3(b) will be discussed.

3.2. Styles of evolution of fronts: variable \( \tau \)

Further, I try to visualize how the variation of the two parameters, \( \tau \) and \( \eta \), affect the behaviour of the model. To generate a series of plots, a set of values of one parameter is combined with a fixed value of another parameter.

In the first series, Fig. 4, one can see the effect of variable \( \tau \): \( \tau = \{0.63, 1.6, 4, 10, 25\} \) at the fixed \( \eta = 0.5 \). When perturbations are low (Figs 4a and b) the imprint of deterministic octagonal shape can be noticed. In the series of plots of Figs 4(a)–(e) one can see that with increase of \( \tau \), the amplitude of front oscillations increases, and its qualitative character changes. At first, front is a single perturbed curve, and a ray from the origin crosses it once. Then, the curve becomes convoluted, so that in many cases a ray from the origin makes multiple crossings. At last, such behaviour intensifies, making lace-like appearance of front; islands of various sizes appear. In other words, the front structure changes from approximately smooth curve to fractal polyline. Front irregularity is an important feature closely related to formation of incoherent HF radiation (Gusev 2013, 2014); to characterize it I use rms front width \( w \).

3.3. Styles of evolution of fronts: variable \( \eta \).

A series of plots for fixed \( \tau = 4 \) and \( \eta = \{0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2\} \) is shown on Fig. 5. Properties of front in this series are following: at \( \eta < 1 \) fronts are, basically, isometric, whereas with approach to \( \eta = 2 \) appreciable angular variations of growth rate arise. One might compare this one-sided development of rupture to the tendency to unilateral growth of real earthquake faults; but this guess may be incorrect. One problem is that when \( \eta > 1 \), fronts evidently become too smooth. Another difficulty is doubtful \( \lambda \) values, the matter to be clarified later.

4. SYSTEMATICAL STUDY OF VARIANTS OF FRONT PROPAGATION

Let us now perform systematical study of behaviour of the model, with the aim to create the basis for eventual estimation of actual values of parameters from observational data.

4.1. A technique for estimation of parameters of front propagation

Further, the behaviour of some properties of fronts over two-dimensional area of parameters (\( \eta, \tau \)) is studied. The zone \( \eta > 1 \) was ignored, for the reasons explained later. As the significant parameters of rupture I selected the following two: (1) growth rates \( \lambda \), and \( \lambda \), and (2) average rupture velocity, \( m \). As a certain digression, also fractal dimension \( D \) of front line will be estimated, despite the absence of observational data to match. Figs 6 and 7 illustrate the process of estimation. The plotted linear trends were determined based on pooled data of 25 Monte Carlo runs. For visibility, only single variant on each plot is supplied with data points, with significant decimation of samples along abscissa, and only for five Monte Carlo runs.

Plots of Fig. 6 show the relationships \( \log w(\log t) \) and \( \log w(\log r_{sp}) \) for two cases: fixed \( \tau = 4 \) and variable \( \eta \) (Figs 6a and b); and fixed \( \eta = 0.5 \) and variable \( \tau \) (Figs 6c and d). In this and other cases, discreteness produces instability at small \( t \), therefore linear regressions were performed over the \( t \) range \([10, t_{\text{final}}]\) and the
Figure 3. Examples of space–time history of simulated rupture front. Hereinafter on such plots, the shade of grey codes time of transition of a cell into the final state B: the later, the lighter. $\eta = 0.5$ is fixed. $a$—the reference case, obstacles are practically absent ($\tau = 0.05$). In the four following examples $\tau = 4$ is fixed. $b$—a typical case of ‘lace’ fronts obtained with self-similar $\Delta t_{ij}$ field and $p_{IF} = 1$. $c$—a self-similar $\Delta t_{ij}$ field like one in $b$ is modified by addition of low-wavenumber component; this results in formation of tongue-like shape. In a particular run, rupture propagation becomes unilateral, though when considered over many runs, its direction is random. $d, e$ $\Delta t_{ij}$ field is self-similar; values of ‘probability of ignition’ are $p_{IF} = 0.30$ and 0.23, correspondingly. Top row $a–e$ is complete picture; lower row $f–k$ shows a zoomed fragment of each upper graph, here and in Figs 4 and 5. The grid $300 \times 300$ is used here and in Figs 4–7.

Figure 4. Examples of space–time history of simulated rupture front. Hereinafter on such plots $p_{IF} = 1$. Spectral exponent of heterogeneity is fixed: $\eta = 0.5$. Mean delay $\tau$ which controls the degree of heterogeneity varies; $\tau = \{0.63, 1.6, 4, 10, 25\}$ for plots $a$ to $e$. Same seed is used for all pictures.

corresponding $r_{eff}$ range. The discussion of the revealed tendencies is postponed to the following section.

Plots of Fig. 7 illustrate determination of $m$, and of fractal dimension $D$, they are organized in the same manner as those of Fig. 6. On Figs 7(a) and (b), the case of fixed $\tau = 4$ and variable $\eta$ is illustrated. On Fig. 7(a), the $r_{eff}$ versus $t$ dependence is shown; slopes of the lines give the estimates of $m$. Fig. 7(b) shows the dependence of the ratio log ($L_{fr}/L_e$) on log $L_e$, the slope of a linear segment yields the estimate of $D–1$. On Figs 7(c) and (d) the case of fixed $\eta = 0.5$ and variable $\tau$ is illustrated in the same manner as in Figs 7(a) and (b). From these plots one can see that $m$ is almost insensitive to variation of $\eta$ but varies expressedly with $\tau$.

4.2. Simulations for systematic coverage of parameter space

In the manner shown on Figs 6 and 7, variation of rupture parameters over entire investigated area of $\eta$ and $\tau$ was studied. The following discrete grids were used: $\eta = \{0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1\}$ and $\tau = \{0.63, 1, 1.6, 2.5, 4, 6.3, 10, 16\}$. The values $\eta < 0$ (“blue spectra”) are physically improbable and were not examined. Also, the values $\eta > 1$ were not examined for the reasons explained later. Obtained relationships are given in the graphical form on Figs 8–11. To obtain stable numerical estimates, simulations were repeated in $N_{MC} = 1000$ Monte Carlo tries; parameters were calculated for each run and then averaged. On plots, standard deviation of individual Monte Carlo estimates is given in many cases; it illustrates the scatter of individual values for various realizations/events. The
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Figure 5. Similar to Fig. 4. Now \( \tau = 4 \) is fixed, and variants differ by the value of \( \eta \): \( \eta = \{0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2\} \) for plots a to e and f to k.

Figure 6. Illustrations for procedures of determination of rupture parameters. (a) Estimation of \( \lambda_t = \frac{d \log w}{d \log r} \) for fixed \( \tau = 4 \) and \( \eta = \{0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1\} \). Straight segments for each value of \( \eta \) are obtained through linear regression over data simulated in 25 runs. Dots are \( w \) estimates for \( \eta = 0.5 \) obtained in five Monte Carlo runs. Dashed lines with slopes 0.5 and 1.0 are guides for eye. (b) Similar to a, for \( \lambda_r = \frac{d \log w}{d \log r_{ref}} \). (c) Similar to a, for fixed \( \eta = 0.5 \) and \( \tau = \{0.25, 1, 4, 12, 36\} \); dots are for the case \( \tau = 4 \). (d) Similar to c, with argument \( r_{ref} \).

Figure 7. Illustrations for procedures of determination of rupture parameters, continued. (a) Estimation of \( m_c = r_{off}/t \), for fixed \( \tau = 4 \) and \( \eta \) from 0 to 1. Dots are \( m \) estimates for \( \eta = 0.5 \) obtained in five Monte Carlo runs. Straight lines for each value of \( \eta \) (as indicated at the bottom) are obtained through linear regression over data simulated in 25 runs. (b) Estimation of \( D-1 = d \log (L_d/L_{Eu})/d \log L_{Eu} \) performed in similar manner. (c) Analog of a, for fixed \( \eta = 0.5 \) and \( \tau \) from 0.25 to 36. (d) Analog of b, for fixed \( \eta = 0.5 \) and \( \tau \) from 0.25 to 36. Negative slope of line 1 on plot d is an artefact of numerical estimation of \( D \) when \( D \) is very near to unity.
are set for $\eta$, with a particular $\eta$ value serving as the parameter of a curve.

Fig. 8 illustrates the behaviour of $m_r$ and $m_c$. On the selected log–log scale, a clear monotonous negative trend versus $\tau$ is seen. Two causes of the simulated trend are seen. One is the trivial increase of delays at each propagation step, directly controlled by the value of $\tau$. Another factor is the convoluted propagation path, with steep vertical turns of local discrete propagation trace, more and more common as $\tau$ increases (Fig. 2).

Dependence of $m_r$ on $\eta$ is weak; for $m_c$ it essentially disappears. The cause of this difference seems to be the fact that at larger $\eta$, angular variations of front shape increase: compare Figs 5(b) and (d). Then, $m_r$ is determined by an individual particular ‘fast tongue’ of the front, with its other parts lagging behind; whereas the $m_c$ value is the average over all directions. Weak dependence of $m_r$ on $\eta$ means that this theoretical plot is useless for deriving estimates of $\eta$ from observations. Oppositely, if even broad a priori bounds are set for $\eta$, one can well estimate $\tau$ from observed $m_r$ at least approximately.

An interesting point is the scatter of individual Monte Carlo estimates, which may well reflect real scatter related to randomness of structure of individual faults at given $\tau$. This scatter (in logarithmic scale) is almost independent of $\tau$, but grows with $\eta$ very fast.

Fig. 9 shows $\lambda_r(\tau)$ and $\lambda_c(\tau)$ relationships. These relationships are not identical, but are qualitatively comparable. As seen here, the values $\eta > 1$ seem to cause physically highly improbable $\lambda > 1$ (front width grows faster than rupture size). Therefore only the range [0 1] was systematically studied for $\eta$. The effect of $\tau$ on $\lambda_r(\tau)$ and $\lambda_c(\tau)$ relationships is present but is not quite systematic; whereas the effect of variation of $\eta$ is expressed. The increase of $\eta$ results, at least at $\tau > 2$, in stable increase of $\lambda_r$ and $\lambda_c$. Therefore, there are some chances to convert the values of $\lambda$ derived from observations into at least rough estimate of $\eta$.

Figs 10 and 11 are given mostly for general understanding and are not used to derive any estimates. Fig. 10 shows the $w_{100}(\tau)$ and $w_{1100}(\tau)$ relationships. The behaviour of $w_{1100}(\tau)$ is quite expectable. First, at a fixed distance $r_0 = 100$, front width $w(r_0)$ grows, in log–log scale, approximately linearly with increase of $\tau$, reflecting increase of front width with increased degree of inhomogeneity. Second, it also systematically grows with increase of $\eta$. The cause of this tendency is less evident; its probable underpinning is that at the white noise case of $\eta = 0$, the effects of two adjacent heterogeneities can often be opposite and compensate one another,

![Figure 8](https://academic.oup.com/gji/article-abstract/215/2/924/5063574)

**Figure 8.** Relationships $m_r(\tau)$ and $m_{c0}(\tau)$ for a number of $\eta$ values. Here and on further three figures, vertical bars at a curve show standard deviations of individual Monte Carlo estimates. Here, bars are given for the curve with $\eta = 0.5$, for several $\tau$ values; similar bars are also added for $\tau = 4$ and marginal values of $\eta$. The hashed area indicates the approximate range of observed $m$ values and the grey line is the observed reference value (hypothetic average) fixed at $m = 0.60$; see the Appendix for details. Dashed vertical line marks the tentative estimate of typical $\tau = 2.5$. Although the curves look quasilinear at a first glance, at closer examination a suspicious double bend (very stretched ‘S’) can be noticed. By using the log–log scale, such a feature can be excluded, however at the cost of pronounced curvature.

![Figure 9](https://academic.oup.com/gji/article-abstract/215/2/924/5063574)

**Figure 9.** Relationships $\lambda_r(\tau)$ (a) and $\lambda_c(\tau)$ (b) for a number of $\eta$ values. The hashed area indicates the approximate range of realistic $\lambda$ values assumed to be equal to observational estimates of $\lambda = -3 \log b_{\text{obs}}$, see the Appendix for details. Grey solid line is the observed reference value (hypothetic average) taken as $\lambda = 0.60$. Dashed vertical line marks a tentative estimate of typical $\tau = 2.5$ reproduced from the previous picture.
whereas at larger \( \eta \) (the case of expressed autocorrelation), many adjacent inhomogeneities affect a relevant segment of front in a coordinated way and therefore much more effectively. In the case of fixed propagation time \( t_0 = 100 \), the picture is different. The initial increase of \( w_{r100}(\tau) \) is qualitatively similar to that of \( w_{r100}(\tau) \), but it soon saturates and negative slope appears. This tendency reflects the fact that with increased fault heterogeneity, rupture velocity becomes relatively low; so at larger \( \tau \), \( w_{r100} \) cannot further follow the increase of \( \tau \), because \( w_{r100} \) is, intrinsically, proportional to propagation distance, and not to the time spent to reach this distance. On Fig. 11, \( D(\tau) \) relationships are given. \( D \) increases with \( \tau \) and, in the range \( \eta = 0–0.75 \), also with \( \eta \). At \( \eta = 1 \), a tendency to saturation appears. Probably it develops further at \( \eta > 1 \) as suggested by less irregular shapes on Fig. 5(d) and especially Fig. 5(e).

With the relationships \( m_\tau(\tau, \eta) \) and \( \lambda_\eta(\tau, \eta) \) at hand, it is now possible to compare the calculated relationships with observational data, to be done in the next section.

5. COMPARING PARAMETERS OF SIMULATED FAULTS TO PROPERTIES OF REAL EARTHQUAKE SOURCES

In the current model, the style of fault evolution depends on the two parameters \( \tau \) and \( \eta \). Comparing observed parameters with those of simulated faults one may attempt to estimate the range of \( \tau \) and \( \eta \) for real faults. These estimates will be very preliminary as they rely upon theoretical relationships of Figs 8 and 9 whose construction was based on simplifications and uncertain guesses. These are: unconstrained (near-circular in simple cases) rupture growth; self-similarity of \( \Delta t \) field; and exponential law for \( \Delta t \) distribution. Still, to find such estimates is at least a useful exercise; moreover, one can hope to obtain reasonable order-of-magnitude estimates.

Determination of reference values for properties of real faults is a separate problem, outside the line of this particular study; therefore it is moved to the Appendix. There, the following summary estimates are found through compilation: for normalized rupture velocity \( m \) (equated to \( m_\tau \)), the range 0.45–0.75, the reference value 0.6; for \( \lambda_\eta \) (equated here to \( \lambda_\tau \)), the range 0.45–0.75, the reference value 0.6 (the coincidence is accidental). It is assumed that \( \lambda \approx \chi = \frac{\log f_c}{\log f_c \log f_c} \).

As must be clear from previous discussion, in order to estimate parameters \( \tau \) and \( \eta \) of real faults one can try to use curves of Fig. 8 for \( \tau \), and those of Fig. 9 for \( \eta \). On Fig. 8, point and interval estimates for \( m \) are shown at the ordinate axis. Similarly, On Fig. 9, point and interval estimates for \( \lambda_\eta \) are shown in similar way. Reference values are treated as point estimates. Using calculated trends of Figs 8 and 9 for calibration, from the observed values of \( m \) and \( \lambda_\eta \), one can derive estimates of \( \tau \) and \( \eta \).

The chain of this derivation is presented in the Table 1. The initial acceptable range for \( \eta \), of \([0 1] \), is bounded: on the bottom—by the condition of not permitting blue noise \( \Delta t_0 \) field; on the top—by physically highly doubtful values \( \lambda_\tau > \lambda > 1 \) at \( \eta > 1 \). See Fig. 9. Bold values indicate accepted estimates. In selecting them, I believed that taking into account the range estimates simultaneously on both \( m \) and \( \lambda_\eta \) would result in unrealistically wide bounds. Summarizing, observational evidence combined with the theoretical curves of Figs 8 and 9 imply the following parameter estimates (rounded): point estimates: \( \tau = 2.5, \eta = 0.6 \); interval estimates: \( \tau = 1–6, \eta = 0.25–0.75 \).

6. GENERATING EXAMPLE SOURCE ACCELERATION SPECTRA

It is interesting to demonstrate operation of the developed concepts and to check their ability to produce verisimilar acceleration spectra. There are three specific features of HF part of source radiation: flat acceleration spectrum (\( \omega^{-1} \) property), two-corner spectral shape, and diminution of directivity at high frequencies. Among these, only the presence of the former two can and will be checked, because any effects of directivity are fully suppressed both by near-symmetric geometry of simulated front and by the selected position of the receiver.

To simulate source spectra (i.e. far-field body wave spectra), the procedure of G14 was used. I shall remind only its key points; a reader is addressed there for more details. The approach of G14 is based heavily on (Das & Kostrov 1983, 1986, 1988; Boatwright...
1988; Gusev 1989). The initial (not realistic) model is one of an infinite zero-strength fault, with a strong patch or asperity that occupies a bounded area \( \Sigma_1 \) on it, loaded by shear load. The term ‘asperity’ is used here, following Boatwright (1988), in a loose sense; the patch \( \Sigma_1 \) can be relatively strong or weak; the only requirement is finite strength. Rupture fronts nucleate at some point of \( \Sigma_1 \), and then sweeps over it; this causes successive failure of fault elements. Failure of an element is instant in terms of stress drop (not in terms of slip!). This failure generates body waves in each half-space, and also fault-guided wave train, mostly of Rayleigh waves. For the characteristic case of \( SH \) wave, the displacement and velocity from a fault element \( dS \) at a far-field receiver at a point \( x' = (x', y', z') \) and time \( t \) can be written as:

\[
du^{SH \infty}(x', t) = A \tau(\xi) H(t - (R - \xi \cdot \gamma)/c_\gamma - t_f(\xi))dS;
\]

where \( \xi = (x, y, \theta) \) is location of \( dS \), the hypocentre is at \( \xi = 0 \); \( \tau(\xi) \) is local dynamic stress drop on \( dS \); \( R = |x' - y'| \); \( \rho \) is density; \( c_\gamma \) is S-wave velocity; \( t_f(\xi) \) is the time of arrival of rupture front to \( \xi \). \( \delta(\cdot) \) is delta-function. Thus, failure at \( dS \) produces elementary step in far-field displacement. Integration of (3a) over \( \Sigma_1 \) produces the initial variant of source time function. Note that (1) far-field force equivalent for this model is single-dipole, and (2) its seismic moment \( M_0 \) is integral of a sum of step functions, therefore it equals infinity.

The next step to more realism is to account for limited size of a free-slipping area, introducing a boundary which exists somewhere around \( \Sigma_0 \) on a real geological fault. Denote the area enclosed by the boundary and containing \( \Sigma_1 \) as \( \Sigma_2 \). Outside \( \Sigma_2 \) entire fault is now welded. This causes dying out of fault-guided waves (which include running dislocation step) at some distance from the asperity \( \Sigma_1 \). This stopping of fault-guided waves converts step function (3a) into an elementary unipolar pulse of finite duration, with abrupt leading and, (typically) gradual trailing edges; let its shape be described by \( G_0(t, \xi) \). It is at this moment that the second dipole appears. It precisely compensates the initial one in terms of torque; this guarantees symmetry of the resulting seismic moment tensor (Aki & Richards 2002, sect 3.2). Far-field wave displacement time function is now pulse-like and provides finite seismic moment.

And the final step (Boatwright 1988) is to assume that the entire area \( \Sigma_2 \) is completely covered by ‘asperities’ whose contributions into the far-field waveform are additive. To obtain approximate estimates, the duration and shape of the \( G_0(t, \xi) \) pulse was assumed identical for all radiating spots on the fault: \( G_0(t, \xi) = G(t) \). This element of the G14 procedure was followed here. The pulse shape \( G(t) \), was selected following Boatwright (1988), as:

\[
G(t) = \begin{cases} 
H(t) - 0.5(1 + \cos \pi t/T_B); & t < T_B \\
0 & t > T_B 
\end{cases}
\]

where duration parameter \( T_B \) was selected following the assumption that it is directly defined by the front width: \( T_B = 1.67T_r \), where \( T_r \) is rise time: \( T_r = \omega_p/m_\nu \). The rupture front both in the numeric model G14 and here consists of a set of cells; only here they are components of the fault model and not mere finite elements as in G14. Each cell generates a spike timed at the arrival of front to it. The sequence of spikes arrived to receiver was convolved with the \( G(t) \) pulse. This convolution corresponds to certain filter in frequency domain. It is just this filter that forms second spectral corner, located at \( \omega_f = 0.5T_r \).

An important component of G14 was setting stress drop field \( \tau(\xi) = \tau_j' \). It was simulated as realization of self-similar random field with amplitude spectrum of the \( k^{-\alpha} \) kind, with the particular value of \( \alpha \) set to 1.0. It was shown in G14 that the described procedure results in spectra and traces, which satisfy acceptably the three requirements listed above. In the current simulation, the stress field \( \tau(\xi) = \tau_j' \) model of G14 was used again. Generally speaking, instead of generating \( \Delta t_{ij} \) and \( \tau_{ij}' \), independent random fields one might introduce correlation between them, in the manner of for example Schmedes et al. (2012). Unfortunately, no good way is seen to predict the kind of such correlation. For heterogeneity of the ‘barrier’ kind, high (dynamic) stress drop is related to high local strength, low local \( v_\nu \) and large \( \Delta t_{ij} \). Oppositely with heterogeneity of the ‘asperity’ kind, high local stress drop is related to a highly loaded spot which may break with a minimal delay. As in reality both modes probably combine, the independence of \( \Delta t_{ij} \) and \( \tau_{ij}' \) looks as a reasonable initial choice.

To perform simulation, one has to define elementary contribution from a unit cell. As seen from (3b), for far-field velocity time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( m = 0.6 )</td>
<td>( \eta_1 = 0 { 1 } )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda = 0.6 )</td>
<td>( \tau_1 = [2.1 \ 3.8] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m = 0.6 )</td>
<td>( \eta_2 = 0.62 { 3 } )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m = [0.45 \ 0.75] )</td>
<td>( \eta_3 = 2.5 { 5 } )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda = [0.45 \ 0.75] )</td>
<td>( \tau_3 = [1.1 \ 5.6] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m = [0.45 \ 0.75] )</td>
<td>( \eta_4 = [0.28 \ 0.78] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m = [0.45 \ 0.75] )</td>
<td>( \eta_5 = [0.84] { 5 } )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m = [0.45 \ 0.75] )</td>
<td>( \tau_4 = [1 \ 8] )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Number of the figure used for deriving the estimate.
2 A priori bounds.
3 The final interval estimate.
4 Employing the narrow range of the theoretical \( m(\tau|\eta) \) curves of Fig. 8, the interval estimate for \( \tau = \tau_1 \) is converted here to the final point estimate of \( \eta_1 \), with accuracy \( \pm 0.02 \).
5 The final interval estimate. The narrower (preferred) version, anchored at the point estimate of another parameter.
6 The final interval estimate. The wider (cautious) version, anchored at the interval estimate of another parameter.
7 Formally, the values \( \eta < 0 \) are also possible; these were excluded as improbable.
function this contribution is delta-like for infinitesimally small fault element, and therefore can be taken as one-sided pulse for a finite cell of the model. The shape of this ‘unit’ pulse must be selected sufficiently smooth to create no spectral distortions. I used pulse shape function

\[ F(t') = t' \exp(-t'), \text{ with } t' = t/2T_c \]

where \(2T_c\) is the characteristic cell time, and \(T_c\) is the halfwidth (onset to centroid time) of unit pulse. This function is selected in order to provide \(\xi^2\) rolloff of acceleration spectrum at HF. The value of \(T_c\) is related to the time interval that the rupture needs to cross a cell. Therefore, it was assumed that \(T_c\) depends linearly on \(\tau\), and

\[ T_c = 1.55 + 0.125\tau. \]

The value of \(T_c\) defines the location of the upper cut-off of acceleration spectrum, that is source-controlled \(f_{\text{max}}\), or \(f_c\). In entire simulation of signals and spectra, the time step was set to 0.25; this choice occurred to be sufficient to sidestep any significant artefacts. The pulse (5) was used in convolution in the same manner as the pulse (4).

In simulation of earthquake rupture, one should be accurate with effects of rupture termination: when it is described inadequately, artefacts in the form of unrealistically sharp stopping phases may appear, distorting accelerograms and their spectra. In G14, the rupture run over a rectangular area, and nucleation point was located near one of its corners; thus stopping of propagation at the contour of the area was rather stretched out in time. For this reason, without any special measures, no significant contamination from stopping phases arose. In the present case, when entire rupture front is stopped simultaneously, and the receiver is located on fault normal, the displacement time history at the receiver shows abrupt, jump-like, termination. Corresponding powerful spikes appear on velocity and acceleration traces, and spectra are severely distorted. For this reason, in order to generate more verisimilar time histories and spectra, simulated seismograms are artificially tapered over their later part.

Three particular pairs of parameters \((\tau, \eta)\) were chosen to produce different intervals between \(f_{c1}\) and \(f_{c2}\), and three corresponding series of accelerograms and spectra were generated. Each series included 20 Monte Carlo runs (Fig. 12). One can see acceleration spectra with two corners and a considerable range of plateau-like behaviour. Originally, simulated seismic moments, \(M_0\), varied somewhat from one MC run to another because random realizations of local stress drop (and implicitly of slip) were non-identical. To compensate related scatter of no deep meaning, all spectra were reduced to the common \(M_0\) (average of the original series). To make visible different relative levels of HF spectral plateau, \(A_{HF}\), spectra were once more normalized, now jointly, setting their average level to unity at \(f_{c1}\). All simulated space–time histories were played on the same 400 × 400 grid; but time history durations, and with them \(f_{c1}\) values, varied somewhat depending on the average rupture velocity (which is defined mostly by \(\tau\), Fig. 8). The (relative) position of the second corner varies significantly, depending on the width of rupture front, as expected. The case of Fig. 12(a) is one of a wide front and thus of low \(f_{c2}/f_{c1}\) ratio, with plateau of acceleration spectrum well discernible and relatively low. The cases of Figs 12(b) and (c) are of more and more narrow front, with increasingly higher level of the plateau of acceleration spectrum. Unexpectedly, the slope of the plateau is not completely stable: slopes vary systematically from negative to positive values, within the range ±0.2. Still, around the preferable values \((\tau = 2.5, \eta = 0.6)\) the slope is quite close to zero,
in a good match with the \(\omega^{-2}\) concept. To conclude, within the performed simulation test the expected appearance of spectrum was successfully realized: one sees a two-corner spectrum with acceleration spectral plateau.

### 7. DISCUSSION

Departing from the typical ranges of observed parameters \(m_v = 0.45–0.75\), \(\lambda = 0.45–0.75\), this research resulted in tentative ranges of model parameters: mean additional delay per cell \(\tau = 1–6\), the exponent of 2-D amplitude spectrum of delay field \(\eta = 0.25–0.75\). As a point estimate, one may accept \(\tau = 2.5\), \(\eta = 0.6\). It is interesting to juxtapose the obtained estimates with parameters of real faults. The proposed range of \(\eta\) can be compared to other spectral exponents of fault surface. As delay field in the present model may represent strengths of cells, an appropriate candidate for comparison is local stress drop, which may reflect local strength. Mai & Beroza (2002) found the typical value for amplitude spectral exponent for slip to be 1.75, this suggests the exponent for stress drop field \(\alpha = 0.75\). However, Lavallée et al. (2006) believe that high-wavenumber components of slip spectrum may be artificially suppressed during inversion procedures. Their preferred estimates for \(\alpha\) are in the range \((-0.15)+0.35\), with the average value around zero. It was also proposed to associate local fault strength with the local slope of fault geometrical profile (Main 1988). Candela et al. (2012) found amplitude spectrum of fault profile to behave as \(k^{-(0.6–0.8)}\). For a hypothetical fresh rupture with such a profile, Main’s logic gives ‘blue’ strength spectrum \(k^{-(0.2–0.4)}\), predicting anticorrelation of strength between adjacent spots; but the applicability of this approach is disputable. Taking into account these not quite consistent pieces of information, we can treat the obtained range \(\eta = 0.25–0.75\) as quite acceptable.

As regards \(\tau\), its point estimate of 2.5 may look strange. Indeed, at mean velocity of \(m = 0.6\), mean delay per unit distance, that is per cell size, is \(\tau^* = m^{-1} = 1.67\). At the same time, full average delay per cell is much larger: \(\langle \Delta t_j^{\prime}\rangle = \langle \Delta t_i \rangle + \langle \Delta t_{ij} \rangle = 1.25 + \tau = 1.25 + 2.5 = 3.75\). This contradiction is apparent however as it tacitly assumes that the failure process develops along a single chain of cells. In fact, however, for a certain cell of a front line, among its eight neighbour cells, about four of them have already failed before, and any of the four can ‘ignite’ it. The simplest assumption that all the four themselves were ‘ignited’ simultaneously, actual effective additional delay per cell will be on the order of the smallest value among four independent exponentially distributed random numbers, equal on the average to \(\tau^* = 0.25\tau\), or 0.63. Adding mean propagation delay of 1.25 gives 1.88, in an unexpectedly good match to the above-mentioned value \(\tau^* = 1.67\). This match should not be taken too seriously: there are other participating factors. Firstly, rupture front can go around strong spots of the general strength relief rather effectively; and this Fermat-style ‘optimization’ increases observed velocity as compared to the rough estimate. There is another factor, whose effect is of opposite sign: the propagating rupture spends additional time, as compared to straight-line propagation, because of random curved path of the ‘ignition signal’ (Fig. 2). It is difficult to estimate contributions of the last two effects into final observed velocity; still they look as secondary. It is possible to conclude that the obtained estimate of \(\tau\) shows no striking misfit when compared to the empirical average/typical value of \(m\).

Evidently, some characteristic properties of real earthquake sources are not described within the limits of the performed simulation. First of all, it is elongated fault geometry; also it is often unilateral propagation mode. Within the present general approach, this behaviour can be easily simulated quite traditionally, adding suitable artificial external borders, and positioning the nucleation point asymmetrically within them. This was done in G14 where the borders were impenetrable (of infinite strength). Such artificial barriers are somewhat doubtful tectonophysically, and may also produce unwanted stopping phases. Another way to stop rupture (or to switch off radiation) might be to taper stress drop field along the periphery of simulation area. Both these approaches look acceptable for future study, though somewhat artificial.

As regards unilateral propagation mode in particular, it was found by try and error that asymmetric propagation can be simulated within the developed approach (see Fig. 3c). It was found however, that to generate unilateral ruptures, one needs to significantly enhance low-wavenumber part of delay spectrum. To achieve this, one can either use unrealistic \(\eta\) values around or above 2.0, or to admix low-wavenumber term to the main self-similar delay field. Both ways look unattractive. Also, the problem of fully consistent stopping of a rupture remains unresolved in this approach. Generally, causes of unilateral elongated ruptures seem to be an open question.

It was found in G14 that at fixed values of fault size \(L\), seismic moment \(M_0\) and fault-average stress drop \(\langle \Delta \sigma \rangle\), \(A_{HF}\) and correspondingly the value of ‘stress parameter’ are determined by the \(w_p/w_L\) ratio. The present results (Fig. 12) permit to extend this chain of relationships and to formulate the following statement: at given values of \(L, M_0, \langle \Delta \sigma \rangle\) and of spectral exponent of fault heterogeneity, \(\eta\), both the \(A_{HF}\) and the ‘stress parameter’ are determined at least partly by the value of mean delay parameter \(\tau\), which operates through the intermediate \(w_p\) parameter. Generally, the larger is \(\tau\), the larger is \(w\), the lower is \(f_{c2}/f_{c1}\) ratio and the lower is \(A_{HF}\). This concordant behaviour of \(f_{c2}\) and \(A_{HF}\) is well seen on Fig. 12; the effect of some variations of \(\eta\) is secondary. Therefore, the results of simulation by the kinematic cellular model may improve understanding of physical factors that affect strong ground motion amplitudes.

An important absent point is the direct comparison of \(w\) values to observations (e.g. to slip pulse width). To do this, one needs at first to pass from dimensionless values of time and distance used here, to natural scales. To do this one needs observational estimates of unit cell size. As noted in Introduction, its order of magnitude is, roughly, 100–300 m, but establishing it more accurately is a point of a separate study.

Another point for future study is the effects of various probability laws for local values of delay field. The absence of such analysis is the main cause why the present study should be qualified, rather, as a demonstration of concept. Confident estimates of parameters \(\tau\) and \(\eta\) can be obtained only when a proper probability law is assumed; thus, the estimates obtained above should be treated as tentative. Some less significant generalizations of the present approach are also possible, for example permitting negative values for \(\Delta t_{ij}\), and thus allowing ‘lakes’ of front line. However, first experiments along his line did not indicate any qualitative changes of behaviour of the model.
8. CONCLUSION

A continuous-time cellular model is designed, aimed at description of the evolution of random rupture front during formation of earthquake source. The particular version of the model is developed, controlled by two parameters: mean additional front delay per cell, $\tau$, and the exponent $\eta$ of power-law power spectrum of supposedly self-similar 2-D random delay field.

A set of parameters of rupture evolution is introduced and a technique for their estimation is proposed. Among them, the two are found which can be compared to parameters of real earthquake ruptures. These are: normalized front velocity $m$ (Mach number), and the exponent $\lambda$ which describes how fast the rms width of random front increases in the process of front propagation.

By Monte Carlo experiments, a variant of relationships $m(\tau, \eta)$ and $\lambda(\tau, \eta)$ is determined. On this basis, and using observational data on $m$ and $\lambda$, tentative estimates of $\tau$ and $\eta$ for real faults are derived.

Numerical experiments were performed in which the simulated rupture fronts were combined with a realistic model of local stress drop field over a fault surface; radiated far field body wave acceleration signals from such sources were found and converted to spectra. These spectra bear two characteristic properties of observed source acceleration spectra: two distinctive spectral corners, and a plateau above the second corner frequency.

Despite being kinematic, the developed model provides some insight into the physical mechanisms which control strong ground motion amplitudes; it therefore may occur useful for eventual prediction of realistic strong motion and for estimation of its variability.
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regressions of Seekins & Boatwright (2010) obtained average about 10 per cent data with \( \theta = 0.8 \). Early estimates of \( \ell, L, \) were compiled by Geller (1976) who converted them to \( m \). His average, \( m = 0.72 \) over 23 cases was widely accepted. Recently, estimates of \( \ell \), for 114 \( M_w \geq 7 \) subduction earthquakes were obtained by Ye et al. (2016) who performed mass inversion of rupture evolution for each event. Their reference point estimate is \( \ell = 2.5 \) km s\(^{-1} \), and interval estimate is 2.0–3.0 km s\(^{-1} \). For subduction events, there is no well-established estimate of \( c_S \) as this interface is to a large degree bimaterial. I chose \( c_S = 4 \) km s\(^{-1} \) and got: average \( m = 0.625 \), and the range 0.5 to 0.75. For 47 \( M_w = 3.5–5.4 \) earthquakes analysed using regional Northern California data, Seekins & Boatwright (2010) obtained average \( m \) around 0.8 and about 10 per cent data with \( \ell > 1 \) (intersonic). The difference with large subduction events may result from simpler, typically unisegment \( M_w = 3.5–5.4 \) sources as compared to often multisegment ruptures of large events.

Independent estimates of \( m \) can be derived combining rupture duration \( d \) and fault length \( L \) data. One can estimate \( \ell \) as \( \theta L/d \) where \( \theta \) is the average degree of unilaterality of ruptures; its preferred value must be assumed. I set it to 0.875 which is the average between the purely unilateral case of \( \theta = 1 \) and the case of uniform random distribution of hypocentre along length, which gives \( \theta = 0.75 \). Estimates will be further discussed based on empirical regressions of \( d \) and \( L \) for shallow earthquakes picked at \( M_w = 7 \). An alternative to \( d \) proper is using somewhat more stable temporal centroid \( d_c \) that can be equated to 0.5\( d \). Regression of Duputel et al. (2013) gives \( d_c = 8.8 \) s that produces \( d = 17.6 \) s. The estimate of \( d_c \) after Ye et al. (2016) is practically identical. As for \( d \) from the regression of Vallée (2013), \( d = 23 \) s. Earlier regression of \( d(M_w) \) after Houston (2001) (based on inversions of Tanioka & Ruff 1997) gives \( d \approx 17 \) s. As a summary estimate I use 18 s. For \( L \), the classical regression of Wells & Coppersmith (1994) predicts \( L = 49 \) km for all variants of unit tensor stacked. Compilation after Blaser et al. (2010) gives \( L = 46 \) km for pooled data. From Leonard’s (2010) data analysis one obtains \( L = 40 \) for dip-slip and \( L = 50 \) for strike-slip cases, with average of 45 km. As a summary estimate I use 46 km. Combining with \( \theta \) and \( d \) values selected above this results in \( \ell = 2.24 \) km s\(^{-1} \). Because using of mixture of crustal and subduction data in \( L \) estimate, \( c_S = 3.8 \) km s\(^{-1} \) is used to derive \( m \), resulting in \( m = 0.59 \). As the final point estimate \( m = 0.60 \) is taken, and the interval estimate is set as \( [0.45, 0.75] \).

Scaling of second corner frequency and its relation to that of rms front width

It was found in G14, eq. (10), through numerical simulation, that rms front width, \( w \), is approximately proportional to \( 1/f_{c2} \), where \( f_{c2} \) is the second corner frequency of source spectrum. Therefore, one can expect that scaling of \( w \) can be deduced from scaling of \( f_{c2} \). Observational data on scaling of \( f_{c2} \) were compiled by Gusev (2013) who found them to show certain scatter. For \( \chi = \frac{d \log f_{c2}}{d \log M_w} \) from (Atkinson 1993) one can derive \( \chi \approx 0.5 \) for Eastern North America data. From (Atkinson & Boore 1998) follows \( \chi = 0.46 \) for Western USA. From left cut-offs of Mexican acceleration spectra of (Aguirre & Irikura 2007), Gusev (2013) derived \( \chi = 0.39 \). The trends of interbarrier interval \( \lambda \), a parameter of the barrier source model, can be hypothetically be used to estimate \( \chi \), but this is rather uncertain. If one assumes this possible, from Beresnev & Atkinson (2002) one would obtain \( \chi = 0.8 \) for Western USA data; from Halldorsson & Papageorgiou (2005) this value will be \( \chi = 1 \). Gusev (2013) concluded that the value \( \chi = 0.5 \) can serve as a reasonable first approximation. Assuming kinematic similarity of sources \( \chi = -\frac{d \log f_{c2}}{d \log M_w} = -\frac{d \log f_{c2}}{d \log M_w} \).

Recently Denolle & Shearer (2016), using abundant good-quality teleseismic data found that for dip-slip sources, the \( \log f_{c2} \) (log \( M_w \)) relationship consists of two branches. At lower \( M_w \leq 7–7.5 \), \( \chi \approx 0.6 \), whereas at larger \( M_w, f_{c2} \) saturates and \( \chi \) approaches zero. Such a tendency, as well as the difficulty of estimating \( f_{c2} \) from regional data at larger magnitudes, may partly explain the mentioned scatter of estimates of \( \chi \). The value \( \chi = 0.6 \) will be chosen as the preferred point estimate, with the assumed range of scatter (0.45–0.75). It corresponds to magnitudes \( M_w \leq 7.5 \). For larger magnitudes, as one can derive from Denolle & Shearer (2016), ruptures seem to be definitely confined in width; thus, it is hardly adequate to confront their observed trends to the present results of simulation of unbounded propagation of rupture. On the basis of the mentioned simulation results of G14, the estimates of \( \chi \) will be treated as estimates of \( \lambda \).