High-resolution relocation and mechanism of aftershocks of the 2007 Tocopilla (Chile) earthquake
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SUMMARY
We study the distribution of the aftershocks of Tocopilla Mw 7.7 earthquake of 2007 November 14 in northern Chile in detail. This earthquake broke the lower part of the seismogenic zone at the southern end of the Northern Chile gap, a region that had its last megathrust earthquake in 1877. The aftershocks of Tocopilla occurred in several steps: the first day they were located along the coast inside the co-seismic rupture zone. After the second day they extended ocean-wards near the Mejillones peninsula. Finally in December they concentrated in the South near the future rupture zone of the Michilla intermediate depth earthquake of 2007 December 16. The aftershock sequence was recorded by the permanent IPOC (Integrated Plate Boundary Observatory in Chile) network and the temporary task force network installed 2 weeks after the main event. A total of 1238 events were identified and the seismic arrival times were directly read from seismograms. Initially we located these events using a single event procedure and then we relocated them using the double-difference method and a cross-correlation technique to measure time differences for clusters of aftershocks. We tested a 1-D velocity model and a 2-D one that takes into account the presence of the subducted Nazca Plate. Relocation significantly reduced the width of the aftershock distribution: in the inland area, the plate interface imaged by the aftershocks is thinner than 2 km. The two velocity models give similar results for earthquakes under the coast and a larger difference for events closer to the trench. The surface imaged by the aftershocks had a length of 160 km. It extends from 30 to 50 km depth in the northern part of the rupture zone; and between 5 and 55 km depth near the Mejillones peninsula. We observed a change in the dip angle of the subduction interface from 18° to 24° at a depth of 30 km. We propose that this change in dip is closely associated with the upper limit of the rupture zone of the main event. We also studied the focal mechanisms of the aftershocks, most of them were thrust events like the mainshock. As the aftershock activity was significantly reduced, on 2007 December 13, an Ml 6.1 event occurred offshore of the Mejillones peninsula reactivating the seismicity. Three days later the Michilla intraslab earthquake of Mw 6.8 ruptured an almost vertical fault with slab-push mechanism. The aftershocks locations of this event define a planar zone about 11 km in depth, situated right below the subduction interface.
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1 INTRODUCTION
Northern Chile seismicity is dominated by the subduction of the Nazca Plate beneath South America. Subduction in Chile generates a large number of destructive earthquakes and tsunamis, like the recent Maule (Mw 8.8) earthquake of 2010 February 27 (Vigny et al. 2011) and the Valdivia megathrust earthquake of 1960 May 23 of magnitude Mw 9.5 (Kanamori & Cipar 1974; Cifuentes 1989). In an attempt to understand the occurrence of large earthquakes in the Chilean subduction zone several seismic gaps were identified in the 1970s and 1980s by Lomnitz (1971), Kelleher et al. (1973) and Compte et al. (1986). Gaps were defined as region that has not had a large earthquake in a long time, generally more than 50 yr for Chile. The geographical distribution and the extension of those gaps were based on historical descriptions mainly based on the work by Montessus de Ballore (1911–1916) and are therefore affected by large uncertainties. The availability of new seismic and geodetic data has recently helped to identify more precisely the seismic gaps and their boundaries (Ruegg et al. 2009; Madariaga et al. 2010).
et al. 2004) show that the Mejillones peninsula stopped the rupture transferring stresses into the southern part of the 1877 gap. In 2007, the Tocopilla earthquake of magnitude $M_w 7.7$ broke approximately 20 per cent of the Northern Chile gap releasing only a small amount of the accumulated stresses (Delouis et al. 2009; Béjar-Pizarro et al. 2010; Motagh et al. 2010; Peyrat et al. 2010). As shown in Fig. 1, in the area situated immediately in the North of Tocopilla an $M_w 7.4$ event occurred on 1967 December 21, studied by Malgrange & Madariaga (1983).

In the present paper, we study the aftershocks that followed the 2007 Tocopilla earthquake using 34 d of continuous recordings acquired by the IPOC network and by the German task force (TF) for earthquakes deployed 15 d after the mainshock (Sobiesiak et al. 2008) in the vicinity of the Mejillones peninsula. Because of the excellent quality of the available data we were able to perform a comprehensive analysis including event identification, accurate location, magnitude estimation and the determination of focal mechanisms. Our aim is to determine the aftershock area activated by the Tocopilla earthquake in order to study the following questions: what were the up and down dip limits of the rupture? Can these seismic observations define the subducted plate geometry? Did the Tocopilla earthquake activate upper-plate structures? And which are the focal mechanisms that played the main role in the broken area?

2 THE TOCOPILLA EARTHQUAKE

On 2007 November 14 the Tocopilla earthquake of magnitude $M_w 7.7$ (Delouis et al. 2009; Peyrat et al. 2010) broke the southern part of the Northern Chile gap. The slip distribution of this earthquake, shown in Fig. 2, was obtained by kinematic inversion of the source (Peyrat et al. 2010) using far and near field data. The slip distribution was composed of two main patches: the rupture started in the northern patch and propagated towards the south breaking a second patch that covers an area close to the ocean and stopped at the Mejillones peninsula. The results of seismic inversion were confirmed by interferometric synthetic aperture radar (InSAR) and global positioning system (GPS) observations (Béjar-Pizarro et al. 2010; Motagh et al. 2010; Schurr et al. 2012). The joint inversion of these geodetic data shows that the Tocopilla earthquake broke the subduction interface between 30 and 50 km depth. This observation is in agreement with the aftershock distribution of the first 24 hr following the Tocopilla earthquake (Delouis et al. 2009; Motagh et al. 2010; Schurr et al. 2012).

Two important aftershocks of $M_w 6.8$ and $M_w 6.3$ occurred on 15 November 2007, almost 24 hr after the mainshock, off-shore the Mejillones peninsula (Peyrat et al. 2010; Schurr et al. 2012). Both are thrust events with the same mechanism as the Tocopilla earthquake. In the same zone we identified five events of magnitude $M_w$ larger than 6 that occurred during the first week after the Tocopilla earthquake (Lancieri et al. 2012; Schurr et al. 2012) (see Fig. 2).

Seismic activity after November 15 occurred mainly offshore to the north of the Mejillones peninsula until a strong intraslab event of $M_w 6.8$ occurred at the bottom of the seismogenic interface on 2007 December 16. This event, the Michilla earthquake, was situated inside the Nazca Plate at 46 km of depth, 5 km below the subduction interface. The Michilla earthquake and its main aftershocks had a slab-push mechanism characterized by an along the slab compression. This event had an almost vertical main rupture plane (Peyrat et al. 2010; Ruiz & Madariaga 2011). As discussed by Lemoine et al. (2002) and Gardi et al. (2006) this kind of earthquake has also been observed after other strong thrust events in Chile, Peru and Mexico and their origin is still a matter of debate.
seismograms and the coda of the events raises the level of background noise. We chose to use the Filter Picker detection algorithm of Lomax et al. (2012), which is an extension of the Allen (1978) and Baer & Kradolfer (1987) methods. It is specifically designed to operate on continuous, real-time (but in this case we had off-line data), broadband signals so as to avoid excessive triggering during large events. We set the threshold parameters of Filter Picker so that it could detect as many of the events of $M_s$ larger than 2 as possible.

The association procedure (binding) analyses the $P$ wave arrival times at every station to determine whether they are compatible with propagation across the network from a common source (Lancieri et al. 2011). This technique is based on the coincidence of a minimum of five picks within a given time window. We then automatically cut windows of 3 min (60 s before and 120 s after the $P$ phase) around each of the events that were identified. During the first 2 weeks, when only the IPOC network was available, we were not able to locate all the detected events; this is due to the high seismic activity and the large distance between the stations, the recorded $P$ phase were often hidden by the $S$ phase or the coda of the previous events. After the TF installation the distance between stations was reduced, improving the detection capacity. Thanks to the stations located on the Mejillones peninsula the offshore events were also better located.

In order to obtain the best possible locations, we manually determined the arrival time of $P$ and $S$ phases on the seismic traces using the seismic analysis code (SAC) of Goldstein et al. (2003). We also read the $P$-phase polarities to determine focal mechanisms. Overall we located 1238 events, 500 from November 14 to 28 when only the IPOC network was available, and 738 from November 29 to December 17 after the deployment of the TF network (see Table 1).

### 3 Seismological Data

The Tocopilla aftershocks were locally recorded by the IPOC and TF networks in the North of Chile (Fig. 2). The IPOC network was installed in 2006 thanks to an agreement between the International Laboratory Montessus de Ballolle (LIA) and the German Research Centre for Geosciences (GFZ) with the aim of monitoring the seismic gap of northern Chile. The IPOC network was composed of 12 stations equipped with broadband seismometers (STS-2) and accelerometers (GMG-5 and Episensor FBA ES-T), spanning the northern Chile gap with an inter-station distance of 80 km. The network was operational in 2007 November when the main event and the entire aftershock sequence were recorded at the seven southernmost stations (Fig. 2). The PB04 station was located right above the hypocentre of the main event and station PB05 was situated above the Michilla slab-push event of 2007 December 16. The IPOC network has been continuously improved and is currently operational in Northern Chile. In order to understand the activity of the southern part of the rupture, from 2007 November 29 a temporary network TF was deployed around the Mejillones peninsula (Sobiesiak et al. 2008). The network was composed of 20 mostly short period instruments (LA-3D) recording continuously with a sampling rate of 100 Hz; the average distance between these stations was 15 km.

### 4 Aftershock Locations

#### 4.1 Event detection

Intense aftershock activity requires a sophisticated method for the identification of events because their records often overlap in the...
### Table 1. Summary of depth errors for the two velocity models used to locate the aftershocks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Located events</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>$M_w$ range</th>
<th>Error 1-D (km)</th>
<th>Error 2-D (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>IPOC</td>
<td>2007 November 14–2007 November 28</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$M_w$</td>
<td>[2.6–7.8]</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>IPOC + TF</td>
<td>2007 November 29–2007 December 15</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>$M_L$</td>
<td>[2.2–6.2]</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>IPOC + TF</td>
<td>2007 December 16–2007 December 17</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>$M_L$</td>
<td>[1.8–6.8]</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.** Hypocentral locations of the aftershocks of the Tocopilla earthquake of 2007 November 14 obtained with the Nonlinloc software. On the left-hand side, we plot the locations obtained with the 1-D velocity model proposed by Husen et al. (2000). On the right-hand side, the locations determined using the 2-D model proposed by Patzwahl et al. (1999). Above the plan views we show E–W cross-sections of the aftershocks. On (c) and (d), we plot the hypocentres determined in period I when only the IPOC network was available. (d) and (f) are the locations obtained when both the Task Force and IPOC network were operational.
Period I covers the first 2 weeks of aftershocks of the Tocopilla earthquake (cross-section on Figs 3c and d), when only seven IPOC network stations were available; period II extends from the TF installation until the occurrence of the Michilla earthquake on December 16 (20 additional stations); period III includes the Michilla earthquake and 2 d of its aftershocks. The events that occurred during periods II and III were located using both the TF and IPOC networks and are shown by the cross-sections of Figs 3(e) and (f).

The solutions obtained for the first period using each of the two velocity models provide a clear image of the subduction interface. The events located offshore and in the southern area show a certain dispersion due to poor azimuthal coverage by the IPOC network. The 2-D model produced locations that were less scattered compared to those obtained with the 1-D model but both have large errors in depth. For periods II and III, after the installation of the temporary TF network, the dispersion of hypocentre distribution was significantly reduced (Figs 3e and f). The hypocentres obtained from the 1-D model (Fig. 3e) are distributed along a thin surface with a dip angle that decreases as the events get closer to the trench. The distribution of aftershocks located using the 2-D model images a subduction interface that has a constant slope, so that the offshore events reach the surface about 10 km from the trench.

To determine which velocity model provides the best locations, we looked at the uncertainties of hypocentral depth. We focused on events that reach the surface about 10 km from the trench. The solutions obtained for the first period using each of the two velocity models provide a clear image of the subduction interface. The events located offshore and in the southern area show a certain dispersion due to poor azimuthal coverage by the IPOC network. The 2-D model produced locations that were less scattered compared to those obtained with the 1-D model but both have large errors in depth. For periods II and III, after the installation of the temporary TF network, the dispersion of hypocentre distribution was significantly reduced (Figs 3e and f). The hypocentres obtained from the 1-D model (Fig. 3e) are distributed along a thin surface with a dip angle that decreases as the events get closer to the trench. The distribution of aftershocks located using the 2-D model images a subduction interface that has a constant slope, so that the offshore events reach the surface about 10 km from the trench.

To determine which velocity model provides the best locations, we focused on depth because this is the parameter affected by the largest errors. Table 1 summarizes the depth errors computed from the covariance matrix derived for the two velocity models (Lomax et al. 2000).

As expected, the errors increase towards the trench for the two models (Fig. S2). During period I, the network geometry dominated the uncertainties, so that we were not able to decide which model produced better locations based on the formal errors. For period II (see Table 1), the errors in depth determination were improved with a mean value of 1.73 km for the 1-D model and 2.15 km for the 2-D model. Finally for period III, the errors were smaller because the Michilla earthquake and its aftershocks were located inland, just below the TF network. We obtained a mean error of 0.78 km for the 1-D and 1.20 km for the 2-D models. In conclusion, the 1-D model produce locations with smaller errors than the 2-D model, but the difference between them may not be very significant. The influence of the velocity model particularly on the depths of the off-shore events is significant and has to be kept in mind for the interpretations.

### 4.3 Double-difference relocation

In order to improve the location of clusters of repeating aftershocks, we used the double-difference (DD) relocation algorithm (Waldhauser & Ellsworth 2000). The DD method relates travel-time differences of pairs of nearby events recorded by the same instrument to their spatial separations and therefore cancels out the correlated errors arising from unmodelled structure along the segment of the path that they share. The DD method has been shown to be particularly effective if precise differential traveltimes are measured using waveform cross correlation. Cross correlation-based travelt ime differences are often an order of magnitude more precise than those derived from manually picked earthquake catalogues.

We focus our relocation analysis on periods II and III of the data set starting from 2007 November 29; these include the dense TF station network. Cross correlations for $P$-phases were computed from the vertical components after applying a 3-pole causal 1–10 Hz Butterworth bandpass filter for windows from 0.5 s before to 1.5 s after the $P$-wave pick. For $S$ phases horizontal components were windowed from 1.0 s before to 2.0 s after the $S$-wave pick. For $S$ phases the same frequency filter as for $P$ phases was used and in addition traces were integrated to displacement because we found that this enhanced the $S$ signal. For the $S$ phase windows, we stacked the cross-correlation function of the two horizontal components and obtained the lag time and correlation coefficient from the maximum amplitude of the stack. Lag times with a correlation coefficient $>0.7$ were saved for the relocation, using the correlation coefficient as a weight for the hypocentre inversion. We calculated the cross-correlation function for event pairs with a maximum epicentral separation of 15 km. This procedure yielded 27 117 cross correlation $P$ lag time measurements and 29 198 cross correlation $S$ lag time measurements. The event separation threshold was incrementally reduced to 5 km during the relocation procedure. As velocity model we used the 1-D model of Husen et al. (1999).

Fig. 4 shows the location obtained after the DD relocation. The northern aftershocks were located on an elongated zone that extends between 30 and 50 km depth (Fig. 4a). The aftershock zone is much larger in the southern part as shown in Figs 4(b) and (c), where the events were distributed between 5 and 55 km depth. In this area, a change in the dip angle of the aftershock distribution is clearly observed in the cross-section of Fig. 4(b). This change in dip angle from 18° to 24° occurs at a depth of 30 km under the coastline. The DD relocations reduce the width of the aftershock distribution to a thin layer about 2 km of thickness that we identify as the subduction interface. A comparison between locations before and after DD relocation is presented in Fig. S3 of the supplementary material. In Fig. 5 we show a zoom on the aftershock locations pointing out some interesting features.

### 5 CHARACTERIZATION OF SEISMICITY

#### 5.1 Magnitude estimation

Once we built a catalog of aftershocks, we computed local magnitudes and focal mechanisms. For the first period of data, Period I in Table 1, a moment magnitude catalogue ($M_w$) was computed using the Brune (1970) spectral analysis of ground acceleration waveforms (Lancieri et al. 2011). That technique could not be applied to the second period because the TF network had only short period instruments. Many events of this second period were recorded at only two IPOC stations. For period II and III, when the largest number of stations was available, we evaluated the local magnitude using the Kanamori & Jennings (1978) procedure. This local magnitude ($M_l$) is defined as the logarithm of the maximum displacement measured by a Wood–Anderson torsion seismograph at an epicentral distance of 100 km (Richter 1935):

$$M_l = \log A + \log A_0$$

where $A$ is one half the peak-to-peak displacement $A_{max}$ weighted by distance $R$ by the relation: $A = A_{max} \times R/100$. $A_0$ is the reference amplitude $\log A_0(R = 100 \text{ km}) = -3$.

For all the short-period seismograms the mean value and linear trend was removed before processing the data. The signals were deconvolved from instrumental response and re-convolved with the response of a Wood–Anderson instrument. We determined the maximum amplitude of the S wave on the horizontal components and corrected for the epicentral distance to evaluate the local magnitude.
Figure 4. Joint double-difference relocations applied to event pairs with a maximum epicentral separation of 15 km and waveform cross-correlation coefficients $>0.7$. On the left-hand side, we show the N–S vertical cross-section of the relocated events for all the sequence. In the centre, we plot their geographical distribution, plotting with red the relocated events that occurred during the first 2 weeks and in blue those that took place after the TF installation. The E–W cross-sections (at the right-hand side) are plotted only for the second period because of their much better resolution. The aftershocks extend between 30 and 50 km depth in the northern area (a) and between 5 and 55 km (b and c) depth in the Mejillones peninsula zone. A dip change from 18° to 24° is observed under the coastline at a depth of 30 km.

at each station. Finally, for each event we took the average of all stations following the procedure proposed by Bobbio et al. (2009).

Fig. S4 of the supplementary material shows the number of events as a function of local magnitude interval for the three periods defined in Table 1. The first period had the broader range of magnitudes with several strong events: six events of magnitude larger than 6, and 33 larger than 5. Unfortunately, the geometry of the network did not permit us to locate smaller events, especially in the southern and offshore areas where the activity was the strongest. This situation improved with the installation of the TF network, but this period was less active with only one event with magnitude $M_L$ larger than 6, and six events of $M_L$ larger than 5. The third period corresponds mainly to the aftershocks of the Michilla earthquake. In this period, we had a very good azimuthal coverage necessary to locate a large number of events, including those events with smaller magnitudes. The $b$-value of the Gutenberg–Richter law was computed for the periods I, II and III. Its value was close to 1 for the ranges [3.6–6], [3–5] and [3–5], respectively (see Fig. S4).

With the goal of standardizing the two catalogues of magnitude obtained for the two different geometries, we had to study the lower magnitude thresholds. For magnitudes larger than 3 the effect of changing the network on aftershock location was very strong. On the other hand, if we choose a cut off magnitude of 4, the number of events that appear in both catalogues becomes very small. For this reason we made the space–time analysis in Section 6 using only local magnitudes $M_L$ greater than 3.5.

5.2 Focal mechanisms

We determined the focal mechanism of the aftershocks from the first motions of $P$ waves read directly from the seismograms that were used for the aftershock location in the previous sections. The FPFIT software (Reasenberg et al. 1985) was used to compute the focal mechanisms of the events having more than six polarity readings. We read the polarities from the vertical seismograms at each station and weighted it based on the signal to noise ratio. Using the incidence angles obtained from our locations, we determined the focal mechanisms for epicentral distances less than 110 km. This distance corresponds to the critical distance of the Pn phase arrival. For period I, the number of readings and the distance between stations was not enough to define robust fault plane solutions. For this reason we determined only the mechanisms of the events that occurred after the TF network installation. Mechanisms for period I were determined by Schurr et al. (2012) using moment tensors determined from wave form modelling at regional distances.

We obtained 231 mechanisms in period II, before the Michilla earthquake, with well resolved solutions, meaning errors of less than 30° in strike, dip and rake (Fig. 6). Most of them are thrust events just as the Tocopilla mainshock, and a significant part of them were located offshore. Unfortunately, in the offshore area the azimuthal coverage is less good so that the mechanisms are less well resolved. Inland, in the deeper seismogenic zone we observe a larger variability in the focal mechanism, including a few along-slab
tensional mechanisms (slab-pull) such as the $M_L 4.6$ event of 2007 December 15 (Fig. 6). A short sequence of aftershocks started with the $M_L 6.1$ thrust event of 2007 December 13; this event triggered several $M_L 5$ events for which we could determine their mechanisms. The rose diagram in Fig. 7 summarizes the fault angles computed for events with dip errors less than 20°. We observe that most of the events had dips between 15° and 30°. We see no evidence of non-thrust events in our catalogue as those found by Schurr et al. (2012) at shallow depths in the upper plate; those events occurred during the first week of aftershocks when the TF was not yet in operation.

The focal mechanism of the Michilla earthquake (in red in Fig. 7) had an along the slab compression mechanism (slab-push). As shown in the figure this event occurred on an almost vertical plane inside the Nazca Plate at 46 km depth. Its aftershocks (plotted in red) and foreshocks (in blue) are shown in Fig. 8. The foreshocks occurred during the 2 weeks that preceded the Michilla event and had moderate magnitude ($M_L \approx 3$) with a similar slab-push mechanism to Michilla event. In the rose diagram presented as an inset in Fig. 7 we observe that almost all the aftershocks had a rake angle close to 90°. We observe that the main aftershocks had a rake angle close to 80° similar to that of the slab-push Michilla earthquake, and a second dip angle close to 25° that is typical of the thrust events of the main Tocopilla event. Thus inside the aftershock zone of the Michilla earthquake most events have the same mechanism as the slab-push event, but there are still a few shallow dip slip thrust events. They can be seen in Fig. S4.

6 SPACE–TIME DISTRIBUTION

The aftershock sequence of the Tocopilla earthquake is characterized by three main zones of activity: the area broken by the mainshock located inland; a strong activity off the Mejillones peninsula and the fore- and aftershock sequence of Michilla event. The temporal evolution of the events including their magnitude are shown separately for the two areas in Fig. 8: inland (plotted in red) and offshore (blue).

For the events located inland the activity started with the main Tocopilla event shown with a large star and its aftershocks were of moderate magnitude. Two patches of seismicity are highlighted: the events associated with the mainshock rupture area and the seismicity that was triggered offshore of the Mejillones peninsula producing two events of $M_w 6.8$ and another one of $M_w 6.3$ are indicated with the left-hand arrow. Seismicity remained high during the first week, with several events of magnitude greater than 6. It was reactivated several times and eventually became quieter during the second and third week of aftershocks. Finally, the offshore area was reactivated by the $M_L 6.1$ event that occurred on 2007 December 13. Some events migrated to the deeper parts of the seismogenic zone during the 3 d that preceded the Michilla earthquake of 2007 December 16.

7 DISCUSSION

The 2007, Tocopilla earthquake is one of the best instrumented earthquakes in Chile. Thanks to the IPOC network installed before the earthquake, we were able to study the principal features of the mainshock and its larger aftershocks (Peyrat et al. 2010; Schurr et al. 2012). Northern Chile offers ideal conditions for the study of seismicity because site effects are very limited and attenuation is low as discussed by Lancieri et al. (2012). In the 2 weeks that followed the main event, most of the aftershocks occurred offshore and in the southern part of the main rupture, where there were fewer
stations installed before the earthquake. For this reason, we were not able to locate all the events that were identified by the automatic event picking algorithm. This situation improved significantly once the TF network was installed. The quantity of instruments and its spatial distribution allowed us to better identify seismic arrivals and reduce the error of locations particularly of southern and offshore events.

The location of the aftershocks situated offshore of the Mejillones peninsula was significantly affected by the velocity model used for the determination of hypocentres (see Fig. 9). We tested two velocity models that had been proposed for the region by earlier studies. A 1-D model determined for the aftershocks of the 1995 Antofagasta earthquake by Husen et al. (1999), and a 2-D model obtained by Patzwahl et al. (1999) for a seismic profile at the latitude of Tocopilla. The main difference in the locations is in the depth distribution of offshore events: the locations obtained using the 1-D model define a surface that smoothly joins the trench. Locations obtained with the 2-D model, on the other hand, define a plane that intersects the seafloor 10 km inland from the trench. We think that the 1-D velocity performs better for this zone because the errors were smaller, nevertheless it is less realistic because it lacks the slab. Locations obtained with the 1-D model define a dip angle of the plate interface that is in very good agreement with previous studies of the seismicity in the vicinity of Antofagasta, that imaged a plate interface zone with dip angles in the range from $17^\circ$ to $18^\circ$ (Comte et al. 1994; Delouis et al. 1996).

Figure 6. Focal mechanism of the aftershocks of the period from 2007 November 29 and 2007 December 16 when the TF network was recording. The rose diagram in the upper right-hand side shows the dip angles of the fault planes which are clearly dominated by an angle of $18^\circ$. The events of magnitude larger than 4.5 are highlighted in black and events of smaller magnitude are shown in grey. The Michilla (slab-push) and the $M_L$ 6.1 event of 2007 December 13 epicentres are represented by stars.
Relocation using cross correlation of clusters of aftershocks significantly reduced the width of the seismogenic structures; aftershocks collapsed into a very thin surface of a thickness of about 2 km that we interpret as the shear zone located in the immediate vicinity of the plate interface. In Fig. 5, we zoom on the cross-section of Fig. 4(b). Three main features are evident: a shallow structure appears to detach from the subduction interface (Fig. 5a) in the offshore zone; in the region of the kink, shown in Fig. 5(b), we observe that the hypocentres do not delineate a single layer but a small branch appears near −70.5°. Finally, as shown in Fig. 5(c), the Michilla earthquake rupture zone is clearly delimited by its aftershocks that define an 11 km depth section situated immediately below the subduction interface.

The kink found from the 1-D locations across the Mejillones peninsula increases the dip angle by about 6 degrees as observed in Fig. 5. Unlike the study of Contreras-Reyes et al. (2012), the change in dip angle of our aftershock distribution is situated at 30 km depth, instead of 18 km as proposed by them. Our locations do not image an abrupt change of dip but rather a broad zone of about 10 km width in the E–W direction (see Fig. 5b). We observe the presence of a small seismicity branch inside the Nazca Plate right under the kink zone. The location of this change in dip corresponds to the upper limit of the aftershock distribution of the northern part of the Tocopilla earthquake. It is tempting to associate this kink with the arrest of the rupture, but other authors (Schurr et al. 2012) have suggested that the main event was stopped by a change in frictional properties of the plate interface. We have no data that is relevant to resolve these two hypotheses, although the change in frictional properties may be associated with the change in dip of the plate interface. To improve the geometry of the plate interface near the trench we would need ocean bottom instruments in order to resolve variations on the dip angle using the same localization methods.

In the inland zone, we did not find any evidence of activity at shallow depths, as could have been expected for some recent normal faults in the Mejillones peninsula plotted in Fig. 10 after (Armijo & Thiele 1990; Victor et al. 2011; Vargas et al. 2011). We observe a strong seismic activity under the Mejillones peninsula below these faults, but these events have depths of about 30 km, so that they are close to the plate interface. The only evidence of shallow seismicity is in the offshore area of the Mejillones peninsula: a cluster of aftershocks located in the upper plate that may be due to a possible splay fault (see Fig. 5a). As we have already discussed those events are not sufficiently well located because of the lack of ocean bottom instruments. Another interesting observation is the diagonal alignment of seismicity just north of Mejillones peninsula: a cluster of aftershocks located in the upper plate that may be due to a possible splay fault and could be interpreted as due the presence of fluids as was proposed by Nippress & Rietbrock (2007) for the aftershocks of the Antofagasta earthquake, but this hypothesis needs to be confirmed by other observations.

The focal mechanism of almost all well located events was thrust faulting, typical of subduction events. A significant part of these events was located offshore where fault plane solutions are not well constrained due to poor azimuthal coverage. For period I,
Figure 8. Migration of seismicity during the Tocopilla aftershocks of 2007. The catalogue is separated into inland (red) and offshore (blue) zones. On the right-hand side, we plot the space–time evolution of seismicity, the ordinate represents the latitude and the abscissa the time in days. The figure shows the patches of seismicity for the mainshock (the large yellow star in right-hand panel) in agreement with the slip distribution of Fig. 2. This main event triggered the offshore events (black arrow on the left-hand side). The Mejillones offshore seismicity (plotted in blue) remained active longer than the main rupture plotted in red. Activity decreased after the first 2 weeks to restart 3 d before the Michilla earthquake with a 6.1 thrust event that preceded the Michilla event (black arrow to the right-hand side). Events of $M_L > 6$ are shown with yellow stars.

Figure 9. The aftershock distribution of the 2007 Tocopilla earthquake superimposed on the velocity model recently proposed by Contreras-Reyes et al. (2012) for the latitude 22° S. Our locations are centred on the Mejillones peninsula. On the left-hand side, we plot the aftershock locations obtained with a 1-D layered velocity model proposed by Husen et al. (1999). On the right-hand side, locations determined using the 2-D model proposed by Patzwahl et al. (1999). The velocity model proposed by Contreras-Reyes et al. (2012) is well defined above the the dashed-line. The two aftershock distributions are very similar at depth, delineating the same planar zone situated near the top of the oceanic crust of the subducted Nazca Plate. At shallower depths, the locations differ significantly but we consider that these aftershocks were not well located because of the lack of ocean bottom instruments.

Schurr et al. (2012) found some normal fault mechanisms in the upper plate from waveform modelling, but we could not confirm their results because fault plane solution were not well constrained in the southern part of the aftershock sequence during the two first weeks. Although we looked carefully for shallow aftershocks in our data we could not find a single well located event in the region close to the coast. This is in stark contrast with the seismicity produced by the Maule $M_w$ 8.8 earthquake of 2010 February 27 whose
largest aftershock was an event that occurred on a shallow fault near Pichilemu (Farías et al. 2011). Although the aftershocks or the Maule earthquake have not been fully relocated yet, the studies by Lange et al. (2012) and Rietbrock et al. (2012) have reported many shallow and quite a few deep aftershocks. The rupture zone delineated by the aftershock distribution seems to be much wider in Maule than in Tocopilla. Part of the difference may simple be that a very large event like Maule necessarily breaks a broad zone of the plate interface and produces many aftershocks away from this seismogenic zone. In Tocopilla, we observe that the aftershocks occurred in a very thin zone at the contact between the Nazca and South American plates. It is possible that the localization of aftershocks in a narrow zone is very different for megathrust events and regular subduction events like Tocopilla.

The Michilla slab-push earthquake and its aftershocks occurred near the centre of the network so that their focal mechanisms are very well determined. The rupture zone of this event was an almost vertical, planar zone very well defined by the aftershocks. These slab-compression events have been observed several times in Chile (Astiz & Kanamori 1986; Lemoine et al. 2002; Gardi et al. 2006), but this is the first time that the rupture plane is so well delineated by the distribution of the aftershocks. The majority of these aftershocks had very similar mechanisms as those of the main event. They ruptured a compact zone of 14 km length by 11 km depth with the hypocentre situated in the centre. This rupture zone extends from the top of the megathrust seismogenic zone to a depth that is probably very close to the base of the oceanic crust. In Fig. 5, we compare our locations with the results of a receiver functions sections obtained by Sodoudi et al. (2011). This slab push earthquake occurred below the second patch of the mainshock and was very likely triggered by stress transfer from the main shock as discussed by Peyrat et al. (2010). It occurred 3 d after a reactivation of the aftershock seismicity offshore the Mejillones peninsula as observed in Fig. 8. This reactivation occurred when the aftershocks of the Tocopilla main event had significantly diminished. The Michilla earthquake had its own set of aftershocks and foreshocks that remained very close to the rupture zone of the earthquake at least during the 2 d that we studied. Of all slab-push events in Chile, the Punitaqui earthquake of 1997 October 15 (Lemoine et al. 2002; Gardi et al. 2006) is the most similar to Michilla, at least in size and position with respect to the transition zone in Chile. As for Michilla, the Punitaqui earthquake was preceded by a series of thrust events near the centre of the seismogenic zone on the plate interface. Those events, however, occurred as a swarm in 1997 July at a distance of more than 50 km from the Punitaqui hypocentre. For both events we claim that stress reduction on the plate interface loaded the region near the tip of the transition zone, where slip occurs continuously, triggering these slab push earthquakes inside the subducted Nazca Plate.

8 CONCLUSIONS

We studied the aftershock distribution of the 2007, 7.7 Tocopilla earthquake of Northern Chile. We used data from a sparse permanent network of stations (IPOC) and a dense temporary array (TF) to locate the aftershocks, determine their magnitude and identify their mechanisms. The aftershocks define an activated zone of about 160 km of length in north-south direction by 25 km of width in the northern area near the down-dip limit of the seismogenic zone, and a broad zone in the southern part of the rupture of about 50 km of large. Using P and S phases individually read from seismograms and a double-difference method, we could significantly improve the locations. We found that the aftershocks of the Tocopilla earthquake are distributed on a very narrow seismogenic zone at the interface between the Nazca and South American plates. The vertical cross-section of the seismicity depends significantly on the velocity model used for the locations. The simpler 1-D model produces a curved interface that smoothly reaches the trench, while a 2-D velocity model derived from a local seismic experiment produces a seismogenic interface that intersects the surface far from the trench. We can not resolve the differences between these two velocity models because the off-shore locations are less accurate than the inland ones. To improve the quality of the offshore locations and better image the geometry of the slab we would have required ocean bottom instruments. Our study confirms the previous work by Peyrat et al. (2010); Béjar-Pizarro et al. (2010) who proposed that the Tocopilla earthquake broke the bottom of the plate interface, just above the transition zone. The plate interface in the Tocopilla region did not have a large earthquake in at least 135 yr since the great Iquique earthquake of 1977. A possible scenario is that the rupture of the bottom part of the seismogenic zone may have increased the risk of a future tsunamigenic earthquake that will break the entire plate interface. We cannot exclude however an alternative scenario in which a series of earthquakes of magnitude close to 8 may occur along the coast of the northern Chile gap delaying the occurrence of a very large megathrust earthquake. Future observations will permit us to decide which of these two scenarios is more likely in Northern Chile.

Figure 10. 1-D Locations in the Mejillones peninsula zone. This peninsula has well-known geological structures plotted on the map (Armijo & Thiele 1990). We did not find any shallow aftershocks associated with these structures.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was carried out under the Montessus de Ballore International Laboratory established by the University of Chile and the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) in France. This work was supported by FONDECYT No. 1100429 in Chile and by ANR project S4 in France. AF was supported by a fellowship from AXA. We thank the many researchers in Chile, Germany and France that have installed and maintained seismic networks in Northern Chile, in particular GFZ that makes the IROP data openly available from the GEOFOH website. We deeply thank Sergio Ruiz and Claudio Satriano for numerous discussions. The manuscript was improved thanks to the constructive comments of the editor and two anonymous referees. We used the Generic Mapping Tool (http://gmt.soest.hawaii.edu/) to prepare many of the figures.

REFERENCES

Kausel, E., 1986. Los terremotos de agosto de 1868 y mayo de 1877 que afectaron el sur del perú y norte de chile, Boletín de la Academia Chilena de Ciencias, 3, 8–14.


Vargas, G., Palacios, C., Reich, M., Luo, S., Shen, C.-C., González, G. & Wu, Y.-C., 2011. U-series dating of co-seismic gypsum and submarine paleoseismology of active faults in northern Chile (23 s), *Tectonophysics*, 497(1), 34–44.


**Supporting Information**

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

**Figure S1.** P-wave velocity model used for the location of the 2007 Tocopilla aftershocks.

**Figure S2.** Error distribution of aftershock locations of the 2007 Tocopilla earthquake.

**Figure S3.** Aftershocks of the 2007 Tocopilla earthquake.

**Figure S4.** Determination of the Gutenberg–Richter law for the Tocopilla aftershocks.

**Figure S5.** Zoom on the aftershock zone of the 2007 December 16 Michilla earthquake (http://gji.oxfordjournals.org/lookup/ suppl/doi:10.1093/gji/ggt163/-/DC1).

Please note: Oxford University Press is not responsible for the content or functionality of any supporting materials supplied by the authors. Any queries (other than missing material) should be directed to the corresponding author for the article.