Observation and scaling of microearthquakes from the Taiwan Chelungpu-fault borehole seismometers
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SUMMARY
Microearthquakes with magnitude down to 0.3 were detected by the Taiwan Chelungpu-fault Drilling Project Borehole Seismometers (TCDPBHS). Despite the large coseismic slip of 12 m at the drill site during the 1999 Chi–Chi earthquake, our studies show very little seismicity near the TCDPBHS drill site 6 yr after the Chi–Chi main shock. The microearthquakes clustered at a depth of 9–12 km, where the Chelungpu thrust fault turns from a 30$^\circ$ dipping into the horizontal decollement of the Taiwan fold-and-thrust tectonic structure. Continuous GPS surveys did not observe post-slip deformation at the larger slip region and no seismicity was observed near the drill site. Therefore we suggest that the thrust belt above the decollement is locked during this interseismic period. We further investigated source parameters of 242 microearthquakes by fitting $\omega^{-2}$-shaped Brune source spectra to our observation data using a frequency-independent $Q$ model. We find that the static stress drop increases significantly with increasing seismic moment. However, due to the intense debate on this topic of scaling-relations and the related self-similarity of earthquakes, we further improve the data analysis and correct for path and site effects using the Projected Landweber Deconvolution (PLD) method for events within some clusters. The PLD method analyzes the source time functions of the larger and the smaller event by an iterative technique. As a result we received source dimensions and stress drops of larger events including path and site effect corrections. The results from the PLD method are less scattered and also show a positive relation between static stress drop and seismic moment. We find a similar positive trend for the apparent stress scaling with seismic moment.
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1 INTRODUCTION
The Taiwan Chelungpu drilling project (TCDP) drilled a 2-km-deep hole (hole A) through the major slip zone at 1111 m of the 1999 Chi–Chi earthquake ($M_w$ 7.6) in 2004. A seven-level vertical borehole seismic array (TCDPBHS) was installed in hole A covering the depth from 946 to 1274 m with 50–60-m depth intervals (Fig. 1) in 2006 July. For this layout, three seismometers were placed in the hanging wall and footwall, respectively. The forth one is located at the depth of 1110.28 m, close to the identified major slip zone (Ma et al. 2006) with coseismic slip of about 12 m. In addition, a surface short period seismic network with 10 stations was deployed in a radius of about 5 km around TCDP drill site between 2006 August and 2007 September, to better constrain microearthquake locations. Borehole installations with linear array configuration have been used to investigate seismically active fault zones (Daley & McEvilly 1990; Abercrombie 1995; Nishigami et al. 2001; Oye et al. 2004; Oye & Ellsworth 2005). Most of these studies, determined accurate microearthquake locations by combining surface network and borehole array records and thereby identified the seismic activity within the fault zone (Jost et al. 1998; Tadokoro et al. 2000; Thurber et al. 2003; Ake et al. 2005). For events that are too small to be detected by surface networks, an alternative useful method is to use solely borehole stations and include information on polarization analysis in the inversion method (Abercrombie 1995; Oye & Roth 2003). In this study, we use observations of our near fault-zone TCDPBHS to investigate the seismic activity of a recently ruptured slip zone of the Chelungpu-fault and we try to draw some implications for the seismotectonics. In addition to that, source parameters such as magnitude, rupture dimension, stress drop, radiated energy and apparent stress were determined for these microearthquakes. Their results contribute to the compilation of earthquake scaling relationships and to the understanding of the dynamics of earthquakes.

The scaling relation of stress drop and apparent stress with seismic moment or earthquake size has been and still is debated in seismology. The scaling of static stress drop, which is defined as...
the seismic moment divided by the cube of the source dimension (Eshelby 1957), provides the kinematic behaviour between small and large earthquakes. Apparent stress, which is proportional to the ratio of radiated energy and seismic moment, indicates the radiated energy released per unit fault area and unit slip. According to the energy budget of the earthquake process, a lower radiated energy release within a unit area would indicate that more energy is spent to create the fracture or is dissipated as heat and less energy is available to be radiated as seismic energy. The scaling in apparent stress to seismic moment indicates this dynamic property of earthquakes (Kanamori & Brodsky 2004). Several studies (Gibowicz et al. 1991; Kanamori et al. 1993; Singh & Ordaz 1994; Mayeda & Walter 1996; Mori et al. 2003; Ide et al. 2004; Oye et al. 2005; Yamada et al. 2007; Mayeda & Malagnini 2009) had made some effort in determination of the scaling relationship in either static stress drop or apparent stress to the seismic moment using different sets of data, especially borehole data from various regions to contribute to the observation of small earthquakes (Abercrombie 1995; Ide et al. 2003; Imanishi et al. 2004; Stork & Ito 2004; Venkataraman et al. 2006). The source parameters of earthquakes are often determined through the spectral analysis for an \( \omega^{-2} \) model and a frequency-independent attenuation (Gibowicz et al. 1991; Kanamori et al. 1993; Singh & Ordaz 1994; Abercrombie 1995; Mayeda & Walter 1996; Stork & Ito 2004; Yamada et al. 2007). Abercrombie (1995) analysed the microearthquakes from deep borehole recordings at 2.5 km depth in the Cajon Pass, California and concluded that the significant positive relation in stress drop scaling and apparent stress increases with earthquake size for events smaller than \( M \geq 3 \). However, Yamada et al. (2007) concluded constant stress drop and constant apparent stress scaling using spectral analysis for events of size \( M \leq 0 \) to \( M \geq 1 \) from African gold mine records. Another argument in this context is that the influence of attenuation is generally described by a constant, frequency-independent \( Q \). This assumption is not always valid because \( Q \) may be frequency-dependent (Ide et al. 2003, 2004; Stork & Ito 2004; Oye et al. 2005) and might in particular have a strong influence on small events. Consequently, several studies suggested to use empirical Green’s functions (eGf) to remove the influence of path effects, such as attenuation in the spectral analysis (Ide et al. 2003, 2004; Mori et al. 2003; Oye et al. 2005; 2006; Venkataraman et al. 2006; Mayeda & Malagnini 2009). Ide et al. (2003) made a comparison between the standard spectral fitting approach and the eGf analysis using records from the Long Valley Exploratory Well at 2 km depth. They found that the positive trend of stress drop and apparent stress scaling turned into a constant, when using the eGf method. They also suggested that the spectral fitting analysis with frequency-independent \( Q \) may systematically underestimate the corner frequency and therefore an artificial positive trend might be obtained in the scaling-relations. However, Ide et al. (2004) also analysed aftershocks of western Tottori earthquakes and there they found a significant scaling of apparent stress with seismic moment. They suggested that complexities in the source model or frequency-bandwidth limitation might explain this scaling behaviour. Similarly, Abercrombie & Rice (2005) made an analysis of clusters from the Cajon Pass borehole records by spectral fitting and eGf methods. Both results show some tendency for increasing stress drop and increasing apparent stress with increasing moment. In a further study by Stork & Ito (2004), path effects were eliminated by a frequency-dependent \( Q \) assumption, though they still concluded with an increase in apparent stress with increasing moment. Some arguments are concerned with limitations in the bandwidth of seismic records as the concern of \( \omega_{max} \) of Hanks (1982), mainly due to a limited upper sampling rate. The seismic energy is calculated from the velocity spectra and because over 80 per cent of the total energy is carried by frequencies that are larger than the corner frequency, the energy is generally underestimated for small magnitude events with high corner frequencies (Ide & Beroza 2001). Therefore, not correcting for a potential loss of energy at the high frequencies may provide an artificial trend to the scaling relations (Boore 1986; Bona & Rovelli 1998; Singh & Ordaz 1994; Hough 1996). In view of all the debates over the issue on scaling of static stress drop and apparent stress to seismic moments, we contribute to this compilation with our observations from a 1.3-km-deep vertical borehole seismic array in the Taiwan Chelungpu-fault.

2 THE TCDP BOREHOLE SEISMOMETER AND OBSERVATIONS

The TCDPBHS is a seven-level vertical borehole seismic array covering the depth from 946 to 1274 m with 50–60-m-depth intervals (Fig. 1), which was installed in the zone of maximum coseismic slip mapped from the coseismic slip distribution of Ji et al. (2001) during the 1999 Chi–Chi earthquake in 2006 July. The sensors are velocity-type short period seismometers with Galperin deployment (IESE, NZ). The natural frequency of TCDPBHS sensors is near 4.5 Hz with the damping of about 29 per cent. The sensitivity approaches to the level of 1.6 V cm\(^{-1}\) s\(^{-1}\). Since 2006 November, the deployment was successfully monitoring microearthquake activities near the Chelungpu-fault in continuous recording mode. From the start on the sampling rate was set to 1000 Hz and since 2008 January decreased to 200 Hz. The removal of instrument response, correction of the Galperin angle and the orientation of the three-component sensors were carried out systematically before the analysis of waveforms.

To assure the quality of the data, all continuous data of the first half year were investigated visually and events were classified into different groups. Events associated with downgoing waves along the vertical borehole geophones were considered to be human activity related and were therefore discarded. Events with clear \( P \) and
$S$ waves were further classified with respect to the mean travelt ime difference between $S$- and $P$-wave arrivals ($\Delta t_{sp}$). In this study, we focused on the events with the $\Delta t_{sp}$ of less than 2.0 s to investigate the fault zone related events. After visual inspection of the first half year of continuous data, we developed semi-auto-picking techniques to increase the efficiency on the event identification. The semi-auto-picking technique considered the ratio of short-term average amplit udes (STA) and long-term average amplitudes (LTA) for $P$-phase picking. To confirm that upgoing waves are real microearthquakes, we calculated cross-correlation coefficients and delay times of $P$ phases between the seven-level borehole seismometers. In the next step we picked the $S$ wave manually to further select only events with $\Delta t_{sp} < 2.0$ s. The comparison of the local events we obtained between the semi-auto-picking and the visualized picking for the first half a year data reached about 90 per cent accuracy.

During 14 months of continuous recording, 13 232 seismic events were classified, including regional and teleseismic events. Among them, 2780 events have $\Delta t_{sp} < 2.0$ s and we call these from now on ‘local events’. In average, about seven to eight local events were detected daily by the TCDPBHS. Fig. 2 shows the temporal distribution of the seismicity recorded by the TCDPBHS, indicating the events with $\Delta t_{sp} < 2.0$ s. Due to the site construction, the noise level in high frequency increased after 2007 July 4, but with less influence to the identification of $\Delta t_{sp} < 2.0$ s. Comparing the amount of microearthquakes detected by TCDPBHS and CWBSN, the result indicates that TCDPBHS has much lower detection threshold for microearthquakes in the volume of interest. This is mainly due to the low noise level in the borehole and absence of high attenuation in the uppermost few hundred meters of the crust. The site is also far away from human activities. Fig. 3 shows a histogram of events with $\Delta t_{sp} < 6.0$ s, which indicates that a zone of high seismicity exists with $\Delta t_{sp}$ 1.0–2.0 s. Only few events occurred with $\Delta t_{sp}$ smaller than 1.0 s.

To examine the TCDPBHS capability, we made the synthetic signal-to-noise ratio (S/N) to the function of distance and magnitude to examine the detection limit of the TCDPBHS at the distance for a given magnitude. For a given magnitude, we constructed the corresponding velocity spectra by considering Brune’s $\omega^{-1}$ model for a certain distance and $r'$, where an attenuation factor, $Q'$, of 166 (Wang et al. 2012) was considered. The maximum amplitudes of the obtained velocity spectra were then divided by the average noise level of TCDPBHS as of $5.24 \times 10^{-6}$ cm s$^{-1}$ to obtain the synthetic S/N as function of distance to the magnitudes as shown in Fig. 4 curves. If we consider the S/N of 1.5 as the threshold for signal detection, the intersections of the S/N = 1.5 to the curves represented in Fig. 4 indicate the TCDPBHS detection capability to the distance and magnitude. However, since the synthetic S/N was made for a smooth spectrum curve, the capability we received could be considered as a lower bound of TCDPBHS capability. The result indicates that the limitation of microearthquake detection of TCDPBHS approaches $M_w = 0.5$ for the events within the distance of 1 km, which shows an improvement of the TCDPBHS to the magnitude completeness, $M_C$, compared to the regular surface network of CWBSN with $M_C$ of $M_w = 2.0$ (Ma et al. 2005).

2.1 Microearthquake locations and seismicity in the Chelungpu-fault near the TCDPBHS

The locations of the local events were determined with a directed grid-search inversion similar to the method as described in Oye & Roth (2003). The input parameters for the inversion only consist of $S$-$P$ arrival time measurements ($\Delta t_{sp}$) and the direction of the incoming wavefield, that is, azimuth and incidence angles derived from $P$-wave polarization analysis. Using only travelt ime
differences instead of absolute traveltimes stabilizes the inversion method, which only inverts for the hypocentre location, whereas the origin time is derived from the location. Most of the events were too small to be detected by the surface stations and we therefore used only the TCDPBHS for hypocentre determination. Due to strong electric noise at BHS6 and BHS7, we only used the remaining five stations of the vertical array. The inversion iteratively applies the generalized matrix inversion location method so as to minimize the residual. We obtain the residuals by comparing the observation at all levels in the array with travel times and arrival angles calculated with homogenous velocity model as 4.10 and 2.60 km s\(^{-1}\) for P wave and S wave, respectively. This velocity structure was an average 3-D velocity model for this area of Taiwan (Kim et al. 2005). We adopted that homogenous velocity model because the location of the borehole stations avoids a shallow structure with very low seismic velocity and we do not expect large velocity variation with a few kilometres in our study area. Due to the geometry of the vertical array, the location accuracy is limited for events that are far away from the array and errors in location are mainly due to uncertainties in the azimuth and in the velocity model. We therefore compared the hypocentre locations of some larger events (\(M\sim1.5\)) that are detected on the surface network using (1) the full network consisting of surface network and borehole network and (2) only the borehole network. The comparison between the determined locations shows that the difference is less than 2 km in horizontal and less than 1 km in vertical directions (please see Supporting Information). Due to the data quality, only 270 out of the 2780 local events were finally located. Most of the located events have S/N ratios of larger than 4. Fig. 5 shows the distribution of these events. It shows that most events were clustered in a flat horizontal zone at about 10 km depth. This zone has also been identified as a deformation zone where the 30\(^\circ\) dipping Chelungpu thrust flattens to a decollement of the Taiwan fold and thrust tectonic structure (Wang et al. 2002; Hung et al. 2007; Wang et al. 2007). An interesting observation is that there was not any seismicity around TCDPBHS and near the Chelungpu main fault even after 6 yr of the occurrence of the 1999 Chi–Chi earthquake. This observation indicates first, the possible complete stress drop of the Chi–Chi earthquake, which left no stress for the occurrence of aftershocks and secondly the lock of the splay fault zone during the interseismic period. We further discuss this issue in Section 4.1.

The recording capability and the related detection threshold of the TCDPBHS are also shown in Fig. 5. It shows that within a region of 2 km from the TCDPBHS, any microearthquake larger than magnitude 0.0 should have been detectable. Since no such event was detected, it is likely that the main fault zone is silent and locked during this interseismic period.

**2.2 Identification of event clusters using waveform cross-correlation**

During the detecting procedures for event identification, we noted that several events are highly similar in waveforms. To quantify this observation, we performed waveform cross-correlation of the 2780 local events. We classified the events to be in the same cluster if their correlation coefficient is larger than 0.8 for the Z-component. We found 198 clusters, which have at least two events in each cluster. Fig. 6 shows the example for cluster number 13, which has five events showing similar waveforms. The first event,
and obtained that the shortest cutting time-window length would produce an underestimation problem in corner frequency because of missing low frequency information in the spectral fitting process. The window length should be longer than 1 s and we therefore considered 2 s as best time-window length. Besides, due to the limitation on S/N in the high frequency range, the spectral fitting was made from 1 Hz up to 50–70 Hz, where S/N ratio is larger than 1 (Fig. 7, bottom figure, blue bars). In this analysis, we used the records from BHS1 and BHS4 for the spectral analysis, because these two recordings are most stable in data quality. Other stations were often contaminated with strong coupling phases in the S wave or had strong electronic interferences, which mainly affected small events. Because the corner frequency is a source parameter that should be a constant for every individual event recorded at both stations, two steps in the LSQENP analysis were used for the source parameter determination. First, we obtained the values of \( \Omega_0 \), \( f_c \) and \( f_i \) by minimizing the residuals between the observed and the theoretical spectrum. Then, for every individual event, a corner frequency was obtained by averaging the value of the \( f_c \) recorded by both stations. Thus, the obtained \( f_c \) is fixed for the second step of the LSQENP, where we then estimate \( \Omega_0 \) and \( Q \). These two parameters were averaged for our further calculation with the fixed \( f_c \). However, we discarded the events if differences in the \( f_c \) determination of BHS1 and BHS4 were larger than a 90 per cent confident interval in the statistic for all events. In total, 242 events fulfilled the quality criteria and were accepted for our source parameter determination.

The seismic moment of each event was calculated from \( \Omega_0 \) using the relationship described by Brune (1970):

\[
M_0 = \frac{4\pi \rho v^3 \Omega_0 d}{F},
\]

where \( \rho \) is the density (2700 kg m\(^{-3}\)), \( v \) is the seismic wave speed (2.60 km s\(^{-1}\) for \( Sh \) wave), \( d \) is the hypocentral distance and \( F \) is the radiation pattern. We consider an average radiation value of 0.63 for \( Sh \) waves (Aki & Richards 2002) and average the \( \Omega_0 \) values of BHS1 and BHS4. The magnitudes of these 242 located microearthquakes determined from \( \Omega_0 \), with magnitudes between \( M_w \) 0.33 and 2.20 (Fig. 5).

We further determined the rupture dimension and static stress drop of these events. The rupture dimension or the source radius \( r \) was determined from the corner frequency assuming the circular source model of Sato & Hirasawa (1973):

\[
r = \frac{C v}{2\pi f_i},
\]

where \( C \) is a constant (1.9 for \( Sh \) wave) (Stork & Ito 2004) and \( v \) is the seismic wave speed (2.60 km s\(^{-1}\) for \( Sh \) wave). The static stress drop, \( \Delta \sigma_s \), is estimated from \( M_0 \) and \( r \) (Eshelby 1957):

\[
\Delta \sigma_s = \frac{7M_0}{16\pi^{3}}.
\]

The rupture dimension and stress drop of these events range from 21 to 204 m and 4.4E-4 to 2.40 MPa as listed in Table S1, respectively. Further discussion on the scaling of these parameters to the size of earthquakes will be addressed later in the discussion.

3.2 Estimation of the radiated energy and apparent stress

The radiated energy was obtained by integrating three component velocity seismograms (Ikeh et al. 2003)

\[
E^v = 4\pi \rho v^2 r^2 \int_{f_i}^{f} \left| \hat{u}(f) \exp \left( \frac{-\pi f f_t}{Q} \right) \right|^2 \, df,
\]

where \( Q \) is the hypocentral distance and

\[
Q = \frac{1}{f_i} \int_{f_i}^{f} \left| \hat{u}(f) \exp \left( \frac{-\pi f f_t}{Q} \right) \right|^2 \, df.
\]
where $c$ is the type of wave, $P$ or $S$ wave, $\rho$ is the density (2700 kg m$^{-3}$), $v$ is the velocity of $P$ or $S$ wave (4.10 and 2.60 km s$^{-1}$ for $P$ and $S$ wave, respectively) and $r$ is the distance from source to receiver. $Q^P$ is a constant value about 220 from $Q$ structure study in Taiwan (Wang et al. 2010) and $Q^S$ is given from the best-fitting parameter $Q$ of the previous spectral analysis. We applied energy corrections for frequency-bandwidth limitations following Ide & Beroza (2001). In our case, the average corner frequency of the events we determined is about 15.8 Hz and the available frequency bandwidth is 60 Hz for most of the events. By considering the correction provided by Ide & Beroza’s (2001), we have increased the calculated radiated energy in average by 30 per cent to our determined total radiated energy. The total radiated energy ($E$) is the sum of $E^P$ and $E^S$. The apparent stress, $\sigma_a$, is calculated from the total energy $E$ and the seismic moments $M_0$ (Kanamori & Brodsky 2004)

$$\sigma_a = \mu \frac{E}{M_0} = \frac{E}{\bar{D}S},$$

where $\mu$ is the rigidity ($1.8 \times 10^4$ MPa). The apparent stress represents the radiated energy released per unit area and unit slip on the fault zone and thus, the scaling of the apparent stress to different sizes of events indicates dynamic processes on the fault at different scales (Kanamori & Brodsky 2004). The apparent stresses of these events range from 5.88E-4 to 1.46 MPa, as also listed in Table S1.

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Implications on seismotectonics from microearthquake distributions

The near horizontal distribution of microearthquakes from the flat deformed zone at about 10 km with no seismicity on the main rupture Chelungpu-fault observed from our TCDPBHS, show similar patterns as the distribution of the relocated aftershocks of the Chi–Chi earthquake (Chang et al. 2000; Carena et al. 2002; Chang et al. 2007). The detecting capability of the TCDPBHS, as we have shown earlier, suggested that the lack of seismicity on the northern portion of the Chelungpu-fault near the drill site is real. This observation provides two possible implications for the northern part of the Chelungpu-fault, where the largest coseismic slip of up to 12 m was found. (1) The complete stress drop of the asperity in the northern portion of the fault left not even stresses for the occurrence of aftershocks. (2) The fault is locked during this interseismic period. Wu (2009) analysed electric logs from TCDP and concluded that the azimuth of the maximum horizontal principal stress ($S_{h\text{max}}$) rotated around 90° from the regional tectonic stress direction (N130° E) after the earthquake. The minimum horizontal principal stress ($S_{h\text{min}}$) magnitude was almost equal to the maximum horizontal principal stress ($S_{h\text{max}}$) after the Chi–Chi earthquake, suggesting a complete stress drop at the Chelungpu-fault in the Chi–Chi earthquake (Wu 2009). The complete stress drop indicated that the
cumulative stresses on the Chelungpu main fault zone before 1999 Chi–Chi earthquake were totally released by the large coseismic slip of the earthquake, thus, left little shear stress on the fault. The low shear stress on the fault explains why the lack of microearthquakes occurred on the Chelungpu-fault. The geodetic observation from inversion of the GPS data for the post-seismic slip and interseismic slip modelling on the Chelungpu-fault plane gave a coupling ratio of 1.0 in this area, suggesting the fault in this region was strongly locked (Hsu et al. 2009). Our observations of microearthquakes location with no seismicity on the main fault might provide the direct evidence to the locked of the fault.

A near-complete stress drop from a locked splayed fault for a large earthquake might have mechanical implication in tectonics for the coupling between the splayed fault and the near horizontal detachment. The depth of detachment at about 10 km in the northern part of the Chelungpu-fault was well determined from the massive amount of relocated aftershocks by several studies (Hirata et al. 2000; Carena et al. 2002; Chen et al. 2002). Hsu et al. (2003) and (2009) also suggested a decollement depth of 8–12 km beneath the Central Ranges by GPS data inversion. This high seismicity detachment may be associated with the decollement of the Taiwan fold-and-thrust tectonic structure (Yue et al. 2005). This detachment, as shown by Hsu et al. (2009), consists of low shear stresses of ~2 MPa and a low effective friction of ~0.01. The exceptionally low shear stress suggests the possible existence of fluid. The tomography study of Wu et al. (2007) suggested a high Vp/Vs zone at 9 km depth beneath the northern portion of the Chelungpu-fault and Chen & Chen (2002) analysed magnetotelluric (MT) data in the northern part of the Chelungpu-fault concluded that a low resistivity zone exists at 10 km depth beneath the northern portion of the Chelungpu-fault, indicating the possible existence of fluid in the detachment. In addition to that, as shown earlier, the seismicity in the detachment also occurs in earthquake clusters. The tectonic implication on the mechanics in the coupling of the locked splayed fault to the high seismicity with clusters of the horizontal detachment is an interesting subject to explore whether or not this locked splayed fault in the fold-and-thrust belt is a typical and a near complete stress drop will be always a consequence once the earthquake ruptured the splayed fault.

4.2 Scaling of rupture dimension and stress drop with frequency independent Q correction and with eGF correction

In Fig. 8(a), we show the determined corner frequencies and related source dimension and compare them against the seismic moment (corresponding to $M_w$ of about 0 to 2). There is no obvious trend in the data, revealing more or less constant corner frequencies over the observed magnitude range. However, the scatter in the data is quite large and the source dimension seems to get larger and the scatter is smaller with increasing magnitude. The smallest observed source dimension reaches the value of about 20 m. Fig. 8(b) shows the relationship of the stress drop against the seismic moment for these microearthquakes. It shows an increase of the stress drop with increasing seismic moment. Alternatively, we tried to use a main fault plane (Strike = 15, Dip = 20, Rake = 110) to correct the radiation pattern more precisely, assuming that all microearthquakes would have a very similar source mechanism. This assumed main fault plane was determined by $P$ wave first motion solution from an event ($M_1 1.5$) which is clearly recorded by the surface network. However, the slope of the alternatively determined regression line only differs by 10 per cent, revealing a similar relation and hence we further used the more conservative model of mean focal mechanism corrections. However, several investigations of source parameter determination of small events had shown the possible influence of frequency dependent $Q$, the trade-off between $Q$ and corner frequency and frequency–bandwidth limitation of the data (Ide et al. 2003, 2004; Mori et al. 2003; Oye et al. 2005; Venkataraman et al. 2006; Mayeda & Malagnini 2009). For further scaling analysis we remove the path effect directly through the deconvolution.

We used the cluster events identified in Section 2.2 to analyse the scaling of source parameters with path effect correction by using an eGF method. In this study, an iterative technique of deconvolution, Project Landweber Deconvolution (PLD), was used to calculate source time functions of the main event in each pair. Compared to the typical spectral division deconvolution technique, we can avoid the critical value division problem. The PLD is also more efficient in case of events with small difference in magnitudes (Lanza et al. 1999). The Landweber technique scheme is as follows (Bertero et al. 1997; Lanza et al. 1999),

$$f_{n+1} = f_n + \tau G^T \ast (u - G \ast f_n),$$

(7)

where $f$ is the relative source time function, $n$ is the number of iterations, $u$ indicates the main event waveform, $G$ is the eGF, $G^T(t) = G(t)$, denotes the convolution product, $\tau$ is the relaxation operator.
Figure 9. An example of the PLD analysis (a) Solid line and dotted line show the seismogram of main event and reconstructed event, respectively. (b) Empirical Green’s function of the analysis (c) Black line is the source time function and T indicates the duration time of the source time function (d) Residual of the analysis. Grey dot indicates the time range of calculation (t = 0.16) and the residual (error = 0.18) in this analysis.

Table 1. Waveform similarity pairs used in this study: result of PLD analysis Source parameters estimation of 14 pairs for PLD analysis. In each pair, there are a main event and a smaller event used as an empirical Green’s function. If more than two events were selected to be pairs from the same cluster, the smallest event was chosen as an empirical Green’s function.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds</th>
<th>Cluster #</th>
<th>M_w</th>
<th>Duration (s)</th>
<th>R-PLD (m)</th>
<th>Stress drop PLD (MPa)</th>
<th>R Spectral (m)</th>
<th>Stress drop Spectral (MPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2006/11/24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3419.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6.65E−01</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.73E−01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2006/11/24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2433.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2006/11/24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>118.03</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.45E−01</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.24E−01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2006/11/24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2433.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2006/11/24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>268.49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.73E+00</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5.61E−01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2006/11/24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2433.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2006/11/29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2223.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6.50E−01</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.60E−01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2007/05/26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2892.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2007/10/20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>751.08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.90E−01</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.02E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2007/05/26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2892.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2007/10/20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1996.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.99E−01</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.29E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2007/05/26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2892.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2007/01/14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2046.9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.90E−01</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.75E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2007/02/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1786.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2007/02/27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>393.99</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.14E−01</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.80E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2007/02/27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3083.8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2007/03/09</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3128.2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7.09E−02</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.57E−01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2007/03/09</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3080</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2007/08/16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.54E+00</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.53E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2007/08/15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2809.1</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2007/08/16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3547.5</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.18E+00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.40E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2007/08/15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2809.1</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2007/09/20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1607.3</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.39E−01</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.28E−01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2007/09/21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2238.1</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2007/09/23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2414.4</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.65E−01</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.38E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2007/09/23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2483.9</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>2007/11/24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2777</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.21E−01</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.26E−01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>2007/11/24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.061</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If \( \|u - G \times f_e\| \) approaches a minimum after a specified number of iterations, we can obtain the source time function of the main event. The residual is calculated as follows

\[
e = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{(A_{\text{obs}}(i) - A_{\text{rec}}(i))^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (A_{\text{obs}}(i))^2} \right]^{1/2},
\]

where \( N \) is the number of time points, \( A_{\text{obs}}(i) \) is the main event seismogram equal to \( u \) and \( A_{\text{rec}}(i) \) is the reconstructed seismogram equal to \( G \times f_e \). We suggested that the residual must be less than 0.3 to ensure the waveform coherence between \( A_{\text{obs}} \) and \( A_{\text{rec}} \) in this experiment. Fig. 9 shows an example of the PLD analysis. The reconstructed seismogram, \( A_{\text{rec}} \) (Fig. 9a dot line), is very consistent to the seismogram of the main event, \( A_{\text{obs}} \) (Fig. 9a solid line). The duration time, manually estimated from the source time function is 0.031 s in Fig. 9(c).

We selected 14 pairs or events from 9 clusters where the magnitude difference between the events is at least equal to or greater than 0.5 for the PLD analysis (Table 1). If more than two events were selected to be pairs within the same cluster, the smallest event was chosen to be the eGf of the larger events. We determined the duration of the source time function of the larger earthquakes, \( \tau_s \), through the PLD to determine the source dimension, \( L \), following (Lanza et al. 1999):

\[
L = \frac{\tau_s \upsilon}{1 + \upsilon \sin \theta/c(s)},
\]

where \( \upsilon \) is the rupture velocity, which is now considered to be 0.75 times the S-wave velocity, \( c(s) \) is the velocity at the source region and \( \theta \) is the angle between the normal to the fault plane and the outgoing ray. Here we assumed a horizontal fault plane, thus, \( \theta \) is the angle of the outgoing ray to the station. In the analysis we used the \( V_p \) and \( V_s \) velocities at the depth of about 11 km as determined by Kim et al. (2005). Figs 8(a) and (b) show also the scaling relationship of the source dimension and stress drop to the seismic moments using the PLD method for \( Q \) correction, respectively, in comparison to the relationship with frequency-independent \( Q \) correction. The results after the \( Q \) correction from the PLD method show that the determined rupture dimensions are more distinctively constant within the observed ranges of magnitudes (Fig. 8a) and the stress drop is increasing (Fig. 8b) with the seismic moment.

### 4.3 Scaling of radiated energy and apparent stress to the seismic moments

Figs 10(a) and (b) show the relationship of the radiated energy and the apparent stress to the seismic moment, respectively. In this radiated energy study, we only use the spectral fitting analysis without using eGf analysis due to the noise in high frequencies (>50 Hz), which is preventing us from determining the corner frequency of our small eGf events in our clusters. The range of apparent stresses determined is between \( 10^{-3} \) and 1 MPa and indicates an increasing relation to the seismic moment. For the estimation of the energy radiation from \( P \) and \( S \) waves, our results show that the energy from the \( S \) wave is about 20 times larger than the \( P \)-wave energy (Fig. 11). It indicates that the radiated energy of \( P \) wave is about 5 per cent of total seismically radiated energy. This result is similar to the result of Abercrombie (1995), that 7 per cent \( P \)-wave energy radiation of total radiated energy.

We compared our results to other studies and split them into two groups: one group that uses spectral fitting or similar analysis (Gibowicz et al. 1991; Kanamori et al. 1993; Singh & Ordaz 1994; Abercrombie 1995; Mayeda & Walter 1996; Stork & Ito 2004; Yamada et al. 2007) and another group that uses eGf analysis (Ide et al. 2003, 2004; Mori et al. 2003; Oye et al. 2005; Venkataraman et al. 2006; Mayeda & Malagnini 2009), as shown in Fig. 12. Many of these studies investigated events of similar size as ours of about \( M_w 0.0–2.5 \). This study’s results show similar patterns as the results from Stork & Ito (2004) and from Abercrombie (1995), that is, an increase of apparent stress with seismic moment with scatter around \( 10^{-3}–10 \) MPa.

Fig. 12 shows that, except for the study of Yamada et al. (2007), most of the studies using spectral fitting analysis and other methods show an increasing relation of the apparent stress to the seismic moments, with scattering mostly in the range of \( 10^{-2}–10 \) MPa. Similar feature is also found for the South African mine borehole data set by Gibowicz et al. (1991), even though their event magnitudes reach down to \(-4 \) to \(-2 \). The results from eGf analysis tends to narrow the scattering and suggest near constant values in apparent stress in the range of \( 10^{-2}–10 \) MPa, except the data set by Oye et al. (2005), where the events from a deep ore mine have apparent stresses of between \( 10^{-1} \) and \( 10^{-3} \) MPa. In our study, we could unfortunately not carry out the eGf analysis due to limited resolution in high frequencies in our data. However, either the increasing relation is an apparent relationship due to the instrumentation limitation or an indication in the difference of scaled energy in various sizes of earthquakes, our TCDBPBS data is another set of important data to this debate.
5 CONCLUSION

The TCDP borehole seismometers array, which was a vertical array deployed through a recent large slipped fault zone of the 1999 Chi-Chi \( (M_w 7.3) \) earthquake, is a unique setting in the world. We monitored microearthquake activity down to magnitude 0.0 for the region surrounding this large coseismic slip zone 6 yr after the earthquake. Considering the TCDPBHS recording capability, we confirm that no seismic activity occurred on the coseismic slip fault zone during the observation period, which also gives a good agreement to GPS observation as no post-slip was observed in the large coseismic zone. These observations suggest that the Chelungpu-fault is locked during this interseismic period. The Chelungpu-fault is considered as a splayed fault from the fold-and-thrust tectonic setting of Taiwan and the complete absence of microseismicity near the TCDP is also an indication for a complete stress drop during the main shock. Most of the microearthquakes that we detected occurred at a 10-km-deep flat zone, a western extension of the decollement. This flat deformed zone appeared to have repeating clusters of microearthquakes, which might be related to fluid pressurization. This observation suggests the lock of a splayed fault with active cluster type seismicity from the decollement related deformed zone. Whether or not this seismotectonic model is a general feature for other regions with similar tectonic settings or, only a feature for the Chelungpu-fault, requires further observations in different regions and possibly from fault zone dynamic modelling.

In addition to the seismotectonic implication of our observation, our kinematic source parameter scaling analysis suggests an increase of stress drop with seismic moment between magnitudes 0 and 2. To reduce the influence of path effects \( (Q \text{ effect}) \), we also estimated the source parameters by eGf using the PLD method. The investigation still results in a positive relationship, but with less scattering. For dynamic parameter scaling, the relation between apparent stress and seismic moment were made, which also showed positive relationship, indicating different dynamic behaviour in magnitudes of 0 to 2. When we compare our results with a wider range of magnitudes \( (M = 4 \text{ to } 8) \), our observations of apparent stresses cluster in the range between \( 10^{-3} \) and 1 MPa, similarly to other observations. Thus, our observation seems not to have the ability to discriminate the debate on the constant or positive relationship of the apparent stress (scaled energy) to the seismic moment. However, our TCDPBHS is another data set to give the contribution of the global compilation on the investigation of the source scaling for microearthquakes.
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Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

Figure S1. A surface network including nine surface stations was deployed around drilling site from November 2006 to September 2007. However, most of the events were too small to be recorded by the surface stations. Only three events (Mw ~1.5) in 2006 November were recorded by the surface stations, which could be used for earthquake locations. The comparison of the locations with and without surface stations is shown here. Solid circles mark the microearthquake locations with surface stations, while asterisks mark those without surface stations, for events 20061112–2136, 20061115–1749 and 20061129–0737 marked as number 1–3, respectively. The dotted lines represented the corresponding difference in locations. Grey squares show the locations of the surface stations and the red triangle is the TCDP borehole station. It shows that the differences in horizontal and vertical in location are close to 2 and 1 km, respectively.

Table S1. The catalogue of earthquakes analysed for the spectral fitting analysis. Source parameter estimations of 270 events by spectral fitting analysis. Symbols ‘-’ indicate the events which cannot fit observed spectrum correctly or the difference in the fc determination of BHS1 and BHS4 beyond the 90 per cent confident interval in the statistic of all the events.
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