The 16 April 2016, M_w 7.8 (M_s 7.5) Ecuador earthquake: a quasi-repeat of the 1942 M_s 7.5 earthquake and partial re-rupture of the 1906 M_s 8.6 Colombia-Ecuador earthquake

Lingling Ye^{a,*}, Hiroo Kanamori^a, Jean-Philippe Avouac^a, Linyan Li^b, Kwok Fai Cheung^b, Thorne Lay^c

^aSeismological Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

^bDepartment of Ocean and Resources Engineering, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI, 96822 USA

^cDepartment of Earth and Planetary Sciences, University of California Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA

*Corresponding author: Lingling Ye (lingling@gps.caltech.edu)

Key Words:

- 2016 Ecuador earthquake
- Re-rupture of 1942 event
- Source rupture model
- Ecuador-Colombia earthquake sequence

Abstract

The 2016 Ecuador M_w 7.8 earthquake ruptured the subduction zone boundary between the Nazca and South American plates. Joint modeling of seismic and tsunami observations indicates an ~120 km long rupture area beneath the coastline north of the 1998 M_w 7.2 rupture. The slip distribution reveals two discrete asperities near the hypocenter and around the equator. Their locations and the patchy pattern are consistent with the prior

interseismic geodetic strain, which showed highly locked patches also beneath the coastline. Aftershocks cluster along two streaks, one aligned nearly parallel to the plate convergence direction up-dip of the main slip patches, and the other on a trench-perpendicular lineation south of the 1958 rupture zone. Comparisons of seismic waveforms and magnitudes show that the 2016 event and 1942 earthquakes have similar surface wave magnitude (M_S 7.5), overlapping rupture areas, and similar main pulses of moment rate. The same area ruptured as the southernmost portion of the larger earthquake of 1906 (M_W 8.6, M_S 8.6). The seismic behavior reflects persistent heterogeneous frictional properties of the Colombia-Ecuador megathrust.

1. Introduction

An increasing number of large earthquakes are rupturing portions of subduction zone plate boundaries that previously experienced large earthquakes documented by seismology. This provides new information about the persistence of regions of large slip through multiple earthquake cycles. For example, the 16 September 2015 Illapel, Chile, M_W 8.3 earthquake re-ruptured a portion of the plate boundary that had failed in 1943 during an M_S 8.1 event [e.g., *Kelleher, 1972; Nishenko, 1991; Beck et al., 1998; Ye et al., 2016b*]. The information available for past large ruptures is limited, but comparison with observations from recent earthquakes can nonetheless provide valuable insights and help resolve their overall characteristics.

On 16 April 2016, a large plate boundary earthquake ruptured beneath the coast of Ecuador (Fig. 1) in the vicinity of the 14 May 1942 Ecuador earthquake [*Kanamori and McNally, 1982; Mendoza and Dewey, 1982; Swenson and Beck, 1996*]. The U.S. Geological

Survey National Earthquake Information Center (USGS-NEIC) hypocenter for the 2016 earthquake is 0.352°N, 79.926°W, 21.0 km deep [<http://earthquake.usgs.gov>]. The locally determined hypocenter is 0.31°N, 80.12°W, 19.2 km deep (Geophysical Institute of the National Polytechnic School at Ecuador, <http://www.igepn.edu.ec/portal/ultimo-sismo/informe-ultimo-sismo.html>). The quick global centroid moment tensor (gCMT) solution for this event [<http://www.globalcmt.org>] has a best-double-couple shallow-dipping thrust fault geometry (26° strike, 23° dip and 123° rake), seismic moment 5.53×10^{20} Nm (M_W 7.8) at a centroid depth of 24.1 km, and a centroid time shift of 19.5 s.

The Ecuador-Colombia plate boundary is being obliquely underthrust by the Nazca plate at ~4.6 cm/yr, with the upper plate being a fragment of the South American plate called the North Andean Sliver [Nocquet *et al.*, 2014; Chlieh *et al.*, 2014]. Slip partitioning along the right-lateral Dolores-Guayaquil fault zone [e.g., Mégar, 1987] accommodates about 20% of the ~5.6 cm/yr motion between the Nazca and South American plates. Most of the length of the subduction zone had ruptured in the 31 January 1906 ($M_{S(G-R)}$ 8.6 [Gutenberg and Richter, 1954]) earthquake, for which the rupture zone was subsequently overlapped by earthquakes on 14 May 1942 ($M_{S(G-R)}$ 7.9, $M_{(ISC-GEM)}$ 7.8 [<http://www.isc.ac.uk/iscgem>]), 19 January 1958 ($M_{S(G-R)}$ 7.3, $M_{(ISC-GEM)}$ 7.6), and 12 December 1979 ($M_{W(gCMT)}$ 8.1, $M_{S(G-R)}$ 7.7 [Kanamori and McNally, 1982]). These magnitude estimates are discussed in section 3. Modeling of interseismic geodetic strain indicates that locking of the plate interface is heterogeneous [Chlieh *et al.*, 2014]. Patches with close to 100% interseismic coupling (defined as the ratio of slip deficit rate over long term slip rate) are distributed along the coast and show some correspondence to the locations of the 1942, 1958 and 1978 slip

zones (Fig. 1a), supporting the notion of some persistent segmentation of the plate boundary. To evaluate this issue, we determine the slip distribution for the 2016 Ecuador event through joint modeling of seismic and tsunami observations and compare it with what is known about the prior ruptures in the region.

2. Modeling of seismic and tsunami data

We model global seismic wave observations and regional tsunami recordings for the 16 April 2016 Ecuador earthquake to constrain the rupture model. We first assess the long-period point-source characteristics of the mainshock, then perform back-projections of high frequency P waves to constrain the rupture extent, and finally obtain a finite-fault model of the space-time slip distribution by iteratively modeling broadband P and SH body wave observations and tsunami recordings.

We perform a W-phase inversion [Kanamori and Rivera, 2008] of long-period ground motions in the passband 1-5 mHz using 181 channels of 152 stations. This provides a predominantly double-couple solution of 29.5° strike, 18.3° dip and 126.8° rake with centroid depth of 30.5 km, 24 s centroid time shift and seismic moment estimate of 6.5×10^{20} Nm (M_W 7.8). This estimate is consistent with the gCMT solution (Fig. 1b).

Broadband teleseismic P waves recorded at two large aperture networks in North America (NA) and Europe (EU) (Fig. S1) were aligned on reference travel times by multi-station cross-correlation, filtered in the passband 0.5-2.0 Hz, and separately back-projected to a horizontal surface around the source region following the procedure of Xu *et al.* [2009]. The back-projections both indicate southward unilateral expansion of the rupture from

0.3°N to 0.2°S with two discrete patches of high frequency radiation at 20 s and ~30-50 s respectively (Fig. 2). The data suggest southward propagation of the rupture at about 2.5 to 3.0 km/s with a duration of ~40 s (Fig. 2). Animation M1 in the Supporting Information shows the space-time sequence of these back-projections.

Global broadband seismic body waves are inverted for a kinematic multi-time window and spatially distributed source with variable rake using a least squares procedure for specified fault-model geometry and rupture expansion speed [e.g., *Hartzell and Heaton, 1983; Kikuchi and Kanamori, 1982*]. Our finite-fault inversions use 76 P-wave and 46 SH-wave ground displacement waveforms filtered in the 0.005-0.9 Hz passband. The fault model geometry has variable dip, initially extending from the trench to below the coast guided by the Slab 1.0 model of *Hayes et al. [2012]* (Fig. S2), with a uniform strike of 26°. The subfault source time functions of the final model are parameterized with 10 2.5-s rise-time symmetric triangles, offset by 2.5 s each. The hypocentral depth is set at 19.2 km, with the epicenter slightly shifted from the USGS-NEIC position to (0.43°N, 80.03°W), based on searching solution around the local and NEIC estimates.

Inversions of the seismic waves consistently show a patch of large slip near the hypocenter with a larger separate patch extending from 30 to 100 km southward. The precise placement of the second patch varies with assumed rupture speed by about 30 km over the range of rupture speed from 2.5 to 3.0 km/s indicated by the back-projections. Minor amounts of slip are found far offshore to the south and north in models that extend all the way to the trench. However, the rake and placement of this up-dip slip is not stable, so we forward model tsunami recordings for a large number of slip models from teleseismic

inversions to better constrain the off-shore and along-strike slip distribution based on fitting of tsunami signals (e.g. Fig. 3e). The various slip models from teleseismic inversion are obtained by fine perturbations in rupture speed, variable fault extent both along dip and along strikes, and by shifting the overall rupture area by adjusting the hypocenter location on the Slab 1.0 geometry. The slip pattern relative to the hypocenter is better constrained by teleseismic data than the absolute hypocenter location given the uncertain earth structure and trade-off with earthquake origin time.

Tsunami recordings from three deep-water seafloor pressure sensors at DART stations 32607, 32411 and 32413 and the tide gauge at La Libertad provide good azimuthal coverage relative to the source region (Fig. 3d). In particular DART 32067 is located immediately offshore of the rupture zone about 50 km from the trench. We follow an iterative modeling procedure that has proved successful in achieving self-consistent models for teleseismic and tsunami observations for numerous events [e.g., *Lay et al.*, 2013; *Yamazaki et al.*, 2013; *Bai et al.*, 2014; *Li et al.*, 2016]. Using the half-space elastostatic Green functions of *Okada* [1985], we compute the displacement and velocity at the seafloor and land surface (Fig. 3b) for each slip distribution inverted from seismic observations. The tsunami is calculated using the shock-capturing dispersive wave code NEOWAVE of *Yamazaki et al.* [2009, 2011]. The staggered finite difference model builds on the nonlinear shallow-water equations with a vertical velocity term to account for weakly dispersive waves and flows over steep slopes as well as a momentum conservation scheme to describe bore formation. As part of the NEOWAVE package, the vertical velocity term also accounts for the time variation of the seafloor vertical motions and

facilitates dispersion of the seafloor excitation across the water column during tsunami generation. The vertical displacement of the water body due to horizontal displacement of the seafloor is approximated following the method from *Tanioka and Satake* [1996]. The slopes around the source are very small and this effect contributes little to the tsunami excitation in this case. We calculate tsunami waves with a grid of 2 arc-min across the eastern Pacific and with a nested regional grid of 0.5 arc-min resolution (Fig. 3c and 3d).

We begin the iterative procedure using fault models extending all the way to the trench and progressively trim shallow rows in the teleseismic inversion (Fig. 3a) as needed to match the onset of the tsunami signals. Even small amounts of slip located too shallow on the megathrust produce too strong and too early first tsunami arrivals at the DART stations (Fig. S3). Simultaneously, the down-dip slip is constrained to a narrow band beneath the coastline and shifted along strike into the embayment through adjustment of the hypocenter and rupture speed in order to match the main pulses recorded at the DARTs (Fig. S4). Shifting of the slip patch shoreward and toward the northeast improves the agreement of the computed and recorded waveforms at the La Libertad tide gauge (Fig. 3e). A satisfactory fit to the tsunami observations and the teleseismic data is found for a model with unilateral rupture speed of 2.5 km/s extending ~120 km southwest along the coast from the final estimated epicenter (0.43°N , 80.03°W) with depth of 19.2 km (Figs. 1 and 4). The model reproduces the DART signals very well and the long-period waveform at La Libertad is fit adequately (Fig. 3e), with the somewhat early predicted arrival likely due to the low resolution of the complex coastline and shallow structure for the 0.5 arc-min bathymetry model. Teleseismic P and SH waveforms are also well matched for this

164 model (Fig. S5).

165 The nearshore slip produces seafloor uplift from near the top of the continental slope to
166 the shore (Fig. 3b). Most of the uplift is within a relatively flat shelf delineated by the 200-
167 m depth contours and two massive headlands prone to resonance oscillations or seiches.
168 These physical factors along with the capabilities of NEOWAVE to account for tsunami
169 generation from time-varying seafloor excitations and local dispersion on steep slopes are
170 crucial in reproducing the double peaks of the initial pulse and their precise timing
171 recorded at the near-field DART station 32067 (Fig. 3e). The first peak is overlapped by the
172 tail end of the ground surface wave motion, but its longer duration in comparison to the
173 ground motion pulse width points to the source being from an ocean surface wave. This is
174 corroborated by the double-peaked feature in the initial arrivals at DARTs 32411 and 32413,
175 which are far away from the seismic source. Animation M2 in the Supporting Information
176 shows that the first peak at DART 32067 and La Libertad originates from the initial sea
177 surface uplift over the continental slope that propagates directly offshore with part of the
178 energy refracted along the continental slopes to the north and south. The initial pulse over
179 the shelf is trapped as partial standing waves and subsequent energy leakage accounts for
180 the second peak at DART 32067 with a small lag associated with the shelf processes.

181 The continental shelf functions like a waveguide channeling tsunami waves along its
182 length through internal reflection, when the propagation speed varies rapidly across the
183 steep continental slope. The presence of canyons and headlands reflect the longshore
184 edge waves effectively trapping the energy along the shelf. This explains the persistent
185 oscillations with considerable amplitude at the La Libertad tide gauge after the first two

small peaks from the initial tsunami pulse (Fig. 3e). The shelf environment is conducive to belated arrivals of the peak wave during a tsunami event [Cheung et al., 2013; Yamazaki and Cheung, 2011; Yamazaki et al., 2013]. Animation M₃ illustrates the propagation of the tsunami across the ocean and the formation of the initial pulse at DART 32411 and 32413 from the initial sea surface uplift on the continental slope and the subsequent energy release from inside the shelf. The recorded tsunami waveforms, which are highly sensitive to the location of the initial tsunami pulse in relation to the continental slope and shelf, allow precise placement of the near-shore slip in this case. It also strongly rules out slip further seaward under the continental slope or near the trench.

It is well known that finite source models can be significantly improved, in particular regarding the absolute and details of the main slip patches, when geodetic or remote sensing data are included in the inversion [e.g., Konca et al., 2008]. As the discussion above shows, the tsunami data provide similar constraints on the offshore part of the source model. Onshore measurement of ground displacements would be helpful to constrain further the down-dip part of the slip distribution. In the absence of available geodetic ground deformation data, we have compared the predictions of our final slip model with line-of-sight (LOS) displacement maps derived from SAR interferometry using Sentinel-1A and ALOS-2 satellites [Xu and Sandwell, personal communication, 2016; Spaans and Hooper, personal communication, 2016]. As these results are preliminary and not yet published, we used them only for reality check. We find that our model (see model predictions in Fig. S6) is very consistent to first order with the location, pattern and amplitude of the ground displacement measured from these SAR images. We note in

particular that the minor slip patch at the southeast corner of the source, which explains the tail of the moment rate distribution, between 60 s and 75 s, helps reproduce the SAR observations. Minor discrepancies are observed though. They suggest that the down-dip extent of our slip distribution may extend a bit too far to the east. While there is no doubt that the inclusion of SAR and GPS data will help refine the source model, we anticipate that only minor modifications of our best fitting model will be necessary.

Our final slip model (Fig. 4) shows a patch of large slip near the hypocenter with a larger separate patch extending from 30 to 100 km southward from the hypocenter, consistent with the back-projection images (Fig. 5a). The space-time slip history is shown in Animation M4. The peak slip is ~5 m, and the average slip, after removing those subfaults with inverted seismic moment less than 15% of the peak subfault seismic moment, is ~2.0 m. The slip-weighted static stress drop is ~2.8 MPa [Ye *et al.*, 2016a], a value typical of ordinary interplate earthquakes. The radiated energy, up to ~1 Hz, for the 2016 event estimated from teleseismic data with the method of Ye *et al.* [2016a] is 4.60×10^{15} J (Fig. 4). The corresponding moment-scaled radiated energy is 8.5×10^{-6} and the radiation efficiency is ~0.21, similar to the average values for large megathrust earthquakes.

3. Historical Earthquakes: 1906, 1942, 1958 and 1979

The slip distribution for the 2016 Ecuador earthquake encompasses the hypocenter and likely source region inferred from aftershocks for the 1942 earthquake (Fig. 1). To further assess whether these events are comparable, we evaluated historical measurements and seismic recordings for the 1942 event, and the other large events along the coast in 1906, 1958, and 1979.

230 One of the key measures of the size of historic large events is provided by surface wave
 231 magnitudes, but comparisons have to be made carefully due to changes in measurement
 232 procedures over time. Although various values are cited in the literature for the 1906, 1942,
 233 and 1958 events, we primarily use the data listed in Beno Gutenberg's notepads [*Goodstein*
 234 *et al.*, 1980], which are the basis of *Gutenberg and Richter* [1954]. For the 1979 and 2016
 235 events, we use the data provided by USGS-NEIC. We also use *Abe's* [1981] catalog for
 236 cross checking. Although the M_S values listed in these catalogs vary in minor details, they
 237 are generally consistent [e.g., *Abe*, 1981; *Lienkaemper*, 1984] and are appropriate for the
 238 purpose of this study. Fig. 6 compares the M_S values for the 1979 and 2016 events listed by
 239 USGS-NEIC, along with those for earlier events taken primarily from the Gutenberg
 240 Notepads (see Table S3 for details). USGS-NEIC lists the average M_S of the 1979 and the
 241 2016 events as 7.7 and 7.5, respectively. *Abe* [1981] gives $M_S = 7.6$ for the 1979 event. As
 242 indicated by the data for the 1979 and 2016 events, the scatter of the M_S values between
 243 stations is very large, ranging over 1.5 magnitude units. This amount of scatter is common
 244 and is most likely a result of complex multi-pathing and interference of surface waves.
 245 Thus, a straight average or median of the measured values can be misleading, especially
 246 when the azimuthal coverage is limited as is the case for most old events. This large
 247 scatter suggests that even if individual measurements are correct, the uncertainty in the
 248 average M_S for old events appears to be at least $\frac{1}{4}$ M_S unit. In some cases, it can be even
 249 larger, and we must keep in mind this amount of uncertainty in interpreting the M_S for old
 250 events. Although *Gutenberg and Richter* [1954] assigns $M_{S(G-R)} = 7.9$ to the 1942 event, Fig.
 251 6 shows that the station M_S values for the 1942 event taken from the Gutenberg notepad
 252 (red stars) follow approximately the same azimuthal trend with rather high values as the

better sampled 2016 event, suggesting that the average M_S of the 1942 event is
 approximately the same as that of the 2016 event, i.e., $M_S = 7.5$. The M_S values at
 individual stations for the 1958 event are close to, or slightly below, the trend of the 2016
 event. Thus, $M_S = 7.3$ given by Abe [1981] appears reasonable. In contrast, the station M_S
 values for the 1906 event are consistently larger than those for the other events. In fact,
Gutenberg and Richter [1954] and Abe [1981] list this event as $M_S = 8.6$, and 8.7,
 respectively. However, some catalogs [e.g., Abe and Noguchi, 1983] revised it to 8.2
 primarily because they suspected that some amplitude data were obtained from the
 undamped Milne records. However, the 1906 event's M_S values for stations like Potsdam,
 Leipzig, and Jena were probably from the damped Wiechert records. Also our own
 measurement from the Omori seismograms at Mizusawa gives $M_S = 8.5$. Thus, we believe
 that M_S of the 1906 event is considerably larger than for the other events in this sequence,
 and the *Gutenberg and Richter* [1954] $M_S = 8.6$ is reasonable. In this study, we adopt $M_S =$
 8.6, 7.5, 7.3, 7.7, and 7.5 for the 1906, 1942, 1958, 1979, and 2016 events, respectively.
 Given the uncertainties arising from unknown instrument calibration, insufficient
 azimuthal coverage, station corrections, and complex and yet not-fully-understood path
 effects, any difference smaller than $\frac{1}{4} M_S$ unit should not be given much significance.

In addition to M_S , for a more quantitative understanding of the slip budget it is important
 to determine the seismic moment (i.e., M_W) estimated at very long period. For the 1979
 and 2016 events, M_W is relatively well constrained to 8.1 (gCMT) and 7.8 (gCMT and W-
 phase solutions), respectively. The moment of the 1958 event is estimated to be smaller
 than the 1979 event by 0.5 M_W unit (i.e. $M_W \sim 7.6$) [Kanamori and McNally, 1982]. Swenson

275 *and Beck* [1996] estimated $M_o = 6 \text{ to } 8 \times 10^{20} \text{ N-m}$ ($M_W \sim 7.8$) for the 1942 event, although
 276 this value appears somewhat uncertain because of the limited frequency band for the data
 277 used and uncertain instrument calibration. No reliable estimate of M_W from seismic data is
 278 available for the 1906 event, despite being the largest event in the sequence.

279 *Okal* [1992] compared the Wiechert seismograms of the 1979 and 1906 event recorded at
 280 Uppsala (UPP). According to *Kulhánek* [1988], the response of the Uppsala Wiechert
 281 seismographs remained essentially constant. Thus, the comparison made by *Okal* [1992] is
 282 most relevant and important. The records for the 1906 and the 1979 events are taken from
 283 *Okal* [1992], and that for the 2016 event is taken from the GSN record at station KONO,
 284 here used as a proxy of the record at UPP. The Wiechert seismogram for KONO is
 285 simulated from the GSN broad-band record by deconvolution of the instrument response
 286 and convolution of the Wiechert response. The similarity in dispersion to that for the 2016
 287 event, which has three component seismic data, confirms that the UPP signal for the 1906
 288 event is the G1 Love wave. Figure 7a shows comparisons of 3 different period passbands,
 289 100-500 s, 150-500 s, and 200-500 s. The increase in the peak-to-peak amplitude ratios
 290 with period probably reflects the corner frequency shift toward low frequency with
 291 increasing M_W . However, given the extremely low gain at long period, the solid friction
 292 between the recording stylus and paper, and hand digitization error, the ratios for the 200-
 293 500 s passband are less reliable. We choose the ratios for the 150-500 s passband to
 294 estimate the M_W differences. The ratios for the 150-500s band are 1906/1979=2.9 and
 295 1906/2016=17.8, corresponding to M_W differences of 0.3 and 0.8, respectively. Also, the
 296 1906 seismogram is larger by a factor of 1.35 than the synthetic seismogram computed for

297 an $M_W = 8.5$ event with the mechanism of the 2016 event, corresponding to $\Delta M_W \sim 0.1$.
 298 Thus, these comparisons indicate that M_W of the 1906 event is ~ 8.6 which is comparable to
 299 the tsunami magnitude M_t (8.5 to 8.7) (Table S1).

300 The comparable M_S and aftershock distributions (Figs. 1a and S7) of the 1942 and 2016
 301 events suggest a similar rupture area. Fortunately, we have obtained P waves recorded for
 302 both 1942 and 2016 events for direct comparisons from seismic stations at Pasadena,
 303 California (PAS) and at De Bilt, Netherlands (DBN) at different azimuths. We simulate the
 304 waveforms for the 2016 event from the GSN broad-band record by deconvolution of the
 305 instrument response and convolution of the corresponding instrumental responses for the
 306 1942 recording. The Benioff instrument at PAS is sensitive to signals with periods around 1
 307 s to 90 s with peak gain at 1 s; and the Galitzin seismometer at DBN is sensitive to slightly
 308 longer periods with peak gain at 25 s. The recorded P waves at these two stations show
 309 substantial information about source complexity. Comparisons aligned with the initial and
 310 the peak at PAS and DBN are shown in Figs. 7b and 7c, respectively. The peak-to-peak
 311 amplitude ratios of 1942/2016 = 0.7 (PAS) and 1.25 (DBN) are close to 1, allowing for some
 312 uncertainties in instrumental response, errors in reading historical paper data, and some
 313 variation in source. Discrepancy in duration from the onset to the peak motion suggests
 314 some difference between the two ruptures, and the shorter signal interval for the 1942
 315 event indicates that it may not have involved slip near the hypocenter of the 2016 event.
 316 The similar motions of the aligned waveforms with respect to the peak between the two
 317 events show that the main slip area of the 2016 event probably overlaps that of the 1942
 318 event. The intensity distributions (Fig. S8), even with strongly subjective and variable

criteria, show very similar relative patterns between the two events. Altogether, based on these observations, the 2016 event appears to be a quasi-repeat of the 1942 event, with the main slip patch being in common. The short duration and low-amplitude P wave from the 1958 event at PAS is consistent with the small M_S value. The P wave amplitude for the 1979 event is comparable to the 1942 and 2016 events, but the longer duration is consistent with its larger long-period magnitudes and stronger tsunami excitation [Kanamori and McNally, 1982; Beck and Ruff, 1984].

4. Discussion

The ~2.0 m average slip for the 2016 M_w 7.8 Ecuador earthquake is commensurate with accumulated slip deficit since the 1942 earthquake given the patchy pattern of interseismic coupling. It is equivalent to an average interseismic coupling ~0.6 across the region given the 4.6 cm/yr convergence rate, which seems reasonable in view of the interseismic model of *Chlieh et al.* [2014] (Fig. 1a) and consistent with ~50% locking on average from *Trenkamp* [2002] and *White et al.* [2003]. Our preferred slip model for the 2016 event shows two main large-slip patches with high static shear stress drop (> 5 MPa). A minor deep asperity (at depth of ~30 km) is inferred at the southeastern end of our model and relates to tapering of the rupture indicated by the tail of the moment rate function. This is in the vicinity of the M_w 7.2 1998 and M_w 7.0 1992 earthquakes. We infer rupture of several asperities beneath the coastline, a pattern also qualitatively consistent with the patchy interseismic locking pattern and location of the large slip deficit patches. A quantitative correlation analysis between the co-seismic slip distribution and interseismic coupling is not justified given the uncertainties of both quantities.

341 Aftershocks of the 2016 event from a regional catalog (Geophysical Institute of the
342 National Polytechnic School at Ecuador) cluster along streaks normal to the trench at the
343 northern edge of the mainshock rupture at $\sim 0.8^\circ\text{N}$ and oblique to the trench along the
344 equator (Figs. 5b and S7). Interestingly these clusters line up with the two main slip
345 patches (Fig. 5b) extending up-dip of their shallow edges. The precise location of
346 aftershocks is uncertain due to effects of uncertain velocity structure, station distribution,
347 etc. However, the relative locations between aftershock are generally more reliable and
348 the same general patterns are evident in the smaller number of aftershocks determined by
349 the USGS-NEIC. A possible interpretation is that the 2016 Ecuador earthquake triggered
350 up-dip afterslip producing aftershocks, as was observed following some large megathrust
351 events such as the 2005 M_w 8.6 and 2007 M_w 8.4 earthquakes offshore Sumatra [*Hsu et al.*,
352 2006; *Avouac*, 2015].

353 The 1906/1942-1958-1979-1998/2016 Ecuador-Colombia sequence demonstrates
354 substantial variability among successive ruptures of the same subduction zone area. As
355 pointed out by *Kanamori and McNally* [1982], the entire area can rupture in a great $M_w > 8.5$
356 event or rupture piecewise in smaller events. Similar behavior has been observed
357 elsewhere, for example, in Japan and Sumatra [e.g., *Lay et al.*, 1982; *Thatcher*, 1990; *Konca*
358 *et al.*, 2008] (Fig. 8). An interesting aspect of the Ecuador-Colombia example is the
359 similarity of the 1942 and 2016 events. Together with the observed patchy interseismic
360 coupling pattern, this observation suggests that the seismic asperities are probably
361 associated with persistent spatial variations of frictional properties of the megathrust over
362 successive ruptures. The 2016 and 1942 events seem to have ruptured a similar subset of

363 asperities, which probably also ruptured as part of the 1906 event (Fig. 8). Mechanical
364 interactions and triggering between the adjacent slip patches are likely among the
365 important causes for the non-characteristic behavior; temporal changes in the plate
366 boundary frictional properties can be another factor. *Kaneko et al.* [2010] numerically show
367 that asperities, corresponding to area with rate-weakening friction interlaced in rate-
368 strengthening areas, could produce such variable rupture scenarios as well as the
369 repetition of similar events.

370 Spatial variations of frictional properties of the plate interface in the rupture area of the
371 1906 to 2016 earthquake sequence might be related to the influence of the Carnegie ridge,
372 which is being subducted beneath the coast of Ecuador (Fig. 1). The subduction of a
373 seismic ridge can lead to a complex pattern with seismic asperities intermingled with
374 aseismic creep areas as observed where the Nazca ridge is subducting beneath southern
375 Peru [*Perfettini et al.*, 2010;] or where the Investigator fracture ridge is subducting beneath
376 Sumatra [*Konca et al.*, 2008].

377 Our estimate of M_w (8.6) for the 1906 event based on waveform comparisons is 0.2
378 magnitude units smaller than that of *Kanamori and McNally* [1982] based on aftershock
379 zone area. The moment of the 1906 event is still greater than the sum of the moments for
380 1942, 1958, and 1979 events by a factor of three (rather than five). This may be because
381 the asperities and surrounding areas are driven to slip more during synchronized failure of
382 multiple asperities than when ruptured in isolation. Given this variability, the
383 'characteristic earthquake' model [*Schwartz and Coppersmith*, 1984] for long-term hazard
384 estimation is over-simplified. Rupture variability as observed for the Colombia-Ecuador

sequence needs to be factored in when constructing scenario earthquake models, as is done in the recent scenario earthquake project for the Nankai trough earthquake, Japan, where the historical data clearly demonstrate significant variability [*Earthquake Research Committee*, 2013, Japan; Fig. 8d].

5. Conclusion

The benefit of jointly modeling teleseismic and tsunami observations to constrain the location of coseismic slip during a large megathrust rupture is dramatically demonstrated by our modeling for the 2016 Ecuador earthquake. The complex rupture pattern observed during the M_w 7.8 2016 Ecuador earthquake suggests that it ruptured a common main asperity that had previously ruptured in a similar event in 1942, and as part of a larger, M_s 8.6 event in 1906. The pattern of asperities ruptured in 2016 is consistent with the heterogeneous pattern of interseismic locking of the plate interface. Altogether these observations suggest that asperities can be persistent features determined by the spatial variations of the mechanical properties of the subduction megathrust. However, non-characteristic behavior due to synchronization and dynamic triggering lead to variable rupture dimensions and repeat times as found for the 1906, 1942-1958-1979-1998, 2016 Ecuador-Colombia sequence. This is commonly observed. Detailed and quantitative studies of the rupture variability are needed to provide a basis for realistic scenario earthquake models.

References

- Abe, K. (1981). Magnitudes of large shallow earthquakes from 1904 to 1980. *Phys. Earth and Planet. Int.*, 27(1), 72-92.
- Abe, K., and S. I. Noguchi (1983). Determination of magnitude for large shallow earthquakes 1898–1917. *Phys. Earth and Planet. Int.*, 32(1), 45-59.
- Avouac, J.-P. (2015), From Geodetic Imaging of Seismic and Aseismic Fault Slip to Dynamic Modeling of the Seismic Cycle, *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sci.*, Vol 43, 43, 233-271.
- Bai, Y., K. F. Cheung, Y. Yamazaki, T. Lay, and L. Ye (2014), Tsunami surges around the Hawaiian Islands from the 1 April 2014 North Chile M_w 8.1 earthquake, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41, 8512-8521, doi:10.1002/2014GL061686.
- Beck, S. L., and L. J. Ruff (1984). The rupture process of the great 1979 Colombia earthquake: evidence for the asperity model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 89, 9281-9291.
- Beck, S. L., S. Barrientos, E. Kausel, E., and M. Reyes (1998), Source characteristics of historic earthquakes along the central Chile subduction zone. *J. of S. A. Earth Sciences*, 11(2), 115-129.
- Cheung, K.F., Y. Bai, and Y. Yamazaki (2013), Surges around the Hawaiian Islands from the 2011 Tohoku tsunami. *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, 118(10), 5703-5719.
- Chlieh, M., P. A. Mothes, J. M. Nocquet, P. Jarrin, et al. (2014), Distribution of discrete seismic asperities and aseismic slip along the Ecuadorian megathrust, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 400, 292-301.
- Earthquake Research Committee (2013). Long-term evaluation of seismicity along Nankai Trough (2nd version) (in Japanese). *Headquarters for Earthquake Research Promotion*. See http://www.jishin.go.jp/main/chousa/13may_nankai/index.htm.
- Goodstein, J. R., H. Kanamori and W. H. K. Lee (1980). Seismology microfiche publications from the Caltech archives. *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 70(2), 657-658.
- Gutenberg, B. U., and C. F. Richter (1954). Seismicity of the earth and related phenomena. *Princeton (NJ)*.
- Hartzell, S. H., and T. H. Heaton (1983), Inversion of strong ground motion and teleseismic waveform data for the fault rupture history of the 1979 Imperial Valley, California, earthquake, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 73(6A), 1553-1583.
- Hartzell, S. H., and T. H. Heaton (1985). Teleseismic time functions for large, shallow subduction zone earthquakes. *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 75, no. 4: 965-1004.
- Hayes, G. P., D. J. Wald, and R. L. Johnson (2012), Slab 1.0: a three-dimensional model of global subduction zone geometries, *J. Geophys. Res.* 117, B01302.
- Hsu, Y. J., M. Simons, J. P. Avouac, J. Galetzka, K. Sieh, M. Chlieh, D. Natawidjaja, L. Prawirodirdjo, and Y. Bock (2006), Frictional afterslip following the 2005 Nias-Simeulue earthquake, Sumatra, *Science*, 312(5782), 1921-1926.
- Kanamori, H., and K. C. McNally (1982), Variable rupture mode of the subduction zone along the Ecuador-Colombia coast, *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.*, 72(4), 1241-1253.
- Kanamori, H., and L. Rivera (2008), Source inversion of W phase: speeding up seismic tsunami warning, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 175, 222-238, doi:10.1111/j.1365-246X.2008.03887.x.

- Kaneko, Y., J. P. Avouac, and N. Lapusta (2010), Towards inferring earthquake patterns from geodetic observations of interseismic coupling, *Nature Geosci.*, 3(5), 363-369.
- Kelleher, J. A. (1972), Rupture zones of large South American earthquakes and some predictions, *J. Geophys. Res.* 77(11), 2087-2103.
- Kikuchi, M., and H. Kanamori (1982), Inversion of complex body waves—III. *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 81(6), 2335-2350.
- Konca, A. O., J. P. Avouac, A. Sladen, et al. (2008), Partial rupture of a locked patch of the Sumatra megathrust during the 2007 earthquake sequence, *Nature*, 456(7222), 631-635.
- Kulhánek, O. (1988), The status, importance and use of historical seismograms in Sweden. *Historical Seismograms and Earthquakes of the World*, Academic Press, San Diego, California, USA, 64-69.
- Koper, K. D., A. R. Hutko, T. Lay, C. J. Ammon, and H. Kanamori (2011). Frequency-dependent rupture process of the 2011 M_w 9.0 Tohoku Earthquake: Comparison of short-period P wave backprojection images and broadband seismic rupture models, *Earth, Planets, and Space*, 63(7).
- Lay, T. (2015), The surge of great earthquakes from 2004 to 2014, *Earth and Planetary Sci. Lett.*, 409, 133-146.
- Lay, T., H. Kanamori, and L. Ruff (1982), The asperity model and the nature of large subduction zone earthquake occurrence, *Earthquake Prediction Res.*, 1, 3-71.
- Lay, T., L. Ye, H. Kanamori, Y. Yamazaki, et al. (2013), The February 6, 2013 M_w 8.0 Santa Cruz Islands earthquake and tsunami. *Tectonophysics*, 608, 1109-1121.
- Li, L., T. Lay, K. F. Cheung, and L. Ye (2016), Joint modeling of teleseismic and tsunami wave observations to constrain the 16 September 2015 Illapel, Chile, M_w 8.3 earthquake rupture process, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 43, doi:10.1002/2016GL068674.
- Lienkaemper, J. J. (1984). Comparison of two surface-wave magnitude scales: M of Gutenberg and Richter (1954) and Ms of "Preliminary Determination of Epicenters". *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 74(6), 2357-2378.
- Megard, F. (1987). Cordilleran Andes and Marginal Andes: a review of andean geology North of Arica elbow (18"). Circum-Pacific orogenic belts and evolution of the Pacific Ocean basin, eds, Monger, J. W. H. and Francheteau, *J. Geodynamics Series*, 18, Am. Geophys. Un., Washington, DC.
- Mendoza, C., and J. W. Dewey (1984), Seismicity associated with the great Colombia-Ecuador earthquakes of 1942, 1958 and 1979: implications for barrier models of earthquake rupture, *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.* 74(2), 577-593.
- Nishenko, S. P. (1991), Circum-Pacific seismic potential: 1989-1999. *Pure Appl. Geophys.*, 135, 169-259.
- Nocquet, J. M., J. C. Villegas-Lanza, M. Chlieh, et al. (2014), Motion of continental slivers and creeping subduction in the northern Andes. *Nat. Geosci.*, 7, no. 4: 287-291.
- Okada, Y. (1985), Surface deformation due to shear and tensile faults in a half space, *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.* 75(4), 1135-1154.
- Okal, E. A. (1992). Use of the mantle magnitude M_m for the reassessment of the moment of historical earthquakes. *Pure Appl. Geophys.*, 139(1), 17-57.
- Perfettini, H., J. P. Avouac, H. Tavera, et al. (2010), Seismic and aseismic slip on the Central Peru megathrust, *Nature*, 465(7294), 78-81.

- Schwartz, D. P., and K. J. Coppersmith (1984), Fault behavior and characteristic earthquakes: examples from the Wasatch and San Andreas fault zones, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 89, 5681-5698.
- Sieh, K., D. H. Natawidjaja, A. J. Meltzner, et al. (2008). Earthquake supercycles inferred from sea-level changes recorded in the corals of west Sumatra. *Science*, 322(5908), 1674-1678.
- Swenson, J. L., and S. L. Beck (1996), Historical 1942 Ecuador and 1942 Peru subduction earthquakes, and earthquake cycles along Colombia-Ecuador and Peru subduction segments, *Pure Appl. Geophys.*, 146(1), 67-101.
- Tanioka, Y., and K. Satake (1996), Tsunami generation by horizontal displacement of ocean bottom, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 23, 861-864.
- Thatcher, W. (1990), Order and diversity in the modes of Circum-Pacific earthquake recurrence, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 95(B3), 2609-2623.
- Trenkamp, R., J. N. Kellogg, J. T. Freymueller, and H. P. Mora (2002). Wide plate margin deformation, southern Central America and northwestern South America, CASA GPS observations. *J. of South Amer. Earth Sci.*, 15(2), 157-171.
- Venkataraman, A., and H. Kanamori (2004), Observational constraints on the fracture energy of subduction zone earthquakes, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, B05302, doi:10.1029/2003JB002549.
- White, S. M., R. Trenkamp, and J. N. Kellogg (2003). Recent crustal deformation and the earthquake cycle along the Ecuador-Colombia subduction zone. *Earth and Planet. Sci. Letters*, 216(3), 231-242.
- Xu, Y., K. D. Koper, O. Sufri, L. Zhu, A. R. Hutko (2009), Rupture imaging of the M_w 7.9 12 May 2008 Wenchuan earthquake from back projection of teleseismic P waves, *Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.*, 10, Q04006, doi:10.1029/2008GC002335.
- Yamazaki, Y., and K.F. Cheung (2011), Shelf resonance and impact of near-field tsunami generated by the 2010 Chile earthquake, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 38, L12605, doi:10.1029/2011GL047508.
- Yamazaki, Y., Z. Kowalik, and K. F. Cheung (2009), Depth-integrated, non-hydrostatic model for wave breaking and run-up, *Int. J. Numer. Methods Fluids* 61(5), 473-497.
- Yamazaki, Y., K. F. Cheung, and Z. Kowalik (2011), Depth-integrated, non-hydrostatic model with grid nesting for tsunami generation, propagation, and run-up, *Int. J. Numer. Methods Fluids* 67(12), 2081-2107.
- Yamazaki, Y., K. F. Cheung, and T. Lay (2013), Generation mechanism and near-field dynamics of the 2011 Tohoku tsunami, *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.*, 103, 1444-1455, doi:10.1785/0120120103.
- Ye, L., T. Lay, and H. Kanamori (2011), The Sanriku-Oki low-seismicity region on the northern margin of the great 2011 Tohoku-Oki earthquake rupture, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, B02305, doi:10.1029/2011JB008847.
- Ye, L., T. Lay, H. Kanamori and L. Rivera (2016a). Rupture Characteristics of major and great ($M_w \geq 7$) Megathrust Earthquakes from 1990-2015: 1. Moment Scaling Relationships, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 121, 821-844.
- Ye, L., T. Lay, H. Kanamori, and K. D. Koper (2016b), Rapidly estimated seismic source parameters for the 16 September 2015 Illapel, Chile M_w 8.3 earthquake, *Pure Appl. Geophys.*, 173(2), 321-332.

Acknowledgments. The IRIS DMS data center (<http://www.iris.edu/hq/>) was used to

519 access the seismic data from Global Seismic Network and Federation of Digital Seismic
520 Network stations. Bernad Dost at the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute in Dutch
521 helped check the peak-to-peak amplitude and the instrumental response for the 1942
522 event, and also provide the broadband record for the 2016 event at Debilt. Björn Lund at
523 Uppsala university helped check the historical instrumental responses at Uppsala station.
524 Omori seismograms for the 1906 earthquake are provided by the Mizusawa observatory.
525 Stephen Hartzell and Tom Heaton provided high-resolution copies of Pasadena P
526 waveforms records for the 1942, 1958 and 1979 events. The copies of the papers of the
527 Gutenberg notepad are provided by the Archives of the California Institute of Technology.
528 James Dewey at USGS provided us ISC-NEIC information on M_s for 1979 and 2016 events.
529 Stephen Hernandez helped provide access to the local seismic catalog. Mohamed Chlieh
530 provided his preferred geodetic coupling model. Yong Wei provided the post-processed
531 DART and tide gauge time series, where the original data can be downloaded from the
532 NOAA National Data Buoy Center (<http://www.ndbc.noaa.gov/>) and CO-OPS Tsunami
533 Capable Tide Stations (<http://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/tsunami/>). David Sandwell and
534 Xiaohui Xu at UC San Diego, Karsten Spaans and Andrew Hooper at Leeds showed us their
535 InSAR images respectively for comparison, along with helpful discussions. This data
536 analysis made use of GMT, SAC, and Matlab software. We thank Nadia Lapusta and Luis
537 Rivera for helpful discussion. This work was supported by NSF grant EAR1245717 to
538 Thorne Lay, and Caltech Seismological Laboratory Director's fellowship to Lingling Ye.

Figure 1. (a) Interseismic coupling model [Chlieh *et al.*, 2014], relocated aftershocks of the 1942, 1958 and 1979 earthquakes [Mendoza and Dewey, 1984], earthquakes with magnitude larger than 7 since 1990 (blue circles; locations from USGS-NEIC), and focal mechanisms since 1976 from gCMT catalog (www.globalcmt.org). Bold dashed purple ellipses indicate the possible rupture areas for the 1906, 1942, 1958 and 1979 earthquakes as inferred from aftershocks. The inset map shows the plate configuration with the Nazca plate converging relative to the South American Plate with a rate of ~5.6 cm/yr. (b) Coseismic slip distribution and slip azimuth of the preferred rupture model, along with the corresponding moment tensor solution (red beach ball), the best-double couple faulting mechanisms from W-phase inversion (blue) and global centroid moment tensor (gCMT) catalog (black). The red star is the shifted epicenter for the final slip model. Dashed orange curves circulate areas with interseismic coupling larger than 0.6.

Figure 2. (a1) and (b1) 4-th root stacked signal power as a function of time for 0.5-2.0 Hz P wave back projections from NA (left) and EU (right) networks. (a2) and (b2) Spatial distribution of time-integrated beam power for the back-projection images. The white stars indicate the 2016 mainshock epicenter. Elapsed time color-coded stars and diamonds (see a3 and b3) are local maxima of time-integrated images, indicating the foci of high-frequency radiation. (a3) and (b3) The distance of high-frequency radiation bursts from the epicenter plotted as a function of their elapsed time from the earthquake origin time. The trends indicate an average rupture speed ~ 2 to 3 km/s.

Figure 3. Tsunami model settings and results. (a) Slip model, same as Figures 1b and 4a, and outline of the initial rupture model (large rectangle). (b) Seafloor and land surface vertical displacement calculated from the slip distribution of the preferred rupture model (small rectangle) of the 2016 Ecuador earthquake. The star indicates the epicenter location and the dashed lines denote the far-offshore trench and the shelf boundary defined at 200 m depth. The initial tsunami wave is mostly trapped over the shelf. (c) Near-field tsunami wave amplitude. The wave energy off the shelf propagates directly offshore with part of the energy refracted over the continental slope to the north and south. (d) Tsunami wave peak amplitude across the eastern Pacific and regional nested (black rectangle) grids at 2 and 0.5 arc-min resolution. (e) Comparison of computed (red) and recorded (black) waveforms at water-level stations. The initial pulses comprise the initial tsunami wave and subsequent leakage and longshore propagation of the trapped waves. The labels 1 and 2 indicate the first and second peaks.

Figure 4. The preferred finite-fault source model for the 2016 Ecuador earthquake iteratively constrained by teleseismic and tsunami waves modeling. The fault model has a strike $\phi = 5^\circ$, variable dip angle shown in Fig. S2 and average rake $\lambda = 126.4^\circ$, with a rupture expansion speed of 2.5 km/s. (a) The moment rate function (MRF) for the slip model. (b) Far-field source spectrum, combining the MRF spectrum for frequencies < 0.05 Hz, and logarithmically averaged P-wave displacement spectra corrected for radiation pattern, geometric spreading, and attenuation at 0.05 to 2.0 Hz. The dashed curve shows a reference ω^{-2} spectrum with 3 MPa stress parameter. (c) Inverted slip distribution with slip vector and source time function in each subfault. Dashed lines indicate 10 s rupture isochrones. (d) The stress change at the mid-point of each subfault computed for the entire distribution of slip over the model surface. The stress drops calculated by trimming off those subfaults that have a seismic moment less than 15% of the peak subfault moment and using the remaining average slip and residual fault area, $\Delta\sigma_{0.15}$ is 2.0 MPa. The slip-weighted stress drop measured from the variable stress change distribution, $\Delta\sigma_E$ is 2.8 MPa. (e) P and SH radiation patterns and lower hemisphere data sampling for waveforms used in the inversion and the average focal mechanism. Animation of the slip history is presented in Supporting Information Movie M4.

Figure 5. (a) Comparison of the preferred slip model with distribution of coherent high-frequency seismic radiation derived from back-projection of teleseismic body-waves filtered between 0.5 and 2 Hz. Stars and diamonds indicate the locations of bursts of high-frequency seismic radiation from teleseismic P waves recorded of NA and EU networks, respectively. These are color-coded by the elapsed time from the origin, and indicate a rupture speed of ~2 to 3 km/s. (b) Location of aftershocks over 35 days following the mainshock from the Geophysical Institute of the National Polytechnic School at Ecuador (<http://www.igepn.edu.ec/portal/ultimo-sismo/informe-ultimo-sismo.html>) superimposed on the slip model.

Figure 6. Surface wave M_s measurements for 1906, 1942 and 1958 earthquakes (mainly from Gutenberg's notepads with few points from station bulletins and seismic records), and M_s for the 1979 and 2016 events from USGS/PDE (see detailed information in Table S3).

Figure 7. (a) Comparison of N-S component G1 of the 1906 (red), 1979 and 2016 earthquakes. The data for 1906 and 1979 event are recorded by UPP Wiechert instrument with pendulum period ~ 6.8 s, peak gain ~ 230 and damping $\varepsilon = 3$ (modified from *Okal, 1992*). The waveform for the 2016 event is the convolution of displacement (after remove the broadband instrumental response) at station KONO (close to UPP) and the Wiechert instrumental response. Comparisons of long-period signals at frequency bands of 100 – 500 s, 150 – 500 s and 200 – 500 s for 1906, 1979 and 2016 events, along with peak-to-peak amplitudes, are shown. The gray curves are synsthetic seismogram at with corresponding frequency bands from the 1906 hypocenter to the UPP site with M_w 8.5, same focal mechanism of the 2016 event and PREM earth structure. (b) Comparisons of vertical P-wave waveforms at Pasadena (PAS) with 1-90 s Benioff instrumental response (peak gain of 3000 at period of 1 s) between 1942 (purple), 1958 (black), 1979 (green) and 2016 (blue) events. The corresponding peak-to-peak amplitudes are shown at the top of each panel. Waveforms for 1942, 1958, and 1979 events are digitized from *Hartzell and Heaton [1985]*. Waveforms for the 1942 and 2016 event are aligned at the beginning (1st row) and at the peak (2nd row) for comparison. (c) Comparison of P waves at E-W component of the 1942 (purple) and 2016 (blue) events at station DBN with Galitzin instrumental response (pendulum/galvanometer periods ~ 25 s and gain factor of 310). The waveform for 1942 is from *Swenson and Beck [1996]* with peak-to-peak amplitude confirmed by Bernad Dost from the DBN station bulletin. The waveform for the 2016 event is the convolution of displacement (after remove the broadband instrumental response) with the Galitzin instrumental response. They are aligned at the beginning (left) and at the peak (right).

Figure 8. Examples of subduction zone megathrusts with temporally varying rupture areas and magnitudes for great earthquakes. Earthquake Sequences are shown for (a) Colombia-Ecuador, (b) off-shore Honshu [Koper et al., 2011; Ye et al., 2011], (c) Sumatra [Lay, 2015], and (d) Nankai Trough [Earthquake Research Committee, 2013, Japan].