# **@AGU**PUBLICATIONS

## **Geophysical Research Letters**

#### **RESEARCH LETTER**

10.1002/2014GL062863

#### **Key Points:**

- The relationship between *b* value and stress is verified and calibrated
- Subduction zone b values correlate with plate tectonic forces
- The *b* value can be used to map variations in stress

#### Correspondence to:

C. H. Scholz, scholz@ldeo.columbia.edu

#### Citation:

Scholz, C. H. (2015), On the stress dependence of the earthquake *b* value, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *42*, 1399–1402, doi:10.1002/2014GL062863.

Received 12 DEC 2014 Accepted 10 FEB 2015 Accepted article online 12 FEB 2015 Published online 13 MAR 2015

### On the stress dependence of the earthquake b value

#### Christopher H. Scholz<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, New York, USA

**Abstract** Laboratory experiments have shown that the *b* value in the size distribution of acoustic emission events decreases linearly with differential stress. There have been a number of observations that indicate that this relation may also hold for earthquakes. Here using a simple frictional strength model for stresses in the continental lithosphere combined with earthquake *b* values measured as a function of depth in a wide variety of tectonic regions, we verify and calibrate that relation, finding  $b = 1.23 \pm 0.06 - (0.0012 \pm 0.0003)$  ( $\sigma_1 - \sigma_3$ ), where the stress difference ( $\sigma_1 - \sigma_3$ ) is in megapascal. For subduction zones, we find that *b* value correlates linearly with the slab pull force and with the net reduction of plate interface normal force, both of which also indicate a negative linear relation between *b* value and differential stress.

#### 1. Introduction

Earthquakes obey a power law size distribution, which when described in terms of magnitude is given by logN = a - bM, where N is the number of earthquakes greater or equal to magnitude M, and a and b are the constants [*Gutenberg and Richter*, 1944]. The parameter a describes the total number of earthquakes, and the parameter b, often referred to as the b value, describes their relative size distribution.

Acoustic emissions from microfracturing in rock fracture experiments were found to obey the same form of size distribution, and further, that *b* value decreases linearly with increasing differential stress( $\sigma_1 - \sigma_3$ ) [Scholz, 1968]. This result on the stress dependence of *b* value in rock fracture experiments was reproduced more recently by *Amitrano* [2003], and the same stress dependence was found in stick-slip friction experiments by *Goebel et al.* [2013]. *Scholz* [1968] interpreted this behavior in terms of a positive influence of stress on the transition probability of incremental fracture growth leading to an increased probability of larger fractures with larger stress.

There have been a number of studies that suggest that the same stress dependence applies to *b* values of earthquakes. It has been found that the *b* value for earthquakes in the continental crust decreases approximately linear with depth [*Mori and Abercrombie*, 1997; *Spada et al.*, 2013]. It has also been found that *b* value depends systematically on earthquake focal mechanism, being smaller for thrust than for normal faulting events and having an intermediate value for strike-slip earthquakes [*Gulia and Wiemer*, 2010; *Schorlemmer et al.*, 2005].

Subduction zones are tectonic areas where there are a great variety of tectonic styles [*Uyeda*, 1982]. These have long been suggested to be due to large variations in tectonic stress owing to local variations in the plate tectonic driving forces [e.g., *Ruff and Kanamori*, 1980]. *Nishikawa and Ide* [2014] have recently investigated variations in *b* value among subduction zones. They found a correlation between *b* value and the age of the subducted lithosphere, which is related to one of the main driving forces of subduction zones.

This note is meant to provide some clarification as to how these observations relate to the dependence of *b* value on stress.

#### 2. Stress and b Values in the Continental Crust

The results of stress measurements in deep boreholes in the continental crust in various tectonic regimes indicate that stress is governed by the frictional strength of preexisting faults with friction coefficients in the range of 0.6–1.0 and with the vertical stress being given by the lithostatic gradient minus a hydrostatic pore pressure gradient [*M. D. Zoback and Townend*, 2001; *M. L. Zoback and Zoback*, 2007]. As a simple example, if we assume a friction coefficient of 0.75, a rock density of 2500 kg/m<sup>3</sup>, and hydrostatic pore pressure, we obtain, for compressional regions dominated by thrust faulting, a vertical gradient of differential stress ( $\sigma_1 - \sigma_3$ ) of





**Figure 1.** The *b* value plotted versus stress difference for a variety of tectonic regions. The *b* value data are from *Spada et al.* [2013] and the stresses computed from the stress model discussed in the text.

45 MPa/km; for extensional regimes dominated by normal faulting, one of 11.25 MPa/km; and for a strike-slipdominated region, one of about 20 MPa/km. If *b* value decreases with differential stress as in the experimental results, this simple model can explain both the depth dependence of *b* value and the focal mechanism dependence described above.

Spada et al. [2013] presented results for *b* value as a function of depth for a number of tectonic regions. They found that *b* value decreases down to a depth, which they identify as the brittle-ductile transition, below which the *b* value was observed to increase dramatically (note that this interpretation agrees with the observation of *Scholz* [1968], who found much higher *b* values in the deformation of ductile

than of brittle rocks). Spada et al. also noted that the *b* value gradient with depth implies a similar gradient with stress.

To make a direct examination of the correlation, I calculated the stress difference for each of the *b* value determinations of Spada et al. using the simple stress model described above, down to the reversal of trend at the brittle-ductile transition. The normal faulting stress gradient was used for the data for Italy and Greece and the strike-slip profile for California and Turkey. Switzerland has normal faulting focal mechanisms in the south and thrust faulting mechanisms in the extreme north, but otherwise is dominated by strike-slip focal mechanisms [*Kastrup et al.*, 2004], so I used the strike-slip gradient there. Intraplate Japan is dominated by thrust mechanism in NE Honshu and strike-slip mechanisms in SW Honshu and Shikoku [*Wesnousky et al.*, 1982], so for the combined data set for Japan, I used a gradient intermediate between strike slip and thrust of 30 MPa/km. The result is given as a plot of *b* value versus stress difference in Figure 1. A very nice



**Figure 2.** The *b* value for subduction zones plotted versus  $L\sqrt{T}$ . The *b* values are from *Nishikawa and Ide* [2014], and the slab length *L* and plate age *T* are from *Scholz and Campos* [1995].

data collapse is seen: the data for all the regions combine to define a very good negative correlation with stress,  $b = 1.23 \pm 0.06 - (0.0012 \pm 0.0003)$  ( $\sigma_1 - \sigma_3$ ), where stress is in MPa. This plot simultaneously explains both the depth and focal mechanism dependence of *b* value discussed earlier.

## 3. Stress and *b* Values for Subduction Zones

Nishikawa and Ide [2014] determined the *b* value for a global collection of subduction zones and attempted to find correlations between *b* value and a number of plate tectonic parameters. They found a good correlation with age of the subducted plate for plates with ages less than 80 Ma. They pointed out

## **AGU** Geophysical Research Letters



that plate age is related to the negative buoyancy of the subducting plate, one of the main driving forces of subduction. Plate age is related to that force, called the slab pull force, by  $F_{SP} = cL\sqrt{T}$ , where T is the age of the subducting slab and L is the length of the slab [Carlson et al., 1983]. We plot the b values of Nishikawa and Ide versus  $L\sqrt{T}$  in Figure 2, where the values of *L* and *T* were obtained from Table 1 of Scholz and Campos [1995]. We find a good linear correlation that now extends to all plate ages. Note that increasing  $L\sqrt{T}$  corresponds to decreasing values of the vertical component of the normal stress acting across the plate interface and hence, because the interface is

**Figure 3.** The *b* value plotted versus the net reduction of interface normal force  $\Delta F_N$  for subduction zones.

frictional, to decreasing differential stress in the adjacent plates. Thus, the negative correlation of *b* value with stress is the same as found in continental regions.

Variations in the horizontal component of the plate interface normal force is supplied by the sea anchor force,  $F_{SA}$ , which is proportional to the slab length and the velocity of the upper plate relative to the mantle. The reduction of the net plate interface normal force from a reference state is given by  $\Delta F_N = F_{SA} \sin \varphi + F_{SP} \cos \varphi$ , where  $\varphi$  is the interface dip [*Scholz and Campos*, 1995]. The correlation of  $\Delta F_N$  with *b* value is shown in Figure 3, where the  $\Delta F_N$  values were taken from Figure 7 and Table 2 of *Scholz and Campos* [1995]. Here again, increasing values of  $\Delta F_N$  correspond with decreasing normal force and hence differential stress so the negative correlation with *b* value is the same as before.

#### 4. Discussion

This analysis shows that the *b* value for earthquakes decreases linearly with stress for both continental and subduction zone environments. The data collapse shown in Figure 1 demonstrates that both the depth dependence and focal mechanism dependences of *b* values are the result of the underlying stress dependence. This rules out other interpretations, such as that of rock heterogeneity [*Mori and Abercrombie*, 1997] in explaining the variation in *b* value.

The robustness of this result leads to greater confidence in using *b* value to map out stress variations in fault zones [*De Gori et al.*, 2012; *Goebel et al.*, 2012; *Tormann et al.*, 2014; *Westerhaus et al.*, 2002; *Wiemer and Wyss*, 1997] and interpreting temporal *b* value variations during the seismic cycle [*Imoto*, 1991; *Nakaya*, 2006; *Smith*, 1981].

#### References

Amitrano, D. (2003), Brittle-ductile transition and associated seismicity: Experimental and numerical studies and relationship with the b value, J. Geophys. Res., 108(B1), 2044, doi:10.1029/2001JB000680.

Carlson, R. L., T. Hilde, and S. Uyeda (1983), The driving mechanism for plate tectonics: Relation to age of the lithosphere at trenches, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *10*, 297–300, doi:10.1029/GL010i004p00297.

De Gori, P., F. P. Lucente, A. M. Lombardi, C. Chiarabba, and C. Montuori (2012), Heterogeneities along the 2009 L'Aquila normal fault inferred by the *b* value distribution, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *39*, L15304, doi:10.1029/2012GL052822.

Goebel, T. H. W., T. W. Becker, D. Schorlemmer, S. Stanchits, C. Sammis, E. Rybacki, and G. Dresen (2012), Identifying fault heterogeneity through mapping spatial anomalies in acoustic emission statistics, J. Geophys. Res., 117, B03310, doi:10.1029/2011JB008763.

Goebel, T. H. W., D. Schorlemmer, T. W. Becker, G. Dresen, and C. G. Sammis (2013), Acoustic emissions document stress changes over many seismic cycles in stick-slip experiments, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 2049–2054, doi:10.1002/grl.50507.

Gulia, L., and S. Wiemer (2010), The influence of tectonic regimes on the earthquake size distribution: A case study for Italy, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 37, L10305, doi:10.1029/2010GL043066.

Gutenberg, B., and C. Richter (1944), Frequency of earthquake in California, Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am., 34, 185-188.

Imoto, M. (1991), Changes in the frequency-magnitude b value prior to large ( $\geq$ 6) earthquakes in Japan, *Tectonophysics*, 193, 311–325.

#### Acknowledgments

I thank Hannah Rabinowitz for the creation of the figures in this paper. The *b* value data used in this paper are from *Spada et al.* [2013] and *Nishikawa and Ide* [2014], and plate tectonic parameters are from *Scholz and Campos* [1995].

The Editor thanks two anonymous reviewers for their assistance in evaluating this paper.

Kastrup, U., M. L. Zoback, N. Diechmann, K. F. Evans, D. Giardini, and A. J. Michael (2004), Stress field variations in the Swiss Alps and the northern Alpine foreland derived from inversion of fault plane solutions, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, B01402, doi:10.1029/2003JB002550.
Mori, J., and R. E. Abercrombie (1997), Depth dependence of earthquake frequency-magnitude distributions in California: Implications for

rupture initiation, J. Geophys. Res., 102(B7), 15,081–15,090, doi:10.1029/97JB01356.

Nakaya, S. (2006), Spatiotemporal variation in b value within the subducting slab prior to the 2003 Tokachi-oki earthquake (M 8.0), Japan, J. Geophys. Res., 111, B03311, doi:10.1029/2005JB003658.

Nishikawa, T., and S. Ide (2014), Earthquake size distribution in subduction zones linked to slab bouyancy, *Nat. Geosci.*, 7, 904–908, doi:10.1038/NGE02279.

Ruff, L., and H. Kanamori (1980), Seismicity and the subduction process, Phys. Earth Planet. Int., 23, 240–252.

Scholz, C. H. (1968), The frequency-magnitude relation of microfracturing in rock and its relation to earthquakes, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am., 58*, 399–415.

Scholz, C. H., and J. Campos (1995), On the mechanism of seismic decoupling and back-arc spreading in subduction zones, J. Geophys. Res., 100, 22,103–22,115, doi:10.1029/95JB01869.

Schorlemmer, D., S. Wiemer, and M. Wyss (2005), Variations in earthquake-size distribution across different stress regimes, *Nature*, 437(7058), 539–542.

Smith, W. D. (1981), The b value as an earthquake precursor, Nature, 289(5794), 136–139.

Spada, M., T. Tormann, S. Wiemer, and B. Enescu (2013), Generic dependence of the frequency-size distribution of earthquakes on depth and its relation to the strength profile of the crust, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 709–714, doi:10.1029/2012GL054198.

Tormann, T., S. Wiemer, and A. Mignan (2014), Systematic survey of high-resolution *b* value imaging along Californian faults: Inference on asperities, *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth*, *119*, 2029–2054, doi:10.1002/2013JB010867.

Uyeda, S. (1982), Subduction zones: An introduction to comparative subductology, Tectonophysics, 81, 133–159.

Wesnousky, S. G., C. H. Scholz, and K. Shimazaki (1982), Deformation of an island arc: Rates of moment release and crustal shortening in intraplate Japan determined from seismicity and quaternary fault data, J. Geophys. Res., 87, 6829–6852, doi:10.1029/JB087iB08p06829.
Westerhaus, M., M. Wyss, R. Yilmaz, and J. Zschau (2002), Correlating variations of b values and crustal deformations during the 1990s may

westernaus, w., w. wyss, n. minaz, and J. Zschau (2002), correlating variations of b values and crustal deformations during the 1990s may have pinpointed the rupture initiation of the  $M_w$  = 7.4 lzmit earthquake of 1999 August 17, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 148(1), 139–152.

Wiemer, S., and M. Wyss (1997), Mapping the frequency-magnitude distribution in asperities: An improved technique to calculate recurrence times?, J. Geophys. Res., 102(B7), 15,115–15,128, doi:10.1029/97JB00726.

Zoback, M. D., and J. Townend (2001), Implications for hydrostatic pore pressures and high crustal strength for the deformation of intraplate lithosphere, *Tectonophysics*, 336, 19–30.

Zoback, M. L., and M. D. Zoback (2007), Lithospheric stress and deformation, in *Treatise on Geophysics*, edited by A. B. Watts, pp. 253–274, Elsevier, Amsterdam.