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ABSTRACT

On 16 September 2015, the \( M_w \) 8.3 Illapel, Chile, earthquake broke a large area of the Coquimbo region of north-central Chile. This area was well surveyed by more than 15 high-rate Global Positioning System (GPS) instruments, installed starting in 2004, and by the new national seismological network deployed in Chile. Previous studies had shown that the Coquimbo region near Illapel was coupled to about 60%. After the \( M_w \) 8.8 Maule megathrust earthquake of 27 February 2010, we observed a large-scale postseismic deformation, which resulted in a strain rate increase of about 15% in the region of Illapel. This observation agrees with our modeling of viscous relaxation after the Maule earthquake. The area where upper-plate GPS velocity increased coincides very well with the slip distribution of the Illapel earthquake inverted from GPS measurements of coseismic displacement. The mainshock started with a small-amplitude nucleation phase that lasted 20 s. Backprojection of seismograms recorded in North America confirms the extent of the rupture, determined from local observations, and indicates a strong directivity from deeper to shallower rupture areas. The coseismic displacement shows an elliptical slip distribution of about \( 200 \text{ km} \times 100 \text{ km} \) with a localized zone where the rupture is deeper near 31.3° S. This distribution is consistent with the uplift observed in some GPS sites and inferred from field observations of bleached coralline algae in the Illapel coastal area. Most of aftershocks relocated in this study were interplate events, although some of the events deeper than 50 km occurred inside the Nazca plate and had tension (slab-pull) mechanisms. The majority of the aftershocks were located outside the 5 m contour line of the inferred slip distribution of the mainshock.

Online Material: Catalog of relocated seismicity.

INTRODUCTION

At 22:54:31 (UTC) on 16 September 2015, an \( M_w \) 8.3 earthquake occurred near the city of Illapel in the Coquimbo region of north-central Chile. Using all available local data, we located this event at 71.7° W, 31.5° S, in agreement with the location from the Centro Sismológico Nacional (CSN) of the Universidad de Chile, Chile. The event broke a well-instrumented area, with more than 15 high-rate GPS instruments deployed between 2004 and 2007 (Vigny et al., 2009) and several broadband and strong-motion instruments deployed by CSN (Fig. 1). Coupling models computed from GPS data identified an extended area (from 34° S to 30.5° S) between the Nazca and South American plates where coupling was higher than 60% (Métois et al., 2014, 2016). The Illapel earthquake occurred between two lower coupling zones (LCZs): a small zone near 32° S, and a larger one in the north, near 30.5° S in front of La Serena. These LCZs coincide with two major oceanic structures of the Nazca plate that are currently colliding with the continental South American plate: the Challenger fracture zone and the Juan Fernandez Ridge (Fig. 2).

The Illapel earthquake occurred near the northern end of the rupture zone of the 1730 mega-earthquake (Montessus de Ballore, 1912, Urrutia and Lanza, 1993; Lomnitz, 2004; Udías et al., 2012), a large megathrust earthquake (\( M_w \sim 9.0 \)) that probably controls the seismic cycle of central Chile (see Fig. 2). A recent paleoseismological study (Dura et al., 2015) proposes a recurrence interval between \( \sim 200 \) and \( \sim 650 \) years for these mega-earthquakes. Considering two earthquakes of magnitude \( M_w \sim 8.0 \) occurred previously (in 1943 and 1880; Beck et al., 1998), Nishenko (1985) suggested that the Illapel zone was a seismic gap. Several other large events occurred in the last century south of the Illapel rupture: Valparaíso in 1906 (\( M_w \) 8.6), La Ligua in 1971 (\( M_w \) 7.9), Valparaíso in 1985 (\( M_w \) 8.0), and Maule in 2010 (\( M_w \) 8.8) (Malgrange et al., 1981; Comte et al., 1986; Vigny et al., 2011). The La Serena LCZ appears to be a barrier to seismic ruptures; for example, the 1922 Atacama megathrust earthquake stopped just to the north in this zone (Beck et al., 1998) (Fig. 2).

Seismicity in the Coquimbo region increased in the last 15 years, after a swarm of several \( M_w \sim 6.0 \) events occurred in the plate interface in July–October 1997 (Fig. 3). These
events preceded the 1997 $M_w$ 7.1 Punitaqui intraplate compressional (slab-push) intermediate-depth earthquake of 15 October 1997 (Lemoine et al., 2001; Pardo et al., 2002; Gardi et al., 2006). The sudden seismicity increase in 1997, together with the previous occurrence of the 1730 megathrust earthquake, encouraged the deployment of a GPS network in the Coquimbo region (Vigny et al., 2009). Since 2004, a group of researchers of Instituto de Physique du Globe de Paris and École Normale Supérieure, France, and Universidad de Chile deployed a GPS network that has been fully operational since 2007. This dense network and the broadband and strong-motion instruments deployed by the CSN in recent years (Fig. 1) monitor the long- and short-term processes of upper-plate deformation. We supplemented the instrumental information with coseismic uplift observations of bleached lithothamnoids crustose coralline algae (Ortlieb et al., 1996; Farías et al., 2010; Vargas et al., 2011) located in the coastal zone of Coquimbo region. In this study, we analyzed the earthquake sequence of the $M_w$ 8.3 Illapel earthquake using the GPS time series, the coseismic rupture using local and teleseismic data, and the aftershock distribution using the local broadband data.

### BEFORE THE 2015 ILLAPEL MAINSHOCK

The historical seismicity of Chile was compiled, among others, by Montessus de Ballore (1912), Urrutia and Lanza (1993), and Lomnitz (2004), who extended their work back to Spanish settlements in the middle of the sixteenth century. Central Chile seismicity, as was mentioned earlier, is dominated by the 1730 mega-earthquake (Lomnitz, 2004; Udías et al., 2012), followed by several events of magnitude close to $M_w$ 8.0 that occurred in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Fig. 2a). In the northern end of the zone (30.5° S) where the city of La Serena was established in 1544, the situation is quite different. There is little information about earthquake damage to buildings; only small tsunamis in 1730, 1849, 1880, and 1922 had been reported (Urrutia and Lanza, 1993)—and now again, following the Illapel 2015 event. Low coupling values deduced from GPS measurements of the upper-plate deformation around La Serena are consistent with these historical observations. In contrast, higher coupling is observed to the south of the 2015 Illapel rupture. The coupling map (Fig. 2c) shows indeed a striking segmentation at 32° S and 30° S. GPS measurements conducted during the interseismic period showed that only a small portion of the coast between 31.5° S and 31° S was subsiding, suggesting a deepening of the highly coupled zone (Métois et al., 2014, 2016).

Similarly to what was observed before the 2011 Tohoku and 2014 Iquique earthquakes (Kato et al., 2012; Ruiz et al., 2014), transient deformation revealed by changing upper-plate velocities was observed in the Illapel zone prior to the seismic rupture. This transient deformation is observed in the continuous GPS (cGPS) time series of stations in the area where a significant change in velocity trend was observed after the 2010 Maule mega-earthquake (Fig. 4). A similar observation was made at campaign GPS sites that were measured about 10 times before 2010 and yearly since that time (Fig. 4b). According to Klein et al. (2016), this change in the velocity field was produced by postseismic viscoelastic relaxation due to the 2010 Maule earthquake. The relaxation took place mainly in the asthenosphere and in a thin viscous channel in the deep interface between the Nazca and South American plates, as expected from viscoelastic rebound modeling. As previously observed following giant megathrust earthquakes—for example, 1960 $M_w$ 9.5 Valdivia (Khazendarze and Klotz, 2003), 2005 $M_w$ 9.2 Sumatra (Hu and Wang, 2012), and 2011 $M_w$ 9.1 Tohoku (Watanabe et al., 2014) earthquakes—post-Maule upper-plate velocities show sustained trench-ward displacements in front of the rupture area. In the middle of the 2010, rupture zone postseismic deformation contributes significantly to the release of strain in the upper plate. On the other hand, at both edges of the 2010 rupture, we observed a rotation of the postseismic displacements toward inland directions (Fig. 5). In the Illapel area,
Figure 2. (a) Lateral extent of historical ruptures inferred in central Chile (Urrutia and Lanza, 1993; Beck et al., 1998; Lomnitz, 2004). (b) Along-strike variations of the average coupling value from the trench to 60 km depth and two alternative models that fit almost equally well with the data (different smoothing parameters, dashed curves). The average coseismic slip amount for the 2015 Illapel earthquake is the dashed area. Both interseismic averaged coupling and averaged coseismic slip curves have been calculated with 0.2°-wide sliding windows. The lower coupling zones (LCZs) are indicated (modified from Métois et al., 2016). (c) Interseismic coupling distribution for central Chile: thin dashed line, 60-km-depth slab contour; dots, position of GPS stations used for the inversion; and contour curves, 2 m coseismic-slip contours for our proposed Illapel slip distribution. The Challenger fracture zone (CFZ) and Juan Fernandez Ridge (JFR) are indicated. The color version of this figure is available only in the electronic edition.

Figure 3. (a) Seismicity larger than magnitude $M_w$ 6.0 that preceded the main event of 16 September 2015. (b) Cumulative seismicity versus time. The slope of the curve is proportional to the rate of the seismicity of magnitude larger than $M_w$ 4.5 from National Earthquake Information Center (NEIC) catalog. The color version of this figure is available only in the electronic edition.
this yields northeastern directions, roughly aligned with the preseismic directions, producing an increase close to 15% of upper-plate GPS velocities and thus leading to an increase of strain accumulation in the upper plate.

**THE COSEISMIC RUPTURE PROCESS OF THE $m_W$ 8.3 ILLAPEL EARTHQUAKE**

In spite of the increase in the upper-plate strain rate that we detected during the five years before the Illapel earthquake, we did not observe any significant increase in the seismicity of the area during the weeks before the mainshock. The coseismic rupture process of the 2015 $M_w$ 8.3 Illapel event started with a relatively weak amplitude phase (or immediate foreshock) that had a strong south to north directivity, as can be observed in the near-field records and in the backprojection results (Fig. 6).

Direct imaging of the $M_w$ 8.3 Illapel earthquake was obtained by backprojection of teleseismic P-waves. For this purpose, we used the P-waves recorded at the Transportable Array network (Meltzer et al., 1999). After deconvolution of the instrument response, the velocity seismograms were filtered between 0.2 and 1 Hz and aligned according to the theoretical P-wave travel time predicted by the IASP91 model (Kennett, 1991). To account for 3D velocity anomalies along the P-wave path into the mantle, we further aligned the traces using an iterative procedure based on multichannel correlation technique (VanDecar and Crosson, 1990). The delay and polarity of each channel were updated during each iteration. Only P-waves with correlation coefficient larger than 0.8 were retained for the stack. The first arrival is assumed to come from our proposed epicenter (71.7° W, 31.5° S), whereas the timing

![Figure 4](image-url)  
(a) Time series of coastal GPS permanent stations, ordered by increasing latitude, for the north (top) and the east (bottom) components (comp.). The dotted lines represent the preseismic trends estimated before the Maule earthquake, open arrows highlight the postseismic increase of the trend. (b) Residual velocities (difference between the postseismic [post-2010] and the preseismic [pre-2010] velocities) in mm/yr. cGPS stations represented in (a) are identified by their names and dots. Gray vectors represent less-well-known velocities (few campaign measurements or interpolated pre-2010 velocities). The slip distribution is roughly represented by its contour lines. The star shows the epicenter.
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Horizontal cumulative displacements (in centimeters) over five years (between 2010 and the end of 2014), corrected from interseismic trends (modified from Klein et al., 2016).
Figure 6. (a) Backprojection of the 2015 Illapel mainshock. The dots represent the locations of the sources determined from back-projection of teleseismic $P$-waves and are coded following the rupture time measured with respect to the hypocentral time. (b) Strong-motion records (east–west components) ordered by latitude: the arrows show the arrivals of different bursts of energy, and the gray rectangles show the seismic waves associated with the first starting phase. (c) Strong-motion records (east–west components) of the $M_w$ 8.3 Illapel earthquake recorded by the Centro Sismológico Nacional (CSN). The color version of this figure is available only in the electronic edition.
of each ensuing coherent arrival is obtained by stacking the seismograms after calculating the differential travel time from each potential source to the hypocenter. The source area was discretized with a grid with spacing of 0.1°. To enhance the coherence of the later arrival, a four-root stacking procedure was applied (Koper et al., 2011).

Figure 6 shows that the strong ground motions recorded at stations located south of the epicenter have longer durations than those situated to the north. Also, in the southern records, we observed three distinct pulses that are not clearly identified in the northern records. We attributed this difference to strong northward directivity. The first large amplitude accelerations observed in the strong-motion records (shaded zone in Fig. 6b) correspond to the initial rupture. We estimated the seismic moment of the immediate precursor as $M_o 2.61 \times 10^{39}$ N·m, equivalent to $M_w 6.9$; which is a small fraction of the $M_o 3.94 \times 10^{21}$ N·m ($M_w 8.3$) obtained from GPS data for the coseismic displacement for the main event (Fig. 7a).

Assuming that the fault surface was situated at the plate interface as defined by Hayes et al. (2012), the slip distribution for the Illapel earthquake was inverted from GPS data. The fault surface was discretized into many rectangles of 100 km². The lithosphere was approximated as linear elastic, homogeneous, and isotropic half-space. The displacement at any observation point is calculated using the formulation of Okada (1985). Our resolution was verified by a checkerboard test (Fig. 7b) with patches of 60 km by 60 km. At this scale, there is a good resolution near the coast except south of 32.5° S but very little resolution close to the trench and below 60 km of depth. Our results show that, between 31° S and 31.5° S, the rupture is located in a narrow deep contact zone coinciding with the observed coseismic coastal uplift zone that was previously subsiding during the interseismic period (Fig. 8).

Along the coast of the epicentral area, we observed a conspicuous white fringe of bleached lithothamnoids crustose coralline algae that, together with dry littoral communities, confirmed the coseismic coastal uplift (Fig. 8). In particular, bleached lithothamnoids have been used as a marker of rapid vertical coseismic displacements during field surveys following other recent earthquakes along the Chilean subduction margin, such as the $M_w 8.0$ Antofagasta earthquake in 1995 (Ortlieb et al., 1996) and the $M_w 8.8$ Maule earthquake in 2010 (Farias et al., 2010; Vargas et al., 2011). These algae can be found attached to the rocks between the subtidal and the lower intertidal zones. The most obvious lithothamnoids algae recognizable in the field are of reddish–pinkish color (Guiler, 1959) and turn white when suddenly exposed to solar radiation with no permanent humidification, possibly because of calcareous secretions (Ortlieb et al., 1996; Vargas et al., 2011). For the Illapel earthquake, we especially observed these bleached algae at Puerto Oscuro, just in front of the epicenter (Fig. 8b), and along the coast located immediately to the north (Fig. 8c).

### AFTERSHOCKS

The CSN catalog for the Coquimbo region is complete starting from local magnitude $M_L \sim 4.0$ since the installation of the new seismic network in 2014. This catalog shows that the aftershock zone extended from 29° S to 33° S two weeks after the main event (Fig. 9). Figure 9 shows that the rupture of the Illapel earthquake was followed by a large zone of aftershocks that surrounds the 5 m contour line of the coseismic slip distribution.

We used local data to relocate and compute the centroid depth of the moment tensor for the aftershocks (Fig. 10). We located the precursory seismicity using the SEISAN software (Havskov and Ottemöller, 1999) with the same velocity model used by CSN for this zone (Tables 1 and S1, available in the electronic supplement to this article). We relocated 78 events of magnitudes larger than $M_w 5.0$ that occurred from 16 September 2015 to 5 October 2015. The CSN catalog was used as reference. The events were relocated using the arrival time of $P$ and $S$ waves hand-picked from all available traces with a visually good signal-to-noise ratio. Once the aftershocks were relocated, the centroid moment tensor for 51 events was computed using the Computer Programs in Seismology package (Herrmann, 2013). For this purpose, the epicenter location was fixed while we searched for the centroid depth and the best-fitting double-couple source mechanism. This was done by a grid search: for each possible depth, we tested all possible double couples and kept those that minimized the variance between observed and simulated traces. Figure 10 shows that aftershocks mostly occurred outside the 5 m contour line of the slip distribution, consistent with previous observations of anticorrelations between mainshock slip and aftershock distributions (Das and Henry, 2003; León-Ríos et al., 2016). The aftershocks are located in the deeper zone of the contact beyond 50 km from the trench, just like those following the 2007 Tocopilla and 2010 Maule earthquakes (Agurto et al., 2012; Fuenzalida et al., 2013). This aftershock distribution is different from that of the 2014 Iquique earthquake, in which the aftershocks were mainly located in the upper plate, below the accretionary wedge (León-Ríos et al., 2016) (Fig. 10). Another interesting feature of this sequence is that several small events reported by CSN are outer rise, whereas other events are intraplate intermediate depth, similar to the 1997 $M_w 7.1$ Punitaqui earthquake.

### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

As shown in Figure 3, before the Illapel earthquake, we observed a steady increase in seismicity in the Coquimbo region that started right after the occurrence of the Punitaqui intermediate-depth earthquake on 15 October 1997. In the period from the end of 1997 until the Illapel earthquake in September 2015, several events clustered in time (Vigny et al., 2009). However, in the weeks before the Illapel earthquake of 16 September 2015, we did not observe any particular seismicity increase, in contrast to what we observed before the
Figure 7. Slip distribution of the 2015 Illapel earthquake. (a) Coseismic slip distribution inverted from static GPS displacements (difference between 17 September and 16 September) showing the discretization used in this work. (b) Checkerboard test for the finite source slip inversion using squares of 60 km of side (left figure, input model; right figure, recovered model). The color version of this figure is available only in the electronic edition.
2014 Iquique earthquake (Kato et al., 2012; Ruiz et al., 2014). On the other hand, after the 2010 $M_w$ 8.8 Maule earthquake, an important increase (of up to 15%) of velocities derived from GPS measurements were observed at all stations located in the Illapel earthquake area (Klein et al., 2016). We hypothesize that a possible reason for the triggering of the Illapel earthquake was that the viscoelastic deformation of the asthenosphere after the 2010 mega-earthquake induced a deep transient slow slip that changed the stress conditions in the seismogenic contact of this region. In contrast, south of 32° S, the deep viscoelastic relaxation produced an overall decrease of the velocities of the upper plate. The influence of viscoelastic deformation plus the presence of a low coupling boundary at $-32^\circ$ S and $-30^\circ$ S could have favored the occurrence of the Illapel earthquake, a large but frequent event of $M_w$ 8.3 similar to the previous 1880 or 1943 events. The Illapel event may have delayed the triggering of an $M_w$ 9 mega-earthquake, which would have been a repetition of the 1730 event.

The Illapel mainshock had a nucleation phase of about 20 s with a magnitude of around $M_w$ 6.9. This initial phase has a strong south-to-north directivity observed in the teleseismic $P$ waves of the Transportable Array of North America and in the local strong-motion records. Our inversion of coseismic displacement vectors shows an elliptical slip distribution of about 200 km $\times$ 100 km, with a narrow zone where the rupture is deeper between 31.5° S and 31° S. This is consistent with the uplift observed in the GPS sites and also inferred by our geological observations.

We relocated 78 aftershocks and estimated the moment tensor of 51 of them. Most of these events are concentrated in the deeper parts of the plate interface. Near the trench, we did not observe large magnitude aftershocks, suggesting that the eroded and fractured volcanic wedge (Contreras-Reyes et al., 2015) could be an up-dip limit of the seismic rupture. The fault-plane solutions for the aftershocks reveal mainly reverse faulting, showing a predominance of interplate events. Several events have along-slab tensional mechanisms (slab-pull) and are located near the top of the Nazca plate, at depths larger than 50 km. Finally, we observed that most of the aftershocks are located outside the 5 m contour line of the slip distribution that we inverted from GPS data for the 2015 Illapel earthquake.

DATA AND RESOURCES

Local data used in this study were collected by the National Seismological Center. Local seismic data can be accessed at http://evt.csn.uchile.cl (last accessed March 2016) and Global Positioning System (GPS) data at http://www.csn.uchile.cl and https://www.lia-mb.net (last accessed March 2016). The teleseismic data were obtained from Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology Data Management Center (http://ds.iris.edu/wilber3, last accessed March 2016).
Figure 9. Aftershocks of the 2015 Illapel earthquake. (a) Seismicity reported by CSN between 16 September 2015 and 30 September 2015. (b) Seismicity reported from CSN between 1 October 2015 and 10 December 2015. The open circles correspond to the seismicity shown in (a). Contours of the coseismic slip distribution of Figure 7 are plotted in the figures for reference. The color version of this figure is available only in the electronic edition.

Figure 10. Moment tensors of aftershocks of the 2015 Illapel earthquakes. (a) Moment tensor determination for events of magnitude greater than $M_w$ 5.0 occurred between 16 September 2015 and 5 October 2015. The gray focal mechanisms are those interpreted as intraplate intermediate depth or crustal events. (b) Schematic profile of the Nazca plate subduction in the Illapel region based on Hayes et al. (2012) and Contreras-Reyes et al. (2015). The hatched zone is composed of eroded and fractured volcanics (Contreras-Reyes et al., 2015) that could act as an up-dip limit for the seismic rupture. The color version of this figure is available only in the electronic edition.
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Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Velocity Model Used to Localize and Compute Moment Tensors Used in This Work and Used by the Centro Sismológico Nacional for This Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth (km)</td>
<td>$V_p$ (km/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−5.00</td>
<td>5.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>6.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>6.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>6.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>6.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>7.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>7.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>7.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>7.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>7.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>8.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>8.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>8.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>8.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>8.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>8.441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


