



HAL
open science

Simultaneous estimation of secular and episodic crustal motion via geodetic observations

C. Mitsakaki, A. Mimidou

► **To cite this version:**

C. Mitsakaki, A. Mimidou. Simultaneous estimation of secular and episodic crustal motion via geodetic observations. *Journal of Geodynamics*, 2010, 49 (3-4), pp.224. 10.1016/j.jog.2009.10.001 . hal-00615320

HAL Id: hal-00615320

<https://hal.science/hal-00615320>

Submitted on 19 Aug 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Accepted Manuscript

Title: Simultaneous estimation of secular and episodic crustal motion via geodetic observations

Authors: C. Mitsakaki, A. Mimidou

PII: S0264-3707(09)00112-4
DOI: doi:10.1016/j.jog.2009.10.001
Reference: GEOD 939

To appear in: *Journal of Geodynamics*

Received date: 26-11-2008
Revised date: 29-6-2009
Accepted date: 6-10-2009

Please cite this article as: Mitsakaki, C., Mimidou, A., Simultaneous estimation of secular and episodic crustal motion via geodetic observations, *Journal of Geodynamics* (2008), doi:10.1016/j.jog.2009.10.001

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.






Figure 1 Positions of the gulf of Corinth GPS network points: red triangles, blue dots and black dots correspond respectively to the 1st order, 2nd order points (also old Hellenic triangulation network points) and to the ones common with the Central Greece network (another series of GPS campaigns in Greece). Dented segments show the localisation of the main active faults in the area. From (Briole *et al.*, 2002).





Figure 2 Smoothed velocity field (Peloponnesus fixed) from GPS observations between 1990 and 2000. The pole of rotation of the Central Greece block with respect to ‘fixed Europe’ is shown in inset. Its coordinates and rotation rate are given in Table 3 of Avallone et al., (2004).

1



11

12 **Figure 3** Dislocation model and fault geometry in a local three-dimensional
 13 Cartesian system (x_1, x_2, x_3) with origin the centre of the fault trace at the earth's
 14 surface (x_1^o, x_2^o, x_3^o) . (E_C, N_C) the reference system projection coordinates of the
 15 origin.

16 **ss, ds** Strike and dip slip of the dislocation parallelogram

17 **α** strike (azimuth) of the fault trace

18 **θ** dip angle

19 **L** fault length

20 **D** fault slab depth (DU: top, DL: bottom, $D = DU - DL$)

21

22

1992 and 1995 Earthquakes								
Date	Ms	Mo (Nm)	Lat degrees	Long degrees	Length (km)	Strike degrees	Dip degrees	Top/Bottom (km)
18/11/1992	5.9	0.5×10^{18}	38.30	22.45	14	270	30	5.2/9.7
15/06/1995	6.2	3.9×10^{18}	38.36	22.20	15	277	35	4.5/9.7

Table 2 Parameters for the offshore faults of the 1992 and 1995 earthquakes.

The parameters are: **Ms** the magnitude of the event, **Mo** the seismic moment, **Lat** and **Long** the geodetic coordinates of the fault's center, **Length** the length of fault, **Strike** the fault's azimuth, **Dip** the fault's dipping angle and **Top/Bottom** the upper and lower depth of the fault (*Briole et al., 1993*), (*Bernard et al., 1997*), (*Avallone et al., 2004*)

1

		<i>This work</i>		<i>Smoothed Data</i>
<i>Secular rate parameters</i>		<i>All Epochs (1990-2001)</i> <i>(3 fault segments for the episodic motion)</i>	<i>Epochs 1990-1997.8</i> <i>(3 fault segments for the episodic motion)</i>	
North block	\dot{d}_E (mm/yr)	-2±1	-3±2	0±1
	\dot{d}_N (mm/yr)	5±2	8±2	8±1
	$\dot{\rho}$ (μstr/yr)	.12±.02	.11±.03	.11±.03
	$\dot{\omega}$ (μstr/yr)	.08±.02	.11±.03	.10±.03
	$\dot{\gamma}$ (μstr/yr)	.30±.02	.22±.03	.22±.03
	A (degrees)	17°.2	17°.1	13°.6
	\dot{e}_{max} (μstr/yr)	.25±.03	.22±.04	.21±.04
	\dot{e}_{min} (μstr/yr)	-.02±.02	-.00±.02	-.00±.02
South block	\dot{d}_E (mm/yr)	-0±1	-1±1	-2±1
	\dot{d}_N (mm/yr)	1±1	2±1	-1±1
	$\dot{\rho}$ (μstr/yr)	.02±.02	-.00±.02	.08±.02
	$\dot{\omega}$ (μstr/yr)	.02±.02	.03±.02	.01±.02
	$\dot{\gamma}$ (μstr/yr)	.14±.02	.10±.03	.21±.02
	A (degrees)	16°.1	16°.9	5°.3
	\dot{e}_{max} (μstr/yr)	.10±.03	.04±.03	.18±.03
	\dot{e}_{min} (μstr/yr)	-.05±.02	-.05±.02	-.03±.02
$\hat{\sigma}_o$ (mm/yr)	±22	±12	±3	

2

3 **Table 3** Secular strain parameters for the two homogeneously deforming blocks
4 (North and South). At the same time three fault segments are considered for the
5 episodic motion: a single segment model for the 1992 Galaxidi earthquake and a
6 double one (the upper slab and a lower relaxation segment) for the 1995 Aigion event.
7 A is the azimuth of maximum strain rate (semiaxis of the strain ellipse) e_{max} .

8 The last column is taken from previous work (*Agatza et al., 2003*), (*Avallone et al.,*
9 *2004*). It represents the secular parameters estimated after the average co-seismic
10 motion for the 1995 Aigion earthquake (considered as a single dislocation segment) is
11 eliminated from the GPS data.

Accepted Manuscript

Slip for the 1992 and 1995 Earthquakes									
<i>Cases examined</i>			Length (km)	Dip degrees	Top/Bottom (km)	Strike slip (m)	Dip slip (m)	$\hat{\sigma}_o^*$ (m)	
First case	this study	Only 1992 Galaxidi	14	30	5.2/9.7	.95 ± .06	.90 ± .08	±.02	
	<i>Slip values from (Briole et al., 1993)**</i>		14	30	5.2/9.7	Total slip 0.12m			
Second case	this study	1992 Galaxidi	14	30	5.2/9.7	.92 ± .02	.93 ± .05	±.038 / ±.030	
		1995 Aigion (<i>single block</i>)	15	35	4.5/9.7	1.0 ± .03	1.0 ± .04		
Third case	this study	1992 Galaxidi	14	30	5.2/9.7	.95 ± .01	.91 ± .03	±.022 / ±.012	
		1995 Aigion (<i>2 blocks</i>)	<i>Upper block</i>	15	35	4.5/9.5	1.01 ± .02		1.0 ± .02
			<i>Lower block</i>	20	80	9.5/19.5	1.02 ± .01		.70 ± .025
Fourth case	this study	1995 Aigion (<i>2 blocks</i>)	<i>Upper block</i>	15	35	4.5/9.5	1.0 ± .02	1.0 ± .02	±.022 / ±.012
			<i>Lower block</i>	20	80	9.5/19.5	1.04 ± .02	.68 ± .03	
	<i>Slip values from (Bernard et al., 1997)**</i>	Only 1995 Aigion (<i>Single block</i>)	15	35	4.5/9.7	Total slip 0.87m			

2 **Table 4** Parameters chosen and slip results for the 1992 and 1995 earthquakes with the a posteriori variance factor $\hat{\sigma}_o$ of the model.
3 *First case*: Only the 1992 event modelled; *second case*: the 1992 and 1995 earthquakes modelled as single blocks; *third*
4 *case*: the 1992 as a single block and the 1995 as a two block dislocation; *fourth case*: only the 1995 event modelled as a
5 two block dislocation.

6 * The first values for the a posteriori $\hat{\sigma}_o$ of the model refer to the case of using all available GPS data (1990-2001) and the
7 second one when only data from the interval 1990-1997.8 have been used.

8 ** The shadowed rows refer to results from previous studies (*Briole et al., 1993*), (*Bernard et al., 1997*) for comparison.

9

10

11

GPS Campaigns	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995.5	1995.8	1997*	2001
First order points	7	23	9	43	16	23	51	12	35
Second order points	-	9	-	34	24	22	84	10	23

Table 1 Overview of the GPS campaigns for the Gulf of Corinth.
* The data were acquired within the frame of a project in the vicinity of the Gulfs of Euboea and Corinth (*Agatza-Balodimou et al., 2003*).

1 *Simultaneous estimation of secular and episodic crustal motion via*
2 *geodetic observations*

3
4 * C. Mitsakaki, A. Mimidou

5
6 Laboratory of Higher Geodesy, School of Rural and Surveying Engineering,
7 National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece
8

9
10 **Abstract**

11
12 *Repeated high quality geodetic observations allow the*
13 *estimation of the free surface velocity field for a region. Usually,*
14 *a yearly secular rate is estimated, while the possible episodic*
15 *motion (seismic slip) due to an earthquake is evaluated via*
16 *inversion of the geodetic data. The episodic motion influence is*
17 *subtracted from the total field. The actual region and the*
18 *respective geodetic observations affected by the seismic event are*
19 *often assessed by rather vague criteria.*

20
21 *This paper deals with an attempt to estimate simultaneously*
22 *the secular and the episodic two-dimensional crustal motion for a*
23 *region by means of repeated GPS observations of a geodetic*
24 *network, carried out for a number of epochs.*
25

1 *The model is applied to the Gulf of Corinth available GPS*
2 *data, spanning a time interval of more than a decade, and the*
3 *results are discussed.*

4

5 *Keywords:* GPS Positioning, Deformation Measurements, Dislocations,
6 Corinth Rift

7

8

9

10 * Corresponding Author at: Laboratory of Higher Geodesy, School of
11 Rural and Surveying Engineering, National Technical University of
12 Athens,
13 9 H. Polytechniou Str., Zographou, 157 80 Athens, Greece
14 *E-mail address:* topocris@central.ntua.gr

15

1 **1. Introduction**

2

3 Tectonic movements in continental areas are driven by the complicated
4 mechanical behaviour of the earth's crust. Repeated geodetic observations allow the
5 estimation of the velocity field of the earth's free surface at discrete locations and
6 for distances of many kilometres from the traces of active faults. Nowadays, in
7 many cases, networks of GPS permanent stations provide practically continuous
8 monitoring. Therefore, such observations permit an independent direct estimation
9 of the deformation gradient tensor for a deforming area.

10

11 Greece, with the highest seismicity rate in Europe, belongs, mostly, to a
12 continental region, with tectonics controlled by complicated mechanical behaviour.
13 The most pronounced characteristic is the high extension rate over the Aegean Sea.
14 Thus, the southwestern Aegean moves, relative to Eurasia, toward the SSW at
15 about 30-40 mm/yr (*Nyst and Thatcher, 2004*). Normal faulting, organized into sub-
16 parallel systems distributed over areas of tens or even hundred kilometres wide, is a
17 feature often appearing in actively extending regions on the continents.

18

19 One of the most prominent and active features of such a system of faults is the
20 rift along the Gulf of Corinth, with a large seismicity rate. It is an area of high
21 seismic risk, since it is surrounded by several large, densely populated cities,
22 among them Athens. Therefore extensive research work has been carried out for
23 more than a decade.

24

1 The Gulf of Corinth is the most rapidly extending rift system in Greece with
2 about 120km length and 30km width and a WNW-ESE trend. It is believed to be
3 active at the present rates since the last 5Myrs (*Taymaz et al., 1991*), (*Armijo et al.,*
4 *1996*). Most of the active surface normal faults are located on the south side of the
5 gulf (North Peloponnesus) while some south-dipping faults appear on its northern
6 side (Sterea Hellas) (*Armijo et al., 1996*). Present day extension rates, estimated
7 from GPS observations, for the eastern part of the gulf are significantly lower (~ 5 -
8 6mm / yr) than the central-western ones (*Briole et al., 2000*), (*Clarke et al., 1997*).
9 Medium size seismic events of the order of $M_S \sim 5.5 - 6.5$ are often the case.

10

11 Since 1990 the Higher Geodesy Laboratory of NTUA, participating in a
12 European multi-disciplinary research program concerning the tectonic behaviour of
13 the area, contributes in the acquisition and analysis of the geodetic data (Corinth
14 Rift Laboratory). Between 1990 and 2001 eleven epochs of observations with GPS
15 receivers were carried out on a network consisting of about 200 points, out of
16 which 142 are pillars belonging to the Hellenic triangulation network (*Figures 1 and*
17 *2, Table 1*). Today, beyond these periodically observed points, five permanent GPS
18 stations have been established in the area for continuous monitoring (*Briole et al.,*
19 *2001*).

20

21 The key objective of this long-term project is to combine methods and data in
22 order to estimate the seismic hazard in the region. Data both from the periodic
23 reoccupation of the dense geodetic GPS network and the ones derived from the
24 small permanent network may be used for this purpose. More explicitly, not only

1 the evaluation of the *inter-seismic strain rate* across the Gulf of Corinth but also the
2 estimation of the geometric parameters (*co-seismic fault slip*) of the episodic
3 motion associated with seismic events is sought after.

4

5 Often the rapture of the fault occurs at depth and no surface trace of the slip is
6 visible. Thus, in order to evaluate episodic motion parameters using the surface
7 velocity field derived from geodetic observations (today mostly GPS ones) one has
8 to solve an inverse problem which has no unique solution. For medium size seismic
9 events a typical procedure is a trial-and-error one, while observations and data from
10 other disciplines (seismology, geology etc) provide constraints for the solution of
11 the problem via a dislocation model (e. g., *Snay et al., 1983; Hudnut et al., 1996*).

12

13 Thus, geodetic network points with repeated observations (e.g., GPS) considered
14 relatively close to the location of the earthquake and therefore probably affected by
15 the co-seismic displacements are chosen. The coordinate time series of these are
16 computed and examined in order to assess whether their positions are influenced
17 from the event and to what extent. A dislocation model is chosen, with some of its
18 parameters constrained by other than geodetic data (e.g., aftershock distribution at
19 depth) and its displacement field on the earth's free surface is compared with the
20 one available from the geodetic observations. The procedure is repeated until the
21 estimated dislocation model parameters best fit the surface displacement field.

22

23 In the present work a two-dimensional model is described that solves for both
24 the secular and some parameters of the episodic motion and accepts all available
25 geodetic data (coordinate time series) as observations. Medium to large seismic

1 events affect the velocity field of broad areas. The radius of interference is
2 represented by a constraint embedded in the computer programme and easily
3 adapted to the size of the earthquake. The model is applied for the Galaxidi 1992
4 and Aigion 1995 earthquakes and the results are discussed.

5

6

7

8 **2. The model**

9

10 Until today, the common technique for deformation studies using geodetic
11 observations is to carry out campaigns where discrete network points on the earth's
12 surface are occupied repeatedly. Therefore, the data are sparse both spatially and
13 temporally, and they should be homogenized by referring them to the same
14 geodetic reference frame (e.g., ITRF2000) and epoch in order to be further used.
15 Moreover, geodetic observations, like all types of observations have random errors,
16 while they may be, also, contaminated by systematic errors (biases)¹ or gross errors
17 (mistakes or outliers)². Therefore, their reliability has to be statistically tested. The
18 deformation model that is estimated by the geodetic observations has also to be
19 tested for its congruency and its parameters for their statistical significance. Only
20 the parameters found statistically significant should remain in the final expression
21 of the model.

22

¹ *Systematic errors* may appear in observations when necessary reductions are omitted, or the influence from various sources (such as the ionosphere effects on GPS measurements) may be not properly modelled etc. They usually obey physical laws and in most cases may be modelled by mathematical expressions.

² *Outliers* are mistakes occurring by negligence. They are large in size and relatively easily detected.

1 So far, the geodetic GPS observations available in Greece, remain mostly sparse
2 and thus, inadequate to discern a combination of parameters regarding the fault
3 geometry. Thus, the detection of which fault is responsible for a seismic event, its
4 geometry and location are information derived primarily from geological and
5 seismotectonic observations. At present, the model described here solves only for
6 the strike and dip slip components of the episodic motion of a seismic event that
7 occurred during the time interval for which adequate GPS observations are
8 available. The software uses as data the displacement at a given position if that
9 location is within the specified radius of the centroid of the earthquake.

10

11 With respect to the secular motion the area is considered as consisting of a
12 mosaic of blocks with borders active fault traces or lines that distinguish changes in
13 the velocity field.

14

15 Since the accuracy of the vertical component determined from GPS observations
16 is at least two to three times worse than the horizontal components the two-
17 dimensional approach was chosen in this study. Thus, a two-dimensional model
18 was developed that solves for both the secular and the two episodic motion
19 parameters (strike and dip slip). Due to the average size of displacements, the
20 infinitesimal elastic strain theory is followed for the secular motion without loss of
21 the required precision. The data consists of the two-dimensional projection
22 coordinates of the network point positions (E , N) for the various epochs of
23 observations derived from the three-dimensional GPS (X , Y , Z) ones.

24

1 Software, already written and used in previous studies (e.g. *Agatza-Balodimou et*
2 *al., 2003*), was modified in order to solve for the episodic motion parameters with
3 their respective full covariance matrices so as to test their statistical significance. It
4 should be mentioned that the displacement residuals may be statistically inspected
5 for outliers at a certain confidence level. Suspect observations are signalled by the
6 programme but their elimination depends on the software user. The software
7 accepts data consisting of as many files as the available epochs of observations.
8 Each file referring to epoch t_j contains the arrays of the projected plane coordinates
9 derived at the respective epoch. Furthermore, the program allows for breaking up
10 the region into several blocks. The solution of the parameters is carried out using
11 simultaneously all the pertinent data files for each block and/or seismic event. The
12 advantage of the program lies in its ability to utilize positional information *sparse*
13 *both in space and time* and solve for the deformation rate inside each block as well
14 as the episodic motion.

15
16 The map projection coordinates (E_i, N_i) of a network point i , belonging to the k -
17 th block, at observation epoch t^j , are modelled as function of the following; its
18 coordinates (E^o, N^o) at reference epoch t^o , the secular homogeneous infinitesimal
19 strain rate and the contribution of the m -th seismic event that occurred at t^m time
20 (*Mitsakaki, 1987*):

21

22

23

24

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{bmatrix} E_i^j - E_i^0 \\ N_i^j - N_i^0 \end{bmatrix}_k &= \begin{bmatrix} \dot{d}_E \\ \dot{d}_N \end{bmatrix}_k (t^j - t^0) + \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\rho} + \frac{\dot{\gamma}_1}{2} & \dot{\omega} + \frac{\dot{\gamma}_2}{2} \\ -(\dot{\omega} - \frac{\dot{\gamma}_2}{2}) & \dot{\rho} - \frac{\dot{\gamma}_1}{2} \end{bmatrix}_k \begin{bmatrix} E_i^j - \bar{E}_0 \\ N_i^j - \bar{N}_0 \end{bmatrix}_k (t^j - t^0) + \\
&+ \sum_m r(t^j, t^m) \cdot R_a \cdot [F_m(E, N) - F_m^0(\bar{E}_0, \bar{N}_0)] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} ss_m \\ ds_m \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

5

6 For the rigid body translation and the secular homogeneous infinitesimal strain
7 rates (first two terms of formula 1) the variables are:

8

9 (E_i^j, N_i^j) Easting and Northing of point i at observation epoch j

10 (E_i^0, N_i^0) Easting and Northing of point i at reference epoch t^0

11 (\bar{E}_0, \bar{N}_0) Easting and Northing of the network reference point,
12 considered stable both in space and time

13 $(E_i^j - \bar{E}_0), (N_i^j - \bar{N}_0)$ i point position with respect the reference point
14 (\bar{E}_0, \bar{N}_0)

15 (\dot{d}_E, \dot{d}_N) rigid body translation rate components

16 $\dot{\gamma}_1, \dot{\gamma}_2$ shear strain rate components

17 $\dot{\omega}$ solid body rotation rate

18 $\dot{\rho}$ dilatation rate

19 (t^0, t^j) reference epoch and observation epoch j

20

21 Often, maximum and minimum strain rates (i.e. the axes of the strain rate ellipse)

22 e_{max} and e_{min} are also used, as well as the total shear rate $\dot{\gamma} = (\dot{\gamma}_1^2 + \dot{\gamma}_2^2)^{1/2}$.

23

1 The last term in formula (1), expressed as a summation, refers to the episodic
 2 motion. The term describes the change in position (E_i^j, N_i^j) of the i -th point due to
 3 the slip components of the slipping fault (ss_m and ds_m : slips on the fault surface
 4 parallel and transverse to the fault strike respectively). This change takes place at
 5 the instant t^m of an earthquake occurring on the m -th parallelogram that represents
 6 the fault surface. The total effect on the position of each point is given by summing
 7 up all contributions from the m -parallelograms.

8

9 The dependence of the episodic motion on time is made obvious in the case of
 10 the *step function* $r(t^j, t^m)$ used in the model which is defined by the conditions
 11 (Snay et al., 1983):

$$\begin{aligned}
 12 \quad & \text{for } t^m < t^o \quad r(t^j, t^m) = \begin{cases} -1 & t^j < t^m \\ 0 & t^j > t^m \end{cases} \\
 13 & \\
 14 \quad & \text{for } t^m > t^o \quad r(t^j, t^m) = \begin{cases} 0 & t^j < t^m \\ 1 & t^j > t^m \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2}$$

15

16 Conditions (2) consider that the slip on the m -th parallelogram occurs
 17 instantaneously at the instant t^m even though this may result in mistakenly assigning
 18 a post-seismic activity to the co-seismic phase. However, a more refined model that
 19 would attempt to distinguish between the phases of the seismic cycle (pro-, co- and
 20 post-seismic cycle) would require continuous monitoring observations, at several
 21 network points. This, until recently, was not easily realized in the case of the GPS
 22 networks and still remains a demanding and rather expensive approach.

23

1 The functions of the last term of expression (1) correlate the fault slips ss_m and
 2 ds_m with the displacements on the earth's free surface. Quite often the fault rupture
 3 due to an earthquake does not reach the surface. If the fault rectangle is buried, the
 4 upper edge of the parallelogram that simulates the fault surface is projected
 5 vertically until it meets the earth's surface. The middle of this line is regarded as the
 6 centre of the fault (x_1^0, x_2^0, x_3^0) defining the origin of a local three-dimensional
 7 right-handed Cartesian system (x_1, x_2, x_3) . The axis x_1 coincides with the direction
 8 of the fault dip, while the axis x_2 is taken parallel with the fault strike (*Figure 3*).

9
 10 The displacement, in map projection coordinates, of an arbitrary point (E_i^j, N_i^j)
 11 on the earth's surface due to the m -th parallelogram is analysed in two components.
 12 One is oriented parallel to the fault azimuth (*along strike*) $u_{1m}(E, N)$ and the other
 13 transversely to this $u_{2m}(E, N)$. Then, from dislocation theory there are functions f_{im}
 14 (E, N) and $g_{im}(E, N)$ (with $i=1, 2$) such that:

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{1m}(E, N) \\ u_{2m}(E, N) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f_{1m}(E, N) & g_{1m}(E, N) \\ f_{2m}(E, N) & g_{2m}(E, N) \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} ss_m \\ ds_m \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

17
 18 Functions f_{im} and g_{im} depend on the point's position. They, also, depend on the
 19 geometry, the position and the orientation of the parallelogram as well as the
 20 Poisson ratio ν , which characterizes the elasticity of the earth's crust. In this model
 21 the Okada dislocation formulae are used (*Okada, 1985*).

22

23 Formulae (3) refer to the local three-dimensional system (x_1, x_2, x_3) , with origin
 24 the centre of the fault trace at the free surface. The origin's coordinates in the map

1 projection reference system are E_C, N_C . This point is considered free of
2 displacement.

3

4 For a point on the earth's surface, with map projection coordinates (E_-, N_-)
5 before the m -th earthquake, the relation that connects the two-dimensional geodetic
6 reference system (E, N) with the arbitrary local reference system (x_1, x_2) is:

7

$$8 \quad \begin{bmatrix} E_- - E_C \\ N_- - N_C \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\alpha & \sin\alpha \\ -\sin\alpha & \cos\alpha \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

9

10 where α is the fault azimuth (*strike*).

11

12 The contribution of the dislocation expressed in the local system (x_1, x_2) due to
13 the m -th event is the vector (u_{1m}, u_{2m}) . Then, directly after the earthquake, the new
14 projection coordinates of the point (E_+, N_+) are expressed as:

$$15 \quad \begin{bmatrix} E_+ - E_C \\ N_+ - N_C \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\alpha & \sin\alpha \\ -\sin\alpha & \cos\alpha \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x_1 + u_{1m} \\ x_2 + u_{2m} \end{bmatrix} \quad (5)$$

16

17 where the point (E_C, N_C) is considered as free from motion.

18 Combining expressions (4) and (5) the influence of the m -th dislocation on the map
19 projection coordinates of the point is:

$$20 \quad \begin{bmatrix} E_+ - E_- \\ N_+ - N_- \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\alpha & \sin\alpha \\ -\sin\alpha & \cos\alpha \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} u_{1m} \\ u_{2m} \end{bmatrix} = R_a \cdot \begin{bmatrix} u_{1m} \\ u_{2m} \end{bmatrix} \quad (5')$$

21

22 The motion due to the earthquake at the network reference point (\bar{E}_0, \bar{N}_0) ,

23 with regard to the fault origin (E_C, N_C) , may be expressed by the

24 functions (u_{1m}^0, u_{2m}^0) according to (5'). When the motion of the arbitrary point $(E_i,$

1 N_i) is expressed with respect to the reference point (\bar{E}_o, \bar{N}_o) , which is now
 2 considered stable, (5') becomes:

$$3 \quad \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_m E \\ \Delta_m N \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} E_+^o - E_-^o \\ N_+^o - N_-^o \end{bmatrix} = R_a \cdot \begin{bmatrix} u_{1m} - u_{1m}^o \\ u_{2m} - u_{2m}^o \end{bmatrix}$$

5 Here (E_-^o, N_-^o) and (E_+^o, N_+^o) , the coordinates of i point before and after the
 6 earthquake respectively, refer to the reference point (\bar{E}_o, \bar{N}_o) .

7 The above expression may be written as:

$$8 \quad \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_m E \\ \Delta_m N \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} E_+^o - E_-^o \\ N_+^o - N_-^o \end{bmatrix} = R_a \cdot [F_m(E, N) - F_m^o(\bar{E}_o, \bar{N}_o)] \begin{bmatrix} ss_m \\ ds_m \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

10

11

$$12 \quad \text{From (3) it is obvious that: } F_m(E, N) = \begin{bmatrix} f_{1m}(E, N) & g_{1m}(E, N) \\ f_{2m}(E, N) & g_{2m}(E, N) \end{bmatrix}$$

13

14 while the expression

$$15 \quad F_m^o(\bar{E}_o, \bar{N}_o) = \begin{bmatrix} f_{1m}(\bar{E}_o, \bar{N}_o) & g_{1m}(\bar{E}_o, \bar{N}_o) \\ f_{2m}(\bar{E}_o, \bar{N}_o) & g_{2m}(\bar{E}_o, \bar{N}_o) \end{bmatrix}$$

16 refers to the network reference point.

17

18 Finally, the formula (1) for each k -th block and all m seismic events may be
 19 generalized as:

20

$$21 \quad \delta = [\dot{d}_k + \dot{E}_k \cdot \delta(\bar{E}_o, \bar{N}_o)] \cdot \delta t + \sum_m r(t^j, t^m) \cdot R_a \cdot [F_m(E, N) - F_m^o(\bar{E}_o, \bar{N}_o)] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} ss_m \\ ds_m \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

22

23 The variables in formula (7) are:

$$1 \quad \delta = \begin{bmatrix} E_i^j - E_i^0 \\ N_i^j - N_i^0 \end{bmatrix}_k, \quad \dot{d}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{d}_E \\ \dot{d}_N \end{bmatrix}_k, \quad \dot{E}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\rho} + \frac{\dot{\gamma}_1}{2} & \dot{\omega} + \frac{\dot{\gamma}_2}{2} \\ -(\dot{\omega} - \frac{\dot{\gamma}_2}{2}) & \dot{\rho} - \frac{\dot{\gamma}_1}{2} \end{bmatrix}_k,$$

$$2 \quad \delta(\bar{E}_0, \bar{N}_0) = \begin{bmatrix} E_i^j - \bar{E}_0 \\ N_i^j - \bar{N}_0 \end{bmatrix}$$

3

4 The method described here has similarities to block modelling (e.g., *McCaffrey*,
5 *2002*), although ours is a much simpler model. For the part of the surface velocities
6 due to a locked fault (episodic motion) *McCaffrey* (2002) uses the same dislocation
7 formulae (*Okada, 1985*). However, the approach in *McCaffrey* (2002) refers to
8 block-bounding faults that follow the stick-slip model (aseismic steady state slip
9 and slip ‘deficit’, as it is called in the locked phase). The present work is better
10 suited for active faults, not of necessity bordering a block, that slip due to an
11 earthquake.

12

13 In the present work, the secular motion is described by the infinitesimal strain
14 rate inside each block. We preferred strain rate modelling, instead of the GPS
15 velocity field, since the requirement for a strictly common spatio-temporal
16 reference frame is not essential in our case. Part of the strain rate tensor is the solid
17 body rotation rate of the block. This rotation rate may be transformed to an Euler
18 rotation rate according to *McCaffrey* (2002).

19

20 Another difference lies in the data used in the present work. The data are
21 positional information from several GPS campaigns, and the model solves for strain

14

1 rates and co-seismic slips (*formula 7*). The data in the block modelling approach is,
2 usually, smoothed averaged velocities that rather lack the inconsistencies of real
3 data. However, they still need to refer to the same geodetic reference frame and the
4 same epoch (e.g., ITRF2005, epoch 2007.5) in order to be used as data for
5 deformation analyses (*McCaffrey, 2002*), (*Nyst and Thatcher, 2004*).

6

7

8

9

10

11 **3. Analysis**

12

13 Since 1990 the Higher Geodesy Laboratory of the National Technical University
14 of Athens participated in a European multi-disciplinary research programme for
15 monitoring the tectonic behaviour of the Corinth rift region. A GPS network, part
16 of a much larger network was established in Greece by several research teams
17 (*Briole et al., 2000*). The network includes about 50 first order points (measured at
18 least three times in a given campaign). In addition, about 150 second order points
19 were observed one or two times during at least one campaign. It should be
20 mentioned that approximately 140 of these GPS network points are pillars of the
21 Hellenic triangulation network.

22

23 Eleven GPS campaigns were carried out from 1990 to 2001 (*Table 1*). Two of
24 them (November 1992 and June 1995) took place after the $M_S = 5.9$, 18 November
25 1992, Galaxidi and the $M_S = 6.2$, 15 June 1995, Aigion earthquakes.

1

2 For all campaigns, IGS precise orbits and data from IGS stations were used to tie
3 the network to ITRF2000. No ambiguity fixing was allowed for baselines longer
4 than 100 km, in other words between points in the network and the IGS sites. The
5 average percentage of ambiguities fixed in the network was $\sim 85\%$ (*Avallone et al.*,
6 2004). Expected sources of errors in each campaign's final results are the centring
7 of the antennas for the horizontal components, and the antenna heights and
8 troposphere modelling for the vertical component (*Avallone et al.*, 2004). So far,
9 only horizontal solutions of the GPS data have been employed for the Gulf
10 analyses; the same applies here. Time series of the map projection coordinates offer
11 average uncertainty estimation of the order of a few mmyr^{-1} , which is a more
12 realistic estimate than the uncertainties based on the GAMIT solutions (*Avallone et*
13 *al.*, 2004).

14

15 Previous extensive research work carried out for the Gulf of Corinth shows that
16 the extension of the rift is localised along a narrow offshore zone of about 10km
17 width. The extension rate, as derived from about 11 years of GPS observations is
18 not uniform, with an average of 11mm/yr in the central part of the rift (largest rate
19 of 16mm/yr close to Aigion town) and tapering off to 5-6mm/yr at the eastern edge
20 of the gulf (*Avallone et al.*, 2004), (*Agatza-Balodimou et al.*, 2003), (*Briole et al.*,
21 2002).

22

1 In view of these findings and in order to keep the model as simple as possible it
2 was decided to consider the area of the gulf as consisting of two blocks, the north
3 and south.

4
5 It is estimated that for the central part of the rift all recent large earthquakes
6 (Eratine of Phokida, $M_S = 6.3$, 1965; Antikyra, $M_S = 6.2$, 1970; Galaxidi, $M_S = 5.8$,
7 1992, Aigion, $M_S = 6.2$, 1995) activated offshore faults with shallow north-dipping
8 planes (*Baker et al., 1997*). In contrast the deformation pattern of the western part of
9 the Corinth rift differs in that all active normal faults dip at large angles (50° to 60°)
10 suggesting a probably significant structural change (*Bernard et al., 2006*).

11
12 Since the first GPS campaign took place in 1990, it was decided, at first, to
13 investigate only the Aigion 1995 earthquake for the episodic motion. The event was
14 large enough to affect the displacement field of a broad region and GPS data were
15 available both before and after its occurrence.

16
17 The Galaxidi 1992 earthquake, an event of smaller size, took place in 1992. At
18 the time, the GPS network was only partially established. Thus, the velocity field
19 was poorly resolved. However, an attempt was made to include this event in the
20 analysis.

21
22 The parameters for the two earthquakes taken from previous studies are
23 presented in *Table 2* (*Bernard et al., 1997*), (*Briole et al., 1993*), (*Mitsakaki et al.,*
24 *2006*).

25

1 Several tests were carried out with respect to the sensitivity of the model to
2 various dislocation parameters. Thus, different depths and dip angles were used and
3 the resulting strike and dip slips were compared. Usually, the model appeared to be
4 insensitive to minor changes of the aforementioned parameters. Radical changes of
5 depth and dip angles affected the model but also decreased the statistical reliability
6 of the solution.

7

8

9 **Secular motion parameters**

10

11 The most characteristic cases for the secular motion parameters of the North and
12 South blocks are depicted in *Table 3*. It should be mentioned here that the
13 displacement residuals were statistically inspected for outliers at the 99%
14 confidence level. The respective suspect observations were eliminated and the
15 revised data set was used for a new solution. The last column (*Table 3*) is extracted
16 from previous work (*Agatza-Balodimou et al., 2003*), (*Avallone et al., 2004*) and
17 presented here for comparison. The effect of the average co-seismic motion for the
18 1995 event was estimated and eliminated from the velocity field (*Avallone et al.,*
19 *2004*). Then the secular parameters were estimated (*Agatza-Balodimou et al.,*
20 *2003*).

21

22 In the present work the secular parameters of the 1990-1997.8 dataset appear to
23 be in better agreement with the smoothed data ones –at least for the north block.
24 This may be due to the way the smoothed field was estimated by Avallone et al.

1 (2004). They used linear regression models making use of all the GPS time series
2 (1990-2001). A co-seismic offset for 15 points, located close to the 1995 event's
3 epicentre, was estimated from the regression models. This co-seismic effect was
4 subtracted from the total field of the affected points. Then the velocities estimated
5 from the regression models were considered as the smoothed secular velocity field.
6 Since the north block GPS points were the ones mostly affected by the 1995 event,
7 the removal of the co-seismic effect by Avallone et al. (2004) is probably the
8 critical factor for the smoothing out of the remaining secular displacement field.
9 This smoothed field was used in Agatza-Balodimou et al. (2003) but the two blocks
10 were treated separately and the respective secular parameters were independently
11 estimated.

12
13 In the present work not only the secular motion for the two blocks but also the
14 episodic motion was estimated simultaneously. Therefore, the effect of the 1995
15 event's episodic motion was also relieved in our model, especially for the north
16 block. Hence, the secular motion solution of Avallone et al. (2004) of the smoothed
17 field for the north block is very similar to ours.

18
19 In contrast, the present solution for the south block is similar whether the 1990-
20 1997.8 dataset or all data (1990 - 2001) are used (*Table 3*, 1st and 2nd column).
21 These secular strain rates are quite lower compared to the ones estimated in the
22 previous work (*Table 3*, last column) (*Agatza-Balodimou et al., 2003; Avallone et*
23 *al., 2004*). It appears that the present model allows for some network points of the
24 south block (located around the region of Aigion and close to the coast) to be
25 partially influenced by the co-seismic effect of the 1995 earthquake. Therefore, a

1 lower residual secular displacement field for this block remains, providing smaller
2 secular strain rates.

3

4 **Episodic motion parameters**

5

6 In all cases the geodetically derived co-seismic fault slip was significantly larger
7 than the values derived in previous studies (*Table 4*). Several trials took place in
8 order to estimate the model that better fitted the data. Global congruency testing for
9 choosing the best fitting model for the Galaxidi and Aigion events was carried out
10 for all cases. No weighting of the GPS data was considered; therefore the test
11 statistic used was:

$$12 \quad \frac{\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u} / (n - m)}{\sigma_o^2} = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_o^2}{\sigma_o^2} \leq F_{(1-\alpha, r, \infty)}$$

13 In the formula \mathbf{u} is the vector of the model residuals, $r = n - m$ the degrees of
14 freedom (with n the observations and m the parameters to be estimated), σ_o^2 the
15 apriori variance factor and $F_{(1-\alpha, r, \infty)}$ the limit value of the Fischer distribution. The
16 statistical significance of the model parameters was also tested using the test
17 statistic $\frac{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i}{\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i}} \leq \sqrt{F_{(1-\alpha_o, r, 1)}}$. Here $\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i}$ is the standard error of the $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i$ parameter and r
18 is the degrees of freedom of the model.

19

20 For the 1992 Galaxidi event, GPS data from the period 1990-1994 were used.
21 The estimated slip is quite larger (~120cm total slip) than the previously derived
22 one of 12cm (*Table 4*, first case, 2nd row) (*Briole et al., 1993*), while the two slip

20

1 components are statistically significant at the 95% confidence level (*Table 4*, first
2 case, 1st row). However, these high rates may not represent realistically the true
3 motion. This discrepancy may be due to the fact that no full covariance matrices
4 were used for weighting the geodetic coordinates in the deformation model. The
5 use of the full variance - covariance matrix of the coordinates as the weight matrix
6 for a least squares adjustment of a deformation model controls the statistical
7 significance of all the parameters. This significance has to do not with their high
8 value but their real contribution to the model (*Agatza-Balodimou and Mitsakaki,*
9 *1985*). Thus, high rates of deformation parameters may still be statistically
10 insignificant if properly weighted.

11
12 Furthermore, Briole et al. (1993) used not only the relatively few GPS data
13 available at the time (1990-1992) but also seismotectonic information to constrain
14 some of the dislocation parameters. The present study used only data from the GPS
15 campaigns. Thus, their dislocation positional parameters (*Table 1*) were chosen as
16 known and only the strike and dip slips were estimated. It appears, though, that the
17 geodetic data alone may not be sufficient to constrain the episodic motion for the
18 Galaxidi event properly.

19
20 The slip for the 1995 earthquake (*Table 4*, 8th row) is also larger than the 87cm
21 estimated by Bernard et al. (1997). However, a slip of this size is in accordance
22 with the Harvard solution of $M_0 = 5.1 \times 10^{18} \text{Nm}$ (*Bernard et al., 1997*).
23 Alternatively, using the seismic moment (*Table 2*, 2nd row) given by Bernard et al.
24 (1997), and a slightly lower rigidity of $\mu = 2.9 \times 10^{10} \text{Nm}^{-2}$, instead of $\mu =$
25 $3.39 \times 10^{10} \text{Nm}^{-2}$ used in their study, the slip is again of the order of 1m. Besides, the

1 Bernard et al. (1997) solution was derived using not only the GPS data but also the
2 InSAR images available for the region.

3

4 For a number of network points, the size of the remaining residuals, after the
5 1992 and 1995 earthquakes had been modelled, was of the order of several cm
6 (*Table 4*, second case). These points were rather far away from the 1995 Aigion
7 earthquake area. This behaviour indicated possible post-seismic relaxation for the
8 1995 event. In order to evaluate whether such an event took place, the 1995 Aigion
9 earthquake was modelled as a two block dislocation model. The upper one
10 describes the co-seismic episodic motion, as previously discussed. The deeper one,
11 with the same position and strike angle as the upper one, deals with the post-
12 seismic relaxation (*Table 4*, third and fourth case, 3rd and 2nd rows respectively)
13 (*Ergintav et al., 2002*), (*Feigl and Thatcher, 2006*).

14

15 Global congruency testing indicated that the best fitting model for the Aigion
16 event was the one with two blocks. The statistical significance of the model
17 parameters was also tested. In all two-block trials the model parameters for the
18 episodic motion were found significant at the 95% confidence level.

19

20 Finally, the two-block model for the Aigion 1995 earthquake (i.e., *Table 4*, third
21 and fourth case, 3rd and 2nd rows respectively) was chosen as best fitting the data.
22 The upper block has the geometry estimated from Bernard et al. (1997), with a total
23 slip of 100 ± 12 cm. The deeper block dips 80 degrees, extends from 9.5km to 20km
24 depth and has a length of 20km. In this case the a posteriori $\hat{\sigma}_o$ of the deformation

1 model improved significantly (i.e., from $\pm 0.038\text{m}$ to $\pm 0.022\text{m}$ in the case of using
2 all epochs). When data from the 1990-1997.8 interval were used the a posteriori $\hat{\sigma}_o$
3 was improved from $\pm 0.030\text{m}$ to $\pm 0.012\text{m}$ respectively.

4
5 A statistical value that merits some reflection is the a posteriori $\hat{\sigma}_o$ of the
6 deformation model (*Tables 3 and 4*). The inclusion of more epochs results in
7 increasing the number of observations which, in turn, raises the degrees of freedom.
8 However, the a posteriori $\hat{\sigma}_o$ of the model shows higher values in this case. The
9 network around the Gulf of Corinth was established in a piecewise manner and the
10 network geometry (points observed) differed in each campaign. Therefore, the
11 remaining undetected errors (systematic errors and/or outliers) affect differently the
12 precision of the respective coordinates of each campaign. In other words, not all
13 epochs of observations are of equivalent quality. Since the model used these
14 coordinates as data the residuals of the model are influenced. More explicitly, using
15 more epochs may increase the degrees of freedom but, also, adds to the size of the
16 quadratic sum of the residuals. Hence, the larger values of the a posteriori $\hat{\sigma}_o$ for the
17 model.

18
19 A last comment on the values of the a posteriori variance of the model; the
20 a posteriori $\hat{\sigma}_o$ of the two-block model for the Aigion earthquake is clearly
21 improved against the single block model. This is evident even in the case discussed
22 previously, when data from all epochs were used (*Table 4*, last column, first values
23 of $\hat{\sigma}_o$).

24

1

2

3

4 **4. Conclusions**

5

6 The model described in this paper appears to be able to estimate the parameters
7 for both the secular and episodic motion for a number of blocks and seismic events.
8 However, a displacement field with good temporal and spatial coverage is
9 necessary.

10

11 A modification of the model to account for possible post-seismic relaxation may
12 improve its sensitivity to better discern between the inter-seismic and post-seismic
13 behaviour of the area under study. The implementation of any post-seismic
14 relaxation model will, obviously, increase the number of unknown parameters. The
15 complexity of such a model would need data from continuous GPS stations in order
16 to better resolve the overall tectonic behaviour of an area.

17

18 Furthermore, a full three-dimensional model using the GPS coordinates (X, Y,
19 Z) should be considered in order to describe more accurately the actual three-
20 dimensional dislocation model.

21

22 Finally, a topic that merits investigation is whether full covariance matrices for
23 the coordinates would provide better estimates for the reliability of the model and
24 the statistical significance of its parameters.

1

2

3

4 **Acknowledgments**

5

6 The authors would like to thank Prof. M. Sakellariou for offering valuable advice.

7 This work was supported by the Basic Research Programme Leykippos (2006-

8 2008) of the National Technical University of Athens.

9

10

11

12 **REFERENCES**

13

14 Agatza-Balodimou A.M., Mitsakaki C., *Deformation Studies in the Mornos*
15 *Dam Area (Greece)*. Survey Review, Vol. 28, No 217, (1985).

16

17 Agatza-Balodimou A.M., Avallone A., Briole P., Karamitsos S., Marinou
18 A., Mitsakaki C., Papazissi K., Veis G. (2003). Deformation Studies in the
19 Corinthian Gulf via Multi-epoch Analysis of Geodetic Data, *11th FIG*
20 *Intern. Symp. On Deformation Measurements, 25-28 May, Santorini,*
21 *Greece.*

22

23 Armijo R., Meyer B., King G., Rigo A., Papanastassiou D., (1996).
24 Quaternary evolution of the Corinth Rift and its implications for the Late
25 Cenozoic evolution of the Aegean, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 126, 11–53.

1

2 Avallone A., Briole P., Agatza-Balodimou A.M., H. Billiris, Charade O.,
3 Mitsakaki C., Nercessian A., Papazissi K., Paradissis D., Veis G. (2004)
4 Analysis of eleven years of deformation measured by GPS in the Corinth
5 Rift Laboratory area. *Comptes Rendues Geoscience, Special Issue on the*
6 *Corinth Rift Laboratory, Vol.336, Fasc. 4-5, pp.301-312.*

7

8 Baker, C., Hatzfeld, D., Lyon-Caen, H., Papadimitriou, E., and Rigo, A.,
9 (1997). Earthquake mechanisms of the Adriatic Sea and Western Greece,
10 *Geophys. J. Int., 131, 559-594.*

11

12 Bernard P., Briole P., Meyer B., Lyon-Caen H., Gomez J.M., Tiberi C.,
13 Berge C., Hatzfeld D., Lachet C., Lebrun B., Deschamps A., Courboux F.,
14 Larroque C., Rigo A., Massonet D., Papadimitriou P., Kasaras J.,
15 Diagourtas D., Makropoulos K., Veis G., Papazissi K., Mitsakaki C.,
16 Karakostas V., Papadimitriou E., Papanastasiou D., (1997). The $M_S=6.2$,
17 June 15, 1995 Aigion earthquake (Greece): Evidence for low angle normal
18 faulting in the Corinth rift. *Journal of Seismology, No 1, pp. 131-150.*

19

20 Bernard P., Lyon-Caen H., Briole P., Deschamps A., Boudin F.,
21 Makropoulos K., Papadimitriou P., Lemeille F., Patau G., Billiris H.,
22 Paradissis D., Papazissi K., Castarède H., Charade O., Nercessian A.,
23 Avallone A., Pacchiani F., Zahradnik J., Sacks S., Linde A. (2006).
24 Seismicity, deformation and seismic hazard in the western rift of Corinth:

26

1 New insights from the Corinth Rift Laboratory (CRL). *Tectonophysics* **426**,
2 pp. 7–30.

3
4 Briole P., Deschamps A., Lyon-Caen H., Papazissi K. and Martinod J.,
5 (1993). The Itea (M ~ 5.9) Earthquake of November 18, 1992. -
6 Characteristics of the Main Shock Inferred from Body Wave and Ground
7 Displacement Analysis. *Proc. of the 2nd Congress of the Hellenic*
8 *Geophysical Union, Florina, Greece, 5-7, May, 297-308.*

9
10 Briole P. Rigo A., Lyon-Caen H., Ruegg J.C., Papazissi K., Mitsakaki C.,
11 Agatza-Balodimou A.M., Veis G., Hatzfeld D., Deschamps A., (2000).
12 Active Deformation of the Gulf of Korinthos, Greece: Results From
13 Repeated GPS Surveys Between 1990 and 1995. *JGR, Solid Earth, Vol.105,*
14 *No B11, 25605-25625.*

15
16 Briole, P.; Billiris, H.; Felekis, S.; Papazissi, K.; Paradissis, D.; Veis, G.;
17 Avallone, A.; Charade, O.; Nercessian, A. (2001). The Gulf of Corinth
18 "CORSEIS" permanent GPS network: framework and perspectives.
19 Presented at *EGS XXVI General Assembly, Nice, France, March 2001.*

20
21 Briole P., Avallone A., Agatza-Balodimou A.M., Billiris H., Charade O.,
22 Lyon-Caen H., Mitsakaki C., Papazissi K., Paradissis D., Veis G.,
23 Karamanou A., Marinou A., (2002). A ten year analysis of deformation in
24 the Corinthian Gulf via GPS and SAR Inteferometry. *11th General*
25 *Assembly of the WEGENER Project, June 12-14, Athens, Greece.*

1

2 Clarke P.J., Davies R.R., England P.C., Parsons B.E., Billiris H., Paradissis
3 D., Veis G., Denys P.H., Cross P.A., Ashkenazi V., Bingley R., (1997).
4 Geodetic estimate of seismic hazard in the Gulf of Korinthos. *Geophysical*
5 *Research Letters* 24, 1303-1306.

6

7 Ergintav S., Bürgmann McClusky R., S., Çakmak R., Reilinger R. E., Lenk
8 O., Barka A., and Özener H. (2002) Post-seismic Deformation near the
9 İzmit Earthquake (17 August 1999, *M* 7.5) Rupture Zone, *Bulletin of the*
10 *Seismological Society of America*, Vol 92, pp. 194 - 207.

11

12 Feigl Kurt L., Thatcher Wayne, (2006). Geodetic observations of post-
13 seismic transients in the context of the earthquake deformation cycle
14 *Comptes Rendus Geoscience*, Vol.338, Issues 14-15, pp.1012-1028

15

16 Hudnut K. W., Shen Z., Murray M., McClusky S., King R., Herring T.,
17 Hager B., Feng Y., Fang P., Donnellan A. and Bock Y., (1996). Co-Seismic
18 Displacements of the 1994 Northridge, California, Earthquake, *Bulletin of*
19 *the Seismological Society of America* volume **86**, No. **1B**, pp. S19-S36.

20

21 McCaffrey R., (2002). Crustal Block Rotations and Plate Coupling, in
22 *Plate Boundary Zones, AGU Geodynamic Series Vol. 30*, 425 p.

23

- 1 Mitsakaki C., (1987) A Method for Deformation Studies in Two
2 Dimensions Using Geodetic Data, *Dr. of Engin. Thesis, School of Rural &*
3 *Surveying Engineering, National Technical Univ. of Athens, Greece, (In*
4 *Greek).*
- 5
- 6 Mitsakaki C., Papazissi K., Sakellariou M., Marinou A., Tsinas D. (2006)
7 Coulomb Stress Changes in the Gulf of Corinth (Greece) for the 1992-1995
8 Period. *3rd Symposium on Geodesy for Geotechnical and Structural*
9 *Engineering and 12th Symposium on Deformation Measurements, May 22 -*
10 *24, Baden, Austria.*
- 11
- 12 Nyst M., Thatcher W., (2004). New constraints on the active tectonic
13 deformation of the Aegean, *J.G.R.*, *109*, B11406.
- 14
- 15 Okada, Y., (1985) Surface deformation due to shear and tensile faults in a
16 half-space, *Bull. Seismol. Soc.Am.*, *75*, 1135-1154.
- 17
- 18 Okada, Y., (1992) Internal deformation due to shear and tensile faults in a
19 half-space, *Bull. Seismol. Soc.Am.*, *82*, 1018-1040.
- 20
- 21 Snay R.A., Cline M.W., Timmerman E.L. (1983). Regional deformation of
22 the earth model for the San Diego region, California, *JGR, Vol.88, No B6,*
23 *pp. 5009-5024.*
- 24

1 Taymaz T., Jackson J.A., McKenzie D.P. (1991). Active tectonics of the
2 north and central Aegean Sea, *Geophys. J. Int.* 106, 433–490.

3

Accepted Manuscript