

Interplay of seismic and a-seismic deformation during the 2020 sequence of Atacama, Chile

Emilie Klein, Bertrand Potin, Francisco Pasten-Araya, Roxane Tissandier, Kellen Azua, Zacharie Duputel, C. Herrera, Luis Rivera, Jean-Mathieu Nocquet, Juan Carlos Baez, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

Emilie Klein, Bertrand Potin, Francisco Pasten-Araya, Roxane Tissandier, Kellen Azua, et al.. Interplay of seismic and a-seismic deformation during the 2020 sequence of Atacama, Chile. Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 2021, 570, pp.117081. 10.1016/j.epsl.2021.117081. hal-03285558

HAL Id: hal-03285558 https://hal.science/hal-03285558

Submitted on 18 Nov 2021

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.

Interplay of seismic and a-seismic deformation during the 2020 sequence of Atacama, Chile.

3	E. Klein ^{1,*} , B. Potin ² , F. Pasten-Araya ² , R. Tissandier ³ , K. Azua ² , Z. Duputel ⁴ , C. Herrera ⁵
4	L. Rivera ⁴ , J.M. Nocquet ^{3,6} , J.C. Baez ⁷ , D. Zigone ⁴ , R. Madariaga ^{1,2} , J.P. Ampuero ⁶ , S.
5	Ruiz ² , C. Vigny ¹

- ⁶ ¹Laboratoire de géologie CNRS UMR 8538, Ecole normale supérieure PSL University, Paris, France
- ⁷ ²Departamento de Geofísica, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile
- ⁸ ³Université de Paris, Institut de Physique du Globe de Paris, CNRS, F-75005 Paris, France
- ⁹ ⁴Institut Terre et Environnement de Strasbourg, Université de Strasbourg/EOST/ENGEES, CNRS UMR 7063,
- ¹⁰ 5 rue Descartes, Strasbourg F-67084, France

⁵School of Earth and Ocean Sciences, University of Victoria, 3800 Finnerty Road, Victoria, British Columbia

¹² V8P 5C2, Canada

1

2

- ¹³ ⁶Université Côte d'Azur, IRD, CNRS, Observatoire de la Côte d'Azur, Géoazur, 250 rue Albert Einstein,
- ¹⁴ Sophia Antipolis, 06560 Valbonne, France
- ¹⁵ ⁷Centro Sismológico Nacional Universidad de Chile Blanco Encalada 2002 Santiago CP 8370449, Chile

16 Abstract

An earthquake sequence occurred in the Atacama region of Chile throughout September 17 2020. The sequence initiated by a mainshock of magnitude $M_w = 6.9$, followed 17 hours 18 later by a M_w = 6.4 aftershock. The sequence lasted several weeks, during which more than 19 a thousand events larger than $M_l = 1$ occurred, including several larger earthquakes of mag-20 nitudes between 5.5 and 6.4. Using a dense network that includes broad-band, strong motion 21 and GPS sites, we study in details the seismic sources of the mainshock and its largest after-22 shock, the afterslip they generate and their aftershock, shedding light of the spatial temporal 23 evolution of seismic and aseismic slip during the sequence. Dynamic inversions show that 24 the two largest earthquakes are located on the subduction interface and have a stress drop and 25 rupture times which are characteristics of subduction earthquakes. The mainshock and the 26

aftershocks, localised in a 3D velocity model, occur in a narrow region of interseismic cou-

Corresponding author: E., Klein, klein@geologie.ens.fr

28	pling (ranging 40%-80%), <i>i.e.</i> between two large highly coupled areas, North and South of
29	the sequence, both ruptured by the great $M_w \sim 8.5$ 1922 megathrust earthquake. High rate
30	GPS data (1 Hz) allow to determine instantaneous coseismic displacements and to infer co-
31	seismic slip models, not contaminated by early afterslip. We find that the total slip over 24
32	hours inferred from precise daily solutions is larger than the sum of the two instantaneous
33	coseismic slip models. Differencing the two models indicates that rapid aseismic slip de-
34	veloped up-dip the mainshock rupture area and down-dip of the largest aftershock. During
35	the 17 hours separating the two earthquakes, micro-seismicity migrated from the mainshock
36	rupture area up-dip towards the epicenter of the M_w 6.4 aftershocks and continued to propa-
37	gate upwards at ~ 0.7 km/day. The bulk of the afterslip is located up-dip the mainshock and
38	down-dip the largest aftershock, and is accompanied with the migration of seismicity, from
39	the mainshock rupture to the aftershock area, suggesting that this aseismic slip triggered the
40	M_w = 6.4 aftershock. Unusually large post-seismic slip, equivalent to M_w = 6.8 developed
41	during three weeks to the North, in low coupling areas located both up-dip and downdip
42	the narrow strip of higher coupling, and possibly connecting to the area of the deep Slow
43	Sleep Event detected in the Copiapo area in 2014. The sequence highlights how seismic and
44	aseismic slip interacted and witness short scale lateral variations of friction properties at the
45	megathrust.

Key Words:

46

47

48

Chilean subduction zone, Atacama, earthquake sequence, GPS, post seismic, seismology

49 **1 Introduction**

The Atacama region $(26^{\circ}S-30^{\circ}S)$ is one of the long lasting seismic gaps of Chile [Lom-50 nitz, 2004; Métois et al., 2016; Ruiz and Madariaga, 2018]. In this region, the last megath-51 rust earthquake occurred in 1922, a M_w 8.6 event that stroke North-Central Chile and trig-52 gered a transpacific tsunami [Willis, 1929; Beck et al., 1998; Soloviev and Go, 1976; Ruiz 53 and Madariaga, 2018; Kanamori et al., 2019]. After 1922, the largest earthquake that oc-54 curred in the area was in 1983 with a magnitude 7.7 [Pacheco and Sykes, 1992; Comte et al., 55 1992]. More recently, in 2013, an event of magnitude 6.8 located around 50 km depth oc-56 curred, probably at the bottom-end of the seismogenic zone along the plate interface. A 57 decade of survey GPS measurements conducted in this region revealed two large highly cou-58 pled zones, the Atacama and the Chañaral segments, separated by a relatively large inter-59 segment of intermediate to low coupling, named the Baranquilla low coupling zone (LCZ) 60 [Métois et al., 2013; Métois et al., 2016; Klein et al., 2018a]. Additionally, a 1.5 year-long, 61 $M_w \sim 7$, slow slip event (SSE) was also detected in the region in 2014, but occurred deeper 62 (40-60 km) than usual seismogenic depths (10-40 km) [Klein et al., 2018b]. A detailed anal-63 ysis of the only continuous GPS site in the region at this time also revealed two episodes of 64 transient deformation, prior to the 2014 event, in 2005 and 2009, suggesting a possible recur-65 rence of about 5-years for deep slow slip events in the region [Klein et al., 2018b]. 66

Here, we study a large seismic sequence that occurred in the Atacama region through-67 out September 2020 (Fig. 1), South of an area where seismic swarms have occurred several 68 times in the past, i.e. in 1973, 1976 and 2016, offshore the town of Caldera [27°S, Fig. 1, 69 Comte et al., 2002; Holtkamp et al., 2011]. The 2020 sequence initiated on September, 1st, 70 at 04:09 UTC, with an earthquake of magnitude 6.9. It was followed 20 minutes later by an 71 event of magnitude 6.3, close to the mainshock epicenter and 17 hours later, at 21:09 UTC, 72 by another event of magnitude 6.4, the largest aftershock of the entire sequence, 20 km up-73 dip the mainshock. Overall, the sequence lasted several weeks with more than a thousand 74 events and includes several large earthquakes of magnitude larger than 5. We use a complete 75 set of seismological sites deployed in the area prior to the sequence that includes broad-band, 76 strong motion and GPS to monitor the spatio-temporal evolution of this sequence (Fig. 1). 77

-3-

Thanks to this dense network we greatly improve the threshold detection down to magnitude (with a magnitude of completeness of 2.5) and the precision of the localisation through a 3-D refined velocity model. Focusing on the first day, we compare the high rate and the daily GPS solutions to quantify the amount of seismic and aseismic deformation that took place after the mainshock. Finally, we discuss how this sequence takes place in the earthquakes history of this area and how it may alter the potential seismic hazard of the nearby highly coupled zones.

2 Seismic analysis

The Atacama region is poorly covered by the national seismic network (CSN, *Centro Sismológico Nacional*, University of Chile, Santiago) with only 2 broad-band stations at less than 100 km from the sequence. Since 2013, less than 2000 earthquakes have been located in Chile between latitudes 30° S and 26° S.

90

2.1 Building the sequence catalogue

We built a catalogue using data from 14 broad-band stations of the CSN in a 300 km 91 radius around the sequence, completed by data from three semi-permanent stations in the 92 Copiapo region (30-150 km North), 10 temporary stations between Vallenar and Ovalle 93 (100-300 km South), and 30 stations from the national strong-motion network of the CSN 94 [Barrientos, 2018; Levton et al., 2018] providing data only for the 16 largest events (Fig. 1). 95 Event detection was performed by STA/LTA method using the six closest stations, with two 96 constraints: firstly, one of the three closest stations had to be first in triggering a detection 97 and secondly, each event had to trigger detections on at least 5 stations to be considered. 98 These criteria geographically restricted the area of study and filtered out the smallest local 99 events and the hundreds of earthquakes happening everyday in Chile. Between the 25th of 100 August and the 25th of September included, 1354 events have been detected, out of which 101 50 % happened within the first four days of the sequence. No significant raise in seismic ac-102 tivity was detected prior to the main event: 1 to 9 events/day occurred between the 25th and 103 the 31st of August (Fig. 1-B). Manual P- and S-wave arrival-times readings were performed, 104 leading to 916 earthquake locations out of which 843 events belong to the dense core of the 105 sequence and 74 correspond to surrounding activity that may or may not be related to the se-106 quence. Specifically, half of these (35 events) occur up North in a 80 x 80 km² area, 11 are 107

located further inland, 15 are poorly located beyond the trench or very deep below the con tact and the last 13 correspond to quarry blasts.

Earthquake locations were determined by a double-difference approach in a regional 110 3D velocity model obtained by regional tomography [Potin et al., 2019]. Figure 2 represents 111 a trench-perpendicular vertical cross-section across the sequence, with P-wave velocities and 112 P- over S-wave velocity ratios [based on earthquakes arrival times, *Potin et al.*, 2019]. The 113 seismicity associated with the sequence is located at the interface, mainly between 15 km and 114 40 km deep, with some events scattered within the first 15 km of the upper plate. The back-115 ground seismicity visible on Fig. 2, located within a 50 km range on both sides of the cross-116 section, appears to extend within the plunging oceanic plate and can be interpreted as the 117 double seismic zone observed in several places along the Chilean coast [Bloch et al., 2014, 118 2018; Comte and Suarez, 1994; Sippl et al., 2018], although these events are poorly located 119 due to the lack of local observations. P-wave velocities and P- over S-wave velocity ratios for 120 the upper plate, the interface and the upper oceanic mantle are consistent with others local 121 tomographic models obtained in northern Chile [Pastén-Araya et al., 2018, 2021]. 122

Figure 3 shows the spatio-temporal evolution of the seismicity over the first 72 h fol-123 lowing the mainshock. Immediately after the mainshock, seismicity spread over a 20 x 20 km² 124 region, a size roughly consistent with the rupture area (Fig. 3-C and 3-D). This initial spatial 125 extension shows the area of influence of the stress increase due to the mainshock. Through-126 out these first 72 hours, both the North-South and Eastern (downdip) boundaries of seismic-127 ity remain stable. On the contrary, seismicity slowly spreads updip (westward), with an av-128 erage velocity of approximately ~ 0.7 km/hour (considering a dip of 20°; red dashed line on 129 Fig. 3-C), resulting in almost doubling the initial area of aftershock. 130

2.2 Moment magnitudes

131

To constrain the magnitude of the largest events of the sequence, we perform regional W-phase source inversions [*Duputel et al.*, 2012] combined with a bootstrap analysis [*Efron and Tibshirani*, 1993]. We use broad-band velocimetric data from the Federation of Digital Seismic Networks (FDSN) (C, C1 (doi.org/10.7914/SN/C1), CX (doi:10.14470/ PK615318), G (doi:10.18715/GEOSCOPE.G), GT (doi.org/10.7914/SN/GT) and II (doi.org/10.7914/SN/II) networks) within 26 degrees of epicentral distance. To improve the homogeneity of the data coverage, we select one station per cell in a 100 km ×

-5-

100 km grid in the vicinity of the source. The used time window starts at the P-wave arrival 139 time. Its duration is 300 s for epicentral distances smaller than 12° and grows with distance 140 $(15 \times \Delta s/\circ)$ for farther stations. Waveforms are filtered using a frequency band-pass that 141 varies with the Global CMT magnitude. Here we filter between 50-80 s and 120-250 s. The 142 average M_w and $\pm 2\sigma$ uncertainties are: 6.87 \pm 0.07, 6.29 \pm 0.04, 6.42 \pm 0.07 for the events 143 that occurred on 2020/09/01 at 04:09 UTC, 04:30 UTC and 21:09 UTC. The bootstrap his-144 tograms are shown on Fig. 4 and estimated parameters are gathered in the supporting infor-145 mation. 146

147

2.3 Characterisation of the sequence: Mainshock-Aftershock sequence or Seismic swarm ?

To evaluate the difference of the 2020 Atacama seismicity compared to a standard 149 mainshock-aftershock sequence, we analyze earthquake sizes and temporal distribution in 150 the area. Considering seismic events in the epicentral area since 2017 in the CSN catalog, we 151 estimate a b-value of $b = 0.8 \pm 0.2$ using the Aki [1965] approach (consistently, we estimate 152 $b = 0.7 \pm 0.1$ for the 2020 Atacama sequence using the catalog presented in section 2.1). The 153 time of aftershocks relative to the $M_w = 6.9$ mainshock is consistent with the Omori-Utsu 154 law $r(t) = K(t + c)^{-p}$ with p = 1.0, c = 0.1 days and K = 16.3 [see Fig. S1 of the Sup-155 porting Information; Omori, 1894; Utsu, 1957]. Looking independently into the magnitude 156 and temporal distribution of the earthquakes, the sequence does not seem different from a 157 classical mainshock-aftershock sequence. However, what seems anomalous is the occurrence 158 of two $M_w > 6$ aftershocks within 24 hours after the mainshock. Using a simple approach 159 similar to Reasenberg and Jones [1989], we forecast the number of aftershocks of magnitude 160 $M_w \ge 6.3$ within 24 hours after the mainshock using b = 0.8 and Omori-Utsu parame-161 ters mentioned above. Results shown in Fig. S1 indicate that there is only a probability of 162 0.3% of having at least two aftershocks of magnitude $M_w \ge 6.3$ shortly after the mainshock. 163 However, this estimate depends on the assumed b-value. If we consider b = 0.7 as for the 164 Atacama sequence, the aforementioned probability increases to about 4%. 165

3 GPS data analysis

Early 2019, in order to densify the CSN network [*Báez et al.*, 2018], we installed 5 continuous GPS (cGPS) stations in the Atacama region. Three of them were collocated with broad-band seismometers (see section 2.1). Overall, we benefit from 12 cGPS stations lo-

-6-

cated in the area of the sequence complemented by 5-6 stations further away for the refer-170 ence (Fig. 1). In this study, we use both the stations positions obtained from 24-hours daily 171 solutions throughout the whole duration of the sequence and the high rate (1 Hz, hereafter 172 HRGPS) data that allow to decipher the successive displacements during the first day. 173

174

3.1 24-hours daily solutions

In addition to the data from the national Chilean network [Báez et al., 2018] and from 175 the 5 additional stations, we include data of the Argentinian RAMSAC network [Piñón et al., 176 2018] and of the Brazilian RBMC network. We also include all the IGS stations available on 177 the South American continent. This dataset is processed using the GAMIT/GLOBK software 178 following the classical MIT methodology [Herring et al., 2010a,b]. In a second step, we pro-179 duce daily time series by constraining continental stations to their well-known coordinates in 180 the ITRF2014 [Altamimi et al., 2017] with the PYACS toolbox. 181

A specific difficulty needs to be addressed when several large earthquakes occur during 182 the same day. If a single coordinate is calculated for the entire day, it will end up being any-183 where between the pre- and post-earthquakes coordinate, depending on different parameters: 184 when exactly the earthquakes occur during the day, which data segment (before, between and 185 after the earthquakes) is the longest, and how the filter will handle data that does not fit the 186 obtained average position of the day. In order to eliminate the pre-seismic observation (be-187 fore 4:30 UTC) and to separate the two events in the data (see Fig. S2), we consider at which 188 time the two main events occurred (M_w = 6.9 at 4:09 UTC and M_w = 6.4 at 21:09 UTC) 189 and the day of the earthquake was processed using only the observations acquired between 190 4:30 UTC and 21:00 UTC. Therefore, this day's position corresponds to an averaged position 191 of the station after the first event ($M_w = 6.9$) and before the second event ($M_w = 6.4$). Note 192 that the selected time window also allows us to exclude the $M_w = 6.3$ aftershock. Because 193 only 25 min separates this aftershock from the mainshock, the potential deformation gener-194 ated by this aftershock is most likely impossible to differentiate from the mainshock, using 195 daily GPS solutions. 196

197

Time series reveal significant displacements on at least 7 stations (Fig. 5). Steps between days 244 and 245 (resp. 245 and 246) correspond to the coseismic displacements 198 generated by the first (resp. the second) event, both occurring during day 245 (September 199 1st). The typical curvature of the time series of the stations nearest the events during the 200

-7-

days (possibly weeks) following the mainshock also reveals postseismic deformation. This 201 deformation seems unusually large ($\sim 100 \%$ in only a couple of days) at the nearest station 202 (TTRL). The estimation of the coseismic displacement of the first event of M_w = 6.9 at 04:09 203 (the mainshock) is obtained by differentiating between the position at midday 245 (between 204 4:30 and 21:00 UTC) and the position of the day before (244) (Fig. 6-A, vectors in light red). 205 It includes part, but not all, of the post-seismic deformation occurring during the 15 hours 206 time span between the mainshock and the large aftershock at 21:09, which is potentially a 207 combination of rapid after-slip and a-seismic deformation, but also potential deformation 208 due to the M_w = 6.3 aftershock of 04:30. The estimation of the co-seismic displacement of 209 the second event $(M_w = 6.4)$ is obtained by difference between the position of the following 210 day (246 - 02/09/2020) and the position of the day of the 2 earthquakes previously described 211 (midday 245, between 4h30 and 21:00 UTC). In a similar way, it also includes a combination 212 of rapid after-slip and potential a-seismic deformation that might have occurred after both 213 events (Fig. 6-B, vectors in light blue). 214

215

3.2 High rate GPS observations

High rate data are processed with Track software from MIT (T. Herring) which is a 216 double-difference software, meaning that we compute the motion of a "rover" station relative 217 to a "fixed" station. In this processing we use 5 "fixed" stations surrounding the area of inter-218 est (represented by black diamonds on Fig. 1): LSCH (La Serena) and LHOR (LosHornos) 219 to the South; PAZU (Pan de Azucar) to the North; ALUM in Argentina and MRCG (Mar-220 icunga) to the East and North-East. We use the tropospheric zenital delays (ZTD) gener-221 ated by the 24 h static solution (one delay estimated every 2 hours at every site) to constrain 222 the tropospheric delay in the kinematic processing to the static value. For the three largest 223 events, we generate motograms (high rate evolution of position with time, from the latin 224 word "moto" for motion) of one hour spanning the events (see Fig. S5 for the mainshock at 225 4:09 UTC, Fig. S6 for the largest aftershock at 21h09 UTC and Fig. S7 for the smaller after-226 shock at 4:30 UTC). For all motograms, we built a sidereal filter by simply stacking the 1-227 hour data segments, of 3 (or 6) days before the earthquake with a 4 m 7 s time delay everyday 228 following Choi et al. [2004]. We then filter the co-seismic motogram, by simply subtract-229 ing this common mode to the original data. Then, the co-seismic jump is simply estimated 230 as the offset between the 3-minutes data segment before and after the time of the earthquake 231 (Fig. 6). Uncertainties are estimated visually from the motograms and range between 1 and 232

5 mm for the horizontal components and 5 and 10 mm for the vertical component. We are
able to identify clear co-seismic jumps at most stations for the mainshock, small but discernable jumps at several stations for the largest aftershock, but nothing for the smaller aftershock
of 4:30 UTC. This is an indication of the threshold detection of our current cGPS network :
between magnitude 6.3 and 6.4.

Comparing coseismic offsets extracted from both the daily solution and from the HRGPS 238 solution offers some confidence. Although the HRGPS is associated with larger uncertainties 239 (5 mm) than daily solutions (1-2 mm), both solutions appear very consistent and show very 240 similar offset. Specifically, stations located more than 50 km from the epicenter compare 241 very well (BING, MMOR, UDAT, TAMR, TOT5, TRST). However, for both events, near-242 field stations (TTRL, BAR2, and LLCH) exhibit a smaller HRGPS coseismic offset (smaller 243 by 50%) than the daily solution one. This is very significant and indicates additional defor-244 mation is present immediately after the earthquake occurrence. 245

246

4 Analysis of major earthquakes

247

4.1 Coseismic slip static inversions

We built a fault geometry with triangular patches based on Slab2.0 [Hayes et al., 2018] 248 between 26.5°S and 29°S and down to 60 km depth. We evaluated the slip distributions gen-249 erated by the two largest earthquakes by inverting the coseismic displacements estimated 250 from the HRGPS. We compute constrained least squares inversions using the CSI toolbox 251 [Gombert et al., 2019]. For both models, we apply as little smoothing as possible and we 252 forbid back slip in the thrust direction. We assume only one slip component which direc-253 tion is fixed parallel to the plate convergence [convergence vector from Klein et al., 2018a]. 254 Green functions are calculated at each node of the fault plane, assuming a homogeneous elas-255 tic half-space [Meade, 2007]. 256

10 to 14 stations spanning the area were used in the inversion (Fig. 6). Resolution tests
are fully described in the Supplemental material. They show that (1) a good recovery for
~40 x40 km patterns is found between 15-55 km depth even with conservative noise budget
for co-seismic offsets; (2) a very good (1-2 km) ability to locate the area of maximum slip;
(3) peak-slip amounts are recovered within 10-30% and magnitude by 0.1; (4) extent of slip
might be smeared by a few km.

For the mainshock, we find a slip distribution spreading over a rather large surface of 263 80 x 40 km², between 27.5°S and 28.5°S. This surface seems too large for a M_w 6.9 earth-264 quake, but the bulk of the slip is concentrated in a much smaller area of only about 25 x 20 km² 265 (Fig. 7-A). There is a trade-off between the quantity of slip and the size of the rupture zone. 266 We test several models in which we concentrate larger slip amount in a narrower zone (for 267 ex. within the region currently yielding more than 60 mm, or more than 80 mm of slip, see 268 Fig. S8). Southward offsets can be reproduced by a larger amount of slip in the north (see 269 Fig.S8-B). But reducing the rupture zone to \sim 30 x 30 km² leads to significantly larger resid-270 uals at closest stations (BAR2 and TTRL, Fig. S8-C). Therefore, the extension of the rupture 271 zone to the north is required by the observations at more than 50 km, yielding significant 272 westward coseismic offsets which are not converging toward a pin point. The best fit model 273 includes a narrow strip of slip, elongated below the coastline south of the high slip area. This 274 feature depicts only several cm of slip and is requested only by millimetric variations at a 275 few stations. It may be beyond the resolution of our data and modelling. The deep extension 276 of slip, reaching 40 km down, observed at 28°S seems required both by the large coseismic 277 displacement measured at station TOT5 located some 75 km away from the epicenter, and 278 by the coseismic uplift measured at BAR2 and LLCH. Although vertical data do not appear 279 essential since an inversion considering only the horizontal coseismic displacements pro-280 duces similar slip pattern. We tested models with pure dip slip direction perpendicular to the 281 trench, and models with two slip directions, but neither provides satisfying results (see sup-282 porting information for more details). We estimate a seismic potency of $4.14 \cdot 10^8 \text{ m.m}^2$, 283 which corresponds to a moment of 2.01 \cdot 10¹⁹ N.m (M_w = 6.8) using a shear modulus of 284 $4.9 \cdot 10^{10}$ Pa (which is the value used for the W-phase). The geodetic moment appears slightly 285 smaller than the seismic moment re-estimated at long-period using the W-phase but still lies 286 within the error bar. Considering the size of this event, we made the approximation of a ho-287 mogeneous half-space for all our inversions, which could account for part of the difference. 288

For the largest aftershock, because it generates smaller displacements than the mainshock at many stations, we dispose of less well determined co-seismic vectors. In particular we do not use any vertical displacement in the inversion of the aftershock slip distribution. Also, considering that we have very few observations, we decreased the uncertainties of nonzero vectors to 1mm, in order to strongly encourage the model to fit these. We find a circular slip distribution, significantly smaller with about 30 x 30 km overall (only 10 x 10 km for the bulk of the slip), with a peak slip at 95 mm (Fig. 7-B). For this event as well, the

-10-

geodetic moment also appears slightly larger than the seismologic one, with $6.04 \cdot 10^{18}$ N.m ($M_w = 6.5$, corresponding to a seismic potency of $1.24 \cdot 10^8$ m.m²). Finally, the epicenter of the mainshock is located on the updip-western edge of the rupture zone, suggesting a downdip-bilateral propagation. The aftershock slip distribution is located updip the mainshock rupture zone and shows a striking complementary (Fig. 7-C). The aftershock lies in the hole left by the bean-shaped mainshock. Together they homogenise the slip over a larger and rounder area.

303

4.2 Dynamic inversions

We used seismic waveforms from strong motion stations deployed in the area (Fig. 1) 304 to estimate the dynamic properties of the coseismic rupture. The low-frequency source prop-305 erties (e.g., average slip and stress drop) of the largest event were estimated using an ellipti-306 cal patch approach (e.g., [Ruiz and Madariaga, 2011; Herrera et al., 2017]). In this model, 307 the rupture nucleates within a circular area and then propagates through a larger elliptical 308 area. This rupture process is controlled by the friction law proposed by Ida [1972]. Hence, in 309 addition to the geometric parameters defining the circle and the ellipse, this dynamic model 310 also includes the stress drop (T_e) , the yield stress (T_u) , and the slip-weakening distance (D_c) . 311 We used strong-motion records integrated to displacement and band-pass filtered in low 312 frequency (0.02-0.2 Hz for the mainshock). The AXITRA code [Bouchon, 1981; Coutant, 313 1989] was used to simulate the source-to-receiver wave propagation via an appropriate 1-D 314 velocity model for the area, which was extracted from [Potin et al., 2019]. The inversion of 315 the dynamic model was performed using the Neighborhood Algorithm [Sambridge, 1999], 316 which finds the model that best fits the observed waveform data. The misfit between ob-317 served and modeled waveforms was calculated using an L2 norm. 318

The best solution for the mainshock converged toward an elliptical rupture of 24.4 km 319 by 26 km (Fig. 8), with a minimum misfit of 0.24 (Figs. 8 and S11), a maximum slip of 320 1.1 m and a M_w =6.7, which is similar to the solution obtained from HRGPS (Fig. 7). Also, 321 the associated dynamic parameters are $T_e = 5.3$ MPa, $T_{\mu} = 5.59$ MPa, and $D_c = 0.72$ m. 322 These dynamic parameters are similar to those obtained for inter plate events along Chilean 323 subduction [Ruiz et al., 2017; Otarola et al., 2021] and the stress drop parameters are in the 324 average of thrust earthquakes occurring on a subduction interface [Kanamori and Anderson, 325 1975]. 326

327

5 Interplay between seismic and aseismic slip

328

5.1 Static inversion of afterslip on the day of the mainshock

On one hand, we compute the total co-seismic motion due to both events, both quan-329 tified by daily cGPS between the 30/08/2020 and the 02/09/2020 (shown in light red on 330 Fig. 9-A). This calculation includes both events and the total amount of aseismic slip that 331 occurred over the two days. On the other hand, we compute the total displacements measured 332 by HRGPS (shown by dark red arrows on Fig. 9-A). Considering that the HRGPS allows to 333 extract the pure co-seismic motion over a couple of minutes around the earthquakes, the dif-334 ference between the total daily cGPS co-seismic estimates and the total HRGPS estimates 335 (Fig. 9-B) should highlight the amount of early afterslip during the day of the earthquakes. 336 Indeed, this difference shows a significant westward motion at TTRL and BAR2, similar to 337 the post-seismic motion observed over the following days (Fig. 9-C). 338

Using the same methodology and parameters as previously (section 4.1), we compute 339 static inversions of the different displacements fields. Unsurprisingly, the slip distribution in-340 ferred from the total daily cGPS displacements (Fig. 9-Ai, noted in following Ai) shows sig-341 nificantly more slip than the slip distribution inferred from the total HRGPS displacements 342 (Fig. 9-Aii, noted in following Aii). In particular the peak slip of (Ai) reaches 17 cm com-343 pared to only 10 cm for (Aii). But both distributions show very similar patterns over a some-344 how circular area extending from 27.4°S to 28.5°S. The distribution of early postseismic 345 shows slip occurring on a significantly smaller, narrow peanut-shape area elongated along 346 a roughly NS direction (Fig. 9-B). Part of this slip could be coseismic slip due the $M_w = 6.3$ 347 aftershock which occurred at 4:30 UTC and that we were not able to extract from HRGPS. 348 Small amount of slip observed at greater depth is most likely unresolved. 349

350

5.2 Time-dependent inversion of the postseismic deformation

Significant displacements are observed on the cGPS time series during a 22-days period, between the 2nd and the 24th of September. In order to quantify the slip evolution after the second large aftershock, we perform a kinematic inversion of the cGPS times series. We invert for slip on the subduction interface (following *Rolandone et al.* [2018] and *Bletery and Nocquet* [2020]). We find that the best fit to the time series is obtained with a smoothing parameter $\sigma = 20 \text{ mm.}\sqrt{\text{day}}$ and a correlation distance between subfaults of $D_{corr} = 35 \text{ km.}$ The total slip after 22 days is equivalent to $M_w = 6.8$. Overall, it spreads over roughly the

same area as the area ruptured by the mainshock and its largest aftershock, between 27.5°S 358 and 28°S (Fig. 9-C). A static inversion of the cumulative postseismic displacement (follow-359 ing the same methodology as the coseismic static inversions) over the same period yields 360 a very similar same pattern (Fig. S12). Regarding its spatio-temporal evolution, the post-361 seismic slip begins offshore and starts developing onshore and deeper after 6 days (Fig. 9-C1 362 & 9-C2). At a later stage, on the ninth day, a dissociated smaller patch begins more to the 363 North, between 27°S and 27.5°S (Fig. 9-C3). It is deeper - at a depth of approximately 35 to 364 55 km - and localised in the updip vicinity of the 2014 slow slip event [Klein et al., 2018b]. 365 The northward migration of post-seismic slip is associated with a northward rotation of post-366 seismic vectors wrt. co-seismic vectors at several stations near the epicenter area (BAR2, 367 LLCH, TTRL) and the development of Westward vectors North of the epicenter area (BING, 368 MMOR, UDAT). The source time function associated to this inversion shows a quasi-steady 369 decrease in the slip's intensity. Then, negligible slip is found to occur after approximately 18 370 days. A movie of the postseismic slip evolution is provided in the supporting information. 371

372

6 Discussion and Conclusions

373

6.1 General agreement and small discrepancies

Concerning the mainshock, the different types of modelling presented here are in good 374 agreement, with some discrepancies regarding the magnitudes, the size of slip distributions 375 and the peak slip. The dynamic model yields a smaller magnitude ($M_w = 6.7$) than the one 376 inferred from the W-phase ($M_w = 6.9$). This is common and due to the simple elliptical ge-377 ometry used for the dynamic inversion, which can therefore not fully capture the correct slip 378 distribution and concentrate the solution. GPS constrained slip models yield a magnitude of 379 6.8, slightly smaller than the W-phase magnitude, but the difference is within the error bar 380 (cf section 2.2 and table S1, same observation for the difference in magnitude of the largest 381 aftershock between the static inversion and the W-phase analysis). Slip models inferred from 382 GPS show a quite larger rupture zone, which could have several origins. First, it could be an 383 artefact imposed by wrongly detected small displacements at stations located farther away 384 from the epicenter, although this should mostly be taken into account by the uncertainties. 385 Second, the geodetic models might be contaminated by inaccuracies in the Earth model as 386 we assume an homogeneous half-space and neglect topography [e.g., Duputel et al., 2014; 387 Langer et al., 2020]. Finally, the model resolution is limited by the number of observations, 388 resulting in a trade-off between the amount of slip and the size of the rupture. Eventually, 389

from both analyzes, we are confident that the greatest slip is well concentrated in an area of 391 30 x 30 km², associated with the rupture of a single asperity. The HRGPS inversion shows a 392 more extended rupture area, the lesser slip regions probably being at the resolution limit of 393 our data.

394

6.2 Relation with Coupling on the interface

We compare the two slip distributions with the coupling distribution proposed in the 395 region by Klein et al. [2018a] (Fig. 10. The whole September sequence takes place in be-396 tween the highly coupled Atacama segment (South of 28°S), and the Chañaral segment (North 397 of 27° S). There, in the so-called Baranquilla inter-segment, we observe a narrow strip highly coupled connecting the 2 segments with significantly lower coupling on both the shallower 399 and deeper part of the interface. We find that most of the slip due to the 01/09/2020 main-400 shock (dark blue contour) occurred downdip of its epicenter (dark blue dot), mostly overlap-401 ping the narrow strip of higher coupling. The largest aftershock at 21:09 UTC (light blue 402 contour) shows a striking complementarity with the mainshock, occurring updip and ex-403 tending in the low coupled region (Fig. 10). Early afterslip that occurs during the 17 hours 404 between the mainshock and the largest aftershock (Fig. 9-B), is located mostly between the 405 rupture zones of the two earthquakes, in a peanut-like shape (Fig. 10). Part of the obtained 406 slip could be coseismic due to the 4:30 UTC M_w = 6.3 aftershock, and part indeed due to 407 aseismic slip. 408

409

6.3 Interplay of seismic and aseismic slip in an area of heterogeneous coupling

We showed that the probability of having at least two aftershocks of magnitude $M_w >$ 6 within 24 hours is quite low. This leads us to question whether it is a simple mainshockaftershock sequence or a seismic swarm, which is commonly defined as an increase of seismicity rate without a clear mainshock earthquake [*Holtkamp et al.*, 2011]. It could also mean that there is room for other processes that could have triggered these earthquakes so shortly after the mainshock.

⁴¹⁶ During the first 17 hours, seismicity spread updip the mainshock epicenter and out-⁴¹⁷ side its rupture zone, into what later became the largest aftershock rupture zone, (Fig. 7-C). ⁴¹⁸ The asymmetry observed between the updip and downdip propagations of seismicity over ⁴¹⁹ the first 72 h (Fig. 3-C) is most likely driven by a specific source. Incidentally, the quantity

-14-

of aseismic slip occurring directly after the mainshock, and over the following 20 days, is 420 abnormally high. There is some overlap between the afterslip distribution, and the the co-421 seismic slip distributions of the mainshock and the largest aftershock (Fig. 10). But the bulk 422 of the distributions are disconnected and the overlap lies within the regions of lesser slip. 423 We suggest that slow slip could be responsible for increasing shear stress at the front of the 424 slip zone, propagating updip at approximately 0.7 km/hour ([which is within the range of 425 slow slip propagation speeds observed elsewhere, Gao et al., 2012] - Fig. 3-C), until sur-426 rounding a locked asperity which eventually triggered the $M_w = 6.4$ aftershock, 17 hours af-427 ter the mainshock. Such a relation between seismicity at the front of the slip has been pro-428 posed in various context, during the interseismic phase but also during SSE, associated or 429 not with non-volcanic tremors [Bartlow et al., 2011, 2014; Vaca et al., 2018; Bletery and 430 Nocquet, 2020], and is consistent with numerical models of seismicity driven by slow slip 431 [e.g. Ariyoshi et al., 2012; Yingdi and Ampuero, 2017; Wynants-Morel et al., 2020] 432

The equivalent moment released over a period of 22 days, following the mainshock, 433 reaches more than 80% of the coseismic moment, spreading in a much broader region than 434 the coseismic rupture zone where the coupling is lower, as well as in a broader region than 435 the aftershocks area. Usually, postseismic deformation reaches around 25% of the co-seismic 436 deformation after a month. However, several cases have been documented where moder-437 ate size earthquakes are followed by abnormally large afterslip in Japan [Yagi et al., 2001; 438 Suito et al., 2011] and northern Peru where moment released through aseismic slip during 439 a sequence was several time larger (3 to 14) than the moment released through earthquakes 440 [Villegas Lanza et al., 2015]. For the latter, it has been suggested that additional processes 441 - i.e. not only an earthquake but also, for example, one or several slow slip events - were 442 involved to explain such a large amount of afterslip. A similar hypothesis was proposed to 443 explain the abnormally rapid and large early afterslip following the 2016 M_w 7.8 Ecuador 444 earthquake [Rolandone et al., 2018]. Complex sequence with large afterslip occurring very 445 close a the recurrent SSE patch was also observed in Mexico [Radiguet et al., 2016]. The At-446 acama region seems propitious to slow slip events, while such an event was observed in the 447 region in 2014 [Klein et al., 2018b]. Here, overall, we estimated from the geodetic models 448 that the sequence released a total moment of $4.94 \cdot 10^{19}$ N.m ($M_w = 7.1$), with close to 60% 449 through earthquakes and 40% through aseismic slip. Slip occurred spread over an area of 450 $\sim 100 \text{ x} 100 \text{ km}^2$, much larger than expected for M<7 earthquakes, also highlighting the role 451 of aseismic slip during the sequence. Postseismic slip migrates to greater depth 6 days after 452

the mainshock, reaching eventually the 2014 slow slip area. Therefore, the Baranquilla LCZ
seems prone for aseismic processes, potentially recurrent at depth as observed in the past,
and favors large postseismic slip.

456

6.4 Considerations on seismic hazard in the area

Considering the historical seismicity in the region, *i.e.* the $M_w \ge 8.5$ mega-earthquakes 457 of 1819 and 1922, and the high coupling imaged in the Atacama and Chañaral segments, 458 we previously suggested that a joint rupture of these two segments was highly plausible in 459 the future [Klein et al., 2018b]. Both segments have indeed accumulated enough deforma-460 tion since 1922 to generate a $M_w \ge 8$ earthquake [Klein et al., 2018a]. What is the impact 461 of this sequence regarding scenarios for future megathrust ruptures in the region ? Differ-462 ent scenarios seem plausible. On one hand, the whole September 2020 sequence is likely to 463 have increased the stress at the edges of the highly locked Atacama and Chañaral segments, 464 promoting future rupture(s) there. In particular the whole sequence occurred very near the 465 northern edge of the Atacama segment. Could this initiate the destabilization of this highly 466 locked patch and trigger a rupture of this segment already ? And would a rupture of the Ata-467 cama segment trigger in turn the rupture of the Chanaral segment, initiating a 1819 or 1922 468 like megathrust earthquake ? On the other hand, this same sequence may have released a sig-469 nificant amount of stress in the Baranquilla LCZ, which could in turn decrease the potential 470 for a joint rupture of the Atacama and Chañaral segments by reinforcing its ability to act as 471 a barrier for megathrust rupture propagation. In this scenario, Atacama and Chañaral seg-472 ments could rupture independently, at different times and with smaller earthquakes than in 473 1819 and 1922. It is difficult to decipher between these scenarios, but the occurrence of a 474 seismic sequence between two highly locked patches identified to be responsible for devas-475 tating earthquakes 100 and 200 years ago is a clear sign that this region should be monitored 476 closely in the next future. 477

478 Acknowledgments

479 We would like to warmly thank all CSN staff, for their precious help for the fieldwork. We

- also are thankful to the CSN, IRIS and IPOC for providing the data used in this study, as
- well as to the Institut National des Sciences de l'Univers (INSU-CNRS) and the Réseau
- 482 Sismologique & Géodésique Français (RESIF, as part of the "Investissements d'Avenir"
- ⁴⁸³ program, ANR-11-EQPX-0040, and the French Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Develop-

-16-

ment and Energy) for providing the geodetic instruments for campaigns and 3 broadband 484 seismometers. Part of the computations presented in this paper were performed using the 485 GRICAD infrastructure (https://gricad.univ-grenoble-alpes.fr), which is sup-486 ported by Grenoble research communities. Finally, we would like to thank our reviewer for 487 the constructive comments which helped us improving our manuscript. 488 Fundings: This work was supported by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (projects 489 ANR-19-CE31-0003), the CNRS-INSU Tellus program and the European Research Council 490 (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant 491 agreement n°: 805256). SR was supported by Fondecyt project (N ° 1200779, ANID, Chile). 492

JCB was supported by FONDECYT1200779 and ANID PIA ACT192169

Figures have been made using Generic Mapping Tools GMT [*Wessel et al.*, 2013] using topography from ETOPO5. Python toolboxes used: PYACS+ PYEQ (https://github. com/JMNocquet/pyacs36, CSI (http://www.geologie.ens.fr/~jolivet/csi) and Pyrocko (https://pyrocko.org/)

Data availability: Seismic data collected are available through the Incorporated Re search Institutions for Seismology (IRIS) Data Management Center. The results of the W phase analysis are available on the Supporting information. The relocated catalog will be
 made available at final publication.

The coseismic offset tables extracted from daily and HRGPS presented in the study are in the supporting information. Position time series of the sequence can be made available upon request.

505 References

- Aki, K. (1965), Maximum likelihood estimate of b in the formula log N = a-bM and its confidence limits, *Bull. Earthq. Res. Inst., Tokyo Univ., 43*, 237–239.
- Altamimi, Z., L. Métivier, P. Rebischung, H. Rouby, and X. Collilieux (2017), Itrf2014 plate
- motion model, *Geophysical Journal International*, 209(3), 1906–1912.
- Ariyoshi, K., T. Matsuzawa, J.-P. Ampuero, R. Nakata, T. Hori, Y. Kaneda, R. Hino, and
- A. Hasegawa (2012), Migration process of very low-frequency events based on a chain-
- reaction model and its application to the detection of preseismic slip for megathrust earth-
- ⁵¹³ quakes, *Earth, planets and space*, 64(8), 693–702.

514	Báez, J., F. Leyton, C. Troncoso, F. del Campo, M. Bevis, C. Vigny, M. Moreno, M. Si-
515	mons, E. Kendrick, H. Parra, et al. (2018), The Chilean GNSS network: Current status
516	and progress toward early warning applications, Seismological Research Letters.
517	Barrientos, S. (2018), The seismic network of chile, Seismological Research Letters, 89(2A),
518	467–474.
519	Bartlow, N. M., S. Miyazaki, A. M. Bradley, and P. Segall (2011), Space-time correlation of
520	slip and tremor during the 2009 cascadia slow slip event, Geophysical Research Letters,
521	38(18).
522	Bartlow, N. M., L. M. Wallace, R. J. Beavan, S. Bannister, and P. Segall (2014), Time-
523	dependent modeling of slow slip events and associated seismicity and tremor at the hiku-
524	rangi subduction zone, new zealand, Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth,
525	119(1), 734–753.
526	Beck, S., S. Barrientos, E. Kausel, and M. Reyes (1998), Source characteristics of historic
527	earthquakes along the central Chile subduction zone, Journal of South American Earth
528	Sciences, 11, 115–129.
529	Bletery, Q., and JM. Nocquet (2020), Slip bursts during coalescence of slow slip events in
530	cascadia, Nature communications, 11(1), 1–6.
531	Bloch, W., J. Kummerow, P. Salazar, P. Wigger, and S. A. Shapiro (2014), High-resolution
532	image of the North Chilean subduction zone: seismicity, reflectivity and fluids, Geophysi-
533	cal Journal International, 197(3), 1744–1749.
534	Bloch, W., T. John, J. Kummerow, P. Salazar, O. S. Krüger, and S. A. Shapiro (2018), Watch-
535	ing dehydration: Seismic indication for transient fluid pathways in the oceanic mantle of
536	the subducting Nazca slab, Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems, 19(9), 3189-3207,
537	doi:10.1029/2018GC007703.
538	Bouchon, M. (1981), A simple method to calculate Green's functions for elastic layered me-
539	dia, Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 71(4), 959–971.
540	Choi, K., A. Bilich, K. M. Larson, and P. Axelrad (2004), Modified sidereal filtering: Impli-
541	cations for high-rate gps positioning, Geophysical research letters, 31(22).
542	Comte, D., and G. Suarez (1994), An inverted double seismic zone in Chile: Evidence of
543	phase transformation in the subducted slab, Science, 263(5144), 212-215.
544	Comte, D., M. Pardo, L. Dorbath, C. Dorbath, H. Haessler, L. Rivera, A. Cisternas, and
545	L. Ponce (1992), Crustal seismicity and subduction morphology around antofagasta, chile:
546	preliminary results from a microearthquake survey, Tectonophysics, 205(1-3), 13-22.

547	Comte, D., H. Haessler, L. Dorbath, M. Pardo, T. Monfret, A. Lavenu, B. Pontoise, and
548	Y. Hello (2002), Seismicity and stress distribution in the copiapo, northern Chile subduc-
549	tion zone using combined on- and off-shore seismic observations, Physics of the Earth and
550	Planetary Interiors, 132(1-3), 197 - 217, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0031-9201(02)
551	00052-3, subduction Zone Structure and Megathrust Earthquakes.
552	Coutant, O. (1989), Programme de simulation numerique AXITRA, Rapport LGIT.
553	Duputel, Z., L. Rivera, H. Kanamori, and G. Hayes (2012), W phase source inversion for
554	moderate to large earthquakes (1990-2010), Geophysical Journal International, 189(2),
555	1125–1147, doi:10.1111/j.1365-246X.2012.05419.x.
556	Duputel, Z., P. S. Agram, M. Simons, S. E. Minson, and J. L. Beck (2014), Accounting for
557	prediction uncertainty when inferring subsurface fault slip, Geophys. J. Int., 197(1), 464-
558	482.
559	Efron, B., and R. J. Tibshirani (1993), An introduction to the Bootstrap, Chapman &
560	HALL/CRC.
561	Gao, H., D. A. Schmidt, and R. J. Weldon (2012), Scaling relationships of source parameters
562	for slow slip events, Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 102(1), 352-360.
563	Gombert, B., Z. Duputel, E. Shabani, L. Rivera, R. Jolivet, and J. Hollingsworth (2019), Im-
564	pulsive source of the 2017 mw= 7.3 ezgeleh, iran, earthquake, Geophysical research let-
565	ters, 46(10), 5207–5216.
566	Hayes, G. P., G. L. Moore, D. E. Portner, M. Hearne, H. Flamme, M. Furtney, and G. M.
567	Smoczyk (2018), Slab2, a comprehensive subduction zone geometry model, Science,
568	362(6410), 58–61.
569	Herrera, C., S. Ruiz, R. Madariaga, and P. Poli (2017), Dynamic inversion of the 2015 Jujuy
570	earthquake and similarity with other intraslab events, Geophysical Journal International,
571	209(2), 866–875.
572	Herring, T., R. King, and S. C. McClusky (2010a), GAMIT : GPS Analysis at MIT, release
573	10.4.
574	Herring, T., R. King, and S. C. McClusky (2010b), GLOBK : Global Kalman filter VLBI and
575	GPS analysis program release 10.4.
576	Holtkamp, S. G., M. E. Pritchard, and R. B. Lohman (2011), Earthquake swarms in South
577	America, Geophysical Journal International, 187(1), 128–146, doi:10.1111/j.1365-246X.
578	2011.05137.x.

579	Ida, Y. (1972), Cohesive force across the tip of a longitudinal-shear crack and Griffith's spe-
580	cific surface energy, Journal of Geophysical Research, 77(20), 3796–3805.
581	Kanamori, H., and D. L. Anderson (1975), Theoretical basis of some empirical relations in
582	seismology, Bulletin of the seismological society of America, 65(5), 1073-1095.
583	Kanamori, H., L. Rivera, L. Ye, T. Lay, S. Murotani, and K. Tsumura (2019), New con-
584	straints on the 1922 atacama, chile, earthquake from historical seismograms, Geophysical
585	Journal International, 219(1), 645–661.
586	Klein, E., M. Métois, and V. C. D. A. Meneses, G. (2018a), Bridging the gap between North
587	and Central Chile : insight from new GPS data on coupling complexities and the Andean
588	sliver motion, Geophysical Journal International, 213(3), 1924 – 1933.
589	Klein, E., Z. Duputel, D. Zigone, C. Vigny, JP. Boy, C. Doubre, and G. Meneses (2018b),
590	Deep transient slow slip detected by survey gps in the region of atacama, chile, Geophysi-
591	cal research letters, 45(22), 12–263.
592	Langer, L., T. Ragon, A. Sladen, and J. Tromp (2020), Impact of topography on earthquake
593	static slip estimates, Tectonophysics, 791, 228,566.
594	Leyton, F., A. Leopold, G. Hurtado, C. Pastén, S. Ruiz, G. Montalva, and E. Saez (2018),
595	Geophysical characterization of the chilean seismological stations: First results, Seismo-
596	logical Research Letters, 89(2A), 519–525.
597	Lomnitz, C. (2004), Major earthquakes of Chile: A historical survey, 1535-1960, Seismolog-
598	ical Research Letters, 75, 368-378, doi:10.1785/gssrl.75.3.368.
599	Meade, B. J. (2007), Algorithms for the calculation of exact displacements, strains, and
600	stresses for triangular dislocation elements in a uniform elastic half space, Computers &
601	Geosciences, 33(8), 1064–1075.
602	Métois, M., A. Socquet, C. Vigny, D. Carrizo, S. Peyrat, A. Delorme, E. Maureira, MC.
603	Valderas-Bermejo, and I. Ortega (2013), Revisiting the north Chile seismic gap segmenta-
604	tion using GPS-derived interseismic coupling, Geophysical Journal International, 194(3),
605	1283–1294, doi:10.1093/gji/ggt183.
606	Métois, M., C. Vigny, and A. Socquet (2016), Interseismic coupling, megathrust earthquakes
607	and seismic swarms along the Chilean subduction zone (38–18 $^{\circ}$ S), Pure and Applied
608	Geophysics, 173(5), 1431–1449.
609	Omori, F. (1894), On the Aftershocks of Earthquakes, Journal of the College of Science, Im-
610	perial University of Tokyo, 7, 111–200.

Otarola, C., S. Ruiz, C. Herrera, R. Madariaga, and C. Siegel (2021), Dynamic rupture of subduction earthquakes located near the trench, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 562,

116,842.

613

- Pacheco, J. F., and L. R. Sykes (1992), Seismic moment catalog of large shallow earth-
- quakes, 1900 to 1989, Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 82(3), 1306–1349.
- Pastén-Araya, F., P. Salazar, S. Ruiz, E. Rivera, B. Potin, A. Maksymowicz, E. Torres, J. Vil-
- larroel, E. Cruz, J. Valenzuela, D. Jaldín, G. González, W. Bloch, P. Wigger, and S. A.
- ⁶¹⁸ Shapiro (2018), Fluids Along the Plate Interface Influencing the Frictional Regime of the
- ⁶¹⁹ Chilean Subduction Zone, Northern Chile, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 45(19), 10,378–
 ⁶²⁰ 10,388, doi:10.1029/2018GL079283.
- Pastén-Araya, F., B. Potin, S. Ruiz, L. Zerbst, F. Aden-Antoniów, K. Azúa, E. Rivera, A. Rietbrock, P. Salazar, and A. Fuenzalida (2021), Seismicity in the upper plate of the North-
- ern Chilean offshore forearc: Evidence of splay fault South of the Mejillones peninsula.,
- 624 *Tectonophysics*, accepted.
- Piñón, D. A., D. D. Gómez, R. Smalley Jr, S. R. Cimbaro, E. A. Lauría, and M. G. Bevis
 (2018), The history, state, and future of the Argentine continuous satellite monitoring network and its contributions to geodesy in Latin America, *Seismological Research Letters*,
 89(2A), 475–482.
- Potin, B., S. Barrientos, B. Valette, and S. Ruiz (2019), Tomography of Chile, in *8th International Symposium on Andean Geodynamics (ISAG)*.
- Radiguet, M., H. Perfettini, N. Cotte, A. Gualandi, B. Valette, V. Kostoglodov, T. Lhomme,
 A. Walpersdorf, E. C. Cano, and M. Campillo (2016), Triggering of the 2014 Mw 7.3 Pa-
- panoa earthquake by a slow slip event in Guerrero, Mexico, *Nature Geoscience*, 9(11),
- 634 **829**.
- Reasenberg, P. A., and L. M. Jones (1989), Earthquake hazard after a mainshock in california, *Science*, 243(4895), 1173–1176.

Rolandone, F., J.-M. Nocquet, P. A. Mothes, P. Jarrin, M. Vallée, N. Cubas, S. Hernandez,

- M. Plain, S. Vaca, and Y. Font (2018), Areas prone to slow slip events impede earthquake rupture propagation and promote afterslip, *Science Advances*, *4*(1), eaao6596.
- Ruiz, S., and R. Madariaga (2011), Determination of the friction law parameters of the mw
- 641 6.7 michilla earthquake in northern chile by dynamic inversion, *Geophysical Research* 642 *Letters*, 38(9).

643	Ruiz, S., and R. Madariaga (2018), Historical and recent large megathrust earthquakes in
644	chile, Tectonophysics, pp, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2018.01.015.
645	Ruiz, S., F. Aden-Antoniow, J. Baez, C. Otarola, B. Potin, F. Campo, P. Poli, C. Flores,
646	C. Satriano, F. Leyton, et al. (2017), Nucleation phase and dynamic inversion of the Mw
647	6.9 Valparaíso 2017 earthquake in Central Chile, Geophysical Research Letters, 44(20).
648	Sambridge, M. (1999), Geophysical inversion with a neighbourhood algorithm—I. Searching
649	a parameter space, Geophysical journal international, 138(2), 479-494.
650	Sippl, C., B. Shurr, G. Asch, and J. Kummerow (2018), Seismicity structure of the northern
651	Chile forearc from >100,000 double-difference relocated hypocenters, Journal of Geo-
652	physical Research: Solid Earth, 123(5), 4063–4087.
653	Soloviev, S., and C. Go (1976), Catalog of tsunamis on the western coast of the pacific
654	ocean, nauka, urss (in russian).
655	Suito, H., T. Nishimura, M. Tobita, T. Imakiire, and S. Ozawa (2011), Interplate fault slip
656	along the japan trench before the occurrence of the 2011 off the pacific coast of tohoku
657	earthquake as inferred from gps data, Earth, planets and space, 63(7), 19.
658	Utsu, T. (1957), Magnitude of Earthquakes and Occurrence of their Aftershocks, Zisin (J.
659	Seismol. Soc. Jap.), 10, 35-45, doi:10.4294/jpe1952.43.1.
660	Vaca, S., M. Vallée, JM. Nocquet, J. Battaglia, and M. Régnier (2018), Recurrent slow slip
661	events as a barrier to the northward rupture propagation of the 2016 pedernales earthquake
662	(central ecuador), Tectonophysics, 724, 80-92.
663	Villegas Lanza, J., J. Nocquet, F. Rolandone, M. Vallee, H. Tavera, F. Bondoux, T. Tran,
664	X. Martin, and M. Chlieh (2015), A slow slip and seismic swarm sequence in a weakly
665	coupled subduction zone in northern peru, AGUFM, 2015, S31A-2735.
666	Wessel, P., W. H. F. Smith, R. Scharroo, J. Luis, and F. Wobbe (2013), Generic Mapping
667	Tools: Improved version released, Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union,
668	94(45), 409–410, doi:10.1002/2013EO450001.
669	Willis, B. (1929), Studies in Comparative Seismology: Earthquake Conditions in Chile, 382,
670	Carnegie Institution of Washington.
671	Wynants-Morel, N., F. Cappa, L. De Barros, and JP. Ampuero (2020), Stress perturbation
672	from aseismic slip drives the seismic front during fluid injection in a permeable fault,
673	Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, 125(7), e2019JB019,179.
674	Yagi, Y., M. Kikuchi, and T. Sagiya (2001), Co-seismic slip, post-seismic slip, and after-
675	shocks associated with two large earthquakes in 1996 in hyuga-nada, japan, Earth, planets

676 *and space*, 53(8), 793–803.

- ⁶⁷⁷ Yingdi, L., and J.-P. Ampuero (2017), Preprint: Tremor migration patterns and the collective
- ⁶⁷⁸ behavior of deep asperities mediated by creep.



Figure 1. Overall context of the sequence of September 2020 in the Atacama region of Chile. The relo-679 cated earthquakes catalog is plotted as a function of time since the mainshock (in days since the mainshock). 680 Events represented with white contours were relocated outside of the core sequence. Mechanisms and M_w 681 of the 3 largest events are the re-estimated one. The different observation networks used in this study are rep-682 resented. A. Cross section of the relocated catalog of the core sequence, as function of depth, with the same 683 color scale function of time. B. Local magnitudes M_l of the relocated catalog of the core sequence as function 684 of time. Violet stars show swarms locations [Holtkamp et al., 2011]. Slab isodepth from Hayes et al. [2018]. 685 The dashed red lines illustrates the approximate length 1819 and 1922 earthquakes rupture zones. 686

-24-



Figure 2. Vertical cross-section of tomography model for both P-wave velocity and V_P/V_S velocity ratio. Cross-section oriented perpendicular to the trench, across the sequence. Blue dots represent background seismicity in a 50 km range from the cross-section (CSN catalog, 2013 – 07/2020). Red dots represent the seismic sequence between August 25th and September 25th included. All earthquakes were relocated in the local 3D tomography model presented. Seismicity of the sequence spreads along subduction contact between the trench and about 40 km at depth.



Figure 3. Analysis of the relocated catalog over the first 72 h after the mainshock; A. map view, distances are in km, coordinate (0,0) correspond to the mainshock and colours represent time; B. number of events/h, time is relative to the mainshock origin time. Bins are centered on the hour; C. distance to mainshock in the West-East direction vs. time, in km; D. distance to mainshock in the South-North direction vs. time, in km; E. horizontal distance to main shock in km. The 3 main events are highlighted by the red diamonds on subplots C, D E, the mainshock is black contoured. The red dashed lines on subplots C and D depict the seismicity boundaries.



Figure 4. Histograms of the bootstrap analysis for the moment magnitude of the three largest events with 10⁵ inversions. Average M_w and $\pm 2\sigma$ uncertainties are given in the legend.



Figure 5. Time series of GPS daily positions from stations in the region of the sequence on the 3 components. The vertical black lines flag the exact time of the 2 events of September 1st, at the beginning of the sequence.



Figure 6. Comparison of 24 hours CGPS and HRGPS static co-seismic offset estimations; A. mainshock of
 04:09 (reddish vectors) and B. aftershock of 21:09 (blueish vectors). Horizontal top row, vertical bottom row.
 Earthquakes' locations from the relocated catalog and mechanisms from the W-phase analysis.



Figure 7. Slip distributions of A. the mainshock at 4:09 UTC inverted from the HRGPS (Fig. 6-A); B. the aftershock at 21:09 UTC inverted from the HRGPS (Fig. 6-B); Distributions are represented as the blue color scale (in mm), blue isolines are represented every 20 mm; Horizontal coseismic displacements are depicted by arrows: Observations (red) vs predictions (pink); Vertical coseismic displacements are depicted by colored dots : Observations (big circles) vs predictions (small circles) with amplitude represented with the polar color scale; C. Zoom in to compare both slip distributions and the relocated catalog of aftershocks occurring between the 2 events represented with the color scale. Isodepth from Slab2.0 [*Hayes et al.*, 2018]



Figure 8. Coseismic model of the mainshock obtained from the dynamic inversion. A. Geographic context
of the mainshock rupture and stations used for modeling. The moment tensor was obtained from GCMT. B.
Dynamic slip model on the fault plane and waveform misfit convergence colored with the stress drop. The
bottom plot shows the E-W observed (blue) and modeled (red) waveforms of the best dynamic model.



A.Total coseismic (Mainshock04h09UTC+Aftershock21h09UTC)

Figure 9. Slip history over the sequence: A. Total coseismic: vectors show the total coseismic displace-719 ment on September, 1st (including both events and the aseismic slip that occurred during that period) mea-720 sured by CGPS (light red) and the corresponding Slip distribution (i), compared with the total coseismic 721 displacement due to the 2 events measured by HRGPS (dark red) and the corresponding slip distribution (ii); 722 B. Early afterslip estimated from the difference between CGPS and HRGPS estimates and the corresponding 723 slip distribution; C. Slip-time dependent inversion of the postseismic deformation 22 days with 3 snapshots 724 of the cumulative slip distribution. Yellow and red arrows are respectively model-predicted and observed 725 displacements for CGPS sites recorded since the mainshock. Postseismic slip contours are every 10 mm. Gray 726 lines are Slab2.0 isodepth from Hayes et al. [2018]. 727



728	Figure 10. Slip distributions of the M_w = 6.9 mainshock (01/09/2020-4:09 UTC, dark blue contours every
729	20 mm starting at 60mm), the M_w = 6.4 aftershock (01/09/2020-21:09 UTC, light blue contours every 20 mm
730	starting at 60 mm); the rapid afterslip between the 2 events (red contours every 20 mm starting at 40 mm), and
731	1 month of postseismic slip (yellow contours every 15 mm starting at 15 mm). The epicenter of the $M_w = 6.2$
732	aftershock (4:30 UTC) is depicted by the orange dot. Comparison with the coupling distribution in the re-
733	gion [Klein et al., 2018a] and the 2014 SSE distribution [Klein et al., 2018b, , represented by the dark green
734	contours every 50 mm starting at 200 mm]). Background seismicity from relocated catalog depicted by white
735	dots. Slab2.0 isodepth from Hayes et al. [2018] every 10 km.