Shallow seismic structure of Kunlun fault zone in northern Tibetan Plateau, China: implications for the 2001 Ms8.1 Kunlun earthquake
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SUMMARY
The shallow seismic velocity structure of the Kunlun fault zone (KLFZ) was jointly deduced from seismic refraction profiling and the records of trapped waves that were excited by five explosions. The data were collected after the 2001 Kunlun Ms8.1 earthquake in the northern Tibetan Plateau. Seismic phases for the in-line record sections (26 records up to a distance of 15 km) along the fault zone were analysed, and 1-D P- and S-wave velocity models of shallow crust within the fault zone were determined by using the seismic refraction method. Sixteen seismic stations were deployed along the off-line profile perpendicular to the fault zone. Fault-zone trapped waves appear clearly on the record sections, which were simulated with a 3-D finite difference algorithm. Quantitative analysis of the correlation coefficients of the synthetic and observed trapped waveforms indicates that the Kunlun fault-zone width is 300 m, and S-wave quality factor Q within the fault zone is 15. Significantly, S-wave velocities within the fault zone are reduced by 30–45 per cent from surrounding rocks to a depth of at least 1–2 km, while P-wave velocities are reduced by 7–20 per cent. A fault-zone with such P- and S-low velocities is an indication of high fluid pressure because Vs is affected more than Vp. The low-velocity and low-Q zone in the KLFZ model is the effect of multiple ruptures along the fault trace of the 2001 Ms8.1 Kunlun earthquake.
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1 INTRODUCTION
The internal properties of active fault zones are of great interest to seismologists who study the earthquake source and to geologists who investigate the deformation of the crust in response to regional stresses (Aki 1979; Kanamori 1994). Several recent reviews have demonstrated that an improved knowledge of the detailed physical properties of a major fault zone can be used to improve the understanding of earthquake processes and the long-term evolution of a fault (Aki & Richards 2002; Scholz 2002; Sibson 2002; Lyakhovsky & Ben-Zion 2008). An opportunity to study the shallow seismic structure of an active fault was presented by the Kunlun Ms8.1 earthquake of 2001 November 14, which occurred in the northern Tibetan Plateau (Fig. 1a). This earthquake generated a rupture zone with a total length of 426 km oriented in a nearly E–W direction along the southern piedmont of the Kunlun Mountains, with the Kekexili Plateau to the south. The epicentre is located at (36.2°N, 90.9°E), and the focal depth is 15 km (Institute of Geophysics, CSB 2002). The seismic fault-plane solution from moment tensor inversion indicates left-lateral strike-slip with a dip-angle of 85° and a slip-angle of −10° (Xu & Chen 2005). Field geological surveys indicate that the macroscopic epicentre is located in the southern piedmont of the Kunlun Mountains, to the northeast of the Hoh Sai Lake, and about 80 to 90 km west of the Kunlun Pass. They also indicate that the surface rupture is predominated by left-lateral strike-slip with a maximum slip of 7.6 m (Lin et al. 2002b; Van der Woerd et al. 2002; Xu et al. 2002).

The shallow structure of a major fault zone can be explored in several ways, including active-source seismic profiling, seismic tomography (Loug et al. 1988; Lees & Malin 1990; Thumber et al. 1997) and fault-zone trapped waves (Li & Leary 1990; Li et al. 1999; Ben-Zion et al. 2003; Lewis et al. 2005). A number of seismic experiments have been carried out at the site of rupture zones generated by recent destructive earthquakes, such as the Parkfield segment of the San Andreas fault (Li et al. 2004; Li et al. 2006), the 1992 Ms7.5 Landers earthquake (Li et al. 1994, 1999; Peng et al. 2003), the 1995 Ms7.2 Kobe earthquake (Li et al. 1998), the 1999 M7.1 Hector Mine earthquake (Li et al. 2002a) and the 1999 Mw7.4 Izmit earthquake (Ben-Zion et al. 2003). These studies of the fault-zone internal structure have shown that major crustal faults are generally characterized by seismic low-velocity zones with width of a few hundred metres to a few kilometres. Such low-velocity zones are considered to be caused by an unknown combination of fluid concentration near faults, clay-rich fault gouge, increased...
porosity and crack dilatation that may occur during the earthquake rupture process (Thurber 1983; Cormier & Spudich 1984; Mooney & Ginzburg 1986; Li & Leary 1990; Ben-Zion 1998; Ben-Zion & Sammis 2003). Recent borehole measurements (Hickman et al. 2005) confirm that densely fractured rocks associated with active faults have significantly reduced velocities. Thus, there is a correlation between fault slip behaviour and seismic velocity structure within the fault zone.

Two months after the 2001 Kunlun earthquake, a 32-station broad-band seismic network was deployed along and across the surficial rupture trace in the eastern segment of the Kunlun rupture zone, and collected seismic records excited by explosions (Fig. 1b). The objective of this seismological experiment is to image the shallow structure of the fault zone using both seismic P- and S-refracted waves, and trapped waves propagating in the low-velocity damaged fault zone. The eastern segment of the Kunlun fault zone (KLFZ), from the Hoh Sai Lake to the Kunlun Pass, corresponds to the main surface rupture, and also to the most active aftershock zone of the 2001 Kunlun earthquake (China Seismological Bureau 2003). This experimental site was also selected based on the simplicity of the near-surface geology. The fault rupture here broke the surface in bedrock, avoiding possible complications due to sedimentary layers that can diffuse and mask signals propagating within the fault zone. In this paper, based on the analysis of the refracted phases and the trapped waves produced by explosive shots and recorded by linear seismic arrays along and across the Kunlun rupture zone, the shallow seismic structure of the fault zone is jointly presented by means of numerical simulations of the fault-zone trapped waves and interpretation of the refracted waves.

2 REGIONAL GEOLOGIC SETTING AND PREVIOUS GEOPHYSICAL STUDIES

The Tibetan Plateau has been uplifted over the past 45 Ma by the collision of the Indian and Eurasian plates. From south to north, the Tibetan Plateau can be divided into six tectonic units: Himalaya block, Lhasa block, North Tibetan block, Qiantang block, Songpan–Ganzi Complex and Qaidam block (Fig. 1a, inset map, Yin &
The large-scale rupture zone associated with the 2001 Kunlun earthquake provides an attractive target of the investigation of the internal structure of a major continental strike-slip fault. For this reason, an active seismic experiment using explosive sources was conducted in 2002. The field site is situated on the eastern segment of the surface rupture, extending westwards about 15 km from the Kunlun Pass (Fig. 1b).

### 3.1 Geometry of the seismic refraction experiment

Several papers elucidated the fault-zone trapped waves that are generated by earthquake or explosive source and recorded by seismographs distributed over the fault zone (e.g. Li et al. 1999; Ben-Zion et al. 2003; Lewis et al. 2005). In the KLFZ field experiment, 32 temporary seismic stations were deployed along two profiles, Line A and Line B (Fig. 1b). Line A consists of 13 stations parallel to the rupture zone and is about 20 km in length. A denser linear seismic array of 19 stations was deployed on Line B, which is perpendicular to the rupture zone and is about 3 km long. The geometry of Line B is shown in the inset map of Fig. 1(b), where the central station (B10) is closest to the rupture trace. Stations were unevenly distributed, with an interval of 30 m in the central part and gradually increasing outwards to 300 m at the two ends of the profile. The three-component seismographs with hard disk memory were deployed, where the seismometers have a frequency band from 20 s to 40 Hz (Zhao et al. 1997). There are five explosions in the experiment (Table 1), each of which was fired in boreholes at depths of about 25 m, with explosive charges of 250 kg. Except for SP1, which is located outside the fault zone, 2.7 km from the rupture trace, shot points are located within the fault zone, some 20 m or less from the rupture trace (Fig 1b). Seismic waves excited by explosions were simultaneously recorded at stations on Line A and Line B. All recorders and shots were synchronized through GPS clocks, and timing errors are smaller than 0.01 s. The sampling interval on records is 10 ms. The experiment was carried out under adverse field conditions. Temperature in the experimental site decreased below −15°C, and some hard disk memories malfunctioned.

### 3.2 Traveltime analysis of $P$ and $S$ arrivals on the record sections

#### 3.2.1 In-line record sections along fault zone (Line A)

In the field experiment, out of 13 stations on Line A, the instruments at only six or seven stations worked normally. In view of limited amount of arrival-time data from individual shot, the records at the stations along the fault zone from all four shots on Line A were merged into a data file, and a composite record section was plotted based on the shot-receiver distance. The vertical and radial component record sections (Figs 2a and b) contain 26 records with
Figure 2. (a) Trace-normalized vertical-component record section on Line A (parallel to the fault zone). The station number is marked at the top of each trace, where the first numeral represents shot number and the following two numerals are station number. The direct and refraction phases are marked by thick dotted line. (b) Trace-normalized radial-component record section on Line A. Thick dotted lines denote the first P arrivals (P1, P2 and P3) and S arrivals (S1, S2 and S3), which are marked on the vertical and radial record sections. The radial component is in the fault-parallel direction. (c) Sketch map of time-distance graph of arrivals P1, P2 and P3, and related ray paths in a three-layer model ($V_{p3} > V_{p2} > V_{p1}$). P1 is a direct wave. P2 and P3 are head waves along interfaces R1 and R2, respectively.
relatively small receiver spacing. The radial component is in the fault parallel direction. The merging of all recordings from the four shots is justified by assuming the lateral homogeneity within a small interval of 15 km on Line A. The resulting composite section provides a measurement of the average traveltimes of the uppermost crust along the profile. Although the near-surface geology at the sites of four shots close to the fault zone is not completely identical, traveltimes of each phase are consistent with each other. Spectral analysis of the waveforms indicates that the body waves (both P and S) excited by these shots fall into the frequency range of 4–10 Hz.

The interpretative method for deep seismic sounding (Giese & Prodehl 1976; Meissner 1986; Mooney 1989; Holbrook et al. 1992; Wang et al. 2007) was applied to the record sections (Figs 2a and b), similar to the analysis of Ben-Zion & Malin (1991). As usual, the first arrivals on the record section of vertical component are recognized as shallow crustal P-wave refractions. Fig. 2(c) illustrates the seismic phases observed on the record sections in Figs 2(a) and (b). The P-wave velocity structure can be determined from P-wave first arrivals by using the ray tracing method for head waves or diving waves (Cerveny & Psenick 1984). In this manner, the P-wave first arrivals were inverted for a 1-D P-wave three-layer velocity model to a depth of about 5 km.

Depending on the seismic source used, active-source record sections do not always present S-wave arrivals. However, some record sections of deep seismic sounding profiles conducted in different geologic settings show clear S-wave arrivals (Braile et al. 1974; Assumpcao et al. 1978; El-Isa et al. 1987; Holbrook et al. 1988; Wang et al. 2000). A generally acceptable explanation for the S-wave phases is that the Earth’s free surface generates converted P–S waves from an explosive point source (Fertig 1984). The S-wave arrivals are distinct on horizontal-component records of both in-line and off-line record sections in Figs 2–4. After the first P arrivals on the vertical-component section were well defined (Fig. 2a), the corresponding S arrivals on the radial-component section can be traced (Fig. 2b), and then both the 1-D P- and S-wave velocity models were determined. The S-wave phases are, of course, secondary arrivals and so the accuracy of S-arrival pickings is lower than that of the first P arrivals due to interference with the P-wave coda.

Asymptotic ray theory (Cerveny & Psenick 1984) was used to calculate theoretical traveltimes of the seismic phases, and a comparison was made with observed traveltimes. Ray tracing was carried out in the 1-D models, where the refracted phases were simulated by diving waves travelling in a layer with a slight velocity gradient. This scheme was used to refine the layer’s seismic velocity and thickness for a layered velocity structure. The 1-D P- and S-wave velocity structures along Line A, determined by ray tracing, are shown in Table 2, where the third layer is semi-infinite. The rms traveltime residuals are 0.05 and 0.11 s for P and S arrivals, respectively.

3.2.2 In-line record sections from shot SP1

Out of the 19 stations deployed on Line B, the seismographs at 17 stations worked. Fig. 3(a) shows the three-component in-line record sections on Line B from shot SP1. On the record sections, the first P arrival and S arrival are marked as P2 and S2, in agreement with the nomenclature used for the phases on Line A (Figs 2a and b). The apparent velocity of phase P2 is 4.4 km s^{-1} at distances from 1.2 to 2.4 km, and then decreases to 4.0 km s^{-1} from 2.4 to 2.8 km. The phase S2 has an apparent velocity of 2.8 km s^{-1} at distances from 1.2 to 2.4 km, and 2.1 km s^{-1} from 2.4 to 2.8 km (Fig. 3a). Phases P2 and S2 are designated as the refractions from the second layer at distances from 1.2 to 3.6 km, following the analysis of record sections along Line A (Figs 2a and b). The apparent velocities of P2 and S2 were adopted as the velocities in the second layer outside the fault zone in the initial 3-D model of KLFZ.

Fig. 3(b) shows the vertical- and radial-component record sections for six stations on Line B that are 100 m or more south of rupture trace and three stations on Line A. Thus, the greater part of the ray path of all phases lies outside the fault zone. In comparison with the phases (P2, P3 and S2, S3) within the fault zone (Figs 2a and b), the arrivals on this section appear early, which means that the velocities of both P and S waves outside the fault zone are faster than that within the fault zone. In addition, the oscillatory shear waves travel after the S arrival in the seismograms are observed.

3.3 Waveform analysis of fault-zone trapped waves

On the in-line record sections along the fault zone (Line A), distinct seismic arrivals with a high-amplitude, low-frequency and long-wave train appear after the S arrival (Figs 2a and b). This wave train has been recognized as fault-zone trapped waves (Li & Lecar 1990; Ben-Zion 1998). Besides on Line A, the stations on Line B also recorded the seismic waves excited by four shots (SP2, SP3, SP4 and SP5), which are at distances of 2.1, 4.8, 5.5 and 8.5 km from Line B, respectively (Fig. 1b). Off-line three-component record sections on Line B are shown in Fig. 4, where the stations were arranged in even record interval (same arrangement is used in further figures) and the real station locations are shown in the inset map of Figs 1(b) and 3(a). As seen on Line A, a high-amplitude, low-frequency wave train appears after the S arrivals in the vertical-component sections on Line B. Similar waveform features of the phases present on the radial-component sections, where the shear-wave phases (refractions and reflections) are clearly observed. Detailed analysis and numerical modelling of the phases will be described in the following sections.

Differing from an earthquake at a definite depth which causes fault-zone trapped waves, an explosion simultaneously creates Rayleigh waves, also called ground roll, and fault-zone trapped waves. Within the low-velocity fault zone, energy of the ground roll is much smaller than that of the trapped waves, as discussed in Section 5.2. Thus, the distinct arrivals with high-amplitude, low-frequency and long-wave train after the S arrival on both in-line and off-line record sections are called the trapped waves in this paper.

3.3.1 Amplitude spectra of trapped waves

The amplitude spectra on the records with sampling interval of 10 ms (i.e. 100 samples per second for Fourier transformation) were calculated for a 10 s time window starting from the S arrivals, using a Hanning window with a 50-ms taper. The arrival times of the S phase are related to shot-receiver distance (Fig. 2b), and depend upon the 1-D velocity model (Table 2). Amplitude spectra of coda waves were also calculated in a time window with the same length of 10 s, and starting 15 s after the S arrivals. The amplitude spectra were normalized using coda waves, so that site and source effects on the spectral amplitudes were eliminated (Li et al. 1999).

Figs 5(a)–(e) show the amplitude spectra of vertical-component records on Line B from shots SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5 and SP1. The records at stations on Line B constitute off-line profiles for shots SP2, SP3, SP4 and SP5, while they constitute in-line profile for SP1. The spectral peaks are located at 1.8–2.0 Hz for shots SP3 and
Figure 3. (a) Trace-normalized three-component record sections on Line B from shot SP1, which is located outside the fault zone. Upper panel: vertical component; Middle: radial component and lower panel: transverse component. The station number is marked at the top. Phases P2 and S2 are refracted waves, which are in agreement with the nomenclature used for the phases on Line A in Figs 2(a) and (b). (b) Trace-normalized record sections outside the fault zone, which are excited by shot SP1 and recorded at stations on Line A or Line B. The station number is marked at the top of each trace, where the first letter denotes the line. Upper panel: vertical component and lower panel: radial component. For comparison, the phases within and outside the fault zone are, respectively, denoted by light lines and thick dotted lines, and relevant phase marks P2, P3 and S1, S2, S3 have the same meaning as that in Fig. 2(b).

SP4 (Figs 5b and c). For shot SP5, the spectral peaks are located at 1.9–2.1 Hz, whereas another arrival appears behind the trapped waves, with spectral peak at 1.4–1.6 Hz (Fig. 5d). For shot SP2, the peaks of spectral aspect are broader and located at about 2.0 Hz at stations north of the rupture trace, but they are not dominant at 2.0 Hz at stations south of the rupture trace where there is another peak at about 3.0 Hz (Fig. 5a).

In general, the coda-normalized amplitude spectra of records on Line B from the shots within the fault zone are characterized by spectral peaks at about 2.0 Hz, as evidenced by the stations close by the rupture trace. The amplitude spectra at frequencies <2.5 Hz could therefore be regarded mainly as the result of trapped waves. This implies that the seismic energy at frequencies <2.5 Hz is concentrated within the KLFZ. The coda-normalized amplitude spectra at stations B06 to B15 for four shots (Figs 5a–d) show a high degree of consistency, an observation that lends further support to their interpretation as the trapped waves (Li et al. 1999).

The amplitude spectra of vertical-component records from 3.2 to 4.2 s at stations on Line B from shot SP1 (Fig. 5e) have peaks at 1.3–1.6 Hz except for the records at stations B17–B19, where the peaks are irregularly distributed. Figs 5(a)–(e) manifest that the peaks of the spectra from in-line section are much broader than...
Figure 4. Trace-normalized three-component record sections with even trace interval from shots (a) SP2, (b) SP3, (c) SP4 and (d) SP5. These sections are plotted along the off-line profile (Line B). Real station locations are shown in the inset map of Figs 1(b) and 3(a). Tw denotes the trapped waves. P2, S2, P3, S3 are P- and S-refracted waves from the layer 2 and layer 3, respectively. Left-hand panel: vertical component, central panel: radial component and right-hand panel: transverse component.
3.3.2 Dispersion of the trapped waves

Velocity dispersions were calculated using time-frequency analysis based on a multiple filter technique (Dziewonski et al. 1969). A four-pole Butterworth filter (two way type) was used to analyse the velocity dispersion of fault-zone trapped waves. Fig. 6(a) (left-hand and central panels) shows the trace-normalized record sections for the trapped waves filtered with lower frequency bands of 0.8–1.0 and 1.4–1.6 Hz on Line A, respectively. According to the dispersive characteristics of trapped waves shown in Fig. 6(a), it is obvious that the trapped waves at lower frequencies travelled faster than those at higher frequencies. The same waveform character of the trapped waves is observed in the records on Line B from shots SP2 to SP5. Fig. 6(b) shows the filtered record sections on Line B from shot SP3 filtered in three frequency bands with bandwidth of 0.3 Hz and central frequency of 0.95, 1.45 and 1.95 Hz, respectively. Again, it is obvious that the trapped waves at lower frequencies (0.8–1.1 Hz) travelled faster than those at higher frequencies (1.8–2.1 Hz).

To illustrate the dispersion of the trapped waves, we calculated the envelope of bandpass filtered seismograms at the stations on Line A from four shots by using the Hilbert transformation. Fig. 6(c) shows the waveform and relevant envelopes of bandpass-filtered records at station A03 from shots SP2 to SP5. The seismic records were filtered using a bandpass filter with a bandwidth of 0.2 Hz and a central frequency varying from 0.5 to 2.9 Hz in increments of 0.2 Hz. The peak of the envelope indicates the arrival of trapped energy at the specified frequency band.

Based on the position of the envelope peaks (Fig. 6c), the time difference between the arrivals of S waves (Fig. 2b) and those of the trapped waves increases with shot-receiver distance. This is due to the fact that S waves propagate at a velocity of 2.62 km s⁻¹ (Table 2), which is greater than the group velocities (<1.92 km s⁻¹) of the trapped waves, analysed in the next section.

3.3.4 Estimate of the S-wave quality factor Q

The spectral ratio method (Teng 1968) was used to estimate the S-wave quality factor Q within and outside the fault zone on the understanding that the two stations simultaneously received seismic waves excited by two shots in the KLFZ experiment. The spectral ratio between two stations from one shot and the spectral ratio between two shots at one station are first formulated. These two spectral ratios are then used to form an equation to solve the Q value at a specific frequency.

The relationship between surface-wave spectral amplitude A(r) and attenuation Q is

\[ A(r) = A_0 D(r) \exp \left(-\frac{\omega}{2CQ}\right) I(r), \]

where \( A(r) \) and \( A_0 = A(0) \) denote, respectively, the spectral amplitude at distance r and \( \omega \), \( \omega \) is circular frequency, \( C \) is phase velocity, \( D(r) \) is geometric attenuation factor and \( I(r) \) is the factor related to station and instrument. For the two stations \( r_1 \), and \( r_2 \), the spectral amplitude ratio between \( A(r_1) \) and \( A(r_2) \) from one event is

\[ \frac{A(r_1)}{A(r_2)} = \frac{A_0 D(r_1)}{A_0 D(r_2)} \exp \left[-\frac{\omega}{2CQ}(r_1 - r_2)\right] \frac{I(r_1)}{I(r_2)} \]

which is related to the ratio between \( I(r_1) \) and \( I(r_2) \). Let \( A_i(r_j) \) be the spectral amplitude of event i at station \( r_j (i,j = 1, 2) \). The spectral amplitude ratio can be written as

\[ \frac{A_1(r_1)}{A_2(r_2)} = \frac{A_{10} D(r_1)}{A_{20} D(r_2)} \exp \left[-\frac{\omega}{2CQ}(r_1 - r_2)\right], \]

which is independent of the station and instrument response. When seismic records excited by two events are recorded at two stations, we have

\[ Q = \frac{\omega}{2C} \times \frac{1}{\ln \left[ \frac{A_1(r_1)A_2(r_2)D(r_1)D(r_2)}{A_1(r_2)A_2(r_1)D(r_1)D(r_2)} \right]} \]

Table 2. 1-D velocity structure along Line A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Depth interval (km)</th>
<th>P velocity (km s⁻¹)</th>
<th>S velocity (km s⁻¹)</th>
<th>( Vp/Vs )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00–0.40</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.40–1.05</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.05–5.00*</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asterisk denotes semi-infinite layer.
Figure 5. Coda-normalized amplitude spectra of vertical-component records along Line B from shots (a) SP2, (b) SP3, (c) SP4, (d) SP5 and (e) SP1. The seismograms and relevant amplitude spectra at stations on Line B are plotted with even trace interval. Spectral amplitudes are expressed by global normalization. Grey rectangle denotes the area of spectral analysis on the record sections. Amplitude spectra from shot SP1 are different from shots SP2 to SP5.
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Figure 6. (a) Trace-normalized vertical-component record sections for trapped waves filtered with lower frequency bands of 0.8–1.0 Hz (left-hand panel) and 1.4–1.6 Hz (central panel) and relevant coda-normalized amplitude spectra (right-hand panel) along Line A. (b) Trace-normalized record sections (along Line B) filtered with frequency bands of 0.8–1.1 Hz (left-hand panel), 1.1–1.4 Hz (central panel) and 1.4–1.7 Hz (right-hand panel) from shot SP3. (c) Multiple bandpass-filtered seismograms and their calculated envelopes at a station (A03) within the fault zone from (1) SP2, (2) SP3, (3) SP4 and (4) SP5. The seismograms were filtered using a bandpass filter with a bandwidth of 0.2 Hz and the central frequency ranges from 0.5 to 2.9 Hz in increment of 0.2 Hz. Filtered seismograms and envelopes are plotted using channel normalization. The peaks of envelopes are denoted by solid circles.

As mentioned above, the spectral peaks of the trapped waves are at about 2.0 Hz, and the frequency range of body waves is from 4 to 10 Hz. In this estimate, $Q$ value was calculated at six frequencies from 1 to 6 Hz. The geometric attenuation factor $D(L) = 1/\sqrt{L}$ for 1, 2 and 3 Hz for trapped waves, where $L$ is shot-receiver distance, and $D(L) = 1/L$ for 4, 5 and 6 Hz for body waves, where $L$ is the ray path length of the refraction waves.

In the measurement of $Q$, the multiple source-station pairs remove the effect of source, instrument and site effects at stations. In the KLFZ experiment, eight groups of two event–two station pair with high-quality data were formed (Table 3), where shot and station locations are shown in Fig. 1(b). In each group, quality factor $Q$ was calculated at frequencies from 1 to 6 Hz, respectively. The mean value and the standard deviation of quality factor $Q$ were calculated from the results of eight groups (Table 4).

The spectral amplitudes at stations on Line A from the shots close to the fault trace were used to calculate $Q$ value in the fault zone. Correspondingly, the spectral ratio method was also used to estimate $Q$ value outside the fault zone, where the stations are B03 and B05 on Line B and the events are SP1 and another chosen from either SP3 or SP5 (Table 3). The final $Q$ value within and outside the fault zone at a specific frequency is an arithmetic mean of $Q$ measurements (Fig. 8), respectively. The uncertainty of $Q$ estimation in the surrounding rocks is greater than that within the fault zone due to a few available records.

4 SIMULATION OF FAULT-ZONE TRAPPED WAVES

4.1 Simulation method and algorithm

The finite difference method was used to simulate the wavefield, whereby the seismic waves propagate in a 3-D medium with a planar free-surface boundary and spatially variable anelasticity (i.e. the quality factor $Q$). The model consists of a layered model with a low-velocity and low-$Q$ zone sandwiched between two-layered half-spaces with relatively high-velocities and high-$Q$ values.

Parameters used in the staggered-grid finite-difference algorithm (Graves 1996) to calculate the synthetic waveforms are as follows: a grid interval of 25 m, time step length of 0.002 s and 7500 calculation steps. The source is an explosion with a delta source function.
Figure 7. (a) Group velocities of trapped waves measured from multiple bandpass-filtered records along the fault-zone profile (Line A) for shots SP1 to SP5. Each data point denotes an average of the group velocities measured at all stations along the fault zone at the specified frequency. The standard deviation is denoted by error bar at each point (frequency, velocity). The group velocities from shot SP1 outside the fault zone are higher than those within the fault zone. (b) Group velocities of trapped waves measured from multiple bandpass-filtered records cross the fault zone (Line B) for shots SP2 to SP5. Each point denotes an average of the group velocities measured at eight stations close by the rupture trace on Line B at the specified frequency. (c) Fitness of the calculated group velocities to the observation shown in Fig. 7(a) and the relevant S-wave velocity models from shot SP1. Top panel: measured (circles) and calculated (thick line) group velocities. Bottom panel: 1-D S-wave velocity structure.

Table 3. Pairs of two events and two stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Event 1</th>
<th>Event 2</th>
<th>Station 1</th>
<th>Station 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fault zone</td>
<td>SP2</td>
<td>SP5</td>
<td>A02</td>
<td>A06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP2</td>
<td>SP5</td>
<td>A03</td>
<td>A07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP3</td>
<td>SP5</td>
<td>A02</td>
<td>A06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP3</td>
<td>SP5</td>
<td>A02</td>
<td>A07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP3</td>
<td>SP5</td>
<td>A03</td>
<td>A06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP3</td>
<td>SP5</td>
<td>A03</td>
<td>A07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding rocks</td>
<td>SP1</td>
<td>SP3</td>
<td>B03</td>
<td>B05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP1</td>
<td>SP5</td>
<td>B03</td>
<td>B05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and a rise time of 0.1 s. A four-pole Butterworth filter with a low cut-off at 0.2 Hz and a high cut-off at 6.0 Hz was used at the source. The gridpoint number in the 3-D model is 100 (x) \times 380 (y) \times 200 (z), where the x-axis is perpendicular to y; the y-axis is parallel to the rupture trace and the z-axis is depth. The total number of gridpoints is 7.6 \times 10^6. The fault zone is depicted as a low-velocity zone along the central part of the grid network. A point source is embedded within the fault zone at a depth of 25 m. Station B10 is located at the central line of the low-velocity zone, which coincides with the rupture trace. Supposing the fault-zone width of 300 m, stations B06 and B15 on Line B are, respectively, located on the two-side boundaries of the fault zone.

4.2 Effects of fault-zone width on wavefield

As presented by Ben-Zion & Aki (1990) and Igel et al. (1997), the waveform character of fault-zone trapped waves is related to the fault-zone width. In the KLFZ experiment, the vertical-component record sections of shots SP3–SP5 show that the waveforms of trapped waves at 10 stations close to the rupture trace (from B06

Table 4. Quality factor $Q$ within and outside the fault zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (Hz)</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
<th>Group 7</th>
<th>Group 8</th>
<th>Mean $Q$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In* is the fault zone and *Out* is the surrounding rocks.
Figure 8. Mean Q values at six frequencies within the fault zone (circles) and the surrounding rocks (solid triangles).

to B15) do not bear significant differences (Figs 4b–d). In addition, the amplitude spectra at stations from B06 to B15 for shots SP3 to SP5 show good consistency (Fig. 5).

In order to understand the effects of the fault-zone width, we set up a simplified model (Fig. 9a, top panel) with different fault-zone widths (200, 300 and 400 m). To simulate the record section of shot SP4 on Line B (Fig. 4c), the synthetic seismograms were calculated on the simplified models at distance of 5.5 km from source to Line B (Fig. 9a, bottom panel). A low-velocity zone with a smaller width (200 m) generates higher frequency trapped waves than that with larger width (300 and 400 m). The trapped waves generated by waveguide with a width of 300 m give a better fitness to the record section. According to the analysis of the seismic wavefield, the energy of trapped waves in the low-velocity zone could pass through the boundary of the zone and propagate in the surrounding rocks to a certain extent. Different frequency bands on seismic records may define the width of the damage zone (e.g. Peng et al. 2003; Peng & Ben-Zion 2004).

4.3 Effect of velocity contrast on wavefield

The velocity contrast between the low-velocity fault zone and the surrounding rocks has significant effect on wavefield. For this simulation, the calculation of synthetic seismograms was based on the simplified model with different velocity contrast. Fig. 9(b) shows that the lower velocity contrast causes the trapped waves to propagate outwards farther extent from the boundary than that by the higher velocity contrast. Considering the precise extent of the trapped waves on the record sections on Line B (Fig. 4), the locations of the south and north boundaries of the low-velocity zone can be identified as being between stations B05 and B06, and between B15 and B17, respectively. However, there is a large gap (∼70 m) between stations B05 and B06 and an even larger gap (∼80 m) between stations B15 and B17. Therefore, the boundary location of the low-velocity zone has a certain error.

Figure 9. (a) Vertical-component synthetic seismograms of trapped waves based on different fault-zone width. The fault-zone model consists of a low-velocity zone with surrounding rocks. Upper panel: velocity model and lower panel: three synthetic sections calculated at distance of 5.5 km on the models with fault-zone width of 200, 300 and 400 m, respectively. (b) Synthetic seismograms of trapped waves with different velocity contrast between surrounding rocks and low-velocity zone. Upper panel: velocity models and lower panel: vertical-component synthetic sections at distance of 5.5 km on the models with fault-zone width of 300 m. All of the synthetic seismograms were filtered with low passband (<3 Hz) and plotted with trace normalization and station interval of 50 m. Velocity unit: km s⁻¹.
4.4 Wavefield excited by shots outside fault zone

Some studies (e.g. Li et al. 1994) presented that the trapped waves of fault zone are only generated when the sources are close to or inside the low-velocity fault zone. In addition, the trapped waves from sources outside the fault zone were numerically simulated by Fohrmann et al. (2004), where considerable trapping efficiency is possible for source well outside a shallow fault zone, and large source volumes are able to generate local amplification above faults. The observation above the Karadere–Duzce branch of the North Anatolian fault has shown that trapped wave energy is generated by earthquakes occurring in a large volume around the active fault (Ben-Zion et al. 2003).

To simulate the trapping efficiency excited by a point source outside the fault zone, we calculated synthetic seismograms on a three-layer fault-zone model. Fig. 10(a) shows the energy decay of trapped waves with distances from shot to the fault zone. An explosion generates significant trapped wave energy when the distance from source to the fault zone is smaller than about 600 m. The energy decay is faster than that generated by the source of large volumes in Fohrmann et al. (2004). Fig. 10(b) shows the vertical-component synthetic sections at four stations close to the rupture trace, excited by shot SP1. Though the oscillatory shear wave trains after the S arrival in the records at station within the fault trace are evident, the energy ratio between trapped waves and S waves from the sources outside the fault zone is smaller than 1.0, which is consistent with that of synthetics in Fig. 10(a), except for the record at station A06, where there exists abnormal low-frequency response on vertical component. It is probably caused by the local site effect.

4.5 Quantitative analysis of fitness between synthetics and observation

The initial 3-D velocity model was formed from several sources, including the 1-D velocity model along the fault zone (Table 2), the inversion of surface-wave group velocities (Fig. 7c), the apparent velocities of phases P2 and S2 (Figs 3a and b) and the Q estimation (Table 4). Fig. 11 shows a three-media model of KLFZ, with three layers, fault zone, source and receivers on Line B. Actually, the 3-D model in this paper should be a 2.5-D model, or called pseudo-3-D model. A forward modeling approach was used to model the observed waveforms. Due to the limited observed data, the number of model parameters is decreased in the numerical simulation, that is, we only make a trade-off between the fault-zone width and quality factor Q, which are primary parameters to affect the waveform of the trapped waves, and fix other parameters on the model.

In order to quantitatively analyse the fitness between synthetics and observed trapped waves, we calculated the correlation coefficients of synthetic and observed waveforms. A 2-D grid search process was carried out in an appropriate range of the fault-zone width and quality factor Q, where the fault-zone width is from 125 to 475 m with step of 25 m, and the quality factor Q is from 5 to 50 with step of 5. Fig. 12(a) shows the topography of correlation coefficients of the trapped waves between synthetics and observed records from shots SP3 and SP4. The correlation coefficient has the maximum value of 0.76 for a fault-zone width of 300 m and a quality factor Q of 15. Figs 12(b) and (c) show the cross-section of correlation coefficients at the Q value of 15 and at the fault-zone width of 300, respectively. The topography illustrates that the maximum value of the correlation coefficients is global, and so the determination of the fault-zone width and quality factor Q is reasonable.

4.6 Final KLFZ model

The final KLFZ model (Table 5) shows a three-layer 3-D velocity structure. Shear velocities in the fault zone are 30–45 per cent smaller than that in the surrounding rocks from the surface to a minimum depth of 1 km. The synthetic seismogram sections along Line A and Line B (Figs 13 and 14) were, respectively, calculated on the final 3-D KLFZ model. The dispersive behaviour of the trapped waves after the S arrival is evident. On the trace-normalized vertical-component synthetic sections, the amplitude of the first P arrival is smaller than that of the trapped waves, but still clear. Although the travel-times between synthetics and observations along the fault zone are quite consistent, the fitting of the amplitude is more variable, reflecting simplicity of our 3-D anelastic model.

Figs 15(a) and (b) show the fitness of the vertical- and radial-component synthetics with observations on Line B for shots SP3 and SP4, respectively, where a low pass filter with cut-off frequency...
of 6.0 Hz was used. The synthetic trapped waves for stations B06 to B15 are consistent with observations on both vertical and radial components. Figs 16(a) and (b) show the fitness of synthetic and observed waveforms and amplitude envelopes at station B10 for shots SP3 and SP4 in the frequency band from 0.5 to 2.3 Hz, respectively. For shot SP3, the correlation coefficients calculated in the time interval from 5 to 10 s are from 0.643 to 0.862, where the maximum value (0.928) falls into the frequency band 1.7–2.0 Hz. For shot SP4, the correlation coefficients in the time interval from 5 to 10 s are from 0.520 to 0.927. The maximum value (0.987) also falls into the same frequency band as that for SP3. The relevant amplitude envelopes at station B10 (Figs 16a and b, bottom) show that the synthetic and observed amplitude envelopes have a fair fitness of above 0.8 Hz.

5 DISCUSSIONS

5.1 Physical properties of shallow fault zone

The results concerning physical properties of the damage zone of Kunlun fault are highly consistent with the studies of other major strike-slip faults, such as the San Andreas Fault, where the damage zone is 150-m wide, and it has a S-wave velocity reduction of 30–40 per cent and a quality factor $Q$ of 10–50 (Li et al. 2004). These results are consistent with earlier studies by Lees & Malin (1990), Michelini & McEvilly (1991) and Thurber et al. (1997), and the study of San Jacinto fault by Lewis et al. (2005). Many of our insights regarding the properties of the shallow KLFZ are based on the characteristics of the fault-zone trapped waves and quantitative analysis of these waves. Due to the dispersion feature, the position of the centre point of trapped waves changes with frequency (Figs 16a and b). Fig. 13 illustrates that the time differences between the $S$ arrival and the trapped wave group increase with shot-receiver distance along the fault zone. Shear velocities in the fault zone are reduced by 30–45 per cent smaller than those in the surrounding rocks from the surface to a depth of at least 1 km.

The numerical simulation of trapped waves excited by explosive sources near the surface demonstrates that the trapped waves propagate from the surface to about 1–2 km in depth. Phases P3 and S3 are clear at distances from 3.5 to 15.0 km, and are considered as refractions from the interface at the depth of about 1 km on the basis of the record sections along Line A (Figs 2a and b). The essential prerequisite for generating these refractions is that the medium below the interface is vertically homogeneous for head waves, and the layer has a definite thickness. Thus, the S-wave velocity reduction extends to the depth below 1 km.

Recent observations suggest that the fault-zone trapped waves can be produced in fault zones that are not currently active (e.g. Rovelli et al. 2002). Fault-zone waveguide structures could be a common feature, and related to the top part of a flower-type structure within the fault zone that is highly damaged and usually aseismic (Ben-Zion et al. 2003). As mentioned above, KLFZ is a long-lived palaeo-earthquake fault zone, which may have experienced hundreds of earthquakes, with an evident width in the surface geology. Based on recent studies, we have not found any evidence that the recent rupture trace was generated by previous earthquakes, and we have no way to distinguish the relative roles in creating the waveguide effects by recent and previous earthquakes. Therefore, the shallow structure of KLFZ imaged in this paper is in response to the cumulative effects of earthquakes in the past, though the authors consider the pronounced waveguide structure (i.e. 30–45 per cent S-wave velocity reduction) to be possibly an effect enhanced by the recent rupture.

5.2 Head waves on the records along line A

The first $P$ arrival P3 (head wave) beyond the critical distance of 3.65 km in Fig. 2(a) has an apparent velocity of 5.35 km s$^{-1}$. It would have been equal to the velocity of the faster medium if the phase were a ‘head wave’ refracted along the cross-fault material contrast, as discussed by Ben-Zion & Malin (1991), who analysed microearthquake seismograms from a borehole seismic network,
Figure 12. (a) Topography of correlation coefficients of the trapped waves between synthetic and observed waveforms from shots SP3 and SP4 on a 2-D area of fault-zone width and $Q$ value, where the fault-zone width is from 125 to 475 m with step of 25 m, and $Q$ value is from 5 to 50 with step of 5. (b) Cross-section of correlation coefficients at $Q$ value of 15. The maximum value is located at fault-zone width of 300. (c) Cross-section of correlation coefficients at fault-zone width of 300.

Table 5. Final 3-D fault-zone velocity model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer No.</th>
<th>Waveguide width (m)</th>
<th>Thickness of layer (km)</th>
<th>$V_p$ (km s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$V_s$ (km s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$\rho$ (g cm$^{-3}$)</th>
<th>$Q$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In’ is the fault zone and ‘Out’ is the surrounding rocks. Asterisk denotes semi-infinite layer.
Shallow seismic structure of Kunlun fault zone

Figure 13. Synthetic seismograms recorded on Line A. The time differences between the S arrival and the trapped wave group increase with distance along the fault zone. Trace interval is 100 m. Top panel: vertical component and bottom panel: radial component. Tw: Trapped waves; P3 and S3: refractions same as in Figs 2(a) and (b).

where the focal depths are about 5 km. In general, source depth is critical for judging the existence of head wave arrivals. In the KLFZ experiment, both sources and receivers are located at the surface. The surrounding rocks would have had a high velocity (5.35 km s$^{-1}$) near the surface if the phase P3 were refracted along the cross-fault material contrast. $P$-wave velocity inside the fault zone in a shallow layer is determined to be 2.25 km s$^{-1}$ by the arrival times of phase P1 (direct wave) (see Fig. 17a). Phase P3 has an intercept time of 0.34 s and an arrival time of 1.15 s at the distance of 4.30 km on trace 302 (Fig. 2a).

Fig. 17(b) illustrates the possible paths of head waves and the related traveltimes when the head waves are generated along the cross-fault material contrast. Based on the velocities of the faster and slower media and the intercept time, the half-width of fault zone
Figure 14. Synthetic seismograms from shot SP4, recorded on Line B. Trace interval is 50 m. Top panel: vertical component, middle panel: radial component and bottom panel: transverse component. Tw: Trapped waves; P3 and S3: refractions same as in Figs 4a and (b).
Figure 15. Comparison of trapped waves on vertical- and radial-component synthetics (solid lines) with observations (dotted lines) on Line B for shots (a) SP3 and (b) SP4. A low-pass filter with cut-off frequency of 6.0 Hz was used to filter both synthetics and observations. Left-hand panel: vertical component and right-hand panel: radial component.
Figure 16. Comparison of synthetics and relevant amplitude envelopes (solid lines) with observation (dotted lines) at station B10 in frequency band from 0.5 to 2.3 Hz. (a) Shot SP3; (b) shot SP4; top panel: waveform fitting and bottom panel: amplitude envelope fitting.

Figure 17. (a) Records at distances from 0 to 2.4 km on Line A. Phase P1 is direct wave, whose apparent velocity (2.25 km s$^{-1}$) is determined by arrival times. (b) Travel-time graph and ray path diagram for direct wave and head waves. Upper panel: time-distance graph of direct wave and head waves showing crossover distance at S3. Lower panel: ray paths passing through the fault zone. ‘W’ denotes the half of the fault-zone width, $t_0$ is the intercept time.
Figure 18. Synthetic seismograms excited by an explosion on two models (left-hand panel) and particle motions on the (y, z) plane from observed records. Distance from shot to station line (triangles) is 5.5 km. Asterisks below the synthetic sections denote rupture trace. Trace interval is 50 m. (a) Synthetics on the model of layered medium with the near-surface low-velocity layer. ‘Rw’ denotes the Rayleigh waves. (b) Synthetics on the fault-zone model with a low-velocity zone and the near-surface low-velocity layer. ‘Tw’ denotes trapped waves. (c) Synthetics at station B10 on Line B, calculated on models of Figs 18(a) and (b), respectively. Amplitude ratio between the Rayleigh waves (Rw) and the trapped waves (Tw) is about 0.2. (d) Particle motion on the (y, z) plane (see Fig. 11) from shot SP4, plotted on records from 6 to 8 s. (e) Particle motion on the (y, z) plane from shot SP5, plotted on records from 8 to 11 s.

is determined to be 422 m using geometric ray theory. It means that the fault-zone width would be 844 m. Previous studies (Haberland et al. 2003; Peng et al. 2003; Li et al. 2004) presented that fault-zone width is highly variable, ranging from several tens of metres to 200–300 m. But a fault-zone width of over 800 m has not been reported for a near-vertical strike-slip fault. Furthermore, on the off-line record sections cross fault-zone boundary (Figs 4b–d), there is not obvious difference of the arrival time of phase P3 between two sides of the boundary. This explains that phase P3 does not refracted from the boundary.

Reflected P wave on the free surface cannot be separated from the original P wave due to the limited depth source and on-surface stations. As mentioned in Section 3.2.1, the Earth’s free surface is a likely cause for converted P–S waves from an explosive point source (Fertig 1984). Exact shot positions and times may contribute to determine the behaviour of seismic phases and reduce uncertainty of phase recognition. In this paper, the head waves P3 along Line A are interpreted to be the phase along a faster medium below the low-velocity layer near the surface, as is illustrated by a routine analysis in exploration seismology.

5.3 Rayleigh waves excited by explosion

Rayleigh waves are generally created by an explosion for a velocity model with a surficial low-velocity layer. The KLFZ model deduced in this paper involves not only a low-velocity zone in the fault parallel direction, but also a low-velocity zone in vertical direction. Under this circumstance, an explosion excites both trapped waves and Rayleigh waves. Synthetic seismograms were calculated for
such a model by using the finite-difference algorithm. Figs 18(a) and (b), respectively, show the synthetic Rayleigh waves and trapped waves on two models with a low-velocity zone, which indicate that the amplitude of Rayleigh waves is about one-fifth of that of the trapped waves (Fig. 18c), though two kinds of surface waves present similar amplitude spectra.

Theoretically, for Rayleigh waves, the particle of the medium describes a retrograde ellipse and the maximum displacement parallel to the direction of propagation is about two-thirds of that in the vertical direction. In the KLFZ experiment, the particle motions at station B10 from the shots Sp4 and SP5 present clockwise rotation, as shown in Figs 18(d) and (e), which indicate that the main part of the arrival with a high-amplitude, low-frequency and long-wave train behind S arrivals should indeed be the trapped waves.

6 CONCLUSIONS

We present a shallow crustal model of the KLFZ along a segment of the fault zone that ruptured in the Ms8.1 earthquake on 2001 November 14. The seismic data involve a 15-km-long active-source seismic refraction profile and fault-zone trapped waves generated by explosive sources. The recording arrays were located both along and across the Kunlun fault. Fault-zone trapped waves were clearly recorded on the vertical and horizontal components of the seismometers.

The active-source seismic profile along the fault provides refraction measurements of $P$- and $S$-wave seismic velocities in the upper ~1–2 km of the fault zone. In comparison with the crust outside the fault zone, $S$-wave velocity at a depth of 1 km is reduced by 25 per cent and $P$-wave velocity is reduced by 12 per cent; velocity reductions are still larger at depths ~<1 km. Thus, the damage zone has a much larger reduction in $S$-wave velocity than in $P$-wave, an observation that is consistent with previous studies of fault-zone properties. $P$-wave velocities in the surrounding rocks are reduced by 7–20 per cent. The fault zone with such $P$- and $S$-wave low velocities is an indication of high fluid pressure because $V_S$ is affected more than $V_P$.

Quantitative analysis of the correlation coefficients of the trapped waves between synthetic and observed waveforms indicates that the KLFZ width is 300 m, and the shear-wave quality factor $Q$ within the fault zone is 15. The physical properties of the damage zone of the Kunlun fault are highly consistent with the studies of other major strike-slip faults, such as the San Andreas Fault. The low-velocity and low-$Q$ zone in the KLFZ model is the effect of multiple ruptures along the fault trace of the 2001 Kunlun Ms8.1 earthquake.
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