



**HAL**  
open science

## Surface displacement of the Mw 7 Machaze earthquake (Mozambique): Complementary use of multiband InSAR and radar amplitude image correlation with elastic modelling.

Daniel Raucoules, B. Ristori, Marcello de Michele, P. Briole

### ► To cite this version:

Daniel Raucoules, B. Ristori, Marcello de Michele, P. Briole. Surface displacement of the Mw 7 Machaze earthquake (Mozambique): Complementary use of multiband InSAR and radar amplitude image correlation with elastic modelling.. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 2010, 114 (10), pp.2211-2218. 10.1016/j.rse.2010.04.023 . hal-00509818v1

**HAL Id: hal-00509818**

**<https://brgm.hal.science/hal-00509818v1>**

Submitted on 16 Aug 2010 (v1), last revised 28 Jun 2011 (v2)

**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.

1 **Surface displacement of the  $M_w$  7 Machaze earthquake (Mozambique): Complementary use of**  
2 **multiband InSAR and radar amplitude image correlation with elastic modelling.**

3

4

5 Raucoules D. (1), Ristori B. (1), de Michele M. (1), Briole P. (2)

6

7 (1) BRGM 3 avenue Claude Guillemin 45060 Orléans cedex 2 France

8 Corresponding author: d.raucoules@brgm.fr

9 (2) ENS, Laboratoire de Géologie, 24 Rue Lhomond, 75005 Paris

10

11

12 **Abstract**

13

14 In this paper we investigate the surface displacement related to the 2006 Machaze earthquake using  
15 Synthetic Aperture Radar Interferometry (InSAR) and sub-pixel correlation (SPC) of radar amplitude images.  
16 We focus on surface displacement measurement during three stages of the seismic cycle. First, we  
17 examined the co-seismic stage, using an Advanced SAR (ASAR) sensor onboard the Envisat satellite. Then  
18 we investigated the post-seismic stage using the Phase Array L-band SAR sensor (PALSAR) onboard the  
19 ALOS satellite. Lastly, we focussed on the inter-seismic stage, prior to the earthquake by analysing the L-  
20 band JERS-1 SAR data. The high degree of signal decorrelation in the C-band co-seismic interferogram  
21 hinders a correct positioning of the surface rupture and correct phase unwrapping. The post-seismic L-band  
22 interferograms reveal a time-constant surface displacement, causing subsidence of the surface at a ~ 5  
23 cm/yr rate. This phenomenon continued to affect the close rupture field for at least two years following the  
24 earthquake and intrinsically reveals a candidate seismogenic fault trace that we use as a proxy for an  
25 inversion against an elastic dislocation model. Prior to the earthquake, the JERS interferograms do not  
26 indicate any traces of pre-seismic slip on the sismogenic fault. Therefore, slip after the earthquake is post-  
27 seismic, and it was triggered by the Machaze earthquake. This feature represents a prominent post-seismic  
28 slip event rarely observed in such a geodynamic context.

29

30


## 31 **1 Introduction**

32

33 On February 22, 2006, a  $M_w$  7.0 earthquake occurred in Machaze, Manica Province, Mozambique (Figure 1)  
34 affecting an area characterised by low-level historical seismicity. This earthquake inflicted little damage on  
35 property and individuals, mainly because of the typology and density of housing in the area (i.e. scattered  
36 villages with light-weight structures). During the 20th century, three earthquakes with magnitudes larger than  
37 5.0 concerned this area: the first in 1951 and the two others in 1957. They were characterised by shallow  
38 slip at depths of less than 20 km (Fenton & Bommer, 2006). The fault system associated with these  
39 earthquakes can be related to the southern portion of the East African Rift and belongs to a divergent plate-  
40 boundary geodynamic context. The 2006 Machaze earthquake occurred at a depth of 12 km and produced a  
41 north-south oriented surface rupture about 30-40 km long with a co-seismic surface slip of up to 2 metres  
42 (Fenton & Bommer, 2006). The fault ruptured with a normal mechanism with a  $70^\circ$  west dipping fault plane.  
43 Fenton & Bommer (2006) stated that the surface rupture, although visible in the field, could not be followed  
44 along its entire length due to the danger posed by buried land mines in the area. Moreover, extensive  
45 liquefaction phenomena were associated to this event (Lopez-Querol et al., 2007).

46 In this paper, we called on remote-sensing satellite data to complement data acquired on the ground to help  
47 understand the Machaze earthquake. In particular, we used InSAR (e.g. Massonnet & Feigl, 1998) and SPC  
48 (e.g. Michel & Avouac, 2002) techniques along with Envisat-ASAR, JERS-1 and ALOS-PALSAR data to  
49 measure the ground surface displacement produced by the Machaze earthquake at different stages of the  
50 seismic cycle, i.e. before, during and after the earthquake. Then, we used the co-seismic displacement field  
51 to constrain the seismogenic fault geometry at depth by inverting the surface displacement field against a  
52 simple elastic dislocation model (Briole et al., 1986).

53 We proceeded as follow. First, we used the ALOS PALSAR data to produce a post-seismic interferogram  
54 revealing the position and surface geometry of the seismogenic fault (not observable on the co-seismic  
55 interferograms because of high deformation rates). Then we looked at the inter-seismic interferograms to  
56 detect possible creep or pre-seismic slip on this previously unmapped fault. Finally, we built a co-seismic  
57 interferogram and used the retrieved fault surface geometry parameters to constrain the fault's co-seismic  
58 slip and geometry at depth by means of an inversion procedure.



59

60

61 Figure 1 : Location of the Machaze Earthquake

62

63 **2 Data**

64

65 In this study, we made a complementary use of C and L band radar from different sensors. Due to the dense  
 66 vegetation covering the terrain in the area of interest and the large size of surface deformation expected (~  
 67 metre), we decided to use ALOS-PALSAR and JERS-1 L-band radar data. Moreover, the measurements  
 68 obtained from radar data at longer wavelengths (23 cm as opposed to 5.6 cm for C-band) would be less  
 69 affected by fringe aliasing as there would be fewer fringes for given deformation values. Therefore,  
 70 interferometric phases could be unwrapped over larger areas (e.g. Raucoules et al., 2007). Unfortunately,  
 71 ALOS and JERS-1 data were not available during the co-seismic phase of the Machaze earthquake. We  
 72 accordingly called on Envisat/ASAR C-band data to retrieve co-seismic surface displacement while using

73 ALOS-PALSAR and JERS-1 to investigate possible post-seismic and pre-seismic surface displacement  
74 respectively. In this study we used six PALSAR images (Dec. 2006- Dec. 2008, ascending mode), seven  
75 ASAR images (Nov. 2003, Feb. 2007, descending mode) and three JERS-1 images (Apr. 1993 – Oct. 1996,  
76 ascending mode). Tables 1 to 3 describe the characteristics of the PALSAR, ASAR and JERS-1  
77 interferograms that we built using the GAMMA software (Wegmuller et al., 1998).

78

79 Table 1: Interferograms produced using ALOS PALSAR SAR images. Post-seismic period.

80

<b>Interferogram</b>	<b>Image1 (date)</b>	<b>Image2 (date)</b>	<b><i>Perpendicular baseline (m)</i></b>	<b><i>Time span (days)</i></b>
1	20061226	20070210	725	46
2	20061226	20071229	-881	368
3	20061226	20080213	-632	414
4	20061226	20080330	-1191	460
5	20061226	20081231	1512	736
6	20070210	20071229	-1607	322
7	20070210	20080213	-1357	368
8	20070210	20080330	-1916	414
9	20070210	20081231	787	690
10	20071229	20080213	249	46
12	20071229	20081231	2394	368
13	20080213	20080330	-558	46
14	20080213	20081231	2145	322
15	20080330	20081231	2704	276

81

82

83 Table 2: Interferograms produced using ASAR Envisat SAR images. Co-seismic period.

84

<i>Interferogram</i>	<i>Image1</i>	<i>Image2</i>	<i>Perpendicular baseline (m)</i>	<i>Time span (days)</i>
1	20031109	20060507	720	910
2	20031109	20060611	230	945
3	20031109	20070211	432	1190
4	20040118	20060507	1114	840
5	20040118	20060611	623	875
6	20040118	20070211	826	1120
7	20040328	20060507	-131	770
8	20040328	20060611	-622	805
9	20040328	20070211	-420	1050
<b>10</b>	<b>20040606</b>	<b>20060507</b>	<b>-198</b>	<b>700</b>
11	20040606	20060611	-689	735
12	20040606	20070211	-486	980

85

86

87 Table 3: Interferograms produced using JER-1 SAR images. Pre-seismic period.

88

<i>Interferogram</i>	<i>Image1</i>	<i>Image2</i>	<i>Perpendicular baseline (m)</i>	<i>Time span (days)</i>
1	19930406	19950311	-68	704
2	19930406	19960820	110	1232
3	19950311	19960820	179	528

89

90

91

### 92 **3 Data Processing**

93

#### 94 *Post-seismic Slip*

95

96 For each of the three observation periods, we apply different processing strategies.

97 - Hashimoto et al. (2007) detected and provided a preliminary estimate of the post-seismic deformation

98 phenomenon based on a single ALOS/PALSAR pair prior to December 2006. Our objective here has

99 therefore been to obtain a precise location of the displacement field and to derive the post-seismic

100 displacement rate over a longer period. We further would be interested in ascertaining whether post seismic

101 displacement is decelerating. In this perspective, we built a stack of 15 unwrapped interferograms according

102 to the methodology proposed by Le Mouelic et al. (2005):

103 [eq 1] 
$$V = \frac{\langle \Delta\Phi \rangle \frac{\lambda}{2}}{\langle \Delta T \rangle 2\pi}$$

104 Brackets in eq. 1 indicate the average value on the data set.  $\Delta\Phi$  is the interferometric phase,  $\Delta T$  is the time

105 span associated with an interferogram and  $\lambda$  is the wavelength.

106 Under such conditions, averaging a series of interferograms reduces the relative importance of the

107 atmospheric component of the interferometric phase as compared with the displacement signal. Considering

108 the characteristics of the studied phenomenon (slow deformation with respect to the sensor wavelength) and

109 the good coherence of the interferograms, unwrapping errors will be reduced and should not impact the

110 velocity map.

111 Then, based on an optimization procedure, we estimated the velocity by linear regression (Gamma, 2008).

112 The result of this procedure was observed to be equivalent to that obtained by averaging. However, the

113 linear regression procedure allows an image to be achieved of the discrepancy with respect to the linear

114 regression (standard deviation) which provides quality control for the velocity estimation (in particular

115 including temporal fluctuation due to atmospheric effects), and useful information to identify possible non-

116 linear-with-time slip evolution during the observation period. The process accordingly yields a displacement

117 rate map and a map showing discrepancy with respect to linearity (Figures 2a, 2b).

118

119

120

121 *Inter-seismic Slip*

122

123 - Our objective for the pre-seismic period was to detect pre-seismic deformation. We therefore constructed  
124 interferograms covering long time spans and examined them near the location of the earthquake rupture.  
125 We should mention that the JERS-1 provides poor coverage for this study area (only three images  
126 acquired).

127

128 *Co-seismic Slip*

129

130 - In order to map the co-seismic surface displacement, we built 12 differential interferograms. After visual  
131 comparison of all the interferometric series produced (Table 2), we selected interferograms having the least  
132 noise. In view of the high displacement rate (tens of interferometric fringes), the atmospheric component of  
133 the interferometric phase is negligible with respect to the displacement component. The results are shown in  
134 Figure 4.

135 As direct unwrapping is not relevant (areas with major deformation are not amenable because of the high  
136 fringe rate), visible fringes were digitised manually in order to perform an inversion of a dislocation model  
137 (Okada, 1985; Briole, 1986). Considering such a model as a direct source of information about the  
138 phenomenon, we proposed to re-inject the inverted parameters so as to produce a simulated interferogram.  
139 Once the simulated interferogram was subtracted from the initial interferogram, we obtained a residual,  
140 which is easier to unwrap. The unwrapped residual was added to the simulated interferograms and provided  
141 an improved unwrapped differential interferogram (Section 5).

142 It should be stated that the global unwrapping method used by Gamma tends to underestimate phase  
143 gradient value where the residual image is noisy. The simulation can therefore help correct these errors. To  
144 simplify the principle behind the proposed method, where the phase is noisy, the final result will correspond  
145 to the model and where the initial interferogram signal is reliable, the result will correspond to the  
146 interferometric data. In a certain way, this procedure interpolates the interferogram on the noisy areas (and  
147 in particular in the near-field deformation area) by taking into account a physical model based on the far-field  
148 deformation obtained by InSAR and ancillary knowledge about the earthquake.

149

150



151 **4 Results**

152

153 *Post-seismic Slip*


154

155 Figure 2a shows the displacement map derived from PALSAR interferometry. The most prominent feature in  
156 the post-seismic displacement map is the constant-with-time subsidence affecting the area formerly  
157 ruptured. The RMSE to linearity (Figure 2b) shows no correlation between the position of the rupture and the  
158 discrepancy with respect to linearity. That suggests that surface displacement is characterised by a constant  
159 rate over the 2-year observation period. In fact, the deformation along the rupture appears as linear as on  
160 stable areas (where deformation is obviously linear), far from the rupture. We measured a post-seismic  
161 surface displacement up to 3.5 cm/year, assuming a mainly vertical displacement phenomenon consistent  
162 with a 70°-dip normal fault. This phenomenon affected the study area for at least two years after the  
163 earthquake. According to our observations, post-seismic displacement did not decrease with time, though  
164 this might be due to the relatively short window of observation. Assuming that the post-seismic displacement  
165 occurred on the initial seismic rupture location, we can clearly locate (and digitise) a candidate for the co-  
166 seismic surface rupture. At this stage of the processing, one might think that the seismogenic fault  
167 underwent pre-seismic slip or creeping. We subsequently assessed the pre-seismic displacement field in the  
168 near-fault field and tried to discriminate between post-seismic relaxations and a possible pre-seismic slip  
169 component, which in principle should affect the area before the event as well.

170 Another prominent feature in the post-seismic displacement map is a 5 cm/yr vertical displacement feature  
171 located NNW of Figure 2. At first sight, this phenomenon is difficult to correlate with the 2006 Machaze  
172 earthquake as it is located 10 km west of the main rupture. Although not addressed in detail here, this  
173 phenomenon certainly does merit further investigation.

174

175



176

177

178 Figure 2 a): Average deformation (2006-2008) in Line of sight (cm/year). The surface rupture (dashed line) has been  
179 digitised on the image. b): RMSE (rad) of the re-ordered phase screens with respect to linear deformation (root-mean-  
180 square residual to the estimated constant rate LOS displacement). No correlation with the rupture position is  
181 observable.

182

### 183 *Pre-seismic Displacement*


184

185 Figure 3 shows interferograms for the inter-seismic periods 1993-1995 and 1993-1996. No surface  
186 displacement phenomena are identified in the vicinity of the seismogenic fault prior to the earthquake. This  
187 observation leads us to rule out the presence of measurable pre-seismic slip or creep on this segment of the  
188 fault.

189

190

191



192

193

194

195 Figure 3: a) 1993-1995 JERS-1 interferogram. Black line: the seismogenic fault trace derived from the post-seismic  
196 displacement map. b) 1993-1996 JERS-1 interferogram. Values are given in radians. Positions of the ten 10-km profiles  
197 used for offset computation (Table 4) have been plotted.

198

199 In order to confirm the observation, using a profile tool from the *cosi-corr* software (Leprince and Ayoub,  
200 2007) designed to estimate deformation-value differences on either side of a fault by comparing linear  
201 regressions, we derived the phase values. Table 4 presents the averages of estimations on ten profiles  
202 (from north to south) perpendicular to the fault location.

203

204

205

206

207 Table 4: offset (in rad) on either side of the fault estimated from the interferograms for ten profiles. Sigma corresponds to  
208 the standard deviations on the linear regressions on either side of the digitised fault computed by Cosi-corr.

209

<b><i>Interferogram 1993-1995</i></b>		<b><i>Interferogram 1993-1996</i></b>	
Offset (rad)	Sigma (rad)	Offset (rad)	Sigma (rad)
0.053	0.072	0.100	0.149

210

211

212 From Table 4 we can conclude:

213

214 - For the period 1993-1995, the mean deformation value equals approximately 0.05 rad (*i.e.* 0.09 cm), with a  
215 mean sigma of 0.07 rad (*i.e.* 0.12 cm)

216 - For the period 1993-1996, the mean deformation value equals 0.10 rad (*i.e.* 0.2 cm), with a mean sigma of  
217 0.15 (*i.e.* 0.3 cm)

218 The values obtained (about 1-3 mm) are very small in terms of the method sensitivity. There is accordingly  
219 no pre-seismic motion on the fault that is high enough to be observed with conventional INSAR.

220

221 *Co-Seismic Deformation*


222

223 Interferogram 2004/04/06 – 2006/05/07 (Figure 4) was selected as the most relevant for interpretation in  
224 terms of deformation. This interferogram provides information on the far-field deformation except on the  
225 northern area where the coherence is poor (probably because of vegetation). We will note that the  
226 deformation phenomenon observed in the post-seismic deformation map is located in the incoherent area.  
227 We thus cannot confirm, based on this interferogram, that a rupture did indeed occur at this location.

228 The near-field deformation is, of course, not measurable because the deformation gradients (metres of  
229 displacement on short distances) are far beyond what InSAR is capable of measuring.

230

231



233

234

235 Figure 4 geocoded interferogram 2004/04/06 – 2006/05/07. One fringe corresponds to 2.8 cm of displacement in Line of  
 236 sight. The position of the fault trace at the surface estimated from post-seismic deformation is shown.

237


238 Although the precision of image correlation applied to the radar amplitude images (with a slant range  
 239 resolution of about 7 m) is much poorer than with interferometry, we tested the methodology in order to  
 240 obtain an estimate of the deformation profile along the fault trace. This information could complement the  
 241 radar interferometry information where surface displacement is too high (i.e. close to the rupture). Figures 5  
 242 and 6 show the results (offset image and deformation profile) of the correlation. The displacement values on  
 243 the rupture are determined from linear least square fit to displacement profiles drawn perpendicularly to the  
 244 rupture. Based on the a priori knowledge of the fault position, this procedure (Avouac et al., 2006; Leprince  
 245 et al., 2007) fits the deformation profile perpendicularly to the fault by 2 half straight lines on either side of the  
 246 fault (the profiles are limited by the same point on the fault); the deformation estimate is then provided by the  
 247 difference between the two fitted values at the fault point location.

248 The observed displacement ranges from 1.5 to 2 m (consistent with Fenton & Bommer (2006) if we assume  
249 that in view of the geometries of the fault (dip  $>70^\circ$ ) and the sensor (incidence  $\sim 2$ , we are mainly  
250 measuring vertical deformation) in the southern part of the rupture and 0.7 m to 1.3 in the northern section  
251 (consistent with Hasimoto et al. (2007) who proposed a smaller displacement on the northern segment).  
252 Azimuth offsets were not used as they are not relevant to our study. Because the deformation is mainly  
253 oriented east-west, there are no measurable offsets in the azimuth direction ( $\sim$  south-north displacements)  
254 taking into account the sensitivity of this technique if applied on ENVISAT ASAR data ( $1/10^{\text{th}}$  of the pixel  
255 size, i.e.  $\sim 40$  cm).  
256

257

258

259




260

261

262 Figure 5: Slant range offset (in pixels of about 7 m) between images 2004/04/06 and 2006/05/07. The location of the  
263 rupture trace is shown. Squares indicate the location of the points on Figure 6, where offsets have been estimated.

264 Although the result is noisy, the position of the rupture is consistent with the derived displacement variation.

265



267

268

269 Figure 6: LOS displacement on the fault (in metres, east side with respect to west side) versus latitude obtained using  
 270 the cosi-corr (Leprince and Ayoub, 2007) profile/stacking tool. The error bars correspond to the standard deviation in the  
 271 linear regressions to either side of the fault.

272

### 273 5 Co-seismic deformation modelling

274

275 We propose an inversion based on an elastic dislocation model (Okada, 1985; Briole, 1986). Because of the  
 276 large number of parameters (location, dip, depth, size, displacement for the two fault segments) to be  
 277 inverted using only one component (Line of sight) of the deformation, we had to use pre-existing information  
 278 (estimates of the parameters from Feitio, 2008) and trial-and-error adjustments to correct several of the  
 279 parameters before inverting the slip values. For convenience, we used rake values of  $-90^\circ$  for both segments  
 280 (Feitio, 2008, used  $-80^\circ$ ).

281 As in Hasimoto et al., (2007) we propose a model with two contiguous fault segments implied in the  
 282 deformation. However, the position and orientation of the segments are derived from the trace obtained from



283 the post-seismic deformation. Thus, the orientation of the northern segment differs from that proposed by  
 284 Hasimoto et al., (2007).

285 Table 5 summarizes the resulting parameters. The slip values are consistent with Hasimoto et al., (2007).

286

287 Table 5: Inverted model parameters.


288

<b><i>Parameter</i></b>	<b><i>Southern segment</i></b>	<b><i>Northern segment</i></b>
UTM 36 S east (km) of the centre of the segment	537	537
UTM 36 S north (km) of the centre of the segment	7647	7667
Segment azimuth (deg)	170	-172
Depth of the top of the segment (km)	5	3
Half length of the segment (km)	10	10
Width of the segment (km)	11	9
Dip (deg)	70	70
Slip (mm)	3400	2660

289

290 As described in section 3, the model obtained is suitable for inclusion in a procedure for improving the  
 291 unwrapping process and interpolating where the interferogram's coherence is inadequate. Figure 7 shows  
 292 the modified interferogram. We should state that improvement can be expected to be better in the far-field  
 293 deformation areas (where the model is more reliable, being derived from interferometric data unavailable in  
 294 the rupture zone). Near the rupture, the result still appears underestimated. For instance, the maximum  
 295 relative deformation is about 115 cm in LOS (i.e., about 125 cm in vertical) as opposed to 2 m observed by  
 296 Fenton & Bommer (2006) and Figure 7. However, the underestimation is much less than with a direct  
 297 unwrapping of the interferogram. We think that such interferogram unwrapping (once the area along the  
 298 rupture has been masked) could be used for inverting a more complex deformation model provided it was  
 299 combined with additional data. As only one component of deformation is available, if we intend to consider  
 300 inhomogeneous slips on the fault planes, we would need additional information in order to cope with the  
 301 non-uniqueness of the solution, in particular other components of deformation and a better description of

302 fault geometry. In fact, in the case of our simple model based on constant slip on two large surfaces  
 303 combined with basic assumptions on the geometry, we do not believe that re-using these results to improve  
 304 the model could provide better results than those based on data derived from displacement data obtained by  
 305 fringe digitizing. To test such a possible “iterative” method (improve the previous model using the corrected  
 306 interferograms), at least two components of deformation would be required. In the present test case, the  
 307 available data set does not allow us to go further. Let us note that an additional advantage for such  
 308 interferogram improvement would be to facilitate interferogram stacking. Indeed, if we had several  
 309 interferograms for the same event, we would plan to average them in order to reduce noise or atmosphere  
 310 or compensate for residual biases (not fully compensated). For such stacking procedures, prior unwrapping  
 311 is needed. Because of the limitations of standard unwrapping with a high deformation gradient and areas of  
 312 low coherence, such stacking could fail. In this perspective, the described procedure could prove helpful, but  
 313 unfortunately in our test case only one reliable interferogram was actually produced.  
 314



315  
 316  
 317 Figure 7: a) Interferogram simulation obtained using the inverted parameters. One fringe corresponds to 8.4 cm in LOS.  
 318 The approximate locations of the modelled fault surfaces are shown. b) Interferogram 2004/04/06 – 2006/05/07  
 319 unwrapped taking into account the simulation and rewrapped for visualisation purposes (one fringe corresponds to 8.4  
 320 cm in LOS) c) Interferogram 2004/04/06 – 2006/05/07 geocoded and unwrapped taking into account the simulation.  
 321 Values in rad. The fault trace derived from post-seismic deformation is shown.

322  
 323  
 324

## 8 Discussion and Conclusion

325 The results presented in this paper provide new information for understanding surface displacement of the  
326 Machaze earthquake in a broad sense.

327 We have used Satellite-based Radar Interferometry to map surface displacement during three phases (inter,  
328 co and post-seismic) of the seismic cycle associated with the 2006 Machaze earthquake. The area affected  
329 by the Machaze earthquake is not instrumented on the ground and it is only partially accessible in the field  
330 due to the presence of land mines. This makes satellite remote sensing techniques the only tools available  
331 to make broad-scale measurements in the area allowing the whole earthquake-induced surface  
332 displacement to be observed. We have made use of archive data from both L-band and C-band sensors on  
333 board J-ERS, ALOS-PALSAR and ENVISAT-ASAR respectively. The use of J-ERS data drawn from  
334 archives to try to enhance possible inter-seismic surface displacements is an interesting aspect of the InSAR  
335 technique for such *a posteriori* studies.

336 As the surface displacement characteristics during the three phases of the seismic cycle differ in terms of  
337 linearity, deformations gradients and localization, we adapted *ad hoc* processing strategies to the data  
338 appertaining to each observation period. In particular, our study started by identifying the location of a  
339 candidate surface rupture based on the post-seismic surface displacement location, which completes and  
340 complements the surface rupture field observations made by Fenton & Bommer (2006). Interferogram  
341 stacking (by averaging) was needed for inter- and post-seismic regimes, while for the co-seismic phase we  
342 proceeded by visual selection of reliable interferograms from an extensive interferogram series and used a  
343 simulation (from an elastic dislocation model) for improving phase unwrapping. Finally, we proposed a new  
344 inversion of the earthquake parameters taking into account the identified rupture location.

345 The post-seismic deformation seems to be constant with time, about 3.5 cm/year for at least the two years  
346 after the earthquake. Such a post-seismic phenomenon is intriguing and begs further dedicated  
347 investigation. As far as this study is concerned, we tried to discriminate broadly among different possible  
348 known source phenomena such as viscoelastic relaxation (e.g. Thatcher, 1983; Freed et al., 2007),  
349 poroelastic rebound (e.g. Jonsson et al., 2003), afterslip (e.g. Marone et al., 1991) and dilatancy recovery  
350 (e.g. Fielding et al., 2009). Although these phenomena might have occurred, we could reasonably rule out  
351 substantial contribution from viscoelastic relaxation and poroelastic rebound, as these phenomena would  
352 yield a post-seismic signal opposite in direction to the co-seismic signal, which was not the case here. The  
353 dilatancy recovery phenomenon was observed geodetically on the BAM strike-slip fault system in Iran  
354 (Fielding et al., 2009). Although this phenomenon is not well understood for normal faulting and certainly

355 would deserve more attention for the Machaze case, we might argue that dilatancy recovery would affect a  
356 broad zone in the fault area, one not particularly limited by the fault plane, which is not our case. Afterslip  
357 occurs when coseismic stress changes drive best candidate in the Machaze area, as its direction the same  
358 as that of the coseismic slip, a fact observed elsewhere (e.g. Freed, 2007).

359

360 In further work, we intend to address the following issues about this earthquake that deserve investigation.

361 The post-seismic deformation over a longer period has to be monitored with the objective of detecting  
362 deformation slowing (or termination) in order to be able to model for this evolution.

363 Finally, the deformation observed north-north-west of the epicentre after the earthquake is still unexplained  
364 and should be investigated.

365

## 366 **9 Acknowledgements**

367

368 The study was conducted with the support of the Research Division of BRGM. Parts of the presented study  
369 were carried out in the framework of the MSc work of B. Ristori presented at École Nationale des Sciences  
370 Géographiques in June 2009. We wish to thank the reviewers for their help in improving the manuscript.

371

## 372 **10 References**

373

374 Avouac, J.P., Ayoub, F., Leprince, S., Konca, O., & Helmberger, D.V. (2006), The 2005, Mw 7.6 Kashmir  
375 earthquake: Sub-pixel correlation of ASTER images and seismic waveforms analysis, *EPSL*, 249, 514-528.

376

377 Briole, P., De Natale, G., Gaulon, R., Pingue, F., & Scarpa, R. (1986), Inversion of geodetic data and  
378 seismicity associated with the Friuli earthquake sequence (1976-1977) Italy, *Annales Geophysicae*, 4 B,  
379 481-492

380

381 Feitio P. (2008), Relocation of the Machaze and Lacerda earthquakes in Mozambique and the rupture  
382 process of the 2006  $M_w$  7.0 Machaze earthquake, Master Paper, IISEE, Tsubuka, Japon,  
383 (<http://iisee.kenken.go.jp>)

384

385 Fenton C. & Bommer J., (2006), The  $M_w$  7 Machaze, Mozambique, Earthquake of 23 February 2006,  
386 *Seismological Research Letters*, 77, 426-432  
387  
388 Fielding, E.J., Lundgren, P.R., Bürgmann, R., Funning, G.J., (2009), Shallow fault-zone dilatancy recovery  
389 after the 2003 Bam earthquake in Iran, *Nature*, 458, 64-68  
390  
391 Freed, A.M., (2007), Afterslip (and only afterslip) following the 2004 Parkfield, California, earthquake,  
392 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, art. no. L06312  
393  
394 Gamma RS, (2008), "IPTA Reference Manual", Gamma RS, Gumligen  
395  
396 Hashimoto M., Fukushima Y. & Ozawa T. (2007), co-seismic and post-seismic displacements from the  
397 Mozambique earthquake of 22 February 2006 detected by InSAR, *Fringe07*, Frascati, Italy, 26th-30th  
398 November 2007  
399  
400 Jónsson, S., Segall, P., Pedersen, R., Björnsson, G., (2003), *Post-earthquake ground movements correlated*  
401 *to pore-pressure transients*, *Nature*, 424 (6945), 179-183  
402  
403 Le Mouélic S., Raucoules D., Carnec C. & King C., (2005), A Least-squares adjustment of multi-temporal  
404 InSAR data – Application to the ground deformation of Paris, *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote*  
405 *Sensing*, 2, 197-204  
406  
407 Leprince S. & Ayoub F., (2007), Cor-registration of Optically Sensed Images and Correlation, *User's Guide to*  
408 *COSI-CORR*, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena  
409  
410 Leprince S., Ayoub F., Klinger Y. & Avouac J.P., (2007), Co-Registration of Optically Sensed Images and  
411 Correlation (COSI-Corr): an Operational Methodology for Ground Deformation Measurements, IGARSS  
412 2007, 23-27 July 2007 - Barcelona, Spain

413 López-Querol, S., M. Coop, W.W. Sim, J.J. Bommer & C. Fenton, (2007), Back-analysis of liquefaction in  
414 the 2006 Mozambique earthquake. *Georisk* 1(2), 89-101.  
415

416 Marone, C.J., Scholtz, C.H., Bilham, R., (1991), On the mechanics of earthquake afterslip, *Journal of*  
417 *Geophysical Research*, 96 (B5), 8441-8452  
418

419 Massonnet, D. & Feigl, K.L., (1998), Radar interferometry and its application to changes in the earth's  
420 surface, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 4, 441-500.  
421

422 Michel R. & Avouac J., (2002), Deformation due to the 17 August 1999 Izmit, Turkey, earthquake measured  
423 from SPOT images. *Journal of Geophysical Research B: Solid Earth*, 4, 2-1.  
424

425 Okada, Y.,(1985), Surface deformation due to shear and tensile faults in a Halfspace, *Bull. Seismol. Soc.*  
426 *Amer.*, 75, 1135–1154  
427

428 Raucoules D., Colesanti C. & Carnec C., (2007), Use of SAR interferometry for detecting and assessing  
429 ground subsidence, *Compte Rendus Geosciences*, 5, 289-302  
430

431 Thatcher, W., (1983), Nonlinear strain buildup and the earthquake cycle on the San Andreas fault. *Journal of*  
432 *Geophysical Research*, 88 (B7), 5893-5902  
433

434 Wegmuller, U., Werner, C. & Strozzi, T., (1998), SAR interferometric and differential interferometric  
435 processing chain. *International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS)*, 2, 1106-1108, July  
436 1998, Seattle  
437

Figure 1  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 2  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)






Figure 3  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 4  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 5  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 6  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 7  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

