Giant earthquakes on quiet faults governed by rheological transitions
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The apparent stochastic nature of earthquakes poses major challenges for earthquake forecasting attempts. Physical constraints on the seismogenic potential of major fault zones may aid in improving seismic hazard assessments, but the mechanics of earthquake nucleation and rupture are obscured by the complexity that faults display. In this work, we investigate the mechanisms behind giant earthquakes by employing a microphysically based seismic cycle simulator. This microphysical approach is directly based on the mechanics of friction as inferred from laboratory tests, and can explain a broad spectrum of fault slip behaviour. We show that regular earthquakes are controlled by the size and distribution of nominally unstable asperities, whereas fault-spanning earthquakes are governed by a rheological transition occurring in creeping fault segments. Moreover, this facilitates the nucleation of giant earthquakes on faults that are weakly seismically coupled. This microphysically based approach offers opportunities for investigating long-term seismic cycle behaviour of natural faults.

One major limitation of seismic hazard assessments is that they are mostly based on statistics rather than physics. Particularly for large earthquakes that have recurrence times of up to several centuries, instrumental catalogues of seismic events in a given region are short or absent, so that statistical analyses can only be performed through the extrapolation of smaller, more frequent events, which entails model assumptions that are difficult to test. Constraints originating from a physical understanding of earthquakes may therefore greatly improve seismic hazard assessments, but basic underlying mechanisms are obscured by the enormous complexity inherent to natural fault zones.

Over the last two decades or so, innovative techniques in palaeoseismology have substantially expanded our catalogue of (pre)historic seismic events, revealing earthquake supercycles in the form of spatio-temporal clustering of earthquakes1−4 and occurrences of exceptionally large events (‘superimposed cycles’)5−8. In addition, millenary recurrence of $M_w \geq 9.0$ earthquakes has been anticipated for the Main Himalayan Thrust9 and Japan Trench10 regions on the basis of geodetic estimates of moment accumulation rates. These inferences suggest that the lack of instrumental recordings of great ($M_w > 8$) and giant ($M_w > 9$) earthquakes does not imply an intrinsic upper limit of event magnitude. The 2004 Sumatra-Andaman and 2011 Tohoku-Oki $M_w > 9$ events, hosted by subduction thrusts that were previously marked in hazard maps as being incapable of generating such large magnitude events10−12, are exemplary to this notion. Statistical analyses of earthquake catalogues do not exclude that most (if not all) subduction regions are intrinsically capable of hosting giant earthquakes13,14, provided that the seismogenic zone geometry is not restrictive (e.g. Weng & Yang15).
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The occurrence of great earthquakes in all subduction settings is suggestive of a common underlying mechanism. On the other hand, though numerous subduction regions have been identified to host giant earthquakes, some of these regions presently exhibit high seismicity rates (Japan Trench\textsuperscript{8}, Sumatra\textsuperscript{4}), while other megathrusts are currently quiescent except for deeper slow slip and tremor (Alaska\textsuperscript{16}, Cascadia\textsuperscript{17}), or generally display low levels of background seismicity (Andaman, Chile Maule\textsuperscript{18}). This geographical variability in seismic character requires that the mechanism for the generation of giant earthquakes is at least partly independent of that of regular earthquakes, allowing great and giant earthquakes to occur in both seismically active and quiet regions. Furthermore, seismological and numerical evidence suggests that creeping (weakly seismically coupled) fault segments may host propagation of dynamic ruptures\textsuperscript{19–21}, even though creeping segments are generally thought to impede fast rupture events\textsuperscript{22}. To elucidate the emergence of giant earthquakes that inevitably propagate through (or possibly nucleate within) creeping fault segments, the underlying physical mechanisms of fault rock deformation need to be closely considered.

**A microphysically based approach for earthquake modelling**

The seismic cycle behaviour of (heterogeneous) faults has been explored in numerical studies\textsuperscript{22–25}, most commonly employing the rate-and-state friction\textsuperscript{26} (RSF) formulation as a description for the time- and velocity-dependence of fault strength (see Supplementary Information S1). While the classical RSF framework is originally motivated by laboratory observations\textsuperscript{27}, it is empirical in nature, and so provides limited physical basis for the extrapolation of laboratory results to natural scales and conditions. Most importantly, the RSF model parameters are typically assumed to be independent of fault slip velocity, whereas much laboratory evidence suggests a more complex velocity-dependence of friction\textsuperscript{28–32}. Since the fault slip velocity likely varies by over 10 orders of magnitude over the course of a seismic cycle, the assumption of constant values of the RSF constitutive parameters greatly impacts the transient slip and nucleation behaviour, as seen in seismic cycle simulations\textsuperscript{33}.

As an alternative approach, microphysical models allow for an interpretation of their parameters in terms of thermodynamic or material quantities, such as temperature, fault gouge nominal grain size, or solubility of the solid phase\textsuperscript{34,35}. This facilitates the generalisation of complex laboratory behaviour, and the extrapolation of laboratory results to natural scales and conditions with an independent assessment of the validity of the model outcomes. Most commonly, microphysical descriptions of (steady-state) fault rheology are based on plastic creep of contact asperities between bare rock interfaces, motivated by metallurgical and tribological studies of friction of metals (e.g. refs\textsuperscript{36–38}; Supplementary Information S2). Such models do not, however, fully acknowledge the complex granular dynamics of fault gouges and corresponding deformation mechanisms observed in laboratory experiments and in field studies (see Supplementary Information S3). In this study, we employ the Chen-Niemeijer-Spiers (CNS) model\textsuperscript{34,39}, which specifically considers the deformation of fault gouges, and is seated on laboratory and field observations. Previous work\textsuperscript{33} has demonstrated how the implementation of the CNS model into the seismic cycle simulator QDYN\textsuperscript{40}, is capable of producing a range of fault slip behaviours previously ascribed only to rate-and-state friction, while maintaining a clear physical interpretation. In its
essence, the CNS microphysical model considers the interplay between a time-dependent compaction mechanism
(pressure solution creep), and dilatant granular flow (see Methods). Both these micro-mechanisms have been
identified to be highly relevant for fault rock deformation at seismogenic zone conditions\textsuperscript{32,41–45}. Because
the microphysical principles for the CNS model are based on a wide range of laboratory\textsuperscript{30,34,39} and field\textsuperscript{46,47}
observations, the model outcomes are readily understood in terms of micro-scale observable quantities.

By using a microphysical model for describing the fault rheology, one can readily incorporate field and
laboratory observations into a numerical seismic cycle simulator\textsuperscript{33}. Following numerous field studies of
exhumed fault zones, we distinguish between two types of fault rock (Fig. 1 and Supplementary Information
S3): a phyllite-mylonite matrix deforming predominantly by pressure solution creep, and gouge derived from
“competent” lenses (competence defined at the imposed strain rate) that exhibits both pressure solution creep
and granular flow. In analogy to seismogenic asperities identified by seismological studies, we refer to fault
segments associated with competent lenses as asperities. These asperities obey a fractal distribution in size
and separation distance (c.f. Fagereng\textsuperscript{41}), adding to the complexity of heterogeneous faults. To address this
complexity, simplifications have to be made regarding the architecture of the fault in order to reduce the highly
complex fault zone structure to one that is numerically feasible (see Fig. 1a). As a first-order representation, we
simulate a one-dimensional, along-strike fault line that cuts through the fault zone, alternatingly encountering
one of the two end-member types of fault rock defined above (i.e. the matrix or the gouge). This produces
an alternating pattern of phyllosilicate matrix and asperity-derived gouge (see the “Idealisation” in Fig. 1a),
characterised by a fractal dimension $D$ and occupation ratio $f$ – see also the Methods section. One important
drawback of this procedure is that the details of the volumetric distribution of deformation are lost, and so the
model remains unconstrained in the strain rate accommodated within the fault zone.

The CNS model envisions a microstructure that is representative of a gouge consisting predominantly of
structure-forming minerals like quartz or calcite. While this assumed geometry holds for the asperity-derived
gouges, it does not fully capture the microstructure of the phyllosilicate-dominated matrix segments. However,
microphysical models\textsuperscript{35} that consider a geometry that is more appropriate for the matrix, predict similar trends
in fault rheology as does the CNS model via the same micro-scale mechanisms (i.e. non-dilatant creep by
pressure solution and dilatation by granular flow), the main difference lying in geometric parameters derived
from the model geometry. We therefore take the CNS model to describe the rheology of both the matrix and
gouge segments. The compositional distinction between the two types is made through a contrast in pressure
solution kinetics, with the matrix exhibiting faster pressure solution kinetics than the asperities (Fig. 1b) as
suggested by field observations\textsuperscript{41} and by experiments conducted on halite-phyllosilicate interfaces\textsuperscript{48}.

We consider a set of conditions typical for subduction zones at seismogenic depths with temperature
$T = 250$°C, far-field driving velocity $V_{imp} = 10^{-9}$ m/s ($\approx 30$ mm/yr), and effective normal stress $\sigma = 50$ MPa
(although no consensus exists on the average magnitude of the fluid pressure, leaving great uncertainty in
the value of $\sigma$). At steady-state deformation under these conditions, the matrix deforms predominantly by
velocity-strengthening ductile creep, whereas the asperities deform by parallel operation of pressure solution and
granular flow, producing velocity-weakening behaviour. However, in the seismic cycle simulations deformation occurs under non-steady state conditions, resulting in a spectrum of fault slip transients governed by the rheological model. Following the procedure described in the Methods section, we simulate 2000 years of slip along the strike of a heterogeneous, one-dimensional periodic fault (under the a “2.5D” approximation), with an along-strike length of 16 km (Fig. 1a), and investigate emergent transient slip features. Although the dimensions of the model fault are smaller than those typical for megathrusts, the outcomes of the numerical simulations are interpreted in a general framework suitable for up-scaling.

**Emergence of giant earthquakes**

Slip distribution maps for all 10 simulations (with various combinations of fractal dimension $D$ and asperity occupation $f$) are given in Supplementary Information S4. Examples of characteristic fault slip behaviour produced in the simulations are given in Fig. 2a. Sections on the fault that exhibit a high asperity density display repeated seismic activity, rupturing small clusters of closely-spaced asperities in a single event. Dynamic ruptures are arrested by regions consisting predominantly of ductile matrix, so that separated clusters of asperities remain mostly isolated. Motivated by Luo & Ampuero, we classify this type of events as partial or P-instabilities, defined as an instability that ruptures only a portion of the entire fault. Note that, unlike Luo & Ampuero, P-events may encompass several (clusters) of nominally velocity-weakening asperities. The seismic character of the simulation (i.e. maximum slip velocities during P-instabilities) seems largely controlled by the fractal dimension $D$ of the asperity size distribution: simulations with $D = 1$ (dominated by several large asperities) show P-instabilities that attain coseismic slip rates, whereas simulations with $D = 2$ (dominated by numerous small asperities) only exhibit aseismic P-instabilities in the form of small slow slip events, consistent with geological observations.

In addition to these P-events, the fault occasionally hosts seismic events that rupture the full extent of the fault, reaching coseismic slip velocities even in regions dominated by ductile matrix. This second class of seismic events is referred to as (“total”) T-instabilities. The occurrence of T-events is not restricted to simulations with seismic P-instabilities, as T-instabilities are also produced in simulations that otherwise only exhibit small slow slip events (which would likely remain undetected by surface monitoring stations). Aside from the seismic character of the model fault, the value of $D$ also affects the style of nucleation of the T-instabilities, with a cascade-up mode of nucleation observed in simulations with $D = 1$, and a preslip (or “own nucleation”) mode observed in simulations with $D = 2$ (see Fig. 2a).

Extending these observations to natural fault zones, one can draw an analogy between P-events, being controlled by a local asperity distribution of nominally velocity-weakening material, and regular natural earthquakes. The T-instabilities generated in the simulations may find their natural counterpart in multi-segment ruptures and anomalously large events ($M_w > 9$), as appearing in palaeoseismic records. It is most striking that simulated faults that exhibit weak seismic coupling over their entire extent and that are otherwise seismically quiet are also capable of generating T-instabilities. This shows that the mechanisms and conditions for generating T-events are different from those for P-events. Furthermore, these simulations demonstrate that
creeping fault segments may also host or nucleate seismic ruptures, instead of quenching or impeding dynamic ruptures.  

Microphysical mechanisms behind giant earthquakes

More insight into the emergence of T-instabilities is gained by considering the time-evolution of average fault stress (Fig. 2b). In simulations that exhibit a fractal dimension \( D = 1 \), the average shear stress supported by the asperities remains roughly constant over time, whereas the average stress on the matrix increases between subsequent T-instabilities, so that the net fault stress increases over time. At a critical value of stress, a T-instability is generated. In the simulations with \( D = 2 \), the stress is more homogeneously distributed, and the stress supported by both the asperities and the matrix segments follows a similar upward trajectory, until a critical stress is reached and a T-instability nucleates. For \( D = 2 \), the fault behaves similar to one exhibiting homogeneous frictional properties.

The occurrence of a fault-spanning instability at a critical stress level can now be explained by a rheological transition predicted by the CNS model, and is illustrated in Fig. 3. At a given moment in time early in a T-cycle, a segment of ductile matrix is deforming by steady-state, non-dilatant pressure solution creep (point 1 in Fig. 3). By continuous tectonic loading and non-uniform fault slip, the average stress supported by the matrix increases over time (point 2). The kinetics of pressure solution assigned to the matrix segments are such that at steady-state (i.e. at the far-field driving velocity), the matrix can accommodate the imposed strain rate entirely by ductile creep. In the absence of interactions with the asperities on the fault, the matrix would remain nominally stable (see inset in Fig. 3). However, stress perturbations resulting from mechanical interactions with the asperities may raise the stress acting on a given matrix segment up to a critical value that marks the onset of dilatant granular flow (point 3 in Fig. 3). If a sufficient volume of matrix is critically stressed, a T-instability is triggered in which both the asperities and the matrix segments enter the unstable granular flow regime (point 4). A fault-spanning rupture then results as the entire fault has become unstable. This kind of “mode switching” has previously been identified in laboratory experiments and in numerical simulations at coseismic slip rates (\( \sim 1 \) m/s), but not at slip rates relevant for the nucleation stage (\( \sim 10^{-9} \) m/s).

As compared to previous studies considering spatially heterogeneous faults (e.g. refs 23,53–55), the mechanism for generating fault-spanning events is similar in many respects: while the overall state of stress on a fault resides below a critical level, small (partial) ruptures break portions of the fault. As the stress state of the fault approaches criticality, nucleation of a fault-spanning event is permitted. In all of the aforementioned studies, the simulated fault was taken to be intrinsically unstable (i.e. velocity-weakening friction within the seismogenic domain), facilitating dynamic ruptures over the full extent of the fault. By contrast, in the present study the matrix material (which occupies 50% of the fault) shows strong velocity-strengthening behaviour at the imposed loading rate, with the equivalent rate-and-state friction \((a - b)\) parameter assuming a value of the order of 0.5. Following Kaneko et al., such a large value of \((a - b)\) would allow a single matrix segment of merely 160 m in length to fully arrest a 16 km long rupture (assuming an average coseismic stress drop of 10 MPa) in the absence of a transition into the velocity-weakening regime. Hence, the rheological
transition proposed here is a requirement for nucleating and dynamically propagating fault-spanning events on compositionally heterogeneous faults. This has further implications for the interpretation of laboratory friction tests performed under in-situ conditions (e.g. Niemeijer & Vissers\textsuperscript{46}), as measurements of strong velocity-strengthening behaviour cannot a-priori exclude the possibility of nucleation or propagation of dynamic ruptures. Lastly, in previous studies where heterogeneous frictional parameters were adopted\textsuperscript{23,53–55}, the simulated faults were always observed to be seismically active in between fault-spanning events, whereas our simulations with \( D = 2 \) are seismically quiet and weakly coupled (see Fig. 2a), implying that purely creeping faults are nonetheless prone to T-instabilities.

It is noteworthy that this rheological transition predicted by the CNS microphysical model has been observed in various materials in laboratory experiments\textsuperscript{30–32,56}. This transition is commonly known as the brittle-ductile\textsuperscript{57}, or flow-to-friction\textsuperscript{58} transition. The outcomes of the numerical simulations are therefore not a mere peculiarity unique to the adopted fault rheology, and it is expected that models that feature such brittle-ductile transition (e.g. Den Hartog & Spiers\textsuperscript{35} and Noda & Shimamoto\textsuperscript{59}) will also display an emergence of T-instabilities due to a stress-driven rheological transition. While such a transition can be enforced within the current rate-and-state friction framework (e.g. Beeler\textsuperscript{60}), microphysical models from which the brittle-ductile transition naturally emerges are more appealing than purely empirical flow-to-friction laws, as they can be extrapolated based on measurable material properties, and thereby have stronger predictive capabilities. Moreover, the use of a microphysical model facilitates the incorporation of laboratory and field observations into numerical modelling efforts, which further promotes the participation of these disciplines in physically-based earthquake hazard assessments.

Methods

Description of the microphysical model. The derivation of the CNS model, the comparison with classical rate-and-state friction, and its implementation into QDYN are described in detail in refs \textsuperscript{33,34,39,61,62}. Some key concepts of this model are recited here.

The CNS model geometry is based on the microstructural observations provided by ref. 30, and considers a granular gouge layer of uniform thickness \( h \), characterised by a nominal grain size \( d \) and porosity \( \phi \). A representative volume element is subjected to an effective normal stress \( \sigma \) and deformation rate \( V_{\text{imp}} \), which is accommodated internally by parallel operation of granular flow (grain rolling and sliding), and one or more thermally-activated, time-dependent deformation mechanisms. Following previous work\textsuperscript{33,34,39} and based on the observations summarised in Supplementary Information S3, we take intergranular pressure solution as the sole time-dependent mechanism, ignoring other mechanisms such as stress corrosion cracking\textsuperscript{63,64}. The constitutive relation for the rheology of the fault then results from the individual constitutive relations for granular flow and pressure solution, which are dependent on the instantaneous state of stress and gouge porosity.

For intergranular pressure solution, the flow law for dissolution controlled pressure solution creep is given as\textsuperscript{65,66}:

\[
\dot{\gamma}_{ps} = \frac{A}{RT} I_s \Omega \tau I_1(\phi) \\
\dot{\varepsilon}_{ps} = \frac{A}{RT} \frac{\sigma}{d} I_2(\phi)
\]

Here, \( \dot{\gamma}_{ps} \) and \( \dot{\varepsilon}_{ps} \) are the strain rates in the fault tangential and normal directions, respectively, \( A \) is a geometric factor accounting for the grain shape, \( I_s \) is the dissolution rate constant, \( \Omega \) is the molar volume, \( R \) is the universal gas constant, and \( T \) is the absolute
temperature, and $\tau$ and $\sigma$ are the macroscopic shear and effective normal stress, respectively. The evolution of the grain-grain contact area (and grain contact stress) with porosity $\phi$ is described by the porosity function $f_1(\phi)^{67}$. For dissolution controlled pressure solution creep, this function takes the following form,$^{33,66}$:

$$f_1(\phi) = \frac{\phi_e}{\phi_e - \phi} \quad (2a)$$

$$f_2(\phi) = \frac{\phi - \phi_0}{\phi_e - \phi} \quad (2b)$$

where $\phi_0$ is a lower cut-off porosity corresponding to the percolation threshold for an interconnected pore network of 3%,$^{68}$, and $\phi_e$ is the maximum attainable porosity of a purely dilatant gouge material, referred to here as the ‘critical state’ porosity.$^{39,69}$

Typically, a porosity function similar to $f_1(\phi)$ is used in analytical models for intergranular pressure solution that employ a porosity function.$^{36,67}$ However, in laboratory compaction test it has been observed that microphysical model predictions for compaction by pressure solution overestimate experimentally measured strain rates at low porosities ($< 20\%$), sometimes by several orders of magnitude.$^{65}$ While the physical mechanisms behind this discrepancy are yet to be fully identified, the trends in the experimental data can be approximated by the modified porosity function $f_2(\phi)$, which asymptotically reduces $\dot{\varepsilon}_p$ to zero for $\phi \rightarrow \phi_0$. Furthermore, this ensures that $\phi > \phi_0$ at all times, preventing negative porosities that are physically unrealistic.

By contrast, shear creep accommodated by pressure solution does not involve volume changes (i.e. porosity reduction), so it is expected that $\dot{\gamma}_p > 0$ even for $\phi = \phi_0$. A functional form like $f_1(\phi)$ is therefore more likely to describe shear creep by pressure solution, as is adopted for this study.

The constitutive relations for granular flow have been derived as$^{34}$:

$$\dot{\gamma}_{gr} = \dot{\gamma}_{gr}^* \exp \left( \frac{\tau [1 - \tilde{\mu}^* \tan \psi] - \sigma [\tilde{\mu}^* + \tan \psi]}{\dot{\gamma}_{gr}^*} \right) \quad (3a)$$

$$\varepsilon_{gr} = - \tan \psi \dot{\gamma}_{gr} \quad (3b)$$

In these relations, $\dot{\gamma}_{gr}$ and $\varepsilon_{gr}$ denote the granular flow strain rates tangential and normal to the fault plane, respectively, and $\tan \psi$ denotes the average grain-grain dilatation angle, which can be written as $\tan \psi = 2H (\phi_e - \phi)$, where $H$ is a geometric constant of order 1.$^{39,69}$ The microscopic coefficient of friction of grain-grain contacts is given by ref. $^{34}$ as $\tilde{\mu} = \tilde{\mu}^* + \bar{a} \ln (\dot{\gamma}_{gr}/\dot{\gamma}_{gr}^*)$, $\tilde{\mu}^*$ being a reference value of $\bar{a}$ evaluated at $\dot{\gamma}_{gr}^*$, and $\bar{a}$ being the coefficient of logarithmic rate-dependence of $\tilde{\mu}$.

With the above constitutive relations for the relevant deformation mechanisms, the evolution of the macroscopic shear stress and gouge porosity of a zero-dimensional (spring-block) fault can be expressed in the following set of differential equations$^{34}$:

$$\frac{d\tau}{df} = k (V_{imp} - h [\dot{\gamma}_{gr} + \dot{\gamma}_p]) \quad (4a)$$

$$\frac{d\phi}{df} = -(1 - \phi) (\varepsilon_{gr} + \varepsilon_p) \quad (4b)$$

in which $k$ is the effective shear stiffness (units: Pa m$^{-1}$) of the fault. The instantaneous fault slip velocity $V$ is obtained from the addition of the strain rates of granular flow and pressure solution (i.e. $V = h [\dot{\gamma}_{gr} + \dot{\gamma}_p]$).

One important characteristic to note, is that the steady-state velocity-dependence of friction, i.e. a material being velocity-strengthening or -weakening, changes with velocity (see Fig. 1b). As a result, classical rate-and-state friction is only comparable to the CNS model near steady-state conditions$^{62}$, i.e. for small velocity perturbations around steady-state for which the velocity-dependence $(a - b)$ can be approximated to be constant, so that the steady-state friction is proportional to $\log (V)$. With increasing departure from steady-state, both model frameworks predict different frictional behaviour, as is notably seen in seismic cycle simulations.$^{33}$

Finally, the adopted rheological model currently does not feature any high-velocity dynamic weakening mechanisms (see e.g. ref. $^{70}$). In the absence of dynamic weakening, the coseismic stress drop and maximum slip velocity as produced by the simulations are likely of smaller magnitude than anticipated for earthquakes in nature, where such mechanisms are known to operate. Accordingly, afterslip and interseismic creep likely constitute a larger portion of the total slip budget in the simulations than in nature. Since this study considers the effect of rheological transitions on the nucleation of seismic events (during which dynamic weakening is inactive), we leave such an extension of the currently adopted model rheology for future studies.
The fault slip velocity $V(t)$ is obtained as a function of stress and porosity as $V(\tau, \sigma, \phi) = h[\gamma_{gr}(\tau, \sigma, \phi) + \gamma_{ps}(\tau, \phi)]$. The acceleration term on right hand side of Eqn. (6) is then decomposed in its partial derivatives as:

\[
\frac{dV}{dt} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial \tau} \frac{d\tau}{dt} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi} \frac{d\phi}{dt}
\]

Substitution of (7) into (6), and rearrangement gives:

\[
\frac{d\tau_i}{dt} = -K_{ij} [V_j(t) - V_{imp}] - \eta\frac{dV}{dt}
\]

These equations are of the general form $X = F(X, t)$, with $X(t)$ being a vector containing the collection of $\tau_i(t)$ and $\phi_i(t)$ variables on all fault elements. This system of ordinary differential equations is solved by the 4(5)th-order Runge-Kutta-Fehlberg method with adaptive time stepping, as to maintain a relative error of $<10^{-5}$.

**Description of the boundary element method.** To model spatio-temporal variations of fault slip, we employ the boundary element code QDYN\textsuperscript{40}. This seismic cycle simulator originally utilizes rate-and-state friction to describe the model fault rheology, but it has been extended\textsuperscript{33} to include the CNS microphysical model as described above. Regardless of the underlying rheological model, the shear stress at point $i$ on the fault is obtained using the quasi-dynamic approximation\textsuperscript{71}:

\[
\tau_i(t) = -K_{ij} [d_j(t) - d_{imp}] - \eta V_i(t)
\]

Here, $K_{ij}$ is a stress transfer kernel whose coefficients represent the shear stress induced on the $i$-th fault element by unitary slip on the $j$-th fault element, $d_j$ is the total fault slip on the $j$-th fault element, and $d_{imp}$ is the far-field displacement, accumulating as $d_{imp} = V_{imp} \times t$. Radiation damping due to seismic wave radiation normal to the fault plane is accounted for by the last term on the right-hand side, in which the damping factor $\eta$ assumes a value of $G/2c_s$, with $G$ being the shear modulus of the homogeneous elastic medium, and $c_s$ the shear wave speed\textsuperscript{71}. The stress transfer kernel $K_{ij}$ is computed using a “2.5D” approximation for infinite one-dimensional faults embedded in two-dimensional homogeneous media (see ref. 24), and fault stresses are obtained via the spectral approach in finite-size domains\textsuperscript{72}. For numerical implementation, Eqn. 5 is differentiated with respect to time to give:

\[
\frac{d\tau_i}{dt} = -K_{ij} [V_j(t) - V_{imp}] - \eta\frac{dV}{dt}
\]

The fault slip velocity $V(t)$ is obtained as a function of stress and porosity as $V(\tau, \sigma, \phi) = h[\gamma_{gr}(\tau, \sigma, \phi) + \gamma_{ps}(\tau, \phi)]$. The acceleration term on right hand side of Eqn. (6) is then decomposed in its partial derivatives as:

\[
\frac{dV}{dt} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial \tau} \frac{d\tau}{dt} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi} \frac{d\phi}{dt}
\]

Note that these partial derivatives are given specifically for the assumed porosity functions (Eqn. (2)). Substitution of (7) into (6), and rearrangement gives:

\[
\frac{d\tau_i}{dt} = -K_{ij} [V_j - V_{imp}] - \eta\frac{dV}{dt}
\]

These equations are of the general form $X = F(X, t)$, with $X(t)$ being a vector containing the collection of $\tau_i(t)$ and $\phi_i(t)$ variables on all fault elements. This system of ordinary differential equations is solved by the 4(5)th-order Runge-Kutta-Fehlberg method with adaptive time stepping, as to maintain a relative error of $<10^{-5}$.

**Rendering the heterogeneous fault structure.** By employing a microphysical model that contains microstructural information, one can closely relate the model fault geometry to field and laboratory observations. In this work, guided by numerous field reports, we define heterogeneity through spatial variations in pressure solution kinetics, which reflect contrasts in fault rock composition or spatial variations in strain rate. Following ref. 41, we assume that competent lenses (the asperities) obey a power-law distribution in size, i.e.:

\[
F_X(x) = 1 - cx^{-D}
\]

where $F_X$ is the cumulative size distribution of asperity size $X$, $D$ is the fractal dimension (or power-law exponent), and $c$ is a proportionality constant. Strictly speaking, this cumulative distribution function does not exist for $D > 0$ on an infinite domain, but it can be re-defined based on a re-scaled probability density function integrated over a finite range of $0 < x_{min} \leq X \leq x_{max}$.
and $D \neq 0$, which yields:

$$f_X(x) = \frac{-D x^{-D-1}}{x_{\text{max}}^D - x_{\text{min}}^D}$$  \hspace{1cm} (10a)$$

$$F_X(x) = \frac{x^{-D} - x_{\text{min}}^{-D}}{x_{\text{max}}^{-D} - x_{\text{min}}^{-D}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (10b)$$

In accordance with the above relations, the realisation of the asperity size distribution $x$ can be generated from a uniform variate $\tilde{X}$ as:

$$x = \left( x_{\text{min}}^{-D} + \left[ x_{\text{max}}^{-D} - x_{\text{min}}^{-D} \right] \tilde{X} \right)^{-1/D}$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)$$

The procedure to render a fault with the desired statistical properties is then as follows:

1. First, the discrete asperity size distribution $x_i$ is realised in accordance with Eqn. (11), with $x_{\text{min}}$ corresponding to twice the fault element size, and $x_{\text{max}} = L$. Between simulations, $D$ is systematically varied between 1 and 2, following the phacoid fractal dimensions reported by ref. 41;

2. Next, a second size distribution ($y_i$) is realised that represents the spacing between neighbouring asperities, assuming that the “gaps” between asperities obey the same power-law distribution;

3. In order to realise the desired asperity occupation ratio $f$, $x_i$ is multiplied by $f/ (1 - f)$ (i.e. the ratio of total asperity length over total matrix length) before being combined in an arrangement with $y_i$;

4. The spatial distribution of $Z_{ps}$ for the asperities and the matrix is then sampled from a piece-wise alternating arrangement of $x_i$ and $y_i$, respectively, where $i$ ranges from 1 to $N$, so that $\sum_{i=1}^{N} (x_i + y_i) \geq L$. In other words, the spatial layout of the fault follows an arrangement $x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, ..., x_N, y_N$;

Owing to the fault’s finite size, stochastic noise causes some variability in the statistical properties of the fault geometry, e.g. by randomly introducing one excessively large asperity, which skews the asperity size distribution. To prevent this, we compare each realised asperity size distribution with the expected distribution (Eqn. (10b)), and the realised value of $f$ with the one that is requested. For large ($> 5\%$) deviations of the size distribution and $f$ from the expected values, the rendered fault structure is rejected and a new one generated.

From the above procedure, we obtain a fault structure that is consistent with our interpretation of the field observations summarised in Supplementary Information S3 (see also Fig. 1). This fault geometry is projected onto a one-dimensional periodic fault, and the fault is subjected to down-dip conditions of $V_{\text{imp}} = 10^{-9} \text{ m s}^{-1}$ and $\sigma = 50 \text{ MPa}$. For the kinetics of pressure solution $Z_{ps}$ defining the asperity and the matrix, we adopt values of $5 \times 10^{-16}$ and $3 \times 10^{-15} \text{ Pa s}^{-1}$. A value of $Z_{ps} = 3 \times 10^{-15} \text{ Pa s}^{-1}$ corresponds to theoretical estimates of $Z_{ps}$ for monomineralic quartz at $250^\circ \text{C}$ and a grain size of $5 \mu\text{m}$. The simulation is then run for at least 2,000 years.
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Figure 1  Properties of the model fault. a. Idealisation of the envisioned fault geometry, after Fagereng. 41  b. Assumed microstructure and micro-processes (granular flow and pressure solution).  c. Schematic diagram of the steady-state shear strength versus strain rate, as predicted by the CNS microphysical model. The compositional variation along the fault is reflected by a contrast in pressure solution kinetics, causing a relative shift of the steady-state strength curves.
Figure 2 Examples of model fault behaviour. a, Spatio-temporal distribution of fault slip velocity (left panels) and nucleation of the last T-instability in each simulation (right panels). The fractal dimension $D$ is as indicated. P-instabilities are identified as small ‘hot’ regions that span only a portion of the fault, whereas T-instabilities span the entire fault. For reference, the seismogenic asperity distribution is indicated by the black bars at the top of each panel. Simulations with $D = 1$ show numerous regular earthquakes controlled by the local asperity distribution, and a cascade-up style of nucleation of a T-instability. Simulations with $D = 2$ exhibits only minute slow slip events during the interseismic period of a T-event, which emerges with no precursory activity from a small nucleus. b, Time-series of the average stress supported by the asperities, the matrix, and the fault as a whole, for $D = 1$ and $D = 2$. A T-instability is triggered when the stress supported by the matrix reaches a critical value. The red coloured numbers in this figure serve to identify unique T-events across the different panels.
Figure 3  Synoptic overview of the nucleation process. The steady-state strength profile of the matrix, as a function of strain rate, is characterised by a transition from non-dilatant ductile creep (stable) to dilatant granular flow (unstable). At a given moment in time, the stress supported by the matrix is indicated by point 1. Due to tectonic loading and non-uniform fault slip, the stress on the matrix increases (point 2). At a critical value of stress, the matrix enters the dilatant granular flow regime, and a T-instability nucleates.