The Berkovići (BIH) earthquake series – preliminary results of seismological research

Marijan Herak*, Davorka Herak, Helena Latečki, Tena Belinić Topić, Snježana Cvijić Amulić¹, Iva Dasović, Marija Mustać Brčić, Marin Sečanj, Bruno Tomljenović², Josip Stipčević

> Department of Geophysics, Faculty of Science, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia ¹Republic Hydrometeorological Institute, Department of Seismology, Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina ²Faculty of Mining, Geology and Petroleum Engineering, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia * Presenting author (mherak@gfz.hr)



Mainshock:	– 22 April 2022, 21:07, M _L = 6.0, M _w = 5.7 (Figs. 1, 5, 6)
Aftershocks:	– 23 April 2022, 02:20, M _w = 4.4

- -24 April 2022, 04:27, $M_w = 4.7$ (Figs. 5, 6)
- SE Bosnia and Herzegovina, wider Berkovići region (blue outline, Fig. 1) **Epicentral area:**
- DF01 (Ljubinje), 15 km to the south of the mainshock epicentre (Fig. 2) **Closest station:**
- -7327 aftershocks in the first 9 months, complete for M \ge 1.3 (Fig. 4) Eq. catalogue: - Unexpectedly large focal depths, but within the zone of midcrustal events – grey dashed outline in Fig. 1 (also Figs. 5, 6)
- Locations: - With source-specific station corrections (SSSC, 7 iterations)
 - Means of solutions for 54 combinations of velocity models and program control parameters
- Aleatory variation (mean of individual 90%-confidence ellipse **Uncertainties:** major semiaxes)
 - Epistemic uncertainty (radius of 90%-confidence region of 54 sets of solutions)

Fig. 1. Seismicity in the greater area of the Berkovići earthquake series (blue outline). Epicentres of all earthquakes in the Croatian Earthquake Catalogue are shown satisfying criteria shown in the top right corner (M_{min} – minimum local magnitude; $\sigma_{h,max}$ – maximum allowed standard error for the epicentre). Focal depth is indicated by the colourscale, and the symbol size scales with magnitude. Focal mechanism solutions (FMS) are from the Croatian FMS-database (M. Herak, personal communication; Herak et al., 2016). The style of faulting is colour-coded by the colour of the compressional quadrant (blue – reverse, red – strike-slip, green – normal, violet – transpression, black – unknown). Thick grey dashed lines delineate a zone of mid-crustal events. The red rectangle in the inset map shows the geographical position of the region presented in this figure.

a) Mean horizontal aleatory variability, a_h , km (25 eqs., $M_{min} = 0.5$) $M_{c} = 1.3$ 10¹ b) Mean horizontal epistemic uncertainty, ε_h , km (25 eqs., M_{min} = 0.5) Station DF01 75% • Median 25% out of order c) Mean vertical epistemic uncertainty, ε_z , km (25 eqs., M_{min} = 0.5) $\log N = a - bM_{I}$ = 2.34, b = 1.01 1.0 20

Fig. 3. Temporal variation of the location uncertainty measures estimated as a mean value of the corresponding measure in a sliding window containing 25 consecutive events with $M_1 \ge 0.5$. a) Mean aleatory variability (major half-axis of the 90% confidence ellipse); b) Mean epistemic uncertainty (90percentile radius) of the horizontal coordinate; c) Mean epistemic uncertainty of the hypocentral depth (90-percentile radius). Bars topped with arrows indicate value larger than 5 km. Periods of increased uncertainty correlate well with the times when the closest stations were out of order.



Cumulative

4.0

Non-cumulative



– Very dependent on the station coverage, especially for depth (Fig. 3) Focal mechanisms: – Pure reverse on a gently dipping fault (mainshock), normal (!) for some aftershocks (Figs. 5, 6)



Fig. 2. Blue dots: Epicentres of the earthquakes, 22 Apr. 2022 – 22 Jan. 2023 ($M \ge 1.0$); Seismic stations used are shown as coloured triangles (see the legend). Major faults separating tectonic units are after Shmid et al. (2020).

DU FAULT





Fig. 5. Epicentres of the best located earthquakes, satisfying criteria shown in the bottom right corner (M_{min} – minimum local magnitude; γ_{max} – maximum allowed station azimuthal gap; N_{min} – minimum number of phases used; $a_{h,max}$ – maximum allowed aleatory variability for the epicentre; $\varepsilon_{h,max}$ – maximum allowed epistemic horizontal uncertainty). The focal depth is shown by colourscale. Best double couple solutions for the focal mechanism are shown as lower hemisphere beachballs. The compressional quadrant colour indicates the data source: Black – First motion polarity (this study), Other colours – Moment tensor inversion (see the legend). The surface projection of the assumed fault plane is shown as black rectangle. The thick black line shows the shallowest fault edge.

Acknowledgments: This study has been partly supported by the Croatian Science Foundation, grant IP2020-02-3960 (DuFault project). The AdriaArray workshop 2023 in Dubrovnik is partly supported by ORFEUS & EPOS within the EPOS SP project (Horizon 2020 Grant Agreement No. 871121).



REFERENCES

Herak, M., Herak, D., and Dasović, I. (2016). Fault-plane solutions and stress orientation in the greater region of Northern and Central Dinarides. Book of Abstracts, 35th General Assembly of the European Seismological Commission, 5-8 September 2016, Trieste, Italy, ESC2016-480.

Fig. 6. Top left: Epicentres of earthquakes from the first nine months of the Berkovići sequence satisfying criteria shown in the top right corner (M_{min} – minimum magnitude; $a_{h,max}$ – maximum allowed aleatory variability for the epicentral coordinates; $\varepsilon_{h,max}$ – maximum allowed epistemic uncertainty for the epicentral coordinates; N_{min} – minimal number of phase onset times used for location; γ_{max} – maximal allowed station azimuthal gap). Beach-balls are lower hemisphere stereographic projection of the best solution. Blue and green compressional quadrants denote reverse and normal styles of faulting, respectively, and the size scales with magnitude. A–D: Vertical cross-sections along

Schmid, S.M., Fügenschuh, B., Kounov, A., Matenco, L., Nievergelt, P., Oberhänsli, R., Pleuger, J., Schefer, S., Schuster, R., Tomljenović, B., Ustaszewski, K. & van Hinsbergen, D.J.J. (2020). Tectonic units of the Alpine collision zone between Eastern Alps and western Turkey. Gondwana Research, 78, 308-374; doi: 10.1016/j.gr.2019.07.005

the lines shown in the map (top left). The FMS in the profiles are shown as farther hemisphere projections in the profile plane. Blue line in C)

is cross-section with the assumed fault plane shown in Fig. 5.