

## **Estimating slip distribution for the Izmit mainshock from coseismic GPS, ERS-1, RADARSAT and SPOT measurements**

Kurt L. Feigl <sup>1</sup>, Francesco Sarti <sup>2</sup>, H     Vadon <sup>2</sup>, Simon Mclusky <sup>3</sup>, Semih Ergintav <sup>4</sup>,  
Philippe Durand <sup>2</sup>, Roland B  rgmann <sup>5</sup>, Alexis Rigo <sup>1</sup>, Didier Massonnet <sup>2</sup>, and  
Rob Reilinger <sup>3</sup>

- 1 Department of Terrestrial and Planetary Dynamics (UMR 5562)  
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique  
14 ave. E. Belin, 31400 Toulouse, France  
Kurt.Feigl@cnes.fr
- 2 Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales (CNES)  
18 ave. E. Belin, 31401 Toulouse, France  
Francesco.Sarti@cnes.fr, Helene.Vadon@cnes.fr, Philippe.Durand@cnes.fr,  
Didier.Massonnet@cnes.fr
- 3 Department of Earth, Atmospheric, and Planetary Sciences  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
E34, 42 Carleton Street, Cambridge, MA 02142 USA  
simon@wegener.mit.edu, reilinge@erl.mit.edu
- 4 TUBITAK, Marmara Research Center, ESRI,  
Gebze 41470, Turkey  
semih@yunus.mam.gov.tr
- 5 Department of Earth and Planetary Science  
307 McCone Hall, University of California, Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA 94720 USA  
burgmann@seismo.berkeley.edu

Revised 17 October, 2001 for publication by *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, special issue on Izmit and Duzce Turkey earthquakes. MS 2000830

Number of characters =	68829
Number of words =	13292
Number of pages (without figures) =	42
Number of black and white figures	11
Number of color figures =	5
Number of tables =	1
Microsoft Word Version	8.0
EndNote Add-In Version	3.0
File name =	izmitcoseismicgeodesy25.doc

**ABSTRACT**

1 We use four geodetic satellite systems (GPS, ERS, RADARSAT, and SPOT) to measure  
2 the permanent deformation field produced by the Izmit earthquake of August 17, 1999. The  
3 emphasis is on measurements from interferometric analysis of synthetic aperture radar  
4 (INSAR) images acquired by ERS and RADARSAT and their geodetic uncertainties. The  
5 primary seismological use of these data is to determine earthquake source parameters, such as  
6 the distribution of slip and the fault geometry. After accounting for a month's post-seismic  
7 deformation, tropospheric delay, and orbital gradients, we use these data to estimate the  
8 distribution of slip at the time of the Izmit mainshock. The different data sets resolve different  
9 aspects of the distribution of slip at depth. Although these estimates agree to first order with  
10 those derived from surface faulting, teleseismic recordings, and strong motion, careful  
11 comparison reveals differences of 40% in seismic moment. We assume smooth  
12 parameterization for the fault geometry and a standard elastic dislocation model. The RMS  
13 residual scatter is 25 mm and 11 mm for the ERS and RADARSAT range changes,  
14 respectively. Our estimate of the moment from a joint inversion of the four geodetic data sets  
15 is  $M_0 = 1.84 \times 10^{20}$  N.m, a moment magnitude of  $M_w = 7.50$ . These values are lower than  
16 other estimates using more realistic layered earth models. Given the differences between the  
17 various models, we conclude that the real errors in the estimated slip distributions are at the  
18 level of 1 meter. The prudent geophysical conclusion is that co-seismic slip during the Izmit  
19 earthquake tapers gradually from approximately 2 m under the Hersek Delta to 1 m at a point  
20 10 km west of it. We infer that the Yalova segment west of the Hersek Delta may remain  
21 capable of significant slip in a future earthquake.

## INTRODUCTION

The Izmit earthquake of August 17, 1999 was the first earthquake to generate a co-seismic displacement field measured by four geodetic satellite systems: GPS, ERS, RADARSAT, and SPOT. As such, it provides a unique opportunity for calibrating the INSAR measurements and estimating the earthquake source parameters. In view of the intense interest in this earthquake, we consciously seek to complement, rather than duplicate, previous work. Reilinger et al. (2000) use the GPS data to measure and model both co-seismic and post-seismic deformation for the Izmit event. We concentrate on the co-seismic slip, leaving the detailed analysis of the post-seismic deformation to other studies (Bürgmann et al., 2002; Ergintav et al., 2002; Hearn et al., 2002). The same GPS network later captured the co-seismic deformation for the November 12 Duzce earthquake (Ayhan et al., 2001; Bürgmann et al., 2002). Here, we consider only the Izmit event. Using four different ERS interferograms, Wright et al. (2001) estimate the fault geometry and the slip distribution, including slip triggered on two secondary faults. Inverting the ERS-2 interferogram, strong-motion accelerograms and teleseismic seismograms (separately and jointly), Delouis et al. (2002), estimate the slip distribution in both time and space. Buchon et al. (2001) solve the same problem using the strong-motion only, while Yagi and Kikuchi (2000) use both the strong-motion and teleseismic recordings. Concentrating on the geodetic data only, we add the RADARSAT measurements and the SPOT correlation map calculated by Vadon and Massonnet (2000) to the ERS and GPS data sets. Taken together, these data measure six different components of the static co-seismic displacement field (Figure 1). In our inversions, we do not allow the slip distribution to vary in time. We do, however, admit the possibility of systematic errors, such as tropospheric artifacts and orbital gradients, in the interferograms.

The surface rupture caused by this earthquake has been mapped in the field (Barka, 1999; Barka et al., 1999; Çemen et al., 2000). We complement the preliminary surface rupture map with a trace digitized from the correlation of two optical SPOT satellite images (Vadon and

Massonnet, 2000) as well as the correlation of two ERS radar backscatter (“amplitude”) images (Sarti et al., 2000). The conventional epicenter appears as star in Figure 1.

One of the underlying motivation for all these studies is to evaluate the seismic hazard near Istanbul. Using Coulomb theory to calculate stress transfer, Hubert-Ferrari et al. (2000), Parsons et al. (2000), and Hearn et al. (2002) find that the Izmit earthquake increased the likelihood of earthquakes at both ends of the rupture trace. Yet these calculations rely heavily on reliable determinations of the source parameters, particularly the fault geometry and the slip gradient. This sensitivity motivates us to find robust estimate for these parameters.

## **TYPES OF GEODETIC DATA**

### **GPS displacement vectors**

We use the GPS displacement vectors published previously by Reilinger et al. (2000) These authors estimated them using data from a GPS network of continuous stations and survey-mode benchmarks established prior to the earthquake (Ayhan et al., 1999; McClusky et al., 2000; Straub et al., 1997; Yalcin et al., 1999). Five continuous GPS stations were operating prior to the Izmit earthquake within the co-seismic deformation field. Fifty-one GPS sites were re-surveyed within two weeks of the Izmit main shock to measure co-seismic displacements (Ergintav et al., 2002).

Reilinger et al. (2000) analyzed the GPS data following standard procedures using the GAMIT/GLOBK GPS processing software (Herring, 1991; King and Bock, 1997) as described elsewhere (McClusky et al., 2000). To estimate co-seismic displacements, Reilinger et al. (2000) used a simple, linear-in-time model for elastic strain accumulation to extrapolate the pre-quake measurement of station position to the instant just before the Izmit event. Similarly, they used the elastic model for post-seismic after-slip to extrapolate positions measured after the earthquake backwards in time to the instant just after the main shock. The result is a set of “instantaneous” co-seismic displacement vectors for August 17. In principle,

they include no post-seismic deformation. These corrected measurements of the east, north, and up components of displacements at 48 stations form the 144 data points in data set  $G$  (for GPS). The measurement errors include the uncertainties in the rates. The measurements and their uncertainties are available as an electronic supplement on the Internet at [www.sciencemag.org](http://www.sciencemag.org) (Reilinger et al., 2000).

### INSAR range changes from ERS-1

Although GPS records three components of the co-seismic displacement vector  $\mathbf{u}$  of a benchmark, INSAR records only the component along the line of sight between the satellite and ground point. The line of sight between the point on the ground and the radar satellite in the sky defines the unit vector  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}$ . For the ERS-1, its east, north, and upward components are -0.371, -0.087, +0.925, respectively at the epicenter. The change in range  $\Delta\rho$  or the distance measured along the line of sight between the satellite and ground point is  $\Delta\rho = -\mathbf{u} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{s}}$ . Note that the sign convention is such that an upward movement will produce a positive value of  $\mathbf{u} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{s}}$  and a negative value of  $\Delta\rho$  (i.e., a decrease in range). Consequently, a purely horizontal east-west displacement of  $|\mathbf{u}| = 75$  mm at the epicenter will produce a range change of  $\Delta\rho$  of one 28-mm fringe in the interference pattern.

In our inversions, we consider only the 35-day coseismic ERS-1 interferogram, i.e., the phase difference between images acquired on August 12 (orbit number 42229) and on September 16 (42730). It is the best available co-seismic interferometric pair, as previously described by Reilinger et al. (2000). They published it as their Figure 5A.

Our interferograms were calculated using the same raw SAR data from the European Space Agency (ESA), the same DIAPASON software (CNES, 1997), and the same digital elevation model (DEM) calculated from ERS tandem pairs (Fielding et al., 1999), the same filtering algorithm (Goldstein and Werner, 1998) as used by Wright et al. (2001). Their ERS-1 interferogram differs from ours only in width, orbital parameters, and the fringe points sampled by manual unwrapping. In contrast, Delouis et al. (2002) use the ERS-2

interferogram, the ROI\_PAC software and automatic wrapping, to build an INSAR data set for inversion in combination with strong motion recordings and teleseismic seismograms. Armijo et al. (1999) and Çakir et al. (2001) also consider the same August 12 – September 16 interferogram, adding surface rupture data and geomorphological observations. Despite their similarities, the numerous versions of the few usable co-seismic interferograms for the Izmit mainshock differ in important ways that we can use to infer the nature of the uncertainty budget for INSAR measurements.

Before using these interferograms to estimate the source parameters of the Izmit earthquake, we must understand them, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Thoroughly addressing these issues in an uncertainty budget is the primary geodetic objective in this paper. First, we interpret the interferogram qualitatively to understand how different effects contribute to the fringe pattern. Many instructive examples appear in review papers by Massonnet and Feigl (1998), Madsen and Zebker (1998) and Bürgmann et al. (2000). The mathematical details appear in another review (Bamler and Hartl, 1998). For the Izmit earthquake, the most important effects involve the time interval, topographic relief, orbital trajectories, and tropospheric refraction, apparently in combination.

The ERS-1 interferogram spans a time interval ending 29 days after the main shock. We assume that this interferogram contains up to 20 mm of post-seismic range change, based on the post-quake GPS measurements and post-seismic modeling (Reilinger et al., 2000). There are at least two possible approaches to resolve the discrepancy in time interval between the GPS and INSAR measurements. The simplest approach is to neglect the difference, assuming that ERS interferograms record essentially co-seismic deformation, as do Delouis et al. (2002), Armijo et al. (1999), and Çakir et al. (2001). Our approach uses a 1-fault post-seismic slip model to predict the first 29 days of post-seismic deformation (Reilinger et al., 2000). These “corrections” are then subtracted from the ERS-1 measurements to obtain a “purely co-seismic” set of range changes pertaining to the instant of the mainshock rather than an interval of time.

126 The correlation in both interferograms is fairly good outside the agricultural areas in the  
127 valley floor because the temporal separation is only 35 days. Thus changes in the ground  
128 cover are small.

129 In addition, the separation between orbital trajectories was minimized in an orbital  
130 maneuver following the Izmit mainshock. Rather than adjust the satellite's velocity to follow  
131 its nominal trajectory, ESA's European Space Operations Center used their regularly  
132 scheduled maneuver in September to match the August trajectories. Such a rapid response in  
133 an operational satellite system is laudable and requires excellent lines of communication  
134 between the seismological community and the space agencies.

135 As a result of the small orbital separation, the ERS interferograms are fairly insensitive to  
136 topography. To quantify the topographic effect, we use the altitude of ambiguity  $h_a$  defined by  
137 Massonnet and Rabaute (1993) as the shift in altitude needed to produce one topographic  
138 fringe. For the ERS-1 interferogram, its value is  $h_a = 336$  m at the epicenter. Even if  
139 Fielding's DEM contains errors of the order of  $\varepsilon \sim 50$  m, they would produce a phase error of  
140 only  $\varepsilon/h_a \sim 1/8$  fringe or 4 mm range in the ERS-1 interferogram. As a result, we can safely  
141 neglect the effect of topographic errors in the ERS-1 interferogram.

142 Shortcomings in modeling the orbital trajectories can still leave small artifacts in the  
143 interferograms. Our experience with the preliminary "ORRM" trajectories leads us to expect  
144 several orbital fringes ( $\sim 100$  mm in range) across a 100 km scene, for a proportional error of  
145  $\sim 10^{-6}$  in the range change measurements. This error usually appears as a gradient, or planar  
146 fringe ramp in the interferogram. In most cases, these artifactual "orbital" fringes run roughly  
147 parallel to the satellite's ground track, striking more north-south than east-west. To avoid  
148 orbital errors' biasing our estimates, we admit a gradient in the interferogram. This involves  
149 adding two nuisance parameters to the estimation procedure: an eastward derivative  $\partial(\Delta\rho)/\partial x$   
150 and northward derivative  $\partial(\Delta\rho)/\partial y$ . These apply only to the INSAR data. We estimate two  
151 such gradient parameters for the ERS-1 data set and two more for the RADARSAT data set.

Tropospheric artifacts also contaminate the ERS-1 and ERS-2 interferograms, as we have argued previously (Reilinger et al., 2000). Since the interferometric fringes “hug” the topography like contour lines, they may be caused by the interplay between tropospheric layering and topographic relief. These artifacts can exceed 50 mm in range, as apparent in a comparison of the ERS and GPS estimates of co-seismic range change (Figure 2, discussed below). Artifacts of this size are also corroborated by estimating tropospheric delay parameters from the two GPS receivers operating at the time of the ERS-1 passes (note 46 in *Reilinger et al., (2000)*), comparing independent ERS-1 and ERS-2 interferograms (Figure 7 in *Reilinger et al., (2000)*), and a 1-day interferogram acquired before the mainshock (Figure 3).

Separating the tropospheric noise from the deformation signal can be very difficult, particularly when both are correlated with topographic relief (e.g., Rigo and Massonnet, 1999). Indeed, variations in the refractive index of the troposphere remain the dominant source of error in the INSAR technique (Goldstein, 1995; Hanssen, 1998; Hanssen, 2001; Massonnet and Feigl, 1995; Rosen et al., 1996; Tarayre and Massonnet, 1996; Zebker et al., 1997). The hugging effect was first observed as several concentric fringes in a 1-day interferogram on Mount Etna (Beauducel et al., 2000; Delacourt et al., 1998; Massonnet et al., 1995). One can recognize this subtle effect using pair-wise logic (Massonnet and Feigl, 1995) or using a DEM and local meteorological observations (Delacourt et al., 1998; Williams et al., 1998).

To mitigate the effect of the tropospheric artifacts on our estimates of the co-seismic slip distribution, we implicitly assume a uniform troposphere. We then estimate the (negative) correlation between tropospheric delay along the radar line of sight and the topographic elevation. As a free “nuisance” parameter in our estimation procedure, this “topo-tropo” scale factor applies only to the ERS range changes in the *E* data set. This parameterization differs slightly from the layered tropospheric model employed by Beauducel et al. (2000). Our approach adds only one free parameter to the inversion. Theirs adds one parameter per



179 tropospheric layer. Yet neither approach allows horizontal variations in tropospheric delay.  
180 Such variations could contribute, however, to the horizontal gradients we estimate to account  
181 for orbital errors. The essential point is to reduce the trade-off between the nuisance  
182 parameters and those of interest in the fault model.

183 To use the radar interferograms as data in an inverse problem requires an unambiguous  
184 measurement of the range change, which implies “unwrapping” the interferogram. For the  
185 Izmit interferogram, we simply count and digitize the fringe pattern. Although tedious, this  
186 technique avoids errors because the human eye is very good at following colored fringes, even  
187 where they are noisy. It also recognizes areas where the fringes become too noisy to count. On  
188 the other hand, Delouis et al. (2002) were able to unwrap their interferogram using an  
189 automatic procedure to sample the deformation field on a regular grid.

190 Even unwrapped, radar range changes are still only relative measurements. To make them  
191 absolute, we must identify the fringe corresponding to zero deformation. In our joint  
192 inversions, we do this by estimating additive constants. Like Delouis et al. (2002), we must  
193 estimate two such parameters: one on the north side, and another on the south side of the fault  
194 trace because we cannot follow an interferometric fringe the across the fault. The radar  
195 correlation breaks down in the Gulf of Marmara and the cultivated valley floor including the  
196 fault trace. Consequently, the difference between these two nuisance parameters trades off  
197 almost perfectly with the total slip on the fault unless we include GPS vectors in the inversion.

## 198 **INSAR range changes from RADARSAT**

199 We also consider a RADARSAT interferogram that reaches from the epicenter to Istanbul.  
200 Shown in Figure 4, it is the phase difference between images acquired on August 16 (orbit  
201 number 19731) and on October 3 (20417). The altitude of ambiguity  $h_a$  for this pair is 46 m.  
202 Both images were acquired in descending passes using standard mode in swath 7 with an  
203 incidence angle between  $44^\circ$  and  $49^\circ$  from vertical. The unit vector  $\hat{s}$  along the line of sight  
204 between the point on the ground and the RADARSAT satellite in the sky has east, north and

upward components of 0.694, 0.114, 0.711, respectively at the epicenter. This vector forms an angle of  $66^\circ$  with the ERS unit vector. Consequently, a range change  $\Delta\rho$  of one 28-mm fringe in the RADARSAT interference pattern corresponds to  $|\mathbf{u}| = 40$  mm of purely horizontal east-west displacement at the epicenter.

To calculate this interferogram, we followed essentially the same procedures as for the ERS-1 data. Orbital information can be extracted from the header file or requested from the Canadian Space Agency or Radar Sat International prior to ordering. The state vectors are given every 8 minutes in an inertial reference system, starting at the equator. One file contains 15 such samples, spanning slightly more than one orbital cycle. Using a Hermitian spline, we interpolated the orbits to 1 minute sampling intervals in a terrestrial reference frame for input to the DIAPASON software.

Since none of the RADARSAT fringes cross the fault, their ability to resolve fault slip is limited. For the  $R$  data set, we use 159 digitized values on the northern side of the fault only, where the co-seismic RADARSAT fringes extend well beyond the edge of our ERS-1 interferogram. Consequently, a single free parameter suffices to determine the constant value to be added to the range changes. In addition, we estimate three gradient parameters for the  $R$  data set, as for the  $E$  data set.

### **Correlation of two optical images acquired by the SPOT satellite**

It is also possible to detect (large) co-seismic displacements by correlating two optical images. The “lag” vectors estimated between corresponding cells of a pre-quake and a post-quake image measure the horizontal components of the co-seismic displacement vector field with sub-meter precision and sub-hectometer resolution (Crippen, 1992; Crippen and Blom, 1992; Vadon and Massonnet, 2000; Van Puymbroeck et al., 2000). To capture the Izmit earthquake of August 17, we correlate optical images acquired by the SPOT4 satellite on July 9 and the SPOT2 satellite on September 16 (Vadon and Massonnet, 2000). After anti-aliasing resampling, the result is a measurement of the offset between the two images at each 20-meter

pixel where the correlation succeeds. In this case, lines of the SPOT images are almost parallel to the fault, so we use only the offset in image columns to determine the horizontal component of displacement in the direction  $S77^{\circ}E$ . In other words, this data set measures the projection of the displacement field along the horizontal unit vector with east, north, and upward components  $[+0.974, -0.225, 0]$ , respectively.

The two images were acquired in very similar geometric configurations with a small angle between their viewing vectors. Nonetheless, the correlation map still shows the effects of slight differences in spacecraft position and sensor attitude. These we model empirically with a biquadratic polynomial fit. After median filtering with a 100 m –by– 100 m window, we map the measurements into cartographic coordinates using an affine transformation (Figure 5). This map shows a discontinuity corresponding to the trace of the surface rupture mapped between the east end of the Bay at Izmit and Sapanca Lake. The mean offset between two 5-by-20-km blocks on opposite sides of the fault is  $4.60 \pm 0.24$  m. After median filtering with a 2-by-2-km window, we retain 148 values as traced in Figure 6 in the  $S$  (for SPOT) data set. We correct them for 35 days of post-seismic deformation, as for the ERS data.

### **Correlation of two SAR backscatter images acquired by the ERS satellites**

A similar correlation technique also applies to SAR images. By correlating two Single Look Complex (SLC) SAR amplitude (“backscatter”) images acquired at different times, Michel et al. (1999) measured ground displacements for the Landers earthquake. Their result is “a two-dimensional displacement field with independent measurements every about 128 m in azimuth and 250 m in range. The accuracy depends on the characteristics of the images. For the Landers test case discussed in the study, the  $1-\sigma$  uncertainty is 0.8 m in range and 0.4 m in azimuth” (Michel et al., 1999). Furthermore, these authors claim that “this measurement provides a map of major surface fault ruptures accurate to better than 1 km and an information on co-seismic deformation comparable to the 92 GPS measurements available. Although less accurate, this technique is more robust than SAR interferometry and provides a

complementary information since interferograms are only sensitive to the displacement in range” (Michel et al., 1999).

For Izmit, however, Sarti et al. (2000) find less accurate results. Using multiple scales for their correlation cells, they find the range component of the co-seismic displacement with a scatter in excess of a meter. Indeed, it is difficult to discern even the trace of the fault in the map of ERS range offsets (Figure 7). Consequently, we do not include these data in our inversion.

### **The standard elastic half-space model**

To explain the observed co-seismic deformation, a simple model of a dislocation in an elastic half space provides a good approximation. Okada (1985) derives the expressions for the co-seismic (permanent) displacement  $\mathbf{u}$  at the Earth’s surface caused by a fault at depth in closed analytic form. Here we follow Okada’s (1985) notation, as in Feigl and Dupré (1999). To describe a single fault element (also called a “sub-fault” or “patch”) as a dislocation requires ten parameters. The fault patch has length  $L$  and width  $W$ . The slip on the fault plane is a vector  $\mathbf{U}$  with three components,  $U_1$ ,  $U_2$ , and  $U_3$ . The position coordinates of the fault patch are  $E$ ,  $N$ , and  $d$ , taken positive east, north, and down. The azimuth  $\alpha$  gives the strike of the fault, in degrees clockwise from north. Finally, an observer facing along strike should see the fault dip at  $\delta$  degrees to his right.

In each of our solutions, the only free parameters in this model are the along-strike components  $U_2$  of the slip vector at each element. The other nine parameters are held fixed to their prior values for each element. These fixed parameters incorporate several important assumptions: a double couple mechanism ( $U_3 = 0$ ), pure, horizontal strike slip ( $U_1 = 0$ ), a vertical fault ( $\delta = 90^\circ$ ) rupturing from the surface to  $d = 21$  km depth, and a trace approximating the mapped surface rupture (Figure 8).

The standard Okada model assumes that the Earth’s surface is flat, corresponding to the bounding plane of the elastic half space. The Lamé coefficients  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  specify the elastic

medium. For simplicity, we assume that  $\lambda = \mu$ , so that these parameters drop out of the expressions for surface displacement. Such a medium, called a Poisson solid, has a Poisson's ratio of 1/4. We assume the shear modulus  $\mu = 30$  GPa (Feigl, 2001). Our assumptions differ slightly from those in other studies. Delouis et al. (2002) assume  $\mu = 33$  GPa, while Wright et al. (2000) assume  $\mu = 34.3$  GPa and  $\lambda = 32.2$  GPa, implying a Poisson's ratio of 0.242.

## ESTIMATION PROCEDURE

We seek to estimate two types of quantities: slip values on individual fault patches and nuisance parameters, such as gradients and offsets, needed to account for unmodeled systematic errors in the data sets. To estimate these parameters using least squares, we use a singular value decomposition (SVD) algorithm (Anderson et al., 1992; Menke, 1989). To avoid spurious values typical of an oscillatory solution, we apply a smoothing operator. It minimizes the second spatial derivative (discrete Laplacian) of the slip distribution (Segall and Harris, 1987). We choose the weighting for this smoothing constraint by evaluating the trade-off between roughness and misfit and then use the same value for all data sets. We select a weighting that is rough enough to resolve some detail, but smooth enough to inhibit backwards (left-lateral) slip. This way, we need not apply additional smoothing by truncating the singular values.

One advantage of the SVD procedure is that it provides an estimate of the uncertainty of the estimates in the form of an *a posteriori* standard deviation of each model parameter. This we quote without multiplying by the normalized RMS for the solution.

One disadvantage of the SVD approach is that it allows backwards slip, i.e. left-lateral slip in our case. A symptom of poor resolution, this artifact tends to occur at the ends of the fault, and at depth. To avoid it, we impose  $0 \pm 1$  mm of slip at the ends of the faults and on the patches in the 18-21 km depth range. In the final, joint *ERGS* solution, only 18 patches have more than 0.2 m of left-lateral slip.

## DETERMINING THE UNCERTAINTIES IN THE DATA

In solving this inverse problem, we expect to find a more reliable solution and a better estimate of the uncertainties if we correctly weight the different data sets (e.g., Barrientos and Ward, 1990; Holdahl and Sauber, 1994). In our case, we assume a diagonal covariance matrix. We will determine the appropriate standard deviations, and thus the relative weighting, for the  $E$ ,  $R$ , and  $S$  data sets by comparison with the  $G$  data set.

### Data covariance matrix for GPS displacement vectors

As a basis for comparison, we assume that the GPS uncertainties determined by Reilinger et al. (2000) are correct as published for the stations observed during survey campaigns. The standard deviations of the coseismic displacement vector at a typical benchmark ranges from 3 to 5 mm for the horizontal components and from 10 to 20 mm for the vertical components. At the continuous GPS stations (TUBI, DUMT, KANT, MERT, and MADT), we assign standard deviations of approximately 3 mm for the horizontal components and 10 mm for the vertical components. We neglect the correlations between the components as well as any correlations between stations.

To verify these uncertainties, we evaluate the residuals obtained by fitting a dislocation model to data set  $G$  alone. Their scatter is greater than expected. The RMS scatter in the residuals is 32 mm, 23 mm, and 55 mm for the east, north, and vertical components, respectively (Table 1). We attribute most of the misfit to deficiencies in the model, as we shall discuss below.

To avoid conflicts between the vertical components of the GPS-determined vectors and the mostly vertical ERS range changes, we have multiplied the standard deviations by a factor of 10 for the vertical components at nine GPS survey benchmarks: KTOP, KANR, YUHE, KDER, SEYH, SMAS, SISL, SILE, and KUTE. Most of them are within 10 km of the fault trace. Many of them disagree with the ERS estimates in range.

### Measurement uncertainty for ERS range changes

We compare the INSAR range changes with the projection of the GPS vectors along the ERS radar line of sight (Figure 2). Compared to the GPS estimates, the RMS difference is 30 mm and 42 mm along the radar line of sight for the ERS-1 and ERS-2 interferograms, respectively. To find the standard deviations  $\sigma_G$  for the GPS range determinations, we propagate the individual GPS uncertainties through the projection onto the radar line of sight. These uncertainties appear as vertical error bars in Figure 2. Of course, we can make this comparison only at those points which meet three conditions: (1) pre-quake GPS observation, (2) post-quake GPS observation, and (3) fall in a coherent part of the co-seismic interferograms. Only 17 points meet these conditions for our co-seismic ERS-1 interferogram at Izmit. By focussing the raw images all the way to the last illuminated pixel, Wright et al. (2001) were able to extend their interferogram by 15 km to locate seven additional points, confirming a scatter of several centimeters in range. At Landers, the same type of comparison at nine points found an RMS discrepancy of 34 mm in range between ERS-1 and the dual-frequency co-seismic GPS measurements (Massonnet and Feigl, 1998; Massonnet et al., 1993). Although such comparisons are painstaking, they can reveal blunders in the recordings of the GPS antenna heights. By using independent GPS measurements for calibration, these comparisons presumably yield the accuracy of the ERS range change measurements, including any systematic effects, but excluding the additive constant.

On the other hand, some of the discrepancy must be due to errors in the GPS measurements. Indeed, the ERS – GPS difference exceeds 100 mm in range at five points not shown in Figure 2 (SISL, KDER, GLCK, KUTE, and SMAS). At DERB, the ERS – GPS difference exceeds 3 standard deviations in range. After omitting these points and removing a linear trend, we find an RMS difference of 27 mm between the ERS and GPS estimates of range change. By assigning a standard deviation of  $\sigma_E = 22$  mm to the ERS range change measurements, we can explain the scatter. The histogram of the ERS-GPS differences

normalized by  $(\sigma_G^2 + \sigma_E^2)^{1/2}$  looks like a normal distribution (Figure 2). In this case, the  $X^2$  statistic normalized by the degrees of freedom  $f$  is unity. Accordingly, we assign a standard deviation of 22 mm to all the ERS range change measurements in the  $E$  data set.

To confirm our value for the measurement uncertainty, we invert the ERS measurements in the  $E$  data set alone. The residual range changes have an RMS scatter of 23 mm. This solution, including five free nuisance parameters (two additive constants and three gradients), is called solution  $E_n$  in Table 1. It effectively uses the dislocation model as an empirical “best fit” to describe the data.

Yet we know very little about how these measurements are correlated with one another. As a first approximation, we assumed the ERS measurements to be independent and set the  $E$  data covariance matrix to be diagonal, that is  $(22 \text{ mm})^2$  times the identity matrix.

### Measurement uncertainty for SPOT offset maps

*A priori*, we assume a value of 63 cm for the standard deviation for a SPOT measurement, after averaging on a 2-km square pixel. We have determined this value from the residuals obtained by fitting a dislocation model to the union of data sets  $G$  and  $S$  (Table 1). In this  $GS$  solution, however, we also estimate one nuisance parameter — the additive constant. The RMS scatter of the SPOT residuals in the  $GS$  solution is 636 mm. Similarly, in the  $S_n$  inversion of the  $S$  data set alone, we find an RMS residual scatter of 615 mm.

This level of uncertainty is higher than we expected based on a null calibration. Applying the same technique to two images of the same ground scene taken at the same time by nearly identical instruments, we have found typical RMS scatters of 20–30 cm in the estimates of offset. In the Izmit case, both temporal decorrelation over the two months between acquisition epochs and the slight difference in the spectral bands of the two instruments are likely to increase the measurement uncertainty. Our uncertainty is also higher than the “accuracy of ~20 cm” Van Puymbroeck et al. (2000) found at Landers by comparison to an elastic dislocation model.



As for the ERS data, we know very little about how the SPOT offset measurements are correlated with one another. As a first approximation, we assume that the filtered values are independent, because they sample the displacement field on profiles 2 km apart. Thus, we take the covariance matrix for the  $S$  data set to be the identity matrix times  $(630 \text{ mm})^2$ . As a consequence, the SPOT observations carry very little weight (compared to the  $G$ ,  $E$ , or  $R$  measurements) in the joint inversions.

## INVERSION RESULTS

Table 1 summarizes the solutions in terms of residual statistics and moments.

### GPS alone

Figure 9 shows the slip distribution estimated from the GPS data by Reilinger et al. (2000), assuming the 6-segment fault geometry shown in Figure 8a. The characteristics of this slip distribution are: (1) a peak of over 5 m of slip near Golcuk some  $25 \pm 5$  km west of the hypocenter, (2) a peak of over 5 m of slip in the West Sapanca segment 10 km east of the hypocenter, (3) a peak of over 4 m of slip east of Sapanca, some 38 km east of the hypocenter, (4) less than 4 m of slip some  $43 \pm 5$  km west of the hypocenter (under the Hersek Delta), decaying to less than 0 m some 50 km west of the hypocenter, (5) a pronounced gap with no resolvable slip between the East Sapanca and Karadere segments 50 and 60 km to the east of the hypocenter, (6) maximum slip at shallow ( $9 \pm 3$  km) depths, (7) shallow slip less than 3 m on the Karadere segment between 70 km east of the hypocenter, gradually decaying to less than 1 m some 80 km east of the hypocenter, (8) a gap with less than 2 m of slip between the West Sapanca and East Sapanca segments 20 to 30 km east of the hypocenter, and (8) a gap with less than 2 m of slip from 3 to 10 km west of the hypocenter, between the West Sapanca and Golcuk segments.

### The effect of geometry

One drawback of the 6-segment fault model is the large displacements it predicts near the fault tips. Imposing a no-slip boundary condition mitigates this problem, at the expense of realism at step-overs, such as the right-stepping extensional jogs at Golcuk (near Kilometer – 7) and Hersek.(near Kilometer –34).

Another drawback of a piece-wise linear geometric parameterization is that the modeled fault segments can fall too close to geodetic measurements in the near field. This will lead to an overestimate of slip on the fault patch nearest to the measurement point. Although this issue arises for the GPS benchmarks only at GLCK, KDER, SISL, OLU4, and SMAS, it becomes crucial for the imaging pixels. For example, the ERS fringes come within 5 km of the fault trace at its western termination near the Hersek delta. Similarly, both the SPOT and the ERS measurements are within 2 km in the hypocentral segment between Izmit and Lake Sapanca.

To minimize these problems, we choose another, smoother geometric parameterization for the fault trace that passes as close as possible to the mapped surface rupture (Figure 8b). It also includes the Mudurnu Valley fault segment and the Iznik fault segment, where Wright et al. (2001) infer small amounts of triggered slip.

Using this smooth geometry with the GPS data alone, we find a slip distribution that retains the essential characteristics of Figure 9 from Reilinger et al. (2000). For example, Figure 10a shows that the slip at the western end of the fault drops to less than 2 m at a point 40 km west of the hypocenter (below the tip of the Hersek delta) and to less than 1 m some 13 km to the west, around Kilometer –53 km.

Compared to Reilinger et al. (2000), the main difference is that our bottom boundary condition prohibits slip below 18 km. Our smoothing constraint appears to be stronger than theirs because it causes a steeper gradient and more slip at the maxima. The notable differences in the slip distribution are that: (1) the maximum slip values increase to 7 m, 6 m and 5 m at the three peaks, (2) the slip peaks are deeper at 6–12 km depth rather than 0–6 km that the centroid moves downward to 11 km depth, (3) the moment increases to  $M_0 = 1.84 \times$

10<sup>20</sup> N.m, and (4) the slip gap narrows between 50 and 60 km east of the epicenter, as the fit improves in the near-field GPS data at SISL and SMAS. The backwards left-lateral slip in this gap appears to be a desperate attempt to fit the GPS vector at KDER, only 1 km from the fault trace. Here in the near field, our elastic dislocation model is a drastic simplification.

The smooth geometry provides a better fit than does the 6-segment geometry. The misfit in the north component of the displacement vectors decreases to 23 mm from 33 mm in residual RMS scatter. We use this smooth geometry for subsequent inversions.

### ERS range change data only

Using the *E* data set, we perform two solutions. The first, with the 5 nuisance parameters free, has been presented above as the *E<sub>n</sub>* solution. Now, in the *E* solution, we hold them fixed to zero. Instead, we have corrected the *E* data set using the values of the nuisance parameters estimated in a joint solution called *GE* which combines the *G* and *E* data sets. In the *E* solution, the residuals have an RMS scatter of 21 mm, slightly better than the value of 23 mm we obtained for the *E<sub>n</sub>* solution.

Figure 10b shows the slip distribution estimated from the ERS data alone in the *E* solution. It barely resolves the slip maxima in the Golcuk (Kilometer –23) and West Sapanca (Kilometer 9) segments. The maximum in the East Sapanca segment is smeared inside the 1-meter contour reaching from Kilometer 40 to Kilometer 80. At the western end of the fault, the *E* inversion retrieves a vague 10-km-wide smear of less than 2 m of slip to the west of the tip of the Hersek Peninsula at Kilometer –43. The 2-meter contour falls within 3 km of its position in the *G* solution.

The resolution is poor because the INSAR fringes do not cross the fault, causing a trade-off between the nuisance parameters and the total fault slip. The  $M_0 = 1.43 \times 10^{20}$  N.m moment of the *E<sub>n</sub>* solution, in which the nuisance parameters are free, is 9% smaller than the value we find in the *E* solution, in which they are fixed. At the other (eastern) end of the fault, the *E* data set resolves no more than 2 m of slip beyond 30 km from the epicenter, where the GPS

data over 3 m around Kilometer 80 km. This seems to be a consequence of the lack of measurements in our *E* data set in this area. The moment for the *E* slip distribution is  $M_0 = 1.57 \times 10^{20}$  N.m, 15% smaller than for the *G* data set alone.

#### **RADARSAT range change data only**

Using the *R* data set, we perform two solutions. The first has 4 free nuisance parameters: one offset and three gradients. Called  $R_n$ , this solution yields an RMS residual scatter of 7 mm. The moment of  $M_0 = 0.67 \times 10^{20}$  N.m is 63% smaller than for the *G* solution. Second, in the *R* solution, we fix the nuisance parameters to zero, after correcting the RADARSAT data using the values of the nuisance parameters estimated in the *GR* solution. The *R* residuals have an RMS scatter of 14 mm and a moment  $M_0 = 1.68 \times 10^{20}$  N.m, within 10% of the value we found in the *G* solution. The nuisance parameters are again trading off with the fault slip.

#### **ERS-1, RADARSAT, SPOT data sets each combined with the GPS data set**

To test our assumptions about the relative weighting of the data sets, we invert each of the *E*, *R*, and *S* data sets in combination with the *G* data set. These solutions are called *GE*, *GR*, and *GS*, respectively. They yield misfits of 21 mm, 12 mm, and 636 mm in RMS scatter for the *E*, *R*, and *S* residuals, respectively. These values, coupled with the almost unchanged RMS scatter in the *G* residuals, confirm our choice of a priori standard deviations.

The *GE*, *GR*, and *GS* solutions also determine the nuisance parameters we apply to the data in used in the individual *E*, *R*, and *S* solutions we have described above and shown in panels b, c, and d of Figure 10

#### **Combined ERS-1, RADARSAT, GPS, and SPOT data set**

Figure 10e shows the slip distribution estimated from the combination of the *E*, *R*, *G*, and *S* data sets. This is our preferred solution, and the one we will interpret.

The residual RMS misfits are 25 mm for the *E* subset, 11 mm for the *R* subset, and 804 mm for the *S* subset. These values are less than 3 mm above those determined for each data

set individually. Similarly, the GPS residuals in the *ERGS* solution are less than 2 mm worse in RMS than in the *G* solution. These results suggest that the relative weighting of the four data types is about right (Table 1). The small residual RMS value for the *R* subset suggests that the nuisance parameters are absorbing misfit. Indeed, the small spatial extent of the digitized values we extracted from the coherent fringes on the north side of the fault seem to prevent meaningful estimates of the gradients or the offset for the *R* data set.

To evaluate this solution, we show the normalized residuals in Figure 11, map them in Figure 12, and profile them in Figure 13. We also use the *ERGS* solution to predict supersets of the data sets included in the inversions. Accordingly, Figure 14 shows the residual ERS-1 fringes, calculated from the *ERGS* slip distribution and its associated nuisance parameters. Although it still shows fringe gradients, the majority of the signal has been explained. The remaining residual fringes appear to result from shortcomings in the model rather than random measurement noise, as we shall discuss below.

The slip distribution estimated from the combined *ERGS* data set resembles the GPS-only solution. Compared to the *G* solution, the *ERGS* solution diminishes the size of the western slip maximum in the Golcuk segment. The peak in the combined *ERGS* solution at Kilometer  $-20$  emphasizes the agreement between the *G*, *E*, and *R* solutions. Further west, around Kilometer  $-35$ , the combined *ERGS* solution compromises between the *E* solution, which barely resolves 1–2 meters of slip, and the *R* and *G* solutions, which push for more than 3 m. East of the the hypocenter, between Izmit and Sapanca Lake, the slip maximum in the combined *ERGS* solution is broader than in the *G* solution. Again, this reflects a compromise between the *E*, *R*, and *S* solutions. The centroid is at  $N40.71^\circ$ ,  $E30.10^\circ$ , over 10 km eastward along strike from the conventional epicenter.

## DISCUSSION

### Gradients in the interferograms

We find large artifactual gradients in the ERS interferograms. Indeed, the eastward and northward derivatives of range change are significant. In our preferred joint inversion (*ERGS*), we find values of  $\partial(\Delta\rho)/\partial x = -0.5 \pm 0.03 \times 10^{-6}$  and  $\partial(\Delta\rho)/\partial y = 1.7 \pm 0.04 \times 10^{-6}$  for these quantities in the *E* data set, respectively. These values are of the same order of magnitude as the slopes of the best-fitting lines in the profiles of ERS – GPS discrepancies (Figure 2). Such large gradients are consistent with our experience with the preliminary ORRM orbits. The gradients imply almost 2 north-striking fringes spread over the 100-km east-west dimension of the interferogram, and over 9 east-striking fringes spread over the 150-km north-south dimension of the interferogram. Left uncorrected, the former error could bias the along-strike variation of the slip distribution. Similarly, the latter effect would lead to an overestimate of the total amount of slip across the fault, and thus the moment. In our case, however, including the two horizontal gradients as nuisance parameters changes the moment by less than 1%.

We find horizontal gradients of the same order of magnitude for the RADARSAT data. In our preferred joint inversion (*ERGS*), we find values of  $\partial(\Delta\rho)/\partial x = +5.2 \pm 0.1 \times 10^{-6}$  and  $\partial(\Delta\rho)/\partial y = -8.6 \pm 0.3 \times 10^{-6}$  for the eastward and northward gradients in the *R* data set, respectively. That the uncertainties for these parameters are larger than for the *E* data set is a consequence of the small spatial extent of the *R* data set.

### **Tropospheric effects**

The most pronounced example of a tropospheric artifact appears as a residual of approximately 8 cm in range almost 50 km north of the fault when Delouis et al. (2002) include the ERS-2 interferogram in their inversion, as shown in profile P1 of their figure 12. As a systematic error, this type of artifact can perturb the slip estimates significantly. The inversion procedure is particularly sensitive to gradients in the displacement field, which are in turn sensitive to errors in range along the steep line-of-sight used by the ERS radar. In the far field, at 50 km from the fault, an error of one 28-mm fringe in range can alter the estimate of slip on the fault by several meters.

In our *ERGS* inversion, the correlation of *E* range change with topography is strong, yielding a vertical gradient of  $\partial(\Delta\rho)/\partial z = 25 \pm 3$  mm in range per kilometer of elevation. This produces more than a fringe in the valley around Izmit, just as in the aseismic one-day interferogram (Figure 3). Estimating this nuisance parameter yields a moment only 1% different than the moment estimated in a solution where we neglect the tropospheric gradient. On the other hand, one parameter may not suffice to describe the troposphere over the entire 100 x 150 km interferogram. For example, the steep slope in the eastern half of the GPS-ERS range differences (Figure 2) suggests an eastward gradient of 50 mm in range over 10 km or  $\partial(\Delta\rho)/\partial x \sim 5 \times 10^{-6}$  that may be related to localized heterogeneities in the troposphere. Similarly, at least one of the fringes remaining in the residual interferogram (Figure 14) may be a tropospheric perturbation over a length scale shorter than the entire 100-km-wide image. We conclude that short-scale tropospheric variations appear to be the dominant source of error contributing to the ~2 cm uncertainty we find for the *E* measurements.

In contrast, the RADARSAT interferogram appears to have a negligible vertical gradient:  $\partial(\Delta\rho)/\partial z = -2.1 \pm 0.2 \times 10^{-8}$ , or less than 0.001 fringe per kilometer of topographic relief. Again, the limited spatial extent of the *R* data set is a caveat.

That the tropospheric noise in our RADARSAT interferogram is smaller than in the ERS-1 interferogram by at least a factor of 2 seems surprising in light of the similarity of the radar sensors. If anything, we would expect the opposite effect: the shallow incidence and daytime acquisition of the RADARSAT images should increase the tropospheric path length and variability with respect to ERS. Instead, we conclude that the tropospheric conditions vary greatly over short time scales (hours to days) and length scales (~10 km). In consequence, the uncertainties we derive from our *E* and *R* data sets may not apply to other INSAR measurements acquired under different atmospheric conditions.

## Moment

Our estimate of the seismic moment from the *ERGS* inversion is only 8% larger than the estimate from strong-motion and teleseismic body-wave data (Yagi and Kikuchi, 2000). Yet our estimate is considerably smaller than others estimated from geodetic data sets, including some of the same ERS interferograms. For example, it is 22 to 25 percent smaller than that estimated by Wright et al. (2001), even after scaling to the same shear modulus. Similarly, our estimate of the moment is 16% smaller than that of Delouis et al. (2002), again after scaling to the same shear modulus.

Less than one tenth of the discrepancy may be explained by the post-seismic deformation, which amounts to  $0.291 \times 10^{20}$  N.m in moment over the first 75 days following the mainshock, based on modeling of the GPS observations (Reilinger et al., 2000). Although the ERS interferograms record 30 days ( $0.1 \times 10^{20}$  N.m) of post-seismic deformation, both Wright et al. (2001), and Delouis et al. (2002) neglect it.

The oversimplified assumption of uniform rheology implicit in our half-space model will tend to bias our moment estimate toward a low value. Using a realistic layered earth model, Hearn et al. (2002) find a moment of  $2.6 \times 10^{20}$  N.m use the same GPS displacement vectors as we do. In other words, our moment estimate is 26% too low because we assume a uniform half space.

## Depth estimates

Our geodetic estimates locate the centroid of the co-seismic slip distribution at 11 km depth, shallower than seismological estimates of the mainshock centroid. This discrepancy has been observed before, for example, for the Northridge earthquake (Hudnut et al., 1995). The explanation involves the differences in rheology assumed in the elastic modeling (Savage, 1987). For computational simplicity, our geodetic inversions assume an elastic half-space with constant properties throughout. Variations in crustal rheology clearly violate this assumption. For example, Hearn et al. (2002) find a centroid several kilometers deeper than ours by using a more realistic layered earth model.



Or, if the value of Poisson's ratio in the upper crust is lower than the  $\nu = 1/4$  value we assume, then the geodetic estimate will underestimate the depth, yielding a centroid location which is too shallow (Cattin et al., 1999).

### **Oversimplifications in the model**

In comparing simple half-space models with more realistic layered rheologies, Hearn et al. (2002) find important differences in the ratio of vertical to horizontal components of displacement. Consequently, our elastic half-space model cannot adequately satisfy both the GPS data, which are primarily horizontal, and the ERS and RADARSAT data, which are primarily vertical. This argument explains why the residual ERS interferogram calculated from the joint *ERGS* solution (Figure 14) contains more fringes than that calculated from the *E* data set alone (not shown). The residual fringes in Figure 14 look as if they were made by an earthquake. Fitting them, without trading slip for nuisance parameters, would tend to increase the moment estimate. This argument explains why Wright et al. (2002) estimate a 50% larger value for moment than we do when fitting only the same ERS-1 interferogram.

### **Secondary rupture off the main trace**

Using the fault geometry chosen to fit the ERS interferograms (Wright et al., 2001), we find  $116 \pm 12$  mm of right-lateral strike slip and  $35 \pm 12$  mm of thrusting up-dip slip between 0.3 and 14.7 km depth on a 10-km-long fault that dips  $50^\circ\text{N}$  and strikes  $\text{N}80^\circ\text{W}$  in the Mudurnu Valley. Near Lake Iznik, we find  $227 \pm 20$  mm of left-lateral strike slip and  $170 \pm 23$  mm of dip slip between 2.5 and 3.5 km depth on a 60-km-long vertical fault that strikes  $\text{S}80^\circ\text{W}$ . These modeled fault values fit the ERS data poorly, as apparent in the residual interferogram (Figure 14). Obtaining a better fit would require adjusting the modeled fault geometry in a non-linear inversion, a task beyond the scope of this paper.

### **How far does the rupture continue beyond the Hersek delta?**

At the western termination of the fault, near the Hersek delta, the location of the 1-meter slip contour depends on the relative geometry of the data sampling and the fault parameterization. In our *G* solution, the GPS data alone place this contour some 9 km west of the delta tip, while the ERS and RADARSAT data sets place it 13 to 15 km west of the delta in the *E* and *R* solutions. Further west, the slip tapers off gradually from 2 m to 1 m in the 10 km past the delta. Our joint *EGS* inversion, dominated by the GPS data, places the 1-meter slip contour 9 km west of the tip of the Hersek delta. At the end of our model fault, 20 km west of the Hersek delta, the slip diminishes to zero. Such a shallow gradient of slip reduces the stress accumulating at the tip of the fault.

Further west, between 20 and 35 km beyond the delta, where Karabulut et al. (2001) found aftershock activity including two events with  $M_w > 4$ , our solutions do not resolve any significant co-seismic slip at the meter level. This suggests that the observed aftershocks represent minor ( $\sim 1$  cm) adjustments induced at the fault tip by the mainshock rather than through-going co-seismic slip. Still, even  $\sim 10$  cm of slip in this area would not appear in our solutions because of the lack of geodetic data offshore and the no-slip boundary condition we impose at the end of the modeled fault.

At this western termination of the fault, our slip distribution appears to be roughly consistent with those of other studies to within the real 1-meter errors of the inversions. For example, the 2-meter slip contour in our *ERGS* solution at 10 km depth falls 40 km west of the hypocenter. It resembles the results of an inversion of strong-motion data alone (Buchon et al., 2001). Below this depth, this contour curves eastward, back toward the hypocenter, in our geodetic solution, whereas it dips westward in the strong-motion solution, presumably because of our bottom boundary condition and smoothing constraint.

Differences in geometric parameterization of the fault model can also effect the slip distribution, especially at the western offshore termination where no surface rupture mapping is available. Finally, the nuisance parameters required for modeling the ERS data trade off with the fault slip parameters, whether the former are explicitly estimated (as in this study),

modeled physically using precise orbits (Wright et al., 2001), or absorbed into “baseline estimation” (Delouis et al., 2002).

Given the differences between the various models, we conclude that the slip distributions include errors at the level of at least 1 meter, considerably larger than the 0.2 m standard deviations we determine formally by linear propagation of the measurement uncertainties. Accordingly, the prudent geophysical conclusion is that co-seismic slip during the Izmit earthquake tapers gradually from 2 m under the Hersek Delta to 1 m at a point 10 km west of it.

### **Sensitivity of stress transfer calculations to slip distribution**

At Landers, we learned a lesson about how the change in Coulomb failure stress depends on the slip distribution assumed in the calculation. By using a fine estimate of slip distribution estimated from several data sources (Wald and Heaton, 1994), Stein et al. (1994) predict aftershock locations better than with their original calculation (Stein et al., 1992) which used only a coarse estimate of slip distribution based on GPS measurements alone (Murray et al., 1993). Yet even the most recent Coulomb calculations do not predict exactly where the triggered slip begins and ends (Massonnet et al., 1994; Price and Sandwell, 1998).

For Izmit, the first two triggering studies (Hubert-Ferrari et al., 2000; Parsons et al., 2000) relied on unpublished, preliminary estimates of the slip distribution. To illustrate the sensitivity, we calculated the Coulomb failure stress perturbation twice: first using the slip distribution estimated from the GPS data alone by Reilinger et al. (2000) on the 6-segment geometry and then using our *ERGS* estimate on the smooth geometry (Figure 15). Near the fault, where a future earthquake is likely to nucleate, the differences exceed 0.5 bar, the conventional threshold for triggering an earthquake.

## CONCLUSIONS

We have combined three distinct types of geodetic data that measure six different components of the co-seismic displacement field. For the ERS-1 range changes, a standard deviation of 22 mm in range is appropriate, provided that we admit the possibility of gradients in the eastward, northward and upward directions. Our estimates for all these gradients are significant, of the order of  $\sim 1$  mm/km horizontally and  $\sim 25$  mm/km vertically. These represent residual orbital and tropospheric effects, respectively. For the small subset of the RADARSAT interferogram we use, the standard deviation is smaller, about 12 mm. Although the horizontal gradients in the RADARSAT data are of the same order of magnitude as those in the ERS data, the vertical gradients appear to be negligible. For the offsets estimated by correlating SPOT images, 63 cm is appropriate for the standard deviation of a  $2 \times 2$  km sample.

After accounting for a month's post-seismic deformation, we have used these data to estimate the distribution of slip at the instant of the Izmit mainshock. The moment  $M_0$  is  $1.84 \times 10^{20}$  N.m and the moment magnitude  $M_W$  is 7.50. Although this value is within 10% of an estimate from seismometer data alone (Yagi and Kikuchi, 2000), it is over 25% smaller than the values estimated from other inversions. The primary cause for this discrepancy is the rheological oversimplification implicit in our half-space model. Other possible explanations for the discrepancy involve neglecting post-seismic deformation, tropospheric artifacts, or orbital gradients. Although our joint inversion of the different geodetic data sets accounts for all these effects, they do not seem to modify the moment by more than about 5%.

We find that a smooth fault geometry fits the geodetic data better than a stepping arrangement of linear segments. We hypothesize that the fault is a single, well-connected surface at depth.

The joint inversion of four different geodetic data sets resolves features of the slip distribution the level of a meter. At the western end of the rupture, where the risk to Istanbul

depends on the stress accumulation, the prudent geophysical conclusion is that co-seismic slip during the Izmit earthquake tapers gradually from 2 m under the Hersek Delta to 1 m at a point 10 km west of it. Our solution cannot resolve any significant slip beyond 10 km west of the Hersek delta. Accordingly, we infer that the Yalova segment to the west of the Hersek delta may remain capable of significant slip in a future earthquake.

A reliable estimate of the slip distribution is important for stress transfer calculations. Subtle differences between two acceptable, and apparently similar, slip distributions can perturb the Coulomb failure stress increment by more than the threshold value usually considered sufficient to trigger an earthquake.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Ziyadin Çakir and Aykut Barka of ITU for precious assistance in the field. We also appreciated the guidance kindly offered by Bob King and Tom Herring of MIT. Eric Fielding selflessly released his DEM early. Tim Wright and Barry Parsons generously provided results in advance of publication. A thorough review by Eric Fielding and Tim Wright improved the manuscript considerably. Geoff King offered helpful guidance as well as his Almond source code. Zhong Lu generously adapted his `ps_filt2` program to clean our fringes. Edmond Nezry of Privateers helped with the ERS correlation. John Dow and Matt Rosengren responded quickly to control and determine the ERS orbits from ESA/ESOC. Betlem Rosich-Tell and Alain Arnaud of ESA/ESRIN accelerated the data distribution. Alain Podaire of CNES astutely recognized the importance of this event. Paul Wessel and Walter Smith's terrific GMT software (Wessel and Smith, 1998) illustrated the paper with the exception of Figure 2. We acknowledge the European Space Agency for providing the ERS data free of cost and the Canadian Space Agency for providing the RADARSAT data free of charge under ADRO2 and the background mission. Financed by *l'Institut National des Sciences de l'Univers*, GDR INSAR and CNES/QTIS in France and NSF grant EAR 9909730 to MIT.

**REFERENCE S**

- Anderson, E., Bai, Z., Bischof, C., Demmel, J., Dongarra, J., Du Croz, J., Greenbaum, A., Hammarling, S., McKenney, A., Ostrouchov, S., and Sorenson, D., 1992, LAPACK Users' Guide: Philadelphia, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- Armijo, R., Meyer, B., Barka, A., de Chabalier, J. B., and Hubert-Ferrari, A., 1999, The 1999 Izmit earthquake rupture and the tectonic evolution of the Sea of Marmara, *Eos*, p. F664.
- Ayhan, M. A., Demir, C., Kiliçoglu, A., Sanli, I., and Nakiboglu, S. M., 1999, Crustal motion around the western segment of the north Anatolian fault zone: geodetic measurements and geophysical interpretation, *in* International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, Birmingham, United Kingdom.
- Ayhan, M. E., Bürgmann, R., McClusky, S., Lenk, O., Aktug, B., Herece, E., and Reilinger, R. E., 2001, Kinematics of the Mw = 7.2, 12 November 1999, Düzce, Turkey Earthquake: *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, v. 28, p. 367-370.
- Bamler, R., and Hartl, P., 1998, Synthetic aperture radar interferometry: Inverse Problems, v. 14, p. R1-R54.
- Barka, A., 1999, The 17 August 1999 Izmit earthquake: *Science*, v. 285, p. 1858-1859.
- Barka, A., Akyuz, S., Altunel, E., Sunal, G., Cakir, Z., Dikbas, A., Yerli, B., Rockwell, T., Dolan, J., Dawson, T., Hartleb, R., Tucker, A., Fumal, T., Langridge, R., Stenner, H., Christofferson, S., Armijo, R., Meyer, B., and Chabalier, J. B. d., 1999, 17 August 1999 Izmit earthquake, northwestern Turkey, *Eos*, p. F647.
- Barrientos, S. E., and Ward, S. N., 1990, The 1960 Chile earthquake: inversion for slip distribution from surface deformation: *Geophys. J. Int.*, v. 103, p. 589-598.

- 740 Beauducel, F., Briole, P., and Froger, J. L., 2000, Volcano wide fringes in ERS synthetic  
741 aperture radar interferograms of Etna: Deformation or tropospheric effect?:  
742 J. Geophys. Res., v. 105, p. 16,391-16,402.
- 743 Buchon, M., Toksoz, M. N., Karabalut, H., Bouin, M. P., Dietrich, M., Aktar, M., and Edie,  
744 M., 2001, Space and time evolution of rupture and faulting during the 1999  
745 Izmit (Turkey) earthquake: ?
- 746 Bürgmann, R., E. Ayhan, Fielding, E., Wright, T., McClusky, S., B. Aktug, Demir, C., Lenk,  
747 O., and Turkezer, A., 2002, Deformation During the 12 November 1999,  
748 Duzce, Turkey Earthquake, from GPS and InSAR Data: Bull. Seism. Soc.  
749 Am., v. submitted.
- 750 Bürgmann, R., Rosen, P. A., and Fielding, E. J., 2000, Synthetic aperture radar Interferometry  
751 to measure Earth's surface topography and its deformation: Annu. Rev.  
752 Earth Planet. Sci., v. 28, p. 169-209.
- 753 Çakir, Z., Chabalier, J. B. d., Armijo, R., Meyer, B., Barka, A., and Peltzer, G., 2001, The  
754 August 17, 1999 Turkey earthquake seen with InSAR imagery and tectonic  
755 field observations, *in* EUG XI Meeting, Strasbourg, France.
- 756 Cattin, R., Briole, P., Lyon-Caen, H., Bernard, P., and Pinettes, P., 1999, Effects of superficial  
757 layers on coseismic displacements for a dip-slip fault and geophysical  
758 implications: Geophys. J. Int., v. 137, p. 149-158.
- 759 Çemen, I., Gökten, E., Varol, B., Kiliç, R., Özaksoy, V., and Erkmen, C., 2000, Turkish  
760 earthquakes reveal dynamics of fracturing along a major strike-slip fault  
761 zone: Eos, v. 81, no. July 11, p. 309-313.
- 762 CNES, 1997, DIAPASON software package: Toulouse, France, Centre National d'Etudes  
763 Spatiales.
- 764 Crippen, R. E., 1992, Measurement of subresolution terrain displacements using SPOT  
765 panchromatic imagery: Episodes, v. 15, p. 56-61.

- Crippen, R. E., and Blom, R. G., 1992, The first visual observation of fault movements from space: the 1992 Landers Earthquake, *Trans. Amer. Geophys. Un.*, p. 364.
- Delacourt, C., Briole, P., and Achache, J., 1998, Tropospheric corrections of SAR interferograms with strong topography. Application to Etna: *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, v. 25, p. 2849-2852.
- Delouis, B., Giardini, B., Lundgren, P., and Salichon, J., 2002, Joint inversion of INSAR, GPS, teleseismic, and strong motion data for the spatial and temporal distribution of earthquake slip: application to the Izmit mainshock: *Bull. Seism. Soc. Amer.*, v. in press.
- Ergintav, S., Bürgmann, R., McClusky, S., Hearn, L., Reilinger, R. E., A., B., Meteris, H., Aktuk, B., Gurkan, O., Ozener, H., Cakmak, R., and Yalcin, N., 2002, Postseismic deformation following Izmit Earthquake, 17 August 1999: *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.*, v. submitted.
- Feigl, K. L., 2001, Measurement of coseismic deformation by satellite geodesy, *in* Lee, W. H. K., Kanamoori, H., and Jennings, P. C., eds., *International Handbook of Earthquake and Engineering Seismology*, Academic Press.
- Feigl, K. L., and Dupré, E., 1999, RNGCHN: a program to calculate displacement components from dislocations in an elastic half-space with applications for modeling geodetic measurements of crustal deformation: *Computers and Geosciences*, v. 25, p. 695-704.
- Fielding, E., Wright, T., Parsons, B., England, P., Rosen, P., Hensley, S., and Bilham, R., 1999, Topography of northwest Turkey from SAR interferometry: application to the 1999 Izmit earthquake: geomorphology and coseismic strain, *Eos*, p. F663.
- Goldstein, R., 1995, Atmospheric limitations to repeat-track radar interferometry: *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, v. 22, p. 2517-2520.



- 792 Goldstein, R. M., and Werner, C. L., 1998, Radar interferogram filtering for geophysical  
793 applications: *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, v. 25, no. 21, p. 4035-4038.
- 794 Hanssen, R., 1998, Atmospheric heterogeneities in ERS tandem SAR interferometry: Delft,  
795 Netherlands, Delft University Press, 136 p.
- 796 Hanssen, R. F., 2001, *Radar Interferometry: Data Interpretation and Analysis, Remote  
797 Sensing and Digital Image Processing*: Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic  
798 Publishers.
- 799 Hearn, E. H., R. Burgmann, and Reilinger, R. E., 2002, Dynamics of Izmit earthquake  
800 postseismic deformation and loading of the Duzce earthquake hypocenter:  
801 *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, v. submitted.
- 802 Herring, T. A., 1991, GLOBK: Global Kalman filter VLBI and GPS analysis program: MIT.
- 803 Holdahl, S. R., and Sauber, J., 1994, Coseismic slip in the 1964 Prince William Sound  
804 earthquake: a new geodetic inversion: *Pageoph*, v. 142, p. 55-82.
- 805 Hubert-Ferrari, A., Barka, A., Jacques, E., Nalbant, S. S., Meyer, B., Armijo, R., Tapponnier,  
806 P., and King, G. C. P., 2000, Seismic hazard in the Marmara Sea region  
807 following the 17 August 1999 Izmit earthquake: *Nature*, v. 404, p. 269-273.
- 808 Hudnut, K. W., Shen, Z., Murray, M., McClusky, S., King, R., Herring, T., Hager, B., Feng,  
809 Y., Fang, P., Donnellan, A., and Bock, Y., 1995, Co-seismic displacements  
810 of the 1994 Northridge, California earthquake: *Bull. Seism. Soc. Amer.*, v.  
811 86, no. 1B, p. S49-S70.
- 812 Karabulut, H., Bouin, M. P., Bouchon, M., Dietrich, M., Cornu, C., and Aktar, M., 2001, The  
813 seismicity in the Eastern Marmara Sea after the August 17, 1999 Izmit  
814 earthquake: ?
- 815 King, R. W., and Bock, Y., 1997, *Documentation for the MIT GPS Analysis Software*:  
816 GAMIT: Mass. Inst. Tech.

- 817 Madsen, S. N., and Zebker, H. A., 1998, Imaging radar interferometry, *in* Henderson, F. M.,  
818 and Lewis, A. J., eds., Principles and Applications of Imaging Radar:  
819 Manual of Remote Sensing: New York, Wiley, p. 359-380.
- 820 Massonnet, D., Briole, P., and Arnaud, A., 1995, Deflation of Mount Etna monitored by  
821 spaceborne radar interferometry: *Nature*, v. 375, p. 567-570.
- 822 Massonnet, D., and Feigl, K. L., 1995, Discriminating geophysical phenomena in satellite  
823 radar interferograms: *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, v. 22, p. 1537-1540.
- 824 Massonnet, D., and Feigl, K. L., 1998, Radar interferometry and its application to changes in  
825 the Earth's surface: *Rev. Geophys.*, v. 36, no. 4, p. 441-500.
- 826 Massonnet, D., Feigl, K. L., Rossi, M., and Adragna, F., 1994, Radar interferometric mapping  
827 of deformation in the year after the Landers earthquake: *Nature*, v. 369, p.  
828 227-230.
- 829 Massonnet, D., and Rabaute, T., 1993, Radar interferometry: limits and potential: *IEEE*  
830 *Trans. Geoscience & Rem. Sensing*, v. 31, p. 455-464.
- 831 Massonnet, D., Rossi, M., Carmona, C., Adragna, F., Peltzer, G., Feigl, K., and Rabaute, T.,  
832 1993, The displacement field of the Landers earthquake mapped by radar  
833 interferometry: *Nature*, v. 364, p. 138-142.
- 834 McClusky, S., Balassanian, S., Barka, A., Demir, C., Ergintav, S., Georgiev, I., Gurkan, O.,  
835 Hamburger, M., Hurst, K., Kahle, H., Kastens, K., Kekelidze, G., King, R.,  
836 Kotzev, V., Lenk, O., Mahmoud, S., Mishin, A., Nadariya, M., Ouzounis,  
837 A., Paradissis, D., Peter, Y., Prilepin, M., Reilinger, R., Sanli, I., Seeger, H.,  
838 Tealeb, A., Toksoz, M. N. T. o. z., and Veis, G., 2000, Global Positioning  
839 System constraints on plate kinematics and dynamics in the eastern  
840 Mediterranean and Caucasus: *J. Geophys. Res.*, v. 105, no. B3, p. 5695-  
841 5720.
- 842 Menke, W., 1989, Geophysical data analysis: discrete inverse theory, International  
843 Geophysics Series: San Diego, Academic Press, 289 p.

- 844 Michel, R., Avouac, J. P., and Taboury, J., 1999, Measuring ground displacements from SAR  
845 amplitude images: application to the Landers earthquake: *Geophys. Res.*  
846 *Lett.*, v. 26, p. 875-878.
- 847 Murray, M. H., Savage, J. C., Lisowski, M., and Gross, W. K., 1993, Coseismic  
848 displacements: 1992 Landers, California Earthquake: *Geophys. Res. Lett.*,  
849 v. 20, p. 623-626.
- 850 Okada, Y., 1985, Surface deformation to shear and tensile faults in a half-space: *Bull. Seism.*  
851 *Soc. Am.*, v. 75, no. 4, p. 1135-1154.
- 852 Parsons, T., Toda, S., Stein, R. S., Barka, A., and Dieterich, J. H., 2000, Heightened odds of  
853 large earthquakes near Istanbul: an interaction-based probability calculation:  
854 *Scienc*, v. 288, no. 5466, p. 661-665.
- 855 Price, E. J., and Sandwell, D. T., 1998, Small-scale deformations associated with the 1992  
856 Landers, California, earthquake mapped by synthetic aperture radar  
857 interferometry phase gradients: *J. Geophys. Res.*, v. 103, no. B11, p. 27,001-  
858 27,016.
- 859 Reilinger, R. E., Ergintav, S., Bürgmann, R., McClusky, S., Lenk, O., Barka, A., Gurkan, O.,  
860 Hearn, L., Feigl, K. L., Cakmak, R., Aktug, B., Ozener, H., and Toksoz, M.  
861 N., 2000, Coseismic and postseismic fault slip for the 17 August 1999,  
862 M=7.4, Izmit, Turkey earthquake: *Science*, v. 289, p. 1519-1524.
- 863 Rigo, A., and Massonnet, D., 1999, Investigating the 1996 Pyrenean earthquake (France) with  
864 SAR Interferograms heavily distorted by atmosphere: *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, v.  
865 26, p. 3217-3220.
- 866 Rosen, P. A., Hensley, S., Zebker, H. A., Webb, F. H., and Fielding, E. J., 1996, Surface  
867 deformation and coherence measurements of Kilauea volcano, Hawaii from  
868 SIR-C radar interferometry: *J. Geophys. Res.*, v. 101, p. 23,109-23,125.
- 869 Sarti, F., Nezry, E., and Adragna, F., 2000, Complementarity of correlation and interferometry  
870 for the analysis of the effects of the Izmit earthquake with radar data, *in* 6th

- International Conference on Information Systems Analysis and Synthesis,  
Orlando, USA.
- Savage, J. C., 1987, Effect of crustal layering upon dislocation modeling: *J. Geophys. Res.*, v. 92, p. 10595-10600.
- Segall, P., and Harris, R., 1987, Earthquake deformation cycle on the San Andreas fault near Parkfield, California: *J. Geophys. Res.*, v. 92, p. 10,511-10,525.
- Snyder, J. P., 1982, Map projections used by the U.S. Geological Survey, Geological Survey Bulletin: Washington, U.S. Gov't Print. Off., 313 p.
- Stein, R. S., King, G. C. P., and Lin, J., 1992, Change in failure stress on the southern San Andreas fault system caused by the 1992 magnitude = 7.4 Landers earthquake: *Science*, v. 258, p. 1328-1332.
- Stein, R. S., King, G. C. P., and Lin, J., 1994, Stress triggering of the 1994 M = 6.7 Northridge, California earthquake by its predecessors: *Science*, v. 265, p. 1432-1435.
- Straub, C., Kahle, H.-G., and Schindler, C., 1997, GPS and geologic estimates of the tectonic activity in the Marmara Sea region, NW Anatolia: *J. Geophys. Res.*, v. 102, no. BB12, p. 27,587-27,602.
- Tarayre, H., and Massonnet, D., 1996, Atmospheric propagation heterogeneities revealed by ERS-1 interferometry: *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, v. 23, p. 989-992.
- Vadon, H., and Massonnet, D., 2000, Earthquake displacement fields mapped by very precise correlation. Complementarity with radar interferometry., *in* IEEE International Geoscience Remote Sensing Symposium, Honolulu, Hawaii, p. 2700-2702.
- Van Puymbroeck, N., Michel, R., Binet, R., Avouac, J. P., and Taboury, J., 2000, Measuring earthquakes from optical satellite images: *Applied Optics*, v. 39, no. 3486-3494.

- 897 Wald, D. J., and Heaton, T. H., 1994, Spatial and temporal distribution of slip for the 1992  
898 Landers, California earthquake: Bull. Seism. Soc. Am., v. 84, p. 668-691.
- 899 Wessel, P., and Smith, W. H. F., 1998, New, improved version of generic mapping tools  
900 released: Eos Trans. AGU, v. 79, no. 47, p. 579.
- 901 Williams, S., Bock, Y., and Fang, P., 1998, Integrated satellite interferometry: Tropospheric  
902 noise, GPS estimates, and implications for interferometric synthetic  
903 aperture radar products: J. Geophys. Res., v. 103, no. B11, p. 27,051-  
904 27,068.
- 905 Wright, T. J., Fielding, E. J., Parsons, B. E., and England, P. C., 2001, Triggered slip:  
906 observations of the 17 August 1999 Izmit (Turkey) earthquake using radar  
907 interferometry: Geophys. Res. Lett., v. 28, p. 1079-1082.
- 908 Yagi, Y., and Kikuchi, M., 2000, Source rupture process of the Kocaeli, Turkey earthquake of  
909 August 17, 1999 obtained by joint inversion of near-field data and  
910 teleseismic data: Geophys. Res. Lett., v. 27, p. 1969-1972.
- 911 Yalcin, N., Ergintav, S., Aktar, M., Gurbuz, C., Gurkan, O., Eyidogan, H., Barka, A., E., A.,  
912 Lenk, O., Reilinger, R., and Toksoz, N., 1999, Seismic Hazard Assessment  
913 in the Marmara Sea Region, *in* International Union of Geodesy and  
914 Geophysics, Birmingham, United Kingdom.
- 915 Zebker, H. A., Rosen, P. A., and Hensley, S., 1997, Atmospheric effects in interferometric  
916 synthetic aperture radar surface deformation and topographic maps: J.  
917 Geophys. Res., v. 102, p. 7547-7563.

**FIGURE CAPTIONS**

Figure 1. #LM# Location map showing conventional epicenter (star) at N40.76°, E29.97° as determined by the Kandilli Observatory from first motions (cited in Delouis et al. (2002)), showing SAR backscatter (“amplitude”) images acquired by RADARSAT (left swath) and ERS-1 (right swath). Coordinates are easting and northing in kilometers using the Universal Transverse Mercator projection, zone 36 (Snyder, 1982).

Figure 2. #PEG# Differences in range change between those measured in the ERS-1 interferogram and those calculated from the GPS displacement vectors (Reilinger et al., 2000) shown in profiles as a function of easting (a), northing (b), and elevation (c). We consider the DERB estimate to be an outliers and exclude it from the statistics. We suspect the vertical components of the GPS measurements at KTOP, KANR, YUHE, KDER, SEYH, SMAS, SISL, SILE, and KUTE. We multiply their uncertainties by a factor of 10 in the G data set. The slopes of the best-fitting lines are 0.14, -0.18 and 6.0 mm/km for the easting, northing and upwards profiles, respectively. Panel (d) shows a histogram of the same ERS-GPS differences normalized by  $(\sigma_G^2 + \sigma_E^2)^{1/2}$ , assuming a standard deviation of  $\sigma_E = 22$  mm for the ERS range change measurements.

Figure 3. #E1E2# Interferogram showing the phase difference between an ERS1 image acquired August 12, 1999 (orbit number 42229) and an ERS-2 image acquired August 13, 1999 (orbit number 22556). The altitude of ambiguity  $h_a$  is 40 m, but the DEM used for this calculation has an estimated RMS accuracy of  $\sim 7$  m. Orbital fringes have been modeled empirically with a linear gradient. As a result, the remaining fringes must be tropospheric in origin.

Figure 4. #RI# Interferogram showing the phase difference between RADARSAT images acquired August 16 (orbit number 19731) and on October 3 (20417). The altitude of

ambiguity  $h_a$  for this pair is 46 m. White circles show locations of the 159 digitized values retained in the R data set. Stars denote hypocenter (H) and centroid (C) locations. The arrow denotes the horizontal projection of the radar “look” vector from satellite to ground.

Figure 5. #SC# [Color] Component at  $S77^\circ E$  of the co-seismic displacement field measured by correlation of SPOT images acquired on July 9 and September 16, 1999 (Vadon and Massonnet, 2000). The black crosses on white disks represent the mapped trace of the surface rupture. The original 20-m pixels have been filtered using a 2-dimensional median filter on a 100-by-100-m window.

Figure 6. #SW# Component at  $S77^\circ E$  of the co-seismic displacement field measured by correlation of SPOT images. Positive values, representing displacement in the direction  $S77^\circ E$  are shaded. These values were extracted from the previous figure after application of a 2-dimensional median filter on a 2-by-2-km window. The curves follow the points retained in the S data set for the inversion. The scale curve at right is calculated assuming 8 m of slip from the surface to 15 km depth. Other symbols as in previous figure.

Figure 7. #EC# [Color] Component at  $S77^\circ E$  of the co-seismic displacement field measured by correlation of two ERS images, as described by Sarti et al. (2000). Note that discontinuity in these measurements does not follow the mapped trace of the fault as well as the SPOT correlation map.

Figure 8. #G6# (a) Map of 6-segment geometric parameterization as traced by Reilinger et al. (2000). Shown as arrows, this parameterization includes 56 lengths of 3 km along strike and 7 widths of 3 km in depth. (b) #GK# Smooth geometric parameterization, including 54 lengths of 3 km along strike and 7 widths of 3 km in depth for a total of 378 patches along main strand of the North Anatolian Fault. In addition, we use one segment in the Mudurnu Valley, and one segment to represent the Iznik fault, as proposed by Wright et al. (2000). Other

features include mapped surface rupture (crosses) (Barka, 1999; Barka et al., 1999; Çemen et al., 2000), epicenter (star), coastline and towns.

Figure 9. #DB# Slip distribution estimated from the GPS data alone by Reilinger et al. (2000). using the same 6-segment geometry to parameterize the fault. The X-axis is labeled with the horizontal coordinate in km along the fault trace relative to the conventional epicenter. The Y-axis is labeled with the vertical coordinate in km relative to the surface. From left (west) to right (east), these segments are named Yalova, Golcuk, West Sapanca, East Sapanca, West Karadere, and East Karadere.

Figure 10. #DREGS# (a) Distribution of horizontal, right-lateral strike slip estimated from the GPS displacement vectors in the *G* data set alone using the smooth parameterization of the fault geometry. Horizontal axis gives distance along the fault trace in km from the epicenter estimated by Kandilli Observatory at N40.76°, E29.97° (Delouis et al., 2002). On this scale, the point of the Hersek Delta projects onto Kilometer -43. Vertical axis is depth in kilometers. Contour interval is 1 meter. (b) Slip distribution estimated from *E* data set extracted from the ERS-1 interferogram. The two offset and three gradient parameters are held fixed to the values estimated from the *GE* solution. (c) Slip distribution estimated from the *R* data set extracted from the RADARSAT interferogram. The offset and three gradient parameters are held fixed to the values estimated from the *GR* solution. (d) Slip distribution estimated from the offset measurements in the *S* data set extracted from the SPOT correlation map. The offset value is held fixed to the values estimated from the *GS* solution. (e) Slip distribution estimated from the *ERGS* data set including the GPS, ERS, RADARSAT, and SPOT observations.

Figure 11. #HERGS# Histogram of residuals for the combined ERS, RADARSAT, GPS, and SPOT data subsets in the *ERGS* solution. The lower right panel shows the normalized



residuals for the complete *ERGS* data set. For this panel, the curve and statistics exclude the outliers beyond 2 standard deviations from the mean.

Figure 12. #RERGS# [Color] Map of normalized residuals for the EGS inversion. Colored circles denote ERS and SPOT normalized residuals, while squares denote the vertical component of the GPS normalized residuals, using the same color scale. Extreme outliers, beyond 4 standard deviations from the mean are shown in gray. The residuals for the horizontal components of the GPS displacements are shown as black arrows with their 95% confidence error ellipses. Mapped surface rupture (green crosses) and modeled fault segments (red arrows).

Figure 13. #PERGS# Profiles along easting, northing, and vertical axes of normalized residuals for the EGS inversion, showing ERS-1 range changes (downward-pointing triangles), showing RADARSAT range changes (upward-pointing triangles), GPS displacements (white, gray, and black circles for east, north, and up components, respectively), and SPOT offsets (squares).

Figure 14. #RE# [Color] Residual (observed minus calculated) wrapped interferogram, shown as 28-mm fringes. The interferogram is calculated from ERS-1 SAR images taken before (August 12, 1999) and after (September 16, 1999) the Izmit earthquake. Each fringe denotes 28 mm of change in range. Here, the altitude of ambiguity  $h_a$  is 336 m. Note that the negative correlation between tropospheric delay and topographic elevation has not been included in this forward calculation. We cleaned the fringes with a power-spectrum filtering algorithm (Goldstein and Werner, 1998).

Figure 15. #COU# [Color] Map of difference in Coulomb failure stress increase between two assumptions for the slip distribution: that estimated from GPS alone (Reilinger et al., 2000) minus that estimated in our *ERGS* joint inversion.

Table 1 Models

919 **END**