The 21 August 2017 Ischia (Italy) Earthquake Source Model Inferred From Seismological, GPS, and DInSAR Measurements
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Abstract The causative source of the first damaging earthquake instrumentally recorded in the Island of Ischia, occurred on 21 August 2017, has been studied through a multiparametric geophysical approach. In order to investigate the source geometry and kinematics we exploit seismological, Global Positioning System, and Sentinel-1 and COSMO-SkyMed differential interferometric synthetic aperture radar coseismic measurements. Our results indicate that the retrieved solutions from the geodetic data modeling and the seismological data are plausible; in particular, the best fit solution consists of an E-W striking, south dipping normal fault, with its center located at a depth of 800 m. Moreover, the retrieved causative fault is consistent with the rheological stratification of the crust in this zone. This study allows us to improve the knowledge of the volcano-tectonic processes occurring on the Island, which is crucial for a better assessment of the seismic risk in the area.

1. Introduction

The Ischia earthquake (IE) (Mw 3.9–M_d 4.0; I_max EMS 8), occurred on 21 August 2017 (18:57 UTC), struck the northern sector of the active volcanic Ischia Island (Southern Italy) causing two casualties, 42 injuries, and extensive damage to the Casamicciola Terme town and its surroundings, along the northern structural rim of Mount Epomeo (Figure 1a); it was followed by a seismic sequence of almost 20 earthquakes with significantly lower magnitude (Figure S1). Moreover, geological coseismic effects, among which fractures and small rock falls, have been induced over an area of ~2.5 km² (Azzaro et al., 2017; EMERGEO Working Group, Nappi et al., 2017).

Seismicity in volcanic areas shows that earthquakes generally have a low magnitude and they do not produce serious damage (McNutt, 2005; Zobin, 2003); however, in a limited number of cases, earthquakes occurring in volcanic areas have been associated to catastrophic effects, thus deserving great attention (Silveira et al., 2017). This is the case of the Ischia Island where low seismic energy events can be associated to high seismic risk. The historical seismic activity of the Ischia Island is recognized since the thirteenth century and caused serious damage, thousands of casualties, and often landslides and surface breaks (Carlino et al., 2010). Macroseismic observations have shown that historical earthquakes are mainly located at Casamicciola Terme, in the northern sector of the Island. These events occurred with short recurrence times, displaying low magnitude (inferred from macroseismic data), and high epicentral intensity, up to 11° MCS, as in the case of the 1883 earthquake (Cubellis & Luongo, 1998). In this case the magnitude (which ranges from 4.2 to 5.2) was inferred from the empirical relationships, for volcanic areas, that correlate this parameter to the maximum intensity, the extension of the source, and the involved area (Cubellis & Luongo, 1998; Okada, 1983; Shebalin, 1972). Macroseismic data also show that earthquakes are characterized by very shallow hypocenter depths (1–2 km), as demonstrated by high-intensity values recorded in the epicentral area and strong attenuation (Carlino et al., 2010). Following the 1883 earthquake, an aseismic period was observed in the Island, but low-magnitude earthquakes have been recorded in the last 40 years in the northern part of the Island (Figure S2).

The most significant seismic activity at Ischia appears to be mainly related to the Mount Epomeo, an upraised structure that dominates the central part of the Island and is interpreted as a resurgent block (volcanic horst)
Figure 1. Study area and geodetic measurements. (a) Simplified structural map superimposed on an optical image of the Ischia Island. The structural framework is redrawn from Acocella and Funiciello (1999), where arrows display dipping; hatches on the downthrown side. The biggest red star indicates the location of the 21 August 2017 main shock, while the smaller ones indicate the seismic sequence from 21–30 August 2017; the locations of the seismic and cGPS stations are reported as yellow points and blue triangles, respectively. (b–e) DInSAR (line of sight [LOS]) displacement maps computed by using S1 images acquired from: (b) ascending orbits on 16–22 August 2017, (c) descending orbits on 16–22 August 2017, (d) ascending orbits on 17–23 August 2017, and (e) CSK images acquired from descending orbits on 19–23 August 2017. The white square in panels (b–e) represents the DInSAR reference pixel. (f) Focal mechanism and the P1 and P2 fault plane solution parameters.
that, from at least 33 ka to about 5 ka, rose of about 800 m (Vezzoli, 1988), possibly due to the magma pushing (Carlino, 2012). The edges of Mount Epomeo are marked by a system of subvertical faults, with NW-SE, NE-SW, N-S, and E-W strike (Sbrana et al., 2009; Tibaldi & Vezzoli, 1998). The northern part of the block, dislocated by roughly E-W and SW-NE faults, is the source area of the historical seismicity.

Since Roman time an inversion of the resurgence seems to be occurred at least in the northern sector of the Island (Buchner, 1986), as also recently recorded by Global Positioning System (GPS) data, leveling surveys, and differential interferometric synthetic aperture radar (DInSAR) measurements, showing a general trend of slow subsidence with the maximum values of about 1 cm/year (De Martino et al., 2011; Manzo et al., 2006).

In this study, we take advantage of the available seismological, GPS, and DInSAR measurements to investigate the causative seismogenic fault of the IE main shock and to define its geometry and kinematics. In particular, we jointly exploit three Sentinel-1 (S1) and one COSMO-SkyMed (CSK) displacement maps, obtained from ascending and descending orbits, and the available GPS measurements to model the finite fault in an elastic and homogeneous half-space. Subsequently, we benefit of the seismological data to support our findings relevant to the modeled source.

Our results allow us to improve the knowledge of the volcano-tectonic processes occurring on the Island, which is crucial for a better assessment of the seismic risk.

2. Exploited Data

In order to investigate the source responsible for the main shock of the 2017 seismic sequence that affected the Casamicciola Terme area, we analyze the seismological data, DInSAR, and GPS measurements discussed in the following.

2.1. DInSAR and GPS Measurements

The ground displacements caused by the earthquake have been detected through DInSAR and GPS measurements. Regarding the DInSAR data, we generate several ascending and descending coseismic interferograms by exploiting both S1 and CSK SAR data. Among them, we select four interferometric pairs (three from S1 data and one from CSK ones) showing better interferometric coherence characteristics. Accordingly, the maximum temporal baseline is of 6 days for the selected S1 interferograms (Figures 1b–1d) and 4 days for the CSK one (Figure 1e); more detailed characteristics are reported in Figure S3. Before generating the S1 interferograms, we coregister the SLC images by using the enhanced spectral diversity approach (Yague-Martinez et al., 2016). Moreover, following the interferograms generation, we first unwrap the interferograms relevant to the selected interferometric SAR data pairs by applying a minimum-cost flow approach (Pepe & Lanari, 2006); subsequently, we compensate for possible atmospheric phase artifacts correlated with the topography of the area to finally retrieve the line of sight displacement maps presented in Figures 1b–1e. Note also that all the measurements are referred to a reference pixel located at Ischia Porto.

In spite of some spatially random signals due to residual atmospheric phase delays (Hanssen, 2001), all the generated displacement maps present a consistent range increase pattern localized in an area south of Casamicciola Terme, independently from the orbit pass, look angle, and interferometric pair (see Figures 1b–1e and S3). This implies that the detected displacements are mainly vertical (i.e., subsidence; see also Figure S4) (Manzo et al., 2006). The maximum range change is of about 4 cm in line of sight. The shape of the displacement pattern shows an E-W alignment, which is in good agreement with the aftershock epicenter distribution (Figure 1a). The extension of the deforming area is of about 1 km².

For what concerns the GPS measurements, six continuous GPS (cGPS) stations managed by the Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia (INGV) Osservatorio Vesuviano are operating at Ischia Island (Figure 1a). Their data processing has been performed by using the Bernese GPS software 5.0 (Dach et al., 2007); a full description of the processing strategies is reported in De Martino et al. (2014). Following the main shock seismic event, some cGPS stations experienced a coseismic deformation. These displacements have been obtained by estimating offsets in the position time-series by considering the time interval extending from 15 days before and 5 days after the main shock, respectively. In particular, the cGPS station on Mount Epomeo (MEPO) shows a maximum horizontal displacement of about 1.5 cm in NNW.
direction, whereas the one located in Casamicciola Terme (OSCM) moved of about 1.0 cm toward NNE. Only the cGPS MEPO station seems to be affected by a vertical coseismic displacement with a subsidence of about 1.0 cm (Figures 2i).

2.2. Seismological Data

The IE $M_s$ 3.9 ($M_L$ 4.0) was recorded by the INGV seismic stations up to 40 km away from the event area and nucleated at a depth of about 1.2 (±0.2) km on the northern rim of the Mount Epomeo block. The aftershocks were instead detected only by the seismic stations located on the Island (Figure S1). In particular, most of
them were only recorded in the Casamicciola Terme Observatory site, where the IOCA and OC9 sensors are located (see Figure 1a). All the earthquakes with, at least, four phase pickings (the main event and five aftershocks) were located by using the NonLinLoc code (Lomax et al., 2000) and an unified 3D velocity model for the Neapolitan volcanic areas, extending from the Ischia Island to the Apennine Mountains (D’Auria et al., 2008). This model has been obtained through a weighted average of the local tomographic velocity models selected from the existing literature (Improta et al., 2000; Judenherc & Zollo, 2004; Scarpa et al., 2002; Vanorio et al., 2005; Zollo et al., 2003). By using this model we account for the velocity differences between the Campi Flegrei caldera and the Ischia Island structures, being this area characterized by high contrast in the elastic properties, particularly at the Campi Flegrei caldera boundaries (Tramelli et al., 2006). The most accurate earthquake locations are reported in Figures 1a and S2 with the epicenters distribution showing an E-W preferential direction. We compute the focal mechanism for the main event (Figure 1f) by using only the $P$ wave polarities at 11 stations (Figure S2) of the seismic network of Ischia, Campi Flegrei, and the regional network, characterized by a clearly detectable signal, and by applying the FFfIT code (Reasenberg & Oppenheimer, 1985). In Figure 1f we also present the achieved focal mechanism and the retrieved fault plane parameters. We further remark that although the estimated rake indicates a transcurrent component in the focal mechanism, the available $P$ wave polarities do not allow to well constrain this parameter.

3. Modeling

3.1. Geodetic Modeling

In order to investigate the seismogenic source parameters we jointly invert the selected DInSAR coseismic displacement maps and the GPS measurements. Note that the DInSAR measurements have been resampled on a regular grid with a mesh of $100 \times 100$ m$^2$. Moreover, we also apply a low-pass filter to each DInSAR displacement map in order to mitigate the decorrelation effects (Franceschetti & Lanari, 1999); note also that the SAR pixels characterized by very high decorrelation effects (i.e., with very low interferometric coherence) have been excluded from our analysis.

Our modeling strategy follows a well-established two-step approach: a nonlinear inversion to estimate the fault plane parameters, followed by a linear inversion to retrieve the slip distribution on the fault plane (Atzori et al., 2009; Solaro et al., 2016). Accordingly, the displacement maps are first modeled through a fault plane and its parameters are retrieved by using a nonlinear inversion based on the Levenberg-Marquardt least squares approach (Marquardt, 1963). The choice of using a single planar source in the optimization procedure is conditioned by the presence of one distinctive lobe in the detected ground deformation pattern (Figures 1b–1e). Specifically, we investigate a finite dislocation planar source in an elastic and homogeneous half-space (Okada, 1985), for which all source parameters are set free during the inversion. We find that the best fit solution consists of an E-W striking south dipping normal fault with its center located at a depth of 800 m; the retrieved best fit parameters are reported in Figure 2. The residual patterns (i.e., the difference between measured and modeled displacements) and the RMSE values for each interferogram are also reported in Figures 2b, 2d, 2f, and 2h; note that the higher residuals are associated to residual atmospheric artifacts. In addition, we perform a statistical analysis on the retrieved fault parameters (Figure S5). The model solution is also compared with the horizontal (Figure 2i) and the vertical (Figure 2j) GPS components highlighting a good agreement also for these measurements.

In order to have a more accurate estimate of the slip along the fault plane, a distributed slip pattern is computed by partitioning the plane into $15 \times 9$ patches each of these extending for about $200 \times 200$ m$^2$. Also, in this case, we jointly invert the selected ascending and descending interferograms and GPS measurements. To this aim, a linear inversion procedure has been performed by starting from the parameters of the previous nonlinear inversion and searching for the differential slip on each patch (Atzori et al., 2008). Note also that the fault length and width are extended to consider the border effects as negligible. We find that the causative fault is characterized by a main region with a maximum slip of about 14 cm at a depth in the 0.7–1.0 km range, along the seismogenic plane (Figure 2k). Finally, we compute a geodetic moment ($M^*$) of about $1.8 \times 10^{15}$ Nm, corresponding to a moment magnitude of about $M_w$ 4.1.

3.2. Seismic Waveform Analysis and Modeling

We analyze the seismic waveforms recorded by the accelerometer (Episensor ES-T) installed at the Casamicciola Terme Observatory (IOCA), at about 1 km distance from the epicenter (Figure 1a).
In particular, in order to investigate the coseismic permanent vertical motion, we compute the vertical displacement waveform by exploiting the recorded acceleration. Note that retrieving static vertical displacement from seismic waveforms is a rather delicate operation requiring careful analysis, but it can provide robust results (Pino & Di Luccio, 2005, 2009). The main problems usually relate either to the long-period drift introduced by the needed double integration (for accelerograms) (Boore, 2001) or to the removal of the instrument response (Zhu, 2003). Several methods have been proposed to correct for the above mentioned drift; here we follow the scheme proposed by Zhu (2003), removing the drift from the displacement waveforms by using polynomial functions. The Figure 3a shows the final vertical displacement obtained for second-, third-, and fourth-order polynomials. All the resulting waveforms show a vertical uplift of about 0.7 cm. Note that although this value resulting from the waveform analysis is below the resolution of the GPS vertical component, it is in a good agreement with the vertical component of the modeled displacement retrieved from the geodetic data inversion (Figures S4c and S4d).

**Figure 3.** Seismic waveforms analysis and their modeling. (a) Coseismic vertical displacements retrieved from the acceleration measurements recorded at the IOCA station (see Figure 1a). Each line represents the result obtained by removing a polynomial function of the indicated order. (b) Comparison between the observed displacements (obtained from double integration of the recorder acceleration) at IOCA and the synthetic ones computed for the focal mechanism derived from the first motion (fm) polarities and the geodetic modeling (gm), respectively. A homogeneous half plane (m1) and a four-layered structural model (m4) have been used. The waveforms are rotated to the vertical (Z), radial (R), and transversal (T) components and band-pass filtered between 0.1 Hz and 2.0 Hz.
In order to further constrain the retrieved fault parameters, we perform an additional analysis on the seismic waveforms. More specifically, we compare the observed waveforms at IOCA with the synthetic seismograms computed for the two source models relevant to the retrieved focal mechanism for plane P1 (Figure 1f) and to the geodetic model (Figure 2); these seismograms are obtained by means of a reflectivity based method (Giardini et al., 1995) with a point-source and double-couple mechanism, and considering two distinct structural models: a homogeneous half space ($V_P = 2.5$ km/s; $V_S = 1.4$ km/s) and a four-layered, laterally homogeneous structure (Figure 3b and Table S1). Note that for the geodetic model, the source is located at the fault center, whereas for the polarity-derived mechanism the source is located at the hypocenter, being the latter deeper than the fault center. For both models, we used the seismic moment $M_0 = 1.0 \times 10^{15}$ Nm.

The comparative analysis between the measured and the modeled waveforms, shown in Figure 3b, indicates that for the synthetic seismograms (referred to as synthetics) both sources provide a reasonable fit with the recorded waveforms (Table S2). We observe that the first pulse duration, controlled by the S-P arrival time, is in better agreement with the longer source-to-station paths, that is, with the deeper hypocentral location of the first motion polarity source and with the longer paths of the four-layered model. This latter produces minor oscillations in the synthetics that slightly increase the misfit. We also remark that the observed relative maximum amplitude of the three components is more compatible with a higher rake angle (i.e., with the geodetic model), as evident if the misfit for each model is computed with the synthetics rescaled by equating the maximum amplitude of the vertical component to the observed one (Table S3).

Overall, the waveform analysis points out that independently of the adopted structural model, the seismogenic fault responsible for the IE is characterized by (i) a E-W striking fault; (ii) a south dipping, high-angle plane; and (iii) a rake value showing a low-to-null strike-slip component.

4. Discussions and Conclusion

The 21 August 2017 IE represents the largest seismic event affecting the Island ever observed with modern techniques. The level of damage and its distribution (EMERGEO Working Group, Nappi et al., 2017; Gruppo di Lavoro INGV sul terremoto dell’isola di Ischia, 2017), with respect to the magnitude, agree with the historical observations of low magnitude-high intensity occurrence and strong attenuation (Carlino et al., 2010). The most relevant damage, observed just in a narrow area of Casamicciola Terme, is related to the shallowness of the source.

A multidisciplinary approach allowed us to investigate the causative source of the IE event. In particular, we have exploited seismological data, multisensor/multiorbit DInSAR measurements, and cGPS ones (Figure 1) to investigate the seismogenic source through analytical modeling techniques.

The joint inversion of the DInSAR and cGPS coseismic measurements allows us to estimate the fault plane parameters and to retrieve the associated slip distribution. We find a main patch of slip (with values up to 14 cm) located at the center of the fault plane at a depth of 800 m (Figure 2). This result provides a picture of the seismogenic mechanism of the earthquake, dominated by a normal fault mechanism where the hanging block (located in the northern part of Mount Epomeo) moves downward. In particular, the retrieved seismogenic fault responsible for the IE is characterized by (i) a E-W striking fault (86°); (ii) a south dipping, high-angle plane (70°); and (iii) a rake value close to −90°. These findings are in rather good agreement with the recorded aftershock alignment along the E-W direction and with the computed focal mechanism relevant to the plane P1 (Figure 1f), thus allowing to resolve for the nonuniqueness of the fault plane solutions. The only main difference between the focal plane P1 and the geodetic modeling solution is relevant to the rake values that, for the former case, results to be −40°±15°. However, although this rake estimate indicates a transcurrent component in the focal mechanism, its value is not well constrained by the P wave polarities available for this earthquake. Moreover, the seismic waveforms at IOCA station show a vertical uplift of about 0.7 cm, which is in good agreement with the modeled displacements.

Two seismic waveform forward modeling have been also carried out by considering the focal mechanism and the geodetic modeling results, respectively. Both models confirm that a high-angle normal fault, with low-to-null transcurrent component, is required in order to satisfactorily reproduce the observed transient ground motion (Figure 3). In this case the main difference with respect to the geodetic modeling results is related to the retrieved seismic moment, which is $1.0 \times 10^{15}$ Nm. The discrepancy between the geodetic...
Figure 4. Source modeling results in the rheological scenario. (a) 3D prospective view of the rheological stratification of the crust beneath Ischia Island. The grey wireframe isosurface represents the brittle/ductile transition from Castaldo et al. (2017). The retrieved fault plane (see Figure 2k) and the distributed slip are also reported. The locations of the selected AA' and BB' cross sections, investigated in the following, are displayed in the upper left corner. The red stars and the green dots indicate the location of the seismicity recorded during August 2017 and during the time interval 1999–2013, respectively. (b) Selected cross sections shown in (a) with the contour map of the computed rheological stratification of the crust; the retrieved fault plane is reported with the continuous green line in AA' and the dotted one (projected) in BB'.
(Mw = 1.8 × 10^{-13} \text{Nm}) and the seismic moment estimations can be attributed to a number of factors such as a possible small component of deformation aseismically accommodated. Note also that according to the classification proposed by Wassermann (2002), the frequency analysis of recorded seismic waveforms allows us to classify the IE as shallow volcanic-tectonic event (above about 1–2 km).

We further remark that the 2017 seismic sequence occurs in the same area where the previous seismicity of Ischia Island was located (Rovida et al., 2016) (Figures 4 and 52). The E-W distribution of the seismic sequence spreads along the main system of faults arranged in parallel segments (Acocella & Funiciello, 1999) over an area, whose dimension is compatible with the fault length inferred from our inversion results. The subvertical normal fault of the earthquake with a southward dipping is in good agreement with the structural framework of Mount Epomeo proposed in the available literature (Acocella et al., 2001; Acocella & Funiciello, 1999; Molin et al., 2003) and with no field evidences of reverse fault systems (Marotta & De Vita, 2014). Moreover, the bathymetric surveys performed in the surrounding region of the volcanic Island do not reveal the existence of morphological elements that could be associated with compressional fault structures (Aiello et al., 2009).

Our study confirms that the seismicity of the northern side of the Island is associated to a local seismicogenic structure that is stressed, and periodically reactivated, by the loading of the Mount Epomeo along its maximum elevation sector (Carlino et al., 2014). In this context, the retrieved normal fault mechanism is very likely induced by the observed long-term subsidence phase (Manzo et al., 2006), since the lithostatic load represents the principal vertical stress. The comparison between the rheological model proposed by Castaldo et al. (2017) and the seismicity recorded at Ischia Island clearly shows that the earthquake hypocenters are at shallower depth than brittle/ductile transition (at about 2 km depth beneath Mount Epomeo) (Figure 4a). This finding is particularly evident if we superimpose the retrieved fault model on the rheological stratification of the area (Figure 4b). Accordingly, our results suggest that (i) the seismicity of Ischia is not associated to magma injection and (ii) the rheology properties of the crust beneath the Ischia Island have an influence on the ongoing volcanic-tectonic processes.
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