

On the Anatomy of Acoustic Emission

Robert A. Guyer^{1,2}, Samson Marty³, Chris Marone⁴, Paul A. Johnson²,
Christopher W. Johnson²

¹Physics, University of Nevada-Reno, NV, USA

²Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM, USA

³California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA

⁴Sapienza University, Rome, Italy

Key Points:

- A properly formulated measure of the acoustic emission is introduced to define *white* (disposable) and *articulate* (informational) components.
- The acoustic emission *articulate* component describes the slider displacement in laboratory earthquake shear experiments.
- The acoustic emission *articulate* component explains mapping to fault mechanical properties.

Corresponding author: C. W. Johnson, cwj@lanl.gov

Abstract

Abrupt frictional fault failure is normally accompanied by acoustic emission (AE)—impulsive elastic wave broadcast—with amplitude proportional to particle velocity. The cumulative sum of the fault particle velocities is a slip displacement. In laboratory shear experiments described here, measurements of a sequence of laboratory earthquakes includes local measurement of fault displacement and AE. Using these measurements we illuminate the connections between “cumulative sum of AE” and “slip displacement”. Additionally, the composition of the AE broadcasts reveals inhomogeneity in the fault mechanical structure from which they arise. This inhomogeneity, leading to a time invariant *white* AE component and an *articulated* AE, indicates that the *articulated* cumulative sum of the AE reveals a fault “state of the mechanical structure” diagnostic, that follows a distinctive pattern to frictional failure. This pattern explains why the continuous AE map to fault displacement as well as fault friction, shear stress, etc., as shown in many recent studies.

Plain English

In two hundred and fifty BCE Archimedes measured the volume of an oddly shaped object by slowly lowering it into a filled glass of water and determining the spillage. The motion in an inaccessible, seismically active zone is coded in the “spillage” of elastic waves from the active zones interior. Today 2024 CE Archimedes can listen to the spillage of elastic waves and deduce the active zones motion. This 2024 CE principle is stated and confirmed in this paper.

1 Introduction

In the last decade it has been discovered that continuous dynamic elastic wave broadcasts from laboratory faults, referred to here as acoustic emission (AE), are rich with information beyond classical precursors to frictional failure (P. A. Johnson et al., 2021, and references therein). By applying machine learning models to the continuous waveforms, these AEs can show where the fault is in the slip cycle. With this demonstration, a fundamental open question is why. The AE from a seismic zone carry an evolving record throughout the earthquake cycle describing the fault zone mechanics that presage the next “big” event. This observation helps drive the extant enthusiasm for the value of new powerful machine-learning-based data acquisition and analysis schemes being used in studying seismology problems (Bergen et al., 2019; Mousavi & Beroza, 2022, 2023).

Today there are an abundance of high-fidelity AE data and state-of-the-art data processing techniques driving these new analyses (Beroza et al., 2021; Kong et al., 2018). One example of current practice, and the focus here, is the successful use of machine learning methods to glean seismic zone evolution from the temporally evolving feature space of the continuous AE (C. W. Johnson et al., 2020; Lubbers et al., 2018; C. W. Johnson & Johnson, 2023; Rouet-Leduc et al., 2019b, 2017; Hulbert et al., 2019, 2020; Corbi et al., 2019; Shreedharan et al., 2021; Rouet-Leduc et al., 2019a; Wang et al., 2021, 2022; Borate et al., 2023; Seydoux et al., 2020; Holtzman et al., 2018; Jasperson et al., 2021; Shokouhi et al., 2021; Laurenti et al., 2022). In this study, we step back from the current machine learning practice to understand why the AE is a powerful predictor of contemporaneous displacement, friction, etc. We do so by analyzing data from a carefully instrumented laboratory bi-axial “earthquake machine” experiment. The experiment analyzed (p5702) is typical of those conducted on a double direct shear device (e.g., Bolton et al., 2021) and allows us to follow the AE while the mechanical state of the “earthquake machine” unfolds. Thus, we can decompose the AE into separable components that have understandable behavior and understandable participation in the evolution of the mechanical state.

2 Laboratory Data

2.1 p5702 Earthquake Experiment

The experiment comprises a granite slider block that is pushed between two granite substrate blocks by a normal stress (N) of 6, 9, 12, 15 *MPa* respectively, during the experiment. See Supporting Information Figure S1a for a schematic of the system and complete details. The granite slider block is driven at a constant servo-controlled load point velocity of $V_0 = 10 \mu\text{m}/\text{sec}$. The slider-substrate interfacial region (yellow area shown in Figure S1a) comprises a shear support structure that carries the shear stress between slider and substrate. Broadcasts from this region are the AE as the shear support structure evolves in time through asperity and fault gouge breaking, rearranging, resetting, etc. and typically detected away from the interfacial region. The experiment is designed so that the normal stress (N) is applied uniformly over a 100 cm^2 area, but it passes non-uniformly through this area due to the shear support structure (e.g., Latour et al., 2013; Selvadurai & Glaser, 2016; Caniven et al., 2017).

The state of the mechanical system is set by the choice of normal stress and load point velocity (N, V_0). Measurements are made through time of (1) the shear stress (determined from the applied stress in the load cell), (2) the position of the on-board-displacement point (relative to the two side blocks in the laboratory frame of reference), and (3) the AE (15-bit Verasonics data acquisition system continuously recording at 4 MHz using broadband $\sim 0.0001\text{--}2$ MHz piezoceramic sensors and downsampled to 100 kHz). Under the conditions (N, V_0) for the p5702 experiment, the motion of the slider undergoes repeated slip-stick cycles of approximately constant duration as observed in the shear stress through time (Figure S1b). The length of substrate crossed in a slip-stick cycle is of order 50–100 μm (dependent on N). For example at $N = 6 \text{ MPa}$, during slip the slider moves quickly (0.4 seconds) through about 40 μm followed by “creep” for about 5 seconds through an additional 7 μm . During creep the composition of the AE evolves as the slip-stick cycle unfolds. This evolution of the AE is a target of our investigation.

2.2 Displacement

To track the motion of the slider we examine the on-board-displacement, denoted X_S , that locates the slider block relative to the laboratory reference frame. In Figure 1a we show X_S through time for the last six slip-stick events at $N = 6 \text{ MPa}$. Note, there is a slow evolution of the amplitude of the slip-stick behavior throughout the experiment as shown in Figure S1b and described in the Supporting Information. To minimize the effect of this evolution, we examine the last six slip-stick events at each applied normal stress (N). These six events are part of a set of steps; there is a “riser” shown by an increase in X_S of about 40 μm that is abrupt in time and a “tread” having complex behavior as seen in the Figure 1b. To describe X_S on the “tread”, we fit X_S to a line of constant slope, $X_S = Ut + h$, where h allows us to align the “treads”. For the six “treads” in Figure 1, the slopes U are 0.0014, 0.0013, 0.0013, 0.0013, 0.0013, 0.0012 *mm/sec*; very consistent among themselves with U about 10% of the load point velocity, $V_0 = 0.01 \text{ mm}/\text{sec}$. At no point on the “tread” is $dX_S/dt = 0$. We further decompose X_S by examining the difference between the X_S on the “tread” and the model Ut . We show $X_S - Ut$, the residual, in Figure 2. The residual is typically of order 0.001 *mm* and less than $UT_{SS} \approx 0.007 \text{ mm}$, where T_{SS} is the time on “tread” (see Table S1 in the Supporting Information for numerical details). The residual is *articulated* in time, i.e., it varies in time markedly over the “tread” in much the same way for all six slip-stick events.

We adopt the view that the slider-interface is inhomogeneous with some regions at essentially constant friction that are sliding parallel to other regions containing shear support structures with sufficient strength to deliver a noticeable impulse to the slider. Thus, the displacement X_S on the “tread” comprise two components; a *white* component

112 (going as Ut) and a *articulated* component (varying non-trivially in time) as the slider
 113 crosses the “tread”. This articulated component of X_S is shown in Figure 2.

114 2.3 Acoustic Emission (AE)

115 We inform our treatment of the AE by the mechanical perspective described above.
 116 There are important prefacing remarks gleaned from numerical experiments (Gao et al.,
 117 2018, 2019, 2020), as follows. When an element of the shear support structure fails, a
 118 short lived force dipole, with strength δF , appears in the system. One component of the
 119 dipole pushes the slider toward the load point and the other component pushes the (massive)
 120 substrate backward. An elastic wave is launched from the domain of the failure and a
 121 velocity impulse δv is delivered to the slider proportional to the strength δF of the failed
 122 support structure. Additionally, the elastic wave, which is a contribution to the AE, is
 123 broadcast with an amplitude that is proportional to $\delta F \propto \delta v$. All δF and δv are positive
 124 since a failure pushes the slider toward the load point. The expectation is that the integral
 125 over time of the *magnitude* of the AE, approximately an integral over δv , is proportional
 126 to the displacement of the slider. Instead of studying the raw AE, we study the AE in
 127 the context of this expectation, i.e., we study

$$128 \quad \mathcal{C}(t) = \int_0^t \beta(t') dt', \quad 0 \leq t \text{ on the "tread"}, \quad (1)$$

129 where $\beta(t)$ is the upper envelope of the AE, $\alpha(t)$, detected at time t .

130 In Figure S2a we show the $N = 6 \text{ MPa}$ AE $\alpha(t)$ for one “tread” where the adjacent
 131 slider block slips are at the bounding red lines. The “tread” is about 5 seconds in duration
 132 and is sampled by about 5×10^5 data points. In Figure S2b we show $\beta(t)$, the upper
 133 envelope of $\alpha(t)$. In Figure 3 we show $\mathcal{C}(t)$ vs t from Equation 1 for six slip-stick events
 134 during each of the four applied normal stresses N . The quantity shown is $\mathcal{C}(t)$ on each
 135 “tread” divided by the length of time of the “tread” to scale $\mathcal{C}(t)$ so the results fit conveniently
 on a single plot.

136 The striking feature of the behavior of $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is that in leading approximation, for
 137 all six slip-stick events and for all four applied normal stresses N , $\mathcal{C}(t)$ rises linearly with
 138 time. That is, $\beta(t)$ is essentially constant through time, $\int_0^t \beta(t) dt \approx \beta \int_0^t dt$. This may
 139 not be apparent when looking at the continuous β (Figure S2b). The noticeable spikes
 140 in $\beta(t)$ are weighted by their time duration in the construction of $\mathcal{C}(t)$ and are minimally
 141 contributing amidst the large number of nearly continuous smaller amplitude contributions.
 142 Emulating the treatment of the on-board-displacement we fit $\mathcal{C}(t)$ to a line: $\mathcal{C}(t) = Wt$.
 143 Then, in Figure 4 we show the residual, $\mathcal{C}(t) - Wt$, for the six “treads” during the four
 144 applied normal stresses N . We note that the residual is essentially the same for each of
 145 the six “treads” for each applied normal stresses N . The shape in time of the residual
 146 is much the same for all N . The residual, $\mathcal{C}(t) - Wt$, closely resembles the articulate
 147 component of the on-board-displacement, Figure 2. These findings support the assertion,
 148 based on the “prefacing remarks”, of the physical connection between the construct involving
 149 the AE, Equation 1, and the on-board-displacement.

150 3 Results and Discussion

151 The data show both X_S and $\mathcal{C}(t)$ on a “tread” comprise a *white* component that
 152 is trivially dependent on t , with no important structure in time beyond proportionality
 153 (Figure 3). By removing the *white* component to isolate the *articulated* component it becomes
 154 evident there is structure in time to X_S and to $\mathcal{C}(t)$ over the entire length of the “tread”
 155 (Figures 2 and 4). The similarity of the *articulated* component of X_S and the *articulated*
 156 component of \mathcal{C} demonstrate the connection between the load-point-displacement X_S
 157 and AE $\alpha(t)$ that informed our data treatment. The two parts of X_S and $\mathcal{C}(t)$ belong
 158 to the two parts of the inhomogeneous shear support structure. They exist adjacent to

159 one another (Trugman et al., 2020) and are associated with two different friction components.
 160 An equation of motion for the slider might take the form

$$M\ddot{X} = k(V_0t - X) - F_w - F_a, \quad (2)$$

161 where F_w and F_a are the forces associated with the *white* and *articulated* components.
 162 The spatial domains of the two components of the shear support structure are determined
 163 by the way in which the normal stress crosses through the shear support structure. These
 164 spatial domains appear to be approximately “location invariant”, i.e., they retain their
 165 integrity as the slider goes through repeated slip-stick cycles as seen in Trugman et al.
 166 (2020) and Marty et al. (2023).

167 In Table S1 we show the numerical values of the parameter that describe the motion
 168 of the slider over one slip-stick cycle length. During slip the *articulated* component of
 169 the shear support structure is dis-engaged and the slider rapidly advances distance b_0
 170 (ranging from $37 \mu\text{m}$ to $151 \mu\text{m}$ as N increases). Slip stops abruptly when the *articulated*
 171 component of the shear support structure re-engages, holding the slider to approximately
 172 constant velocity (from $\approx 1 \mu\text{m}/\text{sec}$ to $\approx 0.2 \mu\text{m}/\text{sec}$ as N increases), then slow motion
 173 toward a new slip unfolds. The slip-to-slip time, T_{SS} , basically the time on the “tread”,
 174 varies from 5.5 sec to 22.6 sec as the applied normal stress N increases. Both b_0 and T_{SS}
 175 scale approximately with N . The total slip-stick length, $b_0 + UT_{ss}$, varies from $44 \mu\text{m}$
 176 to $155 \mu\text{m}$ as N increases.

177 In Table S2 we show the numerical values of the parameters that describe the cumulative
 178 AE over one slip-stick length. The cumulative AE, $\mathcal{C}(t)$ varies from 24.54 to 105.07 as
 179 N increases. It comprises a *white* component, which is almost all of it, and the *articulated*
 180 component shown in Figure 4. The *articulated* component of $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is of order 1% of the
 181 total (listed in the last column of Table S2). Interestingly, the velocity W with which
 182 $\mathcal{C}(t)$ increases on a “tread” is approximately independent of the applied normal stress
 183 N . In Table S3 we list the independent scaling with N of the parameters describing the
 184 behavior of X_S and \mathcal{C} .

185 4 Conclusions

186 We have undertaken the study of a laboratory earthquake system for which we have
 187 access to measurement of (1) the on-board-displacement, X_S , and (2) the AE, $\alpha(t)$. Therefore,
 188 we can conduct an empirical test of the relationship between mechanical variables (displacement,
 189 stress, ...) and the AE. Our treatment of the analysis is informed by a physical model
 190 of shear support structure (Gao et al., 2019) to form \mathcal{C} , the cumulative sum of the magnitude
 191 of the AE. Both X_S and \mathcal{C} are able to be separated into a *white* component and an *articulated*
 192 component. For both X_S and \mathcal{C} the *white* component is time independent as the system
 193 moves between slip events. In contrast, the *articulated* component of \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}_a , has much
 194 the same time dependence as the *articulated* component of X_S and X_a . This similarity
 195 is present during repeated stick domains (i.e., between slip events) for each normal stress
 196 as it is varied from 6 MPa to 15 MPa (Figure 2). We take these similarities to establish
 197 that \mathcal{C}_a is essentially equivalent to the articulated part of X_S . That is, the important
 198 motion of the slider in time, $X_a(t)$, can be tracked by following a properly formed (i.e.,
 199 Gao et al., 2019) measure of the AE, i.e., $\mathcal{C}_a(t)$. From 2024 CE “Archimedes” (Plain English)
 200 $\mathcal{C}_a(t)$ is a valid diagnostic for following slider motion through time. [There are important
 201 differences in Figures 2 and 4 early in time. These differences arise because the timing
 202 on a “tread” in the mechanical data is set by the on-board-displacement “jump”, whereas,
 203 the timing in the AE data is set by the “noise pulse” in that data.]

204 How are the findings here related to the recent studies employing AE? In the typical
 205 machine learning based AE study (e.g., Rouet-Leduc et al., 2017) the basic outcome is
 206 a point-wise in time equation of state, i.e., at each moment of time a one-to-one correspondence
 207 is established between the properties of the feature space derived from the AE and the

208 shear stress state of the slider. It is straight forward in such calculations to replace the
 209 shear stress state of the slider with the on-board displacement. Then, an equation of state,
 210 that is at each time a one-to-one correspondence between the properties of the feature
 211 space of the AE and the on-board-displacement, can be established. In short, the machine
 212 learning model is applied in these calculations in order to find within the AE the set of
 213 features that carry the information correlated with the on board displacement. For instance,
 214 in laboratory shear experiments (Rouet-Leduc et al., 2017) a single feature equation of
 215 state is demonstrated from laboratory experiment AEs and in repeating caldera collapse
 216 sequence (C. W. Johnson & Johnson, 2023) an equation of state is demonstrated using
 217 AEs that carry the evolving ground displacement information. That is why the machine
 218 learning analyses “work” and similarities in the *articulated* components emphasizes this
 219 point.

220 Data Availability Statement

221 Data used in this study are publicly available at <https://doi.org/10.26207/rcgg-x946>.

222 Acknowledgments

223 This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office
 224 of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Geosciences program under Award Number
 225 DE-FG02-09ER16022.

226 References

- 227 Bergen, K. J., Johnson, P. A., de Hoop, M. V., & Beroza, G. C. (2019). Machine
 228 learning for data-driven discovery in solid earth geoscience. *Science*,
 229 *363*(6433), eaau0323. Retrieved from [https://www.science.org/doi/abs/](https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.aau0323)
 230 [10.1126/science.aau0323](https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.aau0323) doi: 10.1126/science.aau0323
- 231 Beroza, G., Segou, M., & Mousavi, S. (2021, 12). Machine learning and earthquake
 232 forecasting—next steps. *Nature Communications*, *12*. doi: 10.1038/s41467-021-
 233 -24952-6
- 234 Bolton, D., Shreedharan, S., Riviere, J., & Marone, C. (2021). Frequency magnitude
 235 statistics of laboratory foreshocks. *JGR Solid Earth*, *126*, e2021JB022175.
- 236 Borate, P., Rivière, J., Marone, C., Mali, A., Kifer, D., & Shokouhi, P. (2023,
 237 06). Using a physics-informed neural network and fault zone acoustic
 238 monitoring to predict lab earthquakes. *Nature Communications*, *14*. doi:
 239 10.1038/s41467-023-39377-6
- 240 Caniven, Y., Dominguez, S., Soliva, R., Peyret, M., Cattin, R., & Maerten, F.
 241 (2017). Relationships between along-fault heterogeneous normal stress
 242 and fault slip patterns during the seismic cycle: Insights from a strike-slip
 243 fault laboratory model. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, *480*, 147-157.
 244 Retrieved from [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012821X1730568X)
 245 [S0012821X1730568X](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012821X1730568X) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2017.10.009>
- 246 Corbi, F., Sandri, L., Bedford, J., Funicello, F., Brizzi, S., Rosenau, M., &
 247 Lallemand, S. (2019). Machine learning can predict the timing and size of
 248 analog earthquakes. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *46*(3), 1303-1311. doi:
 249 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL081251>
- 250 Gao, K., Guyer, R., Rougier, E., & Johnson, P. (2020). Plate motion in sheared
 251 granular fault system. *Earth and Planetary Sci. Lett.*, *548*, 116481.
- 252 Gao, K., User, B., Rougier, E., Guyer, R., & Johnson, P. (2019). From stress chains
 253 to acoustic emission. *Physical. Rev. Lett.*, *123*, 048003.
- 254 Gao, K., User, B., Rougier, E., Guyer, R., Lei, Z., Knight, E., . . . Carmelite, J.
 255 (2018). Modeling stick-slip behavior in sheared granules fault gouge using the
 256 fem/dem method. *JGR Solid Earth*, *123*(7), 5774-5792.

- 257 Holtzman, B. K., Paté, A., Paisley, J., Waldhauser, F., & Repetto, D. (2018).
 258 Machine learning reveals cyclic changes in seismic source spectra in geysers
 259 geothermal field [Journal Article]. *Science Advances*, 4(5), eaao2929. doi:
 260 10.1126/sciadv.aao2929
- 261 Hulbert, C., Rouet-Leduc, B., Johnson, P. A., Ren, C. X., Rivière, J., Bolton,
 262 D. C., & Marone, C. (2019). Similarity of fast and slow earthquakes
 263 illuminated by machine learning. *Nature Geoscience*, 12(1), 69–74. doi:
 264 10.1038/s41561-018-0272-8
- 265 Hulbert, C., Rouet-Leduc, B., Jolivet, R., & Johnson, P. A. (2020). An
 266 exponential build-up in seismic energy suggests a months-long nucleation
 267 of slow slip in Cascadia. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), 4139. doi:
 268 10.1038/s41467-020-17754-9
- 269 Jasperson, H., Bolton, D. C., Johnson, P., Guyer, R., Marone, C., & de Hoop,
 270 M. V. (2021). Attention network forecasts time-to-failure in laboratory
 271 shear experiments. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 126(11),
 272 e2021JB022195. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2021JB022195)
 273 [.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2021JB022195](https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JB022195) (e2021JB022195 2021JB022195) doi:
 274 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JB022195>
- 275 Johnson, C. W., Ben-Zion, Y., Meng, H., & Vernon, F. (2020). Identifying
 276 different classes of seismic noise signals using unsupervised learning [Journal
 277 Article]. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(15), e2020GL088353. doi:
 278 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL088353>
- 279 Johnson, C. W., & Johnson, P. (2023, 11). Seismic fingerprint predicts ground
 280 motions during the 2018 kilauea collapse sequence.
 281 doi: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-2500877/v1
- 282 Johnson, P. A., Rouet-Leduc, B., Pyrak-Nolte, L. J., Beroza, G. C., Marone, C. J.,
 283 Hulbert, C., ... Reade, W. (2021). Laboratory earthquake forecasting:
 284 A machine learning competition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
 285 *Sciences*, 118(5). doi: 10.1073/pnas.2011362118
- 286 Kong, Q., Trugman, D. T., Ross, Z. E., Bianco, M. J., Meade, B. J., & Gerstoft, P.
 287 (2018). Machine learning in seismology: Turning data into insights [Journal
 288 Article]. *Seismological Research Letters*. doi: 10.1785/0220180259
- 289 Latour, S., Voisin, C., Renard, F., Larose, E., Catheline, S., & Campillo, M.
 290 (2013). Effect of fault heterogeneity on rupture dynamics: An experimental
 291 approach using ultrafast ultrasonic imaging. *Journal of Geophysical*
 292 *Research: Solid Earth*, 118(11), 5888-5902. Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2013JB010231)
 293 [agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2013JB010231](https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JB010231) doi:
 294 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JB010231>
- 295 Laurenti, L., Tinti, E., Galasso, F., Franco, L., & Marone, C. (2022). Deep
 296 learning for laboratory earthquake prediction and autoregressive forecasting
 297 of fault zone stress. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 598, 117825.
 298 Retrieved from [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012821X22004617)
 299 [S0012821X22004617](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2022.117825) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2022.117825>
- 300 Lubbers, N., Bolton, D., Mohd-Yusof, J., Marone, C., Barros, K., & Johnson, P.
 301 (2018). Earthquake catalog-based machine learning identification of laboratory
 302 fault states and the effects of magnitude of completeness. *Geophysical Research*
 303 *Letters*, 45. doi: 10.1029/2018GL079712
- 304 Marty, S., Schubnel, A., Bhat, H., Aubry, J., Fukuyama, E., Latour, S., ...
 305 Madariaga, R. (2023). Nucleation of laboratory earthquakes: Quantitative
 306 analysis and scalings. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 128(3),
 307 e2022JB026294.
- 308 Mousavi, S. M., & Beroza, G. C. (2022). Deep-learning seismology. *Science*,
 309 377(6607), eabm4470. doi: doi:10.1126/science.abm4470
- 310 Mousavi, S. M., & Beroza, G. C. (2023). Machine learning in earthquake seismology
 311 [Journal Article]. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*, 51(1), 105-

- 312 129. doi: 10.1146/annurev-earth-071822-100323
- 313 Rouet-Leduc, B., Hulbert, C., Bolton, D., Ren, C., Riviere, J., marone, C., ...
- 314 Johnson, P. (2017). Estimating fault friction from seismic signals in the
- 315 laboratory. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *45*, 1321-1329.
- 316 Rouet-Leduc, B., Hulbert, C., & Johnson, P. (2019a). Continuous chatter of cascadia
- 317 subduction zone revealed by machine learning. *Nature Geoscience.*, *12*, 75-79.
- 318 Rouet-Leduc, B., Hulbert, C., & Johnson, P. A. (2019b). Continuous chatter of the
- 319 Cascadia subduction zone revealed by machine learning. *Nature Geoscience*,
- 320 *12*(1), 75–79. doi: 10.1038/s41561-018-0274-6
- 321 Selvadurai, P., & Glaser, S. (2016, 11). Asperity generation and its relationship
- 322 to seismicity on a planar fault: a laboratory simulation. *Geophysical Journal*
- 323 *International*, *208*(2), 1009-1025. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1093/](https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggw439)
- 324 [gji/ggw439](https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggw439) doi: 10.1093/gji/ggw439
- 325 Seydoux, L., Balestrieri, R., Poli, P., Hoop, M. d., Campillo, M., & Baraniuk, R.
- 326 (2020). Clustering earthquake signals and background noises in continuous
- 327 seismic data with unsupervised deep learning [Journal Article]. *Nature*
- 328 *Communications*, *11*(1), 3972. doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-17841-x
- 329 Shokouhi, P., Girkar, V., RiviĀšre, J., Shreedharan, S., Marone, C., Giles, C. L., &
- 330 Kifer, D. (2021). Deep learning can predict laboratory quakes from active
- 331 source seismic data. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *48*(12), e2021GL093187.
- 332 Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2021GL093187)
- 333 [10.1029/2021GL093187](https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL093187) (e2021GL093187 2021GL093187) doi: [https://](https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL093187)
- 334 doi.org/10.1029/2021GL093187
- 335 Shreedharan, S., Bolton, D. C., RiviĀšre, J., & Marone, C. (2021). Machine
- 336 learning predicts the timing and shear stress evolution of lab earthquakes
- 337 using active seismic monitoring of fault zone processes. *Journal of Geophysical*
- 338 *Research: Solid Earth*, *126*(7), e2020JB021588. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1029/](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JB021588)
- 339 [2020JB021588](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JB021588)
- 340 Trugman, D., McBrearty, I., Bolton, D., Guyer, R., Marone, C., & Johnson, P.
- 341 (2020). The patio-temporal evolution of granular microslip precursors to
- 342 laboratory earthquakes. *Geophysical. Res. Lett.*, *47*, 2020GL088404.
- 343 Wang, K., Johnson, C. W., Bennett, K. C., & Johnson, P. A. (2021, 12). Predicting
- 344 fault slip via transfer learning. *Nature Communications*, *12*. doi: 10.1038/
- 345 [s41467-021-27553-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-27553-5)
- 346 Wang, K., Johnson, C. W., Bennett, K. C., & Johnson, P. A. (2022). Predicting
- 347 future laboratory fault friction through deep learning transformer models
- 348 [Journal Article]. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *49*(19), e2022GL098233. doi:
- 349 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL098233>




Figure 1. Shown in blue is the slider block on-board-displacement during the 6 MPa normal stress for the last six slip-cycles of the p5702 experiment. The red line shows the constant applied loading velocity of $V_0 = 10 \mu\text{m}/\text{sec}$. The inset box is showing one “tread” as described in Section 2.2 Displacement for one loading cycle.




Figure 2. The six loading cycles on-board displacement stacked in time for the $N = 6, 9, 12, 15$ MPa experiments shown in (a), (b), (c), (d), respectively. Shown here is the on-board-displacement as measured from the shear stress using $a\tau = V_0t - b - X_S$, with a and b found from the parameters characterizing the load cell. The on-board-displacement is directly measured in the experiment but there is increased variance in the direct measurement for $N = 12$ MPa and $N = 15$ MPa when compared to the shear stress.




Figure 3. The integral $C(t)$ from Equation 1 for the six “tread” values shown in groups from left to right for the increasing applied normal stress in the experiment.




Figure 4. The residual values of $C(t)$: $C_a(t) = C(t) - (Wt + d)$ for the six applied normal stresses in the experiment. Each “treads” during is shown in a different color for each experiment.