

AD A0 66325

DDC FILE COPY

**LEVEL II**

SDAC-TR-77-3

*12*  
*NW*

**STUDY OF SELECTED EVENTS  
IN THE PAMIRS IN A SEISMIC  
DISCRIMINATION CONTEXT**

P.A. SOBEL, D.H. VON SEGGERN, E.I. SWEETSER & D.W. RIVERS

Seismic Data Analysis Center

Teledyne Geotech, 314 Montgomery Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

10 OCTOBER 1977

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

Sponsored by

The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)

ARPA Order No. 2551

Monitored By

AFTAC/VSC

312 Montgomery Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

*[Handwritten mark]*  
**DDC**  
**RECEIVED**  
MAR 26 1979  
**REGISTERED**  
**D**

79 03 22 064

**Disclaimer:** Neither the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency nor the Air Force Technical Applications Center will be responsible for information contained herein which has been supplied by other organizations or contractors, and this document is subject to later revision as may be necessary. The views and conclusions presented are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Air Force Technical Applications Center, or the US Government.

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE  |  | READ INSTRUCTIONS<br>BEFORE COMPLETING FORM   |
|--|--|---|
| 1. REPORT NUMBER<br>① SDAC-TR-77-3   | 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.  | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER                 |
| 4. TITLE (and Subtitle)<br>② STUDY OF SELECTED EVENTS IN THE PAMIRS<br>IN A SEISMIC DISCRIMINATION CONTEXT.  | 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED<br>③ Technical reptis                 | 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER              |
| 7. AUTHOR(s)<br>④ P.A. Sobels, E.I. Sweetser<br>D.H. von Seggern, D.W. Rivers  | 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)<br>⑤ F08606-77-C-0014, ARPA               |   |
| 9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS<br>Teledyne Geotech<br>314 Montgomery Street<br>Alexandria, Virginia 22314   | 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT PROJECT, TASK<br>AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS<br>VT/7709 | Order-<br>2554                                |
| 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS<br>Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency<br>Nuclear Monitoring Research Office<br>1400 Wilson Blvd, Arlington, Virginia 22209  | 12. REPORT DATE<br>⑥ 10 October 1977                                     | 13. NUMBER OF PAGES<br>71                     |
| 14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)<br>VELA Seismological Center<br>312 Montgomery Street<br>Alexandria, Virginia 22314  | 15. SECURITY CLASS (of this report)<br>Unclassified                      | 15a. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING<br>SCHEDULE |
| 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)<br>APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.<br>⑦ 74 p  |  |   |
| 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)   |  |   |
| 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES<br>Author's Report Date 04/08/77   |  |   |
| 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)<br>Pamirs<br>Seismic Discrimination<br>Underground Nuclear Explosions<br>M <sub>s</sub> versus m <sub>b</sub>   |  |   |
| 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)<br>Eleven earthquakes with low reported M <sub>s</sub> for their m <sub>b</sub> from the Northern Pamirs were examined in a seismic discrimination context. Seismograms from ALPA, LASA, NORSAR, the HGLP and the WWSSN stations were studied for source mechanism, M <sub>s</sub> -m <sub>b</sub> , corner frequency, pP, complexity, and spectral ratio. All the Pamir events can be identified as earthquakes when their characteristics are compared to those of Kazakh explosions. P-waves to NORSAR from these earthquakes exhibit very high frequency, and their spectral corner frequencies are not distinctly different from those of explosions. |  |   |

STUDY OF SELECTED EVENTS IN THE PAMIRS  
 IN A SEISMIC DISCRIMINATION CONTEXT  
 SEISMIC DATA ANALYSIS CENTER REPORT NO.: SDAC-TR-77-3

AFTAC Project Authorization No.: VELA  
 Project Title: Seismic Data Analysis Center  
 ARPA Order No.: 2551 ✓  
 ARPA Program Code No.: 7F10

Name of Contractor: TELEDYNL GEOTECH

Contract No.: F08606-77-C-0014  
 Date of Contract: 01 October 1976  
 Amount of Contract: \$3,005,183  
 Contract Expiration Date: 30 September 1977  
 Project Manager: Robert R. Blandford  
 (703) 836-3882

P. O. Box 334, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| ACCESSION BY                   |   |
| DTIC                           | White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| DDI                            | Buff Section <input type="checkbox"/>             |
| UNANNOUNCED                    | <input type="checkbox"/>                          |
| JUSTIFICATION                  |   |
| BY                             |   |
| DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODE |   |
| Dist. AVAIL. and/or SPECIAL    |   |
| A                              |   |

DDC  
 RECEIVED  
 MAR 26 1979  
 D

79 03 22 064

#### ABSTRACT

Eleven earthquakes with low reported  $M_s$  for their  $m_b$  from the Northern Pamirs were examined in a seismic discrimination context. Seismograms from ALPA, LASA, NORSAR, the HGLP and the WWSSN stations were studied for source mechanism,  $M_s - m_b$ , corner frequency,  $pP$ , complexity, and spectral ratio. All the Pamir events can be identified as earthquakes when their characteristics are compared to those of Kazakh explosions. P-waves to NORSAR from these earthquakes exhibit very high frequency, and their spectral corner frequencies are not distinctly different from those of explosions.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                  | Page |
|----------------------------------|------|
| ABSTRACT                         | 2    |
| INTRODUCTION                     | 7    |
| TECTONIC SETTING                 | 9    |
| General Features                 | 9    |
| Source Mechanisms of Earthquakes | 10   |
| Velocity Model                   | 10   |
| DATA                             | 13   |
| Earthquake Selection             | 13   |
| Explosion Selection              | 13   |
| Seismic Stations                 | 13   |
| SIGNAL ANALYSIS                  | 17   |
| Source Effects                   | 17   |
| Propagation Effects              | 36   |
| DISCRIMINATION ASPECTS           | 56   |
| $M_s - m_b$                      | 56   |
| Corner Frequency                 | 61   |
| Long-Period Body-Wave Excitation | 63   |
| Depth of Focus                   | 63   |
| Complexities                     | 63   |
| Spectral Ratios                  | 65   |
| Radiation Pattern                | 68   |
| S/P Excitation                   | 68   |
| SUMMARY                          | 69   |
| REFERENCES                       | 70   |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure No. | Title  | Page |
|------------|--|------|
| 1          | Map of Pamirs showing faults observed on satellite photographs and NEIS epicenters from January 1971 through February 1975 | 8    |
| 2          | LASA and NORSAR short-period P recordings for the Pamir events studied   | 16   |
| 3          | First motions for Pamir earthquakes in the lower half of the focal sphere (Wulff net)                                      | 18   |
| 4          | LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed  | 19   |
| 5          | Seismic moment versus corner frequency for Pamir earthquakes from LASA and NORSAR P recordings                             | 37   |
| 6          | Observed LR amplitudes ( $T = 20$ sec) for Pamir event 6   | 46   |
| 7          | Average of all spectra for the path Pamirs to LASA   | 47   |
| 8          | Average of all spectra for the path Pamirs to NORSAR   | 48   |
| 9          | $\ln(A) + 2 \cdot \ln(f)$ versus frequency for the path Pamirs to LASA   | 50   |
| 10         | $\ln(A) + 3 \cdot \ln(f)$ versus frequency for the path Pamirs to LASA   | 51   |
| 11         | $\ln(A) + 2 \cdot \ln(f)$ versus frequency for the path Pamirs to NORSAR   | 52   |
| 12         | $\ln(A) + 3 \cdot \ln(f)$ versus frequency for the path Pamirs to NORSAR   | 53   |

LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)

| Figure No. | Title   | Page |
|------------|---|------|
| 13         | Predicted LR raypaths ( $T = 20$ sec) for events 5 through 11 (39.3N, 73.9E)  | 55   |
| 14         | $M_s$ versus $m_b$ for Pamir earthquakes and Kazakh explosions  | 60   |
| 15         | Long-period spectral level versus corner frequency for Pamir earthquakes and Kazakh explosions from LASA and NORSAR P recordings  | 62   |
| 16         | Complexity versus $m_b$ for Pamir earthquakes and Kazakh explosions from LASA and NORSAR P recordings   | 64   |
| 17         | Short-period P spectral ratio versus $m_b$ for Pamir earthquakes and Kazakh explosions recorded at LASA and NORSAR for $t^* = 0$  | 66   |
| 18         | Short-period P spectral ratio versus $m_b$ for Pamir earthquakes and Kazakh explosions recorded at LASA and NORSAR. The $t^*$ values are for $\omega^{-2}$ source models for earthquakes and explosions and $\omega^{-3}$ source models for earthquakes | 67   |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table No. | Title                                 | Page |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|------|
| I         | Velocity Structure in the Pamirs      | 11   |
| II        | NEIS Parameters for Pamir Earthquakes | 14   |
| III       | NEIS Parameters for Kazakh Explosions | 15   |
| IV        | Magnitude Data for Pamir Earthquakes  | 38   |
| V         | Magnitude Data for Kazakh Explosions  | 57   |

## INTRODUCTION

Discrimination parameters have been applied in detail at only a few nuclear test sites and earthquake regions. This study is part of a series which will extend these discrimination studies to other regions of shallow earthquakes. This particular report examines eleven earthquakes in the Northern Pamirs which had low reported  $M_s$  for their  $m_b$ , such that these events fall close to the explosion population on a  $M_s$ - $m_b$  graph. Most of the earthquakes in the Pamirs are probably associated with large thrust faults, which are a result of the Indian-Eurasian collision. Actual seismogram analysis revealed that the events chosen were too small to determine their fault-plane solutions. Paramount in this study is the determination of average  $M_s$  and  $m_b$  for selected events. Further, we investigate other common discrimination parameters such as first motions, corner frequency, complexity, and short-period spectral ratios. Results for the Pamir events will be compared to Kazakh explosions and related to the available geophysical data on the crust and upper mantle of the region.




Figure 1. Map of Pamirs showing faults observed on satellite photographs and NEIS epicenters from January 1971 through February 1975

## TECTONIC SETTING

### General Features

Figure 1 is a map of the region of interest. The area just to the west of this map is denoted the "Garm region" by the Soviets; it has the strongest seismicity in the U.S.S.R. (Keilis-Borok, 1960) and recently has been notable for earthquake prediction efforts (Semyenov, 1969). This study will examine crustal seismicity in an area east of Garm in the Northern Pamirs where seismicity is also high. The seismicity in this area is shallow ( $< 70$  km) and runs parallel to the E-W trend of the mountain chain and is probably a result of the ongoing Indian-Eurasian collision (Molnar and Tapponnier, 1975). South of the Pamirs in the Hindu Kush, a vertical zone of intermediate-depth seismic activity suggests that underthrusting of the lithosphere occurred there in the last 10 million years (Molnar et al., 1973). Measurements of vertical and horizontal movements suggest that uplift and thrust faulting are still continuing in the Pamirs.

The Pamirs consist of a high plateau of folded Cenozoic sediments. A large negative Bouguer gravity anomaly of  $-450$  mgal in the Northern Pamirs is associated with relatively large crustal thicknesses (55-65 km) in that region (Kosminskaya et al., 1958).

---

Keilis-Borok, V. I. (1960), Investigation of the Mechanism of Earthquakes, English translation, American Geophysical Union, Washington, D.C.

Semyenov, A. N. (1969), Variations in the travel time of transverse and longitudinal waves before violent earthquakes, Izvestiya, Phys. Solid Earth, No. 4, 245.

Molnar, P., and P. Tapponnier (1975), Cenozoic tectonics of Asia: effects of a continental collision, Science, 189, 419.

Molnar, P., T. Fitch, and F. Wu (1973), Fault plane solutions of shallow earthquakes and contemporary tectonics in Asia, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 19, 101.

Kosminskaya, I., G. Mikhota, and Y. Tulina (1958), Crustal structure of the Pamir-Alai zone from seismic depth-sounding data, Izvestiya, Geophysics Series, 673.

### Source Mechanisms of Earthquakes

NEIS epicenters for events in this area from January 1971 through February 1975 are shown in Figure 1. The geologic faults in this figure were inferred from a satellite photomosaic of the area and published geologic or tectonic maps. Most of the earthquakes are associated with the Pamir thrust fault and the other thrust faults which lie parallel to it (Shirokova, 1967). In the northern part of this region, some of the events lie close to a left-lateral strike-slip fault. The compressive stress component for events along the Pamir thrust fault is generally directed perpendicular to the structural trend of the Pamir Mountain system (Ritsema, 1966). Molnar et al. (1973) found both thrust faulting and strike-slip faulting associated with the Pamir thrust. In general, however, the pattern of fault plane solutions is very complex and unpredictable and has little correlation with known faults (Keilis-Borok, 1960).

### Velocity Model

Seismic studies in the Pamirs report an average crustal thickness of > 50 km (Kosminskaya et al., 1958) with depths to 65 km indicated. Table 1 shows a general crustal and upper mantle velocity structure derived from deep seismic sounding in the area of interest; the actual structure varies rapidly over the area encompassing the earthquakes we have selected for this study though. Seismological data show that a slight low-velocity zone with  $V_p$  -

---

Shirokova, E. (1967), General features in the orientation of principal stresses in earthquake foci in the Mediterranean-Asian seismic belt, Izvestiya, Physics of the Solid Earth, 12, 12.

Ritsema, A. (1966), The fault-plane solutions of earthquakes of the Hindu-Kush center, Tectonophysics, 3, 147.

Molnar, P., T. Fitch, and F. Wu (1973), Fault plane solutions of shallow earthquakes and contemporary tectonics in Asia, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 19, 101.

Keilis-Borok, V. I. (1960), Investigation of the Mechanism of Earthquakes, English translation, American Geophysical Union, Washington, D.C.

Kosminskaya, I., G. Mikhota, and Y. Tulina (1958), Crustal structure of the Pamir-Alia zone from seismic depth-sounding data, Izvestiya Geophysics Series, 673.

TABLE I

## Velocity Structure in the Pamirs

| <u>Thickness (km)</u> | <u>P Velocity (km/sec)</u> | <u>Density (gm/cm<sup>3</sup>)</u> |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 2                     | 5.0                        | 2.6                                |
| 30                    | 5.5                        | 2.7                                |
| 30                    | 6.5                        | 3.1                                |
| mantle                | 8.1                        | 3.3                                |

7.9 km/sec extended from 10 to 20 km below the Moho to about 180 km depth (Aliev et al., 1976, and Vinnik and Lukk, 1974). This contrasts with the much more pronounced low-velocity zone under the western United States where  $V_p \sim 7.7$  km/sec (Archambeau et al., 1969). There is evidence from pP reflections (Vinnik and Godzikovskaya, 1973) of a zone of higher than normal upper-mantle attenuation to the south and east of the area encompassing the earthquakes of this report, but this same data indicated that attenuation is less than normal under the Pamirs itself.

---

Aliev, S., N. Beliaevsky, E. Butovskaya, B. Volvovsky, I. Volvovsky, G. Krasnopevtseva, V. Pak, M. Polshkov, V. Rubailo, V. Sallogub, B. Tal-Virsky, F. Tregub, I. Khamrabayev, and G. Kharechko (1976), The seismic experiment in the Northern Pamirs, in Geodynamics: Progress and Prospects, ed. C. Drake, American Geophysical Union.

Vinnik, L. P., and A. A. Lukk (1974), Lateral inhomogeneities of the upper mantle under the Pamir and Hindu Kush, Izv., Earth Physics, No. 1, 9.

Archambeau, C., E. Flinn, and D. Lambert (1969), Fine structure of the upper mantle, J. Geophys. Res., 74, 5825.

Vinnik, L. P., and A. A. Godzikovskaya (1973), Lateral variations of the absorption by the upper mantle beneath Asia, Izv., Earth Physics, No. 1, 3.

## DATA

### Earthquake Selection

For this study earthquakes were selected which had low reported  $M_s$  for their  $m_b$  so that these events fall close to the explosion population on an  $M_s - m_b$  graph. The NEIS list suggests both shallow and intermediate depth events in this region. Most of the intermediate depth activity takes place south of the area of interest in the Hindu Kush. Shallow depth events (less than 70 km) predominate in the Northern Pamirs. Most of the seismic activity in the Northern Pamirs is associated with the Pamir thrust fault, as shown in Figure 1. The earthquakes chosen were limited to the years 1971 to 1975 so that we could utilize the data from the large seismic arrays and the HGLP network. We selected a total of 11 earthquakes as listed in Table II and shown in Figure 1. Table II also lists the depths determined from pP observations at LASA and NORSAR. All of the events are located within the crust. Events 5 through 11 are all closely located, and although no pP data was available at LASA or NORSAR for event 10, a pP observation at SHI implies a focal depth of 25 km.

### Explosion Selection

The Pamir earthquakes were compared to the Kazakh explosions which lie to the northwest and northeast of the Pamirs. We selected a total of 10 explosions as listed in Table III.

### Seismic Stations

Digital data from the three arrays ALPA, LASA, and NORSAR and from the available HGLP stations and film data from selected WSSN stations were gathered for these events. The LASA A0 subarray and NORSAR C3 subarray short-period P recordings are shown in Figure 2. WSSN stations were selected on the basis of magnification and proximity to the region of study, and it is unlikely that the stations not used here would significantly add to the data base for these Pamir events.

Table II

## NEIS Parameters for Pamir Earthquakes

| Event | Date      | Origin Time | EPICENTER     |                | $m_b$ | NEIS | DEPTH  |      | LASA |
|-------|-----------|-------------|---------------|----------------|-------|------|--------|------|------|
|       |           |             | Latitude<br>N | Longitude<br>E |       |      | NORSAR | LASA |      |
| 1     | 24 Nov 71 | 08 23 24.6  | 38.692        | 73.350         | 5.1   | 33   | 10     |      |      |
| 2     | 12 Dec 71 | 22 27 41.1  | 39.482        | 73.228         | 4.8   | 33   | 17     |      |      |
| 3     | 03 Jan 73 | 15 05 16.6  | 39.119        | 72.097         | 4.8   | 33   | 19     |      | 19   |
| 4     | 20 Feb 74 | 11 43 03.9  | 40.661        | 73.223         | 5.1   | 25   | 20     |      | 20   |
| 5     | 11 Aug 74 | 08 02 54.0  | 39.288        | 73.922         | 5.1   | 12   | 14     |      | 8    |
| 6     | 11 Aug 74 | 09 08 58.5  | 39.236        | 73.859         | 5.1   | 29   | 12     |      | 12   |
| 7     | 11 Aug 74 | 23 18 58.3  | 39.462        | 73.604         | 5.1   | 33   | 15     |      | 12   |
| 8     | 14 Aug 74 | 22 06 52.9  | 39.195        | 73.865         | 5.0   | 33   | 30     |      |      |
| 9     | 21 Aug 74 | 18 08 29.0  | 39.266        | 73.933         | 4.9   | 33   | 7      |      | 6    |
| 10    | 23 Aug 74 | 16 26 30.5  | 39.272        | 73.736         | 4.9   | 33   |        |      |      |
| 11    | 07 Sep 74 | 15 46 30.9  | 39.286        | 73.896         | 4.9   | 33   |        |      | 16   |

Table III

## NEIS Parameters for Kazakh Explosions

| Event | Date      | Origin Time | EPICENTER     |                | $m_b$ |
|-------|-----------|-------------|---------------|----------------|-------|
|       |           |             | Latitude<br>N | Longitude<br>E |       |
| 1     | 22 Mar 71 | 04 32 57.8  | 49.744        | 78.185         | 5.8   |
| 2     | 29 Nov 71 | 06 02 57.1  | 49.758        | 78.126         | 5.5   |
| 3     | 30 Dec 71 | 06 20 57.7  | 49.750        | 78.130         | 5.8   |
| 4     | 10 Feb 72 | 05 02 57.3  | 49.986        | 78.886         | 5.5   |
| 5     | 24 Nov 72 | 09 59 57.8  | 51.843        | 64.152         | 5.2   |
| 6     | 15 Aug 73 | 01 59 57.8  | 42.711        | 67.410         | 5.3   |
| 7     | 19 Sep 73 | 02 59 57.2  | 45.635        | 67.850         | 5.2   |
| 8     | 30 Sep 73 | 04 59 57.5  | 51.608        | 54.582         | 5.2   |
| 9     | 25 Jun 74 | 03 56 57.6  | 49.889        | 78.115         | 4.7   |
| 10    | 07 Dec 74 | 05 59 56.9  | 49.908        | 77.648         | 4.7   |




Figure 2. LASA and NORSAR short-period P recordings for the Pamir events studied

## SIGNAL ANALYSIS

### Source Effects

We wanted initially to identify a source mechanism for each event so that we could predict the radiation pattern for body-wave and surface-wave phases. Determination of the fault planes for earthquakes whose magnitudes are below 6.0 is generally not reliable with teleseismic data, and all our earthquakes have  $m_b$  less than 6. Few clear first motions were recorded from the data we had collected. ISC bulletin data was available for events 1 through 4; only events 3 and 4 had sufficient numbers of first motions to attempt a focal mechanism plot. We have plotted the ISC (International Seismological Center) first motions for events 3 and 4 in Figure 3. Unfortunately, the short-period data were not consistent and it is impossible on the basis of the plots alone to determine fault planes because dilatational and compressional first motions do not separate.

Corner frequencies and seismic moments for our Pamir events have been estimated from short-period LASA and NORSAR spectra. The spectra are shown in Figure 4. These spectra are from the phased beams of the A0 short-period subarray at LASA and C3 short-period subarray at NORSAR. The sample length was 6.4 seconds. The signals have been tapered, and the instrument response was removed from the signal and noise spectra; but noise spectra have not been subtracted from the signal spectra. Attenuation was removed from the spectra by multiplying by the factor  $\exp[-\pi f t^*]$  with a  $t^*$  of .53 for a  $\omega^{-2}$  source model and .34 for  $\omega^{-3}$  source models at LASA and  $t^*$  of .00 for  $\omega^{-2}$  and  $\omega^{-3}$  source models at NORSAR. The basis for these  $t^*$  values will be shown later in this report. Corner frequencies were estimated with the assumption of complete stress drop over a circular or square fault plane and a  $\omega^{-2}$  or  $\omega^{-3}$  asymptotic relation at high frequencies. Note that, for many of the spectra of Figure 4, dashed lines are used to indicate the long-period level and the corner frequency. This indicates our lack of confidence in the estimates. Occasionally we computed spectra for 25.6-second windows for those cases where the signal-to-noise ratio was high. For these cases the shape of the spectra were sufficiently identical to those for the 6.4-second windows that we have not shown them.






Figure 3. First motions for Pamir earthquakes in the lower half of the focal sphere (Wulff net)



EVENT 1 - LASA



SIGNAL



NOISE

0.00 64.0 PTS.

Figure 4. LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.




Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.





Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.



EVENT 5 LASA



SIGNAL



NOISE

0.00 64.0 PTS.

Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.




Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.




Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.





Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.



EVENT 11 - LASA




SIGNAL



NOISE

0.00 64.0 PTS.


Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.



EVENT 1 - NORSAR



Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.




EVENT 2 - NORSAR



0.00 64.0 PTS.

Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.




EVENT 3 - NORSAR



0.00 64.0 PTS.

Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.



EVENT 4 - NORSAR



0.00 64.0 PTS.

Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.






Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.



EVENT 6 - NORSAR




NOISE



0.00 64.0 PTS.

Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.



EVENT 7 - NORSAR



SIGNAL

NOISE



0.00 64.0 PTS.

Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.





Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.

EVENT 8 - NORSAR



0.00 64.0 PTS.



EVENT 9 - NORSAR



0.00 64.0 PTS.

Figure 4 (cont.) LASA A0 and NORSAR C3 subarray spectra of P waves from Pamir earthquakes with instrument response and attenuation removed.

Seismic moment was calculated from the long-period body-wave spectral displacement levels  $|\Omega_0|$  estimated in Figure 4 using the relation

$$M_0 = \frac{4\pi\rho\alpha^3 D |\Omega_0|}{R_{0\phi}}$$

where  $R_{0\phi}$  was assumed to be unity due to lack of knowledge of the focal mechanism, values of  $\rho\alpha^3$  from Table I appropriate to the source depth were used, and the divergence factor  $D$  was applied (Ben-Menahem et al., 1965). A graph of moment versus corner frequency is shown in Figure 5. Our events fall between the constant stress drop lines of Hanks and Thatcher (1972), indicating that our events are of intermediate stress drop.

We attempted to find the LR radiation pattern for each event by plotting the antilogs of the  $M_s$  values for each event as listed in Table IV. The results from the largest  $M_s$  earthquake, event 6, are shown in Figure 6. The observed distribution of amplitudes does not readily conform to any quadrupole radiation pattern, which is probably due to varying propagation effects coupled with the large epicentral distances and the small magnitudes of the events studied. The scatter of data points for all the events was so poor that no attempt was made to find the best-fitting radiation patterns.

#### Propagation Effects

We measured relative mantle attenuation along the paths from the Pamirs to LASA and NORSAR, the only two sites for which we had short-period digital data. Our measurement of attenuation is the factor  $t^*$ , which is the travel time along the ray path divided by the average attenuation factor  $Q$ .

We determine  $t^*$  by first summing and then normalizing the observed ( $t^* = 0.0$ ) spectra shown in Figure 4 for the two paths--Pamirs to LASA and Pamirs to NORSAR. These averages are shown in Figure 7 and 8. If we assume that the source spectra has a  $f^{-2}$  falloff at high frequencies, then

$$A(f) \approx S \cdot f^{-2} \cdot e^{-\pi f t^*}$$

---

Ben-Menahem, A., S. Smith, and T. Teng (1965), A procedure for source studies from spectrum of long-period seismic body-waves, Bull. Seism. Soc. Am., 55, 203.

Hanks, T., and W. Thatcher (1972), A graphical representation of seismic source parameters, J. Geophys. Res., 77, 4393.




Figure 5. Seismic moment versus corner frequency for Pamir earthquakes from LASA and NORSAR P recordings

Table IV

Magnitude Data for  
Pamir Earthquakes

## Event 1

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $m_b$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| ALP                 | 71.6     |       | 3.38  |
| ALQ                 | 106.3    |       | -4.16 |
| CHG                 | 29.8     |       | -4.20 |
| CTA                 | 90.0     |       | -3.98 |
| FBK                 | 71.5     |       | -4.42 |
| KOD                 | 28.5     | 4.27  |       |
| KON                 | 44.4     |       | -3.65 |
| LAO                 | 95.0     | 5.05  | -4.94 |
| NAO                 | 44.0     | 4.39  | 3.11  |
| POO                 | 20.0     | 3.97  |       |
| TLO                 | 57.9     |       | -3.23 |
| RINGDAL<br>ESTIMATE |          | 4.42  | 3.19  |

---

- negative sign indicates no signal visible, and upper bound on  $M_s$  is computed from background noise

## Event 2

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $m_b$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| ALP                 | 70.9     |       | -3.63 |
| ALQ                 | 105.6    |       | 4.26  |
| BUL                 | 72.6     | 4.57  |       |
| CHG                 | 30.3     |       | 3.90  |
| CTA                 | 90.4     |       | 4.29  |
| FBK                 | 70.7     |       | 4.00  |
| KON                 | 43.8     |       | 4.57  |
| NAO                 | 43.3     | 4.23  | 4.56  |
| NUR                 | 36.6     | 4.47  |       |
| OGD                 | 94.3     |       | 4.52  |
| POO                 | 20.8     | 4.28  | -4.42 |
| SHI                 | 19.6     | 3.82  | -4.22 |
| SHL                 | 20.8     |       | 3.95  |
| TAB                 | 21.0     | 4.67  | 3.63  |
| TLO                 | 57.5     |       | 3.62  |
| RINGDAL<br>ESTIMATE |          | 4.34  | 4.04  |

## Event 3

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $m_b$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| ALP                 | 71.5     |       | -3.46 |
| ALQ                 | 105.9    |       | 4.61  |
| BUL                 | 71.7     | 4.26  |       |
| CHG                 | 30.9     |       | 3.41  |
| COL                 | 71.6     | 4.95  |       |
| CTA                 | 91.0     |       | 3.86  |
| DAG                 | 52.5     | 4.37  |       |
| KIP                 | 103.4    |       | 4.02  |
| KOD                 | 29.1     | 4.33  |       |
| LAO                 | 94.6     | 5.25  |       |
| NAO                 | 43.0     | 4.13  | -4.14 |
| OGD                 | 94.3     |       | 4.17  |
| SHL                 | 21.3     | 3.59  |       |
| RINGDAL<br>ESTIMATE |          | 4.41  | 3.75  |

## Event 4

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $m_b$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| ALQ                 | 104.6    |       | 4.74  |
| ALQ                 | 104.6    |       | 4.71  |
| BAG                 | 47.3     |       | 4.17  |
| BUL                 | 73.4     | 4.70  |       |
| CTA                 | 90.8     | 5.15  | 4.10  |
| DAG                 | 51.3     | 4.70  |       |
| GDH                 | 63.5     | 5.00  |       |
| KON                 | 42.9     |       | 4.58  |
| LAO                 | 93.0     | 5.72  | 4.44  |
| MAT                 | 49.8     |       | 4.33  |
| MAT                 | 49.8     | 4.54  | 4.23  |
| NAO                 | 42.4     | 4.47  | 4.61  |
| NUR                 | 35.6     | 3.60  |       |
| OGD                 | 93.2     |       | 4.49  |
| SDB                 | 78.2     | 5.22  |       |
| SHI                 | 20.0     | 4.45  | 4.05  |
| TAB                 | 20.9     |       | 3.71  |
| TLO                 | 57.0     |       | 4.23  |
| RINGDAL<br>ESTIMATE |          | 4.75  | 4.34  |

## Event 5

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $m_b$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| ALP                 | 70.9     |       | -3.53 |
| ALQ                 | 105.7    |       | -4.10 |
| BAG                 | 46.5     | 5.03  | 4.23  |
| BUL                 | 72.9     | 5.16  |       |
| CHG                 | 29.8     |       | 3.60  |
| CTA                 | 89.8     | 5.00  | -4.37 |
| EIL                 | 33.3     |       | 4.22  |
| KIP                 | 102.3    |       | 4.28  |
| KON                 | 44.3     | 4.53  | 4.35  |
| LAO                 | 94.4     | 4.59  | 3.69  |
| MAT                 | 49.7     |       | 4.23  |
| MAT                 | 49.7     |       | 4.10  |
| MAT                 | 49.7     |       | 4.05  |
| NAI                 | 52.9     | 4.54  | 4.58  |
| NAO                 | 43.8     | 4.77  | 4.07  |
| NUR                 | 36.9     | 4.47  | 3.99  |
| OGD                 | 94.7     |       | -3.43 |
| SHI                 | 20.0     | 4.48  |       |
| TAB                 | 21.5     |       | 3.43  |
| TLO                 | 58.0     |       | -4.08 |
| TLO                 | 58.0     |       | 3.79  |
| RINGDAL<br>ESTIMATE |          | 4.73  | 3.92  |

## Event 6

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $m_b$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| ALP                 | 71.0     |       | -3.70 |
| ALQ                 | 105.8    |       | 4.58  |
| ALQ                 | 105.8    |       | 4.48  |
| BAG                 | 46.5     | 5.30  | 4.71  |
| BUL                 | 72.9     | 5.31  |       |
| CHG                 | 29.8     |       | 4.45  |
| CHG                 | 29.8     | 4.35  | 4.28  |
| CTA                 | 89.8     | 5.10  | 4.21  |
| EIL                 | 33.2     |       | 4.81  |
| GDH                 | 64.9     |       | 4.47  |
| IST                 | 34.0     |       | 3.96  |
| KIP                 | 102.3    |       | 4.59  |
| KON                 | 44.3     | 4.23  | 4.86  |
| KON                 | 44.3     |       | 4.74  |
| LAO                 | 94.5     | 4.74  | 4.32  |
| MAT                 | 49.7     |       | 4.39  |
| MAT                 | 49.7     |       | 4.65  |
| MAT                 | 49.7     |       | 4.60  |
| NAI                 | 52.8     | 4.70  | 4.12  |
| NAO                 | 43.8     | 4.79  | 4.65  |
| NUR                 | 36.9     | 4.47  | 4.51  |
| OGD                 | 94.7     |       | -3.91 |
| SHI                 | 20.0     | 4.54  |       |
| SNG                 | 40.1     |       | 4.05  |
| STU                 | 46.0     | 4.76  | 4.35  |
| TAB                 | 21.4     |       | 4.03  |
| TLO                 | 58.0     |       | 4.33  |
| TLO                 | 58.0     |       | 4.20  |
| RINGDAL<br>ESTIMATE |          | 4.75  | 4.37  |

## Event 7

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $m_b$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| ALP                 | 70.8     |       | 3.57  |
| ALQ                 | 105.6    |       | 4.65  |
| ALQ                 | 105.6    |       | 4.10  |
| BAG                 | 46.8     | 5.16  |       |
| BUL                 | 72.9     | 4.65  |       |
| CHG                 | 30.1     | 3.84  |       |
| EIL                 | 33.1     |       | 3.70  |
| GDH                 | 64.6     | 5.00  | 4.44  |
| IST                 | 33.7     |       | 3.77  |
| KIP                 | 102.3    |       | -4.69 |
| KON                 | 44.0     | 4.94  | 4.90  |
| KON                 | 44.0     |       | 4.20  |
| LAO                 | 94.2     | 5.49  | 4.07  |
| MAT                 | 49.9     |       | 3.91  |
| MAT                 | 49.9     |       | -4.11 |
| MAT                 | 49.9     |       | 4.12  |
| NAI                 | 52.8     | 4.66  |       |
| NAO                 | 43.5     | 5.08  | 4.30  |
| NUR                 | 36.6     | 4.80  | 3.81  |
| OGD                 | 94.4     |       | -4.85 |
| SHI                 | 20.7     | 4.24  |       |
| STU                 | 45.7     | 4.80  |       |
| TAB                 | 21.2     | 4.67  | 3.49  |
| TLO                 | 57.7     |       | 4.19  |
| TLO                 | 57.7     |       | 4.08  |
| RINGDAL<br>ESTIMATE |          | 4.78  | 4.06  |

Event 8

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $m_b$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| ALP                 | 71.0     |       | -3.48 |
| ALQ                 | 105.8    |       | -4.62 |
| ALQ                 | 105.8    |       | 4.21  |
| BAG                 | 46.5     | 5.08  |       |
| BUL                 | 72.9     | 4.74  |       |
| CHG                 | 29.8     |       | 4.26  |
| CHG                 | 29.8     | 4.30  | 3.96  |
| CHG                 | 29.8     |       | 3.66  |
| CTA                 | 89.8     |       | 4.46  |
| EIL                 | 33.2     |       | 4.20  |
| KIP                 | 102.4    |       | 4.27  |
| KON                 | 44.3     |       | 4.42  |
| LAO                 | 94.5     |       | 4.15  |
| MAL                 | 59.8     |       | 4.39  |
| MAT                 | 49.8     |       | 4.13  |
| MAT                 | 49.8     | 4.36  | 4.14  |
| NAO                 | 43.9     | 4.77  | 4.59  |
| NUR                 | 36.9     | 4.46  | 3.99  |
| OGD                 | 94.8     |       | 3.42  |
| SHI                 | 20.0     | 3.82  | -4.24 |
| TAB                 | 21.5     | 4.90  | 3.60  |
| TLO                 | 58.0     |       | 4.56  |
| TLO                 | 58.0     |       | 4.32  |
| RINGDAL<br>ESTIMATE |          | 4.56  | 4.10  |

## Event 9

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $m_b$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| ALP                 | 70.9     |       | -2.75 |
| ALQ                 | 105.8    |       | 4.44  |
| BAG                 | 46.5     | 4.87  |       |
| BUL                 | 72.9     | 4.56  |       |
| CHG                 | 29.8     |       | -3.57 |
| CTA                 | 89.8     |       | -4.27 |
| EIL                 | 33.3     |       | 3.40  |
| KIP                 | 102.3    |       | -3.44 |
| KON                 | 44.3     | 4.64  | 3.77  |
| LAO                 | 94.4     | 4.44  | 3.67  |
| MAT                 | 49.7     |       | -2.55 |
| MAT                 | 49.7     | 4.36  | 3.44  |
| NAO                 | 43.8     | 4.51  | 3.88  |
| NUR                 | 36.9     | 4.46  |       |
| OGD                 | 94.7     |       | -3.67 |
| SHI                 | 20.0     | 3.73  |       |
| TLO                 | 58.0     |       | -3.49 |
| TLO                 | 58.0     |       | 3.22  |
| RINGDAL<br>ESTIMATE |          | 4.45  | 3.24  |

## Event 10

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $m_b$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| BAG                 | 46.6     |       | 4.26  |
| BUL                 | 72.8     | 4.56  |       |
| CHG                 | 29.9     |       | 3.56  |
| CTA                 | 89.9     | 4.37  | -4.35 |
| DAG                 | 52.5     | 4.36  |       |
| KON                 | 44.2     | 4.50  | 4.32  |
| KON                 | 44.2     |       | 4.10  |
| LAO                 | 94.4     |       | 4.93  |
| MAT                 | 49.8     |       | 4.47  |
| MAT                 | 49.8     | 4.46  | 4.11  |
| MAT                 | 49.8     |       | 4.33  |
| NAO                 | 43.7     |       | 4.13  |
| NUR                 | 36.8     | 4.50  | 4.11  |
| OGD                 | 94.6     |       | -3.26 |
| SHI                 | 19.9     | 4.12  | 3.67  |
| TAB                 | 21.3     |       | 3.42  |
| TLO                 | 57.9     |       | -3.54 |
| TLO                 | 57.9     |       | 3.52  |
| RINGDAL<br>ESTIMATE |          | 4.41  | 3.94  |

## Event 11

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $m_b$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| ALP                 | 70.9     |       | 3.65  |
| ALQ                 | 105.8    |       | -4.67 |
| ALQ                 | 105.8    |       | 4.94  |
| BAG                 | 46.5     |       | 4.16  |
| BUL                 | 72.9     | 4.56  |       |
| CHG                 | 29.8     | 4.09  | 4.03  |
| CHG                 | 29.8     |       | 3.82  |
| CTA                 | 89.8     |       | 4.08  |
| DAG                 | 52.5     | 4.70  |       |
| EIL                 | 33.3     |       | 4.01  |
| IST                 | 34.0     |       | 3.83  |
| KIP                 | 102.3    |       | 4.31  |
| KON                 | 44.2     |       | -5.11 |
| KON                 | 44.2     |       | 4.72  |
| LAO                 | 94.4     | 5.02  | -4.43 |
| LEM                 | 55.7     |       | -4.49 |
| MAT                 | 49.7     |       | 4.38  |
| MAT                 | 49.7     | 4.67  | 4.41  |
| NAI                 | 52.9     |       | 4.15  |
| NAO                 | 43.8     |       | 4.54  |
| NUR                 | 36.9     | 4.80  | -4.77 |
| PMG                 | 83.3     | 5.60  |       |
| SHI                 | 20.0     | 4.20  | 4.29  |
| SNG                 | 40.1     |       | 3.57  |
| TLO                 | 58.0     |       | 4.11  |
| TLO                 | 58.0     |       | 3.88  |
| RINGDAL<br>ESTIMATE |          | 4.70  | 4.14  |




Figure 6. Observed LR amplitudes ( $T = 20$  sec) for Pamir event 6




Figure 7. Average of all spectra for the path Pamirs to LASA




Figure 8. Average of all spectra for the path Pamirs to NORSAR

where  $A(f)$  is the observed spectrum (corrected for seismograph response),  $S$  is the source spectrum scale constant, and  $f$  is frequency in Hz. Then after taking the natural log of this equation

$$\ln[A(f)] + 2 \cdot \ln(f) - \ln(S) = -\pi f t^*$$

or

$$\ln(A) + 2 \cdot \ln(f) = -\pi t^* f + \ln(S)$$

If we plot  $\ln(A) + 2 \cdot \ln(f)$  versus frequency for each path, as shown in Figures 9 and 11, the slope of the graph is  $-\pi t^*$ . We calculated the slope in the frequency range 1.0 to 2.5 Hz, where the signal-to-noise ratio was highest, and presumably beyond the corner frequency so that the high-frequency asymptotic slope of  $f^{-2}$  characterizes the source spectrum. Similarly, the equation for the source spectra with an  $f^{-3}$  falloff is

$$\ln(A) + 3 \cdot \ln(f) = -\pi t^* f + \ln(S)$$

If we plot the left-hand side of this relation versus frequency for each path, as shown in Figures 10 and 12, the slope of the graph is again  $-\pi t^*$ ; but  $t^*$  now is based on an assumed  $f^{-3}$  source spectrum. The  $t^*$  values for an  $f^{-2}$  source model are  $.53 \pm .09$  for the Pamir to LASA path and  $.00 \pm .05$  for the Pamir to NORSAR path. The  $t^*$  values for an  $f^{-3}$  source model are  $.34 \pm .08$  for the Pamir to LASA path and  $-.18 \pm .06$  for the Pamir to NORSAR path. Since a negative  $t^*$  path is unrealistic, the  $f^{-3}$   $t^*$  value for the Pamir to NORSAR path is set equal to zero. The Pamir to NORSAR path has less attenuation as expected since the path is mostly through continental shield areas. Values of  $t^*$  for the Kazakh explosions for  $f^{-2}$  source models were also calculated. These  $t^*$  values are  $.16 \pm .10$  for the East Kazakh (events 1 through 4 and 9 and 10) to LASA path,  $.05 \pm .08$  for the East Kazakh to NORSAR path,  $.29 \pm .13$  for the West Kazakh (events 5 through 8) to LASA path, and  $.19 \pm .04$  for the West Kazakh to NORSAR path. As expected the  $t^*$  values for the paths to NORSAR are lower than the values for the paths to LASA since the paths to NORSAR are through continental shield areas while those to LASA pass under tectonically active provinces.




Figure 9.  $\ln(A) + 2 \cdot \ln(f)$  versus frequency for the path Pamirs to LASA




Figure 10.  $\ln(A) + 3 \cdot \ln(f)$  versus frequency for the path Pamirs to LASA




Figure 11.  $\ln(A) + 2 \cdot \ln(f)$  versus frequency for the path Pamirs to NORSAR




Figure 12.  $\ln(A) + 3 \cdot \ln(f)$  versus frequency for the path Pamirs to NORSAR

Von Seggern and Sobel (1975) have presented a method of predicting 20-second Rayleigh-wave amplitudes by geometrical ray tracing. Their work shows that lateral changes in 20-second LR-phase velocity can cause major multipathing and also large teleseismic amplitude variations due to small-scale refraction effects. Figure 13 illustrates the paths of rays which result for earthquakes 5 through 11, which are grouped near 39.3N, 73.9E. No attempt is made to quantitatively relate these patterns to observed LR amplitudes since we cannot correct the predicted amplitudes for source mechanism. We can qualitatively compare the pattern of rays to  $M_s$  residuals calculated from the magnitude data in Table IV. The  $M_s$  residuals at ALPA are negative, as can be predicted from the ray tracing diagram which shows diverging rays near ALPA. The  $M_s$  residuals at EIL average to about 0, as would be expected since the ray pattern is smooth near EIL. Where the rays cross, we can expect either destructive interference (large negative residuals as at CHG, IST, TAB, and TLQ in Table IV) or a mixture of both constructive and destructive interferences (as at CTA, LASA, and MAT). Stations which record a stable amplitude are desirable for calibrating a source region for amplitude. For events from the Pamirs, such stations could be located in eastern China, southern India, western Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Israel, Finland, and northcentral Russia. The complicated LR ray-tracing figure partially explains why we were unable to determine LR radiation patterns from our amplitude observations.

---

von Seggern, D., and P. Sobel (1975), Experiments in refining  $M_s$  estimates for seismic events, SDAC Reprot No. TR-75-17, Teledyne Geotech, Alexandria, Virginia.




Figure 13. Predicted LR raypaths ( $T = 20$  sec) for events 5 through 11  
(39.3N, 73.9E)

## DISCRIMINATION ASPECTS

$$\frac{M_s - m_b}{}$$

In this and the following sections we apply several common discriminants between earthquakes and explosions to the Pamir earthquakes and Kazakh explosions. We had chosen those Pamir events which, during preliminary screening, were of low  $M_s$  for their  $m_b$ . Then we independently determined average  $M_s$  and  $m_b$  values for the Pamir events in Table II using WWSSN stations, HGLP stations and the ALPA, LASA, and NORSAR arrays. The data used in the average estimates are listed in Table IV. Negative values in the table indicate noise measurements which were used as upper bounds for the signal amplitudes. Magnitudes were computed according to the formulas

$$m_b = \log(A/T) + B(\Delta)$$

$$M_s = \log(A/T) + 1.66 \log \Delta + 0.3$$

where  $A$  = one-half the peak-to-peak maximum recorded amplitude reduced to  $m_\mu$  ground displacement,

$T$  = period in seconds (restricted to 17 to 23 sec for  $M_s$  calculations),

$\Delta$  = epicentral distance in degrees,

$B(\Delta)$  = Gutenberg-Richter correction term for surface-focus P waves.

We also independently determined  $M_s$  for the Kazakh explosions in Table III using the NORSAR array and HGLP stations. The data used in the average estimates for explosion  $M_s$  are listed in Table V, and explosion  $m_b$  values are from NEIS list. We have throughout used a method of magnitude estimation proposed by Ringdal (1976), in which the magnitudes at the individual stations are assumed to follow a gaussian distribution. Among this distribution, some magnitudes will fall below the noise level, and Ringdal's method then substitutes a noise measurement at those stations which do not detect and computes the maximum likelihood estimate of magnitude based on measured signals and noise. The effect of this procedure is to more accurately define the magnitude of events not widely recorded. Based on this method, average magnitude values for small events, where many of the readings are noise levels, are lower than what would

---

Ringdal, F. (1976), Maximum-likelihood estimate of event magnitude, Bull. Seism. Soc. Am., 66, 789.

Table V  
Magnitude Data for Kazakh Explosions

Event 1

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|
| CHG                 | 35.1     | 3.23  |
| Ringdal<br>Estimate |          | 3.23  |

Event 2

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|
| CHG                 | 35.2     | -3.47 |
| EIL                 | 38.1     | -4.45 |
| KON                 | 38.9     | 3.59  |
| NAO                 | 38.0     | 3.49  |
| Ringdal<br>Estimate |          | 3.47  |

Event 3

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|
| CHG                 | 35.2     | 3.48  |
| EIL                 | 38.1     | 3.71  |
| KON                 | 38.9     | 3.59  |
| NAO                 | 38.0     | 3.96  |
| Ringdal<br>Estimate |          | 3.68  |

Event 4

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|
| KON                 | 39.1     | -3.73 |
| Ringdal<br>Estimate |          | -3.73 |

Event 5

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|
| CHG                 | 42.8     | -3.44 |
| KON                 | 30.7     | 2.86  |
| Ringdal<br>Estimate |          | 2.86  |

Event 6

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|
| CHG                 | 35.8     | -3.83 |
| KON                 | 38.4     | 3.64  |
| MAT                 | 53.3     | -3.85 |
| Ringdal<br>Estimate |          | 3.60  |

Event 7

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|
| KON                 | 36.6     | 3.31  |
| MAT                 | 52.1     | -4.08 |
| Ringdal<br>Estimate |          | 3.31  |

Event 8

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|
| KON                 | 26.0     | 3.54  |
| Ringdal<br>Estimate |          | 3.54  |

Event 10

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|
| NAO                 | 37.9     | -3.1  |
| Ringdal<br>Estimate |          | -3.1  |

Event 9

| Station             | $\Delta$ | $M_s$ |
|---------------------|----------|-------|
| NAO                 | 38.1     | -2.61 |
| Ringdal<br>Estimate |          | -2.61 |



result if only measured signal amplitudes were used. The magnitude averages for the Pamir earthquakes and Kazakh explosions are shown in Figure 14. Arrows indicate  $M_s$  values based solely on noise measurements. In these cases the maximum  $M_s$  value was used as the  $M_s$  value. The line  $M_s = m_b - 1.5$  (arbitrarily drawn here) clearly separates the Pamir earthquakes from the Kazakh explosion population. This line would also separate the suite of Asian events studied by Dahlman et al. (1974). The Kazakh explosions are located in two test areas approximately 10 to 15 degrees northwest and northeast of the Pamir earthquakes.

#### Corner Frequency

Figure 15 is a plot of  $|\Omega_0|$  versus corner frequency for the Pamir earthquakes and Kazakh explosions recorded at LASA and NORSAR. No long-period P phases were recorded at the long-period arrays due to the small magnitudes of the events, so the values of  $|\Omega_0|$  were estimated from the spectral data of the short-period vertical component. Hanks and Thatcher (1972) have shown that for a given long-period level Aleutian explosions have a higher corner frequency than Aleutian earthquakes. The physical basis of this discriminant is the smaller source time dimension of the explosion for a given long-period level. However, Figure 15 shows no separation between the Pamir earthquakes and the Kazakh explosions. Furthermore, there is only a slight trend toward higher corner frequencies for lower  $|\Omega_0|$  for both the explosions and the earthquakes.

One possible reason that no separation was observed is that this study used only short-period P recordings, whereas Hanks and Thatcher used long-period body wave recordings. Another possible explanation is that due to the low magnitudes of the events studied here, a clear asymptotic value of  $|\Omega_0|$  was not possible in most cases. Finally, the lack of separation could be due to characteristics of the sources examined in this study which were not present

---

Dahlman, O., H. Israelson, A. Austegard, and G. Hornstrom (1974), Definition and identification of seismic events in the USSR, Bull. Seism. Soc. Am., 64, 607.

Hanks, T, and W. Thatcher (1972), A graphical representation of seismic source parameters, J. Geophys. Res., 77, 4393.




Figure 15. Long-period spectral level versus corner frequency for Pamir earthquakes and Kazakh explosions from LASA and NORSAR P recordings

in the Aleutian events studied by Hanks and Thatcher. For example, the source material in the Aleutians was lava and bedded tuffs whereas the source material for the Kazakh explosions was presumed to be granite.

#### Long-Period Body-Wave Excitation

There were too few long-period P observations to determine average event ratios of these quantities to long-period LR ground displacement. All of the long-period P observations were close to the noise level, as would be expected for these small magnitude events. No clear long-period S waves were observed on the recordings analyzed for the Pamir earthquakes.

#### Depth of Focus

All of the Pamir events studied here, except event 10, had apparent pP phases recorded at either LASA or NORSAR or both arrays. No LASA or NORSAR short-period data was available for event 10; however, pP for event 10 was observed at a few of the WWSSN stations. The pP phases recorded at the WWSSN stations agreed with the depths determined at LASA and NORSAR for all cases. Thus many low  $M_s - m_b$  events in this region could be identified as earthquakes on the basis of pP observations. pP was, of course, not identified for the explosions and does not, therefore, function as a positive discriminant. Also, for crustal-depth events there is little pP moveout, and thus positive identification of this phase is not possible when the observing stations are in a limited epicentral range.

#### Complexities

We have computed the "complexity" parameter as seen as LASA and NORSAR for the Pamir earthquakes and Kazakh explosions in the manner given by Lambert et al. (1969). Figure 16 shows the complexity values versus  $m_b$ . LASA beams for the Pamir events show apparent pP signals for 4 of the 5 cases where complexity was determined. NORSAR beams show apparent pP signals for 5 of the 8 cases where complexity was determined. We believe that the lack of a clear pP signal in the other cases was due to noisy data or to a pP signal that could not be visually separated from the P coda. Complexity numbers were not calculated for some cases because of the low signal-to-noise ratio, which would have made those complexity numbers doubtful. The complexity numbers for the Kazakh ex-

---

Lambert, D., D. von Seggern, S. Alexander, and G. Galat (1969), The LONGSHOT Experiment, Volume II. Comprehensive Analysis, SDL Report No. 234, Teledyne Geotech, Alexandria, Virginia.




Figure 16. Complexity versus  $m_b$  for Pamir earthquakes and Kazakh explosions from LASA and NORSAR P recordings

plosions were low (3.08-5.66) as would be expected for an explosion. The complexity numbers for the Pamir events were generally higher (4.24-11.09), but overlap the numbers for the Kazakh explosions. Due to the relatively low attenuation of the Pamir earthquake signals at LASA and NORSAR, we cannot ascribe the higher complexity of the earthquakes to attenuation of the initial P as suggested by Douglas et al. (1973); therefore the additional earthquake coda energy must be related to source mechanism and crustal effects.

### Spectral Ratios

Spectral ratios have been calculated at LASA and NORSAR according to a form suggested by Lacoss (1969):

$$R = \frac{\int_{1.55}^{1.95} A(f)df}{\int_{.45}^{.85} A(f)df}$$

where sums of the equivalent terms of the discrete Fourier transform have replaced the amplitude spectrum integrals over  $A(f)$ . These ratios are plotted against  $m_b$  in Figure 17 for the Pamir earthquakes and Kazakh explosions for the case  $t^* = 0$ , that is, using the uncorrected spectra. The spectral ratios for the same P recordings are plotted in Figure 18 with  $t^*$  values for  $\omega^{-2}$  source models for earthquakes and explosions and  $\omega^{-3}$  source models for earthquakes. Bars connect the cases where there are two different  $t^*$  values for the two source models. The amplitudes of the P spectra were greater than the amplitudes of the noise spectra in the frequency range 0.4 to 2.5 Hz for all of the LASA and NORSAR beams. For many cases the P spectra were greater than the noise spectra in the range 0.5 to 5.0 Hz. NORSAR signal beams (C3 subarray) possessed more high frequencies and therefore generally had higher spectral ratios than the LASA beams (A0 subarray), in accord with our previous  $t^*$  estimates for the two paths. The spectral ratio did not depend on  $m_b$ ,  $M_s$ , or depth. In general, the Kazakh explosions show larger spectral ratios than the Pamir earthquakes, but the explosion and earthquake populations cannot be said to separate.

---

Douglas, A., P. Marshall, P. Gibbs, J. Young, and C. Blamey (1973), P signal complexity reexamined, Geophys. J., 33, 195.

Lacoss, R. (1969), A large-population LASA discrimination experiment, Technical Note 1969-24, Lincoln Laboratory, Lexington, Massachusetts.




Figure 17. Short-period P spectral ratio versus  $m_b$  for Pamir earthquakes and Kazakh explosions recorded at LASA and NORSAR for  $t^* = 0$




Figure 18. Short-period P spectral ratio versus  $m_b$  for Pamir earthquakes and Kazakh explosions recorded at LASA and NORSAR. The  $t^*$  values are for  $\omega^{-2}$  source models for earthquakes and explosions and  $\omega^{-3}$  source models for earthquakes

### Radiation Pattern

Body waves for eight of the eleven Pamir events show both apparent compressional and dilatational first motions, suggesting that these events are earthquakes. Due to the low magnitudes of these events, first motions were difficult to determine on most records. The overlapping compressional and dilatational first motions on the first motion diagrams indicate that this is not a reliable discriminant. For the three events which do not show both compressional and dilatational first motions, no clear first motions were observed on any of the records. The first motions recorded for the other events were too few in number to determine fault plane solutions on a focal sphere. We were not able to determine a radiation pattern from the LR amplitudes owing to the large scatter, which is caused by propagation effects, such as Q differences, dispersion effects on time-domain amplitudes, and focusing or defocusing due to refraction as illustrated in the predicted raypaths in Figure 13.

### S/P Excitation

As would be expected for these small magnitude events, there were no short-period S observations from the Pamir events to determine the ratio of S/P ground displacement.

#### SUMMARY

Eleven events with low reported  $M_s$  for their  $m_b$  from the Northern Pamirs and ten Kazakh explosions were examined in a seismic discrimination context. All the Pamir events lie close to major faults observed in satellite photographs. It was impossible on the basis of first motions to determine fault plane solutions due to the small magnitudes of the events. We were also unable to determine a radiation pattern from the LR amplitudes, probably due to varying propagation effects. The following characteristics of the Pamir events indicate that all the events are earthquakes:

- o All the presumed earthquakes had consistent pP phases recorded at LASA, NORSAR, or some of the WWSSN stations. Although little moveout for pP can be detected for shallow earthquakes, the clarity and size of the phase was sufficient in most cases to identify it with some confidence.
- o All the Pamir events studied here fall above the line  $M_s = m_b - 1.5$ . The Kazakh explosions clearly lie below the line  $M_s = m_b - 1.5$ .

There are other areas in Asia, notably near 30°N, 95°E, where earthquakes do not clearly separate from explosions in Asia on an  $M_s$ - $m_b$  plot. Also shot arrays could be used to raise the  $M_s$  of an explosion by about 0.3  $M_s$  units or more without raising  $m_b$ , placing it close to the earthquake population studied here.

Complexity and spectral ratio were not useful discriminants in this data set. The low magnitudes of the earthquakes studied here ( $m_b$  from 4.3 to 4.8 and  $M_s$  from 3.2 to 4.4) made clear discrimination difficult with the available data and probably represents nearly the lowest threshold of discrimination for the stations and area studied in this report. The installation of high-quality SRO stations in Asia will permit the examination of lower-magnitude events with multistation short-period data.

## REFERENCES

- Aliev, S., N. Beliaevsky, E. Butovskaya, B. Volvovsky, I. Volvovsky, G. Krasnopevtseva, V. Pak, M. Polshkov, V. Rubailo, V. Sallogub, B. Tal-Virsky, F. Tregub, I. Khamrabayev, and G. Kharechko (1976), The seismic experiment in the Northern Pamirs, in Geodynamics: Progress and Prospects, ed. C. Drake, American Geophysical Union.
- Archambeau, C., E. Flinn, and D. Lambert (1969), Fine structure of the upper mantle, J. Geophys. Res., 74, 5825.
- Ben-Menahem, A., S. Smith, and T. Teng (1965), A procedure for source studies from spectrum of long-period seismic body waves, Bull. Seism. Soc. Am., 55, 203.
- Bungum, H., and D. Tjostheim, (1976), Discrimination between Eurasian earthquakes and underground explosions using the  $m_b:M_s$  method and short-period autoregressive parameters, Geophys. J., 45, 371.
- Dahlman, O., H. Israelson, A. Austegard, and G. Hornstrom (1974), Definition and identification of seismic events in the USSR, Bull. Seism. Soc. Am., 64, 607.
- Douglas, A., P. Marshall, P. Gibbs, J. Young, and C. Flamey (1973), P signal complexity reexamined, Geophys. J., 33, 195.
- Hanks, T., and W. Thatcher (1972), A graphical representation of seismic source parameters, J. Geophys. Res., 77, 4393.
- Keilis-Borok, V. I. (1960), Investigation of the Mechanism of Earthquakes, English translation, American Geophysical Union, Washington, D.C.
- Kosminskaya, I., G. Mikhota, and Y. Tulina (1958), Crustal structure of the Pamir-Alai zone from seismic depth-sounding data, Izvestiya, Geophysics Series, 673.
- Lacoss, R. (1969), A large-population LASA discrimination experiment, Technical Note 1969-24, Lincoln Laboratory, Lexington, Massachusetts.
- Lambert, D., D. von Seggern, S. Alexander, and G. Galat (1969), The LONGSHOT Experiment, Volume II. Comprehensive Analysis, SDL Report No. 234, Teledyne Geotech, Alexandria, Virginia.
- Molnar, P., T. Fitch, and F. Wu (1973), Fault plane solutions of shallow earthquakes and contemporary tectonics in Asia, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 19, 101.
- Molnar, P., and P. Tapponnier (1975), Cenozoic tectonics of Asia: effects of a continental collision, Science, 189, 419.

REFERENCES (Continued)

- Ringdal, F. (1976), Maximum-likelihood estimate of event magnitude, Bull. Seism. Soc. Am., 66, 789.
- Ritsema, A. (1966), The fault-plane solutions of earthquakes of the Hindu Kush centre, Tectonophysics, 3, 147.
- Semyenov, A. N. (1969), Variations in the travel time of transverse and longitudinal waves before violent earthquakes, Izvestiya, Phys. Solid Earth, No. 4, 245.
- Shirokova, E. (1967), General features in the orientation of principal stresses in earthquake foci in the Mediterranean-Asian seismic belt, Izvestiya, Phys. Solid Earth, No. 12, 12.
- Vinnik, L. P., and A. Godzikoskaya (1973), Lateral variations of the absorption by the upper mantle beneath Asia, Izvestiya, Earth Physics, No. 1, 3.
- Vinnik, L. P., and A. A. Lukk (1974), Lateral inhomogeneities of the upper mantle under the Pamir and Hindu-Kush, Izvestiya, Earth Physics, No. 1, 9.
- von Seggern, D., and P. Sobel (1975), Experiments in refining  $M$  estimates for seismic events, SDAC Report No. TR-75-17, Teledyne Geotech,<sup>s</sup> Alexandria, Virginia.