

How resolving are teleseismic forward and backscattered P to S converted waves?

Alexandrine Gesret



Receiver function example



\circ Hellenic subduction zone

- Receiver functions (RF) technique widely used to image the subducting crust which is identified as a Low Velocity Layer (LVL)
- The LVL appears as a trough followed by a peak on the RF
- The spacing between trough and peak is related to the LVL thickness and Vp/Vs ratio inside the LVL
- In several subduction zones, high Vp/Vs estimated from RF

RF obtained for an earthquake recorded at the VLI station with a common filter between 3 et 13s



peak ∆t=1.8 s ⇔LVL thickness = 15 km

>Typical oceanic crust has a thickness of 7-8 km
=> Below Peloponnesus : not an oceanic crust,
high Vp/Vs inside the crust or lack of resolution ?



○Sensitivity to frequency ⇔ wavelet response in conversion



- Dominant period $T_b < 0.9$ s required to identify an oceanic crust
- Common processing : apparent thickness twice the true one!
- Typical oceanic crust subducting below Eastern Peloponnesus

37

Extension to backscattered waves



Ratios between theoretical time delays τ_2/τ_1 , τ_3/τ_1 , τ_3/τ_2 do not depend on LVL thickness



Extension to backscattered waves

Synthetic forward and backscattered converted waves for a family of wavelets for a typical oceanic crust





- In the non interaction domain, measured spacing Δ = theoretical time delay τ
- Backscattered waves (Pps,Pss) have a better resolution
- But Vp/Vs ratio deduced from spacing ratios Δ_2/Δ_1 , Δ_3/Δ_1 , Δ_3/Δ_2 , generally Δ_2/Δ_1



Extension to backscattered waves



=> Overestimation of Vp/Vs for common filters!





OApplication to real data

Multiscale analysis for a stack of earthquakes recorded to the SERG station of the Corinth Rift Laboratory



- Vp/Vs deduced from Δ_2/Δ_1
- At low frequency, Vp/Vs \approx 2.4 whereas at high frequency, Vp/Vs \approx 1.8
- Hellenic subduction => oceanic crust ≈ 7km thick with Vp/Vs ≈ 1.8