

Two volcanic tsunami events caused by trapdoor faulting at a submerged caldera near Curtis and Cheeseman Islands in the Kermadec Arc

Osamu Sandanbata¹, Shingo Watada², Kenji Satake², Hiroo Kanamori³, and Luis Rivera⁴

¹National Research Institute for Earth Science and Disaster Resilience

²University of Tokyo

³Seismological Laboratory, California Institute of Technology

⁴Université de Strasbourg

October 27, 2023

Abstract

Two submarine earthquakes (M_w 5.8) occurred near volcanic islands, Curtis and Cheeseman, in the Kermadec Arc in 2009 and 2017. Following both earthquakes, similar tsunamis with wave heights of about a meter, larger than expected from their moderate seismic magnitudes, were observed by coastal tide gauges. We investigate the source mechanism for both earthquakes by analyzing tsunami and seismic data of the 2017 event. Tsunami waveform analysis indicates that the earthquake uplifted a submerged caldera around the islands. Combined analysis of tsunami and seismic data suggests that *trapdoor faulting*, or sudden intra-caldera fault slip interacted with magma reservoir deformation, occurred due to magma overpressure, possibly in association with caldera resurgence. The earthquake scaling relationship for trapdoor faulting events at three calderas deviates from that for regular earthquakes, possibly due to the fault-reservoir interaction in calderas.

Two volcanic tsunami events caused by trapdoor faulting at a submerged caldera near Curtis and Cheeseman Islands in the Kermadec Arc

Osamu Sandanbata^{1,2†}, Shingo Watada¹, Kenji Satake¹, Hiroo Kanamori³, and Luis Rivera⁴

¹ Earthquake Research Institute, the University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan.

² National Research Institute for Earth Science and Disaster Resilience, Ibaraki, Japan.

³ Seismological Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA.

⁴ Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, ITES UMR 7063, Strasbourg F-67084, France.

Corresponding author: Osamu Sandanbata (osm3@bosai.go.jp)

[†]*Now at* National Research Institute for Earth Science and Disaster Resilience, Ibaraki, Japan.

Key Points:

- Unusual tsunamis were caused by two M_w 5.8 volcanic earthquakes in 2009 and 2017 near Curtis and Cheeseman Islands in the Kermadec Arc.
- By using tsunami and seismic data of the 2017 event, we suggest that a trapdoor faulting event occurred at a submerged resurgent caldera.
- Trapdoor faulting events at calderas had abnormally large slips, possibly due to the fault-reservoir interaction in calderas.

Abstract

Two submarine earthquakes (M_w 5.8) occurred near volcanic islands, Curtis and Cheeseman, in the Kermadec Arc in 2009 and 2017. Following both earthquakes, similar tsunamis with wave heights of about a meter, larger than expected from their moderate seismic magnitudes, were observed by coastal tide gauges. We investigate the source mechanism for both earthquakes by analyzing tsunami and seismic data of the 2017 event. Tsunami waveform analysis indicates that the earthquake uplifted a submerged caldera around the islands. Combined analysis of tsunami and seismic data suggests that *trapdoor faulting*, or sudden intra-caldera fault slip interacted with magma reservoir deformation, occurred due to magma overpressure, possibly in association with caldera resurgence. The earthquake scaling relationship for trapdoor faulting events at three calderas deviates from that for regular earthquakes, possibly due to the fault-reservoir interaction in calderas.

Plain Language Summary

Most tsunamis are generated by large earthquakes with seismic magnitudes $M > \sim 7$, but two moderate-sized earthquakes with only M 5.8 near volcanic islands, north of New Zealand, generated unusual tsunamis with a maximum wave height of about a meter. In this study, we examine the unusual source mechanism of the volcanic earthquakes that caused unexpected tsunamis. By analyzing the records of tsunamis and seismic waves from the earthquakes, we suggest that the inside of a curved fault system beneath a submerged volcano with a caldera structure suddenly moved upward, together with a large intra-caldera fault slip and a volume increase of a shallow magma reservoir. Overpressure created by magma accumulation beneath the submarine caldera recurrently induces meter-scale tsunamis without significant ground motions, calling for attention to tsunami hazards from submarine calderas.

1 Introduction

On 17 February 2009 and 8 December 2017 (UTC), peculiar tsunamis were recorded at coastal tide gauges for tsunami monitoring in New Zealand, after shallow earthquakes with moment magnitudes of M_w 5.8. Both earthquakes occurred near Curtis and Cheeseman Islands, volcanic islands in the Kermadec Arc (Figure 1a; Table S1); we hereafter call them *Curtis earthquakes*. The maximum tsunami wave heights from the 2009 and 2017 earthquakes were about 50 cm (LOTT) and 80 cm (RFRT), respectively (Figure 1b), much larger than expected for their seismic magnitudes (Abe, 1981). The tsunami waveforms from these earthquakes were similar at three stations, LOTT, NCPT, and TAUT, and their moment tensors are similarly dominated by the compensated-linear-vector-dipole (CLVD) component with a nearly vertical tension-axis. Such *vertical-T CLVD earthquakes* are often observed in active volcanic contexts (Sandambata, Kanamori, et al., 2021; Shuler, Nettles, et al., 2013). These indicate that a similar volcanic phenomenon near the islands repeatedly caused the tsunamis.

The mechanism of tsunamigenic vertical-T CLVD earthquakes has been controversial. For the Curtis earthquakes, Gusman et al. (2020) analyzed tsunami data at tide gauges and broad-band (20–500 s) seismic data and proposed a model involving two sources at different depths. They suggested that a hydrofracturing source at a depth of ~ 1.5 km in the crust generated tsunamis without significant seismic radiations, and a deeper source at ~ 10 km related to fluid flow radiated seismic waves. Similar events were observed at Sumisu caldera, south of Japan, for which various models were proposed: hydrofracturing of magma-water

interaction (Kanamori et al., 1993; Satake & Kanamori, 1991), ring-faulting (Ekström, 1994), shallow tensile crack (Fukao et al., 2018). Recently, Sandanbata et al. (2022) showed that the trapdoor faulting mechanism explains both tsunami and long-period seismic data from an event at Sumisu caldera.

We investigate the source mechanism of the 2017 Curtis earthquakes using an approach similar to that used by Sandanbata et al. (2022). After estimating the initial sea surface displaced by the earthquake using tsunami data, we explore a unified source model that explains both tsunami and long-period seismic data from the earthquake. We then propose a source mechanism and discuss submarine volcanism and its atypical earthquake scaling relationship.

2 Geological background

Curtis and Cheeseman Islands are the emergent portions of a submarine dacitic volcano containing a crater with fumaroles activity (Doyle et al., 1979; Smith et al., 1988; Global Volcanism Program, 2013). Doyle et al. (1979) reported 18-m uplift during the 200 years before their survey on/around the islands, implying active magma supply. Beneath the islands, a cone structure is surrounded by a circular bathymetric depression with a maximum water depth of ~400 m, indicating a submerged caldera with a size of 7 km × 6 km (Figure 2a), as mentioned in Global Volcanism Program (2013); we hereafter call it *Curtis caldera*.

3 Data

3.1 Tsunami data

We use four coastal tide gauge records at RBCT, RFRT, LOTT, and GBIT stations from the 2017 earthquake, with a sampling rate of one sample/minute (Figure 1b). We extract the tsunami signals from the raw record by removing tidal trends approximated as low-order polynomial functions. The signals have dominant periods from 200 to 500 s. We do not use records at NCPT and TAUT, because of poor signal-to-noise ratios.

3.2 Long-period seismic data

We use long-period seismic waveform data from the 2017 earthquake, recorded on LH or BH channels at seismic stations (network codes: IU, NZ, AU, and G). We select 33 good-quality records after data screening, remove the instrument response from the seismograms to obtain displacement records, and apply a causal fourth-order Butterworth band-pass filter with corner frequencies at 0.005 and 0.0125 Hz (period: 80–200 s); these procedures are performed with the W-phase package (e.g., Kanamori & Rivera, 2008).

4 Source modeling of the 2017 earthquake

4.1 Vertical sea-surface displacement model

We start our modeling by estimating the vertical sea-surface displacement due to the 2017 earthquake with the tsunami data (see Text S1, for details). We first simulate dispersive tsunami waveforms at the tide gauges with the JAGURS code (Baba et al., 2015). We delayed the waveforms at two distant stations, LOTT and GBIT, to incorporate the effects of seawater compressibility and Earth's elasticity (Ho et al., 2017; Sandanbata, Watada, et al., 2021;

Watada et al., 2014). We then perform a tsunami waveform inversion to reconstruct the vertical sea-surface displacement.

The obtained model (Figure 2b) involves a large uplift of ~ 1.3 m localized on the western caldera floor, a peripheral subsidence of ~ 1.3 m to the south of the uplift, and another meter-scale uplift to the southeast. This model explains the tsunami data well (Figure 2c). To examine the model robustness, we estimate a sea-surface *uplift* model without subsidence by imposing the non-negative condition on the inversion. In the obtained uplift model (Figure 2d), a similar localized uplift is estimated over the western part of the caldera but with a larger amplitude of ~ 2.4 m. In this case, the uplift to the southeast seen in Figure 2b disappears. The two sea-surface displacement models with and without subsidence are different, but the tsunami waveform fits are comparable (Figures 2c and 2e). These results suggest that the tsunami was excited mainly by an uplift localized in the western caldera floor, as supported by our resolution tests (see Text S1).

Given the inferred deformation localized on one side of the caldera, the *trapdoor faulting* mechanism (Figure 3a) would be a good candidate. This mechanism, driven by magma pressure in a reservoir, was first proposed for seismic events at a subaerial caldera of Sierra Negra, Galapagos (e.g., Amelung et al., 2000; Zheng et al., 2022), and recently found at Sumisu caldera in oceans (Sandanbata et al., 2022). The trapdoor faulting is a sudden slip of a part of an intra-caldera fault involving an asymmetric deformation of a crack-like reservoir. This mechanism can cause a large asymmetric caldera uplift with a vertical-T CLVD earthquake, as observed from the Curtis earthquake.

4.2 Dislocation model of the fault-crack composite source

We explore an earthquake source model by using both the tsunami and long-period seismic data, following Sandanbata et al. (2022) (see Text S2, for details). First, we assume a fault-crack composite source system, or an inward-dipping partial ring fault connected to a horizontal crack at a depth of 3 km in the crust (Figures 3b and S1). We fix the partial ring fault on the western side of the caldera (Figure 3b), given the estimate sea-surface uplift (Figure 2a); the dip angle is varied from 65 – 85° . Second, by a tsunami waveform inversion, we determine dislocations of the source system, i.e., reverse slips of the ring fault and vertical opening/closure of the horizontal crack, to obtain source models. We assume a reverse slip on an inward-dipping ring fault because this combination can cause a vertical-T CLVD earthquake that accompanies a caldera uplift (see Figure 1 in Sandanbata, Kanamori, et al., 2021). Here, the vertical component of the slip at the fault bottom is assumed to be the same as the opening of the horizontal crack at its contact. Third, we compute long-period (80–200 s) seismograms from the models and compare them with the seismic data for validation, assuming that Lamé's constants are $\lambda = 34.2$ GPa and $\mu = 26.6$ GPa.

Consequently, we find source models that explain both datasets. The tsunami waveform inversion successfully determines the dislocations of the fault-crack composite source system, as shown by an example model in Figure 3b. The model is expected to uplift the sea surface by ~ 2 m (Figure 4a), explaining the tsunami data well (Figure 4b). Although we vary the ring-fault dip angle, all the obtained models yield similarly good waveform fit (Figure S2) with small waveform misfits (tsunami NRMS of 0.60–0.76; Figure 3c), indicating weak constraints on the dip angle.

In contrast, long-period seismic wave amplitudes from the models change significantly depending on the dip angle (Figure S3), resulting in large variations of the misfit of seismic waveforms (seismic RMS of 0.86–2.08 μm ; Figure 3c). This is because seismic excitation by a shallow ring-faulting becomes less efficient as the dip is close to vertical (Sandarbata, Kanamori, et al., 2021). Thus, models with dip angles in a narrow range of 75° to 81° yield reasonable seismic waveform fits (seismic RMS < 1.0 μm ; Figure 3c). Figures 4c–e show moment tensors and long-period seismograms computed from the model shown in Figure 3b, which has a ring-fault dip angle of 78° ; this model explains the seismic waveform data well (Figure 3e), yielding the smallest seismic RMS of 0.86 μm (Figure 3c).

Therefore, we propose the model shown in Figure 3b as a best-fit source model. It presents a reverse slip of 4.4 m at a maximum along the ring fault with a dip angle of 78° and asymmetric opening and closure of the horizontal crack with maximum amounts of 5.4 m and 2.9 m, respectively. The crack increases its inner volume by $+3.5 \times 10^7 \text{ m}^3$. This model causes a sea-surface uplift localized over the western caldera floor with a smaller subsidence outside the fault (Figure 4a). The pattern and amplitude of this sea-surface displacement are different from those estimated in Section 4.1 (Figures 2b and 2d) due to strong constraints from the fault-crack source system, but this model explains the tsunami data well (Figure 4b). Figure S4 shows synthetic tsunami waveforms from the horizontal crack and the ring fault separately, demonstrating that both parts contribute the tsunami generation.

The model's total moment tensor is highly isotropic with M_w 6.24 (Figure 4c; Table S2), composed of the horizontal crack (M_w 6.19) with a strong isotropic component and the ring fault (M_w 5.96) with a large vertical-T CLVD component (Figure 4d). In Figure S5, we show that only limited components of the ring fault, which constitute a vertical-T CLVD moment tensor, mainly contribute to the seismic radiation, and that the horizontal crack contributes little (see Text S3, for details). This explains why vertical-T CLVD solutions were obtained by moment tensor analyses assuming no isotropic component, as seen in the GCMT catalog.

5 Discussion

5.1 Trapdoor faulting mechanism

We have shown that our source model (Figure 3b) explains both the tsunami and long-period seismic data from the 2017 Curtis earthquake. The asymmetrical motion of the source system is like those estimated for trapdoor faulting events at Sumisu and Sierra Negra calderas (e.g., Sandarbata et al., 2022; Zheng et al., 2022). Similarly, we suggest the trapdoor faulting mechanism for the Curtis earthquake, as follows. Before faulting, the caldera gradually inflated due to continuous magma influx into the reservoir, and the magma pressurization increased shear stress on an inward-dipping ring fault. At the time of the earthquake, the western fault suddenly slips in a reverse sense due to the critically increased shear stress created by the magma pressure. The fault slip instantaneously moves up the western upper wall of the crack, expanding the crack near the fault. The asymmetrical crack expansion induces magma flow from the eastern to western sides, which results in the closure of the eastern side of the crack with magma depressurization; the crack closure might be alternatively caused by magma mass outflow due to an eruption, but the two possible cases are indistinguishable from our dataset.

During the earthquake, the ring faulting, reservoir deformation, and magma movement occur interactively and almost simultaneously, and this entire process contributes to the generation of tsunami and seismic waves. Thus, we refer to this fault-reservoir interactive process as a trapdoor faulting mechanism; this follows the usage in Sandanbata et al. (2022). We note that, most previous studies (e.g., Amelung et al., 2000; Bell, Hernandez, et al., 2021) used the term, “trapdoor faulting”, to describe only the faulting part.

The similarities between the Curtis earthquakes in 2009 and 2017 suggests that trapdoor faulting events recurred at Curtis caldera. The tsunami waveforms from the earthquakes are almost identical at LOTT, NCPT, and TAUT (Figure 1b). To further investigate the earthquake similarity, we perform deviatoric moment tensor analysis using long-period seismic data (Table S3; see Text S6). We neglect two moment-tensor components, $M_{r\theta}$ and $M_{r\phi}$, that are indeterminate for such shallow earthquakes to obtain *resolvable moment tensors* \mathbf{M}_{res} as proxies for the ring-fault geometry (Sandanbata, Kanamori, et al., 2021) (Figure S6). Similar null-axis directions (NNW-SSE) of \mathbf{M}_{res} indicate that ring-fault segments of the two events are oriented similarly, while a more dominant vertical-CLVD component of the 2017 event (larger k_{CLVD} ; see the definition in Text S4) implies that a longer ring fault was ruptured by this event than the 2009 event. Recurrence of trapdoor faulting events was reported for Sumisu and Sierra Negra calderas, being attributed to continuous magma supply causing fault failures repeatedly (Gregg et al., 2022; Bell, Hernandez, et al., 2021; Sandanbata et al., 2022); this would be the case for Curtis caldera.

In Text S5, we demonstrate that different fault-crack composite source models, obtained by assuming a deeper crack, a longer ring fault, or an additional normal faulting component on the eastern fault, similarly reproduce the datasets. Although this indicates limited source resolution of our analysis based on long-period ($>\sim 100$ s) waveform data at regional-far field, a similar mechanism in a fault-reservoir composite source system is still inferred from these alternative models; we also emphasize that the fault-crack composite sources explain our datasets clearly better than only a ring fault or a horizontal crack (see Text S6, for details). To better constrain the source geometries, near-field data analyses with finer surface and sub-caldera structural information would be required; such analyses will also help to resolve how the fault rupture propagates and the magma-filled reservoir responds to faulting.

Gusman et al. (2020) suggested a different mechanism for these earthquakes to explain tsunami and broadband seismic waveforms. They separately attributed the tsunami generation to a hydrofracturing source at a shallow depth and the vertical-T CLVD seismic radiation to a deeper source. On the other hand, we demonstrated that the trapdoor faulting mechanism beneath the caldera reproduces tsunami and long-period seismic waveforms. The two mechanisms seem indistinguishable from the low-sampling and limited tsunami data. Given the difficulty in determining shallow source depths (Ekström et al., 2012) and resolving seismic sources that involve volume change at shallow depths (Kawakatsu et al., 1996), the two mechanisms cannot be distinguished from available seismic data in regional or far field.

5.2 Implications for submarine volcanism

The trapdoor faulting events may have occurred in the *resurgence* process of Curtis caldera. Resurgence is a long-term caldera uplift driven by gradual pressure increase of magma accumulating in a shallow reservoir and facilitated by ring-fault reactivations, as observed in many calderas like Toba, Long Volley, Valles, and Iwo-Jima (Iō Tō). Although most resurgent

calderas accompany earthquakes with only seismic magnitudes $M < \sim 3$ (Acocella et al., 2015; references therein), $M \sim 5$ trapdoor faulting events occurred during the resurgence of Sierra Negra caldera (Bell, La Femina, et al., 2021; Gregg et al., 2018, 2022). The significant uplift on/around Curtis Island found by Doyle et al. (1979) may be attributed to resurgence. The cone structure within the caldera (Figure 2a) is possibly a *resurgent dome*, as seen within many resurgent calderas (Acocella, 2019; Acocella et al., 2001) and replicated by numerical/analog experiments (Acocella & Funiciello, 1999; Brothelande et al., 2016). Active fumaroles on the island (Doyle et al., 1979) are common features for resurgent domes (Cole et al., 2005; Molin et al., 2003).

The relationship between trapdoor faulting earthquakes and submarine eruptions at Curtis caldera remains unclear. About a month before the 2009 earthquake, ocean acoustic waves from near the caldera were recorded by a seismic network (Global Volcanism Program, 2013). These signals perhaps indicated submarine eruptions, but their origins are yet to be confirmed.

5.3 Earthquake scaling relationship for trapdoor faulting

The earthquake scaling relationship for trapdoor faulting events at calderas is distinct from that for tectonic earthquakes. Figure 5 shows seismic moment magnitudes and maximum fault slips estimated for four trapdoor faulting events with proposed source models: events on 8 December 2017 at Curtis (M_w 5.8 and 4.4 m [this study]), 2 May 2015 at Sumisu (M_w 5.7 and 6.8 m [Sandanbata et al., 2022]), and 16 April 2005 (m_b 4.6 and 2.0 m [Zheng et al., 2022]; m_b is used because M_w was not reported) and 22 October 2005 (M_w 5.4 and 1.8 m [Yun, 2007]) at Sierra Negra. Compared with the empirical scaling relationship by Wells & Coppersmith (1994), the trapdoor faulting events involved far larger, 10–20 times, fault slips than those by tectonic earthquakes with similar seismic magnitudes. While seismic estimates of moment magnitudes for trapdoor faulting events are often smaller than geodetic (or tsunami) estimates because of the aseismic slip or small shear stiffness in calderas (e.g., Amelung et al., 2000; Jónsson, 2009), the magnitude discrepancies cannot explain the scaling gap (see Text S7). The atypical scaling relationship would indicate that intra-caldera faults accommodate large slips because of their connection to a reservoir, contributing to large tsunamis when they occur underwater (Sandanbata et al., 2022). Hence, to understand how the tsunami size is controlled, it is critical to study the earthquake physics in the fault-reservoir interactive system.

6 Conclusions

Both seismic and tsunami data from two peculiar earthquakes near Curtis and Cheeseman Islands are explained well by the trapdoor faulting mechanism within the submerged caldera. The large tsunamis can be attributed to the sudden asymmetric caldera-floor uplift of meters, possibly facilitated by the fault-reservoir interactive system beneath calderas. A long-term resurgence of Curtis caldera, inferred from bathymetric and geological features, suggests its eruption potential and the importance of the volcano monitoring.

Acknowledgments

We thank Editor, Christian Huber, and Falk Amelung and an anonymous reviewer for constructive suggestions. We thank Zhongwen Zhan for helpful discussion. This study is funded by the JSPS KAKENHI (JP17J02919, JP20J01689, and JP19K04034), by the JST J-RAPID (JPMJRR1805). Osamu Sandanbata's travel to California Institute of Technology was

supported by Oversea Internship Program of Earthquake Research Institute, the University of Tokyo.

Data availability

The tide-gauge data are provided from Land Information New Zealand (LINZ; <https://www.linz.govt.nz/sea/tides/sea-level-data/sea-level-data-downloads>). The topography and bathymetry data are provided from GEBCO Compilation Group through the British Oceanographic Data Centre (Weatherall et al., 2015; https://www.gebco.net/data_and_products/gridded_bathymetry_data/gebco_30_second_grid/), the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research in New Zealand (NIWA; <https://niwa.co.nz/our-science/oceans/bathymetry>), and LINZ (<https://data.linz.govt.nz/>). The seismic data are available through the Data Management Center of the Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology (IRIS)'s Wilber 3 system (<https://ds.iris.edu/wilber3/>) or IRIS Web Services (<https://service.iris.edu/>), including the seismic networks of IU (GSN; Albuquerque Seismological Laboratory, 1988), AU (ANSN; H., G., & Geoscience Australia, 2021), NZ (New Zealand National Seismograph Network), and G (GEOSCOPE; IPGP & EOST, 1982). The earthquake information is available from the GCMT catalog (Ekström et al., 2012; <https://www.globalcmt.org/>), or UGSG (<https://earthquake.usgs.gov/>). The W-phase package (Duputel et al., 2012; Hayes et al., 2009; Kanamori & Rivera, 2008) is available through the website of W Phase source inversion (<http://eost.u-strasbg.fr/wphase/index.html>). We plotted focal mechanisms representing moment tensors with a MATLAB code developed by James Conder (available from <https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/61227-focalmech-fm-centerx-centery-diam-varargin>). The best-fit source model presented in this paper is contained in Data Set S1, which is available from Zenodo (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7502680>).

References

- Abe, K. (1981). Physical size of tsunamigenic earthquakes of the northwestern Pacific. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 27(3), 194–205. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9201\(81\)90016-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9201(81)90016-9)
- Acocella, V. (2019). Bridging the Gap From Caldera Unrest to Resurgence. *Frontiers of Earth Science in China*, 7, 173. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2019.00173>
- Acocella, V., & Funiciello, R. (1999). The interaction between regional and local tectonics during resurgent doming: the case of the island of Ischia, Italy. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 88(1–2), 109–123. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0377-0273\(98\)00109-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0377-0273(98)00109-7)
- Acocella, V., Cifelli, F., & Funiciello, R. (2001). The control of overburden thickness on resurgent domes: insights from analogue models. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 111(1–4), 137–153. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0377-0273\(01\)00224-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0377-0273(01)00224-4)
- Acocella, V., Funiciello, R., Marotta, E., Orsi, G., & de Vita, S. (2004). The role of extensional structures on experimental calderas and resurgence. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 129(1), 199–217. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-0273\(03\)00240-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-0273(03)00240-3)
- Acocella, V., Di Lorenzo, R., Newhall, C., & Scandone, R. (2015). An overview of recent (1988 to 2014) caldera unrest: Knowledge and perspectives. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 53(3), 896–955. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015rg000492>
- Aki, K., & Richards, P. G. (1980). *Quantitative seismology: theory and methods* (Vol. 842). Freeman San Francisco, CA.
- Amelung, F., Jónsson, S., Zebker, H., & Segall, P. (2000). Widespread uplift and ‘trapdoor’ faulting on Galápagos volcanoes observed with radar interferometry. *Nature*, 407(6807), 993–996. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35039604>
- Albuquerque Seismological Laboratory (ASL)/USGS. (1988). Global Seismograph Network - IRIS/USGS [Data set]. International Federation of Digital Seismograph Networks. <https://doi.org/10.7914/SN/IU>
- Baba, T., Takahashi, N., Kaneda, Y., Ando, K., Matsuoka, D., & Kato, T. (2015). Parallel Implementation of Dispersive Tsunami Wave Modeling with a Nesting Algorithm for the 2011 Tohoku Tsunami. *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, 172(12), 3455–3472. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-015-1049-2>
- Bell, A. F., La Femina, P. C., Ruiz, M., Amelung, F., Bagnardi, M., Bean, C. J., et al. (2021). Caldera resurgence during the 2018 eruption of Sierra Negra volcano, Galápagos Islands. *Nature Communications*, 12(1), 1397. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21596-4>
- Bell, A. F., Hernandez, S., La Femina, P. C., & Ruiz, M. C. (2021). Uplift and seismicity driven by magmatic inflation at Sierra Negra volcano, Galápagos islands. *Journal of Geophysical Research, [Solid Earth]*, 126(7). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021jb022244>
- Brothelande, E., Peltier, A., Got, J.-L., Merle, O., Lardy, M., & Garaebiti, E. (2016). Constraints on the source of resurgent doming inferred from analogue and numerical modeling — Implications on the current feeding system of the Yenkahe dome–Yasur volcano complex (Vanuatu). *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 322, 225–240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2015.11.023>

- Cole, J. W., Milner, D. M., & Spinks, K. D. (2005). Calderas and caldera structures: a review. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 69(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2004.06.004>
- Dahlen, F. A., & Tromp, J. (1998). *Theoretical Global Seismology*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691216157>
- Doyle, A. C., Singleton, R. J., & Yaldwyn, J. C. (1979). Volcanic activity and recent uplift on Curtis and Cheeseman Islands, Kermadec Group, Southwest Pacific. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 9(1), 123–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03036758.1979.10418159>
- Duputel, Z., Rivera, L., Kanamori, H., & Hayes, G. (2012). W phase source inversion for moderate to large earthquakes (1990–2010). *Geophysical Journal International*, 189(2), 1125–1147. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2012.05419.x>
- Dziewonski, A. M., & Anderson, D. L. (1981). Preliminary reference Earth model. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 25(4), 297–356. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9201\(81\)90046-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9201(81)90046-7)
- Ekström, G. (1994). Anomalous earthquakes on volcano ring-fault structures. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 128(3–4), 707–712. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821x\(94\)90184-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-821x(94)90184-8)
- Ekström, G., Nettles, M., & Dziewoński, A. M. (2012). The global CMT project 2004–2010: Centroid-moment tensors for 13,017 earthquakes. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 200–201, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pepi.2012.04.002>
- Fukao, Y., Sandanbata, O., Sugioka, H., Ito, A., Shiobara, H., Watada, S., & Satake, K. (2018). Mechanism of the 2015 volcanic tsunami earthquake near Torishima, Japan. *Science Advances*, 4(4), eaao0219. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aao0219>
- Global Volcanism Program. (2013). Curtis Island (242010). In E. Venzke (Ed.), *Volcanoes of the World*, v. 4.10.2 (24 Aug 2021). Smithsonian Institution. Retrieved from <https://volcano.si.edu/volcano.cfm?vn=242010>
- Gregg, P. M., Le Mével, H., Zhan, Y., Dufek, J., Geist, D., & Chadwick, W. W., Jr. (2018). Stress triggering of the 2005 eruption of Sierra Negra volcano, Galápagos. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 45(24), 13288–13297. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018gl080393>
- Gregg, P. M., Zhan, Y., Amelung, F., Geist, D., Mothes, P., Koric, S., & Yunjun, Z. (2022). Forecasting mechanical failure and the 26 June 2018 eruption of Sierra Negra Volcano, Galápagos, Ecuador. *Science Advances*, 8(22), eabm4261. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abm4261>
- Gusman, A. R., Kaneko, Y., Power, W., & Burbidge, D. (2020). Source process for two enigmatic repeating vertical-T CLVD tsunami earthquakes in the kermadec ridge. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(16). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020gl087805>
- Hanks, T. C., & Kanamori, H. (1979). A moment magnitude scale. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 84(B5), 2348. <https://doi.org/10.1029/jb084ib05p02348>
- Hayes, G. P., Rivera, L., & Kanamori, H. (2009). Source Inversion of the W-Phase: Real-time Implementation and Extension to Low Magnitudes. *Seismological Research Letters*, 80(5), 817–822. <https://doi.org/10.1785/gssrl.80.5.817>
- Ho, T.-C., Satake, K., & Watada, S. (2017). Improved phase corrections for transoceanic tsunami data in spatial and temporal source estimation: Application to the 2011 Tohoku earthquake. *Journal of Geophysical Research, [Solid Earth]*, 122(12), 10155–10175. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017jb015070>

- H., G., & Geoscience Australia. (2021). Australian National Seismograph Network Data Collection [Data set]. Commonwealth of Australia (Geoscience Australia).
<https://doi.org/10.26186/144675>
- Institut de physique du globe de Paris (IPGP), & École et Observatoire des Sciences de la Terre de Strasbourg (EOST). (1982). GEOSCOPE, French Global Network of broad band seismic stations [Data set]. Institut de physique du globe de Paris (IPGP), Université de Paris. <https://doi.org/10.18715/GEOSCOPE.G>
- Jónsson, S. (2009). Stress interaction between magma accumulation and trapdoor faulting on Sierra Negra volcano, Galápagos. *Tectonophysics*, 471(1), 36–44.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2008.08.005>
- Kajiura, K. (1963). The Leading Wave of a Tsunami. *Bulletin of the Earthquake Research Institute, University of Tokyo*, 41(3), 535–571. Retrieved from
<https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/120000866529/>
- Kanamori, H. (1977). The energy release in great earthquakes. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 82(20), 2981–2987. <https://doi.org/10.1029/jb082i020p02981>
- Kanamori, H., & Given, J. W. (1981). Use of long-period surface waves for rapid determination of earthquake-source parameters. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 27(1), 8–31. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9201\(81\)90083-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9201(81)90083-2)
- Kanamori, H., & Rivera, L. (2008). Source inversion of Wphase: speeding up seismic tsunami warning. *Geophysical Journal International*, 175(1), 222–238.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2008.03887.x>
- Kanamori, H., Ekström, G., Dziewonski, A., Barker, J. S., & Sipkin, S. A. (1993). Seismic radiation by magma injection: An anomalous seismic event near Tori Shima, Japan. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 98(B4), 6511–6522.
<https://doi.org/10.1029/92jb02867>
- Kawakatsu, H. (1996). Observability of the isotropic component of a moment tensor. *Geophysical Journal International*, 126(2), 525–544. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.1996.tb05308.x>
- Kawakatsu, H., & Yamamoto, M. (2015). 4.15 - Volcano Seismology. In G. Schubert (Ed.), *Treatise on Geophysics (Second Edition)* (pp. 389–419). Oxford: Elsevier.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-53802-4.00081-6>
- Molin, P., Acocella, V., & Funicello, R. (2003). Structural, seismic and hydrothermal features at the border of an active intermittent resurgent block: Ischia Island (Italy). *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 121(1–2), 65–81.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/s0377-0273\(02\)00412-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0377-0273(02)00412-2)
- Nikkhoo, M., & Walter, T. R. (2015). Triangular dislocation: an analytical, artefact-free solution. *Geophysical Journal International*, 201(2), 1119–1141.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggv035>
- Peregrine, D. H. (1972). Equations for Water Waves and the Approximation behind Them. In R. E. Meyer (Ed.), *Waves on Beaches and Resulting Sediment Transport* (pp. 95–121). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-493250-0.50007-2>
- Persson, P.-O., & Strang, G. (2004). A Simple Mesh Generator in MATLAB. *SIAM Review. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 46(2), 329–345.
<https://doi.org/10.1137/s0036144503429121>
- Sandanbata, O., Watada, S., Satake, K., Fukao, Y., Sugioka, H., Ito, A., & Shiobara, H. (2018). Ray Tracing for Dispersive Tsunamis and Source Amplitude Estimation Based on

- Green's Law: Application to the 2015 Volcanic Tsunami Earthquake Near Torishima, South of Japan. *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, 175(4), 1371–1385.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-017-1746-0>
- Sandanbata, O., Kanamori, H., Rivera, L., Zhan, Z., Watada, S., & Satake, K. (2021). Moment tensors of ring-faulting at active volcanoes: Insights into vertical-CLVD earthquakes at the Sierra Negra caldera, Galápagos islands. *Journal of Geophysical Research, [Solid Earth]*, 126(6), e2021JB021693. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021jb021693>
- Sandanbata, O., Watada, S., Ho, T.-C., & Satake, K. (2021). Phase delay of short-period tsunamis in the density-stratified compressible ocean over the elastic Earth. *Geophysical Journal International*, 226(3), 1975–1985.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggab192>
- Sandanbata, O., Watada, S., Satake, K., Kanamori, H., Rivera, L., & Zhan, Z. (2022). Sub-decadal volcanic tsunamis due to submarine trapdoor faulting at sumisu caldera in the Izu–Bonin arc. *Journal of Geophysical Research, [Solid Earth]*, 127(9).
<https://doi.org/10.1029/2022jb024213>
- Satake, K., & Kanamori, H. (1991). Abnormal tsunamis caused by the June 13, 1984, Torishima, Japan, earthquake. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 96(B12), 19933–19939. <https://doi.org/10.1029/91jb01903>
- Shuler, A., Nettles, M., & Ekström, G. (2013). Global observation of vertical-CLVD earthquakes at active volcanoes. *Journal of Geophysical Research, [Solid Earth]*, 118(1), 138–164. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012jb009721>
- Shuler, A., Ekström, G., & Nettles, M. (2013). Physical mechanisms for vertical-CLVD earthquakes at active volcanoes. *Journal of Geophysical Research, [Solid Earth]*, 118(4), 1569–1586. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrb.50131>
- Silver, P. G., & Jordan, T. H. (1982). Optimal estimation of scalar seismic moment. *Geophysical Journal International*, 70(3), 755–787. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.1982.tb05982.x>
- Smith, I. E. M., Brothers, R. N., Muiruri, F. G., & Browne, P. R. L. (1988). The geochemistry of rock and water samples from Curtis Island volcano, Kermadec group, southwest Pacific. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-0273\(88\)90035-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-0273(88)90035-2)
- Takeuchi, H., & Saito, M. (1972). Seismic surface waves. *Methods in Computational Physics*, 11, 217–295.
- Watada, S., Kusumoto, S., & Satake, K. (2014). Traveltime delay and initial phase reversal of distant tsunamis coupled with the self-gravitating elastic Earth. *Journal of Geophysical Research, [Solid Earth]*, 119(5), 4287–4310. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013jb010841>
- Weatherall, P., Marks, K. M., & Jakobsson, M. (2015). A new digital bathymetric model of the world's oceans. *Earth and Space*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015EA000107>
- Wells, D. L., & Coppersmith, K. J. (1994). New Empirical Relationships among Magnitude, Rupture Length, Rupture Width, Rupture Area, and Surface Displacement. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, 84(4), 974–1002.
<https://doi.org/10.1785/BSSA0840040974>
- Yun, S.-H. (2007). *A mechanical model of the large-deformation 2005 Sierra Negra volcanic eruption derived from InSAR measurements* (Ph.D. Dissertation). Stanford University. Retrieved from https://web.stanford.edu/group/radar/people/Yun_thesis_small.pdf

483 Zheng, Y., Blackstone, L., & Segall, P. (2022). Constraints on absolute magma chamber
484 volume from geodetic measurements of trapdoor faulting at Sierra Negra volcano,
485 Galapagos. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49(5). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021gl095683>
486




Figure 1. Curtis earthquakes. (a) Earthquake centroids (red star) and tide gauges (triangles), with an inset satellite image obtained from Google Earth. (b) Tsunami waveforms at tide gauges. Black and blue lines represent waveforms from the 2009 and 2017 earthquakes, respectively.




Figure 2. Vertical sea-surface displacement models for the 2017 earthquake. (a) Bathymetry around the islands, showing a caldera-like depression (white dashed line). Black dashed lines represent 1-m and 2-m contours of the sea-surface uplift model (shown in d). (b) Model estimated when uplift and subsidence are allowed, and (c) synthetic tsunami waveforms (red) and observation (black) (d) Model estimated when only uplift is allowed, and (e) its synthetic tsunami waveforms. In b and d, contour lines are plotted every 50 m of water depth. In c and e, gray lines represent data lengths for the inversion. Rectangle in d indicates the area shown in a.




Figure 3. Trapdoor faulting mechanism. (a) Schematic illustration of the mechanism (not scaled). (b) Our best-fit source model for the 2017 earthquake. Red color on the ring fault represents reverse slip. Red and blue colors on the horizontal crack represent opening and closing, respectively. (c) Tsunami and seismic waveform misfits for models with different dip angles.




Figure 4. Model performance of our source model (Figure 3b). **(a)** Vertical sea-surface displacement. **(b)** Tsunami waveforms of the synthesis (red) and observation (black). Gray lines represent data lengths used for the inversion. **(c)** Total moment tensor of the model. **(d)** Partial moment tensors of the horizontal crack and the ring fault. **(e)** Long-period seismograms of the synthesis with the model (red; moment tensor in **c**) and observation (black). Red dots delimitate data length to calculate waveform misfit. In inset panels, red circle and blue star represent the station and earthquake locations, respectively. Network and station names, record component, station azimuth, and epicentral distance are indicated on top.




Figure 5. Earthquake scaling relationship for trapdoor faulting events. Circles represent the maximum slip amount and the seismic magnitude for four trapdoor faulting events at Curtis, Sumisu, and Sierra Negra. The magnitude scale is m_b (UGGS) for the 16 April 2005 event at Sierra Negra, but M_w (the GCMT catalog) for the others. Black line represents the relationship for tectonic earthquakes. See text for details.

Two volcanic tsunami events caused by trapdoor faulting at a submerged caldera near Curtis and Cheeseman Islands in the Kermadec Arc

Osamu Sandanbata^{1,2,†}, Shingo Watada¹, Kenji Satake¹, Hiroo Kanamori³, and Luis Rivera⁴

¹Earthquake Research Institute, the University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan.

²National Research Institute for Earth Science and Disaster Resilience, Ibaraki, Japan.

³Seismological Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA.

⁴Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, ITES UMR 7063, Strasbourg F-67084, France.

Contents of this file

Figures S1 to S18

Tables S1 to S3

Texts S1 to S7

Additional Supporting Information (Files uploaded separately)

Caption for Data Set S1

Introduction

This Supporting Information contains supplementary texts, figures, and tables. We describe methodologies for estimation of the vertical sea-surface displacement (Text S1) and for earthquake source modeling (Text S2), moment tensor representation of our source model (Text S3), moment tensor analysis (Text S4), examinations of the model uniqueness (Text S5), modeling results with either only a ring fault or only a horizontal crack (Text S6), and an earthquake scaling relationship compared with geodetic moment magnitudes (Text S7). Figures S1–S6 and Tables S1–S3 are mentioned in Main Text, while Figures S7–S18 are mentioned only in this Supporting Information. Data Set S1 contains the data of the best-fit source model of the 2017 earthquake.

Supplementary Figures (mentioned in Main Text)





Figure S1. An assumed fault-crack composite source system, composed of a partial ring fault and a horizontal crack, viewed from the east (left) and above (right). This structure is discretized into triangular meshes.


(a) Source parameters

Ring-fault dip angle: 70° / Crack depth: 3.0 km



(b) Source parameters

Ring-fault dip angle: 78° / Crack depth: 3.0 km



(c) Source parameters

Ring-fault dip angle: 85° / Crack depth: 3.0 km





Figure S2. Source models with different ring-fault dip angles: **(a)** 70°, **(b)** 78°, and **(c)** 85°. All the models have a horizontal crack at a depth of 3 km in the crust. (Left) Dislocations of the fault-crack source system determined by the tsunami waveform inversion. See the caption of Figure 3b in Main Text. (Right) Synthetic tsunami waveforms from this model (red), compared with observed waveforms (black). See the caption of Figure 4b in Main Text. Note that variations of the ring-fault dip angle do not change the tsunami waveforms.

(a) Source parameters

Ring-fault dip angle: 70° / Crack depth: 3.0 km

$$M_w = 6.21$$

$$M_0 = 2.57 \times 10^{18} \text{ (N m)}$$



$$\begin{bmatrix} 3.36 & & \\ 0.10 & 0.49 & \\ 0.86 & 0.02 & 0.39 \end{bmatrix} \times 10^{18} \text{ (Nm)}$$


$$M_w = 6.12$$

$$M_0 = 1.92 \times 10^{18} \text{ (N m)}$$




$$M_w = 5.99$$

$$M_0 = 12.16 \times 10^{17} \text{ (N m)}$$



Ring fault




(b) Source parameters

Ring-fault dip angle: 78° / Crack depth: 3.0 km

$$M_w = 6.24$$

$$M_0 = 2.87 \times 10^{18} \text{ (N m)}$$



$$\begin{bmatrix} 3.59 & & \\ -0.18 & 0.95 & \\ 0.98 & 0.07 & 0.85 \end{bmatrix} \times 10^{18} \text{ (Nm)}$$


$$M_w = 6.19$$

$$M_0 = 2.44 \times 10^{18} \text{ (N m)}$$




$$M_w = 5.96$$

$$M_0 = 11.11 \times 10^{17} \text{ (N m)}$$



Ring fault




(c) Source parameters

Ring-fault dip angle: 85° / Crack depth: 3.0 km

$$M_w = 6.26$$

$$M_0 = 3.13 \times 10^{18} \text{ (N m)}$$



$$\begin{bmatrix} 3.77 & & \\ -0.33 & 1.29 & \\ 0.99 & 0.04 & 1.25 \end{bmatrix} \times 10^{18} \text{ (Nm)}$$


$$M_w = 6.24$$

$$M_0 = 2.86 \times 10^{18} \text{ (N m)}$$



$$M_w = 5.95$$

$$M_0 = 10.67 \times 10^{17} \text{ (N m)}$$



Ring fault




Figure S3. Moment tensors and seismic waveforms from the source models with a dip angle of (a) 70°, (b) 78°, and (c) 85°; all these models have a horizontal crack at a depth of 3 km in the crust, which are shown in Figure S2. Partial moment tensors of the horizontal crack and the ring fault are shown with the moment tensor of the model. Red and black lines represent synthetic and observed waveforms, respectively. Note that variations of the ring-fault dip angle change the seismic wave amplitudes largely.




Figure S4. Contributions to tsunami waves by the horizontal crack and the ring fault of the best-fit source model (Figure 3b in Main Text). **(a–b)** Vertical sea-surface displacements caused by **(a)** the horizontal crack and **(b)** the ring fault. Red and blue colors represent uplift and subsidence, respectively, with white contour lines plotted every 0.5 m. **(c)** Comparison of the synthetic tsunami waveforms from the horizontal crack (blue) and the ring fault (red), compared with the observed (black) waveforms. The gray line represents the time interval used for the inversion.





Figure S5. Contributions to long-period seismic waves by the best-fit source model (Figure 3b in Main Text). Red lines in the right panels represent synthetic waveforms from (a) M ($= M_{HC} + M_{RF}$), the partial moment tensors of (b) the horizontal crack M_{HC} and (c) the ring fault M_{RF} , and (d) the moment tensor of the ring fault, excluding $M_{T\theta}$ and $M_{T\phi}$. Note that that the smaller-amplitude waveforms from M_{HC} have the reversed polarities relative to those from M_{RF} , reducing the seismic amplitudes of M , and that the main contributor to the long-period seismic waves is the limited moment-tensor components shown in d.

(a) M_{res} of the 2009
earthquake


$$M_w 5.76$$
$$M_0 = 5.44 \times 10^{17} \text{ (N m)}$$



$$k_{CLVD} = 85.1 \%$$

(b) M_{res} of the 2017
earthquake

$$M_w 5.71$$
$$M_0 = 4.62 \times 10^{17} \text{ (N m)}$$



$$k_{CLVD} = 77.1 \%$$

Figure S6. Resolvable moment tensors M_{res} of the (a) 2017 and (b) 2009 Curtis earthquakes determined by the moment tensor analysis (see Text S4). The orientation of the best double-couple solution is shown by thin curves, whose Null-axis direction coincides with that of M_{res} . The focal mechanisms are shown by projection of the lower focal hemisphere.

Supplementary Tables (mentioned in Main Text)

Date	Time	Longitude	Latitude	Depth	M_w	M_s
17 Feb. 2009	03:30:58.6	178.54°W	30.56°S	12.1 km	5.8	6.0
8 Dec. 2017	02:10:03.0	178.56°W	30.49°S	13.4 km	5.8	6.2

Table S1. Earthquake information reported in the GCMT catalogue. Note that the depth may be determined at a greater depth than the accurate depth to maintain the stability of solutions (Ekström et al., 2012).

Moment tensor	M_w	M_θ (10^{18} N m)	Moment tensor (10^{18} N m)					
			M_{rr}	$M_{\theta\theta}$	$M_{\phi\phi}$	$M_{r\theta}$	$M_{r\phi}$	$M_{\theta\phi}$
Composite, \mathbf{M}	6.24	2.87	3.59	0.95	0.85	-0.18	0.98	0.07
Horizontal crack, \mathbf{M}_{HC}	6.19	2.44	3.02	1.18	1.18	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ring-fault, \mathbf{M}_{RF}	5.96	1.11	0.57	-0.23	-0.34	-0.18	0.98	0.07

Table S2. Moment tensors of our best-fit source model (Figure 3b in Main Text) of the 2017 earthquake: the moment tensor of the model \mathbf{M} ($= \mathbf{M}_{HC} + \mathbf{M}_{RF}$), and the partial moment tensors of the horizontal crack \mathbf{M}_{HC} and the ring fault \mathbf{M}_{RF} .

Event	M_w	M_θ (10^{18} N m)	Moment tensor (10^{18} N m)						$t_c = t_h$ (s)
			M_{rr}	$M_{\theta\theta}$	$M_{\phi\phi}$	$M_{r\theta}$	$M_{r\phi}$	$M_{\theta\phi}$	
2009	6.45	5.92	0.615	-0.276	-0.339	-2.201	-5.468	0.103	4.0
2017	6.45	5.98	0.505	-0.186	-0.320	-2.441	-5.437	0.134	3.0

Table S3. Deviatoric moment tensor inversion results for the 2009 and 2017 earthquakes using long-period seismic data. We assume that the centroid time shift t_c and the half duration t_h are the same. Note that two components representing the vertical dip-slip ($M_{r\theta}$ and $M_{r\phi}$) are poorly determined because of their weak excitation of long-period seismic waves (Kanamori & Given, 1981; Sandanbata, Kanamori, et al., 2021).

Supplementary Texts

Text S1. Methodology for vertical sea-surface displacement modeling

S1.1. Tsunami waveform inversion for vertical sea-surface displacement

We estimate the vertical sea-surface displacement of the 2017 Curtis earthquake using a tsunami inversion method. We set a tsunami source area of 25 km × 25 km square around Curtis and Cheeseman Islands and distribute 181 unit sources of vertical sea-surface displacement with 1.25 km intervals (Figure S7), each of which is formulated as:

$$\eta^k(x, y) = 0.25 \times \left[1.0 + \cos \frac{\pi(x-x^k)}{L} \right] \times \left[1.0 + \cos \frac{\pi(y-y^k)}{L} \right], \quad (|x-x^k|, |y-y^k| \leq L) \quad (S1)$$

where η^k is the vertical sea-surface displacement (in meter) of the k -th unit source ($k = 1, \dots, K$; here $K = 181$) with the central location at (x^k, y^k) (in km) with a source size of L (1.25 km, here).

We compute the Green's function $\mathbf{g} = g_j^k$, relating the k -th unit source to tsunami waveform at the j -th station ($j = 1, \dots, J$; here $J = 4$). We use the simulation code JAGURS (Baba et al., 2015) to solve the standard Boussinesq-type equations (Peregrine, 1972). The rise time for each unit source is assumed as 10 s, which is similar to a source duration of 6 s determined by the moment tensor analysis (see Text S4; Table S2). Bathymetry data in broad regions is modeled with GEBCO_2014 (Weatherall et al., 2015) with 30 arcsec grid spacing, and the New Zealand Regional Bathymetry with 250 m grid spacing downloaded from the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA) in New Zealand.




Figure S7. Unit sources of vertical sea-surface displacement around Curtis & Cheeseman Islands. Black dots represent central locations of the unit sources. Each unit source has a cosine-tapered shape with a horizontal source size of 1.25 km x 1.25 km. Contour lines of the water depth are plotted every 50 m.

To include nearshore effects around tide gauges, we use finer bathymetry data (~28 m) obtained by combining digital topographic data on land and bathymetric data digitized and interpolated from analogue charts of the Land Information of New Zealand (LINZ) department. Because tsunami speed is reduced by the elasticity of the Earth, the compressibility and the density stratification of seawater, and the gravitational potential change due to tsunami motions (Ho et al., 2017; Sandanbata, Watada, et al., 2021; Watada et al., 2014), we approximately incorporate the effects by delaying the synthetic waveforms by 25 s at LOTT and GBIT with epicentral distances of ~830 km. The delay time is based on the estimation by Sandanbata, Watada, et al. (2021), who calculated that short-period tsunamis with a period of 500 s in water of 1-km depth are delayed by about 3 s every 100-km distance.

We then solve the observation equation by the damped least-squares method (pp. 695–699 in Aki & Richards [1980]):

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{g} \\ \alpha \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{m}, \quad (\text{S2})$$

where $\mathbf{d} = [d_1(t) \ \dots \ d_j(t)]^T$ is the column vector of the observed tsunami data at the j -th station, $\mathbf{g} = \begin{bmatrix} g_1^1(t) & \dots & g_1^K(t) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ g_j^1(t) & \dots & g_j^K(t) \end{bmatrix}$ is the Green's function, $\mathbf{m} = [m^1 \ \dots \ m^K]^T$ is an unknown column vector of the amplitude factor of the k -th unit source, \mathbf{I} is the identity matrix, and α is the damping parameter to obtain a smooth source model, which we assume as 0.02. We set data length to include several wave crests and troughs of the tsunami signal. By the superposition of the unit sources η^k weighted by m_i^k , we obtain the vertical sea-surface displacement model. Additionally, we obtain an uplift source model without subsidence, by solving Equation S2 with the non-negative condition (i.e., $\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}$).

S1.2. Resolution tests

Our modeling is mainly based on tsunami data from the tide gauge records with a low sampling rate (one sample per 60 s) and limited azimuthal coverage of stations. To investigate the resolution of our tsunami waveform inversion, we conduct two resolution tests, in which we prepare two target models: (1) a checker-board distribution (Figure S8a), and (2) an uplift distribution near Curtis caldera (Figure S9a). Synthetic tsunami waveforms from the two target models are computed by the tsunami simulation method explained in Text S1.1, and resampled with a time interval of 60 s; additionally, the waveforms of LOTT and GBIT are delayed by 25 s. We then apply the tsunami waveform inversion to these synthetic waveform data.

For the checker-board distribution (Figure S8a), the tsunami waveform inversion yields a solution (Figure S8b), which is somewhat different from the target, although the target waveforms are reproduced well (Figure S8c). This shows that complex distribution patterns near the caldera can be poorly constrained from our inversion based on the tide-gauge tsunami data. On the other hand, the inversion for the uplift distribution near the caldera (Figure S9a) yields uplift distribution over the caldera similar to the target model (Figure

S9b), reproducing the target waveforms (Figure S9c). We note that the peak location is estimated well, while the horizontal size and amplitude are estimated with slight difference.

These results suggest that, although our inversion cannot resolve complex pattern of sea-surface displacement, a simple-shaped displacement focused near the caldera can be resolved well with good resolutions on its location and overall shape. We emphasize that the observed tsunami waveforms have long-period characters (Figure 1b in Main Text) and are similar to the waveforms computed from the uplift distribution (Figure S9c) rather than those from the checker-board distribution (Figure S8c). This indicates that the actual sea-surface displacement caused by the earthquake and the uplift distribution were alike (Figure S9a); this was also proposed by Gusman et al. (2020). Therefore, it is plausible to consider that our vertical displacement models with a localized uplift in the western part of the caldera, which are estimated in Section 4.1 (Figures 2b and 2d) in Main Text, reasonably reflect the actual sea-surface displacement due to the earthquake.




Figure S8. Resolution test of the tsunami waveform inversion for vertical sea-surface displacement: a case of a checker-board distribution. (a) Target model, and (b) inverted model. (c) Synthetic tsunami waveforms from the target (red) and inverted models (black). The gray line represents the time interval used for the inversion.




Figure S9. Same as Figure S8, but for a case of an uplift distribution near Curtis caldera.

Text S2. Methodology for earthquake source modeling

S2.1. Source structures of the fault-crack composite source system

We assume a fault-crack composite source system, composed of an inward-dipping ring fault connected to a horizontal crack at a depth of 3 km in the crust, which is discretized with triangular meshes (Figure S1). Given the focused uplift estimated in Section 4.1 in Main Text, we assume a partial ring fault on the western side of the caldera with a central angle of 150° that extends from the seafloor to the crack edge. Although the detailed geometry is unknown, the ring fault is assumed to be along an elliptical line; this ellipse is with the center at (178.56°W , 30.542°S), the major axis oriented $\text{S}60^\circ\text{E}$, and the horizontal size of $3.4 \text{ km} \times 2.8 \text{ km}$ on the seafloor. For the ring fault, we assume a uniform inward dip angle, varied from 65° to 85° . Only inward dip angles are considered, because the vertical-T CLVD moment tensor can be generated when the caldera floor uplifts along with an inward-dipping ring fault (see Figure 1 in Sandanbata, Kanamori, et al. 2021; Figure 9 in Shuler, Ekström, et al., 2013). Thus, we prepare tens of source structures with different ring-fault dip angles.

We discretize the source system into triangular source elements. The ring fault is divided into elements with an arc angle of 30° along the circumference and 1.5 km along the depth, and a trapezoid composed of two neighboring triangular elements with the same dip and strike angles is considered as a sub-fault. The horizontal crack is discretized using the DistMesh code (Persson & Strang, 2004), each of which is considered as sub-crack. By a tsunami waveform inversion explained later, we will determine amounts of the reverse slip of each sub-fault and the opening/closure of each sub-crack, denoted by $\mathbf{s} = [s_1 \ \cdots \ s_{N_s}]^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\delta} = [\delta_1 \ \cdots \ \delta_{N_\delta}]^T$, respectively. Because the dislocations of the ring fault and the horizontal crack should be similar to each other at their contacts, we link the vertical component of the sub-fault slip at bottom to the sub-crack opening/closing at edge adjacent to the sub-fault by imposing a kinematic condition:

$$s_p \sin \Delta_p = \delta_q \quad (\text{S3})$$

where Δ_p is the dip angle of the p -th sub-fault to which the q -th sub-crack is adjacent.

S2.2. Tsunami waveform inversion of dislocations of the fault-crack composite source

For each source structure assumed above, we perform a tsunami waveform inversion to obtain a fault-crack composite source model. We use the same tsunami data, as described in Section 3.1 of Main Text.

To efficiently compute the Green's function relating each sub-fault slip or sub-crack opening to the tsunami waveforms, we use the method proposed in a previous study (Sandambata et al., 2022), which is summarized as follows. First, we compute the vertical sea-surface displacement excited by unit dislocation of the i -th source element (i.e., 1-m reverse slip of sub-fault or 1-m vertical opening of sub-crack; $i = 1, \dots, I$; here I depend on source structure). We calculate vertical *seafloor* displacement due to each source element by the triangular dislocation method (Nikkhoo & Walter, 2015) assuming flat seafloor and Poisson's ratio of 0.25, and we convert it into vertical *sea-surface* displacement by applying the Kajiura's filter (Kajiura, 1963). The water depth of 400 m is used for this filter. We thus compute the sea-surface displacement from the i -th source element $h_i(x, y)$. Second, we approximate the vertical sea-surface displacement $h_i(x, y)$ of the i -th source element by a linear combination of the unit sources $\eta^k(x, y)$ used in Section 4.1 of Main Text and Text S1 (Equation S1; Figure S7):

$$h_i(x, y) \approx \sum_{k=1}^K m_i^k \eta^k(x, y), \quad (\text{S4})$$

where the amplitude factors m_i^k are obtained by a least-squares method. Third, we compute the Green's functions relating the i -th source element to the tsunami data at the j -th station by superimposing the Green's functions of the unit sources g_j^k multiplied by the amplitude factors m_i^k :

$$G_{ij}(t) = \sum_k m_i^k g_j^k(t). \quad (\text{S5})$$

Finally, to obtain a source model, we determine the dislocations of the fault-crack composite source system by solving the observation equation with the damped least-squares method:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G} \\ \mathbf{K} \\ \beta \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ \boldsymbol{\delta} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{S6})$$

where \mathbf{d} is the observed tsunami data at the j -th station, and $\mathbf{G} = \begin{bmatrix} G_{11}(t) & \cdots & G_{I1}(t) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ G_{1J}(t) & \cdots & G_{IJ}(t) \end{bmatrix}$ is

the matrix of the Green's functions G_{ij} . \mathbf{s} is an unknown column vector of reverse slip amounts for sub-faults, for which we impose the non-zero condition ($\mathbf{s} \geq \mathbf{0}$), and $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is an unknown column vector of opening amounts for sub-cracks, for which we allow either positive (opening) or negative (closing) values. The linear equation of $\mathbf{K} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ \boldsymbol{\delta} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0}$ represents the kinematic condition of Equation S3. β is the damping parameter, which we set at 0.015 by taking a balance between the solution smoothness and the waveform fit (Figure S10).

To evaluate the waveform fit between the observed tsunami waveforms and synthetic waveforms from an obtained source model, we quantify the normalized root-mean-square (NRMS) misfit of the tsunami waveforms, which we call *tsunami NRMS misfit*:

$$\sqrt{\sum_j \|\mathbf{c}_j^t - \mathbf{d}_j^t\|^2 / \sum_j \|\mathbf{c}_j^t\|^2}, \quad (\text{S7})$$

where \mathbf{c}_j^t and \mathbf{d}_j^t are the observed waveform and synthetic waveforms within the inversion time window at the j -th station, respectively. $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the L2 norm of data vector.

S.2.3. Forward computation of long-period seismic waveforms

For validation of fault-crack composite source models obtained by the tsunami waveform inversion, we compute long-period seismic waveforms from the source models and compare them with the seismic data. The moment tensor of the models \mathbf{M} is written by:

$$\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}_{RF} + \mathbf{M}_{HC} = \sum \mathbf{m}_{RF}^p + \sum \mathbf{m}_{HC}^q, \quad (\text{S8})$$

where \mathbf{M}_{RF} and \mathbf{M}_{HC} represent moment tensors of the ring fault and the horizontal crack, respectively, and \mathbf{m}_{RF}^p and \mathbf{m}_{HC}^q are moment tensors of the p -th sub-fault and the q -th sub-crack, respectively. We compute \mathbf{m}_{RF}^p with the slip amount and strike, dip, and rake (90°) angles (Box 4.4 in Aki & Richards, 1980), with the seismic moment of $\mu s_p A_p$, where s_p and A_p are slip amount and area, respectively, and μ is rigidity, or Lamé's constant. We calculate \mathbf{m}_{HC}^q by:

$$\mathbf{m}_{HC}^q = \begin{bmatrix} M_{rr} & M_{\theta r} & M_{\phi r} \\ M_{r\theta} & M_{\theta\theta} & M_{\phi\theta} \\ M_{r\phi} & M_{\theta\phi} & M_{\phi\phi} \end{bmatrix} = \delta_q \times A_q \times \begin{bmatrix} \lambda + 2\mu & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{S9})$$




Figure S10. Source models inverted with different damping parameters β of (a) 0.005, (b) 0.015, and (c) 0.030. (Left) Dislocations of the fault-crack source system determined by the tsunami inversion. See captions of Figure 3b in Main Text. (Right) Synthetic tsunami waveforms from the models (red), compared with observed waveforms (black). See the caption of Figure 4b in Main Text. By taking the balance between the solution smoothness and the tsunami waveform fit, we use β of 0.015.

where δ_q and A_q are the opening amount and area, respectively (Kawakatsu & Yamamoto, 2015). We assume Lamé's constants of λ and μ as 34.2 GPa, and 26.6 GPa, respectively, calculated with the P- and S-wave velocities and the density in the shallowest crust layer of 1-D Preliminary Reference Earth Model (PREM) (Dziewonski & Anderson, 1981). The total seismic moment is calculated by

$$M_0 = \sqrt{\sum_{ij} M_{ij} M_{ij} / 2}, \quad (\text{S10})$$

(pp. 166–167 in Dahlen & Tromp, 1998; Silver & Jordan, 1982) and the moment magnitude by

$$M_w = \frac{2}{3} (\log_{10} M_0 - 9.10), \quad (\text{S11})$$

with M_0 in the N m scale (Hanks & Kanamori, 1979; Kanamori, 1977).

Using the W-phase package (Duputel et al., 2012; Hayes et al., 2009; Kanamori & Rivera, 2008), we compute long-period seismic waveforms from the moment tensor \mathbf{M} . Green's functions of seismic waves are calculated with the PREM model by the normal mode method (Takeuchi & Saito, 1972). The centroid is at the center of Curtis caldera (178.56°W, 30.54°S) and at the depth of 0.5 km below the seafloor. Both the half duration and the centroid time shift are assumed to be 5 s, which are comparable to the values (3 s and 3 s, respectively) obtained by the moment tensor inversion (Text S4; Table S3). We apply the same filter to the synthetic waveforms, as used for the seismic data.

To quantify the seismic waveform fit, we calculate the root-mean-square (RMS) misfit of the seismic waveforms, which we call *seismic RMS misfit*:

$$\sqrt{\sum_j \|c_j^s - d_j^s\|^2}, \quad (\text{S12})$$

where c_j^s and d_j^s are the synthetic and observed seismic waveforms at the j -th station. The data length for this calculation includes P, S, and surface waves.

Text S3. Contribution to long-period seismic waves

The moment tensor of our best-fit source model \mathbf{M} is highly isotropic with M_w 6.24 (Figure 4c in Main Text), whereas the deviatoric moment tensor of the 2017 Curtis earthquake reported in the GCMT catalogue is a vertical-T CLVD type with M_w 5.8 (Figure 1a in Main Text). Here we discuss the reason for the differences between the moment tensors. Figure S5a shows synthetic seismograms at representative stations from the moment tensor \mathbf{M} ($= \mathbf{M}_{HC} + \mathbf{M}_{RF}$) of our model. For comparison, we show synthetic seismograms from moment tensors of the horizontal crack \mathbf{M}_{HC} and the ring fault \mathbf{M}_{RF} in Figures S5b and S5c, respectively. Although \mathbf{M}_{HC} has a larger moment magnitude (M_w 6.19) than \mathbf{M}_{RF} (M_w 5.96), the seismic amplitudes from \mathbf{M}_{HC} are much smaller than those from \mathbf{M}_{RF} . This is because the vertical motion of a horizontal crack at a very shallow depth has only a low efficiency of long-period seismic radiation (Fukao et al., 2018; Sandanbata, Kanamori, et al., 2021). Note that the polarities of seismograms from \mathbf{M}_{HC} are reversed to those from \mathbf{M}_{RF} , which is known as the trade-off between the vertical-CLVD and isotropic components at shallow depth (Kawakatsu, 1996; Sandanbata, Kanamori, et al., 2021; compare Figures S5b and S5c). Hence, \mathbf{M}_{HC} slightly reduces the seismic amplitudes from \mathbf{M} but does not change the waveform shapes much.

To further examine radiations from the ring fault, we show in Figure S5d synthetic seismograms from \mathbf{M}_{RF} excluding two components representing vertical dip-slip, $M_{r\theta}$ and

$M_{r\varphi}$ (i.e., from M_{rr} , $M_{\theta\theta}$, $M_{\varphi\varphi}$, and $M_{\theta\varphi}$ of \mathbf{M}_{RF}). Although the moment magnitude decreases by 0.2 compared to that of \mathbf{M}_{RF} , the synthetic seismograms are very similar to those from \mathbf{M}_{RF} . This demonstrates that the two excluded components, $M_{r\theta}$ and $M_{r\varphi}$, at a very shallow depth are very inefficient in radiating long-period seismic waves (Sandarbata, Kanamori, et al., 2021). Hence, long-period seismic waves of the earthquakes mainly arise from the four components, M_{rr} , $M_{\theta\theta}$, $M_{\varphi\varphi}$, and $M_{\theta\varphi}$, of \mathbf{M}_{RF} . This moment tensor composed of the four components is a vertical-T CLVD type, which is very similar to the GCMT solution (Figure 1a in Main Text).

Text S4. Moment tensor analysis

We use the W-phase code (Duputel et al., 2012; Hayes et al., 2009; Kanamori & Rivera, 2008) to perform the deviatoric moment tensor (MT) inversion analysis for the 2009 and 2017 earthquakes using long-period seismic data. This analysis is independent of the source modeling in Main Text. For the two earthquakes, we download seismic records of LH and BH channels at stations within 5°–30° from seismic networks (network codes: II, IU, AU, NZ, and G). For computation of the Green's function of seismic waveforms, we use the normal mode method (Takeuchi & Saito, 1972) with the 1-D Preliminary Reference Earth Model (PREM) (Dziewonski & Anderson, 1981). The time window includes P, S, and surface waves. We impose the zero-trace constraint, $M_{rr} + M_{\theta\theta} + M_{\varphi\varphi} = 0$. We assume the centroid location at (178.56°W, 30.54°S) and the depth at 2.5 km in the crust, and apply the same filter, as done in the source modeling (see Text S2.3). We start the inversion with a half duration t_h and a centroid time shift t_c reported in the GCMT catalog, and grid-search optimal values for $t_h = t_c$. During the inversion process, we select seismic data yielding a single-record normalized root-mean-square (NRMS) misfit ≤ 1.0 , which is calculated by $\sqrt{\|\mathbf{c}_i^s - \mathbf{d}_i^s\| / \|\mathbf{c}_i^s\|}$, where \mathbf{c}_i^s and \mathbf{d}_i^s are synthetic and observed data in the inversion window at the i -th station, respectively. The selected datasets are composed of 29 and 33 records of the 2009 and 2017 earthquakes, respectively (Figures S11 and S12).

Table S3 shows the obtained deviatoric moment tensor of the 2009 and 2017 earthquakes. The seismic moment and moment magnitude of the two earthquakes are much larger than those in the GCMT catalogue (Table S1), because for such shallow earthquakes $M_{r\theta}$ and $M_{r\varphi}$ cannot be estimated accurately (Kanamori & Given, 1981; Sandarbata, Kanamori, et al., 2021).

Following a previous study (Sandarbata, Kanamori, et al., 2021), we estimate the ring-fault geometries of the 2009 and 2017 earthquakes using *resolvable moment tensor* \mathbf{M}_{res} . We obtain \mathbf{M}_{res} by removing $M_{r\theta}$ and $M_{r\varphi}$ from the estimated deviatoric moment tensor, decompose \mathbf{M}_{res} into two components, i.e., vertical-CLVD component \mathbf{M}_{CLVD} and vertical strike-slip component \mathbf{M}_{SS} , and calculate the moment ratio of \mathbf{M}_{CLVD} to \mathbf{M}_{SS} , or the CLVD ratio k_{CLVD} . Figure S6 shows thus-obtained \mathbf{M}_{res} and the CLVD ratios of the two earthquakes. Using the relationships between the Null-axis direction of \mathbf{M}_{res} and the ring-fault orientation, and between k_{CLVD} and the arc angle of the ring fault (see Figure 4 in Sandarbata, Kanamori, et al., 2021), we estimate that the 2009 and 2017 earthquakes

occurred with ring faults with arc angles of $\sim 100^\circ$ and $\sim 120^\circ$, respectively, both of which are oriented in the NNW–SSW direction.




Figure S11. Model performance of the MT analysis for the 2009 earthquake. Red and black lines represent synthetic and observed waveforms, respectively. The time window for the inversion is indicated by red dots.




Figure S12. Same as Figure S11, but for the 2017 earthquake.

Text S5. Examinations of the uniqueness of the source geometry

To examine the uniqueness of our source model proposed in Section 4.2 in Main Text, we additionally perform the source modeling with some modifications in geometries, and assumption of the fault-slip direction.

S5.1. Source geometry

We examine how the source geometries of trapdoor faulting, i.e., crack depth and ring-fault length, are constrained by our analysis. As proposed below, models with slightly different geometries can explain the tsunami and seismic data overall, suggesting that our analysis have only weak constraints on the two parameters.

(1) Depth of a horizontal crack

We first test a fault-crack composite source system with a deeper horizontal crack at a depth of 6 km in the crust (Figure S13). The tsunami waveform inversion yields a dislocation pattern of the fault-crack source system (Figure S13a) similar to that presented in our main results (Figure 3b in Main Text), and the tsunami waveform fit is overall good (tsunami NRMS of 0.74; Figure S13b). Long-period seismic waveforms computed with this model also show good agreements with the observed seismic data (seismic RMS of 0.96 μm ; Figure S13e).

(2) Length of a ring fault

We also test a fault-crack source system with a longer ring fault (with a central angle of 240°), as shown in Figure S14a. The modeling results show that the estimated dislocations of the source system support the trapdoor faulting mechanism, and the tsunami and seismic waveform data are explained sufficiently (the tsunami NRMS of 0.68 and seismic RMS of 0.91 μm ; Figures S14b and S14e).

S5.2. Slip direction of a ring fault

In Main Text, we assume only reverse slip on the ring fault. Here, we instead assume a fully elliptic ring fault and perform the tsunami waveform inversion by allowing both reverse and normal slips on the ring fault. In this case, we obtain a source model that contains reverse slips on the northern, western, and southern faults but normal slip on the eastern fault, as shown in Figure S15a. This model can explain the tsunami and seismic data overall, with a tsunami NRMS of 0.68 and seismic RMS of 0.97 μm ; Figure S15b and S15e). This suggests that the trapdoor faulting perhaps involved normal faulting associated with the magma flow within the crack, but our analysis cannot determine whether a fault on the eastern side slipped or not.




Figure S13. Fault-crack composite source model with a horizontal crack at a depth of 6 km in the crust. **(a)** Dislocations of the fault-crack source system determined by the tsunami waveform inversion. See the caption of Figure 3b in Main Text. **(b)** Synthetic tsunami waveforms from this model (red), compared with observed waveforms (black). See the caption of Figure 4b in Main Text. **(c–e)** Results of long-period seismic waveform modeling. See the caption of Figure 4c–e in Main Text.

Source parameters

Ring-fault dip angle: 78° / Crack depth: 3.0 km




Figure S14. Fault-crack composite source model with a longer ring fault (with a central angle of 240°) and a horizontal crack at a depth of 3 km in the crust. See the caption of Figure S13.

Source parameters

Ring-fault dip angle: 81° (reverse or normal slip allowed)/ Crack depth: 3.0 km




Figure S15. Same as Figure S14, but for a fault-crack composite source model with a fully elliptic ring fault, on which reverse or normal slips are allowed.

Text S6. Models of only a ring fault or only a horizontal crack

We test if the fault-crack composite source model is preferable to models of only a ring fault or only a horizontal crack. We conduct the source modeling by assuming only a fully elliptical ring fault (with reverse slip), or only a horizontal crack (with vertical opening or closure), as shown in Figures S16 and S17, respectively. The model of only a ring fault explains the tsunami waveform data worse (Figure S16b), while the long-period seismic data are well explained (Figure S16c). On the other hand, the horizontal crack opening alone reproduces the tsunami data well (Figures S17b), but the model excites far smaller-amplitude seismic waves with flipped polarities compared to those of the observed waveforms (Figures S17c). These suggest that our model combining a ring fault and a horizontal crack is more plausible for the earthquake source model, compared to only a ring-faulting or only a crack opening.

Source parameter (Only ring fault)
Ring-fault dip angle: 85°




Figure S16. Results of the source modeling for only a fully elliptic ring fault. (a) Dislocations of the ring fault determined by the tsunami waveform inversion. (b) Synthetic tsunami waveforms from this model (red), compared with observed waveforms (black). (c) Results of long-period seismic waveform modeling. (Left) moment tensor of the model, and (right) comparison between synthetic and observed seismic waveforms at representative stations.

Source parameter (Only horizontal crack)
Crack depth: 3.0 km




Figure S17. Same as Figure S16, but for only a horizontal crack. In (a), dislocations of the horizontal crack determined by the tsunami waveform inversion are shown.

Text S7. Scaling relationships between the maximum fault slip with the geodetically estimated moment magnitude

In Section 5.3 and Figure 5 in Main Text, we discuss the scaling relationship between the maximum fault slip and the seismic magnitude for trapdoor faulting events at three calderas. Yet, previous studies suggested that there are gaps between seismic and geodetic estimates of moment magnitudes of trapdoor faulting events (Amelung et al., 2000; Jónsson, 2009; Zheng et al., 2022). Hence, instead of seismically estimated magnitudes, we here compare geodetically estimated moment magnitudes with the maximum fault slip.

For the Sierra Negra caldera cases, the source models (Zheng et al., 2022; Yun, 2007) were geodetically estimated using data from Global Positioning System (GPS) sensors and Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (InSAR). Zheng et al.'s (2022) model for the 16 April 2005 earthquake had a geodetic moment magnitude of M_w 5.3 for the fault slip component, while Yun's (2007) model for the 22 October 2005 event had M_w 5.4. In both cases, a shear modulus μ of 10 GPa was assumed.

For the two submarine calderas, Curtis and Sumisu, the source models were mainly determined based on tsunami data by this study and Sandanbata et al. (2022). For these two models, we here calculate geodetic moment magnitudes for the fault slip component by $\Sigma_p(\mu s_p A_p)$; this can be considered as a "geodetic" magnitude. This study's model for the 2017 Curtis earthquake is with a geodetic moment magnitude of M_w 6.0 for the fault slip part, while Sandanbata et al.'s (2022) model for the 2015 Sumisu earthquake is with a geodetic moment magnitude of M_w 6.3. In the cases, a shear modulus μ is assumed as ~30 GPa. If a lower value is used, the geodetic moment magnitudes become smaller; for example, if we assume a three-times smaller value (~10 GPa), the magnitude becomes smaller by 0.32 ($2/3 \cdot \log_{10}(1/3)$), according to Equation S11.

In Figure S18, we show the scaling relationship between the maximum fault slip and the geodetic moment magnitudes for the trapdoor faulting events. This demonstrates that, even when considering the discrepancies between seismic and geodetic estimates of moment magnitudes, the scaling relationship for trapdoor faulting events deviate from the empirical relationship proposed by Wells & Coppersmith (1994). This supports the idea that trapdoor faulting events are atypical compared to tectonic earthquakes.




Figure S18. Earthquake scaling relationship for trapdoor faulting events, with geodetic moment magnitudes. Circles represent the maximum slip amount and the geodetic magnitudes for four trapdoor faulting events at Curtis, Sumisu, and Sierra Negra. The black line represents the relationship for tectonic earthquakes proposed by Wells and Coppersmith (1994).

Caption for Data Set S1

Data Set S1. Fault-crack composite source model (separate file), including a source model presented in Figure 3b in Main Text. This dataset is also available from a repository, Zenodo (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7502680>).

References

- Amelung, F., Jónsson, S., Zebker, H., & Segall, P. (2000). Widespread uplift and “trapdoor” faulting on Galápagos volcanoes observed with radar interferometry. *Nature*, 407(6807), 993–996. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35039604>
- Aki, K., & Richards, P. G. (1980). *Quantitative seismology: theory and methods* (Vol. 842). Freeman San Francisco, CA.
- Baba, T., Takahashi, N., Kaneda, Y., Ando, K., Matsuoka, D., & Kato, T. (2015). Parallel Implementation of Dispersive Tsunami Wave Modeling with a Nesting Algorithm for the 2011 Tohoku Tsunami. *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, 172(12), 3455–3472. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-015-1049-2>
- Dahlen, F. A., & Tromp, J. (1998). *Theoretical Global Seismology*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691216157>
- Duputel, Z., Rivera, L., Kanamori, H., & Hayes, G. (2012). W phase source inversion for moderate to large earthquakes (1990–2010). *Geophysical Journal International*, 189(2), 1125–1147. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2012.05419.x>
- Dziewonski, A. M., & Anderson, D. L. (1981). Preliminary reference Earth model. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 25(4), 297–356. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9201\(81\)90046-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9201(81)90046-7)
- Ekström, G., Nettles, M., & Dziewoński, A. M. (2012). The global CMT project 2004–2010: Centroid-moment tensors for 13,017 earthquakes. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 200–201, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pepi.2012.04.002>
- Fukao, Y., Sandanbata, O., Sugioka, H., Ito, A., Shiobara, H., Watada, S., & Satake, K. (2018). Mechanism of the 2015 volcanic tsunami earthquake near Torishima, Japan. *Science Advances*, 4(4), eaao0219. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aao0219>
- Gusman, A. R., Kaneko, Y., Power, W., & Burbidge, D. (2020). Source process for two enigmatic repeating vertical - T CLVD tsunami earthquakes in the kermadec ridge. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47(16). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020gl087805>
- Hanks, T. C., & Kanamori, H. (1979). A moment magnitude scale. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 84(B5), 2348. <https://doi.org/10.1029/jb084ib05p02348>
- Hayes, G. P., Rivera, L., & Kanamori, H. (2009). Source Inversion of the W-Phase: Real-time Implementation and Extension to Low Magnitudes. *Seismological Research Letters*, 80(5), 817–822. <https://doi.org/10.1785/gssrl.80.5.817>
- Ho, T.-C., Satake, K., & Watada, S. (2017). Improved phase corrections for transoceanic tsunami data in spatial and temporal source estimation: Application to the 2011 Tohoku earthquake. *Journal of Geophysical Research, [Solid Earth]*, 122(12), 10155–10175. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017jb015070>

- Jónsson, S. (2009). Stress interaction between magma accumulation and trapdoor faulting on Sierra Negra volcano, Galápagos. *Tectonophysics*, 471(1), 36–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2008.08.005>
- Kajiura, K. (1963). The Leading Wave of a Tsunami. *Bulletin of the Earthquake Research Institute, University of Tokyo*, 41(3), 535–571. Retrieved from <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/120000866529/>
- Kanamori, H. (1977). The energy release in great earthquakes. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 82(20), 2981–2987. <https://doi.org/10.1029/jb082i020p02981>
- Kanamori, H., & Given, J. W. (1981). Use of long-period surface waves for rapid determination of earthquake-source parameters. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 27(1), 8–31. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9201\(81\)90083-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9201(81)90083-2)
- Kanamori, H., & Rivera, L. (2008). Source inversion of Wphase: speeding up seismic tsunami warning. *Geophysical Journal International*, 175(1), 222–238. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2008.03887.x>
- Kawakatsu, H. (1996). Observability of the isotropic component of a moment tensor. *Geophysical Journal International*, 126(2), 525–544. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.1996.tb05308.x>
- Kawakatsu, H., & Yamamoto, M. (2015). 4.15 - Volcano Seismology. In G. Schubert (Ed.), *Treatise on Geophysics (Second Edition)* (pp. 389–419). Oxford: Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-53802-4.00081-6>
- Nikkhoo, M., & Walter, T. R. (2015). Triangular dislocation: an analytical, artefact-free solution. *Geophysical Journal International*, 201(2), 1119–1141. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggv035>
- Peregrine, D. H. (1972). Equations for Water Waves and the Approximation behind Them. In R. E. Meyer (Ed.), *Waves on Beaches and Resulting Sediment Transport* (pp. 95–121). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-493250-0.50007-2>
- Persson, P.-O., & Strang, G. (2004). A Simple Mesh Generator in MATLAB. *SIAM Review. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 46(2), 329–345. <https://doi.org/10.1137/s0036144503429121>
- Sandanbata, O., Kanamori, H., Rivera, L., Zhan, Z., Watada, S., & Satake, K. (2021). Moment tensors of ring-faulting at active volcanoes: Insights into vertical-CLVD earthquakes at the Sierra Negra caldera, Galápagos islands. *Journal of Geophysical Research, [Solid Earth]*, 126(6), e2021JB021693. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021jb021693>
- Sandanbata, O., Watada, S., Ho, T.-C., & Satake, K. (2021). Phase delay of short-period tsunamis in the density-stratified compressible ocean over the elastic Earth. *Geophysical Journal International*, 226(3), 1975–1985. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggab192>
- Sandanbata, O., Watada, S., Satake, K., Kanamori, H., Rivera, L., & Zhan, Z. (2022, February 14). *Sub-decadal Volcanic Tsunamis Due to Submarine Trapdoor Faulting at Sumisu Caldera in the Izu-Bonin Arc*. *Earth and Space Science Open Archive*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/essoar.10510526.3>
- Shuler, A., Ekström, G., & Nettles, M. (2013). Physical mechanisms for vertical-CLVD earthquakes at active volcanoes. *Journal of Geophysical Research, [Solid Earth]*, 118(4), 1569–1586. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrb.50131>

- Silver, P. G., & Jordan, T. H. (1982). Optimal estimation of scalar seismic moment. *Geophysical Journal International*, 70(3), 755–787. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.1982.tb05982.x>
- Takeuchi, H., & Saito, M. (1972). Seismic surface waves. *Methods in Computational Physics*, 11, 217–295.
- Watada, S., Kusumoto, S., & Satake, K. (2014). Traveltime delay and initial phase reversal of distant tsunamis coupled with the self-gravitating elastic Earth. *Journal of Geophysical Research, [Solid Earth]*, 119(5), 4287–4310. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013jb010841>
- Weatherall, P., Marks, K. M., & Jakobsson, M. (2015). A new digital bathymetric model of the world's oceans. *Earth and Space*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015EA000107>
- Wells, D. L., & Coppersmith, K. J. (1994). New Empirical Relationships among Magnitude, Rupture Length, Rupture Width, Rupture Area, and Surface Displacement. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, 84(4), 974–1002. <https://doi.org/10.1785/BSSA0840040974>
- Yun, S.-H. (2007). *A mechanical model of the large-deformation 2005 Sierra Negra volcanic eruption derived from InSAR measurements* (Ph.D. Dissertation). Stanford University. Retrieved from https://web.stanford.edu/group/radar/people/Yun_thesis_small.pdf
- Zheng, Y., Blackstone, L., & Segall, P. (2022). Constraints on absolute magma chamber volume from geodetic measurements of trapdoor faulting at Sierra Negra volcano, Galapagos. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49(5). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021gl095683>