## Compartmentalization of Axial Seamount's magma reservoir inferred by analytical and numerical deformation modeling with realistic geometry

Sandra R Slead<sup>1</sup>, Meng (Matt) Wei<sup>1</sup>, Scott Lee Nooner<sup>2</sup>, William W. Chadwick Jr.<sup>3</sup>, David W Caress<sup>4</sup>, and Jeffrey Watson Beeson<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Rhode Island <sup>2</sup>University of North Carolina Wilmington <sup>3</sup>Oregon State University <sup>4</sup>Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute

December 10, 2023

#### Abstract

Axial Seamount is a submarine volcano on the Juan de Fuca Ridge with enhanced magma supply from the Cobb Hotspot. Here we compare several deformation model configurations to explore how the spatial component of Axial's deformation time series relates to magma reservoir geometry imaged by multi-channel seismic (MCS) surveys. To constrain the models, we use vertical displacements from pressure sensors at seafloor benchmarks and repeat autonomous underwater vehicle (AUV) bathymetric surveys covering 2016-2020. We show that implementing the MCS-derived 3D main magma reservoir (MMR) geometry with uniform pressure in a finite element model poorly fits the geodetic data. To test the hypothesis that there is compartmentalization within the MMR that results in heterogeneous pressure distribution, we compare analytical models using various horizontal sill configurations constrained by the MMR geometry. Using distributed pressure sources significantly improved the Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) between the inflation data and the models by an order of magnitude. The RMSE between the AUV data and the models was not improved as much, likely due to the relatively larger uncertainty of the AUV data. The models estimate the volume change for the 2016-2020 inter-eruptive inflation period to be between 0.054-0.060 km3 and suggest that the MMR is compartmentalized, with most magma accumulating in sill-like bodies embedded in crystal mush along the western-central edge of the MMR. The results reveal the complexity of Axial's plumbing system and demonstrate the utility of integrating geodetic data and seismic imagery to gain deeper insights into magma storage at active volcanoes.

#### Hosted file

980858\_0\_art\_file\_11639677\_s4wf53.docx available at https://authorea.com/users/704948/ articles/690535-compartmentalization-of-axial-seamount-s-magma-reservoir-inferred-byanalytical-and-numerical-deformation-modeling-with-realistic-geometry

## Compartmentalization of Axial Seamount's magma reservoir inferred by analytical and numerical deformation modeling with realistic geometry

- 3
- 4 S.R. Slead<sup>1</sup>, M. Wei<sup>1</sup>, S.L. Nooner<sup>2</sup>, W.W. Chadwick<sup>3</sup>, D.W. Caress<sup>4</sup>, and J. Beeson<sup>3,5</sup>
- <sup>5</sup> <sup>1</sup>Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, Narragansett, RI, USA.
- <sup>6</sup> <sup>2</sup>Department of Earth and Ocean Sciences, University of North Carolina Wilmington,
- 7 Wilmington, NC, USA
- <sup>3</sup>Oregon State University, Cooperative Institute for Marine Resources Studies, Hatfield Marine
   Science Center, Newport, OR, USA
- <sup>4</sup>Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute, Moss Landing, CA, USA
- <sup>5</sup>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory,
- 12 Newport, OR, USA
- 13
- 14 Corresponding author: Sandra Slead (<u>sslead@uri.edu</u>)
- 15

### 16 Key Points:

- Uniform pressurization of Axial Seamount's seismically imaged magma reservoir does
   not adequately fit the observed geodetic data
- Our models estimate that Axial's magma reservoir inflated by 0.054-0.060 km<sup>3</sup> during the inter-eruptive recharge period between 2016-2020
- Axial's magma reservoir is likely compartmentalized, with magma accumulating in sills
   along the western-central edge of the magma reservoir
- 23

#### 24 Abstract

- 25 Axial Seamount is a submarine volcano on the Juan de Fuca Ridge with enhanced magma supply
- 26 from the Cobb Hotspot. Here we compare several deformation model configurations to explore
- 27 how the spatial component of Axial's deformation time series relates to magma reservoir
- 28 geometry imaged by multi-channel seismic (MCS) surveys. To constrain the models, we use
- 29 vertical displacements from pressure sensors at seafloor benchmarks and repeat autonomous
- 30 underwater vehicle (AUV) bathymetric surveys covering 2016-2020. We show that
- 31 implementing the MCS-derived 3D main magma reservoir (MMR) geometry with uniform
- 32 pressure in a finite element model poorly fits the geodetic data. To test the hypothesis that there
- 33 is compartmentalization within the MMR that results in heterogeneous pressure distribution, we
- compare analytical models using various horizontal sill configurations constrained by the MMR
   geometry. Using distributed pressure sources significantly improved the Root Mean Square Error
- 36 (RMSE) between the inflation data and the models by an order of magnitude. The RMSE
- 37 between the AUV data and the models was not improved as much, likely due to the relatively
- 38 larger uncertainty of the AUV data. The models estimate the volume change for the 2016-2020
- inter-eruptive inflation period to be between  $0.054-0.060 \text{ km}^3$  and suggest that the MMR is
- 40 compartmentalized, with most magma accumulating in sill-like bodies embedded in crystal mush
- 41 along the western-central edge of the MMR. The results reveal the complexity of Axial's
- 42 plumbing system and demonstrate the utility of integrating geodetic data and seismic imagery to
- 43 gain deeper insights into magma storage at active volcanoes.
- 44

## 45 Plain Language Summary

46 Axial Seamount is a submarine volcano on the Juan de Fuca Ridge (NE Pacific Ocean) with 47 enhanced magma supply from the Cobb Hotspot. Its frequent activity and long-term deformation 48 time series covering eruptions in 1998, 2011 and 2015 make it an ideal place to study volcanic 49 processes. Improved magma reservoir modeling at Axial will aid in understanding how magma 50 transport and storage are related to surface deformation, seismicity, and eruption timing. Here we 51 compare several models of Axial's magma reservoir to explore how the spatial component of the 52 observed deformation at Axial compares to seismically imaged magma reservoir geometry. To 53 constrain the models, we use vertical displacements covering an inflation period between 2016-54 2020, derived from pressure measurements collected at seafloor benchmarks and repeated bathymetric surveys. The models estimate the volume change for the 2016-2020 inflation period 55 to be between 0.054-0.060 km<sup>3</sup>. Our results suggest that the Axial's magma reservoir is 56 57 compartmentalized, with most magma accumulating in sill-like bodies embedded in crystal 58 mush. The results reveal the spatial complexity of Axial's plumbing system and demonstrate 59 how deformation data and seismic imagery can be used together to gain deeper insights into 60 magma storage at active volcanoes. 61

- 62
- 63

#### 64 1. Introduction

65 Axial Seamount is an active submarine volcano located at the intersection of the Juan de

66 Fuca Ridge and the Cobb hotspot about 500 km west of the Oregon coast in the NE Pacific

- 67 (Figure 1). It has erupted at least 52 times over the last 800 years (Clague et al., 2013), most
- recently in 1998, 2011, and 2015. A nearly continuous deformation time series from 1998 68
- through the present covering the past 3 eruptions has revealed that Axial exhibits a relatively 69
- 70 repeatable inflation-deflation cycle, which has allowed for two successful eruption forecasts
- (Chadwick et al., 2012; Nooner & Chadwick, 2016). Even though Axial itself does not pose a 71 72 direct threat to humans because of its remoteness, insight gleaned from observations made at
- 73
- Axial contribute to a growing body of knowledge about eruptive precursors that can be applied
- 74 to more threatening locations.





76 Figure 1. a) Axial Seamount's tectonic setting at the intersection of the Juan de Fuca Ridge 77 (JdFR) and the Cobb hotspot. b) Zoom-in of Axial's summit caldera with geodetic 78 instrumentation as of 2020 labeled. White dots are benchmarks where campaign-style mobile 79 pressure recorder (MPR) measurements are made, green dots are mini bottom pressure recorders 80 (BPRs), blue dots are moored BPRs, and red dots are BPRs and tilt meters connected to the 81 Ocean Observatories Initiative (OOI) cabled observatory.

82

83 Deformation models of Axial have evolved from simple to more complex over the years 84 as more geodetic data have become available. A point source (Mogi, 1958) was initially used as 85 the pressure source when few observations were available to constrain models and little was 86 known about the actual geometry of Axial's magma storage system (Chadwick et al., 2006; 87 Nooner & Chadwick, 2009). Once more benchmarks for pressure measurements were added and more analytical model geometries were considered, a steeply dipping prolate spheroid geometry 88 89 became the best-fit model (Hefner et al., 2020; Nooner & Chadwick, 2016). The prolate spheroid 90 model depth, location, and geometry were somewhat consistent with a set of vertically stacked

91 deep sills later imaged by multi-channel seismic (MCS) data and interpreted by Carbotte et al.,

- 92 (2020). However, as autonomous underwater vehicle (AUV) repeat bathymetry data (Caress et
- al., 2020) has begun to provide more spatial coverage and therefore additional constraints for

94 deformation modeling than the limited number of point-pressure observations alone, a

- 95 rectangular horizontal sill deformation model with about the same outline as the summit caldera
- has been found to fit both the AUV and pressure data better than a prolate spheroid (Hefner etal., 2021).
- 98

99 The acquisition of multi-channel seismic (MCS) data at Axial (Arnulf et al., 2014, 2018; 100 Carbotte et al., 2020) provided a high-resolution view of the magma reservoir geometry beneath 101 the summit of Axial for the first time. Given the simplicity of the previous analytical deformation 102 models, a logical next step was to investigate how a more realistic geometry of the magmatic 103 system relates to deformation observed at the surface, in order to add more physical meaning to 104 the modeling results. Arnulf et al., 2018 used MCS data to define the 3-D geometry and location 105 of the main magma reservoir (MMR) beneath the summit caldera at Axial, as well as a secondary 106 magma reservoir (SMR) to the east. The MMR vertically extends from 1.1-2.8 km depth below seafloor, is slightly offset from Axial's caldera to the east, and extends beyond the caldera to the 107 108 north and south (Figure 2). The deep stacked sills imaged by Carbotte et al., (2020) are located 109 below the southern half of the MMR between 3-5 km below the seafloor.

110

111 We constructed deformation models constrained by the MMR geometry in several ways. 112 First, we directly used the 3D MMR geometry with uniform internal pressure in a finite element 113 model (FEM), but we found that doing so provides very poor fit to the geodetic data. We then 114 constructed and considered several analytical deformation models as alternatives, including: 1) 115 approximating the MMR shape using one rectangular horizontal sill, 2) approximating the MMR 116 shape using 3 rectangular non-horizontal sills, 3) allowing for non-uniform pressure distribution 117 in a 2D horizontal sill at the average depth of the MMR roof, and 4) allowing for non-uniform 118 pressure distributed over the 3D MMR roof. The models are constrained by the observations of 119 vertical deformation from seafloor pressure data and repeated AUV bathymetric surveys during 120 Axial's current inter-eruption phase between 2016-2020. Our inversion results suggest that the 121 MMR is likely compartmentalized, which is consistent with current thinking on magma reservoir 122 structure.

122

## 124 **2. Deformation data**

Bottom pressure recorders (BPRs) measure pressure at the seafloor; if the seafloor is uplifted, there is less water column above it and therefore lower pressure. Similarly, if the seafloor subsides, the BPR measures higher pressure. The pressure data are converted to depth after removing tidal signals (Eble et al., 1989). BPRs were deployed at Axial's summit caldera in 1998 when Axial's first observed eruption occurred (Chadwick et al., 2013; Dziak & Fox, 1999; Embley et al., 1999; Fox, 1999; Fox et al., 2001). After a two-year gap in coverage, the

- 131 deformation time series resumed in 2000 with an array of seafloor benchmarks and the time
- series has been continuous through the present (Figure 1; Chadwick et al., 2006, 2012, 2022;
- 133 Nooner & Chadwick, 2009, 2016). Since 2000, BPR measurements have been supplemented by
- 134 measurements from mobile pressure recorders (MPRs), which are used in campaign-style
- 135 surveys at seafloor benchmarks with a remotely operated vehicle (ROV) every 1-2 years to
- 136 correct for the BPRs' long-term drift where the two are co-located (Chadwick et al., 2006). We
- used the MPR data for our study instead of BPR data because there were more MPR
  measurement locations in 2016-2020 and we are more interested in the spatial component of
- deformation than the temporal component.
- 140

141 Bathymetric surveys at 1-m scale have been conducted at Axial since 2006 using 142 multibeam sonar equipped AUVs, first to obtain comprehensive coverage of the volcanic terrain, 143 and then to measure the extent and thickness of lava flows from the 2011 and 2015 eruptions 144 through differencing of repeated surveys (Caress et al., 2012; Chadwick et al., 2016). Beginning 145 after the most recent eruption in 2015, a new sparse pattern of AUV survey lines extending well 146 outside the caldera (Figure 2) was established to measure vertical surface deformation by 147 differencing (Caress et al., 2020); this pattern has been repeated each summer since except 2021. Differencing the repeated components of the surveys reveals vertical surface deformation over a 148 149 broader area than from the pressure sensors alone. However, compared to the MPR data which 150 has an accuracy of  $\pm 1$  cm, the AUV repeat bathymetry data have a lower vertical displacement 151 accuracy of  $\pm$  20 cm. We used AUV vertical displacement data between two surveys in 2016 and 152 2020 (Figure 2). An AUV bathymetric survey was also conducted in 2015, but this survey 153 apparently had higher errors than subsequent surveys, because the AUV depth changes between 154 2015-2020 poorly match the MPR depth changes from the same time period. Since MPR 155 measurements were made in 2015 and 2017 (but not in 2016), we estimated the uplift values in 156 2016 at the MPR benchmarks by interpolating between the 2015 and 2017 MPR measurements 157 assuming a linear deformation rate. The BPR record shows that deformation at the center of the 158 caldera during this time period was not entirely linear (Chadwick et al., 2022). The benchmark at 159 the center of the caldera had uplifted by 55 cm from mid-2015 to mid-2016, about 10 cm 160 shallower in summer of 2016 than a linear interpolation would predict (Figure S1 in 161 Supplementary Material). The deformation rate is highest at this benchmark compared to the 162 other benchmarks, so our interpolation introduces an additional uncertainty of  $\leq 10$  cm in the 163 estimated 2016 benchmark depths. Nevertheless, the estimated 2016-2020 depth changes at the 164 benchmarks agree relatively well with the 2016-2020 AUV data (Figure S2 in Supplementary 165 Material). 166

167



168

Figure 2. AUV repeat bathymetry data covering 2016-2020. Colors represent depth changes
between AUV surveys. Background bathymetry contour interval is 35 m and select contours are
labeled. The MMR is outlined with a red dotted line. The shallowest parts of the MMR roof are
shown with depth contours at -1250m and -1500m (below seafloor) in orange and cyan,
respectively.

174

We only used deformation data covering the inflation period from 2016 to 2020 to constrain our models because the main objective of our study is to investigate the spatial component of the deformation signal and its implications for the underlying magma storage system. Previous studies have shown that the spatial pattern of inflation does not vary significantly between different time periods (Nooner & Chadwick, 2016), except for major episodes of deflation during eruptions when slip on the caldera ring faults may contribute to the deformation field (Hefner et al., 2020).

182

#### 183 **3. Deformation modeling**

Our objective was to improve upon previous deformation models by reconciling the MMR geometry with the observed spatial deformation pattern. To do this, we constructed a series of models with increasing complexity, all constrained/bounded by the MMR. Each is

- 187 discussed in detail below. For all models, typical mechanical properties were used (Poisson's
- ratio = 0.25, shear modulus = 30 GPa, Young's modulus = 70 GPa; Turcotte & Schubert, 2014).
- 189 Table 1 contains a summary of model configurations, inversion methods, and performance. See
- 190 Figures 3 and 4 for a comparison of model geometries.
- 191

	Model configuration	Inversion method	Volume change (km <sup>3</sup> )	RMSE <sub>mpr</sub> (m)	RMSE <sub>auv</sub> (m)
Model 1	FEM, MMR with uniform internal pressure	Parameter search	0.173	0.312	0.254
Model 2a	Analytical, 1 rectangular, horizontal sill	MCMC	0.056	0.059	0.122
Model 2b	Analytical, 3 rectangular, non- horizontal sills	MCMC	0.06	0.047	0.097
Model 3a	Analytical, 2D horizontal grid of Okada sill sources	Least squares regression	0.06	0.009	0.130
Model 3b	Analytical, 3D Okada sill sources draped over MMR roof	Least squares regression	0.054	0.002	0.139

192

193 **Table 1.** Summary of model configurations, inversion methods, modeled volume changes, and

194 Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) values between each model and the MPR and AUV data.





196 **Figure 3.** North/South cross section showing deformation model geometries investigated in this

197 study. The MMR geometry from Arnulf et al., (2018) is shown as a gray mesh and represents the

198 Model 1 FEM source geometry. The other models are single or multiple combination of

rectangular Okada sills (colored lines) with either uniform or distributed (non-uniform) opening.

200 See text for details.





202 Figure 4. Model configurations and modeled openings of each pressure source. For Models 2a-

203 3b, the MMR is shown as a transparent gray mesh to provide context for the model geometries.





Figure 5. Model configurations and modeled openings of each pressure source overlain on

bathymetric contours (each contour is 35 m). The MMR is outlined in each plot with a dotted
 green line. Each model's volume change (dV) and RMSE values between the model and the
 MPR and AUV data are plotted in the lower left corner of each panel.

#### 209 Model 1a: Finite element model with MMR geometry and uniform pressure

210 As a first step, we constructed an FEM using the MMR geometry from Arnulf et al., 2018 211 with a uniform pressure source. We started with a 3D point cloud defining the combined MMR 212 roof and floor (see Arnulf et al., 2018 for more detail on how the roof and floor boundaries were 213 defined). A 3D surface was constructed from the point cloud using a ball-pivoting algorithm, 214 which starts with a seed triangle and creates new triangles by pivoting a ball with user-defined 215 radius around the edges until it meets new points (Bernardini et al., 1999). This 3D surface was 216 then loaded into Abaqus/CAE 2020, which we used to carry out the FEM simulations. To 217 validate the FEM methodology, we compared an analytical prolate spheroid model (Yang et al., 218 1988) to an FEM with a pressurized cavity of the same dimensions and verified that both models 219 predict the same surface deformation (Figure S3 in Supplementary Material).

220

221 The FEM domain measures 50 km long x 50 km wide x 30 km deep and the boundary 222 conditions were specified by a free top surface, a roller constraint on the side surfaces, and a 223 fixed bottom surface. We added bathymetry to the model using GMRT bathymetry data (Ryan et 224 al., 2009). The effect of gravity was accounted for by adding an additional analysis step (prior to 225 pressurization of the source) in which gravitational equilibrium is established by adding a pre-226 stress defined by hydrostatic equilibrium. This is an 'initial guess' which is used as a starting 227 point to solve for the gravitational force that balances out the pressure force to result in near-zero 228 ground deformation according to a defined threshold. We tested the effect of ocean loading by 229 adding a downward hydrostatic pressure applied to the seafloor and found it to be negligible. 230

The MMR was incorporated by subtracting its volume from the domain and applying a uniform internal pressure on the cavity walls. The pressure was varied over many simulations to minimize the combined root-mean-squared error (RMSE) between the modeled surface displacements and the AUV and MPR data.

235 236

#### 3.1. Models 2a and 2b: Analytical sill models using Bayesian inference

Model 2a is a single rectangular horizontal sill (Okada, 1985) and Model 2b consists of 3
non-horizontal rectangular sills constrained by the MMR geometry. We used the Volcanic and
Seismic Source Modeling (VSM) package (Trasatti, 2022) to conduct joint inversions using
Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) simulations to estimate the source parameters that produce
surface deformation that best fits the AUV and MPR data.

242

For Model 2a, all inversion parameters were allowed to vary except for the dip angle of the sill, which was fixed at zero (horizontal). The sill's depth was bounded by the minimum and maximum MMR depth. For Model 2b, the 3-sill geometry was constrained by the MMR geometry by fixing the strike and dip angles in the inversion to follow the general trend of 3 main MMR segments (Figures 4 and 5). The locations of the sills were allowed to vary within 3 248 defined segments of the MMR volume and the sill opening values were allowed to vary freely.

249 See Table 2 for a summary of fixed and best-fit variable parameters for Models 2a and 2b.

250

		Centroid Longitude	Centroid Latitude	Centroid depth (m bsf)	Length (m)	Width (m)	Strike	Dip	Opening (m)
Model 2a		-130.0100 ± 258 m	45.9637 ± 110 m	$2666 \pm 306$	2561 ± 1119	9680 ± 253	341° ± 2	0	$\begin{array}{c} 2.256 \pm \\ 0.682 \end{array}$
Model 2b	Sill 1	-130.0249 ± 79 m	45.9968 ± 77 m	2241 ± 74	3829 ± 170	5170 ± 115	340°	-7°	1.285 ± 0.041
	Sill 2	-130.0110 ± 83 m	45.9543 ± 97 m	$1712 \pm 70$	2769 ± 166	3475 ± 164	340°	13°	2.071 ± 0.152
	Sill 3	-129.9850 ± 126 m	45.9265 ± 175 m	$1985\pm206$	2800 ± 207	5707.36 ± 325	340°	-7°	$0.893 \pm 0.076$

251

Table 2. Summary of fixed and best-fit inverted parameters with standard deviations for Models 2a and 2b. The strike angle is the orientation of the plane measured clockwise from North according to Okada (1985) (i.e., strike = 0 if the plane is oriented North-South and dips to the East, strike = 90 if the plane is oriented East-West and dips to the South). Fixed parameters have red shading, parameters allowed to vary within the confines of the MMR geometry have yellow shading, and parameters allowed to freely vary have green shading.

258 259

## 3.2. Models 3a and 3b: 2D and 3D distributed pressure inversions

260 Inverting geodetic data to determine variable slip or opening distribution is a standard 261 method for inferring co-seismic slip on faults (e.g., Moreno et al., 2009) and has also been 262 applied in volcanic settings (e.g., Grandin et al., 2009). We performed two joint inversions of the 263 MPR and AUV data following this approach. For Model 3a, we created a 2D horizontal grid of 264 rectangular sill-patches at the average depth of the MMR roof and extending beyond the MMR 265 boundary horizontally by 3 km in both the x and y directions. For Model 3b, we gridded the 266 MMR roof point cloud into rectangular patches where each patch is defined by its position, 267 length, width, strike, and dip. The patches are allowed to dip to the North/South but not 268 East/West to create a continuous 3D grid with no gaps; this is appropriate since there is much 269 more dip variation along the North/South direction of the MMR than there is along the East/West 270 direction. The depths of the patches were defined by the average MMR roof depth at that 271 location (Figures 3 and 4).

272

For both Models 3a and 3b, we treated each patch as a rectangular dislocation (Okada, 1985) and inverted for the opening value of each patch. Posed as a forward problem, the relationship between surface displacements and patch openings can be expressed by the linear system:

277

278

where d is the observation vector composed of vertical surface displacements, G is the Green's function matrix, and m is the vector of model parameters (patch openings). G was constructed by computing the expected vertical displacement at every observation point for each patch caused by a unit opening on that patch. To solve for m, we used a regularized linear least squares

- 283 method which minimizes the objective function,  $\phi(m)$ :
- 284
- 285

 $\phi(m) = \parallel W(G \cdot m - d) \parallel_2^2 + \lambda^2 \parallel L \cdot m \parallel_2^2$ 

The first term  $|| W(G \cdot m - d) ||_2^2$  represents weighted misfit, i.e., the squared Euclidean norm 286 difference between the observed data and the data predicted by the model, where W is a diagonal 287 288 weight matrix which normalizes the contribution of the MPR and AUV datasets based on the relative uncertainties and the number of relative data points. The second term  $\lambda^2 \parallel L \cdot m \parallel_2^2$  is the 289 regularization term, where  $\lambda$  is the regularization parameter that controls the smoothness of the 290 291 model, and L is the regularization matrix. The optimal  $\lambda$  value was chosen using an L-curve, 292 where the preferred smoothness is located at the corner of the curve created by plotting 293 roughness vs. the L2 norm of misfit (Figure 6).





Figure 6. L-curves showing model roughness vs. Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) as a measure
of misfit between the model and the data for (a) the AUV data and (b) the MPR data. The
optimal smoothness occurs at the corner of the curve. Example shown is for Model 3b.

299

#### **3.3. Weighing the AUV and MPR data**

We weighed the AUV and MPR data on a case-by-case basis for each model due to differences among inversion methods. For Model 1, since the best-fit model was found by a parameter search over uniform pressure values on the MMR surface (all other model parameters were fixed), we calculated the AUV RMSE and MPR RMSE for each iteration then normalized them by dividing each by the maximum RMSE value across all iterations and by the relative uncertainties in the datasets. We then calculated the combined RMSE for each iteration by summing the normalized AUV RMSE and MPR RMSE values. The optimal model was chosen as the model with the lowest combined RMSE value. For Models 2a and 2b, we first weighed the
 datasets in an MCMC simulation according to their relative uncertainties, then further adjusted
 the weights over many MCMC simulations to find the weight combination that minimized the
 combined AUV and MPR RMSE values.

311

For Models 3a and 3b, we found a tradeoff between the regularization parameter  $\lambda$  and the relative weights, due to higher noise in the AUV data than in the MPR data. Instead of just normalizing the AUV and MPR datasets using their relative uncertainties, we further normalized them by the number of data points in each dataset. The  $\lambda$  value was then chosen as described above in Section 3.3.

317

#### 318 **4. Results**

319 We found that Model 1 (uniform pressurization of the 3-dimensional MMR) did not fit 320 either the MPR or AUV data well. This was not unexpected, since the MMR geometry is offset 321 from the caldera to the east while the observed deformation is centered on the caldera. Also, the 322 shallowest features along the MMR roof are located beneath the SE part of the caldera and 323 because of this, the model creates the largest surface deformation there, 4-5 km SE of the caldera 324 center (Figures 2, 4a and 6a). This makes sense intuitively since these shallowest MMR features 325 have less overburden and therefore uplift more readily under uniform pressurization. This result 326 tells us that the observed deformation cannot be simply produced by uniform pressure within the 327 entire MMR, which suggests that perhaps the MMR is compartmentalized with isolated melt 328 pockets that are not well connected. The other four models, which were developed to test this 329 idea, showed increasing improvement of fit to the MPR data as more parameters were added, and 330 the AUV RMSE values were also improved, but not as much and varied from model to model 331 (Table 1). We suspect that this is because of the higher uncertainty associated with the AUV 332 data, which was factored into how the datasets were weighed.

333

334 Despite differences among model geometries, the models consistently estimated a best-fit volume change of between 0.054-0.060 km<sup>3</sup>, except for Model 1 which estimated 0.173 km<sup>3</sup>. 335 Modeled deformation and fit to the MPR data are plotted in Figure 7 and AUV repeat 336 337 bathymetry residuals are plotted in Figure 8. In Models 3a and 3b where pressure was allowed to 338 spatially vary, modeled pressure changes were highest along the western-central edge of the 339 MMR (Figures 4 and 5). There is also a region of positive pressure change in the southern-most 340 southward dipping region of the MMR due to a long wavelength deformation signal present in 341 this area in the AUV data.

342



#### 343

344 Figure 7. Predicted surface vertical deformation for all best-fit models with comparison between

- the MPR data (red arrows) and modeled surface displacements (blue arrows). The surface 345 projection of each model geometry is shown as a white outline. Each model's volume change
- 346
- (dV) and rmse values between the model and the MPR and AUV data are plotted in the lower 347
- 348 left corner of each panel.





**Figure 8.** AUV repeat bathymetry residuals plotted by subtracting the modeled displacements

- from the AUV data. The surface projection of each model geometry is plotted as a green outline.
- 352 Each model's volume change (dV) and rmse values between the model and the MPR and AUV
- data are plotted in the lower left corner of each panel.

#### 354 **5. Discussion**

## **5.1. Model assumptions and limitations**

356 All our models assume homogeneous and isotropic elastic half spaces (except for Model 357 1, which includes bathymetry). Masterlark (2007) showed that the presence of layered crustal material can increase source depth estimates when compared to models assuming elastic half 358 359 spaces with uniform properties. Since Axial's volcanic edifice is composed of lava flows 360 emplaced upon one another over time, there is likely some anisotropy in which stiffness is 361 different in the vertical and lateral directions, which could cause an underestimation of source 362 depths. In addition, we found in sensitivity testing that inclusion of Axial's bathymetry in a finite 363 element model using a prolate spheroid pressure source fixed at a depth of 3.8 km (the best-fit 364 model of Nooner & Chadwick, 2016) can affect the volume change estimate by up to 27% 365 (Figure S3 in Supplementary Material). This effect would increase with shallower source depths 366 (Williams & Wadge, 1998) such as at the depth of the MMR. This result was unexpected 367 because of Axial's relatively modest bathymetric relief, so more work must be done to better 368 understand which bathymetric features (e.g., caldera walls vs surrounding bathymetric features) 369 influence the expression of vertical deformation for a given pressure source geometry.

370

371 Our assumption of elasticity could also affect the modeling results since there may be 372 non-elastic or viscoelastic effects unaccounted for in the models. Numerical modeling 373 implementing viscoelasticity at Mt. Etna has shown that lower pressures can produce the same 374 deformation as elastic models with higher pressure due to viscoelastic relaxation over time (Del 375 Negro et al., 2009). Depending on where this region of viscoelasticity is defined (either above or 376 below the pressure source), this phenomenon could result in either inflation or deflation observed 377 on the surface (Nooner & Chadwick, 2009). Cabaniss et al., (2020) found that non-temperature-378 dependent elastic rheology requires greater reservoir overpressures to reproduce the observed 379 surface deformation at Axial compared to models that incorporate a temperature-dependent 380 rheology. Additionally, petrological and tomographic studies increasingly show that magma 381 reservoirs are likely composed of discrete melt lenses/sills embedded within a crystal-rich 382 magma mush (Cashman et al., 2017). Magma mush is expected to behave 383 poroelastically/poroviscoelastically (Gudmundsson, 2012; Liao et al., 2018, 2021). Although 384 viscoelastic effects and the presence of magma mush would likely not significantly impact the 385 spatial distribution of modeled pressure changes in our results, it could impact volume change 386 estimates due to magma compressibility. Modeling viscoelastic effects at Axial would be more 387 strongly relevant to the temporal component of the deformation time series, for example to test 388 hypotheses regarding short-term deflation events proposed by Chadwick et al., (2022). 389 390 We also assumed that Axial's spatial deformation pattern does not vary temporally,

- 391 except for during eruptions when there may be slip on the caldera ring faults (Hefner et al., 2020;
- 392 Levy et al., 2018). The degree to which these ring faults are activated during Axial's inter-
- 393 eruptive periods is unknown. Although there is little evidence of slip on these faults during the

2016-2020 inflation in the AUV repeat bathymetry data (in the form of a sharp offsets along
AUV track lines crossing the faults), the uncertainty in the AUV data (± 20 cm) may be equal to
or higher than the amount of expected slip (8-30 cm; Levy et al., 2018). An FEM that includes
bathymetry, spatially variable pressure, and inclusion of ring faults would be most thorough,
although the number of free parameters in a complex model like this may not be constrainable by
the current deformation data. Recent expansions of the geodetic monitoring network at Axial
will be able to better quantify any slip across the caldera faults in the future.

401 402

### 5.2. Implications for magma storage beneath Axial caldera

403 A best-fitting deformation model cannot reveal the exact geometry of a magma storage 404 system and should not be interpreted as such; rather, a deformation model can provide the 405 approximate location and volume changes of the region(s) where the greatest pressure changes 406 occurred during inter-eruption magma supply into the storage system. While our results provide 407 improved horizontal constraints on where magma accumulates between eruptions, there is 408 inherent non-uniqueness among modeled depths due to the tradeoff between depth and pressure. While our best-fit horizontal sill (Model 2a) is similar in horizontal geometry to the best-fit 409 410 horizontal sill found by Hefner et al. (2021), the depth of our sill is deeper at 2.7 km compared to 0.97-1.24 km, which is likely due to differences in inversion methods and/or the tradeoff 411 412 between depth and pressure.

413

414 Despite this tradeoff, the consistent volume change estimates of 0.054-0.060 km<sup>3</sup> among 415 Models 2a-3b suggests that the volume change is not significantly sensitive to model depths 416 within the depth range of the MMR. In addition, we tested an FEM model using the prolate spheroid geometry (best-fit solution from Nooner & Chadwick, 2016) constrained only by the 417 2015-2020 MPR data, which resulted in a volume change of 0.077 km<sup>3</sup> (Figure S3a in 418 Supplementary Material). Since this included an extra year's worth of inflation compared to the 419 420 2016-2020 models we show in this study, the estimated volume change for the 2016-2020 time 421 period would be somewhat lower, more or less consistent with the volume change estimates 422 using geometries constrained by the MMR above. This demonstrates that the estimated volume 423 change for this inter-eruptive recharge period is not highly sensitive to model geometry, depth, or 424 location.

425

The total volume of the shallow magma storage system beneath Axial was estimated by Arnulf et al. (2014) to be 18-30 km<sup>3</sup> and the modeled co-eruptive volume change associated with previous eruptions has been estimated to vary between 0.147 - 0.206 km<sup>3</sup> using analytical model source depths of 3-3.8 km (Chadwick et al., 1999, 2012; Hefner et al., 2020; Nooner & Chadwick, 2016). Our study models the observed inflation from 2016-2020, during a time when the magma supply rate was initially high, but then waned with time following the 2015 eruption (Chadwick et al., 2022). Given that the magma supply rate is estimated to have varied from >0.1 433 km<sup>3</sup>/year to <0.01 km<sup>3</sup>/year during that time period (Chadwick et al., 2022), our volume change
434 estimates are reasonable.

435

436 Mullet & Segall (2022) demonstrated that as the melt fraction of mush in a magma 437 reservoir increases, the deformation caused by a mush-dominated magma storage system is 438 increasingly driven by the overall shape of the mush body, instead of any pressurized melt lens 439 within the mush. If the melt fraction within the MMR is high enough to cause Axial's 440 deformation to be driven by the entire mushy body (instead of individual sills) and if we assume 441 that the MMR is a continuous body, it follows that using the MMR geometry as a pressure 442 source should fit the deformation data. The poor fit to the data of Model 1 as well as the pattern 443 of pressure distribution in Models 3a and 3b are instead suggestive of compartmentalization of 444 melt within the MMR and a relatively low melt fraction in the surrounding mush (Figure 9). In 445 this context, compartmentalization means that melt bodies within the MMR are not connected 446 hydraulically, at least on time scales that are relevant to the deformation cycle at Axial. 447



448

Figure 9. Schematic diagram illustrating possible compartmentalized melt distribution in which
sills are emplaced in crystal mush both within and below the MMR.

452 The depth of magma residence estimated by petrological analyses (Drever et al., 2013) is 453 deeper at 3-6 km than the MMR depth range of 1.1-2.8 km, but is consistent with the deeper 454 system of stacked sills beneath the MMR imaged by Carbotte et al., 2020 extending from 3-5 km 455 depth below seafloor. Since we did not consider deformation sources in this depth range, we 456 cannot rule out contribution to the deformation field of a potential pressure source (or multiple 457 sources) in the stacked sill region. Non-uniqueness among models due to the tradeoff between 458 depth/pressure would likely hinder efforts to resolve pressurization of multiple vertically stacked 459 sills or the combination of compartmentalized MMR pressurization with a source representing

the stacked sill region. However, since the stacked sills are exclusively beneath the SSE part of

the caldera, they probably cannot produce the observed caldera-centered deformation by

- themselves.
- 463

## 464 6. Conclusions

465 The ability to accurately forecast volcanic eruptions is an important goal in hazard 466 mitigation research. Linking precursory signals like ground deformation to subsurface processes 467 is therefore essential. With the increase in spatial coverage of Axial's deformation monitoring due to the application of AUV repeat bathymetric surveys, there is now adequate data to justify 468 469 more complex deformation modeling than what has been done previously. We constructed a 470 suite of numerical and analytical models geometrically constrained by the shape of the 471 seismically imaged MMR to investigate the role of the MMR in creating the observed surface 472 deformation and to test the hypothesis that the MMR is compartmentalized. Although our 473 estimated volume change of 0.054-0.060 km<sup>3</sup> for the inflation period between 2016-2020 is 474 reasonable considering previous estimates of inflation and eruption volumes, the models make 475 assumptions (flat seafloor, full elasticity, no ring faults) that could influence the volume change 476 and/or depth estimates. Nevertheless, the models with spatially varying pressure (Models 3a and 477 3b) suggest that magma accumulates during Axial's inter-eruptive recharge periods along the 478 western-central edge of the MMR with some potential additional accumulation in the southern-479 most southward dipping region of the MMR. Future modeling efforts with additional complexity 480 and more parameters will likely require increased data constraints in the form of higher 481 resolution seismic imagery and/or horizontal deformation measurements.

482

## 483 Acknowledgements

Collection of data used in this study was funded by the National Science Foundation (awards
OCE-1736926, 1736882, and 1737019) and the David and Lucille Packard Foundation. The
authors are grateful to Adrien Arnulf for providing the MMR top and bottom horizon geometry.
The authors also thank the crews of R/V Thompson, R/V Kilo Moana, R/V Zephyr, and R/V
Rachel Carson for their support at sea, the ROV Jason team (WHOI National Deep Submergence
Facility) for conducting the MPR surveys, and the operational teams of AUV Sentry (WHOI

- 490 National Deep Submergence Facility) and the MBARI Mapping AUVs for conducting the AUV
- 491 surveys.
- 492

## 493 Data Availability Statement

494 The code and data used for this research can be found at <u>https://zenodo.org/records/10219997</u>.

- Academic licensing for Abaqus software is provided by Simulia, Dassault Systèmes. The VSM
   software used for analytical modeling can be found at https://github.com/EliTras/VSM (Trasatti,
- 497 2022).
- 498
- 499
- 500

#### 501 **References**

- Arnulf, A. F., Harding, A. J., Kent, G. M., Carbotte, S. M., Canales, J. P., & Nedimović, M. R.
  (2014). Anatomy of an active submarine volcano. *Geology*, 42(8), 655–658.
  https://doi.org/10.1130/G35629.1
- 505 Arnulf, A. F., Harding, A. J., Kent, G. M., & Wilcock, W. S. D. (2018). Structure, Seismicity,
- and Accretionary Processes at the Hot Spot-Influenced Axial Seamount on the Juan de Fuca
  Ridge. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *123*(6), 4618–4646.
- 508 https://doi.org/10.1029/2017JB015131
- Bernardini, F., Mittleman, J., Rushmeier, H., Silva, C., & Taubin, G. (1999). The ball-pivoting
  algorithm for surface reconstruction. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 5(4), 349–359. https://doi.org/10.1109/2945.817351
- Cabaniss, H. E., Gregg, P. M., Nooner, S. L., & Chadwick, W. W. (2020). Triggering of
  eruptions at Axial Seamount, Juan de Fuca Ridge. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), 1–11.
  https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-67043-0
- 515 Carbotte, S. M., Arnulf, A., Spiegelman, M., Lee, M., Harding, A., Kent, G., Canales, J. P., &
  516 Nedimović, M. (2020). Stacked sills forming a deep melt-mush feeder conduit beneath axial

517 seamount. *Geology*, 48(7), 693–697. https://doi.org/10.1130/G47223.1

- Caress, D. W., Clague, D. A., Paduan, J. B., Chadwick, W. W., Nooner, S. L., & Thomas, H. J.
  (2020). Vertical Deformation of the Axial Seamount Summit from Repeated 1-m Scale
  Bathymetry Surveys Using AUVs. In *American Geophysical Union, Fall Meeting 2020, abstract #V040-0017.*
- 522 Caress, D. W., Clague, D. A., Paduan, J. B., Martin, J. F., Dreyer, B. M., Chadwick, W. W.,
  523 Denny, A., & Kelley, D. S. (2012). Repeat bathymetric surveys at 1-metre resolution of lava
  524 flows erupted at Axial Seamount in April 2011. *Nature Geoscience*, 5(7), 483–488.
  525 https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1496
- Cashman, K. V., Sparks, R. S. J., & Blundy, J. D. (2017). Vertically extensive and unstable
  magmatic systems: A unified view of igneous processes. *Science*, *355*(6331).
  https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aag3055
- 529 Chadwick, W. W., Clague, D. A., Embley, R. W., Perfit, M. R., Butterfield, D. A., Caress, D.
- 530 W., Paduan, J. B., Martin, J. F., Sasnett, P., Merle, S. G., & Bobbitt, A. M. (2013). The
- 531 1998 eruption of Axial Seamount: New insights on submarine lava flow emplacement from
- high-resolution mapping. Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems, 14(10), 3939–3968.
- 533 https://doi.org/10.1002/ggge.20202
- Chadwick, W. W., Embley, R. W., Milburn, H. B., Meinig, C., & Stapp, M. (1999). Evidence for
  deformation associated with the 1998 eruption of Axial Volcano, Juan de Fuca Ridge, from
  acoustic extensometer measurements. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 26(23), 3441–3444.
  https://doi.org/10.1029/1999GL900498
- 538 Chadwick, W. W., Nooner, S. L., Butterfield, D. A., & Lilley, M. D. (2012). Seafloor
- deformation and forecasts of the April 2011 eruption at Axial Seamount. *Nature*
- 540 *Geoscience*, 5(7), 474–477. https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1464

- 541 Chadwick, W. W., Nooner, S. L., Zumberge, M. A., Embley, R. W., & Fox, C. G. (2006).
  542 Vertical deformation monitoring at Axial Seamount since its 1998 eruption using deep-sea
  543 pressure sensors. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, *150*(1–3), 313–327.
  544 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2005.07.006
- 545 Chadwick, W. W., Paduan, J. B., Clague, D. A., Dreyer, B. M., Merle, S. G., Bobbitt, A. M.,
- Caress, D. W., Philip, B. T., Kelley, D. S., & Nooner, S. L. (2016). Voluminous eruption
  from a zoned magma body after an increase in supply rate at Axial Seamount. *Geophysical*
- 548 *Research Letters*, *43*(23), 12,063-12,070. https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL071327
- 549 Chadwick, W. W., Wilcock, W. S. D., Nooner, S. L., Beeson, J. W., Sawyer, A. M., & Lau, T.
  550 K. (2022). Geodetic Monitoring at Axial Seamount Since Its 2015 Eruption Reveals a
  551 Waning Magma Supply and Tightly Linked Rates of Deformation and Seismicity.
  552 *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems, 23*(1). https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GC010153
- 553 Clague, D. A., Dreyer, B. M., Paduan, J. B., Martin, J. F., Chadwick, W. W., Caress, D. W.,
- Portner, R. A., Guilderson, T. P., McGann, M. L., Thomas, H., Butterfield, D. A., &
  Embley, R. W. (2013). Geologic history of the summit of Axial Seamount, Juan de Fuca
  Ridge. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems, 14*(10), 4403–4443.
- 557 https://doi.org/10.1002/ggge.20240
- 558 Del Negro, C., Currenti, G., & Scandura, D. (2009). Temperature-dependent viscoelastic
  559 modeling of ground deformation: Application to Etna volcano during the 1993-1997
  560 inflation period. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, *172*, 299–309.
  561 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pepi.2008.10.019
- 562 Dreyer, B. M., Clague, D. A., & Gill, J. B. (2013). Petrological variability of recent magmatism
  563 at Axial Seamount summit, Juan de Fuca Ridge. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems*,
  564 14(10), 4306–4333. https://doi.org/10.1002/ggge.20239
- 565 Dziak, R. P., & Fox, C. G. (1999). The January 1998 Earthquake swarm at Axial Volcano, Juan
   566 de Fuca Ridge: Hydroacoustic evidence of seafloor volcanic activity. *Geophysical Research* 567 *Letters*, 26(23), 3429–3432. https://doi.org/10.1029/1999GL002332
- Eble, M. C., Gonzalez, F. I., Mattens, D. M., Milburn, H. B., Mosbacher, R. A., Knauss, J. A., &
  Fletcher, J. O. (1989). *Instrumentation, field operations, and data processing for PMEL deep ocean bottom pressure measurements.*
- 571 Embley, R. W., Chadwick, W. W., Clague, D., & Stakes, D. (1999). 1998 eruption of axial
  572 volcano: Multibeam anomalies and sea-floor observations. *Geophysical Research Letters*,
  573 26(23), 3425–3428. https://doi.org/10.1029/1999GL002328
- Fox, C. G. (1999). In situ ground deformation measurements from the summit of Axial Volcano
  during the 1998 volcanic episode. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 26(23), 3437–3440.
  https://doi.org/10.1029/1999GL900491
- Fox, C. G., Chadwick, W. W., & Embley, R. W. (2001). Direct observation of a submarine
  volcanic eruption from a sea-floor instrument caught in a lava flow. *Nature 2001 412:6848*,
- 579 *412*(6848), 727–729. https://doi.org/10.1038/35089066

580 Grandin, R., Socquet, A., Binet, R., Klinger, Y., Jacques, E., De Chabalier, J. B., King, G. C. P.,

- 581 Lasserre, C., Tait, S., Tapponnier, P., Delorme, A., & Pinzuti, P. (2009). September 2005
- 582 Manda hararo-dabbahu rifting event, Afar (Ethiopia): Constraints provided by geodetic
  583 data. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 114(8).
- 584 https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JB005843
- Gudmundsson, A. (2012). Magma chambers: Formation, local stresses, excess pressures, and
   compartments. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 237–238, 19–41.
   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2012.05.015
- Hefner, W. L., Nooner, S. L., Chadwick, W. W., & Bohnenstiehl, D. R. (2020). Revised
  Magmatic Source Models for the 2015 Eruption at Axial Seamount Including Estimates of
  Fault-Induced Deformation. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *125*(4),
  e2020JB019356. https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JB019356
- Hefner, W., Nooner, S. L., Chadwick, W. W., Caress, D. W., Paduan, J. B., Bohnenstiehl, D. R.,
  & Clague, D. A. (2021). Deformation Models for the 2015-Eruption and Post-Eruption
  Inflation at Axial Seamount from Repeat AUV Bathymetry. In AGU Fall Meeting 2021, *held in New Orleans, LA, 13-17 December 2021, id. V45B-0138.*
- Levy, S., Bohnenstiehl, D. R., Sprinkle, P., Boettcher, M. S., Wilcock, W. S. D., Tolstoy, M., &
  Waldhauser, F. (2018). Mechanics of fault reactivation before, during, and after the 2015
  eruption of Axial Seamount. *Geology*, 46(5), 447–450. https://doi.org/10.1130/G39978.1
- Liao, Y., Soule, S. A., & Jones, M. (2018). On the Mechanical Effects of Poroelastic Crystal
  Mush in Classical Magma Chamber Models. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *123*(11), 9376–9406. https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JB015985
- Liao, Y., Soule, S. A., Jones, M., & Le Mével, H. (2021). The Roles of Heat and Gas in a Mushy
  Magma Chamber. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *126*(4).
  https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JB019395
- Masterlark, T. (2007). Magma intrusion and deformation predictions: Sensitivities to the Mogi
   assumptions. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *112*(B6), B06419.
- 607 https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JB004860
- Mogi, K. (1958). Relations between the eruptions of various volcanoes and the deformations of the ground surfaces around them. *Bull. Earthq. Res. Inst.*, *36*, 99–134.
- 610 https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/10017329458/
- Moreno, M. S., Bolte, J., Klotz, J., & Melnick, D. (2009). Impact of megathrust geometry on
   inversion of coseismic slip from geodetic data: Application to the 1960 Chile earthquake.
   *Geophysical Research Letters*, 36(16). https://doi.org/10.1029/2009GL039276
- Mullet, B., & Segall, P. (2022). The Surface Deformation Signature of a Transcrustal, Crystal
  Mush-Dominant Magma System. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *127*(5).
  https://doi.org/10.1029/2022JB024178

# Nooner, S. L., & Chadwick, W. W. (2009). Volcanic inflation measured in the caldera of axial seamount: Implications for magma supply and future eruptions. *Geochemistry, Geophysics,*

619 *Geosystems*, 10(2). https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GC002315

- Nooner, S. L., & Chadwick, W. W. (2016). Inflation-predictable behavior and co-eruption
  deformation at Axial Seamount. *Science*, *354*(6318), 1399–1403.
  https://doi.org/10.1126/SCIENCE.AAH4666
- 623 Okada, Y. (1985). Surface deformation due to shear and tensile faults in a half-space. *Bulletin of*
- 624 *the Seismological Society of America*, 75(4), 1135–1154.
- Ryan, W. B. F., Carbotte, S. M., Coplan, J. O., O'Hara, S., Melkonian, A., Arko, R., Weissel, R.
  A., Ferrini, V., Goodwillie, A., Nitsche, F., Bonczkowski, J., & Zemsky, R. (2009). Global
  multi-resolution topography synthesis. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems, 10*(3).
  https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GC002332
- Trasatti, E. (2022). Volcanic and Seismic Source Modeling: An Open Tool for Geodetic Data
  Modeling. *Frontiers in Earth Science*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2022.917222
- 631 Turcotte, D. L., & Schubert, G. (2014). *Geodynamics* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, C., & Wadge, G. (1998). The effects of topography on magma chamber deformation
   models: Application to Mt. Etna and radar interferometry. *Advances in Difference*
- 634 Equations, 25(10), 1549–1552. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13662-019-2194-1
- Yang, X. M., Davis, P. M., & Dieterich, J. H. (1988). Deformation from inflation of a dipping
  finite prolate spheroid in an elastic half-space as a model for volcanic stressing. *Journal of*

637 *Geophysical Research*, 93(B5), 4249–4257. https://doi.org/10.1029/JB093iB05p04249

638 639

#### Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth

Supporting Information for

## Compartmentalization of Axial Seamount's magma reservoir inferred by analytical and numerical deformation modeling with realistic geometry

S.R. Slead<sup>1</sup>, M. Wei<sup>1</sup>, S.L. Nooner<sup>2</sup>, W.W. Chadwick<sup>3</sup>, D.W. Caress<sup>4</sup>, and J. Beeson<sup>3,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, Narragansett, RI, USA.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Earth and Ocean Sciences, University of North Carolina Wilmington, Wilmington, NC, USA

<sup>3</sup>Oregon State University, Cooperative Institute for Marine Resources Studies, Hatfield Marine Science Center, Newport, OR, USA

<sup>4</sup>Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute, Moss Landing, CA, USA

<sup>5</sup>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory, Newport, OR, USA

#### **Contents of this file**

Figures S1 to S3 Text S1



**Figure S1.** Pressure data from a single BPR at the center of the caldera (blue line, converted to relative depth) and 2 MPR surveys (purple dots in the summers of 2015 and 2017). The "true" MPR relative depth value in August 2016 when the AUV survey was conducted (arrow) is about 10cm higher than linear interpolation would predict (purple dashed line).



**Figure S2.** Comparison between the 2016-2020 AUV repeat bathymetry data and the 2016-2020 MPR data at the locations of six MPR benchmarks (see Figure 1 for locations). The uplift at the MPR benchmarks in mid-02016 was estimated by interpolating between the measured values from the 2015 and 2017 MPR surveys (no MPR survey was made in 2016). The error bars are uncertainties of 20 cm for the AUV data (Caress et al., 2020) and 1 cm for the MPR data (Chadwick et al., 2006). In general, the 2016-2020 MPR uplift values (using the estimated 2016 value) agree reasonably well with the 2016-2020 AUV depth change results.

#### Text S1.

To validate our FEM methodology, we compared an analytical prolate spheroid model (Yang et al., 1988) to an FEM with a pressurized cavity of the same dimensions. The reason we chose a prolate spheroid was to replicate the deformation model proposed by Nooner & Chadwick, 2016 in order to validate all modeling methods, including the analytical model. The prolate spheroid proposed by Nooner & Chadwick (2016) for the 2015 co-eruptive deformation has a centroid depth of 3.81 km, major/minor axes of 2.2/0.38 km, and has a strike/dip of 286°/77°. For the FEM and analytical models, we fixed all geometrical parameters and iterated over volume change

values to optimize fit the 2015-2020 MPR data. The models produced results with acceptably small difference (<3%) such that the FEM physics and boundary conditions can be considered valid (Figure S3a,b).

We also tested the effect of bathymetry in an FEM using GMRT bathymetry data (Ryan et al., 2009). To increase computational efficiency, we progressively down sampled the bathymetry to find the coarsest resolution that does not impact results (100 m resolution). We found that inclusion of bathymetry fit the MPR data better by 40% and the source's best-fit volume change increased by 27% over that of the models with a flat seafloor (Figure S3). This result was surprising since Axial has relatively low bathymetric relief. We suspect that the large depression to the northeast of the caldera (Helium Basin, which is the is the southern-most part of the CoAxial segment of the Juan de Fuca Ridge) could exert some influence. This region has a sharp slope where the depth decreases about 800 m over 4 km and its influence may be enhanced by shallowness of the pressure source, since the effect of topography on deformation increases with decreasing magma chamber depth (Williams & Wadge, 1998). More work must be done to verify that the signal is real and not just numerical artifact.



**Figure S3.** a) Analytical prolate spheroid model (best-fit solution from Nooner & Chadwick, 2016), b) FEM using the same prolate spheroid geometry as in (a), c) FEM using the same prolate spheroid geometry as in (a) and (b) but with bathymetry instead of flat seafloor. For all plots, the MPR displacement data are the red arrows, and the modeled displacements are the blue arrows. Reported RMSE values are between the model and the data.