Left-lateral shear inside the North Gulf of Evia Rift, Central Greece, evidenced by relocated earthquake sequences and moment tensor inversion
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A B S T R A C T

The use of local velocity model in the analysis of seismicity recorded by the Hellenic Unified Seismological Network (HUSN), provides the opportunity to determine accurate hypocentral solutions using the weighted P- and S-wave arrival times for the November 2013, November 2014 and June 2015 North Gulf of Evia (Euboea) sequences. The hypocentral locations, including the determination of the location uncertainties, are obtained applying the non-linear probabilistic analysis. We also calculated the moment tensor solutions for the main events as well as for the strongest aftershocks. The accurate determination of seismicity showed the activation of two left-lateral, NW-SE striking, near-vertical faults, one onshore near village Taxiarchis (2013 sequence) and one offshore (offshore Malessina Peninsula, 2015 sequence). The 2014 sequence, also offshore Malessina Peninsula ruptured an oblique-slip, north-dipping normal fault with a strike of N280°–290°E. All three faults occur at depths 10–16 km, with rupture zone dimensions 5–6 km along strike and 3–4 km along dip. These aftershock depths indicate a seismogenic (brittle) zone of about 15 km in depth for this rift. The left-lateral kinematics indicates strain partitioning inside the rift because of E-W horizontal compression, also evidenced by GPS data. The moderate magnitude of earthquakes (M5.2 ± 0.1) indicates that strike-slip events have a minor contribution to the crustal deformation and to active tectonics of the Gulf.

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

This work presents the results of the hypocentral relocation and stress inversion analysis for three recent earthquake sequences in the northern Gulf of Evia (Euboea), Central Greece (Fig. 1a; during 2013–2015). Gulf of Evia is a juvenile rift (Roberts and Jackson, 1991; Roberts and Ganas, 2000; Walker et al., 2010) with an overall strike of WNW-ESE, hosting a series of mostly north-dipping normal faults that are capable of rupturing up to M7 earthquake events (Ambraseys and Jackson, 1990). The existence of the rift at the western termination of the North Anatolian Fault (Hatzfeld et al., 1999) as well as the absence of M6 + events after 1894 (e.g. Ganas et al., 2006) provide this region with extra motives to study seismicity patterns. On 12 November 2013 (18:09, UTC) a moderate, Mh = 4.8 earthquake, occurred onshore northern Evia, near the village Taxiarchis (Fig. 1a; Moshou et al., 2015). For a period of one month 155 aftershocks were recorded with magnitude Mb > 0.5, while on the first day 85 earthquakes occurred; the largest of them with magnitude Mb = 3.9 (occurred on 13 November 2013 06:50 UTC). About one year later, on November 17, 2014, two shallow earthquakes with magnitude Mh = 5.2 occurred inside the northern Gulf of Evia (offshore), between Malessina Peninsula and Mountain Kandilli (Figs. 1a & 2; Table 1, event 1 & 2). Numerous aftershocks occurred up to January 2015, of which 454 events (0.7 < Mb < 4.0) were selected for further analysis. On June 9, 2015 a fourth, moderate Mh = 5.2 earthquake occurred south of the focal area of the 2014 main shocks (Table 1, event 3). The published focal plane solutions of the 2014 & 2015 events are shown in Table 1, mostly indicating normal faulting with a significant strike-slip component (event 1, event 2) or strike-slip faulting (event 3). The high quality of seismic data available in combination with a good knowledge of the local tectonics (e.g. Hatzfeld et al., 1999; Ganas and Papoulia, 2000; Sakellariou et al., 2007; Rondoyanni et al., 2007; Karastathis et al., 2007, 2011; Ganas et al., 2014a) prompted us to investigate these sequences in order to a) better locate the events and “image” the seismic faults and b) study the kinematics of the ruptures and tie them to the general strain field as was recently published by Kreemer et al. (2004), Müller et al. (2013), Chousianitis et al. (2013, 2015) and Vernant et al. (2014).
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2. Tectonic setting

The North Gulf of Evia (Euboea; Fig. 1) is located between the transtensional North Aegean region (hosting branches of the north Anatolian fault system; Koukouvelas and Aydin, 2002; Kiratzi, 2002; Chatzipetros et al., 2013) and the rapidly extending Gulf of Corinth (Ambraseys and Jackson, 1990, 1997). Onshore syn-rift sequences are of Pliocene–Quaternary age (Mettos et al., 1991, 1992; Rondoyanni et al., 2007; Kranis, 2007). The most notable fault structure in the Gulf of Evia is the Atalanti fault zone (Fig. 1a) (Ganas et al., 1998; Pantosti et al., 2001; Pavlides et al., 2004) that consists of several segments of north-dipping active normal faults. Two major earthquakes that occurred in 20/04/1894 and 27/04/1894 with magnitudes of $M = 6.4$ and $M = 6.6$ respectively, have been associated to this fault system. However, no other $M_6+$ events have been recorded in this rift since 1894 (Fig. 1b; see Ganas et al., 2006 for evolution of stress field). In the vicinity of the 2013–2015 sequences it is observed (Makropoulos et al., 2012; Fig. 1b): a M5.7 event in September 27, 1916; a M5.0 event in April 12, 1925 and a M5.0 event in September 9, 1931. Due to the 10+ km ambiguity in historical epicentral location we cannot associate those events with structures in the field. However, one submarine fault zone of E-W strike, the south-dipping Telethrion fault (Fig. 1a; equivalent to Edipsos segment in Ganas and Papoulia, 2000) can be considered as capable of hosting strong earthquakes (Sakellariou et al., 2013).
Further south (up to Chalkis city; Fig. 1a) several E-W to NW-SE minor normal faults exist (Sakellariou et al., 2007; Karastathis et al., 2007) that are interpreted as secondary structures releasing Evia intra-block strain with moderate seismic potential (Ganas et al., 2014a). Since the beginning of instrumental recordings there have not been strike-slip earthquake sequences in the study area. Nevertheless, towards the north-east of the 2013 sequence (i.e. towards the shores of Aegean Sea) fault plane solutions of many earthquakes suggest predominant strike slip motions (Hatzfeld et al., 1999; Kiratzi, 2002). To the south-east of the 2014–2015 sequences a seismic swarm occurred during 2003 with mostly normal-slip kinematics (Psachna area, Fig. 1a; Benetatos et al., 2004; Papoulia et al., 2006). The north Gulf of Evia is modeled as crustal block boundary by Vernant et al. (2014) across which there is an extension of 3.6 mm/yr and left-lateral shear of 2.5 mm/yr.

3. Methodology and data processing

3.1. Hypocentral relocation

The three seismic sequences with upper magnitudes M_L = 4.9 and M_L = 5.3, of 12 November 2013 17 November 2014 and June 9, 2015 respectively, have been relocated (Fig. 2) using broadband data from HUSN network (stations used are shown in supplementary Fig. S1). A 1-D velocity model on the basis of the 3-D local earthquake tomography model proposed by Karastathis et al. (2011; Fig. 3) was used, consisting of 6 layers of velocity model. The nodes are well distributed in seven horizontal layers (slices) at depths of 0, 1.5, 7, 12, 18.5 and 31 km, with the Moho depth at 31 km (Ganas et al., 2014a) (Table 3). For the 2013 seismic sequence the phase data from National Observatory of Athens include more than 12,700 P- and 4800 S-wave arrivals. Only
events with at least 8 P-wave and 4 S-wave arrivals having an azimuthal gap lower than 180°, location RMS lower than 0.8 s (Figs. 4, 5) and vertical and horizontal errors lower than 1.5 km were selected for processing. The non-linear location method of NonLinLoc (Lomax et al., 2000) was used. NonLinLoc gives, a complete probabilistic solution expressed in terms of a posterior density function (PDF) (Tarantola and Valette, 1982). The software incorporates a 3D version of the Eikonal finite-difference scheme (Le Meur, 1994; Le Meur et al., 1997) for the calculation of travel-times between a station and all nodes of a 3D velocity grid. This results in the creation of a travel time grid for each station in the study area. Those grids are retrieved in a later step, in order to calculate the optimal hypocenter location using the Oct-tree importance sampling algorithm (Lomax and Curtis, 2001) which uses recursive subdivisions and sampling of cells in order to converge to the optimal hypocentral location. Throughout the above-described procedure, the PDF is calculated using the equal-differential-time (EDT) likelihood function (Font et al., 2004). Contrary to the typical least-squares approaches, the difference between observed and synthetic travel times is calculated for pairs of stations and the sum is taken over all possible pairs. This results in a number of advantages. For datasets where mispicked observations (or outliers) have to be taken into account, the EDT likelihood function is more accurate, providing a more reliable uncertainty estimate. Moreover, it is independent of the origin time, thus the 4-D problem of hypocenter location reduces to a 3-D search over spatial location of the hypocenter. As a result, the algorithm was able to detect mispicked phases in our dataset and downweight them significantly, thus improving the location solution (horizontal location error is between 400 m and 1.2 km; Figs. 4, 5). On the contrary, in the initial location analysis by NOA, such outliers affected the final solutions. Moreover, the non-linear location method of NonLinLoc is not affected by the shortcomings of linearized location methods, particularly the dependence of the solution on the quality of the initial guess and the instability for poorly constrained earthquake locations (Husen and Hardebeck, 2010). Events locations acquired at local minima with the focal mechanism was determined at this study by moment

### Table 1

Source parameters published by various institutions for the Nov. 17, 2014 event 23:06 UTC (event 1), Nov. 17, 2014 event 23:09 UTC (event 2), June 9, 2015 event 01:09 UTC (event 3). Mo is seismic moment, Mw is moment magnitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Lat (°)</th>
<th>Lon (°)</th>
<th>Mw</th>
<th>Mo (dyn*cm)</th>
<th>Depth (km)</th>
<th>Strike 1 (°)</th>
<th>Dip 1 (°)</th>
<th>Rake 1 (°)</th>
<th>Strike 2 (°)</th>
<th>Dip 2 (°)</th>
<th>Rake 2 (°)</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INGV</td>
<td>38.6500</td>
<td>23.4000</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.30E+24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>−141</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>−42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>38.6000</td>
<td>23.6700</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.54E+24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>−31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>−126</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFZ</td>
<td>38.6600</td>
<td>23.4000</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.80E+23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>−140</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>−40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTH</td>
<td>38.6580</td>
<td>23.4112</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.34E+23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>−161</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>−11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOA</td>
<td>38.6433</td>
<td>23.4415</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9.17E+23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>−66</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>−123</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOA</td>
<td>38.6398</td>
<td>23.3953</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.50E+23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>−67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>−120</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This study</td>
<td>38.6360</td>
<td>23.3920</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.66E+23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>−40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>−143</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGV</td>
<td>38.6300</td>
<td>23.4300</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.50E+23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>−168</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>−26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>38.7000</td>
<td>23.2800</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.80E+23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>−3</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>−150</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFZ</td>
<td>38.6300</td>
<td>23.3200</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.80E+23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>−14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>−178</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOA</td>
<td>38.6427</td>
<td>23.4067</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.93E+23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>−39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>−148</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTH</td>
<td>38.6450</td>
<td>23.4110</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.95E+23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>−166</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>−10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOA</td>
<td>38.6437</td>
<td>23.3963</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.49E+23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>−64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>−136</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This study</td>
<td>38.6413</td>
<td>23.4087</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.58E+23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>−20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>−164</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGV</td>
<td>38.6300</td>
<td>23.3400</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.3E+24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>−177</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>−10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>38.6700</td>
<td>23.3400</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.3E+24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>−175</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>−9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOA</td>
<td>38.6200</td>
<td>23.3300</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.9E+23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFZ</td>
<td>38.6400</td>
<td>23.4000</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.12E+24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>−162</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>−9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTH</td>
<td>38.6220</td>
<td>23.3890</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.81E+23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This study</td>
<td>38.6220</td>
<td>23.3890</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.58E+23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>−175</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>−10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seismic trends differ). A cross-section in Fig. 8b shows that the 2015 activated fault dips steeply to the North. We interpret these features as two distinct faults because a) in seismicity cross sections the 2014–2015 foci clusters plot separately (Fig. 8 see foci with different colors; blue depicts 2015 events) b) the distance between the two clusters is much greater than the maximum lateral location error (1.2 km; Fig. 5) and the majority of 67% confidence ellipsoids do not overlap (Fig. 9) c) the focal mechanisms of the mainshocks (Nov. 17 2014 vs June 9 2015) are different (see next section), consistent with the interpretation that two distinct structures ruptured. This distinct image of the 2014 vs. 2015 seismicity highlights the resolving power of the relocation procedure used. However, this consideration is valid only under the assumption that there is not any abrupt lateral anomaly in the local velocity structure.

3.2. Moment tensors

The second part of this study is the determination of the focal mechanisms and the calculation of the source parameters (strike, dip, rake, depth and moment magnitude) for the larger events. Seismological broadband data from HUSN were collected and analyzed in order to determine the source parameters of the moderate events. For this purpose, we selected and analyzed the data of 10 broadband seismological stations with three components (see Fig. S2 for location of stations). A linear, time-domain moment tensor inversion method with a point source approximation is applied to the three component waveforms of each event. The method uses the long period part of the signal to invert for the deviatoric part of the moment tensor and is fully described in a number of publications, most notably Randal (1994), Ghose et al. (1998), and Stich et al. (2003). We included in the inversion at least three stations that covered different azimuths on the focal sphere and with an epicentral distance not exceeding 250 km. Five stations at epicentral distances less than 250 km were used for the 12/11/2013 (18:09:27, UTC) event, six and seven stations at epicentral distances less than 230 km were used for the two events on 17/11/2014 (23:05:55 and 23:09:03, UTC) respectively and finally seven stations at epicentral distances less than 240 km for the 09/06/2015 (01:09:03, UTC) event. We calculated Green’s functions for different depths using the reflectivity method of Kennett (1983) as implemented by Randal (1994), using the epicenter location provided by the manual analysis and assuming a delta source time function for small events. For moderate to large events the Green’s functions were convolved with a trapezoid of appropriate length prior to the inversion. Data preparation included the reduction of waveforms to displacement and rotation of horizontal components to radial and transverse with respect to the event’s epicenter.

Moment tensor inversions are usually performed in the frequency band 0.05–0.02 Hz for small earthquakes and in the band 0.05–0.01 Hz for large events. The limited bandwidth of our instruments means that inversions should be performed in a relatively narrow range of frequencies with 0.05 Hz being the lower cutoff frequency. Both the observed waveforms and Green’s functions were filtered between 0.05 and 0.08 Hz using a two-pole Butterworth filter and aligned according

![Fig. 4. Histograms depicting descriptive statistics for Taxiarchis sequence (2013; N = 267) a) horizontal error of location b) vertical error of locations c) root-mean-square error of the solution and d) depth distribution of events. See Fig. 2d for location of events.](image-url)
to their arrival times in order to minimize the effects of the assumed velocity structure and any source mislocation. Test inversions showed that inverting waveforms longer than 60 s resulted in much higher misfits, since our simple velocity models cannot predict complicated waveforms at the 0.05–0.08 Hz frequency band in which we are working. Therefore in all our inversions we use a fixed waveform length of...
motion. Because the aftershock hypocenters are aligned along the NE-SW right lateral strike-slip or NW-SE left lateral strike-slip. The 2013 Taxiarchis source mechanism determination revealed strike-slip faulting with the best fit solution of strike = 325°, dip = 80°, rake = −10°, moment magnitude 4.9 and focal depth at 11 km (Table 2; Fig. S3a). The seismic moment is determined Mo = 2.48 × 1023 dyne·cm, the calculated double couple (DC) was found equal to 90%. The source parameters of the two 2014, shallow events with similar magnitudes Mw = 5.3 and 5.2, on 17 November 2014 (23:05 and 23:09, UTC) were calculated using the moment tensor inversion method, as well. Both of the two events, normal-oblique slip type faulting was revealed after applying the inversion. The obtained focal mechanism for the first earthquake is strike = 280°, dip = 60° and rake = −40° (Supplementary Fig. S3b). The seismic moment is equal to Mo = 8.66 × 1022 dyne·cm, for a focal depth equal to 14 km while for the second is strike = 290°, dip = 75° and rake = −20° (Fig. S3c). The inversion resulted in a DC (Double-couple) value equal to 93%. The seismic moment calculated was Mo = 6.58 × 1022 dyne·cm and the depth at 13 km. The 2015 event source parameters (Mw = 5.2) are strike = 139°, dip = 85° and rake = −10° (Supplementary Fig. S3d). We also performed sensitivity tests to examine if the formal errors are representative of the actual resolving power of the network and inversion method used, focusing on the influence of the crustal velocity model (supplementary Figs. S4, S5 and S6). A summary of the quality parameters of each solution such as misfit and CLVD shows values between 0.12–0.22 (for misfit) and 5.2–9 (for CLVD). The obtained results confirm the robustness of our method.

Furthermore, the focal mechanisms (Figs. 1a; S3a,b,c, and d) of 12 November 2013, 17 November 2014, and 9 June 2015 events indicate either NE-SW right lateral strike-slip or NW-SE left lateral strike-slip motion. Because the aftershock hypocenters are aligned along the NW-SE orientation (Fig. 2), we interpret these events as left lateral strike-slip.

### 3.3. Stress inversion

We obtained the orientation of the local stress-field using the iterative stress inversion of Vavryčuk (2014) that is based on Michael’s (1984) method. It is well known that stress inversions from focal mechanisms require knowledge of which nodal plane is the fault. If such information is missing, and faults and auxiliary nodal planes are interchanged, the stress inversions can produce inaccurate results.

Vavryčuk (2014) showed that the linear inversion method developed by Michael is reasonably accurate when retrieving the principal stress directions even when the selection of fault planes in focal mechanisms is incorrect. He modified Michael’s method and inverted jointly for stress and for fault orientations. The fault orientations are determined by applying the fault instability constraint and the stress is calculated in iterations. The input data comprise the Malesina–Kandilli events, namely 4–15 of Table 2 (i.e. 12 focal mechanisms for the period 2014–2015). As from relocation (Fig. 2) we already determined a general NW-SE alignment of seismicity we entered into the stress inversion code the nodal planes with NW-SE (±30°) strike. In addition, we estimate an error of 10° in strike and 5° in the dip-angle in our data. We found that the tectonic stress is characterized by the horizontal σ3 axis, while the σ2 and σ1 axes significantly deviate from both the horizontal and vertical directions, respectively (Fig. 10a). The retrieved maximum compression (tectonic stress σ1) is 26° from vertical (Fig. 10a). The obtained stress axes are (see Table 4) σ1 (64°/267° plunge/azimuth), σ2 (25°/76°) and σ3 (4°/168°), respectively. The P/T axes with retrieved principal stress directions and the confidence limits of the principal stress directions retrieved by the iterative method are shown in Fig. 10, where a high confidence is calculated for the horizontal axis (σ1; Fig. 10b; red, green and blue colors correspond to the σ1, σ2, and σ3 stress directions, respectively). Regarding the azimuth errors in our stress model we assume an error of 6–7° in the obtained stress directions as in Vavryčuk (2014). We note that a misfit (or deviation) between observed and predicted slip direction of 6° was obtained from stress inversion analysis of the Skyros 2001 earthquake focal mechanisms (Ganas et al., 2005), that is for an earthquake with similar geometrical parameters.
kinematics (left-lateral strike-slip) that occurred 90 km to the east of the 2014–2015 events.

The N12°W (±7°) orientation of the least principal tectonic stress differs by an amount of 32° (±7°) with the geodetic data published by Chousianitis et al. (N20°E; 2013–2015; see orientation of principal horizontal strain rate axes in Fig. 11; also subjected to 5° azimuthal error), as well as by an amount of 27 (±7°) degrees with the fault-slip data of Roberts and Ganas (2000; N14°–15°E). This result may be a true difference in the extension axis due to the different deformation patterns between the upper crust (reflected in both geodetic and geological data) and the middle crust (reflected in our seismic data). However, we refrain from drawing a solid conclusion on this due to the relatively small size of our focal mechanism sample (N = 12).

4. Discussion

Our high-resolution aftershock relocation and moment tensor analysis of the 2013–2015 Gulf of Evia seismic sequences showed the activation of three (3) “blind” faults with a significant left-lateral slip component. The first fault is located near the village Taxiarchis, onshore North Evia (Figs. 1a and 2d). Two seismic faults are located offshore Malesina–Kandilli (Figs. 2b; 9) not ignoring that during activation of aftershock sequences many aftershocks are off-fault aftershocks. The relocated aftershock hypocenters (Fig. 2) are aligned along the NW-SE orientation (Figs. 9 & S3), so we interpret these events as left lateral strike-slip. This is the first time that left-lateral shear is unequivocally documented by seismic data inside the north Gulf of Evia as previous
of about 60 kinematics. In this part of Central Greece the general N-S extension rate (N280°; Chousianitis et al., 2013, 2015) and b) the strike of the activated faults demonstrated by geological (Roberts and Ganas, 2000; Rondoyanni et al., 2007) and geodetic data (Davies et al., 1997; Müller et al., 2013; Chousianitis et al., 2013). Therefore, we interpret the occurrence of moderate sequences (4 < M < 5.5) with horizontal-slip kinematics inside the Gulf of Evia rift as a response of the elastic crust to this compression. These relatively small faults (dimensions 5–6 × 3–4 km; length, width), thus, serve as to release strain accumulated along their surfaces because they are compatibly oriented structures to accommodate the strike-slip component of active tectonics. Moreover, in the same region there are several conjugate structures to the 2013/2015 sequences such as NE-SW oriented, right-lateral and oblique-slip faults that also accommodate present-day strain. Examples of the latter structures include the 14 October 2008 Mantoudi earthquake sequence (offshore NE Evia island; Fig. 1; Roumelioti and Kiratzi, 2010) and the transverse fault zones onshore Evia island that show Quaternary activity (Fig. 1; Palyvos et al., 2006).

In addition, we see no big differences in the depth-range of seismic faulting between the east end of this rift and the more centrally-located, Kallidromon 2013 sequence (west of station ATAL in Fig. 11; Ganas et al., 2014a), i.e. seismicity occurs in the depth range 10–16 km vs 8–13 km in Kallidromon. These aftershock depths indicate a seismogenic (brittle) zone of about 15 km in depth for this rift. In terms of magnitude, this seems to be characteristic of immature faults regarding their seismic potential, however, these earthquakes do present challenges in interpreting their initiation regarding their location: are these “blind” faults randomly located or they are related to viscous shear zones further below? Moreover, it seems that the strike-slip kinematics at mid-crustal depths may explain the deviation of σ3 (principal stress) axis plunge from vertical with depth (26° from vertical; Table 4). In turn, this is probably related to the difference in σ3 azimuth between the local stress and the field data from geology (Roberts and Ganas, 2000) and geodesy (Müller et al., 2013; Chousianitis et al., 2015). We need more data on the stress field at those depths to statistically document or not a rotation of σ3 (the least principal axis) inside the rift.

focal plane solutions included isolated events only (e.g. Hatzfeld et al., 1999; Kiratzi, 2002) because of the lack of a) sufficient number and b) good-quality aftershock data. Previously, the limit for left-lateral tectonics was considered the eastern coastline of mainland Greece (Evia, Thessaly), on the basis of geodetic data (Kreemer et al., 2004; Müller et al., 2013).

Left-lateral shear can be part of the active tectonics in this young rift for the following reasons: a) the activated faults are compatible to the regional stress field because the T-axis azimuth of the local stress field (N168°E; Fig. 10) is close to the general N180°E crustal extension, demonstrated by geological (Roberts and Ganas, 2000; Rondoyanni et al., 2007) and geodetic data (Davies et al., 1997; Müller et al., 2013; Chousianitis et al., 2013, 2015) and b) the strike of the activated faults (N280°–325°E) also fits to the present-day strain field in terms of fault kinematics. In this part of Central Greece the general N-S extension rate of about 60–80 ns/yr (Chousianitis et al., 2015; 1 nstrain corresponds to 1 mm shortening or lengthening over a distance of 1000 km) is accompanied by E-W compression of −20 to −30 ns/yr (Kreemer et al., 2004; Chousianitis et al., 2013; Fig. 11). In particular, the baseline between stations 061A and 026A (Fig. 11) is shortened at 2 mm/yr (Chousianitis et al., 2013) equivalent to −27 ns/yr, way above the error estimates of the method (5–10 ns/yr). On the contrary, extensional strains are evident between stations 061A and 024A (+53 ns/yr; east end of the rift), as well as between stations 072A and 015A (+119 ns/yr; west end of the rift). The horizontal compression is due to the westward movement of the Anatolia microplate and is the dominant mode of deformation in the central Aegean Sea (see for example the 2001 left-lateral Skiros event; Benetatos et al., 2002, Ganas et al., 2005; the 2013 right-lateral Lemnos event, Ganas et al., 2014b).

![Fig. 9. Map of relocated aftershocks (solid circles) of the 2014–2015 Malesina–Kandilli sequence with 67% confidence ellipses of event location. Red circles depict events before Jan. 27, 2015. Blue circles depict events after 19 April 2015. Stars indicate mainshock locations. Beachballs show moment tensor solutions for the three earthquakes, plotted using a lower-hemisphere stereographic projection. Thick yellow lines depict locations of seismic faults with arrows indicating relative sense of motion across the fault.](Image)

![Fig. 10. Iterative inversion for stress using the twelve (12) focal mechanisms in the offshore Malesina–Kandilli region of the North Gulf of Evia rift. a) P/T axes with retrieved principal stress directions, P = red circles, T = blue crosses, b) confidence limits of the principal stress directions.](Image)
5. Conclusions

a) The accurate determination of 2013 seismicity (267 events) onshore North Evia (Euboea) shows the activation of a strike slip fault (preferred nodal plane of 325°/80°/−10°; Taxiarchis sequence; Fig. 1a) at depths 11–14 km.

b) The 2014 and 2015 relocated events (N = 454) allowed us to identify two active faults in this offshore area of the north Gulf of Evia, at depths 10–16 km, by locating linear patterns of aftershocks (Figs. 7, 8, 9) and to analyze the stress field using stress inversion on the activated fault planes (Fig. 10). The 2014 sequence ruptured an N280°–290°E striking, 60°–75° dipping, oblique-slip fault. A near-

---

Table 2
Focal mechanisms of the main events of Gulf of Evia sequences as determined in this study. Mo is seismic moment, Plane 1 is first nodal plane, Plane 2 is second nodal plane, CLVD is compensated-linear-vector-dipole. Moment tensor solutions of this study are shown in Supplementary Fig. S3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>M_o (dyn*cm)</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Plane 1</th>
<th>Plane 2</th>
<th>CLVD (%)</th>
<th>No. of stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Lat (°)</td>
<td>Lon (°)</td>
<td>M_o</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Strike°</td>
<td>Dip°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>131104</td>
<td>22:09:17.4</td>
<td>38.9095</td>
<td>23.0988</td>
<td>0.479E+22</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>131112</td>
<td>18:09:27.8</td>
<td>38.9162</td>
<td>23.1027</td>
<td>0.248E+24</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>131113</td>
<td>06:50:24.8</td>
<td>38.9183</td>
<td>23.0918</td>
<td>0.289E+22</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>171114</td>
<td>23:05:55.8</td>
<td>38.6360</td>
<td>23.3520</td>
<td>0.866E+24</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>171114</td>
<td>23:09:03.5</td>
<td>38.6413</td>
<td>23.4087</td>
<td>0.658E+24</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>171114</td>
<td>23:13:29.3</td>
<td>38.6380</td>
<td>23.4287</td>
<td>0.748E+22</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>171114</td>
<td>23:18:46.9</td>
<td>38.6563</td>
<td>23.3930</td>
<td>0.289E+22</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>171114</td>
<td>23:40:36.6</td>
<td>38.6440</td>
<td>23.3765</td>
<td>0.127E+23</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>181114</td>
<td>00:18:27.3</td>
<td>38.6505</td>
<td>23.4030</td>
<td>0.289E+22</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>181114</td>
<td>00:53:59.7</td>
<td>38.6263</td>
<td>23.4210</td>
<td>0.289E+22</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>181114</td>
<td>01:13:47.3</td>
<td>38.6310</td>
<td>23.4127</td>
<td>0.748E+22</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>191114</td>
<td>00:37:28.8</td>
<td>38.6290</td>
<td>23.4195</td>
<td>0.127E+23</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>191114</td>
<td>19:54:08.6</td>
<td>38.6337</td>
<td>23.4250</td>
<td>0.519E+22</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>201114</td>
<td>16:20:22.5</td>
<td>38.6537</td>
<td>23.3617</td>
<td>0.433E+22</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>090615</td>
<td>01:09:03.0</td>
<td>38.6220</td>
<td>23.3890</td>
<td>0.658E+24</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vertical, strike-slip fault (139°/85°/~10°) was activated during the 2015 offshore sequence.

c) The focal mechanisms (Fig. S3) of 12 November 2013, 17 November 2014, and 9 June 2015 events indicate either NE-SW right lateral strike-slip or NW-SE left lateral strike-slip motion. Because the aftershock hypocenters are aligned along the NW-SE orientation (Fig. 2), we interpret these events as left lateral strike-slip. This is the first time that left-lateral shear is clearly documented inside the Gulf of Evia rift.

d) These aftershock depths indicate a seismogenic (brittle) zone of about 15 km in depth for the Gulf of Evia rift.

e) The strike-slip faults are activated because of an E-W component of shortening strain (Fig. 11) and they accommodate a moderate contribution to the crustal deformation and to active tectonics of the Gulf of Evia.
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