Stable inversions for complete moment tensors
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SUMMARY
The seismic moment tensors for certain types of sources, such as volcanic earthquakes and nuclear explosions are expected to contain an isotropic component. Some earlier efforts to calculate the isotropic component of these sources are flawed due to an error in the method of Jost & Herrmann. We corrected the method after Herrmann & Hutchensen and found great improvement in the recovery of non-double-couple moment tensors that include an isotropic component. Tests with synthetic data demonstrate the stability of the corrected linear inversion method, and we recalculate the moment tensor solutions reported in Dreger et al. for Long Valley caldera events and Dreger & Woods for Nevada Test Site nuclear explosions. We confirm the findings of Dreger et al. that the Long Valley volcanic sources contain large statistically significant isotropic components. The nuclear explosions have strikingly anomalous source mechanisms, which contain very large isotropic components, making it evident that these events are not tectonic in origin. This indicates that moment tensor inversions could be an important tool for nuclear monitoring.
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1 INTRODUCTION
Earthquake source mechanisms are routinely determined through moment tensor inversions. This process requires that synthetic seismograms be represented as the linear combination of fundamental Green’s functions, where the weights on these Green’s functions are the individual moment tensor elements. An analytical representation of this system for a general moment tensor was derived in Jost & Herrmann (1989) (appendix A), based on the work of Langston (1981) for a deviatoric (zero trace) moment tensor (Method 1). However, an error in the Jost & Herrmann (1989) derivation precludes their moment tensor inversion scheme from correctly recovering source mechanisms which include isotropic components, although it is accurate for analysing deviatoric sources. In this paper, we present a correction to their inversion scheme after Herrmann & Hutchensen (1993) (Method 2). Method 2 can accurately recover moment tensors for both deviatoric and non-deviatoric sources. Tests of this method using synthetic data show that it works well, and we have used the new inversion scheme to determine moment tensors for several real volcanic and nuclear explosion sources.

2 METHODOLOGY
Analytical solutions for surface displacement have been derived for a double-couple source (Helmberger 1983), a deviatoric source (Langston 1981) and for a general moment tensor (Jost & Herrmann 1989). A deviatoric point source can be represented by using Green’s functions for three fundamental faults: a vertical strike-slip fault; a vertical dip-slip fault and a dip-slip fault with a dip of 45° (Langston 1981). However, for a complete moment tensor, $M$, we must also include the explosion Green’s functions, so that

$$u_z = A_1 \cdot ZSS + A_2 \cdot ZDS + A_3 \cdot ZDD + M_{iso} \cdot ZEP,$$
$$u_r = A_1 \cdot RSS + A_2 \cdot RDS + A_3 \cdot RDD + M_{iso} \cdot REP,$$
$$u_T = A_4 \cdot TSS + A_5 \cdot TDS,$$

where $u$ is the surface displacement, $SS$ is the vertical strike-slip Green’s function, $DS$ is the vertical dip-slip Green’s function, $DD$ is the 45° dip-slip Green’s function and $EP$ is the explosion Green’s function. $Z$, $R$ and $T$ refer to the vertical, radial and tangential components, respectively, and $M_{iso} = \frac{\text{tr}(M)}{3}$. (2)

It is in the calculation of the $A_i$ coefficients that the two methods diverge.

2.1 Method 1 (Jost & Herrmann 1989)
Method 1 wrongly uses the $A_i$ coefficients for a deviatoric source,

$$A_1 = \frac{1}{2} (M_{xx} - M_{yy}) \cos(2az) + M_{xz} \sin(2az),$$
$$A_2 = M_{xz} \cos(az) + M_{zz} \sin(az),$$
$$A_3 = -\frac{1}{2} (M_{xx} + M_{yy}).$$
\[ A_1 = \frac{1}{2} (M_{xx} - M_{yy}) \cos(2az) - M_{xy} \cos(2az), \]
\[ A_3 = -M_{xy} \cos(az) + M_{xz} \sin(az), \quad (3) \]

where \( M_{ij} \) are the elements of the moment tensor and \( az \) is the source–receiver azimuth. It should be noted that since the seismic moment tensor is symmetric, it has only six independent elements.

Eq. (3) is the same as eq. A5.3 in Jost & Herrmann (1989), which in turn is eq. 3 in Langston (1981) transformed into a coordinate system where \( z \) is positive up and the positive tangential direction is measured clockwise from north.

2.2 Method 2 (Herrmann & Hutchensen 1993; this paper)

Since any tensor can be described as the sum of deviatoric and isotropic tensors, we describe each synthetic seismogram as the sum of a synthetic seismogram with a deviatoric source and one isotropic tensors, \( M^* \), which are the \( A_i \) coefficients calculated from the elements of the deviatoric part of the full moment tensor, \( M^* \), where

\[
\begin{align*}
M^*_{xx} &= M_{xx} - \frac{1}{3} (M_{xx} + M_{yy} + M_{zz}), \\
M^*_{yy} &= M_{yy} - \frac{1}{3} (M_{xx} + M_{yy} + M_{zz}), \\
M^*_{zz} &= M_{zz} - \frac{1}{3} (M_{xx} + M_{yy} + M_{zz}), \\
M^*_{xy} &= M_{xy}, \\
M^*_{xz} &= M_{xz}, \\
M^*_{yz} &= M_{yz}. \\
\end{align*}
\]

Substituting \( M^* \) into eq. (3), we obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
A_i^* &= A_i, \\
A_2^* &= A_2, \\
A_3^* &= -\frac{1}{6} (M_{xx} + M_{yy} - 2M_{zz}), \\
A_4^* &= A_4, \\
A_5^* &= A_5. \\
\end{align*}
\]

Note that for a deviatoric moment tensor for which eq. (3) hold, eq. (5) is identical to eq. (3).

Substituting eq. (5) into eq. (1) and rearranging, we find

\[
\begin{align*}
u_x &= M_{xx} \left[ \frac{ZSS}{2} \cos(2az) - \frac{ZDD}{6} + \frac{ZEP}{3} \right] \\
&\quad + M_{yy} \left[ \frac{ZSS}{2} \cos(2az) - \frac{ZDD}{6} + \frac{ZEP}{3} \right] \\
&\quad + M_{zz} \left[ \frac{ZDD}{3} + \frac{ZEP}{3} \right] \\
&\quad + M_{xy} [ZSS \sin(2az)] \\
&\quad + M_{xz} [ZDS \cos(az)] \\
&\quad + M_{yz} [ZDS \sin(az)], \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
u_y &= M_{yy} \left[ \frac{RSS}{2} \cos(2az) - \frac{RDD}{6} + \frac{REP}{3} \right] \\
&\quad + M_{zz} \left[ -\frac{RSS}{2} \cos(2az) - \frac{RDD}{6} + \frac{REP}{3} \right] \\
&\quad + M_{xz} [RDD \sin(2az)] \\
&\quad + M_{yz} [RSS \sin(2az)] \\
&\quad + M_{yz} [RDS \cos(az)], \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
u_z &= M_{zz} \left[ \frac{TSS}{2} \sin(2az) \right] \\
&\quad + M_{xy} \left[ -\frac{TSS}{2} \sin(2az) \right] \\
&\quad + M_{xz} [TSS \cos(az)] \\
&\quad + M_{yz} [TDS \sin(az)] \\
&\quad + M_{yz} [TDS \cos(az)]. \\
\end{align*}
\]

Note that these equations differ from eqs 5.4–5.6 in Jost & Herrmann (1989). However, this is the same result as was obtained in Herrmann & Hutchensen (1993).

2.3 Comparison

To illustrate why Method 2 is correct and Method 1 is flawed, consider a purely isotropic source,

\[
M_{xx} = M_{yy} = M_{zz} = M_{iso}, \\
M_{xy} = M_{xz} = M_{yz} = 0. \\
\]

Intuitively, the synthetic seismograms for this source should be,

\[
\begin{align*}
u_x &= M_{iso}[ZEP], \\
\nu_y &= M_{iso}[REP], \\
\nu_z &= 0. \\
\end{align*}
\]

This is exactly the solution obtained by eqs (6)–(8). However, the Method 1 (Jost & Herrmann 1989) equations produce

\[
\begin{align*}
u_x &= M_{iso}[ZEP - ZDD], \\
\nu_y &= M_{iso}[REP - RDD], \\
\nu_z &= 0. \\
\end{align*}
\]

Thus, if a non-deviatoric moment tensor is used in the Method 1 equations, then the isotropic component is not only used to weight the isotropic Green’s functions \( ZEP \) and \( REP \) but also incorrectly weights the \( ZDD \) and \( RDD \) deviatoric Green’s functions, and thus full moment tensor inversions implementing the Method 1 equations are incapable of accurately recovering an isotropic component. The Method 2 inversion system presented in this paper (from Herrmann & Hutchensen 1993) eliminates that problem.

3 Results

3.1 Tests with synthetic data

To test the efficacy of Method 2, we inverted synthetic data for many different source mechanisms. We used Green’s functions calculated by frequency–wavenumber integration (Saikia 1994) for a
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1-D velocity structure, and bandpass filtered these Green's functions between 20 and 50 s period with an acausal Butterworth filter. The synthetic data were constructed using the same filtered Green's functions and inverted using a linear time domain moment tensor inversion (Pasyanos et al. 1996; Fukuyama & Dreger 2000).

Fig. 1 is a sample comparison of inversions of deviatoric and non-deviatoric synthetic data. For deviatoric source mechanisms, both inversion methods result in the same mechanisms, which is expected since Method 1 is accurate for deviatoric sources. When we add an isotropic component to those same synthetic data, Method 1 is not able to recover the elements of the moment tensor. In contrast, Method 2 returns the actual source mechanism.

3.2 Application to real data

We applied Method 2 to actual data from several real non-double-couple sources: three Nevada Test Site (NTS) nuclear explosions (BEXAR, MONTELLO and JUNCTION) in 1991 and 1992; the 1997 Mammoth earthquake swarm in the Long Valley caldera (LV1–LV6) and the earthquake swarm associated with the Miyakejima, Japan volcanic eruption in 2000 (MIYVOL) (see Table 1). We also investigated several tectonic earthquakes from the same three source regions (SKULL, LVTEC and MIYTEC) (Table 1). The NTS explosions were previously studied by Dreger & Woods (2002) using Method 1. Dreger & Woods (2002) found that the NTS explosions had very anomalous mechanisms, which could be used to help distinguish them from naturally occurring earthquakes. The full moment tensor results had large isotropic components, but they were not statistically significant and were found to suffer from a trade-off with a vertically oriented compensated linear vector dipole (CLVD) component (Knopoff & Randall 1970). The deviatoric inversions had large, predominantly vertically oriented CLVDs that were consistent with the nuclear explosion mechanisms reported in Patton (1988). This inability to recover the explosive nature of the source could be due to free-surface effects; and other studies have found that isotropic components of shallow events are difficult to constrain (e.g. Patton 1988; Dufumier & Rivera 1997). However, after repeating this study using Method 2, it appears that these events actually contain large isotropic components (Fig. 2, Table 2). Furthermore, sensitivity tests show that it is possible to resolve isotropic components of moment tensors for NTS explosions with source depths as small as 300 m (Ford et al. 2007). These new mechanisms clearly identify BEXAR, MONTELLO and JUNCTION as being principally explosive and non-tectonic in origin.

In addition to the NTS explosions, we studied volcanic earthquakes from the Long Valley caldera, California (LV1–LV6, Fig. 3, Table 3) and from Miyakejima, Japan (MIYVOL, Fig. 4,
This paper reproduces the observed waveforms very well. The resulting focal mechanism clearly shows that the source was explosive.

Dreger & Woods (2002)

Table 2. Mechanisms for Little Skull Mountain earthquake and NTS explosions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>$T$-axis</th>
<th>$I$-axis</th>
<th>$P$-axis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SKULL</td>
<td>278.80</td>
<td>116.96</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEXAR</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>−54.88</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTELLO</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>−53.21</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNCTION</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>102.52</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKULL</td>
<td>294.40</td>
<td>116.85</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEXAR</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>−55.16</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTELLO</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>−70.66</td>
<td>35.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNCTION</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>107.25</td>
<td>62.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Eigenvalues are given in $10^{15}$ N m. Orientations (trend and plunge) are given in degrees.

This table shows the mechanisms for the Little Skull Mountain earthquake and NTS explosions. The $T$-axis and $I$-axis components are listed, along with their corresponding trends and plunges. The $P$-axis values are also provided, with their trends.

The Miyakejima volcanic event seems somewhat different from the other events studied. The new mechanism is very complicated, consisting of double-couple and isotropic (DC + ISO) components with a small CLVD component. This is consistent with other studies which found that regional data for events in the Long Valley caldera are best fit by DC + ISO mechanisms (Templeton & Dreger 2006).

The new moment tensor inversion, which employs the corrected equations presented in this paper, reproduces the observed waveforms very well. The resulting focal mechanism clearly shows that the source was explosive.

Figure 2. (a) Location map and station distribution used for inversion of NTS explosions and Little Skull Mountain earthquake. Focal mechanisms are based on deviatoric moment tensor inversions (Dreger & Woods 2002). (b) Focal mechanism and waveform fits from the new full moment tensor inversion for BEXAR (Table 1). Data are plotted with solid lines, synthetics with dashed lines. The new moment tensor inversion, which employs the corrected equations presented in this paper, reproduces the observed waveforms very well. The resulting focal mechanism clearly shows that the source was explosive.
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Figure 3. (a) Location map and station distribution used for inversion of Long Valley volcanic earthquakes. Focal mechanisms are based on deviatoric moment tensor inversions (Dreger et al. 2000). (b) Focal mechanism and waveform fits from the new full moment tensor inversion for LV2 (Table 1). Data are plotted with solid lines, synthetics with dashed lines. This mechanism, calculated with the corrected equations, is predominantly comprised of double-couple and isotropic components.

Table 3. Same as Table 2 for Long Valley earthquakes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>T-axis Value</th>
<th>T-axis Trend</th>
<th>T-axis Plunge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LVTEC</td>
<td>92.70</td>
<td>−58.34</td>
<td>28.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV1</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>−131.07</td>
<td>22.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV2</td>
<td>40.92</td>
<td>−122.48</td>
<td>16.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV3</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>−154.69</td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV4</td>
<td>45.54</td>
<td>−124.75</td>
<td>9.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV5</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>−106.48</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV6</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>−110.48</td>
<td>18.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>P-axis Value</th>
<th>P-axis Trend</th>
<th>P-axis Plunge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LV1</td>
<td>−4.38</td>
<td>68.34</td>
<td>48.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV2</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>−40.23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV3</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>−64.22</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV4</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>143.99</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV5</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>−16.43</td>
<td>9.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV6</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>54.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This study</th>
<th>T-axis Value</th>
<th>T-axis Trend</th>
<th>T-axis Plunge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LVTEC</td>
<td>94.90</td>
<td>−59.32</td>
<td>25.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV1</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>−130.43</td>
<td>39.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV2</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td>−110.53</td>
<td>51.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV3</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>−154.51</td>
<td>23.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV4</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>−126.98</td>
<td>55.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV5</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>−106.47</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV6</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>−109.07</td>
<td>24.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>P-axis Value</th>
<th>P-axis Trend</th>
<th>P-axis Plunge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LV1</td>
<td>−104.90</td>
<td>−165.08</td>
<td>28.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV2</td>
<td>−6.38</td>
<td>54.49</td>
<td>66.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV3</td>
<td>−9.20</td>
<td>108.71</td>
<td>64.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV4</td>
<td>−3.23</td>
<td>39.53</td>
<td>79.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV5</td>
<td>−2.73</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>77.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV6</td>
<td>−10.09</td>
<td>148.89</td>
<td>29.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and the CLVD component actually increases. This event is located along the NW trending earthquake swarm. This swarm is argued to be due to an inflating dyke related to the caldera collapse of Mount Oyama on Miyakejima (e.g. Nishimura et al. 2001; Furuya et al. 2003). The complex mechanism, including the isotropic component, indicates that MIYVOL has a fluid-controlled source process.

We also applied both methodologies to tectonic earthquakes from all three source regions to make sure that our non-double-couple components were not artefacts from path effects. These earthquakes are the SKULL earthquake which occurred near the NTS, LVTEC near Long Valley and MIYTEC near Miyakejima (Table 1). In all cases, both methodologies yielded double-couple mechanisms for the tectonic earthquakes, indicating that our inferred earthquake source mechanisms are not being contaminated by unmodelled Earth structure or biases due to the source–receiver geometries (Fig. 5).

4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Inversions of synthetic data (Fig. 1) show that the corrected inversion, Method 2, is capable of accurately recovering both deviatoric source mechanisms and mechanisms containing isotropic components. With Method 2, we find that several volcanic earthquakes and nuclear explosions have mechanisms with larger isotropic components, smaller CLVD components and smaller total moments, than the mechanisms determined using the incorrect inversion scheme, Method 1 (Fig. 5, Table 5). Most of these mechanisms appear to be predominantly DC + ISO.

Method 2 is the correct full moment tensor inversion methodology, and the Method 2 mechanisms presented in this paper are meant to replace the solutions in Dreger et al. (2000) and Dreger & Woods (2002). Although the two full moment tensor inversion methodologies result in very different solutions, the solutions fit the data the same. Thus, the statistical analyses in Dreger et al. (2000) and Dreger & Woods (2002) are unchanged.
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One concern with full moment tensor inversions is that they can yield larger moments than a deviatoric moment tensor inversion for the same event. Such increases in moment can be caused by trade-offs between elements of the moment tensor and thus indicate that the full moment tensor solution may be invalid (Dreger & Woods 2002). However, for the non-tectonic earthquakes, Method 2 results in moments which are smaller than the moments from Method 1—the original incorrect full moment tensor inversion methodology (Table 5).

Woods et al. (1993) proposed using an $M_L: M_0$ differential measure as a regional discriminant for nuclear explosions. Method 1 inflated the apparent moment magnitude of the three NTS explosions. Method 2 decreases the moment magnitudes of these events, thereby increasing the $M_L - M_0$ differential, making it easier to distinguish these sources from normal earthquakes. Thus, it appears that moment tensor inversions could be a useful tool for nuclear monitoring.

Compared with the results from Method 1 (Dreger et al. 2000), the Method 2 source mechanisms for LV2, LV3 and LV4 have smaller CLVD components. These Method 2 moment tensors obtained by full moment tensor inversion are in agreement with the results obtained by Templeton & Dreger (2006) using a grid search technique. The double-couple components of LV2, LV3 and LV4 have an east–west striking steeply-dipping nodal plane, with a right-lateral sense of motion that is consistent with the trend of background seismicity in the south moat of the caldera, as well as focal mechanisms of smaller events. These source mechanisms are consistent with shear-faulting on pre-existing planes, following injection of high pressure fluid or gas as Julian & Sipkin (1985) suggested for the 1980 Long Valley swarm.

We also used Method 2 to recompute the SKULL full moment tensor published in Dreger & Woods (2002). SKULL was a tectonic earthquake, which we would expect to be mainly double-couple. We do find that the mechanism is dominated by a double-couple component, and thus there is little difference between the deviatoric mechanism and the results from the Method 1 and Method 2 full moment tensor inversions (Fig. 5, Tables 2 and 5). We find similar results for the other two tectonic earthquakes, LVTEC and MIYTEC, as well as LV5 and LV6. While LV5 and LV6 are members of the 1997 Long Valley earthquake swarm, these earthquakes appear to not be directly related to volcanic processes, although the earthquakes could have occurred on pre-existing faults after being triggered by stress transfer from seismic activity and deformation in the resurgent dome.

Table 4. Same as Table 2 for Miyakejima earthquakes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>$T$-axis</th>
<th>$I$-axis</th>
<th>$P$-axis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>Plunge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method 1</td>
<td>MIYTEC</td>
<td>5619</td>
<td>−123.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIYVOL</td>
<td>2931</td>
<td>−133.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method 2</td>
<td>MIYTEC</td>
<td>4951</td>
<td>−123.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIYVOL</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>−133.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5. Comparison of deviatoric moment tensors inversions, full moment tensor inversions computed using the flawed methodology (Method 1) and full moment tensor inversions computed using the corrected methodology (Method 2). The nodal planes of the double-couple component are plotted with grey lines. Diamonds indicate the orientation of the pressure and tension axes. Method 2 produces mechanisms for the three nuclear explosions (BEXAR, JUNCTION and MONTELLO), which are substantially more explosive in character than the old mechanisms. These new mechanisms also have smaller $M_w$.

Table 5. Moment, moment magnitude and epsilon values for full moment tensor inversions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>$M_L$</th>
<th>Deviatoric</th>
<th>Method 1</th>
<th>Method 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moment</td>
<td>$M_w$</td>
<td>$\varepsilon$</td>
<td>Moment</td>
<td>$M_w$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKULL</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>306.30</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEXAR</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTELLO</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNCTION</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVTEC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>98.75</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20.61</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>28.90</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIYTEC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4395</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIYVOL</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1814.1</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Moments are given in $10^{15}$ N m and are calculated using the methodology of Silver & Jordan (1982). $\varepsilon = |m^*_1/m^*_2|$ where $m^*_i$ are the deviatoric eigenvalues of the moment tensor and $|m^*_1| \geq |m^*_2| \geq |m^*_3|$ (Dziewonski et al. 1981).
Our inversions of the NTS explosions (BEXAR, MONTELLO and JUNCTION) have very large isotropic components. The small deviatoric part of these mechanisms seems to be due to two different mechanisms. For events BEXAR and MONTELLO, the deviatoric component appears to be tectonic release on either north–south right-lateral or east–west left-lateral faults. In this case, the northeast striking tension axis is consistent with inferred stress and focal mechanisms of natural earthquakes occurring in the Basin and Range province. For the JUNCTION explosion, the deviatoric part is a mixture of a vertically oriented CLVD and a reverse fault. This is consistent with a mechanism of dynamically driven block faulting over a buried source as suggested by Masse (1981).

Unlike the findings from some previous studies of nuclear explosions, the source mechanisms for the NTS events presented in this study truly look like explosions. However, as Dreger & Woods (2002) note, these NTS explosions were ideally located since they were at regional distances from large seismic networks and had well-studied travel paths. Moment tensor inversions of nuclear explosions in regions with poorly understood travel paths and low quality or scarce data may not be able to resolve the isotropic part of the source mechanism without additional waveform modelling and path calibration. Regardless of its value for nuclear monitoring, the inversion scheme presented in this paper results in improved full moment tensor inversions, and this, in turn, will lead to a better understanding of complex source mechanisms.
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