

Marouchka Froment, Quentin Brissaud, Sven Peter Näsholm, Johannes Schweitzer, Tina Kaschwich

# Source and subsurface inversion using earthquake-generated infrasound recorded at a balloon platform: Application to the 2021 Mw 7.3 Flores earthquake

# EGU PICO 5.14 – 2 May 2025









# Flores sea earthquake – A unique balloon dataset to prepare future planetary missions



- Seismic waves can be detected from a balloon and used to retrieve subsurface structures
- The Mw7.3 Flores earthquake was detected across the Strateole2 balloon network in 2021
- Pressure waveforms show P, S, and Rayleigh waves





# First balloon-borne inversion results



• Location is well captured with ~15 km uncertainty

Sharing not

- Source depth and origin time not as well captured
- **20-km crustal interface**, matching regional CRUST2.0 velocity profiles
- Surface- and body-wave travel time measurements provide constraints on velocity down to ~500 km, although at limited resolution





# **PICO presentation slides**



Source and subsurface inversion using earthquake-generated infrasound recorded at a balloon platform: application to the 2021 Mw 7.3 Flores earthquake - PICO 5.14 - 2 May 2025

#### 1 - Event & experiment

- Balloon borne inversions might be the only way to investigate Venus interior structure
- Seismic waves can couple to the atmosphere as sound
- 2021 Flores sea earthquake recorded by a balloon network and seismic stations



• We invert for source location/depth & subsurface velocities using MCMC sampling



- 2 Inverted source parameters & Data
- Pressure waveforms show P, S & Rayleigh waves

A



- Location is well-captured with ~15 km uncertainty
- Source depths and origin time not as well captured due to strong trade-offs between inverted distributions





#### 3 - Inverted crust & mantle

- Resolve a 20±5 km crust similar to CRUST2.0 estimates below islands
- Changes in velocity down to around ~500 km are suggested, although at limited resolution



#### 4 - Discussion

- First seismic inversion using balloon infrasound
- A joint inversion framework (source location + seismic velocities) yields satisfying results
- Difficulty in picking seismic phases in single-component traces.
- Improving the LF balloon oscillation removal for better RW picking?
- Other balloon noise sources balloon wake turbulence?
- Infrasound propagation effects topographic scattering?

 $\Theta$ 



### Inversion method - Markov Chain Monte Carlo





**Distribution of parameters** 



## **Observations of earthquake infrasound**





**Alaska network:** many pressure sensors collocated with infrasound sensors. Excellent coherence between Pressure and seismic velocity following large earthquake.

Scaling factor:  $\Delta P(t) = \rho_a tm cv_z(t)$ 

Figures from:

Fee, D., Macpherson, K., Gabrielson, T., (2023). BSSA, 113, 1581–1595. 10.1785/0120220226, Macpherson, K., Fee, D., Coffey, J., Witsil, A. (2023) BSSA, 113, 10.1785/0120220237





Two types of earthquake infrasound: *epicentral* and *far-field*.





## Trade-offs in the joint inversion







There exist trade-offs between source location and origin time, and seismic velocities.







A lot of variety in crustal thickness and sediment deposits around the event. We construct a "**Median model**" from the available data in the literature at each station location. It is our baseline for assessing our inversion results.





Sediment thickness / [km]