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Abstract. A site constraint generalized inversion technique (GINV) has been used in the present study to develop source and site spectra for the regions in and around north-west Himalaya. Database consists of 156 earthquake (EQ) records corresponding to 21 EQ events [2.5<magnitude (M)<5.8], recorded at 78 recording stations. Source parameters like scalar moment (\(M_0\)), corner frequency(\(f_c\)), stress drop(\(\Delta\sigma\)), apparent stress drop(\(\sigma_A\)), and seismic energy(\(E_s\)) are computed for each EQ event by fitting the point source model to the obtained source spectra. Calculated \(M_0\) and \(f_c\) values for all events are found in the range of \(4.96 \times 10^{13}\)Nm-\(2.91 \times 10^{16}\)Nm and \(1.50\)Hz-\(5.50\)Hz respectively. Further, regression analysis between the above two parameters lead to the relation: \(M_0f_c^3 = (2.09 \times 10^{16} \text{Nm/s}^3)\) for the study area. Value of \(E_s\) computed in the study varies from \(1.86 \times 10^8\)J-\(1.75 \times 10^{12}\)J.

Further, value of \(\Delta\sigma\) is found varying from 0.65MPa-21.13MPa while \(\sigma_A\) is found in the range of 0.07MPa-2.76MPa. It is observed that both \(\Delta\sigma\) and \(\sigma_A\) approximately follow the theoretical relation as; \(\sigma_A=0.23\Delta\sigma\). Another outcome of the study is the site amplification curves developed based on the GINV results of horizontal and vertical components for all the recording stations. Further, site transfer function (STF) for all the recording stations characterised by the ratio of horizontal and vertical site amplification components is computed and, amplification function (\(A_{peak}\)) and predominant frequency (\(f_{peak}\)) are determined. Comparison of estimated STFs based on GINV and results of Horizontal to Vertical Spectral Ratio method (HVSR) show similarity in terms of the \(f_{peak}\) values.

Subject classification: Earthquake source and dynamics, source characteristics, stress drop, apparent stress, site characteristics, Generalized Inversion, HVSR
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**List of Symbols**

- \(S(f)_j\) Source spectrum
- \(P(f, R_{ij})\) Path attenuation component
- \(G(f)_j\) Site term
- \(Q_s(f)\) Quality factor for S wave
- \(\beta\) Average shear wave velocity of the crustal medium
- \(R\) Hypocentral distance
- \(R_\theta\) Average shear wave radiation pattern
- \(F\) Free surface amplification
- \(V\) Accounts for the partition of S wave energy into two horizontal components
- \(\rho\) Mass density
- \(R_0\) Reference distance
- \(M_{0j}\) Moment rate spectrum
- \(M_0\) Scalar moment
- \(f_c\) Corner frequency
- \(H\) Focal depth
1. Introduction

The north-west Himalaya and its foothills within India encompassing the states of Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Punjab, Haryana and national capital of India, New Delhi is home for about 96 million people as per 2011 Census. This is one of the fastest growing regions in the entire Himalayan belt with respect to population growth due to rapid urbanization. Records of seismic activities suggest that the above area represents an active tectonic region experiencing frequent damage inducing EQs. High seismicity of this region is because of continuous subduction of the Indian plate under the Eurasian plate (Gansser 1964). Major Seismotectonic features in this region is mainly defined by three north-dipping thrusts namely; the Main Central Thrust (MCT), the Main Boundary Thrust (MBT) and the Himalayan frontal Thrust (HFT) (Valdiya, 1984). Both the MCT and the MBT are produced during the Cenozoic shortening (Valdiya 1984; Malik and Nakata 2003). The HFT is the youngest active thrust separating the Himalaya region and the Indo-Gangetic alluvial plain (Kumar et al. 2009). Continuous thrusting along the MCT, HFT and MBT have produced major EQs in north-west Himalaya (Philip et al. 2014). Two major EQs occurred in the past 120 years in this region include the 1905 Kangra-Himachal Pradesh EQ (Ms=7.8) (Ambraseys and Douglas, 2004) and the 2005 Muzzafarbad-Kashmir EQ (Mw=7.6) (Avouac et al. 2006). The above mentioned EQs had left behind a trail of severe loss of lives and infrastructure. Bhattacharya and Kayal (2005) reported the source zone of the 1905 Kangra EQ to be beneath the Himalayan Frontal Fault, south of the MBT. 1905 Kangra EQ killed 20,000 people (Wallace et al. 2005) and caused a 15 cm uplift in the region of Dehra Dun, located 250 km from the epicentre, (Burrard, 1910a, b). 2005 Muzzafarbad EQ killed about 82,000 people in Kashmir and caused wide spread slope failures in Neelum, Jhelum, and Kunhar valleys. (Aydan et al. 2009). Recent EQs including the 1991 Uttarkashi (Mw=6.8) and the 1999 Chamoli (Mw=6.6) occurred in the MCT zone (Harbindu et al. 2014). The 1991 Uttarkashi EQ killed 760 people (Kayal, 2001) and caused huge damages to buildings in Uttarkashi district (Kumar and Mahajan, 1994). The 1999 Chamoli EQ caused landslides in Gopeshwar town, located less than 2km northwest of Chamoli city (Sarkar et al. 2001) and produced tremors in locations like Chandigarh and Delhi, located far away from the epicentre (Mundepi et al. 2010). It has to be highlighted here that IS 1893: 2016 classifies the entire north-west Himalaya region as seismic zone IV and V, indicating regions of high to very high seismic activity.

It has been widely acknowledged that ground motion at a certain site during an EQ is a collective function of site, path and source parameters (jointly referred to as EQ parameters). Site parameters accounts for the modification of incoming seismic waves characteristics (amplitude, frequency content and duration) by subsurface soil medium. Similarly, path parameters constitute geometric spreading and anelastic attenuation which account for the attenuation of seismic waves as travel away from the source through the crustal medium. On the other hand, source parameters include $M_0$ (defined as the measure of the size of seismic disturbance), $E_s$ (defined as
wave energy that would be released if an EQ happened in an infinite medium without energy loss) and \( \Delta \sigma \) (defined as the measure of change in the average state of stress before and after rupture). Knowledge about region specific EQ parameters is important for seismic hazard assessment, especially those using physical models (Hassani et al. 2011). Widely used approach to estimate EQ parameters in Fourier amplitude is to apply generalized inversion (GINV) method to the recorded EQ data. GINV was introduced by Andrews, (1986) after modifying the standard spectral ratio method (Borcherdt, 1970) into a generalised inversion problem. Authors worldwide have used this method on seismic records to estimate EQ parameters (Castro, 1990; Boatwright et al. 1991; Harinarayan and Kumar, 2018b, c).

Previously, Harinarayan and Kumar, (2019) had evaluated path attenuation parameters and site characteristics for regions in and around the north-west Himalaya using a two-step non-parametric-non-reference site GINV technique. However, estimation of source parameters was not attempted by Harinarayan and Kumar, (2019). In the current study, ground motions corresponding to 21 EQs happened between the years 2004 and 2017, are analysed in the frequency range of 0.25 Hz to 15 Hz for estimating source and site spectra simultaneously using GINV. Obtained source spectra from the horizontal component of ground motion (calculated as the root mean square average of the east-west and north-south components) is then interpreted using the point source model (Brune, 1970) to determine source parameters like \( M_0 \) and \( f_c \). Further, relationships between above source parameters, termed as scaling relations, are developed for the region under study. Scaling relations give parameters such as \( E_s \), \( \Delta \sigma \) and \( \sigma_A \), which are required for scenario EQ simulation as well as development of regional attenuation relations. Further, site amplification for the horizontal and the vertical component is determined, and STF is estimated as the ratio of horizontal to vertical site amplification. Finally, the STF for each of the recording stations obtained using GINV in the present study is compared with HVSR estimates developed similar to Chopra et al. (2018) and Harinarayan and Kumar, (2018a).

2. Strong Motion Data Set

EQ data used in this work is obtained from PESMOS (Program for Excellence in Strong Motion Studies) database, which consist of accelerograms from recording stations installed during or after 2004 as part of a project titled “National Strong Motion Instrumentation Network”. EQs are recorded using internal AC-63 GeoSIG triaxial force balanced accelerometers attached with external GPS (Kumar et al. 2012). Information regarding the instrumentation can be found on the PESMOS website (http://www.pesmos.in/).

EQ records from PESMOS database, for the region in and around the north-west Himalaya, are considered here. While selecting ground motion records, EQs with at least three recordings available, are considered for further analyses. Thus, final database used in the present study consists of 156 three components accelerograms from 21 EQs, recorded at 78 stations, located widespread across the study area. The range of \( M \) for the database varies from 2.5 to 5.7 with \( H \) ranging from 5 to 39.3km. Location details of each of the recording station, used in the current study are summarized in Table 1. Details of EQs including \( M \) and epicentre coordinates are listed in Table 2. In addition, Fig. 1 shows the location of the recording stations and EQs used for inversion.
Figure 1: Map of the region under study with location of EQs (stars) and recording stations (triangles).

Note: A - Himachal Pradesh, B - Punjab, C - Haryana, D - Gujarat, E - Uttarakhand, F - Delhi

| Si.No. | Station Code | Lat.(°)(N) | Lon.(°)(E) | $f_{\text{peak}}$ | $A_{\text{peak}}$ | $f_{\text{peak}}$ | $A_{\text{peak}}$ | Range of $f_{\text{peak}}$ as per Alessandro et al. (2012) classification scheme |
|--------|--------------|------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1      | ALM          | 29.6       | 79.7       | 2.1             | 3.0             | 2.8             | 4.4             | VI                                                               |
| 2      | BAG          | 29.8       | 79.8       | 1.5             | 4.7             | 1.5             | 5.2             | VII                                                              |
| 3      | BAR          | 30.8       | 78.2       | 3.0             | 4.5             | 2.8             | 7.0             | II, $2.5 \text{ Hz} \leq f_{\text{peak}} \leq 5 \text{ Hz}$                  |
| 4      | CHA          | 32.6       | 76.1       | 3.6             | 2.4             | 2.0             | 2.9             | III, $1.66 \text{ Hz} \leq f_{\text{peak}} \leq 2.5 \text{ Hz}$              |
| 5      | CHP          | 29.3       | 80.1       | 5.4             | 5.2             | 5.6             | 6.5             | I, $f_{\text{peak}} > 5 \text{ Hz}$                                          |
| 6      | DHA          | 29.8       | 80.5       | 3.1             | 3.3             | 2.7             | 5.5             | VII                                                              |
| 7      | DNL          | 30.4       | 78.2       | 2.8             | 3.3             | 2.0             | 7.1             | IV, $f_{\text{peak}} < 1.66 \text{ Hz}$                                      |
| 8      | DUD          | 30.3       | 78.0       | 2.9             | 5.8             | 3.1             | 7.1             | II, $2.5 \text{ Hz} \leq f_{\text{peak}} \leq 5 \text{ Hz}$                  |
|   | GAR  | 30.1 | 79.3 | 2.4 | 3.4 | 2.3 | 4.5 | III | 1.66 Hz ≤ f<sub>peak</sub> ≤ 2.5 Hz |
|---|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------------------------------|
| 10| GHA  | 30.4 | 78.7 | 5.2 | 2.3 | 4.5 | 5.5 | VI  |                                    |
| 11| GLTR | 30.3 | 79.1 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 6.1 | -   |                                    |
| 12| JSH  | 30.5 | 79.6 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 3.0 | VII |                                    |
| 13| KAP  | 29.9 | 79.9 | 3.7 | 6.4 | 3.3 | 9.2 | II  | 2.5 Hz ≤ f<sub>peak</sub> ≤ 5 Hz |
| 14| KHA  | 28.9 | 80.0 | 1.3 | 4.2 | 2.0 | 8.0 | VI  |                                    |
| 15| KOT  | 29.7 | 78.5 | 0.7 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 3.3 | VII |                                    |
| 16| KSK  | 29.2 | 79.0 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 9.9 | -   |                                    |
| 17| MUN  | 30.1 | 80.2 | 4.3 | 2.8 | 7.0 | 3.6 | V   |                                    |
| 18| PTI  | 29.4 | 79.9 | 4.0 | 6.6 | 3.6 | 8.0 | II  | 2.5 Hz ≤ f<sub>peak</sub> ≤ 5 Hz |
| 19| ROO  | 29.9 | 77.9 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 5.2 | VI  |                                    |
| 20| RUD  | 30.3 | 79.0 | 1.3 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 4.2 | V   |                                    |
| 21| TAN  | 29.1 | 80.1 | 5.4 | 3.4 | 5.0 | 6.3 | II  | 2.5 Hz ≤ f<sub>peak</sub> ≤ 5 Hz |
| 22| THE  | 30.4 | 78.4 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 3.6 | VI  |                                    |
| 23| UDH  | 29.0 | 79.4 | 2.7 | 6.9 | 2.5 | 10.1| II  | 2.5 Hz ≤ f<sub>peak</sub> ≤ 5 Hz |
| 24| GDRI | 30.2 | 78.7 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 5.1 | 4.8 | -   |                                    |
| 25| TLWR | 30.3 | 79.0 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 4.6 | -   |                                    |
| 26| UKMB | 30.3 | 79.1 | 1.0 | 2.9 | 1.4 | 10.0| -   |                                    |
| 27| NUTY | 30.2 | 79.2 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 4.7 | 4.3 | -   |                                    |
| 28| STRK | 30.3 | 79.0 | 4.7 | 2.8 | 4.7 | 5.8 | -   |                                    |
| 29| NNP  | 30.3 | 79.3 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 9.1 | -   |                                    |

**Himachal Pradesh**

|   | AMB  | 31.7 | 76.1 | 1.7 | 4.3 | 1.2 | 9.3 | VII |                                    |
|---|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------------------------------|
| 2 | BHA  | 31.6 | 77.9 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 4.1 | 4.4 | II  | 2.5 Hz ≤ f<sub>peak</sub> ≤ 5 Hz |
| 3 | CHM  | 30.4 | 79.3 | 1.4 | 5.4 | 1.5 | 7.5 | VI  |                                    |
| 4 | DHH  | 32.2 | 76.3 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 4.9 | II  | 2.5 Hz ≤ f<sub>peak</sub> ≤ 5 Hz |
| 5 | HAM  | 31.7 | 76.5 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 6.6 | VII |                                    |
| 6 | JUB  | 31.1 | 77.7 | 5.8 | 3.3 | 5.6 | 4.9 | VII |                                    |
| 7 | SND  | 31.5 | 76.9 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 4.2 | VI  |                                    |
| 8 | HGR  | 26.7 | 76.9 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 7.0 | -   |                                    |

**Haryana**

|   | PAL  | 28.1 | 77.3 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.4 | VI  |                                    |
|---|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------------------------------|
| 2 | JAFR | 28.6 | 76.9 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 7.1 | 2.6 | I   | f<sub>peak</sub> > 5 Hz          |
| 3 | GUR  | 28.4 | 77.0 | 1.0 | 4.1 | 1.0 | 5.2 | V   |                                    |
| 4 | REW  | 28.2 | 76.6 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 3.7 | -   |                                    |
| 5 | SON  | 29.0 | 77.0 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 4.0 | VI  |                                    |
| 6 | ROH  | 28.6 | 77.2 | 1.4 | 3.1 | 1.7 | 4.6 | IV  | f<sub>peak</sub> < 1.66 Hz        |
| 7 | CRRJ | 29.0 | 77.1 | 4.3 | 3.5 | 4.4 | 9.3 | -   |                                    |
| 8 | BAL  | 28.3 | 77.3 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 1.4 | 5.8 | VI  |                                    |
| 9 | KAI  | 29.8 | 76.4 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 6.5 | VI  |                                    |
| 10| PLW  | 28.13| 77.33| 2.4 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 4.4 | -   |                                    |
| 11| NOI  | 28.51| 77.479| 2.3 | 3.8 | 2.3 | 10.4| III | 1.66 Hz ≤ f<sub>peak</sub> ≤ 2.5 Hz|

**Punjab**

|   | JAL  | 31.3 | 75.6 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 2.9 | 1.7 | -   |                                    |

**Delhi**

|   | IGN  | 28.5 | 77.2 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 3.9 | -   |                                    |
|---|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------------------------------|
| 2 | DJB  | 28.7 | 77.2 | 2.2 | 3.2 | 10.0| 4.5 | V   |                                    |
| 3 | IMD  | 28.7 | 77.2 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 6.3 | 2.9 | -   |                                    |
2.1 Data processing

For inversion analysis, EQ records are subjected to baseline correction with a 5% cosine taper followed by bandpass Butterworth filter in the frequency range of 0.25Hz and 15Hz. Further, S wave part of each accelerogram is selected as the time windows beginning from 0.5s before the starting of the S wave and ending when 90% of the total energy of the EQ record is reached (Bindi et al. 2009). In addition, the time windows for EQ records vary from 4 to 15s. The maximum window length is restricted to 15s in order to avoid records having too much Coda wave energy (following Oth et al. 2008). Further, the Fourier amplitude spectra (FAS) are calculated for S wave portion of the EQ record. Obtained FAS is then smoothened as per Konno and Ohmachi (1999) algorithm with a smoothing parameter $b = 20$. Further, source and site spectra are generated simultaneously using an inversion procedure as discussed in Section 3.

3. Generalized Inversion Method

The smoothened FAS, $U_{ij}(f, R_{ij})$ at a recording station $i$, from source $j$ with $M$ and hypocentral distance $R$ can be expressed in frequency domain ($f$) following Castro, (1990) as;

$$U(f)_{ij} = S(f)_{j} P(f, R_{ij})_{ij} G(f)_{j}$$

(1)

Here, $S(f)_{j}$, $P(f, R_{ij})_{ij}$ and $G(f)_{j}$ denote the source spectrum, path attenuation component and site term respectively. Later, the path attenuation component is removed from $U(f)_{ij}$ in accordance with Andrews (1986) as;

$$U^A(f)_{ij} = \frac{U(f)_{ij}}{P(f, R_{ij})_{ij}} = S(f)_{j} G(f)_{j}$$

(2)

The value of $P_{ij} \left( f, R_{ij} \right)$ includes the effects of anelasticity of heterogeneous media and geometric spreading, which as per Castro, (1990) can be determined using the following expression;
\[
P(f)_{ij} = \frac{1}{R_{ij}} \left[ e^{-(\pi f R_{ij})} \right]
\]

In eq. 3, \(Q_s(f)\) is the quality factor for S wave and \(\beta\) is the average shear wave velocity of the crustal medium for the region considered as 3.5km/s as per Mukhopadhyay and Kayal, (2003). Value of \(Q_s = 105 f^{0.94}\) as given by Harinarayan and Kumar, (2018c) for the region in and around the north-west Himalaya is used in this work. Eq. 2 is linearized by taking natural logarithms as follows;

\[
ln U^A(f)_{ij} = ln S(f)_j + ln G(f)_i
\]

According to Andrews, (1986), an undetermined degree of freedom between source and site term exists in eq. 4 that can be resolved by using constrained site spectral function in the inversion (Castro et al. 1990), by setting the average of site spectra of a set of recording stations located on rock site (termed as reference sites) to unity, for the entire frequency range. Reference sites are carefully selected, since site and source terms in the inversion are related to the imposed site constraint. Any discrepancies in the reference site condition would lead to a systematic bias in the source spectra (Oth and Kaiser, 2014). Identifying reference sites in PESMOS based recording stations is a challenging task because of lack of accurate site class information. For this reason, reference stations are chosen based on the results of HVSR study by Harinarayan and Kumar, (2018a). Fig. 2 shows an example of site amplification curves for reference station in JNU based on HVSR (Harinarayan and Kumar, 2018a) results. A flat response curve throughout the frequency range, with amplification value close to 1.0 can be observed in Fig. 2. Complete list of reference stations used for the present work is presented in Table 1.

Eq. 4 constitute a system of linear equations of the form \(Ax = b\), where \(x\) is the model vector matrix, \(A\) is the system matrix, and \(b\) is the data vector which includes \(ln U^A(f)_{ij}\) and constrained reference site amplification values. Eq. 4 in this work is solved to obtain source and site spectrum using Singular value decomposition algorithm in a least square sense for each frequency following Menke, (2018).

---

**Figure 2:** HVSR curve for JNU recording station (Harinarayan and Kumar 2018a)
4. Result

Earlier discussed source and site spectrum are estimated here using the inversion procedure discussed in the preceding section. Results of the inversion are discussed below.

4.1 Source Parameters

The source spectrum, $S(f)_j$ of all the 21 EQ events obtained from inversion is shown in Fig. 3 (indicated by dashed line). In order to estimate source parameters, each source spectrum is compared and fitted to point source model of Brune, (1970) as discussed below;

The obtained source spectra, $S(f)_j$ of the $j^{th}$ EQ event, from the inversion is expressed as (Brune, 1970);

$$S(f)_j = \left[ \frac{4\pi^2 f^2 (R_0)VF}{(4\pi \rho \beta^3 R_0)} \right] \tilde{M}_{0j} \quad (5)$$

In eq. 5, $R_0 = 0.55$ (Mandal and Dutta, 2011), is the average shear wave radiation pattern; $F=2$ (Zafarani et al. 2012) represents the free surface amplification; $V = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, accounts for the partition of S wave energy into two horizontal components; $\rho=2.8g/cm^3$ and $\beta=3.5km/s$ denote the mass density and the shear wave velocity in the vicinity of the EQ source (Mandal and Dutta, 2011); $R_0=1km$ is a reference distance and $\tilde{M}_{0j}$ represents the moment rate spectrum. Rearranging the terms of eq. 5 gives;

$$\tilde{M}_{0j} = \frac{S(f)_j}{\left[ \frac{4\pi^2 f^2 (R_0)VF}{(4\pi \rho \beta^3 R_0)} \right]} \quad (6)$$

$\tilde{M}_{0j}$ of 21 EQ events, based on $S(f)_j$, obtained in inversion, is computed using eq. 6 as shown in Fig. 3. Further, $\tilde{M}_{0j}$ of each EQ event is compared and fitted to the theoretical model given in eq. 7 (after Brune, 1970) in order to estimate source parameters.

$$M_{0j} = \frac{\tilde{M}_{0j}}{1+(f/f_c)^\gamma} \quad (7)$$

A nonlinear least square approach (similar to Bindi et al. 2009) is adopted here to determine the values of $M_0$, $f_c$ and $\gamma$ for each EQ event, based on $\tilde{M}_0$ values in eq. 7. The values of $M_0$, $f_c$ and $\gamma$ obtained in the present study are tabulated in Table 2 column 7, 8 and 9 respectively. Value of $M_0$ as obtained from the analysis ranges between $4.96 \times 10^{13}$Nm to $2.91 \times 10^{16}$Nm. Further, the value of $f_c$ is found in the range of 1.5Hz to 5.5Hz while the value of $\gamma$ is in the range of 1.4 to 3. An excellent fit between the theoretical $\tilde{M}_0$ (obtained by substituting the values of $M_0$, $f_c$ and $\gamma$ in eq. 7) and the computed $\tilde{M}_0$ as observed in Fig. 3 indicates the robustness of the above estimated source parameters. Afterwards, $\Delta \sigma$, $E_s$, and $\sigma_A$ for each of the 21 EQ events are computed as discussed below.

$\Delta \sigma$ for each of the 21 EQ event are computed using eq. 8 below, based on the above determined $M_0$, and $f_c$ values and assuming a circular fault of radius $r$, in accordance with the theoretical source model of Brune, (1970).

$$\Delta \sigma = \left( \frac{7M_0}{16\pi r^3} \right) \times 10^{-6} \quad (8)$$
Figure 3: The computed (dotted line) and the best-fit (thick line) moment rate spectra

Where,

\[ r = \frac{2.34\beta}{2\pi f_c} \]  \hspace{1cm} (9)

In eq. 8 and 9, \( r, \beta, M_0, \) and \( \Delta\sigma \) have units of m, m/s, Nm and MPa respectively. Values of \( r \) and \( \Delta\sigma \) are tabulated in Table 2, columns 11 and 13 respectively. Value of \( r \) falls between 230.34m and 844.60m for 21 events, with an average of 457.5m. Similarly, the value of \( \Delta\sigma \) vary from 0.53MPa to 21.13MPa, with an average of 6.43MPa for 21 events. Note, while most of the events have \( \Delta\sigma \) lesser than 10 MPa only 5 events (events 5, 9, 10, 12 and 21) have \( \Delta\sigma \) greater than 10 MPa. Further, S wave energy \( (E_s) \) associated with each event is estimated in the frequency range 0.25Hz -15Hz in accordance to the relation (eqs. 10, 11), given by Vassiliou and Kanamori, (1982).

\[ E_s = A \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left| 2\pi f M_0 \right|^2 df \]  \hspace{1cm} (10)

Where,
In eq. 12, \(\sigma\) is underestimated to some extent because of the frequency band limit applied in eq. 10. Based on the value of \(E_s\) estimated in the present study, apparent stress (\(\sigma_A\)) for each of the 21 events are estimated following Brune, (1970) as:

\[
\sigma_A = \mu \frac{E_s}{M_0}
\]  
(12)

Where, \(\mu\) is the rigidity modulus estimated using the formula: \(\mu = \beta^2 \alpha\). Calculated values of \(\sigma_A\) are tabulated in Table 2 Column 13. It can be seen from the Table 2, column 13 that the estimated \(\sigma_A\) in the present study is in the range of 0.07MPa to 2.76MPa, with an average of 0.81MPa for 21 events. Fig. 4 shows a comparison of \(\sigma_A\), \(\Delta\sigma\) and the theoretical line, \(\sigma_A = 0.23 \Delta\sigma\) given by Kikuchi and Fukao, (1988) represented by a solid line.
be seen from Fig. 4 that the relation between estimated $\sigma_A$ and $\Delta\sigma$ in the present study is consistent with the theoretical relation.

![Figure 4: Stress drop versus apparent stress. The theoretical relation ($\sigma_A = 0.23\ \Delta\sigma$) given by Kikuchi and Fukao, (1988) is indicated by solid line](image)

**Comparison with Existing Literatures**

There are limited studies available where source parameters for EQs in the north-west Himalaya were determined (Sharma et al. 2013; Kumar et al. 2016; Mittal et al. 2016a; b). Comparison of the estimated source parameters with those obtained by above researchers for EQs considered in the present study is discussed in this section. Sharma et al. (2013) analysed strong motion records from Uttarakhand region and reported values of $\Delta\sigma$, $f_c$, and $r$ as 1.5MPa, 1.5Hz and 1000m respectively for 2008 August EQ [event no. 2, Table 2]. These findings are close to the values of $\Delta\sigma =$0.9MPa, $f_c=2.3$Hz and $r=550.8$m, obtained in the present study (see Fig. 5a). In another study, Kumar et al. (2016), based on Spectral analysis using grid search technique reported values of $\Delta\sigma$ as 4.16MPa and 3.6MPa for 2009 January EQ [event no. 3, Table 2] and 2008 September EQ [event no. 4, Table 2] respectively. It has to be highlighted here that above values by Kumar et al. (2016) are close with $\Delta\sigma$ of 8.6MPa and 1.6MPa respectively, obtained for the same events, in present study (see Fig. 5b). Mittal et al. (2016a), using least square method estimated $\Delta\sigma$ and $f_c$ as 36.2MPa and 1.19Hz respectively for 2011 Nepal Himalayan EQ [event no. 10, Table 2]. Values estimated by Mittal et al. (2016a) are close to the values obtained in the present study ($\Delta\sigma =31.13$MPa and $f_c=1.19$Hz). In another study, Mittal et al. (2016b) analysed 2012 March EQ [event no. 12, Table 2] using stochastic point source model and reported the value of $\Delta\sigma$ and $f_c$ as 12.4MPa and 1.78Hz respectively, which are matching with the value of $\Delta\sigma = 10.71$MPa and $f_c=2.4$Hz obtained in the present work.

Similarities in the results of the present study with that discussed above is encouraging considering the total independence of the methodologies used in each work including the present one.
Empirical correlations

To understand the relation between $M_0$ and $f_c$ in the north-west Himalaya, $M_0$ is plotted against $f_c$ in logarithmic units (similar to Aki, 1967) and the regression yields the following expression:

$$\log M_0 = -3.19 \log f_c + 16.40$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

Eq. 13 indicates that with increase in $f_c$, $M_0$ decreases. According to Aki, (1967), $f_c$ follows the scaling law: $M_0 f_c^3 = \text{constant}$, indicating self-similarity in the EQ source. Following Aki, (1967), the slope is fixed to -3 and regression analysis is again carried out between $M_0$ and $f_c$ in logarithmic scale, giving the following expression:

$$\log M_0 = -3 \log f_c + 16.25$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

Plot for eq. 14 is indicated by solid line in Fig. 6. Eq. 14 is rewritten as: $M_0 f_c^3 = (1.8 \times 10^{16}\text{Nm/s3})$ corresponding to a constant stress drop of 3.5MPa. Kumar et al. (2008) reported a relation $M_0 f_c^3 = (2.09 \times$
analysing 12 EQ events (4.5<M<7) in the Himalaya region, which is similar to the result obtained in the present study. In another study, Hassani et al. (2011) reported a relation $M_0 f_c^3 = (2.48 \times 10^{16}\text{Nm/s}^3)$ for EQs (3.5<M<7) corresponding to a constant $\Delta \sigma$ of 4.9MPa for Iran. Dutta et al. (2003) obtained a relation $M_0 f_c^3 = (2.09 \times 10^{16}\text{Nm/s}^3)$ for EQs (3<M_L<6.3) corresponding to a constant $\Delta \sigma$ of 2MPa for the anchorage area of Alaska. Findings from above mentioned studies are comparable to those obtained in the present study.

Figure 6: The plot of scalar moment versus corner frequency in logarithmic unit. The regression relation is indicated by solid line

Figure 7: The plot of energy released versus corner frequency in logarithmic unit. The regression relation is indicated by solid line

The relation between $E_s$ and $M_0$, obtained in the present analysis is shown in Fig. 7 and can be linearly expressed in logarithmic scale as;

$$\log E_s = 1.2 \log M_0 - 6$$

In similar study, Zafarani et al. (2012) reported a relation; $\log E_s = \log M_0 - 4.08$ for EQs (4<M_W<7.4) in the Alborz Zone of Iran which is similar to the relation obtained in the present study.
The variation of $\Delta \sigma$ with $M_0$, shown in Fig. 8 illustrate that $\Delta \sigma$ do not exhibit significant variation with $M_0$. Similarly Fig. 9 shows lack of dependence of $\Delta \sigma$ with $M$. The significant lack of dependence of $\Delta \sigma$ with $M_0$, and $M$ along with the cube root scaling of $f_c$ (in eq. 13) collectively indicates that the EQs in the north-west Himalaya follow the self-similarity process. A similar observation is reported by Kumar et al. (2016) for EQs (3.4<$m_b$<5.8) in the north-west Himalaya.

Figure 8: The plot of stress drop versus seismic energy

Figure 9: The plot of Stress drop versus magnitude

Site Parameters

After estimating source parameters, site amplification curves for horizontal and vertical components are developed separately using GINV. Fig. 10 depicts typical amplification curves obtained for horizontal (indicated by dotted lines) and vertical (indicated by solid lines) components at 4 stations. It can be seen from Fig. 10 that the obtained amplification value for horizontal component is greater than vertical component. In general, for several recording stations, clear and well defined peak in the amplification curve is observed (see Fig. 10). Moreover, the frequency corresponding to the maximum amplification for the vertical and the horizontal components are matching with each other. Further, STF is computed based on the GINV results as the ratio of horizontal component to vertical
component of site amplification terms for each recording station. The frequency corresponding to the maximum value of STF (denoted as $A_{\text{peak}}$) is termed as $f_{\text{peak}}$. The values of $f_{\text{peak}}$ and $A_{\text{peak}}$ are given in Table 1, Columns 5 and 6 respectively. Maximum value of $f_{\text{peak}}$ of 6Hz is observed for the recording station JAFR with $A_{\text{peak}}$ of 2. Maximum value of $A_{\text{peak}}$ of 6.9 for UDH recording station is observed at 2.7Hz. Range of $A_{\text{peak}}$ varies between 2 and 6.9, while the range of $f_{\text{peak}}$ varies between 0.7Hz and 6Hz.

![Figure 10(a-d): Site amplification curves obtained using GINV for horizontal component (H) and vertical component (V)](image)

Above computed STF curves based on GINV are later compared with HVSR based site amplification curves estimated for the same recording stations by Harinarayan and Kumar, (2018a) and Chopra et al. (2018) Detailed description on HVSR methodology is given in Harinarayan and Kumar, (2018a) and Chopra et al.2018 and is not discussed in the present study. The values of $A_{\text{peak}}$ and $f_{\text{peak}}$ based on HVSR analysis reported by Harinarayan and Kumar, (2018a) are listed in Column 7 and 8 respectively of Table 1. Fig. 11 shows the comparison of results of HVSR (indicated by dotted lines) and GINV (indicated by solid line) for 4 typical recording stations considered in the present study. It can be concluded that both HVSR and STF based curves show similar patterns in terms of the general shape for all the recording stations. Further, overall value of $f_{\text{peak}}$ obtained using GINV and HVSR exhibit 1:1 match at all the recording stations. A difference in terms of $A_{\text{peak}}$ values between the curves can be observed. $A_{\text{peak}}$ values obtained using HVSR are found higher compared to those obtained using GINV. This observation is also reported by many studies done for other regions (Sharma et al. 2013; Field and Jacob, 1995; Ahmadzadeh et al. 2017).

Further, the results of HVSR, obtained in the present study are compared with those reported by Chopra et al. (2018) for each recording stations separately. Chopra et al. (2018) attempted site classification of 90 recording stations across India. It has to be mentioned here that all the 78 recording stations considered in the present work are not common with Chopra et al. (2018) and thus comparison in terms of site class is possible for
common stations only. Column 9, Table 1 lists the site class of each recording station as per Chopra et al. (2018). Site classification by Chopra et al. (2018) was done as per classification scheme of Di‘Alessandro et al. (2012). In addition to site class given by Chopra et al. (2018), the possible range of $f_{\text{peak}}$ (see Table 3), estimated from the range of period ($T_g$) as given by Di‘Alessandro et al. (2012), for each site class, is also presented in column 10, Table 1. It can be clearly observed that the value of $f_{\text{peak}}$, found as per the present work for common stations, are well within the possible range of $f_{\text{peak}}$ for that recording station, following Di‘Alessandro et al. (2012) site classification scheme, as given by Chopra et al. (2018). In addition, it has to be mentioned that there are recording stations for which site class is not available as per Chopra et al. (2018) and thus are left blank in columns 9 and 10, Table 1. Further, for certain number of recording stations, though site class was given by Chopra et al., (2018), no range of $f_{\text{peak}}$ is given by Di‘Alessandro et al. (2012) is available and thus there is site class but no range of $f_{\text{peak}}$ given as can be observed from columns 9 and 10, Table 1.

In addition to site class, comparison of the present work with that by Chopra et al. (2018) is done in terms of H/V curves. Fig. 11(a-d) present H/V curves obtained from the present work based on HVSR and GINV methodologies for each specific recording station. In addition, average H/V curve for site class which is assigned to that recording station, as per Chopra et al. (2018), is also presented in Fig. 11(a-d). In can be clearly observed from Fig. 11(a-d) that $f_{\text{peak}}$ values based on each of the three curves, for each of the recording stations considered, are closely matching.

![H/V Curves](image)

Figure 11(a-d): Horizontal to vertical ratio curve obtained using GINV and HVSR method
Table 3: Site Classification criteria proposed by D’Alessandro et al. (2012)

| Site   | Description                                      |
|--------|--------------------------------------------------|
| CL-I   | $f_{\text{peak}} > 5$ Hz                         |
| CL-II  | $2.5$ Hz $\leq f_{\text{peak}} \leq 5$ Hz       |
| CL-III | $1.66$ Hz $\leq f_{\text{peak}} \leq 2.5$ Hz    |
| CL-IV  | $f_{\text{peak}} < 1.66$ Hz                     |
| CL-V   | $f_{\text{peak}}$ not identifiable/flat H/V      |
| CL-VI  | Broad amplification/multiple peaks above 5 Hz     |
| CL-VII | $f_{\text{peak}}$ not identifiable/multiple peaks over period range |

Conclusion

In the present study, 156 EQ records from regions in and around the north-west Himalaya are processed and analysed for separating source and site spectra using GINV method. Obtained source spectra is fitted to the theoretical source model to get $M_0$ and $f_c$. Furthermore, $\Delta \sigma$, $E_s$ and $\sigma_A$ are also calculated for the above events. Based on these findings, correlations between the estimated source parameters are proposed leading to the following conclusions;

1. Within the range $4.96 \times 10^{13}$Nm $< M_0 < 2.91 \times 10^{16}$Nm, $M_0$ is approximately proportional to $f_c^{-3}$, with $M_0 f_c^{-3} = (1.8 \times 10^{16}$Nm/s3 ), corresponding to a constant $\Delta \sigma$ of 3.5MPa, indicating self-similarity nature of EQs in the region.
2. Value of $\Delta \sigma$ for individual EQs varies from 0.53MPa to 21.13MPa with an average of 0.81MPa and the relation between $\Delta \sigma$ and $\sigma_A$ is consistant with the theoretically expected relation of $\sigma_A = 0.23 \Delta \sigma$ given by Kikuchi and Fukao, (1988) based on global records.
3. $\Delta \sigma$ shows no dependence with $M$ and $M_0$.
4. Least square regression between $E_s$ and $M_0$ yields; $\log E_s = 1.2 \log M_0 - 6$ for in the range of $4.96 \times 10^{13}$Nm $< E_s < 2.90 \times 10^{16}$Nm.

In addition, STF curves developed based on the results of GINV for horizontal and vertical components shows clear and distinct peak for majority of the recording stations. Values of $f_{\text{peak}}$ and $A_{\text{peak}}$ obtained from the STF curves are in the range of 0.7 to 6Hz and 2 to 6.9 respectively. STF curves from GINV method is compared with HVSR estimates. Comparison between the two methods shows similarities in terms of the general shape and values of $f_{\text{peak}}$ and are found matching with the existing literature.
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