Earthquake ruptures and topography controlled by plate interface deformation
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Figure 1: S1 - Cross-sections used for inversion.
Figure 2: S2 - Topographic slope ($\alpha$) versus slab dip ($\beta$) for swath profiles along the a. Antofagasta, b. Illapel and c. Maule segments (locations on Figure S1). Segments at critical state, according to inversion, are shown in green: when accretion, in blue: light blue when probably erosive, dark blue for probable underplating. Grey: swath plus or minus standard deviation. Properties of each segment are provided in Table T1.
Figure 3: S3 - Marginals 1D obtained for Figure 2 profiles.
Table 1: **T1** - Best misfits of critical segments identified on figures 2 and **S2** ($\delta_b$: angle between forward verging thrust and basal décollement).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-section</th>
<th>Internal pore pressure ratio</th>
<th>Internal friction angle $\phi_{int}$ (°)</th>
<th>Effective basal friction angle $\phi_{eff}$ (°)</th>
<th>Diff. of effective friction angle $\Delta\phi$ (°)</th>
<th>Diff. of dip $\delta_b$ (°)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iquique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tocopilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antofagasta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilapel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>38.75</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>27.75</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>25.25</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>25.25</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>37.25</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: **S4** - Topographic slope ($\alpha$) versus slab dip ($\beta$) of Figure 2b and 2c profiles with depth evolution and distance from the front shown as a gradient of color.
Figure 5: S5 - Figure 2b profile, original and smoothed topography by different window size (10, 25 and 40 km) and shape (rectangular, triangular). The critical areas are visible on original and smoothed data for both window shapes. The 25km large window allows keeping some topographic complexities and is smoothed enough to capture critical areas.
Figure 6: S6 - Frictional properties of segments at critical state retrieved by inversion: Best misfits for internal pore pressure, internal friction angle and effective megathrust friction angle.
Figure 7: S7 - FFT applied on raw and smoothed lengths of segments at critical state, as a function of latitude degrees. We can identify four major peaks: 8, 4, 2, 1.5°.
Figure 8: S8 - Histograms of coupling values for a. critical segments and for b. Metois et al. (2016) model
Metois et al. (2016)
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