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SUMMARY
In the 2005 TICOCA V A explosion seismology study in Costa Rica, we observed crustal turning waves with a dominant frequency of ∼10 Hz on a linear array of short-period seismometers from the Pacific Ocean to the Caribbean Sea. On one of the shot records, from Shot 21 in the backarc of the Cordillera Central, we also observed two seismic phases with an unusually high dominant frequency (∼20 Hz). These two phases were recorded in the forearc region of central Costa Rica and arrived ∼7 s apart and 30–40 s after the detonation of Shot 21. We considered the possibility that these secondary arrivals were produced by a local earthquake that may have happened during the active-source seismic experiment. Such high-frequency phases following Shot 21 were not recorded after Shots 22, 23 and 24, all in the backarc of Costa Rica, which might suggest that they were produced by some other source. However, earthquake dislocation models cannot produce seismic waves of such high frequency with significant amplitude. In addition, we would have expected to see more arrivals from such an earthquake on other seismic stations in central Costa Rica. We therefore investigate whether the high-frequency arrivals may be the result of a deep seismic reflection from the subducting Cocos Plate. The timing of these phases is consistent with a shear wave from Shot 21 that was reflected as a compressional (S×P) and a shear (S×S) wave at the top of the subducting Cocos slab between 35 and 55 km depth. The shift in dominant frequency from ∼10 Hz in the downgoing seismic wave to ∼20 Hz in the reflected waves requires a particular seismic structure at the interface between the subducting slab and the forearc mantle to produce a substantial increase in reflection coefficients with frequency. The spectral amplitude characteristics of the S×P and S×S phases from Shot 21 are consistent with a very high V_p/V_s ratio of 6 in ∼5 m thick, slab-parallel layers. This result suggests that a system of thin shear zones near the plate interface beneath the forearc is occupied by hydrous fluids under near-lithostatic conditions. The overpressured shear zone probably takes up fluids from the downgoing slab, and it may control the lower limit of the seismogenic zone.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Some of the largest earthquakes occur at subduction zones, where strain is accumulated and released at the contact between the two converging tectonic plates. Seismic studies have shown that these seismogenic zones often do not extend deeper than the base of the forearc crust (DeShon et al. 2003; DeShon & Schwartz 2004). Beneath this depth, it has been speculated that hydrous minerals, such as serpentine and talc, enable steady or transient creep at the plate interface between oceanic lithosphere and the mantle wedge (Hyndman & Peacock 2003; Hilairet et al. 2007). Alternatively, high fluid pressures due to dehydration of these minerals may reduce the friction across this interface (Kodaira et al. 2004; Moore & Lockner 2007). Improving our understanding of the rheology and intermediate-depth seismogenic processes at convergent plate boundaries primarily requires direct
observations of the release and transport of fluids within the subduction system. Prograde metamorphic reactions cause the release of volatiles from the oceanic crust and upper mantle as they are subducted and subjected to increasing pressure and temperature (Bebout 2007). The transformation from blueschist to eclogite facies in the oceanic crust and the breakdown of serpentinite in the upper mantle of the downgoing plate may be the most important sources of water deep in the subduction zone (Rüpke et al. 2004; Peacock et al. 2005). Fluids released from downdropping slabs into the mantle wedge affect subduction zone processes at a variety of scales. Fluids that are absorbed by the overlying mantle wedge will alter its viscosity, thereby exerting a control on mantle flow and temperature structure (Manea & Gurnis 2007). Water that is subducted to depths of \( \sim 100 \) km can lead to mantle melting beneath volcanic arcs (Schmidt & Poli 1998). If the permeability of the mantle wedge corner is low (Mibe et al. 1999), or if the plate interface itself forms an impermeable seal (Audet et al. 2009), water expelled from the downgoing plate may become trapped at the slab interface. The possible presence of free water here has great implications for the rheology of the megathrust and the conditions that may result in slow-slip events (Shelly et al. 2006; Moore & Lockner 2007; Liu & Rice 2007).

The structure of the shear zone between the two plates has been investigated extensively in exhumed, ancient high-pressure and ultrahigh-pressure terranes (Bebout 2007). These studies show that water released during prograde metamorphism chemically altered fault zones, but not much of the surrounding rock of the downgoing oceanic lithosphere (Barnicot & Cartwright 1995; Spandler et al. 2003). This observation suggests a strong relationship between fluid flow and fault slip near the plate interface. Unfortunately, some of the context of ancient subduction zones is unknown, such as the age and speed of descending lithosphere. Seismic imaging of high \( V_p/V_s \) in modern subduction zones provides evidence of elevated fluid pressures in the slab beneath the forearc of Nicaragua, Mexico, Japan, and British Columbia (Abers et al. 2003; Kodaira et al. 2004; Audet et al. 2009; Song et al. 2009) that likely originate from dehydration reactions in the downgoing plate. The long seismic wavelengths used in most of these studies make it difficult to distinguish hydrous fluids in discrete fault zones from fluids distributed throughout the subducting crust.

In this study we show deep seismic phases from a seismic refraction study in central Costa Rica that have distinct frequency and amplitude characteristics, which may enable us to infer physical properties of the slab–mantle interface beneath the forearc. Such \textit{in situ} seismic constraints can fill an important gap in our understanding of geological processes at the plate boundary at these intermediate depths.

2 TECTONIC SETTING

The arc and forearc of central Costa Rica form the western margin of the Caribbean Plate (Alvarado et al. 1997), which is a large igneous plateau that originated in the eastern Pacific (Hauff et al. 1997). Miocene (22 Ma) to present subduction of the Farallon Plate and Cocos Plate (Vogel et al. 2004; Mann et al. 2007) resulted in the construction of a volcanic arc with a thickness of \( 27–40 \) km (Sallarès et al. 2001; MacKenzie et al. 2008). The deep crustal structure of the arc, with compressional seismic velocities \( (V_p) \) varying from \( \sim 6.0 \) km s\(^{-1}\) in the upper crust to \( \sim 7.2 \) km s\(^{-1}\) in the lower crust (Sallarès et al. 2001; Husen et al. 2003), is indicative of a mafic composition. The partially serpentinitized mantle wedge corner at depths to \( \sim 50 \) km has seismic velocities that are not substantially higher than that of the lower arc crust (DeShon & Schwartz 2004; Syracuse et al. 2008). The subducted and metamorphosed oceanic crust of the Cocos Plate has a \( V_p \) of \( 7.0–7.5 \) km s\(^{-1}\) at depths of \( \sim 50 \) km (Husen et al. 2003), which is also similar to that of the overriding lower arc crust and the mantle wedge corner. Tomographic images of the subduction zone are therefore not very helpful in distinguishing the deep structure of the forearc, but the depth of the interface between the top of the Cocos slab and the forearc mantle is fairly well illuminated by its seismicity (Syracuse & Abers 2006).

The oceanic lithosphere of the Cocos Plate that subducted beneath central Costa Rica formed at the Cocos-Nazca spreading centre. The Galápagos hotspot, which was located in the vicinity of this spreading centre since at least 20 Ma (Sallarès & Charvis 2003), produced the Cocos Ridge, which has been estimated to be 21 km (Walther 2003) and 18–19 km (Sallarès et al. 2003) thick. In addition, several large seamounts and plateaus formed outboard the Middle American Trench (von Huene et al. 2000; Fig. 1). Collision
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\( \text{Figure 1.} \) (a) Tectonic map of southern Central America. NIC, Nicaragua; PAN, Panama; 21, Shot 21. Volcanoes in Costa Rica are marked as black triangles. (b) Location map of the 2005 TICOCAVA experiment in Costa Rica. MAT, Middle American Trench; CAR, Caribbean Plate. Dashed lines are depth contours of the Cocos Plate beneath Costa Rica (Syracuse & Abers 2006). Black circles indicate explosions from the seismic study. Shot 21 is marked with a star. Shots 22, 23 and 24 are marked with annotated black circles. White line marks the array of vertical-component seismometers. Open circle offshore marks the location of the 1990 March 25, earthquake and its aftershock area (dash-dotted outline) (Protti et al. 1995).
of this thickened oceanic crust with the overriding plate caused uplift and tectonic erosion of the Costa Rica margin (Vannucchi et al. 2006; La Femina et al. 2009; Sak et al. 2009) since the last 2–3 Ma (MacMillan et al. 2004). The seafloor that currently lies outboard of the trench offshore central Costa Rica is approximately 18–22 Ma old (Barckhausen et al. 2001), and it is converging with the stable interior of the Caribbean plate at 8.5 mm yr\(^{-1}\) at a 20° angle from the orthogonal direction (DeMets 2001).

The seamounts on the subducting seafloor offshore central Costa Rica appear to moderate the magnitude of thrust earthquakes (Bilek et al. 2003), because these asperities form rupture surfaces of limited size. Some of the largest earthquakes reported in the region are the 1983 Osa (\(M_w = 7.3\)) earthquake (Adamek et al. 1987), the 1990 Gulf of Nicoya (\(M_w = 7.0\)) earthquake (Protti et al. 1995) and the 1999 (\(M_w = 6.9\)) Quepos earthquake (Bilek & Lithgow-Bertelloni 2005). Husen et al. (2002) show a seismic velocity image of an asperity in the opening of the Gulf of Nicoya that may have slipped during the 1990 earthquake. Each of these historic earthquakes offshore central Costa Rica is smaller than the 1950 (\(M_w = 7.7\)) Nicoya Peninsula earthquake (DeShon et al. 2006). The smoother seafloor offshore northern Nicoya Peninsula and farther northwest toward Nicaragua is believed to provide stronger coupling between the two plates in the seismogenic zone (Bilek et al. 2003; DeShon et al. 2006).

Microseismicity in central Costa Rica is mostly located in the vicinity of the subducting Cocos Plate and in the upper crust of the volcanic front (Protti et al. 1994; Husen et al. 2003; DeShon et al. 2006). The upper crust near the Pacific coast of central Costa Rica shows less seismic activity (Protti et al. 1995; Quintero & Guendel 2000). Recent seismicity and geotectonic studies have found areas of the slab interface with increased seismicity (DeShon et al. 2003, 2006) and locked patches (Norabuena et al. 2004; Ghosh et al. 2008) that could rupture as a large earthquake. The deeper limit of this complex seismogenic zone is estimated to range from ~26 km in the southern Nicoya peninsula to ~35 km near the Osa peninsula (DeShon et al. 2003, 2006), which is not much different from the depth of the Moho beneath the forearc (MacKenzie et al. 2008). This coincidence suggests that the juxtaposition of serpentinites from the outer corner of the mantle wedge and downgoing oceanic lithosphere creates a stable sliding regime at the slab interface (DeShon et al. 2006).

\section*{3 DATA}

\subsection*{3.1 Deep seismic phases}

During the 2005 Transsects to Investigate the Crustal Origin of the Central American Volcanic Arc (TICOCAVA) experiment, we recorded a total of 37 explosions on an array of 748 vertical-component seismometers from the U.S. national seismic instrumentation facility IRIS/PASSCAL. The seismic array was first deployed along a line from the Pacific across the volcanic arc near Barva volcano to the Caribbean coast, and it was subsequently moved to a transect along the volcanic front from the Nicaraguan border to Irazú volcano. The 154-km-long refraction line across the volcanic arc had an average instrument spacing of 200 m (Fig. 1). Most of the observed seismic arrivals were compressional waves, but we also recorded some excellent shear wave arrivals in this experiment.

Shot 21, which was located 45 km northeast of the volcanic arc on the first transect, appears to have generated two strong, deep seismic phases with a dominant frequency of approximately 20 Hz. The frequency content is much higher than the ~10 Hz average frequency of the turning waves from Shot 21 and other explosions (Fig. 2a). The two phases were recorded on approximately 300 instruments in the forearc of central Costa Rica at source–receiver offsets between 70 and 125 km. No such deep phases were recorded in the northeastern arc and backarc portion of this shot gather. A clear compressional turning wave (\(P_g\)) and a faint shear turning wave (\(S_g\)) from Shot 21 appear at offsets that are consistent with an existing regional seismic velocity model (Husen et al. 2003).

The arrival times of the deep seismic phases of Shot 21 are consistent with that of a shear wave converted to a compressional wave (\(S \times P\)) and a shear-to-shear converted wave (\(S \times S\)) from the subducting Cocos slab. If the corner of the mantle wedge in central Costa Rica is serpentinized by ~15\% (DeShon et al. 2003), which corresponds to a compressional velocity (\(V_p\)) of ~7.2 km s\(^{-1}\) and a shear velocity (\(V_s\)) of 4.0 km s\(^{-1}\) (Hacker et al. 2003; Christensen 2004), we can fit the arrival times of the \(S \times P\) and \(S \times S\) phases mostly within 1 s (Fig. 3). This traveltime fit is an indication that the \(S \times P\) and \(S \times S\) phases bounced off an interface that lies within no more than a few km of the top of the Wadati-Benioff zone at depths between 35 and 55 km (Syracuse & Abers 2006). Arroyo et al. (2009) recently interpreted the top of low seismic velocity anomaly in their tomographic image as the slab interface beneath the Pacific coast of Costa Rica. However, at depths greater than 40 km, the slab seismicity, which extends to 200 km (Protti et al. 1994; Syracuse & Abers 2006) outlines a boundary that lies approximately 10 km deeper. In our study we use the slab interface parameterization of Syracuse & Abers (2006), which shows a smoother bend in the downgoing Cocos Plate beneath the forearc mantle. At depths shallower than 40 km there is less ambiguity in the slab interface (Fig. 3). Given that the forearc crust here is roughly 30 km thick (DeShon et al. 2003; DeShon & Schwartz 2004; MacKenzie et al. 2008), the wave paths of the reflections must traverse the upper 5–25 km of the outer corner of the mantle wedge.

Unfortunately, the \(S \times P\) and \(S \times S\) phases were not observed in other shot records of the TICOCAVA study. Shots 22, 23 and 24 (Figs 2b–d), located farther northeast in the backarc of the Cordillera Central (Fig. 1b), recorded \(P_g\) and \(S_g\), but not the \(S \times P\) and \(S \times S\) phases. Interpreting the \(S \times P\) and \(S \times S\) phases of Shot 21 as slab reflections therefore implies that the explosions do not consistently produce detectable shear-wave reflections from the subducting slab. Shot 24 recorded a weak compressional wave reflecting off the subducting slab (\(P \times P\)), which does not have the high-frequency character of \(S \times P\) and \(S \times S\) in the record of Shot 21.

\subsection*{3.2 Seismicity}

The traveltimes of the \(S \times P\) and \(S \times S\) phases of Shot 21 are consistent with the best existing estimates for the position of the slab (Syracuse & Abers 2006) and for mantle-wedge seismic velocities (Husen et al. 2003), so our explanation of these phases as slab reflections is in some sense the simplest interpretation. The \(S \times P\) and \(S \times S\) phases are very clear seismic arrivals, but the absence of such phases in other TICOCAVA shot records requires inspection of time-series from other seismic stations that were operating during the detonation of Shot 21.

An alternative explanation for the deep seismic phases is that a small earthquake might have occurred right after the detonation of Shot 21. Given the high seismicity at the Wadati-Benioff zone of the subducting Cocos Plate, the most likely place for such an event would be beneath the forearc at depths between 15 and 40 km.
Figure 2. (a) Shot 21 gather of seismic refractions. The main diagram shows all seismic phases ($P_g$, $S_g$, $S\times P$ and $S\times S$) with a reduction velocity of 8 km s$^{-1}$. The three black squares mark the location of the enlargements ($P_g$, $S\times P$ and $S\times S$) of three panels above; $X$ is the source–receiver distance. (b) Vertical-component receiver gather of Shot 22. The locations of all shots are marked in Fig. 1(b). The horizontal and vertical axes are as in (a). (c) Shot 23 lies northeast of both Shots 21 and 22. Besides the turning waves $P_g$ and $S_g$, we interpret a reflection from the arc Moho ($PmP$). (d) Shot 24 was located near the Caribbean coast, at the largest distance from the subducting Cocos slab. The inset shows an enlargement of the box inside the receiver gather, with a phase that we interpret as $P\times P$. 
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However, ray tracing shows that if an event occurred in the seismo-
genic zone near the Pacific coast of Costa Rica, the traveltime
branches of $P_g$ and $S_g$ would have a steeper slope than the $S \times P$ and
$S \times S$ observed in our data (Fig. 4a). On the other hand, an earth-
quake could produce $P_g$ and $S_g$ waves that are consistent with $S \times P$
and $S \times S$ in the TICOCAVA data if this secondary event occurred
near the slab interface beneath the forearc mantle at a distance of
$\sim 40$ km from the Pacific coast and at a depth of $\sim 52$ km (location $Q$
in Fig. 4b and in Fig. 5), roughly 25 s after Shot 21 was fired.
This scenario fits both the $S \times P$ ($P_g$) and $S \times S$ ($S_g$) phases fairly
well. The alternative source may also lie outside the plane of our
refraction profile in the forearc. In that case the earthquake would

Figure 2. (Continued.)
Figure 3. (a) Traveltime fit of the $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ phases of Shot 21. (b) Ray diagram along the seismometer array with Cocos slab surface SA06 (Syracuse & Abers 2006), which we use in this paper. The slab interface inferred by Arroyo et al. (2009) from their tomographic seismic velocity model is indicated by a dashed line. Shot 21 is marked with a star. Other shots are marked with a circle. The angle of incidence of shear waves at the slab–mantle interface is indicated in $10^\circ$ increments. (c) The ray paths were traced in an existing seismic velocity model (Husen et al. 2003).

Figure 4. Ray tracing tests for two scenarios with a secondary source during Shot 21. (a) If a secondary source is placed at the plate boundary near the Pacific coast (bottom), we calculate traveltime curves (dashed lines, above) that have a steeper slope than the observed $S \times S$ and $S \times P$ arrivals. (b) Diagram with traveltimes of phases observed after Shot 21 (solid lines). If the secondary source is placed at the plate interface at 52 km depth, calculated traveltime slopes are flatter (dashed lines). If this secondary event, which we label $Q$, was $\sim 25$ s after Shot 21 (dash-dotted curves), its $P$ and $S$ waves would match $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ quite well. In both (a) and (b), we have dash-dotted ray paths where we did not observe $S \times S$ and $S \times P$. Have to be shallower, because the total length of the path between the source and receivers is constrained by the $\sim 7$ s time gap between the incoming $S \times P$ ($P_g$) and $S \times S$ ($S_g$) phases. Microseismicity beneath the forearc of central Costa Rica is mostly confined to the subducting oceanic crust and the upper 20 km of the forearc crust (Husen et al. 2003). Besides location $Q$ at 52 km depth on our reflection line, a small earthquake in the upper crust of the forearc to the northwest ($Q_{NW}$) or southeast ($Q_{SE}$) could perhaps also have produced $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ (Fig. 5). Regardless of the location of their source, there is no ambiguity between the timing of the event and...
Source locations $Q$, $Q_{NW}$ and $Q_{SE}$ (Fig. 5). The ‘a’ arrival on ZAPA is later than any $P$ or $S$ traveltime from $Q$, $Q_{NW}$ or $Q_{SE}$. Station IRZU does not show any events after the $P_g$ from Shot 21. Event ‘b’ on station COVE coincides nicely with the expected $P$ arrival time from $Q$, but a second event ‘c’ recorded by COVE is too early to represent the $S$ arrival from $Q$. The other locations $Q_{NW}$ and $Q_{SE}$ do not predict the arrival of ‘b’ or ‘c’. We conclude that $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ were only observable in the forearc, where the southwestern portion of the TICOCA V A array of seismometers, with the area where explosive shots are marked by light grey stars. The open circles mark the locations observed shaded in grey. Explosive shots are marked by light grey stars. The data confirm that the small arrivals ‘a’ and ‘b’ and the distance that the $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ phases travelled to our instruments. If these phases were not converted reflections from the slab, they must come from a separate event that occurred approximately 25 s after Shot 21.

A small earthquake with an origin time 25 s after Shot 21 on 2005 March 3 in central Costa Rica might be registered by permanent and temporary seismic arrays. However, the earthquake catalogue derived from the Costa Rican monitoring network does not identify such an event following shortly after Shot 21. If the TICOCA V A short-period instrument array recorded a small earthquake in this location $Q$ (Fig. 5), we would expect to see this event on stations in the northeastern half of this array (Fig. 2a). The ray diagram of Fig. 4(b) shows that direct waves from a source beneath the forearc mantle can easily reach the arc and backarc region of our refraction profile, however we did not observe the high-frequency phases here (Fig. 4b). We also inspected data from the TUCAN broadband seismic array (G.A. Abers, personal communication, 2008), which was also operating in 2005, for possible arrivals from a microearthquake during Shot 21. A few of the TUCAN stations were placed relatively close to Shot 21 and the TICOCA V A array (Fig. 5). Time-series and spectra from the vertical component of Shot 21 from TUCAN broadband stations ZAPA, IRZU and COVE, all recording at 50 samples s$^{-1}$, are shown in Fig. 6. The TUCAN data confirm that the $S_g$ arrival of Shot 21 was weak compared to $P_g$, because $S_g$ is only visible on one of these instruments. A low-amplitude arrival ‘a’ followed 38 s after $P_g$ on ZAPA, and two small arrivals ‘b’ and ‘c’ came in on COVE, 28 and 39 s after $P_g$, respectively. These arrivals do not appear as prominent as the $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ phases in the TICOCA V A data, but we nevertheless test whether they may be direct arrivals from one of the alternative 4 METHOD

4.1 Data analysis

We here investigate if the anomalously high frequencies of $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ phases of Shot 21 can be a response characteristic of the seismic velocity structure within a ~1-km-thick zone at the boundary between the Cocos and Caribbean plates. To explain the observed discrepancy between dominant frequency of these deep phases (~20 Hz) and the crustal turning waves (~10 Hz), the
reflections from the plate interface.

Before we compare the observed reflection amplitudes with reflection coefficients calculated for seismic velocity models of the slab–mantle interface, we project our data from the Earth’s surface onto the shear zone. The S×P and S×S arrivals span a distance of approximately 55 km along our refraction profile, from the Pacific coast to the volcanic arc, with the strongest of the S×P phase arriving near the coast, and most of the S×S phase arriving farther inland (Fig. 9a). Using the ray paths of the S×P and S×S phases in the seismic velocity model (Fig. 9b), we map these reflection amplitudes onto reflection points at the slab–mantle interface between depths of 35 and 55 km (Fig. 9c). The projection shows that the S×P and S×S reflection points cover a horizontal distance of just 25 km along the slab interface. Moreover, it appears that the spatial correlation of S×P and S×S amplitudes between 15 and 20 Hz is much better on top of the slab than at the Earth’s surface (Fig. 9).

To interpret the variation in amplitude of the S×P and S×S phases along the array of vertical-component geophones, we must consider the polarization of particle motion for these two arrivals. The S×P particle motion is oriented in the direction of wave propagation as it approaches the instrument array, whereas S×S is polarized perpendicular to its wave path. Consequently, if S×P and S×S were direct P and S generated by a separate source beneath Costa Rica (location Q in Fig. 4b), we would expect to record highest S×P amplitudes inland, and we would see amplitudes decrease toward the Pacific coast where the incidence angle of ray

Figure 6. Vertical-component recording of three TUCAN stations of Shot 21. We identify the compressional and shear waves of this explosion with the labels P and S. The labels PQ and SQ and small black bars mark the predicted P and S arrival times for the hypothetical earthquake Q (for location, see Fig. 5) with an origin time 25 s after Shot 21. Similarly, we predict the P- and S-wave arrival for the source locations QNW and QSE. D21 and D0 are epicentral distances to Shot 21 and Q. Events labelled a, b and c are discussed in the text. The spectra of these arrivals are shown on the right (solid curve) with 67% confidence levels indicated by dashed lines.
paths are larger. Conversely, the amplitude of a direct shear wave would be largest near the Pacific coast, and decrease farther inland where ray paths arrive with a small (more vertical) incidence angle. As we noted earlier, the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ phase in the data of Shot 21 (Figs 2a and 9) show the opposite variation with distance from the Pacific coast, with high $S\times S$ amplitudes inland, and high $S\times P$ amplitudes near the Pacific coast. The large-scale (0–60 km in Fig. 9) amplitude variation along the refraction line can be explained by a difference in reflection angles for $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ wave paths. The short-wavelength $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ amplitude variations observed along the array may represent variations in small-scale structure along the surface of the slab.

Using the ray trajectories of the slab reflections obtained with the traveltime analysis (Fig. 3), we can correct the reflection amplitudes for geometrical spreading and polarization angle. The ray geometry (Fig. 9b) does not predict large lateral differences in geometrical spreading for $S\times P$ and $S\times S$. On the other hand, the near-vertical approach of the ray paths toward the instruments at the Earth’s surface has great implications for the true amplitude of the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ phases. Due to the near-vertical incidence of the upward traveling wave paths, the orientation of these sensors is much more favourable to incoming $S\times P$ than to the $S\times S$ phase. Although $S\times S$ amplitudes were observed to be only slightly larger than $S\times P$ amplitudes in our data (Fig. 9c), we estimate that the true amplitude of the observed $S\times S$ waves was roughly four times larger than the amplitude of $S\times P$, although this amplitude ratio may have a large uncertainty. The polarization of high-frequency compressional and shear waves can locally deviate from the expected direction of particle motion by as much as 20° due to scattering from km-scale heterogeneities in the crust (Menke & Lerner-Lam 1991). We therefore assume that a larger component of the $S\times P$ arrivals was recorded on the geophones than what we may assume from our ray geometry.

We estimate the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ reflection amplitudes for all arrivals at the slab–mantle interface between distances of 28 and 45 km from the Pacific coast by stacking the frequency-dependent reflection amplitudes in 1-km-wide overlapping bins (Fig. 10). Our data analysis shows that both the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ amplitudes increase strongly with frequency between 10 and 20 Hz. We do not see a variation in this basic character of the spectral amplitude with the angle of incidence at the plate interface, which increases steadily from 18° to 36° in the seaward direction. In the next section, we compare the calculated seismic response of velocity models of the plate interface with the reflection coefficient measured at 34 km (Fig. 10), where the angle of incidence is 28°. We will also verify whether the calculated $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ reflection amplitudes vary much between incidence angles 22° and 32°.

### 4.2 Reflectivity

Our analysis of the $S\times P$, $S\times S$, $P_s$, and $S_g$ phases of Shot 21 suggests a strong increase in the $S–P$ and $S–S$ reflection coefficients with frequency at the plate interface beneath the forearc of central Costa Rica. Assuming a shear wave speed $V_s$ of 4.0 km s$^{-1}$ in the forearc mantle, a 10 Hz wave impinging on the slab surface has a wavelength of approximately 400 m, whereas a 20 Hz wave has a wavelength of just 200 m. To get significantly different reflection amplitudes at these two frequencies, the plate interface must exhibit strong variations in seismic structure over distances that are just a fraction of the corresponding wavelengths. However, we do not anticipate that this reflector is the result of a juxtaposition of two plates with very different physical properties. The seismic velocities of the mantle wedge corner of central Costa Rica and the subducting oceanic crust are quite similar (Ye et al. 1996; Husen et al. 2003;
DeShon & Schwartz 2004; Arroyo et al. 2009), so the reflections must be caused by anomalous structure within the shear zone itself. We therefore investigate whether a thin weak layer, or a series of weak layers, between the two bounding tectonic plates can explain our observations from Shot 21.

Our ray diagram (Fig. 9) shows that we expect the reflectivity of the plate interface to be fairly consistent over a distance of roughly 20 km, whereas we expect fine structure over distances less than 100 m across this boundary. The frequency-dependent reflection and transmission coefficients for plane waves in an 1-D medium with strongly varying properties can be calculated by using propagator matrices (Haskell 1962; Aki & Richards 2002). A simplified model for the shear zone may be composed of one or several thin, homogeneous layers. For each of these layers we specify \( V_p, V_s \) and mass density \( \rho \), where we derive \( \rho \) from \( V_p \) following an empirical relationship (Brocher 2005). As we explained, we assume that the slab–mantle interface lies between a 15% serpentinized mantle wedge and metamorphosed oceanic crust. In all of our calculations, we assume a \( V_p \) of 7.2 km s\(^{-1}\) and a \( V_s \) of 4.0 km s\(^{-1}\) for both half spaces. We will obtain significant reflection coefficients (not much smaller than 1.0) if either \( V_p \) or \( V_s \) inside the shear zone is very different from the seismic velocities of the wall rock. The most realistic scenario is that \( V_s \) is much smaller than 4.0 km s\(^{-1}\), which could be the result of high fluid pressures at the slab–mantle interface (Christensen 1984).

In our first test, we verify whether a single 5-m-thick weak layer at the plate interface can preferentially reflect seismic waves of high frequency. We calculate the \( S\times P \) and \( S\times S \) reflection coefficients for a range of \( V_s \) and frequency at an incidence angle of 28°. Both the \( S\times P \) and \( S\times S \) reflection coefficients increase with frequency and decrease with shear velocity in the shear zone layer, although \( S\times S \) coefficients are consistently larger than \( S\times P \) coefficients (Fig. 11). A similar difference between \( S\times S \) and \( S\times P \) amplitudes was apparent in the data from Shot 21 (Fig. 10). To make a direct comparison between the modelling results and our data from Shot 21, we select the reflection coefficients for \( V_s = 1.0, 2.0 \) and 3.0 km s\(^{-1}\) (horizontal lines in Fig. 11). The single-layer model can qualitatively reproduce the strengthening of reflection coefficients with frequency (Fig. 12a). However, the slopes of the frequency spectra from Shot 21 are too steep to be matched by this model, regardless of the \( V_s \) that is used inside the shear zone. For example, if the shear velocity is as low as 1.0 km s\(^{-1}\) in a 5-m-thick layer, the reflection coefficients for \( S\times P \) and \( S\times S \) at 20 Hz will be 0.17 and 0.48, respectively (Fig. 12a). These reflection coefficients are
large and increase by nearly a factor of 2 between 12 and 20 Hz, but this increase is less than the observed fourfold increase in this frequency band.

In a second test, we amplify the increase of reflection coefficients with frequency by assuming a series of 10 5-m-thick shear zones, spaced 45 m apart. This is a simplified model of a splayed fault system, where the fault strands are approximately parallel to the general trend of the megashear. As in our first test, we probe a range of seismic frequencies and V into the shear zones. The two bounding plates and layers of wall rock within the megashear are again all assumed to have a constant Vp of 7.2 km s\(^{-1}\) and constant Vs of 4.0 km s\(^{-1}\). The calculated reflection coefficients for these 10-layer models show a strong increase in the reflection coefficients with decreasing Vs inside the shear zones and increasing frequency (Fig. 11b). A comparison of these modelling results for Vs = 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0 km s\(^{-1}\) inside the shear zones shows that they all predict an increase of the S–S and S–P reflection coefficients with frequency, but reflection coefficients for Vs = 1.0 km s\(^{-1}\) are much larger than for Vs = 3.0 km s\(^{-1}\). The data fit of the 10-layer model (Fig. 12b) is much better than that of the single-layer model (Fig. 12a), but the choice of the best shear velocity Vs inside the shear zones of the multilayer model may require a closer inspection of the data.

The reflection amplitudes of Shot 21 (Fig. 2b) give an indication of the magnitude of the Vs anomaly represented by shear zones at the slab interface. The amplitudes of the S×S and S×P phases are much larger than those of S×S and P×S, which can in part be explained by relatively small amounts of geometrical spreading for these reflections (Fig. 3). To observe these slab phases, it is also essential that the S×P and S×S reflection coefficients are not an order of magnitude smaller than 1.0. Our modelling shows that the S×S reflection coefficient is 0.9 at 20 Hz for Vs = 1.0 km s\(^{-1}\) (Fig. 12b), which is clearly large enough. In contrast, the same S×S coefficient is only 0.2 if Vs = 2.0 km s\(^{-1}\), and it is smaller than 0.05 if Vs = 3.0 km s\(^{-1}\). A second constraint on Vs inside the fault zones is the relative strength of S×P and S×S amplitudes. If Vs = 1.0 km s\(^{-1}\), we find no clear difference in the data fit of S×P and S×S (Fig. 12b). On the other hand, if Vs = 2.0 or 3.0 km s\(^{-1}\), the S×P coefficients are consistently higher than the best-fitting data curve, whereas the S×S coefficients fall below the scaled amplitude spectrum. These results suggest that models where the shear zones have a Vs of 2.0 or 3.0 km s\(^{-1}\) will underestimate the strength of S×S relative to S×P, so we prefer a Vs as low as 1.0 km s\(^{-1}\) inside the 5-m-thick shear zones.

In a third calculation (Fig. 13), we verify whether changes in the angle of incidence between 22° and 32° have a large impact on the distribution of S×P and S×S reflection coefficients over the same range of frequency and Vs. As in the first example, where the angle is 28°, the reflection coefficients increase steadily with frequency, and S×S is significantly larger than S×P. However, we see a gradual increase in the size of S×P reflection coefficients with angle of incidence, and a coincident decrease in the S×S reflection coefficients. This small trend was not observed in the data (Fig. 10). We cannot see a general trend in the variation of reflection amplitudes with angle of incidence, because these amplitudes vary on a much shorter wavelength (∼2 km), presumably due to variations in structure along the slab surface.

A significant complication in the interpretation of S×P and S×S as slab reflections from Shot 21 is the absence of slab reflections from the incoming compressional (P) wave. A P wave can convert as a compressional (P×P) and a shear (P×S) wave at the slab–mantle interface. Our seismic velocity model of the upper 60 km of the subduction zone (Fig. 3c) would predict P×P and P×S phases from Shot 21 to arrive near the Pacific coast after the Pg phase, and before the S×P phase (Fig. 2a), but neither P×S or P×P were recorded. The absence of a P×P arrival from Shot 21 would seem consistent with the small reflection coefficient of this phase (Fig. 14).
calculated $P \times P$ reflection coefficients are small because the difference in compressional velocity between weak (6.8 km s$^{-1}$) and strong (7.2 km s$^{-1}$) layers in the reflectivity model of the slab–mantle interface is modest (6%). However, due to large ($>100$%) shear wave contrasts in this model of the slab–mantle interface (Fig. 12), the $S \times S$ reflection coefficients (Fig. 14) are similar to, and apparently even larger than, the calculated $S \times P$ coefficients (Fig. 11). The horizontal polarization of the $P \times S$ phase would not be favourable to the vertical-component record of Shot 21 (Fig. 2a), but the complete absence of the converted $P$ wave in the data requires one of the following two explanations:

(1) Shot 21 emitted an unusually strong burst of shear wave energy at angles less than 40° from the vertical, which resulted in strong $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ arrival. In this scenario, the $S_2$ wave from Shot 21 was weaker because it was emitted at shallower (larger) angles (Fig. 3). Although an unusually strong shear wave propagated at small angles from Shot 21, Shots 22, 23 and 24 did not radiate similar high-energy seismic waves toward the slab–mantle interface (Figs 2b–d).

(2) As discussed in Section 3.2, we were not able to find evidence of a second seismic source near the slab–mantle interface $\sim 25$ s after the detonation of Shot 21. Moreover, the variation of amplitude with distance of both the $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ phases along our profile (Fig. 9) is inconsistent with that of a direct $P$ and $S$ waves from a second source in central Costa Rica. On the other hand, a separate seismic source for $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ provides a simple explanation for the absence of $P \times S$ for Shot 21, and other converted phases for Shots 22, 23 and 24.

### 4.3 Effect of attenuation ($Q$)

Our frequency analysis of the interpreted slab reflections $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ neglected the possible effect of intrinsic attenuation and scattering on the waveforms of all phases in the record of Shot 21. If attenuation significantly distorted the amplitude spectra of any of these three phases, our estimated frequency-dependent reflection coefficients (Fig. 12) are affected accordingly. Because intrinsic attenuation preferentially decreases the amplitude of high frequencies, it usually results in seismic amplitude spectra with steeper slopes at larger source–receiver offsets. However, the reflections from the TICOCAVA shots show a remarkable consistency in the shape of amplitude spectra. The spectra of Shots 21 and 22 (Fig. 15) show that the amplitudes may even increase slightly between 15 and 55 km offset. This characteristic may be explained by very low intrinsic attenuation (high $Q$), and trapping of high-frequency scattered waves in the upper crust (Dainty 1981; Davis & Clayton 2007). The consistency of the spectra of Shot 21 at different offsets (Fig. 15) gives us confidence that the $P_\perp$ arrivals can be used to approximate the spectrum of the wave that impinges on the Cocos slab, but we must also consider the effect of attenuation on the $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ phases. At depths larger than a few kilometres, scattering may not be as important due to the high overburden pressure, so the $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ arrivals, which sample the entire crust and outer mantle wedge, may be more affected by intrinsic attenuation.

The best model for the attenuation structure in our study area comes from the TUCAN experiment. Rychert et al. (2008) show that $Q_p$ and $Q_s$ in the arc lithosphere are high, but a substantial low $Q_p$ and $Q_s$ anomaly ($<100$) resides in the mantle wedge beneath the volcanic front at depths between 70 and 100 km. This anomaly is too deep to be traversed by ray paths of the $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ arrivals (Fig. 16). Before we calculate the effect of attenuation on our analysis of Shot 21 using the TUCAN model, we note three reasons why we cannot determine it with much accuracy: (1) The TUCAN data provide constraints on the attenuation structure of the subduction zone $\sim 140$ km northwest of the TICOCAVA active-source seismic profile. We here assume that the attenuation structure does not vary along the strike of the arc, but the work of Rychert et al. (2008) suggests that $Q_p$ and $Q_s$ generally increase to the southeast. (2) The TUCAN data do not constrain attenuation in the top 15 km of the crust (Rychert et al. 2008). Based on the spectra of TICOCAVA shots (Fig. 15), we know that $Q_p$ may be as high as 1000 in the upper crust. (3) Seismic attenuation is often assumed to be frequency dependent, particularly if it is caused by both an elasticity and seismic scattering (Toksoz et al. 1990). Seismic studies show that attenuation may be parameterized in the form $Q = C f^{\alpha}$ both in the crust and in the mantle, but the frequency dependence $\alpha$ is generally larger in the crust ($\sim 0.65$) than in the mantle ($\sim 0.27$) (Stachnik et al. 2004).

With these provisions we use the TUCAN $Q$ model (Rychert et al. 2008) to quantify the effect of seismic attenuation on our estimates of the $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ reflection coefficients (Fig. 12). First we integrate $Q_p$ and $Q_s$, which are both calibrated at 1 Hz, along the ray paths from Shot 21 to obtain the path-averaged attenuation $t_\alpha^p$ (Fig. 15). The calculated $t_\alpha^p$ for the $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ arrivals from Shot...
Figure 11. Calculation of S×P and S×S reflection coefficients for various \( V_s \) inside the faults zones and frequencies between 5 and 25 Hz. All reflection coefficients are contoured (dashed lines) at 0.2. We test two models: (a) a single weak zone of 5 m thickness and (b) a system of 10 5-m-thick fault zones that are spaced 45 m apart. The horizontal lines mark the reflection coefficient curves plotted in Fig. 12.

Figure 12. Variation of S×P and S×S reflection coefficient with frequency for a plane wave impinging on the slab surface at 28°. The reflection coefficients are calculated for (a) a single fault layer and (b) 10 thin fault layers. For each of these two models, we show the S×P and S×S response for the case that the shear wave velocity (\( V_s \)) inside the 5-m-thick fault zones is 1.0, 2.0 or 3.0 km s\(^{-1}\) (dashed curves). The S×P and S×S reflection amplitude measured from the refraction data (solid curve) is scaled to fit the reflection coefficient for each \( V_s \). The roughness in the calculated reflection coefficients for the multilayer model (b) is due to reverberations within these layers. On the right side of the spectral plots we show a cartoon of the S×P and S×S ray paths together with the 1-D model for the plate boundary. The thin black lines in the insets represent the thin layers with low shear-wave velocity.
Figure 13. Calculation of $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ reflection coefficients at two different angles of incidence. Note that the amplitudes vary by only a small amount, but $S \times S$ decreases slightly with incidence angle, whereas $S \times P$ increases slightly with incidence angle.

Figure 14. Calculation of $P \times P$ and $P \times S$ reflection coefficients for an angle of incidence of $28^\circ$ and the same 10-layer model for a slab–mantle interface as in Fig. 12(b).

21 are fairly small (0.069–0.098 s), but not as small as the $t_0^s$ for $P_g$ arrivals (0.010–0.048 s). We expect a decrease in the spectral amplitude of all arrivals of the form $A(f t_0^s) = A_0(f) \exp(-\pi f^{1-\alpha} t_0)$, where $A_0(f)$ is the amplitude spectrum of the seismic arrival without attenuation. To obtain the reflection amplitude diagrams of Fig. 10, we divided the $S \times S$ and $S \times P$ spectra by the spectrum of $P_g$ arrivals with a $t_0^s$ of 0.012 s. This $t_0^s$ suggests a very small decay of $P_g$ amplitude with frequency. The larger $t_0^s$ of $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ imply that these slab reflections lost more of their high-frequency signal. As a result, our estimated reflection coefficients probably underestimated the amplitudes at higher frequencies. As we ignored attenuation, we found an increase in $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ amplitudes of about 7 between 10 and 20 Hz (Fig. 12), but the true increase of these amplitudes with frequency may have been even higher. In Fig. 17, we show to what degree reflection amplitudes for a given $t_0^s$ and frequency may have decayed relative to the amplitude of the same $t_0^s$ at 10 Hz. If we assume that $\alpha = 0.65$, as in many other crustal seismic studies (Stachnik et al. 2004), and $t_0^s = 0.080$, which is roughly the average for our observed $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ arrivals (Fig. 16), we find that the reflection arrival amplitude at 20 Hz is reduced to 0.75, relative to the amplitude at 10 Hz. Therefore, if our assumptions regarding the attenuation structure beneath the TICOCAVA transect are correct, we may have underestimated the increase of the $S \times S$ and $S \times P$ reflection coefficients with frequency between 10 and 20 Hz by roughly 25%. Given the uncertainties in the attenuation structure and other modelling assumptions in our analysis, this result does not alter the basic conclusions of our study. The discrepancy in frequency between seismic refractions and slab reflections from TICOCAVA Shot 21 is a remarkable observation that may be explained by a series of thin layers at the slab–mantle interface with unusually low shear-wave velocities.

5 DISCUSSION

5.1 Interpretation of $S \times P$ and $S \times S$

We have presented an unusual explosion seismology record from Shot 21 in the TICOCAVA study in central Costa Rica, in which we found crustal refractions $P_g$ and $S_g$, with a dominant frequency
Figure 15. Spectra of $P_g$ arrivals of Shots 21 and 22 at three different source-receiver offsets. The comparison shows that the spectrum of $P_g$ does not vary much with recording distance. This observation is consistent with all other shots of the TICOCA study.

of $\sim$10 Hz, followed by two deep seismic phases ($S\times P$ and $S\times S$), which both have a dominant frequency of $\sim$20 Hz. The location of Shot 21 in the backarc suggests that we may have captured wide-angle reflections from the subducting Cocos slab across the forearc of the Costa Rican isthmus. In that case, the anomalous frequency of the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ phases can give us new insight in the fine structure of the Cocos slab surface beneath the forearc mantle. A schematic overview of this analysis, including ray tracing, multitaper analysis, the calculation of spectral ratios and reflectivity modelling is shown in Fig. 18.

Our reflectivity model of the slab–mantle interface (Fig. 12) would also predict a strong $P\times S$ reflection (Fig. 14), which we did not observe in the record of Shot 21. Neither were $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ phases recorded for Shots 22, 23 and 24, the three other explosions in the backarc (Figs 2b–d). This interpretation of $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ would therefore imply that the two phases were converted at the slab interface from an unusually strong downward pulse of shear-wave energy from Shot 21. Alternatively, we consider the possibility that the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ phases were produced by a small earthquake that happened just $\sim$25 s after Shot 21. There are a number of challenges to this second explanation for $S\times P$ and $S\times S$:

(1) The probability of recording an earthquake with an apparent source location and origin time similar to the arrival of a seismic wave from Shot 21 at the Cocos slab is small. Our traveltime constraints show that the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ waves did not come from Costa Rica's seismogenic zone offshore or near the Pacific coast (Fig. 4a). However, the traveltimes alone do not rule out the possibility that these phases originated from a point source $\sim$40 km inland and roughly 52 km deep (Fig. 4b), a location that we named $Q$ (Fig. 5). The subducting oceanic lithosphere exhibits diffuse seismicity at this depth (Husen et al. 2003). A small earthquake located northwest or southeast ($Q_{NW}$ and $Q_{SE}$ in Fig. 5) of our refraction profile would have to be at a shallower depth in the forearc crust to be consistent with the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ traveltimes. The forearc crust in our study area experiences relatively few earthquakes (Protti et al. 1995), so these shallower locations adjacent to our refraction line are less likely as a source for $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ than location $Q$.

(2) Seismic stations throughout central Costa Rica recorded turning waves ($P_g$ and $S_g$) from Shot 21 and small local earthquakes (Figs 6 and 7), but the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ phases were only observed in the forearc. A ray diagram (Fig. 4b) shows that seismic waves from location $Q$ would travel a relatively short distance to seismic stations in the arc and backarc region, but the high-frequency phases were not observed here. An interpretation of the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ as specular reflections from the Cocos slab, with Shot 21 as their source in the backarc, provides an explanation for the absence of these phases farther to the northeast.

(3) The spectra of $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ (Fig. 8) are unlike those of small earthquakes in central Costa Rica (Fig. 7). According to dislocation models, the magnitude of an earthquake and its frequency content both scale with the size of the rupture surface (Aki 1967). The $\sim$7 s delay between the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ phases requires that they travelled separately over a distance of approximately 50–60 km.
Figure 16. Calculated effect of attenuation on Shot 21 $P_g$, $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ phases, and their effect on inferred $S \times P$ and $S \times S$ reflection coefficients. We used the attenuation model for $Q_p$ and $Q_s$ from the TUCAN experiment (Rychert et al. 2008) (see Fig. 5, for location), which is calibrated at 1 Hz, to calculate $t^*$ for (a) $S \times P$, (b) $S \times S$ and (c) $P_g$ arrivals. The TUCAN attenuation model does not cover the top 15 km of the crust. Based on the fact that TICOCAVA $P_g$ spectra show little change with source–receiver offset (Fig. 15), we assume that intrinsic compressional ($Q_p$) and shear ($Q_s$) attenuation in the upper crust may be as high as 1000. As a result, $t^*$ may be as low as 0.012 for $P_g$, whereas the TUCAN $Q$ model predicts a $t^*$ of 0.069–0.080 for $S \times P$ and 0.083–0.098 for $S \times S$.

Figure 17. Variation in seismic amplitudes due to attenuation calculated over a range of frequencies and $t^*$. Because we want to compare different frequencies for a fixed $t^*$, we have normalized all results such that the amplitude at 10 Hz is 1.0. Following previous work on seismic attenuation, we assume that $Q$ is proportional to $f^{\alpha}$, where $\alpha$ is determined empirically. (a) In the TUCAN experiment (Rychert et al. 2008) and other studies of the mantle wedge (Stachnik et al. 2004), $Q$ appears to increase slowly with frequency ($\alpha = 0.27$), which leads to a steady decrease of seismic amplitudes with frequency. (b) We assume that the TUCAN model (Rychert et al. 2008) (Fig. 15) makes an accurate prediction of $Q$ around 10 Hz, because the spectral slopes $\alpha$ were measured between 1 and 20 Hz. However, many seismic attenuation studies assume a higher $\alpha$ to describe the frequency dependence of $Q$ in the crust (Stachnik et al. 2004; Atkinson 1995; Li et al. 2006). We therefore parameterize $Q$ with $\alpha = 0.65$ for frequencies between 10 and 25 Hz. The result is a slower decay of seismic amplitudes with frequency than in (a).
The amplitude of these phases (Fig. 2) is nonetheless high, so they must have originated from an event of significant size. On the other hand, the ~20 Hz dominant frequency, which in this context could be interpreted as the second corner frequency of an earthquake, requires that the rupture had a magnitude $M_w < 0$ (Aki 1967). Such a low magnitude would not be detectable. It is therefore difficult to reconcile the strong amplitude of the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ phases with their high dominant frequency if the source of this event was an earthquake or similar dislocation event, as opposed to an explosive or implosive event.

(4) The variation in amplitudes of the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ phases with distance along our vertical-component instrument array (Fig. 2a) is difficult to reconcile with a point source at large depth in central Costa Rica. The $S\times P$ amplitudes are largest near the Pacific coast whereas $S\times S$ are largest inland (Fig. 9a), which is opposite of what we would expect if the observed lateral amplitude variations track the vertical component of direct $P$ and $S$ waves from a point source. Alternatively, if $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ are wide-angle reflections, the wider reflection angle of the $S\times P$ wave paths would explain the lateral offset of these two phases at the surface (Fig. 9b). The good correlation of $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ amplitude variations on the slab surface on length scales of a few kilometres suggests that they represent seismic structure at the plate interface (Fig. 9c).

We have not explored the nature of a possible second source that could have produced the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ phases during Shot 21. As we mentioned, the high-frequency character of these arrivals suggests that they were not produced by a fault dislocation (Aki 1967). A volcanic origin must also be ruled out, because the traveltimes constrain the origin of such an event to the forearc of Costa Rica, roughly 50 km southwest of the volcanic arc (Fig. 5). If the $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ phases were indeed produced by a small earthquake in central Costa Rica, a key question is whether its mechanism is related to subduction of the Cocos slab. More observations of such high-frequency seismic waves would be necessary to place this occurrence in a tectonic context.

5.2 Implications for slab interface structure

The models that we developed to explain $S\times P$ and $S\times S$ as high-frequency slab reflections of Shot 21 suggest that the shear-wave velocity at the plate interface is locally quite low (1–2 km s$^{-1}$), with low shear-strength material accumulated into banded layers with a thickness of roughly 5 m, spaced ~45 m apart. This modelling result does not depend strongly on the angle of incidence (Fig. 13), and it is also robust with respect to variations in the number of weak layers in the shear zone, or the distance between them. Each of the thin faults within a complex shear zone will preferentially reflect the higher frequencies of an incoming shear wave (Fig. 11a), and the aggregate effect for the plate boundary can be a reflection coefficient that is strongly dependent on frequency (Fig. 11b). We consider 2-D and 3-D models of the plate interface outside the scope of this paper, but small variations in the dip of the individual fault strands should not have a large effect on the cumulative reflection coefficients.

The suggested shear velocity of ~2 km s$^{-1}$ inside these fault zones is too low for known crustal or mantle rock properties at hydrostatic pressures (Hacker et al. 2003). On the other hand, if fluid pressure in the pore space at the plate interface approaches the lithostatic pressure, $V_s$ will decrease much more rapidly than $V_p$ (Christensen 1984). We envision that fluid release from the subducting slab, combined with low permeability, are responsible for a $V_p/V_s$ ratio as high as 6 at the slab–mantle interface in Central Costa Rica. Offshore Costa Rica, sediment compaction at the base of the accretionary wedge similarly leads to a very high $V_p/V_s$ ratio of 2.8 to 5.2 (Schnabel et al. 2007). These results suggest that the Cocos Plate interface is an important conduit for fluids that are released from the subducting slab. Limited permeability in the adjacent wall rock (Mibe et al. 1999) can lead to overpressures near the plate interface (Wada et al. 2008), which would explain the high $V_p/V_s$ ratios (Christensen 1984).

Our model for the slab–mantle interface (Fig. 12b) could represent a ~500-m-wide system of roughly 5 m thick, anastomosing fault zones under high pore pressure. The presence of such a fault system is consistent with current interpretations of strain localization in a brittle–ductile transition (Mancktelow & Pennacchioni 2005). New faults can form as hydrofractures in the upper or lower plate near the subduction thrust, after which they develop into broader ductile shear zones with increasing strain and fluid–rock interaction. Such a fault system would form a mixing zone between the subducting oceanic lithosphere and the overlying mantle wedge (Bebout 2007). At a tectonically eroding margin such as in Costa Rica (Vannucchi et al. 2003), high fluid pressures at the plate interface may weaken and disintegrate rocks from the forearc mantle, a mechanism that von Huene et al. (2004) already proposed for the shallower subduction zone. The ability of this dynamic system of shear zones to maintain weak tectonic coupling between the two plates, even in the presence of large structural heterogeneities on the slab surface, may be required to sustain subduction over tens of millions of years (De Franco et al. 2008).

The depths of 35–55 km over which we infer high observed high seismic reflection coefficients coincides well with the depth range over which we anticipate a large release of aqueous fluids due to the metamorphic transition from blueschist to eclogite facies in subducting oceanic crust of the Cocos Plate (Husen et al. 2008).
of dehydration reactions in the subducting oceanic lithosphere, and it lies down-dip of the seismogenic zone offshore central Costa Rica. These correlations suggest a strong relationship between shearing and deformation between the two plates, the availability of water from dehydration reactions in the oceanic lithosphere, and the rheology of the shear zone.

5.3 Implications for seismogenesis

The portion of the Cocos slab surface beneath Costa Rica where we infer a zone of high $V_p/V_s$ ratios covers distances of 25–40 km from the Pacific coast. The presence of fluids at the plate boundary would reduce the amount of tectonic coupling, and we assume that present-day plate motion here is accommodated by steady-state creep and transient slip on slab-parallel shear zones under high fluid pressure (Shelly et al. 2006; Liu & Rice 2007). We may have observed the anomalously weak plate interface, manifest as anomalous seismic reflectivity, at depths as shallow as 35 km. This depth is roughly the same as the lower limit of the seismogenic zone in this region (DeShon et al. 2003).

Perhaps the most applicable record of the seismogenic properties of the subduction zone in central Costa Rica comes from the seismicity before and after the 1990 earthquake in the Gulf of Nicoya (Protti et al. 1995), since this event ruptured an asperity just up-dip of our study area (Fig. 1). The distribution of foreshocks and aftershocks from this large earthquake shows a history of loading back toward the accretionary prism (Zhu et al. 2009), where it may be released through fractures and cold seeps (Klaucke et al. 2008; Ranero et al. 2008). Chemically bound water stored deeper in the subducting lithosphere may be insulated from the hotter mantle wedge during subduction (Peacock et al. 2005). This portion of the H$_2$O budget will be released at greater depths, where it can contribute to arc magmatism (Schmidt & Poli 1998; Rüpke et al. 2004), or it may be recycled into the lower mantle (Hacker 2008).

6 CONCLUSIONS

During an explosion seismology study in central Costa Rica, we recorded deep seismic phases that we interpret to be reflections from the subducting Cocos Plate beneath the forearc mantle. The frequency of these reflections is very high (~20 Hz) compared to the average frequency of turning waves in this experiment (~10 Hz). We explain this discrepancy with a seismic velocity model for the plate boundary that preferentially reflects the higher seismic frequencies. This model consists of 10 5-m-thick layers with a shear wave velocity $V_s$ as low as 1.0 km s$^{-1}$. These thin layers may represent a system of fault zones under high pore pressure. The 35–55 km depth interval in which we inferred this reflective portion of the plate boundary coincides with the likely depth range of dehydration reactions in the subducting oceanic lithosphere, and it lies down-dip of the seismogenic zone offshore central Costa Rica. These correlations suggest a strong relationship between shearing and deformation between the two plates, the availability of water from dehydration reactions in the oceanic lithosphere, and the rheology of the shear zone.
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