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#### Abstract

Regional centroid moment tensor solutions have been determined for seven moderatesized earthquakes in eastern Canada during 2017. Two additional earthquakes were also evaluated but their solutions did not meet the minimum quality standards for acceptance. The moment tensor inversion method is used to determine the focal mechanism, depth and seismic moment of the earthquakes. These parameters, in turn, provide information about the seismotectonic environment in which the earthquakes occur and may help improve seismic hazard estimates. The purpose of this report is not to provide an in-depth analysis of any specific earthquake but to catalog the solutions and data used to obtain them to make them available for future research projects.


## Introduction

Earthquake focal mechanisms provide information about the orientation and direction of motion on the fault that generated the earthquake. A suite of focal mechanisms from a particular region can be used to improve the understanding of the seismotectonic environment in which the earthquakes occur. Prior to the early 2000s, focal mechanisms for eastern Canada were most often determined by the polarity distribution of first motions. This method is time-consuming and requires a large number of clear readings from a wide variety of azimuths, which makes it difficult to obtain unique solutions for smaller earthquakes or those occurring in regions, such as the offshore, where the station density is low and azimuthal coverage poor. Moment tensor inversion, which makes use of a longer duration of the waveform, is a more robust and more objective method to determine focal mechanisms. Moment tensor solutions also provide the hypocentral depth, which has implications for seismic hazard as well as information about regional seismotectonics, and seismic moment (and moment magnitude), which is generally considered the best measure of earthquake magnitude. However, moment tensors use relatively long-period data and they, too, do not always result in good-quality solutions for smaller earthquakes, which do not always have a good signal to noise $(\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{N})$ ratio at the frequencies of interest, roughly $0.06-0.03 \mathrm{~Hz}$. Having said that, since roughly 2005-2006 when the regional centroid moment tensor (RCMT) inversion method (Kao et al., 1998) was implemented in eastern Canada there has been an increase in the percentage of magnitude 4+ earthquakes for which focal mechanisms could be determined. The impact is most notable in the north and offshore regions where it was difficult to obtain focal mechanism solutions based on first motions for all but the few earthquakes large enough to be well-recorded at teleseismic distances. For example, Bent et al (2003) were able to obtain focal mechanisms for only four of fourteen events evaluated in the region extending from the Labrador Sea to northern Baffin Bay-Baffin Island during the period 1994-2000. From 2011 through 2016 twenty-seven solutions were obtained via the RCMT inversion method for thirty-six events evaluated in the same region (Bent, 2015a.b, 2017, 2018) and another six out of eight in the Arctic for 2017.

For seismological purposes eastern Canada is roughly defined as east of $100^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$ longitude. Some judgment calls in whether to treat earthquakes as western or eastern, however, are made in the case of the extreme north where lines of longitude are close together and where the $\mathrm{Mn}_{\mathrm{N}}$ or Nuttli magnitude scale (Nuttli, 1973) used for eastern Canada may be used as the primary or database magnitude for earthquakes west of this line. As a general practice earthquakes falling within the territory of the United States or Greenland are not included although exceptions may be made in the case of any event close to the border that was widely felt in Canada. In some cases the closest seismograph station to the earthquake may be in the United States or Greenland even if the earthquake is in Canada. With respect to offshore earthquakes there are no strict criteria used to determine which earthquakes to study but most earthquakes occurring close enough to Canadian territory to have been recorded by a reasonable number of seismograph stations at distances between 150 and 1500 km will be evaluated.

RCMT solutions for all of Canada through the end of 2010 were summarized by Kao et al. (2012) and eastern solutions for 2011-2016 were catalogued Bent (2015a,b, 2017, 2018). In western Canada, RCMT solutions have been routinely determined since 2001 although
there are solutions for some earthquakes dating back to 1995 (for example, Ristau, 2004). In eastern Canada, RCMT was adopted for routine use in approximately 2005 although there are solutions for some events that occurred in the earlier 2000s. The current paper catalogs the RCMT solutions for eastern Canada in 2017. Solutions that met the minimum quality criteria, discussed in the RCMT Inversion Method section, were obtained for seven out of nine earthquakes evaluated. This report is the fifth in a series of RCMT summaries for eastern Canada intended to be produced on an annual basis although other options for the dissemination of RCMT solutions, such as the creation of an online database are being explored. It should be noted that although this report focuses on eastern Canada, the RCMT method is also routinely applied to earthquakes in western Canada. (for example, Ristau, 2004; Ristau et al., 2007; Kao et al., 2012)

## Regional Centroid Moment Tensor Inversion Method

Moment tensor inversion is one method by which earthquake focal mechanisms, or faulting parameters may be determined. It also provides additional source parameters including depth, seismic moment and source time function as well as a measure of any non-double couple component of the source. Note that source time function is generally not well resolved for small and moderate earthquakes because it is small relative to the frequencies modeled. For all earthquakes summarized in this paper a 1.0/1.0/1.0 (sec) time function is assumed. In the case of very large earthquakes, the default value may not be appropriate and a different value may be used. Because the RCMT method is based on fitting a relatively long portion of the recorded waveform and provides a quantitative measure of the fit, the RCMT is advantageous over other methods of focal mechanism determination, such as first motions which are based on a very small portion of the waveform, which can be difficult to accurately determine for small earthquakes or emergent arrivals or arrivals within the noise and which require a larger number of good quality recordings for a unique solution to be determined. In theory, an RCMT solution can be obtained from a single station. However, it is preferable to have more to ensure that the preferred solution is the one that provides the best fit for a range of azimuths and distances.

The RCMT method used to analyze Canadian earthquakes is that of Kao et al (1998). More details about the method may be found in that paper and an in-depth discussion of its implementation in Canada is covered by Kao et al (2012). Both papers also include references which provide supplementary background information on centroid moment tensors. The discussion below is focused on topics specifically related to eastern Canada.

In eastern Canada the RCMT inversion is run for all earthquakes of magnitude 4.0 or greater. Note that the Nuttli $(\mathrm{M} N)$ magnitude is the most commonly used magnitude scale in eastern Canada but that Mı may be listed as the magnitude for offshore earthquakes for which the Lg wave is either not observed or is strongly attenuated. This minimum threshold is used only for identifying events large enough for the RCMT method to be a viable analysis tool. The selection is based on the value and not the magnitude type.

Moment magnitude, Mw , for eastern Canada is, on average, about 0.5 magnitude units smaller than $\mathrm{Mn}_{\mathrm{N}}$ (Bent, 2011). Good quality solutions cannot always be obtained for the smallest earthquakes because the signal to noise ratio is generally poor at the long periods
modeled. The default frequency range is $0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ but the inversion code will modify the range if there is sufficient long period energy in the data in other frequency bands, sufficient energy being roughly defined as a signal to noise ratio $(\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{N})$ of 2.0 or greater.

Data from three-component broadband (both bh* or 40 Hz and hh* or 100 Hz ) stations are used in the inversion. Standard practice is to use only stations from which data are received in real time by Natural Resources Canada (CNWA, 2019). Data from additional stations may be added if an earthquake is of particular interest and if additional data are likely to improve the quality of the solution. For example, data from Greenland often help constrain the solutions for earthquakes occurring in Baffin Bay. Similarly, data from New England improve coverage for the southeastern offshore regions.

Two velocity models are used- one for southeastern Canada and one for the north. Essentially these are the same model, the only difference being the depth of the Moho discontinuity, which is at 40 km for the south and 35 km for the north. These are referred to as EM40 and EM35 models respectively. With the exception of the modified Moho depth the velocity model is that of Brune and Dorman (1963). The boundary between north and south is at approximately $60^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$. If an earthquake occurs close to the boundary the inversion may be run with both models and the best solution selected. At some future point a suite of regional models may be implemented if there is evidence that this would improve the quality of the solutions. The current model is based on shield paths but it should be noted that even for those earthquakes that occur in the Appalachians most of the paths modeled are sufficiently long that there will be a strong shield component. This statement may not be true for all offshore events. The northern model is shown in Table 1. For the southeast, the thickness of layer 3 is increased to 24 km . The lowermost layer is a mantle half-space. It should be noted that the southern model was used for the suite of earthquakes that occurred in Barrow Strait as it was found to provide a better fit to the data at larger distances. The choice of model is discussed in further detail by Bent et al. (2018).

Table 1
Velocity Model for Northeastern Canada (EM35)

| Layer | Thickness (km) | Vp (km/s) | Vs (km/s) | Density ( $\left.\mathbf{g} / \mathbf{c m}^{\mathbf{3}}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 6 | 5.64 | 3.47 | 2.70 |
| 2 | 10 | 6.15 | 3.64 | 2.80 |
| 3 | 19 | 6.60 | 3.85 | 2.85 |
| 4 | - | 8.10 | 4.72 | 3.30 |

Solutions are rated using the quality classification table in Kao et al. (2001). The classification consists of a character value from $A$ through $F$ based on the average misfit and a numerical value from 1 through 4 based on the compensated linear vector dipole (CLVD) component. Solutions must have a minimum quality of C4 to be accepted. Any user of these solutions should bear in mind that the quality classification is strictly based on the fit of the solutions to the data modeled and does not consider the number of components modeled. Solutions based on small numbers of modeled waveforms, roughly defined as three or fewer stations, should be used with some caution even if the fit is
reasonably good.

## Regional Centroid Moment Tensor Solutions for Eastern Canada

Nine earthquakes were evaluated (Figure 1 and Tables 2 and 3). Solutions of quality C4 or better were obtained for the seven events in Table 2. The two events in Table 3 are those for which the solution quality was not acceptable. While the details of why a solution is not acceptable may vary from event to event, it is most often because the average misfit was in the D-F range and did not show an appreciable improvement for any combination of stations tested even if the data set was reduced to only the few best stations. A misfit value is not included in Table 3 because it is not necessarily representative of the best possible solution but would merely indicate the quality of the best solution obtained prior to deciding that further work on the event would be unlikely to produce a solution that met the quality criteria. For reference, the boundary between $C$ (acceptable) and $D$ (not acceptable) is an average misfit of 0.7 .

Table 2
Earthquakes Evaluated: Solutions Obtained

| Date | Time (UT) | Lat $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathbf{N}\right)$ | Lon $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathbf{W}\right)$ | Mag $\left(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{w}}\right)$ | Location/Region | Quality |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2017-01-08$ | $23: 47: 11$ | 74.27 | 92.13 | 5.9 | Barrow Strait, NU | B2 |
| $2017-01-09$ | $17: 55: 35$ | 74.37 | 92.15 | 5.0 | Barrow Strait, NU | B4 |
| $2017-01-09$ | $19: 43: 46$ | 74.32 | 92.24 | 4.1 | Barrow Strait, NU | C2 |
| $2017-01-20$ | $01: 26: 15$ | 78.18 | 106.60 | 4.7 | 97 km SE of Isachsen, NU | C2 |
| $2017-02-10$ | $15: 01: 49$ | 74.29 | 92.17 | 5.3 | Barrow Strait, NU | B4 |
| $2017-05-22$ | $01: 35: 52$ | 75.00 | 72.75 | 4.0 | Baffin Bay, NU | C1 |
| $2017-12-28$ | $08: 51: 12$ | 47.18 | 76.29 | 3.7 | 83 km NW of Ferme-Neuve, QC | C2 |

Table 3
Earthquakes Evaluated: No Acceptable Solution Obtained

| Date | Time (UT) | Lat ( $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathbf{N}\right)$ | Lon ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$ ) | Mag | Location/Region | Quality |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2017-10-15 | $02: 09: 32$ | 65.40 | 91.29 | $4.1\left(\mathrm{ML}^{2}\right)$ | 231 km NNW of Chesterfield Inlet, NU | NA |
| 2017-11-26 | $11: 42: 11$ | 60.80 | 58.01 | $4.1(\mathrm{ML})$ | 376 km E of Resolution Island, NU | NA |



Figure 1: Locations and quality of solutions for all earthquakes evaluated in this study. Symbol size is scaled to $M w$ if a solution of $A-C$ quality was obtained and to the magnitude type listed in Table 3 otherwise. Note that no A quality events were obtained for 2017. Also note that four earthquakes (the Barrow Strait sequence) plot at essentially the same point on this map; they have been plotted with the largest at the back of the layer and smallest in front. The events are labeled by date of occurrence. Four earthquakes plot almost at the same point. They are indicated by the "*". From outermost to innermost circle they are 20170108, 20170210, 20170109.1755 and 20170901.1943.

The solutions for the earthquakes listed in Table 2 are presented below (Figures 2a-2g) in chronological order without additional comments. Each solution is presented as a figure with
the format discussed in the next few paragraphs. The solution is summarized in the upper left corner. The origin times and epicenters are taken from the Canadian National Earthquake Database (CNED, 2019). All other parameters are derived from the RCMT inversion. Only the best fitting double couple solution is summarized on the figure. The complete moment tensor solutions may be found in the Appendix. The Appendix also includes the moment tensor solutions for the range of depths modeled.

The map in each plot shows the best fitting focal mechanism (lower hemisphere projection) from the inversion. The solid lines show the best fitting double couple solution and the shaded and white regions show the full moment tensor solution with the shaded regions representing compressional regions and white dilations. The P - and T -axes are indicated by gray and white dots, respectively.

To the right of the map the average misfit is plotted as a function of depth. The best fitting focal mechanism for each depth is plotted and the size of the symbol is scaled to the moment magnitude for that particular solution. Lack of variation in symbol size, as is most often the case, indicates that the calculated seismic moment is not heavily dependent on depth. A flat misfit plot indicates that the depth is not well constrained (for example, 20170109 17:55, Figure 2b) whereas a sharp dip in the misfit function is an indication of a well-constrained depth (for example, 20170522, Figure 2f). In most cases the focal mechanism is relatively independent of depth but there are solutions for which this is not the case. If the best fitting mechanism has a significantly lower misfit than one indicating a different style and/or orientation of faulting it is likely correct (for example, 20171228, Figure 2g). If two significantly different mechanisms have similar misfits (for example, 20141003, Figure $2 f$ in Bent, 2015) then both mechanisms need to be considered as viable options or additional techniques applied to the data to determine which solution is better.

In the bottom section, the waveforms are shown with the solid lines representing the data and the dashed lines the synthetic seismograms. For each station the waveforms from left to right are the vertical, radial and tangential components respectively. The misfit is indicated below the waveforms. The horizontal (time) and vertical (amplitude) scales are indicated to the right. The waveforms for each station are scaled to the largest amplitude at that station. Components not plotted were not used in the inversion. The most common reason for rejecting a component is a poor signal to noise ratio at the periods modeled. There could be other reasons, however, such as lack of data from one component. Note that the RCMT inversion program allows for more complicated weighting schemes but practice is to use either 1.0 (full weight) or 0.0 (not used). This provides a stable comparative base among RCMT catalog solutions over the years. There were other weighting schemes proposed in RCMT studies in other regions, such as given higher weighting for stations with good $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{N}$ or lower weight for a group of stations in the same area. Given the station distribution in eastern and northern Canada there have been no obvious benefits derived from using other weighting schemes. The text to the left of each set of waveforms provides information about the station. The first line is the station code and velocity model used. The second line indicates the azimuth of the station with respect to the epicenter. The third line gives the epicentral distance, the fourth the frequency range modeled and the fifth the average misfit for the station.

2017/01/08 23:47:11.1 (UT) Epicenter: 74.27 -92.24 Depth: 33 km Mw: 5.92
Mo: 9.547e+17 Nt-m
Best double couple solutions FP1: 314.1135 .31105 .91
FP2: 114.8656 .2379 .02
Iso.= -0.6 \% CLVD= 29.3 \% Misfit= 0.390


V-comp


R-comp


CLRN (EM40) 106.29 deg . 896.64 km $0.01-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.676 EUNU (EM40) 9.80 deg . 660.52 km $0.01-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.553 ILON (EM40) 141.41 deg . 654.33 km $0.01-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.121
KUKN (EM40)
240.25 deg. 1085.05 km $0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.101

T-comp



Source Time Function: 1.001 .001 .00
Figure 2a: RCMT solution for event 2017-01-08. See text for explanation of figure.

2017/01/09 17:55:35.4 (UT)
Epicenter: 74.33-92.25
Depth: $\mathbf{2 1}$ km Mw: 4.95
Mo: 3.297e+16 Nt-m
Best double couple solutions
FP1: 335.5425 .53110 .14
FP2: 133.4266 .1380 .66
Iso.= -0.6 \% CLVD= 44.4 \% Misfit= 0.393




Source Time Function: 1.001 .001 .00

Figure 2b. RCMT solution for event 2017-01-09 at 17:55. See text for explanation of figure.

2017/01/09 19:43:46.1 (UT) Epicenter: 74.32-92.24 Depth: $\mathbf{3 0} \mathbf{~ k m ~ M w : ~} 4.09$
Mo: $1.680 \mathrm{e}+15 \mathrm{Nt}-\mathrm{m}$
Best double couple solutions
FP1: 264.8764 .59 -3.21
FP2: 356.25 87.10-154.55
Iso.= -0.0 \% CLVD= 11.3 \% Misfit= 0.559


EUNU (EM40)
9.88 deg.
654.88 km
$0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$
Misfit: 0.777
ILON (EM40)
141.72 deg.
658.79 km
$0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$
Misfit: 0.816
RES (EM40)
298.51 deg.
89.10 km
$0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$
Misfit: 0.086


R-comp
T-comp




Source Time Function: 1.001 .001 .00
Figure 2c: RCMT solution for event 2017-01-09 at 19:43. See text for explanation of figure.

2017/01/20 01:26:15.5 (UT) Epicenter: 78.18-106.60 Depth: 9 km Mw: 4.71 Mo: $1.431 \mathrm{e}+16 \mathrm{Nt}-\mathrm{m}$ Best double couple solutions FP1: 32.8751 .30160 .11

FP2: 135.6274 .6040 .43
Iso.= 4.6 \% CLVD= 10.9 \% Misfit= 0.550


A36M (EM35)
227.10 deg.

| 866.25 km |
| :--- |
| $0.01-0.04 \mathrm{~Hz}$ |
| Misfit: 0.657 |

EUNU (EM35)

Source Time Function: 1.001 .001 .00

Figure 2d: RCMT solution for event 2017-01-20. See text for explanation of figure.

2017/02/10 15:01:49.9 (UT)
Epicenter: 74.31-92.27
Depth: 16 km Mw: 5.27
Mo: 9.830e+16 Nt-m
Best double couple solutions
FP1: 345.5945 .53152 .88
FP2: 95.3371 .0247 .80
Iso.= -0.0 \% CLVD= 60.4 \% Misfit= 0.406



EUNU (EM40) 9.92 deg.
656.09 km $0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.382
ILON (EM40) 141.56 deg. 658.61 km $0.01-0.04 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.662 RESN (EM40) 299.38 deg. 88.71 km $0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.174

V-comp


R-comp

0.382

0.635
T-comp


Source Time Function: 1.001 .001 .00
Figure 2e: RCMT solution for event 2017-02-10. See text for explanation of figure.

2017/05/22 01:35:52.2 (UT)
Epicenter: 75.00-72.75
Depth: 10 km Mw: 4.60
Mo: 9.718e+15 Nt-m
Best double couple solutions
FP1: 303.3634 .28102 .39
FP2: 108.4756 .6381 .68
Iso.= -8.8 \% CLVD= 32.6 \% Misfit= 0.468



Source Time Function: 1.001 .001 .00
Figure 2f: RCMT solution for event 2017-05-22. See text for explanation of figure.

2017/12/28 08:51:12.4 (UT)
Epicenter: 47.17-76.31
Depth: 8 km Mw: 3.71
Mo: $4.538 \mathrm{e}+14 \mathrm{Nt}-\mathrm{m}$
Best double couple solutions
FP1: 179.3446 .6450 .99
FP2: 49.0555 .60123 .68
Iso. $=13.5$ \% CLVD= 15.0 \%
Misfit= $\mathbf{0 . 6 7 2}$

BCLQ (EM40)
92.06 deg. 391.17 km $0.02-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.626
DPQ (EM40)
100.10 deg. 274.41 km $0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.778
GAC (EM40)
158.26 deg. 174.90 km $0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.738
GRQ (EM40) 151.03 deg. 71.27 km $0.01-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.703
KGNO (EM40) 182.58 deg. 327.14 km $0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.648
KILO (EM40)
301.30 deg . 295.22 km $0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.747
KIPQ (EM40) 259.70 deg. 213.15 km $0.01-0.05 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.414
MNTQ (EM40) 130.89 deg . 277.71 km $0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.553
ORIO (EM40) 161.85 deg . 200.43 km $0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.652


0.414

0.436

0.677



R-comp
 0.831




T-comp

$8.79 \mathrm{e}-05 \mathrm{~mm}$

50 sec


Source Time Function: 1.001 .001 .00

2017/12/28 08:51:12.4 (UT)
Epicenter: 47.17-76.31
Depth: $\mathbf{8} \mathbf{~ k m ~ M w : ~} 3.71$
Mo: $\mathbf{4 . 5 3 8} \mathrm{e}+14 \mathrm{Nt}-\mathrm{m}$
Best double couple solutions
FP1: 179.3446 .6450 .99
FP2: 49.0555 .60123 .68
Iso. $=13.5$ \% CLVD= 15.0 \%
Misfit= $\mathbf{0 . 6 7 2}$

OTT (EM40) 166.74 deg 202.36 km $0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.621
PLVO (EM40)
194.33 deg. 243.84 km
$0.02-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$
Misfit: 0.764
VABQ (EM40)
158.78 deg.
150.35 km
$0.01-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$
Misfit: 0.861
WBO (EM40) 161.26 deg. 253.74 km $0.03-0.06 \mathrm{~Hz}$ Misfit: 0.623




0.334

R-comp

0.811



T-comp

$1.70 \mathrm{e}-04 \mathrm{~mm}$

$2.52 \mathrm{e}-04 \mathrm{~mm}$



Source Time Function: 1.001 .001 .00

Figure 2g: RCMT solution for event 2017-12-28. See text for explanation of figure. Note that the solution for this event is plotted in two parts as the plotting package allows a maximum of nine stations per page.

## Related Studies

The 8 January $2017 \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{w}} 5.9$ earthquake that occurred in Barrow Strait was one of the largest earthquakes to occur in eastern Canada during the past 50 years. It and its largest aftershocks as well as the 20 January 2017 earthquake southeast of Isachsen were studied by Bent et al (2018) in greater depth than presented in the current paper. In particular, analysis of teleseismic depth phases confirmed that the events were relatively deep, 33-35 km for the mainshock. Preliminary analysis of the spectra suggested that the mainshock was a high stress drop ( $\sim 90 \mathrm{MPa}$ ) event although many of the aftershocks appear to have been lower stress drop events. Bent et al. (2018) noted that the occurrence of magnitude 5 and greater earthquakes in the north tends to coincide with periods of enhanced seismicity that is not attributable to the occurrence of aftershocks. More research is needed before it can be established whether the link is cause, effect or coincidence. A second paper on the Barrow Strait sequence by Motazedian and Ma (2018) obtained similar results in terms of focal mechanism and depth.

## Summary

Regional moment tensor solutions have been determined for seven moderate earthquakes occurring in northeastern Canada during 2017. Two other events were evaluated but good quality solutions were not obtained. The moment tensor solutions include focal mechanisms, depths and moment magnitudes which provide input into further studies regarding seismic hazard, regional seismotectonics or stress field. These results are particularly valuable in regions, such as the north and offshore, where there have been considerable difficulties in obtaining these parameters through other methods. This paper is the fifth in what is intended to be a series of annual updates. In addition, other methods for disseminating the solutions are being explored, such as an online database.
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## Appendix

## Complete Moment Tensor Solution for Earthquakes in Table 2

For each event listed in Table 2 the full moment tensor from the RCMT inversion is given. The format is described below (written communication from Kao, 2005). The earthquakes are identified by date of occurrence. In the case of two events on the same day, the origin time (hh:mm) is added for clarification.

```
Line 1-25: depth, E_nosh, E_sh, Mxx, Myy, Mzz, Mxy, Mxz, Myz
    (E_nosh: average misfit without any shift of synthetic seismograms)
    (E_sh: average misfit with shift of synthetic seismograms)
< repeat for each depth >
Line 26: station(i), ishift(i), E(i), Ez(i), Er(i), Et(i)
    (station: station name)
    (ishift: number of shifted points,
            original position + ishift = final position)
            (E: average misfit for this station at the best-fitting depth)
            (Ez: Z-comp misfit for this station at the best-fitting depth)
            (Er: R-comp misfit for this station at the best-fitting depth)
            (Et: T-comp misfit for this station at the best-fitting depth)
< repeat for each station >
```

Author's note: the misfit for each component is given for all stations used regardless of whether the component was used in the inversion; the average misfit, both for each station and overall, is calculated only from the components that were used.

| 11 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | $0.10000 \mathrm{E}+01$ | $-0.10000 \mathrm{E}+01$ | $0.00000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.00000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.00000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.00000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | 0.6471 | 0.4778 | -47706.68442 | -13047.75599 | 99305.92252 | -30917.39414 | 26127.31165 | -537.69639 |
| 13 | 0.6300 | 0.4656 | -48387.17894 | -15886.08658 | 93787.95568 | -31063.85594 | 24394.27713 | -739.97542 |
| 14 | 0.6142 | 0.4559 | -47633.99231 | -17005.81351 | 87715.16681 | -30407.20867 | 24984.95905 | 681.88636 |
| 15 | 0.6019 | 0.4453 | -45838.29811 | -16997.78635 | 80970.04903 | -30266.46855 | 25064.60074 | 1456.60144 |
| 16 | 0.5921 | 0.4429 | -50388.56762 | -20865.71807 | 88811.46395 | -31167.73031 | 28194.72020 | 1855.10675 |
| 17 | 0.5823 | 0.4332 | -49252.76225 | -20365.94693 | 83459.90430 | -31923.35558 | 29372.34991 | 2966.17038 |
| 18 | 0.5571 | 0.4254 | -55786.27052 | -23148.98122 | 91471.45597 | -36664.80084 | 32908.44201 | 3885.05823 |
| 19 | 0.5442 | 0.4179 | -55406.25138 | -22747.63493 | 88186.93639 | -37874.12142 | 32233.03208 | 3787.00557 |
| 20 | 0.5361 | 0.4132 | -54369.42202 | -21930.52734 | 85084.80640 | -38923.98836 | 33348.60595 | 4862.49002 |
| 21 | 0.5229 | 0.4055 | -54357.26861 | -21520.08572 | 83597.04304 | -39424.49051 | 33178.29522 | 5160.59402 |
| 22 | 0.5204 | 0.4025 | -53643.89235 | -20972.26138 | 81419.14590 | -40465.70094 | 33899.91855 | 6414.44266 |
| 23 | 0.5090 | 0.3985 | -54152.68360 | -20778.15313 | 80657.82140 | -41054.26061 | 33780.50953 | 6652.89214 |
| 24 | 0.5077 | 0.3981 | -51869.52329 | -19517.67752 | 75947.57868 | -40535.23014 | 33425.73073 | 7130.95109 |
| 25 | 0.5001 | 0.3965 | -52353.03287 | -19300.47426 | 75261.39677 | -40838.05999 | 33683.59188 | 7374.49350 |
| 26 | 0.4915 | 0.3949 | -53333.45213 | -19112.39810 | 75020.37816 | -42445.45463 | 33289.39160 | 7017.58492 |
| 27 | 0.4874 | 0.3974 | -53739.28688 | -19009.82791 | 74515.24026 | -42822.71371 | 34474.01228 | 8180.04363 |
| 28 | 0.4797 | 0.3962 | -55036.67031 | -18860.03594 | 74773.84352 | -44628.43674 | 34045.91970 | 7771.90501 |
| 29 | 0.4786 | 0.3957 | -55606.41668 | -18610.15269 | 74481.14015 | -46059.26595 | 34820.04544 | 8288.13398 |
| 30 | 0.4729 | 0.3941 | -57097.86313 | -18855.42554 | 75527.02112 | -47077.95584 | 34244.73669 | 8747.39170 |
| 31 | 0.4728 | 0.3930 | -57863.09116 | -18630.36473 | 75693.69067 | -48697.98344 | 34885.30008 | 9164.83470 |
| 32 | 0.5210 | 0.4490 | -62968.18833 | -348.48277 | 61292.33483 | -37681.39081 | 27368.06066 | 13507.01405 |
| 33 | 0.4617 | 0.3899 | -61507.59930 | -18632.14729 | 78265.97873 | -52066.63936 | 34594.26559 | 8829.55301 |
| 34 | 0.4622 | 0.3914 | -62799.86745 | -18753.98558 | 79246.26855 | -52966.91796 | 35385.02881 | 9687.66450 |
| 35 | 0.4569 | 0.3905 | -65366.10395 | -18940.56878 | 81472.07230 | -55869.79138 | 34810.34766 | 9151.90276 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| a36m | 0 | 0.497510 | 0.543518 | 0.567681 | 0.381331 |
| Clrn | -2 | 0.676320 | 0.680378 | 0.562133 | 0.786451 |
| eunu | 2 | 0.553383 | 0.601797 | 0.516137 | 0.542215 |
| ilon | 2 | 0.121191 | 0.105902 | 0.122229 | 0.135442 |
| kukn | -1 | 0.101142 | 0.112851 | 0.144248 | 0.046328 |


| 6 | 0.5163 | 0.4962 | 1199.53329 | 801.74180 | -652.08600 | -719.16702 | 2743.73848 | 2647.70894 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | 0.9388 | 0.9388 | $0.42702 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $0.45920 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $0.13896 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $-0.12513 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $0.11704 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $0.16946 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| 8 | 0.4496 | 0.4354 | 26.19360 | -821.50919 | 2581.69828 | -1034.89005 | 2279.52541 | 2100.31964 |
| 9 | 0.4704 | 0.4572 | -484.19290 | -1125.75564 | 2614.53498 | -819.72539 | 1421.22583 | 1260.45082 |
| 10 | 0.4625 | 0.4569 | -603.06054 | -1235.85294 | 2433.29292 | -796.87945 | 1174.63695 | 1028.88372 |
| 11 | 0.4504 | 0.4417 | -575.05741 | -1238.55034 | 2164.53428 | -814.68240 | 1069.78683 | 935.13276 |
| 12 | 0.4439 | 0.4292 | -524.63349 | -1173.79689 | 1901.71953 | -822.91205 | 962.45388 | 839.33241 |
| 13 | 0.4406 | 0.4229 | -748.13174 | -1921.95882 | 2859.61122 | -1459.94822 | 1595.94950 | 1403.73737 |
| 14 | 0.4347 | 0.4135 | -682.65705 | -1872.02461 | 2645.72333 | -1529.45690 | 1538.62681 | 1351.55161 |
| 15 | 0.4316 | 0.4075 | -499.94026 | -1597.35909 | 2113.86565 | -1401.64547 | 1350.99785 | 1194.48117 |
| 16 | 0.4352 | 0.4037 | -654.39024 | -1658.26686 | 2355.91278 | -1466.67023 | 1545.02765 | 1376.02918 |
| 17 | 0.4337 | 0.4006 | -553.12463 | -1570.32297 | 2128.23459 | -1473.44761 | 1516.06839 | 1362.62884 |
| 18 | 0.4338 | 0.3976 | -560.77562 | -1557.48891 | 2100.22324 | -1564.64660 | 1535.29116 | 1386.29919 |
| 19 | 0.4351 | 0.3959 | -557.46850 | -1490.17954 | 2014.70722 | -1606.40372 | 1505.97715 | 1363.59619 |
| 20 | 0.4379 | 0.3938 | -511.47225 | -1473.39786 | 1937.87943 | -1678.23649 | 1544.17704 | 1399.82551 |
| 21 | 0.4399 | 0.3931 | -549.71248 | -1466.97260 | 1956.46818 | -1789.83419 | 1568.26314 | 1436.66307 |
| 22 | 0.4440 | 0.3946 | -537.74625 | -1415.36337 | 1878.77762 | -1827.44700 | 1637.90801 | 1489.72561 |
| 23 | 0.4482 | 0.3964 | -545.89994 | -1313.70590 | 1779.88953 | -1836.45245 | 1569.59441 | 1428.33073 |
| 24 | 0.4543 | 0.3994 | -529.91535 | -1293.78179 | 1739.92329 | -1932.50958 | 1614.48135 | 1470.64679 |
| 25 | 0.4600 | 0.4031 | -569.85817 | -1295.91852 | 1774.32750 | -2087.70710 | 1654.26141 | 1506.83343 |
| 26 | 0.4665 | 0.4070 | -519.62241 | -1266.37188 | 1695.91630 | -2142.49197 | 1647.17013 | 1493.93843 |
| 27 | 0.4713 | 0.4101 | -533.21810 | -1247.89596 | 1690.38202 | -2255.86353 | 1637.23955 | 1483.24977 |
| 28 | 0.4769 | 0.4108 | -549.45088 | -1230.22863 | 1689.36466 | -2377.44217 | 1626.03490 | 1471.59111 |
| 29 | 0.4854 | 0.4139 | -528.38811 | -1254.78885 | 1697.59325 | -2524.47214 | 1659.16946 | 1506.03816 |
| 30 | 0.4880 | 0.4162 | -567.14613 | -1213.55564 | 1697.55959 | -2614.08221 | 1678.06864 | 1510.43681 |

eunu 00.6348760 .4934370 .7065280 .704662
ilon -10.2883920 .1415090 .4352741 .000000
kukn -2 0.4226840 .3060390 .4752920 .486720
resn 00.2265550 .4763820 .0528380 .150444

## 2017-01-09 19:43

| 6 | 0.7274 | 0.6898 | -56.61115 | -39.00135 | 75.53304 | -69.45091 | 28.24642 | 99.03706 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | 0.7227 | 0.6871 | -35.83885 | -14.87458 | 21.35367 | -75.86968 | 29.60411 | 102.52960 |
| 8 | 0.6954 | 0.6674 | 9.00035 | 29.51970 | -71.41259 | -78.74015 | 31.34830 | 112.43758 |
| 9 | 0.6704 | 0.6323 | 41.12349 | 59.19039 | -127.98668 | -83.03031 | 31.86095 | 114.74700 |
| 10 | 0.6588 | 0.6223 | 46.68073 | 63.05761 | -128.45487 | -83.32910 | 27.88777 | 100.47844 |
| 11 | 0.6510 | 0.6185 | 39.00782 | 55.47957 | -107.17181 | -84.16703 | 24.22579 | 86.90508 |
| 12 | 0.6472 | 0.6173 | 34.14502 | 53.19260 | -97.30849 | -95.05290 | 23.93112 | 84.59760 |
| 13 | 0.6408 | 0.6159 | 27.57253 | 47.65056 | -82.81023 | -97.60281 | 22.26593 | 75.84727 |
| 14 | 0.6350 | 0.6143 | 20.72190 | 41.99472 | -68.54174 | -98.77141 | 20.46313 | 68.85999 |
| 15 | 0.6197 | 0.6067 | 12.42343 | 29.54336 | -45.46675 | -76.54088 | 14.88070 | 48.16006 |
| 16 | 0.6137 | 0.6108 | 12.20554 | 32.26313 | -46.85224 | -83.80785 | 17.91882 | 54.77951 |
| 17 | 0.6035 | 0.6046 | 8.51045 | 31.02473 | -41.33183 | -92.16288 | 18.81320 | 56.39954 |
| 18 | 0.5960 | 0.5903 | 4.82186 | 28.51595 | -34.59065 | -95.28399 | 18.67824 | 55.19137 |
| 19 | 0.5884 | 0.5837 | 1.99893 | 31.93718 | -34.99334 | -118.73136 | 22.40627 | 65.98845 |
| 20 | 0.5840 | 0.5800 | -0.90671 | 29.50607 | -29.45181 | -120.84869 | 21.92214 | 66.63856 |
| 21 | 0.5812 | 0.5776 | -3.65507 | 27.99345 | -25.01957 | -123.70161 | 21.54781 | 65.44591 |
| 22 | 0.5788 | 0.5758 | -6.23057 | 26.54961 | -20.84774 | -126.24959 | 21.30258 | 65.60496 |
| 23 | 0.5768 | 0.5731 | -8.57830 | 25.31356 | -17.12504 | -128.76090 | 21.05175 | 65.96103 |
| 24 | 0.5757 | 0.5714 | -10.84062 | 24.47161 | -13.91635 | -131.00602 | 20.71844 | 66.58551 |
| 25 | 0.5743 | 0.5695 | -12.90180 | 23.66760 | -10.97384 | -133.58952 | 20.40350 | 67.15921 |
| 26 | 0.5723 | 0.5670 | -14.33246 | 21.51503 | -7.41237 | -130.42085 | 19.02905 | 65.59705 |
| 27 | 0.5715 | 0.5654 | -16.15685 | 21.11462 | -5.14278 | -133.18922 | 18.65652 | 66.10009 |
| 28 | 0.5716 | 0.5641 | -17.87052 | 22.34692 | -4.59161 | -141.38376 | 19.27583 | 70.19112 |
| 29 | 0.5701 | 0.5609 | -19.86345 | 22.00129 | -2.30587 | -145.67973 | 18.49473 | 70.34074 |
| 30 | 0.5698 | 0.5595 | -21.90450 | 22.06737 | -0.30472 | -149.47199 | 18.05186 | 71.31872 |

[^1]
## 2017-01-20

| 6 | 0.6937 | 0.6164 | 1418.46557 | -729.56510 | -524.73495 | -541.48173 | 860.36449 | 691.02270 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | 0.6237 | 0.5507 | 1220.66470 | -849.96656 | -159.72601 | -410.38698 | 784.52784 | 560.13402 |
| 8 | 0.6229 | 0.5513 | 1052.49187 | -1052.28346 | 230.56605 | -335.80604 | 739.22949 | 464.08875 |
| 9 | 0.6215 | 0.5499 | 885.43348 | -1251.38419 | 564.86996 | -236.62079 | 708.77885 | 393.77921 |
| 10 | 0.6181 | 0.5514 | 807.46811 | -1375.75031 | 708.73900 | -113.77450 | 702.34350 | 341.79213 |
| 11 | 0.6209 | 0.5578 | 796.03600 | -1421.92957 | 708.63170 | -9.69714 | 684.70471 | 305.56575 |
| 12 | 0.6294 | 0.5697 | 821.31076 | -1429.28329 | 645.59792 | 109.19187 | 671.90995 | 276.80158 |
| 13 | 0.6409 | 0.5835 | 860.29581 | -1422.12075 | 566.45944 | 243.16226 | 663.48970 | 251.94830 |
| 14 | 0.6540 | 0.5990 | 903.68567 | -1411.79690 | 488.97854 | 385.99978 | 658.04112 | 229.40646 |
| 15 | 0.6668 | 0.6124 | 920.06079 | -1361.67605 | 406.79819 | 511.27064 | 635.01244 | 201.67981 |
| 16 | 0.6677 | 0.6133 | 997.75586 | -1474.26083 | 442.34725 | 587.19206 | 754.54351 | 196.82506 |
| 17 | 0.6916 | 0.6399 | 1029.66721 | -1434.32465 | 356.32450 | 787.57913 | 754.91480 | 183.48261 |
| 18 | 0.7146 | 0.6746 | 1080.57452 | -1430.45808 | 294.72790 | 904.24815 | 764.74238 | 163.56944 |
| 19 | 0.7468 | 0.7088 | 1133.01092 | -1433.60051 | 241.75405 | 993.26617 | 775.44661 | 144.83293 |
| 20 | 0.7439 | 0.7071 | 1185.08954 | -1437.46128 | 190.55547 | 1045.88827 | 770.09652 | 132.44873 |
| 21 | 0.7396 | 0.7063 | 1239.60995 | -1453.41020 | 151.87120 | 1093.33833 | 781.70801 | 115.51759 |
| 22 | 0.7367 | 0.7071 | 1289.97317 | -1472.20865 | 123.18112 | 1130.84139 | 795.98000 | 96.39015 |
| 23 | 0.7337 | 0.7054 | 1345.64886 | -1497.74056 | 94.57242 | 1152.23057 | 807.55015 | 79.86202 |
| 24 | 0.7314 | 0.7051 | 1401.87762 | -1526.82675 | 69.33159 | 1167.46919 | 818.38008 | 63.27315 |
| 25 | 0.7286 | 0.7170 | 1452.13681 | -1565.94801 | 59.97418 | 1196.58785 | 829.29574 | 62.31170 |
| 26 | 0.7271 | 0.7172 | 1510.34676 | -1601.94327 | 40.00639 | 1206.87298 | 838.82453 | 44.93957 |
| 27 | 0.7261 | 0.7179 | 1569.67128 | -1640.59231 | 21.69203 | 1217.86204 | 846.95363 | 27.24802 |
| 28 | 0.7258 | 0.7204 | 1632.14053 | -1676.83700 | -4.10377 | 1237.82600 | 837.93142 | 16.92489 |
| 29 | 0.7258 | 0.7211 | 1695.67068 | -1724.30012 | -18.68402 | 1252.94775 | 844.39095 | -2.60285 |
| 30 | 0.7264 | 0.7225 | 1761.69455 | -1773.46544 | -32.24984 | 1272.39920 | 848.66155 | -22.75240 |

a36m 40.6572100 .6460200 .7618460 .563764
eunu 30.5724990 .4243051 .0000000 .293191
ilon -80.4685870 .2638140 .1419461 .000000
resn 10.5013320 .4072730 .7364160 .360307

## 2017-02-10




## 2017-12-28


bclq 20.6263770 .6263770 .9723080 .989335 dpq -20.7781990 .7781990 .9743380 .966095 gac 00.7381740 .6549350 .8309850 .728603 grq 00.7034920 .7034920 .9631990 .884992 kgno 10.6484000 .7286180 .7958280 .420754 kilo 00.7473680 .6771640 .8175720 .850849 kipq 60.4141180 .4141180 .9920820 .932262 mntq 00.5531800 .4358010 .6705591 .000000 orio 00.6515020 .5264650 .8350430 .592999 ott $\quad 20.6214160 .4314050 .8114261 .000000$ plvo 20.7643110 .7643110 .9972790 .994139 vabq 20.8614250 .8614250 .9982200 .996212 wbo 40.6230030 .3340170 .8446510 .690342


[^0]:    Publications in this series have not been edited; they are released as submitted by the author.

[^1]:    eunu 20.7766160 .7766160 .9447670 .727039
    ilon 00.8157910 .8115390 .9840490 .820043
    res 00.0862050 .1055350 .0480620 .105016

