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Abstract

The month-to-year-long deformation of the Earth’s crust where active subduction zones terminate is poorly explored. Here we report on a multidisciplinary dataset that captures the synergy of slow-slip events, earthquake swarms and fault-interactions during the ~5 years leading up to the 2018 M 6.9 Zakynthos Earthquake at the western termination of the Hellenic Subduction System (HSS). It appears that this long-lasting preparatory phase initiated due to a slow-slip event that lasted ~4 months and released strain equivalent to a ~M 6.3 earthquake. We propose that the slow-slip event, which is the first to be reported in the HSS, tectonically destabilised the upper 20-40 km of the crust, producing alternating phases of seismic and aseismic deformation, including intense microseismicity (M<4) on neighbouring faults, earthquake swarms in the epicentral area of the M 6.9 earthquake ~1.5 years before the main event, another episode of slow-slip immediately preceding the mainshock and, eventually, the large (M6.9) Zakynthos Earthquake. Tectonic instability in the area is evidenced by a prolonged (~4 years) period of overall suppressed b-values (<1) and strong earthquake interactions on discrete strike-slip, thrust and normal faults. We propose that composite faulting patterns accompanied by alternating (seismic/aseismic) deformation styles may characterise multi-fault subduction-termination zones and may operate over a range of timescales (from individual earthquakes to millions of years).
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1 Introduction

Well-monitored examples of large-magnitude earthquakes that rupture subduction plate-boundaries reveal that these earthquakes may be preceded by episodes of slow-slip, swarm activity and/or large foreshocks (i.e. Kato et al., 2012; Bouchon et al., 2013; Schurr et al., 2014). Examples that document such interactions, most of which have been operating on the plate-interface, include the 2011 M_w 9 Tohoku-Oki Earthquake in Japan, the 2012 M_w 7.6 Nicoya Peninsula Earthquake in Costa Rica, and the 2014 M_w 8.1 Iquique megathrust earthquake in Chile (Kato et al., 2012; Schurr et al., 2014; Ruiz et al., 2014; Davis et al., 2015; Uchida et al.,
The interrelation, and possible interdependence, of these deformational processes is nevertheless poorly understood, especially in circumstances where upper-plate faulting accommodates a significant percentage of the plate-motion, with the plate-interface playing a secondary role (i.e. Wallace et al., 2012; Cesca et al., 2017). Such settings are often encountered at the terminations of subduction zones (Mouslopoulou et al., 2019), where plate-motion transitions from thrust to strike-slip faulting, producing complex kinematic patterns in the overriding plate (Mann and Frohlich, 1999). The characteristics (duration, size, distribution) of the interplay between the various types of deformation (seismic vs aseismic) along subduction terminations, especially prior or immediately after large-magnitude earthquakes, is poorly explored mainly due to the lack of relevant data.

The M$_w$ 7.8 Kaikoura Earthquake, that ruptured the southern-end of the Hikurangi margin in 2016 (Cesca et al., 2017), to-date provides the only well-monitored example of a large-magnitude earthquake that ruptured a subduction termination (Mouslopoulou et al., 2019). This earthquake enhanced our understanding of seismogenesis along subduction terminations, as it demonstrated that earthquake-rupture involved primarily (~80%) slip on upper-plate faults, with only weak seismic-slip and aseismic afterslip on the plate-interface (Mouslopoulou et al., 2019).

On October 25$^{th}$, 2018 a M$_w$ 6.9 earthquake ruptured the western termination of the Hellenic Subduction System (HSS) across a zone where plate-motion transitions from mainly thrust to mainly strike-slip faulting (Royden and Papanikolaou, 2011), providing a valuable new case-study of a well-monitored earthquake that ruptures a subduction termination (Fig. 1). This earthquake, that occurred southwest of the island of Zakynthos (Sokos et al., 2020) (Fig. 1), was preceded by a 5-year-long tectonic instability in the broader epicentral area of the M$_w$ 6.9 event and an intense aftershock sequence (Figs 2 and 3). Here, we report on a multidisciplinary dataset of seismological, geodetic, seismic-reflection and bathymetric information that, collectively, capture the earthquake and fault kinematics within this earthquake sequence (hereafter refer to as the Zakynthos Earthquake Sequence - ZES), prior to and after the main event. We find that alternating phases of aseismic and seismic deformation on the subduction-thrust and the overriding plate, respectively, preceded the M$_w$ 6.9 event and accounted for at least 15% of the relative Eurasian/African plate-motion. The aftershock sequence was accommodated by thrust, strike-slip, and normal faulting in the upper-plate (<20 km) and accounted for ~75% of the plate convergence.
2 The kinematics of the western HSS and the Mw 6.9 Zakynthos Earthquake

In the eastern Mediterranean, the oceanic African Plate is being obliquely subducted along the Hellenic margin beneath the continental Eurasian Plate at rates ranging from ~ 26 to 34 mm/yr (McClusky et al., 2000) (Fig. 1). At its western-end the subduction system terminates against the dextral Kefalonia Transform Fault (Louvari et al. 1999; Sachpazi et al. 2000), transferring its relative plate-motion onto the Apulian collision front (Pérouse et al., 2017) (Fig. 1). The kinematic transition from nearly orthogonal convergence (in the south) to pure strike-slip (in the north) is accommodated, along a ~100 km wide zone offshore from western Peloponnese, by strike-slip, thrust and normal faulting (Fig. 1). The faults presented in Figure 1 are derived from a combination of published information (Kokinou et al., 2005; Kokalas et al., 2013; Makris and Papoulia, 2014; Wardell et al., 2014), analysis of bathymetric data (https://portal.emodnet-bathymetry.eu/?menu=19) and re-interpretation of four (Z207, KY301, Z151AB, KY311 and KY209; for location see Fig. 1) published Multi-channel seismic reflection profiles (Kokalas et al., 2013; Wardell et al., 2014) (Fig. 4).

Beneath western Peloponnese the top of the plate-interface lies at depths between 20-40 km and has an average dip of ~17° (Pearce et al., 2012; Halpaap et al., 2018, 2019) (Figs. 1 and 3). Just southwest of Zakynthos and proximal to the region of the 2018 mainshock, the plate-interface lies at ~15 km depth (Clément et al., 2000), with a series of east-dipping thrust faults displacing the upper section (<15 km) of the crust and the sea-bed (Louvari et al. 1999; Sachpazi et al. 2000; Wardell et al., 2004; Kokinou et al. 2005). Low-dipping reverse faulting in the area is also supported by moment tensors of instrumental seismicity (i.e. Anderson and Jackson, 1987). On the hangingwall of these thrust faults, numerous normal faults have been identified to displace post-Miocene deposits down to depths of at least 10 km (Kokalas et al, 2013; Wardell et al., 2014; this study) (Fig. 4).

The 2018 Zakynthos mainshock ruptured the upper <20 km of the crust as a result of shallow thrust and moderately dipping dextral strike-slip faulting (Haddad et al., 2020; Sokos et al., 2020). The focal mechanism presents a large non-double-couple (non-DC) component with a large negative CLVD indicating a complex rupture process (Sokos et al., 2020). The Global Centroid Moment Tensor (Global CMT) project suggests a centroid depth for this event of ~12 km and a total seismic-moment release of 2.32x10^{19} Nm (Dziewonski et al., 1981; Ekström et al., 2012). Three past earthquakes with sizes and focal mechanisms similar to that recorded in 2018,
have ruptured the crust proximal to Zakynthos over the last ~60 years (in 1959, 1976 and 1997; http://bbnet.gein.noa.gr/HL/). The orientation of their focal mechanisms (Kiratzi and Louvari, 2003; Sokos et al., 2020) is in agreement with the plate-convergence (Fig. 1), indicating that these earthquakes accommodated a fraction of the relative African-Eurasian plate-motion. No events greater than M7 have been recorded in the ZES region instrumentally or historically (Papazachos and Papazachou, 2003).

3 The 2014-2019 Zakynthos Earthquake Sequence (ZES)

3.1 Sequence characteristics

The earthquake sequence analysed here (lon: 19.5°E to 21.6°E / lat: 36.8°N to 38°N) derives from the Hellenic Unified Seismological Network (HUSN; http://bbnet.gein.noa.gr/HL/) and includes data from the stations of the National Observatory of Athens (NOA), the University of Patras (UP), the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (AUTH) and eight additional seismic stations deployed in western Peloponnese immediately after the mainshock. The ZES extends over an area of ~18,000 km², from northwest Peloponnese to the west of the islands of Zakynthos and Kefalonia (Figs 1 and 3), and spans a time-period of ~5 ½ years (January 1st, 2014 to May 31st, 2019) (Fig. 2a). The ZES includes >12,000 earthquakes (Table S3), with the largest event (M_w 6.9) having occurred ~40 km southwest of the island of Zakynthos on October 25th, 2018 (22:54 UTC) due to oblique-thrust faulting (Fig. 1; Table S4). About one third of the events in the ZES occurred prior to the mainshock while two thirds were aftershocks (Figs 2 and 3). The majority of these earthquakes have magnitudes below 3.5 (Fig. 2a). The magnitude of completeness (M_c) in the ZES prior to the mainshock is 2.0±0.1, it abruptly increases to 3.5 after the mainshock (Fig. 2b) while it returns to pre-mainshock values (~2.0) about 120 days after the mainshock (Fig. 2b).

The seismic-moment (M_0) release during the ZES has not been uniform (Fig. 2c). In addition to the energy released during the mainshock, two M>5 earthquakes that occurred on January 11th, 2014 (M_w 5.1) and on March 29th, 2016 (M_w 5.4) dominate the graph in Figure 2c. A further M_w 4.9 earthquake struck about 30 minutes before the mainshock (22:22 UTC); however, its seismic-moment is poorly resolved (Fig. 2c), as it is overprinted by the mainshock’s moment release. The total M_0 released in the ~5 years prior to the mainshock is...
equivalent to a ~M5.8 earthquake, while the cumulative M\textsubscript{0} released during the entire ZES is equivalent to a ~M7 earthquake (Table S1).

Seismicity rates within the ZES also vary through time (Fig. 2c). For example, a 6-month interval of increased seismicity (September 2016 to April 2017) is preceded (December 2015 to August 2016) and followed (May 2017 to October 2018) by yearlong periods where the seismicity rates are lower, especially proximal to the epicentral area of the M\textsubscript{w} 6.9 earthquake (Fig. 2a,c and Fig. S2). This swarm-like activity initiated ~1.5 years before the mainshock and is characterised by 3 times higher seismicity rates compared to the preceding and following time-periods, absence of a dominant earthquake at the start of the sequence, spatiotemporally clustered events in the proximity of the (future) mainshock location, and the largest (1.59) coefficient of variation (CV) during the ZES (Fig. 2c,d). These characteristics collectively indicate temporally clustered earthquake activity.

To assess whether these fluctuations in the seismicity rates reflect stress changes within the Earth’s crust, we have calculated the evolution of the b-value of the Gutenberg-Richter frequency-magnitude distribution in the study area, from January 2013 to May 2019 (Fig. 2d and Fig. S1c). The b-value in a given area describes the relative abundance of small to large-magnitude earthquakes at that location and, thus, any temporal variation in b-values is often interpreted to reflect changes in the confining stress within the seismogenic crust (Schorlemmer et al., 2005). Namely, b-values have been found to relate inversely to differential stresses, with low (<1) b-values often indicating elevated stress while high (>1) b-values indicate low/heterogeneous stresses. Here, b-values were derived for subsets of 500 earthquakes with half-overlapping time-windows for the foreshock sequence (01.01.2013 to 25.10.2018) and for subsets of 1000 events in the aftershock sequence (for more details on the b-value calculation refer to Text S1 in the Supporting Information). We find that during the ~70 months preceding the mainshock, b-values in the ZES fluctuate over four main time-intervals (Fig. 2d and Fig. S1c): (i) from January 2013 to December 2014 the b-value is uniform and about 1 (0.94±0.09); (ii) from January 2015 to August 2016, the b-value drops significantly (as low as 0.81); (iii) from September 2016 to April 2017, there is a sharp increase in the b-values (up to 1.36) while (iv) from May 2017 till the mainshock (October 25\textsuperscript{th}, 2018), the b-value drops again below 1 (average of 0.88±0.08). The mean b-value of the aftershock sequence is 1.18±0.12, in agreement with values from other aftershock sequences worldwide (Gulia et al., 2018). In
summary, b-values in the ZES remained uniform and equal to ~1 during 2013 and 2014, while from early 2015 until the main-shock in late 2018 the b-values were overall <1, except for the 6-month time-period of the swarm-like activity (Fig. 2d). For a sequence such as the ZES, where multiple faults appear to be active simultaneously in the subsurface (Figs 1-4), earthquake relocation is vital, not only because it allows delineation of individual earthquake clusters with discrete faults (Waldhauser and Ellsworth, 2002) but also because it may help identify day-to-month long earthquake interactions between neighbouring faults (Mouslopoulou and Hristopulos, 2011).

3.2 Earthquake relocation

We successfully relocated 12,620 earthquakes that occurred within the ZES from 01.01.2014 until 31.05.2019 (Fig. 3), using a local minimum 1-D velocity model (Sachpazi et al., 2000) and manually picked P & S phase onsets determined at the National Observatory of Athens (NOA). The main challenges associated with the relocation arose from the large azimuthal gaps (average >180°) between the seismic source and the seismographs, the poor station density and the complex velocity structure of the study area (Karastathis et al., 2015). We used a constant Vp/Vs ratio of 1.80 in accordance with other seismological studies in the area (Kassaras et al., 2016; Haddad et al., 2020). Pick quality classes and associated errors derive from NOA (Table S2). Our preferred earthquake location software is the Non Linear Location (NLLoc) (Lomax et al., 2000) that uses a non-linear location algorithm which is thought to provide more reliable solutions and hypocentre error estimates in case of ill-conditioned locations (such as those encountered within the ZES). For more details on the earthquake relocation refer to Text S2 in the Supporting Information. Overall, the relocation of the ZES reduced the average RMS from 0.39 (revised NOA catalogue) to 0.2, with average horizontal and vertical errors of ~3.8 km (in Hypo71 format from NLLoc).

The most intriguing finding from the relocation is that, in the foreshock sequence, the vast majority of the earthquakes ruptured the upper 20 km of the crust through four main clusters (i-iv in Fig. 3a-b), each of which appears to have involved slip on multiple inferred slip surfaces (see red dashed lines in Fig. 3). Our results are broadly consistent with those of Sokos et al. (2020) and Haddad et al. (2020), although these studies focus on subsets of the ZES. Earthquake relocation highlights a prominent gap in the seismicity between Zakynthos and western
Peloponnese during the foreshock sequence, at depths ranging from ~7 to 20 km (Fig. 3a-b). This feature persists also, perhaps slightly less pronounced, during the aftershock sequence (Fig. 3c). To better evaluate possible interrelations between these clusters and assess their impact in the ZES evolution, below we constrain the kinematics of these earthquakes.

3.3 Earthquake focal mechanisms

We have obtained the moment tensors (MTs) of 102 earthquakes that occurred during the ZES by inverting regional broadband data and fitting full waveform and amplitude spectra in the time and frequency domain (Cesca et al. 2010, 2013; Heimann et al., 2018; Figs S3-S4, see the Text S3-S4 in the Supporting Information for more details). The studied earthquakes range in moment magnitude from Mw 3.9 to Mw 6.9, show shallow crustal depths down to about 25 km, and are associated with all types of faulting, with a predominance of strike-slip and thrust mechanisms (Fig. 5 and Table S4). Seventeen of these events (Figs 3 and 5) have occurred in the time-period that precedes the main earthquake (October 25th, 2018), one is the mainshock and the remaining 84 occurred during the aftershock sequence (Fig. 5).

The most interesting result of the MT inversion is that it demonstrates a high variability of MT configurations and faulting style over a quite compact region, extending laterally less than 60 km (Figs 1 and 5). Most of the 102 MT solutions could be classified (Cesca, 2020; see Fig. S5) into 8 families, each sharing similar focal mechanisms, spanning from pure strike-slip to pure thrust and normal faulting. The variability in these mechanisms is consistent with a NE-SW trending pressure axes, in agreement with the convergence direction, and a NW-SE tension axis (Fig. 5c). This faulting style complexity is supported by offshore seismic-reflection profiles (e.g., Kokkalas et al., 2013; Wardell et al., 2014; this study) that indicate abundance of deep-thrust and shallow normal faulting as well as steeply dipping strike-slip faults (Fig. 4). This is also evidenced in the diverse present-day crustal stress field inferred from regional-scale inversion of focal mechanisms (Konstantinou et al., 2017). Further, our data support a clear difference among the distribution and predominance of different focal mechanisms before and after the mainshock (Figs 3 and 5). Results suggest the activation of a complex, shallow (< 20 km) fault network and the presence of strong stress heterogeneities, probably induced or enhanced by the occurrence of the Mw 6.9 event in the ZES, which was able to trigger microseismicity across a range of fault geometries and faulting styles (Fig. 5c). The average depth of reverse faulting, which occur
mostly at the western edge of the hypocentral cloud of the main event, is ~10 km, while for strike-slip and normal faulting, which occurs also east of Zakynthos and on Peloponnese, is ~8 and 9 km, respectively (Table S4 and Figs. S6-S7).

3.4 Foreshock kinematics

In the years preceding the ZES, the focal region is characterized by diffuse seismicity that highlights different local spatial clusters and different styles of faulting (Figs 3a-b, 5a). Most prominent clusters are found at about 37.5°N, 20.6°E, in the vicinity of the 2018 Mw 6.9 mainshock and close to the Peloponnese coastline, both onshore and offshore (Figs 3a-b, 5a). The clusters appear to mostly delineate along a NW-SE direction (Fig. 3a-b), marking known active faults both offshore western Peloponnese (Kokkalas et al., 2013; Wardell et al., 2014; Makris and Papoulia, 2014; Haddad et al., 2020) and onshore (Fountoulis et al., 2015), some of which have recently hosted large-magnitude historic earthquakes (e.g., the 1997 Mw 6.5 Strofades earthquake; Kiratzi and Louvari, 2003) (Fig. 1). In addition to the NW-SE striking earthquake clusters, a NE-SW cluster in onshore Peloponnese appears to delineate the large NE-SW right-lateral strike-slip Movri Fault that produced the 2008 M6.4 Movri Earthquake (Fig. 3a-b and Fig. S2a-b) (Konstantinou et al., 2009; Cesca et al. 2010). This fault is active during the ZES foreshock sequence down to depths of ~20 km (Movie S1). Indeed, distinct deep (c. 0-20 km) and shallow (< 5 km) seismicity clusters from June to November 2015 and from May to August 2016, respectively, highlight intermittent activity on sections of the Movri Fault (Movie S1 and Fig. S14). The horizontal (dextral) sense of slip on this fault is further supported by the strike-slip focal mechanisms recorded along this structure prior to the main event (Fig. 5a).

Moment tensor analysis (Fig. 5) coupled with earthquake relocation (Fig. 3) suggest that the early phase of the ZES involved slip on a series of steeply dipping NW-SE trending left-lateral strike-slip faults offshore western Peloponnese, at depths ranging from 15 to 20 km (see along-strike distance of 120-130 km on Profile A-A’ in Figure 3a). The predominantly sinistral strike-slip faulting is in agreement with focal mechanisms obtained by Haddad et al. (2020). In the following 3.5 years, seismicity migrated first eastward (towards onshore Peloponnese), involving strong interactions between faults immediately offshore and onshore western Peloponnese (Fig. 3a-b) while earthquake activity west of Zakynthos was minimal, and from
November 2015 until October 2018, the seismicity of the ZES migrated westward, towards the epicentral area of the Mw 6.9 event (Movie S1). During the entire foreshock sequence (1-1-2014 to 25-10-2018), the ZES involved slip on mainly strike-slip and normal faults, with negligible contribution of thrust faulting (Fig. 3a & b, Fig. 5).

3.5 Mainshock and aftershock kinematics

The mainshock of the Zakynthos Earthquake is characterized by an oblique (thrust to strike-slip) mechanism. A full moment tensor inversion suggests a significant non-double-couple component (Fig. 6), as proposed also by global catalogues (Global CMT) and previous studies (e.g. Sokos et al. 2020). This MT solution is compatible with the combination of two sources (as proposed also by Sokos et al., 2020), one characterized by thrust faulting, similar to those resolved for a cluster of aftershocks north of the mainshock hypocenter, and one by strike-slip to oblique mechanism, as found for several aftershocks east of the mainshock hypocentre (Fig. 5b and Fig. S6). These two individual sources share a common pressure axis with our overall MT solutions (Fig. 5c and Fig. 6).

The aftershock sequence of the Zakynthos Earthquake appears outstanding in its heterogeneities. Seismicity spreads over about 60 km along the trench and 50 km across it (Figs 3c and 5b), and involves all type of earthquake types, including strike-slip, normal, thrust and oblique faulting (Fig. 5c), suggesting complex fault patterns on multiple faults of different depths and orientations. This is in agreement with local stress heterogeneities and fault diversity suggested for the study area by Konstantinou et al. (2017). The spatial distribution of the aftershocks presents two main trends: (1) the progressive localisation of aftershocks towards the epicentral area of the main event (Fig. 3c), and (2) long-range (>50 km) interactions between the epicentral region and earthquakes occurring within clusters (i) and (ii) (Fig. 3c). The latter fault interactions initiated ~2 months after the mainshock and are animated in Movie S1.

The mainshock and some aftershocks (Fig. 5b) suggest the rupture of an NNE-SSW striking and ESE-dipping (~50°) thrust fault, which most likely reflects a thrust fault in the overriding plate (as opposed to the subduction plate-interface) (Figs 3, 5 and 6; Table S4), in agreement with results from Cirella et al., (2020) and Sokos et al., (2020). The latter is supported by published seismic-reflection and bathymetric data (Figs 1 and 4, Fig. S17) that reveal numerous ~NNW-SSE trending thrusts that dip 30-50° to the northeast, beneath Zakynthos and
western Peloponnese (Sachpazi et al., 2000; Kokkalas et al., 2013; Wardell et al., 2014; Makris and Papoulia, 2014; this study) and the recording of a minor tsunami (10 cm) along the western coastline of Peloponnese that suggests rupture of the sea-bed (Cirella et al., 2020). It is also supported by the low-dipping (15-17°) angle of the plate-interface beneath the epicentral area (e.g. Halpaap et al., 2018). Nevertheless, the majority of the aftershocks mark the activation of other faults (Fig. 5b). The location, depth and focal mechanisms of the latter events are incompatible with both the mainshock rupture plane and the geometries recorded during the foreshock activity (Figs. 3 and 5). Specifically, joint analysis of the location and mechanisms of the aftershock sequence suggests the activation of multiple steeply-dipping strike-slip faults that run in ~NE-SW orientations (and at high angles to the trench). The seismicity is confined above the subduction interface (<20 km) and deepens accordingly towards the coast of the Peloponnese (Fig. 5e-f). A second family of events (blue in Figs 5b-f) denote normal faulting along one or more additional NW-SE faults. Normal faulting earthquakes mostly occurred at shallow depths, indicating reactivation in the aftershock sequence of shallow normal faults located mostly on the hangingwall of thrust faults (Kokkalas et al., 2013; Wardell et al., 2014; this study) (Fig. 4). It is noteworthy that focal mechanisms between the island of Zakynthos and western Peloponnese (cluster ii in Fig. 3a-b) mark a similar region as in the years preceding the main event, but with different mechanisms (Fig. 5), suggesting that stress perturbations during the mainshock are able to inhibit strike-slip and oblique-normal mechanisms, which were dominant before October 25th 2018, and favour strike-slip and extensive pure thrust faulting. Fault slip reversed between the interseismic and postseismic periods has been also observed on crustal faults in Chile and is linked to the megathrust seismic cycle (Shirzæi et al., 2012).

4 Slow-slip events during the ZES

To assess the likely involvement of aseismic slip transients in the evolution of the ZES, we analyse the deformation on the Earth’s surface recorded by 10 permanent GPS stations located within the broader study area (Fig. 1). We find that the earthquake activity within the ZES was accompanied by aseismic-slip release in the form of two slow slip events (SSEs). Below, we first discuss the analysis and modelling of the GPS data and, following, we present evidence for two prominent GPS transient signals – which are the first SSEs to be recorded in the HSS.
4.1 GPS time-series analysis and modelling

Continuous GPS data with daily recordings were obtained from 10 permanent GPS stations located along western Peloponnese and the island of Zakynthos (Fig. 1). We analysed the ITRF08 daily coordinates of 5 stations (TRIP, RLSO, PYRG, PYL1 and PAT0) available at the NEVADA Geodetic Laboratory (http://geodesy.unr.edu/magnet.php; Blewitt et al., 2018) and of 5 stations (063A, 003A, 028A, 030A, 029A) that belong to the HEPOS network of the Hellenic Cadastre. Collectively, our GPS dataset provides observations for a period of ~5.5 years (from 01.01.2014 till 31.05.2019) which is comparable to the time-period of the ZES (Fig. 2e). The recordings at stations PYRG, RLSO and TRIP have, however, slightly shorter duration (see Fig. 2d and Supplementary Figs S8-S9). For more details on the geodetic dataset used in this study see Text S5 in the Supporting Information.

As a first step in our analysis, we removed outliers from the GPS signal by applying the Hampel filter, a common approach for reducing noise (Pearson, 2005). Subsequently, we applied the Greedy Automatic Signal Decomposition algorithm (GrAtSiD; Bedford and Bevis, 2018) to decompose the GPS signal into (i) the seasonal oscillation signal; (ii) secular and transient motions and (iii) the residual signal. The secular motion corresponds to the long-term velocity of the station, which is in principle stable, while the transient signal is estimated by fitting a minimum number of multi-transient signals that are defined as the sum of two or more exponentially decaying time functions. The modelled signal is derived by using a linear regression representing a trajectory model (see Bevis & Brown, 2014). The onset of the transient signal is not pre-defined, as GrAtSiD automatically detects possible transient onsets. We applied the GrAtSiD time series decomposition using a station-by-station and component-by-component approach (Fig. S8). This process was repeated 250 times in order to retrieve the statistical information (median and interquartile range) of the 250 modelled trends (red lines in Figs S8 and S9) resulting, thus, in a time-dependent estimate of the velocity uncertainty.

Transient signals in GPS timeseries may be tectonic (e.g., Wallace and Beavan, 2010) but may also be due to environmental or anthropogenic conditions, such as high precipitation rates or monument instability (Williams et al., 2004; Larson et al., 2008). To account for non-tectonic signal, we assessed the maintenance history of all ten stations used in this analysis as well as the fluid loading history in the area. The latter was predicted at each station location based on the ESMGFZ model (http://rz-vm115.gfz-potsdam.de:8080/repository), which produces values of
elastic surface loading (Dill and Dobslaw, 2013; doi:10.1002/jgrb.50353). Transient signal in the fluid loading timeseries was modeled using GrAtSiD (Fig. S11 and Movie S2). Results suggest that there is no strong correlation in space and/or time between the two GPS transients and the predicted fluid transients, which are mostly very short-lived (Fig. S11 and Movie S2). Therefore, the recorded transients are very likely tectonic.

4.2 Slip transients during the ZES

Tectonic transient signals in a GPS timeseries may be related to SSEs and/or post-seismic relaxation (e.g., Sun et al., 2014). The latter is excluded because there is no large (M>6) earthquake in the foreshock sequence (Bedford et al., 2016). To assess the spatiotemporal changes of the GPS velocity pattern within the study area, we calculate the daily median GPS network velocity along the east component, which is normal to the trench (Fig. 2e). Examination of Figure 2e reveals two significant changes in the GPS velocities both associated with an eastward acceleration of the mean velocity of the vectors before their abrupt westward rotation (Fig. 2e). The first of these transients occurs in late 2014 and lasts slightly more than 6 months, while the second starts in mid-2018 and continues until prior to the $M_w$ 6.9 earthquake, lasting for about 5 months (Fig. 2e, Fig. 7). Here, we need to clarify that although the transient signal lasts for about 6 and 5 months during the 2014 and 2018 episodes, respectively, the slow slip events themselves have shorter duration (112 days in 2014 and 107 days in 2018; see Fig. 2e and Text S5 in the Supp. Information). This is because each transient signal comprises individual deformational periods of different durations that include, successively, landward network acceleration, trenchward network acceleration (i.e. the SSE) and, for the 2018 transient, landward network acceleration until the main $M_w$ 6.9 event (see below for details). The daily evolution of these velocities, and the associated deformational periods within each transient, can be seen in Movie S3 whereas the interrelation between these SSEs and the seismic-moment release is highlighted in Movie S1.

The first transient initiates at 24.09.2014 and terminates at 20.03.2015 (that is, a total of 178 days) (Fig. 2e and Movie S3). During this episode all ten stations appear, first, to accelerate eastwards for about two months and, subsequently, to deviate from their main equilibrium position and rotate westwards (Figs 2e and 7a & 7c and Movie S3). Maximum cumulative displacement of about 5 mm is recorded at station 028A in Zakynthos, while attenuated
displacements are observed in eastern and southern Peloponnese (e.g. stations 030A, 063A and TRIP; Fig. 7). The small vector obliquity observed at station 028A in Zakynthos with respect to vectors in Peloponnese, possibly indicates the involvement in this slow-slip event of additional (mainly strike-slip) structures of offshore Peloponnese (e.g., Bürgmann, 2018). No significant microseismicity is associated with this SSE (Movie S3).

The second transient signal spans the time-period between 14.05.2018 and 25.10.2018 (~164 days), immediately preceding the Mw 6.9 Zakynthos Earthquake (Fig. 2e). This SSE shows very similar characteristics to those recorded during the 2014-2015 transient (e.g., acceleration and trenchward rotation of the vectors; see Fig 2e, Fig 7d and Movie S3). Here, the vector acceleration lasts also for ~2 months, followed by a trenchward rotation of the vectors (Fig 2e, Fig 7 and Movie S3) and velocity acceleration until the Zakynthos mainshock (Fig. 7d). Interestingly, here, station 028A at Zakynthos Island records each deformational phase (acceleration/rotation/readjustment and acceleration) with a time delay of ~30 days compared to the remaining stations (see Movie S3). This likely suggests an upward migration of slip from greater depths (beneath Peloponnese) to shallower depths (beneath Zakynthos). Similarly to the 2014 SSE, cumulative maximum displacement is observed on Zakynthos (station 028A) and is of comparable size (5.3 mm) to the 2014 transient. This transient is associated with shallow (<10 km) seismic-moment release proximal to the epicentral area (Movie S1 and Fig. S15).

The widespread occurrence of deformation along the entire western Peloponnese and Zakynthos Island, coupled with the trenchward orientation of the vectors (Fig. 7a-b), collectively suggest that both transients likely originate on the subduction plate-interface that extends beneath central-western Peloponnese. To better explore the origin and spatial distribution of these two transients we performed forward modelling and, assuming a homogeneous elastic half-space and using the analytical equations of Okada (1985), obtained surface displacements by assigning slip on the plate-interface (Fig. S12). After testing for various displacement scenarios we derived, for each SSE, the best uniform-slip model by allowing average slip of 5 mm on the plate-interface (Fig. S12c). The total geodetic moment released during each SSE is $3.20 \times 10^{18}$ Nm and corresponds to a Mw ~6.3 earthquake (Table S1). The relationship between geodetic moment release / duration of the Zakynthos transients is similar to the relationships observed for other tectonic transient signals globally (Fig. S13; Peng and Gomberg, 2010), reinforcing the tectonic origin of these deformational episodes. Some discrepancies observed in the north of the study
area (Fig. S12), likely reflect additional distributed slip on the plate-interface and/or upper-plate faults. Thus, the estimated average slip of 5 mm on the plate-interface should be considered as the minimum slip required for reproducing the observed surface deformation. Slip-inversion of the transient events will allow better assessment of their spatial distribution and is currently in progress (Saltogianni et al. Pers. Com). Further, the acceleration of the vectors observed prior to both slow-slip events was recorded in all 10 stations to last for about 2 months in each case (Fig 2e, Fig. 7 and Movie S3). This acceleration may be indicative of deep active processes related to changes in slab pull force (Bedford et al., 2020) and/or to a dynamic increase of locking along the plate-interface zone prior to seismic or aseismic slip events (Materna et al., 2019). The described SSEs of this study are the first to be reported in the HSS.

5 The preparatory phase leading to the M6.9 Zakynthos Earthquake

Our data suggest that the b-values in the ZES systematically dropped below 1 soon after the trenchward rotation of the GPS velocity vectors during the 2014-2015 transient (Fig. 2d-e and Supplementary Fig. S1c). Since that time, and until the main event in late 2018, the b-values in the ZES remained overall suppressed (<1), with one exception: the ~6-months (September 2016 to April 2017) where swarm-like microseismicity ruptured repeatedly the epicentral area accounting for high b-values (up to 1.36) and strong spatiotemporal earthquake clustering (Fig. 3b, Supplementary Fig. S2c and Movie S1); note that high b-values were again encountered only in the aftershock sequence (b~1.2; Fig. 2d). Suppressed b-values (<1) have been observed prior to mainshocks globally (e.g. Nuannin et al., 2005; Schurr et al. 2014). On the other hand, elevated b-values (>1) often characterise aftershock sequences and/or earthquake swarms (Scholz, 2015; Gulia et al. 2018). The fluctuations recorded in the b-values of the ZES during the ~5 years preceding the mainshock are in accordance with these observations (Fig. 2d), with low b-values (<1) most likely indicating increased stresses in the crust during the years preceding the main event (Schorlemmer et al., 2005).

Combining the above, we propose a scenario in which the SSE that occurred beneath western Peloponnese in late 2014, tectonically destabilized (b<1) the western termination of the subduction system to, first, trigger swarm-like activity in the epicentral area of the main-shock in late 2016 and, subsequently, the Mw 6.9 Zakynthos Earthquake (Figs. 2 and 3). As discussed in Section 4.2, it is likely that the first SSE involved, in addition to slip on the plate-interface, a
triggered slow-slip on one (or more) strike-slip structures in the upper-plate (see vector obliquity between Zakynthos/mainland in Fig. 7a), a scenario that could promote widespread stress changes in the upper-plate (e.g. Hamling and Wallace, 2015). The persisting low (<1) b-values in the ZES after the first SSE and until the M_w 6.9 Zakynthos Earthquake about 4.5 years later, suggests significant stress perturbations which were not fully accommodated during the swarm seismic-moment release (equivalent to a ~M_w 4.9; Table S1) in the broader epicentral area of the Zakynthos mainshock. Interestingly, following these swarms, the epicentral area remained mostly quiet for the following year (from May 2017 to April 2018; Movie S1) before it becomes next active with the onset of the second transient in May 2018 (Movie S1 and Fig. S15).

The second transient immediately precedes the main M_w 6.9 Zakynthos Earthquake (Fig 2d,e and Fig. 7b; Movie S3). The ~30 day phase-lag recorded in the reversal of the GPS vectors between Zakynthos (028A) and the rest of western Peloponnese (e.g., 030A, 029A, etc.), suggests the gradual up-dip migration of slip along the plate-interface, from ~40 km depth beneath Peloponnese to shallower crustal depths (<20 km) near Zakynthos (Fig. 7d and Movie S3). It is possible for SSEs that operate either on the subduction plate-interface (Wallace and Beavan, 2010) or nearby crustal faults (Hamling and Wallace, 2015; Bürgmann, 2018), to trigger stress changes in the crust that would lead to generation of large-magnitude earthquakes. Whether this up-dip slip migration a few days before the mainshock produced static-stress changes on one or more upper-plate faults (King et al., 1994) capable of triggering the Zakynthos Earthquake, is investigated in a follow-up study (Saltogianni et al. Pers. Com).

6 Interplay between seismic and aseismic deformation at the termination of the HSS

Our analysis records successive phases of seismic and aseismic deformation during the build-up to the M_w 6.9 Zakynthos Earthquake. One question that arises is what drives this type of deformation and how representative this may be in accommodating plate-motion over multiple earthquake–cycles. Slow-slip events that trigger swarm activity and/or moderate-to-large-sized earthquakes have been recorded before in major subduction zones globally, including New Zealand, Japan, Ecuador, Chile and Mexico (Beavan et al., 2007; Kato et al., 2012; Vallée et al., 2013; Ruiz et al., 2014; Obara and Kato, 2016; Colella et al., 2017). Although the detailed distribution of interseismic coupling beneath western Peloponnese in Greece has not been
constrained, a first-order difference between the global examples and the Greek case is that the SSEs here occur on a weak plate-interface that largely creeps (Vernant et al., 2014; Saltogianni et al., 2020). The only other references for SSEs along creeping sections of the plate-interface (or sections with heterogeneous interseismic coupling) is at the central/northern Hikurangi margin in New Zealand (Wallace et al., 2016), in Ecuador (Vallee et al. 2013), Costa Rica (Davis et al. 2015) and the Boso Peninsula in Japan (Ozawa et al. 2007). In all these cases, however, the SSEs occur near the trench, at shallow (<10 km) sections of the plate-interface, and are accompanied by intense earthquake activity. By contrast, the SSEs at Zakynthos are deep (~20-40 km) and mostly seismicity free (Movie S3).

One possible explanation for the occurrence of aseismic transients at these depths of the HSS (i.e. 20-40 km) is that they mark the downdip end of locally isolated locked patches (Lay, 2015). Such patches have been recently discovered south of Crete (Saltogianni et al., 2020) and between Crete and Peloponnese (Howell et al., 2017), where they locally appear to accumulate interseismic strain that may account for up to 85% of the plate-motion. Seismic tomography coupled with analysis of seismic attributes beneath the area of ZES suggests the existence of a high (~1.9) Vp/Vs ratio zone at crustal depths ranging between ~10-30 km (Halpaap et al., 2018), which is indicative of water-rich fluids (Audet et al., 2009) (Fig. 8). As SSEs require very low effective stress (e.g., near lithostatic pore fluid pressures) and high fluid pressures (e.g., Liu and Rice, 2005; Gao and Wang, 2017), their presence beneath western Peloponnese is not surprising. Further, studies have shown that fluids liberated from the plate-interface during SSEs tend to migrate upwards, into the lower portion of the seismogenic zone (Audet et al., 2009; Nakajima and Uchida, 2018) to trigger widespread microseismicity, often in the form of earthquake swarms. The network of strike-slip faults onshore/offshore western Peloponnese (Figs. 1 and 4) is likely to have acted as conduits for fluid migration and triggering of microseismicity within the ZES (Fig. 8), as it is the case with upper-plate faults elsewhere in the Hellenic forearc (Ruscic et al., 2019).

Recurring slow-slip events are common along subduction margins and in some cases (e.g., Nankai Trough megathrust) they appear to accommodate up to >50% of the total plate-motion (Araki et al., 2017). In Greece, two SSEs and significant microseismicity are recorded over a period of ~5 years to precede a large event (Fig. 2d). A question that arises is what percentage of the plate-motion is accommodated by each process operating at the western-end of the HSS. To
address this question we have quantified the contribution of each component of deformation (seismic and aseismic) for the period that precedes the $M_w$ 6.9 event (Table S6; for details refer to Text S6 of Supplementary Information). We find that the aseismic slip-rate (produced collectively by the two SSEs) amounts to ~2.1 mm/yr (or ~8% of the plate-motion), accommodating significantly more subduction-related strain compared to that produced by the ZES seismicity (slip-rate ~1.3 mm/yr or 5% of the plate-motion) (Table S6). These numbers collectively imply that during the ~5 years preceding the Zakynthos Earthquake, at least 15% of the plate-motion was released, ~70% was stored elastically (on upper-plate faults and/or the plate-interface), while the remaining ~15% was accommodated by aseismic creep along the downgoing plate (Table S6). Knowing that the average locking along the Hellenic subduction interface is weak (Vernant et al., 2014; Saltogianni et al., 2020) and that the crust beneath the ZES is broken up by numerous upper-plate faults (Figs 1, 4 and 8), we anticipate that a significant fraction of the 70% interseismic strain was stored on one or more faults in the overriding plate. That was confirmed by the $M_w$ 6.9 Zakynthos Earthquake that followed and ruptured faults in the upper crust (Fig. 8). Further, analysis of the aftershock sequence shows that, during the six months following the mainshock, strain equivalent to ~75% of the plate-motion was accommodated by upper-plate faults (Table S1). Similar kinematics characterise the southern termination of the Hikurangi margin in New Zealand, where about 80% of the plate-motion (Wallace et al., 2012) and seismic-moment release during large-magnitude earthquakes (Mouslopoulou et al., 2019) are accommodated by upper-plate faults. Composite faulting patterns accompanied by alternating styles of deformation may characterise multi-fault subduction-termination zones. Our data support the view that the aseismic and seismic displacements observed within the ZES ~5 years prior to the $M_w$ 6.9 Zakynthos Earthquake are probably manifestations of very late interseismic stress conditions (i.e. Schurr et al., 2014). Whether these features characterise the seismogenesis at the western termination of the HSS will be tested as additional data from future well-monitored large-magnitude earthquakes become available.

### 7 Conclusions

We have studied the deformation of the Earth’s crust where active subduction zones terminate prior and after the 2018 $M_w$ 6.9 Zakynthos Earthquake. Using earthquake, GPS, seismic-
reflection and bathymetric data we find that the mainshock was preceded by a synergy of slow-slip events, earthquake swarms and fault-interactions between the subduction thrust and upper-plate faults that lasted about 5.5 years. This long-lasting preparatory phase initiated due to a plate-interface slow-slip event that released strain equivalent to a \( \sim M_w 6.3 \) earthquake, tectonically destabilising the upper 20-40 km of the crust and producing alternating phases of seismic and aseismic deformation between the upper-plate and the plate-interface. Tectonic deformation included intense microseismicity (M<4) on neighbouring faults, earthquake swarms in the epicentral area of the mainshock, another episode of slow-slip immediately preceding the mainshock and, eventually, the large (M\(_w\) 6.9) Zakynthos Earthquake. Tectonic instability in the area is evidenced by a prolonged (~3.5 years) period of overall supressed b-values (<1) and strong earthquake interactions on discrete strike-slip, thrust and normal faults. Composite faulting patterns accompanied by alternating (seismic/aseismic) deformation styles may reflect late interseismic stress conditions prior to large-magnitude earthquakes that rupture subduction-termination zones.
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Figure 1. Overview of the kinematics of the study area and the datasets used. Map illustrating the major active faults in the offshore study area and the focal mechanisms of all 14 $M_w > 5$ earthquakes that occurred during the Zakynthos Earthquake Sequence (ZES), including the $M_w$ 6.9 main event on October 25th 2018, colour coded according to fault style (green=strike-slip, blue=normal, red=thrust). Two of these events (indicated) occurred prior to the main-shock. The black moment tensor solutions indicate the epicentres (ISC-GEM; Storchak et al., 2013) and mechanisms (Global GMT; Dziewonski et al., 1981; Ekström et al., 2012) of the two $M>6$ earthquakes that occurred in the study area during the instrumental period: the 2008 M6.4 Movri Earthquake onshore Peloponnese and the 1997 M6.6 Strofades Earthquake. Grey triangles indicate the seismic stations used for earthquake-relocation and calculation of moment tensor solutions, while yellow-circles localities of permanent GPS stations. Lines Z207, KY301-Z151AB, KY311 and KY209 indicate the localities of the seismic-reflection profiles from Wardell et al., 2014 (re-interpreted in Figure 4). The bathymetric profile A-B is presented in Supplementary Fig. S17. Main cities are indicated by black circles. Contours mark the top of the plate-interface (Halpaap et al., 2019). Offshore bathymetry derived from EMODnet (https://portal.emodnet-bathymetry.eu/?menu=19). Black arrow indicates the relative Eurasia-Africa plate motion (Pérouse et al., 2017). Inset: the study area is located at the western termination of the Hellenic subduction margin, the main tectonic features of which are indicated by red lines. The northward extent of the accretionary prism is indicated by yellow-dashed line. Bathymetry is from GEBCO. Stars indicate the epicentres of the 365AD (west) and 1303AD (east) earthquakes in offshore Crete. Yellow arrow indicates the relative Eurasia-Africa plate motion as derived from GPS measurements (Saltogianni et al., 2020). Str=Strofades islets.
Figure 2 (previous page). Main characteristics of the seismic and GPS deformation recorded during the ZES. a, Moment magnitude ($M_w$) evolution during the Zakynthos Earthquake Sequence (ZES). Stars indicate events $M>5$. b, Evolution of magnitude of completeness ($M_c$) through time. c, Cumulative seismic-moment and cumulative number of earthquakes during the ZES as a function of time (Jan 1st, 2014 till May 31st 2019). d, b-value evolution (and its standard deviation) through time. High and low b-values, slow-slip events and earthquake swarms are indicated on all graphs for comparison. The coefficient of variation (CV) for each time interval is annotated. The average inter-event time (days) and the standard deviation are indicated with $\mu$ and $\sigma$, respectively. e, Evolution of the east GPS component during the ZES, averaged over the stations indicated in the lower panel. Trenchward motion is west. The duration of the two transients observed in the ZES is indicated by red arrows.
Figure 3. Spatial and temporal distribution of the ZES. Map-view and cross-section of the relocated ZES over three distinct time-intervals: a, January 1st, 2014 to May 31st, 2016; b, June 1st, 2016 to October 25th, 2018; c, October 25th, 2018 to May 30th, 2019. Earthquake activity in each panel is projected along the profile A-A’ (70 km either side of the profile) and colour-coded according to time (see legend). Seismic events have horizontal and vertical locations errors <5 km and RMS <0.5 sec. Black dashed-lines in map-view and cross-section indicate the depth-to-the-top of the plate-interface (from Halpaap et al., 2019) while red star indicates the Mw 6.9 epicenter. The seventeen focal mechanisms obtained within the pre-October 25th 2018 sequence are colour-coded according to fault type (red=thrust, blue=normal, green=strike-slip). Locations i-iv indicate prominent earthquake clusters (see text for discussion). Z=Zakynthos Island. Bathymetry derives from https://www.gmrt.org/.
Figure 4. Long-term faulting and kinematics within the ZES. Migrated (top) and re-interpreted (bottom) sections of MCS seismic-reflection profiles Z207, KY301-Z151A/B, KY311 and KY209 from Wardell et al. (2014). Normal (blue), thrust (red) and strike-slip (green) faults are colour-coded as per focal mechanisms presented in Figures 3 and 5. P-Pt=Pliocene-Pleistocene, UP=Upper Pliocene, UM-LP=Upper Miocene-Lower Pliocene, M-Me=Miocene and Messinian, Mz-P=Mesozoic-Paleocene, Tr-Evap=Triassic evaporates (orange). The seismic stratigraphy is adopted from Kokalas et al. (2013).
Figure 5. Focal mechanisms within the ZES. Map-view (a-b) and cross-sections (d-f) of 102 focal mechanisms from the ZES. Beachballs are colour coded according to 8 clusters of earthquakes with similar focal mechanisms, with the colours recalling the fault type (red=thrust, blue=normal, green=strike-slip and associated shadings when events span various types of faulting; black is used for solutions with unclustered focal mechanisms; see Supplementary Fig. S5 for details). The triangle diagram in (c) denotes the kinematics of events analysed by means of pressure (P) and tension (T) axes orientations and a triangular diagram after Frohlich (1992). Circles in c-f indicate events that occurred during the aftershock sequence while triangles represent events that occurred prior to the main event (Oct. 25th, 2018). The relocated ZES seismicity is indicated in (a) and (b) with small grey circles.
Figure 6. Mainshock moment tensor obtained (a) Full moment tensor (MT) obtained for the mainshock and its deviatoric and pure double couple (DC) components. (b) Overview of composite mainshock moment tensor obtained superposing two moment tensors with different contributions, one for an earthquake (5.11.2018 12:21) of the red thrust cluster and one for an earthquake (18.11.2018 5:18) of the sea-green cluster; focal sphere are plotted with lower transparency as they better fit the mainshock full MT (a blue line, denoting the Kagan angle among double couples of the mainshock and composite MTs, shows that the DC is also well reproduced for the suggested MT composition).
Figure 7. Slow-slip events along the termination of the HSS. Transient signals of surface deformation as derived from the analysis of GPS timeseries. Cumulative trench-ward transient displacements, together with their uncertainties (1-sigma), observed between a, 24.09.2014-20.03.2015 and b, 14.05.2018-25.10.2018 c, and d, Snapshots of the daily velocity evolution of the transient GPS signal with respect to the long-term velocity of each station for the periods corresponding to transient signals of (c) and (d), respectively. The upper-left panels in (c) and (d) show the network-wide acceleration observed before the reversal of the velocity vectors (Fig. 2e). Contours in a-b mark the top of the plate-interface (Halpaap et al., 2019).
Figure 8. 3D-views of the deformation processes operating at the HSS termination. Schematic block diagram illustrating the spatial distribution of the seismic (earthquake) and aseismic (SSEs) deformation at the western-end of the Hellenic subduction margin as recorded during the 5 years preceding the $M_w$ 6.9 Zakynthos Earthquake. Faults are colour-coded according to fault type (red=thrust, blue=normal, green= strike-slip) as per Figs 1, 3 and 4. The high Vp/Vs zone and the plate-interface contours derive from Halpaap et al. (2019). Shading around earthquakes highlights the larger clusters. The cross-section presented here partly reflects the seismic-reflection line KY301-Z151A/B presented in Figure 4 (for location see Fig. 1). The black moment tensor solutions indicate the two $M>6$ earthquakes that ruptured two distinct thrust faults of the study area (see caption of Fig. 1 for details). Offshore bathymetry derived from EMODnet (https://portal.emodnet-bathymetry.eu/?menu=19).
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Table S3: Attributes of all relocated earthquakes in the ZES
Table S4: The moment tensor solutions that have been obtained for 102 ZES earthquakes
Table S5: Hypocentral depths estimated for M_w 4.5+ earthquakes of the Zakynthos sequence
Table S6: Summary of the contribution of each process to the plate-convergence strain budget
Movie S1: Evolution of the monthly seismic moment distribution
Movie S2: Modeling of the fluid loading in the study area and comparison with SSEs
Movie S3: Evolution of the daily velocities of the transient GPS signal
Text S1. Calculation of b-value, $M_c$ and conversion of $M_L$ to $M_w$

B-values are here calculated for the time-period of between Jan 31\textsuperscript{st} 2013 and October 31\textsuperscript{st} 2019 (Fig. 2d and Fig. S1c). Although there are earthquake data for the time-period prior to 2013, here we have decided to restrict our b-value analysis to the post 2013 time-period for the following reasons: a) Prior to January 31\textsuperscript{st} 2011 all reported magnitudes are duration magnitudes ($M_d$) and not local magnitudes ($M_L$). As a result, the magnitudes of completeness are significantly larger ($M_c>=3$) prior to Feb. 1st 2011 than in the considered time span (average of about $M_c=2.0\pm0.1$) preventing, thus, any meaningful comparisons; and b) For the time period between February 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2011 and December 31\textsuperscript{st}, 2012 the magnitude of completeness ($M_c$) fluctuates significantly (see Fig. S1a), preventing the robust statistical calculation of b-values and their comparison with the subsequent time-intervals.

The magnitude of completeness ($M_c$) (Fig. 2b and Supplementary Figure S1) is calculated from the ‘goodness-of-fit’ test (Wiener and Wyss, 2000), as the mean value over 1000 bootstrap runs using $M_L$ published by the National Observatory of Athens (NOA). The b values reported in Fig. 2d are calculated as the mean value of 1000 bootstrap runs using the maximum-likelihood method (Aki, 1965; Utsu, 1965) and $M_c$ constrained by the Goodness-of-Fit Test (Wiener and Wyss, 2000). The events have been grouped in subsets of 500 earthquakes (with half-overlapping windows; starting from the mainshock time and going backwards in time) and the b-value for each subset is calculated (Fig. 2d and Fig. S1). The b-value for aftershocks is calculated for subsets of 1000 events. The greater number of events used for calculating b-values in the aftershock sequence obtains results which are thought to be less susceptible to possible changes in the number of events in the revised aftershock catalogue (the catalogue, as of February 2020, is still under revision). Nevertheless, the impact of such revision is minimal as the main analysis of this work concerns the period prior to the main Zakynthos Earthquake.

The seismic moment (Fig. 2c and Supplementary Table S1) is estimated by using the Hanks and Kanamori (1979) equation after converting $M_L$ to $M_w$. The conversion from $M_L$ to $M_w$ was achieved by comparing the $M_w$ obtained for a set of 102 events during moment tensor inversion (see Text S3) and the $M_L$ adopted from NOA ($M_w = 0.975 \times M_L + 0.323$).

Text S2. Earthquake relocation

Our preferred earthquake location software is the NLLoc (Lomax et al., 2000, 2009) that uses a non-linear location algorithm which is thought to provide more reliable solutions and hypocentre error estimates in case of ill-conditioned locations such as those encountered within the ZES. To reduce location errors and enhance the quality of the hypocentral solutions, we used only those phases from 30 stations located along the western coast of Peloponness and the islands of Zakynthos and Kefalonia (22 HUSN seismographs and 8 temporary stations installed in western Peloponnesse immediately after the mainshock; Fig. 1). The inclusion of additional seismic stations from central Peloponnese and/or northern Greece would have challenged the validity of our velocity model without reducing the azimuthal gap, because the crustal thickness between the mainshock region and central Peloponnesse varies considerably (Pearce et al., 2012). Indeed, the average azimuthal gap for the analysed seismicity when all available HUSN stations are used is 212\textdegree{} (e.g. NOA solutions) while it is 216\textdegree{} when only the stations proximal to the ZES are analysed (Fig. 1; this study). We performed two runs in NLLoc to obtain the most accurate hypocentral solutions. The second run was performed to include travel-time residuals obtained from the first run. The inclusion of these residuals aims to correct for deviations from the 1-D velocity model at each station and improve the final solutions.
For the relocation we used a constant Vp/Vs ratio of 1.80 in accordance with other seismological studies in the area (Kassaras et al., 2016; Haddad et al., 2020). The earthquake catalogue and P and S phase picks herein were downloaded from the NOA website (http://bbnet.gein.noa.gr/HL/); last accessed in May 2019 for the period before the mainshock and November 2019 for the aftershocks. Furthermore, as of February 2019 the National Observatory of Athens has slightly changed the pick class qualities and associated errors for the standard routine earthquake analysis (Table S2). All relocated earthquakes are presented in the Supplementary Table S3.

Text S3. Regional moment tensor inversion, classification and decomposition
Regional moment tensor inversion has been performed for the mainshock and more than 100 earthquakes in the mainshock focal region following two full waveform-based approaches, using the Kiwi tools (Cesca et al., 2010, 2013) and Grond (Heimann et al. 2018) software. Both approaches are based on the fit of 3-components full waveforms and, in case of the first approach, the fitting of amplitude spectra. For this analysis we used regional broadband data from stations pertaining to the following networks: GE (GEOFON, 1993), IU (Albuquerque Seismological Laboratory (ASL)/USGS, 1988), II (Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 1986), G (IPGP and EOST, 1982), MN (MedNet Project Partner Institutions, 1990), IV (INGV Seismological Data Centre, 2006), HT (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1981), HL (National Observatory of Athens, 1997), HP (University of Patras, 2000), HA (University of Athens, 2008), AC (Institute of Geosciences, Energy, Water and Environment, 2002), 4A (INGV, 2009), X5 (Sokos, 2015). Data and metadata have been downloaded using the FDSN web services of Orfeus, INGV, NOA, IRIS and Geofon. Seismic data are restituted, integrated to displacement, demeaned, detrended and rotated to a radial-transversal-vertical coordinate system. Data quality have been manually assessed, and a number of traces have been removed, either because containing saturated waveforms, data gaps, large noise and/or overlap with seismic signals of other events. For each earthquake, we defined a range of epicentral distances and a frequency band for the inversion, based on the catalog magnitude. For the first approach using the Kiwi tools, the general choice was as follows: The epicentral range of distances have been fixed to 150-500 km, 75-400 km, 50-300 km and 30-300 km for events with magnitude above Ml 6, Ml 5-6, Ml 4-5, and below Ml 4, respectively. Similarly, the following four frequency bandpass filters have been used for the four ranges of magnitudes, respectively: 0.010-0.040 Hz, 0.025-0.050 Hz, 0.035-0.070 Hz and 0.040-0.080 Hz. For the second, independent approach using Grond, epicentral distances of 80-400 km and a frequency band of 0.02-0.07 Hz were considered. For both approaches these parameters have been slightly modified for few events, especially during the first hours of the sequence when signals of different earthquakes overlap, in order to improve the fit.

For the moment tensor inversions based on the Kiwi tools (Cesca et al., 2010), we use a pure double couple (DC) constraint for all events. Inversions are performed in two following steps, first fitting 3-component full waveform amplitude spectra to resolve the scalar moment, centroid depth, strike, dip and rake, but not the focal mechanism polarity (Cesca et al., 2010) and later in the time domain, to resolve the focal mechanism polarity and horizontal shifts of the centroid location. An example of the inversion results after these two inversion steps is shown in Fig. S3. We also tested the inversion using a full moment tensor configuration (Cesca et al., 2013), but judged that the non-DC terms are not robustly resolved for many earthquakes, due to the limited
azimuthal coverage and the weak magnitude of the target earthquakes. Therefore, in this work, a full MT solution is only discussed for the mainshock, where we obtain 72% DC, 18% CLVD and 10% isotropic component. The presence of a significant non-DC component and the ENE-WSW orientation and negative sign of the CLVD major axis are in agreement with reference solutions by Global CMT and Sokos et al. (2020). The second MT inversion using Grond (Heimann et al., 2018), is in this study based on the inversion of displacement traces only. An important advantage of Grond is that the moment tensor optimization is performed simultaneously simulating many station configurations using a bootstrap approach: analysing the ensemble of best solutions for different station configurations allows estimating source parameter uncertainties. Comparison of results and estimated uncertainties for selected parameters are illustrated in Fig. S4.

We processed 124 earthquakes, all those occurring in the time period 1.1.2014-31.5.2019 with local magnitude equal or larger than 4.0 and within latitudes 36.8°-38.0° and longitudes 19.5-21.6° according to our relocated catalog. Good quality moment tensor solutions have been obtained for a subset of 102 earthquakes, down to a moment magnitude Mw 3.9 (Table S4). The selection of best solutions was done upon the quality of the misfit after the two inversion steps.

Focal mechanisms of the 102 solutions are classified using a clustering algorithm (Cesca, 2020), using clustering parameters Nmin=2 and eps=0.16 (equivalent to 19.2° Kagan angle). We identify 8 clusters, representing ~77% of the focal mechanisms (Fig. S5). Clusters are characterized either by strike-slip mechanisms or by thrust and normal faulting mechanisms with oblique components. Two clusters located in the vicinity of the mainshock epicenter show trench parallel thrust faulting (red focal mechanisms in Fig. 5) and oblique (strike-slip to normal) mechanism (seagreen mechanisms in Fig. 5). These two types of mechanisms are observed for many early aftershocks and could thus map the geometry of faults activated during the mainshock, as found for previous complex earthquakes (e.g. Cesca et al., 2017). They also resemble the mechanisms proposed by Sokos et al. (2020) for two subfaults contributing to the Zakynthos earthquake rupture. Supposing that the two faults were active during the mainshock, their combined contribution could resemble the full MT solution of the mainshock and its non-DC component. A similar result has been shown for the 2017 Kaikoura earthquake, New Zealand (Cesca et al., 2017). Figure 6 in the main article shows how a combination of ~53% and ~47% oblique faulting can qualitatively reproduce the mainshock MT and its double couple.

**Text S4. Depth estimation using seismic array at teleseismic distances**

Hypocentral locations for offshore seismicity may suffer, in absence of dedicated amphibious seismic deployments, from the asymmetry of the land stations distribution and the large azimuthal gap. This problem can affect to a certain extent the analysis of the Zakynthos sequence, given the lack of local stations West of Zakynthos Island. Typically, the source parameter which is mostly affected is the source depth, which can have large uncertainties. Furthermore, there may be trade-offs among the resolved origin time, epicentral locations and depth. Here, we supplement the hypocentral relocation based on local onshore data, with an independent analysis at large distances using seismic arrays. This method has been used for the depth estimation of crustal seismicity in previous studies (e.g., Negi et al., 2017, Grigoli et al., 2018).
We stack seismic waveforms recorded at the seismic stations composing the GERES array, to construct a seismic beam, where the similar waveforms produced by a far distance earthquake (e.g. at Zakynthos) sum up constructively, in contrast to the uncorrelated seismic noise. As a result, we can obtain beams with a high signal-to-noise ratio for events of magnitude larger than Mw 4.5. We can then compare the observed beam with synthetic beams computed for the known moment tensor solution and variable source depths.

The following Figs. S6-S7 show two examples of comparison of observed and synthetic array velocity beams at the GERES array, Germany. The best depth is chosen upon a visual assessment of the fit, mostly aiming to reproduce the time delay of the pP arrival with respect to the first P onset. The pP phase travels from the earthquake focus to the surface (or the seafloor) and backward, later following a common path with the P phase. Thus the path difference among P and pP rays is the one traveled by the pP ray above the source. The pP-P delay measures the time needed for a P phase to travel two times above the hypocenter: the larger is the time delay, the larger the hypocentral depth. The absolute hypocentral depth can be directly inferred from this time delay, known the crustal velocity structure at the focal region.

In this work, we have obtained acceptable fits, and thus independent depth estimates (Supplementary Table S5), for 20 out of 24 tested events.

**Text S5. GPS data, analysis and modeling**

**GPS data**
As there are institutional/governmental restrictions associated with some of the raw geodetic data used in this study, we obtained the ITRF08 daily coordinates of 5 stations (TRIP, RLSO, PYRG, PYL1 and PAT0) available at the NEVADA Geodetic Laboratory (http://geodesy.unr.edu/magnet.php; Blewitt et al., 2018) and of 5 stations (063A, 003A, 028A, 030A, 029A) that belong to the HEPOS network of the Hellenic Cadastre. In both cases Precise Point Positioning (PPP) solutions were obtained. The NEVADA GPS coordinates have been processed using the GIPSY OASIS II (Jet Propulsion Laboratory, JPL) software while the HEPOS coordinates using the Canadian Spatial Reference System (CSRS) PPP software version 2.26.0. The discrepancies between the two solutions are of sub-mm level and are incorporated in the calculated velocity uncertainties (illustrated in Figure 7 in the main article and Movies S2 and S3 of the Supporting Information).

Stations ZAK2 and STRF on Zakynthos and Strofades islands, respectively, were not analyzed due to limited data (duration of timeseries <3yrs). Geodetic records of more than 3 years are required for reliable estimation of the noise level and other velocity characteristics in the GPS signal.

**Optimum model solution derived from GRATSID:**
Our optimum model solution (Fig. 2e) arises from a combination of the following two models: (i) pre-seismic model that derives by decomposing the pre-seismic signal only and (ii) post-seismic model that derives by decomposing the full-timeseries (1-1-2014 till 31-05-2019). This combined model was selected as the preferred solution because the 2018 transient signal was masked (Fig. S10) when we modelled the entire sequence (model ii) due to over-fitting of the large M6.9 offset on some of the stations (i.e., at station 028A these displacements reach ~40 mm and ~54 mm along the East and North component, respectively).
Forward modeling:
To better explore the origin and spatial distribution of these two transients we performed forward modelling and, assuming a homogeneous elastic half-space and using the analytical equations of Okada (1985), predicted surface displacements by assigning slip on the plate-interface (Fig. S12). The long wavelength of the GPS deformation pattern (Figure 7) suggests that aseismic slip has occurred beneath western/central Peloponnese in both SSEs of 2014 and 2018. In addition, maximum displacements are observed on Zakynthos Island, thus, implying slip at depth between mainland and the Island of Zakynthos. After testing for various displacement scenarios, we derived the best uniform-slip model for average slip of 5 mm on the plate-interface (Fig. S12c) and total geodetic moment release of $3.20 \times 10^{18}$ dyne*cm (that corresponds to a $M_w \sim 6.3$ earthquake; Table S1) for each SSE, in good agreement with other transient signals globally (Supplementary Fig. S13) (i.e. Peng and Gomberg, 2010), a fact that reinforces the tectonic origin of these transients. Some discrepancies observed in the north of the study area (Fig. S12), likely reflect additional distributed slip on the plate-interface or/and upper-plate faults there. Thus, the estimated average slip of 5 mm on the plate-interface should be considered as the minimum slip required for reproducing the surface deformation observed in the study area.

Characteristics of the 2014 transient (network acceleration – SSE)
Transcient duration: 24/9/2014-20/3/2015: 178 days
SSE duration: 29/11/2014-20/3/2015: 112 days = 112 * 24 * 3600= 9.6x10^6 s
Minimum moment released: 3.20x10^18 Nm

Characteristics of the 2018 transient (network acceleration – SSE – network acceleration)
Transcient duration: 14/5/2018-25/10/2018: 164 days
SSE duration: 10/7/2018-30/9/2018: 107 days = 83 * 24 * 3600= 7.2x10^6 s
Minimum moment released: 3.20x10^18 Nm

Text S6. Strain budget within the ZES
The relative African-Eurasian plate-motion at the western-end of the HSS is ~26 mm/yr (Pérouse et al., 2017). A question that arises is what percentage of the plate-motion is accommodated by each process operating at the western-end of the HSS. To answer this question we have quantified the contribution of each component of deformation (seismic and aseismic) for the period that precedes the $M_w$ 6.9 event (Supplementary Table S6). To calculate cumulative seismic moment along the orthogonal to the plate-motion transect C-C’, we first converted local magnitudes ($M_L$) to moment magnitude ($M_w$) using an empirical relationship derived in this study ($M_w = 0.975 \times M_L + 0.323$) and then calculated the seismic moment ($M_0$) using the relation between $M_0$ and $M_w$ ($M_0= 10^{(1.5\times M_w+16.1)}$; Hanks and Kanamori, 1979). We used calculated $M_w$ for earthquakes for which we obtained focal mechanism solutions. The average slip (D) has been estimated using the equation $M_0 = GDA$ (Aki, 1966), where the shear modulus (G) has been assumed equal to 30 GPa (standard value for the crust), $M_0$ has been calculated as described above along the 20 km wide transect C-C’ (Fig. S16), while the fault area (A) has been estimated according to geometry of the subducting slab (see Fig. S16).

Total geodetic moment release, as obtained from the modeled aseismic events of 2014 and 2018 (Figure S12), is estimated at $6.40 \times 10^{25}$ dyne*cm (Table S1). The seismic (1.3 mm/yr; Table S6) and geodetic (2.1 mm/yr; Table S6) slip rates accommodated in the study area due to earthquake and slow-slip events, respectively, are estimated over the observational period (4.8 years).
Figure S1. Graphs illustrating the evolution of the magnitude of completeness (a & b) and the b-values (c) in the study area for time periods from 1st January, 2011 to 31st October, 2019. Red dashed line indicates the timing of the M6.9 Zakynthos earthquake on October 25th, 2018. Note the fluctuating Mc values in 2012.
Figure S2. Map-view of the relocated foreshock ZES over four distinct time-intervals. Earthquake activity in each panel is colour-coded according to time (see legend). Seismic events have horizontal and vertical locations errors ≤25 km and RMS ≤1.5 sec. Black dashed lines in map-view and cross-section indicate the top of the plate-interface (from Halpaap et al., 2019) while white star indicates the M₆.9 epicentre. Bathymetry derives from https://www.gmrt.org/
Figure S3. Example of moment tensor inversion result for the Zakynthos aftershock on 26.10.2018 at 12:11:17 UT: a, DC focal sphere after amplitude spectra inversion (white quadrants) and time domain inversion (red-white quadrants); b, relative misfit changes by perturbation of the source depth (the focal sphere denote the best solution); c, relative misfit changes by perturbation of strike, dip and rake (a solid circle denotes the best solution in each plot); d, comparison of observed (red) and synthetic (black) amplitude spectra along the vertical (left), radial (center) and transversal (right) components for selected stations (station names, epicentral distance and station azimuth are reported); e, comparison of observed (red) and synthetic (black) waveforms along the vertical (left), radial (center) and transversal (right) components for selected stations (station names, epicentral distance and station azimuth are reported).
Figure S4. Comparison of solutions obtained for the same earthquakes with the Kiwi tools (Cesca et al. 2010, 2013) and Grond (Heimann et al. 2018) software, showing (a) the comparison of resolved pressure, tension, and null axes, (b) histograms with deviations among mechanisms (Kagan angle), moment magnitudes and depth estimates (values estimated by Kiwi tools minus those by Grond) and (c) histograms with uncertainties (focal mechanism orientations, moment magnitudes and depths) estimated by Grond though bootstrap: for each event, the inversion in Grond was run in parallel in 500 bootstrap chains with varying weightings of the fitting targets (station-component-phases combinations) as well as in one ‘global’ chain in which weightings...
only compensate station-event distances; uncertainties of our moment tensor solutions are assessed by comparing the best solution of each event to the ten best solutions of the 100 best performing bootstrap chains and the global chain; this approach assures meaningful statistics since we consider more than 1000 bootstrap solutions.

**Figure S5.** Results of the moment tensor clustering using seiscloud (Cesca 2020), showing similarity matrices for events sorted chronologically (left) and after clustering (right), where 8 clusters are identified (red dashed lines denote the edges of the clusters, focal mechanisms are representative (median) focal mechanisms for each clusters (colors as in Fig. 5); ~23% of the focal mechanisms remain unclustered.
Figure S6. Comparison of the observed array beam at the GERES array, Germany, (blue) and synthetic beams for different depths (black lines), for an earthquake of the Zakynthos sequence occurring on 2018-10-30 at 08:32:26 UT. The best depth (here 17.5 km) is chosen upon a visual assessment of the waveforms fit. In particular, we aim to model the time delay of the pP arrival (here at ~ 6.5 s) with respect to the first P phase (0.0 s). Beams (here velocity waveforms) are bandpass filtered in the frequency range 0.7-2.0 Hz and normalized.

Figure S7. A second example (earthquake on 2018-10-26 12:41:14 UT) of comparison among observed and synthetic beams at the GERES array.
Figure S8. Timeseries of daily GPS coordinates analysed in this study along the East and North components. Filtered GPS signal, after subtracting the modeled seasonal and step-related signal, is indicated by black dots, while the decomposed transient GPS signal is indicated by the red line. Vertical red-dashed lines indicate the timing of the main-shock (October 25th, 2018).
Figure S9. Similar to Figure S8, but for three selected GPS stations. Note the modelled ‘wobbles’ (Bedford et al. 2020) during the transient signals of 2014 and 2018.

Figure S10. Evolution of the averaged GPS network velocity along the East component during the ZES, as derived from analysis of the entire pre and post-seismic GPS signal (model ii). The transient signal is clearly evident in late 2014, however, the 2018 transient signal before the mainshock (dashed red line), which is visible in Figure 2e, here is masked by the over-fitting of the seismic offset.
**Figure S11.** Modeled GPS transient signal (black line) and fluid loading (green line) signal averaged along the entire network along the East and North component. Shaded areas denote the major detected GPS transient signals.

**Figure S12.** Results of the forward model. Predicted surface displacements (red dots) are compared with the observed GPS displacements (black dots) for the 2014 SSE (a) and the 2018 SSE (b), when slip of 5mm is assigned between the 20-40 km isodepths of the plate-interface and locally between the Zakynthos Island and Peloponnese.
Figure S13. Graph showing the seismic moment versus source duration for a variety of fault-slip observations. Large red star indicates the 2014 and 2018 SSEs in the Hellenic margin. Figure modified from Peng & Gomberg (2010).

Figure S14. Snapshots of Movie S1 illustrating the seismicity recorded to delineate the Movri Fault from June to November 2015 and from May to August 2016. White star represents the epicentre of the October 25th, 2018 Mw 6.9 Zakynthos Earthquake.
Figure S15. Snapshots of Movie S1 showing that clusters of shallow (<10 km) earthquakes occur within the epicentral area of the main Zakynthos event during the onset (May 2018) and throughout the 2nd transient. White star represents the epicentre of the October 25th, 2018 Mw 6.9 Zakynthos Earthquake.
Figure S16. Transect over which the cumulative seismic (derived from earthquakes) moment release has been calculated. See text for details.
Figure S17. Bathymetric profile along the transect A-B (for locality see Fig. 1 in the main article) highlighting the control of active upper-plate faulting in the bathymetry. Faults are partly constrained by the interpretation of the seismic-reflection line KY301-Z151A/B presented in Fig. 4 and are colour coded according to Figs 1, 3, 4 and 7. The two thrust faults which are thought to have ruptured during the 1997 and 2018 M>6 earthquakes, are indicated. Vertical exaggeration x 10.
Table S1. Seismic moment released during the foreshock, aftershock and the entire ZES. Last column shows the % of the relative Eurasian-African plate-motion accommodated by each process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table S1</th>
<th>Seismic Moment (dyne-cm)</th>
<th>Mw</th>
<th>% of plate-motion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreshock sequence (Jan 1st, 2014 till Oct 25th 2018)</td>
<td>4.95x10^{24}</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aftershock sequence excluding main event (Oct 25th, 2018 till May 31st 2019)</td>
<td>2.60 x10^{25}</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swarm-like activity (Sept. 2016 till Apr. 2017)</td>
<td>3.02 x10^{23}</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire ZES (Jan. 1st, 2014 till May 31st 2019)</td>
<td>3.13 x10^{26}</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow Slip event 2014</td>
<td>3.24x10^{25} (min)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow Slip event 2018</td>
<td>3.20 x10^{25} (min)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S2. Pick quality classes, and associated errors in seconds, during the ZES. Data are from the National Observatory of Athens (https://doi.org/10.7914/SN/HL).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before February 2019</th>
<th>Since February 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pick quality class</td>
<td>Error (sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table S3.** Table presenting the attributes of all relocated earthquakes in the ZES (see uploaded .csv file).

**Table S4:** The moment tensor solutions that have been obtained for 102 ZES earthquakes (see uploaded .csv file).

**Table S5.** Hypocentral depths estimated for same Mw 4.5+ earthquakes of the Zakynthos sequence, estimated upon array beam modeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Depth [km]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-01-02</td>
<td>06:16:29</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-12-12</td>
<td>08:34:47</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-10-21</td>
<td>23:44:55</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-10-26</td>
<td>01:06:04</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-10-26</td>
<td>05:48:37</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-10-26</td>
<td>12:41:14</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-10-26</td>
<td>16:07:10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-10-30</td>
<td>03:00:00</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-10-30</td>
<td>08:32:26</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-11-01</td>
<td>03:44:49</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-11-04</td>
<td>03:12:46</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-11-05</td>
<td>06:46:13</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-11-11</td>
<td>23:38:35</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-11-12</td>
<td>06:50:29</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-11-15</td>
<td>09:02:06</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-11-15</td>
<td>09:09:27</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-11-19</td>
<td>13:05:56</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-12-25</td>
<td>01:41:28</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-03-17</td>
<td>11:49:40</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-05-13</td>
<td>16:57:17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S6. Table summarising the contribution of the various seismic and/or aseismic processes to the overall plate-convergence strain budget. See text for discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process captured</th>
<th>Slip rate (mm/yr)</th>
<th>% of total convergence rate (26 mm/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interseismic velocity between Zakynthos/western</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peloponnese</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microseismicity</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSEs</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain released due to seismic/aseismic deformation</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain stored elastically in the crust</td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Movie S1. Evolution in map-view and cross section (along the transect A-B) of the monthly seismic moment distribution, and equivalent Mw, within the study area. Grey contours in map view and cross section mark the top of the plate-interface (Halpaap et al., 2019). Highlighted with blue contours mark the map-view extent of the transient signal. Inset: timeline indicating the two transient signals (blue rectangles) in 2014 and 2018. See text in the main article for details.

Movie S2. Green arrows and ellipses indicate the daily displacements and respective errors of the GNSS stations. Magenta arrows indicate the daily displacements and respective errors predicted by fluid loading. Scale is shown with the black arrow at the bottom of the plot. Velocities and errors have been estimated from the GNSS and fluid loading displacement time series by using the GrAtSiD algorithm (Bedford and Bevis, 2018) that models trajectories. Displacements shown in this animation are taken from the averaged trajectory model minus the background seasonal oscillation (Fourier terms). Earthquakes from the ZES are plotted as red circles with radius corresponding to the scale (bottom left).

Movie S3. Evolution of the daily velocities of the transient GPS signal with respect to the long-term velocity of each station.
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