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Abstract

Slip at a frictional interface occurs via intermittent events. Understanding how these events are nucleated, can propagate, or stop spontaneously remains a challenge, central to earthquake science and tribology. In the absence of disorder, rate-and-state approaches predict a diverging nucleation length at some stress $\sigma^*$, beyond which cracks can propagate. Here we argue that disorder is a relevant perturbation to this description. We justify why the distribution of slip contains two parts: a power-law corresponding to ‘avalanches’, and a ‘narrow’ distribution of system-spanning ‘fracture’ events. We derive novel scaling relations for avalanches, including a relation between the stress drop and the spatial extension of a slip event. We compute the cut-off length beyond which avalanches cannot be stopped by disorder, leading to a system-spanning fracture, and successfully test these predictions in a minimal model of frictional interfaces.

1 Introduction

When a frictional interface is driven quasi-statically, periods of loading are punctuated by sudden macroscopic slip events. Field observations on earthquakes \cite{1, 2} and laboratory studies support that slip nucleates at weak regions of the interface and then propagates ballistically as a fracture \cite{3–11}. Understanding under which conditions large slip events are triggered and can propagate is central to tribology, for example to explain the observed variability of friction coefficients \cite{12–14}. It is also key for earthquake science \cite{15}. Earthquakes are power law distributed when averaged over many faults \cite{16}. When fault specific data are considered, observations are instead consistent with a power-law behaviour at small magnitude on several decades, with a few top outliers at large magnitude \cite{17}. Elucidating the mechanism causing such distribution remains a challenge.

These questions are complicated by the fact that frictional forces can decrease with sliding velocity. Various mechanisms can lead to such a velocity-weakening, including thermal creep \cite{18–22} or the mere effect of inertia \cite{23–27}. Rate-and-state models \cite{2, 28–30} describe the dynamics of frictional interfaces via differential equations that capture velocity weakening. The latter is characterised by a length scale $L_c$ below which its effect is small in comparison to elastic forces \cite{31–36}. Importantly, in the case where the stress vs sliding velocity displays a minimum $\sigma_{\text{min}}$, this approach predicts \cite{8, 37, 38} a characteristic stress $\sigma^*$ very close to $\sigma_{\text{min}}$, beyond which a slip pulse of spatial extension larger than $L^*$ will invade the system. In \cite{38}, it is found that $L^*/L_c \sim (\sigma - \sigma^*)^{-1}$. Yet, these results apply when the interface is homogeneous: their validity in the presence of disorder nor their connection to the observed broad distribution of earthquakes is clear.

Another approach describes how an elastic manifold driven through a disordered media can be pinned by disorder \cite{39, 40}, and was specifically applied to frictional interfaces \cite{23, 24, 39, 40}. In simple settings that exclude the existence of velocity weakening, the stress of a quasi-statically driven interface converges to some critical value, where slip events are power law distributed. Unfortunately, these results do not apply in presence of velocity-weakening effects where even the presence of large avalanches was debated \cite{23, 41–43} \textsuperscript{1}, yet experimentally observed in \cite{44}. Very recently \cite{45}, we introduced a minimal model of frictional interfaces that contains long-range elastic interactions, disorder, and inertia. Criticality was observed, with power-law distributed avalanches whose size can span four decades as the stress reaches some critical value $\sigma_c$. Yet, inertia introduces novel phenomena. For example, the distribution of slip events is similar to that found in individual faults \cite{17}: power-law distributed avalanches co-exist with

---

\textsuperscript{1}In this article we define \textit{avalanches} as a cascade of slip events that does not involve the entire system.
system-spanning events. Which mechanism causes such large avalanches, and how their duration, length scale, and stress drop are related to each other remain unknown. So is the relationship between $\sigma_c$ governing avalanches and rate-and-state approaches.

In this article, we argue theoretically that $\sigma_c = \sigma^*$, implying that rate-and-state approaches capture the critical stress affecting the slip statistics. Yet, we find that disorder is a relevant perturbation: consequently, previous results for the diverging nucleation length scale near $\sigma_c$ neither based on a homogeneous system [38] nor on Griffith’s argument [45] apply. Our current analysis justifies the presence of large power-law avalanches and leads to scaling relations between their length, stress drop, and duration; which are found to be related to a fractal property of the slip geometry at the interface. We successfully test all predictions numerically.

2 Scaling theory for slip events with velocity weakening

Observables describing slip events. We characterise slip events by their linear spatial extension (or ‘width’ in one dimension) $A$, the total slip (the increment of slip, or increment of displacement discontinuity, integrated across the the event’s ‘width’) $S$, and their duration $T$. As sketched in Fig. 1A, in disordered systems displaying stick-slip [17, 25, 45], the distribution $P(S)$ consists of two parts. First, there is a power-law distribution cut-off beyond some characteristic value $S_c$, i.e. $P_a(S) = S^{-\tau} f(S/S_c)$ where $f$ is a rapidly decreasing function of its argument. We call the associated events ($S < S_c$) ‘avalanches’ and denote by $A_c$ their cut-off spatial extension along the interface. Second, there are system-spanning slip events of extension $A \approx L$, where $L$ is the system size, resulting in the ‘bump’ at large $S$ in Fig. 1A. Empirical observations [46, 47] support the existence of scaling behaviours of the type:

$$P(S) \sim S^{-\tau},$$

$$S \sim A^d_f,$$

$$T \sim A^\nu,$$

$$A_c \sim (\sigma - \sigma_c)^{-\nu}.$$  

Figure 1. A. Sketch of distribution of avalanche sizes in a finite system: on the left there is a power-law distribution cut-off beyond some characteristic value $S_c$, on the right there are system-spanning events. B. Sketch of a flow curve (stress $\sigma$ vs slip rate $\dot{u}$) with a minimum at $\sigma = \sigma_{\min}$.

from the history from previous slip events, that leads to irregular stresses along the interface. Upon loading, the interface will acquire some slip $u(r)$ at location $r$. Due to the disorder, $u(r)$ will fluctuate spatially. These fluctuations can be characterised by introducing the roughness exponent $\zeta$ of the interface [40]:

$$||u(r) - u(r')|| \sim |r - r'|^\zeta$$

with $||\ldots||$ the root-mean-square.

We have so far introduced five exponents: $\tau$, $\zeta$, $\nu$, $\delta r$, $d_f$. Our central goal is to propose three new scaling relations relating $\zeta$, $\nu$, $\delta r$, $d_f$ together, allowing for a stringent empirical test of our views.

Effect of disorder on the rate-and-state description. Previous attempts to describe the joint effects of disorder and velocity-weakening sought to treat the later as a perturbation [23, 41]. We take the opposite approach, and seek to characterise how disorder affects the dynamics of a homogeneous interface subjected to velocity weakening, as captured by the rate-and-state description [8, 38]. The relationship $\sigma(\dot{u})$ between the far-field stress $\sigma$ to the slip rate $\dot{u}$ at any location is key in this approach. If it does display a minimum $\sigma_{\min}$ for some slip rate $\dot{u}_{\min}$ as illustrated in Fig. 1B, then it was shown that beyond some stress $\sigma^*$ just above $\sigma_{\min}$, slip events of length $L^* \sim (\sigma - \sigma^*)^{-1}$ can nucleate system-spanning events [38].

However, in a finite disordered system of size $L$, $\sigma^*$ cannot be defined precisely. It must display fluctuations of magnitude $\delta \sigma^*$:

$$\delta \sigma^* \sim L^{-\chi}.$$  

If the action of the disorder on the system has small spatial correlations, a simple central limit argument gives $\chi = d/2$, but in general correlations emerge $\chi \leq d/2$ [48]. Here, $d$ is the dimension of the interface.
(separating objects of dimensions $d + 1$). Below, we will provide data supporting that this bound is not saturated.

We argue that due to these fluctuations, rate-and-state results on nucleation in homogeneous systems cannot apply to disordered ones. Indeed, consider $\sigma - \sigma^*$ to be small but positive, and a slip event occurring on a length scale $L^* \sim (\sigma - \sigma^*)^{-1}$. On that length scale, the fluctuations of $\sigma^*$ are stronger than the distance to threshold $\sigma - \sigma^*$: $\delta \sigma^* \sim (L^*)^{-\chi} \sim (\sigma - \sigma^*)^\chi \geq (\sigma - \sigma^*)$, because $\chi \leq d/2 \leq 1^2$ for the physical cases $d = 1$ or $d = 2$. Thus a theory neglecting the fluctuations of $\sigma^*$ cannot self-consistently hold near threshold.

**Roughness of the interface.** The strength of the interface, as characterised by $\sigma^*(r)$, varies in space. The interface must adjust to these variations: the slip $u(r)$ will be larger where $\sigma^*(r)$ is small. As is more generally the case for an elastic manifold in disordered environments [40], we expect such adjustments to stop when the fluctuations of these elastic stresses (of order $||u(r)-u(r')||/||r-r'||$) are of order of the fluctuations of $\sigma^*(r)$ on that scale (of order $||r-r'||^{-\chi}$). Using Eq. (5) then implies:

$$\chi = 1 - \zeta. \quad (7)$$

**Justifying power-law avalanches.** We now argue that Eq. (6) gives a natural explanation for the presence of power-law slip events or ‘avalanches’. Consider a system at $\sigma = \sigma^*$ where a slip that starts to occur at the origin whose extension grows in time as $A(t)$. It will stop if the effective threshold $\sigma^*(A)$ for slip propagation felt on that scale becomes larger than the applied stress, i.e. $\sigma^*(A) > \sigma^*$. To significantly change the value of $\sigma^*(A)$ around its mean $\sigma^*$, $A$ must increase by a significant factor as well. Concretely, every time $A$ doubles in size, there is a finite probability $p_2$ that slip stops. It implies a power-law distribution $P(A) \sim A^{-\chi} \delta A$ with $\tau_A = 1 - \ln(p_2)/\ln(2)$. Thus we predict that the stress $\sigma_c$ at which avalanches are power law, follows:

$$\sigma_c = \sigma^*. \quad (8)$$

**Maximal avalanche extension $A_c$.** Consider the same argument applied to the case $\sigma > \sigma^*$. As long as the scale of fluctuations $\delta \sigma(A) \gg \sigma - \sigma^*$, the difference $\sigma - \sigma^*$ is insignificant (as sketched in Fig. 2), and one recovers a power-law distribution of slip events as argued above. However, in the other limit where $\delta \sigma(A) \ll \sigma - \sigma^*$, disorder becomes irrelevant, and it cannot stop a propagating ‘crack’. The crossover between the two regimes occurs for a slip extension $A_c$ satisfying $\delta \sigma(A_c) \sim \sigma - \sigma^*$. Using Eqs. (5) and (6) one obtains $A_c \sim (\sigma - \sigma_c)^{-\nu}$ (Eq. (4)) with:

$$\nu = \frac{1}{\chi} = \frac{1}{1-\zeta}. \quad (9)$$

which corrects a Griffith argument proposing $\nu = 2$ [45], which neglected the (dominant) effect of disorder.

![Figure 2](Sketch) Disorder leads to a distribution of $\sigma_c$ of a patch of size $A$. If an event has a size $A$ that is sufficiently small, disorder can still stop an event if nucleated at $\sigma > \sigma_c$, because the distribution, $\delta \sigma_c$, is large. However, $\delta \sigma_c$ decreases with $A$, such that an event of size $A > A_c$ cannot be stopped by disorder.

**Geometry of avalanches.** When slip occurs on a length scale $A$, the disorder characterising this region evolves, so that locally the interface strength decreases by some increment $\delta \sigma(A) \sim A^{-\chi}$. Slip will stop when the local stress decreases by a similar magnitude, corresponding to a slip of order $u$ satisfying $u/A \sim A^{-\chi}$. Using that $S \sim A^{\delta_f}$ then leads to $S \sim A^{\delta_f}$ (Eq. (2)) with:

$$d_f = d + 1 - \chi = d + \zeta. \quad (10)$$

Note that Eqs. (7), (9) and (10) are well known to hold in the absence of inertia and velocity weakening [40]. The proposition that they describe the pinning of velocity-weakening elastic materials, where avalanches co-exist with system-spanning events and where the flow curve has a minimum at finite slip rate, is to the best of our knowledge new. Indeed, most previous theoretical works argued that powerlaw avalanches would be absent in that case [23, 41].
Yet, the values of the exponents will differ in the absence or presence of large inertia, as we document below. We now turn to a scaling relation that is specific to the presence of velocity weakening.

**Duration of avalanches.** For stresses in the vicinity of $\sigma_c$, according to the flow curve sketched in Fig. 1B, slip is possible only if the slip rate lies in the vicinity of $\dot{u}_{\text{min}}$. We make the hypothesis that within an avalanche, a sizeable fraction of the interface is slipping at any given point in time. The characteristic slip rate of an avalanche, $\dot{u}$, thus satisfies $\dot{u} \equiv S/(A^\ell T) \sim \dot{u}_{\text{min}}$ that behaves as a constant as $\sigma \to \sigma_c$, which implies $T \sim A^\zeta$ (Eq. (3)) with:

$$z = d_f - d = \zeta \quad (11)$$

### 3 Testing the theory

#### 3.1 A Rosetta Stone Model for frictional interfaces

We consider the minimal model of frictional interface containing disorder, long-range elasticity and inertia introduced in [45]. Its details, as well as the dimensionless units we choose, are reviewed in the Appendix. As illustrated in Fig. 3A, the frictional interface is discretised in $L$ (orange) “blocks” of unit size, embedded within two homogenous linear elastic bodies, of total height $L$, modelled by finite elements (blue). The system is driven at the top and fixed at the bottom, and presents periodic boundaries on the horizontal axis. Each block responds linear elastically up to a randomly chosen yield stress, whereupon it slips. This corresponds to a potential energy that, as a function of local slip, comprises a sequence of parabolic wells of random width, as illustrated in Fig. 3A. Disorder stems from randomly choosing the yield stresses, which are proportional to the width of the wells. Such models are used to study the depinning transition [49], where they allow for fast simulations and a simple definition of avalanches, whose size $S$ is simply the number of times blocks rearranged within an event.

We consider inertial dynamics, whereby a small damping term is chosen to ensure that elastic waves become damped after propagating on a length scale of order $\sim L$, modelling the leakage of heat at the system boundary. As we show below, the presence of (weakly damped) inertia leads to a velocity weakening well described by rate-and-state approaches. Thus, this model is ideally suited to build a dictionary between the rate-and-state approach (that focuses on velocity-weakening) and the depinning viewpoint (that focuses on disorder).

#### 3.2 Calibrating and testing rate-and-state

**Stationary velocity weakening.** Velocity-weakening is already apparent under a quasi-statically imposed shear, where it leads to stick-slip. As illustrated in Fig. 3B, system-spanning events drop the stress to some value indicated in blue, are punctuated by “avalanches” in which a fraction of the blocks yield (small markers). Fig. 4A shows a spatiotemporal map of two system-spanning events spontaneously occurring upon loading (i.e. at large stress), whereas Fig. 4B illustrates two large avalanches (that we triggered directly after system spanning events, i.e. at low stress).

To model velocity-weakening, we consider the rate-and-state framework relating the interfacial stress $\sigma_f$ as a function of slip rate $\dot{u}$ and time $t$ as: $\sigma_f = \sigma_s + a \ln(\dot{u}) + b \ln(\theta(u,t))$. Here, the time dependence enters implicitly through a ‘state’ parameter $\theta$, $\sigma_s$ is some offset and $a$ and $b$ are parameters. Usually, the state parameter is assumed to follow a
simple linear ageing law $\dot{\theta} = 1 - \theta \dot{u}/D_c$. This equation captures that memory is lost once slip becomes larger than a distance $D_c$, beyond which the steady state ($\dot{\theta} = 0$) is reached, which implies the stationary behaviour:

$$\sigma_f = \sigma_s + (a - b) \ln(\dot{u}). \quad (12)$$

Note that in frictional experiments, the “state” parameter is often associated to the real contact area. This is not the case in our model, where the contact area is fixed. Instead, we think of the state parameter as characterising the mechanical noise stemming from inertia, that must take a finite time to reach a stationary equilibrium.

To calibrate Eq. (12), we measure the steady state interfacial stress $\sigma_f$ for different imposed slip rates $\dot{u}$, averaged in both space and time. Measurements correspond to the solid blue markers in Fig. 5. The solid blue line fits them according to Eq. (12), and leads to $a - b \approx -0.03$ (and $\sigma_s \approx 0.041$). Note, however, that this measurement is impossible at small imposed slip rate, where stick slip occurs and the dynamics is intermittent. However, the relationship $\sigma_f$ vs $\dot{u}$ at small strain rate can be obtained by measuring the spatial average of these quantities in system-spanning events after they span the system. It corresponds to the orange points in Fig. 5 that also are well fitted by Eq. (12) with the same parameters.

As mentioned in the introduction, in rate-and-state descriptions there is a characteristic length scale $L_c$ beyond which velocity-weakening effects are important. As recalled in the Appendix, we can now estimate $L_c$ using the value of $a - b$ and a natural estimate for the slip $D_c$ where stationarity is reached (which we take as the characteristic slip length for which plasticity occurs in a given block). We obtain $L_c \approx 20$ blocks. In what follows, we focus on the quantification of slip events that are larger than $L_c$.

**Figure 5.** Blue: Constitutive behaviour of the interfacial stress $\sigma_f$ vs slip rate $\dot{u}$. The “rate-and-state” law, Eq. (12), is fitted on the solid blue markers that are measured in the steady state of a “flow experiment” in which the system is subjected to a constant shear rate. The fit is confirmed through a measurement of $(\sigma_f, \dot{u})$ during stopping systems-spanning events (orange points, truncated at low $\dot{u}$ when there are no more plastic events). In red: effective flow curve relating the far-field stress $\sigma$ to the local slip rate $\sigma = \sigma_f(\dot{u}) + \dot{u}$. The solid red curve corresponds to the fit obtained from the solid blue curve, while grey points are obtained from orange points. The large cross-markers and open markers indicate respectively the measurements of $(\sigma_f, \dot{u})$ and $(\sigma, \dot{u})$ obtained by measuring the slip rate $\dot{u}$ and interfacial stress $\sigma_f$ within a rupture occurring at an imposed stress $\sigma$. The minimum of the effective flow curve $\sigma_{\text{min}}$ is indicated using a dash-dot line.

Radiation damping leads to a non-monotonic effective flow curve. The blue curve in Fig. 5 describes a stationary situation. However, when a slip event occurs and has not yet spanned the entire system, it must accelerate the elastic material around it. Zheng and Rice [8] show that it leads to a “radiation damping” term, where the stress in the far field $\sigma$ differs from that of the interface $\sigma_f$. In our dimensionless units (detailed in the Appendix), it simply reads:

$$\sigma = \sigma_f(\dot{u}) + \dot{u}. \quad (13)$$

This quantity is shown in red in Fig. 5. A key observation is that this curve is non-monotonic, and presents a minimum $\sigma_{\text{min}} \approx 0.17$. Following previous works [8, 38], nucleation of a system-spanning, crack-like, event in homogeneous systems is possible beyond some stress $\sigma^* \approx \sigma_{\text{min}}$. Below, we will support em-
empirically our prediction that \( \sigma^* \) is also the stress \( \sigma_c \) where avalanches display a diverging cut-off.

Another prediction of rate-and-state (less relevant to our present purpose, but useful to further support the predictive power of rate-and-state in our model) is that when a system-spanning event starts to invade the material, away from the rupture front the local stress and slip rate can be readily extracted from Eq. (13), see Barras et al. [50]. This result is illustrated using the arrows in Fig. 5, showing that for a given imposed stress (horizontal arrow), \( \dot{\sigma} \) and \( \sigma_t \) within system-spanning events can be read from this curve (vertical arrow). We confirm this construction in Fig. 5, and find that \( (\sigma_t, \dot{\sigma}) \) away from the rupture front indeed closely follow the identified steady-state flow curve.

### 3.3 Statistics of slip events

We now test the (i) scaling relations we derived earlier for slip events and (ii) the correspondence between the stress \( \sigma_c \), where avalanches diverge and the rate-and-state characteristic stress \( \sigma_{\text{min}} \), in the neighbourhood of which nucleation of unstable rupture front is predicted in homogeneous systems [38].

**Interface roughness.** We consider the system directly after 4000 system-spanning events \(^3\), indicated in blue in Fig. 3B. Fig. 6A displays the relationship between the slip fluctuations \( ||u(r) - u(r')|| \) and the distance \( ||r - r'|| \), which confirms a power law postulated in Eq. (5) with an exponent \( \zeta \approx 0.60 \).

We use the same configurations to study how the fluctuations of interfacial stress \( \delta \sigma \) depend on the size \( A \) of randomly chosen patches. In Fig. 6B, we confirm the power-law behaviour \( \delta \sigma \sim A^{-\chi} \) postulated in Eq. (6). Our measurement is consistent with the scaling relation \( \chi = 1 - \zeta \) of Eq. (7).

**Statistics of avalanches.** To acquire a large statistics, we follow the strategy of [45] of manually triggering 9,000 events such as Fig. 4B, using a local perturbation at imposed strain, following a system spanning event. The post mortem effect of such an avalanche on the slip profile is shown in Fig. 7A, illustrating the definitions of the spatial extension \( A \) and the total slip \( S \). As shown in Figs. 7B to 7D, we confirm power-law behaviours for the distribution of avalanches \( P(S) \sim S^{-\tau} \), the avalanche geometry \( S \sim A^{d_f} \) and duration \( T \sim A^2 \) with \( \tau \approx 1.77 \).

\[^3\]Which is about 10\% of the total number of events that occur during quasi-static loading.

\[^4\]An exponent \( z < 1 \) is asymptotically impossible, since it would lead to a diverging propagation speed \( v \sim A^{1-z} \) for large events. Once the speed of sound is reached, one presumably finds \( z = 1 \). At that point, our hypothesis on the existence of a characteristic slip rate of avalanches must break down, instead we expect this rate to decrease with system size. However, this limit is presumably very hard to reach empirically. In our system, we estimate that the speed of sound would be reached for \( A = 40,000 \) blocks or \( 2000L_c \), far beyond what we can achieve numerically. This crossover is also presumably not observable in earthquakes, since \( L_c \) is believed to be kilometric in faults.

\[^5\]\( r_A = 1 + (\tau - 1)(1 + \zeta) \) as follows from Eqs. (1), (2) and (10).
The scaling predictions and measured exponents in our $d = 1$ system. We report the fitted exponents in Figs. 6 and 7. The uncertainty sums the statistical error plus an estimate of the systematic error stemming from the finite system size (which is estimated by considering the change in exponent in a twice smaller system).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scaling</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P(S) \sim S^{-\tau}$</td>
<td>$\tau \simeq 1.77 \pm 0.02$</td>
<td>$1.77 \pm 0.25$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta u(r) \sim \rho^z$</td>
<td>$\nu \simeq 0.60 \pm 0.08$</td>
<td>$0.60 \pm 0.08$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S \sim A^{d_f}$</td>
<td>$1 + \zeta \simeq 1.60$</td>
<td>$1.60 \pm 0.09$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T \sim A^z$</td>
<td>$\zeta \simeq 0.60$</td>
<td>$0.64 \pm 0.06$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_c \sim (\delta \sigma)^{-\nu}$</td>
<td>$1/(1 - \zeta) \simeq 2.5$</td>
<td>$2.25 \pm 0.77$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...lent agreement with our predictions ($\nu$ is nicely consistent with those, but cannot be extracted precisely).

These exponents differ markedly from those obtained in the absence of inertia with the same dimension $d = 1$ and long-range interactions, for which it is found numerically that $\zeta \in [0.34, 0.39]$ and $z \in [0.74, 0.77]$ [51–56]. These values are in reasonable agreement with renormalization group (RG) predictions [54, 57, 58]. However, RG has not been successfully developed when velocity weakening is important. In that case, our results indicate the existence of a new universality class.

At the experimental level, crack propagation [59–61] and contact line experiments [62, 63] often report $\zeta \in [0.5, 0.7]$. These exponents are closer to our predictions, yet it is unclear if inertia is responsible for this discrepancy with over-damped numerical observations [51–56], or if other effects are at play [61].

4 Conclusion

We have introduced a theoretical framework for the nucleation and statistics of slip at a disordered frictional interface. It builds on rate-and-state results [8, 38] showing that in the presence of strong velocity-weakening effects, a homogeneous system presents a threshold stress $\sigma^*$ beyond which a rupture can invade the system. We have argued that in the presence of disorder, such a threshold must lead to power-law avalanches. Rupture occurs when one avalanche becomes larger than some size $A_c$ beyond which the disorder becomes negligible and cannot stop a rupture. $A_c$ diverges as $\sigma \to \sigma^*$ with some new exponent. This framework leads to quantitative predictions, partly based on extending arguments from the depinning literature [40], where the threshold stress can be defined statically, to situations where the threshold is dynamically defined.

Next, we used a minimal model of frictional interface as a Rosetta Stone, in which (i) rate-and-state equations can be calibrated and their predictions tested and (ii) disorder is easily controllable and slip statistics readily measurable. It allowed for a stringent test of our scaling predictions, and put forwards numerical values for exponents that future theories should seek to explain.

More generally, our methodology of finding a minimal model with a desired rate-and-state behaviour and controlled disorder can be used to incorporate other phenomena of interest, and study how they shape slip statistics. A particularly relevant case is thermal creep, which is expected to lead to a $N$-
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**Details of the model**

**Units.** Our numerical description provides us with local measurement of strain and stress. Below we report the slip (≡ shear strain) as

\[ u \equiv \sqrt{(\varepsilon_{ij})^2} \sqrt{\varepsilon_{ij}}^{1/2} \]

where \( \varepsilon_{ij} \) is the deviatoric (trace-free) part of the strain tensor (af-
ter possibly averaging spatially along the interface, and ensemble averaging). Likewise, the shear stress \( \sigma \equiv (2 \text{dev}(\sigma_{ij}) \text{dev}(\sigma_{ij}))/2 \). Units are thereby given by the typical yield strain \( \varepsilon_0 \) of a block, such that \( \varepsilon_{ij} \equiv \varepsilon_{ij}/\varepsilon_0 \) and \( \sigma_{ij} \equiv \sigma_{ij}/\sigma_0 \) with \( \sigma_0 \equiv 4\mu \varepsilon_0 \), with \( \mu \) the shear modulus. Thereby, we denote dimensionless quantities \( \bullet \) and their dimension-full equivalent \( \bullet \). Note that we also use \( \sigma \) and \( \varepsilon \) to indicate the macroscopic stress and strain (the interpretation is clear from context). We define the plastic slip \( u_p \equiv \bar{u}_p/\bar{\varepsilon}_0 \) as the location of the current local minimum in dimensionless slip space, see Fig. 3A. These definitions are such that, on average, the number of times a block yields \( s(r) = \Delta u_p(r)/2 \approx \Delta u(r)/2 \); while the reported stress corresponds to the fraction of the typical yield stress of a block. The slip rate \( \dot{u} \equiv \Delta u/\Delta t \), with time \( t \equiv t/\ell_0 \), where \( \ell_0 \equiv \ell_0/\bar{\varepsilon}_s \) with \( \bar{\varepsilon}_s \) the shear wave speed. A slip rate \( \dot{u} = 0.5 \) thus indicates that a typical block yields once during time it takes a shear wave to travel the distance of one block. We note that length is expressed in units of \( \ell_0 \) such that \( L \equiv L/\ell_0 \) and \( \ell_0 = \ell_0/\ell_0 = 1 \). Finally, we extract the total slip \( S \equiv \int s(r) dr \) as the total number of times blocks yield, \( A \) the number of blocks that yield at least once \(^6\), and \( T \) the dimensionless duration between the first and the last time that a block yield during an event.

**Numerical model.** All details are described in the Supporting Information of [45]. Different from that reference, here we consider a bigger system of \( 4 \times 3^6 \) (except for the results in Fig. 4 which are made on the system of [45]). All parameters are identical to [45] except for a ten times smaller typical strain \( \varepsilon_0 \), that we use to acquire more events per realisation. Note that in terms of the dimensionless quantities reported here and in [45] this does not lead to any change. In addition, we perform flow experiments by imposing a fixed shear rate to the top boundary. In practice, the shear is supplied to the system in a distributed manner, such that in each time step all nodal displacements are updated according to an affine simple shear, though only the top boundary is fixed. We measure both \( \sigma \) and \( \dot{u} \) as averaged in space along the interface and on a finite window of time deep in the steady state, as well as on different realisations.

**Radiation damping.** A nucleating event, whereby part of the interface and bulk are still static as the rupture invades the interface, is stabilised by the bulk surrounding it: to increase the slip rate \( \dot{u} \) the bulk around the rupture has to be accelerated. Due to the cost of accelerating an expanding volume, the interface experiences an effective stress. Because the bulk is accelerated by elastic waves that radiate away from the interface this additional term is commonly referred to as “radiation damping”. This corresponds to a cost of stress [8] as follows: \( \Delta \sigma_{xy} = \tilde{v} \mu/(2\tilde{c}_s) \), with \( \tilde{v} \equiv 2\Delta(\delta \varepsilon_x)/\Delta t \) [66] the rate of change of the displacement continuity \( \delta \tilde{\varepsilon}_x \equiv 2\tilde{\varepsilon}_{xy} \tilde{\ell}_0 = 2\tilde{u} \tilde{\ell}_0 \) such that \( \Delta \tilde{\sigma} = (4\tilde{\mu} \tilde{\ell}_0/\Delta \tilde{t}) (\tilde{\mu}/\tilde{c}_s) = 4\tilde{\mu} \Delta \tilde{u}/(\Delta \tilde{t}/\tilde{\ell}_0) \) or \( \Delta \tilde{\sigma}/(4\tilde{\mu} \tilde{\ell}_0) = (\Delta \tilde{u}/\tilde{\ell}_0)/(\Delta \tilde{t}/\tilde{\ell}_0) \) and thus \( \Delta \sigma = \tilde{u} \).

**Power law fits.** The power law fit of \( y = cx^b \) is performed using a least square fit of the linear relation \( z \equiv \ln y = \ln c + b \ln x \). In the case of an uncertainty \( \delta y \) (typically a standard deviation) we assume that \( \delta y \ll y \) such that we use \( \delta c = \delta y/y \). The error of the fitted exponent, \( \delta b \), is then the square root of the relevant component at the diagonal of the 2x2 covariance matrix. Where possible, we also compute the fluctuations of the exponent, \( \delta b_t \), by reducing the fitting range by a factor of two and four. We report \( \delta b_t \) in Fig. 6A, and \( \delta b_f \) in Figs. 7B to 7D (in Figs. 7B and 7C the \( \delta b_t \) was simply found lower or equal to \( \delta b_f \); in Fig. 7D the range is not sufficient to be reduced).

In Fig. 7F we account for the error in \( \sigma \) by taking the error as dimensionless, allowing us to compose it in equal amounts of the errors in \( \sigma \) (the standard deviation of \( \sigma \) in each bin) and in \( A_f \), (the fitting error from Fig. 7E). We use this protocol also to fit \( \nu \) given \( \sigma_{\min} \approx 0.17 \) as reported in Table 1.

In Table 1 we estimate the error on \( \nu \) as the difference between our prediction and a fit of the exponent of the data in Fig. 7F using \( c_{\min} \) defined as the bottom of the effective flow curve in Fig. 5.