Detecting precursory earthquake migration patterns using the pattern informatics method
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[1] In this paper we analyze the evolution of seismic activity using a dynamic modification of the pattern informatics method. This method identifies locations that have systematic fluctuations in seismicity on PI maps. By investigating the evolution of hotspot configurations on the PI map and calculating the distance between hotspots and the epicenter of the impending large earthquake, a migrating pattern of (increasing or decreasing) precursory change in seismicity is revealed. We find that hotspots on the PI map appear increasingly closer to the epicenter as the time of the forthcoming earthquake is approached, implying the existence of an earthquake preparation process. The migration pattern and associated decreasing distance is confirmed by a stochastic test, and therefore we conclude that a preparation process prior to large earthquakes can be detected. Citation: Wu, Y.-H., C.-C. Chen, and J. B. Rundle (2008), Detecting precursory earthquake migration patterns using the pattern informatics method, Geophys. Res. Lett., 35, L19304, doi:10.1029/2008GL035215.

1. Introduction

[2] Earthquake migration remains one of the most intriguing seismicity patterns before large earthquakes, since the time it was proposed by Mogi [1968]. Most of the reported earthquake migration patterns are related to the fluid/magma movement in the volcanic areas [e.g., Battaglia et al., 2005; Kao et al., 2007]. Detecting such a small-scaled migration pattern requires a dense seismic network, together with precise information on earthquake locations. On the other hand, based on the critical point theory of earthquakes [e.g., Rundle et al., 2000c; Chen et al., 2006], it is believed that there is a large-scaled preparation process associated with stress accumulation and nucleation before a large earthquake, thus implying a migration pattern in seismicity around the source area of the large earthquake. However, there exists as yet no systematic methodology to investigate the temporal behavior of earthquake migration patterns before large earthquakes.

[3] Earthquake fault systems are characterized by complex dynamics, thus it is hard to understand the behavior of earthquakes without knowledge of the unobservable underlying dynamics [Rundle et al., 2000a, 2000b; Tiampo et al., 2002a]. An alternative approach is to develop methods based on analyzing the dynamics of space-time patterns of seismicity, together with the associated space-time correlations. These correlations are the observable manifestations of the time-dependent drift of a high-dimensional state vector in a phase dynamical system [Fukunaga, 1970; Holmes et al., 1996; Mori and Kuramoto, 1997; Rundle et al., 2000a; Tiampo et al., 2002a] (see Figure 1). The pattern informatics method, which is an example of a phase dynamical measure, was originally proposed as a promising method to detect the characteristic precursory patterns before large threshold earthquakes. In this study, we modify the PI method to investigate the time- and space-varying patterns calculated from seismicity in a progressive series of change intervals. Using this modification, the earthquake migration patterns before large earthquakes can be clearly observed. This study therefore proposes a systematic approach to understanding the process of anomalous earthquake seismicity migration before large earthquakes.

2. PI Method and the Measure of Migration Pattern

[4] While there are a variety of ways in which the PI state vector can be defined, we use the following steps [Rundle et al., 2000a; Tiampo et al., 2002a, 2002b; Chen et al., 2005; Holliday et al., 2007]:

[5] The study region is first divided into boxes with size of 0.1° × 0.1°. The seismic intensity function I(xb, tb) is defined as the average number of earthquakes with magnitude larger than the cutoff magnitude Mc that occur in a grid box xb and its eight neighboring boxes (the Moore neighbors). For investigating the seismicity change of the system within an interval from tb through t2, the seismic intensity change is then calculated as ΔI(xb, tb, t2) = I(xb, t2) − I(xb, tb) and denoted by ΔI(xb, tb). The sampling reference time tb is shifted from t0 which usually means the beginning time of earthquake data, to t1. Shifting tb consequently produces a time series of ΔI(xb, t0) for each xb. The temporal normalization, i.e., subtracting the temporal mean ⟨ΔI(xb, t0)⟩ and dividing by the temporal standard deviation σ(ΔI(xb, t0)), is then carried out, and we could get a temporally normalized intensity change ΔI(xb, t0). Similarly, for each xb, the space series of ΔI(xb, t0) is spatially normalized furthermore. Consequently, we could get a spatiotemporally normalized intensity change ΔI(xb, t0). For taking both seismic activation and quiescence into consideration, the absolute value of normalized intensity change |ΔI(xb, t0)| is further taken. The temporal average of |ΔI(xb, t0)|, denoted by [|ΔI(xb)|], is then computed at each location xb. Finally, the mean squared change P(xb) ≡ |ΔI(xb)|^2, indicating the occurrence probability of future threshold events, is computed. The color-coded “hotspots” with high P(xb) in a PI...
map thus show the locations where the anomalous seismic activity occurred in the change interval of $t_1, t_2$. For example, as shown in Figure 1 is the retrospective PI analysis of the 2006 Pingtung (Taiwan) doublets with magnitudes of 6.7 and 6.4 by using $t_1$ as 2004/03/01 and $t_2$ as 2006/05/01. Colored pixels (hotspots) represent areas with large seismicity changes caused by both the seismic activation and quiescence, indicating high probability for future large events.

For demonstrating the earthquake migration pattern, now we propose a statistic to measure the average distance between the PI hotspots and target earthquakes, which is a measure of forecast error for a given configuration of PI hotspots. As shown in Figure 2a, the “error distance” $e_n$ is defined as the distance between the $n$th earthquake and the hotspot closest to it. The mean error distance $\langle e \rangle$ is then defined by $\langle e \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} e_n$ for a set of target events. Since the number of hotspots is dependent on the decision threshold, the area $A_{HI}$ covered by hotspots would give a fraction $f = A_{HI}/A$ of the map whereas the total area of the map is $A$. $\langle e \rangle$ will decrease with increasing $f$ which means lowering the threshold of hotspot plotting, as shown in Figure 2b, since more hotspot pixels appear in the PI map. For each $t_1$ in each specified change interval, a relation between $\langle e \rangle$ and $f$ (Figure 2b) thus gives the averaged distance $\varepsilon_{area}(t_1)$ obtained by integrating the curve of $\langle e \rangle$ versus $f$. Accordingly, the temporal evolution of anomalous seismic activity in space, i.e., the migration pattern, could be investigated by $\varepsilon_{area}(t_1)$.

3. Results

In this study, we used the earthquake catalogue maintained by the Taiwan Central Weather Bureau map thus show the locations where the anomalous seismic activity occurred in the change interval of $\{t_1, t_2\}$. For example, as shown in Figure 1 is the retrospective PI analysis of the 2006 Pingtung (Taiwan) doublets with magnitudes of 6.7 and 6.4 by using $t_1$ as 2004/03/01 and 2002/03/15 in Figures 1a and 1b, respectively. The blue circles represent earthquakes occurred in a short span of six months after $t_2$ (= 2006/05/01). It is worth noticing that the colored pixels indicating high seismicity changes apparently migrate toward the source areas of the Pingtung doublets from 2002/03/15 (Figure 1b) through 2004/03/01 (Figure 1a). For the details of the retrospective PI analysis of the Pingtung doublets, we refer the readers to the paper by Wu et al. [2008].

Figure 1. PI maps around the Pingtung doublet earthquakes calculated from the CWB catalogue with $t_0$ as 1994/01/01 and $t_2$ as 2006/05/01. Blue circles represent events larger than 4 that occurred after $t_2$. $t_1$ in the PI calculation are (a) 2004/03/01 and (b) 2002/03/15. Colored pixels (hotspots) represent areas with large seismicity changes caused by both the seismic activation and quiescence, indicating high probability for future large events.

Figure 2. (a) Schematic diagram of the definition of error distance. The red blocks represent the hotspots in a PI map and the blue circles the locations of large earthquakes occurred after $t_2$. The error distance $e_n$ is the distance between the $n$th earthquake and the hotspot closest to it. (b) The relation between the mean error distance and the coverage fraction $f$ of the PI hotspots.
We first consider the migration pattern for the 2006 Pingtung doublets. The Pingtung doublets struck a historically inactive region to the offshore southwestern Taiwan on 26 December 2006, where no earthquake with magnitude larger than five had occurred since 1973. The first event occurred at 8:26 p.m. (local time), then the second one occurred eight minutes later. Several undersea fiber-optic cables used to route internet traffic and telephone services between Taiwan and Asian area were seriously damaged.

Events with magnitude larger than 3.2 and depth in the range 30 km to 100 km were used for this study. Again, for the selection criteria of earthquakes in the PI analysis, we refer the readers to the paper by Wu et al. [2008]. The result of error distance is shown as the red curve in Figure 3 by setting $t_0$ as 1994/01/01, $t_2$ as 2006/12/25, and $t_1$ shifting from 2002/01/01 to 2005/01/01 tri-monthly. The decreasing trend presented by the red curve in Figure 3 illustrates that the PI hotspots were genuinely getting closer to the hypocenters of the Pingtung sequence. That means the anomalous seismic activity (either increasing or decreasing activity) was approaching the source areas, as the time of the main shock approached. The slope obtained by fitting the decreasing linear trend is $-0.0366$ (kms/days). To provide a null hypothesis test, the curves in blue with error bars obtained by randomly shuffling the occurrence time, location, and both for the selected events from the catalogue in Figures 3a, 3b, and 3c, respectively, all show flat trends. After 500 realizations of randomizing both the occurrence time and location (Figure 3c), the mean slope of fitted linear trend in $e_{area}$ ($t_1$) and its standard deviation are 0.0031 (kms/days) and 0.019 (kms/days), respectively. Therefore, we confirm observation of the seismicity migration pattern before the Pingtung doublets at the 95% confidence level.

We are also interested in analyzing the migration pattern of the 1999 Mw 7.6 Chi-Chi earthquake, by using the same strategy. Figure 4 shows our results for the Chi-Chi case. The events with magnitude larger than 3.5 and within the depth of 20 km were selected from CWB catalogue, whereas $t_0$ and $t_2$ were fixed at 1980/01/01 and 1999/06/30, respectively. For the selection criteria of earthquakes in the PI analysis of the Chi-Chi case, we refer the readers to the paper by Chen et al. [2005]. Then, we could explore the evolution of PI patterns with time by considering different $t_1$ into calculation. Two examples of PI maps are shown in Figures 4a and 4b with $t_1$ as 1992/12/23 and 1998/7/25, respectively. Similar to the Pingtung case, the PI hotspots far from the epicenter in Figure 4a become closer to the source areas of the Chi-Chi sequence in Figure 4b, indicating the migration process. Again, a decreasing trend of the migration pattern can be found in the error distance calculation for the case of Chi-Chi earthquake. As shown in Figure 4c, the slope of the red curve obtained from the actual earthquake catalogue is $-0.0146$ (pixels/days). We also did the null hypothesis test for the Chi-Chi case. The mean slope obtained from 500 realizations of spatiotemporally randomizing the selected events is $0.874 \times 10^{-5}$ (pixels/days), together with a standard deviation of 0.0074 (pixels/days). Only 4 out of 500 have the slopes smaller than the actual one. Again we observe, the slope data indicate that at the 95% confidence level, the seismicity migration to the source area of the Chi-Chi...
Chi sequences cannot be obtained by chance from randomizing the catalogue.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

[10] Since the PI map is derived by computing the seismicity rate changes in the change interval relative to the background seismicity, the change interval plays an important role in the PI calculation. As shown in Figures 1 and 4, the PI pattern evolved in space over the different change intervals, leading us to examine the associated seismicity changes over time. We found the PI hotspots associated with intense seismicity changes were approaching closer to the source areas of the forthcoming large earthquakes, for instance, from Figure 1b through Figure 1a for the Pingtung sequence and from Figure 4a through Figure 4b for the Chi-Chi event. Observations such as these are reminiscent of the so-called earthquake migration process [Mogi, 1968, 1969, 1981, 1985; Rydelek and Sacks, 2001; Battaglia et al., 2005; Kao et al., 2007].

[11] Migration of seismic activity can be produced by different physical processes, requiring considerations from both seismological and tectonic viewpoints. For example, a prominent migration pattern was observed in a series of large earthquakes \[M \geq 7.5\] moving down the Japan Trench from north to south at intervals of 2 or 3 years in the 1930’s and was understood as the development of large-scale fracturing along the trench [Mogi, 1969, 1985]. The appearance of the doughnut pattern exhibited by earthquakes with magnitude larger than 3.0 around the area of the Izu Peninsula was hypothesized to be a preparation process prior to the forthcoming large earthquake [Mogi, 1981, 1985]. During the preparation process of crack nucleation, these ideas imply that seismicity will tend to migrate towards the direction in which the fault grows [Scholz, 2002].

[12] In this study we demonstrated that the migration trend of seismicity can be observed by calculating the average error distance between hotspots and target epicenters. The \[\varepsilon_{\text{area}}(t_1)\] curves in Figures 3 and 4c show that the distances between target epicenters and PI hotspots became smaller and smaller as the times of the major Pingtung and Chi-Chi earthquakes approached. Our findings thus suggest that migration of seismic activity may exist before large earthquakes and migration toward the source area of the events might be caused by a nucleation process. In many previous works on earthquake migration, researchers have provided different algorithms to detect the migration process, usually by sophisticated calculations of stress and strain [e.g., Stein, 1999; Niu et al., 2003; Rydelek and Sacks, 2001] that are difficult to observe in nature. By contrast, the results of the migration pattern in this study were obtained by an easy and direct calculation of seismicity rate changes. We propose that earthquake rate changes revealed by the PI method might find considerable use as a type of earthquake “stress meter” [e.g., Dieterich et al., 2000; Chen et al., 2006], allowing the detection of space-time migration patterns before large earthquakes and consequently, leading to new advances in our understanding of earthquake physics.

Figure 4. (a and b) are PI maps around the Chi-Chi earthquake. Blue circles represent earthquakes larger than 6 that occurred after \(t_2\), which is 1999/06/30. PI hotspots represent areas with large seismicity changes. (c) Red curve of integrated error distance \(\varepsilon_{\text{area}}(t_1)\) represents the result obtained from real catalogue. Blue curve with error bars shows the results of spatiotemporally randomizing the catalogue.
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