Convolutional event embeddings for fast probabilistic earthquake assessment

Jannes Münchmeyer¹, Dino Bindi¹, Ulf Leser², and Frederik Tilmann¹

 $^1\mathrm{Helmholtz}$ Centre Potsdam GFZ German Research Centre for Geosciences $^2\mathrm{Humboldt}$ University of Berlin

November 22, 2022

Abstract

Recent research showed that machine learning, in particular deep learning, can be applied with great success to a multitude of seismological tasks, e.g. phase picking and earthquake localization. One reason is that neural networks can be used as feature extractors, generating generally applicable representations of complex data. We employ a convolutional network to condense earthquake waveforms from a varying set of stations into a high dimensional vector, which we call event embedding. For each event the embedding is calculated from instrument-corrected waveforms beginning at the first P pick and updated continuously with incoming data. We employ event embeddings for real time magnitude estimation, earthquake localization and ground motion prediction, which are central tasks for early warning and for guiding rapid disaster response. We evaluate our model on the IPOC catalog for Northern Chile, containing 100,000 events with low uncertainty hypocenters and magnitude estimates. We split the catalog sequentially into a training and a test set, with the 2014 Iquique event (Mw 8.1) and its foreand aftershocks contained in the test set. Following preliminary results the system achieves a test RMSE of 0.28 magnitude units (m.u.) and 35 km hypocentral distance 1 s after the first P arrival at the nearest station, which improves to 0.17 m.u. and 22 km after 5 s and 0.11 m.u. and 15 km after 25 s. As applications in the hazard domain require proper uncertainty estimates, we propose a probabilistic model using Gaussian mixture density networks. By analyzing the predictions in terms of their calibration, we show that the model exhibits overconfidence i.e. overly optimistic confidence intervals. We show that deep ensembles substantially improve calibration. To assess the limitations of our model and elucidate the pitfalls of machine learning for early warning in general, we conduct an error analysis and discuss mitigation strategies. Despite the size of our catalog, we observe issues with two kinds of data sparsity. First, we observe increased residuals for the source parameters of the largest events, as training data for these events is scarce. Second, similar inaccuracies occur in areas without events of a certain size in the training catalog. We investigate the impact of these limitations on the Iquique fore- and aftershocks.

HEIBRIDS lelmholtz Einstein International Research School in Data Science



Helmholtz Centre Potsdam **GFZ GERMAN RESEARCH CENTRE** FOR GEOSCIENCES

Abstract

Timely and accurate earthquake source parameter estimates are essential for early warning. Classical parametric models suffer from simplified assumptions and discard information. We use a deep learning model directly on the waveforms to alleviate these issues. A key idea of our model is to represent events as vectors that are independent of the specific set of contributing stations and the time. We call these representations event embeddings.

We compare our model to a Bayesian peak displacement baseline on two catalogs from Japan and Chile. On both catalogs our model achieves a higher precision 2 s after the first P arrival than the baseline after 8 s. After 8 s our model has a 50 % lower RMSE.



		Chile	Japan
est ern	Events	96 132	8 258
	Records	1 785 434	322 205
	Spatial extent	4.5° x 3.5°	25.5° x 34.5°
	Magnitude range	M _A 1.2 - 8.1	M _w 3.5 - 8.7
	Stations	29	696
	Station density	17 km	37 km
	Years	2007 - 2014	1997 - 2018
	Sensors	Broadband & Strong motion	Strong motion
	Correction	Instrument response	Gain
	Recordings	Continuous	Trigger based
Ve	Borehole sensors	None	All stations

split both data sets Table 1: Characteristics of the two data sets used for training, evaluation. Station density is given as median

sets with a ratio of 60:10:30. The test set for Chile consists of all events after 07/2012, for Japan after 02/2013. We use the development set for model selection. All results reported on this poster are test set results.

Figure 1: Events (dots) and stations (triangles) in the Japan (top) and Chile (bottom) catalogs.

Catalogs from Sippl et al. (2018)/Münchmeyer et al. (2019) and NIED F net. Waveforms from NIED KIK-net, IPOC, GEOFON, CSN, WestFissure, Iquique and Minas networks.

Parametric magnitude estimation

Most source based early warning methods rely on waveform features and parametric models. Typical features are peak displacement (Lancieri and Zollo 2008), 👮 energy (Festa et al. 2008), or dominant 🗖 period (Allen 2007). We use the Bayesian peak displacement method by Lancieri and Zollo (2008) as baseline, as i performed best on our data sets.

Parametric models suffer from imprecise assumptions, saturation effects for large magnitudes and errors in location estimates. Location errors are especially a pronounced for estimates with only few contributing stations. For the baseline experiments we use the final hypocenter estimate, which is overly optimistic as it is Figure 2: Early magnitude estimates at 2 s and 8 s only avaible after P wave detections at a after the first P arrival using the Bayesian peak sufficient number of stations.



displacement method from Lancieri and Zollo (2008). The lines indicate moving 20th and 80th percentiles.

Convolutional event embeddings for fast probabilistic earthquake assessment Jannes Münchmeyer^{1,2}, Dino Bindi¹, Ulf Leser², Frederik Tilmann^{1,3}

¹ GeoForschungsZentrum Potsdam² Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin³ Freie Universität Berlin



Method

Our model consists of a feature extraction, combination feature and an estimation step for magnitude and location. The feature extraction 1S convolutional neural applied to each station. feature

combination transformer model



(Vaswani et al. 2017), Figure 3: Schematic overview of the fast assessment model. Each row integrating information corresponds to one station. Boxes represent neural networks, arrows represent from a variable set of data vectors.

stations. The estimators are mixture density networks, outputting probabilistic estimates for magnitude and location. We train the model end-to-end.

The output of the feature combination is a vector representation of the event, which we call event embedding. It is independent of the contributing stations and the time. Therefore event embeddings can be used as features for predicting event properties like magnitude and location.

Probabilistic predictions

At each time after the first P arrival (t = 0 s) our model outputs distribution over magnitudes. This ≥, allows to evaluate model's the to real response time data.

The model input always consists of 30 s long waveform samples at 100 Hz. The samples start ≥ 5 seconds before the first P arrival at any station. To simulate real time all data,

measurements are set to zero. This data augmentation is applied both in training and evaluation model. the As



Figure 4: Predicted magnitude distributions for four sample events indicated by after a given time quantile lines. The additional ticks above the x axis show approximate P arrivals at contributing stations for interpretation purposes. These picks were not used by the algorithm. The events are: a large ($M_A = 5.0$), deep (150 km) on-shore event in Chile (top left); a deep (110 km) but small (M_A = 1.3) event colocated with the one before (bottom left); a large (M_w = 6.2) shallow (20 km) event offshore (100 km) the Japanese east coast (top right); an intermediate size (M_{w} = 4.2) event underneath central Honshu at 47 km depth (bottom right). The inset shows the evolution of the location prediction over time through its likelihood.

Japanese data set is trigger based, there we always blind out stations until their respective trigger time.

Results

The proposed model improves precision and timeliness in both data sets compared to the parametric estimates. This holds true in terms of both R² and RMSE. The quality of predictions is generally better for $\ ^{\circ}$ the Chile dataset, likely caused by the more homogeneous data set and lower amount of offshore events.

Large magnitudes are generally σ = 0.11 $\sigma_{M \ge 5} = 0.77$ $\sigma_{M \ge 5} = 0.29$ underestimated. For events with a magnitude above 5.0 we see an increased RMSE for the Chile catalog compared to the baseline. For the Japan catalog, we still see a decrease in RMSE compared to the baseline, but it is lower than the average True decrease. Underestimation occurs already Figure 5: Mean magnitude predictions at different for smaller magnitudes in the Chile times after the first P arrival (t = 0 s). The lines indicate moving 20th and 80th percentiles. catalog than in the Japan one.

Transfer learning

We assume the underestimation of large $8 R^2 = 0.88$ 8 $R^2 = 0.96$ $\sigma = 0.13$ *σ* = 0.21 magnitude events is caused by data $\sigma_{M \ge 5} = 0.73$ $\sigma_{M \ge 5} = 0.45$ Therefore we trained an 👷 6 sparsity. additional transfer learning model for the Chile data set by first training on the combination of both catalogs and then finetuning on the Chile one. This increases the number of large events available in the training set and reduces the severity of Figure 6: Mean predictions for the Chile catalog underestimation. On the other hand we using transfer learning. The lines indicate moving see a slight degradation for the predictive ^{20th} and 80th percentiles. performance at small magnitudes, while still clearly outperforming the baseline.

Conclusion

• We built an end to end model to estimate magnitude and location in real time after the first P arrival. The model provides probabilistic estimates. • Our model achieves the same precision 2 s after the first P arrival as a baseline method after 8 s.

• Transfer learning form the Japan catalog to the Chile catalog reduces RMSE for large magnitude events (M>5) by 40 %. • We propose the event embedding, a vector representation for events that is independent of time and the specific set of contributing stations.

References

peaks. Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth. Advances in neural information processing systems

Acknowledgements Jannes Münchmeyer acknowledges the support of the Helmholtz Einstein International Berlin Research School in Data Science (HEIBRiDS). We thank IPOC and NIED for providing the data sets.

Contact: 🖾 munchmej@gfz-potsdam.de 🌐 munchmeyer.de 🎧 github.com/yetinam





Helmholtz Centre

Ροτςρα

S43E-0698





Allen, R. M. (2007). The ElarmS earthquake early warning methodology and application across California. In Earthquake Early Warning Festa, G., Zollo, A., & Lancieri, M. (2008). Earthquake magnitude estimation from early radiated energy. Geophysical research letters.

Lancieri, M., & Zollo, A. (2008). A Bayesian approach to the real-time estimation of magnitude from the early P and S wave displacement Münchmeyer, J., Bindi, D., Sippl, C., Leser, U., & Tilmann, F. (2019). Low uncertainty multifeature magnitude estimation with 3-D corrections

and boosting tree regression: application to North Chile. Geophysical Journal International. Sippl, C., Schurr, B., Asch, G., & Kummerow, J. (2018). Seismicity structure of the Northern Chile forearc from> 100,000 double-difference relocated hypocenters. Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth. Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł, & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need.

HELMHOLTZ