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Overview: I

- scientific problem: given data from DART buoys and models for unit magnitude earthquakes from various tsunami source locations, determine actual magnitudes (slips) and location(s) of actual earthquake
- will describe elements of basic inversion algorithm
- start with detided DART buoy data, noting need for detrending
- look at model for single buoy, noting need for interpolation
- introduce least squares criterion by looking at estimation of slip for single source model based upon data from one buoy
- consider assessing statistical variability in estimated slip
- look at effect of using varying amounts of buoy data
- considering adding data from a second DART buoy
Overview: II

- look at using more than one source
- discussion of various ‘bells and whistles’ currently implemented
  - imposing constraints on slips
  - allowing shifting and stretching of source models
- discussion of work in progress
  - use of statistical tests to select sources
- demo of R implementation of algorithm (if time permits)
- will motivate basic ideas behind algorithm using the Kuril Island event of Nov 2006
Detided DART Buoy Data for Kuril Island Event
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Detrending

• inversion procedure assumes data have been successfully detided, which is not the case here

• data subjected to simple detrending procedure
  – identify region before start of first wave
  – fit line to this data using least squares procedure
  – extend fitted line through all the data
  – subtract extended line from data, yielding detrended data

• detrended data used as input to inversion procedure
Detided DART Buoy Data for Kuril Island Event
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Line Fitted to Bouy Data Before First Wave
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Detrended DART Buoy Data for Kuril Island Event
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Models for DART Buoys

• consider source locations for Kuril Island event

• for a given source location (e.g., a12), can generate a model of what we would expect to see at each bouy if the earthquake came from just that source

• each model is generated over a grid of discrete times, which might or might not correspond to the times at which DART buoy data are collected

• use cubic spline to interpolate model, so can regard model $g(t)$ and its first derivative $g'(t)$ as being defined for all times $t$

• as an example, consider model from a12 source for buoy 21414
a12 Source Model for Buoy 21414

The diagram shows modeled data (in meters) over hours since an event. The data shows a sharp peak around 2.2 hours, followed by oscillations.
Fitting Models to DART Buoy Data: I

• model from a12 source for buoy 21414 generated under assumption of a unit magnitude for the earthquake

- poor match, so multiple model \( g(t) \) by \( A \) to get a better fit, where \( A \) is interpreted as earthquake magnitude (the ‘slip’)
Fitting Models to DART Buoy Data: II

- let $x_t$ represent the DART buoy data at time $t$
- we entertain the model

$$x_t = A \cdot g(t) + e_t,$$

where $e_t$ is a residual term (mismatch between data and model)
- if we let $A$ range over a grid of values, then we can compute corresponding residuals $e_t = x_t - A \cdot g(t)$ for any given $A$
- as an example, let’s compute residuals from fit of a12 source to buoy 21414 data for $A = 1.0, 1.2, 1.4, \ldots, 10.0$, marking residual with largest absolute value with a red dot (for discussion later on)
Matching a12 Model to 21414 Data by Varying Slip

\[ A = 10 \]
Fitting Models to DART Buoy Data: III

• Q: what is the ‘best’ choice for $A$?
• set $A$ such that residuals $e_t$ are ‘small’ by some measure
• many measures are possible – here are three common ones:
  – make sum of squared residuals as small as possible:
    $\sum_{t} e_t^2 = \sum_{t} [x_t - A \cdot g(t)]^2 \equiv f_2(A)$
  – make sum of magnitudes of residuals as small as possible:
    $\sum_{t} |e_t| = \sum_{t} |x_t - A \cdot g(t)| \equiv f_1(A)$
  – make largest magnitude of residuals as small as possible:
    $\max_{t} |e_t| = \max_{t} |x_t - A \cdot g(t)| \equiv f_\infty(A)$
Fitting Models to DART Buoy Data: IV

• here is a specialized one:
  – make sum of squared residuals at peak and trough as small as possible:
    \[ e_{t_0}^2 + e_{t_1}^2 = [x_{t_0} - A \cdot g(t_0)]^2 + [x_{t_1} - A \cdot g(t_1)]^2 \equiv f_{pt}(A), \]
    where \( t_0 \) and \( t_1 \) are such that
    \[ g(t_0) = \max_t \{g(t)\} \quad \text{and} \quad g(t_1) = \min_t \{g(t)\} \]

• let’s look at plots of \( f(A) \) versus \( A \) for the four measures, where, as before, \( A = 1.0, 1.2, 1.4, \ldots, 10.0 \) (for explanation of ‘bath-tub’ appearance of \( f_\infty(A) \) vs. \( A \), study evolution of red dots on plots of residuals)
Four Residual Measures $f(A)$ versus Slip $A$
Fitting Models to DART Buoy Data: V

• estimated slips are $\hat{A}_2 = 4.2$, $\hat{A}_1 = 5$, $\hat{A}_\infty = 3.8$ and $\hat{A}_{pt} = 4.2$
• two measures based on least squares, i.e., $f_2(A)$ and $f_{pt}(A)$, have certain advantages, including:
  – no need to do grid search because location of minimum of
    
    \[ f(A) \equiv \sum_t [x_t - A \cdot g(t)]^2 \]

    is given by a simple formula:

    \[ \hat{A}_{ls} = \frac{\sum_t x_t g(t)}{\sum_t [g(t)]^2}, \quad \text{here yielding } \hat{A}_2 = 4.17 \text{ and } \hat{A}_{pt} = 4.26 \]

    (follows from taking equation $f'(A) = 0$ and solving for $A$)
  – statistical variation in $\hat{A}_{ls}$ easy to quantify
Assessing Variability in $\hat{A}_{ls}$: I

- reformulate model $x_t = A \cdot g(t) + e_t$ in vector notation as $\mathbf{x} = A\mathbf{g} + \mathbf{e}$, where $\mathbf{x}$ is column vector containing the $x_t$’s etc.
- least squares estimate of $A$ is $\hat{A}_{ls} = \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{x} / \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{g}$
- need to consider statistical properties of residuals $e_t$
- if residuals were Gaussian (normally) distributed and uncorrelated with a common variance $\sigma_e^2$, then $\hat{A}_{ls}$ is Gaussian distributed with mean $A$ and variance $\sigma_e^2 / \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{g}$
- allows us to compute standard deviations (SDs) and to write $\hat{A}_2 = 4.17 \pm 0.59$ and $\hat{A}_{pt} = 4.26 \pm 2.69$ (note size of SDs)
- assumptions of uncorrelatedness and common variance are dicey, as can be seen from plot of residuals associated with $\hat{A}_2$
Least Squares Estimate $\hat{A}_2$ of Slip for a12 & 21414

$A = 4.17$
Assessing Variability in $\hat{A}_{ls}$: II

- Assumption of common variance of $e_t$'s not viable for data before first wave, but, because $g(t) = 0$ there, these data have no effect on estimate $\hat{A}_{ls} = \sum_t x_t g(t)/\sum [g(t)]^2$

- While assumption of common variance reasonable for data beginning at first wave, assumption of uncorrelatedness is not

- Can model correlation using a first order autoregressive process:
  
  $$e_t = \phi e_{t-1} + w_t,$$

  where $w_t$ is Gaussian white noise

- Implies that correlation between $e_t$ and $e_{t+\tau}$ given by $\phi^{|\tau|}$

- Estimate of $\phi$ via correlation between $e_t$ & $e_{t+1}$ yields $\hat{\phi} \approx 0.86$
Assessing Variability in $\hat{A}_{ls}$: III

- theory says $\hat{A}_{ls}$ is Gaussian distributed with mean $A$ and variance $\sigma_e^2 \cdot g^T V g / (g^T g)^2$, where $V$ is matrix whose $(j, k)$th element is $\phi|j-k|
- yields $\hat{A}_2 = 4.17 \pm 1.33$, which has larger SD than what was obtained under questionable assumptions ($\hat{A}_2 = 4.17 \pm 0.59$)
Least Squares (LS) as Criterion for Estimating Slips

• inversion algorithm uses LS as criterion for estimating slip $A$
• user must decide amount of DART data to use
• two extremes: all available data or just two data points
• use of more data should yield estimator $\hat{A}$ with smaller variance \textit{if} model is valid over entire range of data
• if model decreases in validity as time increases, should limit data to, say, first quarter wave or first full wave
• real-time constraints also dictate interest in use of limited amount of data
• starting with a quarter wave of data, let’s look at LS fits involving varying amounts of data
LS Fit of a12 Model to Selected 21414 Data

A = 6.07
Mean Squared Errors and $\hat{A}$ for Selected 21414 Data
Incorporating Data from a Second Buoy: I

- so far, have modeled data from buoy 21414 in terms of an earthquake coming from source a12

- in vector notation, we have $\mathbf{x} = A\mathbf{g} + \mathbf{e}$

- in preparation for looking at additional buoys and additional sources, let’s rewrite model as $\mathbf{x}_1 = A_{a12} \cdot \mathbf{g}_{1,a12} + \mathbf{e}_1$, where
  - $\mathbf{x}_1$ is a vector containing data from first buoy (here 21414)
  - $A_{a12}$ is a scalar representing slip associated with source a12
  - $\mathbf{g}_{1,a12}$ is a vector containing unit slip model for what first buoy should see from earthquake originating at source a12
  - $\mathbf{e}_1$ is a vector of residuals (represents combination of measurements errors and model inaccuracies)
Incorporating Data from a Second Buoy: II

- in this notation, LS estimator of $A_{a12}$ is given by

$$\hat{A}_{a12} = \frac{g_{T,1,a12} x_1}{g_{T,1,a12} g_{1,a12}} = \left( g_{T,1,a12} g_{1,a12} \right)^{-1} g_{T,1,a12} x_1$$

(last expression of interest for generalizations to come)

- now consider data $x_2$ from a second buoy (46413)

- model this data as $x_2 = A_{a12} \cdot g_{2,a12} + e_2$

- note that, while $g_{2,a12}$ for buoy 46413 is different from $g_{1,a12}$ for buoy 21414, both models have the same slip $A_{a12}$

- given our estimate $\hat{A}_{a12} = 4.17$ based upon just $x_1$, let’s see how well $x_2$ and $\hat{A}_{a12} \cdot g_{2,a12}$ match up (‘cross-validation’)
a12 Slip from 21414 Data Applied to 46413 Data

\[ A = 4.17 \]
a12 Slip from 21414 Data Applied to 21414 Data

A = 4.17
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Incorporating Data from a Second Buoy: III

- can also estimate $A_{a12}$ using just data from 46413:

$$\hat{A}_{a12} = \left(g_{2,a12}^T g_{2,a12}\right)^{-1} g_{2,a12}^T x_2$$

- yields $\hat{A}_{a12} = 3.22$, whereas we had $\hat{A}_{a12} = 4.17$ from 21414
- can look at plots corresponding to the ones we had before
a12 Slip from 46413 Data Applied to 46413 Data

\[ A = 3.22 \]
a12 Slip from 46413 Data Applied to 21414 Data

\[ A = 3.22 \]
Incorporating Data from a Second Buoy: IV

• another approach is to use data from both buoys to get a joint estimate for $A_{a12}$

• joint model is $x_{1:2} = A_{a12} \cdot g_{1:2,a12} + e_{1:2}$, where
  – $x_{1:2}$ is a vector formed by stacking $x_1$ on top of $x_2$
  – $A_{a12}$ is a scalar representing slip associated with source $a12$
  – $g_{1:2,a12}$ is a vector formed by stacking $g_{1,a12}$ on top of $g_{2,a12}$
  – $e_{1:2}$ is a vector of residuals

• LS estimator of $A_{a12}$ now takes the form
  $$\hat{A}_{a12} = \left( g_{1:2,a12}^T g_{1:2,a12} \right)^{-1} g_{1:2,a12}^T x_{1:2}$$

• yields $\hat{A}_{a12} \doteq 3.68$ (cf. 4.17 from 21414 and 3.22 from 46413)

• can look at plots corresponding to the ones we had before
a12 Slip from Both Buoys Applied to 46413 Data

\[ A = 3.68 \]
a12 Slip from Both Buoys Applied to 21414 Data

\[ A = 3.68 \]
Using Linear Combinations of Sources: I

- so far, have modeled data in terms of a single source \( a_{12} \)
- in vector notation, our model is \( \mathbf{x}_{1:2} = A_{a_{12}} \cdot g_{1:2,a_{12}} + \mathbf{e}_{1:2} \)
- suppose earthquake is actually a linear combination of two sources, namely, \( a_{12} \) and \( b_{13} \)
- our model is now \( \mathbf{x}_{1:2} = A_{a_{12}} \cdot g_{1:2,a_{12}} + A_{b_{13}} \cdot g_{1:2,b_{13}} + \mathbf{e}_{1:2} \)
- can reexpress this model as \( \mathbf{x}_{1:2} = G \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{e}_{1:2} \), where
  - \( G \) is a matrix with two columns, namely, \( g_{1:2,a_{12}} \) and \( g_{1:2,b_{13}} \)
  - \( \mathbf{A} \) is a vector with two elements, namely, \( A_{a_{12}} \) and \( A_{b_{13}} \)
- LS estimator of \( \mathbf{A} \) is given by \( \hat{\mathbf{A}} = (G^T G)^{-1} G^T \mathbf{x}_{1:2} \), which is similar in form to
  \[
  \hat{A}_{a_{12}} = \left( g_{1:2,a_{12}}^T g_{1:2,a_{12}} \right)^{-1} g_{1:2,a_{12}}^T \mathbf{x}_{1:2}
  \]
Using Linear Combinations of Sources: II

• complication: models from two sources can be very similar!

• in worse case scenario, have \( g_{1:2,b13} = \alpha g_{1:2,a12} \equiv \alpha g \)

• in this case, \( G = [g, \alpha g] \) and

\[
G^T G = \begin{bmatrix}
g^T g & \alpha g^T g \\
\alpha g^T g & \alpha^2 g^T g
\end{bmatrix},
\]

which has a determinant of zero, so \((G^T G)^{-1}\) does not exist

• instead of using \( \hat{A} = (G^T G)^{-1} G^T x_{1:2} \), can handle this case by solving equation \( G^T G \hat{A} = G^T x_{1:2} \) with help of a singular value decomposition (SVD) of the matrix \( G^T G \)

• in general, use of SVD yields protection against problems of numerical stability in computing \( \hat{A} \)
Using Linear Combinations of Sources: III

• using sources \( a_{12} \) and \( b_{13} \) to model data from buoys 21414 and 46413, LS estimates of slips are

\[
\hat{A} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_{a_{12}} \; \hat{A}_{b_{13}} \end{bmatrix}^T \approx [2.61, 3.81]^T
\]

• fitted model and residuals for 21414 are given by

\[
f_1 \equiv \hat{A}_{a_{12}} \cdot g_{1,a_{12}} + \hat{A}_{b_{13}} \cdot g_{1,b_{13}} \quad \text{and} \quad e_1 = x_1 - f_1
\]

likewise, fitted model and residuals for 46413 are given by

\[
f_2 \equiv \hat{A}_{a_{12}} \cdot g_{2,a_{12}} + \hat{A}_{b_{13}} \cdot g_{2,b_{13}} \quad \text{and} \quad e_2 = x_2 - f_2
\]

• can use this model to predict what a third buoy should see:

\[
f_3 \equiv \hat{A}_{a_{12}} \cdot g_{3,a_{12}} + \hat{A}_{b_{13}} \cdot g_{3,b_{13}}
\]

(‘cross-validation’)
Data, Fitted Model and Residuals for 21414

![Graph showing data, fitted model, and residuals for 21414 meters. The graph includes two plots: one for data and model, and another for residuals. The x-axis represents the range 1.5 to 3.0, with tick marks at 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, and 3.0. The y-axis for the data and model plot represents meters with tick marks at -0.05, 0.00, and 0.05. The residuals plot also shows a range from -0.05 to 0.05 on the y-axis.]
Data, Fitted Model and Residuals for 46413

![Graph showing data, fitted model, and residuals for 46413. The graph plots meters against the x-axis and residuals (meters) against the x-axis. The data line is solid, and the model line is dashed. The residuals are shown at the bottom of the graph.]
Data, Fitted Model and Residuals for 46408
Bells & Whistles

• current implementation of inversion algorithm allows for
  – constraints on slips (either $A \geq 0$ or $A \leq 0$)
  – shifting of source models, i.e., use of
    \[ \tilde{g}(t) = g(t - a), \]
    where $a$ is a shift that can be constrained to interval $[a_l, a_u]$
  – stretching/shrinking of source models, i.e., use of
    \[ \tilde{g}(t) = g(t/b), \]
    where $b$ is a stretch/shrink factor that can be constrained to interval $[b_l, b_u]$
  – shifting and stretching/shrinking together, i.e., use of
    \[ \tilde{g}(t) = g((t - a)/b) \]
    with constraints on both $a$ and $b$
Future Directions

- inversion algorithm requires choice of sources as part of input
- seismic information might suggest, say, eight sources
- currently user can do a joint fit and then manually select sources
- want to investigate use of statistical tests to select sources
- two approaches: step-up and step-down
  - step-up approach starts with one source and uses statistical tests to add other sources one at a time
  - step-down approach starts with, say, eight sources and uses statistical tests to remove sources one at a time
- idea is that these approaches might provide guidance on source selection for users
Demo of R Implementation

• R is an interpretive statistical language freely available from
  
  http://www.r-project.org/

  under the General Public License (GPL)

• R is popular in the statistical community for
  – testing out new ideas in statistics,
  – performing statistical analysis and
  – creating graphics

• inversion algorithm has been bread-boarded in R