



## A comparison of $\tau_c$ and $\tau_p^{\max}$ for magnitude estimation in earthquake early warning

Jang-Tian Shieh,<sup>1</sup> Yih-Min Wu,<sup>1</sup> and Richard M. Allen<sup>2</sup>

Received 11 August 2008; revised 9 September 2008; accepted 15 September 2008; published 16 October 2008.

[1] We determined the  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$  parameters from the K-NET strong motion records of 16 earthquakes in Japan with moment magnitude ( $M_w$ ) ranging from 6.0 to 8.3. A 0.075 Hz high-pass Butterworth filter was applied for determination of  $\tau_c$  based on our previous studies. It was found that different pole selections of the Butterworth filter lead to different uncertainty in magnitude determination. Our results show that using two poles in the filters results in the best magnitude estimates, i.e., minimized the standard deviation in magnitude determination in comparison to  $M_w$  using  $\tau_c$ . The  $\tau_p^{\max}$  parameters (Allen and Kanamori, 2003) were also determined with the same dataset using the Wurman et al. (2007) procedure. It was found that  $\tau_p^{\max}$  values obtained from this dataset, and using the Wurman procedure, had a larger uncertainty. However, when a 0.075 Hz high-pass Butterworth filter with five poles was added, the uncertainty in  $\tau_p^{\max}$ -derived magnitude estimates decreased minimizing the standard deviation in magnitude determination using  $\tau_p^{\max}$ . This difference in the behavior of  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$  can be used to further reduce the uncertainty in rapid magnitude determination for earthquake early warning. When the magnitude estimations from  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$  of each event are averaged to provide a new magnitude estimate, the standard deviation in magnitude estimates is reduced further to 0.27 magnitude units. **Citation:** Shieh, J.-T., Y.-M. Wu, and R. M. Allen (2008), A comparison of  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$  for magnitude estimation in earthquake early warning, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 35, L20301, doi:10.1029/2008GL035611.

### 1. Introduction

[2] A central component of earthquake early-warning (EEW) systems is the determination of the magnitude and location of an earthquake as soon as possible and before destructive energy arrives. Nakamura [1988] first introduced the concept of using the frequency content of the initial few seconds of P-wave arrivals. He observed that larger events cause initial ground motion with longer periods than smaller events. Average ground motion period  $\tau_c$  and dominant ground motion period  $\tau_p^{\max}$  are two important parameters frequently used to estimate the magnitude in EEW [e.g., Allen and Kanamori, 2003; Kanamori, 2005; Olson and Allen, 2005; Wu and Kanamori, 2005a, 2008a, 2008b; Wu et al., 2007; Wurman et al., 2007; Olivieri et al., 2008]. One measure of P-wave

frequency content is  $\tau_c$  which uses the first 3 seconds of P-wave data. The results of Wu and Kanamori [2005a, 2005b, 2008a, 2008b] and Wu et al. [2006, 2007] show a good relationship between  $\tau_c$  and  $M_w$  determined from data collected from Japan, Taiwan and southern California. This suggests that it is possible to estimate the magnitude 3 seconds after the P-wave arrival with the  $\tau_c$  method.

[3] Building of the results of Allen and Kanamori [2003] in southern California, Olson and Allen [2005] also found a good scaling relationship between  $\tau_p^{\max}$  and  $M_w$  for a global earthquake dataset. While they used up to 4 sec of P-wave data,  $\tau_p^{\max}$  values for most of the records occurred within 2 seconds of the P-wave arrival. This relationship between  $\tau_p^{\max}$  and  $M_w$  also allows estimation of magnitude from the first few seconds of P-wave data. The fact that their observations were made prior to the termination of the earthquake rupture was also interpreted as suggesting that earthquake rupture is deterministic. This interpretation remains controversial. Rydelek and Horiuchi [2006] used a dataset of earthquakes with  $M > 6.0$  from Japan to investigate the proposed scaling relation and argued that there was no obvious scaling relation between  $\tau_p^{\max}$  values and magnitude.


[4] Here we focus on the applicability of both the  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$  parameters for EEW. We use a dataset that is similar to that of Rydelek and Horiuchi [2006], and compute  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$  values from the vertical acceleration component of the K-NET strong motion records collected in Japan from 1997 to 2008. There are more than 1000 K-NET stations across Japan, and 16 events were selected in this study (Figure 1). We use the same dataset to determine both  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$  and compare the performance of these parameters as magnitude estimators. We also experiment with the frequency band within which  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$  are determined and find that this plays an important role in the robustness of magnitude estimates.

### 2. Data

[5] The purpose of EEW is to issue a warning before strong ground motion of a destructive earthquake comes. Thus, sixteen larger earthquakes with  $M_w \geq 6$  (Table S1 in the auxiliary material) were chosen for analysis in this study.<sup>1</sup> The criteria for selecting events was: (1) events of  $6 \leq M_w < 7$  with focal depth less than 30 km and at least six records within an epicentral distance of 70 km, and (2) events of  $M_w \geq 7$  with focal depth less than 70 km and at least six records within an epicentral distance less than 200 km. Earthquakes with less than 6 records are not included in this analysis. In this study we use 3 seconds

<sup>1</sup>Department of Geosciences, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan.

<sup>2</sup>Seismological Laboratory, Earth and Planetary Science, University of California, Berkeley, California, USA.



**Figure 1.** Epicenter distribution of events (grey stars) used in this study. Small squares show the locations of K-NET stations.

of data in our determination of  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$ . Given that it is not possible to determine periods greater than  $\sim 12$  seconds, i.e., our 3 second data window constitutes  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the wavelength, we apply a 0.075 Hz high-pass filter, and also discard any observations greater than 10 seconds period. Considering the purpose of EEW in this study, for each event, we use the averaged value from the six waveform records with valid  $\tau_c$  or  $\tau_p^{\max}$  nearest to the epicenter.

### 3. The $\tau_c$ Method

[6]  $\tau_c$  is a measure of the average period of ground motion within some specified time window. It was first

introduced by *Kanamori* [2005] and is a modified version of the method originally developed by *Nakamura* [1988]. The period parameter  $\tau_c$  is calculated from the first several seconds of P-wave data as follows:


$$\tau_c = 2\pi / \sqrt{\left[ \int_0^{t_0} \dot{u}^2(t) dt \right] / \left[ \int_0^{t_0} u^2(t) dt \right]} \quad (1)$$

where  $u$  is the high-pass filtered displacement of the vertical component ground motion and  $\dot{u}$  is the velocity differentiated from  $u$ . Following a series of studies [*Wu and Kanamori*, 2005a, 2005b, 2008a, 2008b; *Wu et al.*, 2006, 2007], the waveforms have a 0.075 Hz high-pass Butterworth filter applied to the velocity component during the procedure of  $\tau_c$  determination (see Text S1, section S1a). A 3 seconds time window starting from first P-wave arrival is set to determine the  $\tau_c$  in this study, i.e.,  $\tau_0$  in equation (1) is set as 3 seconds after the P-wave arrival.


[7] In order to study the effect of different numbers of poles in the 0.075 Hz high-pass Butterworth filter, we tested filters with 1 through 6 poles (Figure S1 shows amplitude response curves) and examined the relationship between  $\tau_c$  and  $M_w$ . We average the  $\tau_c$  values from the six closest waveform records to each event and determined the linear relation between  $M_w$  and the averaged  $\tau_c$  values using least-squares. Figure 2 shows the results of applying filters with 2 and 5 poles. Generally, the  $\tau_c$  values with a small number of poles have larger slope versus  $M_w$ , which is good for magnitude estimation, but they also have a larger scatter (Figure 2a). A larger number of poles results in a smaller slope versus  $M_w$ , but with a smaller scatter (Figure 2b).

### 4. The $\tau_p^{\max}$ Method

[8]  $\tau_p^{\max}$  was introduced by *Allen and Kanamori* [2003] (in which it is called  $T_p$ ) and was applied to a global seismic



**Figure 2.** The  $\tau_c$  estimated with (a) two poles and (b) five poles. A 0.075 Hz high-pass Butterworth filter was applied. Open diamonds represent the  $\tau_c$  of each record, and solid circles represent the averaged  $\tau_c$  values from records of the same events. Solid line shows the least-squares fit and the two dashed lines show the range of one standard deviation.



**Figure 3.** The  $\tau_p^{\max}$  estimated (a) by the original method of *Allen and Kanamori* [2003] and (b) by adding a five pole high-pass Butterworth filter at 0.075 Hz. Open diamonds represent the  $\tau_p^{\max}$  values of each record, and solid circles represent the average  $\tau_p^{\max}$  values from records of the same events. Solid line shows the least-squares fit and the two dashed

dataset by *Olson and Allen* [2005]. It is nearly identical to the original concept proposed by *Nakamura* [1988]. While the purpose of  $\tau_p^{\max}$  is the same as for  $\tau_c$  in that it is a measure of frequency content, the approach is quite different.  $\tau_c$  is determined by selecting a specific time window, 3 seconds in this case, and measuring the frequency content of the entire selected window.  $\tau_p$  is a timeseries determined recursively and continuously from the seismic waveform. As such  $\tau_p$  at any given time contains information about the frequency content of the entire waveform up to the given point in time, though the contribution of a given waveform segment decreases with time. This makes  $\tau_p^{\max}$  a dominant period parameter of ground motion while  $\tau_c$  is an average period parameter.  $\tau_p^{\max}$  is also a ratio of the velocity and acceleration signals, while  $\tau_c$  is the ratio of displacement and velocity signals.

[9] The parameter  $\tau_p$  is computed by

$$\tau_i^p = 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{X_i}{D_i}}$$

where  $X_i = \alpha X_{i-1} + x_i^2$

$$\text{and } D_i = \alpha D_{i-1} + \left(\frac{dx}{dt}\right)_i^2 \quad (2)$$


$x_i$  is the velocity signal to which both high- and low-pass filters have been applied [*Wurman et al.*, 2007] (see Text S1, section S1b) and  $\alpha$  is a smoothing constant which is set as 0.99 in this study. It is  $\alpha$  that determines how quickly the contribution of a given segment of the time series to  $\tau_p$  decreases with time.  $\tau_p$  is computed at every time step and the maximum value,  $\tau_p^{\max}$ , within some time window is chosen to be the parameter used to estimate magnitude for EEW. In this study the time window used

was 3 seconds for similarity with  $\tau_c$ .  $\tau_p^{\max}$  is therefore the maximum value of  $\tau_p$  within 3 seconds of the P-wave arrival.  $\tau_p^{\max}$  is selected from the time window starting at 0.05s rather than from 0.00s because of the recursive nature of the  $\tau_p$  calculation as discussed by *Olson and Allen* [2005]. As with the  $\tau_c$  vs.  $M_w$  relations in this study, the linear relation is shown by the least-squares fit between  $M_w$  and averaged values of  $\tau_p^{\max}$  from the same six records for each earthquake.

[10] Figure 3a shows  $\tau_p^{\max}$  values for the 16 earthquakes in this study. While  $\tau_p^{\max}$  increases with  $M_w$ , there is a large scatter in individual station observations for several of the smallest events resulting in the larger averaged  $\tau_p^{\max}$  values than for the larger events. This scatter is likely attributed to processing problems for smaller signal-to-noise ratio waveforms. Using the appropriate filter reduces the scatter. As with  $\tau_c$ , we tried to apply a high-pass Butterworth filter at 0.075 Hz in the  $\tau_p^{\max}$  calculation. Figure 3b shows  $\tau_p^{\max}$  when five poles are used. This has the effect of narrowing the frequency band included in the  $\tau_p^{\max}$  calculation. The standard deviation of least-squares fitting of  $\tau_p^{\max}$  versus  $M_w$  decreases from 0.48 to 0.22 with the application of this filter.

## 5. Discussion and Conclusions

[11] The present study demonstrates that the filter application plays an important role in the calculation of  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$ . In order to determine the best pole setting for the 0.075 Hz high-pass filter, relationships of  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$  versus  $M_w$  were analyzed by least-squares fitting for pole values from 1 to 6. In the EEW application, we use the equation of least-squares fitting of  $\tau_c$  or  $\tau_p^{\max}$  to estimate magnitude of an event. Since the purpose of these methods is to estimate the magnitude, standard deviations of estimated magnitude were used as the index to compare




**Figure 4.** Standard deviations in magnitude estimation using  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$  for different numbers of poles in the 0.075 Hz high-pass Butterworth filter.

results of different pole values. As shown in Figure 4 the best magnitude estimates are obtained from  $\tau_c$  when the number of poles equals 2, which results in a standard deviation of 0.36 in the magnitude estimation. For  $\tau_p^{\max}$ , 5 poles had the best result in magnitude estimation resulting in a standard deviation of 0.56. Without the 0.075 Hz high-pass filter the standard deviation in the magnitude estimate from  $\tau_p^{\max}$  is 2.48.

[12] Based on this result,  $\tau_c$  approach seems more robust than  $\tau_p^{\max}$ . However, these two parameters are based on the same concept from Nakamura [1988]. For the  $\tau_c$  calculation, a three seconds window after P arrival is used, while the  $\tau_p$  calculation is recursive. Thus, the  $\tau_p$  value may be influenced by signals before P arrival. To abate this influence, we calculated  $\tau_p$  by setting waveform values to zero prior to 0.05 seconds after the P-wave arrival.  $\tau_p^{\max}$  was then determined from the  $\tau_p$  timeseries up to 3 seconds after P-wave arrival. A 0.075Hz high-pass Butterworth filter with 5 poles was also applied. Figure 5 shows the  $\tau_p^{\max}$  results. The uncertainty in magnitude estimation is decreased resulting in a standard deviation in the magnitude estimate of 0.40. This uncertainty is essentially the same as the uncertainty from the  $\tau_c$  method.

[13] These tests have shown the importance of filter application in the calculation of  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$ . We find that adding a 0.075 Hz high-pass Butterworth filter with a sharp cutoff in frequency (5 poles) is optimal for  $\tau_p^{\max}$  analysis enhancing the relationship between  $\tau_p^{\max}$  and magnitude. For  $\tau_c$ , 2 poles have a best result in magnitude estimation. The different filter applications to  $\tau_p^{\max}$  analysis results in a diversity of measurements that may be the cause of the controversy introduced by Rydelek and Horiuchi [2006]. While there is difference in the behavior of  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$ , when the appropriate specific procedure is applied, both methods have good linear trends with  $M_w$ . This suggests that it may be useful to include both  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_p^{\max}$  in the estimation of magnitude in earthquake early warning

systems. The magnitude estimates of  $\tau_c$  with two poles and  $\tau_p^{\max}$  with five pole calculated from 0.05 seconds after P arrival could be averaged to provide a more robust magnitude estimate. This average magnitude estimation has a lower uncertainty than either  $\tau_c$  or  $\tau_p^{\max}$  alone. The



**Figure 5.** The  $\tau_p^{\max}$  estimated in the same way as Figure 3b, i.e., applying a five pole high-pass Butterworth filter at 0.075 Hz, but with the signals before 0.05s after the P-wave arrival set to zero. Hollow diamonds represent the  $\tau_p^{\max}$  values of each record, and solid circles represent the average  $\tau_p^{\max}$  values from records of the same events. Solid line shows the least-squares fit and the two dashed lines show the range of one standard deviation.

standard deviation of this average magnitude estimate is 0.27 magnitude units.

[14] **Acknowledgments.** We would like to thank M. Olivieri and one anonymous reviewer for their valuable comments. This research was supported by the Central Weather Bureau and the National Science Council of the Republic of China (NSC96-2625-Z-002-025 and NSC95-2119-M-002-043-MY3). Support was also provided by the USGS NEHRP program (06HQAG0147). Figure 1 was made using Generic Mapping Tool [Wessel and Smith, 1991].

## References

- Allen, R. M., and H. Kanamori (2003), The potential for earthquake early warning in southern California, *Science*, *300*, 786–789.
- Kanamori, H. (2005), Real-time seismology and earthquake damage mitigation, *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.*, *33*, 195–214.
- Nakamura, Y. (1988), On the Urgent Earthquake Detection and Alarm System (UrEDAS), in *Proceedings of Ninth World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, August 2–9, 1988, Tokyo-Kyoto, Japan*, vol. 7, pp. 673–678, Assoc. for Earthquake Disaster Prev., Tokyo.
- Olivieri, M., R. M. Allen, and G. Wurman (2008), The potential for earthquake early warning in Italy using ElarmS, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, *98*, 495–503, doi:10.1785/0120070054.
- Olson, E. L., and R. M. Allen (2005), The deterministic nature of earthquake rupture, *Nature*, *438*, 212–215.
- Rydelek, P., and S. Horiuchi (2006), Is earthquake rupture deterministic?, *Nature*, *442*, E5–E6.
- Wessel, P., and W. H. F. Smith (1991), Free software helps map and display data, *Eos Trans. AGU*, *72*, 441.
- Wu, Y. M., and H. Kanamori (2005a), Experiment on an onsite early warning method for the Taiwan early warning system, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, *95*, 347–353.
- Wu, Y. M., and H. Kanamori (2005b), Rapid assessment of damaging potential of earthquakes in Taiwan from the beginning of *P* waves, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, *95*, 1181–1185.
- Wu, Y. M., and H. Kanamori (2008a), Exploring the feasibility of on-site earthquake early warning using close-in records of the 2007 Noto Hanto earthquake, *Earth, Planets and Space*, *60*, 155–160.
- Wu, Y. M., and H. Kanamori (2008b), Development of an Earthquake Early Warning System Using Real-Time Strong Motion Signals, *Sensors*, *8*, 1–9.
- Wu, Y. M., H. Y. Yen, L. Zhao, B. S. Huang, and W. T. Liang (2006), Magnitude determination using initial *P* waves: A single-station approach, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *33*, L05306, doi:10.1029/2005GL025395.
- Wu, Y. M., H. Kanamori, R. M. Allen, and E. Hauksson (2007), Determination of earthquake early warning parameters,  $\tau_p$  and  $P_d$ , for southern California, *Geophys. J. Int.*, *170*, 711–717.
- Wurman, G., R. M. Allen, and P. Lombard (2007), Toward earthquake early warning in northern California, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *112*, B08311, doi:10.1029/2006JB004830.

R. M. Allen, Seismological Laboratory, Earth and Planetary Science, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA.

J.-T. Shieh and Y.-M. Wu, Department of Geosciences, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan. (drymwu@ntu.edu.tw)