Local Magnitude Scale for the Philippines: Preliminary Results

Johnlery Pino Deximo¹ and Tatsuhiko Hara²

- 1. Corresponding Author. Science Research Analyst, Philippine Institute of Volcanology and Seismology, Department of Science and Technology, Quezon City, Philippines. Email: johnlery.deximo@phivolcs.dost.gov.ph
- 2. Chief Research Scientist, International Institute of Seismology and Earthquake Engineering, Building Research Institute, Tsukuba, Japan. Email: thara@kenken.go.jp

Abstract

We analysed broadband waveform data from the Philippine Seismic Network in order to obtain a local magnitude formula appropriate for the Philippines. We used data from 162 events that occurred between May, 2012 and March, 2016. We calculated simulated Wood-Anderson seismograms from vertical component waveform data to measure maximum amplitudes. We conducted a grid search to determine the coefficients for the log(r) and r terms of the distance correction function, where r is the hypocentral distance. The preliminary results consist of sets of the coefficients which explain the data relatively well without large hypocentral distance dependence. Compared to the distance correction functions for southern California, central California, and the central United States obtained by previous studies, the distance correction functions of the preliminary results are similar to that for southern California.

Keywords: Local magnitude, distance correction, grid search

1. INTRODUCTION

The Philippine Seismic Network (PSN) has been deployed since 2012. It consists of 29 broadband stations. Ten stations have been deployed in the SATREPS (Science and Technology Research Partnership for Sustainable Development) project by the NIED (National Research Institute for Earth Science and Disaster Prevention) and the Philippine Institute of Volcanology and Seismology (PHIVOLCS) entitled "Enhancement of Earthquake and Volcano Monitoring and Effective Utilization of Disaster Mitigation Information in the Philippines" funded by the JST (Japan Science and Technology Agency) and the JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency). Nineteen stations have been deployed by the PHIVOLCS.

The SWIFT (Source Parameter determinations based on Waveform Inversion of Fourier Transformed seismograms, Nakano et al., 2008, 2010) system has been implemented for rapid earthquake source parameter determination for earthquakes up to around M_w 4.5 using the PSN data (Bonita et al. 2015).

 M_L (Richter, 1935, 1958) is applicable to events smaller than M_w 4.5 and to those up to around M_w 7 (e.g., Hanks and Kanamori 1979; Hanks and Boore 1984). In this study, we analyzed broadband waveform data from the PSN to obtain a distance correction function for M_L for the Philippines following the IASPEI standard procedure for magnitude determination (IASPEI, 2013).

2. METHOD

The IASPEI (2013) recommends a M_L formula based on the distance correction function of Hutton and Boore (1987) 'for crustal earthquakes in regions with attenuative properties similar to those of southern California'. It recommends the calibration of a distance correction function using amplitudes from vertical component instruments 'for crustal earthquakes in regions with attenuation properties that are different from those of coastal California'. Since the attenuation property in the Philippines is not well understood, we tried to determine the distance correction function appropriate for the Philippines using data from the PSN.

Following previous studies such as Bakun and Joyner (1984), Hutton and Boore (1987), Miao and Langston (2007), we adopted the following formula:

 $M_L = \log A + n \log(r/100) + K (r - 100) + 3 + S$ (1) where A is the maximum amplitude on the vertical component record, r is the hypocentral distance in kilometers, the coefficients n and K are constants to be determined by observed data, and S is a station correction. The sum of the second, third, and fourth terms corresponds to a distance correction function, $-\log(A_0)$, in the Richter's local magnitude.

We performed a grid search to determine these coefficients. The upper and lower bounds and increment for *n* are set to 0.75, 1.7, and 0.05, respectively. Those for *K* are set to 0.0008, 0.007, and 0.00005, respectively. For a given pair of *n* and *K*, we determined station corrections using the differential scheme of Uhrhammer et al. (1996) with an assumption that the sum of station corrections is zero. Then, we calculated M_L estimates for that pair of the coefficients with the station corrections. We chose a median of M_L estimates for each event as the M_L estimate for that event. We calculated the magnitude residual that is the difference between each M_L estimate and the M_L estimate for that event (i.e., the median). To find an optimal estimate of the parameters, we calculated the root mean square (RMS) of the magnitude residuals and, in addition, investigate the hypocentral distance dependence of the magnitude residuals. For the latter, we fitted a straight line to the magnitude residuals with respect to the hypocentral distance by the least squares method. We evaluated the hypocentral distance dependence by the product of 1000 and the slope of the fitted line, which corresponds to the systematic difference for the range of 1000 km.

3. DATA

In this study, we used waveform data recorded at 18 broadband seismic stations of the PSN considering their operation periods. We selected 162 shallow (up to a depth of 34 km) local earthquakes that occurred in the period from May 2012 to March 2016 for each of which at least six data are available in the hypocentral distance range up to 1000 km. We calculated simulated Wood-Anderson seismograms using the instrument response of the Wood-Anderson seismograph obtained by Uhrhammer and Collins (1990).

4. **RESULTS**

We performed a grid search to determine the coefficients n and K in eq. (1) by the procedure explained in section 2. As was explained, we evaluated the hypocentral distance dependence of the magnitude residuals by the product of 1000 and the slope of the fitted line. We selected the sets of coefficients n and K under the constraint that the absolute value of the product is less than or equal to 0.02. Figure 1 shows the distance correction functions for the selected sets of the coefficients with those for southern California (Hutton and Boore, 1987), central California (Bakun and Joyner, 1984), and the central United States (Miao and Langston, 2007). The distance correction functions of the preliminary results are similar to that for southern California. The pair of n = 1.70 and K = 0.0013 provides the minimum RMS magnitude residual (0.23). Since the distribution of the coefficients.



Figure 1. The distance correction functions for the selected sets of the coefficients are shown by gray curves. The black curve, dashed and dotted curves are the distance correction functions for southern California (Hutton and Boore, 1987), central California (Bakun and Joyner, 1984), and the central United States (Miao and Langston, 2007).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Dr. Bartolome Bautista, Mr. Ishmael Narag, and Dr. Renato Solidum, Jr. for their supports of this study. We used Seismic Analysis Code (SAC, Goldstein et al. 2003; Goldstein and Snoke 2005) in some parts of the data processing. We used the rdseed software retrieved from the IRIS DMC (Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology, Data Management Center) for data format conversion. The Generic Mapping Tools (GMT, Wessel and Smith 1998) was used to make the figure.

REFERENCES

Bakun, W.H. and Joyner, W. (1984) The M_L scale in central California, *Bull. Seis. Soc. Am.*, Vol 74, No 5, pp 1827-1843.

Bonita, J.D., Kumagai, H. and Nakano, M. (2015) Regional moment tensor analysis in the Philippines: CMT solutions in 2012-2013, *Journal of Disaster Research*, Vol 10, No 1, pp 18-24.

Goldstein, P., Dodge, D., Firpo, M. and Minner, L. (2003) SAC2000: Signal processing and analysis tools for seismologists and engineers, Invited contribution to *"The IASPEI International Handbook of Earthquake and Engineering Seismology"*, Edited by Lee, W.H.K., Kanamori, H., Jennings, P.C., and Kisslinger, C., Academic Press, London.

Goldstein, P. and Snoke A. (2005) SAC Availability for the IRIS Community, *Incorporated Institutions for Seismology Data Management Center Electronic Newsletter*, Vol 7, No 1, http://ds.iris.edu/ds/newsletter/vol7/no1/sac-availability-for-the-iris-community/.

Hanks, T.C. and Kanamori H. (1979) A moment magnitude scale, J. Geophys. Res., Vol 84, No B5, pp 2348-2350.

Hanks, T.C. and Boore, D.M. (1984) Moment-magnitude relations in theory and practice, *J. Geophys. Res.*, Vol 89, No B7, 6229-6235.

Hutton, L.K. and Boore, D.M. (1987) The M_L scale in southern California, *Bull. Seis.* Soc. Am., Vol 77, No 6, pp 2074-2094.

IASPEI, 2013, Summary of Magnitude Working Group Recommendations on Standard Procedures for Determining Earthquake magnitudes from Digital Data, http://www.iaspei.org/commissions/CSOI/Summary_WG_recommendations_201303 27.pdf

Miao, Q. and Langston, C.A. (2007) Empirical distance attenuation and the localmagnitude scale for the central United States, *Bull. Seis. Soc. Am.*, Vol 97, No 6, pp 2137-2151.

Nakano, M., Kumagai H. and Inoue H. (2008) Waveform inversion in the frequency domain for the simultaneous determination of earthquake source mechanism and moment function, *Geophys. J. Int.*, Vol 173, No 3, pp 1000-1011.

Nakano, M., Yamashina, T., Kumagai, H. and Inoue, H. (2010) Centroid moment tensor catalogue for Indonesia, *Phys. Earth Planet. Int.*, Vol 183, Nos 3-4, pp 456-467. Richter, C.F. (1935) An instrumental earthquake magnitude scale, *Bull. Seis. Soc. Am.*, Vol 25, No 1, pp 1-32.

Richter, C.F. (1958) Elementary seismology, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco, CA, 578pp.

Uhrhammer, R.A. and Collins, E.R. (1990) Synthesis of Wood-Anderson seismograms from broadband digital records, *Bull. Seis. Soc. Am.*, Vol 80, No 3, pp 702-716.

Uhrhammer, R.A., Loper, S.J. and Romanowicz, B. (1996) Determination of local magnitude using BDSN broadband records, *Bull. Seis. Soc. Am.*, Vol 86, No 5, pp 1314-1330.

Wessel, P. and Smith, W.H.F. (1998) New, improved version of the Generic Mapping Tools released, *Eos Trans. Am. geophys. Un.*, Vol 79, No 47, p 579.