# Improving earthquake detection with data mining & machine learning

#### Karianne Bergen

kbergen@stanford.edu

Institute for Computational and Mathematical Engineering, Stanford University [next position: Data Science Initiative Postdoctoral Fellow, Harvard University]

#### IRIS Meeting 2018 | Karianne Bergen

# What is Machine Learning?

#### Machine learning (ML)

A set of tools for *automatically* learning and recognizing complex patterns *from data* 

e.g. linear regression, logistic regression, PCA

#### Data mining

Tools for extracting unknown patterns or information from large data sets

Closely related to machine learning



# Machine learning for data-driven discovery

Scientific discovery depends on ability to *extract information* from *massive data sets*.

#### Use machine learning & data mining to:

- Automate large-scale data processing or specialized, repetitive tasks
- Model complex relationships
- Discover interesting or unexpected patterns





# Selecting a machine learning approach

How much data?

What is your modeling task?



# Why data mining & ML for earthquake detection?

- Two key properties:
  - Data-driven outcomes

## Energy detectors (STA/LTA)



Does not adapt / improve based on past observations

# Why data mining & ML for earthquake detection?

- Two key properties:
  - Data-driven outcomes
  - Ability to generalize

#### **Template Matching**



#### Memorizes template waveforms – no new sources

# Seismologists have been using ML for > 20 years

# Artificial Neural Networks (e.g. Dowla et al., 1990; Dysart & Pulli, 1990)



Dowla et al., (1990)

#### Hidden Markov Models

(e.g. Ohrnberger, 2001; Beyreuther et al., 2008)



Beyreuther et al., (2008)

IRIS Meeting 2018 | Karianne Bergen

#### Recent developments $\rightarrow$ New opportunities in seismology

- Massive seismic data sets
- New ML algorithms and models
- Improvements in computing technology



#### Recent developments $\rightarrow$ New opportunities in seismology

- Massive seismic data sets
- New ML algorithms and models
- Improvements in computing technology



IRIS Meeting 2018 | Karianne Bergen

#### Recent developments $\rightarrow$ New opportunities in seismology

- Massive seismic data sets
- New ML algorithms and models
- Improvements in computing technology



# Data mining for earthquake detection



# FAST: a data mining approach to earthquake detection



# Fingerprint and Similarity Thresholding (FAST)

- Uses waveform-similarity as basis for detection
- Unsupervised technique does not require templates

- Detection task: find all pairs of similar waveforms in continuous data
  - Data mining similarity search / near neighbor search
  - Computational efficiency locality-sensitive hashing, not exhaustive search
- Similar to technology for audio clip identification

Yoon et al. (2015), Sci. Adv.



# **FAST Detection** Pipeline



# **FAST Detection Pipeline**



#### Network (Multi-station) Detection with FAST



### Association of pairwise detections



IRIS Meeting 2018 | Karianne Bergen

## Results: 2014 M8.2 Iquique foreshock sequence

2788

candidate events identified by FAST (at 4+ of 5 stations)

#### **57** events in local (CSN) catalog

#### < % false discovery rate

Bergen & Beroza (2018), Geophys. J. Int.



## Results: Induced seismicity in Guy-Greenbrier, AK



#### 75

Events in catalog,  $1.2 < M_L < 2.9$ 

**I** 3,026 Events detected by FAST,  $-1.5 < M_L < 2.9$ 

FAST reveals spatial and temporal correlations between events and individual stages of hydraulic fracturing stimulation

Yoon et al. (2017), J. Geophys. Res.

# FAST in long-duration (large-T) data



Better memory management Parallel queries in similarity search

#### FAST software: <a href="https://github.com/stanford-futuredata/FAST">https://github.com/stanford-futuredata/FAST</a>

IRIS Meeting 2018 | Karianne Bergen

Rong et al. (2018), *arXiv*.

# Recent work: data mining & ML in seismology

#### Automation

Earthquake detection and phase-picking with deep neural networks

[e.g. Perol et al (2018), Wu et al, (2018), Ross et al. (2018), Zhu & Beroza (2018)]

#### Modeling

- Synthetic seismograms with deep generative models [Krischer & Fichtner (2017)]
- Ground motion prediction with random forests [Trugman & Shearer (2018)]

#### Discovery

 Identifying temporal patterns in seismic source spectra with unsupervised learning [Holtzman et al. (2018)]

# The future of data mining & ML in seismology

- Benchmark data sets
- Open source code & data
- Data science education

# **Benchmark data sets**

Benchmark data sets & competitions drive progress in ML/AI communities

IM AGENET

- High quality data set available to community
- Compare algorithms & identify best methods



## **Benchmarks: Moving toward better algorithms**



IRIS Meeting 2018 | Karianne Bergen

## **Benchmarks: Moving toward better algorithms**



## Benchmark data sets – earthquake detection

- SeismOlympics: Aftershock detection contest 2008 Wenchuan Earthquake
- Task: detection and phase-picking
- Data: 16 stations, 5 months
- Ground truth: from CEA analysts
- I000+ teams competed
- Opportunity for researchers to test their algorithms
- Need more benchmarks/contests
  - Challenge: ground truth, bias
  - Diversity of tasks & data sets



Fong et al. (2017), SRL.

# The future of data mining & ML in seismology

- Benchmark data sets
- Open source code & data
- Data science education



kbergen@stanford.edu

#### FAST software available at: <a href="https://github.com/stanford-futuredata/FAST">https://github.com/stanford-futuredata/FAST</a>

#### **References:**

- Yoon et al. (2015). Earthquake detection through computationally efficient similarity search. Science Advances.
- Bergen & Beroza (2018). Detecting Earthquakes over a Seismic Network using Single-Station Similarity Measures. Geophys. J. Int.
- Rong et al. (2018). Locality-sensitive hashing for earthquake detection: A case study scaling data-driven science. arXiv:1803.09835.