

Earthquake forecasting: Statistics and Information

V.Gertsik , M.Kelbert, A.Krichevets

the date of receipt and acceptance should be inserted later

Abstract We present an axiomatic approach to earthquake forecasting in terms of multi-component random fields on a lattice. This approach provides a method for constructing point estimates and confidence intervals for conditional probabilities of strong earthquakes under conditions on the levels of precursors. Also, it provides an approach for setting multilevel alarm system and hypothesis testing for binary alarms. We use a method of comparison for different earthquake forecasts in terms of the increase of Shannon information. 'Forecasting' and 'prediction' of earthquakes are equivalent in this approach.

1 Introduction

The methodology of selecting and processing of relevant information about the future occurrence of potentially damaging earthquakes has reached a reasonable level of maturity over the recent years. However, the problem as a whole still lacks a comprehensive and generally accepted solution. Further efforts for optimization of the methodology of forecasting would be productive and well-justified.

A comprehensive review of the modern earthquake forecasting state of knowledge and guidelines for utilization can be found in [Jordan et al., 2011]. Note that all methods of evaluating the probabilities of earthquakes are based on a combination of geophysical, geological and probabilistic models and considerations. Even the best and very detailed models used in practice are in fact only 'caricatures' of immensely complicated real processes.

A mathematical toolkit for earthquake forecasting is well presented in the paper [Harte and Vere-Jones, 2005]. This work is based on the modeling of earthquake se-

Institute of Earthquake Prediction Theory and Mathematical Geophysics RAS, Moscow, RF, getzrik@ya.ru

Dept. of Mathematics, Swansea University, Singleton Park, Swansea, SA2 8PP, UK. Institute of Earthquake Prediction Theory and Mathematical Geophysics RAS, m.kelbert@swansea.ac.uk

Lomonosov MSU, Department of Psychology, Moscow, Russia, ankrich@mail.ru

Address(es) of author(s) should be given

quences in terms of the marked point processes. However, the mathematical technique used is quite sophisticated and does not provide direct practical tools to investigate the relations of the structure of temporal-spatial random fields of precursors to the appearance of strong earthquakes.

The use of the multicomponent lattice models (instead of marked point processes) gives a different/novel way of investigating these relations in a more elementary way. Discretization of space and time allows us to separate the problem in question into two separate tasks. The first task is the selection of relevant precursors, i.e., observable and theoretically explained physical and geological facts which are casually related to a high probability of strong earthquakes. Particularly, this task involves the development of models of seismic events and computing probabilities of strong earthquakes in the framework of these models. Such probabilities are used as precursors in the second task.

The second task is the development of methodology of working with these precursors in order to extract the maximum information about the probabilities of strong earthquakes. This is the main topic of this paper.

Our approach allows us to obtain the following results:

- Estimates of probabilities of strong earthquakes for given values of precursors are calculated in terms of the frequencies of historic data.
- Confidence intervals are also constructed to provide reasonable bounds of precision for point estimates.
- Methods of predictions (i.e., binary alarm announcement [Keilis-Borok, 1996], [Keilis-Borok, Kossobokov, 1990], [Holiday et al., 2007]) and forecasting (i.e., calculating probabilities of earthquakes [Jordan et al., 2011], [Kagan and Jackson, 2000], [Harte and Vere-Jones, 2005], [WGNCEP]) are equivalent in the following sense: the setting of some threshold for probability of earthquakes allows to update the alarm level. On the other hand, the knowledge of the alarm domain based on historical data allows us to evaluate the probabilities of earthquakes. In a sense, the prediction is equivalent to hypothesis testing as well, see Section 11.
- In our scheme we propose a scalar statistic which is the ratio of actual increment of information to the maximal possible increment of information. This statistic allows us to linearly order all possible forecasting algorithms. Nowadays the final judgement about the quality of earthquake forecasting algorithms is left to experts. This arrangement puts the problem outside the scope of natural sciences which are trying to avoid subjective judgements.

The foundation of our proposed scheme is the assumption that the seismic process is random and cannot be described by a purely deterministic model. Indeed, if the seismic process is deterministic then the inaccuracy of the forecast could be explained by the non-completeness of our knowledge about the seismic events and non-precision of the available information. This may explain, at least in principle, attacks from the authorities addressed to geophysicists who failed to predict a damaging earthquake. However, these attacks have no grounds if one accepts that the seismic process is random. At the end of the last century (February-April 1999) a group of leading seismologists organized a debate via the web to form a collective opinion of the scientific community on the topic: 'Is the reliable prediction of individual earthquakes a realistic scientific goal?' (see <http://www.nature.com/nature/debates/earthquake/>).

Despite a considerable divergence in peripheral issues all experts taking part in the debate agreed on the following main principles:

- the deterministic prediction of an individual earthquake, within sufficiently narrow limits to allow a planned evacuation programme, is an unrealistic goal;
- forecasting of at least some forms of time-dependent seismic hazard can be justified on both physical and observational grounds.

The following facts form the basis of our agreement with this point of view.

The string-block Burridge-Knopov model, generally accepted as a mathematical tool to demonstrate the power-like Gutenberg-Richter relationship between the magnitude and the number of earthquakes, involves the generators of chaotic behaviour or dynamic stochasticity. In fact, the nonlinearity makes the seismic processes stochastic: a small change in the shift force may lead to completely different consequences. If the force is below the threshold of static friction the block is immovable, if the force exceeds this threshold it starts moving, producing an avalanche of unpredictable size.

This mechanism is widespread in the Earth. Suppose that the front propagation of the earthquake approaches a region of enhanced strength of the rocks. The earthquake magnitude depends on whether this region will be destroyed or remains intact. In the first case the front moves further on, in the second case the earthquake remains localized. So, if the strength of the rocks is below the threshold the first scenario prevails, if it is above the threshold the second scenario is adapted. The whole situation is usually labelled as a *butterfly effect*: infinitesimally small changes of strength and stress lead to macroscopic consequences which cannot be predicted because this infinitesimal change is below any precision of the measurement. For these reasons determinism of seismic processes looks more doubtful than stochasticity.

The only comment we would like to contribute to this discussion is that the forecasting algorithms based exclusively on the empirical data without consistent physical models could hardly be effective in practice (see Sections 12, 13 for more details).

In conclusion we discuss the problem of precursor selection and present a theorem by A. Krichevets stating that using a learning sample for an arbitrary feature selection in pattern recognition is useless in principle.

Finally, note that our approach may be well-applicable for the space-time forecasting of different extremal events outside the scope of earthquake prediction.

2 Events and precursors on the lattice

In order to define explicitly estimates of probabilities of strong earthquakes we discretize the two-dimensional physical space and time, i.e., introduce a partition of three-dimensional space-time into rectangular cells with the space partition in the shape of squares and time partition in the shape of intervals. These cells should not intersect to avoid an ambiguity in computing the frequencies for each cell. In fact, the space cells should not be perfect squares because of the curvature of the earth's surface, but this may be neglected if the region of forecasting is not too large.

So, we obtain a discrete set Ω_K with $N = I \times J \times K$ points which is defined as follows. Let us select a rectangular domain A of the two-dimensional lattice with $I \times J$ points $x = (x_i, y_j)$; $x_i = a \times i$; $i = 1, \dots, I$ and $y_j = a \times j$; $j = 1, \dots, J$, a is the step of the lattice. A cell in Ω_K takes the shape of parallelepiped of height Δt with a square base. Clearly, any point in Ω_K has coordinates (x_i, y_j, t_k) , $t_k = t + k\Delta t$; $k = 0, \dots, K$.

We say that a *seismic event* happens if an earthquake with magnitude greater than some pre-selected threshold M_0 is registered, and this earthquake is not foreshock or

aftershock of another, more powerful earthquake (we put aside a technical problem of identification of foreshocks and aftershocks in the sequence of a seismic event). For any cell in our space-time grid we define an *indicator of an event*, i.e., a binary function $h(i, j, k)$. This function takes the value 1 if at least one seismic event is registered in a given cell and 0 otherwise. Suppose that for all points (x_i, y_j, t_k) the value of a vector precursor $\mathbf{f}(i, j, k) = \{f_q(i, j, k), q = 1, \dots, Q\}$ is given. The components of the precursor $f_q(i, j, k)$, $q = 1, \dots, Q$ are the scalar statistics constructed on the base of our understanding of the phenomena that precede a seismic event.

Remark 1 Note that specifying an alarm domain as a circle with center at a lattice site and radius proportional to the maximal magnitude of the forecasted earthquakes leads to a contradiction. Indeed, suppose we announce an alarm for earthquakes with minimal magnitude 6 in a domain A_6 . Obviously, the same alarm should be announced in the domain A_7 as well. By the definition $A_6 \subset A_7$ and we expect an earthquake with magnitude at least 7 and do not expect an earthquake with magnitude at least 6 in the domain $A_7 \setminus A_6$. But this is absurd.

3 Mathematical assumptions

A number of basic assumptions form the foundation of the mathematical technique of earthquake forecasting. In the framework of mathematical theory they can be treated as axioms but are, in fact, an idealization and simplification with respect to the description of the real phenomena. Below we summarize the basic assumptions which are routinely used in existing studies of seismicity and algorithms of earthquake forecasting even the authors do not always formulate them explicitly.

We accept the following assumptions or axioms of the mathematical theory:

(i) The multicomponent random process $\{h(i, j, k), \mathbf{f}(i, j, k)\}$, describing the joint evolution of the vector precursors and the indicator of seismic events, is stationary.

This assumption provides an opportunity to investigate the intrinsic relations between the precursors and the seismic events based on the historical data. In other words, the experience obtained by analysing the series of events in the past, is applicable to the future as the properties of the process do not depend on time.

In reality, this assumption holds only approximately and for a restricted time period. Indeed, plate tectonics destroys the stationarity for a number of reasons including some purely geometrical considerations. For instance, the movements of the plates leads to their collisions, their partial destruction and also changes their shapes. Nevertheless, the seismic process can be treated as quasi-stationary one for considerable periods of time. At the time when the system changes one quasi-stationary regime to another (say, nowadays, many researcher speak about the abrupt climate change) the reliability of any prediction including the forecast of seismic events is severely restricted.

(ii) The multicomponent random process $\{h(i, j, k), \mathbf{f}(i, j, k)\}$ is ergodic.

Any quantitative characteristic of seismicity more representative than a registration of an individual event is, in fact, the result of averaging over time. For instance, the Gutenberg-Richter law, applied to a given region relates the magnitude with the average number of earthquakes where the averaging is taken over a specific time interval. In order to associate with the time averaging a proper probabilistic characteristic of the process and make a forecast about the future one naturally needs the assumption of ergodicity. This exactly means that any averaging over time interval $[0, T]$ will converge

to the stochastic average when $T \rightarrow \infty$. In view of ergodicity one can also construct unbiased and consistent estimates of conditional probabilities of strong earthquakes under conditions that the precursors take values in some intervals. Naturally, these estimates are the frequencies of observed earthquakes, i.e., ratios of the number of cells with seismic events and prescribed values of precursors to the total number of cells with the prescribed values of precursors. (Recall that an unbiased point estimate $\hat{\theta}$ of parameter θ satisfies the condition $\mathbf{E}\hat{\theta} = \theta$, and a consistent estimate converges to the true value θ when the sample size tends to infinity).

(iii) Any statement about the value of the indicator of a seismic event $h(i, j, k)$ in the cell (i, j, k) or its probability should be based on the values of the precursor $\mathbf{f}(i, j, k)$ only.

This assumption means that the precursor in the given cell accumulates all the relevant information about the past and the information about the local properties of the area that may be used for the forecast of the seismic event in this cell. In other words, the best possible precursor is used (which is not always the case in practice). As in the other cases, this assumption is only an approximation to reality, and the quality of a forecast depends on the quality of the selection and accumulation of relevant information in the precursors.

Below we present some corollaries and further specifications.

(iii-a) For any k the random variables $h(i, j, k)$, $i = 1, \dots, I$, $j = 1, \dots, J$ are conditionally independent under the condition that the values of any measurable function $u(\mathbf{f}(i, j, k))$ of the precursors $\mathbf{f}(i, j, k)$, $i = 1, \dots, I$, $j = 1, \dots, J$ are fixed..

In practice this assumption means that the forecast for the time $t_k = t_0 + k\Delta t$ cannot be affected by the values related to the future time intervals $(t_k, t_k + \Delta t]$. In reality all of these events may be dependent, but our forecast does not use the information from the future after t_k .

(iii-b) The conditional distribution of the random variable h at a given cell depends on the values of the precursors at this cell \mathbf{f} and is independent of all other variables.

(iii-c) The conditional probabilities $\Pr_{ij} \{h \mid u(\mathbf{f})\}$ of the indicator of seismic events h in the cell (i, j, k) , under condition $u(\mathbf{f})$ in this cell do not depend on the position of the cell in space (the time index k related to this probability may be dropped due to the stationarity of the process).

In other words, the rule for computing the conditional probability $\Pr_{ij} \{h \mid u(\mathbf{f})\}$ based on the values of precursors is the same for all cells, and the space indices of probability \Pr may be dropped. This condition is widely accepted in constructions of the forecasting algorithms but rarely formulated explicitly. However, the probability of a seismic event depends to a large extent on the local properties of the area. Hence, the quality of the forecasting depends on how adequately these properties are summarized in the precursors. This formalism properly describes the space inhomogeneity of the physical space because the stationary joint distribution of $\Pr_{ij} \{h, f \leq x\}$ for an arbitrary precursor f depends, in general, on the position of the cell in the domain A . Below we will use the distributions of precursors and indicators of seismic events in domain A that do not depend on the spatial coordinates and have the following form

$$\Pr_A \{h, f \leq x\} = \frac{1}{I \cdot J} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} \Pr_{ij} \{h, f \leq x\},$$

$$P_A(x) \equiv \Pr_A \{f \leq x\} = \frac{1}{I \cdot J} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} \Pr_{ij} \{f \leq x\},$$

$$p_A \equiv \Pr_A \{h=1\} = \frac{1}{I \cdot J} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} \Pr_{ij} \{h=1\},$$

(iii-d) Note that assumption (iii) implies that the conditional probabilities $\Pr(h|u(\mathbf{f}))$ are computed via the probabilities $\Pr_A \{h, f \leq \mathbf{x}\}$ only.

The properties listed above are sufficient to obtain the point estimates for the conditional probabilities of seismic events under conditions formulated in terms of the values of precursors. However, additional assumption are required for a testing of the forecasting algorithm:

(iv) The random variables $\mathbf{f}(i, j, k)$, are conditionally independent under condition that $h(i, j, k) = 1$.

Again, these conditions are not exactly true, however they may be treated as a reasonable approximation to reality. Indeed, if the threshold M_0 is sufficiently high than the strong earthquakes may be treated as rare events, and the cells where they are observed are far apart with a high probability. Any two events related to cells separated by the time intervals Δt are asymptotically independent as $\Delta t \rightarrow \infty$ because the seismic process has decaying correlations (the mixing property in the language of random processes). The loss of dependence (or decaying memory) is related to the physical phenomenon such as healing of the defects in the rocks, relaxation of strength due to viscosity, etc. As usual in physical theories, we accept an idealized model of the real phenomena applying this asymptotic property for large but finite intervals between localizations of seismic events.

The independence of strong earthquakes is not a new assumption, in the case of continuous space-time it is equivalent to the assumption that the locations of these events form a Poisson random field.. (Note that the distribution of strong earthquake should be homogeneous in space, because there is no information about the heterogeneity a priori .) The Poisson hypothesis is used in many papers, see, e.g. [Harte and Vere-Jones, 2005]. It is very natural for the analysis of the «tails» of the Gutenberg-Richter law for large magnitudes [Pisarenko et al., 2008]. Summing up, the development of the strict mathematical theory of earthquake forecasting does not require any additional assumption except those routinely accepted in the existing algorithms but usually not formulated explicitly.

4 The standard form for precursors

The correct solution of the forecasting problem given the values of precursors $\mathbf{f}(i, j, k) = (f_1(i, j, k), \dots, f_Q(i, j, k))$ is provided by the estimate of conditional probability $\Pr\{h | \mathbf{f}(i, j, k)\}$ of the indicator of seismic event in the cell (i, j, k) . In practice this solution may be difficult to obtain because the number of events in catalog is not sufficient.

Indeed, the range of value of a scalar precursor is usually divided into a number M of intervals, and only a few events are registered for any such interval. For a Q -dimensional precursor the number of Q -dimensional rectangles, covering the range, is already M^Q , and majority of them contains 0 event. Only a small number of such rectangles contains one or more events, that is the precision of such an estimate of conditional probability is usually too low to have any practical value.

For this reason one constructs a new scalar precursor in the form of the scalar function of component of the vector precursor, and optimize its predictive power. This

approach leads to additional complication as the units of measurement and the physical sense of different components of precursor are substantially different. In order to overcome this problem one uses some transformation to reduce all the components of the precursor to a standard form with the same sense and range of values.

Let us transform all the precursors $f_q(i, j, k)$, $q = 1, \dots, Q$ to variables with the values in $[0, 1]$ providing estimates of conditional probabilities. So, after some transformation F we obtain an estimate of $\Pr \{h = 1 \mid u(\mathbf{f}(i, j, k)) = 1\}$, where u is a characteristic function of some interval \mathbf{B} , i.e., the probability of event $h(i, j, k) = 1$ under condition that this precursor takes the value $\mathbf{f}(i, j, k) \in \mathbf{B}$.

The transformation F of a scalar precursor $f(i, j, k)$ is defined as follows. Fix an arbitrary small number ε . Let L be a number of cells (i, j, k) such that $h(i, j, k) = 1$, and Z_l , $l = 1, \dots, L$, be the ordered statistics, i.e., the values $f(i, j, k)$ in these cells listed in non-decreasing order. Define a new sequence z_m , $m = 0, \dots, M$, from the ordered statistics Z_l by the following recursion: $z_0 = -\infty$, z_m is defined as the first point in the sequence Z_l , such that $z_m - z_{m-1} \geq \varepsilon$. Next, construct the sequence $z_m^* = z_m + (z_{m+1} - z_m)/2$, $m = 1, \dots, M-1$, and add the auxiliary elements $z_0^* = -\infty$, $z_M^* = \infty$. Define also a sequence n_m , $m = 1, \dots, M$, where n_m equals to the number of values in the sequence Z_l , such that $z_{m-1}^* \leq Z_l < z_m^*$. Finally, define the numbers N_m , $m = 1, \dots, M$ counting all cells such that $z_{m-1}^* \leq f(i, j, k) < z_m^*$, $m = 1, \dots, M$. Observe that $\sum_{m=1}^M n_m = L$, $\sum_{m=1}^M N_m = N$, and use the ratios

$$\lambda = \frac{L}{N} \quad (1)$$

as estimate of unconditional probability of a seismic event in a given cell

$$p_A \equiv \Pr_A \{h(i, j, k) = 1\} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Pr \{h = 1 \mid x\} dP_A(x). \quad (2)$$

The transformation F is defined as follows

$$g = Ff(i, j, k) = \frac{n_m}{N_m}, \text{ if } z_{m-1}^* \leq f(i, j, k) < z_m^*, \quad m = 1, \dots, M. \quad (3)$$

This definition implies that transformation F replace the value of precursor for the frequency, i.e., the ratio of a number of cells containing a seismic event and the values of precursor from $[z_{m-1}^*, z_m^*)$ to the number of cells with the value of precursor in this range. These frequencies are the natural estimates of conditional probabilities $\Pr \{h = 1 \mid z_{m-1}^* \leq f < z_m^*\}$, $m = 1, \dots, M$, computed with respect to stationary distribution $P_A(x)$:

$$\Pr \{h = 1 \mid z_{m-1}^* \leq f < z_m^*\} = \frac{\int_{z_{m-1}^*}^{z_m^*} \Pr \{h = 1 \mid x\} dP_\Omega(x)}{\int_{z_{m-1}^*}^{z_m^*} dP_A(x)}. \quad (4)$$

(This conditional probability can be written as $\Pr \{h = 1 \mid u(f)\}$, where u is the characteristic function of interval $[z_{m-1}^*, z_m^*)$). The function g has a stepwise shape, and the length of the step in bounded from below by ε . It can be checked that there exist the limit $\tilde{g} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} g = \Pr \{h = 1 \mid f\}$.

The estimates of conditional probabilities in terms of the function g are quite rough because typically the numbers n_m are of the order 1. As a final result we will present below more sharp but less detailed estimates of conditional probabilities and confidence intervals for them.

5 Combinations of precursors

There are many ways to construct a single scalar precursor based on the vector precursor $(Ff_q, q = 1, \dots, Q)$. Each such construction inevitably contains a number of parameters or degrees of freedom. These parameters (including the parameters used for construction of the precursors themselves) should be selected in a way to optimize the predictive power of the forecasting algorithm. The optimization procedure will be presented below, its goal is to adapt the parameters of precursors to a given catalog of earthquakes, that is to obtain the best possible retrospective forecast. However, this adaptation procedure creates a "ghost" information related with the specific features of the given catalog but not present in physical properties of real seismicity. This "ghost" information will not be reproduced if the algorithm is applied to another catalog of earthquakes. It is necessary to increase the volume of the catalog and to reduce the number of free parameters to get rid of this "ghost" information.. Clearly, the first goal requires the considerable increase of the observation period and may be achieved in the remote future only. So, one concentrates on the reduction of number of degrees of freedom. The simplest ansatz including $Q - 1$ parameters is the linear combination

$$f^* = Ff_1 + \sum_{q=2}^Q c_{q-1} Ff_q. \quad (5)$$

As a strictly monotonic function of precursor is a precursor itself the log-linear combination is an equally suitable choice

$$f^* = \ln(Ff_1) + \sum_{q=2}^Q c_{q-1} \ln(Ff_q), \quad (6)$$

Here $c_q, q = 1, \dots, Q - 1$ are free parameters. The result of the procedure has the form $g = Ff^*$.

6 Alarm levels, point and interval estimations

In view of (3) the precursor g is the set of estimates for probabilities

$$\Pr \{h = 1 \mid z_{l-1}^* \leq f(i, j, k) < z_l^*\}, l = 1, \dots, L(f).$$

Its serious drawback is that typically $\{z_{l-1}^* \leq f(i, j, k) < z_l^*\}$ correspond to single events, and therefore the precision of these estimates is very low (the confidence intervals discussed below may be taken as a convenient measure of precision). In order to increase the precision it is recommended to use the larger cells containing a larger number of events, that is a more coarse covering of the space where the precursor takes its values. In a sense, the precision of the estimation and the localization of the precursor values in its time-space region are related by a kind of "uncertainty principle": the more precise estimate one wants to get the more coarse is the time-space range of their values and vice versa.

We adapt the following approach in order to achieve a reasonable compromise.

1. For fixed thresholds $a_s, s = 1, \dots, S + 1, a_1 = 1, a_s < a_{s+1}, a_{S+1} = 0$, we define S possible alarm levels $a_{s+1} \leq g(i, j, k) < a_s$ and subsets $\Omega_s, s = 1, \dots, S$, of

the set Ω_K corresponding to alarm levels, i.e., Ω_s is a set of cells of Ω_K , such that $a_{s+1} \leq g(i, j, k) < a_s$

There are different ways to choose the number S of alarm levels and the thresholds a_s , $s = 2, \dots, S$. Say, fix $S = 5$, and select $a_s = 10^{-\alpha(s-1)}$. This is a natural choice of the alarm level because at $\alpha = 1$ it corresponds to decimal places of the estimate of the conditional probability given by the precursor. The problem with $S = 2$, i.e., two-level alarm, may be reduced to the hypothesis testing and discussed in more details below.

2. Compute the point estimates θ_s of probabilities $\Pr\{h = 1 \mid a_{s+1} \leq g(i, j, k) < a_s\}$, $s = 1, \dots, S$, obtained via the distribution $P_\Omega(x)$ of precursor g in the same way as in (4). The property (iv) implies that for any domain Ω_s the binary random variables $h(i, j, k)$ are independent and identically distributed, i.e

$$\Pr\{h = 1 \mid a_{s+1} \leq g(i, j, k) < a_s\} \equiv p_s,$$

and the unbiased estimate of p_s takes the form

$$\theta_s = \frac{m_s}{n_s} \quad (7)$$

where n_s stands for the number of cells in domain Ω_s , and by m_s we denote the number of cells in Ω_s containing seismic events.

3. The random variable m_s takes integer values between 0 and n_s . The probabilities of these values are computed via the well-known Bernoulli formula $\Pr(m_s = k) = \binom{n_s}{k} p_s^k (1 - p_s)^{n_s - k}$. Let us specify the confidence interval covering the unknown parameter p_s with the confidence level γ . In view of the integral Mouvre-Laplace theorem for n_s large enough the statistics $\frac{(\theta_s - p_s)\sqrt{n_s}}{\sqrt{p_s(1-p_s)}}$ is approximately Gaussian $N(0, 1)$ with zero mean and unit variance. Note that the values n_s increase with time. Omitting straightforward calculations and replacing the parameter p_s by its estimate θ_s we obtain that $\theta_s^- < \theta_s < \theta_s^+$, where $\theta_s^- = \theta_s - \frac{t_\gamma \sqrt{\theta_s(1-\theta_s)}}{\sqrt{n_s}}$, $\theta_s^+ = \theta_s + \frac{t_\gamma \sqrt{\theta_s(1-\theta_s)}}{\sqrt{n_s}}$, and t_γ is the solution of equation $\Phi(t_\gamma) = \frac{\gamma}{2}$. Here Φ stands for the standard Gaussian distribution function.

4. As a result of these considerations we introduce 'the precursor of alarms' which indicates the alarm level: $\mathbf{R}(f(i, j, k)) = s(i, j, k)$. It will be used for calculations of point estimate and the confidence interval in the form $\{\theta_{s(i,j,k)}^- < \theta_{s(i,j,k)} < \theta_{s(i,j,k)}^+\}$. This result will be use for prospective forecasting procedure.

7 The information gain and the precursor quality

The construction of a 'combined' precursor \mathbf{R} involves parameters from formula (5) or (6) as well as parameters which appear in definition of each individual precursors f_q . It is natural to optimize the forecasting algorithm in such a way that the information gain related to the seismic events is maximal. In one-dimensional case the information gain as a measure of the forecast efficiency was first introduced by Vere-Jones [Vere-Jones, 1998]. Here we exploit his ideas in the case of multidimensional space-time process.

Remind the notions of the entropy and information. Putting aside the mathematical subtlety (see [Kelbert, Suhov, 2013] for details) we follow below an intuitive approach of the book [Prohorov, Rozanov, 1969]. The information containing in a given text is, basically, the length of the shortest compression of this text without the loss of its content. The smallest length S of the sequence of digits 0 and 1 (in a binary code) for

counting N different objects satisfies the relations $0 \leq S - \log_2 N \leq 1$. So, the quantity $S \approx \log_2 N$ characterizes the shortest length of coding the numbers of N objects.

Consider an experiment that can produce one of N non-intersecting events A_1, \dots, A_N with probabilities q_1, \dots, q_N , respectively, $q_1 + \dots + q_N = 1$. A message informing about the outcomes of n such independent identical experiments may look as a sequence $(A_{i_1}, \dots, A_{i_n})$, where A_{i_k} is the outcome of the experiment k . But for long enough series of observations the frequency n_i/n of event A_i is very close to its probability q_i . It means that in our message $(A_{i_1}, \dots, A_{i_n})$ the event A_i appears n_i times. The number of such messages is

$$N_n = \frac{n!}{n_1! \dots n_N!}.$$

By the Stirling formula the length of the shortest coding of these messages

$$S_n \approx \log_2 N_n \approx -n \sum_{i=1}^N q_i \log_2 q_i.$$

The quantity S_n measures the uncertainty of the given experiment before its start, in our case we are looking for one of possible outcomes of n independent trials. The specific measure of uncertainty for one trial

$$\frac{1}{n} S_n = \frac{1}{n} S_n(q_1, \dots, q_N) = - \sum_{i=1}^N q_i \log_2 q_i$$

is known as Shannon's entropy of distribution q_1, \dots, q_N (in physical literature it is also known as a measure of chaos or disorder). After one trial the uncertainty about the future outcomes decreases by the value $S = S_n - S_{n-1}$, this decrement equals to the *information gain* $I = S$, obtained as a result of single trial.

The quantity

$$S(h) = -p_A \log_2 p_A - (1 - p_A) \log_2 (1 - p_A) \quad (8)$$

is the (unconditional) entropy of distribution for indicator of seismic event h in a space-time cell in the absence of any precursors. The conditional entropy $S(h | a_{s+1} \leq g < a_s)$ under condition that in the cell (i, j, k) the alarm level s is set up equals

$$S(h | a_{s+1} \leq g < a_s) = -p_s \log_2 p_s - (1 - p_s) \log_2 (1 - p_s)$$

The expected conditional entropy $S_{\mathbf{R}}(h)$ of indicator of seismic events where the averaging is taken by the distribution of precursors \mathbf{R} takes the form

$$S_{\mathbf{R}}(h) = - \sum_{s=1}^S [p_s \log_2 p_s + (1 - p_s) \log_2 (1 - p_s)] P_A(a_{s+1} \leq g < a_s) \quad (9)$$

We conclude that the knowledge of the precursor values helps to reduce the uncertainty about the future experiment by $S(h) - S_{\mathbf{R}}(h)$ which is precisely information $I(\mathbf{R}, h)$ obtained from the precursor. Taking into account (8), (9) and the fact that

$$p_A = \sum_{s=1}^S p_s P_A(a_{s+1} \leq g(i, j, k) < a_s)$$

we specify the information gain as

$$I(\mathbf{R}, h) = \sum_{s=1}^S \left[p_s \log_2 \frac{p_s}{p_A} + (1 - p_s) \log_2 \frac{1 - p_s}{1 - p_A} \right] P_A(a_{s+1} \leq g < a_s).$$

By analogy with the one-dimensional case [Kolmogorov, 1965] the quantity $I(\mathbf{R}, h)$ may be called the mutual information about the random field h that may be obtained from observations of random field \mathbf{R} . It is known that the information $I(\mathbf{R}, h)$ is non-negative and equals to 0 if and only if the random fields h and \mathbf{R} are independent. This mutual information $I(\mathbf{R}, h)$ takes its maximal value $S(h)$ in an idealized case of absolutely exact forecast. The mutual information quantifies the information that the distributions of precursors contribute to that of the indicator of seismic event. For this reason it may be considered as an adequate scalar estimate for the quality of the forecast.

The quantity $I(\mathbf{R}, h)$ depends on the cell size, i.e., on the space discretization length a and time interval Δt . We need a formal test to compare precursors defined for different size of the discretization cells. For this aim let us introduce the so-called 'efficiency' of precursors as the ratio of information gains

$$r(\mathbf{R}, h) = \frac{I(\mathbf{R}, h)}{S(h)}.$$

This efficiency varies between 0 and 1 and serves as a natural estimate of information quality of precursors. It allows to compare different forecasting algorithms and select the best one.

A natural estimate of $S(h)$ based on (1) and (2) is defined as follows

$$\hat{S}(h) = -\lambda \log_2 \lambda - (1 - \lambda) \log_2 (1 - \lambda). \quad (10)$$

Taking into account (7) and using an estimate of $P_A(a_{s+1} \leq g < a_s)$ in the form of ratio $\tau_s = \frac{n_s}{N}$, we construct an estimate of $I(\mathbf{R}, h)$ as follows

$$\hat{I}(\mathbf{R}, h) = \sum_{s=1}^S \left[\theta_s \log_2 \frac{\theta_s}{\lambda} + (1 - \theta_s) \log_2 \frac{1 - \theta_s}{1 - \lambda} \right] \tau_s, \quad (11)$$

$$\hat{r}(\mathbf{R}, h) = \frac{\hat{I}(\mathbf{R}, h)}{\hat{S}(h)}. \quad (12)$$

Remark 2 The economical quality of forecast. A natural economic measure for a quality of binary forecast is the economic risk or damage r related to the earthquakes and the necessary protective measures. In mathematical statistics the risk is defined as the expectation of the loss function, in our case there are two types of losses: damage and expenses related to protection. For each cell of our grid the risk may be specified by the formula

$$r = \alpha \Pr\{h(i, j, k) = 1, \eta(i, j, k) = 0\} + \beta \Pr\{h(i, j, k) = 0, \eta(i, j, k) = 1\} + \gamma \Pr\{h(i, j, k) = 1, \eta(i, j, k) = 1\},$$

here α stands for the average damage from a seismic event; β stands for the average expenses for protection after a seismic alarm is announced; γ stands for the average

damage after the alarm, $\gamma = \alpha + \beta - \delta$, where δ is the damage prevented by the alarm. The coefficient in front of $\Pr\{h(i, j, k) = 0, \eta(i, j, k) = 0\}$, obviously, equals 0, because in the absence both of a seismic event and an alarm there is no loss of any kind. Clearly, only the case when $\delta > \beta$ is economically justified, i.e., the gain from the prevention measures is positive. Obviously, δ should be less than $\alpha + \beta$, i.e., an earthquake cannot be profitable. Taking into account that α, β and γ depend on the geographical position of the cell, we write the total risk as the summation over all cells in the region of a given forecast. In the simplest case of the absence of the spacial component, when a single cell represents a region of forecast, the expression for the risk is simplified as follows $r = \alpha\lambda\nu + \beta\tau + \gamma\lambda(1 - \nu)$.

However, the risk r , which is very useful for economical considerations and as a basis for an administrative decision, could hardly be used as a criteria for quality of seismic prediction. First of all, it cannot be computed in a consistent way because the coefficients α, β and γ are not known in practice, and hence no effective way of its numerical evaluation is known. The computation of these coefficients is a difficult economic problem and goes far beyond of the competence of geophysicists. On the other hand, the readiness of the authority to commit resources to solving the problem depends on the quality of the geophysical forecast. This situation leads to a vicious circle.

The second drawback of the economic risk as a criterion for the quality of prediction is related to the fact that it depends on many factors which have no relation to geophysics or earthquake prediction. These factors include the density of population, the number and size of industrial enterprises, infrastructure, etc. It also depends on subjective factors such as the williness of authorities to use resources for prevention of the damage from earthquakes. The natural sciences could hardly accept the criteria for the forecast quality which depend on the type of state organization, priorities of ruling parties, results of the recent elections, etc.

Remark 3 It seems reasonable to introduce a penalty related to the number of superfluous parameters in evaluating the quality of forecast pointing to the natural analogy with the Akaike test [Akaike, 1974] and similar methods in information theory. In our context the main parameter of importance is $\hat{r}(\mathbf{R}, t)$ and its limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This quantity does not involve the number of parameters directly. Probably, the rate of convergence depends on the number of parameters but this dependence is not studied yet.

8 The forecasting procedure

The number of time intervals, i.e., the number of observation N used in the construction of estimates increases with the growth of observation time. So, the computation procedure requires constant innovations. On the other hand some computation time is required to 'adapt' the model parameters to the updated information about seismic events via an iterative procedure. For these reasons we propose the following forecasting algorithm.

1. Given initial parameter values at the moment $t_{K-1} = t_0 + (K - 2)\Delta t$ we optimize them to obtain the maximum of efficiency $\hat{r}(\mathbf{R}, h)$ of precursor in domain Ω_{K-1} . For this aim the Monte-Carlo methods is helpful: one perturbs the current values of parameters randomly and adapts the new values if the efficiency increases. The process continues before the value of efficiency stabilized, this may give a local

maximum, so the procedure is repeated sufficient number of times. The choice of initial value on the first step of optimization procedure is somewhat arbitrary but a reasonable iteration procedure usually leads to consistent results. The optimization procedure takes the period of time $t_{K-1} < t \leq t_K$.

2. Next, we construct the forecast in the following way. At the moment t_K the values of precursor \hat{g} in each cell $(i, j, K+1)$ is computed with optimized parameters. Based on these parameter values the alarm levels, the point estimates and confidence intervals are computed in each cell as well as the values of efficiency of precursors.

3. The estimates of stationary probabilities of seismic events in the cell $\bar{\theta}(i, j)$ are defined as follows:

$$\bar{\theta}(i, j) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \theta_{s(i, j, k)}.$$

they can be used for creation of the variant of the maps of seismic hazard in the region.

9 Retrospective and prospective informativities

The efficiency of precursor which is achieved as a result of parameters optimization could be considered as *retrospective* as it is constructed by the precursors adaptation to the historical catalogs of seismic events. The prospective efficiency for the space-time domain Ω^* containing the cell in the 'future' is based on the forecast. It is computed via formulas (10), (11), (12) with the only difference that domain Ω_s^* consists from the cells where the forecasted alarm level is s . The efficiency of prospective forecast is smaller compared with the retrospective efficiency, however approaches this value with time. In principle, the prospective efficiency is an ultimate criteria of precursors quality and the retrospective efficiency could serve only for the preliminary selection of precursors and their adaptation to the past history of seismic events.

10 Testing of the forecasting algorithm

The efficiency of precursor could be computed exactly only in an idealized case of infinite observation time. However, its estimate may be obtained based on the observation over a finite time interval. So, if an estimate produces a non-zero value not necessarily the real effects is present. It may be simply a random fluctuation even if the precursor provides no information about the future earthquake. For this reason we would like to check the hypothesis H_0 about the independence of a precursor and an event indicator with a reasonable level of confidence. In case the hypothesis is rejected one have additional assurance that the forecasting is real, not just a "ghost".

So, consider the distributions

$$P_A(x) = \frac{1}{I \cdot J} \sum_{(i, j) \in \Omega} \text{Pr}_{ij} \{g(i, j, k) \leq x\},$$

and

$$P'_A(x) = \frac{1}{I \cdot J} \sum_{(i, j) \in A} \text{Pr}_{ij} \{g(i, j, k) \leq x | h(i, j, k) = 1\}$$

The function $P_A(P_A^{-1}(y)) = y$ of variable $y = P_A(x)$ provides an uniform distribution $F^*(y) = \Pr(\xi \leq y)$ of some random variable ξ on $[0,1]$. Next, consider a distribution function $G(y) = P'_A(P_A^{-1}(y))$ on $[0,1]$, and use a parametric representation for abscissa $P_A(x)$ and ordinate $P'_A(x)$. If random fields g and h are independent the distribution functions $P_A(x) = P'_A(x)$ and $G(y)$ are uniform. So, the hypothesis about the absence of forecasting, i.e., about the independence of g and h , is equivalent to the hypothesis H_0 that the distribution $G(y)$ is uniform.

The empirical distribution $G_L(y)$ related to $G(y)$ is defined as follows. Denote by $u_l, l = 1, \dots, L$ the values of the function $g(i, j, k)$ sorted in the non-decreasing order and belonging to the cells where $h(i, j, k) = 1$. Let n_l be the numbers of cells such that $h(i, j, k) = 1, g(i, j, k) = u_l$. Denote by $m(u_l)$ the numbers of cells from Ω such that $g(i, j, k) < u_l$, and define the empirical distribution $G_L(y)$ as a step-wise function with $G_L(0) = 0$ and positive jumps of the size $\frac{n_l}{L}$ at points $y_l = \frac{m(u_l)}{N}$.

The well-known methods of hypothesis testing requires that the function $G_L(y)$ has the same shape as for independent trials, i.e., random variables $u_l, l = 1, \dots, L$ are independent in view of axiom (iv). Naturally, we accept the precursors such that the hypothesis H_0 is rejected with the reasonable level of confidence. (Remind, that the hypothesis is accepted if and only if its logical negation could be rejected based on the available observations. The fact that the hypothesis cannot be rejected does not mean at all that it should be accepted, it only means that the available observations don't contradict this hypothesis. Say, the well-known fact that "The Sun rise in the East" does not contradict to our hypothesis, however it may not be considered as a ground for its acceptance.) For large values of L the Kolmogorov statistics [Kolmogorov, 1933a] is helpful for this aim

$$D_L = \sup | G_L(y) - y |$$

with an asymptotic distribution

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Pr \left\{ \sqrt{L} D_L \leq z \right\} = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^k e^{-2k^2 z^2}, \quad z > 0,$$

or Smirnov's statistics [Smirnov, 1939]

$$D_L^+ = \sup [G_L(y) - y],$$

$$D_L^- = -\inf [G_L(y) - y],$$

with asymptotic distribution

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Pr \left\{ \sqrt{L} D_L^+ \leq z \right\} = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Pr \left\{ \sqrt{L} D_L^- \leq z \right\} = 1 - e^{-2z^2}, \quad z > 0.$$

The asymptotic expressions for these statistics can be used for $L > 20$ ([Bolshev, Smirnov, 1965]).

11 The binary alarm and the hypothesis testing

The prediction is the form of forecast when an alarm is announced in a given cell without a preliminary evaluation of probability of seismic event. In this case we can estimate the probabilities of events too. (If the alarm is announced in an arbitrary domain Ω we set up an alarm if at least haph of the cell of our model is occupied by alarm.).

Let M be the number of cells in Ω which are in the state of alarm, M_0 be the number of cells where the seismic event is present but no alarm was announced (the number of 'missed targets'). Denote by $\tau = \frac{M}{N}$ the share of the cells with alarm announced, $\lambda = \frac{L}{N}$ the share of the cells with seismic events, and $\nu = \frac{M_0}{M}$ the share of missed targets. Let a random variable $\eta(i, j, k)$, equal 1 if an alarm is announced in the cell (i, j, k) , and 0 otherwise. Obviously, the estimate of conditional probability $\Pr \{h(i, j, k) = 1 \mid \eta(i, j, k) = 1\}$ of the seismic event under the condition of alarm is $\frac{\lambda(1-\nu)}{\tau}$, and the estimate of conditional probability $\Pr \{h(i, j, k) = 1 \mid \eta(i, j, k) = 0\}$ of the seismic event under the condition of no alarm is $\frac{\lambda\nu}{1-\tau}$.

If the alarm is announced according to the procedure described in Section 5 the threshold a_1 specifying the acceptable domain of values for $g(i, j, k)$ should be treated as a free parameter and selected by maximizing the information efficiency $\hat{r}(\eta, h)$. The estimate of information increase for given values of τ and ν equals

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I}(\eta, h) &= \lambda(1-\nu) \log_2 \frac{1-\nu}{\tau} + \lambda\nu \log_2 \frac{\nu}{1-\tau} + \\ &+ [\tau - \lambda(1-\nu)] \log_2 \frac{\tau - \lambda(1-\nu)}{(1-\lambda)\tau} + (1-\tau - \lambda\nu) \log_2 \frac{1-\tau - \lambda\nu}{(1-\lambda)(1-\tau)}. \end{aligned}$$

The value of $\eta(i, j, k)$ characterizes the results of checking two mutually exclusive simple hypothesis:

H_0 : the distribution of $\tilde{g}(i, j, k)$ has the form $P_A^0(x) \equiv \Pr_A \{\tilde{g}(i, j, k) \leq x \mid h(i, j, k) = 0\}$, implying 'no seismic events',

or

H_1 : the distribution of $\tilde{g}(i, j, k)$ has the form $P_A^1(x) \equiv \Pr_A \{\tilde{g}(i, j, k) \leq x \mid h(i, j, k) = 1\}$, implying the presence of seismic event.

Statistics for checking of these hypothesis is the precursor $g(i, j, k)$, and the critical domain for H_0 has the form $\{g(i, j, k) \geq a_1\}$. (If usual method of alarm announcement is used the relevant precursor plays the rôle of statistics and the critical domain is defined by the rule of the alarm announcement). The probability of first type error

$$\alpha = \Pr \{\eta(i, j, k) = 1 \mid h(i, j, k) = 0\},$$

it is estimated as $\frac{\tau - \lambda(1-\nu)}{1-\lambda}$. The probability of second type error

$$\beta = \Pr \{\eta(i, j, k) = 0 \mid h(i, j, k) = 1\},$$

it is estimated as ν . (Note that due to condition (iii) any test used for the checking these hypothesis should not depend on the coordinates of the cell).

The Neyman-Pearson theory allows to define the domain of images of all possible criteria: in coordinates (α, β) it is a convex domain with a boundary

Γ which corresponds to the set of uniformly most powerful tests. This family may be defined in terms of the likelihood ratio $\Lambda(x) = \frac{p_A^1(x)}{p_A^0(x)}$ under condition that the distributions $P_A^1(x)$ and $P_A^0(x)$ has densities $p_A^1(x)$ and $p_A^0(x)$:

$$\begin{cases} \eta(i, j, k) = 1 \text{ if } \Lambda(x) > \omega, \\ \eta(i, j, k) = 0 \text{ if } \Lambda(x) < \omega \end{cases}$$

where ω denotes the threshold. In the paper [Gercsik, 2004] we demonstrated that among all the tests with the images on the boundary Γ there exists three different best tests. Here the term "best" may be understood in three different sense, i.e., maximizing the variational, correlational and informational efficiency. The most relevant criteria is the informational efficiency $\hat{r}(\eta, h)$.

The well-known Molchan's error diagram [Molchan, 1990] where the probability of the first kind error is estimated by τ is constructed in the same way. However, it involve a comparison of two intersecting hypothesis:

H_0 : the distribution $\tilde{g}(i, j, k)$ has the form $P_A^0(x) \equiv \Pr_A \{ \tilde{g}(i, j, k) \leq x \}$, i.e., the seismic event could "either happen or not happen", and

H_1 : the distribution $\tilde{g}(i, j, k)$ has the form $P_A^1(x) \equiv \Pr_A \{ \tilde{g}(i, j, k) \leq x \mid h(i, j, k) = 1 \}$, i.e., the seismic event "will happen"

.Note that the rejection of hypothesis H_0 leads to absurd results.

Remark 4 In the paper [Molchan and Keilis-Borok, 2008] the area of the alarm domain is defined in terms of non-homogeneous measure depending on the spacial coordinates, in terms of our paper it may be denoted as $\bar{\theta}(i, j)$. i.e., $\tau \sim \sum_{i,j} \bar{\theta}(i, j) \eta(i, j, k)$. This approach is used to eliminate the decrease of the share of alarmed sites τ with the extension of the domain when a purely safe and aseismic territory is included into consideration. It would be well-justified if the quantity τ could be accepted as an adequate criterion of the quality of forecast in its own right. On the other hand, it can be demonstrated that the information efficiency $\hat{r}(\eta, h)$ converges to a non-zero value $1 - \nu$ when the number of cells with an alarm is fixed but the total number of cells tends to infinity. An inhomogeneous area of the territory under forecast which is proportional to $\bar{\theta}(i, j)$ does not enable us to calculate the informational efficiency. Moreover, it possesses a number of unnatural features from the point of view of evaluation of economical damage. A seismic event in the territory of low seismicity is more costly because no precautions are taken to prevent the damage of infrastructure. However, in this inhomogeneous area an alarm announced in an aseismic territory will have a smaller contribution than an alarm in a seismically active territory where the losses would be in fact smaller. We conclude that this approach 'hides' the most costly events and does not provide a reasonable estimate of economic damage.

12 The choice of precursors

We use the term 'empiric precursor of earthquake' for any observable characteristic derived from the catalog only which provides for this catalog a reasonable retrospective forecast of seismic events and not derived from basic physical conception of seismicity (say, the periods of relative calm, deviation of some basic characteristic from a long-time average, etc). In contrast, the physical precursors are derived from some of physical processes and characterize physical quantities (stress fields, strength, concentration of

cracks, etc.) or well-defined physical processes (i.e., phase transitions, cracks propagations, etc.) In the meteorological forecast the danger of using empirical precursors was highlighted by A. Kolmogorov in 1933 [Kolmogorov, 1933]. From that time the meteorological forecast relies on the physical precursors which are theoretically justified by the models of atmospheric dynamics. Below we will present A. Kolmogorov's argument adapted to the case of seismic forecast. This demonstrates that the purely empirical precursors work well only for the given catalog from which they are derived. However, their efficiency deteriorates drastically when they are applied to any other independent catalog.

Consider a group of k empirical precursors used for a forecast and selected from a set of n such groups. According to A. Kolmogorov's remark the number k is typically rather small. This is related to the fact that a number of strong earthquakes in catalog is unlikely to exceed a few dozen. As the values of precursors are random there exists a small probability p that the efficiency of the forecast exceeds the given threshold C . Then the probability of event $\hat{r}(\mathbf{R}, h) \leq C$ equals $1-p$, and the probability of event $\hat{r}(\mathbf{R}, h) > C$ for at least one collection of precursors equals $P = 1 - (1-p)^n$ and tends to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. (According to Kolmogorov some arbitrariness of the assumption of independence is compensated by the large number of collections.)

Summing up, if the number of groups is large enough with probability close to 1 it is possible to find a group giving an effective retrospective forecast for a given catalog. In practice this is always the case as the number of empirical precursors could be increased indefinitely by variation of real parameters used in their construction. It is important to note that for such a group, which is highly efficient for the initial catalog, the probability that the efficiency is greater than C is still equal to p for any other catalog. In other words the larger the number of the groups of empirical precursors the less reliable forecast is. So, the collection of a large list of the empirical precursors is counter-productive.

Much more reliable are the physical precursors intrinsically connected with the physical processes which preserve their values with the change of sample. The probability to find such a set of precursors by pure empirical choice is negligible because they are very rare in the immense collection of all possible precursors.

13 Image identification

The possibility to use the pattern recognition formalism in seismic forecast is totally based on the acceptance of deterministic model of seismicity. It is necessary to assume that in principle there exists such a group of precursors which allows to determine with certainty whether a strong earthquake will happen or not. In this case one believes that all random errors are related to the incompleteness of this set of precursors. But if the seismicity is a random process then the image appears only after the earthquake and before it any set of values for precursors cannot guarantee the possible outcome and only the relevant probabilities may be a subject of scientific study. After the discovery of dynamic instability and generators of stochastic behavior of dynamical systems the deterministic model of seismicity is cast in doubts. Its potential acceptance requires substantial evidence which hardly exist at present.

In any case the results of pattern recognition procedure (i.e., a binary alarm) are useful if they are considered alongside with the results of statistical tests. They allow to calculate the estimate of probabilities of seismic events and informational efficiency.

However, the section of 'features' for pattern recognition leads to the same difficulties as the selection of precursors: the 'features' based on the observations only and not related to the physics of earthquakes are not helpful, and any hopes for 'perceptron education' are not grounded. A successful supervised recognition is possible if the features has proved causal relation with pattern. This principle is illustrated by a simple but important theorem by A.N. Krichevets.

Theorem 1 *Let A be a finite set, $B_1, B_2 \subset A, B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$. We say that B_1 and B_2 are finite educational samples. Let $X \in A, X \notin B_1 \cup B_2$ be a new object. Then among all classifications, i.e., subsets (A_1, A_2) such that $B_1 \subset A_1, B_2 \subset A_2, A_1 \cup A_2 = A, A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$ satisfying condition that either $B_1 \cup X \subset A_1$ or $B_2 \cup X \subset A_2$ exactly a half classifies X as an object of sample B_1 and a half classifies X as an object from B_2 .*

Proof It is easy to define a one-to-one between classifications. Indeed, if $\{A_1, A_2\}, A_1 \cup A_2 = A$, is a classification such that $B_1 \subset A_1, X \subset A_1, B_2 \subset A_2$, one maps it into the unique classification $\{A'_1, A'_2\}$ such that $B_1 \subset A'_1, X \subset A'_2, B_2 \subset A'_2$, where $A'_1 = A_1 \setminus X, A'_2 = A_1 \cup X$.

Corollary 1 *A supervised pattern recognition is impossible. After the leaning procedure the probability to classify correctly a new object is the same as before leaning, i.e., $1/2$.*

14 Demonstration of algorithm

A preliminary version of the forecast algorithm described above was used in the paper [Ghertzik, 2008] for California and the Sumatra-Andaman earthquake region. These computations serve as a demonstration of the efficiency of the method but their actual results should be taken with a pinch of salt because the selection of precursors does not appear well-justified from the modern point of view: the number of free parameters to be adapted in the precursor "stress indicator" is too large.

California region. The catalog Global Hypocenter Data Base CD-ROM NEIC/USGS, Denver, CO, 1989, together with data from the site NEIC/USGS PDE (<ftp://hazard.cr.usgs.gov>) for earthquakes with magnitudes $M \geq 4.0$ with epicenters between $113^\circ - 129^\circ$ of western longitude and $31^\circ - 43^\circ$ of northern latitude was used for parameter adaptation. The initial time t_0 was selected by subtracting from the time of actual computation, 08.03.2006, an integer number of half-year intervals such that t_0 fits the first half of the year 1936. (The final time 08.03.2006 could be considered as an initial moment for constructing half-year forecast forward up to the date of the latest earthquake available in the catalog). During the computation the time interval from the first half of 1936 to the first half of 1976 was used for relaxation of the zero initial data used for precursors. After this date the catalog for the earthquakes with magnitude $M \geq 4.0$ was used to estimate the probabilities of strong earthquakes with magnitude $M \geq 6.0$ up to the moment of actual forecast. Note that the adapted restriction to include into consideration only earthquakes with magnitudes $M \geq 4.0$ is a severe restriction. It decreases the precision of precursor computation and therefore, if a prediction is successful, increases the degree of confidence to the predictor choice. We choose $a = 150\text{km}$ as a size of the spacial lattice, and $\Delta t = 6$ months as a time-step. Retrospective forecast was performed with 5 alarm levels defined by the thresholds $a_s = 10^{-\alpha(5-s)}, s = 1, \dots, 4$ and $\alpha = 0.75$. (Due to too short time step no alarms was registered on the lowest level

when parameter $\alpha = 1$ was selected). In order to reduce the influence of the boundary conditions the large square covering all the seismic events in the catalog used in the computations was reduced by two layers of elementary cells from each boundary. As a result of optimization the forecast information efficiency of 0.526 was achieved, i.e., the forecasting algorithm applied to the given catalog extracted from it about 53% of all available information about seismic events. It seems that this result could be only partially explained by a lucky selection of precursors: another contributor to the high efficiency of the algorithm is the adaptation of the parameters to the features of the specific catalog. The influence of this artificial information may be reduced only with the increase of the observation interval.

Accepting the rule of binary alarm announcement in the cells from group 1 and 2 from 5 levels possible one obtains that the space-time share of alarmed cells is 3.4% and the share of missed targets is 18.2%. This result is comparable with the best forecasts available in the literature and obtained by other methods (in the cases when the quantitative parameters of algorithms are presented in the publications). When the forecast was constructed in the future we obtained that the estimate of probability of a strong earthquake anywhere in the area under study is 0.174, and the maximal point estimate of an event in any individual cell is 0.071. As a whole the seismic situation in California did not look too alarming. Indeed, there were no strong earthquakes in California in the next half-year.

SAE region. We have conducted a retrospective forecast of strong earthquakes with magnitudes $M \geq 7.0$ for the whole region where the Sumatra-Andoman earthquake (SAE) happened on 26.12.2004 with magnitude $M = 9.3$. The catalog Global Hypocenter Data Base CD-ROM NEIC/USGS, Denver, CO, 1989, together with the data from the cite NEIC/USGS PDE (<ftp://hazard.cr.usgs.gov>) for earthquakes with magnitudes $M \geq 5.5$ with epicenters between $84.3^\circ - 128^\circ$ of eastern longitude and $20^\circ - 26^\circ$ of northern latitude was used for the parameters adaptation. The initial moment of time t_0 was selected by subtracting from the time of actual computation, 10.11.2004, an integer number of half-year intervals such that t_0 fits the first half of the year 1936. (The final time was selected in such a way that the next half-year period covers SAE and its powerful aftershock). During the computation the time interval from the first half of 1936 to the first half of 1976 was used for relaxation of the zero initial data used for precursors. After this date the catalog was used to estimate the probabilities of strong earthquakes with magnitude $M \geq 7.0$ up to the moment of actual forecast. (For magnitude $M \geq 7.5$ the number of seismic events was not sufficient for reliable forecast because the 5%-confidence intervals strongly overlapped). In this case the restriction to include into consideration only earthquakes with magnitudes $M \geq 5.5$ was adapted. As before, it decreases the precision of precursor computation and therefore, if the prediction is successful, increases the degree of confidence to the predictor choice. We selected the size of the spacial grid as $a = 400\text{km}$ and the size of time-step $\Delta t = \text{half-year}$. Retrospective analysis was conducted following the same scheme as in the previous case. In order to reduce the influence of the boundary conditions the large square covering all the seismic events in the catalog used in the computations was reduced by two layers of elementary cells from each boundary. As a result of optimization the forecast information efficiency was 0.549, i.e., the forecasting algorithm extracted around 55% of all available information about seismic events when applied to the given catalog.

In the case of binary alarm announcement the space-time share of alarmed cells was 3.1% and the share of missed targets was 8.3%. This result is comparable with

the best forecasts available in the literature and obtained by the other methods (in the cases when the quantitative parameters of algorithms are presented in the publications). In the case of forward forecast the two most powerful earthquakes, i.e., SAE and its major aftershock, happened in the alarm zone of the second level, and two other events with smaller magnitudes in the fourth alarm zone. Note that in case of binary alarm announcement one would register a square with 9 elementary cells with only one alarmed and 8 quiet cells. In this case no reliable forward forecast is possible.

Acknowledgements We would like to thank V.Pisarenko and G.Sobolev for stimulating discussions that gave us the impulse for writing this paper.

References

- Akaike, 1974. Akaike, H., A new look at the statistical model identification, *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, **19**, n. 6, 716-723, 1974.
- Bolshev, Smirnov, 1965 . Bolshev L. N., Smirnov V. N., *Mathematical Statistical Tables (in Russian)*. V.A. Steklov Mathematical Institute, Academy of Sciences, Moscow, USSR, 1965, 464 pp.
- Field, 2007. Field, E. H., Overview on the working group for the development of Regional Earthquake Likelihood Models (RELM), *Seismol. Res. Lett.* **78**, 2007.
- Ghertzik, 2008. Gercsik V., Physical concepts of fracture and prediction of probabilities of strong earthquakes, *Phys. Solid Earth*, **44**. n. 3, 22-39. 2008.
- Gercsik, Kelbertl, 2004. Gercsik V., Kelbert M., On comparison of hypothesis tests in Bayesian framework without a loss function, *Journ. Modern Applied Statistical Methods*, **3**, n.2, 399-405. 2004.
- Harte and Vere-Jones, 2005. Harte D. and Vere-Jones D., The entropy score and its uses in earthquake forecasting, *Pure and Applied Geophysics*. **162**, n. 6-7, 1229-1253, 2005.
- Holliday et al., 2007. Holliday J.R., Chien-chih Chen, Tiampo K.F., Rundle J.B., Turcott D.L. and Donnellan A., A RELM Earthquake forecast based on pattern informatics, *Seismological Research Lett.*, **78**, n.1., 97-93, 2007.
- Jackson, 1996 . Jackson D. D., Hypothesis testing and earthquake prediction, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, **93**, 3772-3775, 1996.
- Jordan et all., 2011. Jordan T.H., Chen Y.-T., Gasparini P., Madariaga R., Main I., Marzocchi W., Papadopoulos G., Sobolev G., Yamaoka K. and Zschau J., Operational earthquake forecasting: state of knowledge and guidelines for utilization, *Ann. Geophysics*, **54**, n. 4, 2011.
- Kagan and Jackson 2000. Kagan Y. Y., and Jackson D.D., Probabilistic forecasting of earthquakes, *Geophysical Journal International*, **143**, 438-453, 2000.
- Keilis-Borok., 1996. Keilis-Borok V. I., Intermediate-term earthquake prediction, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **93**, n. 9, 3748-3755, 1996.
- Keilis-Borok, Kossobokov, 1990. Keilis-Borok V.I., Kossobokov V.G. , Premonitory activation of earthquake flow: algorithm M8. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, **61**. 73-83, 1990.
- Kelbert, Suhov, 2013. Kelbert M., Suhov Y., *Information Theory and Coding by Example*. Cambridge Univ. Press: Cambridge, 2013, 530 pp.
- Kolmogorov, 1965 . Kolmogorov A. N., Three approaches to the definition of the notion of information amount, *Probl. Information Transmission*, **1**, n. 1, 3-11, 1965.
- Kolmogorov, 1933. Kolmogorov A. N., On the suitability of statistically obtained prediction formulas, *Zh. Geoz.*, **3**, 7882, 1933.

- Kolmogorov, 1933a. Kolmogorov A. N., Sulla determinazione empirica di una legge distribuzione, G. Ist. Ital. Attuari., 4 (1), 83-91, 1933.
- Molchan, 1990. Molchan G. M., Strategies in strong earthquake prediction, Phys. Earth Plan. Int., **61**, 84-98, 1990.
- Molchan and Keilis-Borok, 2008. Molchan, G. M. and Keilis-Borok V. I., Earthquake prediction: probabilistic aspect, Geophys. Journ. Int., **173**, 1012-1017, 2008.
- Pisarenko et al., 2008. Pisarenko V. F., Sornette A., Sornette D., Rodkin M. V., New approach to the characterization of Mmax and of the tail of the distribution of earthquake magnitudes, Pure and Applied Geophysics, **165**, n 5 , 847-888, 2008
- Prohorov, Rozanov, 1969. Prohorov Yu.V., Rozanov Yu.A., Probability theory, basic concepts. Limit theorems, random processes, Springer-Verlag, 1969, 401 pp.
- Smirnov, 1939. Smirnov N. V., On deviations from the empirical distribution curve, Mat. Sb., 6(48), 1, 3-24, 1939.
- Vere-Jones, 1998. Vere-Jones D., Probability and information gain for earthquake forecasting, in: Problems of Geodynamics and Seismology, Computational Seismology, Issue 30, Moscow, 248-263, 1998.
- WGNCEP, 2011. WGNCEP, 2011 WGNCEP (Working Group on Northern California Earthquake Potential), The Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast, Version 3 (UCERF3) Project Plan : U. S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 1-176, 2011.