Deep learning slow earthquakes in Cascadia and universal frictional characteristics
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Abstract

Slow earthquakes and associated tremor are common to most subduction zones, taking place down dip from the neighboring locked zone where megathrust earthquakes occur. We report observation of quasi-continuous tremor that quantifies the slow slip rate at all times. By training a convolutional neural network to detect known tremor on a single station in Cascadia, we isolate and identify tremor and slip preceding and following known larger slow events. The model trained in Cascadia recognizes tremor in other subduction zones and the San Andreas Fault at Parkfield. The generalization to other fault zones and different tectonic environments suggests that the frictional characteristics underlying slow slip and tremor on faults are universal, as posited from experiment and theory.
Main Text

In many subduction zones where megaquakes occur, slow earthquakes take place deep on the subduction interface, perturbing the stress environment of the neighboring and shallower locked zone, and potentially influencing the occurrence of large megathrust earthquakes \(^{(1, 2)}\). As a result, the relation between slow earthquakes and the locked zone is a topic of intense interest. Non-volcanic tremor, the noise-like seismic signature of slow earthquakes emanating from the subduction zone, was discovered relatively recently \(^{(3, 4)}\). Tremor is identified and located by analyzing the phase correlations of seismic signal envelopes recorded at multiple seismometers \(^{(3, 5)}\). Tremor is frequently used as a qualitative proxy for slow slip \(^{(2, 6)}\), including in situations where GPS shows no displacement, presumably because it is too small to record \(^{(7)}\).

We rely on convolutional neural networks (CNNs), a type of deep learning algorithm, in an effort to characterize tremor from seismic noise and probe the relationship between tremor and slip (Fig. 1). CNNs are at the core of recent dramatic advances in computer vision, natural language processing and recommender systems \(^{(8)}\). The use of CNNs to recognize tremor can be viewed as a deep learning extension of template matching methods \(^{(9, 10)}\), where the deep learning model automatically determines which time-frequency patterns to use, effectively learning something akin to a set of templates that are more general representations of tremor than hand-crafted templates. Tasked with recognizing tremor from portions of single station seismic data, the convolutional layers learn to transform this data into simpler characteristic features. These features are then fed to dense layers that learn to classify whether a portion of seismic data contains tremor or not.

The CNN model is trained on seismic data from the Canadian National Seismograph Network (CNSN) \(^{(11)}\). Figure 2A shows the area analyzed: Vancouver Island on the North Amer-
ican Plate and the subducting Juan de Fuca plate, with a schematic of the locked and slowly slipping portions of the downgoing slab. Our ground truth for the initial training of the neural network is a tremor catalog from the Pacific Northwest Seismic Network (PNSN). The catalog was constructed using Wech’s tremor identification method (multi-station, based upon 5 minute envelope correlation) (12) from the southern portion of Vancouver Island between October 2009 to July 2017. We build our database from 5 minute portions of single station seismograms. For every tremor event in the PNSN catalog, we record the corresponding 5 minute single station waveform, and label it as containing tremor. For the non-tremor examples we randomly sample the seismic data on days where no tremor was identified in the PNSN catalog. This results in about 47’500 time windows of 5 minute single station waveforms labeled as containing tremor, and 47’500 windows of 5 minute single station waveforms labeled as not containing tremor. In order to leverage the ability of CNNs to extract information from images, instead of feeding raw waveforms to the CNN, we first compute the short-time Fourier transform (STFT) of the 5 minute portions of data (Fig. 1B). The original 5 minute waveforms containing 12’000 data points are converted into spectrograms over the 5 minute interval. The spectral image of each 5 minute single station waveform is in turn labeled with the corresponding ‘tremor’ or ‘absence of tremor’ as determined by the multi-station PNSN catalog to constitute our database of 95’000 labeled examples (Fig. 1D,E).

We split our database of 95’000 time (frequency) windows into two contiguous portions for training and testing: the first 80% for training and the last 20% for validation (10%) and testing (10%). In other words, all the examples from the end of 2009 to the end of 2015 are used to train the model (about 6 years of data), the examples from the end of 2015 to the end of 2016 are used for validation, and the examples from the end of 2016 to the end of 2017 are used to test and assess the model. This split into contiguous pieces is of paramount importance for time series in general, and for this problem in particular. For instance, applying a random train/test
Figure 1: **Deep learning tremor.** (A) 5-minute duration, single station (NLLB) seismic signals. (B) Short-time Fourier transform of the waveforms that are fed as input to the convolutional neural network. (C) Schematic of the CNN and its architecture. The convolutional layers learn representations (features) of tremor while the last dense layers determine detection/no detection of tremor based on the presence of these features in a spectrogram. The model is trained on spectrograms labeled using the PNSN catalog of tremor from southern Vancouver Island from 2009 to 2015. (D) Interpretation of the CNN using Taylor decomposition (13), showing in red which parts of the spectrograms were recognized as characteristic of tremor. (E) Reconstruction of the waveforms from only the portions of the spectrograms recognized as tremor according to the CNN and its interpretation.

Split would assign pieces of any tremor burst longer than a few minutes to both the training and the testing set, making the problem dramatically easier – the CNN would only have to memorize
the examples it sees in training.

The architecture of the CNN consists of three convolutional layers and one fully connected hidden layer (see Fig 1 and Supplementary for details). At the end of the training procedure (Fig. S1) the model is fixed and applied to the testing set (the last year of data never analyzed before), to assess how well it generalizes to new examples of tremor.

The CNN outputs an empirical probability that a portion of waveform transformed into the time-frequency domain contains tremor. The performance of the model, measured through the ROC-AUC metric, is shown in Fig. 2. The ROC curve is generated by plotting true positive rate of the model on the y-axis versus the false positive rate on the x-axis at progressively larger threshold settings. The further the curve is from the diagonal line and closer to the upper left corner, the better the model is at discriminating between positives and negatives. Lowering the classification threshold classifies more items as positive, thus increasing both false positives and true positives. For our purposes, true positives are catalogued events detected on a single station by our deep learning model. False positives are detections from our model of possible events that were not catalogued. Figure 2B shows the model performance on the test set (last year of the labeled database, 2017) according to the ROC curve: with a ROC-AUC score of 0.945, the model performs well in discriminating between positives (catalogued events) and negatives (waveforms not catalogued, and on days with no catalogued events). The confusion matrix in inset shows the fraction of classified noise and tremor compared to the actual labels, for a model with a default threshold of 0.5.

Given continuous seismic spectral data as input, the deep learning model outputs an empirical probability that the seismic data contains tectonic tremor. We term this empirical probability ‘tremorness’. We showed in previous work that the energy of continuously-recorded
Figure 2: ‘Tremoriness’ continuously tracks geodetic slow slip displacement rate, and generalizes to nearby stations. (A) Map of Vancouver Island. Slow slip and tremor originate from ductile portions of the interface, down dip from the locked zone where a megathrust earthquake is anticipated. Seismic stations NLLB and PGC as well as the GPS station NANO are noted by colored arrows. (B) The area under the receiving operating characteristic (ROC) curve and the confusion matrix. The ROC curve shows the true (deep learning detection of catalogued event) and false (deep learning detection of a possible but uncatalogued event) positive rates as the threshold of classification of the model is varied. A model that reproduces the catalogue exactly would yield a point in the upper left corner or coordinate (0,1) of the ROC space. The inset shows the confusion matrix, indicating the fraction of classified noise and tremor by the deep learning model compared to the labels from the multi-station catalogue, for a model with a threshold of 0.5. Most tremor catalogued using multi-station cross-correlations are identified on a single station by the neural network. Other signals such as earthquakes, teleseisms, cultural noise and microseisms are easily distinguished from tremor by the model (see also Fig. S2). (C) Blue: daily average of the tremor content of the seismic data from the NLLB station, as determined by the deep learning model. Red: 15 days average of the co-located GPS displacement rate, from station NANO.

Low-amplitude seismic waves track the smoothed GPS displacement rate very well at long time scales (30+ days) and quite well on shorter time scales (one hour) (14). The energy-GPS corre-
lation suggests that tremor is emitted continuously or quasi-continuously at the plate interface from its slowly slipping portion (Fig. 2A). In contrast, catalogued tremor has been shown to be intermittent (15). Using the deep CNN trained to recognize catalogued tremor, we find strong evidence that tremor is emitted at least quasi-continuously, and quantitatively maps to geodetic slow slip.

Figure 2C shows that the daily tremorness characteristic of the seismic data from the NLLB station tracks the co-located SW GPS displacement rate, even at small displacement rates and with modest GPS smoothing. In between the peaks of slow slip rate, the deep learning model finds that the seismic data on any given day contains 15 to 40% tremor (compared with 0.08% at times when no slow slip occurs, the actual false positive rate of our model, see Fig. S2), arguing for a quasi-continuous emission of tremor. These weak tremors that go undetected in the multi-station method map to smaller peaks in the GPS displacement rate (see Fig. S4), demonstrating the existence of numerous slip events in between the known large slow slip events, as have been observed for instance in Mexico (7). If we consider a detection threshold of tremor for a tremorness (CNN output) above 0.5, the default classifier built by the deep learning model, we detect more than 130,000 5-minute waveforms containing tremor events, close to three times the number contained in the catalog for the same time interval.

We note that our neural network has been trained to reproduce the catalogue as well as it could using a single seismic station. This corresponds to a threshold of 0.5 on the ROC curve on Fig. 2B. The deep learning model of tremor is therefore conservatively trained and the additional events it detects do not come from lowering the standards of detection compared to the multi-station method. This means that the model finds more events than those in the catalogue. This finding is not because these events correspond to a lower detection standard, but because according to the spectral features learned on a single station they are as likely to be tremor as the known catalogued events. These events are too weak in amplitude (see Fig. S3) to be
detected on multiple stations, but based on the temporal evolution of their frequency content, the deep learning model cannot distinguish these newly detected tremor events from the known catalogued events. The dramatically improved mapping to GPS displacement rate (Fig. 2C and S4) further proves that these detections are not spurious. As a further test we applied the trained model to seismic data measured in a region known to be seismically inactive, in this case Michigan (Fig., S2). Extremely little tremor is identified in Michigan by our model, supporting that the numerous newly detected tremor events in Cascadia are real. It also indicates that our model is not confused by cultural noise (e.g., train traffic, vehicular traffic, wind farms), meteorological noise (wind, storms), or teleseisms.

Deep learning models are notoriously hard to interpret. However, recent efforts \((13,16)\) have showed that perturbing the input of deep learning models enables their analysis, to some extent. In our case the network outputs the probability that the input contains tremor, and a Taylor expansion of the model reveals the characteristics of tremor pixel by pixel (time-frequency domain component). Fig.1D shows examples of such an analysis, applying a Taylor expansion of the neural network with respect to its input pixels \((13)\) to construct a heatmap of time-frequency components identified as tremor by the deep learning model. Fig.1E shows the tremor signals identified by the deep learning model, reconstructed by inverse short-time Fourier transform the time-frequency components of the initial STFT identified as tremor by the Taylor analysis. Here, because each pixel of our input has a physical meaning as a time-frequency component of the seismic signal, activation of the CNN has a direct physical interpretation and the tremor signal can be separated from the background seismic data.

The features learned by the convolutional neural network are patterns in the time-frequency domain, and we posit these features are directly related to the frictional properties of the slip on the interface that emit the signals. We presume that variations in pore pressure, chemistry,
thermal properties may modulate or influence the emitted signal, but the origin of the signal is due to emissions coming from asperities on the fault interface. In Fig. S5 we show evidence of the link between features learned by the CNN and inferred variations in frictional properties of the fault. The last feature map of the CNN, computed for classically catalogued and located tremor, exhibits a clustering in feature space that is reflected in its geographic location. This relation suggests that the tremor features learned by the CNN may be specific to the frictional properties of slip, as these features evolve systematically with the spatial origin of tremor. This is a point we intend to explore further in future work.

Deep learning models have tremendous expression capabilities, which can lead to overfitting. In the previous section we demonstrated that our network generalizes to new seismic data from the station it was trained on, recorded later in time, suggesting that overfitting is not an issue. A powerful additional test is to see whether the network generalizes to seismic data from another station. Seismic recordings at a given station are a convolution of the source, propagation path and ‘site amplification’ effects, that may vary tremendously over short distances (17). Generalization to another station would suggest that the network did not only learn the specifics of the seismic data it has been trained on. In Fig. 2B we show that our trained network is extremely robust when applied to other seismic stations on Vancouver Island. The network trained on station NLLB from the end of 2009 to the end of 2015 can accurately recognize catalogued tremor on station PGC from 2016 to 2017, 80 km away. This test proves that the network did learn general time-frequency dynamics that are characteristic of tremor.

Furthermore, the model generalizes to other subduction zones and different tectonic environments (Fig. 3). Fig. 3A shows that catalogued tremor in Shikoku, southern Japan (6, 18) (also developed using multi-station envelope correlation) is accurately identified on a single station by our deep learning model of tremor trained in Cascadia, with no further training required. Fig.
Figure 3: The deep neural network model of tremor trained in Cascadia recognizes known tremor in other regions. (A) ROC curves of the deep learning model of tremor exclusively trained in Cascadia, and applied to tremor catalogued in Shikoku, Japan (6, 18). The performance decreases with distance (colors on maps and ROC curves matching). At short distances (<20 km) the model has the same performance on Japanese tremor as it does on Cascadia tremor. (B) ROC curves of the deep learning model applied to tremor catalogued on the San Andreas fault (19). The deep model trained on the Cascadia subduction zone only could not be used to build catalogues there on the San Andreas strike slip fault, but its ability to recognize catalogued tremor in most cases underscores the frictional similarity between strike slip tremor and subduction tremor.

3B shows that known tremor emitted by the San Andreas transform fault (19) –a very different tectonic environment– is also identified by the same deep learning model trained in Cascadia.
Tremor on the San Andreas fault has recently been shown to be due to slow slip on the deep portion of the fault (20), similar to slow slip in subduction zones. These results show that the time-frequency dynamics of tremor signals are dominated by the source characteristics, because our model is station and even region agnostic.

If tremor signals are dictated by source characteristics, then the time-frequency dynamics of these signals are indicative of an event rate and distribution that is characteristic of tremor: bursts of discrete events that are very similar in magnitude (very high b-values), with a very high event rate given by the time-frequency evolution of detected tremor. From this perspective, the time-frequency dynamics of tremor are a fingerprint of the frictional properties of the asperities that emit them. The ability of our model to recognize tremor in Japan and from the San Andreas fault suggests that the waveform characteristics of tremor are universal. This result is in line with laboratory analysis (21) and models (22) – tremor-inducing slow slip occurs within frictional conditions that are very similar for a wide variety of faults, and possibly all faults systems.
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