

 Close Window


**Submitted**

on September 03, 05:44 PM

for agu-fm09

Nimar Arora Paid: \$30.00, Transaction #: 02989B

Credit Card Type: MasterCard

Credit Card Number: xxxxxxxxxxxx3498

Your abstract appears below.

**Please print a copy of this page for your records.**

To return to the Submission Center and check your list of submissions; click "View Submissions" in the left menu.

**Proof****CONTROL ID:** 719922**TITLE:** Vertically Integrated Seismological Analysis II : Inference**PRESENTATION TYPE:** Assigned by Committee**SECTION/FOCUS GROUP:** Seismology (S)**SESSION:** Research and Development in Nuclear Explosion Monitoring (S14)**AUTHORS (FIRST NAME, LAST NAME):** Nimar S Arora<sup>1</sup>, Stuart Russell<sup>1</sup>, Erik Sudderth<sup>2</sup>**INSTITUTIONS (ALL):** 1. Computer Science, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA.

2. Computer Science, Brown University, Providence, RI, USA.

**Title of Team:**

**ABSTRACT BODY:** Methods for automatically associating detected waveform features with hypothesized seismic events, and localizing those events, are a critical component of efforts to verify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). As outlined in our companion abstract, we have developed a hierarchical model which views detection, association, and localization as an integrated probabilistic inference problem. In this abstract, we provide more details on the *Markov chain Monte Carlo* (MCMC) methods used to solve this inference task.

MCMC generates samples from a posterior distribution  $\pi(x)$  over possible worlds  $x$  by defining a Markov chain whose states are the worlds  $x$ , and whose *stationary distribution* is  $\pi(x)$ . In the Metropolis–Hastings (M-H) method, transitions in the Markov chain are constructed in two steps. First, given the current state  $x$ , a candidate next state  $x'$  is generated from a *proposal distribution*  $q(x' | x)$ , which may be (more or less) arbitrary. Second, the transition to  $x'$  is not automatic, but occurs with an *acceptance probability*— $\alpha(x' | x) = \min(1, \pi(x')q(x | x')/\pi(x)q(x' | x))$ .

The seismic event model outlined in our companion abstract is quite similar to those used in multitarget tracking, for which MCMC has proved very effective. In this model, each world  $x$  is defined by a collection of events, a list of properties characterizing those events (times, locations, magnitudes, and types), and the association of each event to a set of observed detections. The target distribution  $\pi(x) = P(x | y)$ , the posterior distribution over worlds  $x$  given the observed waveform data  $y$  at all stations. Proposal distributions then implement several types of *moves* between worlds. For example, *birth* moves create new events; *death* moves delete existing events; *split* moves partition the detections for an event into two new events; *merge* moves combine event pairs; *swap* moves modify the properties and associations for pairs of

events. Importantly, the rules for accepting such complex moves need not be hand-designed. Instead, they are automatically determined by the underlying probabilistic model, which is in turn calibrated via historical data and scientific knowledge.

Consider a small seismic event which generates weak signals at several different stations, which might independently be mistaken for noise. A birth move may nevertheless hypothesize an event jointly explaining these detections. If the corresponding waveform data then aligns with the seismological knowledge encoded in the probabilistic model, the event may be detected even though no single station observes it unambiguously. Alternatively, if a large outlier reading is produced at a single station, moves which instantiate a corresponding (false) event would be rejected because of the absence of plausible detections at other sensors.

More broadly, one of the main advantages of our MCMC approach is its consistent handling of the relative uncertainties in different information sources. By avoiding low-level thresholds, we expect to improve accuracy and robustness. At the conference, we will present results quantitatively validating our approach, using ground-truth associations and locations provided either by simulation or human analysts.

**INDEX TERMS:** [7219] SEISMOLOGY / Seismic monitoring and test-ban treaty verification, [1914] INFORMATICS / Data mining, [1942] INFORMATICS / Machine learning, [1990] INFORMATICS / Uncertainty.

(No Table Selected)

(No Image Selected)

#### **Additional Details**

**Previously Presented Material:** 75% of the material was presented in ISS'09 (International Scientific Studies). A keynote presentation and poster was presented in that conference. It has not been published.

**Scheduling Request:** Please schedule this after part I by Russell et. al.: Vertically Integrated Seismological Analysis I : Modeling.