

1 The study of ionospheric anomalies in Japan area during 1998-2010
2 by Kon et al.: an inaccurate claim of earthquake-related signatures?

3
4 Fabrizio Masci*

5 Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia, via dell'Arcivescovado 8, 67100, L'Aquila,
6 Italy.

7
8 * Corresponding author.

9 Current address: Osservatorio Geofisico INGV, via dell'Arcivescovado 8, 67100, L'Aquila, Italy.

10 E-mail address: fabrizio.masci@ingv.it

11 Phone : +39 0862 709103

12 Fax: +39 0862 709109

13
14
15
16 Abstract

17 The problem of identify earthquake-related precursory signals is a very important topic in the
18 hope of mitigate the seismic hazard, but false precursor claims decrease the credibility of this
19 field of research. The statistical study by Kon et al. (2011) show that positive total electron
20 content (TEC) anomalies occurred 1-5 days before 52 $M > 6$ earthquakes which struck Japan
21 during 1998-2010. Kon et al. (2011) also report in detail three selected case studies claiming
22 the occurrence of TEC anomalies possibly related to large and destructive earthquakes. This
23 paper casts doubts on the possibility that in the three cases variations of TEC values could be
24 undoubtedly induced by seismic events suggesting that the TEC changes could be actually
25 part of normal global geomagnetic activity. As a consequence, also the results of the statistical
26 analysis by Kon et al. (2011) could be seriously influenced by global magnetospheric signals.

27
28
29 *Keywords:* Ionospheric anomalies; Total electron content; Earthquake-related ionospheric
30 anomalies; Short-term earthquake prediction.

31 **1. Introduction**

32 Many studies claim the observation of different types of pre-earthquake seismogenic
33 anomalies. The motivation for the research of earthquake precursors is to realize short-term
34 deterministic earthquake prediction. This field of research is very important because of the
35 great benefit which could be related to accurate prediction, but false alarms could have
36 negative consequences. Ouzounov et al. (2011) affirm that: *“the costs to human life by such*
37 *events are another indication that development of an earthquake hazard mitigation scheme*
38 *requires an interdisciplinary effort”*. In addition, I would like to emphasize that the mitigation
39 of seismic hazard needs of reliable and reproducible earthquakes precursors.

40 Several papers report the observation of pre-earthquake signals, but also show the lack
41 of any firm correlation with the seismic activity. In addition, even if these anomalous signals
42 have been retrospectively related to seismic events, several researchers consider these pre-
43 earthquake signatures a new way towards the possibility of developing earthquakes prediction
44 capabilities (e.g., Uyeda et al., 2009; Hayakawa and Hobara, 2010). On the contrary, many in
45 the scientific community doubt the reliability of anomalous signals claimed to be precursors
46 of pending earthquakes. These researchers criticize the retrospective validation of earthquake
47 precursors, the lack of validation and reproducibility of the precursory signals, and the
48 observation of precursors without expected co-seismic related larger signals (see e.g. Geller,
49 1997; Pham and Geller, 2002; Johnston et al., 2006). Recently, some studies have cast serious
50 doubts on the authenticity of well-known earthquake precursors (e.g. Campbell, 2009;
51 Thomas et al., 2009; Masci, 2010, 2011a, 2011b, 2012a, 2012b). Obviously, it’s likely that an
52 “anomalous variation” can happen before the occurrence of an earthquake, but is rather
53 incorrect to relate the anomaly and the seismic event without further validations. If the
54 anomaly occurs simultaneously or at least shortly prior/after the earthquake, chances are good
55 that it is linked to the seismic event. On the contrary, it is very difficult to associate the

56 precursor with the earthquake if they are separated in time. In this case, the appearance of the
57 anomalies before the earthquakes occurrence could be a chance event. In light of this, a closer
58 inspection of the real presence of seismogenic signals in geophysical data sets is required.

59 Many papers claim the observation of ionospheric phenomena which could be possibly
60 associated with strong seismic events (e.g. Liu et al., 2009; Le et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2011)
61 suggesting also possible mechanisms to account for their generation (e.g. Pulinets et al.,
62 1994). On the contrary, other authors question the anomalous behaviour of the ionosphere
63 considered as earthquake precursor (e.g. Rishbeth et al., 2006a). They maintain that in some
64 cases pre-earthquake anomalies, such as TEC variations, may be actually related to changes in
65 solar and geomagnetic activity which cause not only global alteration of the ionosphere, but
66 also may control local perturbations of ionospheric parameters such as the regional TEC
67 variations (see Afraimovich et al., 2004; Afraimovich and Astafyeva 2008; Rishbeth et al.,
68 2006b). In addition, other studies report the observation of pre-earthquake TEC anomalies but
69 also the lack of any significant statistical correlation, both in time and in space, between these
70 anomalies and the seismic events (e.g. Dautermann et al., 2007) showing that some
71 ionospheric precursors are artefacts caused by enhanced space weather activity. In summary,
72 since the influence of the seismic activity on the ionosphere remains an open question, and
73 many points remain unclear regarding the detection of pre-earthquake effects, a real caution
74 should be adopted before claiming the observation of seismogenic ionospheric precursory
75 signals.

76

77 **2. Kon et al. claims**

78 Kon et al. (2011), hereafter cited as KON, is part of the studies presented at the
79 international workshop VESTO (Validation of Earthquake Precursors by Satellite, Terrestrial,
80 and other Observations) organized in March 2009 at Chiba University, Japan (Ouzounov et al,

81 2011). Twelve selected papers, including KON, were published in a special issue of Journal
82 of Asian Earth Sciences (volume 41, issues 4-5). KON using GIM-TEC, that is TEC data
83 derived from Global Ionospheric Maps, investigate the occurrence of pre-earthquake
84 ionospheric anomalies before strong seismic events which struck Japan during the period
85 1998-2010. The authors calculate the normalized GIM-TEC (hereafter TEC^{*}) by means of the
86 15-day backward running mean and the corresponding standard deviation. Refer to KON for
87 further details. In order to reduce the effect due to strong geomagnetic activity, such as
88 magnetic storms, which can perturb TEC from few hours to 2 days after the onset of
89 magnetospheric disturbances, KON removed 2 days TEC data after the beginning of the
90 perturbed periods. The criterion adopted by the authors to define an ionospheric perturbed
91 period is when the global geomagnetic Dst index exceeds -60nT.

92 As examples of case studies, KON report TEC^{*} time-series in correspondence of four
93 selected strong earthquakes: 2004 mid-Niigata Prefecture Earthquakes (M6.8, M6.1), 2007
94 offshore mid-Niigata Earthquake (M6.8), and 2008 Iwate–Miyagi Nairiku Earthquake (M7.2).
95 Figures 1, 2, and 3 show TEC^{*} time-series in correspondence of these seismic events as
96 reported by KON. The original views also show Kp index, Dst index, and F10.7 solar radio
97 flux index time-series. Vertical green lines refer to the earthquakes dates and grey areas
98 highlight geomagnetic disturbed period (Dst<-60nT). The authors define an ionospheric
99 anomaly when TEC^{*} exceeds 2 σ . More precisely, positive anomalies appear when TEC^{*}
100 exceeds +2 σ , and negative anomalies appear when TEC^{*} exceeds -2 σ . KON, taking into
101 account the results of the three case studies, affirm: “*it is highly suggestive that possible*
102 *positive and negative TEC^{*} anomalies before and after large earthquakes occur*”. As a
103 consequence, they performed a statistical study by means of Superimposed Epoch Analysis
104 (Hocke 2008) claiming that positive TEC^{*} anomalies appear 1-5 days before M>6
105 earthquakes occurrence within an area having a radius of 1000 km around Japan.

106

107 3. Discussion

108 The results of Kon et al. (2011) are investigated in order to verify the real nature of their
109 claims. In figures 1, 2, and 3 green arrows refer to the TEC* anomalies described by KON,
110 whereas yellow arrows refer to other cases of TEC* values exceeding 2σ which are not
111 considered by KON. The authors, referring to the three case studies, claim that: “*Although*
112 *there are some positive and negative TEC anomalies before and after the four earthquakes,*
113 *there is a tendency that positive TEC anomalies appear 1–5 days before all the above*
114 *earthquakes even during the quiet geomagnetic condition.*” According to my opinion, the
115 original views show that there is a reasonable positive correlation between TEC* and Kp over
116 the whole period of time: on average the behaviour of TEC* and Kp time-series are rather
117 similar. Obviously, we should expect this correspondence between TEC* and Kp because the
118 ionosphere is strongly influenced by solar-terrestrial interaction (see Afraimovich et al., 2004,
119 2008; Hocke 2008).

120 To better investigate the real nature of the earthquake-related ionospheric anomalies
121 reported by KON, Kp time-series is superimposed onto the TEC* original views. According
122 to my opinion Figs. 1, 2, and 3 show that:

- 123 (1) on average a close correspondence between TEC* and Kp exists not only during
124 disturbed periods (grey areas in Fig. 1) but also during periods of moderate geomagnetic
125 activity;
- 126 (2) TEC* values exceeding 2σ are present during all the period of time;
- 127 (3) the majority of positive and negative TEC* peaks exceeding 2σ correspond respectively
128 to high and low values of Kp; the correspondence fails in very few cases; as a

129 consequence, TEC* peaks exceeding 2σ seem to be related to changes of the global
130 geomagnetic activity level both before and after the earthquakes occurrence;
131 (4) TEC* increases which occur 1-5 days before the earthquakes actually correspond to Kp
132 increases; there is one exception on 13 June 2008;
133 (5) the delay between Kp changes and TEC* peaks is less than 2 days as, according to KON,
134 is expected for ionospheric perturbations induced by geomagnetic activity.

135 Concerning to the points (3) and (4), since the Kp index is representative of the geomagnetic
136 field average disturbances over planetary scale caused by magnetosphere-solar wind
137 interaction, it must be considered that we should not always expect a strong correspondence
138 between TEC* and Kp. On the other hand, a close correspondence between Kp and TEC*
139 variations indicates that these changes are part of normal global magnetic field variations
140 driven by solar-terrestrial interaction (see also Masci, 2010, 2011a, 2011b).

141 In summary, in the three case studies reported by KON the regional TEC* variations
142 seem to be controlled by geomagnetic activity changes. This suggests that the criterion
143 adopted by KON for reducing the effect of the geomagnetic activity on the ionosphere may
144 not completely eliminate solar and magnetospheric influence. Thus, simply related TEC*
145 values which exceed the threshold of 2σ to the earthquakes occurrence seems to be an
146 inaccurate assumption. In addition, I would like to emphasize that in the three case studies the
147 duration of the majority of the ionospheric anomalies is more than 10 hours. Pulinets and
148 Boyarchuk (2004) affirm that “*The duration of a seismically induced deviation of a given sign*
149 *is comparatively short about 4–6 h (relative to magnetic storm effects). Only in cases of very*
150 *strong earthquakes (such as before the large 1964 Good Friday earthquake, Alaska) can the*
151 *duration of a seismically induced deviation reach about 12 h*” (see also Pulinets et al., 2003).

152 In conclusion, according to Pulinets and Boyarchuk, in the three case studies the seismogenic
153 origin of TEC* changes is rather dubious.

154

155 **4. Conclusions**

156 Kon et al. (2011) report a statistical investigation of the occurrence of possible
157 earthquake-related ionospheric GIM-TEC anomalies in the Japan area during 1998-2010
158 claiming the presence of positive ionospheric anomalies 1-5 days before M>6 earthquakes.
159 The author also report details of three selected case studies. This paper shows that in the three
160 cases no firm evidence of earthquake-related ionospheric anomalies really exists. On the
161 contrary, a close correspondence between total electron content changes and the geomagnetic
162 activity level has been shown. This correspondence is also evident in the days just before the
163 earthquakes occurrence. As a consequence, also the Superimposed Epoch Analysis performed
164 by KON could be influenced by global geomagnetic activity. Thus, the tendency of positive
165 TEC* variation to appear 1-5 days before the earthquakes occurrence could be simply a
166 coincidence. In summary, the results of KON seem to be not completely reliable.

167

168 **Acknowledgements**

169 The author is grateful to the World Data Center for Geomagnetism, Kyoto University for
170 providing the Kp index.

171

172 **References**

- 173 Afraimovich, E. L., Astafyeva, E. I., Gokhberg, M. B., Lapshin, V. M., Permyakova, V. E.,
174 Steblov, G. M., Shalimov, S. L., 2004. Variations of the total electron content in the
175 ionosphere from GPS data recorded during the Hector Mine earthquake of October 16,
176 1999, California. *Russian Journal of Earth Sciences*, 6(5), 339–354.
177 doi:10.2205/2004ES000155.
- 178 Afraimovich, E. L., Astafyeva, E. I., 2008. TEC anomalies – local TEC changes prior to
179 earthquakes or TEC response to solar and geomagnetic activity changes?. *Earth Planets
180 and Space*, 60, 961–966.
- 181 Campbell, W. H., 2009. Natural magnetic disturbance fields, not precursors, preceding the
182 Loma Prieta earthquake. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 114, A05307.
183 doi:10.1029/2008JA013932.
- 184 Dautermann, T., Calais, E., Haase, J., Garrison, J., 2007. Investigation of ionospheric electron
185 content variations before earthquakes in southern California, 2003–2004. *Journal of
186 Geophysical Research*, 112, B02106. doi:10.1029/2006JB004447.
- 187 Geller, R. J., 1997. Earthquake prediction: a critical review. *Geophys. J. Int.*, 131, 425–450,
188 doi:10.1111/j.1365-246X.1997.tb06588.x.
- 189 Hayakawa, M., Hobara, Y., 2010. Current status of seismo-electromagnetics for short-term
190 earthquake prediction. *Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk*, 1, 2, 115–155, doi:
191 10.1080/19475705.2010.486933.
- 192 Hocke, K., 2008. Oscillations of global mean TEC. *Journal of Geophysical Research* , 113,
193 A04302, doi:10.1029/2007JA012798.
- 194 Johnston, M. J. S., Sasai, Y., Egbert, G. D., Muller, R. J., 2006. Seismomagnetic effects from
195 the long-awaited 28 September 2004 M 6.0 Parkfield earthquake. *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.*,
196 96(4B), S206-S220, doi:10.1785/0120050810.

197 Kon, S., Nishihashi, M., Hattori, K., 2011. Ionospheric anomalies possibly associated with M
198 ≥ 6.0 earthquakes in the Japan area during 1998–2010: Case studies and statistical study.
199 *Journal of Asian Earth Sciences*, 41, 410-420. doi:10.1016/j.jseaes.2010.10.005.

200 Le, H., Liu, J. Y., Liu, L., 2011. A statistical study of ionospheric anomalies before 736
201 M6.0+ earthquakes during 2002-2010. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 116, A023203.
202 Doi:10.11029/2010JA015781.

203 Liu, J.Y., Chen, Y.I., Chen, C.H., Liu, C.Y., Chen, C.Y., Nishihashi, M., Li, J.Z., Xia, Y.Q.,
204 Oyama, K.I., Hattori, K., Lin, C.H., 2009. Seismoionospheric GPS total electron content
205 anomalies observed before the 12 May 2008 Mw7.9 Wenchuan earthquake. *Journal of*
206 *Geophysical Research* 114, A04320. doi:10.10292008JA013698.

207 Liu, J. Y., Le, H., Chen, Y. I., Chen, C. H., Liu, L., Wan, W., Su, Y. Z., Sun, Y. Y., Lin C. H.,
208 Che, M. Q., 2011. Observation and simulations of seismoionospheric GPS total electron
209 content anomalies before the 12 January 2010 M7 Haiti earthquake. *Journal of*
210 *Geophysical Research*, 116, A023202. Doi:10.11029/2010JA015704.

211 Masci, F., 2010. On claimed ULF seismogenic fractal signatures in the geomagnetic field.
212 *Journal of Geophysical Research*, A10236. doi:10.1029/2010JA015311.

213 Masci, F., 2011a. On the seismogenic increase of the ratio of the ULF geomagnetic field
214 components. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 187, 19-32.
215 doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2011.05.001.

216 Masci, F., 2011b. On the recent reaffirmation of ULF magnetic earthquakes precursors.
217 *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 11, 2193–2198. doi:10.5194/nhess-11-2193-
218 2011.

219 Masci, F., 2012a. Comment on “Ultra Low Frequency (ULF) European multi station magnetic
220 field analysis before and during the 2009 earthquake at L’Aquila regarding regional

221 geotechnical information” by Prattes et al. (2011). In press, *Natural Hazards and Earth*
222 *System Sciences*.

223 Masci, F., 2012b. Comment on “Possible association between anomalous geomagnetic
224 variations and the Molise Earthquakes at Central Italy during 2002” by Takla et al. (2011).
225 Submitted to *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors* .

226 Ouzounov, D., Hattori, K., Liu, J. Y., 2011. The validation of earthquake precursors-VESTO.
227 *Journal of Asian Earth Sciences*, 41,369-370. doi:10.1016/j.jseaes.2011.04.008.

228 Pham, V. N., Geller, R. J., 2002. Comment on “Signature of pending earthquake from
229 electromagnetic anomalies” by K. Eftaxias et al. . *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 29(18), 1871,
230 doi:10.1029/2002GL015328.

231 Pulinets, S.A., Legen’ka, A.D., Alekseev, V.A., 1994. Pre-earthquake ionospheric effects and
232 their possible mechanisms. In: Kikuchi, H. (Ed.), *Dusty and Dirty Plasmas, Noise, and*
233 *Chaos in Space and in the Laboratory*. Plenum Publishing, New York, pp. 545–557.

234 Pulinets, S. A., A. D. Legen’ka, T. V. Gaivoronskaya, and V. Kh. Depuev, Main
235 phenomenological features of ionospheric precursors of strong earthquakes, *J. Atmos. Sol.*
236 *Terr. Phys.*, 65, 1337–1347, 2003. doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2003.07.011.


237 Pulinets, S. A., Boyarchuk, K. A., 2004. *Ionospheric Precursors of Earthquakes*. Springer,
238 Berlin, Germany, p. 315. doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2005.03.017.

239 Rishbeth, H., Ionoquakes: Earthquake Precursors in the Ionosphere?, *EOS*, **87**(32), 316–317,
240 2006a. doi:10.1029/2006EO320008.

241 Rishbeth, H.: F-region links with the lower atmosphere?, *J. Atmos. Sol.Terr. Phys.*, 68, 469–
242 478, doi: /10.1016/j.jastp.2005.03.017, 2006b.

243 Thomas, J. N., Love, J. J., Johnston, M. J. S., Yumoto, K., 2009. On the reported magnetic
244 precursor of the 1993 Guam earthquake. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 36, L16301,
245 doi:10.1029/2009GL039020.

246 Uyeda, S., Nagao, T., Kamogawa, M., 2009. Short-term earthquake prediction: Current status
247 of seismo-electromagnetics. *Tectonophysics*, 470, 205-213,
248 doi:10.1016/j.tecto.2008.07.019.
249
250
251




253

254

255 **Fig. 1.** A reproduction of Fig. 3 by Kon et al. (2011). From the top: TEC* variation, Kp
 256 index, Dst index, and F10.7 solar flux. Vertical green lines refer to 2004 mid-Niigata
 257 Prefecture earthquakes. Grey areas refer to disturbed periods according to the criterion
 258 adopted by KON ($Dst < -60\text{nT}$). Kp index time-series is superimposed onto the upper panel of
 259 the original view.

260




261

262

263 **Fig. 2** A reproduction of Fig. 4 by Kon et al. (2011). As Fig. 1 but for the case of 2007 mid-
 264 Niigata Prefecture earthquake.

265



267

268

269 **Fig. 3.** A reproduction of Fig. 5 by Kon et al. (2011). As Fig. 1 but for the case of 2008 Iwate-
 270 Miyagi earthquake. As Kon et al. (2011) pointed out, the TEC* enhancement of 14 June is
 271 caused by disturbed geomagnetic conditions ($K_p=6$) which occurred 1 day after the
 272 earthquake.