Abstract—Predicting earthquakes is an important issue in the study of geography. Accurate prediction of earthquakes can help people to take effective measures to minimize the loss of personal and economic damage, such as large casualties, destruction of buildings and broken of traffic, occurred within a few seconds. United States Geological Survey (USGS) science organization provides reliable scientific information about Earthquake Existed throughout history & the Preliminary database from the National Center Earthquake Information (NEIC) show some useful factors to predict an earthquake in a seismic area like Aleutian Arc in the U.S. state of Alaska. The main advantage of this prediction method that it does not require any assumption, it makes prediction according to the future evolution of the object's time series. The article compares between simulation data result from trained BP and RBF neural network versus actual output result from the system calculations. Therefore, this article focuses on analysis of data relating to real earthquakes. Evaluation results show better accuracy and higher speed by using radial basis functions (RBF) neural network.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Earthquake, one of the most devastating natural disasters occurs due to a sudden movement of the transition to the ground due to the release of elastic energy in a few seconds. The impact of the event is traumatic because it affects a large area to occur suddenly and unpredictably. An earthquake can cause large-scale loss of life, property and violates the basic services such as water, sanitation, energy, communication, transportation and so on. Earthquakes not only destroy cities and villages, but the effects lead to the destabilization of the economic and social fabric of the nation [1].

Alaska in 1964 resulted in a 9.2 magnitude earthquake, the largest ever recorded in North America. Earthquake, also known as the 1964 Alaska earthquake, the great earthquake of Alaska and the Friday earthquake, causing a lot of ground shaking at least 4 minutes and affected virtually all coastal communities in Alaska. The state has suffered enormous damage. A total of 139 people died in the earthquake, including 13 in California and Oregon 4 children. A damaged territory of the Pacific Coast was $311 million.

II. THE REVIEW OF EARTHQUAKE PREDICTION SYSTEMS

Many papers have talked about earthquake prediction and how to make a model that can predict the next earthquake in an area.

S. G. Chern, talked about Yuan-Lin Taiwan as his search area using Fuzzy Adaptive Resonance Theory network (Fuzzy ART) on the years of 1891 to 1980 For magnitude 5 to up deduce that the success rate in predicting liquefaction in Yuan-Lin area by using proposed Fuzz-A RT neural network method is not so satisfactory [2]. In 2004, Yue Liu used Impulse Force based Supervised Adaptive Resonance Theory (IFART) Neural Network on attributes optimization by Genetic Algorithm to identify the different among the categories defined in his model using area of china for years of 1900 to 1998 and compare the results with Adaptive Resonance Theory (ART) Neural Network inferring that prediction accuracy of Category ART is almost 58.3% while IFART is almost 83.3% [3].

China searched using UCI benchmark datasets for the years of 1990 and 1991 by Yue Liu, in 2005 using Constructive Ensemble of RBF Neural Networks in which the number of hidden nodes in RBFNNs is determined automatically with high accuracy and efficiency by using the nearest-neighbor clustering algorithm and he determined that the same as or better than that of other ensemble learning methods [4].

In 2009, Wang Ying talked about the southwest Yunnan province as his search area. Data of year 2001 used by Radial Basis Function (RBF) neural network to predict the magnitude of the earthquake and compare the performance of RBF and Back-Propagation (BP) Neural Network and ratioicate that the predicted speed of RBF Neural Network is much quicker than that of BP [5].

Southern California region, searched in 2009 using two chosen architectures for MLPs based neural networks Back Propagation (BP) and Conjugate Gradient descent (CG) for years data from 1950 to 1990. He draw that the model yields good prediction accuracies for earthquakes of magnitude between 4.5 and 6.0 [6].

Fangzhou Xu, in 2010 used Data Mining technology over the world for years from 2007 to 2008 by taking the way of Three-Layer Back-Propagation Neural Network on
DEMETER data, a series of physical quantities measured by the DEMETER satellite including Electron density, Electron temperature, ions temperature and oxygen ion density, together with seismic belt information in the range of a 30km x 30km region around the epicenter for analysis. The time span is about 30 days before the earthquake and he gets a total accuracy is about 69.96% [7].

Guangyu, far south of China area in 2010 searched using improved RBF neural network model for seismic time series by CHEN Yi understand that one-step prediction result was good, and when the multi-step prediction steps over a range of forecasts, forecast performance quickly declined [8].

Same year, Guang-yu used interpolation techniques on BP neural network deducing that the method of making use of neural network to process occultation data and analyzing the anomalies of seismic ionospheres’ is feasible [9].

Probabilistic Neural Network (PNN) depended on the concept of the Parzen windows classifier used to predict an earthquake in northern China by HUANG, training dataset in 1960 is divided into seven input classes depending on the magnitude. HUANG concluded that The PNN models back propagation (BP) neural network and radial-basis function (RBF) neural network can be used to predict earthquakes with magnitude less than 5.0 while the Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) model can be used to predict earthquakes with magnitude bigger than 5.5 [10].

Habib Shah, searched in Southern California to predict the earthquake magnitude of more than 7.5 investigates the use of the Artificial Bee Colony (ABC) algorithm as a benchmark against MLP training with the standard BP [11].

California searched by K. Tomiyasu in 2012 using years data from 1812 to 2004 starting with Magnitude 8.25, down to 5.2. Calculations show that solar gravitational force is 176.1 times stronger that due to the moon. Rationale that California Earthquakes cannot be predicted but a probability exists [12].

Chile country on the south western side of South America searched on magnitude equal or larger to 3.0 for data of the year 2001 by J. Reyes, in 2013 and he determines that the back-propagation neural networks were able to predict [13].

In 2013 North Taiwan searched by Jui-Pin Wang using First-Order Second-Moment probability analysis since 1900 for magnitude greater than 6.0 and implemented the governing equation analysis on a probabilistic basis to evaluate the mean and variance of Peak ground acceleration (PGA), measure of ground acceleration during an earthquake. The result shows that there is a 30% probability that could exceed 0.3 g in 50 years, PGA associated with a major earthquake with its magnitude greater than 6.0 occurring within 200 km from the study site [14].

Beichuan Qiang County, in Sichuan, China searched by Zhuowei Hu in 2013 using the Geographic information system (GIS) platform made based on gathering fact for 1: 200,000 local geological map, 1: 250,000 geographic data, 30m SRTM DEM. The accuracy of precision using multiple Regression models is about 73.7% and the neural network model can be up to 81.28% determined. It can be concluded that in this area of study neural network model is more accurate in spatial landslide prediction [15].

East Anatolian Fault, Republic of Turkish searched using highly simplified ANN and cluster analysis on magnitude greater than 3 for data from 2005 to 2010 by S. Niksarlioglu conclude that according to the numerical methods the advantage of ANN is the optimization can be done very fast, no mathematical form of the relation between input and the output data is necessary. The disadvantage of neural network is that they require a lot of data to give better confidence in the results [16].

In 2013 North Taiwan searched by Jui-Pin Wang using First-Order In 2013, the Qeshm Island, south of Iran searched by Adel Moatti using the clustering method has been performed to pattern recognition from the years of 1995 to 2012 for magnitude greater than 6.0 and This result is similar to the past studies that reports The b-value of Gutenberg Richter law has been considered as precursor to earthquake prediction decrease as large earthquakes precursor [17].

A. Morales-Esteban used Feed Forward and Recurrent neural networks in the Iberian Peninsula area by The database of the Spanish Geographical Institute concluding that The networks predict the occurrence of large earthquakes for a seven-day [18].

In 2014, southwest areas of China searched by Feiyuan Zhou using Back-Propagation (BP) Neural Network based on the Levenberg–Marquardt (LM) Algorithm, a nonlinear optimization method between Newton’s method and gradient descent method For the overly parameterized problems has been performed for magnitude greater than or equal to three within half a year and The result is convergence speed of LM algorithm is fast and it has a good predictive effect and high accuracy [19].

Article idea is to make a relation between every region in Alaska-Aleutian arc. Every region could affect earthquake happened in other regions and may be this relation repeat in another date. Actual data were the data already happened in the next day for the period of one day and for seven days actual data were the data already happened in the next seven days.

This article train an RBF (Radial Basis Function) neural network by 19 factors as follow month, day and the F-E algorithm is fast and it has a good predictive effect and high accuracy [19].

III. NEURAL NETWORK

The neural network system is a system that is very self-adaptive nonlinear dynamics. The network can extract the portion of hide samples through learning sample mass, and can analyze a complex nonlinear system. Thus, the earthquake prediction by the neural network is effective.
A. RBF Neural Network Model

With the development and use of radial basis functions (RBF) comes radial basis neural networks (RBFNNs) work in the late 1980s [21].

Radial Basis Function displays a network in advance in three layers, with the output of a linear combination of the output of its hidden units. Each hidden unit implements a radial basis function (RBF).

Advantages compared with MLP. RBFNN has a good generalization capacity of the network structure of single avoiding lengthy calculations. The basic structure (Fig. 1) is a network of direct action with three layers, with a total production is a linear combination of the output of the hidden units (each hidden Unit for applying a radial basis function):

\[ f(x) = \frac{\phi(||x - c_i||)}{\sum_{j=1}^{M} \phi(||x - c_j||)} \]

Using the neural network in MATLAB 7.0 Toolbox [22], it is easy to design, analysis and practical use of a neural network. The function that allows designing a radial basis network exactly as follows:

\[ \text{net} = \text{newrb}(P, T, \text{SPREAD}) \]

This function takes two or three arguments: P -matrix RXQ input vectors Q. In this article, means a matrix includes 17 input factors. T -matrix SxQ Q vectors of the target class. In this article, means a matrix includes 17 regions of Alaska-Aleutian arc as factors to predict the next day earthquake initiates rupturing. This article uses month and day of the occurred earthquake.

B. Parzen Windows Classification

Parzen window classification is a technique for non-parametric density estimation, which can be used for classification. Technology approaches a certain training set distributions by a linear combination of the kernel on the observation point centered. In this paper, we have separated approximately earthquakes count for each of the four classes, shown in Table II related to occurrence count in Table III.
Train data using RBF & BP neural networks and simulate samples using RBF compared with Back-Propagation neural network.

C. Prediction Verifications

In the test dataset, the ranges of values are obtained by the neural network relative to the actual output of the target class. 363 test input vectors (simulation dataset) in the period of one day and 357 test input vectors in the period of seven days. Three success rate statistics are calculated for each output class of the number of correct and incorrect predictions.

The probability of detection (POD), false alarm ratio (FAR), and R_score parameters is calculated using the following formulas:

\[
POD = \frac{N_{pc}}{N_{pc} + N_{ni}}
\]

\[
FAR = \frac{N_{pi}}{N_{pc} + N_{pi}}
\]

\[
R = POD - FAR
\]

where \(N_{pc}\) (predicted-correct) is the number of occurrence during a period which the magnitude earthquake class falls within the predicted magnitude range, \(N_{ni}\) (not predicted incorrect) is the number of occurrences during a period which the magnitude earthquake class is greater than the upper limit of the predicted magnitude range, and \(N_{pi}\) (predicted incorrect) is the number of occurrences during a period which the magnitude earthquake class is less than the lower limit of the predicted magnitude range.

The computed values of P0, POD, FAR, and R_score for each magnitude range based on the number of successful and unsuccessful predictions in the testing dataset is presented in the next section.

V. SIMULATION AND RESULTS

Simulation dataset fall within the period of 1st January 2011 to 31st December 2011. Results for one day Actual output versus RBF simulation output as shown in Table IV and actual output versus BP simulation output as shown in Table V.

TABLE II
ALASKA-ALEUTIAN ARC TRAINING DATASET INPUT CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude Rang</th>
<th>Input classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude = 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude &lt; 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;= Magnitude &lt; 5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude &gt;= 5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III
ALASKA-ALEUTIAN ARC EARTHQUAKES COUNT FOR EACH CLASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Alaska</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Alaska</td>
<td>2120</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bering Sea</td>
<td>4008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komandorsky Islands Region</td>
<td>3831</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Islands, Aleutian Islands</td>
<td>3832</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Islands, Aleutian Islands</td>
<td>3816</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreanof Islands, Aleutian Is.</td>
<td>2385</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pribilof Islands, Alaska Region</td>
<td>4012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Islands, Aleutian Islands</td>
<td>2506</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimak Island Region, Alaska</td>
<td>3050</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Bay</td>
<td>4007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Peninsula</td>
<td>2765</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak Island Region, Alaska</td>
<td>3358</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenai Peninsula, Alaska</td>
<td>3387</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf of Alaska</td>
<td>3766</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Aleutian Islands</td>
<td>3904</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Alaska</td>
<td>3453</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IV
COMPUTED VERIFICATIONS VALUES FOR ACTUAL OUTPUT AND RBF SIMULATION OUTPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>p0</th>
<th>Pc</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>pi</th>
<th>POD</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>R_score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.9802</td>
<td>0.0281</td>
<td>0.9521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.9971</td>
<td>0.0360</td>
<td>0.9612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2173</td>
<td>0.0488</td>
<td>0.1685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9302</td>
<td>0.0148</td>
<td>0.9154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE V
COMPUTED VERIFICATIONS VALUES FOR ACTUAL OUTPUT AND BP SIMULATION OUTPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>p0</th>
<th>Pc</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>pi</th>
<th>POD</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>R_score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.9887</td>
<td>0.0279</td>
<td>0.9608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9288</td>
<td>0.0355</td>
<td>0.8932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.8349</td>
<td>0.1355</td>
<td>0.6994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9201</td>
<td>0.0799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Prediction of large earthquakes (Magnitude 5.0 or greater). RBF neural network predicts large earthquakes with percentage 92%. BP neural network predicts large earthquakes with percentage 8%. RBF is better at predicting large earthquakes than BP.

(2) Prediction of moderate earthquakes (Magnitude 3 or bigger but less than 5.0). RBF neural network predicts moderate earthquakes with percentage 17%. BP neural network predicts moderate earthquakes with percentage 70%. BP is better at predicting large earthquakes than RBF.

(3) Prediction of small earthquakes (Magnitude bigger than 0 while less than 3.0). RBF neural network predicts weak earthquakes with percentage 96%. BP neural network predicts weak earthquakes with percentage 89%. RBF is better at predicting weak earthquakes than BP.

(4) Prediction of no earthquakes (Magnitude equal 0). RBF neural network predicts no earthquakes with percentage 95%. BP neural network predicts no earthquakes with percentage 96%. BP is better at predicting large earthquakes than RBF.

For seven days of Actual output versus RBF simulation output as shown in Table VI and actual output versus BP simulation output as shown in Table VII.
TABLE VI
COMPUTED VERIFICATIONS VALUES FOR ACTUAL OUTPUT AND RBF SIMULATION RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>p0</th>
<th>pc</th>
<th>ni</th>
<th>pi</th>
<th>POD</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>R Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9972</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
<td>0.9944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9972</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
<td>0.9944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9972</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
<td>0.9944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5694</td>
<td>0.0195</td>
<td>0.5499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Prediction of large earthquakes (Magnitude 5.0 or greater). RBF neural network predicts large earthquakes with percentage 55%. BP neural network predicts large earthquakes with percentage 43%. RBF is better at predicting large earthquakes than BP.

(2) Prediction of moderate earthquakes (Magnitude 3 or bigger but less than 5.0). RBF neural network predicts moderate earthquakes with percentage 99%. BP neural network predicts moderate earthquakes with percentage 99%. RBF is predicting moderate earthquakes same as BP.

(3) Prediction of small earthquakes (Magnitude bigger than 0 while less than 3.0). RBF neural network predicts weak earthquakes with percentage 99%. BP neural network predicts weak earthquakes with percentage 99%. RBF is predicting small earthquakes same as BP.

(4) Prediction of no earthquakes (Magnitude equal 0). RBF neural network predicts no earthquakes with percentage 99%. BP neural network predicts no earthquakes with percentage 99%. RBF is predicting no earthquakes same as BP.

Longer days in the future cause less accurate results.

VI. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Predict earthquake magnitude class by a neural network can be very effective. The article used the neural network RBF compared with the BP neural network. The RBF network is faster and the accuracy also much higher. Each of the two networks can be realized by software, which is very simple and easy to perform. But some of the measures should be taken to further improve the accuracy of the neural network, such as learning of the neural network with specific data much more efficient data processing. Results showed that RBF neural network is simple but effective too and the method of applying a certain value in the prediction of earthquakes in the future.
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