

From: "Alan Jones" <AlanJones@stny.rr.com>
To: zhonghao_shou@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: Earthquake predictions
Date: Sun, 9 Feb 2003 19:24:06 -0500

Shou,

It is obvious that you do not like the way I handle an earthquake that is near the boundary of a prediction region. How do you suggest they be handled?

----- Original Message -----

Can you tell me the systematic error of your data? I asked you this question before, but you may forget.

I do not know of any systematic error of the data. I assume that the errors are random.

About aftershock, my key question is how you count the number of an interval that contains two or more quakes. Will you count it as one interval that has more quakes, or two or more intervals that contain one quake each?

I thought we handle this the same way. I count the number of intervals that have at least one hit compared to the total number of intervals. Is that what you do? If there are many aftershocks in an interval, it still counts as one interval with a hit.

Besides the above key question, a big problem is no recognized, scientific definition for aftershock. I asked you "After a M7, three quakes: a M6.5, a M7 and a M7.5 happen, will you call all of them aftershocks?" but no response.

I am sorry I did not answer this before. If there is a 7.0 followed by a 6.5, the 6.5 would be considered an aftershock. If there is a M 7.0 followed by a M 7.0, this would be a surprise. It would be studied by many investigators. But such a case does not seem to have happened in the cases in your paper. If there was a 7.0 followed by a 7.5, then the 7.0 would be considered a foreshock for the 7.0.

Alan

Alan Jones
AlanJones@stny.rr.com
<http://home.stny.rr.com/alanjones>
3717 Wildwood Drive
Endwell, NY 13760
607-786-5866 (voice/fax)