

Interactive comment on “Speeding up and boosting tsunami warning in Chile” by Mauricio Fuentes et al.

Anonymous Referee #4

Received and published: 27 March 2019

The paper presents a methodology to speeding up the tsunami forecast in Chile as part of tsunami warning operations. This is a very important topic, in particular because in the last decade many new tsunami warning centers have been established by various countries. This paper presents interesting results for publication. Nevertheless several issues should be explained, discussed and many data are missing, before accepting the paper. Major revision is necessary.

The results of proposed methods depends mainly on the variation of the source parameters between the different methods used, in particular the slip, the dip and the dimension and location of rupture zone, and the focal depth. One first request : the list and values of parameters of the sources of that paper are missing.

It can already been checked on the various maps presented, that the location of the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



epicenter for the elliptic model, and the location of the center of the rupture zone of the fault model are not the same, and there are not the GCMT location. Why ? How do the authors decide the location of the epicenter, and why the locations are different for the different models ?

The second question is why did the authors analyzed the results of such method along other coastlines than Chile ? It doesn't provide any results about the variability of the warning forecast along the Chilean coastlines. On the other hand, two missing recent events have not been modeled and should be added to the study: Chile 1985 and Antofagasta 1995.

One of the recent papers that describes the effectiveness and rapidity of the W-Phase to get robust centroid moment tensor solutions is by J. Roch et al. (Roch, J., Duperray, P. and Schindelé F. (2016) Very fast characterization of focal mechanism parameters through W-Phase Centroid inversion in the context of tsunami warning, *Pure Appl. Geophys.* 173 (2016), 3881–3893, DOI 10.1007/s00024-016-1258-3). In that paper, the authors analyzed W-Phase results at global and regional scale with specific Green's functions to provide accurate solution in 15 minutes (10 minutes of signal). Due to the characteristics of the very long period W-Phase, it wouldn't be physically feasible to compute sooner W-Phase waves.

But it is well known that the first tsunami wave could impact the Chilean coastlines in less than 15 minutes. The mandate and goal of the National tsunami warning center that is facing near-field tsunami warning is to provide the first warning message in less than 15 minutes after the quake occurrence. As the results of W-Phase would not be available, the authors should explain how they would proceed to provide this first bulletin. The authors should identify a preliminary solution to perform modeling before getting the results of the W-Phase computation, and getting results in 15 minutes after the quake. Second point, the authors informed that for their study, they used W-Phase results. How was computed the parameters of all these past events ? In particular, the location of the centroid moment tensor, and on the strike and dip values used for

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



the elliptic method. On this specific method, the authors should present what are the parameters of the seismic sources needed for the elliptic method, and the values of the parameters for all the events processed in this paper.

The next issue is how they plan to implement the complementary messages using W-Phase source parameters. Would this second message be useful when a tsunami warning would already be sent ? How ? Would the CPA be ready to analyze and use a second message ? What is the national standard operation procedure concerning that issue ? The sensitivity of the parameters (slip and dip variation, rupture zone location and size, and focal depth) should be one of the goal of such method. It is well known that the uncertainty of the magnitude in the first 10 minutes after the quake is about ± 0.2 . And the focal depth is also not good constrained. The variation of the results with used parameters with the uncertainty should be analyzed.

Referee1 suggested to compare with the DART buoy measurement. As currently, Chile has 6 DART installed along its coast, it would be very useful to compare the amplitude computed by the various models on these 6 DART stations.

The last comment would be on the practical use of such detailed result for a warning purpose. Disaster management authorities need level of warning along the coastlines of their country or county. Typically 3 levels of warning are in place, decided by Unesco : 30 cm, 1m, 3 m. Some countries implemented a 4th level (5 or 6 m). The comparison of run-up computation should take into account such operational criteria to assess the accuracy or the discrepancy between two methods. This should be applied to the set of results. Statistics should be done for the 3 or 4 levels of warning, and for a detailed analysis, it should be demonstrate that the proposed method is more conservative or less conservative than the detailed finer source model. The results of the proposed warning method should be discussed in the scope of the consequences of the difference of warning level with the finest warning level obtained with finer source and finer propagation modeling. Is their method more conservative or less conservative than the finest method ?

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Proposed modifications on figures.

- a) Figure 2, the scale of the run-up axis should be the same for both figures left and right
- b) Figure 5. The presentation of far field and ocean scale results is useless for the Chilean tsunami warning system and not in the scope of this paper. This figure should be removed.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-9>, 2019.