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INTRODUCTION

This contribution to the Electronic Seismologist presents the online SRCMOD database of finite-fault rupture models for past earthquakes, accessible at \url{http://equake-rc.info/srcmod}. Finite-fault earthquake source inversions have become a standard tool in seismological research. Using seismic data, these inversions image the spatiotemporal rupture evolution on one or more hypothesized fault segments. If geodetic data are used, the source inversions put constraints on the fault geometry and the static slip distribution (i.e., final displacements over the fault surfaces). Joint inversions, using a combination of available seismic, geodetic, and potentially other data, try to match all observations to develop a more comprehensive image of the rupture process. Some joint inversions use all data simultaneously, whereas others take an iterative approach wherein one set of observations is utilized to construct an initial (prior) model for subsequent inversions using other available data.

The field of finite-fault inversion was pioneered in the early 1980s (Olson and Apsel, 1982; Hartzell and Heaton, 1983). Subsequently, their method has been applied to numerous earthquakes (e.g., Hartzell, 1989; Hartzell et al., 1991; Wald et al., 1991; Hartzell and Langer, 1993; Wald et al., 1993; Wald and Somerville, 1995), while simultaneously additional source-inversion strategies were developed and applied (e.g., Beroza and Spudich, 1988; Beroza, 1991; Hartzell and Lui, 1995; Hartzell et al., 1996; Zeng and Anderson, 1996). It is beyond the scope of this article to provide a detailed review of source-inversion methods, their theoretical bases, implementations, and parameterizations; instead, we refer to Ide (2007) for a more comprehensive summary.

Finite-fault source inversions help to shape our understanding of the complexity of the earthquake rupture process. These source images provide information, albeit at rather low spatial resolution, of earthquake slip at depth, and potentially also on the temporal rupture evolution. Therefore, they represent an important resource for research on the mechanics and kinematics of earthquake rupture processes. As such, they have a direct bearing on our understanding of earthquake source dynamics. For example, the seminal work of Heaton (1990) on the existence of slip pulses is based on the analysis of a set of finite-fault rupture models. Building on an early repository of slip models (then maintained by David Wald at the U.S. Geological Survey [USGS]), Somerville et al. (1999), Mai and Beroza (2000, 2002), and Lavallée et al. (2006) investigated slip heterogeneity and source-scaling relations of finite-fault rupture models and related their findings to coseismic stress change and near-source ground motion.

Mai (2004) expanded this early repository of slip models toward a more comprehensive finite-fault source-model database. The initial SRCMOD database was manually composed, consisted of about 80 rupture models for which individual HTML files were generated, and provided the first uniform rupture-model data format. Subsequently, this initial effort was technically improved and expanded to about 150 rupture models (Mai, 2007). The improved database sparked further research to investigate earthquake source complexity and earthquake scaling, also using complimentary data sets (Manighetti et al., 2005; Causse et al., 2010; Strasser et al., 2010; Candela et al., 2011). Using finite-fault rupture-model parameters, several authors studied the dynamics of the rupture process and associated ground motion of past earthquakes (e.g., Ide and Takeo, 1997; Zhang et al., 2003; Tinti et al., 2005, 2009; Mai et al., 2006; Causse et al., 2013). Other studies examined stress change on the fault (Ripperger and Mai, 2004), its relation to aftershock occurrence (Woessner et al., 2006) and effects on stress triggering (e.g., Stein, 2003), and postseismic processes (e.g., Ergintav et al., 2009). Detailed information on the kinematic rupture process also helps to shed light on the physics of rupture nucleation, propagation, and arrest (e.g., Mai et al., 2005; Gabriel et al., 2012) and allows the development of relations between slip asperities, temporal rupture properties, and geometrical source effects. These kinematic source parameters can then be related, for instance, to the occurrence of large near-field velocity pulses (Mena and Mai, 2011). Hence, investigating finite-fault rupture models with respect to their seismic radiation has immediate practical applications for earthquake-engineering purposes. Table 1 lists a small selection of published studies that utilized a previous version of the database.

In this contribution to the Electronic Seismologist, we present the expanded, updated, and refurbished SRCMOD database. Readily accessible at \url{http://equake-rc.info/srcmod}, the current version of SRCMOD currently offers source models, earthquake scientists, and any interested user open access to 300 earthquake rupture models, in a unified representation, published over the last 30 years. This online database also generates enhanced visibility of the research of authors who contribute their rupture models.
of its current status. We then present a brief analysis on source-provide an overview of its contents and some general statistics and implementation of SRCMOD as an online database and

Woessner et al. (2006) On-fault mainshock static shear-stress change does not correlate with aftershock locations over the rupture plane.

Song et al. (2009) Earthquake slip correlates with temporal source parameters for rupture velocity, peak slip rate, and slip duration (rise time).

Hainzl et al. (2009) Variability of Coulomb stress changes affects the correlation between predicted and observed changes in the rate of earthquake production.

Strasser et al. (2010) New source-scaling relationships are presented, with focus on subduction-zone earthquakes.


Causse et al. (2010) Roughness degree of slip distributions correlates with the spatial distribution of peak ground acceleration.

Böse and Heaton (2010) The authors calibrated their one-dimensional stochastic slip models with published finite-fault rupture models.

Gusev (2011) One-point statistics of slip distributions are well approximated by a lognormal probability density function.

Candela et al. (2011) Spatial correlations of slip distributions and fault topography roughness indicate identical self-affine properties.

Goda and Atkinson (2014) Source-to-site distances evaluated from different intraevent finite-fault source models for megathrust subduction earthquakes greatly affect the interpreted ground motions.

Causse et al. (2013) Dynamic source properties (e.g., fracture energy, static, and dynamic stress drop) tend to increase with earthquake magnitude.

Selected Publications that Utilized the SRCMOD Database for Scientific Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manighetti et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Earthquake slip distributions are roughly triangular, both along strike and down dip, and are mostly asymmetric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mai et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Earthquake hypocenters are located either within or close to regions of large-slip asperities; the scaling of slip asperity areas with seismic moment deviates from self-similarity behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woessner et al. (2006)</td>
<td>On-fault mainshock static shear-stress change does not correlate with aftershock locations over the rupture plane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Earthquake slip correlates with temporal source parameters for rupture velocity, peak slip rate, and slip duration (rise time).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hainzl et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Variability of Coulomb stress changes affects the correlation between predicted and observed changes in the rate of earthquake production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasser et al. (2010)</td>
<td>New source-scaling relationships are presented, with focus on subduction-zone earthquakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causse et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Roughness degree of slip distributions correlates with the spatial distribution of peak ground acceleration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Böse and Heaton (2010)</td>
<td>The authors calibrated their one-dimensional stochastic slip models with published finite-fault rupture models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gusev (2011)</td>
<td>One-point statistics of slip distributions are well approximated by a lognormal probability density function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candela et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Spatial correlations of slip distributions and fault topography roughness indicate identical self-affine properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goda and Atkinson (2014)</td>
<td>Source-to-site distances evaluated from different intraevent finite-fault source models for megathrust subduction earthquakes greatly affect the interpreted ground motions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causse et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Dynamic source properties (e.g., fracture energy, static, and dynamic stress drop) tend to increase with earthquake magnitude.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following sections, we describe the technical aspects and implementation of SRCMOD as an online database and provide an overview of its contents and some general statistics of its current status. We then present a brief analysis on source-scaling properties using the current SRCMOD database. Potential further technical expansions and additional developments for expanded online access conclude this article.

TECHNICAL OVERVIEW

The SRCMOD website is built on a three-tier architecture comprised of client-side software (data presentation), server-side coding (data processing), and the back-end data storage. Figure 1 depicts a schematic presentation of components and software for the SRCMOD online database. We employ the Django web framework (Holovaty and Kaplan-Moss, 2009) in a LAMP implementation, in which “LAMP” stands for Linux operating system, Apache webserver, MySQL database server, and Python programming language. The server-side coding is implemented using Python and related packages, such as SciPy and NumPy (see Data and Resources). Specific additional functions for reading data files, file format conversions, and data processing are compiled into the eqSrcPy Python package (http://equake-rc.info/CERS-software; last accessed July 2014). Dynamic webpages are assembled within the Django template system.

For internal data archiving and access, we use both the file system and database management system. The primary data for the source models are stored in three different file formats: as MATLAB (www.mathworks.com/products/matlab; last accessed July 2014) structures (.mat files), as ASCII files that contain finite-source parameters (.fsp files), and as ASCII files that contain a comprehensive slip model (.slp files). Metadata for each rupture model, such as magnitude, seismic moment, hypocentral location, author and publication reference, and other relevant information are stored in the database management system, which is implemented with MySQL. In addition, we utilize the webservice provided by Incorporated Research Institutes for Seismology to obtain the Flinn–Engdahl region for the earthquake location (see Data and Resources). For displaying purposes, Google Maps API is used to generate maps that depict the geographical location of the rupture models (Figs. 2 and 3; see also Data and Resources).

The SRCMOD home page (Fig. 2) contains links to different components of the site. Any individual model can be accessed directly, using its unique identifier (evTAG), through http://equake-rc.info/srcmod/searchmodels/viewmodel/<evTAG>//. The 17-character evTAG string is constructed as “s
For all rupture models in the database. A detailed documentation on file formats and conventions is provided in separately linked pages accessible via the menu bar (Fig. 2). The implementation of the website ensures data integrity, such that data upload is allowed only to registered users authenticated by username and password. The user registration requires an email request, ensuring verification of the user, and his/her email address and affiliation. The data-upload tool currently accepts either .mat or .fsp format (both explained in the file-formats page, http://equake-rc.info/srcmod; last accessed July 2014).

DATA OVERVIEW AND SOURCE-MODEL VARIABILITY

As of June 2014, the SRCMOD database contains 300 models from 146 earthquakes of magnitudes ranging from $M_w$ 4.1 to 9.2, spanning seven orders in seismic moment ($1.6 \times 10^{15}$ N·m ≤ $M_0$ ≤ $7.7 \times 10^{22}$ N·m). The entire database
represents an inhomogeneous global collection of earthquake rupture models—inhomogeneous in the sense of (1) earthquake location and thus tectonic province (interplate, intraplate, subduction), (2) faulting type, (3) available observations and data used in the source inversion, (4) inversion techniques applied, (5) model parameterizations selected and modeling choices made by the modelers, and (6) available rupture-model information provided by the authors. A finite-fault (also called kinematic) rupture model typically comprises several parameters, which include final slip, rise time (duration of slip), rupture-onset time, and rake (angle of slip direction). Not all source studies necessarily invert for all these parameters; instead, some parameters may be fixed/assumed in advance, depending on the data and the applied inversion strategy. The parameters may vary spatially and are defined at node points or subfaults that constitute the rupture surface. In case of inversions using seismic data, the source time function describes the temporal slip evolution on each point of the fault and is typically chosen using a simple parametric shape or as a linear combination of many elementary slip functions (so-called multi time-window inversions). The size of the subfaults (or spacing of node points) accounts for the nominal spatial resolution of the model, but typically the details of the rupture process are resolved at a larger scale as a result of the chosen smoothing constraints or regularization (to handle the ill-posed inversion problem) and the trade-off between parameters (Mai et al., 2007; Monelli et al., 2009). The fault geometry considered may be simple (e.g., a single planar rupture surface with constant strike and dip) or complicated (e.g., including multiple segments of potentially various sizes, with varying strike and/or dip of individual segments).

Figure 4a depicts the number of rupture models annually published since 1983, as chronicled in the database. A significant growth in the source inversions can be seen over the last few years, most likely due to the increased availability of seismic and geodetic networks that allow detailed fault studies. Figure 4b indicates the predominance of large shallow (crustal) earthquakes in the database. The number of models is higher for earthquake magnitudes $M_w \geq 6.0$, but magnitudes in the $M_w 7.0-8.0$ range dominate, and hypocentral depths are generally below 25 km. We also see an abundance of models for reverse-faulting earthquakes (Fig. 4c) and that most source models in the database were inferred using teleseismic data (followed by inversions using a joint approach or strong-motion data).

Figures 2 and 4 illustrate the inhomogeneity of the SRCMOD database in terms of the six aspects listed above. Of course, increased availability of observational data (denser network coverage; near-real-time online data availability; harmonized data formats) and advanced source-inversion...
methods (from linearized multitime-window source inversion [Olson and Apsel, 1982; Hartzell and Heaton, 1983], to frequency-domain [Cotton and Campillo, 1995] and wavelet-domain inversion [Ji et al., 2002] approaches, to nonlinear inversion techniques [e.g., Liu and Archuleta, 2004] and Bayesian inference [Monelli and Mai, 2008; Minson et al., 2013; Razafindrakoto and Mai, 2014] contributed to the growth of the database and to the variability among the inferred rupture models. It is also important to note that so-called fast finite-fault inversions have become an almost routine analysis tool with which source models are generated in a semiautomated fashion within hours of a sizeable earthquake and then published online on institutional webpages.

Fast finite-fault models contribute significantly to the number of available source models. These online models are initially disseminated without peer-review processes, though a subset of them subsequently appears as journal publication (e.g., Hayes, 2011). Scientific projects or institutions that deliver online rupture models (not only fast finite-fault models) include finite-fault models at the USGS (http://earthquake.usgs.gov/earthquakes/eqinthefuture); joint, more than one data set is used for the inversion; SGM, strong ground-motion data; TELE, teleseismic recordings; GPS, Global Positioning System data; INSAR, Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar data; and OTHER, includes tsunami waveforms, leveling, trilateration, or other geophysical data. There are five different faulting styles: RS, reverse faulting with strike-slip components (or vice versa); RR, reverse faulting; SS, strike-slip faulting; NN, normal faulting; and NS, normal faulting with strike-slip components (or vice versa).

The variety of source-inversion methods and available data contributes to the variability in rupture models. This is well documented in the current database, with 56 earthquakes for which multiple source models are available, out of which 31 earthquakes have more than two rupture models. Source models for the same event, such as available for the 2011 Tohoku, 2008 Wenchuan, 1999 Izmit, 1995 Kobe, or 1992 Landers earthquakes, exhibit significant intraevent variability. However, the nominal uncertainties in each of the source-inversion studies are not well known. This has been pointed out previously (e.g., Beresnev, 2003) and can be understood in the context of the data used, the model parameterizations chosen, and the inversion techniques applied in such studies (Cohee and Beroza, 1994; Das and Suhadolc, 1996; Henry et al., 2000; Graves and Wald, 2001; Delouis et al., 2002; Yokota et al., 2004).
Examples of particular interest are the rupture models for the recent $M_w \sim 9$ megathrust earthquakes in Sumatra (2004) and Japan (2011), for which compilations of source models are used for comparative analysis and subsequent research on their tsunamiic properties (Shearer and Burgmann, 2010; Goda et al., 2014; Tappin et al., 2014). The fact that various source models for a specific earthquake exist allows for testing these models in terms of their predictive capabilities of available data, potentially those that have not been used to conduct respective inversion, and thus to obtain an independent posterior assessment of the model quality.

An assessment of intraevent model variability is important for better uncertainty quantification of earthquake source inversions, but also to extract the consistent features of the rupture process of a given earthquake. Such an analysis explores the variability (or consistency) of the models over a broad range of scales and examines various source parameters. Recognizing the justified skepticisms that these models may be far away from the true rupture process, they still collectively represent the current best state of knowledge on earthquake ruptures. Thus, it is important that any study using the database considers the possible sources of uncertainties associated with these models.

A recent effort to validate earthquake source-inversion methods is motivated by the intraevent source-model variability observed in the SRCMOD database. The Source Inversion Validation (SIV; http://equake-rc.info/siv; last accessed July 2014) project builds on a sequence of benchmark exercises of increasing complexity, with "true" solutions (because they are constructed as hypothetical earthquake ruptures), for which synthetic data are generated, disseminated, and then inverted by participating research teams to infer the known input model. Originally developed as a blind test of earthquake source inversion (Mai et al., 2007), the ongoing SIV project expands these efforts toward rigorous uncertainty quantification in earthquake source studies (Page et al., 2011).

**SRCMOD DATA ANALYSIS: A BRIEF CASE STUDY**

In the following, we present a brief case study on source-scaling behavior using the database, examining the behavior of maximum slip and the overall rupture area. The models are categorized by average faulting style, namely strike slip and reverse faulting (including oblique slip due to a component of strike-slip motion; Fig. 4). We consider all available source models for the analysis, without trying to (subjectively) select models that are deemed of higher quality (e.g., Causse et al., 2010; Gusev, 2011; Causse et al., 2013) or to subdivide the data according to other scientific criteria (e.g., Böse and Heaton, 2010; Strasser et al., 2010; Goda and Atkinson, 2014). If several models are proposed for the same event by a single research group, we select...
their preferred source model. We exclude coarsely parameterized models with less than 50 subfaults due to statistical constraints on estimating effective source dimensions.

The earthquake source dimensions (i.e., length, width, or area) are generally estimated prior to the inversion from the spatial distribution of aftershocks. Rupture width is sometimes constrained by the thickness of the seismogenic crust; in other cases, source-scaling relationships are used to estimate fault-plane size. However, the inversion procedures commonly assume conservatively large source dimensions, so that the entire rupture can be accommodated. This leads to overestimated rupture sizes with small (even zero) displacements at the fault boundaries. Thus, it is necessary to trim the rupture model by eliminating superfluous small slips at the fault edges. In the present analysis, we compute effective fault dimensions based on the autocorrelation of the slip distribution, as suggested by Mai and Beroza (2000). Furthermore, in the case of multiple models for same event, we adopt median estimates to be representative of the central tendency of the model variability.

Figure 5 depicts log-log scatterplots of maximum slip (Fig. 5a) and rupture area (Fig. 5b) as a function of seismic moment, showing the estimates for strike-slip and reverse-slip earthquakes by different symbols. In the spirit of previous works on earthquake scaling relations (e.g., Wells and Coppersmith, 1994; Mai and Beroza, 2000; Hanks and Bakun, 2002, 2008; Strasser et al., 2010), we fit a linear least-squares regression of the form \( y = b \log_{10}(M_o) + a \) to the data points (solid and broken lines; corresponding scaling coefficients \( a \) and \( b \) are noted in the diagrams). Despite the large scatter of the data, distinct scaling properties can be observed. For instance, the maximum slip on the fault, \( D_{\text{max}} \), appears to increase more rapidly with seismic moment for strike-slip earthquakes than for reverse-slip ruptures. In contrast, the rupture-area scaling shows self-similarity for dip-slip events (slope \( b = 0.68 \), which is approximately \( 2/3 \) as expected for self-similar scaling) but a significant smaller slope (\( b = 0.58 \)) for strike-slip earthquakes.

Interestingly, these slopes are essentially independent of how the effective dimensions are computed (using either the approach of Mai and Beroza, 2000, or that of Somerville et al., 1999), and also, whether all data points, or their mean or median, are considered when multiple rupture models exist for a single event. We also find that if we combine normal-faulting and reverse-faulting events into a single category (dip-slip events), its scaling is essentially the same as for reverse-slip events (slope \( b = 0.68 \); intercept \( a = -10.09 \) for area-moment scaling). These simple but robust observations suggest the breakdown of self-similarity for large strike-slip earthquakes, as conjectured previously (e.g., Romanowicz, 1992; Mai and Beroza, 2000).

The purpose of this contribution to the Electronic Seismologist is not a discussion on source-scaling properties and their implications for earthquake mechanics. Instead, we want to alert the reader to a number of important aspects of the SRCMOD database and the represented rupture models. Obviously, source models are sensitive to the data used to conduct the inversion, as well as to the chosen inversion methodology and parameterization. Hence, the apparently resolved spatial heterogeneity of the slip distribution depends on the data and the model parameterization. For instance, GPS and InSAR data have limited sensitivity to resolve deep slip but help to constrain seismic moment and geometry of the fault. Telesismic data are strong in constraining seismic moment and overall rupture properties (that is, larger spatial scales) but have difficulties resolving temporal details. Strong-motion data are sensitive to rupture details on relatively fine space–time scales, but data distribution and wave-propagation effects strongly affect the slip inversion. Several studies suggests that a joint inversion of several data sets improves the stability of the inferred source model; however, this is at the expense of not being able to fit the individual data sets as well as in a separate inversion (e.g., Cohee and Beroza, 1994; Wald et al., 1996; Wald and Graves, 2001; Delouis et al. 2002; Yokota et al., 2011). In this context, we suggest that when utilizing rupture-model data for subsequent research, SRCMOD users make the following considerations to account (at least to some extent) for rupture-model uncertainty and the variability of multiple source models for a single earthquake.

1. Select source models according to how they were inferred (single data set; multiple data sets; joint inversion; inversion method; accuracy in Green’s functions), and depending on which source-model information is used in the subsequent study.
2. If multiple models exist for a particular earthquake, assign appropriate weights to each model or compute an average representation of the models based on a measure of central tendency to avoid sampling bias due to the multiple models. The suitable measure of central tendency depends on the nature of the data; we adopt the median in the present analysis on source dimensions because the data distributions are often skewed.
3. The spatial sampling (i.e., subfault size) varies significantly across models in the database; for statistical analysis of rupture properties, this sampling variation needs to be accounted for, or models need to be selected accordingly.
4. As noted previously, models typically have overestimated source dimensions due to the larger fault area used for the inversion procedures. It may be necessary to trim the models, especially if the analysis involves rupture dimensions.
5. Classification of models according to style of faulting is not only important for tectonic and geodynamic considerations, but is also relevant for the mechanics of earthquakes. A style-of-faulting quantification can be achieved using the slip-weighted rake in each subfault to compute an overall rake angle. Some large earthquakes show considerable spatial rake variations, which in itself may lead to interesting earthquake mechanics and/or dynamic rupture interpretation.

**FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS**

We strive to continue developing the SRCMOD database by improving visualization capabilities, providing additional analysis tools, and increasing the number of rupture models. More flexible and interactive visualization of a slip distribution...
(or any other kinematic parameter) in 3D will facilitate a more comprehensive understanding of the rupture process, its geometry, and spatial complexity. The SRCMOD database, providing a unified representation of all source models, warrants a uniform yet flexible plotting approach. An improved visualization tool will address this plotting requirement for the user and additionally provide an immediate visual feedback during the data upload procedure.

To facilitate quantitative comparison of different source models, either for the same earthquake or for models of earthquakes of similar type, we plan to implement a variety of metrics that will be computed on the fly, like centroid location of the slip distribution (McGuire, 2004), effective source dimensions (Mai and Beroza, 2000), and statistical spatial comparison tests (Razafindrakoto et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2014).

The current SRCMOD database contains only a subset of finite-fault rupture models that have been produced over time. Many more earthquakes have been studied using some form of finite-fault source inversion (or forward-modeling approach), and many such rupture models are published in the literature. To facilitate identification and acquisition of source models currently not in the database, we aim to create an online form to allow users/visitors to submit information related to existing but not-yet-available models. Future implementations may include support for direct submission of external file formats (e.g., the subfault format used by USGS) other than the SRCMOD formats in the data upload tool and provide application-oriented output file formats that can be used, for instance, for ground-motion simulations or in Coulomb stress modeling codes.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The SRCMOD database (http://equake-rc.info/srcmod; last accessed July 2014) collects and disseminates finite-fault rupture models of earthquakes worldwide (currently containing 300 source models, magnitude range $M_w$ 4.1–9.2). Rupture models are presented in several unified formats to expedite subsequent research in earthquake mechanics, dynamic rupture processes, and ground-motion simulations. The intraevent variability of the source models allows assessing the inherent uncertainty in earthquake source inversions that arises due to the nonuniqueness of the inverse problem, different inversion methods and parameterizations, and a variety of data and their processing for the inversion procedures. This database is anticipated to be a useful resource for seismological research. We encourage scientists across the globe to further contribute to the database and utilize it for research on the earthquake source processes.

DATA AND RESOURCES

Detailed information on the Python programming language and the open-source packages that use the language can be found at these websites: https://www.djangoproject.com, http://www.python.org, http://www.scipy.org, and http://matplotlib.org. The webservice provided by Incorporated Research Institutes for Seismology to obtain the Flinn–Engdahl region for the earthquake location can be found at http://service.iris.eduirisws/flinnengdahl/2/. Google Maps is an online mapping technology provided by Google Inc.; more details can be found at https://developers.google.com/maps. All the websites were last accessed on April 2014.
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