Journal of Geophysical Research – Space Physics

Supporting Information for

A statistical study of global ionospheric map total electron content changes prior to occurrences of M≥6.0 earthquakes during 2000-2014

J. N. Thomas[1,2,3], J. Huard[1,2,4]and F. Masci[5]

[1]NorthWest Research Associates, Redmond, Washington, USA
[2]Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, DigiPen Institute of Technology, Redmond, Washington, USA
[3]Department of Earth and Space Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA
[4]Department of Aerospace Engineering Sciences, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, USA.
[5]Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia, L'Aquila, Italy

Contents of this file

Supplemental Figures S1-S26.

Introduction

Here we report figures that include GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±1σ and ±3σ per day for ±15 days of earthquakes (in the main paper we show figures that use ±2σ). We also include figures using Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (in the main paper we show figures that use Dst instead of Kp). Lastly, one figure is included that shows data processed using a 24-hr notch filter rather than a 24-hr running average. These additional figures further support the conclusions of our paper.



Figures S1. Same as Figure 6 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±1σ (instead of ±2σ).



Figures S2. Same as Figure 7 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±1σ (instead of ±2σ).



Figures S3. Same as Figure 8 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±1σ (instead of ±2σ).



Figures S4. Same as Figure 9 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±1σ (instead of ±2σ).



Figures S5. Same as Figure 10 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±1σ (instead of ±2σ).



Figures S6. Same as Figure 6 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±3σ (instead of ±2σ).



Figures S7. Same as Figure 7 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±3σ (instead of ±2σ).



Figures S8. Same as Figure 8 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±3σ (instead of ±2σ).



Figures S9. Same as Figure 9 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±3σ (instead of ±2σ).



Figures S10. Same as Figure 10 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±3σ (instead of ±2σ).



Figures S11. Same as Figure 6 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±1σ (instead of ±2σ) and Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S12. Same as Figure 7 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±1σ (instead of ±2σ) and Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S13. Same as Figure 8 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±1σ (instead of ±2σ) and Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S14. Same as Figure 9 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±1σ (instead of ±2σ) and Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S15. Same as Figure 10 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±1σ (instead of ±2σ) and Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S16. Same as Figure 6 in paper, but using Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S17. Same as Figure 7 in paper, but using Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S18. Same as Figure 8 in paper, but using Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S19. Same as Figure 9 in paper, but using Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S20. Same as Figure 10 in paper, but using Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S21. Same as Figure 6 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±3σ (instead of ±2σ) and Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S22. Same as Figure 7 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±3σ (instead of ±2σ) and Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S23. Same as Figure 8 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±3σ (instead of ±2σ) and Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S24. Same as Figure 9 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±3σ (instead of ±2σ) and Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S25. Same as Figure 10 in paper, but using GIM-TEC deviations that exceed ±3σ (instead of ±2σ) and Kp > 3 to remove GIM-TEC data related to geomagnetically disturbed days (instead of Dst criteria described in paper).



Figures S26. Same as Figure 6 in paper, but using a 24-hr notch filter rather than a 24-hr running average filter.