

Kiran Kumar Thingbaijam

Dated: December 23, 2019

In the following, I point out minor corrections in two papers. These corrections do not affect the discussions and conclusions of the studies reported in these papers.

Evidence for Truncated Exponential Probability Distribution of Earthquake Slip

It's a major facepalm for me: an erratum containing yet another silly error. Well, that happened with me – entirely my fault. The correct scaling relation in caption of Figure (9) of Thingbaijam and Mai (2016) and Equation (1) of Thingbaijam and Mai (2017) would be:

$$\log_{10} u_{max} = 0.95 \log_{10} u_{avg} + 0.62, \sigma = 0.10$$

SRCMOD: An online database of finite-fault rupture models

The relations annotated in Figure 5(a) should be

$$\begin{aligned} \log D_{max} &= 0.30 \log(M_0) - 5.57, \text{ and} \\ \log D_{max} &= 0.41 \log(M_0) - 7.50 \end{aligned}$$

for reverse- faulting and strike-slip events, respectively.

References

- Mai, P.M., and K.K.S. Thingbaijam (2014). SRCMOD: An online database of finite-fault rupture models. *Seismological Research Letters* 85, 1348–1357.
- Thingbaijam, K.K.S., and Mai, P.M. (2017). Erratum to Evidence for Truncated Exponential Probability Distribution of Earthquake Slip. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, 107,1983–1983.
- Thingbaijam, K.K.S., and P.M. Mai (2016). Evidence for truncated exponential probability distribution of earthquake slip. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America* 106, 1802–1816.