



HAL
open science

On the Detection Capabilities of Underwater Distributed Acoustic Sensing

Itzhak Lior, Anthony Sladen, Diane Rivet, Jean-Paul Ampuero, Yann Hello,
Carlos Becerril, Hugo F. Martins, Patrick Lamare, Camille Jestin, Stavroula
Tsagkli, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Itzhak Lior, Anthony Sladen, Diane Rivet, Jean-Paul Ampuero, Yann Hello, et al.. On the Detection Capabilities of Underwater Distributed Acoustic Sensing. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 2021, 126 (3), pp.e2020JB020925. 10.1029/2020jb020925 . hal-03229358v2

HAL Id: hal-03229358

<https://hal.science/hal-03229358v2>

Submitted on 29 Nov 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

On the Detection Capabilities of Underwater DAS

Itzhak Lior¹, Anthony Sladen¹, Diane Rivet¹, Jean-Paul Ampuero¹, Yann Hello¹,
Patrick Lamare², Camille Jestin³, Stavroula tsagkli⁴ and Christos Markou⁴.

¹Université Côte d'Azur, CNRS, Observatoire de la Côte d'Azur, IRD, Géoazur

²Aix Marseille Université, CNRS/IN2P3, CPPM

³Febus-optics, Pau, France

⁴NCSR Demokritos, Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics, Ag. Paraskevi
Attikis, Athens, Greece

Corresponding author: Itzhak Lior (itzhaklior22@gmail.com)

Key Points:

- The noise content of underwater DAS along three different telecommunication cables is quantified and compared to adjacent broadband stations.
- Earthquake detection capabilities using DAS are similar to those of broadband instruments.
- Detection capabilities are mainly a function of the recorded noise, cable response and apparent velocity.

22 **Abstract**

23 The novel technique of distributed acoustic sensing (DAS) holds great
24 potential for underwater seismology by transforming standard
25 telecommunication cables, such as those currently traversing most of the
26 world's oceans, into dense arrays of seismo-acoustic sensors. To harness
27 these measurements for seismic monitoring, the ability to record transient
28 ground deformations using telecommunication fibers is investigated here by
29 analyzing ambient noise, earthquake signals, and their associated phase
30 velocities, on DAS records from three dark fibers in the Mediterranean Sea.
31 The recording quality varies dramatically along the fibers and is strongly
32 correlated with the bathymetry and the apparent phase velocities of the
33 recorded waves. Apparent velocities are determined for several well-
34 recorded earthquakes and used to convert DAS S-wave strain spectra to
35 ground motion spectra. Excellent agreement is found between the spectra of
36 nearby underwater and on-land seismometers and DAS converted spectra,
37 when the latter are corrected for site effects. Apparent velocities greatly
38 affect the ability to detect seismic deformations: for the same ground
39 motions, slower waves induce higher strains and thus are more favorably
40 detected than fast waves. The effect of apparent velocity on the ability to
41 detect seismic phases, quantified by expected signal-to-noise ratios, is
42 investigated by comparing signal amplitudes predicted by an earthquake
43 ground motion model to recorded noise levels. DAS detection capabilities on
44 underwater fibers are found to be similar to those of nearby broadband
45 sensors, and superior to those of on-land fiber segments. The results
46 demonstrate the great potential of underwater DAS for seismic monitoring
47 and earthquake early warning.

48 **1 Introduction**

49 To date, most observational earthquake research relies on ground
50 motions recorded by seismometers. These instruments are typically installed
51 in proximity to active faults, as the most valuable observations are those
52 obtained very close to earthquake epicenters: they provide the most
53 coherent view of source processes and allow for early detection of large
54 earthquakes and monitoring of small ones. However, there is a severe
55 observational gap: the vast majority of seismometers are located on-land,
56 while the largest earthquakes, and most tsunami generating earthquakes,
57 occur underwater. Existing technologies to overcome this observational gap,
58 e.g., ocean-bottom seismometers (OBS), are very costly and thus not widely
59 implemented. The lacking ocean-bottom monitoring hinders the ability to
60 conduct underwater seismological research. This is especially critical for
61 hazard mitigation tasks such as providing earthquake early warning (EEW)
62 (e.g., Allen and Melgar, 2019; Lior and Ziv, 2020; Vallée et al., 2017) for
63 underwater earthquakes, since precious time is lost waiting for seismic
64 signals to reach on-land stations. Filling this underwater observational gap

65 will greatly benefit hazard mitigation capabilities and constitute a major step
66 forward in seismological research.

67 In recent years, the innovative approach of distributed acoustic
68 sensing (DAS) is being used for many seismological tasks (Zhan, 2019, and
69 reference therein). DAS enables the measurement of transient ground
70 deformations along standard optical fibers such as those inside the
71 telecommunication cables currently traversing most of the world's oceans.
72 Implementing DAS technology on available underwater fibers has great
73 potential to fill the underwater observational gap. The ability to record and
74 analyze earthquakes using underwater DAS has been recently demonstrated
75 (Sladen et al., 2019; Lindsey et al., 2019; Williams et al., 2019), but is yet to
76 be fully realized. To reliably harness this technique for earthquake
77 monitoring, the nature of underwater DAS measurements needs to be better
78 understood.

79 In a previous study, Sladen et al. (2019) used an underwater optical
80 fiber offshore Toulon, South of France, and showed that uneven cable-ground
81 coupling and water-Earth interactions significantly affect the sensitivity to
82 ground motions thus limiting the reliability of earthquake monitoring on
83 underwater telecommunication fibers. Because these underwater cables
84 were installed for the sole purpose of power and data transmission between
85 two points in space, the mechanical coupling between the cable and the
86 ocean-bottom is not uniform along the fiber. This reduces the cable's
87 recording quality to a point that the coupling of several cable segments is
88 insufficient for seismic measurements. The studies by Lindsey et al. (2019)
89 and Williams et al. (2019) relied on seafloor buried cables, which reduced
90 many of these problems, but buried cables are just a small fraction of the
91 global network of seafloor cables. Sladen et al. (2019) also found that
92 underwater DAS earthquake recordings are dominated by Scholte-waves,
93 indicating that acoustic and seismic waves are converted and scattered at
94 the ocean - solid-earth interface. Moreover, interactions between the water-
95 column and solid-earth generate several noise sources, i.e., gravity waves
96 and microseisms, which constitute coherent noise that could affect
97 earthquake monitoring with underwater DAS measurements.

98 Fully unlocking the potential of underwater DAS will facilitate the use of
99 optical fibers as next-generation dense seismic networks, overcoming the
100 disadvantages of discrete, mainly on-land, seismic sensors, thus filling a vast
101 observational gap. A significant first step, is to understand and quantify
102 earthquake detection and measurement abilities and set detection
103 thresholds by characterizing measured noise, seismic signals, and their
104 relation to ground motions. To this end, underwater DAS noise and seismic
105 signals are analyzed here using data recorded by three different underwater
106 DAS fibers, one in France and two in Greece. DAS records are then compared
107 to those of nearby broadband stations, two of which are located underwater.

108 This manuscript is organized as follows. In the next section, the
 109 dataset used for this study is described. Then, underwater DAS noise is
 110 characterized by computing noise power spectral densities (PSDs). In section
 111 4, several cataloged earthquakes are used to analyze the response of the
 112 different fibers to ground deformation and the conversion from DAS recorded
 113 strain to ground motions. Finally, implications for DAS detection capabilities
 114 are discussed.

115 **2 Data**

116 This study uses an extensive dataset of underwater DAS records,
 117 acquired by Géoazur, from three underwater cables: two offshore Methoni,
 118 south-west Greece, and one offshore Toulon, South of France. In addition,
 119 data from 4 on-land and 2 underwater broadband stations, installed near the
 120 cables, are used. The cables' locations, depth profiles, and broadband station
 121 locations are shown in Figure 1. Because these cables were simply deployed
 122 to provide communication between the two ends of the fiber, the cables'
 123 exact geographical position and bathymetric profiles are not well constrained.
 124 All cables recorded several local earthquakes during the measurement
 125 campaigns; those analyzed in the next sections are indicated in Figure 1 and
 126 listed in Table 1. Here, the cables and instrumental setup are described.

127 DAS data from Greece were acquired on two adjacent dark optical
 128 fibers, situated on the Central Hellenic Shear Zone, near a triple junction: the
 129 Kefalonia Transform Fault to the north-west, and the Hellenic Trench and
 130 Mediterranean Ridge to the south-east (Finetti, 1982). These cables are
 131 intended for the HCMR (Hellenic Centre for Marine Research) and NESTOR
 132 (Neutrino Extended Submarine Telescope with Oceanographic Research)
 133 (Aggouras et al., 2005; Anassontzis and Koske, 2003) projects. DAS data
 134 were acquired on April 18th and 19th 2019 on the HCMR cable and from April
 135 19th to 25th on the NESTOR cable. The HCMR and NESTOR cables span 13.2
 136 and 26.2 km, respectively: from a common landing point, they traverse the
 137 shallow Methoni bay and then diverge in different directions towards the
 138 bottom of the East Ionian Sea (Figure 1). These cables were interrogated
 139 using an old generation Febus A1 DAS interrogator, developed by Febus
 140 Optics. The gauge length and spatial sampling were set to 19.2 meters for

Cable name	Origin time	Magnitude	Location (latitude, longitude, depth[km])	catalog
NESTOR	22/04/2019 19:26:06	3.3	37.4185, 20.6897, 11.0	Athens University
	23/04/2019 17:29:40	3.6	37.7753, 20.7658, 7.0	Athens University
	21/04/2019 22:11:47	2.0	36.8335, 22.0382, 2.0	Athens University
	23/04/2019 19:25:51	2.6	37.2528, 21.4593, 9.0	Athens University
HCMR	18/04/2019 21:44:42	3.7	37.57, 20.66, 8.0	EMSC
	19/04/2019 03:30:19	2.6	37.1523, 20.6662, 1.0	Athens University
MEUST	19/07/2019 21:16:57	2.6	44.374, 6.913, 2.6	Géoazur
	21/07/2019 23:01:58	2.4	42.516, 5.143, 2.0	Géoazur

Table 1: earthquakes used in this study.

141 both cables, equivalent to 688 and 1365 channels of strain-rate equally
 142 spaced along the HCMR and NESTOR cables, respectively. Strain-rate was
 143 sampled at intervals of 6 milliseconds for HCMR and 5 milliseconds for
 144 NESTOR, producing 68 GB and 740 GB of data for HCMR and NESTOR,
 145 respectively. In addition to DAS data, several broadband seismometers were
 146 available during these DAS measurements: two on-land, deployed near the
 147 interrogator for the duration of the measurements, and one permanent OBS




Figure 1: Maps of Methoni and Toulon regions along with cable depth profiles. map of the a) Methoni and b) Toulon regions along with cable locations, broadband stations and analyzed earthquakes. The HCMR, NESTOR and MEUST cables, along with their recorded earthquakes, are indicated in red and blue (left panel), and red (right panel), respectively. Insets correspond to regions marked by gray rectangles. Cable depth profiles are shown in panels (c-e). Sections used in subsequent analysis are indicated in red.

148 near the end of the HCMR cable. Calibration information for the latter, a
149 Guralp CMG40T, was unavailable. The flat frequency response of this sensor,
150 between 30 seconds and 50 Hz, includes the recorded seismic signals, thus,
151 a simple empirical response was estimated by comparing available
152 earthquake records between the OBS and the on-land sensors.

153 The offshore Toulon data were acquired on the same fiber used by
154 Sladen et al. (2019), between July 11th and 31st 2019. The path of this fiber
155 was slightly modified in October 2018, after a first DAS acquisition done by
156 Sladen et al. (2019) (Figure 1). This cable is located in an area of moderate
157 seismicity and is used for the MEUST-NUMerEnv project (Mediterranean
158 Eurocentre for Underwater Sciences and Technologies - Neutrino Mer
159 Environnement) (Lamare, 2016). The cable spans 44.8 km: from the coast to
160 the deep Mediterranean plain. For this cable, an hDAS interrogator (High-
161 Fidelity Distributed Acoustic Sensor), developed by Aragon Photonics, was
162 used, which produces strain measurements. The gauge length and spatial
163 sampling were set to 10 meters, equivalent to 4480 equally spaced channels
164 of strain measured along the cable. Sampling intervals were set to 10 and 2
165 milliseconds for the first and last 10 days of the campaign, respectively,
166 producing 16 TB of data. In addition, 2 on-land broadband sensors, installed
167 near the interrogator, were used. The OBS near the end of the fiber (ASEAF
168 station) was inactive during this measurement campaign, but OBS records
169 from July 2017 were used for noise analysis. These were obtained at a similar
170 time of year, and represent equivalent water temperature (23-24 °C) and
171 wave height conditions, as obtained from the Coriolis database
172 (coriolis.eu.org).

173 **3 DAS Noise Analysis**

174 The recorded DAS noise arises from several natural sources, including
175 ocean-solid earth interactions, which produce gravity waves and microseisms.
176 The natural noise amplitude can be affected by local seismic amplification
177 effects. In addition, ground-cable coupling variations modulate the recorded
178 noise and signals, and instrumental noise dominates several frequency-
179 bands along the fibers. In this section, underwater DAS noise is analyzed and
180 quantified.

181 The noise content of underwater DAS records and broadband sensors
182 is quantified by computing PSDs. These PSDs were calculated for the full
183 duration of each campaign at every measurement point along the fibers,
184 following the procedure described in McNamara and Buland (2004). PSDs for
185 the OBS at the end of the HCMR cable were not computed due to missing
186 instrumental response. Because seismic noise PSDs are typically obtained for
187 ground motion accelerations (McNamara and Buland, 2004), here they are
188 calculated for strain-rate; the transition between acceleration and strain-rate,
189 though not straightforward (section 4.2), facilitates a comparison between
190 both measures. While HCMR and NESTOR records were acquired in strain-
191 rate, MEUST strain records were differentiated to strain-rate in the

192 frequency-domain. The PSDs, averaged per measurement location along the
 193 fiber, are plotted in Figure 2 as functions of frequency and distance from the
 194 interrogator along the fiber. PSDs for selected locations along the cables, as
 195 well as for the broadband sensors, are plotted in Figure 3. The various noise
 196 sources shown in Figures 2 and 3 are further described.

197 Solid-earth - ocean-bottom interactions generate several noise sources,
 198 recorded by the fibers. At shallow water depths, DAS records are dominated
 199 by surface gravity waves at frequencies of 0.05 to 0.3 Hz (black curves in
 200 Figure 2 and panels a and c of Figure 3). The dominant frequency of these




Figure 2: Noise analysis for the 3 cables: average nano-strain-rate PSD as a function of frequency and distance along the fibers. Left panels show the full cable and right panels show the cable up to a water depth of 120 m. Red line indicates bathymetric profiles (right axis), and black lines indicate the peak frequency of gravity waves (frequency associated with the maximum PSD).

201 waves decreases with increasing water depth (red curves in Figure 2) as
 202 predicted by the dispersion relation of surface gravity waves. This effect is
 203 also seen in the comparison of HCMR and NESTOR PSDs at 1 and 2km depths
 204 (Figure 3a). Surface gravity wave amplitudes are in close agreement for




Figure 3: Comparison of DAS (panels a and c) and broadband (panels b and d) PSD. DAS PSDs are displayed for specific distances from the interrogator and water depths as indicated in the panel legends. NESTOR PSD at 0.3 km and MEUST PSD at 1 km correspond to on-land cable segments. Thin and thick lines represent one hour PSD and an average of all available one hour PSDs. The new low and high noise models (Peterson, 1993) are indicated in dashed black lines for broadband data (panels b and d).

205 NESTOR and MEUST in spite of the different regions and interrogators
206 (panels b and f of Figure 2 and panels a and c of Figure 3), while those
207 recorded by HCMR are slightly lower. The disparity between gravity wave
208 amplitudes obtained by NESTOR and HCMR, both recorded in Methoni bay,
209 indicate that they are affected by local meteorological conditions: during the
210 NESTOR measurements a storm occurred, inducing higher amplitude gravity
211 waves.

212 HCMR and NESTOR exhibit an additional signature at frequencies of 1
213 to 2 Hz. This signal is a local effect, only observed on cable sections inside
214 Methoni bay, and thus likely related to the seismic response of a
215 sedimentary basin. Full analysis of this signal is beyond the scope of this
216 manuscript, yet its effect on earthquake ground deformations is further
217 described in section 5.

218 Short fiber stretches are deployed on-land between the DAS
219 interrogators' locations and the shorelines. These extra lengths of fiber
220 provide an opportunity to compare the characteristic noise levels on-land
221 and underwater. The PSDs for NESTOR and MEUST, shown in Figure 3 (panels
222 a and c), indicate lower noise levels than those of underwater segments.
223 However, these short on-land segments, do not record any seismic signals,
224 as further discussed in section 5.

225 At deeper sections, typically deeper than 2000 meters, the MEUST
226 cable records secondary microseisms, as previously observed by Sladen et al.
227 (2019). These microseisms appear at frequencies of 0.3 to 3 Hz and are the
228 result of interference between ocean waves traveling in opposite directions
229 (Longuet-Higgins, 1950). Similar to gravity waves, secondary microseisms
230 exhibit a frequency decrease with increasing water depth as shown in Figure
231 2e and 3c. The peak frequency recorded at the end of the MEUST cable
232 (green curve in Figure 3c) matches that observed by the nearby ASEAF OBS
233 (purple curve in Figure 3d).

234 In addition to natural noise sources, instrumental effects are apparent
235 in Figures 2 and 3. In several frequency bands and distances along the fibers,
236 instrument (interrogator and fiber) related noise dominates the PSDs
237 (Figures 2 and 3). These are slightly higher for the old generation
238 interrogator (used in HCMR and NESTOR) than for the new generation one
239 (used in MEUST), and higher for high frequencies than low frequencies
240 (Fernández-Ruiz et al., 2019). Noise levels have spatial fluctuations along the
241 fibers that are persistent in time and similar for different frequencies, as
242 demonstrated in Figure S1, where average PSDs are plotted for a section of
243 MEUST. Even though the amplitude and distance scales of the fluctuations
244 could be consistent with those observed for fading (e.g., Gabai and Eyal,
245 2016; Martins et al., 2013), it is not plausible that fading patterns persist for
246 more than several seconds (analyzed PSDs are averaged over many hours).
247 These small fluctuations (typically less than 2 dB) may be a result of the
248 fibers' backscattering pattern, which is known to affect high-frequency noise

249 in chirped-pulse interrogators (Costa et al., 2019), yet further research is
250 needed to understand it over a broader frequency band and for other
251 interrogator types.

252 Since the used cables were deployed over seldom irregular bathymetry
253 (Figure 1), their ocean-bottom - cable coupling is nonuniform along the
254 cables. This results in gaps in the measurements of coherent signals: gravity
255 waves, microseism signals (Figure 2), and earthquakes (section 4). In
256 addition, several fiber segments display oscillating patterns, as seen in
257 Figure 2 (e.g., between 12 and 17 km for NESTOR in panel a), which may be
258 related to the fibers' layout, e.g., high tension segments, cables hanging
259 over seafloor valleys. These patterns will require additional research,
260 possibly involving direct inspections of the cable for validation.

261 Finally, broadband seismometers' noise (panels b and d of Figure 3)
262 are mostly within the limits of the new low/high noise models (NLNM and
263 NHNM) of Peterson (1993). Expected exceptions are the slightly higher low
264 frequency noise, resulting from the proximity of the stations to the
265 Mediterranean basin (e.g., De Caro et al., 2014), and the high amplitude
266 second microseism peak observed for the ASEAF OBS.

267 The described natural and instrumental noise sources affect
268 earthquake detection and analysis abilities as detailed in following sections.
269 Next, underwater DAS earthquake signals are analyzed and their interactions
270 with observed noise are discussed.

271 **4 DAS Earthquake Signals**

272 Here, the ability to record earthquakes by underwater DAS, and the
273 response of the different cables to transient ground motions are investigated.
274 Then, apparent velocities are inferred and strain-rate measurements are
275 converted to ground motion accelerations and compared with records of
276 adjacent broadband sensors. To this end, several cataloged earthquakes are
277 analyzed: 2 earthquakes recorded by HCMR, 4 earthquakes recorded by
278 NESTOR, and 2 earthquakes recorded by MEUST. Earthquake locations and
279 magnitudes were taken from one of the available catalogs: European-
280 Mediterranean Seismological Centre (EMSC), University of Athens, or
281 Géoazur catalogs. The earthquake data is summarized in Table 1 and
282 locations, magnitudes and distances to the interrogators appear in Figure 1.

283 **4.1 Cable Response**

284 The response of underwater telecommunication fibers to transient
285 deformations is non-uniform; recorded earthquake signals vary in amplitude

286 and frequency content along the cable. This is clearly seen in Figure 4 for a
 287 magnitude 3.7 earthquake recorded on the HCMR cable (equivalent
 288 examples for the NESTOR and MEUST cables are shown in Figures S2 and S3,




Figure 4: Example of a M3.7 earthquake at approximately 125 km recorded by HCMR. a) depth profile, b) earthquake signals, c) spectra and d) signal to noise ratios along the cable’s path. Time in panel b is relative to the theoretical P-wave arrival at the cable position of 0 km (closest point to the earthquake epicenter). S-wave spectra in (c) are computed in the interval indicated by dashed black lines in (b). The slope of the cable is plotted in red in panel c. Sections that are used in subsequent analysis are indicted by orange rectangles.

289 respectively). The cable’s depth profile (panel a), earthquake time series
 290 (panels b), spectra (panels c) and signal-to-noise-ratio (SNR) (Panels d) are
 291 plotted as a function of distance along the fiber. These signals are extremely
 292 segmented and exhibit amplitude and frequency shifts and jumps (e.g., 5 to
 293 6 km). While several cable segments record high amplitude seismic signals,
 294 others exhibit very weak amplitudes (e.g., 2.5 to 4 km), or lack seismic
 295 signals as seen by the onshore cable segment (0 to 400 meters). SNR were
 296 calculated in the frequency-domain by considering signal and noise
 297 (obtained in section 3) amplitudes between 1 and 15 Hz. In panel d, SNR are
 298 plotted for the displayed earthquake (black curve) and the other analyzed
 299 event on the HCMR cable (gray curve). The similarity between SNR patterns
 300 along the fiber for different earthquakes (also seen in Figures S2 and S3)
 301 indicates that this cable specific property may be used to quantify ground-
 302 cable coupling as well as ground deformation amplifications along the cable.

303 Sections where signals are weak typically correspond to irregular
 304 bathymetry, while high amplitude seismic deformations are measured by
 305 fiber segments deployed on flat or smooth bathymetry. The latter may be
 306 due to the presence of sediments which control amplification and slowness,
 307 while the former, may suggest uneven coupling and/or lack of sediments.
 308 This correlation is evident when comparing the recorded signals’ quality with
 309 the bathymetry (Figure 4a) and slope (red dotted curve in Figure 4c) along
 310 the cable. For example, shallow sections of HCMR and NESTOR record high-
 311 energy signals (Figures 4 and S2): these segments are deployed inside
 312 Methoni bay, a sedimentary basin characterized by flat bathymetry and low
 313 velocities (section 4.2). The smooth SNR increase and decrease when
 314 entering and exiting the bay (Figures 4d and S2d) suggests the presence of a
 315 sedimentary basin: as sediment thickness increases from the edges towards
 316 the middle of the basin, so does ground motion amplification. This SNR
 317 pattern is thus indicative of cable segments traversing sedimentary basins.

318 In-spite of the often unfavorable ocean-bottom - cable coupling,
 319 several cable segments record sufficiently uniform signals for seismic
 320 analysis and specifically, apparent velocity estimation. Two such sections are
 321 identified for each cable, indicated by orange lines in panels b and c of
 322 Figures 4, S2 and S3. Their signals are analyzed in the following sections.

323 4.2 Strain-rate to ground motions conversion

324 To further investigate the response of underwater DAS to transient
 325 ground deformations, DAS signals are compared to the ground motion
 326 measurements recorded by nearby seismometers. To convert strain-rate
 327 records to ground motions, phase velocities need to be determined. Here, we
 328 use the waves’ apparent phase velocities along the fiber, assuming the
 329 signal is dominated by a single plane wave:

$$\dot{\epsilon}_{xx} = \frac{\partial U_x}{\partial t \partial x} = \frac{\partial V_x}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial V_x}{\partial t} \frac{\partial t}{\partial x} = A_x \frac{1}{C_x}, \quad (1)$$

330 where $\dot{\epsilon}_{xx}$, U_x , V_x , A_x and C_x are the strain-rate, ground displacements,
 331 ground velocities, ground accelerations, and apparent phase velocity along
 332 the fiber (x direction), respectively. The relation between the phase velocity
 333 C and the apparent phase velocity is: $C_x = C/\cos\theta$, where θ is the angle
 334 between the wave's propagation direction and the fiber. The apparent
 335 velocity is expected to change along the cable due to local conditions,
 336 sedimentary cover, seismic wave velocities and propagation direction with
 337 respect to the cable's orientation. Here, apparent velocities are estimated
 338 via frequency-wavenumber (f - k) analysis, and DAS strain-rate measurements
 339 are converted to ground accelerations in the frequency-domain. DAS
 340 converted spectra are then compared to broadband seismometer spectra.

341 Apparent velocities are reliably estimated using homogeneous DAS
 342 signals recorded on sufficiently long cable segments. Phase apparent
 343 velocities are defined as f/ν where f and ν are the temporal and spatial
 344 frequencies, respectively. This analysis is performed on the segments
 345 identified in the previous section (orange lines in panels b and c of Figure 4,
 346 S2 and S3). Example f - k plots are shown in Figure 5 (top panels) for four
 347 earthquakes recorded on the NESTOR cable between 0.35 and 1.5 km from
 348 the interrogator, on a section deployed in Methoni bay. Similar f - k plots for
 349 all cable segments are shown in Figures S4-S8.

350 The observed low apparent velocities, generally symmetric f - k plots,




Figure 5: Panels a-d: Examples of f - k plot for four earthquakes on a segment of the NESTOR cable from 0.35 to 1.5 km. The empirical dispersion curve is indicated in magenta in panels a-d and in panel e. White lines correspond to non-dispersive phase velocities of 500 m/s (solid line) and 250 m/s (dotted line). Panel (e) shows the apparent velocity as a function of frequency obtained for all earthquakes at once (solid black curve) and for each event individually (dashed black curves). Shaded gray area indicates one standard deviation to solid black curve's fit. The dispersion for $f > 2$ Hz was linearly extrapolated from the fitted curve.

351 and similarity between different earthquakes with different back-azimuths
 352 (receiver-to-source azimuth), suggest that underwater DAS signals are
 353 dominated by Scholte-waves propagating in a broad range of horizontal
 354 directions. These dispersive waves are a result of body-wave scattering, and
 355 their polarization is radial and vertical, similar to that of Rayleigh waves.
 356 Since the analyzed fiber segments are installed on typically flat bathymetry,
 357 the radial polarization dominates DAS measurements. Strain-rate
 358 measurements of waves propagating at an angle θ relative to the fiber's axis
 359 are modulated by a $\cos^2\theta$ (e.g., Kuvshinov et al., 2016; Mateeva et al.,
 360 2014), significantly reducing the amplitude of waves closer to normal
 361 incidence. Thus, it is expected that the highest amplitude waves recorded by
 362 DAS are those traveling along the fiber, with $C_x = C$ (note that generally
 363 $C_x \leq C$), i.e., the lowest apparent velocity in the f-k plot (top panels of Figure
 364 5). Thus, the phase velocity used for DAS to ground motion conversion is the
 365 lowest apparent velocity, represented by the purple curve in Figure 5 which
 366 separates the low and high energy regions in the f-k plots. Apparent
 367 velocities as a function of frequency, deduced from the curves in Figure 5,
 368 are shown in panel e. The dispersive nature of the waves further supports
 369 the conclusion that these are Scholte-waves.

370 Apparent velocities (purple curve in Figure 5) are obtained for all
 371 analyzed events per cable segment. That f-k plots are symmetric and similar
 372 for different earthquakes recorded by the same segment suggests similar
 373 propagation characteristics, as expected for scattered waves: their
 374 propagation and velocity is dictated by local heterogeneities and velocity
 375 model. Thus, the same apparent velocity is used for all analyzed earthquakes
 376 regardless of source and backazimuth variations. For each event in a specific
 377 cable segment, the boundary between the low and high energy regions (top
 378 panels of Figure 5) is determined per frequency by a simple amplitude
 379 threshold condition. Then, these $f - \nu$ combinations are averaged per
 380 spatial-frequency ν for all available events, and fitted with a third degree
 381 polynomial passing through $f = \nu = 0$. From a certain frequency, this
 382 polynomial is linearly extrapolated to obtain the purple curve in Figure 5.
 383 Apparent velocity errors are represented by the gray region in Figure 5e,
 384 indicating one standard deviation for frequencies corresponding to the
 385 polynomial fit ($f < 2$ Hz in Figure 5). For comparison, dispersion curves were
 386 obtained independently for each earthquake following the same procedure
 387 (dashed curves in Figure 5e). The standard deviation of the different event
 388 specific curves are small: 18.9 and 8.6 m/s at 1 and 4 Hz, respectively,
 389 further justifying the use of a single dispersion curve for all earthquakes. For
 390 several cable segments, the spatial resolution is inadequate (short cable
 391 segments on HCMR and NESTOR, Figures S4 and S5) and f-k plots were fitted
 392 with a simpler linear equation passing $f = \nu = 0$, corresponding to non-
 393 dispersive waves. In the following section, broadband sensors' acceleration
 394 records are converted to strain-rate using the empirical apparent velocities

395 obtained per cable segment. Converted broadband spectra are then
396 compared to DAS spectra.

397 4.3 DAS and broadband comparison

398 Broadband earthquake acceleration spectra are converted to strain-
399 rate and compared with DAS measurements. The conversion was done using
400 the same dispersion curve (Figure 6) or single apparent velocity (Figure 7) for
401 each cable segment. Here, broadband spectra were corrected for
402 hypocentral distance to match with the different DAS fiber segments. Figures
403 6 and 7 show DAS strain-rate time series along the cable (left panels), S-
404 wave spectra along the cable (middle panels), and a comparison between
405 DAS and broadband converted strain-rate spectra (right panels) for 4
406 earthquakes recorded on the NESTOR cable. In the right panels, DAS
407 earthquake spectra and mean noise (obtained in section 3) for each
408 measurement point along the cable segment are plotted as thin black and
409 red curves, respectively, while stacked signal and noise are plotted as thick
410 black and red curves, respectively. These earthquake spectra are resampled
411 in the same manner as noise spectra (McNamara and Buland, 2004) for
412 comparability.

413 Broadband converted acceleration spectra agree with DAS strain-rate
414 spectra when the latter are corrected for site effects. Excellent agreement is
415 observed between DAS and broadband converted spectra for the two closest
416 events in Figure 6 (M2 at 49 km and a depth of 2 km, and M2.6 at 63 km and
417 a depth of 9 km), while the agreement for farther earthquakes is less
418 favorable (M3.3 at 130 km and a depth of 11 km, and M3.6 at 149 km and a
419 depth of 7 km), possibly a result of different propagation effects. In contrast,
420 DAS spectra in Figure 7, recorded in Methoni bay, are rich in low frequencies
421 and poor in high frequencies. Similar behavior is observed for HCMR, when
422 comparing signals recorded outside (Figures S5) and inside (Figures S6)
423 Methoni bay, as well as for different MEUST sections (Figures S7 and S8). The
424 amplification observed for MEUST (Figure S8) is related to the secondary
425 microseismic peak (Figure 2), while that observed in Methoni bay is related
426 to the presence of a low velocity (Figure 5 and S6) basin, as suggested by
427 the noise peak at 1-2 Hz (Figure 2). The stronger attenuation inside the basin
428 may be modeled by a decaying exponential term in the form: $\exp(-\pi \Delta \kappa f)$
429 (Anderson and Hough, 1984), where $\Delta \kappa$ indicates additional attenuation.
430 Imposing such attenuation on the observed broadband spectra (dashed
431 curves in the right panels of Figure 7) results in good agreement between
432 high frequency DAS and broadband spectra.

433 To quantify the amplification and attenuation observed by HCMR and
434 NESTOR, the ratio between DAS spectra recorded inside and outside Methoni
435 bay is inspected in Figure 8. The seemingly tapered edges of these curves
436 represent the signals' amplitudes falling below background noise levels, thus,

437 only frequencies between ~ 1 and ~ 15 Hz (depending on SNR) should be
 438 considered. Earthquakes recorded inside Methoni bay show significant
 439 amplification of up to a factor of 10 at frequencies of 1 to 2 Hz, and stronger
 440 attenuation in the 2 to 20 Hz band compared with signals recorded outside
 441 the bay. This behavior is indicative of sedimentary basins, which are




Figure 6: Spectral analysis for 4 earthquakes recorded by NESTOR between 19.7 and 20.2 km from the interrogator, between 3.1 and 3.3 km depth. Left panels: time series, middle panels: spectra, right panels: strain spectra and converted broadband spectra. Plotted time series (left) were filtered between 1 and 5 Hz. Time in the left panels is relative to the start of the analyzed interval. In the right panels, DAS earthquake and noise spectra for each measurement location along the fiber are indicated by thin black and red curves, respectively, while averages are indicated by thick lines. Green and dark red curves correspond to records from on-land seismometers near the on-land end of the fiber, while the orange curve corresponds to the record of an OBS installed at the end of the HCMR cable.

442 generally characterized by low seismic velocities (e.g., Courboux et al.,
 443 2020; Pratt et al., 2003).

444 In the next section, we quantify the ability to detect seismic signals
 445 using underwater DAS and compare it to that of broadband seismometers.

446 **5 Implications for DAS Detection Capabilities**

447 The results presented in the previous section, in particular the
 448 conversion between strain and ground motions, based on apparent velocities
 449 estimated on each cable segment, are used here to analyze underwater DAS
 450 single-channel signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) capabilities, and compare them to




Figure 7: As in figure 6 for a section between 0.35 and 1.5 km from the interrogator, between 3 and 18 m depth. Dashed curves indicate strain-rate converted broadband spectra subject to additional attenuation ($\Delta\kappa=0.04$ seconds).




Figure 8: Methoni bay amplification. Spectral ratios of distance corrected DAS spectra for events recorded in and out of Methoni bay: thick black curves in right panels of figure 7 (NESTOR) and S5 (HCMR) divided by thick black curves in right panels of figure 6 (NESTOR) and S4 (HCMR), respectively.

451 those of broadband seismometers. For a valid comparison, this analysis
 452 treats DAS signals as independent channels. The spatial coherency between
 453 waveforms recorded along the optical fiber, a unique strength of DAS
 454 facilitating the implementation of high-performance array detection methods
 455 (e.g., Lindsey et al., 2017; Rost and Thomas, 2002), is expected to enhance
 456 earthquake detection capabilities, but is not exploited here. In that sense,
 457 our analysis is a conservative estimate of the performance of seafloor DAS
 458 relative to conventional seismometers. In this section, only the new
 459 generation interrogator is considered, since it better represents state-of-the-
 460 art DAS capabilities. Because the earthquakes we have recorded are
 461 typically observed at $f > 1$ Hz (Figures 5, 6 and 7), this analysis is limited to
 462 this frequency band.

463 5.1 S-wave detection on horizontal underwater fibers

464 DAS detection capabilities are analyzed by considering an earthquake
 465 model, DAS noise (obtained in section 3), and the apparent velocities
 466 (obtained in section 4.2). Earthquake acceleration spectra are simulated
 467 using the omega-squared model (Brune, 1970; Madariaga, 1976) describing
 468 far field body-wave radiation, and subject to high frequency attenuation
 469 (Anderson and Hough, 1984). This model is found to be in good agreement
 470 with observed DAS and broadband spectra (not shown). The model, and
 471 associated parameter tuning, are described in the supplementary.
 472 Horizontally deployed fibers exhibit higher sensitivity to S-waves than P-
 473 waves, a function of the phase's polarization with respect to the fiber (e.g.,
 474 Kuvshinov, 2016; Mateeva et al., 2014; Papp et al., 2017). Owing to the
 475 lower velocities and higher amplitudes of S-waves, they display higher strain

476 amplitudes, compared with P-waves (section 6). Thus, only S-waves are
 477 considered in the following analysis. To determine DAS detection thresholds,
 478 i.e., signal to noise ratios in a certain frequency-band, for specific cable
 479 segments, DAS strain-rate are converted to acceleration noise PSDs
 480 (Equation 1) and compared to the earthquake model.

481 Using the apparent velocities for the slow Scholte-waves (e.g., Figure
 482 5), detection thresholds are found to be similar for DAS and broadband
 483 seismometers. Figure 9 shows detection thresholds for MEUST at 12.4 and
 484 30.2 km from the interrogator, along with those of adjacent on-land (POSAS)
 485 and ocean-bottom (ASEAF) broadband seismometers. Detection thresholds
 486 are compared to ground motion accelerations for earthquakes of magnitudes
 487 1 and 2 at a hypocentral distance of 50 km. These thresholds indicate great
 488 similarity between the detection capabilities of DAS (solid curves in Figure 9)
 489 and nearby broadband OBS (dotted orange curve in Figure 9) for the same
 490 underwater environment and noise conditions (section 3).

491 The ability to detect a seismic signal using DAS greatly depends on the
 492 apparent velocity: at similar acceleration amplitudes, the slower the wave,
 493 the higher its strain-rate values (Equation 1). This is illustrated in Figures 10
 494 and 11, by modeling DAS and broadband SNR values for different magnitude
 495 earthquakes between 1 and 15 Hz. Signals are simulated using the same
 496 earthquake model used in Figure 9 at a hypocentral distance of 50 km




Figure 9: DAS and broadband noise spectra compared to theoretical S-wave spectra. Magnitudes 1 and 2 at distances of 50 km and $\kappa = 0.04$ seconds are indicated by solid gray curves. Representative DAS noise curves are shown for MEUST at 12.4 km (solid green) and 30.2 km (solid red). Noise curves for broadband seismic stations on-land POSAS and underwater ASEAF, located near MEUST, are indicated by dotted blue and orange curves, respectively.




Figure 10: S-wave SNR calculated between 1 and 15 Hz for ground accelerations as a function of magnitude. Earthquake spectra were simulated at a hypocentral distance of 50 km and $\kappa = 0.04$ seconds. DAS noise, calculated on MEUST at 12.4 km from the interrogator, was converted to ground accelerations using several non-dispersive apparent velocities. SNR for ASEAF (the OBS at the end of MEUST) are indicated by the dotted blue curve. SNR for DAS with apparent velocities of 200, 570 and 3000 m/s are indicated by solid red, green and black curves, respectively.

497 (Figure 10) and for various distances (Figure 11). Acceleration spectra noise
 498 thresholds are obtained for MEUST at 12.4 km from the interrogator using
 499 different non-dispersive apparent velocities. The apparent velocity is used to
 500 convert DAS strain-rate to acceleration detection threshold, while modeled
 501 earthquake acceleration spectra do not account for apparent velocities
 502 (supplementary materials). This analysis indicates that for a specific phase
 503 velocity, DAS and broadband SNR are equivalent (green and blue curves in
 504 Figure 10), while slower and faster waves produce higher and lower SNR on
 505 DAS, respectively. In Figure 11, SNR=1 curves are plotted for different
 506 magnitude-distance combinations, constituting detection thresholds for
 507 various apparent velocities: waves to the right of each curve are detected
 508 while those to the left are not. This plot may be used to evaluate the ability
 509 to reliably use S-waves for seismic monitoring for different magnitudes and
 510 distances.

511 The presented analysis indicates that for a given earthquake, and
 512 depending on the ground motion amplitudes, slow phases (e.g., scattered
 513 and surface waves) may be detected, while fast phases (e.g., body waves)
 514 may not. For instance, plotting DAS earthquake (black) and noise (red)
 515 spectra at two different HCMR cable segments (Figure 12), we can observe
 516 either low velocity (240 m/s) high energy strain-rate signals (from km 6 to
 517 6.3, Figure S5), or high velocity (1690 m/s) low energy strain-rate signals
 518 (from km 2.3 to 2.85, Figure S9). Both slow and fast waves are detected for
 519 the M3.7 earthquake (panel a), while only slow waves are detected for the




Figure 11: S-wave detection thresholds (SNR=1), calculated between 1 and 15 Hz, for ground accelerations at different apparent velocities. Earthquake spectra and noise were simulated as in Figure 10 for various magnitudes and hypocentral distances. For each apparent velocity, S-waves at magnitudes-distances to the right of each curve are above noise level.

520 M2.6 earthquake (panel b). Broadband converted strain-rate spectra of the
 521 HCMR OBS using the obtained apparent velocities (orange curves) further
 522 show that the fast waves of the M2.6 earthquake are below DAS noise levels
 523 (dashed orange curve in panel b). Since both analyzed earthquakes display
 524 similar backazimuths and distances, and thus similar propagation
 525 characteristics, the apparent velocity obtained for the M3.7 earthquake
 526 (Figure S9) is used to convert the broadband spectra of the M2.6 earthquake
 527 to strain-rate (orange dashed curve in Figure 12b).

528 In this analysis, on-land cable segments did not measure any
 529 earthquake ground deformations. The longest on-land section is that of
 530 MEUST, deployed for 1.6 km: from the interrogator's position to the coast,
 531 along a two-lane motorway. This segment displays noise levels similar to
 532 those recorded at deeper underwater segments (Figure 3c), and clearly
 533 records vehicles driving along the road. That no seismic signals are recorded
 534 on this segment is interpreted as a result of high apparent velocities, in
 535 agreement with previous studies, which show that on-land Rayleigh waves
 536 are faster than ocean-bottom Scholte-waves (e.g., Kruiver et al., 2010; Park
 537 et al., 2005). This observation suggests that DAS detection capabilities are
 538 enhanced for underwater fibers compared with those installed on-land. Since
 539 unlike DAS records, ground motion amplitudes (and thus broadband
 540 detection capabilities) are invariant to the wave's velocity, OBS are not
 541 expected to outperform on-land seismometers.




Figure 12: Comparison between earthquakes recorded by two cable segments on HCMR. Thick solid curves and thin dashed curves correspond to stacked DAS spectra (black), stacked DAS noise (red) and broadband converted strain-rate. Broadband spectra was converted to strain-rate using different apparent velocities as noted by the legend. Magnitudes, distances and BAZ values are indicated in the top of each panel.

542 5.2 P-wave detection on horizontal underwater fibers and implications
 543 for earthquake early warning

544 That fast waves may not be detected by DAS has significant
 545 implications for several seismological tasks that rely on the information
 546 carried by fast direct body-waves. These objectives include the
 547 determination of earthquake location and source parameters, both crucial for
 548 seismic monitoring and, in particular, for EEW. Using the P-waves is
 549 particularly advantageous for EEW since waiting for the S-waves comes at
 550 the cost of delaying alert issuance. However, the detection capabilities of
 551 fast, low amplitude, P-waves on horizontal optical fibers is hindered by both
 552 the high apparent velocities and near-vertical incident angles; vertically
 553 incident P-waves induce transverse deformations on a horizontal cable, while
 554 fibers are mostly sensitive to longitudinal deformations. The response of a
 555 fiber optic cable to waves propagating at an angle θ with respect to the fiber
 556 is modulated by $\cos^2\theta$. Though signals do not vanish completely at $\theta=90^\circ$
 557 (Kuvshinov et al., 2016; Mateeva et al., 2014, Papp et al., 2017), they have
 558 much smaller amplitude and will hardly be detected.

559 In practice, P-waves are detected since underwater cables follow the
 560 bathymetry and are thus not strictly horizontal (panels c-e of Figure 1), and
 561 since incidence angles, especially for scattered P-waves, would typically be
 562 smaller than 90° . Even for small magnitudes at large distances, as those
 563 analyzed, scattered P-waves are observed for several earthquakes (e.g., in
 564 Methoni bay, Figure 4). Thus, for earthquakes relevant for EEW, i.e., medium
 565 to big magnitudes at close distances, whose ground motion accelerations are
 566 expected to be ~ 2 orders of magnitude higher than those recorded here

567 (e.g., Lior and Ziv, 2020) (Figures 6 and 7). This indicates that underwater
568 telecommunication cables may be reliably used for P-wave detection and
569 thus for EEW, improving alert times for underwater earthquakes. In-depth
570 quantitative analysis of this issue requires further research, beyond the
571 scope of this manuscript, and additional high amplitude earthquake
572 observations.

573 If P-waves cannot be reliably analyzed, the use of S-waves for both
574 tasks is still expected to yield robust estimates, at the cost of time delays.
575 For closely recorded earthquakes, relevant for EEW, these delays are
576 expected to be small, since S-waves follow P-waves by approximately $R/8$
577 seconds, where R is the hypocentral distance in km (e.g., Lior and Ziv, 2018).

578 **6 Conclusions**

579 This study presents the most comprehensive analysis to-date of
580 underwater DAS measurements, addressing both noise and earthquake
581 recordings along three underwater dark fibers in the Mediterranean Sea. This
582 analysis presents various noise sources including surface gravity waves,
583 secondary microseisms and local basin resonance. The effect of these noise
584 sources, as well as ocean-bottom - cable coupling, on measured ground
585 deformations is demonstrated using several small ($M_w < 3.7$) well recorded
586 regional earthquakes. Finally, the ability to detect seismic phases using
587 underwater DAS is discussed for both P- and S-waves.

588 A significant correlation is observed between irregular bathymetry and
589 unfavorable DAS measurements (Figures 4, S2 and S3). Flat or smooth
590 bathymetric slopes typically correspond to sediment accumulating regions,
591 while irregular bathymetry prevents sediment deposition. Sedimentary
592 basins are characterized by low seismic velocities (e.g., Figure 5) and
593 excellent coupling (e.g., Figure 4), while regions that lack sedimentary cover
594 are characterized by higher seismic velocities. In addition, deploying
595 underwater fibers over irregular bathymetry may result in uneven coupling
596 and even cable segments hanging in the water column. It is concluded that
597 the bathymetry dictates the measurement quality, by modulating phase
598 velocities and ground-cable coupling.

599 Frequency-wavenumber analysis indicates that underwater DAS
600 earthquake records are dominated by slow scattered dispersive Scholte-
601 waves. Broadband earthquake spectra are converted to strain-rate using
602 apparent velocities obtained via f - k analysis. Since this analysis was done for
603 scattered Scholte-waves, a single apparent velocity or dispersion curve was
604 used for all earthquakes recorded by the same cable segment. However,
605 when analyzing direct phases, apparent velocities will differ depending on
606 the propagation path and wave-fiber incidence angle, requiring an
607 earthquake specific analysis. Excellent agreement is found between DAS and
608 converted broadband spectra, when the latter is corrected for local
609 amplification and attenuation effects. A local sedimentary basin is identified

610 using both coherent noise and earthquake signals, and is shown to amplify
611 and attenuate low and high frequency seismic signals, respectively.

612 Detection capability analysis indicates the great potential of
613 underwater DAS for earthquake detection and monitoring. DAS detection
614 capabilities are found to be strongly correlated with apparent velocities: for
615 the same ground motion amplitudes, slow and fast waves induce high and
616 low energy DAS strain records, respectively. DAS and broadband detection
617 abilities were found to be similar for the recorded earthquake phases (Figure
618 9). That on-land sections did not record the analyzed earthquakes is
619 attributed to higher on-land velocities, a phenomenon that suggests that
620 DAS detection capabilities are enhanced underwater. Our conservative
621 analysis does not use the spatial coherence of DAS data, a powerful property
622 that may be used to denoise coherent signals. Thus, the ability to analyze
623 earthquakes using underwater DAS is expected to be superior to that of
624 broadband sensors, even for equivalent SNR.

625 The results demonstrate the great potential of underwater DAS for
626 seismic monitoring and for providing EEW using standard underwater
627 telecommunication cables. The latter will greatly enhance hazard mitigation
628 capabilities, increase warning times for underwater earthquakes, and
629 potentially save many lives.

630 **Acknowledgments and Data**

631 DAS data were acquired using a first generation Febus A1 interrogator
632 and an Aragon Photonics hDAS interrogator. Broadband seismometer data
633 were acquired by Géoazur except for OBS records: data for the ASEAF station
634 were downloaded from RESIF (<http://seismology.resif.fr/>, last accessed May
635 2020). The MEUST infrastructure is financed with the support of the
636 CNRS/IN2P3, the Region Sud, France (CPER the State (DRRT), and the Europe
637 (FEDER). This work and IL were supported by the SEAFOOD project, funded in
638 part by grant ANR-17-CE04-0007 of the French Agence Nationale de la
639 Recherche. Part of the project was also supported by Université Côte d'Azur
640 IDEX program UCA^{EDU} ANR-15-IDEX-0001 and the Doebelin Federation
641 (FR2800 CNRS). The fiber optic DAS earthquake recordings used to generate
642 Figures 4, S2 and S3, and the curves plotted in Figure 3 are available in the
643 following OSF repository: <https://osf.io/4bjph/>.

644 **References**

- 645 Allen, R. M., & Melgar, D. (2019). Earthquake Early Warning: Advances, Scientific
646 Challenges, and Societal Needs. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*,
647 47(1), 361–388. doi: [10.1146/annurev-earth-053018-060457](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-earth-053018-060457)
- 648 Aggouras, G., Anassontzis, E., Ball, A. E., Bourlis, G., Chinowsky, W., Fahrún, E.,
649 Grammatikakis, G., Green, C., Grieder, P., Katrivanos, P., Koske, P., Leisos, A.,

- 650 Ludvig, J., Markopoulos, E., Minkowsky, P., Nygren, D., Papageorgiou, K., Przybylski,
 651 G., Resvanis, L. K., & Zhukov, V. A. (2005). Operation and performance of the
 652 NESTOR test detector. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research*
 653 *Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*, *552*,
 654 420–439. doi: [10.1016/j.nima.2005.06.083](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2005.06.083)
- 655 Anassontzis, E., & Koske, P. (2003). Deep-sea station connected by cable to the shore.
 656 *Sea Technology*, *44*, 10–14.
- 657 Anderson, J. G., & Hough, S. E. (1984). A model for the shape of the fourier amplitude
 658 spectrum of acceleration at high frequencies. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society*
 659 *of America*, *74*(5), 1969–1993.
- 660 Brune, J. N. (1970). Tectonic stress and the spectra of seismic shear waves from
 661 earthquakes. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *75*(26), 4997–5009. doi:
 662 [10.1029/JB075i026p04997](https://doi.org/10.1029/JB075i026p04997)
- 663 Costa, L., Martins, H. F., Martin-Lopez, S., Fernandez-Ruiz, M. R., & Gonzalez-Herraez, M.
 664 (2019). Fully Distributed Optical Fiber Strain Sensor With $10^{-12} \epsilon/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$ Sensitivity.
 665 *Journal of Lightwave Technology*, *37*(18), 4487–4495. doi:
 666 [10.1109/JLT.2019.2904560](https://doi.org/10.1109/JLT.2019.2904560)
- 667 Courboux, F., Mercerat, E. D., Deschamps, A., Migeon, S., Baques, M., Larroque, C.,
 668 Rivet, D., & Hello, Y. (2020). Strong Site Effect Revealed by a New Broadband
 669 Seismometer on the Continental Shelf Offshore Nice Airport (Southeastern France).
 670 *Pure and Applied Geophysics*. doi: [10.1007/s00024-019-02408-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-019-02408-9)
- 671 De Caro, M., Monna, S., Frugoni, F., Beranzoli, L., & Favali, P. (2014). Seafloor Seismic
 672 Noise at Central Eastern Mediterranean Sites. *Seismological Research Letters*,
 673 *85*(5), 1019–1033. doi: [10.1785/0220130203](https://doi.org/10.1785/0220130203)
- 674 Fernández-Ruiz, M. R., Soto, M. A., Williams, E. F., Martin-Lopez, S., Zhan, Z., Gonzalez-
 675 Herraez, M., & Martins, H. F. (2020). Distributed acoustic sensing for seismic
 676 activity monitoring. *APL Photonics*, *5*(3), 030901. doi: [10.1063/1.5139602](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5139602)
- 677 Finetti, I. (1982). Structure, stratigraphy and evolution of Central Mediterranean.
 678 *Bollettino Di Geofisica Teorica Ed Applicata*, *24* (96), 247–312.
- 679 Gabai, H., & Eyal, A. (2016). On the sensitivity of distributed acoustic sensing. *Optics*
 680 *Letters*, *41*(24), 5648. doi: [10.1364/OL.41.005648](https://doi.org/10.1364/OL.41.005648)

681 Kruiver, P. P., Deák, A., & Allouche, N. E. (2010). *Extraction of geotechnical properties*
 682 *from Scholte waves in underwater environments*. cp-150-00013. doi:
 683 [10.3997/2214-4609-pdb.150.A05](https://doi.org/10.3997/2214-4609-pdb.150.A05)

684 Kuvshinov, B. N. (2016). Interaction of helically wound fibre-optic cables with plane
 685 seismic waves: Interaction of fibre-optic cables. *Geophysical Prospecting*, *64*(3),
 686 671–688. doi: [10.1111/1365-2478.12303](https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2478.12303)

687 Lamare, P. (2016). The MEUST deep sea infrastructure in the Toulon site. *EPJ Web of*
 688 *Conferences*, *116*, 09001. doi: [10.1051/epjconf/201611609001](https://doi.org/10.1051/epjconf/201611609001)

689 Lindsey, N. J., Dawe, T. C., & Ajo-Franklin, J. B. (2019). Illuminating seafloor faults and
 690 ocean dynamics with dark fiber distributed acoustic sensing. *Science*, *366*(6469),
 691 1103–1107. doi: [10.1126/science.aay5881](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay5881)

692 Lindsey, N. J., Martin, E. R., Dreger, D. S., Freifeld, B., Cole, S., James, S. R., Biondi, B. L.,
 693 & Ajo-Franklin, J. B. (2017). Fiber-Optic Network Observations of Earthquake
 694 Wavefields: FIBER-OPTIC EARTHQUAKE OBSERVATIONS. *Geophysical Research*
 695 *Letters*, *44*(23), 11,792-11,799. doi: [10.1002/2017GL075722](https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL075722)

696 Lior, I., & Ziv, A. (2018). The Relation Between Ground Motion, Earthquake Source
 697 Parameters, and Attenuation: Implications for Source Parameter Inversion and
 698 Ground Motion Prediction Equations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*,
 699 *123*(7), 5886–5901. doi: [10.1029/2018JB015504](https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JB015504)

700 Lior, I., & Ziv, A. (2020). Generic Source Parameter Determination and Ground-Motion
 701 Prediction for Earthquake Early Warning. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of*
 702 *America*, *110*(1), 345–356. doi: [10.1785/0120190140](https://doi.org/10.1785/0120190140)

703 Longuet-Higgins, M. S. (1950). A Theory of the Origin of Microseisms. *Philosophical*
 704 *Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical*
 705 *Sciences*, *243*(857), 1–35.

706 Madariaga, R. (1976). Dynamics of an expanding circular fault. *Bulletin of the*
 707 *Seismological Society of America*, *66*(3), 639–666.

708 Martins, H. F., Martin-Lopez, S., Corredera, P., Salgado, P., Frazão, O., & González-
 709 Herráez, M. (2013). Modulation instability-induced fading in phase-sensitive optical
 710 time-domain reflectometry. *Optics Letters*, *38*(6), 872. doi: [10.1364/OL.38.000872](https://doi.org/10.1364/OL.38.000872)

- 711 Mateeva, A., Lopez, J., Potters, H., Mestayer, J., Cox, B., Kiyashchenko, D., Wills, P.,
 712 Grandi, S., Hornman, K., Kuvshinov, B., Berlang, W., Yang, Z., & Detomo, R. (2014).
 713 Distributed acoustic sensing for reservoir monitoring with vertical seismic profiling:
 714 Distributed acoustic sensing (DAS) for reservoir monitoring with VSP. *Geophysical*
 715 *Prospecting*, *62*(4), 679–692. doi: [10.1111/1365-2478.12116](https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2478.12116)
- 716 McNamara, D. E., & Buland, R. P. (2004). Ambient Noise Levels in the Continental
 717 United States. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, *94*(4), 1517–1527.
 718 doi: [10.1785/012003001](https://doi.org/10.1785/012003001)
- 719 Papp, B., Donno, D., Martin, J. E., & Hartog, A. H. (2017). A study of the geophysical
 720 response of distributed fibre optic acoustic sensors through laboratory-scale
 721 experiments: Geophysical response of fibre optic sensors. *Geophysical*
 722 *Prospecting*, *65*(5), 1186–1204. doi: [10.1111/1365-2478.12471](https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2478.12471)
- 723 Park, C. B., Miller, R. D., Xia, J., Ivanov, J., Sonnichsen, G. V., Hunter, J. A., Good, R. L.,
 724 Burns, R. A., & Christian, H. (2005). Underwater MASW to evaluate stiffness of
 725 water-bottom sediments. *The Leading Edge*, *24*(7), 724–728. doi:
 726 [10.1190/1.1993267](https://doi.org/10.1190/1.1993267)
- 727 Peterson, J. R. (1993). *Observations and modeling of seismic background noise* (Report
 728 No. 93–322; Open-File Report). USGS Publications Warehouse. doi:
 729 [10.3133/ofr93322](https://doi.org/10.3133/ofr93322)
- 730 Pratt, T. L. (2003). Amplification of Seismic Waves by the Seattle Basin, Washington
 731 State. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, *93*(2), 533–545. doi:
 732 [10.1785/0120010292](https://doi.org/10.1785/0120010292)
- 733 R. Fernández-Ruiz, M., Costa, L., & F. Martins, H. (2019). Distributed Acoustic Sensing
 734 Using Chirped-Pulse Phase-Sensitive OTDR Technology. *Sensors*, *19*(20), 4368. doi:
 735 [10.3390/s19204368](https://doi.org/10.3390/s19204368)
- 736 Rost, S. (2002). Array seismology: Methods and applications. *Reviews of Geophysics*,
 737 *40*(3). doi: [10.1029/2000RG000100](https://doi.org/10.1029/2000RG000100)
- 738 Sladen, A., Rivet, D., Ampuero, J. P., De Barros, L., Hello, Y., Calbris, G., & Lamare, P.
 739 (2019). Distributed sensing of earthquakes and ocean-solid Earth interactions on
 740 seafloor telecom cables. *Nature Communications*, *10*(1), 1–8. doi: [10.1038/s41467-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13793-z)
 741 [019-13793-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13793-z)

- 742 Vallée, M., Ampuero, J. P., Juhel, K., Bernard, P., Montagner, J.-P., & Barsuglia, M. (2017).
743 Observations and modeling of the elastogravity signals preceding direct seismic
744 waves. *Science*, *358*(6367), 1164–1168. doi: [10.1126/science.aao0746](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao0746)
- 745 Williams, E. F., Fernández-Ruiz, M. R., Magalhaes, R., Vanthillo, R., Zhan, Z., González-
746 Herráez, M., & Martins, H. F. (2019). Distributed sensing of microseisms and
747 teleseisms with submarine dark fibers. *Nature Communications*, *10*(1), 5778. doi:
748 [10.1038/s41467-019-13262-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13262-7)
- 749 Zhan, Z. (2020). Distributed Acoustic Sensing Turns Fiber-Optic Cables into Sensitive
750 Seismic Antennas. *Seismological Research Letters*, *91*(1), 1–15. doi:
751 [10.1785/0220190112](https://doi.org/10.1785/0220190112)

752 **Supplementary figure captions**

753 Figure S1: Average PSD sections for MEUST at different frequencies between
754 4 and 9 km from the interrogator.

755
756 Figure S2: As in figure 4 for a M2 earthquake at approximately 30 km
757 recorded by NESTOR.

758
759 Figure S3: As in figure 4 for a M2.6 earthquake at approximately 166 km
760 recorded by MEUST.

761
762 Figure S4: As in figure 5 for 4 earthquakes recorded by NESTOR between
763 19.7 and 20.2 km from the interrogator.

764
765 Figure S5: As in figures 5 (top) and 6 (bottom) for 2 earthquakes recorded by
766 HCMR between 6 and 6.3 km from the interrogator.

767
768 Figure S6: As in figures 5 (top) and 6 (bottom) for 2 earthquakes recorded by
769 HCMR between 0.5 and 1.5 km from the interrogator.

770
771 Figure S7: As in figures 5 (top) and 8 (bottom) for 2 earthquakes recorded by
772 MEUST between 29.7 and 30.7 km from the interrogator.

773
774 Figure S8: As in figures 5 (top) and 8 (bottom) for 2 earthquakes recorded by
775 MEUST between 12.2 and 12.6 km from the interrogator.

776
777 Figure S9: As in figures 5 (top) and 8 (bottom) for 2 earthquakes recorded by
778 HCMR between 2.3 and 2.85 km from the interrogator. The earthquake in top
779 panels is detected while that in the bottom panels is not detected.