



HAL
open science

Near-Real-Time Analysis of the Ionospheric Response to the 15 January 2022 Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha'apai Volcanic Eruption

B. Maletckii, E. Astafyeva

► **To cite this version:**

B. Maletckii, E. Astafyeva. Near-Real-Time Analysis of the Ionospheric Response to the 15 January 2022 Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha'apai Volcanic Eruption. *Journal of Geophysical Research Space Physics*, 2022, 127 (10), 10.1029/2022JA030735 . hal-03846791

HAL Id: hal-03846791

<https://polytechnique.hal.science/hal-03846791>

Submitted on 10 Nov 2022

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.

1 **Near-Real-Time analysis of the ionospheric response to the 15 January 2022 Hunga**
2 **Tonga-Hunga Ha'apai volcanic eruption**
3

4 **B. Maletckii¹ and E. Astafyeva¹**

5 ¹ Université Paris Cité, Institut de Physique du Globe de Paris (IPGP), CNRS UMR 7154, 35-39
6 Rue Hélène Brion, 75013 Paris

7 Corresponding author: Boris Maletckii (maletckii@ipgp.fr)
8

9 **Key Points:**

- 10 ● We suggest novel methods that detect and determine spatio-temporal characteristics of
11 ionospheric disturbances in Near-Real-Time (NRT).
12 ● We analyze large- and small-amplitude ionosphere response to the Tonga eruption in near
13 (<2000 km) and far-field (~10000 km) in NRT scenario
14 ● The amplitude of the dTEC/dt response to the Tonga eruption is comparable to the 2011
15 Tohoku earthquake and the 28 October 2003 solar flare
16

17 **Abstract**

18 We present a near-real-time (NRT) scenario of analysis of ionospheric response to the 15 January
19 2022 Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha’apai eruption by using GNSS data in the near field (in the vicinity
20 of the volcano), and in the far-field (Japan, North America and South America). We introduce a
21 new method to determine instantaneous velocities using an interferometric approach and using the
22 time derivative of the total electron content (TEC). Moreover, for the first time, we propose a novel
23 method that automatically estimates the apparent propagation velocity of ionospheric disturbances
24 from near-real-time travel-time diagrams. By using our new methods, we analyzed the dynamics
25 of co-volcanic ionospheric disturbances generated by the Hunga-Tonga eruption, and we estimated
26 the first propagation velocity in the near-field to be $\sim 800\text{-}950$ m/s, subsequently decreasing to
27 ~ 600 m/s. Based on these values, we conclude that in the near-field, we detect ionospheric
28 signatures of acoustic waves. In the far field, the apparent velocity of ionospheric disturbances was
29 estimated to be between 277 and 365 m/s, which corresponds to the propagation of the Lamb wave.
30 It is important to note that our new methods can successfully perform at low spatial resolution
31 networks and with 30-sec cadence data. Also, they enable NRT spatio-temporal analysis of
32 ionospheric TEC response to smaller-amplitude events.

33
34

35 **1 Introduction**

36 It is known that natural hazards, such as earthquakes, tsunamis, and volcanic eruptions
37 generate acoustic and gravity waves that propagate upward in the atmosphere and ionosphere (e.g.,
38 Calais & Minster, 1995; Miyaki et al., 2002; Heki, 2006; Astafyeva, 2019). Ionospheric
39 disturbances generated by volcanic eruptions are called co-volcanic ionospheric disturbances (co-
40 VID). It is known that the co-VID are usually quasi-periodically shaped variations that occur ~ 10
41 to 45 min after the eruption onset, last for 1-1.5 hours, occur in the near field of a volcano (up to
42 ~ 2000 km), and propagate at velocities in the range of 0.5 km/s - 1.1 km/s (Heki, 2006;
43 Dautermann et al., 2009; Nakashima et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2017). Since the first-time detection
44 of co-VID by Heki (2006), nowadays, the disturbances can be systematically detected by ground-
45 based GNSS receivers. Shults et al. (2016) introduced for the first time a term “Ionospheric
46 Volcanology” that refers to the use of ionospheric measurements for the interests of volcanology.
47 For instance, from the co-VID measurements, it is possible to determine the location of an eruptive
48 volcano, the time of eruption onset (Shults et al., 2016), and estimate volcanic eruption power
49 (Heki, 2006; Dautermann et al., 2009; Manta et al., 2021). Ionosphere-based methods would
50 complement conventional ones, which use data from nearby seismometers and infrasound stations.
51 The accuracy of those conventional methods decreases in absence of instrumentation within ~ 100
52 km from a volcano. To make a new step toward ionospheric volcano monitoring and warning
53 systems we must develop real or near-real-time (NRT) methods.

54 In this work, for the first time, we analyze spatio-temporal characteristics of ionospheric
55 disturbances generated by the 15 January 2022 massive eruption of Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha’apai

56 (HTHH) volcano in the NRT scenario. We suggest novel methods that automatically estimate the
 57 apparent propagation speed and direction of propagation of co-VID and other ionospheric
 58 disturbances, including small-amplitude ones, in near-real-time. This work is an important step
 59 toward automatised NRT detection of ionospheric disturbances.
 60

61 **2 Data and Methods**

62 **2.1 Total Electron Content by Global Navigation Satellite Systems**

63

64 Global Navigation Satellite Systems (GNSS) are a helpful tool for ionospheric sounding.
 65 Its main advantage is good spatial and temporal resolution. Nowadays, 30-second data from over
 66 9000 worldwide receivers are available on a daily basis. Each GNSS station can receive signals
 67 from 40+ GNSS satellites, providing numerous ionospheric observation points. High-rate data (1-
 68 second or less) are sparser (around 1000 receivers), however, local networks developed vastly in
 69 this direction over the last year. Phase measurements from dual-frequency GNSS receivers allow
 70 estimation of the ionospheric total electron content (TEC), which is equal to the number of
 71 electrons along a line-of-sight (LOS) between a satellite and a receiver:
 72

72

$$73 \quad TEC_{ij} (phase, slant) = \frac{1}{A} \times \frac{f_i^2 f_j^2}{f_i^2 - f_j^2} \times (L_i \lambda_i - L_j \lambda_j) \quad (1)$$

74

75 where $A = 40.308 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}^2$, L_i and L_j are phase measurements, λ_i and λ_j are wavelengths at the two
 76 the given frequencies (for Global Positioning System (GPS) $i=1, j=2$ and frequencies are 1575.42
 77 and 1227.60 MHz, respectively). The TEC is measured in TEC units (TECu), $1 \text{ TECu} = 10^{16}$
 78 electrons/ m^2 .

79

80 We use the ionospheric thin shell approximation to calculate the spatial positions of
 81 ionospheric disturbances. The intersection points between the LOS and this shell (at a fixed altitude
 82 H_{ion}) are ionospheric pierced points (IPP). We use $H_{\text{ion}} = 320 \text{ km}$ since it is close to the maximum
 83 ionization height $H_m\text{F}2$ (based on the nearest ionosonde station NIUE at 169.9E; 19.1S).

84

85 To study the co-VID signatures driven by the HHTH volcano eruption, we analyze data of
 86 24 ground-based GNSS-receivers in the near-field, i.e., under $\sim 2000 \text{ km}$ away from the volcano.
 87 To extract the co-VID signatures from the TEC data series, researchers usually apply 1-4 mHz
 88 band-pass filters (Heki, 2006; Shults et al., 2016; Nakashima et al., 2016; Manta et al., 2021).
 89 However, in a real-time scenario it is not possible because of the following reasons: a) the
 90 impossibility to stack long series of data in NRT; b) such signal properties as arrival time,
 91 amplitude, and spectral components can be affected by the filter parameters (Maletckii et al.,
 92 2020). For NRT, we propose to use the TEC time derivative, which works as a high-pass filter and
 93 will not modify the amplitude of the co-VID.

93

94 **2.2. The “D1-GNSS-RT” method**

95
96 By using the TEC time derivative approach, Maletckii and Astafyeva (2021a) introduced
97 a method “D1-GNSS-RT” allowing to calculate spatio-temporal properties of traveling
98 ionospheric disturbances (TID) in NRT (Figure 1). To detect TID, the “D1-GNSS-RT” method
99 first analyses TEC data series to find the local maximum value (LMV). Then, it computes the
100 cross-correlation function for each pair of time series around the LMV to calculate the difference
101 in TID arrivals. Finally, based on these time shifts and by using an interferometric approach it
102 estimates the horizontal velocities of TID propagation. The “D1-GNSS-RT” method was tested on
103 several earthquakes but only showed good results with 1-sec data and on dense GNSS networks,
104 such as Japan GEONET. The latter restrictions make it challenging to apply this method to the
105 analysis of the co-VID generated by the HHTH volcanic eruption. The spatial coverage around the
106 Tonga Islands is rather sparse, and only 16 out of 24 GNSS stations provide both 1-sec and 30-sec
107 cadence data, while the others are limited to only 30-sec cadence data (Figure 2a). Besides, 30-sec
108 dTEC/dt signals have smaller amplitudes and narrower spectral composition, which results in less
109 pronounced signals as compared to 1-sec dTEC/dt data (Figure S1).

110 Here, for the first time, we introduce a new “D1-GNSS-RT” applicable to 30-sec data. The
111 main developments are presented in Figure 1. They include: 1) increase of the LMV window to 7
112 minutes, 2) increase of the cross-correlation window to 24 minutes; 3) decrease of the threshold of
113 the coefficient of the cross-correlation function down to 0.7. However, unfortunately, these new
114 parameters modify the definition of NRT from 15 minutes for 1-sec data to 30 minutes for 30-sec
115 data.

116 When the “D1-GNSS-RT” is not applicable (e.g., sparse GNSS coverage), the horizontal
117 TID velocity can be estimated by using travel-time diagrams, or hodocrones, that present the TEC
118 variations with respect to the source location and time. Similar to the D1-GNSS-RT, for NRT-
119 TTD we also use the dTEC/dt parameter. As the source, we take the volcano position. From TTD,
120 the velocity can be estimated as the slope, however, up to now, there was no NRT-compatible
121 automatique method to do that. Here, for the first time, we developed a novel technique to fit the
122 slope line in NRT.

123 124 **2.3 The NRT TTD method and fitting technique**

125
126 The automatic NRT TTD fitting technique consists of two stages: 1) the first maximum
127 “picker” and 2) the “fitter” based on these maxima. To select the maximum along with all dTEC/dt
128 values, we pick the values exceeding a standard deviation of the series and a threshold of 0.15
129 TECu. In the case of the multiple values in the 120-second windows, we chose the centered one in
130 this window. We also remove outliers from the final list of maxima in the given series (values that
131 can appear only with velocities exceeding 5 km/s).

132 We use the first maximum of each data series to fit the first velocity slope. They are sorted
133 based on the source distance - from the closest to the farthest. By analyzing the velocity between

134 the current and previous maximum point we decide whether this maximum is “physically” suitable
135 for the fitting process (velocity between two points should be in the range between 0.1 and 5 km/s
136 and should not vary for more than 20% with respect to the velocity between two previous points;
137 after picking the first 8 suitable maxima we add a new condition - the velocity should not change
138 for more than 50% of the average velocity of all previous points). After the list of suitable points
139 is finished, we fit the slope line by linear regression in these points.

140 In the case of the Quasi-NRT method, we added a second round for the picking process.
141 After we obtain the first NRT velocity we compare all first maximum velocities with this value. If
142 it lies in a 20% difference border interval, we pick this maximum. The new list of points is used
143 for the Quasi-NRT fitting. Since the second round would require more time, we call this method
144 “Quasi-NRT”. However, the Quasi-NRT method seems to be more accurate, therefore it can be
145 used to determine NRT-method accuracy in a particular case.

146 We implement these techniques to the HTHH eruption (Sections 3.1 and 3.2), but also to
147 the M6.6 16 July 2007 Chuetsu earthquake, which is the smallest earthquake ever recorded in the
148 ionosphere (Cahyadi and Heki, 2015) and the 4 August 2020 Beirut explosion (Section 3.3).
149

150 **3 Results and Discussion**

151 As shown recently, the explosive eruption of HTHH volcano produced quite a significant
152 response in the ionosphere, and eruption-driven traveling ionospheric disturbances (TID) were
153 observed as far as 20,000 km away from the volcano (Themens et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022).
154 The amplitude of the near-field response reached as high value as 5-8 TECu (Astafyeva et al.,
155 2022). In the case of the $d\text{TEC}/dt$ parameter, we observe a peak-to-peak disturbance with the
156 amplitude of ~ 8 TECu, which is extraordinary, as this value exceeds by a factor of 2.5-3 all
157 previously recorded co-VID (Figure S2). Previously, disturbances with large $d\text{TEC}/dt$ were only
158 observed during the 2011 Tohoku-Oki earthquake and during the 28th October 2003 solar flare
159 (Figure S2). The exceptionally high amplitude of the HTHH-driven co-VID can be explained by
160 the fact that the eruption was accompanied by explosions of extreme power force (e.g., Matoza et
161 al., 2022; Astafyeva et al., 2022). As known, the amplitude of NH-driven ionospheric disturbances
162 depend on the magnitude of the initial forcing: larger earthquakes and volcanic eruptions generate
163 larger disturbances in the ionosphere (Astafyeva et al., 2013; Cahyadi and Heki, 2015; Shults et
164 al., 2016; Manta et al., 2022).

165 Below we use our newly developed methods and we estimate spatio-temporal evolution of
166 HTHH-driven co-VID in the NRT scenario: the amplitude of the velocity, the azimuths of
167 propagation, and the ionospheric source location.
168
169

170 **3.1 Near-Field ionospheric disturbance due to the Tonga Eruption**

171

172 **3.1.1 Spatio-temporal characteristics of the co-VID from D1-GNSS-RT. Instantaneous** 173 **velocities' field and source location.**

174
175 Figure 2 (b-f) summarizes the results of the application of the D1-GNSS-RT method to
176 the analysis of ionospheric TEC disturbances generated by the 15 January 2022 eruption. The co-
177 VID velocity field maps for the first arrivals following the Hunga-Tonga eruption are shown in
178 Fig. 2b–d, and the localization results are presented in Fig. 2e–f. Figure 2b shows the first velocity
179 vectors at 04:23:30UT, i.e., 525s after the eruption onset time, both on the north-east and south-
180 west out from the volcano. From the time of the first co-VID detection, in the NRT scenario, we
181 need 22 minutes more to compute the first velocity field, which is an increase of the time delay for
182 the NRT method as compared to 1-sec data. The two main reasons are a long 30-sec cross-
183 correlation window (24 minutes vs. 5 minutes with 1-sec data) and sparse spatial resolution. The
184 latter signifies fewer IPP that can be selected for correlation triangles after the first co-VID
185 detection. Therefore, more time is necessary to “form” an interferometric triangle. The first vectors
186 propagate in directions outward from the source. The first horizontal velocities of the co-VID are
187 about ~830-900 m/s, i.e., they correspond to acoustic and shock-acoustic waves, and are in line
188 with retrospective studies (e.g., Themens et al., 2022). The first velocity vectors are used to
189 compute the first source location at the point with coordinates (17.90S; 176.26E) (Fig. 2e). The
190 subsequent co-VID evolution during the next 2 minutes maintains the tendency for both the
191 outward direction of propagation and velocities' values. Further, the velocities decrease to ~500-
192 600 m/s, while the source locations concentrate northwest of the volcano (Fig. 2f).

193 194 **3.1.2 Spatio-temporal characteristics of the co-VID from NRT TTD using 30-sec data.**

195
196 The 30-sec NRT-TTD for all satellites and receivers (e.g, all LOS) is shown in Figure 3a.
197 From these data, our newly developed fitting method estimates the velocity to be 621.1 m/s. This
198 value is in line with previous retrospective observations for the ionospheric response to the Hunga-
199 Tonga eruption (Themens et al., 2022), as well as with our “D1-GNSS-RT” results. The error of
200 the velocity estimations is less than 10% for both NRT and Quasi-NRT method (Figure 3b,c). The
201 difference between NRT and Quasi-NRT estimations is 11,1%. We can observe the existence of
202 the co-VID signatures before the fitted slope line on Figure 3a, but the amplitudes of the
203 disturbances were not sufficient for the “picker” part of the automatic NRT TTD fitting technique.

204 205 **3.1.3 Spatio-temporal characteristics of the co-VID from NRT TTD using 1-sec data.**

206
207 As mentioned above, only 16 GNSS receivers in the near-field of the HTHH volcano
208 provided 1-sec data, which is too few to use the 1-sec “D1-GNSS-RT” method. Fortunately, these
209 limits do not apply to NRT TTD. Figure 4 shows the dTEC/dt-based TTD plotted for the near-
210 field co-VID. We note that the high-rate response to the HTHH volcanic eruption is more complex
211 than the 30-sec one. Figure 5b demonstrates the occurrence of four dTEC/dt disturbances that are,

212 most likely, related to four independent eruptive events that occurred between 04:00 and 05:30
213 UT. The separate events can be distinguished on TTD based on the characteristics of the
214 ionospheric responses, such as signal shape, the apparent velocity of propagation, and the
215 amplitude.

216 The NRT TTD shows one quasi-periodic and three N-shaped signatures (dotted ovals in
217 Figure 4b). The first quasi-periodic response (in the green circle) has the lowest velocity with
218 respect to the other disturbances (~ 0.5 km/s). For the second response, the slope gives the apparent
219 velocity of ~ 1.33 km/s. It appears to consist of three N-shaped signals which have identical
220 velocity slopes. Further, we distinguish the third event based on a new increase in the $d\text{TEC}/dt$
221 from $\sim 05:15$ UT. For this component, the velocity slope is ~ 2 km/s. Finally, the fourth event has
222 an apparent velocity of ~ 1.33 km/s, which distinguishes it from the third event, although it is close
223 in time.

224 Figure 4a shows an example of $d\text{TEC}/dt$ signatures for receiver “SAMO” – satellite
225 GLONASS R21 (in blue-white-red colormap). We also implement a centered moving average
226 filter (5-sec window) to this series (black curve), which allow to remove noise in data and to
227 concentrate on useful signals. These results prove an assumption of two types of the signatures:
228 first, quasi-periodic and then, N-shaped ones. Evenmore, we observed the first co-VID driven
229 signatures a couple of minutes before the USGS-determined eruption onset time (04:15 UT).
230 Generally, it takes ~ 7 -10 minutes for disturbances to reach the ionospheric altitudes, therefore the
231 eruption onset occurred between 04:00 and 04:10 UT.

232 From our NRT-TTD, it is possible to estimate the onset times for all observed co-VID
233 (Figure 4c). To do so, we first compute the intersection of the velocity slope line with the 0-km
234 distance from the source. Second, we estimate the time in the intersection point from the TTD.
235 This time corresponds to the onset time in the ionosphere, which is the time when the eruption-
236 driven acoustic wave reaches the ionosphere (i.e., the altitude of detection, $H_{\text{ion}} = 320$ km). Third,
237 we compute the vertical propagation time for the acoustic wave from the volcano to the ionosphere
238 by using the sound speed profile derived from the NRLMSISE-2 model (Emmert et al., 2020).
239 With a weighted average velocity of the sound speed of 470 m/s (Figure S3b), the acoustic wave
240 will take ~ 11.34 minutes (11 minutes 20 seconds) to reach 320 km of altitude. Finally, we extract
241 this propagation time from the ionospheric onset times in order to obtain the ground onset times
242 for all four events (Table S1). From our method it follows that the HTHH volcano began to erupt
243 at 04:08:26 UT, which is in agreement with satellite observations that suggest the eruption onset
244 between 04:00 and 04:10 UT (Gusman and Rodger, 2022). Our onset time is also very close to
245 that estimated by Astafyeva et al. (2022) from raw unfiltered TEC data by retrospective analysis.
246 However, it is several minutes earlier than seismically-determined onset time (USGS; Poli &
247 Shapiro, 2022), and ~ 20 minutes earlier than the onset estimated by using a pressure station at
248 Tonga (Wright et al, 2022). Our work demonstrates that our ionosphere-based NRT approach can
249 be successfully used along with conventional methods.

250 The occurrence of multiple eruptive events, that is clearly seen in $d\text{TEC}/dt$ data, is in line
251 with previous reports. For instance, Wright et al. (2022) identified four independent events that

252 occurred between 04:00 and 05:30 UT: 04:26 UT, 04:36 UT, 05:10 UT, 05:51 UT. Astafyeva et
253 al, 2022 suggested the occurrence of five eruptive events between 04:00 and 05:30 UT, however
254 their onset times differ from our estimations, which can be due to difference in the approximations
255 used.

256

257 **3.2 Far-Field ionospheric disturbance due to the Tonga Eruption.**

258

259 Previously, we applied our approach to the analysis of ionospheric response in the near-
260 field of the HTHH volcano and earthquakes (Maletckii & Astafyeva, 2021a). The near-field
261 ionospheric disturbances are usually characterized by relatively high velocities (e.g., 800-1200
262 m/s) and high frequencies (e.g., 4-10 mHz). In this section, we demonstrate how this approach and
263 our methods can perform in the Far-Field (i.e., several thousands of km away from the source) and
264 process traveling disturbances with lower velocities and frequencies. Perturbations with such
265 characteristics include tsunami-induced gravity waves. Therefore, the NRT-method can be used
266 for early warning systems.

267 To perform in the Far-Field, the following adjustments in our NRT fitting technique were
268 made: 1) the first maximum threshold is increased from 0.15 TECu/sec to 0.28 TECu/sec (for 30-
269 second data); 2) the velocity between two points should be in the range between 0.18 and 5 km/s.
270 The main reason to do so is to prevent “false detections”. Since the ionosphere is an extremely
271 disturbed medium, different disturbances are always present at any place at any time moment. By
272 increasing the thresholds, we exclude disturbance not related to the eruption.

273 We apply the adjusted method to the detection of HTHH-driven disturbances in Japan,
274 North America and Chile, i.e. between 8,000 and 11,000 km away from the HTHH volcano (Figure
275 5).

276 We use the GEONET GNSS network to detect and characterize traveling ionospheric
277 disturbances on the Japanese coast (Animation S1). The 30-sec NRT-TTD for satellite GPS G07
278 and all available receivers is shown in Figure 5 (a-c). The first vivid signatures appeared at ~10:00
279 UT, ~6 hours after the first eruption. From these data, our newly developed fitting method
280 estimates the velocity to be 336.5 m/s, which is close to the Lamb wave speed, and is in line with
281 previous retrospective observations for the ionospheric response to the Hunga-Tonga eruption in
282 Japan (Themens et al., 2022; Zhang et. al., 2022).

283 The Lamb-wave driven ionospheric disturbances arrived on the West coast of North
284 America at ~12:00 UT, ~8 hours after the eruption onset (Animation S2). Figure 5 (d-f) shows 30-
285 sec NRT-TTD for satellite GPS G10 and all available receivers. Based on the TTD, our newly
286 developed fitting method estimates the velocity to be 365.9 m/s, which is slightly higher than the
287 Lamb wave, and is in agreement with retrospective analysis of the ionospheric response in North
288 America (Zhang et. al., 2022).

289 To study the response in the South-West Coast of South America (Animation S3), we used
290 1-sec data from the Centro Sismológico Nacional Universidad de Chile GNSS archives. The 1-sec
291 NRT-TTD for satellite GPS G18 is shown in Figure 5 (g-i). We also increased the threshold for

292 the picker up to 0.75 TECu/sec, since 1-sec data series are noisier and have larger peak-to-peak
293 amplitudes than 30-sec data (Figure S1). The first disturbances arrive at ~12:00 UT, ~8 hours after
294 the first eruption. From these data, our newly developed fitting method estimates the velocity to
295 be 277.6 m/s. We attribute this disturbance to ionospheric response to the Lamb wave propagation.
296

297 **3.3. Ionospheric disturbances driven by other events: small earthquake and explosion**

298
299 To analyze the applicability and accuracy of the NRT-TTD method and the fitting
300 technique, we analyze two events: 1) the M6.6 16 July 2007 Chuetsu earthquake in Japan, which
301 is the smallest earthquake ever recorded in the ionosphere; 2) the 4 August 2020 Beirut explosion.
302 Both events caused very weak TEC response as compared to the Tonga event (Figure S2).

303 The response to the Chūetsu earthquake as captured by satellite GPS G26 is presented in
304 Figure 6 **(a)-(c)**. Co-seismic ionospheric disturbances are seen ~10 minutes after the earthquake
305 onset. We estimated their propagation speed to be 949.4 m/s, which is in agreement with the
306 retrospective results (1 km/s by Cahyadi and Heki, 2015). The response to the Beirut explosion
307 was captured by satellite GPS G22 (Figure 6 **(d)-(f)**). Clear N-shaped disturbances emerged ~12
308 minutes after the explosion onset and their velocity is estimated to be 883 m/s. Our estimation is
309 in agreement with the retrospective estimations (0.8 km/s by Kundu et. al., 2021). We note that
310 the spatial resolution of the GNSS network was very poor, which made it challenging to
311 automatically process it, but our method succeeded.
312

313 **4 Conclusions**

314 In this work, we performed for the first time a near-real-time analysis of the ionospheric
315 response to the massive 15 January 2022 Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha'apai explosive eruption. Our
316 main developments and findings are summarized below:

- 317 1. For the first time, we introduce a new method to determine spatio-temporal characteristics in
318 the NRT. This method estimates the instantaneous velocities and the ionospheric source
319 location using not only high-rate data but also the “conventional” 30-sec data. In addition,
320 our new method can perform in sparse spatial coverage conditions. We note, however, that
321 30-sec data increase the NRT time delay between the event onset and the first results to ~30
322 minutes. By using this method, in a near-real-time scenario applied for the HTHH eruption
323 case, we estimate the first instantaneous velocities to be ~800-900 m/s, which is in line with
324 retrospective studies (e.g., Themens et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022), and correspond to
325 acoustic and shock-acoustic waves. The location of the ionospheric source determined by our
326 method is in the northwest of the volcano.
- 327 2. For the first time, we present a new method that can estimate the co-VID velocity from a real-
328 time travel-time diagram. For the HTHH volcanic eruption, we observe the apparent co-VID
329 propagation speed to be 621.1 m/s. This value is in line with our “D1-GNSS-RT” results. To
330 further demonstrate the wide applicability of our method, we tested them on lower-amplitude

331 TEC responses in Japan, North America and Chile on the day of the HTHH eruption, and to
 332 the Beirut explosion of 4 August 2020, which was registered by a very sparse GNSS network,
 333 and the M6.6 Chuetsu earthquake of July 2007, which is the smallest earthquake ever
 334 registered in the ionosphere. In all cases, our method managed to capture the response and to
 335 correctly estimate the velocities.

- 336 3. Our dTEC/dt near-field NRT-TTD suggest the occurrence of four distinct eruptions between
 337 04:00 and 05:30 UT. From the velocity slopes in NRT-TTD, we estimate the onset time for
 338 the four events at 04:08:43 UT, 04:31:00 UT, 05:02:30 UT, and 05:05:21 UT. The multi-
 339 eruption scenario is an agreement with the analysis of surface pressure data (Wright et al.,
 340 2022) and that of the unfiltered ionospheric TEC data (Astafyeva et al., 2022).
- 341 4. We emphasize that the amplitude of the dTEC/dt ionospheric response to the HTHH volcanic
 342 eruption is unprecedentedly strong: the peak-to-peak dTEC/dt disturbance amplitude
 343 exceeded by a factor of 2.5-3 all previously recorded co-VID. Such extreme values emphasize
 344 the unprecedented power of the HTHH volcano explosion, and are comparable to the
 345 ionospheric response to the 2011 Great Tohoku-Oki earthquake and the 28 October 2003 solar
 346 flare.

347
 348 Our results once again demonstrate the advantages of the use of the dTEC/dt parameter as
 349 the effective NRT tool to rapidly determine dynamic characteristics of ionospheric disturbances.
 350 We also demonstrate that an ionosphere-based method can be a reliable alternative for detection
 351 of natural hazard events. This is especially important and useful for the analysis of submarine
 352 events, such as the HTHH volcanic eruption, where ground-based instrumentation is very limited.

353 **Acknowledgments**

354 We thank the French Space Agency (CNES, Project “RealDetect”) for the support. BM
 355 additionally thanks the CNES and the IPGP for the Ph.D. fellowship. We acknowledge the use of
 356 “tec-suite” codes developed by I. Zhivetiev (<https://tec-suite.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>).

357 We thank L. Rolland, P. Coïsson, D. Mikesell, M. Ravanelli, E. Munaibari & F. Manta for
 358 fruitful discussions within an ad-hoc Geoazur-IPGP-NGI working group on the 2022 Hunga Tonga
 359 volcano eruption.

360 **Open Research**

362 The Near-field and the Beirut explosion GNSS data are available from the CDDIS data
 363 archives (<https://cddis.nasa.gov/archive/gnss/data/daily/>). The Japan and the Chūetsu earthquake
 364 GNSS data are available from the GeoSpatial Authority of Japan (GSI, terras.go.jp).
 365 http://datahouse1.gsi.go.jp/terras/terras_english.html. The North America West Coast data are
 366 available from the UNAVCO data archives (<https://data.unavco.org/archive/gnss/rinex/>). The
 367 South America West Coast data are available from the Centro Sismológico Nacional Universidad
 368 de Chile data archives (<http://gps.csn.uchile.cl/data/>) and Instituto Geografico Nacional Argentino
 369 (<https://www.ign.gov.ar/NuestrasActividades/Geodesia/Ramsac/DescargaRinex>; Piñón et al.,
 370 2018)

371 Ionosonde station NIUE data are available from the DIDBase Web Portal
 372 ([https://lgdc.uml.edu/common/DIDBMonthListForYearAndStation?ursiCode=ND61R&year=20](https://lgdc.uml.edu/common/DIDBMonthListForYearAndStation?ursiCode=ND61R&year=2022)
 373 [22](https://lgdc.uml.edu/common/DIDBMonthListForYearAndStation?ursiCode=ND61R&year=2022)).

374 Figures were plotted by using Python (ver. 3.7, libraries “matplotlib.pyplot”:
 375 [https://matplotlib.org/3.5.0/api/ as_gen/matplotlib.pyplot.html](https://matplotlib.org/3.5.0/api/as_gen/matplotlib.pyplot.html) and “cartopy”:
 376 <https://scitools.org.uk/cartopy/docs/latest/>)
 377


378 References

- 379 1. Astafyeva, E. (2019) Ionospheric detection of natural hazards. *Reviews of Geophysics*
 380 57(4), 1265-1288. [doi.org: 10.1029/2019RG000668](https://doi.org/10.1029/2019RG000668)
- 381 2. Astafyeva, E., Maletckii, B., Mikesell, T. D., Munaibari, E., Ravanelli, M., Coisson, P., et
 382 al. (2022). The 15 January 2022 Hunga Tonga eruption history as inferred from ionospheric
 383 observations. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49, e2022GL098827. [doi.org:](https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL098827)
 384 [10.1029/2022GL098827](https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL098827)
- 385 3. Astafyeva, E., Shalimov, S., Olshanskaya, E., & Lognonné, P. (2013). Ionospheric
 386 response to earthquakes of different magnitudes: Larger quakes perturb the ionosphere
 387 stronger and longer. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40(9), 1675–1681.
 388 <https://doi.org/10.1002/grl.50398>
- 389 4. Calais, E. & Minster, J. B. (1995) GPS detection of ionospheric perturbations following
 390 the January 17, 1994, Northridge earthquake. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 22, 1045–
 391 1048. [doi.org: 10.1029/95GL00168](https://doi.org/10.1029/95GL00168)
- 392 5. Cahyadi, M. N. & Heki, K. (2015) Coseismic ionospheric disturbance of the large strike-
 393 slip earthquakes in North Sumatra in 2012: M_w dependence of the disturbance
 394 amplitudes, *Geophysical Journal International*, V. 200, I. 1, [doi.org: 10.1093/gji/ggu343](https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggu343)
- 395 6. Dautermann, T., Calais, E., & Mattioli, G. S. (2009). Global Positioning System detection
 396 and energy estimation of the ionospheric wave caused by the 13 July 2003 explosion of the
 397 Soufrière Hills Volcano, Montserrat. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 114(B2), B02202.
 398 [doi.org: 10.1029/2008JB005722](https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JB005722)
- 399 7. Emmert, J. T., Drob, D. P., Picone, J. M., Siskind, D. E., Jones, M., Mlynczak, M. G., et
 400 al. (2020). NRLMSISE 2.0: A whole-atmosphere empirical model of temperature and
 401 neutral species densities. *Earth and Space Science*, 8, e2020EA001321. [doi.org:](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020EA001321)
 402 [10.1029/2020EA001321](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020EA001321)
- 403 8. Gusman, A.R. & Roger, J. (2022). Hunga Tonga - Hunga Ha’apai volcano-induced sea
 404 level oscillations and tsunami simulations. GNS Science webpage, [doi.org:](https://doi.org/10.21420/DYKJ-RK41)
 405 [10.21420/DYKJ-RK41](https://doi.org/10.21420/DYKJ-RK41)
- 406 9. Heki, K. (2006) Explosion energy of the 2004 eruption of the Asama Volcano, central
 407 Japan, inferred from ionospheric disturbances, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 33, L14303, [doi:](https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GL026249)
 408 [10.1029/2006GL026249](https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GL026249).
- 409 10. Kundu, B., Senapati, B., Matsushita, A. et al. (2021) Atmospheric wave energy of the 2020
 410 August 4 explosion in Beirut, Lebanon, from ionospheric disturbances. *Sci Rep* 11, 2793.
 411 [doi.org: 10.1038/s41598-021-82355-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-82355-5)
- 412 11. Liu, X., Zhang, Q., Shah, M., & Hong, Z. (2017). Atmospheric- ionospheric disturbances
 413 following the April 2015 Calbuco volcano from GPS and OMI observations. *Advances in*
 414 *Space Research*, 60 (12), 2836–2846. [doi.org: 10.1016/j.asr.2017.07.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2017.07.007)

- 415 12. Maletckii, B., Yasyukevich, Y., & Vesnin, A. (2020). Wave Signatures in Total Electron
416 Content Variations: Filtering Problems. *Remote Sensing*, 12(8), 1340. [doi.org:
417 10.3390/rs12081340](https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12081340)
- 418 13. Maletckii, B. and Astafyeva, E. (2021a) Determining spatio-temporal characteristics of
419 Coseismic Travelling Ionospheric Disturbances (CTID) in near real-time. *Scientific
420 Reports*, 11:20783, [doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-99906-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-99906-5).
- 421 14. Maletckii, B. and Astafyeva, E. (2021b) Near-Real-Time Analysis of Spatio-Temporal
422 Characteristics of Ionospheric Disturbances of Different Origins. *Session SA022, AGU Fall
423 Meeting 2021, 13-17 December 2021, Hybrid, New Orleans, USA*
- 424 15. Manta, F., G. Occhipinti, E. Hill, A. Perttu, B. Taisne (2021) Correlation Between GNSS-
425 TEC and Eruption Magnitude Supports the Use of Ionospheric Sensing to Complement
426 Volcanic Hazard Assessment, *J. Geophys. Res. - Solid Earth*, [doi: 10.1029/2020JB020726](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JB020726)
- 427 16. R. Matoza, D. Lee, J.D. Assink, A.M. Iezzi, D.N. Green, et al. (2022) Atmospheric waves
428 and global seismoacoustic observations of the January 2022 Hunga eruption, Tonga.
429 *Science*, doi:10.1126/science.abo7063
- 430 17. Miyaki, K., Hayakawa, M. & Molchanov, O. A. (2002) The role of gravity waves in the
431 lithosphere - ionosphere coupling, as revealed from the subionospheric LF propagation
432 data. In *Seismo Electromagnetics: Lithosphere - Atmosphere - Ionosphere Coupling*;
433 TERRAPUB: Tokyo
- 434 18. Nakashima, Y., Heki, K., Takeo, A., Cahyadi, M. N., Aditiya, A., & Yoshizawa, K. (2016).
435 Atmospheric resonant oscillations by the 2014 eruption of the Kelud volcano, Indonesia,
436 observed with the ionospheric total electron contents and seismic signals. *Earth and
437 Planetary Science Letters*, 434, 112–116. [doi.org: 10.1016/j.epsl.2015.11.029](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2015.11.029)
- 438 19. Noll, C. E. & System, T. C. D. D. I. (2010) A resource to support scientific analysis using
439 space geodesy. *Adv. Space Res.* 45(12), 1421–1440. [doi.org: 10.1016/j.asr.2010.01.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2010.01.018) .
- 440 20. Poli, P., & Shapiro, N. M. (2022). Rapid characterization of large volcanic eruptions:
441 Measuring the impulse of the Hunga Tonga Ha’apai explosion from teleseismic waves.
442 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49, e2022GL098123. [doi.org: 10.1029/2022GL098123](https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL098123)
- 443 21. RTCM. (2020) Radio Technical Commission for Maritime Services.
444 <https://www.rtcn.org/>
- 445 22. Shults, K., E. Astafyeva and S. Adourian (2016). Ionospheric detection and localization of
446 volcano eruptions on the example of the April 2015 Calbuco events. *J. Geophys. Res. -
447 Space Physics*, V.121, N10, 10,303-10,315, [doi.org: 10.1002/2016JA023382](https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JA023382).
- 448 23. Themens, D. R., Watson, C., Žagar, N., Vasylykevych, S., Elvidge, S., McCaffrey, A., et al.
449 (2022). Global propagation of ionospheric disturbances associated with the 2022 Tonga
450 Volcanic Eruption. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49, e2022GL098158. [doi.org:
451 10.1029/2022GL098158](https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL098158)
- 452 24. Takasu, T. (2013) RTKLIB: An Open Source Program Package for GNSS Positioning.
453 <http://www.rtklib.com>
- 454 25. Wright, C.J., Hindley, N.P., Alexander, M.J. et al. (2022) Surface-to-space atmospheric
455 waves from Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha’apai eruption. *Nature*. [doi.org: 10.1038/s41586-022-
456 05012-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-05012-5)
- 457 26. Zhang, S.-R., et al. (2022) 2022 Tonga Volcanic Eruption Induced Global Propagation of
458 Ionospheric Disturbances via Lamb Waves. *Frontiers in Astronomy and Space Sciences*,
459 8, [doi.org: 10.3389/fspas.2022.871275](https://doi.org/10.3389/fspas.2022.871275)


461 **Figures Captions**

462 **Figure 1.** Scheme of methods developed and implemented in this work. “D1-GNSS-RT” and NRT
 463 TTD methods require Real-Time TEC (can be transferred by RTKlib software (Takasu, 2013) and
 464 RTCM protocol (RTCM, 2020)) and orbits (can be obtained by Ultra-Rapid Orbits provided by
 465 IGS (Noll, 2010)) data. “D1-GNSS-RT” method calculates the instantaneous velocities’ field and
 466 the direction of propagation for the detected disturbances. Based on these results, we compute the
 467 source location. NRT TTD estimates TID velocity and verifies the link with the source location.
 468 Panel (b) shows the difference in parameters between the 1-sec “D1-GNSS-RT” method that was
 469 developed previously Maletckii and Astafyeva (2021a) and 30-sec “D1-GNSS-RT” that was
 470 developed and implemented here for the first time.




471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491

492 **Figure 2.** Geometry of near-field GNSS observations **(a)** and the results of the D1-GNSS-RT
 493 method **(b-f)**. **(a)** The Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha’apai volcano (red star, 175.382W; 20.53S) and
 494 GNSS receivers (yellow dots) network used in this work. The receivers that provide both 30 sec
 495 and 1 sec data are: “CKIS”, “FAA1”, “FTNA”, “LAUT”, “PTVL”, “SAMO”, “SOLO”, “THTG”,
 496 “TONG”, “TOW2”, “TUVA”, “USP1”. The others provide only 30 second data; **(b-d)** The first
 497 instantaneous velocities’ field obtained by the “D1-GNSS-RT”. Gray arrow denotes the velocity
 498 vector of 1000 m/s. The blue arrows correspond to the instantaneous velocities’ field of co-VID;
 499 **(e-f)** the source locations (blue crosses) obtained from the instantaneous velocity vectors.



500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509


510 **Figure 3.** Application of NRT-TTD method to the near-field observations. **(a)** NRT TTD using
 511 30-sec data and the estimated co-VID velocity (black line). Gray vertical line shows the USGS
 512 onset time at 04:15UT. The source is located in the Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha’apai volcano. The
 513 black line was fitted by the newly developed automatic NRT-algorithm. **(b-c)** The two fitting
 514 algorithms that estimate the velocity from the TTD slope: **(b)** the NRT - the brown line, **(c)** the
 515 Quasi-NRT - purple. The blue dots correspond to the first maximums picked in each data series.
 516 The red and the green dots are used for the linear regression by the NRT and the Quasi-NRT
 517 algorithms, respectively.
 518



519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525


Figure 4. **(a)** dTEC/dt variations from a receiver “SAMO” - a satellite R21 LOS, blue-white-red curve - 1-sec data, black curve - 5 second centered smoothed data; **(b, c)** NRT TTD plotted using 1-sec data **(b)** and **(c)** zoom on the near-field dTEC/dt response from 04:00 to 05:30 UT. Gray

526 vertical line denotes the USGS onset time, the circles highlight four different disturbances detected
 527 in the near-field of the HTHH volcano (green - quasi-periodic signature, dark brown - N-shape
 528 ones). The slopes denote the apparent velocities of these four disturbances; **(d)** schematic
 529 representation of multi-eruption scenario and the onset time for each event



532

533 **Figure 5.** Application of NRT-TTD method to the far-field observations of ionospheric response.
 534 **(a,b,c)** the Japanese GNSS network and satellite GPS G07; **(d,e,f)** North American GNSS
 535 receivers and satellite GPS G10; **(g,h,i)** South American GNSS receivers and satellite GPS G10.
 536 The source is located in the Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha’apai volcano. The black lines **(c,f,i)** were
 537 fitted by the automatic NRT-algorithm. The blue dots on panels **(a,b,d,e,g,h)** correspond to the
 538 first maxima of each series. The red and the green dots **(a,b,d,e,g,h)** are used for the linear
 539 regression by the NRT and the Quasi-NRT algorithms, respectively.




540

541

542 **Figure 6.** Application of NRT-TTD fitting technique to the M6.6 Chuetsu earthquake of 16 July
 543 2007 **(a,b,c)** and the Beirut explosion of 4 August 2020 **(d,e,f)**. The blue dots on panels **(b,c,e,f)**
 544 correspond to the first maxima of each series. The red **(b,e)** and the green **(c,f)** dots are used for
 545 the linear regression by the NRT and the Quasi-NRT algorithms, respectively. NRT velocity's

546 slope - the brown line on (b,e), the black line on (a,d); the Quasi-NRT (c,f) - purple, the event
 547 onset time is indicated by a vertical gray line (a,b).



548