

PROJECT ADMINISTRATION DATA SHEET

Project No. C-35-665\* ☒ ORIGINAL ☐ REVISION NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Project Director: Dr. Anton M. Dainty GTRI/~~XXX~~ DATE 12/16/83  
 Sponsor: Air Force Office of Scientific Research School/~~XXX~~ Geo. Sci.

Type Agreement: Amendment A to Grant AFOSR-83-0037

Award Period: From 11/15/83 To 11/14/84 (Performance) 1/14/85 (Reports)

Sponsor Amount:	This Change	Total to Date
Estimated: \$		\$ 49,000
Funded: \$		\$ 49,000

Cost Sharing Amount: \$ N/A Cost Sharing No: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: "Influence of Scattering on Q in the Lithosphere"

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA

1) Sponsor Technical Contact:	OCA Contact	2) Sponsor Admin/Contractual Matters:
<u>Mr. William J. Best, NP</u>	<u>Lynn Boyd</u>	<u>Hugh M. McElroy, PKZB</u>
<u>U.S. Air Force</u>		<u>US Airforce</u>
<u>AFOSR</u>		<u>AFOSR/PKZB</u>
<u>Building 410</u>		<u>Building 410</u>
<u>Bolling AFB, DC 20332</u>		<u>Bolling AFB, DC 20332</u>
<u>(202) 767-4908</u>		<u>(202) 767-4952/PCA</u>

Defense Priority Rating: N/A Military Security Classification: N/A  
 (or) Company/Industrial Proprietary: \_\_\_\_\_

RESTRICTIONS

See Attached AFOSR Supplemental Information Sheet for Additional Requirements.  
 Travel: Foreign travel must have prior approval - Contact OCA in each case. Domestic travel requires sponsor approval where total will exceed greater of \$500 or 125% of approved proposal budget category.  
 Equipment: Title vests with GIT for items costing \$1,000 or less; however, no acquisitions are proposed in budget. See attached Supplemental Sheet (items c & d). See also Article II.

COMMENTS:

New project No. # assigned because AFOSR requires separate accounting for each year of the grant. This is a continuation of C-35-621\*  
Total grant amount now equal to \$85,000.

COPIES TO:

Project Director	Procurement/EES Supply Services	GTRI
Research Administrative Network	Research Security Services	Library
Research Property Management	Reports Coordinator (OCA)	Project File
Accounting	Research Communications (2)	Other <u>NEWTON</u>

SPONSORED PROJECT TERMINATION/CLOSEOUT SHEET

Date 1/24/85

Project No. G-35-665

School/Dept Geo. Sci.

Includes Subproject No.(s) ~~B/A~~ ~~G-35-621~~

Project Director(s) Dr. Anton M. Dainty

GTRI / GIT

Sponsor Air Force Office of Scientific Research

Title "Influence of Scattering on Q in the Lithosphere"

Effective Completion Date: 11/14/84

(Performance) 1/14/85 (Reports)

Grant/Contract Closeout Actions Remaining:

- ☐ None
- ☒ Final Invoice or Final Fiscal Report
- ☐ Closing Documents
- ☒ Final Report of Inventions
- ☒ Govt. Property Inventory & Related Certificate
- ☐ Classified Material Certificate
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Continues Project No. G-35-621

Continued by Project No. \_\_\_\_\_

COPIES TO:

Project Director  
Research Administrative Network  
Research Property Management  
Accounting  
Procurement/EES Supply Services  
Research Security Services  
Reports Coordinator (OCA)  
Legal Services

Library  
GTRI  
Research Communications (2)  
Project File  
Other M. Heyser

A. Jones

G-35-1

R and D Status Report -- 1 December 1983 - 28 February 1984

- (a) ARPA Order 4397, AM No. 3
- (b) Program Code: 3D60
- (c) Contractor: Georgia Tech Research Institute, Atlanta, GA 30332
- (d) Start Date: 15 November 1982
- (e) Expiration Date: 14 November 1984
- (f) Amount: \$85,000
- (g) Contract Number: AFOSR-83-0037
- (h) Principal Investigator: Anton M. Dainty (404) 894-2860
- (i) Program Manager: William J. Best (202) 767-4908
- (j) Title: Influence of Scattering on Q in the Lithosphere

Sponsored by

Advanced Research Projects Agency (DOD)  
ARPA Order No. 4397, AM No. 3  
Monitored by NP under Grant No. AFOSR-83-0037

Signed:

---

Anton M. Dainty  
Principal Investigator  
School of Geophysical Sciences

(a) Progress:

During this recording period, an additional data set was obtained from the United States Geological Survey, consisting of relatively short records ( 10 sec long) of aftershocks of the Miramichi, New Brunswick (Canada) earthquake of January 9, 1982, recorded very close to the epicenter. Using these records in conjunction with longer records already obtained from the Canadians in the same area, we will be able to analyze coda decay and other factors as a function of coda length, which in turn reflects depth of penetration of scattered energy into the lithosphere. Also, we are seeking to refine and confirm results obtained from coda analysis of two earthquakes near Mammoth Lakes, California. These results, reported in the Annual Technical Report, indicate a disparity between the size of the coda relative to the S wave and the coda decay at low frequencies, as interpreted by single scattering. We are reprogramming to take a close look at this situation.

(b) Major Equipment Purchases: Not applicable

(c) Changes in Key Personnel: None

(d) Meetings: None

(e) Problems: None

(f) Deviations from Planned Effort: None

(g) Fiscal Status:

1. Funds Currently Supplied	\$85,000.00
2. Expenditures and Commitments to Date	\$39,123.70
3. Funds Needed to Complete Work	\$45,581.14
4. Estimated Completion Date	14 November 1984

R and D Status Report -- 1 March 1984 - 31 May 1984

- (a) ARPA Order 4397, AM No. 3
- (b) Program Code: 3D60
- (c) Contractor: Georgia Tech Research Institute, Atlanta, GA 30332
- (d) Start Date: 15 November 1982
- (e) Expiration Date: 14 November 1984
- (f) Amount: \$85,000
- (g) Contract Number: AFOSR-83-0037
- (h) Principal Investigator: Anton M. Dainty (404) 894-2860
- (i) Program Manager: William J. Best (202) 767-4908
- (j) Title: Influence of Scattering on Q in the Lithosphere

Sponsored by

Advanced Research Projects Agency (DOD)  
ARPA Order No. 4397, AM No. 3  
Monitored by NP under Grant No. AFOSR-83-0037

Signed:

Anton M. Dainty  
Principal Investigator  
School of Geophysical Sciences

(a) Progress:

During this recording period, data collection of codas of local earthquakes was completed with the acquisition of a set of aftershock records from the Morgan Hill, California, earthquake of April 24, 1984. These aftershocks were recorded by us on equipment of the United States Geological Survey, Menlo Park, California, through the kind offices of Ralph Archuleta. We now have codas of a variety of lengths from Monticello Reservoir, South Carolina, and New Brunswick, Canada, in eastern North America; and from Mammoth Lakes, California, and Morgan Hill, California, in western North America. Our primary focus in analyzing these data, besides the general goal of determining the contribution of scattering to attenuation in the lithosphere, will be to investigate some unexpected results that have arisen in the investigation and generally to compare (non-tectonic) eastern North America and (tectonic) western North America. The two major unexpected results are, first the variation of Q with time in the coda, at least at Monticello Reservoir, South Carolina; and, second, the disparity between coda decay and coda amplitude observed at other sites. Topics to be investigated include the question of whether these effects are observed at other sites, as well as the explanation for them.

(b) Major Equipment Purchases: Not applicable

(c) Changes in Key Personnel: None

(d) Meetings: "Basic Research in the Vela Program 1959-1984", Santa Fe, New Mexico, May 7-9, 1984. Informal presentation of results, discussed application of results to Detection and Yield Estimation of underground nuclear explosions.

(e) Problems: None

(f) Deviations from Planned Effort: None

(g) Fiscal Status:

1. Funds Currently Supplied	\$85,000.00
2. Expenditures and Commitments to Date	\$45,232.96
3. Funds Needed to Complete Work	\$39,796.04
4. Estimated Completion Date	14 November 1984


R and D Status Report -- 1 June 1984 - 31 August 1984

- (a) ARPA Order 4397, AM No. 3
- (b) Program Code: 3D60
- (c) Contractor: Georgia Tech Research Institute, Atlanta, GA 30332
- (d) Start Date: 15 November 1982
- (e) Expiration Date: 14 November 1984
- (f) Amount: \$85,000
- (g) Contract Number: AFOSR-83-0037
- (h) Principal Investigator: Anton M. Dainty (404) 894-2860
- (i) Program Manager: William J. Best (202) 767-4908
- (j) Title: Influence of Scattering on Q in the Lithosphere

Sponsored by

Advanced Research Projects Agency (DOD)  
ARPA Order No. 4397, AM No. 3  
Monitored by NP under Grant No. AFOSR-83-0037

Signed:



Anton M. Dainty  
Principal Investigator  
School of Geophysical Sciences

(a) Progress:

In this reporting period, we have begun to examine codas of local earthquakes from New Brunswick, Canada, and Morgan Hill, California. These codas are being compared to codas from Monticello, South Carolina, and Mammoth Lakes, California, already reported on in the semi-annual report. Preliminary analysis shows that the Morgan Hill records are like the Mammoth Lakes records and the New Brunswick records are like the Monticello records. This indicates that coda characteristics are regional. Specifically, the New Brunswick records show the presence of a crustal "channel" that may be related to the propagation of Lg, although the evidence for this appears at longer coda times than at Monticello.

(b) Major Equipment Purchases: Not applicable

(c) Changes in Key Personnel: None

(d) Meetings: None

(e) Problems: None

(f) Deviations from Planned Effort: None

(g) Fiscal Status:

1. Funds Currently Supplied	¥85,000.00
2. Expenditures and Commitments to Date	¥68,296.94
3. Funds Needed to Complete Work	¥16,703.06
4. Estimated Completion Date	14 November 1984



2-00-66


R and D Status Report -- 1 September 1984 - 14 November 1984

- (a) ARPA Order 4397, AM No. 3
- (b) Program Code: 3D60
- (c) Contractor: Georgia Tech Research Institute, Atlanta, GA 30332
- (d) Start Date: 15 November 1982
- (e) Expiration Date: 14 November 1984
- (f) Amount: \$85,000
- (g) Contract Number: AFOSR-83-0037
- (h) Principal Investigator: Anton M. Dainty (404) 894-2860
- (i) Program Manager: William J. Best (202) 767-4908
- (j) Title: Influence of Scattering on Q in the Lithosphere

Sponsored by

Advanced Research Projects Agency (DOD)  
ARPA Order No. 4397, AM No. 3  
Monitored by NP under Grant No. AFOSR-83-0037

Signed:



Anton M. Dainty  
Principal Investigator  
School of Geophysical Sciences

(a) Progress:

Most of this recording period has been spent drawing together, evaluating, and analysing results obtained over the last two years on studies of the local coda of earthquakes. Our objective has been to analyse scattering in the near-surface of the lithosphere, and specifically its effects on attenuation, by analysing the excitation and decay of codas. Results obtained show that scattering is an important factor in attenuation, certainly in the upper 10 to 15 km in the crust, that the effect is large enough to affect magnitude ( $m_b$ ) estimates, and that the resulting attenuation is frequency independent, which makes it impossible to detect using many methods of measuring attenuation now in use.

(b) Major Equipment Purchases: Not applicable(c) Changes in Key Personnel: None

(d) Meetings: "Workshop on Attenuation Effects on Body Waves", Washington, DC, October 23-24, 1984. Presented results and discussed application to problem of magnitude bias.

(e) Problems: None(f) Deviations from Planned Effort: None(g) Fiscal Status:

1. Funds Currently Supplied	\$85,000.00
2. Expenditures and Commitments to Date	\$83,962.95
3. Funds Needed to Complete Work	\$1,037.05
4. Estimated Completion Date	14 November 1984

SEMI-ANNUAL TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 2 1 ?

1 December 1983 - 31 May 1984

"Influence of Scattering on Q in the Lithosphere"

By

Anton M. Dainty

School of Geophysical Sciences  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Atlanta, Georgia 30332

Principal Investigator: Anton M. Dainty (404) 894-2860

Contract Amount: \$85,000

Contract Termination Date: 14 November 1984

Program Manager: William J. Best (202) 767-4908

Sponsored by

Advanced Research Projects Agency (DOD)

ARPA Order No. 4397, Am No. 3

Monitored by NP Under Grant No. AFOSR-83-0037

Program Code: 3D60

The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the author and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency or the U.S. Government.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

## REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Georgia Tech Research Institute		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Air Force Office of Scientific Research		
6c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Atlanta, GA 30332			7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Bolling Air Force Base Washington, DC 20332		
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER AFOSR-83-0037		
8c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) 1400 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 27709			10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NOS.		
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Investigation of Scattering and Q in the Lithosphere (UNCLASSIFIED)					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Anton M. Dainty					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Semi-Annual Technical		13b. TIME COVERED FROM 83/12/01 TO 84/05/31		14. DATE OF REPORT (Yr., Mo., Day)	
15. PAGE COUNT					
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB. GR.			
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)					
<p>Codas of local earthquakes from Monticello Reservoir, South Carolina, and Mammoth Lakes, California, have been examined to determine scattering parameters and attenuation for the crust in these areas. The backscattering turbidity (or backscattering cross-section per unit volume) and the total coda Q have been determined. In both areas, strong scattering is observed in the near surface crust (upper 10 km), sufficiently strong that multiple scattering is occurring. Because multiple scattering is occurring, coda Q at short times will underestimate Q experienced by a short pulse. At long times, the coda at Monticello indicates the presence of a low-scattering crustal channel within which energy probably spreads horizontally; this channel is either absent or</p> <p>(Continued)</p>					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS <input type="checkbox"/>			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL			22b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code)		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL

more strongly scattering at Mammoth Lakes. Results at both sites indicate that both in the near surface region and in the aforementioned crustal channel, scattering is probably an important contributor to  $Q$  (at least half of the attenuation). The scatterers are probably predominantly forward scattering (such as velocity fluctuations), and in the near surface there are many scatterers of size 50 m and greater.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Technical Report Summary . . . . .	1
2. Long and Short Cudas in California and South Carolina. . . . .	2

## TECHNICAL REPORT SUMMARY

Codas of local earthquakes from Monticello Reservoir, South Carolina, and Mammoth Lakes, California, have been examined to determine scattering parameters and attenuation for the crust in these areas. The backscattering turbidity (or backscattering cross-section per unit volume) and the total coda  $Q$  have been determined. In both areas, strong scattering is observed in the near surface crust (upper 10 km), sufficiently strong that multiple scattering is occurring. Because multiple scattering is occurring, coda  $Q$  at short times will underestimate  $Q$  experienced by a short pulse. At long times, the coda at Monticello indicates the presence of a low-scattering crustal channel within which energy probably spreads horizontally; this channel is either absent or more strongly scattering at Mammoth Lakes. Results at both sites indicate that both in the near surface region and in the aforementioned crustal channel, scattering is probably an important contributor to  $Q$  (at least half of the attenuation). The scatterers are probably predominantly forward scattering (such as velocity fluctuations), and in the near surface there are many scatterers of size 50 m and greater.

## LONG AND SHORT CODAS IN CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CAROLINA

### Introduction

This report is a follow-up report to an earlier study (Dainty and Tie, 1984) in which the local coda of some aftershocks of the May 25 and 27, 1980, earthquake near Mammoth Lakes, California, were analyzed. This analysis indicated that for coda lengths of 10 seconds or less, the scattering implied by the decay of the coda was not consistent with the scattering implied by the amplitude of the coda relative to the amplitude of the direct S wave. Briefly, the scattering implied by the coda amplitude should lead to more rapid decay of the coda than is observed at frequencies around 3 Hz, if the single scattering theory used to analyze the data is correct.

I have examined other local earthquake records to see if the results presented above are correct for these codas. Besides records of length 10 seconds or less, I have analyzed records of substantially longer length to see if the effects are seen at longer times. Different records from Mammoth Lakes (Archuleta et al., 1982), analyzed by a different investigator, and records from Monticello Reservoir, South Carolina (Fletcher, 1982), will be used. These are the records analyzed by Duckworth (1983) and Dainty and Duckworth (1983).

### Theoretical Summary: Single Scattering and Multiple Scattering

The standard theory used to analyze codas is the single scattering theory due to Aki, summarized in Aki and Chouet (1975). This theory has been used in earlier reports. The theory assumes a whole space in which



scatterers are distributed randomly. These scatterers may be approximated by some body of specified geometrical shape or may be defined by their autocorrelation functions. Since an elastic medium has (at least) three independent relevant material constants, two elastic constants and density, the three quantities must be specified, although we expect some correlation between the three quantities. Generally, it has been assumed that only S to S scattering is important, but recent results by Wu and Aki (1984) suggest that S to P scattering could also be important. P to P and P to S scattering would be less important because earthquakes do not generate as much P as S.

Briefly, the theory alluded to implies that at long times the coda power spectrum shall decay with time  $t$  after origin as

$$P_c(\omega, t) = A_b(\omega) t^{-2} \exp(-\omega t/Q) \quad (1)$$

$$A_b(\omega) = P_s(\omega) \cdot \exp(\omega t_s/Q) \cdot 8\pi V \cdot g(\pi, \omega) \cdot t_s^2 \quad (2)$$

$$1/Q = 1/Q_i + 1/Q_s \quad (3)$$

$$1/Q_s = G(\omega) V/\omega \quad (4)$$

$P_s(\omega)$  is the square of the S wave spectrum,  $V$  is the seismic velocity (assumed to be 3.2 km/sec, typical of S waves in the crust, in this study),  $t_s$  is the S travel time,  $Q_i$  is the  $Q$  due to anelasticity, and  $Q_s$  is the  $Q$  due to scattering. The scattering is described by two parameters. The backscattering turbidity  $g(\pi, \omega)$  or backscattering cross section per unit volume describes the strength of backscattering and controls the amplitude of the coda relative to the amplitude of the S wave, as seen in (2). The total turbidity  $G(\omega)$ , or total cross-section

per unit volume, describes the strength of total scattering in all directions and controls the  $Q$  due to scattering through (4). Another parameter that I have calculated is the apparent total turbidity

$$G_a(\omega) = \frac{\omega}{QV} \quad (5)$$

If the intrinsic attenuation can be neglected, the apparent total turbidity is the same as the total turbidity. Generally, in single scattering,

$$G_a(\omega) \geq G(\omega) \geq g(\pi, \omega) \quad (6)$$

So far, the theoretical discussion has assumed that the coda consists of scattered body waves of one type in a whole space. In view of the results to be presented casting doubt on this, some other possibilities must be discussed. The simplest is the case of singly scattered surface waves, rather than body waves, from a near surface source: Equation (1) becomes

$$P_c(\omega, t) = A_s(\omega) t^{-1} \exp(-\omega t/Q) \quad (7)$$

$$A_s(\omega) = P'_s(\omega) \cdot \exp(\omega t'_s/Q) \cdot 2\pi V' \cdot g'(\pi, \omega) \cdot t'_s \quad (8)$$

$$1/Q = 1/Q'_i + G'(\omega)V'/\omega \quad (9)$$

The primed quantities in (8) and (9) indicate that these variables have the same definitions as before, but for surface waves rather than S waves. Another possibility is of two or more singly scattered "channels" for the transmission of energy that appears in the coda--for

example, one channel could be body wave scattering and the other surface wave scattering. Then the coda power spectrum would become

$$P_c(\omega, t) = P_1(\omega, t) + P_2(\omega, t) \quad (10)$$

where  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are the contributions from each channel.

Another important issue is that of multiple scattering as opposed to single scattering. Dainty and Toksöz (1977) demonstrated that in the limit of extreme multiple scattering, seismic energy diffuses. The coda power spectrum for a point, impulsive source in a whole space then becomes (Dainty and Toksöz, 1981):

$$P_c(\omega, t) = E_b(\omega) t^{-3/2} \exp[-3R^2 G(\omega)/(4Vt)] \exp[-\omega t/Q_i] \quad (11)$$

$$\rightarrow E_b(\omega) t^{-3/2} \exp[-\omega t/Q_i], \quad R \rightarrow 0 \quad (12)$$

$$E_b(\omega) = P_s(\omega) \cdot \sqrt{27G^3(\omega)} / (8\sqrt{\pi^3 V^3}) \quad (13)$$

Here  $R$  is the source-receiver distance, taken to be small in (12). Note that (12) is rather similar to (1) or (7) in that it indicates that at a fixed frequency, for short source-receiver distance (the usual experimental situation), the coda power spectrum should decay with time as the product of an inverse power law intermediate between (1) and (7) and an exponential. Thus if an attempt was made to fit equation (1) or (7) to a situation in fact described by equation (12), an apparently good fit would be obtained. However, the interpretation of the parameters would change. In (12), the exponential decay gives the value of  $Q_i$ , the intrinsic attenuation, and not  $Q$  as defined by (3) or (9). In fact,

$$Q_i \geq Q \quad (14)$$

I will assume that the general effect of multiple scattering is to increase the value of  $Q$  measured as compared to that implied by (3) or (9). This will decrease  $G_a(\omega)$  calculated from (5).

In this paper  $g(\pi, \omega)$  has been calculated from (2) or (8), i.e., under the assumption of single scattering. Essentially, this means that  $g(\pi, \omega)$  has been calculated from the ratio of the coda power to the  $S$  wave power, with a (variable) factor. From (13), this ratio should be large for the case of multiple ("strong") scattering, since  $G(\omega)$  will be large; thus large values of  $g(\pi, \omega)$  should be found. Combining this result with the result for  $G_a(\omega)$  just discussed, increasing  $g(\pi, \omega)$  and simultaneously decreasing  $G_a(\omega)$  should be indicative of the onset of multiple scattering.

Other criteria for determining if multiple scattering is occurring have been proposed. Dainty and Toksöz (1981) give

$$1/Q_i \ll GV/\omega \quad (15)$$

as a sufficient but not a necessary condition for multiple scattering. Sato (1977), on the other hand, gives

$$t_m > 1/(GV) \quad (16)$$

as a necessary but not a sufficient condition for multiple scattering, where  $t_m$  is the total length of the coda after origin.

The remaining theoretical question is the characterization of the scatterers, which controls the relationship between  $g(\pi, \omega)$  and  $G(\omega)$ . Previously, it had been hoped that the measurements reported here would answer this question. However, whilst they appear to shed some light on

the subject, it appears that there are too many parameters involved to allow unique interpretations. Briefly, two types of models have been used to characterize the scatterers--either bodies of a specified shape, distributed randomly (e.g., Dainty, 1981), or random fluctuations of the medium described by their autocorrelation (e.g., Wu, 1982). There are some similarities between the various models--if there is a length scale  $a$  associated with the scatterers (the object size if the scatterers are modelled as bodies, or a correlation scale length for random fluctuations), then for wavelengths  $\lambda$  much longer than this length scale the scattering is weak but strongly frequency dependent, increasing as the fourth power of frequency (Rayleigh scattering). The scattered intensity increases until  $a/\lambda \sim 1$ . For media with sharp boundaries, backscattering is approximately frequency independent for  $a/\lambda \gg 1$  (geometrical scattering; Dainty, 1984), or declines rapidly if there are no sharp boundaries. Thus, if a variety of length scales of scatterers are present in the earth, the length scales that are the same order of magnitude of the wavelength or greater are likely to be important.

An important area of difference between the models, however, lies in the predicted dependence of the scattered intensity on the angle between the original wave and the scattered wave. Almost all possibilities seem to be allowed, including isotropic scattering (spheres at high frequency), strong forward scattering (acoustic velocity fluctuations at high frequency; Dainty, 1984), or strong backscattering (impedance fluctuations; Wu and Aki, 1984). At any given frequency, the angular dependence of scattering controls the ratio of the back-

scattering turbidity  $g(\pi, \omega)$  to the total turbidity  $G(\omega)$ . For the case of isotropic scattering

$$g(\pi, \omega)/G(\omega) = 1/(4\pi) \sim 10\% \quad (17)$$

Ratios of  $g(\pi, \omega)$  to  $G(\omega)$  substantially less than 0.1 (10%) would indicate a medium that predominantly scatters in the forward direction; Dainty (1984), for an acoustic medium with velocity fluctuations at high frequencies, obtains

$$g(\pi, \omega)/G(\omega) = 1/(56\pi) \sim 1\% \quad (18)$$

Likewise, ratios of  $g(\pi, \omega)$  to  $G(\omega)$  substantially greater than 0.1 would indicate a predominantly backscattering medium. Wu and Aki (1984) suggest that an elastic medium with impedance fluctuations would have these properties.

### Analysis and Results

The data used in this paper are mainly those of Duckworth (1983), with data from Dainty and Tie (1984) used for comparison purposes. Analysis methods are given in Duckworth (1983) and Dainty and Duckworth (1983). Briefly, codas are analyzed by determining the power spectrum as a function of time in a moving window 1.28 sec long for the results of Duckworth (1983), or 0.64 sec for the results of Dainty and Tie (1984). The power spectra are averaged over octave bands and then fitted as a function of time at a specified center frequency to equation (1) or equation (7) to obtain  $Q$  and  $A_b$  or  $A_s$ . Then equations (5) and (2) or (8) as appropriate were used to calculate  $G_a(\omega)$  and  $g(\pi, \omega)$ . Further, following Duckworth (1983), the coda was split into two time

sections: times less than 10 seconds after origin and times greater than 10 seconds. This followed visual examination of plots of the Monticello, South Carolina, codas as power at a frequency as a function of time. There appeared to be a change in the decay rate of the coda at about 10 seconds after origin, and separate fits were made to examine this, both on the Monticello, South Carolina, records and the Mammoth Lakes, California, records.

The records used are digital records used by Fletcher (1982) at Monticello Reservoir, South Carolina, and by Archuleta et al. (1982) at Mammoth Lakes. The digital recordings were kindly supplied by Paul Spudich of the United States Geological Survey. The seismograms are sampled at a rate of 200 samples per second with a 12 bit sample. The antialiasing filter has a corner of 50 Hz; analysis has been limited to frequencies less than this. The events and the stations used in this study are shown in Figures 1 and 2. Table 1 indicates which events and stations were used in such analysis.

Results of the analysis are shown in Figures 3 through 6. For each seismogram analyzed, both equation (1) and equation (7) were fit. The results from equation (1) will be called the "spherical" case and the results from equation (7) the "cylindrical" case. Figures 3 through 6 show average values for both  $G_a(\omega)$  and  $g(\pi, \omega)$  for each fit at Mammoth and Monticello for long (>10 sec) and short (<10 sec) codas. Note that results from the "spherical" case usually give lower numerical values than results from the cylindrical case, but the general trend of the data, and the relative values of  $G_a(\omega)$  and  $g(\pi, \omega)$  are similar. Earlier results of Dainty and Tie (1984) using different events and a shorter

Table 1a. Locations of earthquakes and recording stations at Monticello, South Carolina.

Event/Station	"S" Time	Range	Location	
1271000			34°20.03'N	081°19.62'W
DUC	0.68	2.2	34°20.07'N	081°21.06'W
DON	1.05	3.5	34°21.42'N	081°21.20'W
LKS	0.89	3.0	34°19.95'N	081°17.69'W
1320218			NOT POSSIBLE	
JAB	1.66	5.8	34°22.28'N	081°19.47'W
1281119			34°20.70'N	081°20.81'W
JAB	1.31	4.6		
1302328			34°20.49'N	081°20.65'W
SNK	0.56	1.8	34°20.29'N	081°19.54'W
JAB	1.19	3.8		
LKS	1.38	4.7		
1310603			34°18.50'N	081°20.50'W
SNK	1.05	3.7		
LKS	1.48	5.2		
JAB	2.00	7.0		
1281831			NOT POSSIBLE	
JAB	1.02	3.57		



Table 1b. Locations of earthquakes and recording stations at Mammoth Lakes, California.

Event/Station	"S" Time	Range	Location	
1571941			37°32.91'N	118°52.53'W
CBR	5.50	15.2	37°40.75'N	118°49.51'W
TOM	6.11	18.0	37°33.05'N	118°40.32'W
LKM	5.97	17.3	37°41.80'N	118°56.13'W
1592317			37°37.50'N	118°52.52'W
HCF	2.38	3.0	37°38.51'N	118°50.98'W
FIS	2.58	4.2	37°36.84'N	118°49.82'W
CBR	3.60	7.5		
LKM	3.73	9.6		
MGE	4.03	10.6	37°33.67'N	118°47.22'W
LAK	5.30	13.1	37°38.49'N	118°43.70'W
TOM	6.78	19.7		
ROC	6.71	19.8	37°29.78'N	118°43.16'W




Figure 1. Recording stations and epicenters at Monticello Reservoir, South Carolina. Stations - Δ, epicenters - \*




Figure 2. Recording stations and epicenters, Mammoth Lakes, California. Stations -  $\Delta$ , epicenters - \*. Outline of Long Valley Caldera and major faults shown.




Figure 3. Total apparent turbidity ( $G_a$ ) and backscattering turbidity ( $g(\pi, \omega)$ ) as a function of frequency, Monticello, SC, for codas less than 10 seconds long. Open symbols, spherical spreading assumed, closed symbols, cylindrical spreading assumed. Circles are  $G_a$ , triangles are  $g(\pi, \omega)$ .




Figure 4. Total apparent turbidity and backscattering turbidity as a function of frequency, Monticello, SC, for codas more than 10 seconds long. Symbols as for Figure 3.




Figure 5. Total apparent turbidity and backscattering turbidity, Mammoth Lakes, CA, for codas less than 10 seconds long. Symbols as for Figure 3, plus: open squares, total apparent turbidity from Dainty and Tie (1984); open hexagons, backscattering turbidity, Dainty and Tie (1984).




Figure 6. Total apparent turbidity and backscattering turbidity, Mammoth Lakes, CA, for codas more than 10 seconds long. Symbols as for Figure 3.

window are shown in Figure 5 for comparison; these earlier results refer to a spherical case, short coda, and were obtained from Mammoth seismograms. These results will be discussed in the next section.

Sometimes, negative values of  $Q$  were obtained when fitting equation (1), and less frequently equation (7). This indicates that the coda power at that frequency is decaying less rapidly than  $t^{-2}$  if equation (1) is being fit, or less rapidly than  $t^{-1}$  if equation (7) is being fit. Such values have been counted as  $Q \rightarrow \infty$  ( $G_a(\omega) \rightarrow 0$ ) in the averages. In the log-log plots, values of  $G_a(\omega)$  corresponding to this case in the average have been plotted at the lowest scale values.

### Discussion

The first question that will be addressed is the issue of spherical (body wave) spreading as opposed to cylindrical (surface wave) spreading of the scattered waves in the coda. In Figures 3 through 6, the results of spherical spreading fits are shown as open symbols and the results of cylindrical spreading fits as closed symbols. It appears that in most cases, an equally good fit can be obtained using either assumption. The major exception to this statement is seen in Figure 4, Monticello codas more than 10 seconds long, where negative values of  $Q$  are obtained for frequencies near 10 Hz for spherical spreading fits. This suggests that cylindrical spreading along a "channel" is responsible for the coda at Monticello after 10 seconds. Because the effect is noticeable at times as short as 10 seconds, the channel must exist in the crust within about 15 km of the surface, since the scattered energy must get from a shallow ( $\sim 1$  km deep) source to the scatterers and back to the surface receiver in as little as 10 seconds.



It is clear from the results obtained and shown in Figures 3 through 6 that multiple scattering is occurring at frequencies less than about 20 Hz in all cases except the aforementioned Monticello codas at times longer than 10 seconds. For all these cases there is a rise of the backscattering turbidity,  $g(\pi, \omega)$  for frequencies less than 20 Hz, without a corresponding rise in  $G_a(\omega)$ . Indeed, in the case of Mammoth Lakes (Figures 5 and 6),  $g(\pi, \omega)$  is greater than  $G_a(\omega)$  for the lowest frequency studied, 3 Hz. This violates equation (6) severely, and is not possible under the assumption of single scattering. A similar result was obtained by Andrews (1982). Furthermore, in the case of Mammoth Lakes the apparent total turbidity declines by at least a factor of two at 3 Hz, suggesting that at least half of the decay at higher frequencies is due to scattering. The case of Monticello codas at times longer than 10 seconds, however, seems to fit the single scattering theory well, obeying condition (16).

The nature of the scatterers may be partly determined by the data presented here. Basically, the approach is to compare the relative values of  $g(\pi, \omega)$  and  $G_a(\omega)$ . Consider first Figure 4, the data from Monticello for codas longer than 10 seconds. The backscattering turbidity  $g(\pi, \omega)$  and the apparent total turbidity  $G_a(\omega)$  show an excellent correlation with each other. When the apparent total turbidity decreases around 10 Hz, so does the backscattering turbidity. This suggests that the apparent total turbidity is mainly due to scattering and thus a close approximation to the true total turbidity  $G(\omega)$ . The value of the backscattering turbidity is about 1%, or less, than the total turbidity, which indicates a medium that mainly forward and/or

side scatters, such as a velocity fluctuation (Dainty, 1984; Wu and Aki, 1984).

The other cases examined (Figures 3, 5, and 6) are not so easy to interpret for two reasons. One is the effect of multiple scattering already noted, preventing a measure of  $g(\pi, \omega)$  and  $G(\omega)$ . This is the most serious difficulty at low frequency. At high frequencies, we note from Figure 7 that the backscattering turbidity  $g(\pi, \omega)$  has the same behavior for all three cases, quite distinct from the Monticello codas longer than 10 seconds. From Figure 7, however, the apparent total turbidity,  $G_a(\omega)$ , at Mammoth Lakes (both cases) seems to drop at frequencies above 20 Hz. This may be due to contamination by noise, which would tend to make the coda decay seem less than it really is, without affecting the determination of the backscattering turbidity  $g(\pi, \omega)$ , as suggested by Figures 7 and 8. In support of this, note (Andrews, 1984, personal communication) that there is very little energy in the Mammoth Lakes sources above 20 Hz.

If in fact the cases of the Monticello codas less than 10 seconds long and the Mammoth Lakes codas (both coda lengths) are similar, as suggested by Figure 8, we may compare the two Monticello cases of codas less than 10 seconds long (Figure 3) and greater than 10 seconds long (Figure 4). Figures 7 and 8 may also be used. We see that both  $g(\pi, \omega)$  and  $G_a(\omega)$  are a factor of 5 to 10 larger for the short codas as compared to long codas for frequencies greater than 20 Hz. This suggests that the channel in which short coda energy propagates is similar to that for long codas in its scattering properties, but scatters more strongly. At frequencies below 20 Hz, little can be said. It is possible, through




Figure 7. Total apparent turbidity, cylindrical spreading assumed. Circles, data from Monticello, SC, triangles, data from Mammoth Lakes, CA. Closed symbols, data from codas more than 10 seconds long, open symbols, data from codas less than 10 seconds long.




Figure 8. Backscattering turbidity, cylindrical spreading assumed. Symbols as for Figure 7.

equation (15), for the scattering properties at low frequencies to be the same as those at high frequencies, and yet for there to be multiple scattering at low frequencies ( $<20$  Hz) and not at high frequencies ( $>20$  Hz), if  $Q_i$  is around 1000. However, this is the approximate value of the total  $Q$  at high frequency ( $>20$  Hz), leaving no room for a scattering contribution. Accordingly, it seems more likely that there is a group of scatterers of size 50 m and larger causing the increased scattering implied by the rise in  $g(\pi, \omega)$  seen for codas of less than 10 seconds length at Monticello.

Finally, what is the nature of the difference in coda observed before and after 10 seconds at Monticello, South Carolina? I have interpreted this in terms of equation (10), i.e., as two different regions of the crust which scatter differently. Note that if one channel has high scattering, it will tend to dominate at short times because  $g(\pi, \omega)$ , controlling the excitation, is large, but will be negligible at long times because  $G(\omega)$ , controlling the decay, is large. Thus the short time ( $<10$  sec) coda shows the stronger scattering. Since this coda occurs immediately after the S wave, and at Mammoth Lakes does not appear to be dependent on focal depth (Tie, personal communication), I suspect that it is near surface, spherical(?) scattering. The long coda ( $>10$  sec) may represent cylindrical(?) propagation in a crustal "channel", possibly at somewhat deeper depths (10 to 15 km?).

From Figure 8 especially, it seems that there is little difference between the codas at Mammoth Lakes, both long and short, and the short ( $<10$  sec) coda at Monticello. This indicates that the upper crust is rather similar at these two tectonically very different sites. However,

at times greater than 10 seconds the Monticello coda shows evidence of much weaker scattering than at times less than 10 seconds, whereas the Mammoth Lakes data show little if any significant difference between codas in the two time ranges (Figure 8). Either the crustal low-scattering channel seen at Monticello is not present at Mammoth Lakes (the most likely conclusion) or it scatters as strongly as the near-surface channel. Because propagation in the crustal low-scattering channel is suspected to be "cylindrical", i.e., confined to the horizontal direction, it may be the same channel as that used by Lg. If this is true, the results obtained have predicted that Lg would propagate more efficiently at Monticello than at Mammoth Lakes, a prediction that is certainly true for the wider regions in which these areas are located (Nuttli, 1973). Further, the Q measured from long time codas would be representative of Lg Q (Mitchell and Nuttli, 1983).

#### Acknowledgment

Paul Spudich of the U.S. Geological Survey, Menlo Park, kindly supplied the records used in this study.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aki, K., and B. Chouet (1975). Origin of coda waves: source, attenuation and scattering effects. J. Geophys. Res., 80, 3322.
- Andrews, D. J. (1982). Shear wave and coda attenuation of two aftershocks at Mammoth Lakes, California. EOS, 63, 1029.
- Archuleta, R. J., E. Cranswick, C. Mueller, and P. Spudich (1982). Source parameters of the 1980 Mammoth Lakes, California, earthquake sequence. J. Geophys. Res., 87, 4595.
- Dainty, A. M. (1981). A scattering model to explain seismic Q observations in the lithosphere between 1 and 30 Hz. Geophys. Res. Lett., 8, 1126.
- Dainty, A. M. (1984). High frequency acoustic backscattering and seismic attenuation. J. Geophys. Res., 89, 3172.
- Dainty, A. M., and R. M. Duckworth (1983). Observations of coda Q for the crust near Mammoth Lakes, California, and Monticello, South Carolina. Semi-Annual Technical Report, Contract AFOSR-83-0037, p. 4.
- Dainty, A. M., and A. Tie (1984). Investigation of backscattering and coda decay for shallow earthquakes at Mammoth Lakes, California. Annual Technical Report, Contract AFOSR-83-0037, p. 3.
- Dainty, A. M., and M. N. Toksoz (1977). Elastic wave propagation in a highly scattering medium--a diffusion approach. J. Geophys., 43, 375.
- Dainty, A. M., and M. N. Toksoz (1981). Seismic codas on the earth and moon: a comparison. Phys. Earth Planet. Int., 26, 250.
- Duckworth, R. M. (1983). Q estimates from local coda waves. M.S. Thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology.
- Fletcher, J. B. (1982). A comparison between the tectonic stress measured in situ and stress parameters from induced seismicity at Monticello Reservoir, South Carolina. J. Geophys. Res., 87, 6031.
- Mitchell, B. J., and O. W. Nuttli (1983). Attenuation of seismic waves at regional distances. Semi-Annual Report, Contract F49620-83-C-0015.
- Nuttli, O. W. (1973). Seismic wave attenuation and magnitude relations for eastern North America. J. Geophys. Res., 78, 876.
- Sato, H. (1977). Energy propagation including scattering effects single isotropic scattering approximation. J. Phys. Earth, 25, 27.

- Wu, R.-S. (1982). Attenuation of short period seismic waves due to scattering. Geophys. Res. Lett., 9, 9.
- Wu, R.-S., and K. Aki (1984). Scattering of random waves by a random medium and small scale inhomogeneities in the lithosphere. Annual Technical Report, Contract F49620-82-K-0004.



6-21

FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT

15 November 1982 - 14 November 1984

"Influence of Scattering on Q in the Lithosphere"

By

Anton M. Dainty, Robert M. Duckworth, and An Tie

School of Geophysical Sciences  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Atlanta, Georgia 30332

Principal Investigator: Anton M. Dainty (404) 894-2860

Contract Amount: \$85,000

Contract Termination Date: 14 November 1984

Program Manager: William J. Best (202) 767-4908

Sponsored by:

Advanced Research Projects Agency (DOD)  
ARPA Order No. 4397, Am. No. 3  
Monitored by NP under Grant No. AFOSR-83-0037  
Program Code: 3D60

The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency or the U.S. Government.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

## REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Georgia Tech Research Institute		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Air Force Office of Scientific Research		
6c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Atlanta, GA 30332			7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Bolling Air Force Base Washington, DC 20332		
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER AFOSR-83-0037		
8c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) 1400 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 27709			10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NOS.		
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Investigation of Scattering and Q in the Lithosphere					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Anton M. Dainty, Robert M. Duckworth, and An Tie					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final Technical		13b. TIME COVERED FROM 11/15/82 TO 11/14/84		14. DATE OF REPORT (Yr., Mo., Day)	
15. PAGE COUNT					
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB. GR.			
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)					
<p>This project examined the contribution of scattering to the attenuation of short pulses within the crust. Coda decay and excitation for local events were examined at Mammoth Lakes and Morgan Hill, California; Monticello, South Carolina; and New Brunswick, Canada, in the frequency range 3-50 Hz. For short times (less than 10 seconds), the total turbidity determined from coda decay was about <math>0.1 \text{ km}^{-1}</math> for all regions, applying a magnitude bias of 0.2 in <math>m_p</math> if 10 km of such material is traversed. Since the total turbidity is independent of frequency, implying geometrical scattering, this would not be detectable by spectral ratio methods. The backscattering turbidity determined from coda excitation at short times indicates strong scattering in the upper crust, especially for frequencies</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Continued on reverse)</p>					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS <input type="checkbox"/>			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL		22b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code)		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Technical Report Summary. . . . .	iii
2. Influence of Scattering on Q in the Lithosphere -- Anton M. Dainty, Robert M. Duckworth, and An Tie . . . . .	1
3. Appendix 1: Observations of Coda Q for the Crust Near Mammoth Lakes, California, and Monticello, South Carolina -- Robert M. Duckworth and Anton M. Dainty. . . . .	22
4. Appendix 2: High Frequency Acoustic Backscattering and Seismic Attenuation -- Anton M. Dainty . . . . .	59

## TECHNICAL REPORT SUMMARY

This project examined the contribution of scattering to the attenuation of short pulses within the crust. Coda decay and excitation for local events were examined at Mammoth Lakes and Morgan Hill, California; Monticello, South Carolina; and New Brunswick, Canada, in the frequency range 3-50 Hz. For short times (less than 10 seconds), the total turbidity determined from coda decay was about  $0.1 \text{ km}^{-1}$  for all regions, applying a magnitude bias of 0.2 in  $m_b$  if 10 km of such material is traversed. Since the total turbidity is independent of frequency, implying geometrical scattering, this would not be detectable by spectral ratio methods. The backscattering turbidity determined from coda excitation at short times indicates strong scattering in the upper crust, especially for frequencies in the 3-10 Hz range. At times longer than 10-15 seconds for the codas from the eastern North American regions, Monticello and New Brunswick, the coda energy appeared to be channeled into a horizontally propagating mode such as Lg. The total turbidity for this portion of the coda was lower than for the short codas, about  $0.01 \text{ km}^{-1}$ , indicating less scattering, a result born out by the backscattering turbidity. Codas from California, however, did not show this phenomenon, indicating either that this mode is not present or that it is more strongly scattered. This result indicates that attenuation for Lg can be estimated from the coda after 10 seconds, as proposed by other workers. All of the scattering observed in this study occurs in the crust; since in situations where single scattering occurs the

backscattering turbidity is about 1% of the total turbidity, velocity fluctuations may be responsible. Multiple scattering occurred in the short codas at frequencies around 3 Hz.

# INFLUENCE OF SCATTERING ON Q IN THE LITHOSPHERE

By

Anton M. Dainty, Robert M. Duckworth, and An Tie

## Introduction

If accurate assessments are to be made of the size and nature of a seismic event (explosion or earthquake), we must have a good understanding of the changes in amplitude and waveform of seismic waves as they travel from the source to a more or less distant receiver. Conventionally, this problem has been divided into two parts: "geometrical spreading" and "attenuation". These terms derive from a combination of theoretical considerations of idealised problems (ray theory in homogeneous, isotropic--at least piecewise--media) and some simple experimental observations showing that in real media a certain amount of seismic energy is apparently lost, perhaps to heat, compared to ray theory calculations. Anything that can be fitted into the theory of wave propagation in ideal, elastic media is usually called "geometrical spreading", while anything that can be described as loss of energy from the seismic wavefield is usually called "attenuation". In the simplest cases, the effect of geometrical spreading on amplitude often has the form of a frequency independent power law (e.g.,  $I/R$  for spherical spreading), whereas the effect of attenuation on amplitude is described by a frequency dependent exponential law ( $\exp[-\pi f R/QV]$ , where  $Q$  is the quality factor and  $V$  is the wave velocity).

The real media encountered in the earth differ from ideal homogeneous elastic media in several ways. One is the phenomenon of conver-

sion of the elastic energy of the seismic wavefield to heat mentioned above. Another is the presence of inhomogeneity of the elastic parameters and the density, probably on all linear scales. Some of the effects of the large scale inhomogeneity can be included in geometrical spreading explicitly--for example, the depth dependent inhomogeneity commonly observed in the earth. However, much of the inhomogeneity is too complex to be handled by deterministic methods and has to be considered as producing random scattering, whose effects can only be calculated as a statistical average. In considering these effects, a difficulty emerges. Whilst conceptually the effect of scattering is geometrical spreading, since energy does not leave the total seismic wavefield, operationally the effect of scattering may in part be like that of attenuation. For example, if a pulse confined in time propagates through a scattering medium, seismic energy will be scattered out of the time frame containing the pulse. If amplitude measurements are made only in the time frame containing the pulse, a common procedure, the amplitude will appear to have attenuated with an exponential law as  $\exp[-GR/2]$ , where  $G$  is a parameter known as the total turbidity, or the total scattering cross-section per unit volume.

In the work reported on here, we have endeavored to find the attenuation effect due to scattering in the lithosphere of the earth at high frequencies (above 1 Hz) in the sense described above. Since sources of particular interest (explosions) and receivers are located near the surface of the earth, all seismic waves encounter this environment; for regional phases this is the only environment encountered. Scattering has been assessed by examination of the coda of local earthquakes.

Since the coda consists of backscattered energy, we have separately assessed the backscattering turbidity (or backscattering cross-section per unit volume) determined from the size of the coda relative to the direct S wave and the total quality factor Q, expressed as an apparent total turbidity, determined from the coda decay rate. We have done this for two regions of California--Mammoth Lakes and Morgan Hill--and two regions in eastern North America--Monticello, South Carolina, and New Brunswick, Canada.

### Theoretical Summary

In this section we will discuss, in order, the characterisation of scatterers and scattering, attenuation of a short pulse due to scattering, and the theory of local coda. Part of this material is covered in earlier reports submitted under this grant and included as Appendices 1 and 2--references will be made to the Appendices as appropriate.

The simplest case of scattering occurs when there is only one scatterer of prescribed shape. Whilst the case of scattering in an elastic medium has recently been treated by Wu and Aki (1984), many useful ideas about scattering can be illustrated by simpler acoustic cases. Let us consider a sound wave in a uniform acoustic medium of amplitude  $A_I$  and frequency  $f$  incident on a body of different acoustic properties located at the origin of spherical polar coordinate  $R, \theta, \phi$ . At large distances from the body the amplitude of the scattered sound wave  $A_S$  will be given by (Clay and Medwin, 1977):

$$A_S^2 = A_I^2 \cdot \sigma(\theta, \phi, f) \cdot (1/R^2) \quad (1)$$



This indicates that far away from the scattering body the body appears as a point source of magnitude  $A_I \sqrt{\sigma(\theta, \phi, f)}$ , with an angular dependence of radiation controlled by the quantity  $\sigma(\theta, \phi, f)$  known as the differential cross-section. An important special case is  $\theta = \pi$  (backscattering in the strict sense), then  $\sigma = \sigma_b(f)$ , the backscattering cross-section. Figure 1 shows  $\sigma_b$  for a rigid, fixed sphere in an acoustic medium. An important feature of Figure 1 is the division of scattering into two types. At low frequencies, the backscattering cross section increases strongly (as  $f^4$ ) with frequency (Rayleigh scattering) as long as the radius of the sphere is appreciably less than the wavelength. Geometrical scattering occurs at higher frequencies when the wavelength is shorter than the radius of the sphere. Under these conditions, the backscattering cross-section for geometrical scatter is larger than for Rayleigh scatter, but independent of frequency. Also, for both cases, the backscattering cross-section is proportional to the physical cross-section. These results taken together indicate that if a variety of scatterers of different sizes are insonified by a sound wave of a given wavelength, the larger scatterers that are in the geometrical scattering regime will dominate, other things being equal.

If there are  $N$  scatterers per unit volume, the differential cross-section per unit volume, or differential turbidity, is

$$g(\theta, \phi, f) = N\sigma(\theta, \phi, f) \quad (2)$$

The energy scattered in direction  $\theta, \phi$  from a small volume  $\Delta V$  is the

$$A_S^2 = A_I^2 g(\theta, \phi, f) \cdot \Delta V / R^2 \quad (3)$$




Figure 1. Backscattering Function For a Rigid, Fixed, Sphere of Radius  $a$ . Derived from Stenzel (1938), (Clay and Medwin, 1977).

This formulation leads to a second method of describing scatterers, in terms of a random medium. Chernov (1960), using results from earlier workers, showed that if an acoustic medium contained velocity or density fluctuations ("scatterers"), only a knowledge of the autocorrelation of these fluctuations is necessary to calculate  $g(\theta, \phi, f)$ .

To apply (3) to the attenuation of a short pulse, note that scattered energy may be effectively lost from the pulse. In the discussion that follows, the pulse will be discussed in terms of its Fourier components. Energy deflected at small angles to the original direction of travel (forward scatter) will not be lost, however; Sato (1982) suggests that most energy scattered at angles of  $30^\circ$  or less is included in the original pulse, causing fluctuations of amplitude and phase. The total loss of intensity from a wave encountering a volume  $\Delta V$  of scatterers can be found by enclosing the volume in a sphere of radius  $R$  and integrating the scattered intensity given by (3) over the surface of the sphere, excluding energy scattered at angle  $\theta$  less than  $\theta_c \sim 30^\circ$ , as discussed above. Here  $\theta = 0$  is taken as the direction of propagation of the incident wave. Then the intensity loss

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta I_I &= \Delta(A_I^2) = -A_I^2 \cdot \Delta V \cdot \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \int_{\theta_c}^{\pi} d\theta \cdot \sin\theta \cdot g(\theta, \phi, f) \\ &= -I_I \cdot \Delta V \cdot G(f) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

In (4) the  $I$ 's represent intensity and  $G(f)$  is known as the total turbidity. Using (2), we may also define

$$\sigma_t(f) = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{\theta_c}^{\pi} d\theta \cdot \sin\theta \cdot \sigma(\theta, \phi, f) , \quad (5)$$

the total scattering cross-section.

If  $\Delta V$  in (4) is taken as a slab consisting of a unit area face in the plane of the wavefront and a side  $\Delta x$  perpendicular to the wavefront

$$\Delta I_I = -G(f) \cdot I_I \cdot \Delta x \quad (6)$$

If we consider the wave to propagate through a scattering medium that may be split up into such slabs, (6) can be integrated (Wu, 1982) to obtain

$$I_I = I_0 \exp[-G(f)x] \quad (7)$$

This may be expressed formally in terms of a scattering  $Q$ ,  $Q_s$ , if  $Q_s$  is defined by

$$I_I = I_0 \exp[-2\pi f x / (Q_s C)] \quad (8)$$

where  $C$  is the sound velocity. Then

$$1/Q_s = G(f)C/(2\pi f) \quad (9)$$

If the medium also attenuates anelastically, parameterised by an intrinsic  $Q$ ,  $Q_I$ , then the total  $Q$  will be given by (Dainty, 1981)

$$1/Q = 1/Q_I + 1/Q_s \quad (10)$$

$$= 1/Q_I + G(f)C/(2\pi f) \quad (11)$$

The frequency dependence expected for  $Q_s$  may be deduced from the results presented earlier for a rigid, immovable sphere. For low frequencies Rayleigh scattering occurs; generally,  $G(f)$  has a similar frequency dependence as  $g(\pi, f)$ , that is to say,  $G(f)$  increases with

frequency as  $f^4$  leading to  $Q_s \propto 1/f^3$ . For high frequencies, the wavelength will be short and geometrical scattering may occur. Then  $G(f)$  will be independent of frequency and  $Q_s \propto f$ . Dainty (1981) has examined two cases of shear wave  $Q$  in which this may be true for frequencies above 1 Hz in the lithosphere. Dainty (1984) and Wu (1982) discuss the frequency dependence expected for  $Q_s$  when the scattering medium is characterised as a random medium rather than by discrete scatterers. Dainty (1984; included as Appendix 2 of this report) demonstrated that if there is a length scale associated with the random medium, and discontinuities within the medium, then at high frequencies (wavelength shorter than the length scale) the frequency dependence of  $g(\theta, \phi, f)$  and  $G(f)$  will be the same as that for geometrical scattering, i.e., independent of frequency.

The theory presented so far is for the acoustic case. Wu and Aki (1984) have presented results for the elastic case. They find that, in addition to P to P and S to S scattering, which are analogous to acoustic scattering, there is also P to S and S to P scattering ("mode conversion"). However, there are no backscattered mode conversions (i.e., scattered back directly along the ray path). P to P and S to S scattering is similar to acoustic scattering if the random medium consists of velocity fluctuations in that, at high frequencies, most of the energy is scattered forward. However, if the random medium consists of impedance fluctuations, most of the energy is backscattered at high frequencies.

In this report, we shall be dealing with scattered seismic waves that form the coda of local earthquakes. These waves arrive after the

latest direct arrivals, are incoherent between components, and are believed to be either backscattered surface waves or backscattered S waves (Aki and Chouet, 1975). The geometry of the backscattered paths considered in this model is shown in Figure 2. If times are long enough the source and receiver may be considered to be coincident. The source pulse is considered to be short and equivalent to the S wave pulse. Only single scattering is considered. The theory for this case is given in Aki and Chouet (1975) and Appendix 1 attached to this report. For S to S scattering in a medium of average velocity  $V$  (three dimensional spreading), the power spectrum as a function of time  $t$  is given by:

$$P(f,t) = A_b(f)t^{-2} \exp[-2\pi ft/Q] \quad (12)$$

$$A_b(f) = S^2(f) \cdot \exp[2\pi ft_s/Q] \cdot 8\pi V \cdot g(\pi,f) \cdot t_s^2 \quad (13)$$

$S(f)$  is the Fourier transform of the S wave pulse,  $t_s$  is the travel time of the direct S wave,  $g(\pi,f)$  is the S to S backscattering turbidity and  $Q$  is given by (10) or (11). For the case of surface wave scattering (two dimensional spreading),

$$P(f,t) = A_s(f)t^{-1} \exp[-2\pi ft/Q'] \quad (14)$$

$$A_s(f) = [S'(f)]^2 \cdot \exp[2\pi ft'_s/Q'] \cdot 2\pi V' \cdot g'(\pi,f) \cdot t'_s \quad (15)$$

The primed variables in (14) and (15) have the same definitions as before, but for surface waves rather than for S waves. The results discussed in this report will be interpreted using (12) and (14).




Figure 2. Ray path geometry for coda waves (three-dimensional spreading)

### Summary of Analysis and Results

The basic data base consists of digital seismograms of local earthquakes. Five sets of seismograms were available. Four of these sets were taken by the United States Geological Survey, or using their equipment, and consist of sampled time series of three component data with a sampling interval of 0.005 sec. These sets were taken at Mammoth Lakes, California; Morgan Hill, California; Monticello, South Carolina; and New Brunswick, Canada. The fifth set consists of digital seismograms taken by the Eastern Canadian Network, McKendrick Lake Station, vertical component only, recorded at a sampling interval of 60 samples per second. Procedures for analysing the data according to equations (12) or (14) have been presented in Duckworth and Dainty (1983), included in this report as Appendix 1. Briefly, one component of the seismogram is Fourier transformed in a sliding window and the average Fourier amplitude as a function of time determined. Equation (12) or (14) is then fitted to the coda at times greater than twice the S wave travel time, estimated, together with the origin time, from the S-P times. The S wave Fourier amplitude is also determined by taking the average of the two nearest windows; the window length (usually 1.28 sec) was chosen to correspond roughly to the S pulse length. Then the two unknown parameters,  $Q$  and  $g(\pi, f)$  (or their primed equivalents), were determined.

Preliminary results obtained by Duckworth and Dainty (1983) indicated that  $Q$  was approximately proportional to frequency over the frequency range 3-50 Hz. This suggests attenuation primarily by geometrical scattering (see Dainty, 1984, Appendix 2). Accordingly, to



compare  $Q$  and  $g(\pi, f)$ , a quantity called the apparent total turbidity is calculated from

$$G_a(f) = 2\pi f / (QV) \quad (16)$$

$V$  in this report is taken to be 3.2 km/sec, typical of shear/surface wave velocities in the upper crust. If anelastic attenuation can be neglected,  $G_a(f)$  will be equal to  $G(f)$ . Otherwise,

$$G_a(f) > G(f) > g(\pi, f) \quad (17)$$

The last inequality follows from (3) and (4).

In attempting to fit codas from Monticello, South Carolina, it was found that a single value of  $A_b$  (or  $A_s$ ) and  $G(\pi, f)$  (or  $G'(\pi, f)$ ) did not provide a good fit to codas of total duration longer than 10 seconds; there appeared to be a change in the decay rate of the coda at this time (see Appendix 1 for an example). For these codas, separate fits were made of the coda before 10 seconds and the coda after 10 seconds. A similar effect was noted on the records from the Eastern Canadian Network station with the change in decay rate occurring at about 15 seconds. Since the McKendrick Lake station was 25 km from the after-shock area, meaning that the direct  $S$  travel time was about 7.5 seconds, it was not possible to fit the early coda and maintain the rule that only coda at times greater than twice the direct  $S$  travel time is used for the fit. However, the results from McKendrick Lake may be compared to results from the United States Geological Survey New Brunswick seismograms, which are in the same area and from the same aftershock

sequence, but much closer. The U.S.G.S. seismograms are too short to cover the time frame beyond 15 seconds.

In fitting (12) or (14), only one component of data has been used, usually the vertical. Properly, the sum of the squared amplitude spectra for three components in each window should be used. However, three component data was not always available, so single component data was analysed so that results could be compared. This should not affect the measurement of  $G_a(f)$ , since the decay rate should be the same for all components provided that one is not examining different types of waves on different components, but the measurement of  $g(\pi, f)$  could be affected. To test this, and to examine the effect of different components on estimation of  $G_a(f)$ , analyses of three component measurements carried out separately for each component are presented in Figure 3 for a Morgan Hill event and in Figure 4 for a New Brunswick event, using U.S.G.S. data in the frequency range 3-50 Hz. In both cases, the results for  $G_a(f)$  are quite consistent for the three components, with the exception of the vertical in New Brunswick for the frequencies 3 and 6 Hz. The results for  $g(\pi, f)$  are also, in the main, quite consistent. This indicates that sufficiently accurate results for our purposes may be found by analysing only a single component of the data; this considerably increases the amount of data that may be considered.

An implicit assumption made in this analysis is that the parameters  $G_a(f)$  and  $g(\pi, f)$  derived are characteristic of the region in which the measurements are taken and not the station or the event. This assumption was tested at the Mammoth Lakes, California, site, and the




Figure 3. Total apparent turbidity (open symbols) and backscattering turbidity (closed symbols) for three components of event on 8 June, 1984, 17:48 UT at Morgan Hill, California. Circles, vertical component; triangles, North - South component; squares, East - West.




Figure 4. Total apparent turbidity and backscattering turbidity for three components of event on 17 January, 1982, 13:33 UT in New Brunswick, Canada. Symbols as for Figure 3.

results are shown in Figures 5 and 6. While there is considerable variation, the values are consistent, within an order of magnitude.

Typical results for Morgan Hill, California, and New Brunswick, Canada (codas less than 15 seconds long), have already been shown (Figures 3 and 4), using equation (14) (cylindrical spreading). Figure 7 shows typical results from New Brunswick, Canada (codas more than 15 seconds long), again using equation (14). Figures 8, 9, and 10, taken from Dainty (1984), show averaged results for, respectively, Monticello, South Carolina (codas less than 10 seconds long); Monticello, South Carolina (codas more than 10 seconds long); and Mammoth Lakes, California.

### Discussion

From Figures 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 10, the codas examined here may be divided into two cases. Figures 7 and 9 show the results from long codas in eastern North America (Monticello, South Carolina, and New Brunswick, Canada), a non-tectonic area. The values of  $G_a(f)$  are mostly between  $0.005$  and  $0.05 \text{ km}^{-1}$ , and the values of  $g(\pi, f)$  are between  $0.0001$  and  $0.002 \text{ km}^{-1}$ , substantially less than most of the corresponding values in Figures 3, 4, 8, and 10. Also, in fitting (12) and (14) to the data, negative values of  $Q$  (and  $G_a(f)$ ) were often obtained for (12) (spherical spreading). This is indicated in Figure 7 (Monticello data) for frequencies of 6, 9, and 12 Hz; for the New Brunswick data,  $Q$  was negative for 3 Hz, infinite for 6 Hz, and very high for the two higher frequencies. From (12), a negative  $Q$  means that the coda power spectrum decays less rapidly than  $t^{-2}$ . This probably means that these long




Figure 5. Total apparent turbidity for events 1571941 (open symbols) and 1592317 (closed symbols) at Mammoth Lakes, California. (see Appendix 1 for details of events and stations). Open circle, station CBR; open triangles, LKM; open squares, TOM; closed circles, LAK; closed triangles, ROC; closed squares, TOM. Results above 30 Hz probably not reliable.




Figure 6. Backscattering turbidity, same events, stations and symbols as for Figure 5.




Figure 7. Total apparent turbidity (circles) and backscattering turbidity (triangles) for event on 20 March, 1982, 3:7 UT in New Brunswick, Canada, recorded at McKendrick Lake. Long coda, cylindrical spreading.






Figure 8. Total apparent turbidity ( $G_a$ ) and backscattering turbidity ( $g(\pi, f)$ ) as a function of frequency, Monticello, SC, for codas less than 10 seconds long. Open symbols, spherical spreading assumed, closed symbols, cylindrical spreading assumed. Circles are  $G_a$ , triangles are  $g(\pi, f)$ .




Figure 9. Total apparent turbidity and backscattering turbidity as a function of frequency, Monticello, SC, for codas more than 10 seconds long. Symbols as for Figure 8.




Figure 10. Total apparent turbidity and backscattering turbidity, Mammoth Lakes, CA, for codas more than 10 seconds long. Symbols as for Figure 8.

codas consist of energy that is at least partially "channeled" horizontally, like an Lg wave. This in turn implies that measurements on such codas (long means longer than 10 or 15 seconds; this is in fact the usual situation) would probably give a good estimate of Lg  $Q$  (Mitchell and Nuttli, 1983; Pomeroy and Peseckis, 1984). Also, it confirms the importance of scattering in Lg propagation (Gupta and Blandford, 1983).

The short codas (less than 10 or 15 seconds long) in eastern North America (New Brunswick, Figure 4; Monticello, Figure 8) and all the codas, long or short, in California (Morgan Hill, Figure 3; Mammoth Lakes, Figure 10) have higher rates of decay, as shown by values of  $G_a(f)$  of around  $0.1 \text{ km}^{-1}$  and generally higher values of  $g(\pi, f)$ , between 0.005 and 0.1, than the long codas.

The separation of long and short codas may be explained in two ways. One possibility is that, in the case of the eastern North America codas, there are two modes of propagation, one of them ("short codas") more highly scattered (higher  $G_a(f)$  and  $g(\pi, f)$ ) than the other. The more highly scattered mode will dominate at short times, since  $g(\pi, f)$ , which controls the excitation of the coda, is larger, but the faster decay of this mode means that the mode with the smaller value of  $G_a(f)$  (higher  $Q$ , by (16)) will dominate at long times. In California, either the second mode is not present or its scattering characteristics are similar to those of the first mode. If the identification of the long coda mode in eastern North America with waves similar to Lg is correct, the absence or greater scattering of such waves in California implies

that  $L_g$  would not propagate as well in California as in eastern North America, in agreement with observation (Nuttli, 1973).

A second possibility is that the change in coda characteristics at Monticello and New Brunswick is due to a change from single scattering to multiple scattering at 10-15 seconds time. Sato (1977) gives

$$t > 1/(GV) \quad (18)$$

as a necessary but not a sufficient condition for multiple scattering. If  $G \sim 0.1 \text{ km}^{-1}$ , a typical value for the short codas, then (18) is met for  $t > 3 \text{ sec}$ . Also, for the extreme case of very strong scattering, seismic energy in the coda will diffuse (Dainty and Toksöz, 1977), and an appropriate formula for the coda power spectrum in a three-dimensional medium is

$$P(f,t) = E(f)t^{-3/2} \exp[-3R^2G/(4Vt)] \exp[-2\pi ft/Q_i] \quad (19)$$

$$\rightarrow E(f)t^{-3/2} \exp[-2\pi ft/Q_i], \quad R^2/t \rightarrow 0 \quad (20)$$

$$E(f) = S^2(f); \quad \sqrt{27G^3} / (8\sqrt{\pi^3 V^3}) \quad (21)$$

$R$  is the source-receiver distance, taken to be small in (20). Like (12) and (14), (20) has the form of an inverse power law times an exponential, but the exponential contains only the intrinsic attenuation  $Q_i$ , not  $Q$  defined by (11). Accordingly, a change in decay rate to lower values would be expected if the coda changed from a single scattering phenomenon to a multiple scattering phenomenon. Finally, we note that for short codas at frequencies less than 10 Hz, relation (17) is often not met, at the same time that  $G_a(f)$  is decreasing relative to its value

at higher frequencies. This is a strong indication that multiple scattering is occurring in the short codas, and that the values of  $G_a(f)$  obtained by fitting (12) or (14) are too low.

In spite of these indications that multiple scattering is occurring in the short codas, the suggestion that the change from short to long codas reflects a change from single to multiple scattering is rejected for the following reasons. First, all of the arguments in favor of multiple scattering in the eastern United States apply with equal force to California, yet the change in coda is not observed there. Thus, there must be regional differences. Furthermore, if condition (18) is applied with  $G \sim 0.01 \text{ km}^{-1}$ , a typical value for the Monticello codas, then single scattering would be expected for  $t < 30 \text{ sec}$ , which is the typical length of one of these codas. For these Monticello codas, condition (17) is also met, although not at 3 Hz for the New Brunswick codas.

The nature of the scatterers and the contribution of scattering to attenuation may be partially answered from the data presented here. For the long codas at Monticello, there is a good correlation between  $G_a(f)$  and  $g(\pi, f)$ , particularly around 10 Hz. For all codas except the long Monticello codas, there is a good evidence that scattering is strong for frequencies below about 10 Hz, which would indicate a substantial contribution to attenuation through (10) or (11). In cases below 10 Hz where multiple scattering is believed to be occurring,  $G_a(f)$  declines relative to higher frequencies, again indicating that a substantial part of the attenuation is due to scattering, from (11), (16), and (20). Finally, as pointed out earlier,  $G_a(f)$  is approximately constant with

frequency, in the main, implying  $Q$  proportional to frequency; this is characteristic of attenuation by geometrical scattering. For these reasons, we estimate that at least 50% of the attenuation observed in the crust is due to scattering.

The nature and location of the scatterers may be partly determined from the data presented here. In cases where single scattering is believed to be occurring, i.e., long Monticello codas, and other codas at high frequencies ( $>10$  Hz),  $g(\pi, f)$  is about 1% of  $G_a(f)$ ; this is typical of velocity fluctuations in a three dimensional medium (Wu and Aki, 1984; Dainty, 1984, Appendix 2), although it is not clear what would happen in a two dimensional case. Since the events range from 0 to 10 km depth, the short codas must be at least partially due to scatterers in the upper crust, since these codas start immediately after the direct S pulse. The long codas start at 10-15 seconds, which implies a mid to upper crust propagation, since the scattered wave has to get to the scatterer from the source and back in 10-15 seconds at  $\sim 3.2$  km/sec.

The principal remaining question with the codas studied here is whether horizontal channeling of energy (two dimensional spreading, (14)) as opposed to spherical spreading (12) is the mode of energy propagation. For the long codas, evidence has been offered that horizontal channeling is occurring; for the short codas, the question is open. Note that for horizontal channeling, more than surface waves, *sensu strictu* must be involved, since the skin depth of surface waves at, say, 10 Hz is a few hundred meters, less than the focal depth of

many of the events. Generally, the decomposition of codas into waves of different types is a major remaining problem.

What is the significance of these results for the estimation of seismic yield? First, they illustrate that scattering occurs in the upper part of the crust, where the source and the receiver are located, and this scattering has a significant effect on attenuation. For example, if  $G_a(f)$  is 0.1, then on travelling through 10 km of such material, the energy in a short pulse will be down by  $1/e$ . This is equivalent to about 0.2 on the  $m_b$  magnitude scale, which uses measurements at frequencies ( $\sim 1$  Hz) close to those investigated here (3-50 Hz). If the scattering effect varied from place to place, this could introduce bias of the order of tenths of a magnitude point, which is significant. Further, if  $G_a(f)$  is independent of frequency over some frequency range, as has been observed in this study, then the attenuation effect could not be detected by spectral ratio methods within that frequency range.

This study also indicates that the attenuation of the regional phase Lg should vary from region to region, being low in regions similar to eastern North America, a non-tectonic region, and high in regions similar to California, a tectonic region, in accord with observations (Nuttli, 1973). A good estimate of this attenuation should be obtainable from the coda after 10 seconds (Mitchell and Nuttli, 1983).

Three questions for further investigation suggest themselves: Can the scattering characteristics derived for a region from local codas be found from teleseismic observations, such as teleseismic P codas? Could a region be "calibrated" in terms of the scattering attenuation of



teleseismic phases by observations of local coda? What other effects does scattering have on the waveforms of short pulses?

#### Acknowledgments

Paul Spudich of the United States Geological Survey, Menlo Park, kindly supplied the seismograms for Mammoth Lakes, California, and Monticello, South Carolina. Chuck Mueller of the same organization supplied the "short" seismograms for New Brunswick, Canada. Ralph Archuleta and Gene Sembera, also of the above organization, graciously allowed us to use their instruments to collect data from Morgan Hill, California. The data from the Eastern Canadian Network for New Brunswick, Canada, was supplied by Bill Shannon, of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, Government of Canada.

## Bibliography

- Aki, K., and B. Chouet (1975). Origin of coda waves: Source, attenuation, and scattering effects. J. Geophys. Res., 80, 3322.
- Chernov, L. A. (1960). Wave Propagation in a Random Medium. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Clay, C. S., and H. Medwin (1977). Acoustical Oceanography. John Wiley, New York.
- Dainty, A. M. (1981). A scattering model to explain seismic Q observations in the lithosphere between 1 and 30 Hz. Geophys. Res. Lett., 8, 1126.
- Dainty, A. M. (1984). High frequency acoustic backscattering and seismic attenuation. J. Geophys. Res., 89, 3172.
- Dainty, A. M., and M. N. Toksoz (1977). Elastic wave propagation in a highly scattering medium--a diffusion approach. J. Geophys., 43, 375.
- Duckworth, R. M., and A. M. Dainty (1983). Observations of coda Q for the crust near Mammoth Lakes, California, and Monticello, South Carolina. Semi-annual Technical Report No. 1, Contract AFOSR-83-0037.
- Gupta, I. N., and R. R. Blandford (1983). A mechanism for the generation of short-period transverse motion from explosions. Bull. Seis. Soc. Am., 73, 571.
- Mitchell, B. J., and O. W. Nuttli (1983). Attenuation of seismic waves at regional distances. Semi-annual Technical Report No. 1, Contract F49620-83-C-0015.
- Nuttli, O. W. (1973). Seismic wave attenuation and magnitude relations for eastern North America. J. Geophys. Res., 78, 876.
- Pomeroy, P. W., and L. L. Peseckis (1984). The use of regional seismic waves for yield determination. Semi-annual Technical Report No. 1, Contract F49620-83-C-0017.
- Sato, H. (1977). Energy propagation including scattering effects single isotropic scattering approximation. J. Phys. Earth, 25, 27.
- Sato, H. (1982). Amplitude attenuation of impulsive waves in random media based on travel time corrected mean wave formalism. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 71, 559.

- Wu, R.-S. (1982). Attenuation of short period seismic waves due to scattering. Geophys. Res. Lett., 9, 9.
- Wu, R.-S., and K. Aki (1984). Scattering of random waves by a random medium and small scale inhomogeneities in the lithosphere. Annual Technical Report, Contract F49620-82-K-0004.



## APPENDIX 1

OBSERVATIONS OF CODA Q FOR THE CRUST  
NEAR MAMMOTH LAKES, CALIFORNIA, AND MONTICELLO, SOUTH CAROLINA

By Robert M. Duckworth and Anton M. Dainty

Introduction

The seismic Q of a material is a measure of the degree to which it attenuates the harmonic energy content of seismic waves passing through it. Seismic energy released by earthquakes and underground explosions propagates in the earth primarily in the form of elastic waves. To the extent that earth materials are not perfectly elastic the elastic waves will be attenuated. The energy at an initial time,  $E_0$ , and the energy E after elapsed time t are related to the Q by

$$E = E_0 \exp(-2\pi f t / Q) \quad (1)$$

where f is the frequency of the wave. Attenuation is proportional to the distance a wave travels, x, since  $t = x/B$  where B is the speed at which the wave propagates. Therefore, knowledge of Q should be useful in predicting the expected amplitudes of seismic waves for yield estimation and other applications. However, because earth materials are inhomogeneous a prediction of seismic wave amplitude is complicated.

Inhomogeneities lead to reflections and refractions, or scattering, of seismic waves. Scattering by these inhomogeneities is an important part of the seismic trace recorded as a function of time. The first part of a seismogram of a local (within a few hundred km of

the seismic recording station) earthquake is the Primary or P-wave. This is a compressional wave and travels at speeds up to about 8 km/s for local earthquakes. A second major feature is the Secondary or S-wave which is a shear wave and travels at speeds of about  $P\text{-speed}/\sqrt{3}$ . Between the P and S arrivals and following the S arrival additional waves arrive. Their amplitude decays in a generally exponential manner. Aki (1969) proposed that these waves are the result of scattering of surface waves by surface inhomogeneities. He gave them the name Coda [Latin: tail] waves. Later, Aki and Chouet (1975) considered body wave scattering. Also, scattering affects the attenuation of seismic waves in two ways. Energy is scattered out of the primary wave decreasing the apparent Q. Some of this scattered energy arrives at the receiver in the form of coda waves. The amplitude of these depends upon the scattering mechanism, characterised by the turbidity as described below, and the inelastic Q.

This report presents estimates of the apparent Q from the coda of local earthquakes in two different geologic regions. Attempts are made to separate the effects of scattering and inelasticity in order to determine the turbidity and inelastic Q for each region. The excitation of the coda has also been considered.

### Theory

Coda waves are generally considered to be backscattered energy. A model from Aki and Chouet (1975) of coda waves as single, S-wave to

S-wave scatter from a random distribution of scatterers is used in this report.

Observations show the coda to be independent of source-receiver distance,  $R$ , for local coda waves (Aki, 1969; Aki and Chouet, 1975; Rautian and Khalturin, 1978). Sato (1977) lends support to this observation with a model for single isotropic scatter. He shows the time dependence of the mean energy density of the coda near the source to be nearly independent of source-receiver distance  $R$  for  $R \ll Bt/2$ .  $B$  is the velocity of S-waves in the medium and  $t$  is their travel time measured from the origin time. Because the coda shape is nearly independent of source receiver distance for local coda waves, the model is simplified to the case of coincident source and receiver.

Knopoff and Hudson (1967) modeled scatter from small perturbations in an elastic medium. They found the amplitude for S to S scatter to dominate that of P to P scatter by  $(\alpha/B)^2$  for geometric (high frequency) and  $(\alpha/B)^4$  for Rayleigh (low frequency) scatter and P to S and S to P scatter to be "vanishingly small" for geometric scatter.  $\alpha$  and  $B$  represent the speeds of P and S waves respectively. For the crust  $\alpha = \sqrt{3} B$  is a good approximation and the amplitude of S to S scatter is greater than P to P scatter by a factor of 3 for geometric scatter. The observed character of coda waves also supports S to S dominance (Aki, 1980).

Before presenting a model of coda waves the effects of attenuation will be considered. Plane waves traveling in a medium with a random distribution of scatterers will be attenuated. Let  $E_0$  represent the average energy of the waves before scattering and  $E$  represent



the energy of plane waves traveling in the same direction as the primary waves after scattering. We assume the primary cause of attenuation by scattering will be backscatter. For  $(E_0 - E) \ll E_0$  over a distance equal to the average separation of "backscatterers", the attenuation of primary waves is given by

$$E/E_0 = \exp(-x\rho\sigma_b). \quad (2)$$

The backscatter cross section  $\sigma_b$  represents the average of the product of the backscatter function and the projected area of the scatterers, or the average apparent area of the scatterers.  $\rho$  is the number of scatterers per unit volume. As  $\sigma_b$  and  $\rho$  are unknown for the crust, their product is often replaced by a scattering coefficient,  $g$ , called the turbidity. The turbidity represents the fractional loss of energy due to scatter per unit distance traveled. The term was introduced by Chernov (1960) and first used in seismic literature by Galkin et al. (1970). They employ it to describe their observed high frequency spatial variation of seismic amplitudes as a function of distance from the source. Equation (2) may also be applied to the attenuation a plane wave suffers when passing through a medium where scattering is occurring as a result of random fluctuations in the medium properties rather than discrete "backscatterers". In this case,  $g$  is a function of the statistical properties of the medium and the wavelength (Wu, 1982).

In the earth medium there will also be attenuation resulting from inelasticity. This is attenuation that occurs as elastic energy is converted to heat. For  $(E_0 - E) \ll E_0$  over a wavelength, the inelastic

attenuation is given by

$$E/E_0 = \exp(-2\pi fx/BQ). \quad (3)$$

$Q$  is the quality factor,  $B$  is the speed of shear waves,  $x$  is the distance they travel in the medium and  $f$  is frequency. The inelastic attenuation mechanism is not well understood. It is generally observed that  $Q$  is independent of frequency over the range of seismic frequencies studied. This is in agreement with the results of Knopoff (1964) who studied  $Q$  in the laboratory and found it independent of frequency for dry materials. These two attenuation effects can be combined. In terms of the time the energy spends in the medium  $t = x/B$  and for constant  $B$ ,

$$E/E_0 = \exp(-2\pi ft/Q) \cdot \exp(-Btg) \quad (4a)$$

$$= \exp[-t(2\pi f/Q_T)]. \quad (4b)$$

$Q_T$  represents the combined effects of scattering and inelastic attenuation.

$$1/Q_T = 1/Q_i + gB/2\pi f, \quad (5)$$

where  $Q_i$  is the inelastic  $Q$  (Dainty, 1981). Dainty and Toksoz (1981) suggest that for a single scatter theory to apply  $2\pi f/Q_i \gg Bg$  is a necessary condition, as otherwise there would be sufficient energy for higher order scattering.

The power spectrum of the coda as a function of time under the conditions discussed above has been derived by Aki and Chouet (1975). If the spectrum of the source is  $\phi(f|r_0)$  at a reference distance  $r_0$

from the source, the coda power spectrum is

$$P(f|t) = st^{-2m} \exp(-2\pi ft/Q_T) \quad (6)$$

where

$$s = |\phi(f|r_0)|^2 4\pi r_0^{2m} (B/2)^{1-2m} \cdot g \quad (7)$$

$s$  represents the source term, the turbidity  $g = \rho\sigma_b$ , and  $m = 0.5$  for cylindrical (surface wave) or  $m = 1.0$  for spherical (body wave) spreading. The source term,  $s$ , will in general depend on the scatterers through its dependence on  $g$ . The time  $t$  is measured from the origin time of the event.

The average coda amplitude at a particular frequency and time  $A(f|t)$  is related to the power spectrum.

$$A(f|t) = [P(f|t)\Delta f]^{1/2} \quad (8)$$

$\Delta f$  is the band width considered about  $f$ .  $Q_T$  can therefore be measured from the coda wave amplitude attenuation using equation (6). Sato (1977) points out the single scatter model is only applicable for a coda duration  $t < 1/gB$ . Longer times imply a significant contribution of higher order scattering which effects the return of scattered energy to the later parts of the coda. The decomposition of  $Q_T$  to find  $Q_i$  and  $g$  depends upon assumptions about their frequency dependence. This and the applicability of the single scatter model will be considered in the section on results.

## Data

Two sets of earthquake data are available for analysis courtesy of Paul Spudich (U.S. Geological Survey at Menlo Park, California). Both sets contain digital records of earthquakes and their locations. Program Hypoinverse by Klein (1978) is the method of location. Locations and primary S-wave travel times of the earthquakes selected for analysis have been read from the U.S.G.S. tapes (Tables 1 and 2). The first set is from a series of events associated with the filling of Monticello Reservoir in South Carolina. It contains records of 32 earthquakes, recorded in May and June of 1979 and used in a study of stress drops by Fletcher (1982). He reports they are all magnitude  $M < 1.7$ . Secor et al. (1982) report the earthquakes as occurring in a heterogeneous quartz monzonite pluton of Carboniferous age. Zoback and Hickman (1982) suggest that the earthquakes are shallow, occurring along existing fractures, and the result of an increase in pore pressure caused by increasing the head at the reservoir. Figure 1 adapted from Talwani and Hutchenson (1982) shows the location of the seismic stations and the reservoirs. Epicenters for the earthquakes considered have been indicated on this figure. They are all within 8 km of the recording stations. Secor et al. (1982) report on the two reservoirs. Parr Shoals reservoir was impounded in 1914 and increased in 1976 to a volume of  $0.039 \text{ km}^3$  with a surface area of  $18 \text{ km}^2$  and a maximum depth of 11 meters. Monticello reservoir has a volume of  $0.5 \text{ km}^3$ , a surface area of  $27 \text{ km}^2$ , and a maximum depth of 48 meters.

Fletcher (1982) describes the instrumentation used to record the Monticello earthquakes. A summary is given here. Sprengnether

Table 1. Locations of earthquakes and recording stations at Monticello, South Carolina.

EVENT/STATION	"S" TIME	RANGE	LOCATION
1271000			34 20.03 N 081 19.62 W
DUC	0.68	2.2	34 20.07 N 081 21.06 W
DON	1.05	3.5	34 21.42 N 081 21.20 W
LKS	0.89	3.0	34 19.95 N 081 17.69 W
1320218			NOT POSSIBLE
JAB	1.66	5.8	34 22.28 N 081 19.47 W
1281119			34 20.70 N 081 20.81 W
JAB	1.31	4.6	
1302328			34 20.49 N 081 20.65 W
SNK	0.56	1.8	34 20.29 N 081 19.54 W
JAB	1.19	3.8	
LKS	1.38	4.7	
1310603			34 18.50 N 081 20.50 W
SNK	1.05	3.7	
LKS	1.48	5.2	
JAB	2.00	7.0	
1281831			NOT POSSIBLE
JAB	1.02	3.57	

Table 2. Locations of Earthquakes and Recording Stations at Mammoth Lakes, California.

EVENT/STATION	"S" TIME	RANGE	LOCATION	
1571941			37 32.91 N	118 52.53 W
MGE	3.17	8.0	37 33.67 N	118 47.22 W
HCF	4.37	10.6	37 38.51 N	118 50.98 W
CBR	5.50	15.2	37 40.75 N	118 49.51 W
TWL	4.84	13.7	37 36.93 N	119 00.37 W
ROC	5.67	14.9	37 29.78 N	118 43.16 W
TOM	6.11	18.0	37 33.05 N	118 40.32 W
LKM	5.97	17.3	37 41.80 N	118 56.13 W
1592317			37 37.50 N	118 52.52 W
HCF	2.38	3.0		
FIS	2.58	4.2	37 36.84 N	118 49.82 W
CBR	3.60	7.5		
LKM	3.73	9.6		
MGE	4.03	10.6		
TWL	4.52	11.6		
LAK	5.30	13.1	37 38.49 N	118 43.70 W
TOM	6.78	19.7		
ROC	6.71	19.8		




Figure 1. Recording Stations and Epicenters at Monticello Reservoir, South Carolina. stations(Δ), epicenters(\*)

DR-100, 12-bit, digital recorders were used with an unspecified make of geophone. The sample rate was 200 Hz with an antialiasing filter of either 50 Hz or 70 Hz having a 30 db per octave rolloff. The geophones were velocity sensors with damping specified as 0.7 of critical. The possibility of aliasing on Monticello records for which the filter corner frequency was set at 70 Hz was considered. Inspection of bandpass filtered records at the higher frequencies revealed no difference in the rate of amplitude decay between the recordings made with a 50 Hz corner filter and a 70 Hz corner filter.

The second set of data is from Mammoth Lakes, California. It consists of the 150 earthquakes used by Archuleta et al. (1982) in a study of source parameters. The earthquakes followed a series of magnitude  $M > 6.0$  earthquakes which occurred May 25, 1980 (Spudich et al., 1981). Wallace et al. (1982) investigate a discrepancy in fault plane projections as reported in the literature for the Mammoth Lakes earthquakes. Citing evidence of an active magma body, they suggest a low velocity zone related to recent magmatic activity as a possible cause. Figure 2 adapted from Spudich et al. (1981) shows the station locations. Epicenters for the earthquakes considered have been added to this figure. The source receiver distances range from 5 to 25 km. The Long Valley Caldera, a volcanic crater 0.7 million years old, is outlined along with major faults. The instrumentation at Mammoth Lakes is essentially the same as at Monticello, except that accelerometers are used at some of the Mammoth stations. Details of the instrumental operations and clock corrections can be found in Spudich et al. (1981).






Figure 2. Recording Stations and Epicenters at Mammoth Lakes, California. stations(Δ), epicenters(\*)

### Analysis

The rms coda amplitude is related to the power spectrum by  $A(f|t) = [P(f|t)\Delta f]^{1/2}$ . Substituting the equation for the power spectrum in the single scatter model gives

$$A(f|t) = ct^{-m} \exp(-\pi ft/Q_T) . \quad (9)$$

Over the range of frequencies for which geometric scatter is the case,  $\sigma_b$  is constant. Therefore,  $c = (s\Delta f)^{1/2}$  has the same frequency dependence as the source for octave  $\Delta f$ . For cylindrical waves  $m = 0.5$ , while for spherical waves  $m = 1.0$ . Taking the ordinary logarithm of this expression

$$\log[A(f|t)] = C - m \cdot \log(t) - bt \quad (10)$$

is obtained where  $b = \log(e)\pi f/Q_T$  and  $C = \log(c)$ . To estimate  $Q_T$  this equation is fit to filtered records by the method of least squares. This is the approach taken by Aki and Chouet (1975).

To study the temporal decay of coda waves the longest records are chosen. Of these the duration of recording ranges from 8.0 to 23.0 seconds at Monticello and from 10.0 to 35.0 seconds at Mammoth Lakes. Only a few records from Monticello are considered to be of sufficient duration for coda analysis (Table 1). The Mammoth Lakes records chosen for analysis are listed in Table 2.

Travel times are taken from the location data provided with the U.S.G.S. tapes. Some of the Monticello earthquakes were not located. For these the S-wave travel time is calculated from the difference in S and P wave arrival times and assumed S and P wave velocities of

3.5 km/s and 6.0 km/s respectively. Ground displacement amplitude as a function of time in octave wide bands is determined for the selected records by the following procedure.

The mean is removed from a record in a 256 sample (1.28 second) window centered about the origin time. This portion of the trace is multiplied by normalized Hamming coefficients. The windowed trace is corrected for instrument gain, Fourier transformed, and multiplied by  $1/f$  or  $1/f^2$ . Assuming a flat instrument response in the frequency band of interest, this converts the trace to ground displacement amplitude from velocity and acceleration records respectively. It has been assumed, as in Archuleta et al. (1982) and Fletcher (1982), that the velocity response is flat from 2 Hz to 50 Hz and the acceleration response is flat above 0.1 Hz. The average amplitude is calculated within octaves (equal power bands) about selected center frequencies. The log of this amplitude is plotted at time zero on separate plots for each frequency. The window is then moved 100 samples (0.5 seconds) and the process is repeated with the log average amplitude plotted at time 0.5. This is done until the end of the record is reached. The result is a series of plots of log average amplitude versus time, measured from origin time, at selected center frequencies from 3 Hz to 72 Hz. Figure 3 contains a sample record and its corresponding filtered amplitude plots. Frequencies above the corner of the antialiasing filter are considered as the constant reduction in amplitude will only show up in the source term. Therefore  $Q_T$  can still be estimated provided there is sufficient energy present at these frequencies.

1281119R6.JAB  
0 SECONDS = 51.844




Figure 3a. Record of Event 1281119 at Monticello Reservoir.  
The amplitude scale is digitizing units.

Figures 3b-h. Log(amplitude) versus Time for Event 1281119 at Monticello. (following 4 pages) Plots b-j correspond to center frequencies of 3, 6, 9, 12, 18, 24, 36, 48, and 72 Hz respectively. It can be seen from the coda that Q is changing with time. The early coda amplitude falls off rapidly while the late coda shows little decay.




Figure 3. b.(top) c.(bottom)




Figure 3 . d.(top) e.(bottom)




Figure 3. f.(top) g.(bottom)




Figure 3. h.(top) i.(bottom)






Figure 3. j.

The next step is to fit the model equation for  $\log[A(f|t)]$  to the backscatter portion of the  $\log[A(f|t)]$  plots for an estimate of  $Q_T$ . The method of least squares is used and two fits are made corresponding to the two choices of  $m = 1.0$  and  $m = 0.5$ . Standard deviations are also calculated for each fit. Attempts to fit the model taking  $m$  as an independent variable produced erratic results as has been reported in the literature (Aki and Chouet, 1975).

The backscatter portion of the filtered data is determined as follows. Energy arriving after  $\sqrt{2}$  times the primary S-wave travel time is backscatter in the sense that the scattering angle is greater than 90 degrees. However, because of the 1.28 second window and 0.5 second steps used for averaging only arrivals 1.0 second later than this are entirely backscatter.

On some records the dynamic range of the recording instrument has been exceeded for the early coda. The saturated portion of the coda is not considered in the analysis. Also excluded are the last three points of the filter output as they are distorted by artificial extension of the end of the trace necessary in filtering.

Another consideration is noise. The background noise level is assumed constant and taken equal to the peak noise level recorded prior to the P-wave arrival. If no noise is recorded here it is assumed to be + or - 0.5 times one unit of digitization. The noise level is converted to ground displacement amplitude. A reference, five times (14db above) this noise level, is taken as the minimum acceptable signal level. Portions of the coda for which the average signal amplitude falls below this reference are not considered in the fits.

Finally, from the longest records it is evident that  $Q_T$  changes with time causing the  $Q_T$  value obtained to depend on the portion of coda fit. This can be seen on the sample record in Figure 3. This time dependence of  $Q_T$  was also observed by Rautian and Khalturin (1978) who suggest variations of  $Q$  with depth and temporal variations of the geometric spreading factor as possible causes. The variation in spreading factor could result from a change in the type of waves being recorded as a function of time (e.g., surface to body waves as time increases). Another possibility is that of a significant deterministic influence on the energy arriving at the receiver. Long and Wilson (1982) have noticed resonance peaks in the power spectra of the Monticello records. The frequencies at which these occur are in congruence with conceivably supportable resonances in the Monticello reservoir. This can be regarded as an example of multiple scattering, which tends to raise the value of  $Q$  because energy previously scattered out of the coda is scattered back in, reducing the rate of decay. Indeed, in the limit of strong scattering, there is no contribution to  $Q$  from scattering (Dainty and Toksöz, 1977). Because of the observed temporal dependence of  $Q_T$ , fits are made to different portions of the coda where possible.

### Results

Plots of the average over all stations and events of  $\log[Q_T]$  versus  $\log[\text{frequency}]$  are constructed and appear as Figure 4. Because a temporal dependence of  $Q_T$  was observed, three plots are made for each area and  $m$  value. They are from the beginning of backscatter to: I, five seconds beyond; II between five and nine seconds beyond; III,




Figure 4a-f. Average  $\log(Q_{total})$  versus Frequency,  $m=0.5$ . The vertical axes are frequency and the horizontal axes are  $\log(Q_{total})$

a, b, and c are for  $t < 5$ ,  $5 < t < 9$ ,  $9 < t$  respectively at Monticello.

d, e, and f are for  $t < 5$ ,  $5 < t < 9$ ,  $9 < t$  respectively at Mammoth.




Figure 4s-1. Average  $\log(Q_{total})$  versus Frequency,  $m=1.0$ . The vertical axes are frequency and the horizontal axes are  $\log(Q_{total})$

a, b, and c are for  $t < 5$ ,  $5 < t < 9$ ,  $9 < t$  respectively at Monticello.

d, e, and f are for  $t < 5$ ,  $5 < t < 9$ ,  $9 < t$  respectively at Mammoth.

more than nine seconds beyond. These times were chosen arbitrarily within the limits of the data. As the plots are roughly linear, best fits of the equation  $Q_T = af^b$  are made to each of these to determine the values of  $a$  and  $b$ . This approach is common in the literature. The  $a$  and  $b$  values obtained are presented in Table 3.

The frequency dependence of  $Q_T$  may be used to estimate  $Q_i$  and  $g$  if some assumptions are made about their frequency dependence. For the single backscatter model applied here the density of scatterers  $\rho$  is assumed constant. The backscatter cross section  $\sigma_b$  will be a constant for geometric (high frequency) scatter. The result is a constant  $g$  for geometric scatter with the single backscatter model. It is usually assumed that  $Q_i$  is independent of frequency in agreement with most laboratory measurements of  $Q_i$  (Knopoff, 1964). With these assumptions a least squares fit of  $1/Q_T = 1/Q_i + gB/2\pi f$  is made to the  $Q_T$  versus frequency data to estimate  $g$  and  $Q_i$  (Dainty, 1981). Negative values of  $Q_i$  occur when the least square fit results in a  $gB/2\pi f$  which is greater than  $1/Q_T$ . As  $Q_i$  increases with increasing  $gB/2\pi f$  a negative  $Q_i$  result is indicative of a very high  $Q_i$  value. These results are shown in Table 4.

A second estimate of  $g$  is obtained as follows. From the least squares fit of  $\log[A(f t)]$  estimates of  $Q_T$  and the source factor have been obtained. The filter output at the primary S-wave travel time at a given frequency is a component of the source factor  $C$ . This allows a second estimate of  $g$  from the primary S-wave spectra and the source factor  $C = \log (s\Delta f)$ .

Taking a result from the theory section

Table 3. Best Fit a and b Values.  $Q_T = af^b$  at Monticello and Mammoth.  $m = 0.5$  and  $m = 1.0$  correspond to cylindrical and spherical spreading respectively.

Monticello			Mammoth			
a	b	freq	a	b	freq	
<u>m = 0.5</u>						
I	6.3	1.2	6-48	1.5	1.8	3-24
I				6.2	0.6	12-72
II	9.7	1.1	3-72	4.1	1.6	6-72
III	31.8	1.0	3-72	16.6	1.3	6-24
<u>m = 1.0</u>						
I	9.2	1.2	6-72	9.0	1.4	3-36
II	11.0	1.2	6-72	20.0	1.2	6-48
III	29.6	1.5	3-24	7.6	1.7	6-24
III	2750	0	18-48			

Table 4. Log(g) Values From Fitting Equation (5).

Monticello				Mammoth		
	log g	$Q_i$	freq	log g	$Q_i$	freq
<u>m = 0.5</u>						
I	-0.92	940	3-72	-1.28	1050	3-72
II	-1.00	900	3-72	-1.46	860	3-72
III	-1.19	*	3-72	-1.49	1050	3-24
<u>m = 1.0</u>						
I	-0.70	*	3-72	-1.17	1000	3-72
II	-1.92	610	3-72	-1.17	2960	3-48
III	-1.49	*	3-72	-1.82	580	3-24

-----  
 \* indicates  $Q_i$  approaching infinity.



$$s = \left| \phi(f|r_0) \right|^2 4\pi r_0^{2m} (B/2)^{1-2m} g. \quad (11)$$

Also, the average amplitude,  $\left| \phi(f|r) \right|$ , of waves incident at a scatterer at distance  $r$  is

$$\left| \phi(f|r) \right| = \left| \phi(f|r_0) \right| (r/r_0)^{-m} \exp(-\pi f r / B Q_T). \quad (12)$$

It is important to note that  $\left| \phi(f|r) \right|$  is also the average spectral amplitude of the direct S-wave where  $r$  is the source receiver distance. This is estimated from a linear interpolation of the spectral amplitudes measured in the two windows closest to the S arrival time. The interpolation is necessary as the window is generally not centered on the S arrival. Solving equation (12) for the source spectrum at  $r_0$ ,  $\left| \phi(f|r_0) \right|$ , and substituting in (11) a solution for  $\log(g)$  is obtained.

$$\log(g) = 2C - \log[4\pi(B/2)^{1-2m} \left| \phi(f|r) \right|^2 r^{2m} \exp(2\pi f t / Q_T) \Delta f]. \quad (13)$$

Estimates of average  $\log(g)$  are obtained using this equation for  $m = 0.5$  and or  $m = 1$  and are tabulated in Table 5.

### Discussion

The  $\log(Q_T)$  versus  $\log(\text{frequency})$  curves of Figure 4 show  $Q_T$  to be roughly the same for similar fits at Mammoth and Monticello. Though it is generally agreed that  $Q_T$  is higher in the eastern U.S. the results here may be explained by the short lapse times of the codas used to estimate  $Q_T$ . These lapse times are much shorter than are usually reported in the literature for  $Q_T$  from coda estimates.

Table 5. Log(g) as Estimated from the S-wave Spectrum and Coda Source Function.

Monticello			Mammoth	
	log g	freq	log g	freq
<u>m = 0.5</u>				
I	-2.50	3-72	-1.90	3-72
II	-2.53	3-72	-1.78	3-72
III	-3.27	3-72	-2.36	3-24
<u>m = 1.0</u>				
I	-3.03	3-72	-2.46	3-72
II	-2.96	3-72	-2.26	3-48
III	-3.50	3-72	-2.77	3-24

This implies that the results here represent the near surface  $Q_T$  and that it is approximately the same for both regions.

The results presented in Table 3 are the  $a$  and  $b$  values obtained by best fit of  $Q_T = af^b$  to the  $\log[Q_T]$  versus  $\log[\text{frequency}]$  curves of Figure 5. The values of  $b$  in Table 3 range from 0.6 to 1.8, with an average of 1.3. The usual value of  $b$  reported in the literature is around 0.5 (0.6, Fedotov and Boldyrev, 1969; 0.5, Rautian and Khalturin, 1978; 0.5, Tsujiura, 1978; 0.6, Aki, 1980). However, the higher values obtained here are not unique. Rovelli (1982) has reported a  $b$  value of 1.1 for Friuli, Italy. This value was determined by coda analysis. Aki suggests that the  $b$  value, 0.8, which he determined for northeast Kanto, Japan, is the result of increased scattering by a higher density of scatterers associated with the higher level of tectonic activity in this part of the region. Aki and Chouet (1975) report on  $Q$  versus frequency at Stone Canyon, California. A  $b$  value of 0.9 is obtained by best fit of  $Q_T = af^b$  to the reported results. Stone Canyon, Mammoth Lakes, and Friuli are all highly active regions.

The  $b$  value results at Monticello may be considered anomalous for this region of relative tectonic stability. However, in addition to including the reservoirs as a substantial part of the region sampled the codas and hypocentral distances at Monticello are much shorter than are usually reported in the literature for other studies. Consequently the near surface scatterers are favored in sampling. Andrews (1982) has suggested that near surface scattering is the dominant scattering effect for the similar situation at Mammoth Lakes.

Table 4 gives the results of fitting equation (5) to the values of  $Q_T$  as a function of frequency.  $Q_i$  and  $g$  are considered constants with frequency in making this fit. In (5), the two terms on the right hand side will be equal for a frequency  $F$  given by

$$F = gBQ_i/(2\pi) \quad (14)$$

Table 6 gives the values of  $F$  found using the results presented in Table 4. For frequencies less than  $F$ , scattering dominates the attenuation, while for frequencies greater than  $F$ , inelastic attenuation will dominate. From Table 6, scattering dominates attenuation over most of the frequency range in most cases, especially at Monticello. From (5), if scattering dominates then  $Q_T$  should be proportional to frequency, in approximate agreement with the results presented in Table 3. The proportionality of  $Q_T$  with frequency is also seen in Figure 4.

There is, however, another issue raised by Table 6. Dainty and Toksoz (1981) propose that if the frequency  $f < F$ , multiple scattering is a possibility. Obviously this situation holds for most of the codas considered here, from Table 6. Dainty and Toksoz point out that this seems to be true for many cases cited in the literature. However, Dainty and Toksoz's condition is only a necessary, not a sufficient, condition for multiple scattering. Since it will take some time after the origin time for multiple scattering to become important, a condition from Sato (1977) that multiple scattering will become important for times  $t > T$ , where  $T = 1/(gB)$ , is appropriate; if  $f < F$  and  $t > T$ , strong scattering is probably occurring.  $T$  is also

Table 6.  $F = gBQ_i/(2\pi)$ ,  $T = 1/(gB)$ . \* is  $F$  tending to infinity.

Monticello				Mammoth		
	F (Hz)	T (sec)	Freq. Range (Hz)	F (Hz)	T (sec)	Freq. Range (Hz)
<u><math>m = 0.5</math></u>						
I	60	2.4	3-72	30	5.4	3-72
II	50	2.9	3-72	15	8	3-72
III	*	4.4	3-72	20	9	3-24
<u><math>m = 1.0</math></u>						
I	*	1.4	3-72	40	4.2	3-72
II	4	24	3-72	100	4.2	3-48
III	*	9	3-72	5	19	3-24

given in Table 6, and in general indicates that multiple scattering might be occurring in some of the codas, remembering that I indicates  $t \leq 5$  sec; II,  $t \leq 9$  sec; III,  $t > 9$  sec; but in practice  $t$  is less 30 sec for all codas in III. More generally, both  $F$  and  $T$  in Table 6 are of the same order of magnitude as the frequencies and times considered in this study, suggesting that the situation may be transitional between weak and strong scattering. A similar conclusion was reached by Dainty and Toksöz (1981). Theoretical formulations to handle this problem (e.g., Gao et al., 1983) do not appear to conserve energy and do not appear to agree with the strong scattering diffusion formalism of Dainty and Toksöz (1977).

The  $\log[g]$  values obtained from the coda source spectrum are presented in Table 5. In general they are about an order of magnitude to two orders of magnitude smaller than the  $\log[g]$  values obtained from Dainty's equation. Andrews (1982) has found the source spectral amplitude from the coda to be ten times larger than the spectral amplitude measured from the S-wave. As the value of  $g$  here is proportional to the quotient (coda source spectrum/S wave source spectrum), a small  $g$  value means our results do not agree with those of Andrews'. However, they are in agreement with the theoretical results reported in the second part of this report.

Throughout this report, the question of whether the scattering is two-dimensional ( $m = 0.5$ , cylindrical spreading, surface waves) or three-dimensional ( $m = 1.0$ , spherical spreading, body waves) has been left open. As discussed in the section on Analysis, it was not possible to determine the correct value of  $m$  from the data. Aki

(1980) has suggested on various grounds that the three-dimensional case is probably appropriate, but he dealt with much longer codas. Most of the more important results presented here seem to hold for both cases. It must be conceded, however, that the change in coda decay as time increases could be due to a change in  $Q_T$  reflecting the change from surface waves to body waves.

## Bibliography

- Aki, K. (1969). Analysis of the seismic coda of local earthquakes as scattered waves, J. Geophys. Res., 74, 615-631.
- Aki, K. (1980). Scattering and attenuation of shear-waves in the lithosphere, J. Geophys. Res., 85, 6496-6504.
- Aki, K., and Chouet, B. (1975). Origin of coda waves: source, attenuation, and scattering effects, J. Geophys. Res., 80, 3322-3342.
- Andrews, D. J. (1982). Shear wave and coda attenuation of two aftershocks at Mammoth Lakes, California (abstract), EOS, 63, 1029.
- Archuleta, R. J., Cranswick, E., Mueller, C., and Spudich, P. (1982). Source parameters of the 1980 Mammoth Lakes, California, earthquake sequence, J. Geophys. Res., 87, 4595-4607.
- Chernov, L. A. (1960). Wave Propagation in a Random Medium, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Dainty, A. M. (1981). A scattering model to explain seismic Q observations in the lithosphere between 1 and 30 Hz, Geophys. Res. Letters, 8, 1126-1128.
- Dainty, A. M., and Toksöz, M. N. (1977). Elastic wave propagation in a highly scattering medium--a diffusion approach, J. Geophys., 43, 375-388.
- Dainty, A. M., and Toksöz, M. N. (1981). Seismic codas on the Earth and the Moon: a comparison, Phys. Earth Planet. Interiors, 26, 250-260.
- Fedotov, S. A., and Bolydrev, S. A. (1969). Frequency dependence of the body waves absorption in the crust and upper mantle of the Kuril Islands chain, Izv. Akad. Nauk. SSSR, 9, 17-33.
- Fletcher, J. B. (1982). A comparison between the tectonic stress measured in situ and stress parameters from induced seismicity at Monticello Reservoir, South Carolina, J. Geophys. Res., 87, 6031-6944.
- Galkin, I. N., Nikolayev, A. V., and Starshinova, YE. A. (1970). Fluctuations of wave characteristics and small-scale inhomogeneities of the Earths crust, Izv. Earth Physics, 11, 41-48.
- Gao, L. S., Lee, L. C., Biswas, N. N., and Aki, K. (1983). Comparison of the effects between single and multiple scattering on coda waves for local earthquakes, Bull. Seismol. Soc. Amer., 73, 377-389.



- Klein, F. W. (1978). Hypocenter location program HYPOINVERSE, 1: Users guide to versions 1,2,3,and 4, U.S. Geol. Surv. Open File Rept. 78-694.
- Knopoff, L. (1964). Q, Rev. Geophys., 2, 625-660.
- Knopoff, L., and Hudson, J. A. (1967). Frequency dependence of scattered elastic waves, J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 42, 18-20.
- Long, L. T., and Wilson, J. (1982). Personal communication.
- Rautian, T. G., and Khalturin, V. I. (1978). The use of the coda for determination of the earthquake source spectrum, Bull. Seismol. Soc. Amer., 68, 923-948.
- Rovelli, A. (1982). On the frequency dependence of Q in Friuli from short period digital records, Bull. Seismol. Soc. Amer., 72, 2369-2372.
- Sato, H. (1977). Energy propagation including scattering effects single isotropic scattering approximation, J. Phys. Earth, 27-41.
- Secor, Jr., D. T., Peck, L. S., Pitcher, D. M., Prowell, D. C., Simpson, D. H., Smith, W. A., and Snoke, A. W. (1982). Geology of the area of induced seismic activity at Monticello Reservoir, South Carolina, J. Geophys. Res., 87, 6945-6957.
- Spudich, P., Cranswick, E., Fletcher, J., Harp, E., Mueller, C., Navarro, R., Sarmiento, J., Vinton, J., and Warrick, J. (1982). Acquisition of digital seismograms during the Mammoth Lakes, California, earthquake sequence of May-June 1980, U.S. Geol. Surv. Open-File Rept. 81-38.
- Talwani, P., and Hutchenson, K. D. (1982). Induced seismicity and earthquake prediction studies in South Carolina, U.S. Geol. Surv. Final Technical Report, contract no. 14-08-0001-19252.
- Tsujiura, M. (1978). Spectral analysis of the coda waves from local earthquakes, Bull. Earthquake Res. Inst., Tokyo Univ., 53, 1-48.
- Wallace, T., Given, J., and Kanamori, H. (1982). A discrepancy between long- and short-period mechanisms of earthquakes near the Long Valley Caldera, Geophys. Res. Lett., 9, 1131-1134.
- Wu, Ru-Shan (1982). Attenuation of short period seismic waves due to scattering, Geophys. Res. Lett., 9, 9-12.
- Zoback, M. D., and Hickman, S. (1982). In situ study of the physical mechanisms controlling induced seismicity at Monticello Reservoir, S.C., J. Geophys. Res., 87, 6959-6974.

**APPENDIX 2**

# High-Frequency Acoustic Backscattering and Seismic Attenuation

ANTON M. DAINTY

*School of Geophysical Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology*

An expression for the backscattered intensity of acoustic waves singly scattered from a region containing fluctuations of the acoustic velocity has been derived for high frequencies by expanding the autocorrelation of the slowness fluctuations in a Taylor series about zero lag. The resulting expression indicates that the backscattered intensity is independent of frequency and directly proportional to the first derivative of the autocorrelation at zero lag; the next higher term is proportional to the reciprocal of the square of the frequency and directly proportional to the third derivative of the autocorrelation at zero lag. Contributions from terms of the Taylor series involving even numbered derivatives of the autocorrelation are zero. Since for the autocorrelation of a smooth function only the even numbered derivatives are nonzero at zero lag, this result demonstrates that backscattering at high frequencies can only occur from discontinuities of velocity or its derivatives as opposed to fluctuations in which the velocities are smooth. If the backscattered intensity is independent of frequency, the contribution of backscattering to the attenuation parameter  $Q$  is proportional to frequency. Such behavior may have been observed for seismic waves of frequencies greater than 1 Hz, suggesting that scattering from discontinuities is an important part of the attenuation of such waves.

## INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of scattering of seismic waves has attracted increasing attention in recent years. Backscattering of seismic waves has been used to explain terrestrial codas [Aki and Chouet, 1975; Dainty and Toksoz, 1981] and part or all of the attenuation suffered by seismic waves at frequencies of 1 Hz and greater [Aki, 1980; Dainty, 1981; Kikuchi, 1981; Wu, 1982]. To analyze observed data on attenuation, coda amplitudes and other manifestations of scattering, a model of the earth as a scattering medium is required together with a theory to derive quantitative results from this model. Two general types of model have been used. One is the "randomly distributed specific scatterers" model. This model assumes scatterers of a specific type, for example, spheres, randomly distributed throughout an otherwise homogeneous region. Examples of this type of model are the sphere model of Dainty [1981], used to explain the frequency dependence of the attenuation parameter  $Q$  at frequencies above 1 Hz, and the crack model of Kikuchi [1981], also used to analyze  $Q$ . A second type of model is the "random medium" model, in which the earth is considered to have average properties that do not vary from place to place but with random fluctuations of the material properties. Examples are the use of an acoustic random medium by Aki [1980] and Wu [1982] to analyze  $Q$  above 1 Hz.

In this paper I shall examine the acoustic random medium model using the results of Chernov [1960] in the limit of high-frequency backscattering. This problem was chosen because investigators using this model have generally concluded that this is the practical case in the earth for frequencies of 1 Hz and higher [Aki, 1980; Dainty, 1981; Sato, 1982b; Wu, 1982]. By analyzing the high-frequency limit, insight may be gained as to what type of information about the medium may be deduced from high-frequency data. An additional benefit is an understanding of the relationship between the two types of models that have been used to examine this problem.

## RANDOM MEDIUM MODELS

The simplest type of random medium used in seismology is the acoustic random medium discussed by Chernov [1960] (a summary of some useful results is given by Aki and Richards [1980]). The medium is considered to have fluctuations of velocity and density about mean values; for simplicity I will consider only the velocity fluctuations. Let the acoustic velocity  $C$  be given by

$$C = C_0[1 - \mu(x)] \quad (1)$$

where  $C_0$  is a constant and  $\mu(x)$ , the slowness perturbation, is a random function of position  $x$  and has an average value of zero. The autocorrelation  $N(r)$  of the slowness perturbation  $\mu$  is then

$$N(r) = \langle \mu(x)\mu(x+r) \rangle / \langle \mu^2 \rangle \quad (2)$$

The vector  $r$  is the lag, and the angle brackets indicate averaging over all  $x$ . If the fluctuation is isotropic, then

$$N(r) = N(r) \quad (3)$$

that is, the autocorrelation depends only on the magnitude of the lag and not its direction.

Chernov [1960] finds the amplitude of singly (weakly) scattered waves for the case of a plane wave traveling through an acoustic medium of velocity  $C_0$  without velocity fluctuations, except for a volume  $V$  containing velocity fluctuations as described above. If the incident (pressure) wave is given by

$$p_i = A \exp [2\pi f i(t - x/C_0)] \quad (4)$$

where  $f$  is the frequency, then the amplitude of the scattered wave at position  $R$  from the center of  $V$  in the limit of  $R$  large in comparison with the linear dimension of  $V$  is given by

$$|p_s|^2 = \frac{4\pi^2 V A^2 f^3 \langle \mu^2 \rangle}{C_0^3 R^2 \sin(\theta/2)} \int_0^\infty N(r) \cdot \sin \{ [4\pi f r \sin(\theta/2)] / C_0 \} r dr \quad (5)$$

[Chernov, 1960, equation 45, p. 51]. The scattering angle  $\theta$  is the angle between  $R$  and the direction of propagation; I shall define "backscattering" as the case  $\theta > \pi/2$ . Equation (5) was first derived, in a slightly different form, by Pekeris [1947].

Copyright 1984 by the American Geophysical Union.

Paper number 4B0124.  
0148-0227/84/004B-0124\$05.00

This paper is concerned with the evaluation of (5) in the limit of large  $f$  and  $\theta > \pi/2$ .

Before proceeding, it should be noted that the acoustic medium described above is obviously too simple to describe the earth, which is an elastic medium presumably containing fluctuations of both elastic constants and density and through which two types of waves, compressional and shear, can propagate. *Knopoff and Hudson* [1967] have demonstrated that converted waves (scattered compressional waves from incident shear waves, and vice versa) are not important at high frequencies. *Haddon and Cleary* [1974] examined the problem of scattering from an inhomogeneous elastic medium; some of their (unpublished) results are discussed in the work of *Aki and Richards* [1980]. These results indicate that at least some of the formulas equivalent to equation (5) are of a similar form. Accordingly, (5) may be considered typical of integrals that appear in this type of problem.

#### EVALUATION OF THE BACKSCATTERED INTENSITY AT HIGH FREQUENCY

To evaluate (5), we need to find the integral

$$\int_0^\infty N(r) \cdot \sin \{ [4\pi f r \cdot \sin(\theta/2)] / C_0 \} \cdot r dr = F(\infty) - F(0) \quad (6)$$

where  $F$  is the indefinite integral. However, if there is a scale length  $a$  associated with the fluctuations,  $N(r)$  will generally decline rapidly for  $r$  larger than  $a$ . Accordingly, I will assume that  $F(\infty) \rightarrow 0$  in (6); this will certainly be true of  $N(r) \rightarrow \exp[-r/a]$  for large  $r$ . Then

$$\int_0^\infty N(r) \cdot \sin \{ [4\pi f r \cdot \sin(\theta/2)] / C_0 \} \cdot r dr \cong -F(0) \quad (7)$$

To approximate  $F(0)$  in the case of  $f$  large and  $\theta > \pi/2$ , note that for this case the sine term in (7) varies much more rapidly than  $N(r)$ , assuming  $N$  is a smooth function. Accordingly, I will expand  $N(r)$  in a Taylor series near  $r = 0$ . First, however, define

$$u = [4\pi f r \cdot \sin(\theta/2)] / C_0 \quad (8)$$

$$K = [4\pi f \cdot \sin(\theta/2)] / C_0 \quad (9)$$

Then (7) becomes

$$\frac{1}{K^2} \int_0^\infty N\left(\frac{u}{K}\right) \cdot \sin(u) \cdot u du \cong -F(0) \quad (10)$$

Expand  $N(u/K)$  as, remembering that  $u/K = r$ ,

$$N\left(\frac{u}{K}\right) = N(0) + \frac{u}{K} \left(\frac{dN}{dr}\right)_{r=0} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{u}{K}\right)^2 \left(\frac{d^2N}{dr^2}\right)_{r=0} + \dots \quad (11)$$

provided the derivatives at  $r = 0$  exist and are finite. Then

$$\begin{aligned} F(u) \cong \frac{1}{K^2} \left[ N(0) \int u \cdot \sin(u) \cdot du + \frac{1}{K} \left(\frac{dN}{dr}\right)_{r=0} \int u^2 \sin(u) \cdot du + \frac{1}{2K^2} \left(\frac{d^2N}{dr^2}\right)_{r=0} \int u^3 \sin(u) \cdot du + \dots \right] \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

To evaluate (12), use the tabulated integrals [*Carmichael and Smith*, 1962]:

$$\int u \cdot \sin(u) \cdot du = \sin(u) - u \cdot \cos(u) \quad (13)$$

$$\int u^m \sin(u) \cdot du = -u^m \cos(u) + m \int u^{m-1} \cos(u) \cdot du \quad (14)$$

$$\int u^m \cos(u) \cdot du = u^m \sin(u) - m \int u^{m-1} \sin(u) \cdot du \quad (15)$$

$$\int u \cdot \cos(u) \cdot du = \cos(u) + u \cdot \sin(u) \quad (16)$$

Using (14) and (16),

$$\int u^2 \sin(u) \cdot du = 2u \cdot \sin(u) + (2 - u^2) \cos(u) \quad (17)$$

Using (13), (14), (15), and (16),

$$\begin{aligned} \int u^m \sin(u) \cdot du = \cos(u) \cdot \left[ -u^m + \sum_{n=1}^{(m-1)/2} (-1)^{n+1} \cdot m(m-1) \dots (m-2n+1) u^{m-2n} \right] \\ + \sin(u) \left[ mu^{m-1} + \sum_{n=1}^{(m-1)/2} (-1)^n \cdot m(m-1) \dots (m-2n) u^{m-2n-1} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

( $m$  odd)

$$\begin{aligned} \int u^m \sin(u) \cdot du = \cos(u) \left[ -u^m + \sum_{n=1}^{m/2} (-1)^{n+1} \cdot m(m-1) \dots (m-2n+1) u^{m-2n} \right] \\ + \sin(u) \left[ mu^{m-1} + \sum_{n=1}^{(m/2)-1} (-1)^n \cdot m(m-1) \dots (m-2n) u^{m-2n-1} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

( $m$  even)

From (13), (17), (18), and (19), as  $u \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\int u \cdot \sin(u) \cdot du \rightarrow 0 \quad (20)$$

$$\int u^2 \sin(u) \cdot du \rightarrow 2 \quad (21)$$

$$\int u^m \sin(u) \cdot du \rightarrow 0 \quad (m \text{ odd}) \quad (22)$$

$$\int u^m \sin(u) \cdot du \rightarrow (-1)^{m/2+1} m! \quad (m \text{ even}) \quad (23)$$

Substituting in (12) and letting  $u \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$F(0) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{K^{2n+1}} (-1)^{n+1} \frac{(2n)!}{(2n-1)!} \left( \frac{d^{2n-1} N}{dr^{2n-1}} \right)_{r=0} \quad (24)$$

According to (24), under the conditions described the back-scattered intensity depends only on the odd derivatives of  $N$  at  $r = 0$  and not on the even derivatives. Since this is a high-frequency approximation, the first term in (24) will be the most important, that is,

$$F(0) \cong \frac{2}{K^3} \left( \frac{dN}{dr} \right)_{r=0} + O(1/K^5) \quad (25)$$

Substituting in (10) and (5),

$$|p_s|^2 = -\frac{VA^2\langle\mu^2\rangle}{8\pi R^2 \sin^4(\theta/2)} \left(\frac{dN}{dr}\right)_{r=0} + O(1/f^2) \quad (26)$$

This indicates that the backscattered intensity is independent of frequency, provided that the autocorrelation has a nonzero derivative at zero lag. Since the first derivative at zero lag must be negative ( $N(r)$  has a maximum at  $r = 0$ ),  $|p_s|^2$  will be positive.

To test (26), I will compare it to two specified cases of  $N(r)$  for which explicit formulas for  $|p_s|^2$  are available [Chernov, 1960]. If

$$N(r) = \exp(-r/a) \quad (27)$$

then

$$|p_s|^2 = \frac{32\pi^3 VA^2 f^4 a^3 \langle\mu^2\rangle}{R^2 [C_0^2 + 16\pi^2 f^2 a^2 \sin^2(\theta/2)]^2} \quad (28)$$

$$|p_s|^2 \rightarrow \frac{VA^2\langle\mu^2\rangle}{8\pi R^2 a \sin^4(\theta/2)} \quad f \rightarrow \infty, \theta \geq \pi/2 \quad (29)$$

The approximate solution given by (26) reproduces this result.

Another case for which an exact solution is available is

$$N(r) = \exp(-r^2/a^2) \quad (30)$$

Then

$$|p_s|^2 = \frac{4\pi^{7/2} VA^2 f^4 a^3 \langle\mu^2\rangle}{R^2} \exp\left\{-[4\pi^2 f^2 a^2 \sin^2(\theta/2)]/C_0^2\right\} \quad (31)$$

$$|p_s|^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad f \rightarrow \infty \quad \theta \geq \pi/2 \quad (32)$$

Since  $N(r)$  has no nonzero derivatives of odd order for  $r = 0$ , this is also in accord with (26).

#### DISCUSSION

The limit of validity of (26) can be obtained from (7), since we require that the sine terms in (7) vary much more rapidly than  $N(r)$ . If  $a$  is a scale length describing the range of  $r$  over which  $N(r)$  varies appreciably, we must have

$$[4\pi fa \cdot \sin(\theta/2)]/C_0 \gg 2\pi \quad (33)$$

or

$$[2fa \cdot \sin(\theta/2)]/C_0 \gg 1 \quad (34)$$

Note that (34) requires that the scattering angle  $\theta$  cannot be small; in fact,

$$\sin(\theta/2) \gg C_0/(2fa) \quad \theta \geq 30^\circ \quad (35)$$

is necessary. Thus the approximation used here is not valid for forward scattering. It may, however, be valid for  $\theta < \pi/2$  provided the restriction (35) is observed, together with a restriction discussed below requiring  $\theta \geq 30^\circ$ . Within these limits, the scattered intensity varies as  $1/(\sin^4 \theta/2)$ , indicating that "side scattering" ( $\theta \sim \pi/2$ ) is about 4 times as strong as "backscattering" ( $\theta \sim \pi$ ) in the strict sense.

There is, however, another consideration that must be applied to the forward scattering question. In forward scattering ( $\theta \rightarrow 0$ ) the scattered wave merges with the original incident wave [Chernov, 1960; Knopoff and Hudson, 1967]. The theory used to derive (5) does not satisfactorily account for this [Chernov, 1960] and accordingly (26) should never be used for

small  $\theta$ , (35) notwithstanding. Sato [1982a], in fact, indicates that the merging of the scattered and incident wave is a significant effect for  $\theta \leq 30^\circ$  (see (44) and (45), below), and thus I have added the restriction  $\theta \geq 30^\circ$  to (35). It should also be noted, however, that if  $(dN/dr)_{r=0} \neq 0$ , (26) indicates that there is always backscattered energy, no matter how high the frequency of the incident wave. I shall examine the type of velocity fluctuation that gives rise to such a situation below.

An important application of the theory of backscattering is the interpretation of the frequency variation of  $Q$  for shear waves in the range 1–30 Hz [Aki, 1980; Wu, 1982].  $Q$ , the quality factor, describes the attenuation of the amplitude  $A$  in (4) by

$$A(x) = A(0) \exp[-\pi f x / (Q C_0)] \quad (36)$$

The total  $Q$  represents the effects of energy loss from the primary wave by the combined mechanisms of loss of seismic energy to heat ( $Q_i$ ) and loss due to backscattering ( $Q_s$ ) according to the relation [Warren, 1972]

$$1/Q = 1/Q_i + 1/Q_s \quad (37)$$

Wu [1982] derives an expression for  $Q_s$ , with the proper choice of  $V$ , as

$$1/Q_s = \frac{C_0 R^2}{2\pi f A^2 V} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \int_{\pi/2}^{\pi} d\theta |p_s|^2 \sin(\theta) \quad (38)$$

where  $\phi$  is an azimuthal angle about the direction of propagation of the primary wave and the integral over scattering angle  $\theta$  is taken over all backscattering angles.

Substituting for  $|p_s|^2$  from (26) and performing the integral over  $\phi$ , in the limit of high frequency,

$$1/Q_s = -\frac{C_0 \langle\mu^2\rangle}{8\pi f} \left(\frac{dN}{dr}\right)_{r=0} \int_{\pi/2}^{\pi} \frac{\sin(\theta) d\theta}{\sin^4(\theta/2)} \quad (39)$$

This may be evaluated using the trigonometric identity

$$2 \sin^2(\theta/2) = 1 - \cos(\theta) \quad (40)$$

as

$$1/Q_s = -\frac{C_0 \langle\mu^2\rangle}{4\pi f} \left(\frac{dN}{dr}\right)_{r=0} \quad (41)$$

Comparing this with an expression from Dainty [1981],

$$1/Q_s = g C_0 / (2\pi f) \quad (42)$$

then

$$g = -\frac{\langle\mu^2\rangle}{2} \left(\frac{dN}{dr}\right)_{r=0} \quad (43)$$

This indicates that  $g$ , the turbidity, is independent of frequency and depends on the product of the mean square slowness fluctuation and the derivative of the autocorrelation of the slowness fluctuation. The lack of dependence of  $g$  on frequency is the same result obtained by Dainty [1981] for a set of randomly distributed spheres in geometric scatter; thus we may say that the approximation explored in this paper is the analog of geometric scattering from obstacles. Indeed, observationally we cannot distinguish between these cases, nor can we distinguish between different autocorrelation functions  $N(r)$  except insofar as their derivatives at  $r = 0$  differ. The lack of dependence of  $g$  on frequency may be experimentally observed for seismic waves above 1 Hz [Dainty, 1981].

In (38) the integral over the scattering angle was taken over

all backscattered angles. Sato [1982a] has used a different approach (the mean wave method) from that used by Chernov [1960] and Wu [1982]. His work suggests that instead of (38),

$$1/Q_s = \frac{C_0 R^2}{2\pi f A^2 V} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \left[ \int_{\theta_c}^{\pi} d\theta |p_s|^2 \sin(\theta) + \int_0^{\theta_c} d\theta |p_s|^2 \sin^4(\theta/2) \sin(\theta) \right] \quad (44)$$

$$\sin(\theta_c/2) = 1/4 \quad \theta_c \cong 30^\circ \quad (45)$$

Comparing (44) and (38), Sato [1982a] indicates that all energy scattered at angles greater than  $\theta_c$  should be considered lost from the primary wave (the first integral in the brackets) and a fraction of the more forward scattered energy should also be excluded (the second integral). Wu [1982] excluded only the backscattered energy. To evaluate (44), I shall use (26); while (26) is not valid near  $\theta = 0$ , the presence of the weighting factor  $[\sin^4(\theta/2) \sin(\theta)]$  in (44) ensures that the integral is small in this region. Then

$$1/Q_s \cong -\frac{7}{2\pi} \frac{C_0 \langle \mu^2 \rangle}{f} \left( \frac{dN}{dr} \right)_{r=0} \quad (46)$$

from (42) this gives

$$g \cong -7 \langle \mu^2 \rangle \left( \frac{dN}{dr} \right)_{r=0} \quad (47)$$

The value in (47) is larger than that in (43) because a greater part of the scattered energy was considered lost from the primary wave.

The results in (43) and/or (47) may be compared with another parameter, the backscattering turbidity

$$g_\pi = \frac{R^2}{AV} |p_s(\pi)|^2 \quad (48)$$

$$g_\pi = -\frac{\langle \mu^2 \rangle}{8\pi} \left( \frac{dN}{dr} \right)_{r=0} \quad (49)$$

This parameter controls the amplitude level of coda waves relative to the direct wave, after correction for geometrical spreading and attenuation [Aki and Chouet, 1975]. Aki [1980] suggested that  $g_\pi \sim g$ ; Sato [1982b] presented a more detailed calculation. According to the formulas presented here,

$$g_\pi/g = 1/(4\pi) \cong 10\% \quad (50)$$

if expression (43) is used for  $g$ ,

$$g_\pi/g \cong 1/(56\pi) \cong 1\% \quad (51)$$

if (47) is used for  $g$ .

A final, important question has to do with the nature of the slowness fluctuation  $\mu(x)$  that will lead to an autocorrelation  $N(r)$  that has a nonzero first derivative at  $r = 0$ . Chernov [1960] asserts that the first derivative of  $N(r)$  must tend to zero for  $r \rightarrow 0$  if  $\mu(x)$  is continuous, although a proof is only given for the one-dimensional case. This is a special case of a result due to Taylor [1920], who proved (for the one-dimensional case) that the autocorrelation of a continuous function has only even-ordered derivatives that are nonzero at zero lag. Pekeris [1942] comments further on Taylor's result. However, K. Aki (personal communication, 1983) has pointed out that the (one-dimensional) function

$$\mu(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} w(\tau) h(x - \tau) d\tau \quad (52)$$

$$h(x) = \exp[-x/a] \quad x > 0 \\ = 0 \quad x < 0 \quad (53)$$

has the autocorrelation given by (27) if  $w(x)$  is any function with a power spectrum that is constant with frequency. If  $w(x)$  is chosen to be "white noise," considered to be a set of impulses infinitely closely spaced, it appears that (52) may be continuous, even though it has an autocorrelation which has a nonzero first derivative at zero lag. However, the first derivative of (52) is

$$\mu'(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} w(\tau) h'(x - \tau) d\tau \\ = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} w(\tau) [\delta(x - \tau) - (1/a)h(x - \tau)] d\tau \\ = w(x) - (1/a)\mu(x) \quad (54)$$

This is a discontinuous function, since  $w(x)$  is discontinuous. Thus the function  $\mu(x)$  is "continuous" but is not "smooth." This property of  $\mu(x)$  is perhaps the reason that Taylor's [1920] and Chernov's [1960] proofs fail. The lack of smoothness may explain why the results obtained here are equivalent to geometrical scattering from obstacles, since in this case scattering at high frequencies is controlled by the discontinuity which is the boundary of the obstacle. Furthermore, this discontinuity will scatter waves of any frequency.

As an additional limitation on the theory presented here, I note that there is a class of autocorrelation functions, the Von Karman function [Wu, 1982; personal communication, 1983] that have infinite slopes at  $r = 0$  for certain values of their parameters. The Von Karman function is given by

$$N(r) = \frac{1}{2^{m-1} \Gamma(m)} \left( \frac{r}{a} \right)^m K_m \left( \frac{r}{a} \right) \quad (55)$$

where  $\Gamma(m)$  is the gamma function and  $K_m$  is the modified Bessel function. For  $m < 1/2$ ,  $(dN/dr)_{r=0} \rightarrow \infty$ . Obviously, the theory presented here cannot apply to this case, since we may not write (11). For  $m = 1/2$ , (55) becomes (27), and for  $m > 1/2$ ,  $(dN/dr)_{r=0} \rightarrow 0$ .

**Acknowledgments.** K. Aki, J.-C. Mareschal, W. Menke, Ru-Shan Wu, and an anonymous reviewer made suggestions that enhanced my understanding and improved the manuscript. Any errors remaining are mine. This research was supported by the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense and was monitored by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under grant AFOSR-83-0037.

## REFERENCES

- Aki, K., Scattering and attenuation of shear waves in the lithosphere, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **85**, 6496-6504, 1980.
- Aki, K., and B. Chouet, Origin of coda waves: Source, attenuation, and scattering effects, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **80**, 3322-3341, 1975.
- Aki, K., and P. G. Richards, *Quantitative Seismology*, vol. II, pp. 737-744, W. H. Freeman, San Francisco, Calif., 1980.
- Carmichael, R. D., and E. R. Smith, *Mathematical Tables and Formulas*, 261 pp., Dover, New York, 1962.
- Chernov, L. A., *Wave Propagation in a Random Medium*, pp. 6-11 and 41-53, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1960.
- Dainty, A. M., A scattering model to explain seismic Q observations in the lithosphere between 1 and 30 Hz, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **8**, 1126-1128, 1981.
- Dainty, A. M., and M. N. Toksoz, Seismic codas on the earth and moon: A comparison, *Phys. Earth Planet. Inter.*, **26**, 250-260, 1981.
- Haddon, R. A. W., and J. R. Cleary, Evidence for scattering of seismic PKP waves near the mantle-core boundary, *Phys. Earth Planet. Inter.*, **8**, 211-234, 1974.

- Kikuchi, M., Dispersion and attenuation of elastic waves due to multiple scattering from inclusions, *Phys. Earth Planet. Inter.*, 25, 159-162, 1981.
- Knopoff, L., and J. A. Hudson, Frequency dependence of amplitudes of scattered elastic waves, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 42, 18-20, 1967.
- Pekeris, C. L., Comments on T. E. W. Schumann's paper "An investigation concerning G. I. Taylor's correlation coefficient of turbulence," *Philos. Mag.*, 33, 541-543, 1942.
- Pekeris, C. L., Note on the scattering of radiation in an inhomogeneous medium, *Phys. Rev.*, 71, 268-269, 1947.
- Sato, H., Amplitude attenuation of impulsive waves in random media based on travel time corrected mean wave formalism, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 71, 559-564, 1982a.
- Sato, H., Attenuation of S waves in the lithosphere due to scattering by its random velocity structure, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 87, 7779-7785, 1982b.
- Taylor, G. I., Diffusion by continuous movements, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 20, 196-212, 1920.
- Warren, N., Q and structure, *Moon Planets*, 4, 430-441, 1972.
- Wu, R.-S., Attenuation of short period seismic waves due to scattering, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 9, 9-12, 1982.
- A. M. Dainty, School of Geophysical Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332.

(Received August 3, 1983;  
revised January 9, 1984;  
accepted January 17, 1984.)

# High-Frequency Acoustic Backscattering and Seismic Attenuation

ANTON M. DAINTY

*School of Geophysical Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology*

An expression for the backscattered intensity of acoustic waves singly scattered from a region containing fluctuations of the acoustic velocity has been derived for high frequencies by expanding the autocorrelation of the slowness fluctuations in a Taylor series about zero lag. The resulting expression indicates that the backscattered intensity is independent of frequency and directly proportional to the first derivative of the autocorrelation at zero lag; the next higher term is proportional to the reciprocal of the square of the frequency and directly proportional to the third derivative of the autocorrelation at zero lag. Contributions from terms of the Taylor series involving even numbered derivatives of the autocorrelation are zero. Since for the autocorrelation of a smooth function only the even numbered derivatives are nonzero at zero lag, this result demonstrates that backscattering at high frequencies can only occur from discontinuities of velocity or its derivatives as opposed to fluctuations in which the velocities are smooth. If the backscattered intensity is independent of frequency, the contribution of backscattering to the attenuation parameter  $Q$  is proportional to frequency. Such behavior may have been observed for seismic waves of frequencies greater than 1 Hz, suggesting that scattering from discontinuities is an important part of the attenuation of such waves.

## INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of scattering of seismic waves has attracted increasing attention in recent years. Backscattering of seismic waves has been used to explain terrestrial codas [Aki and Chouet, 1975; Dainty and Toksoz, 1981] and part or all of the attenuation suffered by seismic waves at frequencies of 1 Hz and greater [Aki, 1980; Dainty, 1981; Kikuchi, 1981; Wu, 1982]. To analyze observed data on attenuation, coda amplitudes and other manifestations of scattering, a model of the earth as a scattering medium is required together with a theory to derive quantitative results from this model. Two general types of model have been used. One is the "randomly distributed specific scatterers" model. This model assumes scatterers of a specific type, for example, spheres, randomly distributed throughout an otherwise homogeneous region. Examples of this type of model are the sphere model of Dainty [1981], used to explain the frequency dependence of the attenuation parameter  $Q$  at frequencies above 1 Hz, and the crack model of Kikuchi [1981], also used to analyze  $Q$ . A second type of model is the "random medium" model, in which the earth is considered to have average properties that do not vary from place to place but with random fluctuations of the material properties. Examples are the use of an acoustic random medium by Aki [1980] and Wu [1982] to analyze  $Q$  above 1 Hz.

In this paper I shall examine the acoustic random medium model using the results of Chernov [1960] in the limit of high-frequency backscattering. This problem was chosen because investigators using this model have generally concluded that this is the practical case in the earth for frequencies of 1 Hz and higher [Aki, 1980; Dainty, 1981; Sato, 1982b; Wu, 1982]. By analyzing the high-frequency limit, insight may be gained as to what type of information about the medium may be deduced from high-frequency data. An additional benefit is an understanding of the relationship between the two types of models that have been used to examine this problem.

## RANDOM MEDIUM MODELS

The simplest type of random medium used in seismology is the acoustic random medium discussed by Chernov [1960] (a summary of some useful results is given by Aki and Richards [1980]). The medium is considered to have fluctuations of velocity and density about mean values; for simplicity I will consider only the velocity fluctuations. Let the acoustic velocity  $C$  be given by

$$C = C_0[1 - \mu(\mathbf{x})] \quad (1)$$

where  $C_0$  is a constant and  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$ , the slowness perturbation, is a random function of position  $\mathbf{x}$  and has an average value of zero. The autocorrelation  $N(\mathbf{r})$  of the slowness perturbation  $\mu$  is then

$$N(\mathbf{r}) = \langle \mu(\mathbf{x})\mu(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{r}) \rangle / \langle \mu^2 \rangle \quad (2)$$

The vector  $\mathbf{r}$  is the lag, and the angle brackets indicate averaging over all  $\mathbf{x}$ . If the fluctuation is isotropic, then

$$N(\mathbf{r}) = N(r) \quad (3)$$

that is, the autocorrelation depends only on the magnitude of the lag and not its direction.

Chernov [1960] finds the amplitude of singly (weakly) scattered waves for the case of a plane wave traveling through an acoustic medium of velocity  $C_0$  without velocity fluctuations, except for a volume  $V$  containing velocity fluctuations as described above. If the incident (pressure) wave is given by

$$p_I = A \cdot \exp [2\pi f i(t - x/C_0)] \quad (4)$$

where  $f$  is the frequency, then the amplitude of the scattered wave at position  $\mathbf{R}$  from the center of  $V$  in the limit of  $\mathbf{R}$  large in comparison with the linear dimension of  $V$  is given by

$$|p_s|^2 = \frac{4\pi^2 V A^2 f^2 \langle \mu^2 \rangle}{C_0^3 R^2 \sin(\theta/2)} \cdot \int_0^\infty N(r) \cdot \sin \{ [4\pi f r \cdot \sin(\theta/2)] / C_0 \} r dr \quad (5)$$

[Chernov, 1960, equation 45, p. 51]. The scattering angle  $\theta$  is the angle between  $\mathbf{R}$  and the direction of propagation; I shall define "backscattering" as the case  $\theta > \pi/2$ . Equation (5) was first derived, in a slightly different form, by Pekeris [1947].

Copyright 1984 by the American Geophysical Union.

Paper number 4B0124.  
0148-0227/84/004B-0124\$05.00



This paper is concerned with the evaluation of (5) in the limit of large  $f$  and  $\theta > \pi/2$ .

Before proceeding, it should be noted that the acoustic medium described above is obviously too simple to describe the earth, which is an elastic medium presumably containing fluctuations of both elastic constants and density and through which two types of waves, compressional and shear, can propagate. *Knopoff and Hudson* [1967] have demonstrated that converted waves (scattered compressional waves from incident shear waves, and vice versa) are not important at high frequencies. *Haddon and Cleary* [1974] examined the problem of scattering from an inhomogeneous elastic medium; some of their (unpublished) results are discussed in the work of *Aki and Richards* [1980]. These results indicate that at least some of the formulas equivalent to equation (5) are of a similar form. Accordingly, (5) may be considered typical of integrals that appear in this type of problem.

#### EVALUATION OF THE BACKSCATTERED INTENSITY AT HIGH FREQUENCY

To evaluate (5), we need to find the integral

$$\int_0^\infty N(r) \cdot \sin \{ [4\pi f r \cdot \sin(\theta/2)]/C_0 \} \cdot r dr = F(\infty) - F(0) \quad (6)$$

where  $F$  is the indefinite integral. However, if there is a scale length  $a$  associated with the fluctuations,  $N(r)$  will generally decline rapidly for  $r$  larger than  $a$ . Accordingly, I will assume that  $F(\infty) \rightarrow 0$  in (6); this will certainly be true of  $N(r) \rightarrow \exp[-r/a]$  for large  $r$ . Then

$$\int_0^\infty N(r) \cdot \sin \{ [4\pi f r \cdot \sin(\theta/2)]/C_0 \} \cdot r dr \cong -F(0) \quad (7)$$

To approximate  $F(0)$  in the case of  $f$  large and  $\theta > \pi/2$ , note that for this case the sine term in (7) varies much more rapidly than  $N(r)$ , assuming  $N$  is a smooth function. Accordingly, I will expand  $N(r)$  in a Taylor series near  $r = 0$ . First, however, define

$$u = [4\pi f r \cdot \sin(\theta/2)]/C_0 \quad (8)$$

$$K = [4\pi f \cdot \sin(\theta/2)]/C_0 \quad (9)$$

Then (7) becomes

$$\frac{1}{K^2} \int_0^\infty N\left(\frac{u}{K}\right) \cdot \sin(u) \cdot u du \cong -F(0) \quad (10)$$

Expand  $N(u/K)$  as, remembering that  $u/K = r$ ,

$$N\left(\frac{u}{K}\right) = N(0) + \frac{u}{K} \left(\frac{dN}{dr}\right)_{r=0} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{u}{K}\right)^2 \left(\frac{d^2N}{dr^2}\right)_{r=0} + \cdots \quad (11)$$

provided the derivatives at  $r = 0$  exist and are finite. Then

$$\begin{aligned} F(u) \cong \frac{1}{K^2} \left[ N(0) \int u \cdot \sin(u) \cdot du + \frac{1}{K} \left(\frac{dN}{dr}\right)_{r=0} \right. \\ \cdot \int u^2 \sin(u) \cdot du + \frac{1}{2K^2} \left(\frac{d^2N}{dr^2}\right)_{r=0} \\ \cdot \int u^3 \sin(u) \cdot du + \cdots \left. \right] \quad (12) \end{aligned}$$

To evaluate (12), use the tabulated integrals [*Carmichael and Smith*, 1962]:

$$\int u \cdot \sin(u) \cdot du = \sin(u) - u \cdot \cos(u) \quad (13)$$

$$\int u^m \sin(u) \cdot du = -u^m \cos(u) + m \int u^{m-1} \cos(u) \cdot du \quad (14)$$

$$\int u^m \cos(u) \cdot du = u^m \sin(u) - m \int u^{m-1} \sin(u) \cdot du \quad (15)$$

$$\int u \cdot \cos(u) \cdot du = \cos(u) + u \cdot \sin(u) \quad (16)$$

Using (14) and (16),

$$\int u^2 \sin(u) \cdot du = 2u \cdot \sin(u) + (2 - u^2) \cos(u) \quad (17)$$

Using (13), (14), (15), and (16),

$$\begin{aligned} \int u^m \sin(u) \cdot du = \cos(u) \cdot \left[ -u^m + \sum_{n=1}^{(m-1)/2} (-1)^{n+1} \right. \\ \cdot m(m-1) \cdots (m-2n+1) u^{m-2n} \left. \right] \\ + \sin(u) \left[ mu^{m-1} + \sum_{n=1}^{(m-1)/2} (-1)^n \right. \\ \cdot m(m-1) \cdots (m-2n) u^{m-2n-1} \left. \right] \quad (18) \\ (m \text{ odd}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int u^m \sin(u) \cdot du = \cos(u) \left[ -u^m + \sum_{n=1}^{m/2} (-1)^{n+1} \right. \\ \cdot m(m-1) \cdots (m-2n+1) u^{m-2n} \left. \right] \\ + \sin(u) \left[ mu^{m-1} + \sum_{n=1}^{(m/2)-1} (-1)^n \right. \\ \cdot m(m-1) \cdots (m-2n) u^{m-2n-1} \left. \right] \quad (19) \\ (m \text{ even}) \end{aligned}$$

From (13), (17), (18), and (19), as  $u \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\int u \cdot \sin(u) \cdot du \rightarrow 0 \quad (20)$$

$$\int u^2 \sin(u) \cdot du \rightarrow 2 \quad (21)$$

$$\int u^m \sin(u) \cdot du \rightarrow 0 \quad (m \text{ odd}) \quad (22)$$

$$\int u^m \sin(u) \cdot du \rightarrow (-1)^{m/2+1} m! \quad (m \text{ even}) \quad (23)$$

Substituting in (12) and letting  $u \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$F(0) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{K^{2n+1}} (-1)^{n+1} \frac{(2n)!}{(2n-1)!} \left(\frac{d^{2n-1}N}{dr^{2n-1}}\right)_{r=0} \quad (24)$$

According to (24), under the conditions described the backscattered intensity depends only on the odd derivatives of  $N$  at  $r = 0$  and not on the even derivatives. Since this is a high-frequency approximation, the first term in (24) will be the most important, that is,

$$F(0) \cong \frac{2}{K^3} \left(\frac{dN}{dr}\right)_{r=0} + O(1/K^5) \quad (25)$$

Substituting in (10) and (5),

$$|p_s|^2 = -\frac{VA^2\langle\mu^2\rangle}{8\pi R^2 \sin^4(\theta/2)} \left(\frac{dN}{dr}\right)_{r=0} + O(1/f^2) \quad (26)$$

This indicates that the backscattered intensity is independent of frequency, provided that the autocorrelation has a nonzero derivative at zero lag. Since the first derivative at zero lag must be negative ( $N(r)$  has a maximum at  $r = 0$ ),  $|p_s|^2$  will be positive.

To test (26), I will compare it to two specified cases of  $N(r)$  for which explicit formulas for  $|p_s|^2$  are available [Chernov, 1960]. If

$$N(r) = \exp(-r/a) \quad (27)$$

then

$$|p_s|^2 = \frac{32\pi^3 VA^2 f^4 a^3 \langle\mu^2\rangle}{R^2 [C_0^2 + 16\pi^2 f^2 a^2 \sin^2(\theta/2)]^2} \quad (28)$$

$$|p_s|^2 \rightarrow \frac{VA^2 \langle\mu^2\rangle}{8\pi R^2 a \sin^4(\theta/2)} \quad f \rightarrow \infty, \theta \geq \pi/2 \quad (29)$$

The approximate solution given by (26) reproduces this result.

Another case for which an exact solution is available is

$$N(r) = \exp(-r^2/a^2) \quad (30)$$

Then

$$|p_s|^2 = \frac{4\pi^{7/2} VA^2 f^4 a^3 \langle\mu^2\rangle}{R^2} \cdot \exp\{-[4\pi^2 f^2 a^2 \sin^2(\theta/2)]/C_0^2\} \quad (31)$$

$$|p_s|^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad f \rightarrow \infty \quad \theta \geq \pi/2 \quad (32)$$

Since  $N(r)$  has no nonzero derivatives of odd order for  $r = 0$ , this is also in accord with (26).

#### DISCUSSION

The limit of validity of (26) can be obtained from (7), since we require that the sine terms in (7) vary much more rapidly than  $N(r)$ . If  $a$  is a scale length describing the range of  $r$  over which  $N(r)$  varies appreciably, we must have

$$[4\pi fa \cdot \sin(\theta/2)]/C_0 \gg 2\pi \quad (33)$$

or

$$[2fa \cdot \sin(\theta/2)]/C_0 \gg 1 \quad (34)$$

Note that (34) requires that the scattering angle  $\theta$  cannot be small; in fact,

$$\sin(\theta/2) \gg C_0/(2fa) \quad \theta \geq 30^\circ \quad (35)$$

is necessary. Thus the approximation used here is not valid for forward scattering. It may, however, be valid for  $\theta < \pi/2$  provided the restriction (35) is observed, together with a restriction discussed below requiring  $\theta \geq 30^\circ$ . Within these limits, the scattered intensity varies as  $1/(\sin^4 \theta/2)$ , indicating that "side scattering" ( $\theta \sim \pi/2$ ) is about 4 times as strong as "backscattering" ( $\theta \sim \pi$ ) in the strict sense.

There is, however, another consideration that must be applied to the forward scattering question. In forward scattering ( $\theta \rightarrow 0$ ) the scattered wave merges with the original incident wave [Chernov, 1960; Knopoff and Hudson, 1967]. The theory used to derive (5) does not satisfactorily account for this [Chernov, 1960] and accordingly (26) should never be used for

small  $\theta$ , (35) notwithstanding. Sato [1982a], in fact, indicates that the merging of the scattered and incident wave is a significant effect for  $\theta \leq 30^\circ$  (see (44) and (45), below), and thus I have added the restriction  $\theta \geq 30^\circ$  to (35). It should also be noted, however, that if  $(dN/dr)_{r=0} \neq 0$ , (26) indicates that there is always backscattered energy, no matter how high the frequency of the incident wave. I shall examine the type of velocity fluctuation that gives rise to such a situation below.

An important application of the theory of backscattering is the interpretation of the frequency variation of  $Q$  for shear waves in the range 1–30 Hz [Aki, 1980; Wu, 1982].  $Q$ , the quality factor, describes the attenuation of the amplitude  $A$  in (4) by

$$A(x) = A(0) \exp[-\pi f x / (Q C_0)] \quad (36)$$

The total  $Q$  represents the effects of energy loss from the primary wave by the combined mechanisms of loss of seismic energy to heat ( $Q_i$ ) and loss due to backscattering ( $Q_s$ ) according to the relation [Warren, 1972]

$$1/Q = 1/Q_i + 1/Q_s \quad (37)$$

Wu [1982] derives an expression for  $Q_s$  with the proper choice of  $V$ , as

$$1/Q_s = \frac{C_0 R^2}{2\pi f A^2 V} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \int_{\pi/2}^{\pi} d\theta |p_s|^2 \sin(\theta) \quad (38)$$

where  $\phi$  is an azimuthal angle about the direction of propagation of the primary wave and the integral over scattering angle  $\theta$  is taken over all backscattering angles.

Substituting for  $|p_s|^2$  from (26) and performing the integral over  $\phi$ , in the limit of high frequency,

$$1/Q_s = -\frac{C_0 \langle\mu^2\rangle}{8\pi f} \left(\frac{dN}{dr}\right)_{r=0} \int_{\pi/2}^{\pi} \frac{\sin(\theta) d\theta}{\sin^4(\theta/2)} \quad (39)$$

This may be evaluated using the trigonometric identity

$$2 \sin^2(\theta/2) = 1 - \cos(\theta) \quad (40)$$

as

$$1/Q_s = -\frac{C_0 \langle\mu^2\rangle}{4\pi f} \left(\frac{dN}{dr}\right)_{r=0} \quad (41)$$

Comparing this with an expression from Dainty [1981],

$$1/Q_s = g C_0 / (2\pi f) \quad (42)$$

then

$$g = -\frac{\langle\mu^2\rangle}{2} \left(\frac{dN}{dr}\right)_{r=0} \quad (43)$$

This indicates that  $g$ , the turbidity, is independent of frequency and depends on the product of the mean square slowness fluctuation and the derivative of the autocorrelation of the slowness fluctuation. The lack of dependence of  $g$  on frequency is the same result obtained by Dainty [1981] for a set of randomly distributed spheres in geometric scatter; thus we may say that the approximation explored in this paper is the analog of geometric scattering from obstacles. Indeed, observationally we cannot distinguish between these cases, nor can we distinguish between different autocorrelation functions  $N(r)$  except insofar as their derivatives at  $r = 0$  differ. The lack of dependence of  $g$  on frequency may be experimentally observed for seismic waves above 1 Hz [Dainty, 1981].

In (38) the integral over the scattering angle was taken over

all backscattered angles. Sato [1982a] has used a different approach (the mean wave method) from that used by Chernov [1960] and Wu [1982]. His work suggests that instead of (38),

$$1/Q_s = \frac{C_0 R^2}{2\pi f A^2 V} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \left[ \int_{\theta_c}^{\pi} d\theta |p_s|^2 \sin(\theta) + \int_0^{\theta_c} d\theta |p_s|^2 \sin^4(\theta/2) \sin(\theta) \right] \quad (44)$$

$$\sin(\theta_c/2) = 1/4 \quad \theta_c \cong 30^\circ \quad (45)$$

Comparing (44) and (38), Sato [1982a] indicates that all energy scattered at angles greater than  $\theta_c$  should be considered lost from the primary wave (the first integral in the brackets) and a fraction of the more forward scattered energy should also be excluded (the second integral). Wu [1982] excluded only the backscattered energy. To evaluate (44), I shall use (26); while (26) is not valid near  $\theta = 0$ , the presence of the weighting factor  $[\sin^4(\theta/2) \sin(\theta)]$  in (44) ensures that the integral is small in this region. Then

$$1/Q_s \cong -\frac{7}{2\pi} \frac{C_0 \langle \mu^2 \rangle}{f} \left( \frac{dN}{dr} \right)_{r=0} \quad (46)$$

from (42) this gives

$$g \cong -7 \langle \mu^2 \rangle \left( \frac{dN}{dr} \right)_{r=0} \quad (47)$$

The value in (47) is larger than that in (43) because a greater part of the scattered energy was considered lost from the primary wave.

The results in (43) and/or (47) may be compared with another parameter, the backscattering turbidity

$$g_\pi = \frac{R^2}{AV} |p_s(\pi)|^2 \quad (48)$$

$$g_\pi = -\frac{\langle \mu^2 \rangle}{8\pi} \left( \frac{dN}{dr} \right)_{r=0} \quad (49)$$

This parameter controls the amplitude level of coda waves relative to the direct wave, after correction for geometrical spreading and attenuation [Aki and Chouet, 1975]. Aki [1980] suggested that  $g_\pi \sim g$ ; Sato [1982b] presented a more detailed calculation. According to the formulas presented here,

$$g_\pi/g = 1/(4\pi) \cong 10\% \quad (50)$$

if expression (43) is used for  $g$ ,

$$g_\pi/g \cong 1/(56\pi) \cong 1\% \quad (51)$$

if (47) is used for  $g$ .

A final, important question has to do with the nature of the slowness fluctuation  $\mu(x)$  that will lead to an autocorrelation  $N(r)$  that has a nonzero first derivative at  $r = 0$ . Chernov [1960] asserts that the first derivative of  $N(r)$  must tend to zero for  $r \rightarrow 0$  if  $\mu(x)$  is continuous, although a proof is only given for the one-dimensional case. This is a special case of a result due to Taylor [1920], who proved (for the one-dimensional case) that the autocorrelation of a continuous function has only even-ordered derivatives that are nonzero at zero lag. Pekeris [1942] comments further on Taylor's result. However, K. Aki (personal communication, 1983) has pointed out that the (one-dimensional) function

$$\mu(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} w(\tau) h(x - \tau) d\tau \quad (52)$$

$$h(x) = \exp[-x/a] \quad x > 0 \\ = 0 \quad x < 0 \quad (53)$$

has the autocorrelation given by (27) if  $w(x)$  is any function with a power spectrum that is constant with frequency. If  $w(x)$  is chosen to be "white noise," considered to be a set of impulses infinitely closely spaced, it appears that (52) may be continuous, even though it has an autocorrelation which has a nonzero first derivative at zero lag. However, the first derivative of (52) is

$$\mu'(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} w(\tau) h'(x - \tau) d\tau \\ = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} w(\tau) [\delta(x - \tau) - (1/a)h(x - \tau)] d\tau \\ = w(x) - (1/a)\mu(x) \quad (54)$$

This is a discontinuous function, since  $w(x)$  is discontinuous. Thus the function  $\mu(x)$  is "continuous" but is not "smooth." This property of  $\mu(x)$  is perhaps the reason that Taylor's [1920] and Chernov's [1960] proofs fail. The lack of smoothness may explain why the results obtained here are equivalent to geometrical scattering from obstacles, since in this case scattering at high frequencies is controlled by the discontinuity which is the boundary of the obstacle. Furthermore, this discontinuity will scatter waves of any frequency.

As an additional limitation on the theory presented here, I note that there is a class of autocorrelation functions, the Von Karman function [Wu, 1982; personal communication, 1983] that have infinite slopes at  $r = 0$  for certain values of their parameters. The Von Karman function is given by

$$N(r) = \frac{1}{2^{m-1} \Gamma(m)} \left( \frac{r}{a} \right)^m K_m \left( \frac{r}{a} \right) \quad (55)$$

where  $\Gamma(m)$  is the gamma function and  $K_m$  is the modified Bessel function. For  $m < 1/2$ ,  $(dN/dr)_{r=0} \rightarrow \infty$ . Obviously, the theory presented here cannot apply to this case, since we may not write (11). For  $m = 1/2$ , (55) becomes (27), and for  $m > 1/2$ ,  $(dN/dr)_{r=0} \rightarrow 0$ .

**Acknowledgments.** K. Aki, J.-C. Mareschal, W. Menke, Ru-Shan Wu, and an anonymous reviewer made suggestions that enhanced my understanding and improved the manuscript. Any errors remaining are mine. This research was supported by the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense and was monitored by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under grant AFOSR-83-0037.

## REFERENCES

- Aki, K., Scattering and attenuation of shear waves in the lithosphere, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **85**, 6496-6504, 1980.
- Aki, K., and B. Chouet, Origin of coda waves: Source, attenuation, and scattering effects, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **80**, 3322-3341, 1975.
- Aki, K., and P. G. Richards, *Quantitative Seismology*, vol. II, pp. 737-744, W. H. Freeman, San Francisco, Calif., 1980.
- Carmichael, R. D., and E. R. Smith, *Mathematical Tables and Formulas*, 261 pp., Dover, New York, 1962.
- Chernov, L. A., *Wave Propagation in a Random Medium*, pp. 6-11 and 41-53, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1960.
- Dainty, A. M., A scattering model to explain seismic  $Q$  observations in the lithosphere between 1 and 30 Hz, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **8**, 1126-1128, 1981.
- Dainty, A. M., and M. N. Toksoz, Seismic codas on the earth and moon: A comparison, *Phys. Earth Planet. Inter.*, **26**, 250-260, 1981.
- Haddon, R. A. W., and J. R. Cleary, Evidence for scattering of seismic PKP waves near the mantle-core boundary, *Phys. Earth Planet. Inter.*, **8**, 211-234, 1974.

- Kikuchi, M., Dispersion and attenuation of elastic waves due to multiple scattering from inclusions, *Phys. Earth Planet. Inter.*, 25, 159-162, 1981.
- Knopoff, L., and J. A. Hudson, Frequency dependence of amplitudes of scattered elastic waves, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 42, 18-20, 1967.
- Pekeris, C. L., Comments on T. E. W. Schumann's paper "An investigation concerning G. I. Taylor's correlation coefficient of turbulence," *Philos. Mag.*, 33, 541-543, 1942.
- Pekeris, C. L., Note on the scattering of radiation in an inhomogeneous medium, *Phys. Rev.*, 71, 268-269, 1947.
- Sato, H., Amplitude attenuation of impulsive waves in random media based on travel time corrected mean wave formalism, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 71, 559-564, 1982a.
- Sato, H., Attenuation of S waves in the lithosphere due to scattering by its random velocity structure, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 87, 7779-7785, 1982b.
- Taylor, G. I., Diffusion by continuous movements, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 20, 196-212, 1920.
- Warren, N., Q and structure, *Moon Planets*, 4, 430-441, 1972.
- Wu, R.-S., Attenuation of short period seismic waves due to scattering, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 9, 9-12, 1982.
- A. M. Dainty, School of Geophysical Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332.

(Received August 3, 1983;  
revised January 9, 1984;  
accepted January 17, 1984.)