

# Full-Wave Algorithm to Model Effects of Bedding Slopes on the Response of Subsurface Electromagnetic Geophysical Sensors near Unconformities

Kamalesh Sainath<sup>a,\*</sup>, Fernando L. Teixeira<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>The Ohio State University, ElectroScience Laboratory, 1330 Kinnear Road, Columbus, Ohio, USA 43212

---

## Abstract

We propose a full-wave pseudo-analytical numerical electromagnetic (EM) algorithm to model subsurface induction sensors, traversing planar-layered geological formations of arbitrary EM material anisotropy and loss, which are used, for example, in the exploration of hydrocarbon reserves. Unlike past pseudo-analytical planar-layered modeling algorithms that impose parallelism between the formation's bed junctions however, our method involves judicious employment of Transformation Optics techniques to address challenges related to modeling arbitrarily-oriented, *relative* slope (i.e., tilting) between said junctions. The algorithm exhibits this flexibility, both with respect to anisotropy in the formation layers as well as junction tilting, via employing special planar slabs that coat each "flattened" (i.e., originally tilted) planar interface, locally redirecting the incident wave within the coating slabs to cause wave fronts to interact with the flattened interfaces *as if* they were still tilted with a specific, user-defined orientation. Moreover, since the coating layers are homogeneous rather than exhibiting continuous material variation, a minimal number of these layers must be inserted and hence reduces added simulation time and computational expense. As said coating layers are not reflectionless however, they do induce artificial field scattering that corrupts legitimate field signatures due to the (effective) interface tilting. A subsequent version of this manuscript will quantify the spurious scattering's effect on reliable (effective) tilting this algorithm can model, as well as exhibit responses of sensors traversing three-layered anisotropic media with *relative* tilting between the formation layers.

**Keywords:** multi-layered media, deviated formations, geological unconformity, induction well-logging, borehole geophysics, geophysical exploration

---

## 1. Introduction

Long-standing and sustained interest has been directed towards the numerical evaluation of electromagnetic (EM) fields produced by sensors embedded in complex, layered-medium environments [1]. In particular, within the context of exploring geophysical resources experiencing both growing global demand yet increasingly scarcer and harder-to-reach supply (hydrocarbon reserves, for example), there exists great interest to computationally model the response of low-frequency induction-regime (i.e., 2MHz and under) subsurface geophysical exploration tools that can remotely sense the electrical and structural properties of complex geological formations (and consequently, their hydrocarbon productivity) [2]. This is because, among other reasons, induction tools facilitate strategic deployment of and increased chance of reservoir detection using far more invasive and expensive exploration techniques (namely, drilling), resulting in hybrid remote-sensing/drilling techniques such as "Logging While Drilling" operations that can dynamically redirect drilling instruments based on local induction tool readings [3]. Indeed, high-fidelity, rapid, and geophysical formation geometry-robust computational forward-modeling aids fundamental understanding of how the formation's global inhomogeneity structure, conductive anisotropy in formation bed layers, induction tool geometry, exploration borehole geometry, drilling fluid type, etc. affect the sensor's responses. This knowledge informs both effective and robust geophysical parameter retrieval algorithms, as well as sound data interpretation techniques [2, 4].

---

\*Corresponding author

Email addresses: [sainath.1@osu.edu](mailto:sainath.1@osu.edu) (Kamalesh Sainath), [teixeira@ece.osu.edu](mailto:teixeira@ece.osu.edu) (Fernando L. Teixeira)

On the other hand computational forward-modeling engines, and their repeated use, in many cases represent the critical bottleneck, in terms of solution speed, accuracy, and ability to model all of the salient, dominant geophysical formation features, of such retrieval algorithms. Developing forward-modeling algorithms then which not only deliver rapid, accuracy-controllable results, but also simulate the effects of a greater number of dominant, geophysical features without markedly increased computational burden, represents a high priority in subsurface geophysical exploration [5, 6].

In the interest of obtaining a good trade-off between the forward modeler's solution speed while still modeling the EM behavior of the environment's dominant geophysical features, a layered-medium approximation of the formation proves very useful. Indeed cylindrical layering, planar layering, and a combination of the two (for example, to model the cylindrical exploratory borehole and invasion zone embedded within a stack of planar formation beds) are arguably three of the most widely used layering approximations in subsurface geophysics [2–5, 7–25]; their prevalence is self-evident in both onshore and offshore geophysical exploration modeling [26–36]. The prevalence of layered-medium approximations stems in large part, at least from a computational modeling standpoint, due to the typical availability of analytically closed-form EM eigenfunction expansions to compute the sensor's radiated EM field [37][Ch. 2-3]. These rigorously full-wave techniques are quite attractive since they can *robustly* deliver rapid solutions with high, user-controlled accuracy under widely varying conditions with respect to arbitrary anisotropy and loss in the formation's layers, arbitrarily-oriented and positioned electric or (equivalent) magnetic current-based sensors (namely, electric loop antennas), and arbitrary (non-zero) source radiation frequency [22, 36]. The robustness characteristic in particular is highly desirable in geophysics applications since geological structures are known to exhibit a wide range of inhomogeneity profiles with respect to conductivity, anisotropy, and geometrical layering [2, 6, 12]. For example with respect to formation conductivity properties, diverse geological structures can embody macro-scale conductive anisotropy in the induction frequency regime, such as (possibly cross-bedded) sand-shale micro-laminate deposits, clean-sand micro-laminate deposits, and either natural or drilling-induced fractures. The electrical conduction current transport characteristics of such structures indeed are often mathematically described by a uniaxial or biaxial conductivity tensor exhibiting directional electrical conductivities whose value range can span one to four orders of magnitude [2, 7, 14].

Due to its widespread utility and convenience, when employing planar and cylindrical layer formation approximations one almost always assumes (for cylindrical layers) that the interfaces exhibit parallel central axes (say, along  $z$ ) [24, 25], or (for planar layers) that the interfaces are all parallel to a common plane (say, the  $xy$  plane) [3, 12]. However, it may be more appropriate in many cases to admit layered media with material property variation along the direction(s) conventionally presumed homogeneous. For example, in cylindrically-layered medium problems involving deviated drilling, gravitational effects may induce a downward diffusion of the drilling fluid that leads to a cylindrical invasion zone angled relative to the cylindrical exploratory borehole, which motivated our recent investigation into modeling the responses of sensors within tilted, multi-eccentered, and generally anisotropic cylindrically-layered formations [6]. Similarly formations that locally, in the proximity of the EM tool, appear as a “stack” of beds with tilted planar interfaces can appear (for example) due to relatively abrupt temporal discontinuities in the formation's geological record. These temporal discontinuities in turn can manifest as commensurately abrupt spatial discontinuities, known as unconformities (especially, angular unconformities) [38–40]; see Figure 1a below for a schematic illustration. Indeed, the effects of unconformities and other complex formation properties (such as fractures) have garnered increasing attention over the past ten years [41–43], particularly in light of the relatively recent availability of induction sensor systems offering a rich diversity of measurement information with respect to radiation frequency, sensor and receiver orientation (“directional” diversity), and transmitter/receiver separations [43–47].

A natural question now arises, at this stage of the discussion, about what numerical technique is best suited to modeling these more complex geometries involving tilted layers. Namely, what are the advantages and disadvantages of EM eigenfunction expansions (the method we are investigating) versus alternative numerical techniques? One could immediately resort to the most flexible (in terms of geometrical, sensor, and material profile) numerical techniques such as finite difference and finite element methods [3, 16, 46, 48]. The potential for low-frequency instability (particularly serious for the considered low-frequency geophysical sensors), high computational cost (unacceptable, especially for repeated use of the forward-modeler engine in geophysical parameter retrieval), and the ill-posed nature of truncating the domain's exterior arising from the particular transverse translation-variant nature of the tilted-layer domain [49], render these numerical methods unsuitable for use in developing a geophysical sensor forward-modeler engine. Another candidate approach worth mentioning involves employing an asymptotic high-frequency, geomet-

rical ray-like approach which traces the progress of incident rays and their specular reflections within subsurface formations [50]. This method’s high-frequency approximation represents a lack of rigor in solving Maxwell’s Equations (and hence lacks well-defined error-control). Moreover the method’s stipulation of isotropic, highly conductive subsurface media renders it unsuitable for modeling low-frequency sensors, which can operate in highly resistive, highly conductive, and intermediately-conductive media (not to mention anisotropic media!) exhibiting a wide range of characteristic EM skin depth values that (for anisotropic media) can vary also with respect to wave polarization and propagation direction [51]. Yet a third possible approach called the “Tilt Operator” method, which assumes lossless media and negligible EM near-fields to avoid spurious exponential field growths (arising from violation of “primitive” causality [i.e., cause preceding effect], which is inherent in this method), is another possibility [52, 53]. Akin to the other mentioned high-frequency approach however [50], the Tilt Operator method is not appropriate for our more general class of problems with respect to sensor and geological formation characteristics.

Turning our attention henceforth to tilted planar-layered media, we propose a pseudo-analytical method based on EM plane wave eigenfunction expansions that manifest mathematically as two-dimensional (2-D) Fourier integrals. This is in contrast to faster, but more restrictive (with respect to allowed media) 1-D Fourier-Bessel (“Sommerfeld”) and Fourier-Hankel integral transforms that express EM fields in planar-layered media as integral expansions of EM conical wave eigenfunctions [37][Ch. 2]. Our choice rests upon the historic error control and speed performance robustness of the 2-D integral transform with respect to source radiation frequency, source distribution, and material properties [5, 36]. Of course, the pseudo-analytical approach is not without its potential drawbacks; principal among concerns is our having to model the effects of tilted interfaces under the restriction of using a computational geometry consisting of *parallel* planar layers. We propose addressing this challenge by leveraging the versatility of specially-designed Transformation Optics media that coat and “flatten” each (effectively) tilted interface. Indeed these planar “interface-flattening” slabs internally redirect within them, in an unequivocally-prescribed manner based on the user-desired *effective* tilting orientation of the “flattened” interfaces, EM waves such that the waves locally interact with the coated interfaces *as if* said interfaces were in fact tilted (c.f. Figs. 1a-1b).

Before proceeding we should mention three other important characteristics, beyond flexibility with respect to material anisotropy and loss, of our proposed interface-flattening coating slabs; in Fig. 1b, observe any two pink-colored interface-flattening slabs and the shared blue interface they flattened. First, the coating slabs are spatially homogeneous in the employed Cartesian coordinate system, and hence we require only one planar layer to represent each slab, and that too to represent the slab’s spatial material profile *exactly*. This homogeneity characteristic is important from a computational efficiency standpoint, as it means only one coating layer’s EM eigenfunctions, Fresnel reflection and transmission matrices, etc. must be repeatedly computed as part of the integral plane wave expansion process [22]. Second, as we will be fundamentally approximating the transverse translation-*variant* geometry as a transverse translation-*invariant* one, modeling scattering from the “apexes” and more complex intersection points of the tilted bed junctions is simply out of the question. As we concern ourselves with subsurface geophysical media, which typically are quite conductive anyway (typically on the order of  $10^{-3}$ S/m to 2S/m [2]), we conjecture that one can safely ignore these more complex effects on sensor responses so long as the sensors are not in the immediate neighborhood of said intersections. This is quite reasonable in cases where the junction polar tilting angles are kept small; as this manuscript’s subsequent version will show, the spurious wave scattering (introduced in the next paragraph) engendered by these coating slabs will anyway place stringent limits on the effective interface tilting angles.

Finally, a critical point discussed in more detail in this manuscript’s subsequent version: The “interface-coating” slabs themselves are *not* “perfectly” impedance matched to their respective ambient layers.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, for a given flattened interface its upper coating slab is not perfectly impedance matched to the formation layer immediately above it. Likewise holds for the lower coating slab and the formation layer immediately below it. The practical consequence of artificial field reflections, which based on past and present studies lead to artificially-introduced and/or corrupted “cross-polarized” fields and “co-polarized” fields (i.e., received field components orthogonally or identically oriented to the source current, resp.) [6], will be coherent interference, at the sensor’s receiver, between the artificially-scattered wave and the actual wave scattered from the coated (effectively tilted) interface. By judiciously reorienting

---

<sup>1</sup>By “perfectly” impedance matched, we mean that said two layers are impedance matched (i.e., zero wave reflection at the interface), *regardless* of the flattened interface’s desired effective tilting orientation, for any temporal radiation frequency, wave polarization, and EM eigenfunction wave vector (i.e., even for evanescent plane waves) [54].

the geometry to minimize the *absolute* polar deviation of any given interface while still preserving the full range of relative tilting however, we conjecture that artificial scattering can be mitigated to a limited extent (albeit not eliminated).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we overview the 2-D plane wave expansion algorithm, derive the material blueprints for the planar interface-flattening coating slabs, and exhibit how to systematically incorporate these into the computational model for any transmitter and receiver depth. In this manuscript’s subsequent version, Section 3 will exhibit error results to understand how the artificially-scattered fields behave; that is, how the errors depend on effective interface tilting, material profile, transmitter/receiver spacing, sensor position, and complex-valued measurement component (both its real and imaginary parts). In Section 4 we will apply the algorithm to predicting EM multi-component induction tool responses when the tool traverses (effectively) tilted formation beds for different interface tilt orientations as well as central bed conductivity profile. The formation anisotropies studied will span the full gamut: All the way from isotropic to (“Transverse-Isotropic”/non-deviated) uniaxial, (“cross-bedded”/deviated) uniaxial, and full biaxial anisotropy. We adopt the  $\exp(-i\omega t)$  convention, as well as assume all EM media are spatially non-dispersive, time-invariant, and are representable by *diagonalizable* anisotropic  $3 \times 3$  material tensors.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. Formulation

### 2.1. Background: Electromagnetic Plane Wave Eigenfunction Expansions

In deriving the planar multi-layered medium eigenfunction expansion expressions, first assume a homogeneous formation whose dielectric (i.e., excluding conductivity), relative magnetic permeability, and electric conductivity constitutive anisotropic material tensors write as  $\tilde{\epsilon}_r$ ,  $\tilde{\mu}_r$ , and  $\tilde{\sigma}$ . Specifically, the assumed material tensors are those of the layer (i.e., in the anticipated multi-layered case), labeled  $M$ , within which the transmitter resides. Now Maxwell’s Equations in the frequency domain, upon impressing causative electric current  $\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{r})$  and/or (equivalent) magnetic current  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{r})$ , yields the electric field vector wave equation (duality in Maxwell’s Equations yields the magnetic field vector wave equation) [22, 37]:<sup>3</sup>

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\cdot) = \nabla \times \tilde{\mu}_r^{-1} \cdot \nabla \times -k_0^2 (\tilde{\epsilon}_r + i\tilde{\sigma}/\omega) \cdot, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{E}) = ik_0\eta_0\mathcal{J} - \nabla \times \tilde{\mu}_r^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{M} \quad (2.1)$$

Now define the three-dimensional spatial Fourier Transform (FT) pair for some generic vector field  $\mathcal{L}$  (e.g., the magnetic field or current source vector) [22]:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{k}) = \iiint_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{r}) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} dx dy dz, \quad \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{r}) = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^3 \iiint_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} dk_x dk_y dk_z \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\mathbf{r} = (x, y, z)$  is the position vector and  $\mathbf{k} = (k_x, k_y, k_z)$  is the wave vector. Expanding the left and right hand sides, of the second equation in Eqn. (2.1), in their respective wave number domain 3-D integral representations and matching the Fourier-domain integrands on both sides, one can multiply the inverse of  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  (the FT of  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ ) to the left of both integrands. Admitting a single Hertzian/infinitesimal-point transmitter current source located at  $\mathbf{r}' = (x', y', z')$ , and denoting the receiver location  $\mathbf{r}$ , one can then procure the “direct” (i.e., homogeneous medium) radiated time-harmonic electric field  $\mathcal{E}_d(\mathbf{r})$  [22]. Indeed, performing “analytically” (i.e., via contour integration and residue calculus techniques) the  $k_z$  integral leads to the following expression:

$$\mathcal{E}_d(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{i}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[ u(z - z') \sum_{n=1}^2 \tilde{a}_{M,n}^D \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{M,n} e^{i\tilde{k}_{M,nz}\Delta z} + u(z' - z) \sum_{n=3}^4 \tilde{a}_{M,n}^D \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{M,n} e^{i\tilde{k}_{M,nz}\Delta z} \right] e^{ik_x\Delta x + ik_y\Delta y} dk_x dk_y \quad (2.3)$$

<sup>2</sup>Diagonalizability of the material tensors, which physically corresponds to a medium having a well-defined response for any direction of applied electric and magnetic field, is required for completeness of the plane wave basis. All naturally-occurring media, as well as the introduced interface-coating slabs, are characterized by diagonalizable material tensors.

<sup>3</sup> $\epsilon_0$ ,  $c$ , and  $\mu_0 = 1/(\epsilon_0 c^2)$  represent vacuum electric permittivity, vacuum speed of light, and vacuum magnetic permeability, respectively. Furthermore,  $\omega = 2\pi f$  is the angular temporal radiation frequency,  $k_0 = \omega/c$  is the vacuum wave number, and  $\eta_0 = \sqrt{\mu_0/\epsilon_0}$  is the intrinsic vacuum plane wave impedance [37, 55].

where  $\Delta x = x - x'$ ,  $\Delta y = y - y'$ ,  $\Delta z = z - z'$ ,  $u(\cdot)$  denotes the Heaviside step function, and  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{p,n}, \tilde{k}_{p,nz}, \tilde{a}_{p,n}^D\}$  stand for the electric field polarization state vector, longitudinal wave number component, and direct field polarization amplitude of the  $p$ th formation bed's  $n$ th plane wave polarization ( $1 \leq p \leq N$ ,  $1 \leq n \leq 4$ ), respectively. Now introducing additional formation beds will induce a modification, via reflection and transmission mechanisms interfering with the direct field, to the total observed electric field. We mathematically codify this interference phenomenon by deriving the (transmitter layer [ $M$ ] and receiver layer [ $L$ ]-dependent) time-harmonic scattered electric field  $\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{r})$  [22]:

$$\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{i}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[ (1 - \delta_{L,N}) \sum_{n=1}^2 \tilde{a}_{L,n}^s \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{L,n} e^{i\tilde{k}_{L,nz}z} + (1 - \delta_{L,1}) \sum_{n=3}^4 \tilde{a}_{L,n}^s \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{L,n} e^{i\tilde{k}_{L,nz}z} \right] \times e^{ik_x \Delta x + ik_y \Delta y} dk_x dk_y \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\tilde{a}_{p,n}^s$  is the scattered field polarization amplitude of the  $n$ th polarization in layer  $p$ , and  $\delta_{p1,p2}$  denotes the Kronecker Delta function.

## 2.2. Tilted Layer Modeling

For simplicity, assume an  $N$ -layer medium where the  $m$ th planar interface ( $m=1,2,\dots,N-1$ ) is characterized as follows. First, its upward-pointing area normal vector  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}'_m$  is rotated by polar angle  $-90^\circ \leq \alpha'_m \leq 90^\circ$  relative to the  $z$  axis, and azimuth angle  $0^\circ \leq \beta'_m \leq 180^\circ$  relative to the  $x$  axis. Second, the  $m$ th interface's "depth"  $z'_m$  is defined at the Cartesian coordinate system's transverse origin  $(x, y) = (0, 0)$ . See Figure 1 for a schematic illustration of the environment geometry's parameterization.




Figure 1: (Color online) Figure 1a shows the original problem with tilted planar interfaces in an  $N$ -layer geological formation possessing the EM material tensors  $\{\bar{\epsilon}_p, \bar{\mu}_p, \bar{\sigma}_p\}$ . Figure 1b shows the transformed problem obtained through employing special "interface-flattening" media (c.f. Eqn. (2.7)) that coat the underside ( $\{\bar{\epsilon}'_{m+1}, \bar{\mu}'_{m+1}, \bar{\sigma}'_{m+1}\}$ ) and over-side ( $\{\bar{\epsilon}''_m, \bar{\mu}''_m, \bar{\sigma}''_m\}$ ) of the  $m$ th interface.  $d$  represents the thickness of each T.O. slab in meters. For simplicity of illustration, all interfaces here are tilted within the  $xz$  plane (i.e., interface-tilting azimuth orientation angles  $\{\beta'_m\} = 0^\circ$ ).

To make the  $m$ th planar interface parallel to the  $xy$  plane yet retain its tilted-interface scattering characteristics, as the first of two steps we abstractly define, within the two slab regions ( $z'_m - d \leq z < z'_m$  and  $z'_m \leq z < z'_m + d$ ) bounding the  $m$ th interface, a "coordinate stretching" transformation. Namely this transformation relates Cartesian coordinates  $(x, y, z)$ , which parameterize the coordinate mesh of standard "flat space", to new oblique coordinates  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z})$  that parameterize an imaginary "deformed" space whose coordinate mesh deformation systematically induces in turn a well-defined distortion of the EM wave amplitude profile within said slab regions [56–58].<sup>4</sup>

$$\bar{x} = x, \quad \bar{y} = y, \quad \bar{z} = z + a_m x + b_m y \quad (2.5)$$

<sup>4</sup>We remark in passing upon a strong similarity between the coordinate transform shown in Eqn. (2.5) versus the "refractor" and "beam shifter" coordinate transforms prescribed elsewhere [57, 59]. However, while the beam shifter transform (and the equivalent anisotropic medium it induces [57]) is perfectly reflectionless due to *continuously* transitioning the coordinate transformation back to the external ambient medium

where  $a_m = -\tan \alpha'_m \cos \beta'_m$  and  $b_m = -\tan \alpha'_m \sin \beta'_m$ . Indeed this coordinate transform will cause wave fronts to interact with the  $m$ th flattened interface *as if* said interface were geometrically defined by the equation  $z = z'_m - a_m x - b_m y$  rather than  $z = z'_m$ . As the second step in the interface-flattening procedure, we invoke a “duality” (not to be confused with duality between the Ampere and Faraday Laws) between spatial coordinate transformations and doubly-anisotropic EM media which “implement” in flat space the effects, of an effectively deformed spatial coordinate mesh (and hence effectively deformed spatial metric tensor), on EM waves propagating through flat space (see references deriving this “duality” [54, 56, 58, 62, 63]). Following one of two common, equivalent conventions [54, 58] leading seamlessly from coordinate transformation to equivalent anisotropic material properties, by defining the Jacobian coordinate transformation tensor [58]:

$$\bar{\Lambda}_m = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \bar{x}}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial \bar{y}}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial \bar{z}}{\partial x} \\ \frac{\partial \bar{x}}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial \bar{y}}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial \bar{z}}{\partial y} \\ \frac{\partial \bar{x}}{\partial z} & \frac{\partial \bar{y}}{\partial z} & \frac{\partial \bar{z}}{\partial z} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & a_m \\ 0 & 1 & b_m \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.6)$$

within the region  $(z'_m - d) \leq z < z'_m$  one has the interface-flattening material tensors  $\{\bar{\gamma}'_{m+1}\}$  in place of the original formation’s material parameters  $\{\bar{\gamma}_{m+1}\}$  within layer  $m + 1$  ( $\gamma = \epsilon, \mu, \sigma$ ). Similarly, within the region  $z'_m \leq z < (z'_m + d)$  one has the interface-flattening material tensors  $\{\bar{\gamma}''_m\}$  in place of the original formation’s material parameters  $\{\bar{\gamma}_m\}$  within layer  $m$ . How are the interface-flattening material tensors defined though? Quite simply, in fact, and this definition holds *regardless* of the original formation layer’s anisotropy and loss (“T” superscript denotes non-Hermitian transpose) [58]:

$$\bar{\gamma}'_{m+1} = \bar{\Lambda}_m^T \cdot \bar{\gamma}_{m+1} \cdot \bar{\Lambda}_m, \quad \bar{\gamma}''_m = \bar{\Lambda}_m^T \cdot \bar{\gamma}_m \cdot \bar{\Lambda}_m \quad (2.7)$$

Note that if the  $m$ th interface lacks effective tilt then  $\bar{\Lambda}_m$  reduces to the identity matrix, which in turn leads to the two interface-flattening media reducing to the media of the respective formation layers from which they were derived using Eqn. (2.7):  $\bar{\gamma}'_{m+1} = \bar{\gamma}_{m+1}$  and  $\bar{\gamma}''_m = \bar{\gamma}_m$  (as expected!). Now the new material profile, characterized by *parallel* planar interfaces, appears for a simple three-layer, two-interface geometry as:

$$\bar{\gamma}_1, (z'_1 + d) \leq z < \infty \quad (2.8)$$

$$\bar{\gamma}''_1, z'_1 \leq z < (z'_1 + d) \quad (2.9)$$

$$\bar{\gamma}'_2, (z'_1 - d) \leq z < z'_1 \quad (2.10)$$

$$\bar{\gamma}_2, (z'_2 + d) \leq z < (z'_1 - d) \quad (2.11)$$

$$\bar{\gamma}''_2, z'_2 \leq z < (z'_2 + d) \quad (2.12)$$

$$\bar{\gamma}'_3, (z'_2 - d) \leq z < z'_2 \quad (2.13)$$

$$\bar{\gamma}_3, -\infty < z < (z'_2 - d) \quad (2.14)$$

with an analogous material profile resultant for  $N > 3$  layers.

There are two advisories worth mentioning. First, we recommend adaptively (i.e., depending on the transmitter and receiver positions) reducing the thickness  $d$  of coating layer(s), within which receiver(s) and/or transmitter(s) may reside depending on their depth, just enough so that the receivers and transmitters are located once more within the formation layers. Why this recommendation? Although pseudo-analytical techniques are available to compute fields when the receiver and/or transmitter are located in such layers [64], the main reason is to eliminate spurious discontinuities of the normal ( $z$  in our case) electric and magnetic field components manifest when the source (or, as can be anticipated from EM reciprocity, the receiver) traverse a boundary separating a true formation layer and a coating slab [54]. Second, the thickness  $d$  of the coating slabs must also be adjusted to ensure the coating layer just beneath the  $m$ th interface does not cross over into the coating layer just above the  $(m + 1)$ st interface. We account for these two points within our numerical results below.

---

(e.g., free space), our coordinate transformation is inherently *discontinuous*. Indeed, note in Eqn. (2.5) that the mapping  $\bar{z}$ , which depends on  $x$  and  $y$  in addition to  $z$ , can not be made to continuously transition back to the (identity) coordinate transform  $\bar{z}(z) = z$  implicitly present within the ambient/background medium. Alternatively stated, our defined anisotropic coating slabs have the exact same material properties as the beam shifter, but our slabs border the ambient medium at planes that, though parallel to each other, are orthogonal relative to the junction planes between the beam shifter and its background medium (e.g., free space). See other references for the importance of the junction surface’s orientation in ensuring a medium perfectly impedance-matched to the ambient medium [60, 61].

## References

- [1] A. Sommerfeld, *Über die Ausbreitung der Wellen in der Drahtlosen Telegraphie*, *Annalen der Physik* 333 (1909) 665–736.
- [2] B. I. Anderson, T. D. Barber, S. C. Gianzero, *The Effect of Crossbedding Anisotropy on Induction Tool Response*, in: *SPWLA 39th Annual Logging Symposium, Society of Petrophysicists and Well-Log Analysts*, Houston, TX, USA, 1998, pp. 1–14.
- [3] Y.-K. Hue, F. L. Teixeira, L. Martin, M. Bittar, *Modeling of EM Logging Tools in Arbitrary 3-D Borehole Geometries using PML-FDTD*, *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters* 2 (2005) 78–81.
- [4] M. Zhdanov, W. Kennedy, E. Peksen, *Foundations of Tensor Induction Well-Logging*, *Petrophysics* 42 (2001) 588–610.
- [5] K. Sainath, F. L. Teixeira, *Tensor Green's Function Evaluation in Arbitrarily Anisotropic, Layered Media using Complex-Plane Gauss-Laguerre Quadrature*, *Phys. Rev. E* 89 (2014) 053303.
- [6] K. Sainath, F. L. Teixeira, *Interface-Flattening Transform for EM Field Modeling in Tilted, Cylindrically-Stratified Geophysical Media*, *IEEE Antennas and Wireless Propagation Letters* 13 (2014) 1808–1811.
- [7] S. Davdycheva, T. Wang, *Modeling of Electromagnetic Logs in a Layered, Biaxially Anisotropic Medium*, in: *SEG Annual Meeting, Society of Exploration Geophysicists*, Tulsa, OK, USA, 2011, pp. 494–498.
- [8] B. Wei, T. Wang, Y. Wang, *Computing the Response of Multi-Component Induction Logging in Layered Anisotropic Formation by the Recursive Matrix Method with Magnetic-Current-Source Dyadic Green's Function*, *Chinese Journal of Geophysics* 52 (2009) 1350–1359.
- [9] B. I. Anderson, S. Bonner, M. G. Luling, R. Rosthal, *Response of 2-MHz LWD Resistivity and Wireline Induction Tools in Dipping Beds and Laminated Formations*, in: *SPWLA 31st Annual Logging Symposium, Society of Petrophysicists and Well-Log Analysts*, Houston, TX, USA, 1990, pp. 1–25. Paper A.
- [10] A. Howard Jr., *Petrophysics of Magnetic Dipole Fields in an Anisotropic Earth*, *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation* 48 (2000) 1376–1383.
- [11] H. Wang, H. Tao, J. Yao, G. Chen, S. Yang, *Study on the Response of a Multicomponent Induction Logging Tool in Deviated and Layered Anisotropic Formations by using Numerical Mode Matching Method*, *Chinese Journal of Geophysics* 51 (2008) 1110–1120.
- [12] Hongnian Wang, Honggen Tao, Jingjin Yao, Ye Zhang, *Efficient and Reliable Simulation of Multicomponent Induction Logging Response in Horizontally Stratified Inhomogeneous TI Formations by Numerical Mode Matching Method*, *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 50 (2012).
- [13] J. Moran, S. Gianzero, *Effects of Formation Anisotropy on Resistivity-Logging Measurements*, *Geophysics* 44 (1979) 1266–1286.
- [14] D. Georgi, J. Schoen, M. Rabinovich, *Biaxial Anisotropy: Its Occurrence and Measurement with Multicomponent Induction Tools*, in: *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, Society of Petroleum Engineers*, Houston, TX, USA, 2008, pp. 1–18. doi:10.2118/114739-MS.
- [15] S. Liu, M. Sato, *Electromagnetic Well Logging Based on Borehole Radar*, in: *SPWLA 43rd Annual Logging Symposium, Society of Petrophysicists and Well-Log Analysts*, Houston, TX, USA, 2002, pp. 1–14.
- [16] M. Novo, L. Da Silva, F. L. Teixeira, *Application of CFS-PML to Finite Volume Analysis of EM Well-Logging Tools in Multilayered Geophysical Formations*, in: *2006 12th Biennial IEEE Conference on Electromagnetic Field Computation*, 2006, pp. 201–201. doi:10.1109/CEFC-06.2006.1632991.
- [17] Y.-K. Hue, F. L. Teixeira, *Analysis of Tilted-Coil Eccentric Borehole Antennas in Cylindrical Multilayered Formations for Well-logging Applications*, *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation* 54 (2006) 1058–1064.
- [18] H. O. Lee, F. L. Teixeira, L. E. S. Martin, M. S. Bittar, *Numerical Modeling of Eccentered LWD Borehole Sensors in Dipping and Fully Anisotropic Earth Formations*, *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 50 (2012) 727–735.
- [19] Y.-K. Hue, F. L. Teixeira, *Numerical Mode-Matching Method for Tilted-Coil Antennas in Cylindrically Layered Anisotropic media with Multiple Horizontal Beds*, *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 45 (2007) 2451–2462.
- [20] G.-S. Liu, F. Teixeira, G.-J. Zhang, *Analysis of Directional Logging Tools in Anisotropic and Multieccentric Cylindrically-Layered Earth Formations*, *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation* 60 (2012) 318–327.
- [21] H. G. Doll, *Introduction to Induction Logging and Application to Logging of Wells Drilled with Oil Base Mud*, *Journal of Petroleum Technology* 1 (1949) 148–162.
- [22] K. Sainath, F. L. Teixeira, B. Donderici, *Robust Computation of Dipole Electromagnetic Fields in Arbitrarily Anisotropic, Planar-Stratified Environments*, *Phys. Rev. E* 89 (2014) 013312.
- [23] K. Sainath, F. L. Teixeira, B. Donderici, *Complex-Plane Generalization of Scalar Levin Transforms: A Robust, Rapidly Convergent Method to Compute Potentials and Fields in Multi-Layered Media*, *Journal of Computational Physics* 269 (2014) 403 – 422.
- [24] H. Moon, F. L. Teixeira, B. Donderici, *Stable Pseudoanalytical Computation of Electromagnetic Fields from Arbitrarily-Oriented Dipoles in Cylindrically Stratified Media*, *Journal of Computational Physics* 273 (2014) 118 – 142.
- [25] H. Moon, F. L. Teixeira, B. Donderici, *Computation of Potentials from Current Electrodes in Cylindrically Stratified Media: A Stable, Rescaled Semi-Analytical Formulation*, *Journal of Computational Physics* 280 (2015) 692 – 709.
- [26] David Andreis, Lucy MacGregor, *Controlled-Source Electromagnetic Sounding in Shallow Water: Principles and Applications*, *Geophysics* 73 (2008) F21–F32.
- [27] Kerry Key, *1D Inversion of Multicomponent, Multifrequency Marine CSEM Data: Methodology and Synthetic Studies for Resolving Thin Resistive Layers*, *Geophysics* 74 (2009) F9–F20.
- [28] Dylan Connell, Kerry Key, *A Numerical Comparison of Time and Frequency-Domain Marine Electromagnetic Methods for Hydrocarbon Exploration in Shallow Water*, *Geophysical Prospecting* 61 (2013) 187–199.
- [29] Chester Weiss, *The Fallacy of the Shallow-Water Problem in Marine CSEM Exploration*, *Geophysics* 72 (2007) A93–A97.
- [30] Peter Weidelt, *Guided Waves in Marine CSEM*, *Geophysical Journal International* 171 (2007) 153–176.
- [31] Steven Constable, Leonard J. Srnka, *An Introduction to Marine Controlled-Source Electromagnetic Methods for Hydrocarbon Exploration*, *Geophysics* 72 (2007) WA3–WA12.
- [32] Steven Constable, Chester Weiss, *Mapping Thin Resistors and Hydrocarbons with Marine EM Methods: Insights from 1D Modeling*, *Geophysics* 71 (2006) G43–G51.

- [33] S. Ellingsrud, T. Eidesmo, S. Johansen, M. Sinha, L. MacGregor, S. Constable, Remote Sensing of Hydrocarbon Layers by Seabed Logging (sbl): Results from a Cruise Offshore Angola, *Leading Edge* 21 (2002) 972–982.
- [34] T. Eidsmo, S. Ellingsrud, L. MacGregor, S. Constable, M. Sinha, S. Johansen, F. Kong, , H. Westerdahl, Sea Bed Logging (SBL), A New Method for Remote and Direct Identification of Hydrocarbon Filled Layers in Deepwater Areas, *First Break* 20 (2002) 144–152.
- [35] E. Um, D. Alumbaugh, On the Physics of the Marine Controlled-Source Electromagnetic Method, *Geophysics* 72 (2007) WA13–WA26.
- [36] K. Sainath, F. L. Teixeira, Spectral-Domain-Based Scattering Analysis of Fields Radiated by Distributed Sources in Planar-Stratified Environments with Arbitrarily Anisotropic Layers, *Phys. Rev. E* 90 (2014) 063302.
- [37] W. C. Chew, *Waves and Fields in Inhomogeneous Media*, Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1990.
- [38] R. Kyrkjeb, R. Gabrielsen, J. Faleide, Unconformities Related to the Jurassic-Cretaceous Synrift-Post-Rift Transition of the Northern North Sea, *Journal of the Geological Society* 161 (2004) 1–17.
- [39] K. H. Karim, H. Koyi, M. M. Baziany, K. Hessami, Significance of Angular Unconformities between Cretaceous and Tertiary Strata in the Northwestern Segment of the Zagros Fold-Thrust Belt, Kurdistan Region, NE Iraq, *Geological Magazine* 148 (2011) 925–939.
- [40] Geological Characteristics and Tectonic Significance of Unconformities in Mesoproterozoic Successions in the Northern Margin of the North China Block, *Geoscience Frontiers* 5 (2014) 127 – 138.
- [41] C. M. Filomena, H. Stollhofen, Ultrasonic Logging Across Unconformities Outcrop and Core Logger Sonic Patterns of the Early Triassic Middle Buntsandstein Hardegsen Unconformity, Southern Germany, *Sedimentary Geology* 236 (2011) 185 – 196.
- [42] V. Tuncer, M. J. Unsworth, W. Siripunvaraporn, , J. A. Craven, Exploration for Unconformity-Type Uranium Deposits with Audiomagnetotelluric Data: A Case Study from the McArthur River Mine, Saskatchewan, Canada, *Geophysics* 71 (2006) B201–B209.
- [43] C. Dupuis, D. Omeragic, Y.-H. Chen, T. Habashy, Workflow to Image Unconformities with Deep Electromagnetic LWD Measurements Enables Well Placement in Complex Scenarios, in: *SPE Annual Technical Conference, Society of Petroleum Engineers, Houston, TX, USA, 2013*, pp. 1–18.
- [44] S. H. Al-Mahrooqi, A. Mookerjee, W. Walton, S. O. Scholten, R. Archer, J. Al-Busaidi, H. Al-Busaidi, Well Logging and Formation Evaluation Challenges in the Deepest Well in Oman (HPHT Tight Sand Reservoirs), in: *SPE Middle East Unconventional Gas Conference, Society of Petroleum Engineers, Houston, TX, USA, 2011*, pp. 1–9.
- [45] Q. Li, D. Omeragic, L. Chou, L. Yang, K. Duong, J. Smits, J. Yang, T. Lau, C. B. Liu, R. Dworak, V. Dreuillault, H. Ye, New Directional Electromagnetic Tool for Proactive Geosteering and Accurate Formation Evaluation while Drilling, in: *SPWLA 46th Annual Logging Symposium, Society of Petrophysicists and Well-Log Analysts, Houston, TX, USA, 2005*, pp. 1–16.
- [46] Y.-H. Chen, D. Omeragic, V. Druskin, C.-H. Kuo, T. Habashy, A. Abubakar, L. Knizhnerman, 2.5D FD Modeling of EM Directional Propagation Tools in High-Angle and Horizontal Wells, in: *SEG Annual Meeting, Society of Exploration Geophysicists, Tulsa, OK, USA, 2011*, pp. 422–426.
- [47] D. Omeragic, T. Habashy, Y.-H. Chen, V. Polyakov, C.-h. Kuo, R. Altman, D. Hupp, C. Maeso, 3D Reservoir Characterization and Well Placement in Complex Scenarios using Azimuthal Measurements while Drilling, in: *SPWLA 50th Annual Logging Symposium, Society of Petrophysicists and Well-Log Analysts, Houston, TX, USA, 2009*, pp. 1–16.
- [48] H. O. Lee, F. L. Teixeira, Cylindrical FDTD Analysis of LWD Tools through Anisotropic Dipping-Layered Earth Media, *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 45 (2007) 383–388.
- [49] A. F. Oskooi, L. Zhang, Y. Avniel, S. G. Johnson, The Failure of Perfectly Matched Layers, and Towards their Redemption by Adiabatic Absorbers, *Opt. Express* 16 (2008) 11376–11392.
- [50] G. A. Schlak, J. R. Wait, Electromagnetic Wave Propagation over a Nonparallel Stratified Conducting Medium, *Canadian Journal of Physics* 45 (1967) 3697–3720.
- [51] L. B. Felsen, N. Marcuvitz, *Radiation and Scattering of Waves*, Electromagnetic Waves, IEEE Press, Piscataway, NJ, 1994.
- [52] S. Zhang, D. Asoubar, F. Wyrowski, M. Kuhn, Efficient and Rigorous Propagation of Harmonic Fields through Plane Interfaces, 2012. doi:10.1117/12.927071.
- [53] S. Zhang, H. Zhong, D. Asoubar, F. Wyrowski, M. Kuhn, Tilt Operator for Electromagnetic Fields and its Application to Propagation through Plane Interfaces, *Proc. SPIE* 8550 (2013) 85503I–85503I–11.
- [54] F. L. Teixeira, W. C. Chew, Differential Forms, Metrics, and the Reflectionless Absorption of Electromagnetic Waves, *J. Electromagn. Waves Applicat.* 13 (1999) 665–686.
- [55] C. A. Balanis, *Antenna Theory: Analysis and Design*, Wiley-Interscience, 2005.
- [56] J. B. Pendry, D. Schurig, D. R. Smith, Controlling Electromagnetic Fields, *Science* 312 (2006) 1780–1782.
- [57] M. Rahm, S. A. Cummer, D. Schurig, J. B. Pendry, D. R. Smith, Optical Design of Reflectionless Complex Media by Finite Embedded Coordinate Transformations, *Physical Review Letters* 100 (2008) 063903.
- [58] N. Kundtz, D. Smith, J. Pendry, Electromagnetic Design with Transformation Optics, *Proceedings of the IEEE* 99 (2011) 1622–1633.
- [59] L. Lin, W. Wang, J. Cui, C. Du, X. Luo, Design of Electromagnetic Refractor and Phase Transformer Using Coordinate Transformation Theory, *Optics Express* 16 (2008) 6815–6821.
- [60] F. L. Teixeira, K.-P. Hwang, W. C. Chew, J.-M. Jin, Conformal PML-FDTD Schemes for Electromagnetic Field Simulations: A Dynamic Stability Study, *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation* 49 (2001) 902–907.
- [61] F. L. Teixeira, W. C. Chew, On Causality and Dynamic Stability of Perfectly Matched Layers for FDTD Simulations, *IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory and Techniques* 47 (1999) 775–785.
- [62] A. J. Ward, J. B. Pendry, Refraction and Geometry in Maxwell’s Equations, *Journal of Modern Optics* 43 (1996) 773–793.
- [63] U. Leonhardt, T. G. Philbin, General Relativity in Electrical Engineering, *New Journal of Physics* 8 (2006) 247.
- [64] K. Sainath, F. L. Teixeira, Spectral-Domain Computation of Fields Radiated by Sources in Non-Birefringent Anisotropic Media (2015). (Submitted) Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1502.05884>.