

# On Backus average for oblique incidence

David R. Dalton\*, Ayiaz Kaderali†

May 24, 2022

## Abstract

We postulate that validity of the Backus (1962) average, whose weights are layer thicknesses, is limited to waves whose incidence is nearly vertical. The accuracy of this average decreases with the increase of the source-receiver offset. However, if the weighting is adjusted by the distance travelled by a signal in each layer, such a modified average results in a more accurate prediction of traveltimes through these layers.

## 1 Introduction

Hookean solids, which are commonly used in seismology as mathematical analogies of physical materials, are defined by their mechanical property relating linearly the stress tensor,  $\sigma$ , and the strain tensor,  $\varepsilon$ ,

$$\sigma_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^3 \sum_{\ell=1}^3 c_{ijkl} \varepsilon_{k\ell}, \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3,$$

where  $c$  is the elasticity tensor. The Backus (1962) average allows us to quantify the response of a wave propagating through a series of parallel Hookean layers whose thicknesses are much smaller than the wavelength.

According to Backus (1962), the average of  $f(x_3)$  of “width”  $\ell'$  is

$$\bar{f}(x_3) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} w(\zeta - x_3) f(\zeta) d\zeta, \quad (1)$$

---

\*Department of Earth Sciences, Memorial University of Newfoundland, n06drd@mun.ca

†Department of Earth Sciences, Memorial University of Newfoundland,  
ayiazkaderali@gmail.com

where  $w(x_3)$  is the weight function with the following properties:

$$w(x_3) \geq 0, \quad w(\pm\infty) = 0, \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} w(x_3) dx_3 = 1,$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x_3 w(x_3) dx_3 = 0, \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x_3^2 w(x_3) dx_3 = (\ell')^2.$$

These properties define  $w(x_3)$  as a probability-density function with mean 0 and standard deviation  $\ell'$ , explaining the use of the term ‘‘width’’ for  $\ell'$ .

The long-wavelength homogeneous media equivalent to a stack of isotropic or transversely isotropic layers with thicknesses much less than the signal wavelength are shown by Backus (1962) to be transversely isotropic. The Backus (1962) formulation is reviewed by Slawinski (2018) and Bos et al. (2017), where formulations for generally anisotropic, monoclinic, and orthotropic thin layers are also derived. Bos et al. (2017) examine assumptions and approximations underlying the Backus (1962) formulation, which is derived by expressing rapidly varying stresses and strains in terms of products of algebraic combinations of rapidly varying elasticity parameters with slowly varying stresses and strains. The only mathematical approximation in the formulation is that the average of a product of a rapidly varying function and a slowly varying function is approximately equal to the product of the averages of the two functions.

From Slawinski (2018), if isotropic layers are described by the elasticity parameters  $c_{1111}$  and  $c_{2323}$ , the corresponding parameters of the transversely isotropic medium are

$$c_{1111}^{\overline{\text{TI}}} = \left( \frac{c_{1111} - 2c_{2323}}{c_{1111}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{c_{1111}} \right)^{-1} + \left( \frac{4(c_{1111} - c_{2323})c_{2323}}{c_{1111}} \right), \quad (2)$$

$$c_{1122}^{\overline{\text{TI}}} = \left( \frac{c_{1111} - 2c_{2323}}{c_{1111}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{c_{1111}} \right)^{-1} + \left( \frac{2(c_{1111} - 2c_{2323})c_{2323}}{c_{1111}} \right), \quad (3)$$

$$c_{1133}^{\overline{\text{TI}}} = \left( \frac{c_{1111} - 2c_{2323}}{c_{1111}} \right) \left( \frac{1}{c_{1111}} \right)^{-1}, \quad (4)$$

$$c_{1212}^{\overline{\text{TI}}} = \overline{c_{2323}}, \quad (5)$$

$$c_{2323}^{\overline{\text{TI}}} = \left( \frac{1}{c_{2323}} \right)^{-1}, \quad (6)$$

$$c_{3333}^{\overline{\text{TI}}} = \left( \frac{1}{c_{1111}} \right)^{-1}, \quad (7)$$

which are the *Backus parameters* for isotropic layers.

## 2 Formulation for a ten-layer synthetic model

Let us consider a stack of ten isotropic horizontal layers, each with a thickness of 100 meters (Brisco, 2014). Their elasticity parameters are listed in Appendix A, Table 1.

For vertical incidence, the Fermat traveltimes through these layers is 229.46 ms. If we perform the standard Backus average—weighted by layer thickness of these ten layers, as in equation (8), below, which is derived in Appendix B—then, the equivalent density-scaled elasticity parameters, in units of  $10^6 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}^2$ , are  $\langle c_{1111} \rangle = 18.84$ ,  $\langle c_{1212} \rangle = 3.99$ ,  $\langle c_{1133} \rangle = 10.96$ ,  $\langle c_{2323} \rangle = 3.38$  and  $\langle c_{3333} \rangle = 18.43$ . With these parameters and for the vertical incidence, the resulting  $P$ -wave traveltimes through the equivalent transversely isotropic medium is 232.91 ms, which—in comparison to the Fermat traveltimes—is high by 3.45 ms. We also tried a weighting by the traveltimes in each layer, and that resulted in, for vertical incidence, the resulting  $P$ -wave traveltimes through the equivalent transversely isotropic medium of 239.76 ms, which—in comparison to the Fermat traveltimes—is high by 10.30 ms. Thus we did not consider weighting by traveltimes further.

To examine the layer-thickness weighting, let us consider one of the equivalent-medium parameters,

$$c_{1212}^{\overline{\text{TI}}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n h_i c_{2323i}}{\sum_{j=1}^n h_j}, \quad (8)$$

where  $h_i$  is the thickness of the  $i$ th layer, which herein is 100 m for each layer; thus, each layer is weighted equally by 0.1.

### 2.1 Fixed takeoff angle of $\pi/6$

If we consider a  $P$ -wave signal whose takeoff angle, with respect to the vertical, is  $\pi/6$ , this signal reaches—in accordance with Snell’s law—the bottom of the stack at a horizontal distance of 1072.53 m. Its Fermat traveltimes is 330.52 ms.

If we perform the standard Backus average, the traveltimes in the equivalent medium, which corresponds to the ray angle of  $47.01^\circ$ , is 343.82 ms, which is higher by 13.3 ms than its Fermat counterpart. This is obtained using the equations in Appendix D. If, however, we weight the average by the distance travelled in each layer, as in equation (9), below, the equivalent elasticity parameters become  $\langle c_{1111} \rangle = 20.13$ ,  $\langle c_{1212} \rangle = 4.10$ ,  $\langle c_{1133} \rangle = 12.06$ ,  $\langle c_{2323} \rangle = 3.45$  and  $\langle c_{3333} \rangle = 19.76$ . In such a case, the traveltimes is 332.36 ms—which is higher by only 1.9 ms—and is an order of magnitude more accurate than using the standard approach. The distances travelled in each layer and the resulting weights are given in Appendix A, Table 2, columns 2 and 3. In such a case, expression (8) becomes

$$c_{1212}^{\overline{\text{TI}}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n d_i c_{2323i}}{\sum_{j=1}^n d_j}, \quad (9)$$

where  $d_i$  is the distance travelled in the  $i$ th layer, which—for vertical incidence—is equal to  $h_i$ .

According to Lemma 2 of Bos et al. (2017), the stability conditions are preserved by the Backus average. In other words, if the individual layers satisfy these conditions, so does their equivalent medium. This remains true for the modified Backus average.

## 2.2 Extreme oblique example

Let us now consider an extreme oblique example using the same ten layer model as in the previous section but doing two-point ray-tracing with an offset of 7000 m which results in a takeoff angle of 0.61026 radians and a ray angle in the equivalent medium of 1.4289 radians, which is  $81.87^\circ$ .

Given that, the Fermat traveltimes is 1365.0 ms, and the thickness-weighted Backus average medium has the same elasticity parameters as in the previous section and a corresponding traveltimes of 1343.1 ms, which is too high by 266.3 ms. The distances travelled in each layer and the resulting weights are given in Appendix A, Table 2, columns 4 and 5. The slant-distance-weighted Backus average medium elasticity parameters become  $\langle c_{1111} \rangle = 27.73$ ,  $\langle c_{1212} \rangle = 3.52$ ,  $\langle c_{1133} \rangle = 21.04$ ,  $\langle c_{2323} \rangle = 3.16$  and  $\langle c_{3333} \rangle = 26.08$ . The corresponding traveltimes, again obtained using the equations in Appendix D, is 1343.1 ms which is too low by 21.0 ms. Thus the slant-distance-weighting performs better than the thickness weighting again.

## 3 A real data example

We now examine a real data example consisting of 15631 layers taken from a well log from a well offshore Newfoundland and extending over a height of 1595 m from a depth of 1383 m to a depth of 2978 m. Table 3 in Appendix C gives layer thicknesses,  $P$ -wave velocities, and  $S$ -wave velocities for the first ten and last ten layers. The layer density-scaled elasticity parameters  $c_{1111}$  and  $c_{2323}$  are the squares of the  $P$ -wave velocities and  $S$ -wave velocities, respectively.

For vertical incidence, the Fermat traveltimes through these layers is 510.2 ms. If we perform the standard Backus average—weighted by layer thickness of these layers, as in equation (8), the equivalent density-scaled elasticity parameters, in units of  $10^6 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}^2$ , are  $\langle c_{1111} \rangle = 10.75$ ,  $\langle c_{1212} \rangle = 3.29$ ,  $\langle c_{1133} \rangle = 4.10$ ,  $\langle c_{2323} \rangle = 2.42$  and  $\langle c_{3333} \rangle = 9.46$ . With these parameters and for the vertical incidence, the resulting  $P$ -wave traveltimes through the equivalent transversely isotropic medium is 518.5 ms, which—in comparison to the Fermat traveltimes—is high by 8.3 ms.

We consider a takeoff angle of 0.32 radians, which is  $18.3^\circ$ . If, we weight the average by the distance travelled in each layer, as in equation (9), the equivalent elasticity parameters become  $\langle c_{1111} \rangle = 11.05$ ,  $\langle c_{1212} \rangle = 3.41$ ,  $\langle c_{1133} \rangle = 4.14$ ,  $\langle c_{2323} \rangle = 2.49$  and  $\langle c_{3333} \rangle = 9.67$ .

For a takeoff angle of 0.32 radians, the Fermat traveltimes is 581.2 ms, the thickness-weighted Backus average medium traveltimes is 597.6 ms, which is too high by 16.4 ms, and the slant-distance-weighted Backus average medium traveltimes is 591.1 ms, which is too high by 9.9 ms. Thus the slant-distance weighting performs better than the thickness weighting again though even the slant-distance weighting is still off by a fair bit, maybe because the Fermat calculation assumes high frequency and the Backus calculation assumes low frequency.

## 4 Discussion

The Backus (1962) average with weighting by the thickness of layer assumes vertical or near-vertical incidence. Consequently, such an average does not result in accurate traveltimes for the far-offset or, in particular, cross-well data, which nowadays are common seismic experiments, and were not half-a-century ago, when the Backus (1962) average was formulated.

If we modify the weighting to be by the distance travelled in each layer, then the resulting traveltimes are significantly more accurate. Such weighting, however, entails further considerations. Since the distance travelled in each layer is a function of Snell's law, there is a need to modify the weights with the source-receiver offset. However, given information about layers, it is achievable algorithmically by accounting for distance travelled in each layer as a function of offset.

There is also an interesting issue to consider. The modified equivalent medium is defined by its elasticity parameters, which are functions of the obliqueness of rays within each layer. This means that the equivalent-medium parameters are different for the  $qP$  waves, for the  $qSV$  waves and for the  $SH$  waves. However, since a Hookean solid exists in the mathematical realm, not the physical world, such a consideration is not paradoxical. It is common to invoke even different constitutive equations for the same physical material depending on empirical considerations. Furthermore, it might be possible to derive elasticity parameters of a single Hookean solid—possibly of a material symmetry lower than transverse isotropy—whose behaviour accounts for both near and far offsets in the case of three waves.

It is interesting to note that, except for the slant-distance weighted equivalent medium for the extreme oblique model, in each case the traveltimes in the equivalent medium is greater than its Fermat counterpart through the sequence of layers. It might be a consequence of optimization, which—in the case of layers—benefits from a model with a larger number of parameters.

There remains a fundamental question: Is the Fermat traveltimes an appropriate criterion to consider the accuracy of the Backus average? An objection to such a criterion is provided by the following *Gedankenexperiment*. Consider a stack of thin layers, where—in one of these layers—waves propagate much faster than in all others. In accordance with Fermat's principle, distance travelled by a signal within this layer is much larger than in any other layer, which might be expressed by the ratio of a distance travelled in a given layer divided by its thickness. This effect is not accommodated by the standard Backus average, since this effect is offset-dependent and the average is not, but it is accommodated by the modified average discussed herein. However, a property of such a single layer might be negligible on long-wavelength signal. To address such issues, it might be necessary to consider a full-waveform forward model, and even a laboratory experimental set-up.

For the fastest layer, as for  $v_P$  in layer five of Table 1, the distance travelled in that layer becomes much greater than the distance travelled in other layers as the ray angle with respect to the vertical in the fastest layer approaches  $90^\circ$ , and the takeoff angle approaches the maximum takeoff angle. This is exemplified in columns 4 and 5 of Table 2 and in section 2.2.

As an aside, let us recognize that—if we keep the Fermat traveltimes as a criterion—making the propagation speed a function of the wavelength would not accommodate the traveltimes discrepancy due to offset.

Be that as it may, it must be recognized that the discrepancy between the traveltimes in the

layered and equivalent media increases with the source-receiver offset. In the limit—for a wave propagating horizontally through a stack of horizontal layers—the Backus average, even in its modified form, is not valid, due to its underlying assumption of a load on the top and bottom only.

## Acknowledgments

We wish to acknowledge Python coding for verification of the takeoff angle for the 7000 m two-point raytracing by Thomas B. Meehan, discussions with Michael A. Slawinski, and discussions with and Mathematica code for Appendix D from Theodore Stanoev. This research was performed in the context of The Geomechanics Project supported by Husky Energy. Also, this research was partially supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, grant 238416-2013.

## References

- Backus, G.E., Long-wave elastic anisotropy produced by horizontal layering, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **67**, 11, 4427–4440, 1962.
- Brisco, C., Anisotropy vs. inhomogeneity: Algorithm formulation, coding and modelling, Honours Thesis, Memorial University, 2014.
- Bos, L, D.R. Dalton, M.A. Slawinski and T. Stanoev, On Backus average for generally anisotropic layers, *Journal of Elasticity*, **127** (2), 179–196, 2017.
- Slawinski, M.A. *Wavefronts and rays in seismology: Answers to unasked questions*, 2nd edition, World Scientific, Singapore, 2018.
- Slawinski, M.A., *Waves and rays in elastic continua*, 3rd edition, World Scientific, Singapore, 2015.

## Appendix A The ten-layer synthetic model

Layer	$c_{1111}$	$c_{2323}$	$v_P$	$v_S$
1	10.56	2.02	3.25	1.42
2	20.52	4.45	4.53	2.11
3	31.14	2.89	5.58	1.70
4	14.82	2.62	3.85	1.62
5	32.15	2.92	5.67	1.71
6	16.00	2.56	4.00	1.60
7	16.40	6.35	4.05	2.52
8	18.06	4.33	4.25	2.08
9	31.47	8.01	5.61	2.83
10	17.31	3.76	4.16	1.94

Table 1: Density-scaled elasticity parameters, whose units are  $10^6 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-2}$ , for a stack of isotropic layers, and the corresponding  $P$ -wave and  $S$ -wave speeds in  $\text{km s}^{-1}$ .

layer	$d_i(\pi/6)$	$w_i(\pi/6)$	$d_i(7000)$	$w_i(7000)$
1	115.47	0.0773	122.0	0.0167
2	139.45	0.0934	166.2	0.0228
3	195.07	0.1306	560.1	0.0767
4	124.12	0.0831	136.2	0.0188
5	204.61	0.1370	5056.4	0.6921
6	126.88	0.0849	141.1	0.0193
7	127.85	0.0855	142.9	0.0196
8	132.17	0.0885	151.0	0.0207
9	198.04	0.1326	693.0	0.0935
10	130.17	0.0871	147.1	0.0201

Table 2: Distances,  $d_i$ , in meters, travelled by the  $P$  wave in each layer, and the corresponding averaging weights,  $w_i = d_i / (\sum_{j=1}^{10} d_j)$ , for a takeoff angle of  $\pi/6$  and for an offset of 7000 m.

## Appendix B Thickness-weighted arithmetic average derivation

$$\bar{f}(x_3) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} w(\xi - x_3) f(\xi) d\xi.$$

Let

$$w(y) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}\ell'} \mathbb{I}_{[-\sqrt{3}\ell', \sqrt{3}\ell']} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}\ell'} & -\sqrt{3}\ell' \leq y \leq \sqrt{3}\ell' \\ 0 & y < -\sqrt{3}\ell' \text{ or } y > \sqrt{3}\ell' \end{cases}$$

Then if  $Z = 2\sqrt{3}\ell'$ ,

$$w(y) = \begin{cases} 1/Z & -Z/2 \leq y \leq Z/2 \\ 0 & y < -Z/2 \text{ or } y > Z/2 \end{cases}$$

Then if we let the midpoint be  $x_3 = Z/2 = \sqrt{3}\ell'$ ,

$$w(\xi - x_3) = w(\xi - Z/2) = \begin{cases} 1/Z & 0 \leq \xi \leq Z \\ 0 & \xi < 0 \text{ or } \xi > Z \end{cases}$$

So

$$\bar{f}(Z/2) = \frac{1}{Z} \int_0^Z f(\xi) d\xi = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{i=1}^n h_i f_i,$$

where  $Z = \sum h_i$  is the total height, and if  $h_i$  is constant over all layers,

$$\bar{f}(Z/2) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i.$$



## Appendix C The real well-log data

Layer	$h_i$	$v_P$	$v_S$
1	0.0971334	2131.23	1017.06
2	0.0971334	2165.30	1019.65
3	0.0971334	2230.32	1029.47
4	0.0971334	2320.83	1039.11
5	0.0971334	2409.92	1050.14
6	0.0971334	2463.18	1067.63
7	0.0971334	2496.51	1081.11
8	0.0971334	2505.24	1088.57
9	0.0971334	2486.60	1093.83
10	0.0971334	2465.52	1098.30
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
15622	0.106343	3824.09	2200.10
15623	0.106343	3823.88	2200.03
15624	0.106343	3823.43	2199.99
15625	0.106343	3823.07	2199.95
15626	0.106343	3823.03	2199.91
15627	0.106343	3823.03	2199.87
15628	0.106343	3823.03	2199.84
15629	0.106343	3823.03	2199.82
15630	0.106343	3823.03	2199.81
15631	0.106343	3823.03	2199.81

Table 3: Layer number, layer thickness  $h_i$  in m, and corresponding  $P$ -wave and  $S$ -wave speeds in  $\text{m s}^{-1}$ .

## Appendix D Ray velocity in terms of ray angle

To derive the ray velocity from the ray angle in a transversely isotropic medium, we need equations (9.2.19), (9.2.23), (8.4.9), and (8.4.12) of Slawinski (2015), which in our notation, using the density-scaled elasticity parameters, are

$$v_{qP}(\vartheta) = \sqrt{\frac{\left(c_{3333}^{\overline{\text{TI}}} - c_{1111}^{\overline{\text{TI}}}\right) \cos^2 \vartheta + c_{1111}^{\overline{\text{TI}}} + c_{2323}^{\overline{\text{TI}}} + \sqrt{\Delta}}{2}}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\Delta := \left( (c_{1111}^{\overline{\Pi}} - c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}}) \sin^2 \vartheta - (c_{3333}^{\overline{\Pi}} - c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}}) \cos^2 \vartheta \right)^2 + 4 \left( c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}} + c_{1133}^{\overline{\Pi}} \right)^2 \sin^2 \vartheta \cos^2 \vartheta, \quad (11)$$

$$V(\vartheta) = \sqrt{[v(\vartheta)]^2 + \left[ \frac{\partial v(\vartheta)}{\partial \vartheta} \right]^2}, \quad (12)$$

$$\tan \theta = \frac{\frac{p_1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{v} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \vartheta}}{1 - \frac{p_1}{p_3} \frac{1}{v} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \vartheta}} = \frac{\tan \vartheta + \frac{1}{v} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \vartheta}}{1 - \frac{\tan \vartheta}{v} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \vartheta}}. \quad (13)$$

The procedure is, given ray angle  $\theta$ , to numerically solve equation (13) for wavefront normal angle  $\vartheta$ , and then to use equation (12) to solve for ray velocity  $V$ . Also note that

$$\frac{\partial v_{qP}}{\partial \vartheta} = \frac{D}{C} + A$$

$$A = -2(c_{3333}^{\overline{\Pi}} - c_{1111}^{\overline{\Pi}}) \sin(\vartheta) \cos(\vartheta)$$

$$B = 2\sqrt{2} \sqrt{E + (c_{3333}^{\overline{\Pi}} - c_{1111}^{\overline{\Pi}}) \cos^2(\vartheta) + c_{1111}^{\overline{\Pi}} + c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}}}$$

$$C = 2\sqrt{\left[ (c_{1111}^{\overline{\Pi}} - c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}}) \sin^2(\vartheta) - (c_{3333}^{\overline{\Pi}} - c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}}) \cos^2(\vartheta) \right]^2 + 4(c_{1133}^{\overline{\Pi}} + c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}})^2 \sin^2(\vartheta) \cos^2(\vartheta)}$$

$$D = 2(2(c_{1111}^{\overline{\Pi}} - c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}}) \sin(\vartheta) \cos(\vartheta) + 2(c_{3333}^{\overline{\Pi}} - c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}}) \sin(\vartheta) \cos(\vartheta)) \left[ (c_{1111}^{\overline{\Pi}} - c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}}) \sin^2(\vartheta) - (c_{3333}^{\overline{\Pi}} - c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}}) \cos^2(\vartheta) \right] + 8(c_{1133}^{\overline{\Pi}} + c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}})^2 \sin(\vartheta) \cos^3(\vartheta) - 8(c_{1133}^{\overline{\Pi}} + c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}})^2 \sin^3(\vartheta) \cos(\vartheta)$$

$$E = \sqrt{\left[ (c_{1111}^{\overline{\Pi}} - c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}}) \sin^2(\vartheta) - (c_{3333}^{\overline{\Pi}} - c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}}) \cos^2(\vartheta) \right]^2 + 4(c_{1133}^{\overline{\Pi}} + c_{2323}^{\overline{\Pi}})^2 \sin^2(\vartheta) \cos^2(\vartheta)}$$