MASW – From theoretical considerations to practical consequences



Asoc. Prof. Jānis Karušs

Link with mechanical properties



Already in the 19th century different type of waves were observed in seismic records after earthquakes.

Lord Reyleight in year 1885 published mathematical description of one type of those waves.

In year 1911 Love described another type that was later named after him.



Rayleigh, J.W.S., 1885. On waves propagated along the plane surface of an elastic solid. Proc. London Math. Soc. 17, 4–11.

Love, A.E.H., 1911. Some Problems of Geodynamics. Cambridge University Press.

Usually, simple explanation and visualisation of surface waves are presented.

Movement along the surface:

$$u = -0,423kA\sin k\left(x - V_R t\right)$$
$$w = 0,620kA\cos k\left(x - V_R t\right)$$





$$V_R = 0,919\beta$$





 $\beta_2 > V_L > \beta_1$

In every textbook about seismology there are derivation of mathematical description of surface waves.

SEISMIC SURFACE WAVES IN A LATERALLY INHOMOGENEOUS EARTH

Edited by

V. I. KEILIS-BOROK Institute of Physics of the Earth, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Moscow, U.S.S.R.

With contributions by

A. L. Levshin*, T. B. Yanovskaya**, A. V. Lander*, B. G. Bukchin*, M. P. Barmin*, L. I. Ratnikova* and E. N. Its**

* Institute of Physics of the Earth, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Moscow, U.S.S.R.

** Faculty of Physics, Leningrad State University, Leningrad, U.S.S.R.

QUANTITATIVE SEISMOLOGY

Keiiti Aki Formerly with Observatoire Volcanologique du Piton de la Fournaise

Paul G. Richards Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University







In textbooks dedicated to MASW usually it is not present



SURFACE WAVE ANALYSIS FOR NEAR SURFACE APPLICATIONS

GIANCARLO DAL MORO

Institute of Rock Structure and Mechanics Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague, Czech Republic & Eliosoft, Udine, Italy



General concept behind derivation of a solution is to figure out hove we can describe surface waves using plane waves. Crytical angle

Evanescent waves are used.

$$\phi_{1c}=\sin^{-1}(\beta_1/\beta_2).$$

If incidence angle is greater than critical angle, we get wave that travels in the second medium, parallel to the boundary and its amplitude decreases with depth exponentially.

Displacement of the transmitted wave:

$$\mathbf{u}^{(T)} = B_T \exp\left[i\omega(\mathbf{s}\cdot\mathbf{x}-t)\right]\mathbf{e}_y = B_T \exp\left[i\omega\left(px + \frac{\cos\phi_2}{\beta_2}z - t\right)\right]\mathbf{e}_y,$$

As sin function of refracted angle is imaginary:

$$\cos \phi_2 = \sqrt{1 - \sin^2 \phi_2} = \pm i \sqrt{\sin^2 \phi_2 - 1}$$
$$= i \sqrt{\frac{\beta_2^2}{\beta_1^2} \sin^2 \phi_1 - 1} = i \sqrt{\beta_2^2 p^2 - 1} \qquad (\phi_1 \ge \phi_{1c}, \ \omega > 0).$$

We get plane wave that travels in positive x direction with speed 1/p.

$$\mathbf{u}^{(T)} = B_T \exp\left[-\frac{\omega}{\beta_2}\sqrt{\beta_2^2 p^2 - 1} z\right] \exp\left[i\omega(px - t)\right] \mathbf{e}_y \qquad (\phi_1 \ge \phi_{1c}, \ \omega > 0).$$





To derive mathematical solution for the problem, few boundary conditions are stated:



We end up with cubic equation with 4 solutions.

Only one solution satisfy our boundary conditions:



We can also derive the displacement.

$$\begin{split} u_x &= Ak_x \sin (\omega t - k_x x) [\exp (-0.85 \ k_x z) \\ &- 0.58 \exp (-0.39 \ k_x z)], \\ u_z &= Ak_x \cos (\omega t - k_x x) [-0.85 \exp (-0.85 \ k_x z) \\ &+ 1.47 \exp (-0.39 \ k_x z)]. \end{split}$$

Notice that displacement is dependent of frequency!

Waves are more sensitive to mechanical properties of the space, where the displacement is the biggest.

As we have harmonic waves traveling only along the surface, it is reasonable to speak only about horizontal wavelength

$$\lambda_x = 2\pi/k_x$$





Penetration depth

$$u_x = Ak_x \sin (\omega t - k_x x) [\exp (-0.85 k_x z) - 0.58 \exp (-0.39 k_x z)],$$

$$\lambda_x = 2\pi/k_x$$

All frequencies are influenced also by shallow layers.

In this example propagation speed is 500 m/s

 $V \!\!=\!\! \lambda \; x \; f$



0.3

0.2

Love waves are SH waves.

Love waves are more problematic in terms of mathematical derivation. It turns out that they can not exist in homogenious half space – vertical variation in S wave speed must be present.

Usually, solution with one layer that overlies half space is used.



In the end we are looking for solutions that is formed via positive interference of upgoing and downgoing SH wave at the Earth surface.

$$u_{y}^{-}(x, z, t) = B_{1} \exp \left(i(\omega t - k_{x}x - k_{x}r_{\beta_{1}}z)\right) + B_{2} \exp\left(i(\omega t - k_{x}x + k_{x}r_{\beta_{1}}z)\right)$$

We end up with solution that includes several frequencies. It is interpreted in a way that for constructive interference to be present there must be specific frequencies for specific horizontal apparent velocities.

$$\tan (\omega \xi) = \left(\frac{\mu_2 (1 - c_z^2 / \beta_2^2)^{1/2}}{\mu_1}\right) \left(\frac{h}{c_z \xi}\right)$$
$$\zeta = (h/c_x) (c_x^2 / \beta_1^2 - 1)^{1/2}$$



Sometimes Love waves are derived as a summ of S, SS etc. Multiples, but the same result is obtained

0



We end up with typical display of frequency/apparent velocity

Period = 10 s









Notice that for lower frequencies only fundamental mode exist.

We may introduce the cutoff frequencie for the Nth mode.

$$\omega = \omega_{cn} = n\pi / [h(1/\beta_1^2 - 1/\beta_2^2)^{1/2}]$$

Notice that long period wave apparent speed approaches the speed of the halfspace.

Displacement of the particles.

In the layer

$$u^{(1)} = 2A \cos\left[\omega \sqrt{\frac{1}{\beta_1^2} - \frac{1}{c_n^2}} z\right] \cos(\kappa x - \omega t).$$

In the halfspace

$$u^{(2)} = 2A\cos\left[\omega\sqrt{\frac{1}{\beta_1^2} - \frac{1}{c_n^2}}h\right] \exp\left[-\omega\sqrt{\frac{1}{c_n^2} - \frac{1}{\beta_2^2}}(z-h)\right] \cos(\kappa x - \omega t)$$

0

50

100

150

Depth (km)

Waves are more sensitive to mechanical properties of the space, where the displacement is the biggest.

Higher modes are more sensitive to the upper part of the cross section

Love waves can be viewed as superposition of normal modes of the waveguide (our upper layer), this is reason why sometimes they are called guided waves.



 $\kappa_0(\omega)$

 $\kappa_1(\omega)$

Previously we did not show the existence of many modes for Rayleigh waves.

Actually, mathematical proof of Rayleigh waves is seldom presented in literature about surface waves. In no one of previously mentioned books there is derivation of modes for Rayleigh waves.

Explanation form one of the books:

We shall not present a similar discussion for Rayleigh waves, since the calculations are cumbersome, even for the case of the simple model considered here.

Physical meaning of higher order modes is not intuitive and hard to imagine.

One must always remember that they exist even in the case with 2 layers, so it is not indicator of some complicated geological settings.

Travel path

Hove big is the area that influences observed waves?

Usually there is discussion only about vertical direction.

Hove big area influences signal propagation in lateral direction for MASW studies is neglected at all.

We can use approach that is adopted for large scale seismic exploration *«bananadoughnut kernels»*.

We do not use single ray but calculate the volume of influence by using First-Fresnel zone.

If 96m geophone spread is used.

| | V (m/s) | Frekvency (Hz) | | | | |
|--------------|---------|----------------|------|------|------|------|
| | | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 |
| Sand | 500 | 34.6 | 24.5 | 20.0 | 17.3 | 15.5 |
| Glacial till | 2000 | 69.3 | 49.0 | 40.0 | 34.6 | 31.0 |
| Dolomite | 3500 | 91.7 | 64.8 | 52.9 | 45.8 | 41.0 |





Field acquisition parameters

In most of the studies devoted to MASW similar suggestions are given:

```
\lambda_{max} \approx L
```

 $z_{max} \approx 0.5 \lambda_{max}$

more or less equal to $\lambda/3$

Standard survey parameters could be close to these or similar numbers:

| dx | L (24) | λmax | $z \max(\lambda/3)$ | z max | z min |
|----|--------|------|---------------------|-------|-------|
| 4 | 96 | 96 | 32 | 48 | 2.4 |



Data processing

On the field a record of oscillations of each geophone was acquired.



Frequency spectrum

Fourier analysis -a way hove to describe our data.

$$\psi(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} c_n \sin n\pi x$$





Frequency spectrum



Up until now everything was rather smooth.

You can obtain dataset without significant problems.



Mode picking

Sometimes it is rather complicated to identify different modes.

Currently it seems that rather weak layers make life more complicated.





Forward and inverse modelling

It is important to conduct **forward modelling first**.

MASW survey without any geological information about the survey area is ambiguous.

Obtained results could be far from actual situation.

Inverse modelling:

To obtain final result, standard inverse modelling process is conducted – software creates a 1D model of the survey area that has the best fit to the field data.

Input parameters: Layer count; Layer thickness; S wave speed interval; Poisson ratio.



0

Obtained result

Obtained result is a 1D model



It is assumed that in this area there are no lateral variations!!!



Maybe this is advantage and not a problem?

Precision of the obtained result

$$G_{max} = \rho V_S^2$$

$$R = \sqrt{\left(V_s^2 \Delta \rho\right)^2 + (2V_s \rho \Delta V_s)^2}$$

| Ro | 2000 |
|-----|------|
| Vs | 500 |
| dRo | 10 |
| dVs | 50 |

If you assume such numbers partial error is around 10% for calculated G_{max}

In the end also error for G is important!!!

 $G_{\rm sec}/G_{\rm max}$ (often written as $G/G_{\rm max}$)

$$\left(\left(\frac{1}{\rho V s^2}\Delta G\right)^2 + \left(\frac{G}{\rho^2 V s^2}\Delta \rho\right)^2 + \left(\frac{2G}{\rho V s^3}\Delta V s\right)^2\right)$$

Problems to be solved in future

Database of typical S and P wave speed for different rock types.

More local data sets.

| Joint analysis of Rayleigh and Love waves | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | $v_{\rm p} ({\rm kms^{-1}})$ |
|--|------------------------------|
| Unconsolidated materials | |
| Sand (dry) | 0.2-1.0 |
| Sand (water-saturated) | 1.5-2.0 |
| Clay | 1.0-2.5 |
| Glacial till (water-saturated) | 1.5-2.5 |
| Permafrost | 3.5-4.0 |
| Sedimentary rocks | |
| Sandstones | 2.0-6.0 |
| Tertiary sandstone | 2.0-2.5 |
| Pennant sandstone (Carboniferous) | 4.0-4.5 |
| Cambrian quartzite | 5.5-6.0 |
| Limestones | 2.0-6.0 |
| Cretaceous chalk | 2.0-2.5 |
| Jurassic oolites and bioclastic limestones | 3.0-4.0 |
| Carboniferous limestone | 5.0-5.5 |
| Dolomites | 2.5-6.5 |
| Salt | 4.5-5.0 |
| Anhydrite | 4.5-6.5 |
| Gypsum | 2.0-3.5 |
| Igneous/Metamorphic rocks | |
| Granite | 5.5-6.0 |
| Gabbro | 6.5-7.0 |
| Ultramafic rocks | 7.5-8.5 |
| Serpentinite | 5.5-6.5 |
| Pore fluids | |
| Air | 0.3 |
| Water | 1.4-1.5 |
| lce | 3.4 |
| Petroleum | 1.3-1.4 |
| Other materials | |
| Steel | 6.1 |
| Iron | 5.8 |
| Aluminium | 6.6 |
| Concrete | 3.6 |
| | |

Thank You for Your attention!