

This is a repository copy of *When do fractured media become seismically anisotropic?* Some implications on quantifying fracture properties.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/97216/

Version: Supplemental Material

Article:

Yousef, B and Angus, DAC (2016) When do fractured media become seismically anisotropic? Some implications on quantifying fracture properties. Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 444. pp. 150-159. ISSN 0012-821X

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2016.03.040

© 2016, Elsevier. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



1 Supplemental Material for

2	When do fractured media become seismically anisotropic? Some implications on quantifying
3	fracture properties
4	Yousef, B.M. & Angus, D.A.
5	School of Earth & Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK
6	Corresponding author: Doug Angus, d.angus@leeds.ac.uk
7	In Figure S1 we show that the linear slip (LS) effective medium model (EMM) of Schoenberg
8	& Sayers (1995) fails to accurately predict the observed shear-wave splitting (SWS) from the
9	finite-difference explicit fracture model for the case of Z_N/Z_T =1.0 (one of the two conditions
10	where mathematically LS should be valid, Chichinina et al., 2015). In Figure S2 we show that
11	even under the long wavelength approximation (LWA), SWS only develops after propagating
12	at least 1 to 2 wavelengths within the fracture volume. To do this, we simulate a seismic
13	source having dominant frequency of 50 Hz within a model having fracture size d=6 m,
14	fracture density of 0.1 and Z_N/Z_T =0.3. For 50 Hz signal, the wavelength is approximately 60 m
15	such that the ratio of wavelength to fracture size is 10 (i.e., within the LWA of $\lambda/d \gg 1$).
16	



Figure S1: Comparison of LS EMM δ t predictions with the observed SWS for the fracture model: d=6 m, ϵ =0.1 and Z_N=Z_T=1.0. LS EMM predictions of Schoenberg & Sayers (1995) for spacing 2 m, 6 m and 10 m (best fitting LS EMM model) as well as LS EMM predictions from the summed distribution in Figure 9 using 6 different means: arithmetic, geometric, harmonic, quadratic, cubic and weighted. See caption in Figure 4 for details.



Figure S2: Comparison of LS EMM δ t predictions with the observed SWS for dominant source frequency of 50 Hz (approximate wavelength of 60 m) for the fracture model: d=6 m, ε =0.1 and $Z_N=Z_T=1.0$. LS EMM predictions of Schoenberg & Sayers (1995) for spacing 2 m, 6 m and 10 m (best fitting LS EMM model) as well as LS EMM predictions from the summed distribution in Figure 9 using 6 different means: arithmetic, geometric, harmonic, quadratic, cubic and weighted. See caption in Figure 4 for details.

31 **References:**

- 32 Chichinina, T., Obolentseva, I. & Dugarov, G. (2015) Effective-medium anisotropic models of
- 33 fractured rocks of TI symmetry: Analysis of constraints and limitations in linear slip model,
- 34 SEG New Orleans Annual Meeting Expanded Abstracts, 421-426.
- 35 Schoenberg, M. & Sayers, C.M. (1995) Seismic anisotropy of fractured rock, *Geophysics*, **60**,

36 204-211.