Theory and modelling of constant-Q $P$- and $S$-waves using fractional spatial derivatives
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SUMMARY
We derive a time-domain differential equation for modelling seismic wave propagation in constant-Q viscoelastic media based on fractional spatial derivatives, specifically Laplacian differential operators of fractional order. The stress–strain relation is derived from the classical equation expressed in terms of fractional time derivatives. The new formulation has the advantage of not requiring additional field variables that increase the computer time and storage significantly. The spatial derivatives are calculated with a generalization of the Zener model and memory variables. This model uses a spectrum of relaxation mechanisms to describe the constitutive relation. It involves a set of first-order differential equations that can be solved with numerical methods. This approach has been widely applied in geophysical studies, in particular for 3-D simulations, even though it is possible to truncate the fractional operator after a given time period (Podlubny 1999; Carcione et al. 2002).
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1 INTRODUCTION
Seismic wave propagation has anelastic characteristics in real Earth materials. Particularly, in exploration geophysics the target area (the hydrocarbon reservoir) shows high seismic attenuation (i.e. low quality factor, $Q$) which may be caused by the presence of overpressured free gas accumulations (e.g. Carcione et al. 2003; Dvorkin & Mavko 2006). As a result, the recorded signals are significantly affected in amplitude and phase. Therefore, an accurate wavefield modelling approach should be able to account for the effects of attenuation and velocity dispersion.

One of the first attempts to model anelastic wave propagation was carried out by Carcione et al. (1988), based on the generalized Zener model and memory variables. This model uses a spectrum of relaxation mechanisms to describe the constitutive relation. It involves a set of first-order differential equations that can be solved with numerical methods. This approach has been widely applied in geophysical studies (Carcione 1990; Robertsson et al. 1994; Xu & McMechan 1995; Hestholm 1999; Komatitsch et al. 2004; Zhu et al. 2013).

An alternative approach for modelling constant-Q given by Kjartansson (1979) is more attractive because it requires three parameters, namely, $Q$, a reference phase velocity and a reference frequency. This model has been shown to describe the behaviour of seismic waves in Pierre shale (McDonal et al. 1958; Carcione et al. 2002). The model involves a fractional time derivative, that is an irrational (or non-integer) degree of the time derivative (Caputo & Mainardi 1971). The Grünwald–Letnikov approximation (Podlubny 1999) is used to compute this time derivative (Carcione et al. 2002; Carcione 2009). However, this formulation is based on the history of the wavefield, thus requiring to store in memory all the previous values to present time. It becomes unaffordable for practical seismic modelling studies, in particular for 3-D simulations, even though it is possible to truncate the fractional operator after a given time period (Podlubny 1999; Carcione et al. 2002).

To avoid the memory requirements of the fractional time operators, we have developed a constant-$Q$ wave equation using fractional Laplacian operators (Carcione 2010; Treeby & Cox 2010). Zhu & Harris (2013) presented the viscoacoustic case, that is only $P$-wave propagation. Here, we consider the viscoelastic case, that is propagation of $P$ and $S$ waves. We transform the fractional time derivative to a fractional Laplacian operator (Chen & Holm 2002). This operation, computed with the fractional Fourier pseudospectral method, avoids the storage of wavefields, rendering the modelling as efficient as the simulation in lossless media.

The paper is organized as follows: First, we review the derivation of the viscoacoustic stress–strain relation using the fractional Laplacian operator. Then, we derive the viscoelastic constitutive equation from the formulation given in Carcione (2009). The novel stress–strain relation has two sets of fractional Laplacian operators, one for $P$ waves and another for $S$ waves. The modelling algorithm is based on the method introduced by Carcione (2010), where the spatial derivatives are computed by a generalization of the Fourier pseudospectral method to the fractional case. Finally, we validate the modelling algorithm with an analytical solution for a 2-D
homogeneous medium and further illustrate the method with two seismic applications in inhomogeneous media.

2 THEORY

2.1 Fractional viscoacoustic wave equation

We consider the following phenomenological constitutive relation based on the fractional time derivative (Caputo 1967; Carcione et al. 2002) that defines the stress–strain relation in attenuating media

\[ \sigma = \left( \frac{M_0}{t_0^{2\gamma}} \right) \frac{\partial^{2\gamma} \varepsilon}{\partial t^{2\gamma}}, \] (1)

where \( \sigma \) is the trace of the stress tensor, \( \varepsilon \) is the trace of the strain tensor, \( M_0 = \rho c_0^2 \cos^2(\pi \gamma/2) \) is a bulk modulus, \( t_0 = 1/c_0 \) is a reference time, \( c_0 \) is a reference velocity, \( \rho \) is the mass density and \( \gamma = (1/\pi) \tan^{-1}(1/Q) \) is the fractional order, satisfying \( 0 < \gamma < 0.5 \) for any positive value of \( Q \). \( c_0 \) is an arbitrary reference frequency, which should be higher than the source frequencies to guarantee pulse delay with respect to the lossless case. The complete formulation of the constant-\( Q \) model can be found in Kjartansson (1979), Carcione et al. (2002) and Carcione (2009).

Next, we construct a phenomenological stress–strain relation based on fractional spatial differential operators. Applying a wavenumber-frequency domain Fourier transform to eq. (1) yields

\[ \hat{\sigma} = M_0 \omega_0^{2\gamma} (i \omega)^{2\gamma} \hat{\varepsilon}, \] (2)

where \( \omega \) is the angular frequency and \( i \) is the imaginary number. Since \( i^{2\gamma} = \cos(\pi \gamma) + i \sin(\pi \gamma) \), eq. (2) can be written as

\[ \hat{\sigma} \approx M_0 c_0^{2\gamma} \omega_0^{2\gamma} \cos(\pi \gamma) k^{2\gamma} \hat{\varepsilon} + (i \omega) M_0 c_0^{2\gamma-1} \omega_0^{2\gamma} \times \sin(\pi \gamma) k^{2\gamma-1} \hat{\varepsilon}, \] (3)

where we have introduced the wavenumber \( k = \omega/c_0 \). The fractional Laplacian is defined in Chen & Holm (2004) as,

\[ (-\nabla)\alpha/\sigma(t, x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} k^{\alpha} \hat{\sigma}(k, \omega), \quad 0 < \alpha < 2. \] (4)

Applying the inverse Fourier transform to eq. (3), we obtain

\[ \sigma = M_0 \omega_0^{2\gamma} c_0^{2\gamma} \cos(\pi \gamma) (-\nabla)^{\gamma} \varepsilon + M_0 c_0^{2\gamma} \omega_0^{2\gamma} \times \sin(\pi \gamma) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (-\nabla)^{\gamma-1/2} \varepsilon. \] (5)

Combining eq. (5) with the momentum-mass conservation equations, a first-order fractional wave equation can be obtained. Based on the plane-wave analysis of Appendix A, we verify that the phase velocity and quality factor are similar to those of the constant-\( Q \) model proposed by Kjartansson (1979) and Carcione et al. (2002). Wavefield simulations can be found in Zhu & Harris (2013).

2.2 Fractional viscoelastic wave equation

Similarly, we construct a viscoelastic stress–strain relation from the constitutive equation given by Carcione (2009),

\[ \sigma_{ij} = C_p D^{2\gamma_p} \delta_{ij} + 2C_{ij} D^{2\gamma_S} \left( \varepsilon_{ij} - \varepsilon \delta_{ij} \right), \] (6)

where \( \delta_{ij} \) is the Kronecker delta, \( i, j, k \) are spatial indices and the fractional time-derivative operators for the \( P \)- and \( S \)-waves are defined as

\[ D^{2\gamma_p,s} = \frac{\partial^{2\gamma_p,s}}{\partial t^{2\gamma_p,s}}. \] (7)

Moreover,

\[ C_p = M_0 \omega_0^{2\gamma_p}, \quad C_{ij} = \mu_0 \omega_0^{2\gamma_S}, \] (8)

with \( \mu_0 \) the shear modulus and

\[ \gamma_{p,s} = \frac{1}{\pi} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{Q_{p,s}} \right), \] (9)

where \( Q_p \) and \( Q_s \) are the \( P \)- and \( S \)-wave quality factors, respectively. Einstein’s convention of repeated indices is assumed. According to the constant-\( Q \) model (Carcione 2009), the \( P \)-wave modulus \( M_0 \) and the \( S \)-wave modulus \( \mu_0 \) are, respectively, given by

\[ M_0 = \rho c_0^{2\gamma_p} \cos^2 \left( \tan(Q_p^{-1}/2) \right), \quad \mu_0 = \rho c_0^{2\gamma_s} \cos^2 \left( \tan(Q_s^{-1}/2) \right), \] (10)

where \( c_{p0} \) and \( c_{s0} \) are the \( P \)- and \( S \)-wave velocities at the reference frequency, respectively.

Consider the 2D case and the \((x,z)\)-plane. We have

\[ \sigma_{11} = C_p D^{2\gamma_p} (\varepsilon_{11} + \varepsilon_{33}) - 2C_{12} D^{2\gamma_S} \varepsilon_{33}, \] (11)

\[ \sigma_{33} = C_s D^{2\gamma_S} (\varepsilon_{11} + \varepsilon_{33}) - 2C_{12} D^{2\gamma_S} \varepsilon_{11}, \] (12)

\[ \sigma_{13} = 2C_s D^{2\gamma_S} \varepsilon_{13}. \] (13)

Now, we perform a Fourier transform to the wavenumber-frequency domain and replace \( \omega \) by \( c_{p0} k \) in terms containing the \( D^{2\gamma_p} \) derivative and by \( c_{s0} k \) in terms containing the \( D^{2\gamma_S} \) derivative. This \textit{ad hoc} construction provides a stress–strain relation based on fractional spatial derivatives

\[ \hat{\sigma}_{11} = C_p c_{p0}^{2\gamma_p} \left[ \cos(\pi \gamma_p) + i \sin(\pi \gamma_p) \right] k^{2\gamma_p} \left( \hat{\varepsilon}_{11} + \hat{\varepsilon}_{33} \right), \]

\[ -2C_{12} \left[ \cos(\pi \gamma_S) + i \sin(\pi \gamma_S) \right] c_{s0}^{2\gamma_s} k^{2\gamma_s} \hat{\varepsilon}_{33}. \] (14)

Applying inverse Fourier transforms yields

\[ \sigma_{11} = C_p c_{p0}^{2\gamma_p} \left[ \cos(\pi \gamma_p) \left( -\nabla^2 \right)^{\gamma_p} \right. \]

\[ + c_{p0}^{-1} \sin(\pi \gamma_p) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( -\nabla^2 \right)^{\gamma_p-1/2} \left( \varepsilon_{11} + \varepsilon_{33} \right), \]

\[ -2C_{12} c_{s0}^{2\gamma_s} \left[ \cos(\pi \gamma_S) \left( -\nabla^2 \right)^{\gamma_S} \right. \]

\[ + c_{s0}^{-1} \sin(\pi \gamma_S) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( -\nabla^2 \right)^{\gamma_S-1/2} \varepsilon_{33}, \]

which can be re-written as

\[ \sigma_{11} = \left[ 2\tau_p \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( -\nabla^2 \right)^{\gamma_p-1/2} + \eta_p \left( -\nabla^2 \right)^{\gamma_p} \right] \left( \varepsilon_{11} + \varepsilon_{33} \right), \]

\[ -2 \left[ \tau_s \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( -\nabla^2 \right)^{\gamma_S-1/2} + \eta_s \left( -\nabla^2 \right)^{\gamma_S} \right] \varepsilon_{33}. \] (16)

where

\[ \tau_p = C_p c_{p0}^{2\gamma_p-1} \sin(\pi \gamma_p), \] (17)

\[ \eta_p = C_p c_{p0}^{2\gamma_p} \cos(\pi \gamma_p), \] (18)

\[ \tau_s = C_s c_{s0}^{2\gamma_s-1} \sin(\pi \gamma_S), \] (19)

\[ \eta_s = C_s c_{s0}^{2\gamma_s} \cos(\pi \gamma_S). \] (20)
Similarly, eqs (12) and (13) become

$$\sigma_{33} = \left[\tau_P \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(-\nabla^2\right)^{\gamma/2} + \eta_P \left(-\nabla^2\right)^{\gamma/2}\right] (\varepsilon_{11} + \varepsilon_{33})$$

$$- 2 \left[\tau_S \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(-\nabla^2\right)^{\gamma/2} + \eta_S \left(-\nabla^2\right)^{\gamma/2}\right] \varepsilon_{11},$$

$$\sigma_{13} = 2\tau_S \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(-\nabla^2\right)^{\gamma/2} \varepsilon_{11},$$

respectively. Combining eqs (16), (21) and (22) with the momentum conversation equations, we obtain the fractional viscoelastic wave equation. The complete first-order velocity-stress equations are given in Appendix B. When $Q_{P,S} \to \infty$ ($\gamma_{P,S} \to 0$), we obtain the elastic case.

Anelastic propagation described by viscoelasticity is a phenomenological model, whose prediction properties depend on a number of parameters, which are reduced to a minimum in this formulation. The fact that the parameters are assumed to be constant in the derivation of the fractional viscoelastic wave equation does not preclude the fact to use the modeling method to simulate real seismic data for an arbitrary heterogeneous model of the Earth. The essential fact is that this \textit{ad hoc} construction of the rheological equations allows us to avoid the time convolutions and therefore to save substantial computer time.

To solve the wave equation in inhomogeneous media, we use the numerical approach given in Carcione (2010). We calculate the first-order spatial derivatives with the staggered-grid pseudospectral method that minimizes spatial numerical dispersion and non-physical ringing (Özdenvar & McMechan 1996; Carcione 1999). The fractional Laplacian operators are implemented with the fractional Fourier pseudospectral method as shown by Carcione (2010). The perfectly matched layer (PML) approach is used as absorbing boundary to remove non-physical events from the sides of the mesh (e.g. Berenger 1994; Carcione & Kosloff 2013).

3 NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

We validate the proposed viscoelastic wave equation with experimental data and the numerical solver by comparison to the analytical solution. McDonal et al. (1958) reported seismic data from Pierre shale in Colorado which present an approximate constant-$Q$ behaviour, with attenuation coefficients $\alpha_p = 0.12$ dB/kft and $\alpha_s = 1.05 f$ dB/kft, where $f$ is the frequency. The $P$- and $S$-wave quality factors of Pierre shale are $Q_p = 32$ and $Q_s = 10$, and the respective velocities are 2164 and 802 m s$^{-1}$ at the reference frequency of 100 Hz (Carcione 2009). We assume a shale density of 2.2 g cm$^{-3}$. The simulations are performed with a $612 \times 612$ mesh, 1-m grid spacing along the $x$- and $z$-directions and a time step of $9.24 \times 10^{-3}$ s. A Ricker wavelet source with 100 Hz centre frequency is located at (300, 300) m and two receivers at (360, 360) m and (380, 380) m. Fig. 1 shows the recorded waveforms. Then, the attenuation coefficient $\alpha$ (in dB/km) and the phase velocity are calculated with the amplitude spectral ratio as (Picotti & Carcione 2006; Treeby & Cox 2010)

$$\alpha(\omega) = -20 \log_{10} \left(\frac{A_2}{A_1}\right)/d,$$

$$c(\omega) = \frac{\omega d}{\phi_1 - \phi_2},$$

respectively, where $A_{1,2}$ are the amplitude spectra at the two receivers, $\phi_{1,2}$ are the phases and $d$ is the propagation distance in meters.

Fig. 2 displays the calculated attenuation factor (circles), the theoretical curves (solid lines) and the experimental results (triangles) from McDonal et al. (1958). Figs 3(a) and (b) illustrate the $P$- and $S$-wave phase velocity dispersion in Pierre shale. Overall, the calculated attenuation and dispersion values agree with the theoretical constant-$Q$ curves as well as with the experimental results. We note that the calculated $S$-wave attenuation factor and phase velocity oscillate at high frequencies due to the strong attenuation. Similar observations were made by Wuenschel (1965) and Zhu & Harris (2013).

Next, we consider a homogeneous model, where the analytical solution is available, in order to verify the accuracy of the algorithm. For completeness, the Green’s function is given in Appendix C [see also Carcione (2009)]. The $P$- and $S$-wave velocities are 2500 and 1500 m s$^{-1}$, respectively, and the density is 2200 kg m$^{-3}$. We have considered $Q_p = 32$ and $Q_s = 16$. The model is discretized in a mesh with $512 \times 512$ grid points using a 10-m grid spacing in both the horizontal and vertical directions, and the time step is
Figure 2. P- and S-wave attenuation coefficients. The solid lines represent the theoretical attenuation based on the constant-Q model. The dotted points are estimated from the waveforms in Fig. 1. The triangles correspond to the experimental data reported by McDonald et al. (1958).

Figure 3. P-wave (a) and S-wave (b) phase velocity dispersion. The solid lines represent the theoretical phase velocity. The dotted points are estimated from the waveform in Fig. 1.

Figure 4. Comparison of the elastic and viscoelastic numerical results with the respective analytical solutions (normalized values). Elastic case: (a) horizontal $v_x$ and (b) vertical $v_z$, where $Q_p$ and $Q_S$ take infinite values. Viscoelastic case: (c) horizontal $v_x$ and (d) vertical $v_z$, where $Q_p = 32$ and $Q_S = 16$. A vertical source is located at (395, 395) m and the receiver position is (995, 995) m.

Figure 6 shows the elastic and viscoelastic vertical-component snapshots at 0.5 s. The snapshots in Figs 6(a) and (b) clearly show the direct P wave and other events, for example, the reflected PP and
Viscoelastic modelling using fractional spatial derivatives

Figure 5. Layered model with the properties used in the calculation of the synthetic data. The black star represents the source location at (2310, 250) m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (km)</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Properties of the layered model

- $C_p = 3.0$ km/s, $C_s = 1.6$ km/s, $\rho = 2.3$ g/cm$^3$, $Q_p = 100$, $Q_s = 50$
- $C_p = 2.5$ km/s, $C_s = 1.4$ km/s, $\rho = 2.0$ g/cm$^3$, $Q_p = 30$, $Q_s = 15$
- $C_p = 4.0$ km/s, $C_s = 2.2$ km/s, $\rho = 2.5$ g/cm$^3$, $Q_p = 50$, $Q_s = 25$

Figure 6. Snapshots of the wavefield (vertical particle velocity) at 0.5 s corresponding to the three-layer model: (a) elastic case and (b) viscoelastic case. The symbols denote: DP: direct $P$ wave; DS: direct $S$ wave; PP: reflected $P$ waves at the first interface; PS: converted $S$ waves from $P$ waves at the first interface; SS: reflected $S$ waves; SP: converted $P$ waves from $S$ waves at the first interface.

Figure 7. Seismograms (horizontal particle velocity) corresponding to the three-layer model using (a) infinite $Q_p$ and $Q_s$ and (b) the values indicated in Fig. 6. For comparison, using the same attenuation models, we simulated the viscoelastic data (c) by using the standard linear solid model approach.

Figure 8. Comparison of traces computed with the present approach with those computed with the viscoelastic modelling approach using a single standard linear solid element. Overall, the amplitudes are comparable.

In the last example, we apply the present approach to the Marmousi model (Fig. 9), which describes strongly heterogeneous media. We assume an $S$-wave velocity $C_s = C_p/1.73$. The low $Q_p$'s of the upper part simulate a high-attenuation gas cloudy area in Fig. 9(c). Moreover, we assume $Q_s = Q_p/1.2$. The medium is discretized with 921 × 481 grid points and uniform vertical and horizontal grid spacings of 6.25 m. Again, PML absorbing strips of width 20 grid points are implemented at the four boundaries of the computational mesh to avoid wraparound. The source denoted by a
Figure 8. Comparison of corresponding traces of Fig. 7 at horizontal distance 2090 and 3290 m. The black line shows the elastic trace, the blue line shows the viscoelastic case computed with the standard linear solid approach, and the red line shows the viscoelastic case computed with the present approach.

white star in Fig. 9(a) is a vertical force with a Ricker-wavelet time history and a central frequency of 15 Hz, located at (2881, 281) m. The receivers are located at a depth of 219 m and range from 62 to 5687 m, with a spacing 12.5 m. The time step of the modelling algorithm is 0.4 ms. The time length of the simulation is 3 s.

Figs 10(a) and (b) show snapshots of elastic wavefields corresponding to the horizontal and vertical components at 0.9 s, respectively, and Figs 10(c) and (d) show the snapshots in the viscoelastic case. It can be found that the wavefield passing through the high-attenuation gas cloudy zones is attenuated. The wave types (e.g. major reflections) are identifiable. Further, Figs 11(a) and (b) display the corresponding horizontal and vertical particle-velocity synthetic seismograms. This example shows that the proposed fractional viscoelastic wave equation can be used for modelling seismic wave in complex geological models of interest in seismology and exploration geophysics.

Figure 9. Marmousi P-wave velocity (a), density (b), and \( Q_P \) (c) models with the properties used in the calculation of the synthetic data. We calculated \( S \)-wave velocity by \( C_s = C_P/1.73 \). Also, we calculated \( Q_S = Q_P/1.2 \). The white star in (a) represents the source at (2881.3, 281.2) m. The receivers are located at a depth of 218.8 m and range from 62.5 to 5687.5 m.

Numerical results of the proposed wave equation for Pierre Shale exhibit the desired constant-\( Q \) attenuation and dispersion behaviour. Furthermore, comparison to the analytical solution in homogeneous media shows that the algorithm can accurately simulate seismic wave propagation in viscoelastic media. Simulations in inhomogeneous media illustrate the versatility of the methodology.

4 CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a new formulation for simulating wave propagation in viscoelastic media that avoids the use of memory variables or storing the past wavefields. The method is based on fractional spatial derivatives that are computed with a generalization of the Fourier pseudospectral method to the fractional case. The formulation consists of two sets of fractional Laplacian operators to describe the attenuation of the \( P \)- and \( S \)-waves. Setting the respective quality factors to infinite gives the classical elastic formulation. Because the Laplacian operators are evaluated in the spatial domain, the proposed viscoelastic equation is highly efficient, since it avoids the use of additional arrays to store the past values of the wavefields. Since the algorithm is a direct grid method, it holds for all frequencies and arbitrary heterogeneous models.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The first author thanks Prof. Jerry M. Harris for his advice on this topic. We thank the editor Jeannot Trampert and two anonymous reviewers for constructive criticisms that improved the quality of the paper. TZ is partially supported by a ConocoPhillips Fellowship at Stanford. JMC has been partially funded by the CO2Monitor project.
Viscoelastic modelling using fractional spatial derivatives

Figure 10. Wavefield snapshots at 0.9 s. Top: elastic horizontal (a) and vertical (b) particle velocity components. Bottom: viscoelastic horizontal (c) and vertical (d) particle velocity components. Comparing these results, the wave energy (bottom) passing through the high attenuation gas cloudy areas is attenuated.

Figure 11. Viscoelastic horizontal (a) and vertical (b) particle-velocity seismograms.
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**APPENDIX A: CONSTANT-Q PHASE VELOCITY AND ATTENUATION**

Let us assume a plane-wave kernel of the form \( \exp(i\omega t - ik \cdot r) \), where the wavenumber vector \( k \) is complex-valued. Then, eq. (5) yields the following complex modulus

\[
M = M_0 \left( \frac{c_0 k}{\omega_0} \right)^{2\gamma} \left( \cos(\pi \gamma) + i \frac{\omega \sin(\pi \gamma)}{c_0 k} \right), \tag{A1}
\]

It can be shown that for realistic \( Q \) values we can use the relation \( c_0 k = \omega \) and after some calculations the complex velocity obtained from eq. (A1) is given by

\[
u_c = \frac{\omega}{k} = \sqrt{\frac{M}{\rho}}, \text{ where } M = M_0 \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_0} \right)^{2\gamma}, \tag{A2}
\]

where \( M \) is the complex modulus. The phase velocity is

\[
u_{ph} = \text{Re}^{-1}(\nu_c^{-1}) = \sqrt{\frac{M_0}{\rho}} \left( \frac{\omega_0}{\omega} \right)^{\gamma} \left( \cos \frac{\pi \gamma}{2} \right) = c_0 \left( \frac{\omega_0}{\omega} \right)^{\gamma}, \tag{A3}
\]

and the quality factor is

\[
Q = \frac{\text{Re}(M)}{\text{Im}(M)} = \cot(\pi \gamma) \tag{A4}
\]

(Carcione, 2007). These equations are identical to those of the constant-\( Q \) model (Kjartansson 1979; Carcione et al. 2002) and can be used for \( Q \) values as low as five.

Similarly, the complex velocities corresponding to the viscoelastic case are given by

\[
u_P = \sqrt{\frac{M(\omega)}{\rho}} \quad \text{and} \quad v_S = \sqrt{\frac{\mu(\omega)}{\rho}}, \tag{A5}
\]

where

\[
M(\omega) = M_0 \left( \frac{i \omega}{\omega_0} \right)^{2\gamma P} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(\omega) = \mu_0 \left( \frac{i \omega}{\omega_0} \right)^{2\gamma S}, \tag{A6}
\]

while the phase velocities are

\[
c_{phP}(\omega) = c_{p0} \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_0} \right)^{\gamma P} \quad \text{and} \quad c_{phS}(\omega) = c_{s0} \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_0} \right)^{\gamma S}. \tag{A7}
\]

The spatial quality factors are

\[
Q_P = \frac{\text{Re}(M)}{\text{Im}(M)} = \cot(\pi \gamma_p) \tag{A8}
\]

and

\[
Q_S = \frac{\text{Re}(\mu)}{\text{Im}(\mu)} = \cot(\pi \gamma_s). \tag{A9}
\]

These equations, already given in Carcione (2009), can be used for realistic \( Q \) values to estimate the seismic attenuation and phase velocity, otherwise, for very low \( Q \) values, their calculation requires the solution of an implicit equation on the complex velocities.

**APPENDIX B: 2-D VISCOELASTIC WAVE EQUATION IN THE TIME DOMAIN**

The 2-D velocity-stress formulation of the wave equation combines eqs (16), (21) and (22) with the equations of momentum conservation (Carcione 2007). We obtain

\[
\rho \partial_t \upsilon_1 = (\partial_t \sigma_{11} + \partial_1 \sigma_{13} + f_1), \tag{B1}
\]

\[
\rho \partial_t \upsilon_3 = (\partial_3 \sigma_{11} + \partial_3 \sigma_{33} + f_3), \tag{B2}
\]

\[
\sigma_{11} = \tau_p A_p \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\epsilon_{11} + \epsilon_{33}) + \eta_p B_p (\epsilon_{11} + \epsilon_{33}) - 2\tau_s A_s \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \epsilon_{33} - 2\eta_s B_s \epsilon_{33}, \tag{B3}
\]

\[
\sigma_{33} = \tau_p A_p \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\epsilon_{11} + \epsilon_{33}) + \eta_p B_p (\epsilon_{11} + \epsilon_{33}) - 2\tau_s A_s \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \epsilon_{11} - 2\eta_s B_s \epsilon_{11}, \tag{B4}
\]

\[
\sigma_{13} = 2\tau_s A_s \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \epsilon_{13} + 2\eta_s B_s \epsilon_{13}, \tag{B5}
\]

\[
\partial_t \epsilon_{11} = \partial_1 \upsilon_1, \tag{B6}
\]

\[
\partial_t \epsilon_{33} = \partial_3 \upsilon_3, \tag{B7}
\]

\[
\partial_t \epsilon_{13} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_1 \upsilon_1 + \partial_3 \upsilon_3), \tag{B8}
\]

where \( \upsilon_i, \epsilon_{ij} \) and \( f_i \) denote particle velocity, strain and body force components, respectively, and

\[
A_{P,S} = (-\nabla^2)^{\frac{\gamma P}{2}}, \quad B_{P,S} = (-\nabla^2)^{\gamma S}. \tag{B9}
\]
APPENDIX C: ANALYTIC SOLUTION IN HOMOGENEOUS VISCOElastic MEDIA

The solution of the wavefield generated by an impulsive point force in a 2-D elastic medium has been given by Eason et al. (1956) (see Carcione 2007). For a force acting in the positive \( z \)-direction, the displacement solutions can be expressed as

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_1(r, t) &= \left( \frac{F_0}{2\pi \rho} \right) \frac{xz}{r^2} \left[ G_1(r, t) + G_3(r, t) \right], \\
    u_3(r, t) &= \left( \frac{F_0}{2\pi \rho} \right) \frac{1}{r^2} \left[ z^2G_1(r, t) - z^2G_3(r, t) \right],
\end{align*}
\]

where \( F_0 \) is a constant that gives the magnitude of the force, \( r^2 = x^2 + z^2 \),

\[
G_1(r, t) = \frac{1}{c_p} (t^2 - \tau_p^2)^{-1/2} H(t - \tau_p) + \frac{1}{r^2} (t^2 - \tau_p^2)^{1/2} H(t - \tau_p) - \frac{1}{r^2} (t^2 - \tau_s^2)^{1/2} H(t - \tau_s),
\]

\[
G_3(r, t) = -\frac{1}{cs} (t^2 - \tau_s^2)^{-1/2} H(t - \tau_s) + \frac{1}{r^2} (t^2 - \tau_s^2)^{1/2} H(t - \tau_p) - \frac{1}{r^2} (t^2 - \tau_s^2)^{1/2} H(t - \tau_s),
\]

\[
\tau_p = r \frac{c_p}{c_s}, \quad \tau_s = r \frac{c_s}{c_p},
\]

\( c_p \) and \( c_s \) are the compressional and shear wave phase velocities and \( H \) is the Heaviside function. To apply the correspondence principle and obtain the anelastic solution, one needs the elastic frequency domain solution (Bland 1960; Carcione et al. 1988; Carcione 2007).

Using the transform pairs of the zero- and first-order Hankel functions of the second kind,

\[
\begin{align*}
    \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\tau^2} (t^2 - \tau^2)^{1/2} H(t - \tau) \exp(i\omega \tau) d\tau &= \frac{i\pi}{2\omega} H^{(2)}_0(\omega r), \\
    \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\tau^2} (t^2 - \tau^2)^{-1/2} H(t - \tau) \exp(i\omega \tau) d\tau &= -\frac{i\pi}{2} H^{(2)}_0(\omega r),
\end{align*}
\]

we obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_1(r, \omega, c_p, c_s) &= \left( \frac{F_0}{2\pi \rho} \right) \frac{xz}{r^2} \left[ \tilde{G}_1(r, \omega, c_p, c_s) + \tilde{G}_3(r, \omega, c_p, c_s) \right], \\
    u_3(r, \omega, c_p, c_s) &= \left( \frac{F_0}{2\pi \rho} \right) \frac{1}{r^2} \left[ z^2 \tilde{G}_1(r, \omega, c_p, c_s) - z^2 \tilde{G}_3(r, \omega, c_p, c_s) \right],
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
\tilde{G}_1(r, \omega, c_p, c_s) = -\frac{i\pi}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{c_p} \frac{\omega}{c_p} H^{(2)}_0 \left( \frac{\omega r}{c_p} \right) + \frac{1}{\omega c_p} H^{(2)}_1 \left( \frac{\omega r}{c_p} \right) \right],
\]

and

\[
\tilde{G}_3(r, \omega, c_p, c_s) = \frac{i\pi}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{c_s} \frac{\omega}{c_s} H^{(2)}_0 \left( \frac{\omega r}{c_s} \right) - \frac{1}{\omega c_s} H^{(2)}_1 \left( \frac{\omega r}{c_s} \right) \right] + \frac{1}{\omega c_s} H^{(2)}_1 \left( \frac{\omega r}{c_s} \right).
\]

The complex wave velocities given in Appendix B are used to replace the real-valued velocities in the equations above. Then, the 2-D viscoelastic Green’s function can be expressed as

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_{1, 3}(r, \omega) &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
    u_{1, 3}(r, \omega, V_p, V_s), & \omega \geq 0, \\
    u_{1, 3}^*(r, -\omega, V_p, V_s), & \omega < 0,
    \end{array} \right.
\end{align*}
\]