On seismic ambient noise cross-correlation and surface-wave attenuation

Lapo Boschi, Fabrizio Magrini, Fabio Cammarano, Mark van Der Meijde

► To cite this version:

Lapo Boschi, Fabrizio Magrini, Fabio Cammarano, Mark van Der Meijde. On seismic ambient noise cross-correlation and surface-wave attenuation. *Geophysical Journal International*, 2019, 219 (3), pp.1568-1589. 10.1093/gji/ggz379 . hal-02407794

HAL Id: hal-02407794

<https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-02407794>

Submitted on 12 Dec 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

On seismic ambient noise cross-correlation and surface-wave attenuation

Lapo Boschi^{1,2}, Fabrizio Magrini³, Fabio Cammarano³, and Mark van der Meijde⁴

¹Dipartimento di Geoscienze, Università degli Studi di Padova, Italy

²Sorbonne Université, CNRS, INSU, Institut des Sciences de la Terre de Paris, ISTE P
UMR 7193, F-75005 Paris, France.

³Department of Geological Science, Università degli Studi Roma Tre, Italy

⁴Faculty of Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation (ITC), University of
Twente, The Netherlands

August 14, 2019

Summary

We derive a theoretical relationship between the cross correlation of ambient Rayleigh waves (seismic ambient noise) and the attenuation parameter α associated with Rayleigh-wave propagation. In particular, we derive a mathematical expression for the multiplicative factor relating normalized cross correlation to the Rayleigh-wave Green's function. Based on this expression, we formulate an inverse problem to determine α from cross correlations of recorded ambient signal. We conduct a preliminary application of our algorithm to a relatively small instrument array, conveniently deployed on an island. In our setup, the mentioned multiplicative factor has values of about 2.5 to 3, which, if neglected, could result in a significant underestimate of α . We find that our inferred values of α are reasonable, in comparison with independently obtained estimates found in the literature. Allowing α to vary with respect to frequency results in a reduction of misfit between observed and predicted cross correlations.

1 Introduction

A number of theoretical and experimental studies have proved that the cross correlation between two recordings of a diffuse surface-wave field approximately coincides with the surface-wave Green's function associated with the two points of observation. This is relevant to the field of seismology, since recorded seismic ambient signal has been found to mostly consist of seismic surface waves, and empirical Green's functions are now routinely retrieved from the cross correlation of seismic ambient noise [e.g. *Boschi and Weemstra*, 2015, and references therein]. Most authors have been able to derive the medium's velocity from the *phase* of the reconstructed Green's functions; this resulted in successful applications of ambient-noise theory to imaging and monitoring [see the reviews by, e.g., *Campillo and Roux*, 2014; *Boschi*

33 and Weemstra, 2015]. The *amplitude* of the Green’s function in principle provides comple-
 34 mentary information on the medium’s anelastic properties; but it tends to be less accurately
 35 reconstructed by cross correlation.

36 Initial attempts to constrain surface-wave attenuation from ambient noise [e.g. Prieto
 37 et al., 2009; Harmon et al., 2010; Lawrence and Prieto, 2011; Weemstra et al., 2013] were
 38 based on the assumption (questioned by Weaver [2011]) that the “lossy” Green’s func-
 39 tion be simply the product of the elastic Green’s function times an exponential damping
 40 term. Tsai [2011] validated mathematically this assumption, but both he and Harmon et al.
 41 [2010] emphasized the difficulty of constraining earth’s attenuation whenever the ambient
 42 field is not perfectly diffuse. The study of Weemstra et al. [2014] additionally showed that
 43 data-processing techniques typically used in ambient-noise literature, such as whitening or
 44 time-domain normalization [e.g. Bensen et al., 2007], could also affect attenuation estimates.
 45 Whitening and/or normalization, however, are necessary to avoid that localized events of
 46 relatively large amplitude, like earthquakes, obscure random noise and thus bias cross corre-
 47 lations.

48 It is the purpose of this study to introduce a new normalization criterion, which is in prac-
 49 tice similar to whitening, but is derived directly from the reciprocity theorem as stated, e.g.,
 50 by Boschi and Weemstra [2015]; i.e., it does not follow from data-processing considerations,
 51 but from the physics of ambient-noise cross correlation. The relationship we obtain (eq. (30)
 52 in sec. 2.3.2), and on whose basis we formulate an inverse problem to determine attenuation,
 53 can be summarized simplistically by stating that cross correlations are normalized against the
 54 power spectral density of emitted noise. An approximate equation expressing source power
 55 spectral density in terms of recorded data is also found (eqs. (27) and (29), sec. 2.3.2). To
 56 achieve all this, we assume the same theoretical framework of, e.g., Boschi et al. [2018], de-
 57 scribing Love- and Rayleigh-wave as combinations of two-dimensional membrane waves and
 58 “radial eigenfunctions.” Our treatment (sec. 2) involves an independent derivation of the
 59 surface-wave Green’s function in a lossy medium (sec. 2.1 and app. B).

60 Importantly, the fact that the medium is lossy requires that noise sources be uniformly
 61 distributed over the surface of the earth (and not just over all azimuths) for the Green’s
 62 function to be reconstructed by noise cross-correlation [Snieder, 2007; Tsai, 2011]. In addi-
 63 tion, our formulation is strictly valid only if the spectrum of signal emitted by ambient-noise
 64 sources is laterally homogeneous (sec. 2.3). Because seismic ambient noise is mostly origi-
 65 nated by coupling between the solid earth and the oceans, it is reasonable to expect that
 66 both requirements will be best approximated by deploying instruments on an island. We ac-
 67 cordingly test our algorithm on two years of continuous data recorded by an array of fourteen
 68 broadband stations in Sardinia. We explore two different parameterizations of attenuation in
 69 the area of interest, i.e. constant (sec. 3.2.1) vs. frequency-dependent (sec. 3.2.2) attenuation
 70 parameter. In both cases, we identify an attenuation model that minimizes data misfit. We
 71 discuss the resulting models in light of independent studies of Rayleigh-wave attenuation.

2 Theory

2.1 Green's problem for a lossy membrane

Let us first summarize the treatment of surface-wave theory given by *Boschi et al.* [2018], based on earlier studies by *Tanimoto* [1990] and *Tromp and Dahlen* [1993]. We shall work in the frequency (ω) domain and employ the Fourier-transform convention of *Boschi and Weemstra* [2015]. It is convenient to first introduce the Rayleigh- ($\mathbf{u}_R$) and Love-wave ($\mathbf{u}_L$) displacement *Ansätze*

$$\mathbf{u}_R(x_1, x_2, x_3, \omega) = U(x_3, \omega) \mathbf{x}_3 \phi_R(x_1, x_2, \omega) + V(x_3, \omega) \nabla_1 \phi_R(x_1, x_2, \omega), \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{u}_L(x_1, x_2, x_3, \omega) = W(x_3, \omega) (-\mathbf{x}_3 \times \nabla_1) \phi_L(x_1, x_2, \omega), \quad (2)$$

respectively, where x_1, x_2, x_3 are Cartesian coordinates, with the x_3 -axis perpendicular to Earth's surface (which we assume to be flat) and oriented downward; the unit-vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3$ are parallel to the Cartesian axes; ∇_1 denotes the surface gradient $\mathbf{x}_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + \mathbf{x}_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}$. The functions $U(x_3, \omega)$, $V(x_3, \omega)$ and $W(x_3, \omega)$ control the dependence of surface-wave amplitude on depth, and the functions $\phi_R(x, \omega)$ and $\phi_L(x, \omega)$ are respectively dubbed Rayleigh- and Love-wave "potentials". Upon substituting expressions (1) and (2) into the frequency-domain displacement equation, it is found that ϕ_R and ϕ_L can be determined through the Helmholtz' equations

$$\nabla_1^2 \phi_{L,R}(x_1, x_2, \omega) + \frac{\omega^2}{c_{L,R}^2} \phi_{L,R}(x_1, x_2, \omega) = f(x_1, x_2, \omega), \quad (3)$$

where $c_{L,R}(\omega)$ denote the value of Rayleigh- or Love-wave phase velocity at frequency ω and f is a generic forcing term.

This study is limited to recordings of seismic ambient noise. Because seismic noise has been shown to essentially amount to surface waves, it is safe (provided that signals related to large or nearby earthquakes are excluded) to assume that eqs. (1) and (2) correctly describe the corresponding ground displacement. Furthermore, for the sake of simplicity we only consider vertical-component recordings, i.e., the $\mathbf{x}_3$ -component of $\mathbf{u}_R$, or

$$u_{R,3} = U(0, \omega) \phi_R(x_1, x_2, \omega), \quad (4)$$

with $x_3=0$ as long as recordings are made at Earth's surface. It is inferred upon multiplying eq. (3) by $U(0, \omega)$ that the following vertical-displacement equation holds,

$$\nabla_1^2 u_{R,3}(x_1, x_2, \omega) + \frac{\omega^2}{c_R^2} u_{R,3}(x_1, x_2, \omega) = U(0, \omega) f(x_1, x_2, \omega). \quad (5)$$

Eqs. (3) and (5) coincide with the equation governing the displacement of a lossless, stretched membrane [e.g. *Kinsler et al.*, 1999]. Following *Boschi and Weemstra* [2015], we define the Green's function G_{2D} as the membrane response to impulsive (Dirac $\delta(x_1)\delta(x_2)$) initial velocity at the reference-frame origin, with zero initial displacement and zero forcing term f ; it follows (app. A.1) that, for Rayleigh waves,

$$G_{2D}(x_1, x_2, \omega) = -\frac{iP}{4\sqrt{2\pi}c_R^2} H_0^{(2)}\left(\frac{\omega x}{c_R}\right), \quad (6)$$

where i denotes the imaginary unit, $H_0^{(2)}$ the zeroth-order Hankel function of the second kind [e.g. *Abramowitz and Stegun*, 1964, eq. (9.1.4)], P accounts for the physical dimensions of G_{2D} as discussed in app. A.1, and $x = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}$ is the distance between (x_1, x_2) and the “source.”

Following *Tsai* [2011], we now make the assumption that surface-wave attenuation can be accounted for by replacing eq. (5) with a *damped* membrane equation, i.e. introducing an additional forcing term, or “loss term proportional to, and oppositely directed from, the velocity of the vibrating element” [*Kinsler et al.*, 1999, sec. 4.6]. It is convenient to denote $\frac{2\alpha}{c_R}$ the proportionality factor between force and velocity, with the “attenuation coefficient” α coinciding with that of *Tsai* [2011]. In the frequency domain, the resulting displacement equation reads

$$\nabla_1^2 u(x_1, x_2, \omega) + \left(\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} - i \frac{2\alpha\omega}{c} \right) u(x_1, x_2, \omega) = U(0, \omega) f(x_1, x_2, \omega) \quad (7)$$

[e.g. *Kinsler et al.*, 1999; *Tsai*, 2011], where all unnecessary subscripts have been dropped. It is inferred by comparing eqs. (5) and (7) that the expression (6) is still a solution of (7), if the real ratio ω/c in its argument is replaced by the complex number $\sqrt{\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} - \frac{2i\alpha\omega}{c}}$ [*Kinsler et al.*, 1999; *Snieder*, 2007; *Tsai*, 2011; *Weemstra et al.*, 2015]; the two-dimensional, *damped* Green’s function therefore reads

$$G_{2D}^d(x_1, x_2, \omega) = -\frac{iP}{4\sqrt{2\pi}c^2} H_0^{(2)} \left(x \sqrt{\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} - \frac{2i\alpha\omega}{c}} \right). \quad (8)$$

We show in app. B that as long as attenuation is relatively weak, i.e. $\alpha \ll \omega/c$ [*Tsai*, 2011], and provided that frequency is high and/or the effects of near-field sources are negligible, expression (8) can be reduced to the more convenient, approximate form

$$\begin{aligned} G_{2D}^d(x_1, x_2, \omega) &\approx -\frac{iP}{4\sqrt{2\pi}c^2} H_0^{(2)} \left(\frac{\omega x}{c} \right) e^{-\alpha x} \\ &\approx G_{2D}(x_1, x_2, \omega) e^{-\alpha x}; \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

in other words, if $\frac{\omega x}{c} \gg 1$ and $\alpha \ll \omega/c$, the lossy-membrane Green’s function G_{2D}^d can be roughly approximated by the product of the lossless two-dimensional Green’s function G_{2D} times a damping term $e^{-\alpha x}$; we verified this result via numerical tests (Fig. 1).

2.2 Reciprocity theorem for a lossy membrane

We extend the reciprocity-theorem derivation of *Boschi et al.* [2018], who only considered lossless media, to the case of a lossy membrane. The procedure that follows is similar to that of *Snieder* [2007], which, however, is limited to lossy *three-dimensional* media. In analogy with *Boschi et al.* [2018], let us introduce a vector $\mathbf{v} = -\frac{1}{i\omega} \nabla_1 u$, such that

$$\nabla_1 u + i\omega \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (10)$$

Figure 1: Comparison between the exact (red) and approximate (blue) formulae (eqs. (8) and (9), respectively) for the lossy-membrane Green's function. The real parts of the Green's function are shown on the left (panels a, c, e, g), the imaginary parts on the right (b, d, f and h). Green's functions corresponding to interstation distances of 50 km (a through d) and 200 km (e through h), and $\alpha=2 \times 10^{-5}\text{m}^{-1}$ (a, b, e and f) and $\alpha=5 \times 10^{-5}\text{m}^{-1}$ (c, d, g and h) are shown. The approximation is good when α is small and ω is high, and decays with growing α and decreasing ω .

129 Upon substituting (10) into the damped-membrane displacement equation (7),

$$\nabla_1 \cdot (-i\omega \mathbf{v}) + \left(\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} - i \frac{2\alpha\omega}{c} \right) u = U(0, \omega) f. \quad (11)$$

130 After some algebra,

$$\nabla_1 \cdot \mathbf{v} + i \frac{\omega\kappa}{c^2} u - q = 0, \quad (12)$$

131 where $\kappa = 1 - i \frac{2\alpha c}{\omega}$ for brevity, and $q = \frac{i}{\omega} U(0, \omega) f$ to be consistent with *Boschi et al.* [2018].
 132 In the frequency domain, q has units of squared time over distance. (*Kinsler et al.* [1999]
 133 show that, in the stretched-membrane model, this forcing can be thought of as proportional
 134 to “pressure divided by surface density”.)

135 Eqs. (10) and (12) are similar to eqs. (24) and (25) of *Boschi et al.* [2018], except that
 136 the real number $\frac{\omega}{c^2}$ in eq. (25) of *Boschi et al.* [2018] is replaced here by the complex $\frac{\omega\kappa}{c^2}$.

137 Following *Boschi et al.* [2018], consider an area S on the membrane, bounded by the closed
 138 curve ∂S ; let $q_A(x_1, x_2, \omega)$, $u_A(x_1, x_2, \omega)$ and $\mathbf{v}_A(x_1, x_2, \omega)$ denote a possible combination of
 139 the fields q , p and $\mathbf{v}$ co-existing at (x_1, x_2) in S and ∂S . A different forcing q_B would
 140 give rise, through eqs. (10) and (12), to a different “state” B , defined by $u_B(x_1, x_2, \omega)$ and
 141 $\mathbf{v}_B(x_1, x_2, \omega)$. The reciprocity theorem is obtained by combining the left-hand sides of eqs.
 142 (10) and (12) as follows,

$$\int_S d^2\mathbf{x} [(10)_A \cdot \mathbf{v}_B^* + (10)_B^* \cdot \mathbf{v}_A + (12)_A u_B^* + (12)_B^* u_A] = 0, \quad (13)$$

143 where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2)$, $d^2\mathbf{x} = dx_1 dx_2$, and $*$ denotes complex conjugation. $(10)_A$ is short for the
 144 expression one obtains after substituting $u = u_A(\mathbf{x}, \omega)$ and $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_A(\mathbf{x}, \omega)$ into the left-hand
 145 side of eq. (10), etc. Following the same procedure as in sec. 3 of *Boschi et al.* [2018], we
 146 find

$$\int_S d^2\mathbf{x} [\nabla_1(u_A \cdot \mathbf{v}_B^*) + \nabla_1(u_B^* \cdot \mathbf{v}_A)] + \frac{i\omega}{c^2} (\kappa - \kappa^*) \int_S d^2\mathbf{x} u_A u_B^* = \int_S d^2\mathbf{x} (q_A u_B^* + q_B^* u_A). \quad (14)$$

147 Notice that the second term at the left-hand side of eq. (14) would be 0 if the membrane
 148 were lossless ($\alpha=0$, and therefore $\kappa=\kappa^*$); it is easy to see that in that case (14) is equivalent
 149 eq. (31) of *Boschi et al.* [2018].

150 The divergence theorem allows to reduce the first surface integral at the left-hand side
 151 of (14) to a line integral along ∂S . Following *Snieder* [2007], we consider the particular
 152 case where surface integration is over the entire two-dimensional space $\mathbb{R}^2$, i.e. the area S
 153 is infinite. This is relevant to seismic ambient-noise applications, where receiver arrays are
 154 typically deployed within a relatively small area, receiving signal from “noise” sources that
 155 are distributed with (approximately) equal probability over the entire surface of the globe.
 156 Then, for attenuating media the wave field vanishes exponentially at infinity, and the integral
 157 along ∂S accordingly vanishes. We are left with

$$\frac{4\alpha}{c} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2\mathbf{x} u_A u_B^* = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2\mathbf{x} (q_A u_B^* + q_B^* u_A). \quad (15)$$

158 Consider now the states A and B associated with impulsive forcing terms $q_A = F\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_A)$
 159 and $q_B = F\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_B)$, respectively. $\mathbf{x}_A$ and $\mathbf{x}_B$ are two arbitrary point-source locations, and

the factor F accounts for the physical dimensions of q (recall that $\delta(\mathbf{x})$ has dimensions of one over squared distance). It follows from app. A, eq. (A.22), that the corresponding membrane displacements are $u_A = i\omega \frac{Fc^2}{P} G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_A, \omega)$ and $u_B = i\omega \frac{Fc^2}{P} G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_B, \omega)$, respectively. Substituting into eq. (15), F simplifies out and

$$\frac{2\alpha\omega c}{P} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2\mathbf{x} G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_A, \omega) G_{2D}^{d*}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_B, \omega) = -\Im[G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_B, \omega)], \quad (16)$$

which is the sought reciprocity theorem. Eq. (16) is similar, e.g., to eq. (39) of *Boschi et al.* [2018], with one fundamental difference: the integral in (16) is not over a closed curve containing the receiver pair (as in *Boschi et al.* [2018]), but over the entire real plane. As shown in the following, this implies that, for the *lossy* Green’s function G_{2D}^d to be accurately reconstructed by seismic interferometry, sources should be uniformly distributed over space, rather than azimuth, and both in the near and far field of the receivers [*Snieder*, 2007; *Tsai*, 2011; *Weemstra et al.*, 2015].

2.3 Cross-correlation amplitude as a constraint for attenuation

We shall next (sec. 2.3.1) use eq. (16) to establish a relationship between the cross correlation of ambient surface-wave signal (“noise”) recorded at two locations $\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_B$, and the imaginary part of the Green’s function $G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_B, \omega)$. Based on this relationship, in sec. 2.3.2 an inverse problem will be formulated, having attenuation α as unknown parameter, and the cross correlation of recorded noise as data. In this endeavour, it is assumed that ambient noise can be represented by a distribution of point sources of constant spatial density, emitting at random times (i.e., random phase in the frequency domain) but, in analogy with the numerical study of *Cupillard and Capdeville* [2010], all sharing the same spectral amplitude. The assumption that the spectral amplitude of noise sources be constant across the globe is based on the idea that Rayleigh-wave noise on earth is generated by the coupling, at the ocean bottom, between oceans and the solid earth. It has been shown that, while local effects play a role, the resulting spectrum has maxima determined by the main frequencies of ocean waves (i.e., primary and secondary microseisms at 0.05–0.12 and 0.1–0.25 Hz, respectively), independent of location [e.g. *Longuet-Higgins*, 1950; *Ardhuin et al.*, 2011; *Hillers et al.*, 2012]. We accordingly consider our assumption to be valid at least as a rough approximation of the real world.

2.3.1 Noise cross-correlation and the Green’s function

The vertical-component, Rayleigh-wave displacement associated with a noise “event” can be thought of as the time-domain convolution of G_{2D}^d and a source time function. In the frequency domain, convolution is replaced by product, and the signal emitted at a point $\mathbf{x}$ and recorded at, say, receiver $\mathbf{x}_A$ reads $h(\omega)G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}, \omega)e^{i\omega\phi}$, with $h(\omega)$ and ϕ denoting the amplitude and phase of the emitted signal. It follows that the ambient noise recorded at $\mathbf{x}_A$ can be written

$$s(\mathbf{x}_A, \omega) = h(\omega) \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_j, \omega) e^{i\omega\phi_j}, \quad (17)$$

195 where N_S denotes the total number of sources, and the index j identifies the source; as an-
 196 ticipated, it is assumed that the unitless, frequency-domain amplitude $h(\omega)$ is approximately
 197 the same for all noise sources. Based on eq. (17), the cross correlation of noise recorded at
 198 two receivers $\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_B$ can be written

$$\begin{aligned}
 s(\mathbf{x}_A, \omega) s^*(\mathbf{x}_B, \omega) &= |h(\omega)|^2 \left[\sum_{j=1}^{N_S} G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_j, \omega) e^{i\omega\phi_j} \right] \left[\sum_{k=1}^{N_S} G_{2D}^{d*}(\mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}_k, \omega) e^{-i\omega\phi_k} \right] \\
 &= |h(\omega)|^2 \left[\sum_{j=1}^{N_S} G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_j, \omega) G_{2D}^{d*}(\mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}_j, \omega) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} \sum_{k=1, k \neq j}^{N_S} G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_j, \omega) G_{2D}^{d*}(\mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}_k, \omega) e^{i\omega(\phi_j - \phi_k)} \right]. \tag{18}
 \end{aligned}$$

199 The phases $\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \dots$ are assumed to be random (uniformly distributed between 0 and
 200 2π); it follows that the cross correlations of signals emitted by different sources, i.e. the second
 201 term at the right-hand side of (18) (“cross terms”), can be neglected if noise is recorded over
 202 a sufficiently long time, or if a sufficiently large amount of uniformly distributed sources are
 203 present [e.g. *Weemstra et al.*, 2014; *Boschi and Weemstra*, 2015, App. D]; then

$$s(\mathbf{x}_A, \omega) s^*(\mathbf{x}_B, \omega) \approx |h(\omega)|^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_j, \omega) G_{2D}^{d*}(\mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}_j, \omega). \tag{19}$$

204 It is convenient to transform the sum at the right-hand side of eq. (19) into an integral; said
 205 ρ the surface density of noise sources, which we assume to be constant,

$$s(\mathbf{x}_A, \omega) s^*(\mathbf{x}_B, \omega) \approx \rho |h(\omega)|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2\mathbf{x} G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}, \omega) G_{2D}^{d*}(\mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}, \omega). \tag{20}$$

206 It will be noticed that the integral in (20) is over the entire real plane: this follows from the
 207 assumption, made in sec. 2.1, that sources be uniformly distributed over $\mathbb{R}^2$. Dividing both
 208 sides by $\rho |h(\omega)|^2$, we find from eq. (20) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2\mathbf{x} G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}, \omega) G_{2D}^{d*}(\mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}, \omega) \approx \frac{1}{\rho |h(\omega)|^2} s(\mathbf{x}_A, \omega) s^*(\mathbf{x}_B, \omega), \tag{21}$$

209 and finally, substituting eq. (21) into (16),

$$s(\mathbf{x}_A, \omega) s^*(\mathbf{x}_B, \omega) \approx -\frac{|h(\omega)|^2 P \rho}{2\alpha\omega c} \Im[G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_B, \omega)]. \tag{22}$$

210 Eq. (22) is the “lossy” counterpart of, e.g., eq. (65) of *Boschi and Weemstra* [2015].
 211 Let us emphasize, again, that eq. (22) was obtained under the assumption that sources are
 212 uniformly distributed over the entire real plane $\mathbb{R}^2$. It follows from eq. (22) that, in the
 213 absence of attenuation, i.e. $\alpha=0$, the cross correlation of ambient signal at its left-hand side
 214 is divergent. This is why in ambient-noise literature, whenever attenuation is neglected, the
 215 assumption is made that sources are uniformly distributed with respect to *azimuth*, rather
 216 than in space: for instance, the mentioned eq. (65) of *Boschi and Weemstra* [2015] results
 217 from a uniform distribution of sources along a circle that surrounds the receivers.

Like eq. (65) of *Boschi and Weemstra* [2015], eq. (22) can be used as the basis of inverse problems: the seismic observations at its left-hand side are “inverted” to constrain unknown parameters contained in the theoretical formula at its right-hand side. Importantly, surface-wave phase velocity $c(\omega)$ can be determined from eq. (22) without knowledge of the factor $|h(\omega)|^2 P\rho$ (that is to say, of the power spectral density, surface density and intensity of the noise sources); *Ekström et al.* [2009] show that this amounts to identifying the values of c and ω for which the left-hand side of eq. (22) is zero (i.e., the “zero crossings” of the reconstructed Green’s function). The factor $|h(\omega)|^2 P\rho$ becomes relevant if the Green’s function’s amplitude is to be accurately reconstructed, which is necessary if one wants to determine attenuation.

2.3.2 From noise cross-correlation to attenuation: the inverse problem

We show in the following how eq. (22) can be manipulated to formulate an inverse problem with α as unknown parameter, without neglecting $|h(\omega)|^2 P\rho$. Let us start by expressing $|h(\omega)|^2$ as a function of noise data.

It follows from eq. (17) that the power spectral density of the ambient signal recorded at a location $\mathbf{x}$ can be written

$$\begin{aligned} |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 &= |h(\omega)|^2 \left[\sum_{j=1}^{N_S} G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j, \omega) e^{i\omega\phi_j} \right] \left[\sum_{k=1}^{N_S} G_{2D}^{d*}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_k, \omega) e^{-i\omega\phi_k} \right] \\ &= |h(\omega)|^2 \left[\sum_{j=1}^{N_S} |G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j, \omega)|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} \sum_{k=1, k \neq j}^{N_S} G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j, \omega) G_{2D}^{d*}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_k, \omega) e^{i\omega(\phi_j - \phi_k)} \right]; \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

then, if one neglects cross terms based on the same arguments as above,

$$\begin{aligned} |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 &\approx |h(\omega)|^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} |G_{2D}^d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j, \omega)|^2 \\ &\approx |h(\omega)|^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_S} |G_{2D}^d(r_j, \omega)|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where we have introduced the source-receiver distance $r_j = |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_j|$, to emphasize the fact that the value of G_{2D}^d at a given point depends on its distance from the source, but not on the absolute locations of source and receiver. We next transform the sum at the right-hand side of eq. (24) into an integral over source-receiver distance; let us first replace the summation over sources with a summation over N_D distance bins, i.e.,

$$|s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 \approx |h(\omega)|^2 \sum_{k=1}^{N_D} N_k |G_{2D}^d(r_k, \omega)|^2, \quad (25)$$

where N_k denotes the number of sources at distances between r_k and r_{k+1} from the receiver, and it is assumed that $G_{2D}^d(r_k, \omega) \approx G_{2D}^d(r, \omega)$ as long as $r_k \leq r \leq r_{k+1}$ (which will be the case as long as the increment $\delta r = r_{k+1} - r_k$ is small). The area of the annulus centered at the receiver and bounded by the circles of radii r_k and r_{k+1} is approximately $2\pi r_k \delta r$. It follows

243 that $N_k \approx 2\pi r_k \rho \delta r$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
|s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 &\approx 2\pi \rho |h(\omega)|^2 \sum_{k=1}^{N_D} \delta r \, r_k \, |G_{2D}^d(r_k, \omega)|^2 \\
&\approx 2\pi \rho |h(\omega)|^2 \int_0^\infty dr \, r \, |G_{2D}^d(r, \omega)|^2 \\
&\approx \frac{\rho P^2 |h(\omega)|^2}{16c^4} \int_0^\infty dr \, r \, \left| H_0^{(2)}\left(\frac{\omega r}{c}\right) \right|^2 e^{-2\alpha r},
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

244 where we have replaced G_{2D}^d with its leading term, according to eq. (9). We have not been
245 able to find a closed-form solution for the integral at the right-hand side of eq. (26); let us
246 denote

$$I(\alpha, \omega, c) = \int_0^\infty dr \, r \, \left| H_0^{(2)}\left(\frac{\omega r}{c}\right) \right|^2 e^{-2\alpha r}. \tag{27}$$

247 Then, solving eq. (26) for $|h(\omega)|^2$,

$$|h(\omega)|^2 \approx \frac{16c^4}{\rho P^2 I(\alpha, \omega, c)} |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2. \tag{28}$$

248 Eq. (28) stipulates that the power-spectral density of emitted ambient noise can be obtained
249 from the power-spectral density of signal recorded at any receiver $\mathbf{x}$, by application of a
250 simple filter (provided that the surface density ρ and “intensity” P of noise sources are
251 known). Since it was assumed that the function h is the same for all source-receiver vectors
252 $\mathbf{x}$, the right-hand side of (28) can be replaced by an average over all available receivers, which
253 we denote $\langle |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}$:

$$|h(\omega)|^2 \approx \frac{16c^4}{\rho P^2 I(\alpha, \omega, c)} \langle |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}; \tag{29}$$

254 this is irrelevant from a purely theoretical perspective, but useful when processing real data,
255 as averaging over all receivers will reduce effects that are not accounted for in our theoretical
256 formulation, i.e. structural heterogeneities, dependence of the source time function on source
257 location, nonuniformities in noise source distribution, etc.

258 Substituting (29) into (22), we find after some algebra that

$$\frac{s(\mathbf{x}_A, \omega) s^*(\mathbf{x}_B, \omega)}{\langle |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}} \approx \frac{c}{\omega I(\alpha, \omega, c)} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} J_0\left(\frac{\omega |\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|}{c}\right) \frac{e^{-\alpha |\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|}}{\alpha}, \tag{30}$$

259 where J_0 denotes the zeroth-order Bessel function of the first kind [e.g. *Boschi and Weemstra*,
260 2015]; importantly, the intensity P and surface density ρ of noise sources have canceled
261 out, and only α and c remain to be determined. A nonlinear inverse problem can then be
262 formulated, with α as its only unknown parameter. In practice, the dispersion curve $c(\omega)$ is
263 first inverted for, ideally through a robust method that bypasses amplitude information and
264 only accounts for phase [e.g. *Ekström et al.*, 2009; *Kästle et al.*, 2016]. We discuss in sec. 3.2
265 how a cost function to be minimized can then be introduced, based on eq. (30).

266 It might be noticed that a closed-form expression for α can be derived from the above
267 treatment. Let us rewrite eq. (30) after replacing $\mathbf{x}_A$ and $\mathbf{x}_B$ with the locations of two
268 other stations in our array, denoted $\mathbf{x}_C$ and $\mathbf{x}_D$. We next divide eq. (30) by the equation so

Figure 2: (a) Geographical locations of receivers (black triangles with station names) over the island of Sardinia. (b) Distribution of interstation distances for all station pairs in our deployment; the mean and median of the distribution are 114.45 km, 104.95 km, respectively. Acronyms starting with the letters UT identify stations deployed by our team.

obtained, and find

$$\frac{s(\mathbf{x}_A, \omega) s^*(\mathbf{x}_B, \omega)}{s(\mathbf{x}_C, \omega) s^*(\mathbf{x}_D, \omega)} \approx \frac{J_0(\omega |\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|/c)}{J_0(\omega |\mathbf{x}_C - \mathbf{x}_D|/c)} e^{\alpha(|\mathbf{x}_C - \mathbf{x}_D| - |\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|)}, \quad (31)$$

which can be solved for α to obtain the sought formula

$$\alpha(\omega) = \log \left\{ \frac{[s(\mathbf{x}_A, \omega) s^*(\mathbf{x}_B, \omega)] [J_0(\omega |\mathbf{x}_C - \mathbf{x}_D|/c)]}{[s(\mathbf{x}_C, \omega) s^*(\mathbf{x}_D, \omega)] [J_0(\omega |\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|/c)]} \right\} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}_C - \mathbf{x}_D| - |\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B|}, \quad (32)$$

where $\log$ denotes the natural logarithm. We have found that application of eq. (32) to our database does not lead to stable results, and, at the present stage, have not pursued this approach further. Eq. (32) might be of interest in the presence of a more diffuse ambient field, or a higher number of receivers allowing, e.g., for averaging over different azimuths as in *Prieto et al.* [2009].

3 Application to Sardinian data set

At the end of June, 2016, our team has deployed an array of broadband seismic stations (Trilium Nanometrics 120s posthole broadband stations) around Sardinia, as shown in Fig. 2a. This temporary deployment was complemented by three permanent stations belonging to the Italian MN and IV networks. Except for UT001 and UT011, stations recorded continuously for 24 months. Station UT001 recorded from June 2016 until November 2017; it was then removed and redeployed at location UT011, where it recorded November 2017 to September 2018. We next explain how ambient recordings of displacement (vertical component only) were cross correlated to one another, to determine first a set of Rayleigh-wave dispersion curves, and then, according to sec. 2.3.2, the attenuation parameter α .

Figure 3: Five examples of power spectral density $\langle |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}$, computed for five consecutive six-hour long intervals. The computation is repeated for each season, with panels a, b, c and d showing the results obtained in summer, autumn, winter and spring, respectively. Recordings used for this examples start on (a) July 8, 2017 at 8:49AM; (b) October 5, 2017, at 2:49AM; (c) January 20, 2018, at 2:49AM; April 14, 2018, at 8:49PM.

3.1 Data cross correlation

Recordings of earthquakes are characterized by amplitudes much larger than those of truly diffuse, “ambient” signal, and can accordingly bias cross correlations [e.g., *Bensen et al.*, 2007]. After subdividing seismic recordings into relatively short time intervals, some authors minimize this bias by identifying intervals where anomalously large displacements are recorded, to then exclude them from cross correlation. An alternative solution consists of cross-correlating separately the segments of seismic recording associated with each time interval; then, “partial” cross correlations so obtained can be normalized independently, usually by whitening, before being summed.

We follow here the latter approach, but, instead of whitening, normalize by the power spectral density $\langle |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}$, as in the left-hand side of eq. (30). As explained in sec. 2.3.2, $\langle |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}$ is averaged over all stations $\mathbf{x}$, and is proportional, through eq. (29), to the actual power spectral density $|h(\omega)|^2$ of ambient noise. 6-hour long non-overlapping time windows are normalized independently before being summed. We shall refer to this procedure as PSD- (power spectral density) normalization. Examples of the factor $\langle |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}$ are shown in Fig. 3 for twenty different time windows, sampling all four seasons. The cumulative power spectral density $\langle |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}$ is shown in Fig. 4.

To verify that possible biases introduced by anomalous events are indeed suppressed by PSD-normalization, we also attempted to remove them directly from the data. We define as “event” the Fourier transform of one day of recording, and flag it as anomalous (an “outlier”)

Figure 4: Power spectral density $\langle |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}$ (red line) used to normalize the observed cross-spectra as in eq. (30). The power spectral density obtained after removing from the data all 24 hour-long time intervals where anomalous events (sec. 3.1) were recorded (blue line) is also shown.

if the maximum amplitude exceeds a certain value. After testing various criteria to identify outliers, we decided to follow the Interquartile Range rule (IQR) [Tukey, 1977], with outlier constant set to 5, which we applied separately on 2-month-long subsets of the entire data set. The power spectral density $\langle |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}$ obtained after removing the so defined outliers is also shown in Fig. 4 for the sake of comparison. We show in Fig. 5 the cross correlation of signals recorded over more than one year at several stations, before and after removing outliers, as described. After conducting the same test on several other station pairs, we conclude that the two approaches result in practically coincident results. We prefer PSD-normalization as it involves no arbitrary choices, e.g. in the definition of outlier. In Fig. 6 the results of PSD-normalizing and whitening the same cross correlations are compared. Discrepancies are, again, very small, which confirms the stability of our results.

Figs. 5 and 6 also show that the imaginary parts of our observed cross correlations can be relatively large. This is in contrast with eq. (30), stipulating that the imaginary part of the frequency-domain cross correlation should be zero (or, equivalently, the causal and anticausal parts of the time-domain cross correlation should coincide [e.g. App. B of Boschi and Weemstra, 2015]). The same limitation affects many other seismic ambient-noise studies, where the conditions that the field be diffuse and that sources be uniformly distributed over space are not exactly met. To quantify the azimuthal bias of recorded ambient signal, we narrow-band-pass filter and inverse-Fourier-transform the frequency-domain cross-correlation associated with each station pair; we then compute, in the time domain, the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of both causal and anticausal parts of each cross correlation, defined as the ratio of the maximum signal amplitude to the maximum of the trailing noise [e.g. Yang and Ritzwoller, 2008; Kästle et al., 2016]. The results are shown in Fig. 7, where it is apparent that, because our array is small, its azimuthal sampling is limited (sampling is particularly poor around the East-West direction). The sampled azimuths appear however

Figure 5: Real (a, c, e) and imaginary (b, d, f) parts of the cross correlations of the entire available recordings at stations UT.006 and UT.009 (a, b), IV.AGLI and IV.DGI (c, d), UT.002 and UT.003 (e, f). The associated interstation distances are 231, 97 and 57 km, respectively. Cross correlations of the entire recorded traces are PSD-normalized (red lines); alternatively (blue), outliers are removed from the traces prior to cross-correlating, as discussed in sec. 3.1. PSD-normalization is preferred throughout the rest of this study.

Figure 6: Same as Fig. 5, but PSD-normalized (red lines) and whitened cross correlations (blue) are now compared. In both cases, the entire available seismic records are cross correlated, without attempting to identify and remove outliers. For each interstation distance Δ , the Bessel function $J_0(\omega\Delta/c)$ (yellow), to which the real parts of cross correlations should be proportional according to (30), is also shown.

Figure 7: Estimates of the SNR of our cross correlations, as a function of station-pair azimuth, at periods of 3 to 15s, as specified. The value of SNR determines the length of the red segments, while their orientation coincides with the station-pair azimuth, with 0° corresponding to the North, 90° to the East, etc. The signal-to-noise ratios associated with both the causal and anticausal parts of the cross correlations are computed and plotted; for each station pair, the causal and anticausal segments point in opposite directions. In practice, longer segments should point to the direction where most seismic ambient signal comes from.

to be characterized, on average, by similar values of SNR, at least at periods ≥ 5 s, indicating a relatively isotropic ambient field: compare, e.g., with Fig. 12 of *Kästle et al.* [2016], which was obtained by applying the exact same procedure to a larger and denser array.

In the following, we shall further reduce the unwanted effects of azimuthal bias, by implicitly averaging over all station pairs (and therefore all available azimuths) as only one model of α is sought that fits cross correlation group data for all station pairs. Authors that process data from larger/denser arrays often also group station pairs in distance bins, and for each distance bin take an average over all azimuths [e.g. *Prieto et al.*, 2009; *Weemstra et al.*, 2013], but this is not feasible in our case owing to the limited size of our array.

3.2 Dispersion and attenuation parameters

For each station pair i, j , a dispersion curve $c_{ij}=c_{ij}(\omega)$ is derived via the frequency-domain method of *Ekström et al.* [2009], *Boschi et al.* [2013], *Kästle et al.* [2016]. Specifically, the algorithm of *Kästle et al.* [2016] is slightly modified, i.e. the data are PSD-normalized rather than whitened; examples of dispersion curves resulting from both PSD-normalization and whitening are shown in Fig. 8. After determining that both approaches lead to approximately coincident results, we use in the following the dispersion curves obtained by PSD-

Figure 8: Phase velocity curves retrieved from the whitened (red lines) and PSD-normalized (blue) cross-spectra, for station pairs (a) UT.006 - UT.009 (interstation distance ~ 231 km), (b) UT.002 - UT.004 (~ 152 km), (c) IV.AGLI - IV.DGI (~ 97 km), and (d) UT.002 - UT.003 (~ 57 km).

normalization. Importantly, in both cases the frequency range over which the dispersion curve is defined changes depending on the station pair; as a general rule, it is hard to constrain its low-frequency end if stations are relatively close to one another.

3.2.1 Attenuation parameter as a scalar constant

Taking the squared modulus of the difference of the left- and right-hand sides of eq. (30), and summing over all frequency samples ω_k and station pairs i, j , the cost function

$$\sum_{i,j} \sum_k \left| \frac{s(\mathbf{x}_i, \omega_k) s^*(\mathbf{x}_j, \omega_k)}{\langle |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega_k)|^2 \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}} - \frac{2c_{ij}(\omega_k)}{\omega_k \sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1}{I[\alpha, \omega_k, c_{ij}(\omega_k)]} J_0 \left(\frac{\omega_k |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|}{c_{ij}(\omega_k)} \right) \frac{e^{-\alpha |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|}}{\alpha} \right|^2 \quad (33)$$

is obtained.

The right-hand side of eq. (30) is, through the Bessel function J_0 , an oscillatory function of ω . The value of the attenuation parameter α , however, only affects its envelope, and not its oscillations, with respect to ω . Following other authors who estimated attenuation on the basis of ambient-noise cross correlation [e.g., Prieto *et al.*, 2009], we accordingly define the

Figure 9: Cost C_1 as defined by eq. (34), as a function of the scalar attenuation parameter α .

358 cost function

$$C_1(\alpha) = \sum_{i,j} \sum_k \left| \text{env} \left[\frac{s(\mathbf{x}_i, \omega_k) s^*(\mathbf{x}_j, \omega_k)}{< |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega_k)|^2 >_{\mathbf{x}}} \right] - \text{env} \left[\frac{2c_{ij}(\omega_k)}{\omega_k \sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1}{I[\alpha, \omega_k, c_{ij}(\omega_k)]} J_0 \left(\frac{\omega_k |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|}{c_{ij}(\omega_k)} \right) \frac{e^{-\alpha |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|}}{\alpha} \right] \right|^2, \quad (34)$$

359 where env denotes the envelope function, which we implement by fitting a linear combination
360 of splines [e.g. *Press et al.*, 1992] to the maxima of the absolute value of its argument.

361 The attenuation parameter α in this case is a scalar value, independent of both frequency
362 and location. We show in Fig. 9 how C_1 varies as a function of α ; a clear minimum is identified
363 at $\alpha = 3.03 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^{-1}$, which is our preferred attenuation model in this scenario. We next
364 use this value for α to evaluate numerically the right-hand side of eq. (30), and compare
365 the results with the normalized cross-correlation at the left-hand side; this is illustrated in
366 Fig. 10 for four different station pairs. The modeled Green's functions have their zeroes at
367 approximately the same frequencies as the measured ones, indicating that dispersion curves
368 derived as described above are reliable. At short interstation distances, the found value of
369 α also results in a relatively good fit of observed amplitude at most frequencies. The fit
370 deteriorates with increasing distance, indicating that the assumption that α be constant does
371 not honour the actual complexity of the medium.

372 As an additional test, we found the cost function defined by expression (33) (i.e., no
373 envelopes are taken) to be similar to C_1 , with a less prominent but well defined minimum at
374 $\alpha = 2.75 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^{-1}$. The similarity of this estimate of α with the one based on function C_1

Figure 10: Comparison of normalized data (red lines) and model (blue), i.e. left- and right-hand side of eq. (30), after substituting $\alpha=3.03 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^{-1}$, as explained in sec. 3.2.1 (i.e., inversion via the cost function C_1). As in Fig. 8, panels a, b, c and d correspond to station pairs UT.006-UT.009, UT.002 - UT.004, IV.AGLI-IV.DGI and UT.002-UT.003, respectively, with interstation distances decreasing from 231 to 57 km.

Figure 11: Cost function $C_2(\alpha, \omega)$ (sec. 3.2.2) shown (after normalization) as a function of the attenuation parameter α and frequency ω . We normalize C_2 according to the formula $\frac{C_2(\alpha, \omega) - \min[C_2(\alpha, \omega)]}{\max[C_2(\alpha, \omega)] - \min[C_2(\alpha, \omega)]}$, where $\min[C_2]$ and $\max[C_2]$ denote the minimum and maximum values of C_2 for all sampled values of α and ω . The stepwise trend of the minima of C_2 is correlated with the stepwise growth (also as a function of ω) of the number of station pairs for which cross-correlation data are available.

375 suggests that this result is robust.

376 3.2.2 Frequency-dependent attenuation parameter

377 We next allow the attenuation parameter α to change as a function of ω ; in practice, we
378 evaluate the cost function

$$C_2(\alpha, \omega) = \sum_{i,j} \left| \text{env} \left[\frac{s(\mathbf{x}_i, \omega) s^*(\mathbf{x}_j, \omega)}{< |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 >_{\mathbf{x}}} \right] - \text{env} \left[\frac{2c_{ij}(\omega)}{\omega \sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1}{I[\alpha(\omega), \omega, c_{ij}(\omega)]} J_0 \left(\frac{\omega |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|}{c_{ij}(\omega)} \right) \frac{e^{-\alpha |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|}}{\alpha} \right] \right|^2, \quad (35)$$

379 shown in Fig. 11, after normalization, as a function of both α and ω . Since both terms within
380 the square brackets in eq. (35) are close to a Bessel function of ω , it is not surprising that
381 their difference has an oscillatory behaviour with respect to ω ; because only a discrete and
382 limited set of interstation distances are available from our data set, this effect is not canceled
383 by summation, as is apparent from Fig. 11. Fig. 11 also shows that $C_2(\alpha, \omega)$ has a single,
384 well-defined minimum at all frequencies, resulting in the $\alpha(\omega)$ curve of Fig. 12.

385 The actual values of the minima of $C_2(\alpha, \omega)$, without normalization, are shown in Fig. 12.
386 C_2 decreases with growing ω , meaning that relatively high frequencies are better fit than low
387 frequencies. Fig. 13 also shows that the amplitude fit between observed cross correlations
388 and modeled Green's functions is worse for large interstation distances.

389 In analogy with sec. 3.2.1, we also evaluated an alternative cost function, where the differ-
390 ence of observed and theoretical, normalized cross correlation is computed without extracting

Figure 12: Attenuation parameter α (red dots, scale on the left) and corresponding values of the cost function $C_2(\alpha, \omega)$ (blue dots, scale on the right), both plotted as functions of frequency ω .

Figure 13: Same as Fig. 10, but the blue curves are obtained by substituting into eq. (30) the values of $\alpha(\omega)$ obtained by minimizing the cost function C_2 of sec. 3.2.2.

Figure 14: Same as Fig. 11, but the cost function C_3 is evaluated, where contributions of different station pairs are weighted differently (sec. 3.2.3) according to interstation distance.

391 their envelopes. This function varies more rapidly than C_2 does, with respect to both α and
 392 ω ; but it spans a similar range of values and, like C_2 , has a unique minimum at all frequencies.
 393 The corresponding values of α are similar to those obtained based on C_2 ; we do not show or
 394 discuss them here in the interest of brevity.

395 3.2.3 Cost function as a weighted sum

396 Attenuation models of secs. 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 achieve a systematically worse fit of cross corre-
 397 lations between faraway as opposed to nearby stations (see examples in Figs. 10 and 13).
 398 To some (minor) extent, this bias might stem from the error involved in the far-field/high-
 399 frequency approximation discussed in sec. 2.1, causing a fictitious loss of amplitude of the
 400 theoretical cross correlation at large interstation distances (Fig. 1). More importantly, it
 401 might result from the fact that, by geometrical spreading, cross-correlation amplitude de-
 402 creases with growing interstation distance; assuming the *relative* misfit on cross-correlation
 403 amplitude to be independent of distance, pairs of faraway stations are then systematically
 404 associated with smaller *absolute* errors and thus contribute less to the cost functions C_1 and
 405 C_2 . We attempt to reduce this effect by replacing the sum in C_2 with a weighted sum,

$$C_3(\alpha, \omega) = \sum_{i,j} w(|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|) \left| \text{env} \left[\frac{s(\mathbf{x}_i, \omega) s^*(\mathbf{x}_j, \omega)}{\langle |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega)|^2 \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}} \right] - \text{env} \left[\frac{2c_{ij}(\omega)}{\omega \sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1}{I[\alpha(\omega), \omega, c_{ij}(\omega)]} J_0 \left(\frac{\omega |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|}{c_{ij}(\omega)} \right) \frac{e^{-\alpha |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|}}{\alpha} \right] \right|^2, \quad (36)$$

406 where $w(|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|) = |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|^e$ and e is the Euler number. We selected this weighting
 407 scheme after a suite of preliminary tests, where the weight w was chosen to coincide in turn
 408 with different powers (from square root to fourth power) of interstation distance. We show
 409 $C_3(\alpha, \omega)$ in Fig. 14, and the corresponding best-fitting values of α in Fig. 15. Interestingly,

Figure 15: Same as Fig. 12, but the values $\alpha(\omega)$ (red dots) that minimize at each ω the cost function C_3 (sec. 3.2.3), and the corresponding values of C_3 (blue dots) are shown.

it is apparent from Fig. 15 that the so obtained function $\alpha(\omega)$ spans a smaller range of values than its counterpart discussed in sec. 3.2.2; α is also generally smaller, resulting in larger amplitude of modeled cross correlations (Fig. 16) at all interstation distances.

We are unable to determine a unique function $\alpha(\omega)$ that results in a comparably good fit of cross-correlation amplitude for all station pairs: observed amplitudes tend to be overestimated by our “model” at short interstation distances, and underestimated at large interstation distances. This effect might point to possible lateral heterogeneities of α that our data set is too limited to constrain; it could also be associated with the error inherent in ambient-noise-based reconstruction of the Green’s function, when the seismic ambient field (as in most practical applications) is not truly diffuse.

4 Discussion and conclusions

The main purpose of this study was to clarify some aspects of the relationship between the cross correlation of seismic ambient noise and surface-wave attenuation (attenuation parameter α or quality factor Q). It is known that this relationship is complicated by the need to process ambient-noise cross correlation data so as to reduce as much as possible the bias introduced by anomalous high-amplitude events (earthquakes). This is often achieved by subdividing continuous traces into shorter time intervals, which are then whitened and cross-correlated separately before being “stacked” together; but whitening has a complicated effect on the mentioned noise-attenuation relationship [Weemstra *et al.*, 2014]. We develop here a different normalization criterion, with practical effects similar to whitening, but obtained by simply manipulating the reciprocity theorem without any additional data processing. This results in the relationship (30), which is strictly valid provided that sources of seismic ambient noise be uniformly distributed over $\mathbb{R}^2$, that their phases be random and uncorrelated, and that the spectrum of noise sources be spatially uniform (sec. 2.3.2). Our experimental setup,

Figure 16: Same as Figs. 10 and 13, but the blue curves are obtained by substituting into eq. (30) the values of $\alpha(\omega)$ obtained by minimizing the cost function C_3 (sec. 3.2.3).

consisting of a small array deployed on an island, is chosen to approximately satisfy these requirements.

Eq. (30) involves a proportionality factor, relating normalized cross-correlation and the product $J_0(\omega\Delta/c)e^{-\alpha\Delta}$ (with Δ denoting interstation distance), that had been neglected in previous studies. Compare, e.g., with eq. (7) of *Prieto et al.* [2009] or eq. (1) of *Lawrence and Prieto* [2011]. The need to account for such a factor was pointed out theoretically by *Tsai* [2011], while *Harmon et al.* [2010] and *Weemstra et al.* [2013] introduced it as a free parameter of their inversions. Similar to *Tsai* [2011], we have derived an analytical expression for it, and evaluate it numerically based on our estimates for α and phase velocity $c(\omega)$. Fig. 17 shows that the factor in question is of the order of unity, which would explain the success of *Prieto et al.* [2009], *Lawrence and Prieto* [2011] and others in inferring reasonable values for α .

On the basis of eq. (30), we explored several possible definitions of cost function (secs. 3.2.1 through 3.2.3), quantifying the misfit between observed and modeled cross-correlation amplitudes. We first assumed the attenuation parameter α to be constant, independent of frequency and position. We next identified a frequency-dependent $\alpha = \alpha(\omega)$ model that minimizes the misfit for all receiver-receiver pairs at the same time. Since the cost function involves a sum over station pairs, we finally introduced a cost function where the contribution of each station pair was weighted differently depending on interstation distance.

To compare quantitatively the misfit achieved by different models, let us introduce the

Figure 17: Proportionality factor $\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}c/[\alpha\omega I(\alpha,\omega,c)]$ relating normalized cross correlation and $J_0(\omega\Delta/c)e^{-\alpha\Delta}$ in eq. (30). Its numerical value is evaluated based on inferred dispersion curves $c(\omega)$, and estimates for α obtained by minimization of the cost functions C_1 , C_2 , C_3 (each denoted by a different color, as specified). Panels (a) through (d) correspond to the same station pairs used as examples in previous figures.

Figure 18: Number (vertical axis) of station pairs for which the misfit m_{ij} falls within a given interval (horizontal axis), for models of α resulting from the minimization of cost functions (a) C_1 , (b) C_2 , and (c) C_3 . (d) Box plots [Tukey, 1977] of the distributions at (a), (b) and (c).

454 misfit function

$$m_{ij} = \sum_k \left| \frac{s(\mathbf{x}_i, \omega_k) s^*(\mathbf{x}_j, \omega_k)}{\langle |s(\mathbf{x}, \omega_k)|^2 \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}} - \frac{2c_{ij}(\omega_k)}{\omega_k \sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1}{I[\alpha(\omega_k), \omega_k, c_{ij}(\omega_k)]} J_0 \left(\frac{\omega_k |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|}{c_{ij}(\omega_k)} \right) \frac{e^{-\alpha(\omega_k) |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|}}{\alpha(\omega_k)} \right|^2, \quad (37)$$

455 associated to the station pair ij . We implement eq. (37) for each model (corresponding to
 456 the cost functions C_1 through C_3) and for each station pair ij , and visualize the resulting
 457 values of m_{ij} in Fig. 18, in the form of one histogram per model.

458 It is apparent from Fig. 18, and could be anticipated from a visual comparison of Fig. 10
 459 with Fig. 13, that allowing α to vary with respect to ω results in an overall improvement of
 460 fit with respect to constant- α models. Minimizing the cost function C_3 , on the other hand,
 461 results in an increase in the misfit m_{ij} with respect to C_2 , as nearby station pairs tend to
 462 contribute to m_{ij} more than faraway ones (see discussion of the cost function C_2 in sec.
 463 3.2.3). We found by a Kolmogorov-Smirnoff test [e.g. Press et al., 1992] that the probability
 464 that the three histograms in Fig. 18 correspond to the same statistical distribution is always
 465 $\lesssim 3\%$, and always $\lesssim 1\%$ for the histogram in Fig. 18b (C_2 in Fig. 18d). This suggests that the
 466 improvement in fit achieved by the cost function C_2 is significant. Only a limited number of
 467 samples (station pairs) is available, however, and a more reliable statistical analysis should
 468 be conducted in the future on a larger database. In addition, the level of complexity (number

of degrees of freedom) in the function $\alpha=\alpha(\omega)$ that can be constrained by the available data remains to be determined; it is beyond the scope of our current contribution.

It would be useful to compare our observations with independent estimates of α in the region of interest, but, to our knowledge, no studies of surface-wave attenuation in Sardinia have been published so far. Comparison with global surface-wave attenuation literature suggests that our estimates of α (on the order of 10^{-5}m^{-1} in the period range 2-10s according to Figs. 12 and 15) are relatively large. Studies based on earthquake data suggest values of α on the order of 10^{-6}m^{-1} , but quickly growing, with decreasing period, within the period range of interest to us [Mitchell, 1995; Romanowicz and Mitchell, 2015]. Surface waves at those periods are perhaps best sampled by ambient-noise cross correlations; Prieto *et al.* [2009] find $\alpha\approx 6.4 \times 10^{-6}\text{m}^{-1}$ from seismic ambient noise at 5s period, consistent with the laterally-varying values obtained by Lawrence and Prieto [2011], and not far from the values proposed here; Lin *et al.* [2011] estimate $\alpha\approx 1 \times 10^{-6}\text{m}^{-1}$ or lower. Those studies neglect the proportionality factor shown here in Fig. 17, which might partially explain the discrepancy. Both Harmon *et al.* [2010] and Weemstra *et al.* [2013] account for this effect, although in a different way than done here; Harmon *et al.* [2010] find $\alpha\approx 5 \times 10^{-7}\text{m}^{-1}$ at 7.5s period, while Weemstra *et al.* [2013] obtain estimates of α actually *larger* than ours. Viens *et al.* [2017] likewise fit ambient-noise surface-wave data with $\alpha=1.4 \times 10^{-5}\text{m}^{-1}$ in the period range 3-10s, consistent with our estimates.

As values of α obtained from different methods are compared, one should keep in mind the significant uncertainties associated with the many practical issues quantified, e.g., by Menon *et al.* [2014]. Estimates of surface-wave attenuation might be affected by the presence, in seismic ambient noise, of body-wave signal not accounted for by the theory [e.g. Gerstoft *et al.*, 2008]. Differences in the terrains where the data were collected also play a role.

This preliminary application, limited to a small data set, demonstrates that our new algorithm leads to reasonable estimates of α . Future applications to denser instrument arrays, with a more thorough account of heterogeneity in source distribution, are likely to benefit more significantly from the theoretical improvements that we have introduced.

Acknowledgments

Our many exchanges with Julien de Rosny, Emanuel Kaestle, Piero Poli, Victor Tsai and Kees Weemstra were very beneficial to this study. We are also grateful to Nicholas Harmon, one anonymous reviewer and the editor Ana Ferreira for carefully reading and commenting our manuscript. LB is supported by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement 641943 (WAVES network)

References

- Abramowitz, M., and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, National Bureau of Standards–Applied Mathematics Series, 1964.
- Ardhuin, F., E. Stutzmann, M. Schimmel, and A. Mangeney, Modelling secondary microseismic noise by normal mode summation, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *116*, C09,004, doi:10.1029/2011JC006,952, 2011.

- 509 Bensen, G. D., M. H. Ritzwoller, M. P. Barmin, A. L. Levshin, F. Lin, M. P. Moschetti,
510 N. M. Shapiro, and Y. Yang, Processing seismic ambient noise data to obtain reliable
511 broad-band surface wave dispersion measurements, *Geophys. J. Int.*, *169*(3), 1239–1260,
512 DOI:10.1111/j.1365–246X.2007.03,374.x, 2007.
- 513 Boschi, L., and C. Weemstra, Stationary-phase integrals in the cross-correlation of ambient
514 noise, *Rev. Geophys.*, *53*, doi:10.1002/2014RG000,455, 2015.
- 515 Boschi, L., C. Weemstra, J. Verbeke, G. Ekström, A. Zunino, and D. Giardini, On measur-
516 ing surface wave phase velocity from station-station cross-correlation of ambient signal,
517 *Geophys. J. Int.*, *192*(1), 346–358, doi:10.1093/gji/ggs023, 2013.
- 518 Boschi, L., I. Molinari, and M. Reinwald, A simple method for earthquake location by surface-
519 wave time-reversal, *Geophys. J. Int.*, *215*, 1–21, 2018.
- 520 Campillo, M., and P. Roux, Seismic imaging and monitoring with ambient noise correlations,
521 in *Treatise of Geophysics. Vol. 1*, edited by B. Romanowicz and A. M. Dziewonski, Elsevier,
522 2014.
- 523 Cupillard, P., and Y. Capdeville, On the amplitude of surface waves obtained by noise cor-
524 relation and the capability to recover the attenuation: a numerical approach, *Geophys. J.*
525 *Int.*, *181*(3), 1687–1700, doi:10.1111/j.1365–246X.2010.04,586.x, 2010.
- 526 DLMF, *NIST Digital Library of Mathematical Functions*, <http://dlmf.nist.gov/>, Release
527 1.0.20 of 2018-09-15, f. W. J. Olver, A. B. Olde Daalhuis, D. W. Lozier, B. I. Schnei-
528 der, R. F. Boisvert, C. W. Clark, B. R. Miller and B. V. Saunders, eds.
- 529 Ekström, G., G. A. Abers, and S. C. Webb, Determination of surface-wave phase veloci-
530 ties across USArray from noise and Aki’s spectral formulation, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *36*,
531 doi:10.1029/2009GL039,131, 2009.
- 532 Gerstoft, P., P. M. Shearer, N. Harmon, and J. Zhang, Global P, PP, and PKP wave micro-
533 seisms observed from distant storms, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *35*, doi:10.1029/2008GL036,111,
534 2008.
- 535 Harmon, N., C. Rychert, and P. Gerstoft, Distribution of noise sources for seismic interfer-
536 ometry, *Geophys. J. Int.*, *183*, 1470–1484, doi:10.1111/j.1365–246X.2010.04,802.x, 2010.
- 537 Hildebrand, F. B., *Advanced Calculus for Applications (second edition)*, Prentice-Hall, En-
538 glewood Cliffs, N. J., 1976.
- 539 Hillers, G., N. Graham, M. Campillo, S. Kedar, M. Landes, and N. Shapiro, Global oceanic
540 microseism sources as seen by seismic arrays and predicted by wave action models,
541 *Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.*, *13*, Q01,021, doi:10.1029/2011GC003,875, 2012.
- 542 Kästle, E., R. Soomro, C. Weemstra, L. Boschi, and T. Meier, Two-receiver measurements
543 of phase velocity: cross-validation of ambient-noise and earthquake-based observations,
544 *Geophys. J. Int.*, *207*, 1493–1512, 2016.
- 545 Kinsler, L. E., A. R. Frey, A. B. Coppens, and J. V. Sanders, *Fundamentals of Acoustics*
546 (*fourth edition*), Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, N. J., 1999.

- 547 Lawrence, J. F., and G. A. Prieto, Attenuation tomography of the western United States
548 from ambient seismic noise, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *116*, 2011.
- 549 Lin, F.-C., M. H. Ritzwoller, and W. Shen, On the reliability of attenuation measurements
550 from ambient noise cross-correlations, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *38*, 2011.
- 551 Longuet-Higgins, M. S., A theory of the origin of microseisms, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond.*,
552 *243*, 1–35, 1950.
- 553 Menon, R., P. Gerstoft, and W. S. Hodgkiss, On the apparent attenuation in the
554 spatial coherence estimated from seismic arrays, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *119*, 3115–3132,
555 doi:10.1002/2013JB010,835, 2014.
- 556 Mitchell, B. J., Anelastic structure and evolution of the continental crust and upper mantle
557 from seismic surface wave attenuation, *Rev. Geophys.*, *33*, 441–462, 1995.
- 558 Press, W. H., S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, and B. P. Flannery, *Numerical Recipes in*
559 *Fortran 77*, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- 560 Prieto, G. A., J. F. Lawrence, and G. C. Beroza, Anelastic earth structure from the coherency
561 of the ambient seismic field, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *114*, 2009.
- 562 Romanowicz, B. A., and B. J. Mitchell, Deep earth structure: Q of the earth from crust to
563 core, in *Treatise of Geophysics, Second Edition*, pp. 789–827, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2015.
- 564 Snieder, R., Extracting the Green’s function of attenuating heterogeneous acoustic media
565 from uncorrelated waves, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, *121*, 2637–2643, doi:10.1121/1.2713,673,
566 2007.
- 567 Strauss, W. A., *Partial Differential Equations*, John Wiley & Sons, 2008.
- 568 Tanimoto, T., Modelling curved surface wave paths: membrane surface wave synthetics,
569 *Geophys. J. Int.*, *102*, 89–100, 1990.
- 570 Tromp, J., and F. Dahlen, Variational principles for surface wave propagation on a laterally
571 heterogeneous Earth—III. Potential representation, *Geophys. J. Int.*, *112*, 195–209, 1993.
- 572 Tsai, V. C., Understanding the amplitudes of noise correlation measurements, *J. Geophys.*
573 *Res.*, *116*, 2011.
- 574 Tukey, J. W., *Exploratory data analysis*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, PA, 1977.
- 575 Viens, L., M. Denolle, H. Miyake, S. Sakai, and S. Nakagawa, Retrieving impulse response
576 function amplitudes from the ambient seismic field, *Geophys. J. Int.*, *210*(1), 210–222,
577 doi:10.1093/gji/ggx155, 2017.
- 578 Weaver, R. L., On the amplitudes of correlations and the inference of attenuations, specific
579 intensities and site factors from ambient noise, *Comptes Rendus Geoscience*, *343*(8), 615–
580 622, doi:10.1016/j.crte.2011.07.001, 2011.
- 581 Weemstra, C., L. Boschi, A. Goertz, and B. Artman, Seismic attenuation from recordings of
582 ambient noise, *Geophysics*, *78*, Q1–Q14, doi:10.1190/geo2012–0132.1, 2013.

- 583 Weemstra, C., W. Westra, R. Snieder, and L. Boschi, On estimating attenuation from the
 584 amplitude of the spectrally whitened ambient seismic field, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 197, 1770–
 585 1788, doi:10.1093/gji/ggu088, 2014.
- 586 Weemstra, C., R. Snieder, and L. Boschi, On the attenuation of the ambient seismic field:
 587 Inferences from distributions of isotropic point scatterers, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 203, 1054–1071,
 588 doi:10.1093/gji/ggv311, 2015.
- 589 Yang, Y., and M. H. Ritzwoller, Characteristics of ambient seismic noise as a source for
 590 surface wave tomography, *Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.*, 9, DOI:10.1029/2007GC001,814,
 591 2008.

592 **Appendix A Green’s functions of the scalar wave equation** 593 **(homogeneous lossless media)**

594 We describe in the following two definitions of the Green’s function that are commonly found
 595 in the literature. In one case (sec. A.1), the Green’s function is obtained by prescribing
 596 nonzero initial velocity at the source; initial displacement is zero and no other forcing is
 597 present. In another case (sec. A.4), both initial displacement and velocity are everywhere
 598 zero, but an impulsive force is applied at the source. Following *Boschi and Weemstra* [2015],
 599 we adhere throughout this study to the former definition, but in sec. 2.2 implicitly make use
 600 of the latter. Through the mathematical tools provided in secs. A.2 and A.3, a relationship
 601 between the two definitions is obtained; this relationship is employed in sec. 2.2.

602 **A.1 Green’s problem as homogeneous equation**

603 In analogy with *Boschi and Weemstra* [2015], we call Green’s function $G_{2D} = G_{2D}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_S, t)$
 604 (with t denoting time) the solution of

$$\nabla^2 G_{2D} - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 G_{2D}}{\partial t^2} = 0, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

605 with initial conditions

$$G_{2D}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_S, 0) = 0, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

606

$$\frac{\partial G_{2D}}{\partial t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_S, 0) = P\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_S), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

607 i.e. an impulsive source at $\mathbf{x}_S$. Only “causal” solutions, vanishing when $t < 0$, are relevant.
 608 The scalar constant P serves to remind us of the physical dimensions of G_{2D} ; for instance, one
 609 can think of (A.1) as the displacement equation for a membrane, in which case $\frac{\partial G_{2D}}{\partial t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_S, 0)$
 610 is the initial velocity, and P has dimensions of cubed distance over time (recall that, in two
 611 dimensions, δ has dimensions of one over squared distance).

612 *Boschi and Weemstra* [2015] show that, in the time domain, the “Green’s problem” (A.1)-
 613 (A.3) has solution

$$G_{2D}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{P}{2\pi c^2} \frac{H\left(t - \frac{x}{c}\right)}{\sqrt{t^2 - \frac{x^2}{c^2}}}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

614 where H denotes the Heaviside function. This corresponds to

$$G_{2D}(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \frac{P}{4i\sqrt{2\pi}c^2} H_0^{(2)}\left(\frac{\omega x}{c}\right) \quad (\text{A.5})$$

615 in the frequency domain, with $H_0^{(2)}$ denoting the zeroth-order Hankel function of the *second*
 616 kind. When $\omega x/c \gg 1$, the expression (A.5) can be replaced by the far-field/high-frequency
 617 approximation

$$G_{2D}(\mathbf{x}, \omega) \approx \frac{P}{4i\pi c^{3/2}} \frac{e^{-i(\frac{\omega x}{c} - \frac{\pi}{4})}}{\sqrt{\omega x}}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

618 It might be noticed upon comparing our expression (A.5) for $G_{2D}(\mathbf{x}, \omega)$ with that of, e.g.,
 619 *Tsai* [2011], that the membrane-wave Green's function given in that study is proportional
 620 to the zeroth-order Hankel function of the *first* kind: this apparent discrepancy is explained
 621 by the fact that the Fourier-transform convention assumed by *Tsai* [2011] differs from ours
 622 (compare eq. (4) of *Tsai* [2011] and eq. (B2) of *Boschi and Weemstra* [2015], and consider
 623 eq. (E16) of *Boschi and Weemstra* [2015]).

624 A.2 Duhamel's principle

625 Consider the initial-value problem

$$\nabla_1^2 u - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} = \eta(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$u(\mathbf{x}, 0) = 0, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(\mathbf{x}, 0) = 0, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

628 with η an arbitrary forcing term. Suppose that a solution $v(\mathbf{x}, t)$ to the following, similar
 629 homogeneous problem can be found:

$$\nabla_1^2 v - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial t^2} = 0, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$v(\mathbf{x}, 0; \zeta) = 0, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(\mathbf{x}, 0; \zeta) = Dc^2 \eta(\mathbf{x}, \zeta), \quad (\text{A.12})$$

632 with D a scalar constant.

633 It can be shown by direct substitution (applying Leibniz's rule for differentiating under
 634 the integral sign) that if $v(\mathbf{x}, t; \zeta)$ solves (A.10)-(A.12) for all possible values of ζ , and

$$u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{D} \int_0^t d\zeta v(\mathbf{x}, t - \zeta; \zeta), \quad (\text{A.13})$$

635 then $u(\mathbf{x}, t)$ solves (A.7)-(A.9).

636 This result is known as Duhamel's principle [e.g. *Hildebrand*, 1976; *Strauss*, 2008].

637 A.3 General initial condition

638 Once the Green's function associated with a given differential equation is found, it can be used
 639 to solve rapidly more general initial-value problems based on the same equation. Consider

640 for example

$$\nabla_1^2 f - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial t^2} = 0 \quad (\text{A.14})$$

641 with the more general initial conditions

$$f(\mathbf{x}, 0) = 0, \quad (\text{A.15})$$

642

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(\mathbf{x}, 0) = \theta(\mathbf{x}). \quad (\text{A.16})$$

643 It can be proved by direct substitution that if G_{2D} solves (A.1)-(A.3), then

$$f(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{P} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2 \mathbf{x}' G_{2D}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', t) \theta(\mathbf{x}') \quad (\text{A.17})$$

644 solves (A.14)-(A.16).

645 Problem (A.14)-(A.16) is equivalent to (A.10)-(A.12), provided that condition (A.16) is
646 replaced with

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(\mathbf{x}, 0; \zeta) = Dc^2 \eta(\mathbf{x}, \zeta). \quad (\text{A.18})$$

647 Then, based on Duhamel's principle,

$$\begin{aligned} u(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \frac{1}{D} \int_0^t d\zeta f(\mathbf{x}, t - \zeta; \zeta) \\ &= \frac{c^2}{P} \int_0^t d\zeta \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2 \mathbf{x}' G_{2D}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', t - \zeta) \eta(\mathbf{x}', \zeta) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

648 solves the general inhomogeneous problem (A.7)-(A.9) for any forcing term $\eta(\mathbf{x}, t)$.

649 **A.4 Green's problem as inhomogeneous equation**

650 We next consider the membrane-displacement eq. (5); it is convenient to choose the forcing
651 term $U(0, \omega)f(x_1, x_2, \omega) = -i\omega F\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_S)$ so that $q = F\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_S)$ in sec. 2.2. In the time
652 domain the resulting equation reads

$$\nabla_1^2 u(\mathbf{x}, t) - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} u(\mathbf{x}, t) = -F\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_S)\delta'(t), \quad (\text{A.20})$$

653 where $\delta'(t)$ denotes the derivative of the delta function. Assuming zero initial displacement
654 and velocity, eq. (A.20) is a particular case of problem (A.7)-(A.9). A solution is found by
655 substituting $\eta(\mathbf{x}, t) = -F\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_S)\delta'(t)$ into eq. (A.19),

$$\begin{aligned} u(\mathbf{x}, t) &= -\frac{Fc^2}{P} \int_0^t d\zeta \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d^2 \mathbf{x}' G_{2D}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', t - \zeta) \delta(\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}_S) \delta'(\zeta) \\ &= -\frac{Fc^2}{P} \int_0^t d\zeta \delta'(\zeta) G_{2D}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_S, t - \zeta) \\ &= \frac{Fc^2}{P} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} G_{2D}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_S, t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.21})$$

656 In the frequency domain, this maps to

$$u(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = i\omega \frac{Fc^2}{P} G_{2D}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_S, \omega). \quad (\text{A.22})$$

657 In the literature, problem (A.7)-(A.9) with an impulsive forcing term is often presented as
 658 the Green's problem, and its solution (A.21), (A.22) as the Green's function. It is important
 659 to realize that this is not mathematically the same as our Green's function G_{2D} . Other defi-
 660 nitions of Green's function likewise exist. In practice, the phrase "Green's function" always
 661 refers to the response of a medium to an impulsive excitation; but this definition is ambigu-
 662 ous, and, for any given medium, the "impulsive response" can be defined mathematically in
 663 a virtually unlimited variety of ways.

664 **Appendix B Approximate expression for the damped-membrane** 665 **Green's function**

666 We show in the following that, as long as attenuation is weak, the lossy-membrane Green's
 667 function

$$G_{2D}^d(x_1, x_2, \omega) = -\frac{iP}{4\sqrt{2\pi}c^2} H_0^{(2)} \left(x \sqrt{\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} - \frac{2i\alpha\omega}{c}} \right) \quad (\text{copy of eq. 8})$$

668 can be approximated by the product of the lossless Green's function G_{2D} and a term that
 669 decays exponentially with source-receiver distance. Two different arguments are provided in
 670 the next two sections.

671 **B.1 Stationary-phase approach**

672 If z is small, $\sqrt{1+iz} \approx 1+iz/2$ is accurate to first order in z . It is then reasonable to write
 673 the argument of $H_0^{(2)}$ in eq. (8)

$$\begin{aligned} x \sqrt{\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} - \frac{2i\alpha\omega}{c}} &= \frac{\omega x}{c} \sqrt{1 - \frac{2i\alpha c}{\omega}} \\ &= \frac{\omega x}{c} (1 - \varepsilon i), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

674 where $\varepsilon \approx c\alpha/\omega \ll 1$.

675 Substituting expression (B.1) into the integral representation of $H_0^{(2)}$, e.g. eq. (10.9.11)
 676 of DLMF,

$$\begin{aligned} H_0^{(2)} \left(x \sqrt{\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} - \frac{2i\alpha\omega}{c}} \right) &= \frac{i}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt \, e^{-i \cosh(t) \left[\frac{\omega x}{c} (1-i\varepsilon) \right]} \\ &= \frac{i}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt \, e^{-i \frac{\omega x}{c} \cosh(t)} e^{-\varepsilon \frac{\omega x}{c} \cosh(t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

677 V. Tsai (personal communication, 2013) first derived eq. (B.2), and solved the integral on
 678 its right-hand side via the stationary-phase approximation. The right-hand side of (B.2) has
 679 indeed the same form as the one-dimensional stationary-phase integral, e.g. eq. (A1) of
 680 *Boschi and Weemstra* [2015], except for the fact that the non-oscillatory term $e^{-\varepsilon \frac{\omega x}{c} \cosh(t)}$
 681 depends not only on the integration variable t , but also on x . Because this term is small in
 682 the vicinity of the (only) stationary point $t=0$, we assume that the stationary-phase formula
 683 still applies; considering that $\cosh$ coincides with its second derivative, and that $\cosh(0) = 1$,

684 it follows from eq. (A2) of *Boschi and Weemstra* [2015] that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt e^{-i\frac{\omega x}{c} \cosh(t)} e^{-\varepsilon \frac{\omega x}{c} \cosh(t)} \approx 2 e^{-\varepsilon \frac{\omega x}{c}} e^{-i(\frac{\omega x}{c} - \frac{\pi}{4})} \sqrt{\frac{\pi c}{2\omega x}}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

685 with the factor 2 at the right-hand side to account for the fact that the stationary point $t=0$
 686 is *not* one of the integration limits. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} H_0^{(2)} \left(x \sqrt{\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} - \frac{2i\alpha\omega}{c}} \right) &\approx \sqrt{\frac{2c}{\pi\omega x}} e^{-\alpha x} e^{-i(\frac{\omega x}{c} - \frac{\pi}{4})} \\ &\approx H_0^{(2)} \left(\frac{\omega x}{c} \right) e^{-\alpha x}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

687 where we have replaced ε with $c\alpha/\omega$. Substituting eq. (B.4) into (8),

$$G_{2D}^d(x_1, x_2, \omega) \approx -\frac{iP}{4\sqrt{2\pi}c^2} H_0^{(2)} \left(\frac{\omega x}{c} \right) e^{-\alpha x} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

688 Importantly, this approximation is only valid for large x , i.e. the presence of sources in the
 689 near field of the receivers, which is necessary to reconstruct the Green's function according
 690 to sec. 2.2, introduces a possibly significant error.

691 B.2 Taylor-series approach

692 Making use, again, of the Taylor expansion $\sqrt{1+iz} \approx 1+iz/2$ in the argument of G_{2D}^d ,

$$\begin{aligned} G_{2D}^d(x_1, x_2, \omega) &= -\frac{iP}{4\sqrt{2\pi}c^2} H_0^{(2)} \left(\frac{\omega x}{c} \sqrt{1 - \frac{2i\alpha c}{\omega}} \right) \\ &\approx -\frac{iP}{4\sqrt{2\pi}c^2} H_0^{(2)} \left(\frac{\omega x}{c} - i\alpha x \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

693 If one substitutes into (B.6) the far-field and/or high-frequency approximation for $H_0^{(2)}$ [e.g.
 694 *Boschi and Weemstra*, 2015, eq. (C5)],

$$G_{2D}^d(x_1, x_2, \omega) \approx -\frac{iP}{4\sqrt{2\pi}c^2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi \left(\frac{\omega}{c} - i\alpha \right) x}} e^{-i(\frac{\omega x}{c} - \frac{\pi}{4})} e^{-\alpha x} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

695 Expression (B.7) can be simplified if one considers that, for small z , $(1-iz)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \approx 1+iz/2$
 696 is accurate to first order in z ; after so expanding the square root,

$$\begin{aligned} G_{2D}^d(x_1, x_2, \omega) &\approx -\frac{iP}{4\sqrt{2\pi}c^2} \left(1 + i\frac{\alpha c}{2\omega} \right) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi \frac{\omega}{c}}} e^{-i(\frac{\omega x}{c} - \frac{\pi}{4})} e^{-\alpha x}, \\ &\approx -\frac{iP}{4\sqrt{2\pi}c^2} \left(1 + i\frac{\alpha c}{2\omega} \right) H_0^{(2)} \left(\frac{\omega x}{c} \right) e^{-\alpha x}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

697 and the leading term at the right-hand side coincides with the right-hand side of eq. (B.5).
 698 Let us emphasize, again, that this simplification relies not only on the weak-scattering ap-
 699 proximation, but also on the far-field approximation for $H_0^{(2)}$.