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INTRODUCTION

The Exmouth Plateau (Fig. 1) is an unusually broad region of continental crust, deformed during Jurassic rifting that preceded Early Cretaceous seafloor spreading in the adjacent Indian Ocean (Powell, 1976; Veevers and Cotterill, 1978; Larson et al., 1979; Falvey and Mutter, 1981). Extensive commercial and some Australian government-sponsored reflection seismic coverage, dredging, and exploration drilling have allowed a detailed structural stratigraphic history to be drawn for most of the plateau (Exon and Wilcox, 1978, 1980; Barber, 1982; von Stackelberg et al., 1980). The southern Exmouth Plateau which is the focus of this study, forms part of a starved passive continental margin (von Rad and Exxon, 1983).

Recently, Ocean Drilling Program (ODP) drilling at Sites 762 and 763 verified the general stratigraphic and structural description for the central and southern Exmouth Plateau (Haq et al., 1988; Haq, von Rad, O'Connell, et al., 1990). Prior to drilling, the major seismic horizons on the southern Exmouth Plateau and their proposed ages had been based largely on the continuity and similarity of their characteristics in seismic profiles extrapolated over large distances from tie points at commercial wells (Exon and Wilcox, 1976). What remains is to improve this correlation by tying the local reflection seismic horizons to the physical properties changes, and lithostratigraphic and biostratigraphic units, seen in the wells.

The physical properties data cannot be directly compared with the recorded seismic data. Instead, reflection coefficient series and synthetic seismograms (normal incidence case) calculated from the physical properties are used. At normal incidence, synthetic seismograms calculations require values for compressional wave velocity ($V_p$) and bulk density ($\rho$) as a function of depth. An accurate match between the physical properties and recorded seismic data can be used to examine which changes in the lithology create the seismic impedance ($V_p \times \rho$) contrasts that produce the observed reflection horizons.

Because of a high core recovery (greater than 81%) at Site 763, shipboard values for $V_p$ and wet-bulk density were determined every 3 m on average to 1032.79 m below seafloor (mbsf), near the bottom of the well. Grain density, porosity, and water content (see “Explanatory Notes” chapter, Haq, von Rad, O’Connell, et al., 1990) were also measured to fully characterize the physical properties of the sediments. Additional in-situ $V_p$ measurements were obtained for approximately the middle third of the drilled interval of Site 763 and for most of a nearby industry well, Vinck-1. Site 763 was chosen to double nearby Vinck-1 and prevent any unexpected encounter with hazardous formation fluids because the drilling vessel JOIDES Resolution is not equipped to contain highly overpressured hydrocarbon fluids.

Figure 2 displays the projected locations of three different, contiguous seismic data sets that can be tied to geological units at Site 763. Single-channel seismic (SCS) ODP line 5 links Vinck-1 to Site 763. Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory common-depth-point (CDP) multichannel seismic (MCS) reflection profile 667 (Lorenzo et al., in press) intersects ODP line 5 obliquely, and expanded spread profile C2 (ESP C2) has its midpoint centered on the MCS profile (Fig. 1, inset). Line 5 was shot with water guns while line 667 and ESP C2 were shot with a lower frequency airgun source.

ESP's have been used successfully to study the $V_p$-depth structure of passive continental margins (e.g., LASE Study Group, 1986; Mutter and Zehnder, 1988; Diebold et al., 1988; Johansen et al., 1988) through forward modeling of the primary traveltimes of seismic arrivals. Better-constrained models that also include shear wave velocity ($V_s$) and $\rho$-depth information have been derived from ESP's from the deep ocean basins by additional full waveform modeling (e.g., Mithal and Mutter, 1989; Harding et al., 1989; Vera et al., 1990). For the first time, in order to establish the practical accuracy of ESP analyses, we attempt to compare a model for $V_p$ and $\rho$ vs. depth obtained from traveltimes and
waveform modeling, to the physical properties structure derived from a scientific well. In what follows we derive a model for \( V_p, V_t, \rho \), and attenuation from ESP C2. We compare this model with the shipboard and downhole physical properties values to ascertain the accuracy of the ESP analysis. Finally, MCS, SCS, and major ESP seismic reflected arrivals are paired with geologic unit boundaries with the aid of synthetic seismograms and reflection coefficient series, constructed using the physical properties values from Site 763.

**MAJOR SEISMIC REFLECTION HORIZONS**

In spite of the differences in reflection strength and character, and seismic resolution that affect the profiles of MCS line 667 and ODP SCS line 5 in Figure 2, three common prominent seismic horizons/reflective bands are apparent. The horizons can be interpreted tentatively from other published and interpreted reflection profiles (Exon and Willcox, 1980; Haq et al., 1988, 1990). We will refer to them and their equivalent geological intervals, using letters. From top to bottom they include reflectors: “e” (2.25 s of two-way traveltime (s TWT)) believed to indicate the Cenomanian/Turonian boundary, “f” (2.4 s TWT) near a breakup unconformity, and “g” (3.15 s TWT) at the roof of the Triassic pre-rift basement.

Above “e,” another laterally continuous reflector, “b,” is visible in the MCS profile and may possibly tie to the SCS profile at 2.05 s TWT. A set of notable high amplitude reflectors also appear at a depth of about 8 km, below the reach of any present wells. Deep seismic crustal studies conclude that these reflectors correspond to detachment surfaces developed during rifting of the southern margin (Mutter et al., 1989; Lorenzo et al., in press).

ODP SCS line 5 was acquired using two 80-in. waterguns, fired every 12 s, or equivalently, every 30 m of ships’ track at a nominal speed of 9 km/hr (Haq, von Rad, O’Connell, et al., 1990). Although the MCS airgun array emitted more power
Figure 2. Regionally significant reflective zones in ODP SCS line 5 compared with MCS CDP line 667 data. Projected and online well-locations and intersections between seismic lines are superimposed. Letters mark prominent horizons; mbsl indicates meters below sea level.
and was able to image deeper horizons it was only fired at 60 s intervals (or 150 m). In addition, the airguns produce an oscillating bubble pulse that contaminates the data. The MCS data, which were recorded by a 48-channel hydrophone streamer towed by the Conrad, do, however, provide greater fold. Seven-fold CDP gathers were stacked to suppress laterally incoherent noise by a factor of about 2.5 over the SCS data.

ESP C2
ESP Acquisition and Reduction
An ESP experiment is a multiple-fold wide-angle reflection/refraction data set collected using two ships, one recording and the other shooting (Stoffa and Buhl, 1979). Both vessels move away from ("separating ranges") or toward each other ("closing ranges") at a constant speed maintaining a common fixed central reference point, to which derived seismic models are referred. The common midpoint geometry is maintained throughout the experiment to diminish the adverse effects of dipping seismic layers along the profile (Diebold and Stoffa, 1981). ESP C2 was also positioned along a track that had negligible ocean-bottom topography and was parallel to the strike of the basement structure (Exon and Willcox, 1980), to minimize the effect from dipping horizons.

Conrad acted as the shooting ship towing a tuned 10 airgun array (Diebold, 1987), centered about 60 m behind the ship and dipping 15°–20°; the farthest guns lying deepest in the water (Fig. 3). The total airgun volume was 5821 in.³, and the guns were fired regularly every 60 s at a pressure of 1800 p.s.i. Since the separation rate between the two ships was about 18 km/hr, the source-receiver range increment between shots was 300 m. The same airgun array was used to shoot the MCS CDP profile of line 667.

Rig Seismic of the Australian Bureau of Mineral Resources towed a 48-channel streamer with a 50-m group interval; the first receiving channel lay 375 m behind the ship. 32-s long seismograms were digitized by a nonstandard "Phoenix" recording system at a sampling rate of 4 ms with an anti-alias filter applied at 62.5 Hz tapering to a full cut-out at 125 Hz, the Nyquist frequency.

After an initial demultiplexing, the ESP shot traces were gathered into 50-m common-offset bins. Traces within the binning window were stacked along x-t paths with slopes of 8 km/s, chosen to minimize the attenuation of high frequencies (See Appendix A). Under ideal conditions, stacking can
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Figure 3. Approximate distribution of airguns (boxes) and their chamber volume in array used to acquire ESP C2 and MCS line 667.
enhance the signal-to-noise ratio by a factor equal to the square root of the fold (Mayne, 1962; Robinson, 1970; Sengbush, 1983). ESP folds are between 7 and 9 for most of the ESP so that the signal-to-noise ratio could be enhanced by as much as a factor of 3.

Errors inherent in the data acquisition that contribute to mismatches between seismic arrivals can be mostly attributed to, by order of decreasing importance, differences in the two ships’ clocks, inaccuracies in the source-to-receiver ranges, and unaccounted feathering problems. The feathering angle quantifies the deviation between the path of the streamer and the ship.

In order to correct for instrument malfunctions and differential drift between ships’ clocks, radio checks were sent to the Conrad on the minute of the Rig Seismic clock. Thus, we discovered and adequately corrected drift of 40 ms during the experiment and several discrete time jumps as large as 4–20 min.

Ship-to-ship antennae offsets were estimated by a Raydist ranging system for distances greater than 20 km. Error in ships’ ranges from Raydist is inappreciable (less than 5 m) even at 100 km (Stoffa and Buhl, 1979). For offsets less than 20 km, a Miniranger system was used because of its greater accuracy and precision at these distances.

Source-receiver offsets, for most of the ESP experiment geometry, were obtained by assuming the ship and streamer paths were aligned with each other. As ship-to-ship ranges decrease from about 12–15 km to the midpoint, source-receiver offsets become more sensitive to the streamer position. Without corrections for these geometric effects, arrival times are incorrect. In anticipation of this problem, the streamer geometry was monitored from the recording ship by taking radar bearings on a radar-reflecting buoy towed at the tail of the streamer. As well, visual ship-to-ship compass bearings were made as the ships crossed each other at the midpoint. After incorporating the bearings into the reduction, any residual shifts in the data were attributed to inaccurate streamer angles. These shifts were corrected, where possible, through trial and error by linearly moving out the low-velocity direct wave arrival (assuming a water velocity of 1535 m/s) which was a sensitive indicator changes in the streamer-to-ship angles. Hyperbolic moveout reduction for the sea-bottom reflection was also used to correct residual shifts where the direct water wave at farther ranges was not available.

ESP Analytical Techniques

ESP C2 in Figure 4 (top diagram) displays minimal observable topographic effects. Both the closing and separating halves of the experiment produce similar arrivals; herein we analyze only the separating side in detail.

An initial \( V_p \)-vs.-depth model was constructed using the “\( r \)-sum” recursion technique of Diebold and Stoffa (1981). For this purpose, the data were first transformed from the offset-traveltime domain \((x-t)\) into the domain of intercept time-ray parameter \((r-p)\) by slant stacking (Stoffa et al., 1981). In addition, corrections were applied to account for geometric spreading and phase shifts. By this we achieved a plane-wave decomposition (Mithal and Vera, 1987) (Fig. 5, top diagram). Once in the \( r-p \) domain, discrete first-break picks were made on the post-critical arrivals, at velocity \((1/p)\) increments as consistently close as possible to 50 m/s and an intercept time resolvable to less than the 4 ms sample interval (3 ms).

We found that the starting \( V_p \)-depth model (Fig. 6B) could be simplified by using fewer gradient and constant velocity layers. The modified model was still able to match the primary arrival times of the principal events in \( x-t \).

Ray theory amplitude modeling and full waveform modeling of the ESP data employed a source wavelet extracted from the seafloor reflection in the nearest vertical trace \((p \sim 0)\), comprising the primary seafloor pulses and up to and including the first bubble pulse (Fig. 4, inset). We bandpass-filtered both the data that were modeled and the source wavelet used in modeling, between 0 and 20 Hz with a high cosine taper width of 15 Hz. The filter was designed to preserve the dominant frequencies in the airgun source while substantially reducing background noise. Stack and binning effects are also advantageously minimized at these low frequencies (see Appendix A).

Beginning with the seafloor reflection branches and continuing downward, the amplitude-vs-offset decay patterns of the pre-critical reflections were matched by ray theory amplitude modeling. At this stage, \( V_p \) and \( V_s \) values were incorporated into the model. Starting \( \rho \) values were x-ray theory amplitude modeling, an individual change of less than 10%-15% in the values for \( V_p \), \( V_s \), and \( \rho \) does not significantly alter the best match of the offset-amplitude decay pattern. When we imposed travelt ime constraints, the precision of these values appeared doubled.

Further modeling matched computed full-reflectivity seismograms, in the \( x-t \) domain (Fig. 4, bottom diagram) and the \( r-p \) domain (Fig. 5, bottom diagram). Full-reflectivity considers all possible internal multiples and energy losses due to transmissivity, geometric spreading, and attenuation (Appendix B). Parameters \( V_p \), \( V_s \), and \( \rho \) for the best-matching model are shown in Table 2. We used a quality factor \((Q_s)\) \( \sim 500 \) when calculating attenuation effects throughout the model. This value is about one order of magnitude larger than estimated by O’Brien and Manghanani (this volume). Their \( Q_s \) was measured using a 1 Mhz acoustic source. Over the useful range of frequencies in our source, 6–45 Hz, internal friction and, hence, attenuation in rocks is much smaller (i.e., \( Q_s \) larger) than at higher frequencies and can be considered as effectively constant (Knopoff, 1964; Liu et al., 1976). The S-wave quality factor \((Q_s)\) was generated from \( Q_s \) assuming that there is much less dilatation in volume than in shear deformation (Müller, 1985).

Particular care was also taken to forward model the high amplitude waveforms in the nearest-offset trace. Because the ratio of water depth to the first offset distance is large, about 5:1, we were able to assume conditions of normal incidence and use the “acoustic case” approximation of the full-reflectivity method to calculate normal incidence seismograms.

In order to correct for instrument malfunctions and differences in the two ships’ clocks, radio checks were sent to the Conrad on the minute of the Rig Seismic clock. Thus, we discovered and adequately corrected drift of 40 ms during the experiment and several discrete time jumps as large as 4–20 min.

Ship-to-ship antennae offsets were estimated by a Raydist ranging system for distances greater than 20 km. Error in ships’ ranges from Raydist is inappreciable (less than 5 m) even at 100 km (Stoffa and Buhl, 1979). For offsets less than 20 km, a Miniranger system was used because of its greater accuracy and precision at these distances.

Source-receiver offsets, for most of the ESP experiment geometry, were obtained by assuming the ship and streamer paths were aligned with each other. As ship-to-ship ranges decrease from about 12–15 km to the midpoint, source-receiver offsets become more sensitive to the streamer position. Without corrections for these geometric effects, arrival times are incorrect. In anticipation of this problem, the streamer geometry was monitored from the recording ship by taking radar bearings on a radar-reflecting buoy towed at the tail of the streamer. As well, visual ship-to-ship compass bearings were made as the ships crossed each other at the midpoint. After incorporating the bearings into the reduction, any residual shifts in the data were attributed to inaccurate streamer angles. These shifts were corrected, where possible, through trial and error by linearly moving out the low-velocity direct wave arrival (assuming a water velocity of 1535 m/s) which was a sensitive indicator changes in the streamer-to-ship angles. Hyperbolic moveout reduction for the sea-bottom reflection was also used to correct residual shifts where the direct water wave at farther ranges was not available.

ESP Analytical Techniques

ESP C2 in Figure 4 (top diagram) displays minimal observable topographic effects. Both the closing and separating halves of the experiment produce similar arrivals; herein we analyze only the separating side in detail.

An initial \( V_p \)-vs.-depth model was constructed using the “\( r \)-sum” recursion technique of Diebold and Stoffa (1981). For this purpose, the data were first transformed from the offset-traveltime domain \((x-t)\) into the domain of intercept time-ray parameter \((r-p)\) by slant stacking (Stoffa et al., 1981). In addition, corrections were applied to account for geometric spreading and phase shifts. By this we achieved a plane-wave decomposition (Mithal and Vera, 1987) (Fig. 5, top diagram). Once in the \( r-p \) domain, discrete first-break picks were made on the post-critical arrivals, at velocity \((1/p)\) increments as consistently close as possible to 50 m/s and an intercept time resolvable to less than the 4 ms sample interval (3 ms).

We found that the starting \( V_p \)-depth model (Fig. 6B) could be simplified by using fewer gradient and constant velocity layers. The modified model was still able to match the primary arrival times of the principal events in \( x-t \).
Figure 4. ESP C2 seismic data (top diagram) and reflectivity model (bottom) in domain of receiver-source offset-traveltime (x-t). Linear reduction of 3 km/s has been applied to reduce arrivals that have phase velocity of 3 km/s to horizontal. Seafloor reflection pulse of model at p = 0 is normalized to data for direct comparison. "M" lies on first seafloor multiple reflection. Estimated seismic source wavelet (inset) was used to calculate full-reflectivity model.
Figure 5. ESP seismic data (top diagram) of Figure 4, transformed into $\tau$-$p$ domain by plane-wave decomposition; $p$ increases by 0.002 s/km in seismograms. Seafloor reflection pulse is normalized to data for direct comparison.
Figure 6. Comparison between normal incidence reflection seismic data, ESP data and synthetic seismograms, all bandpass-filtered between 0 and 20 Hz, with high cosine taper of width 15 Hz. **A.** CDP seismograms. **B.** $V_p/V_s$-vs.-depth models (thick lines) used to generate synthetic $x-t$ and $r-p$ seismograms of preceding figures. Initial starting model (thin line of $V_p$ vs. depth) was derived using "r-sum" construction technique of Diebold and Stoffa (1981). **C.** On left, full-reflectivity seismogram calculated for normal incidence conditions from best ESP C2 model, and on right, nearest-offset trace from ESP C2. **D.** First nine seismograms from ESP C2 data, seen in top diagram of Figure 5.
matches the data very well (Fig. 6C).

at normal incidence. The resulting synthetic seismogram constructed layers that followed this trend while adjusting those calculated using full-reflectivity. We started by simply thickness layers are artifacts of the technique when applied to thickness at 2.1 s TWT and 3.1 s TWT. These negative waveform can be produced by the negative impedance con-
to the seafloor reflection (Fig. 6). A 180° phase shift in the LVZ's (Diebold, 1980; Vera, 1987; Diebold, 1989).

The underlying branch of post-critically refracted arrivals. The reflection branches descriptively using letter names which we later show correspond to significant geological boundaries.

At normal incidence, "b" and "e," produced in the uppermost sediments, appear 180° phase shifted with respect to the seafloor reflection (Fig. 6). A 180° phase shift in the waveform can be produced by the negative impedance contrast at the top of a LVZ. According to classical ray theory, LVZ's cannot refract rays upward. Instead, rays turn upward on exiting the LVZ, that is, where p is equal to or less than upon entering. In our particular velocity model, p is equal on entering and leaving the LVZ so that only a gap in T is expected. Such a gap is visible in the T-p data set (Fig. 5) below the intersection of the reflection branch from "e" and the underlying branch of post-critically refracted arrivals. The "r-sum" construction (Fig. 6) contains layers of negative thickness at 2.1 s TWT and 3.1 s TWT. These negative thickness layers are artifacts of the technique when applied to LVZ's (Diebold, 1980; Vera, 1987; Diebold, 1989).

Within the LVZ below "e" (Fig. 6B), the layered structure was derived by comparing reflections at normal incidence to those calculated using full-reflectivity. We started by simply assuming a single-gradient velocity structure for the LVZ. We constructed layers that followed this trend while adjusting Vp, Vs, and p to best fit the observed traveltimes and waveforms at normal incidence. The resulting synthetic seismogram matches the data very well (Fig. 6C).

Table 1. Values of physical parameters shown in Figure 5, representing the seismic model constructed from ESP data of Figures 3 and 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (mb)</th>
<th>Two-way traveltime (s)</th>
<th>Vp (km/s)</th>
<th>Vs (km/s)</th>
<th>p (g/cm³)</th>
<th>Reflector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1278</td>
<td>1.737</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;b&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>1.953</td>
<td>1.530/1.775</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.6/1.8</td>
<td>&quot;c&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>1.511/1.15</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>1.511/1.75</td>
<td>&quot;d&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>2.087</td>
<td>2.0/2.0</td>
<td>0.095/0.95</td>
<td>2.1/2.2</td>
<td>&quot;e&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>2.3/2.05</td>
<td>0.95/0.1</td>
<td>2.2/2.05</td>
<td>&quot;f&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777</td>
<td>2.270</td>
<td>1.7/1.95</td>
<td>0.65/0.9</td>
<td>1.6/1.9</td>
<td>&quot;g&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>2.3/2.25</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>&quot;h&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>2.367</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>&quot;i&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>2.403</td>
<td>2.2/2.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>&quot;j&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2.444</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>&quot;k&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>2.462</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>&quot;l&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.490</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>&quot;m&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2051</td>
<td>2.525</td>
<td>2.325</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2081</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>2.578</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2229</td>
<td>2.674</td>
<td>2.445/2.497</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.2/2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2405</td>
<td>2.809</td>
<td>2.497/2.688</td>
<td>1.3/1.4</td>
<td>2.25/2.275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2460</td>
<td>2.849</td>
<td>2.688/2.813</td>
<td>1.4/1.5</td>
<td>2.275/2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2523</td>
<td>2.960</td>
<td>2.183/2.06</td>
<td>1.5/1.6</td>
<td>2.32/3.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2613</td>
<td>3.109</td>
<td>3.3/3.75</td>
<td>1.61/1.75</td>
<td>2.35/2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2963</td>
<td>3.169</td>
<td>4.03/3.75</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5/2.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3098</td>
<td>3.246</td>
<td>4.3/3.6</td>
<td>1.71/1.8</td>
<td>2.4/2.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3481</td>
<td>3.459</td>
<td>3.6/3.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3735</td>
<td>3.596</td>
<td>3.6/3.78</td>
<td>1.8/1.85</td>
<td>2.41/2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3835</td>
<td>3.648</td>
<td>3.778/3.927</td>
<td>1.85/1.95</td>
<td>2.42/2.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3851</td>
<td>3.656</td>
<td>3.972/3.977</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4346</td>
<td>3.893</td>
<td>3.977/4.09</td>
<td>1.95/2.2</td>
<td>2.45/2.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5246</td>
<td>4.297</td>
<td>4.409/4.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.52/2.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A quality factor of Qp = 500 was used for all layers in the model.

comparatively good match was achieved in the x-τ domain for the amplitudes in the far-offset seafloor reflections (Fig. 4).

Principal ESP Arrivals

Many major reflection branches in the x-τ data arise from the top interfaces of low-velocity/density zones (LVZ's). These reflections can also be tied to their homologues in the CDP data of line 667 at the ESP midpoint (Fig. 6). We denote the reflection branches descriptively using letter names which we later show correspond to significant geological boundaries.

Below reflection "g," the LVZ is approximately 900 m thick (see Table 1), about 3 times greater than below "e." Here, however, the r-sum construction does not produce corresponding negative layers and a τ-p data gap, as was produced by reflection "e," is not observed. The phenomenon cannot be explained by ray theory that only considers ray paths at infinitely high frequencies. For real rays and hence for the finite frequencies of our seismic source, there is an exponential decay of energy below every turning point. In the case of the LVZ below "g," the high velocity lid is thin enough for most of the energy to leak into the LVZ without much attenuation over the frequency range of our source. Once in the LVZ, our particular velocity structure is such that rays are refracted upward without a loss of continuity in p in the arrivals. The general phenomenon is known as "wave tunneling" by analogy to a similar effect in quantum mechanics (Aki and Richards, 1980, p. 445; Bullen and Bolt, 1987, p. 192).

Reflection "g" and its extension into the pre- and post-critical reflection branches is best analyzed as a very thin (50 m) high velocity layer (~4 km/s). Calculations using ray theory predict the amplitude of "g" would be half as large as with full-reflectivity theory. According to ray theory, unreasonably large Vp and p contrasts would be required to match the observed amplitudes. We can more simply attribute the large amplitudes to the constructive interference of returning reflections (e.g., Widess, 1973); a phenomenon known as reflection "tuning." The thickness of the layer producing "g" is such that for the estimated airgun seismic source (Fig. 4), the reflections from its top and base (with a reversed polarity), interfere constructively doubling the expected amplitude. On the other hand, in the τ-p domain (Fig. 5), the reflected arrivals from the top and bottom of this "ledge" in the velocity-depth plot, merge near the critical point and thus the layer thickness cannot be distinctly resolved. For a dominant source frequency of 20 Hz, this layer is about one-fourth wavelength thick (~50 m), at the practical limit of resolution.

Comparison of Physical Properties Data with ESP Model

Using a relatively simple model (Table 1 and Fig. 6B), we have been able to match the traveltimes and waveforms of the most significant arrivals in ESP C2 (Fig. 4). The downhole long-spaced sonic tool used at Site 763 and the shipboard velocimeter provide closely spaced measurements at least every few meters. Their sound sources emit frequencies that are 3–5 orders of magnitude higher than the airgun array which was used to shoot ESP C2. Therefore, the ESP-derived model is expected to provide the larger-scale trends in Vp and p with depth.

Physical Properties Data Reduction

Shipboard physical properties measurements are subject to instrument errors and sample rebound effects. In a comparison of shore-based physical properties with the shipboard data from Site 763, O'Brien and Manghnani (this volume) conclude that shore-based density estimates are consistently greater than shipboard bulk densities because of deficiencies imposed by the pycnometer when measuring the wet-bulk density at sea. Moreover, raw shipboard bulk density measurements do not take into account rebound effects—expansion of the samples that increases their porosity above in-situ values (Hamilton, 1976).

We first corrected raw wet-bulk density values taking into account the effect of the pycnometer and sample rebound using regression equations from O’Brien and Manghnani (this volume) and Hamilton (1976), respectively. From these den-
velocities, velocities corrected to in-situ conditions were derived using empirical $V_p$-$p$ relationships for silts and carbonate sediments (Hamilton, 1978). The corrected data were smoothed using a 3-point running average (a 9-m window), with an output at the center of the window. Samples originating below about 600 mbsf were extensively fractured during drilling (Haq, von Rad, O'Connell, et al., 1990) and gave highly erroneous shipboard velocity estimates which we discarded.

Figure 7 displays both the raw and corrected shipboard $p$ and $V_p$ values from Site 763. Raw $V_p$ values underestimate traveltime to major reflectors. "Corrected" $V_p$ values are derived from corrected $p$ values with the known empirical relations (Hamilton, 1978). Both differ from the values in the ESP model by a few hundred meters per second. In this respect, the ESP-derived model may provide more accurate physical properties because it is free from instrument errors, drilling disturbances, and sample rebound effects. Indeed, one possible cause for this discrepancy may be tied to rebound effects. At Site 762, O'Brien and Manghnani (this volume) attribute an offset of 0.3 km/s between the shipboard velocity data and the downhole sonic data to this cause. It is also possible that part of the discrepancy may be due to errors in the electronic calibration for the Hamilton Frame velocimeter (Haq, von Rad, O'Connell, et al., 1990).

Downhole $V_p$ data at Site 763 were collected wholly within a LVZ (below "c") for which we can only make the simplest assumptions regarding the general velocity structure, since there are no refracted returns from this region. Hence, some of the individual model layers appear displaced in depth with respect to the borehole and shipboard physical properties data (Figs. 7 and 8).

Nevertheless, the trend of the $V_p$ data values from the ESP model are closer to the downhole data than the shipboard derived $V_p$ estimates.

Downhole $V_p$ measurements (sonic logs) are free of rebound effects and should agree better with the ESP-derived model. They also provide regularly spaced values regardless of the percentage of core recovery. However, the downhole $V_p$ data set at Site 763 covers only from 406.8 and 600 mbsf and between 657 and 708 mbsf, at regular 0.5 m intervals. $V_p$ values were resampled into 3-m intervals for comparison with the shipboard derived physical properties measurements. Similarly, sonic tool $V_p$ measurements from the Vinck-1 well, 1 km west of Site 763 (Fig. 9B) only exist below about 400 mbsf. Vinck-1 $V_p$ values were digitized from sonic logs once every 2 m, smoothed using a 5-point running average with an output at the center of the window, and resampled at 10 m intervals.

**Origin of Major Reflections**

Site 763 physical properties plots show marked changes in the trends of $V_p$ and $p$ at the depths of major reflectors in ESP C2 (Figs. 7 and 8). The origin of the reflectors lies in the geologic history that created the strong impedance contrasts. The model parameters are better compared with the normal incidence reflection coefficient series, constructed from raw shipboard physical properties data (Fig. 7C) and downhole sonic logs using empirical estimates of $p$ (Hamilton, 1978; and Fig. 8B). The reflection coefficients neither consider energy losses due to transmissivity or geometric spreading, nor account for sample rebound effects, but over these small ranges of depth and velocity, they can serve as a first
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Figure 7. A. Shipboard estimates of $p$ vs. depth. B. Compressional wave velocity ($V_p$) vs. depth in meters below seafloor (mbsf) (thick line). C. Reflection coefficient depth series calculated using raw physical properties data. Biostratigraphic and lithologic boundaries can correspond to large hiatuses (thick wiggles) or smaller ones (thin wiggles).
Figure 8. A. Shipboard physical properties estimates (P.P.) of compressional wave velocity ($V_p$) vs. depth (left thin line) in meters below seafloor (mbsf), also corrected for sample rebound effects and instrument errors (right thin line) and compared to downhole sonic tool data (thick line). All data are from Site 763. B. Reflection coefficient depth series calculated using sonic tool data.

approximation for estimating the relative strength of the normal incidence reflection amplitudes.

Reflector "b" is coincident with the top of a LVZ in the ESP model and in the shipboard physical properties data. Details of these properties can be found in Haq et al. (1990). The smaller $V_p$ and $\rho$ values in the LVZ are macroscopic parameters reflecting the greater degree of induration above "b," also expressed as a relative decrease in the water content of the sediments by ~5% and an increase in the shear strength (Haq, von Rad, O'Connell, et al., 1990). At this depth, calculations suggest that in the late Oligocene, the sedimentation rate (uncompacted) changed from ~6 m/m.y. below to ~2 m/m.y. above "b" (Haq, von Rad, O'Connell, et al., 1990).

Reflector "c" occurs near the Cretaceous/Tertiary unconformity, the largest erosional hiatus drilled at Site 763. With respect to Site 762, it appears that ~350 m of sediment were eroded over a ~30 m.y. time interval, perhaps as a result of increase bottom-water circulation or tectonic uplift (Haq, von Rad, O'Connell, et al., 1990). This unconformity places poorly indurated chalk in contact with underlying more consolidated chalk that was probably compacted by the former load of eroded sediments.

Reflector "e" concurs in depth with the most marked LVZ in the ESP model and a regionally significant LVZ in the shipboard physical properties at approximately the Cenomanian/Turonian boundary. In this case, the negative reflection coefficient is primarily linked to a significant change in the eupelagic carbonate content in the sediments (Haq, von Rad, O'Connell, et al., 1990). The concentration of calcium carbonate increases from about 20%-50% below "e" to about 50%-70% above. In place of the carbonate, below "e" there is a much larger percentage of lower density zeolites (2.2-2.5 g/cm$^3$), clays, and metamorphic detrital minerals (Haq, von Rad, O'Connell, et al., 1990). There may be both local and regional causes to explain the abrupt disappearance of terrigenous sediment components at about the Cenomanian/Turonian transition. (The clastic supply came from the south or the mainland to the east.) Already, by the Hauterivian, Greater India had cleared the western end of the Exmouth Plateau (Larson et al., 1979) and therefore cannot be considered as the Cenomanian supply source. The southern transform margin, however, appears to have undergone extensive erosion during seafloor spreading in response to thermal uplift (Lorenzo et al., in press) after the Hauterivian. Perhaps erosion ceased as the southern margin subsided below wave base during the Cenomanian. The change from detrital to carbonate deposition has been recognized along all of the western Australian margin from 15° to 35°S (Veevers and Johnstone, 1974) and therefore could be related to a generalized diminution in clastic supply.

Reflector "f" occurs within a negative velocity gradient that can be attributed to a rapid decrease in the carbonate content from mid-range values ~20%-50% in the unit above (calcareous claystone), to less than 10% in the silty claystone unit below. Reflector "f" occurs within a tectonically significant segment of the geologic column. At the lower boundary of this lithologic unit, the breakup unconformity divides the post-rift section above from the synrift Cretaceous section below, deposited dur-
Figure 9. A. Compressional wave velocity ($V_p$) vs. depth in meters below sea level (mbsf) from ESP-derived model. B. Vinck-1 downhole sonic tool data. C. Reflection coefficient depth series calculated using Vinck-1 downhole data.
ing the extensional deformation of the Exmouth Plateau that led to Early Cretaceous seafloor spreading (Haq, von Rad, O'Connell, et al., 1990).

Vinck-1 well $V_p$ information was retrieved to a greater depth than at Site 763, providing data from the synrift sedimentary section and the uppermost portion of the pre-rift basement (Fig. 9). At about 1300 mbsf, there lie two isolated high velocity layers, comprising Jurassic claystone and Upper Triassic limestone and mudstone. Similar Triassic lithology was drilled during Leg 122 in the pre-rift basement of the northern Exmouth Plateau and was interpreted as forming part of an outer shelf, shallow carbonate Rhaetian reef complex (Williamson et al., 1989). In the adjacent reflection coefficient series of Figure 9C, the high velocity “ledge” is expressed by a triplet of prominent positive and negative reflection coefficient peaks. The series was constructed using the Vinck-1 sonic tool data and an empirically derived $V_p$ function (Hamilton, 1978).

In the ESP C2 model, a thin high-velocity layer at about 1600 mbsf is responsible for a high-amplitude reflection “g.” In ODP line 5 (Fig. 2), “g” can be traced updip toward the projected location of Site 763 and Vinck-1, where it appears to correspond in TWT to the high-velocity “ledge” in Vinck-1. We infer that “g” closely indicates the top of the Triassic pre-rift basement.

CORRELATION OF DIVERSE SEISMIC DATA SETS

A comparison of all the diverse data sets and models above (Fig. 10) is required to attach geological ages and causes to major reflective zones observed in the profile of SCS ODP line 5 (Fig. 2). The ESP-model normal incidence synthetic seismogram (Figs. 6C and 10B) provides accurate traveltime location of major reflectors that are seen in line 5 but does not reproduce the detailed waveforms derived from the higher frequency watergun source. Normal incidence synthetic seismograms calculated with a watergun source and (1) the downhole measurements from Site 763, Vinck-1, and (2) the shipboard-derived physical properties parameters are more appropriately compared with line 5. These parameters contain small-scale details that are not resolvable with the ESP model. All the seismograms were constructed applying the acoustic case approximation for full reflectivity.

Two seismic sources were used to model the SCS line and compare results. A watergun seismic source wavelet was extracted from the averaged seafloor reflection pulse in the traces of shotpoints 623–629. These shotpoints were assumed free of interference effects from the sub-seafloor reflections. An airgun seismic source, different from that used previously in the ESP C2 synthetic seismograms, was similarly obtained after averaging the near-offset traces of CDP gathers 3099–3103. Averaging over short distances is intended to reduce the amount of unwanted laterally incoherent noise. In either case, because the source wavelet has a finite length, a reflector at depth is represented by a long seismic pulse in time and not a single short event. It is possible to locate the beginning of each major reflected arrival by pairing it to the corresponding peak in the traveltime reflection coefficient series.

Synthetic seismograms in Figures 10D and 10F illustrate the difference in resolving capability between the watergun vs. the airgun source wavelet, for the same physical properties parameters from Vinck-1. The airgun source produces a reflector corresponding to “g” that has one major positive pulse (Fig. 10D), similar to the MCS near-offset traces, the ESP data and model of Figures 10A–10B. The watergun source produces a synthetic seismogram that better resembles the deep multiphase reflector of SCS profile in Figure 10G. The reflections from the top and the bottom of a high-velocity layer have an opposite polarity. If the thickness of the bed diminishes sufficiently, the two reflections will combine destructively; that thickness depends on the dominant wavelength of the source. A comparison of frequency spectra of the sources (Fig. 10, inset) reveals that the watergun source has a dominant frequency close to 45 Hz—about twice that of the airgun source. Consequently, the watergun-source seismogram can resolve the reflection coefficient triplet.

Above “g” (top of pre-rift basement), “e” (just below the Cenomanian/Turonian boundary) is an isolated sub-seafloor reflective region in the SCS data (Figs. 2 and 10G). It is difficult to match the arrival times and amplitudes of the seismograms calculated from the physical properties data and the SCS data of line 5; instrument and sampling techniques discussed above may be responsible. Nevertheless, by using the ESP model and traveltime reflection coefficient series we are able to identify “e” approximately as a series of three positive peaks at about 2.2–2.3 s TWT.

SUMMARY

The major reflectors in MCS CDP line 667, SCS ODP line 5, and ESP C2 can be tied with the drilling results to the lithologic and age unit boundaries in the vicinity of Site 763. By comparison to shipboard-derived and downhole physical properties measurements, the ESP-derived physical parameters more accurately describe the reflective character, especially traveltime to the major sedimentary horizons. $V_p$, $V_s$, $\rho$, and $Q_p$ values were obtained for the ESP model by an initial $\tau$-sum construction and a variety of seismic forward modeling techniques that successfully matched the waveform and traveltimes of the major arrivals at all offsets. The parameters of the model are closer in value to the downhole drilling results at Site 763 than the shipboard derived properties probably because they are not as affected by instrument errors, drilling disturbance, and sample rebound effects. Together, they describe the top 300–400 m of the sediments not sampled by the long-spaced sonic tool, and the synrift and pre-rift section below the extent of drilling at Site 763. The ESP analytical techniques used here incorporate the effects of a finite receiver, source directionality, stacking, and “ghosting.”

A correlation between physical properties reflection coefficient series in depth, lithologic, and biostratigraphic units, and the parameters in the ESP model can help date and explain the cause of major reflectors. Three of these reflectors, “b,” “e,” and “g,” occur near the top of LVZ’s and represent regionally significant geological events. Below “b” there is a decrease in the degree of induration of late Oligocene chalk, coincident with a threefold increase in the calculated sedimentation rate. Reflector “e” is the highest amplitude sub-seafloor reflector and is linked to the abrupt disappearance of terrigenous component in the sediments at the Cenomanian/Turonian boundary. Reflector “f” is found above a breakup unconformity crowning a section of Barremian-Valanginian (?) sediments which were deposited during the extensional deformation of the Exmouth Plateau that led to Early Cretaceous seafloor spreading. Reflector “g” arises from the top of the Triassic pre-rift basement because of the strong impedance contrast between a thin high-velocity region consisting of shallow-water reefal limestone, and the overlying silty synrift sediments and underlying shallow-water mudstones.

Full-reflectivity synthetic seismograms calculated from the shipboard-derived physical properties agree poorly with the waveform and traveltimes of major reflectors seen in the profile of SCS line 5, as a result of the intrinsic errors mentioned above. However, by using the first-order travel-
Figure 10. Integral correlation between observed and synthetic seismogram data sets, and biostratigraphic units; all synthetic seismograms calculated at normal incidence. A. Near-offset CDP traces (fold of 1) from profile 667, at projected Site 763, and bandpass-filtered between frequencies 25 and 60 Hz with high- and low-end cosine tapers of width 10 and 20 Hz, respectively. B. Synthetic seismogram calculated using ESP C2 model parameters, and using airgun source wavelet (inset). Trace has been shifted down in time to align with seafloor reflection and ease correlation between different data sets. C. Biostratigraphic ages (Haq, von Rad, O'Connell, et al., 1990). D. Synthetic seismogram calculated using Vinck-1 downhole data and airgun source wavelet (inset). E. Reflection coefficient depth series calculated from Vinck-1 downhole measurements. F. Synthetic seismogram calculated using Vinck-1 downhole data but using watergun-source wavelet (inset). G. Single-channel seismic data in vicinity of Site 763, bandpass-filtered between frequencies 25 and 60 Hz with high- and low-end cosine tapers of width 10 and 20 Hz, respectively. H. Synthetic seismogram of raw shipboard derived Vp and p measurements, seen in Figure 7. I. Corresponding reflection coefficient series of H. J. Reflection coefficient series of K. K. Synthetic seismogram calculated using sonic log seen in Figure 8 and watergun-source wavelet from inset. L. Time and frequency characteristics of airgun and watergun-source wavelets from multichannel and single-channel seismic data sets. Airgun source wavelet is not filtered and has dominant frequency of 25 Hz. Watergun-source wavelet is bandpass-filtered between 25 and 60 Hz with high- and low-end cosine tapers of width 10 Hz and 20 Hz, respectively, and has a dominant frequency of 45 Hz. Biostratigraphic boundaries are shown tied to seismograms. Broken lines indicate that some degree of uncertainty in correlation exists.
times to major reflectors from the ESP seismograms we can correlate major SCS reflectors to units identified by drilling. The general resolution capability of the single-channel data depends primarily on the dominant wavelength of the seismic source signature which is probably half as long as the airgun source wavelet.
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APPENDIX A

Receiver, Source, Stacking, and Free Surface Effects

The frequency-ray parameter \((\omega - p)\) response of (1) a multiphone finite length receiver, (2) multisource array, and (3) the stacking of the traces inside a given source-receiver offset “bin” have identical mathematical treatments. The source wavelet shape is controlled by the frequency-ray parameter response of free-surface interactions.

Finite Receiver

Let us consider a plane wavefront with ray parameter \(p\) and time function \(a(t)\) impinging on a receiver consisting of \(N\) point phones (Fig. A1). \(d\) is the distance between phones, and a point at a distance \((m d)\) from the first phone is chosen as reference. The time when the wavefront reaches the \(i\)-th phone is

\[ t_i = (i - m - 1) \Delta t, \]

where

\[ \Delta t = p d. \]  

The signal \(A(t,p)\) seen by the receiver is the sum of the signals \(a(t)\), seen at each phone with the proper time shift, that is

\[ A(t,p) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a(t - t_i), \]

or in the frequency domain

\[ A(\omega,p) = a(\omega) \sum_{i=1}^{N} e^{-j\omega t_i}, \]

where \(A(\omega,p)\) and \(a(\omega)\) are the Fourier transform of \(A(t,p)\) and \(a(t)\), respectively, \(j\) is the imaginary unit, and \(\omega = 2\pi f\) is the angular frequency.

Normally \(m = (N-1)/2\) so that the reference point is the receiver midpoint. In this case the sum in equation (A4) can be simplified and the normalized receiver response \(R(\omega,p) = (A(\omega,p)/a(\omega))/N\) is

\[ R(\omega,p) = \frac{\sin \left( \frac{N \omega \Delta t}{2} \right)}{\sin \left( \frac{\omega \Delta t}{2} \right)} \]  

We used a 48-channel streamer consisting of 30 phones in each channel at 1.6 m spacing to estimate the receiver response. The response function was incorporated into the full-reflectivity synthetic seismogram calculations. The function (A5) for this receiver is shown in Figure A2. The main effect of the finite receiver is the attenuation of the high frequencies. The larger the ray parameter, the larger the attenuation.

Source Directionality

Source directionality for a linear array of airguns behind a towing ship is physically analogous to the frequency-\(p\) response of a multi-

Stacking

Stacking of the traces in a given source-receiver offset “bin” to produce a single seismogram at the bin midpoint, can be analyzed by the same approach followed above for the \(N\)-phone receiver response. In both cases the same signal is added several times with different time shifts. Assuming equispaced traces in the bin, for the \(\omega - p\) effect produced by the stacking process, one obtains a formula identical to (A5), except that now \(R\) is the normalized ratio between the output and input trace spectrum, \(N\) is the number of traces in the bin, \(d\) is the trace spacing, and \(p\) is the absolute value of the difference between the data and stacking ray parameters. Figure A3 shows the response for eight traces in a 50 m bin, stacked along a slant trajectory defined by \(p = 0.125 \text{ s/km} \) (8 km/s); this case is typical of the processing performed with the ESP data. There is no distortion of the pulse shape for arrivals having the same phase velocity (ray parameter) as the stacking velocity. Arrivals with a different phase velocity, however, do not add in phase, which causes attenuation of the high frequencies. The larger the difference between the arrival phase velocity and stacking velocity, the larger the attenuation. Although in calculating \(x-t\) seismograms with full-reflectivity, we also applied the stacking response, the effect was minimal because of the additional and larger attenuation by the effect of the free surface.

Source Directionality

Source directionality for a linear array of airguns behind a towing ship is physically analogous to the frequency-\(p\) response of a multi-

Figure A1. Geometry involved in calculating the \(N\)-phone receiver response.

Figure A2. Frequency response for receiver array used in calculating synthetic seismograms with the full-reflectivity.
Free Surface Effect or "Ghosting"

The computation of the reflection response of a layered medium to plane waves is normally carried out considering an infinite upper half-space. The effect of the free surface is added at a later stage and involves the interaction of the plane waves with the free surface (sea surface) near the source and the receiver, also known as "ghosting." Consider an upgoing plane wave front of ray parameter (horizontal slowness) $p$ impinging on a receiver at depth $d_R$ (see Fig. A4). In the case of an infinite upper half-space, the wave front would interact with the receiver once and would then continue traveling upward indefinitely. The free surface, however, reflects this front back producing a downgoing front that is 180° phase-reversed and that reaches the receiver $t_R$ seconds later than the upgoing front. The time delay $t_R$ can be easily calculated as

$$t_R = 2d_R q$$

(A6)

where

$$\theta = \cos \theta = \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{v^2} p^2}$$

(A7)

is the vertical slowness. The signal $A(t,p)$ seen at the receiver, is the sum of the upgoing front, $a(t)$, and the downgoing reflected front, $b(t)$, with the proper time delay, $t_R$. Ideally, the free surface reflection coefficient is $-1$ and thus $b(t) = -a(t)$. (In general, the free surface may not be a perfect reflector and $b(t) = -C_a(t)$ where $C$ is less than one.)

Free surface with reflection coefficient = -1

Figure A4. Geometry involved in calculating free surface effect response.

If, for convenience, we consider that the time at which the upgoing front reaches the receiver is defined as $t = -t_R$, the time for the downgoing front is $t = -\frac{1}{2} t_R + t_R = \frac{1}{2} t_R$, and $A(t,p)$ is then:

$$A(t,p) = a(t + \frac{1}{2} t_R) - a(t - \frac{1}{2} t_R)$$

(A8)

In frequency domain, equation (A8) is

$$A(\omega,p) = \frac{a(\omega)}{a(\omega)} \left( e^{i\omega t_R} - e^{-i\omega t_R} \right)$$

(A9)

where $\omega$ is the angular frequency and $A(\omega,p)$ and $a(\omega)$ are the Fourier transform of $A(t,p)$ and $a(t)$ respectively. Equation (A9) can be simplified and the response of the free surface at the receiver is

$$A(\omega,p) = 2i \sin \left( \frac{\omega t_R}{2} \right).$$

(A10)

 Following exactly the same steps, an expression analogous to (A10) can be found for the response at the source. The total effect of the free surface on the recorded signal, $R(\omega,p)$, is the product of the response at the source and the receiver:

$$R(\omega,p) = 4 \sin \left( \frac{\omega t_s}{2} \right) \sin \left( \frac{\omega d_s}{2} \right).$$

(A11)

where $t_s$ is computed using (A6) and (A7) but using $d_s$, the source depth, instead of $d_R$.

Figure A5 shows the effect of the free surface as a function of frequency for several $p$’s. This effect significantly attenuates arrivals at $p$ of about 0.6 s/km and greater. In our data for ESP C2 (Fig. 4) this $p$ range corresponds to mainly wide aperture seafloor reflections at offsets greater than about 8 km.

APPENDIX B

Reflectivity Calculations

The reflectivity method comprises two parts: the computation of the plane wave $\omega - p$ response of the medium (reflectivity), and the transformation and integration of the reflectivity function to obtain the $x-t$ seismograms. For the reflectivity part, we employed a recursive method that uses frequency independent reflection coefficients to propagate the reflectivity across the layer interfaces, and complex $2 \times 2$ phase matrices within each layer (Kennett, 1974; Müller, 1985). For the integration we followed Wenzel et al. (1982) in which the reflectivity function is first transformed from the frequency to the time domain to obtain $r-p$ seismograms, and the $x-t$ seismograms are then computed by slant stacking in $r-p$.

Figure A5. Frequency response for an airgun and receiver both at depth of 10 m below free surface.