I. INTRODUCTION

Fast modeling methods and algorithms in complex heterogeneous media, especially for 3D media, are crucial to the application of seismic methods in complex structures including the development of interpretation, imaging and inversion methods. Finite-difference and finite-element algorithms are very flexible. In principle, they can be applied to arbitrarily heterogeneous medium. However, they are very time consuming. High-frequency asymptotic methods, such as ray based methods (e.g., Červený, 1981; Červený and Klimes, 1984; Chapman, 1985), provide high computation efficiency for smooth 3D models. However, they fail to deal with complicated 3D volume heterogeneities. Frequency-dependent and wave related phenomena in complex media cannot be correctly modeled by the ray methods. Born scattering formulation (Gubernatis et al., 1977; Wu and Aki, 1985), ray-Born (Beydoun and Mendes, 1989; Coates and Chapman, 1990), or generalized Born scattering methods (Coates and Chapman, 1991) can model small volume complex heterogeneities in a smooth background. However, they are not capable of modeling long distance propagation in complex media. It is necessary to develop intermediate modeling methods functioning between the full wave equation methods and the high-frequency asymptotic methods.

The phase screen method, or split step Fourier method (e.g., Flatté and Tappert, 1975; Tappert, 1977; Thomson and Chapman, 1983), has been used to calculate the one-way forward propagation for acoustic waves. Recently, the method has also been used to deal with elastic waves. To generalize a scalar wave case to vector elastic waves, the center part is the coupling between $P$- and $S$-waves. Fisk and McCartor (1991) derived coupling terms using a projection method. Their method has some problems for some limiting cases. Wu (1994) derived these terms based on formal scattering theory of elastic waves. Wild and Hudson (1998) used another approach, the geometrical derivation, and reached similar results. The screen method has also been used as back propagators for seismic wave migration in either acoustic or elastic media (e.g., Stoffa et al., 1990; Wu and Xie, 1994; Huang et al., 1999). Generally speaking, these methods give better imaging quality compared with the ray based Kirchhoff method. The generalized screen methods are based on the one-way wave equation that neglects backscattered waves, but correctly handles all the forward multiple-scattering effects, e.g., focusing/defocusing, diffraction, interference, and conversion between different wave types. For media where the resonance scattering or reverberations caused by heterogeneities can be neglected, the reflections will be dominated by single backscatterings. In this case, the screen method can also be adopted to calculate reflections. Wu and Huang (1995) tested the method for acoustic reflections. Wu (1996) discussed approximations for forward and backward scatterings of different wave types. Xie and Wu (1996) tested the screen approximation for modeling elastic wave reflections.

In this study, the complex-screen method is extended to deal with both forward propagation and reflection of elastic waves. The current formulation is based on a small angle approximation of the one-way wave equation and the local Born approximation using the perturbation theory. Under the small angle approximation, backscattering can also be formulated into a screen operator which is similar to the screen propagator. The interaction between the incident wave field and the heterogeneities gives both forward and backward scattered waves. The forward scattered waves, together with the primary wave, construct the transmitted waves. The backscattered waves give the reflections by the structure. With an iterative method, it can correctly handle multiple forward scattering and single backscattering. By using a dual-domain operation, it retains the advantages of the original screen method, i.e., high-efficiency in computation speed and tremendous memory savings. Numerical results show
that this is a very promising method in modeling primary reflections from complicated large scale 3D elastic structures.

In the following sections, we first present the formulation. Then numerical examples are conducted to test the method. For a two-dimensional test model, the results from the screen method are compared with that from the full wave finite-difference method.

II. EXPRESSIONS FOR FORWARD AND BACKWARD SCATTERED WAVE FIELDS

We start from the equation of motion for displacement \( \mathbf{u} \) in a linear elastic medium (Aki and Richards, 1980):

\[
-\rho(x)\omega^2 \mathbf{u}(x) = \nabla \cdot \left[ \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{c}(x)(\nabla \mathbf{u}(x) + \mathbf{u}(x) \nabla) \right],
\]

where \( \mathbf{u} \) is the displacement, \( \mathbf{c} \) is the elastic constant tensor, \( \rho \) is density, \( \mathbf{u} \nabla \) is the transpose of \( \mathbf{u} \) and \( \cdot \) is for double scalar product, i.e., \((\mathbf{ab}) : (\mathbf{cd}) = (\mathbf{bc}) \cdot (\mathbf{ad})\). If elastic parameters and the wave field can be decomposed into

\[
\rho(x) = \rho_0 + \delta \rho(x),
\]

\[
\mathbf{c}(x) = \mathbf{c}_0 + \delta \mathbf{c}(x),
\]

\[
\mathbf{u}(x) = \mathbf{u}_0(x) + \mathbf{U}(x),
\]

where \( \rho_0 \) and \( \mathbf{c}_0 \) are density and elastic parameters for the background medium, \( \delta \rho(x) \) and \( \delta \mathbf{c}(x) \) are the corresponding perturbations, \( \mathbf{u}_0(x) \) and \( \mathbf{U}(x) \) are the incident field and the scattered field, then Eq. (1) can be rewritten as

\[
-\rho_0 \omega^2 \mathbf{u}(x) = \nabla \cdot \left[ \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{c}_0 (\nabla \mathbf{u}(x) + \mathbf{u}(x) \nabla) \right] = \mathbf{F}(x),
\]

where

\[
\mathbf{F}(x) = \omega^2 \delta \mathbf{c}(x) \mathbf{u}(x) + \nabla \cdot \left[ \frac{1}{2} \delta \mathbf{c}(x)(\nabla \mathbf{u}(x) + \mathbf{u}(x) \nabla) \right]
\]

is the equivalent body force due to scattering. The scattered field can be expressed as

\[
\mathbf{U}(x) = \int_{v'} d\mathbf{u}' \mathbf{G}(x;x') \mathbf{F}(x'),
\]

where \( \mathbf{G} \) is the Green's function in the background medium.

We will consider a special case where an incident wave \( \mathbf{u}_0(x) \) interacts with a heterogeneous thin slab which is perpendicular to the main propagation direction. Figure 1 shows the primary incident waves and various types of secondary waves generated by the scattering process. If the slab is thin enough, the local Born approximation can be adopted within the slab. The wave field \( \mathbf{u}(x) \) in Eq. (3) can be replaced by the incident field \( \mathbf{u}_0(x) \).

Let \( \hat{e}_z \) be the unit vector along the main propagation direction, and \( x_T = x \hat{e}_x + y \hat{e}_y \) be a position vector in the transverse plane. The slab is between \( z_0 \) and \( z_1 \), with a thickness of \( \Delta z = z_1 - z_0 \). The scattered field from the slab can be expressed as

\[
\mathbf{U}(x) = \int_{z_0}^{z_1} dz' \int d\mathbf{x}_T G(x_T, z; x_T', z') F_0(x_T', z').
\]

where \( F_0(x) \) is Eq. (3) with \( \mathbf{u}(x) \) replaced by \( \mathbf{u}_0(x) \).

The incident field \( \mathbf{u}_0(x) \) can be decomposed into a superposition of plane \( P \)- and \( S \)-waves:

\[
\mathbf{u}_0(x, z) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int dK_T [u_0^P(K_T, z) + u_0^S(K_T, z)] e^{iK_T x},
\]

where \( K_T \) is the incident transverse wave number of plane waves and superscripts \( P \) and \( S \) denote \( P \)- and \( S \)-waves. The forward propagating field is composed of primary wave and forward scattered \( P \)- and \( S \)-waves. At \( z_1 \), it can be expressed as

\[
u_f(x_T, z_1) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int dK_T [u_f^P(K_T', z_1) + u_f^S(K_T', z_1)] e^{iK_T' x},
\]

where

\[
u_f^P(K_T', z_1) = e^{i\gamma_p(z_1 - z_0)} [u_0^P(K_T', z_0) + u_f^PP(K_T', z_0)]
\]

\[+ u_f^PP(K_T', z_0),
\]

\[
u_f^S(K_T', z_1) = e^{i\gamma_p(z_1 - z_0)} [u_0^S(K_T', z_0) + u_f^SP(K_T', z_0)]
\]

\[+ u_f^SP(K_T', z_0),
\]

where \( K_T' \) is the transverse wave number of scattered waves, \( \gamma_p = (k_{\alpha}^2 - K_T^2)^{1/2} \) and \( \gamma_p = (k_{\beta}^2 - K_T^2)^{1/2} \) are longitudinal components of \( P \)- and \( S \)-wave numbers, \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are \( P \)- and \( S \)-wave velocities. Phase advance operators \( e^{i\gamma_p(z_1 - z_0)} \) and \( e^{i\gamma_p(z_1 - z_0)} \) propagate the incident and scattered fields from \( z_0 \) to \( z_1 \). The reflected wave is composed of backscattered \( P \)- and \( S \)-waves. At \( z_0 \), the reflected wave can be expressed as

\[
\mathbf{u}_b(x_T, z_0) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int dK_T [u_b^P(K_T', z_0) + u_b^S(K_T', z_0)] e^{iK_T' x},
\]

where

\[
u_b^P(K_T', z_0) = U_b^{PP}(K_T', z_0) + U_b^{SP}(K_T', z_0),
\]

\[
u_b^S(K_T', z_0) = U_b^{PP}(K_T', z_0) + U_b^{SP}(K_T', z_0),
\]
In above equations, \( U \) denotes scattered waves. The subscripts \( f \) and \( b \) denote forward and backward scatterings, respectively. Superscripts \( PP \), \( PS \), \( SP \) and \( SS \) indicate the scattering between different wave types as shown in Fig. 1. For isotropic elastic medium, the scattered fields for both forward and backward scatterings can be derived from Eq. (5) (Wu, 1994):

\[
U^{PP}(K'_T, K_T) = \frac{i}{2 \gamma_a} k^2 a^P \left( k'_a, k'_a \right) \frac{\delta \rho(K)}{\rho_0} \left[ \frac{\delta \lambda(K)}{\lambda_0 + 2 \mu_0} - \left( k'_a, k'_a \right)^2 \frac{2 \delta \mu(K)}{\lambda_0 + 2 \mu_0} \right],
\]

(13)

\[
U^{PS}(K'_T, K_T) = \frac{i}{2 \gamma_b} k^2 p^P \left( k'_a, k'_a \right) \frac{\delta \rho(K)}{\rho_0} \left[ \frac{\delta \mu(K)}{\mu_0} \right],
\]

(14)

\[
U^{SP}(K'_T, K_T) = \frac{i}{2 \gamma_a} k^2 a^S \left( u^S_0, k'_a \right) \frac{\delta \rho(K)}{\rho_0} \left[ \frac{\delta \mu(K)}{\mu_0} \right],
\]

(15)

\[
U^{SS}(K'_T, K_T) = \frac{i}{2 \gamma_b} k^2 p^S \left( u^S_0, k'_a \right) \frac{\delta \rho(K)}{\rho_0} \left[ \frac{\delta \mu(K)}{\mu_0} \right] \times (k'_a, k'_a),
\]

(16)

where \( u^P_0 = |u_0^P(K_T)| \) and \( u^S_0 = |u_0^S(K_T)| \), \( \delta \rho(K), \delta \lambda(K) \) and \( \delta \mu(K) \) are three-dimensional Fourier transforms of medium perturbations, wave numbers without primes are for incident waves and with primes are for scattered waves, \( \hat{k} = \hat{k}' - k \) is the exchange wave number with \( k \) and \( \hat{k}' \) as the incident and scattering wave numbers, respectively, \( k'_a \) and \( k'_b \) are unit wave vector numbers for \( P \)- and \( S \)-waves, and

\[
k_a = K_T + \gamma_a \hat{e}_z, \quad k_b = K_T + \gamma_b \hat{e}_z,
\]

\[
k'_a = K'_T + \gamma'_a \hat{e}_z, \quad k'_b = K'_T + \gamma'_b \hat{e}_z,
\]

(17)

where the + or − sign depends on whether it is forward or backward scattering, and \( \hat{e}_z \) is the unit vector in the \( z \)-direction. The longitudinal coordinate \( z_0 \) has been temporarily omitted from these equations.

Equations (13)–(16) give scattered fields of different wave types. They are scattered plane waves with transverse wave number \( K'_T \) generated by the plane incident wave with transverse wave number \( K_T \). The total scattered plane wave is the integration of contributions from all incident plane waves,

\[
U(K'_T, z_0) = \frac{1}{4 \pi^2} \int dK_T U(K'_T, K_T, z_0).
\]

(18)

In principle, Eqs. (7)–(18) provide all equations needed for calculating wave fields \( u(x_T, z) \) and \( u_b(x_T, z_0) \). However, from these equations we can see that scattered waves composed of contributions from all \( K'_T \) which are coupled with all incident \( K_T \). For a general three-dimensional velocity model, both of them are two-dimensional and the \( U(K'_T, K_T) \) is a four-dimensional matrix. The calculations of these matrix operations are very time consuming. To obtain a highly efficient algorithm, we introduce a small angle approximation to the formulation.

### III. SMALL ANGLE APPROXIMATION

Under the small angle approximation, \( \gamma_a \) and \( \gamma_a' \) can be approximated by \( k_a \), and \( \gamma_b \) and \( \gamma_b' \) by \( k_b \). The exchange wave numbers for forward and backward scattered fields can be simplified. For forward scattering

\[
k'_a - k_a \approx K'_T - K_T + 0 \hat{e}_z,
\]

\[
k'_b - k_b \approx K'_T - K_T + \xi \hat{e}_z,
\]

(19)

For backward scattering

\[
k'_a - k_a \approx K'_T - K_T - 2 k_b \hat{e}_z,
\]

\[
k'_b - k_b \approx K'_T - K_T - 2 k_a \hat{e}_z.
\]

(20)

The three-dimensional Fourier transforms of the perturbations \( \delta \rho(K), \delta \lambda(K) \) and \( \delta \mu(K) \) can also be simplified. Taking the density perturbation for back scattering as an example,

\[
\delta \rho(k_a - k'_a) = \int_0^{\Delta z} dz e^{i(\gamma_a + \gamma_a')z} \int dK_T \times \delta \rho(K_T - K'_T, z_0) e^{-i(K_T - K'_T) \cdot x_T}.
\]

(21)

If the slab is thin enough, the variation of \( \delta \rho(x_T, z) \) along the \( z \)-direction will be small, the integral can be approximated as

\[
\delta \rho(k_a - k'_a) \approx \Delta z \int dK_T \times \delta \rho(K_T - K'_T, z_0) \delta \rho^{PP}(K_T - K'_T).
\]

(22)

where

\[
\eta_b^{PP} = \frac{1}{12 k_a \Delta z} (e^{i2k_a \Delta z} - 1) = \sin(k_a \Delta z) e^{i k_a \Delta z};
\]

(23)

and \( \sin(z) = \sin(|z|/z) \). In the above equations, the original three-dimensional Fourier transform has been decomposed into a 2D Fourier transform and a 1D Fourier transform. \( \delta \rho(K_T, z_0) \) is a 2D Fourier transform of \( \delta \rho(x_T, z) \) averaged over an interval between \( z_0 \) and \( z_1 \), \( \eta_b^{PP} \) is the 1D Fourier transform of a boxcar function since the medium variation in \( z \) direction has been neglected due to the screen assumption. For simplicity, \( z_0 \) is omitted in the following equations. Similarly, for forward scatterings of different wave types we have
\[
\delta \rho(k_a' - k_a) = \Delta z \delta \rho(K_T' - K_T) \eta_f^{PP}, \\
\delta \rho(k_b' - k_b) = \Delta z \delta \rho(K_T' - K_T) \eta_f^{PS}, \\
\delta \rho(k_a' - k_a) = \Delta z \delta \rho(K_T' - K_T) \eta_f^{SS}, \\
\delta \rho(k_b' - k_b) = \Delta z \delta \rho(K_T' - K_T) \eta_f^{SP}.
\]

(24)

and for backward scatterings of different wave types

\[
\delta \rho(k_a' - k_a) = \Delta z \delta \rho(K_T' - K_T) \eta_b^{PP}, \\
\delta \rho(k_b' - k_b) = \Delta z \delta \rho(K_T' - K_T) \eta_b^{PS}, \\
\delta \rho(k_a' - k_a) = \Delta z \delta \rho(K_T' - K_T) \eta_b^{SP}, \\
\delta \rho(k_b' - k_b) = \Delta z \delta \rho(K_T' - K_T) \eta_b^{SS}.
\]

(25)

The modulating factors are

\[
\eta_f^{PP} = 1, \\
\eta_f^{PS} = \text{sinc}[(k_b - k_a)\Delta z/2]e^{-ik_b' - k_a'\Delta z}, \\
\eta_f^{SS} = 1, \\
\eta_f^{PS} = \eta_f^{PP}, \\
\eta_b^{PP} = \text{sinc}(k_a\Delta z)e^{ik_a\Delta z}, \\
\eta_b^{PS} = \text{sinc}[(k_b + k_a)\Delta z/2]e^{ik_b' + k_a'\Delta z}, \\
\eta_b^{SS} = \eta_b^{PS}, \\
\eta_b^{SS} = \text{sinc}(k_b\Delta z)e^{ik_b\Delta z},
\]

(26)–(27)

where \( \eta^* \) is the complex conjugate of \( \eta \). Similar expressions can be derived for the elastic constants \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \).

Note that under small angle approximation, \((\hat{k}_a', \hat{k}_a)\), \((\hat{k}_b', \hat{k}_b)\), \((\hat{k}_a, \hat{k}_a')\) and \((\hat{k}_b, \hat{k}_b')\) approach \( +1 \) for forward and \(-1 \) for backward scatterings, respectively. Substituting Eqs. (24)–(27) into Eqs. (13)–(16), for forward scatterings we have

\[
U_f^{PP}(K_T', K_T) = -ik_a\Delta z\hat{k}_a' u_0'(K_T) \frac{\delta \alpha(\hat{K}_T')}{\alpha_0} \eta_f^{PP},
\]

(28)

\[
U_f^{PS}(K_T', K_T) = -ik_b\Delta z u_0'(K_T)[\hat{k}_a' - \hat{k}_b'(k_a' \cdot \hat{k}_b')] \\
\phantom{=} \times \left[ \frac{\delta \beta(\hat{K}_T')}{\beta_0} + \left( \frac{\beta_0}{\alpha_0} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{\delta \mu(\hat{K}_T')}{\mu_0} \right] \eta_f^{PS},
\]

(29)

\[
U_f^{SP}(K_T', K_T) = -ik_a\Delta z u_0'(K_T) \hat{k}_a' \\
\phantom{=} \times \left[ \frac{\delta \beta(\hat{K}_T')}{\beta_0} + \left( \frac{\beta_0}{\alpha_0} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{\delta \mu(\hat{K}_T')}{\mu_0} \right] \eta_f^{SP},
\]

(30)

\[
U_f^{SS}(K_T', K_T) = -ik_b\Delta z u_0'(K_T) \cdot \hat{k}_b' \\
\phantom{=} \times \left[ \frac{\delta \beta(\hat{K}_T')}{\beta_0} + \left( \frac{\beta_0}{\alpha_0} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{\delta \mu(\hat{K}_T')}{\mu_0} \right] \eta_f^{SS}.
\]

(31)

and for backward scatterings, we have

\[
U_b^{PP}(K_T', K_T) = -ik_a\Delta z\hat{k}_a' u_0'(K_T) \\
\phantom{=} \times \left[ \frac{\delta \rho(\hat{K}_T')}{\rho_0} + \frac{\delta \alpha(\hat{K}_T')}{\alpha_0} \right] \eta_b^{PP},
\]

(32)

\[
U_b^{PS}(K_T', K_T) = -ik_b\Delta z u_0'(K_T)[\hat{k}_a' - \hat{k}_b'(k_a' \cdot \hat{k}_b')] \\
\phantom{=} \times \left[ \frac{\delta \beta(\hat{K}_T')}{\beta_0} + \left( \frac{\beta_0}{\alpha_0} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{\delta \mu(\hat{K}_T')}{\mu_0} \right] \eta_b^{PS},
\]

(33)

\[
U_b^{SP}(K_T', K_T) = -ik_a\Delta z(u_0'(K_T) \cdot \hat{k}_a') \hat{k}_a' \\
\phantom{=} \times \left[ \frac{\delta \beta(\hat{K}_T')}{\beta_0} + \left( \frac{\beta_0}{\alpha_0} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{\delta \mu(\hat{K}_T')}{\mu_0} \right] \eta_b^{SP},
\]

(34)

\[
U_b^{SS}(K_T', K_T) = -ik_b\Delta z[u_0'(K_T) - \hat{k}_b'(u_0'(K_T) \cdot \hat{k}_b')] \\
\phantom{=} \times \left[ \frac{\delta \beta(\hat{K}_T')}{\beta_0} + \frac{\delta \beta(\hat{K}_T')}{\beta_0} \right] \eta_b^{SS}.
\]

(35)

In Eqs. (28)–(35), \( \hat{K}_T' = K_T' - K_T \) is the exchange transverse wave number, \( \delta \alpha(\hat{K}_T') \) and \( \delta \beta(\hat{K}_T') \) are transverse spectra of \( P_- \) and \( S_- \) wave velocity perturbations, \( \delta Z_{\alpha}(K_T') \) and \( \delta Z_{\beta}(K_T') \) are transverse spectra of \( P_- \) and \( S_- \) wave impedance perturbations, respectively. Equations (28) and (32) show that the forward scattered \( P-P \) wave is proportional to the \( P- \) wave velocity perturbation, while the backward scattered \( P-P \) wave depends on the \( P- \) wave impedance perturbation, consistent with the scattering theory. A similar situation is true for \( S-S \) scattering as can be seen from Eqs. (31) and (35).

The quantity \( (\beta_0/\alpha_0 - 1/2) \) is usually small, and as can be seen from Eqs. (29) and (30), the forward converted waves \( U_f^{PS} \) and \( U_f^{SP} \) are basically controlled by the \( S_- \) wave velocity perturbation. Similarly, from Eqs. (33) and (34), the backward converted waves \( U_b^{PS} \) and \( U_b^{SP} \) are controlled by \( S_- \) wave impedance perturbation. The forward and backward scattered waves reveal different characteristics of the medium, since they are controlled by different medium parameters.

The total scattered plane wave is the integration of contributions from scattering of all incident plane waves. For example, for \( P-P \) forward scattering we have
\[ U_{f}^{PP}(K_{r}, z_{0}) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int dK_{r} U_{f}^{PP}(K_{r}, K_{r}', z_{0}). \]

From Eq. (28) we can see that the above equation is a convolution between the incident wave and medium parameter in the transverse wave number domain. A more efficient calculation is to transfer the wave number domain convolution into a spatial domain multiplication using the fast Fourier transform. Thus

\[
U_{f}^{PP}(K_{r}', z_{0}) = -i k_{\alpha} \Delta z \eta_{f}^{PP} \int d'K_{r} e^{-iK_{r}' \cdot x_{r}'}
\]

\[
\times u_{0}^{P}(x_{r}', z_{0}) \left[ \frac{\beta_{0}}{\alpha_{0}} - \frac{1}{2} \right] \delta(p(x_{r}'))
\]

\[
+ 2 \left( \frac{\beta_{0}}{\alpha_{0}} \delta(p(x_{r}')) \right),
\]

where \( \delta(p(x_{r}')) \) is \( \delta(p(x_{r}, z)) \) averaged over the interval between \( z_{0} \) and \( z_{1} \). Similarly, dual-domain formulas for other wave types can be obtained as

\[
U_{f}^{PS}(K_{r}', z_{0}) = -i k_{\beta} \Delta z \eta_{f}^{PS} \int d'K_{r} e^{-iK_{r}' \cdot x_{r}'}
\]

\[
\times u_{0}^{P}(x_{r}', z_{0}) \left[ \frac{\beta_{0}}{\alpha_{0}} - \frac{1}{2} \right] \delta(p(x_{r}'))
\]

\[
+ 2 \left( \frac{\beta_{0}}{\alpha_{0}} \delta(p(x_{r}')) \right),
\]

\[
U_{f}^{SS}(K_{r}', z_{0}) = -i k_{\beta} \Delta z \eta_{f}^{SS} \int d'K_{r} e^{-iK_{r}' \cdot x_{r}'}
\]

\[
\times e^{-iK_{r}' \cdot x_{r}'} u_{0}^{S}(x_{r}', z_{0}) \frac{\delta(p(x_{r}'))}{\beta_{0}}
\]

\[
+ 2 \left( \frac{\beta_{0}}{\alpha_{0}} \delta(p(x_{r}')) \right),
\]

\[
U_{b}^{PP}(K_{T}, z_{0}) = i k_{\beta} \Delta z \eta_{b}^{PP} \int d'K_{r} e^{-iK_{r}' \cdot x_{r}'}
\]

\[
\times u_{0}^{P}(x_{r}', z_{0}) \frac{\delta(p(x_{r}'))}{\beta_{0}},
\]

\[
U_{b}^{PS}(K_{T}, z_{0}) = i k_{\beta} \Delta z \eta_{b}^{PS} \int d'K_{r} e^{-iK_{r}' \cdot x_{r}'}
\]

\[
\times u_{0}^{P}(x_{r}', z_{0}) \frac{\delta(p(x_{r}'))}{\beta_{0}}
\]

\[
+ 2 \left( \frac{\beta_{0}}{\alpha_{0}} \delta(p(x_{r}')) \right),
\]

where \( \eta_{f}^{PP} \), \( \eta_{f}^{PS} \), \( \eta_{f}^{SS} \), \( \eta_{b}^{PP} \), and \( \eta_{b}^{PS} \) are the elastic wave complex screening coefficients for the incident wave, respectively, and \( \delta(p(x_{r}, z)) \) is a delta function in the medium parameter domain. The model is a 2D profile from the French model (French, 1974). The parameters for the background medium are \( V_{r} = 3.6 \text{ km/s} \), \( V_{s} = 2.08 \text{ km/s} \) and \( \rho = 2.2 \text{ g/cm}^{3} \). The intermediate layer has a ~20% perturbation for both P- and S-wave velocities.
The spatial domain operation of medium-wave interactions are multiplications which are very efficient. The scattered field \( U(K_T, z) \) from Eqs. (36)-(43) is then substituted into Eqs. (7)-(12) to calculate forward and reflected fields. The propagation of plane waves passing through the homogeneous background medium is conducted in wave number domain by Eqs. (8) and (9). In wave number domain, the propagation operator involves only a phase advance, which is also an efficient operation. Note the difference between Eqs. (13)-(16) and Eqs. (28)-(35). The former involves complicated calculations and the medium-wave interactions are not local, while the later involves simple convolutions in the transverse wave number domain, which results from the small angle approximation and greatly simplifies the calculation.

In summary, the wave propagation through a thin slab is decomposed into a series of highly efficient steps. The model parameters are separated into two parts, the background parameters and the perturbations. The interaction with the perturbations in the spatial domain gives the scattered waves. The propagation through the background medium is in the wave number domain. The calculations in both domains are local and very efficient. The forward and inverse fast Fourier transforms switch the wave field between the two domains.

IV. ITERATIVE PROCEDURE AND NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

Figure 2 is a sketch showing how to calculate the interaction between incident wave and a 3D heterogeneous model with an iterative method. First, the 3D model is divided into a series of thin slabs [Fig. 2(B)]. The \( i \)th slab is between \( z_i \) and \( z_{i+1} \). The last section provides us with the formulas for calculating the interaction between the incident wave and a single thin slab [Fig. 2(A)]. With these equations we can calculate the transmitted field \( u_T(z_{i+1}) \) and the backscattered field \( u_B(z_i) \) from the incident wave \( u_I(z_i) \). The transmitted field is used as the input for the next slab and in this way the forward propagated field in the entire model can be obtained. The backscattered field are stored temporarily. After finishing the forward propagation, the backscattered fields are retrieved and once again propagated using the one-way propagator. The reflected fields \( u_R(z) \) in the entire model are calculated [Fig. 2(C)]. In this way, all the multiple forward scatterings and single backscatterings (MFSB) can be taken into account.

Numerical simulations are conducted to test the accuracy and efficiency of this method. The model is a 2D cut from the French model (French, 1974). Figure 3 shows the velocity structure of this model. The parameters of the background medium are \( V_P = 3.6 \text{ km/s} \), \( V_S = 2.08 \text{ km/s} \), and \( \rho = 2.2 \text{ g/cm}^3 \). The intermediate layer has a \(-20\%\) perturbation for both \( P \)- and \( S \)-wave velocities. The \( P \)-wave source and receivers are located 1 km above the upper interface. With this source–receiver configuration, the observed signals are basically reflections from the structure. The synthetic seismograms are calculated using the elastic complex-screen method presented in this study and a finite-difference

**FIG. 4.** Comparison of synthetic seismograms calculated by different methods. The solid lines are from the screen method and the dashed lines are from the finite-difference method. The results show general agreement between the two methods in both amplitude and arrival times.
method. The later is a fourth order elastic wave finite-difference code (Xie and Yao, 1988; Xie and Lay, 1994). Free surface effects and primary arrivals have been properly removed from these results. The synthetic seismograms are compared in Fig. 4. Solid lines are from the complex-screen method and the dashed lines are from the finite-difference method. For the $P-P$ interface, there are mainly $P$-waves. The waves arriving between 0.5 and 0.7 s are $P-P$ reflections from different parts of the upper interface. Several arrivals can be identified. The second group of waves is relatively simple. They are $P$-to-$P$ reflections from the lower plane interface. Due to the complexity of the upper interface, both $P-P$ and $P-S$ reflections from this interface are rather complicated. They are composed of reflections from the flat and curved sections, and diffractions from the sharp corner. The later is a challenge for ray-based methods. The transverse components of the synthetics are composed of $P-S$ reflections from both interfaces, as well as some $P$-waves. Generally speaking, the agreement between the two methods is very good.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The elastic complex-screen method is based on the one-way wave equation, local Born approximation and small angle approximation. It provides an efficient way for calculating both forward and backward scattered waves. This method calculates both forward propagating waves and primary reflections for complicated models. As an example, synthetic seismograms for 2D elastic model are calculated with this method. The results are compared with those of a finite-difference method. For small to medium scattering angles and medium velocity contrast, the method is well in agreement with the finite-difference method. For wide scattering angles, there are errors in synthetic seismograms. Further investigations show that the errors result from the small angle approximation to the scattering radiation pattern (Wu and Wu, 1998) and phase delay under wide angle and large velocity perturbation (Ristow and Ruhl, 1994; Xie and Wu, 1998). Wide angle accuracy should be further improved in future studies.
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