

Mechanics of Layered Anisotropic Poroelastic Media

James G. Berryman^{1,*}

¹*University of California, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory,
One Cyclotron Road MS 90R1116, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

Abstract

The mechanics of vertically layered porous media has some similarities to and some differences from the more typical layered analysis for purely elastic media. Assuming welded solid contact at the solid-solid interfaces implies the usual continuity conditions, which are continuity of the horizontal strain components and the vertical stress components. These conditions are valid for both elastic and poroelastic media. Differences arise through the conditions for the pore pressure and the increment of fluid content in the context of fluid-saturated porous media. The two distinct conditions most typically considered between any pair of contiguous layers are: (1) an undrained fluid condition at the interface, meaning that the increment of fluid content is zero (*i.e.*, $\delta\zeta = 0$), or (2) fluid pressure continuity at the interface, implying that the change in fluid pressure is zero across the interface (*i.e.*, $\delta p_f = 0$). Depending on the types of measurements being made on the system and the pertinent boundary conditions for these measurements, either (or neither) of these two conditions might be directly pertinent. But these conditions are sufficient nevertheless to be used as thought experiments to determine the expected values of all the poroelastic coefficients. For quasi-static mechanical changes over long time periods, we expect drained conditions to hold, so the pressure must then be continuous. For high frequency wave propagation, the fluid typically acts essentially as if it were undrained – or nearly so, with vanishing of the fluid increment at the boundaries being appropriate. The paper treats the poroelastic analysis of both these end-member cases in detail.

*JGBerryman@LBL.GOV

1. Introduction

Poroelastic analysis [1-8] usually progresses from assumed knowledge of dry or drained porous media to the predicted behavior of fluid-saturated and undrained porous media. This class of problems is characterized by a single upscaling step, taking the homogeneous fluid and solid constituent properties and deducing the macroscopic behavior of such systems. In recent work [9], the author has shown in detail how the poroelastic coefficients are related to the microstructural constants of the solid constituents when the overall behavior varies from isotropic to orthotropic. The focus of the present work is on layered poroelastic materials, which are therefore heterogeneous at the mesoscale. Each layer is assumed to satisfy the assumptions of the class of problems considered in reference [9].

The main issue addressed here concerns how the interface boundary conditions between anisotropic porous layers should be treated. For very low frequency (say quasi-static) analysis, this issue is clear since then the boundary conditions must be drained conditions and therefore the fluid pressure is continuous across the boundary. However, for high frequency wave propagation, it is expected to be more appropriate to treat the system as locally undrained, since the pressure of the pore-fluid does not have time to equilibrate via the drainage mechanism, which can take much longer than is appropriate to these quasi-static analyses. The most accurate way to treat these situations is to consider the variables to be frequency dependent and complex. This approach has been taken for example by Pride *et al.* [10-12] for mixtures of isotropic poroelastic materials. But the problem becomes harder for the anisotropic case, as there are were simple exact results for the two-isotropic-component case, but simple results are not available for the anisotropic problems. And more importantly, the interest in layered media is not just for two-component examples, but ultimately for multi-component layered media. So it is important to consider these cases separately, as is done here.

The analysis is restricted to anisotropic systems. The nature of the grains themselves composing the solid frame material will not be a focus of the present paper. This issue does matter, but it is most important for determining the relationship between the grain constants and the off-diagonal coefficients that are called the β 's in this formulation. These issues have been fully addressed in the earlier contribution of the author [9], and will therefore not be treated again in this paper. Our focus here is on heterogeneous poroelastic media when the

heterogeneity is well-represented via layered porous-medium modeling.

2. Basics of Anisotropic Poroelasticity

2.1 Orthotropic poroelasticity

If the overall porous medium is anisotropic either due to some preferential alignment of the constituent particles or due to externally imposed stress (such as a gravity field and weight of overburden, for example), we consider the orthorhombic anisotropic version of the poroelastic equations:

$$\begin{pmatrix} e_{11} \\ e_{22} \\ e_{33} \\ -\zeta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} & s_{13} & -\beta_1 \\ s_{12} & s_{22} & s_{23} & -\beta_2 \\ s_{13} & s_{23} & s_{33} & -\beta_3 \\ -\beta_1 & -\beta_2 & -\beta_3 & \gamma \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} \\ \sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{33} \\ -p_f \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

From here on throughout most of the paper, we drop the δ 's from the stresses and strains, as this extra notation is truly redundant when they are all being treated as small (and therefore resulting in linear effects) as we do here, for small deviations from an initial rest state.

The e_{ii} (no summation over repeated indices) are strains in the $i = 1, 2, 3$ directions. The σ_{ii} are the corresponding stresses, assumed to be positive in tension. The fluid pressure is p_f , which is positive in compression. The increment of fluid content is ζ , and is often defined via:

$$\zeta \equiv \frac{\delta(\phi V) - \delta V_f}{V} \simeq \phi \left(\frac{\delta V_\phi}{V_\phi} - \frac{\delta V_f}{V_f} \right), \quad (2)$$

where $V = V_\phi/\phi \simeq V_f/\phi$ is the pertinent local volume (within a layer in present circumstances) of the initially fully fluid-saturated porous layer at the first instant of consideration, $V_\phi = \phi V$ is the corresponding pore volume, with ϕ being the fluid-saturated porosity of the same volume. V_f is the volume occupied by the pore-fluid, so that $V_f = \phi V$ before any new deformations begin. The δ 's indicate small changes in the quantities immediately following them. For “drained” systems, there would ideally be a reservoir of the same fluid just outside the volume V that can either supply more fluid or absorb any excreted fluid as needed during the nonstationary phase of the poroelastic process. The amount of pore fluid (*i.e.*, the number of fluid molecules) can therefore either increase or decrease from that of the initial amount of pore fluid; at the same time, the pore volume can also be changing, but — in

general — not necessarily at exactly the same rate as the pore fluid itself. The one exception to these statements is when the surface pores of the layer volume V are sealed, in which case the layer is “undrained” and $\zeta \equiv 0$, identically. In such circumstances, it is still possible that both V_f and $V_\phi = \phi V$ are changing; but, because of the imposed undrained boundary conditions, they are necessarily changing at the same rate. The drained compliances are $s_{ij} = s_{ij}^d$, with or without the d superscript.

Undrained compliances (not yet shown) are symbolized by s_{ij}^u .

Coefficients

$$\beta_i = s_{i1} + s_{i2} + s_{i3} - 1/3K_R^g, \quad (3)$$

where K_R^g is again the Reuss average modulus of the grains. The drained Reuss average bulk modulus is defined by

$$\frac{1}{K_R^d} = \sum_{ij=1,2,3} s_{ij}^d. \quad (4)$$

For the Reuss average [13] undrained bulk modulus K_R^u , we have drained compliances replaced by undrained compliances in a formula analogous to (4). A similar definition of the effective grain modulus K_R^g is:

$$\frac{1}{K_R^g} = \sum_{i,j=1,2,3} s_{ij}^g. \quad (5)$$

with grain compliances replacing drained compliances as discussed earlier by Berryman [9]. The alternative Voigt [14] average (also see [15]) of the stiffnesses will play no role in the present work. And, finally, $\gamma = \sum_{i=1,2,3} \beta_i / BK_R^d$, where B is the second Skempton [16] coefficient, which will be defined carefully again later in our discussion.

The shear terms due to twisting motions (*i.e.*, strains e_{23} , e_{31} , e_{12} and stresses σ_{23} , σ_{31} , σ_{12}) are excluded from this poroelastic discussion since they typically do not couple to the modes of interest for anisotropic systems having orthotropic symmetry, or any more symmetric system such as those being either transversely isotropic or isotropic. We have also assumed that we know the true axes of symmetry, and make use of them in our formulation of the problem. Note that the s_{ij} 's are the elements of the compliance matrix \mathbf{S} and are all independent of the fluid, and therefore would be the same if the medium were treated as elastic (*i.e.*, by ignoring the fluid pressure, or assuming that the fluid saturant is air – or vacuum). In keeping with the earlier discussions, we typically call these compliances the drained compliances and the corresponding matrix the drained compliance matrix \mathbf{S}^d , since the fluids do not contribute to the stored mechanical energy if they are free to drain

into a surrounding reservoir containing the same type of fluid. In contrast, the undrained compliance matrix \mathbf{S}^u presupposes that the fluid is trapped (unable to drain from the system into an adjacent reservoir) and therefore contributes in a significant and measurable way to the compliance and stiffness ($\mathbf{C}^u = [\mathbf{S}^u]^{-1}$), and also therefore to the stored mechanical energy of the undrained system.

Although the significance of the formula is somewhat different now, we find again that

$$\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 = \frac{1}{K_R^d} - \frac{1}{K_R^g} = \frac{\alpha_R}{K_R^d} \quad (6)$$

if we also define (as we did for the isotropic case) a Reuss effective stress coefficient:

$$\alpha_R \equiv 1 - K_R^d/K_R^g. \quad (7)$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\gamma = \frac{\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3}{B} = \frac{\alpha_R}{K_R^d} + \phi \left(\frac{1}{K_f} - \frac{1}{K_R^\phi} \right), \quad (8)$$

since we have the rigorous result in this notation [3,16] that Skempton's B coefficient is given by

$$B \equiv \frac{1 - K_R^d/K_R^u}{1 - K_R^d/K_R^g} = \frac{\alpha_R/K_R^d}{\alpha_R/K_R^d + \phi(1/K_f - 1/K_R^\phi)}. \quad (9)$$

Note that both (8) and (9) contain dependence on the distinct pore bulk modulus K_R^ϕ that comes into play when the pores are heterogeneous [3], regardless of whether the system is isotropic or anisotropic. We emphasize that all these formulas are rigorous statements based on the earlier anisotropic analyses. The appearance of both the Reuss average quantities K_R^d and α_R is not an approximation, but merely a useful choice of notation.

2.2 Determining off-diagonal β_i coefficients

We will now provide several results for the β_i coefficients, and then follow the results with a general proof of their correctness.

In many useful and important cases, the coefficients β_i are determined by

$$\beta_i = s_{i1}^d + s_{i2}^d + s_{i3}^d - \frac{1}{3K_R^g}. \quad (10)$$

Again, K_R^g is the Reuss average of the grain modulus, since the local grain modulus is not necessarily assumed uniform here as discussed previously. Equation (10) holds as written

for homogeneous grains, such that $K_R^g = K^g$. It also holds true for the case when K_R^g is determined instead [19] by

$$\frac{1}{K_R^g} \equiv \sum_{m=1, \dots, n} \frac{v_m}{K_m^g}, \quad (11)$$

where v_m is the volume fraction (out of all the solid material present, so that $\sum_m v_m = 1$). However, when the grains themselves are anisotropic, we need to allow again for this possibility, and this can be accomplished by defining three directional grain bulk moduli determined by:

$$\frac{1}{3\overline{K}_i^g} \equiv s_{i1}^g + s_{i2}^g + s_{i3}^g = s_{1i}^g + s_{2i}^g + s_{3i}^g, \quad (12)$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$. The second equality follows because the compliance matrix is always symmetric. We call these quantities in (12) the ‘‘partial grain-compliance sums,’’ and the \overline{K}_i^g are the directional grain bulk moduli. Note that the factors of three have again been correctly accounted for because

$$\sum_{i=1,2,3} \frac{1}{3\overline{K}_i^g} = \frac{1}{K_R^g}, \quad (13)$$

in agreement with (5).

We can also simplify and symmetrize our notation somewhat by introducing a similar concept for the drained constants, so that

$$\frac{1}{3\overline{K}_i^d} \equiv s_{i1}^d + s_{i2}^d + s_{i3}^d = s_{1i}^d + s_{2i}^d + s_{3i}^d, \quad (14)$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then, the formula for (10) is replaced by

$$\beta_i = \frac{1}{3\overline{K}_i^d} - \frac{1}{3\overline{K}_i^g}. \quad (15)$$

If the three contributions represented by (12) for $i = 1, 2, 3$ happen to be equal, then clearly each equals one-third of the sum (13).

The preceding results are for perfectly aligned grains. If the grains are instead perfectly randomly oriented, then it is clear that the formulas in (10) hold as before, but now K_R^g is determined instead by (5).

All of these statements about the β_i are easily proven by considering the situation when $\sigma_{11} = \sigma_{22} = \sigma_{33} = -p_c = -p_f$. Because then, from (1), we have:

$$-e_{ii} = \frac{1}{3\overline{K}_i^d} p_c + \beta_i (-p_f) = (s_{i1}^g + s_{i2}^g + s_{i3}^g) p_f \equiv \frac{p_f}{3\overline{K}_i^g}, \quad (16)$$

in the most general of the three cases discussed, and holding true for each value of $i = 1, 2, 3$. This is a statement about the strain e_{ii} that would be observed in this situation, as it must be the same if these anisotropic (or inhomogeneous) grains were immersed in the fluid, while measurements were taken of the strains observed in each of the three directions $i = 1, 2, 3$, during variations of the fluid pressure p_f . We may consider this proof to be a thought experiment for determining these coefficients, in the same spirit as those proposed originally by Biot and Willis [2,17] for the isotropic and homogeneous case.

2.3 The β_i coefficients and effective stress

Making use of our previous definitions, it is easy to see that the coefficients β_i are closely related to different sort of effective stress coefficient, for the individual principal strain coefficients:

$$e_{ii} = -\frac{1}{3\overline{K}_i^d}(p_c - D_i p_f), \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (17)$$

where

$$D_i = 3\overline{K}_i^d \beta_i = 1 - \frac{\overline{K}_i^d}{\overline{K}_i^g}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (18)$$

and $-p_c = \sigma_{11} = \sigma_{22} = \sigma_{33}$ in the case of uniform applied confining pressure p_c . Then clearly, the D_i 's are completely analogous to the usual Biot (or Biot-Willis [2,17]) coefficient $\alpha_R = 1 - K_R^d/K_R^g$ commonly defined for isotropic poroelasticity.

2.4 Coefficient γ

The relationship of coefficient γ to the other coefficients is easily established because we have already discussed the main issue, which involves determining the role of the various other constants contained in Skempton's coefficient B [16]. This result is

$$B = \left(\frac{1}{\overline{K}_R^d} - \frac{1}{\overline{K}_R^g} \right) \left[\left(\frac{1}{\overline{K}_R^d} - \frac{1}{\overline{K}_R^g} \right) + \phi \left(\frac{1}{\overline{K}_f} - \frac{1}{\overline{K}_R^\phi} \right) \right]^{-1} \quad (19)$$

Again, from (1), we find that

$$-\zeta = 0 = -(\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3) \sigma_c - \gamma p_f, \quad (20)$$

for undrained boundary conditions. Thus, we find again that

$$\frac{p_f}{p_c} \equiv B = \frac{\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3}{\gamma}, \quad (21)$$

where $p_c = -\sigma_c$ is the confining pressure. Thus, the scalar coefficient γ is determined immediately and given by

$$\gamma = \frac{\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3}{B} = \frac{\alpha_R/K_R^d}{B} = \alpha_R/K_R^d + \phi \left(\frac{1}{K_f} - \frac{1}{K_R^\phi} \right). \quad (22)$$

Alternatively, we could say that

$$B = \frac{\alpha_R}{\gamma K_R^d}. \quad (23)$$

We have now determined the physical/mechanical significance of all the coefficients in the poroelastic matrix (1). These results are as general as possible without considering poroelastic symmetries that have less than orthotropic symmetry, while also taking advantage of our assumption that we do typically know the three directions of the principal axes of symmetry.

2.5 Inverting poroelastic compliance

Being in compliance form, the matrix in (1) has extremely simple poroelastic behavior in the sense that all the fluid mechanical effects appear only in the single coefficient γ . We can simplify the notation a little more by lumping some coefficients together, combining the 3×3 submatrix in the upper left corner of the matrix in (1) as \mathbf{S} , and defining the column vector \mathbf{b} by

$$\mathbf{b}^T \equiv (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3). \quad (24)$$

The resulting 4×4 matrix and its inverse are now related by:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S} & -\mathbf{b} \\ -\mathbf{b}^T & \gamma \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{q} \\ \mathbf{q}^T & z \end{pmatrix}^{-1}, \quad (25)$$

where the elements of the inverse matrix can be shown to be written in terms of drained stiffness matrix $\mathbf{C}^d = \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{S}^{-1}$ by introducing three components: (a) scalar $z = [\gamma - \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{b}]^{-1}$, (b) column vector $\mathbf{q} = z \mathbf{C} \mathbf{b}$, and (c) undrained 3×3 stiffness matrix (*i.e.*, the pertinent one connecting the principal strains to principal stresses) is given by $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} + z \mathbf{C} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}^d + z^{-1} \mathbf{q} \mathbf{q}^T \equiv \mathbf{C}^u$, since \mathbf{C}^d is drained stiffness and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}^u$ is clearly undrained stiffness by construction. This result is the same as that of Gassmann [1] for anisotropic porous media, although his results were presented in a form somewhat harder to scan than the form shown here.

Also, note the important fact that the observed decoupling of the fluid effects occurs only in the compliance form (1) of the equations, and never in the stiffness (inverse) form for the poroelasticity equations.

From these results, it is not hard to show that

$$\mathbf{S}^d = \mathbf{S}^u + \gamma^{-1} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{b}^T. \quad (26)$$

This result emphasizes the remarkably simple fact that the drained compliance matrix can be found directly from knowledge of the inverse of undrained stiffness, and the still unknown, but sometimes relatively easy to estimate, values of γ , together with the three distinct orthotropic β_i coefficients, for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

There are clearly many measurements required to determine all these various poroelastic coefficients. Furthermore, the strategy for finding the coefficients depends on available data sets, and whether the porous media of interest are constructed from a homogeneous or heterogeneous set of solid materials, and whether the individual grains are isotropic or anisotropic. It also makes some difference if the pores are round (for granular media) or flat (for fractured media). All these issues have been discussed previously at length, and this discussion will not be repeated here.

The remainder of the paper will concentrate on making use of the general poroelastic equations in situations where at least two and possibly many distinct layers of porous materials obeying these equations are under stress (either quasi-static or dynamic as would occur in a wave propagation scenario). As we will see, the layered poroelastic equations behave somewhat differently from layered elastic equations because there are two distinct additional boundary conditions (drained and undrained) that can occur depending on the details of the excitation itself.

3. Averaging Results for All Drained or All Undrained Boundary Conditions

The two most common boundary conditions to consider in poroelastic media are the drained and undrained conditions. Drained conditions imply that the fluid pressure change is zero while the increment of fluid content in the individual layers may be considered arbitrary. Of course, the total amount of fluid present needs to be properly conserved in the analysis we present, but the usual idea for drained conditions is that the poroelastic systems

is immersed in an infinite reservoir of fluid so that pore fluid is freely available to move in and out of the region of interest. For our present considerations, this situation implies that the layer increments ζ can take arbitrary (small) values, but the fluid pressure is constrained to be a constant value p_f everywhere. So changes in p_f always vanish for drained conditions.

Undrained boundary conditions place the hard constraint on the fluid increment ζ , requiring no flow at the boundaries, so $\zeta = 0$ at all boundaries. These conditions ensure that the fluid pressure p_f does change, since as the boundaries move in or out the pressure on the confined fluid is increasing or decreasing.

Both of these conditions must be approximations to conditions in a generally realistic earth model. We can easily imagine situations where some boundaries between layers (the vertical direction) are plugged, so undrained boundary conditions $\zeta_z \equiv 0$ might be correct while neighboring layers (horizontal direction) might be open to fluid flow (so ζ_x and/or $\zeta_y \neq 0$). We will consider these more general situations in the next section, but for now limit the analysis to that for either *all drained* conditions or *all undrained* conditions. All undrained conditions are also appropriate, as mentioned previously, regardless of the physical boundary conditions if the probe changing the physical variables is a passing high frequency acoustic or seismic wave train or pulse.

3.1 General analysis for layered poroelastic systems

We will now formulate the layered poroelastic earth problem in a way so that both of these standard boundary conditions can be imposed, as needed in any particular modeling problem.

Now we assume throughout the paper that the porous layers are stacked vertically (3- or z -axis) and for this geometry it is easy to see that the three horizontal strains e_{11} , e_{22} , and e_{12} must be continuous if the layers are in solid-welded contact. Furthermore, the vertical stress σ_{33} , and rotational stresses involving the vertical direction σ_{13} and σ_{23} must also be continuous. These conditions from an assumption of welded contact between layers. If contact is not welded, then the system can have more complicated behaviors than we are considering here.

Appendix A summarizes the Backus [20] and/or Schoenberg-Muir [21] approach to elastic layer averaging. The method we present here is a slight generalization of this approach,

taking the presence of the fluid into account. For the drained situation, the influence of the fluid on the system mechanics is minimal (as we shall see). But we should nevertheless have this result available to compare it with the more interesting case of the undrained layers.

Although the shear moduli normally associated with the twisting shear components e_{23} , e_{31} , and e_{12} usually do not interact with the pore-fluid itself in systems as symmetric or more symmetric than orthotropic, we nevertheless need to carry these terms along in the poroelastic formulation for layered systems because of possible boundary effects due to welded contact at interfaces. To accomplish this goal, we will generalize the form of equation (44) from the Appendix. In compliance form, the equations will relate the strains

$$E_T \equiv \begin{pmatrix} e_{11} \\ e_{22} \\ e_{12} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad E_N \equiv \begin{pmatrix} e_{33} \\ e_{32} \\ e_{31} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (27)$$

and fluid increment ζ to the stresses

$$\Pi_T \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} \\ \sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{12} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_N \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{33} \\ \sigma_{32} \\ \sigma_{31} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (28)$$

and the fluid pressure change p_f .

The required general relationship is:

$$\begin{pmatrix} E_T \\ -\zeta \\ E_N \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{TT} & -\mathbf{g}_{12} & \mathbf{S}_{TN} \\ -\mathbf{g}_{12}^T & \gamma & -\mathbf{g}_3^T \\ \mathbf{S}_{NT} & -\mathbf{g}_3 & \mathbf{S}_{NN} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Pi_T \\ -p_f \\ \Pi_N \end{pmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

where, for example, in the orthotropic media considered here we have

$$\mathbf{S}_{TT} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} & s_{16} \\ s_{21} & s_{22} & s_{26} \\ s_{61} & s_{62} & s_{66} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} \\ s_{21} & s_{22} \\ & & s_{66} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (30)$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{NN} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} s_{33} & s_{34} & s_{35} \\ s_{43} & s_{44} & s_{45} \\ s_{53} & s_{54} & s_{55} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{33} \\ & s_{44} \\ & & s_{55} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (31)$$

and

$$\mathbf{S}_{NT} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} s_{31} & s_{32} & s_{36} \\ s_{41} & s_{42} & s_{46} \\ s_{51} & s_{52} & s_{56} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{31} & s_{32} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (32)$$

with $\mathbf{S}_{TN} = \mathbf{S}_{NT}^T$ (the T superscript indicates the matrix transpose). Here all these expressions for elastic compliance refer specifically to drained compliances $s_{ij} = s_{ij}^d$, for all $i, j = 1, \dots, 6$ within each poroelastic anisotropic layer.

All the poroelastic contributions to (29) are determined by γ , \mathbf{g}_{12} , and \mathbf{g}_3 . The scalar γ within the 7×7 matrix in (29) was defined earlier in (8), and is the only term in the 7×7 matrix that includes fluid effects directly through K_f . The remaining pair of vectors contained within the 7×7 matrix in (29) is defined by:

$$\mathbf{g}_{12}^T = (\beta_1, \beta_2, 0) \quad (33)$$

and

$$\mathbf{g}_3^T = (\beta_3, 0, 0), \quad (34)$$

where the β 's were defined previously following (1).

We now consider two examples of special uses of the general equation (29) for different choices of boundary conditions. These two physical circumstances covered in the cases considered are distinct end-members. For relatively high-frequency wave propagation, it is appropriate to consider that the fluids do not have time to equilibrate, and therefore fluid pressures can be different in distinct layers, while the fluid particles do not have time to move very far during wave passage time, so the fluid increment $\zeta = 0$ essentially everywhere. This situation is called the ‘‘undrained’’ condition. An alternative condition is the fully drained condition, in which the fluid particles have as much time as they need to achieve fluid-pressure equilibration, so that $p_f = \text{constant}$. These two limiting situations are clearly connected physically via Darcy’s law, which provides the mechanism to move fluid particles, and ultimately to guarantee that the fluid pressure reaches an equilibrium state. Bringing Darcy’s law actively into play in the equations would result in Biot-style equations which are beyond our current scope. So we consider only the end-member conditions for our present contribution.

3.2 Drained scenario ($p_f \equiv 0$)

Now, recall that, in the drained scenario, changes in pore-fluid pressure are assumed to be zero (or at least negligibly small), so $p_f \equiv 0$ in these equations. Accounting for this condition, the results should (and do) recover the Backus [20] and Schoenberg-Muir [21] results for the elastic parts of the system (found in Appendix A) exactly. Also, we find the additional (expected) result for the poroelastic case that the average fluid increment is:

$$\langle \zeta \rangle = \langle \beta_1 \sigma_{11} \rangle + \langle \beta_2 \sigma_{22} \rangle + \langle \beta_3 \rangle \sigma_{33}, \quad (35)$$

if σ_{33} is nearly constant. Or, if σ_{33} is not uniform from one layer to the next (as might happen due to weight of solid overburden pressure), then the third expression in (35) should be modified, by moving σ_{33} inside the averaging operator. So we have

$$\langle \zeta \rangle = \langle \beta_1 \sigma_{11} \rangle + \langle \beta_2 \sigma_{22} \rangle + \langle \beta_3 \sigma_{33} \rangle, \quad (36)$$

whenever σ_{33} taken to be constant is a poor approximation. The results shown in (35) and (36) are easy to reconcile with the definitions of the β 's, and the meaning of averaging operator $\langle \cdot \rangle$ across all layers. When p_f vanishes everywhere, the final results for the averaging and the various stresses and strains are identical to the results in Appendix A. For the drained scenario, the only difference is the addition of equations (35) or (36).

3.3 Undrained scenario ($\zeta \equiv 0$)

Now consider that the fluid pressure might vary across the stack of layers (as should be expected to happen either because of hydrostatic overburden, or due to fluid injection or extraction at certain chosen depths). Then we can treat this case as well, assuming undrained circumstances, by averaging the fluid pressure itself via $\langle p_f \rangle$. In this case, some knowledge of the fluid-pressure distribution along the stack of layers would be required, as well as some information about whether the undrained condition applies at every interface, or just at some interfaces. Variations might occur if a sealing layer were present to close off flow at the top, or bottom. Both ends might be sealed for some range of porous layers forming a heterogeneous, layered anisotropic reservoir including cap rocks. For this undrained scenario, the fluid pressure in each undrained layer is free to vary compared to all the others; so there

is no constancy of p_f for this case. The averaging condition resulting from the formulation for such a reservoir according to (29) is:

$$\langle p_f \rangle = - \left\langle \frac{1}{\gamma} (\beta_1 \sigma_{11} + \beta_2 \sigma_{22}) \right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{\beta_3 \sigma_{33}}{\gamma} \right\rangle. \quad (37)$$

Proper choice of the range of depth for averaging will clearly depend on the details of each reservoir, and the type of physical probe being used. For example, either quarter- or half-wavelength for seismic waves, when used as the probe, would be typical choices of the averaging depth in this case.

While the preceding part of the averaging for undrained boundary conditions was straightforward, we still need to check what happens when averaging the remainder of the equations. We show the work in Appendix B leading to the general undrained result (63), but just quote the final answer here – being valid for each undrained layer in the overall system:

$$\begin{pmatrix} E_T \\ E_N \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{TT}^u & \mathbf{S}_{TN}^u \\ \mathbf{S}_{NT}^u & \mathbf{S}_{NN}^u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Pi_T \\ \Pi_N \end{pmatrix}, \quad (38)$$

where

$$\mathbf{S}_{TT}^u \equiv \begin{pmatrix} s_{11}^u & s_{12}^u \\ s_{21}^u & s_{22}^u \\ & & s_{66} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (39)$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{NN}^u \equiv \begin{pmatrix} s_{33}^u \\ & s_{44} \\ & & s_{55} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (40)$$

and

$$\mathbf{S}_{NT}^u \equiv \begin{pmatrix} s_{31}^u & s_{32}^u \\ & 0 \\ & & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (41)$$

while $\mathbf{S}_{TN}^u = (\mathbf{S}_{NT}^u)^T$. Once these definitions are used for the undrained matrices, the layer analysis for the system follows exactly the same steps as in Appendix A. Note that we arrived at these results in another (step-by-step) way in Appendix B in order to prove that this is the right answer for the undrained problem. Fortunately, the right answer is also the same as the intuitive answer.

4. Summary and Conclusions

Acknowledgments

Work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy, at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231. Support was provided specifically by the Geosciences Research Program of the DOE Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Division of Chemical Sciences, Geosciences and Biosciences.

APPENDIX A: THE SCHOENBERG-MUIR METHOD

The quasi-static elasticity equations are often written in compliance form using the Voigt 6×6 matrix notation as:

$$\begin{pmatrix} e_{11} \\ e_{22} \\ e_{33} \\ e_{23} \\ e_{31} \\ e_{12} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} & s_{13} & s_{14} & s_{15} & s_{16} \\ s_{21} & s_{22} & s_{23} & s_{24} & s_{25} & s_{26} \\ s_{31} & s_{32} & s_{33} & s_{34} & s_{35} & s_{36} \\ s_{41} & s_{42} & s_{43} & s_{44} & s_{45} & s_{46} \\ s_{51} & s_{52} & s_{53} & s_{54} & s_{55} & s_{56} \\ s_{61} & s_{62} & s_{63} & s_{64} & s_{65} & s_{66} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} \\ \sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{33} \\ \sigma_{23} \\ \sigma_{31} \\ \sigma_{12} \end{pmatrix} \equiv \mathbf{S} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} \\ \sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{33} \\ \sigma_{23} \\ \sigma_{31} \\ \sigma_{12} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (42)$$

where \mathbf{S} is the symmetric 6×6 compliance matrix. The numbers 1,2,3 always indicate Cartesian axes (say, x,y,z respectively). The z -direction is usually chosen as the layering direction, which could be oriented any direction in the earth. But, in many geological and geophysical applications, the 3-axis (or z -axis) is also taken to be the vertical direction, and we conform to this convention here. The principal stresses are σ_{11} , σ_{22} , σ_{33} , in the directions 1,2,3, respectively. Similarly, the principal strains are e_{11} , e_{22} , e_{33} . The stresses σ_{23} , σ_{31} , σ_{12} are the torsional shear stresses, associated with rotation-based strains around the 1, 2, or 3 axes, respectively. The corresponding torsional strains are e_{23} , e_{31} , and e_{12} , where the torsional motion is again a rotational straining motion around the 1, 2, or 3 axis. The compliance matrix is symmetric, so $s_{ij} = s_{ji}$, and this fact could have been used when displaying the matrix. The axis pairs in the subscripts 11, 22, 33, 23, 31, and 12, are often labelled (again following the conventions of Voigt) as 1,2,3,4,5,6, respectively.

The important contribution made by Backus [20] (also see Postma [22]) is the observation that, in a horizontally layered system, there are certain strains e_{ij} and stresses σ_{ij} that are

necessarily continuous across boundaries between layers, while the others are not necessarily continuous. We have been implicitly (and now explicitly by calling this fact out) assuming that the interfaces between layers are in welded contact, which means practically that the in-plane strains are always continuous: so if axis 3 (or z) is the symmetry axis (as is most often chosen for our layering problem), we have e_{11} , $e_{12} = e_{21}$, and e_{22} are all continuous. Similarly, in welded contact, we must have continuity of the all the stresses involving the 3 (or z) direction: so σ_{33} , $\sigma_{13} = \sigma_{31}$, and $\sigma_{23} = \sigma_{32}$ must all be continuous.

Then, following Backus [20] and/or Schoenberg and Muir [21] but — for present purposes considering instead the compliance (inverse of stiffness) matrix — we have rearranged the statement of the problem so that:

$$\begin{pmatrix} e_{11} \\ e_{22} \\ e_{12} \\ e_{33} \\ e_{32} \\ e_{31} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} & s_{16} & s_{13} & s_{14} & s_{15} \\ s_{21} & s_{22} & s_{26} & s_{23} & s_{24} & s_{25} \\ s_{61} & s_{62} & s_{66} & s_{63} & s_{64} & s_{65} \\ s_{31} & s_{32} & s_{36} & s_{33} & s_{34} & s_{35} \\ s_{41} & s_{42} & s_{46} & s_{43} & s_{44} & s_{45} \\ s_{51} & s_{52} & s_{56} & s_{53} & s_{54} & s_{55} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} \\ \sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{12} \\ \sigma_{33} \\ \sigma_{32} \\ \sigma_{31} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (43)$$

Note that this equation, although similar to (42) is quite different because of the rearrangement of the matrix elements and the reordering of the strains and stresses. The expression in (43) is general for all elastic media. In the main text we restrict our discussion to orthotropic media. Assuming then that we are using the correct axes as the symmetry axes in the presentation, all off-diagonal compliances having subscripts 4, 5, or 6 in (42) vanish identically. The diagonal shear compliances s_{44} , etc., generally do not vanish however.

Expression of can be made more compact by writing it as:

$$\begin{pmatrix} E_T \\ E_N \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{TT} & \mathbf{S}_{TN} \\ \mathbf{S}_{NT} & \mathbf{S}_{NN} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Pi_T \\ \Pi_N \end{pmatrix}, \quad (44)$$

where

$$\mathbf{S}_{TT} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} & s_{16} \\ s_{21} & s_{22} & s_{26} \\ s_{61} & s_{62} & s_{66} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{11} & s_{12} \\ s_{21} & s_{22} \\ & & s_{66} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (45)$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{NN} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} s_{33} & s_{34} & s_{35} \\ s_{43} & s_{44} & s_{45} \\ s_{53} & s_{54} & s_{55} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{33} & & \\ & s_{44} & \\ & & s_{55} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (46)$$

and

$$\mathbf{S}_{NT} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} s_{31} & s_{32} & s_{36} \\ s_{41} & s_{42} & s_{46} \\ s_{51} & s_{52} & s_{56} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{31} & s_{32} & \\ & 0 & \\ & & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (47)$$

with $\mathbf{S}_{TN} = \mathbf{S}_{NT}^T$ (with T superscript indicating the matrix transpose). Also we have

$$E_T \equiv \begin{pmatrix} e_{11} \\ e_{22} \\ e_{12} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad E_N \equiv \begin{pmatrix} e_{33} \\ e_{32} \\ e_{31} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (48)$$

and

$$\Pi_T \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} \\ \sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{12} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_N \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{33} \\ \sigma_{32} \\ \sigma_{31} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (49)$$

It is important to distinguish between “slow” and “fast” variables in this analysis, since this distinction makes it clear when and how averaging should be performed. The “slow” variables, *i.e.*, those that are continuous across the (here assumed horizontal) boundaries and also essentially constant for the present quasi-static application, are those contained in E_T and Π_N . So, after averaging $\langle \cdot \rangle$ along the layering direction, we have:

$$\begin{pmatrix} E_T \\ \langle E_N \rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{TT}^* & \mathbf{S}_{TN}^* \\ \mathbf{S}_{NT}^* & \mathbf{S}_{NN}^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \langle \Pi_T \rangle \\ \Pi_N \end{pmatrix}, \quad (50)$$

where $\mathbf{S}_{TN}^* = (\mathbf{S}_{NT}^*)^T$, and all the starred quantities are the *nontrivial* average compliances we seek. They are defined in terms of layer average quantities where the symbol $\langle \cdot \rangle$ indicates a simple volume average of all the layers. By this notation we mean that a quantity Q that takes on different values in different layers has the layer average $\langle Q \rangle \equiv x_a Q_a + x_b Q_b + \dots$. The definition is general and applies to an arbitrary number of different layers where the fraction of the total volume occupied by layer a is x_a , etc. Total fractional volume is $x_a + x_b + \dots \equiv 1$.

Of the three final results, the two easiest ones to compute are:

$$\mathbf{S}_{TT}^* = \langle \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \rangle^{-1}, \quad (51)$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{TN}^* = (\mathbf{S}_{NT}^*)^T = \langle \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \rangle^{-1} \langle \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{TN} \rangle = \mathbf{S}_{TT}^* \langle \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{TN} \rangle, \quad (52)$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is the layer average of some quantity. These results follow from this equation:

$$\langle \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \rangle E_T = \langle \Pi_T \rangle + \langle \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{TN} \rangle \Pi_N, \quad (53)$$

which followed immediately from the formula

$$E_T = \mathbf{S}_{TT} \Pi_T + \mathbf{S}_{TN} \Pi_N \quad (54)$$

multiplying through first by the inverse of \mathbf{S}_{TT} , and then performing the layer average. [Note that \mathbf{S}_{TT} and \mathbf{S}_{NN} are both normally square and invertible matrices, whereas for most systems the off-diagonal matrix \mathbf{S}_{NT} is not invertible. But, this fact does not cause problems in the analysis, because we do not need to invert \mathbf{S}_{NT} in order to solve the averaging problem at hand.] These averages are meaningful because when the matrix equations presented are multiplied out, we never have any cross products of two quantities that are both unknown. [From this view point, Eq. (53) is an equation for $\langle \Pi_T \rangle$, just as the unaveraged version of (53) is an equation for Π_T in each layer.] So simple layer averaging suffices (thereby providing the main motivation and value of this method). Multiplying (53) through by $\langle \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \rangle^{-1}$ then gives the results (51) and (52).

The remaining result is more tedious to compute, since it requires several intermediate steps in its derivation. But the final result is given by the formula:

$$\mathbf{S}_{NN}^* = \langle \mathbf{S}_{NN} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{S}_{NT} \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{TN} \rangle + \mathbf{S}_{NT}^* (\mathbf{S}_{TT}^*)^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{TN}^*. \quad (55)$$

To provide some clues to the derivation, again consider:

$$\Pi_T = \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} E_T - \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{TN} \Pi_N, \quad (56)$$

which is just a rearrangement of (54). The point is that $\langle \Pi_T \rangle$ is then given immediately in terms of the quantities E_T and Π_N , which are both “slow” variables and therefore essentially constant. An intermediate result that helps to explain the form of this relation (55) is:

$$\mathbf{S}_{NT}^* (\mathbf{S}_{TT}^*)^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{TN}^* = \langle \mathbf{S}_{NT} \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \rangle \langle \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \rangle^{-1} \langle \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{TN} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{S}_{NT} \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \rangle \mathbf{S}_{TN}^*. \quad (57)$$

Substituting for Π_T from (56) into

$$E_N = \mathbf{S}_{NT} \Pi_T + \mathbf{S}_{NN} \Pi_N \quad (58)$$

and then averaging, we find that

$$\langle E_N \rangle = \langle \mathbf{S}_{NT} \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \rangle E_T + \langle \mathbf{S}_{NN} - \mathbf{S}_{NT} \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{TN} \rangle \Pi_N, \quad (59)$$

an expression completely determining the remaining coefficients. After some more algebra, the formula giving the final result is:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle E_N \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{S}_{NT} \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \rangle \langle \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \rangle^{-1} [\langle \Pi_T \rangle + \langle \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{TN} \rangle \Pi_N] \\ &\quad + [\langle \mathbf{S}_{NN} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{S}_{NT} \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{TN} \rangle] \Pi_N \\ &= \mathbf{S}_{NT}^* \langle \Pi_T \rangle + \mathbf{S}_{NN}^* \Pi_N. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Equation (60) contains all the information needed to produce the third and final result found in (55).

Another check on these formulas is to compare them directly to those found by Schoenberg and Muir [21]. However, direct comparison is not so easy, since their analysis focuses on the stiffness version of the equations. Our treatment makes use of the compliance version instead. Since the symmetries of the two forms of the equations nevertheless are nearly identical, cross-checks and comparisons will be left to the interested reader.

APPENDIX B: POROELASTIC FORMULAS FOR UNDRAINED BOUNDARY CONDITIONS IN LAYERED SYSTEMS

Using equation (29) as our starting point, we now consider the boundary condition $\zeta = 0$ for undrained layers (meaning that the fluid is actually physically trapped in the layer, or the physical process is so fast – such as high frequency wave propagation – that the fluid inertia prevents rapid movement of fluid particles over non-infinitesimal distances). Depending on the application scenario, this boundary condition might be applied to all layers, or only to just one or a few layers.

We consider first a single layer having the undrained boundary condition. For this case, the condition from Eq. (29) becomes

$$0 = \mathbf{g}_{12}^T \Pi_T + \gamma p_f + \mathbf{g}_3^T \Pi_N, \quad (61)$$

within the layer. Next, the equation can be solved to express the fluid pressure p_f strain dependence in each undrained layer (the layer labels are suppressed here for simplicity) as

$$p_f = -\frac{1}{\gamma} (\mathbf{g}_{12}^T \Pi_T + \mathbf{g}_3^T \Pi_N). \quad (62)$$

Then, substituting this condition back into the expressions for E_T and E_N from (29), we find that

$$\begin{pmatrix} E_T \\ E_N \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{TT} - \gamma^{-1} \mathbf{g}_{12} \mathbf{g}_{12}^T & \mathbf{S}_{TN} - \gamma^{-1} \mathbf{g}_{12} \mathbf{g}_3^T \\ \mathbf{S}_{NT} - \gamma^{-1} \mathbf{g}_3 \mathbf{g}_{12}^T & \mathbf{S}_{NN} - \gamma^{-1} \mathbf{g}_3 \mathbf{g}_3^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Pi_T \\ \Pi_N \end{pmatrix}. \quad (63)$$

To understand the significance of (63), we next find it is straightforward to show that each of these composite matrix elements corresponds exactly to the undrained version of the Schoenberg-Muir matrices. So that,

$$\mathbf{S}_{TT}^u \equiv \mathbf{S}_{TT} - \gamma^{-1} \mathbf{g}_{12} \mathbf{g}_{12}^T, \quad (64)$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{NN}^u \equiv \mathbf{S}_{NN} - \gamma^{-1} \mathbf{g}_3 \mathbf{g}_3^T, \quad (65)$$

and

$$\mathbf{S}_{TN}^u \equiv \mathbf{S}_{TN} - \gamma^{-1} \mathbf{g}_{12} \mathbf{g}_3^T = (\mathbf{S}_{NT}^u)^T. \quad (66)$$

All these expressions follow directly from the form of (63).

Thus, we arrive at a result that might have been anticipated, which is that the undrained layers respond according to the usual undrained conditions in each individual layer. The part of the result that is new concerns the forms of the undrained matrices \mathbf{S}_{TT}^u , $\mathbf{S}_{NT}^u = (\mathbf{S}_{TN}^u)^T$, and \mathbf{S}_{NN}^u , in the now modified Schoenberg-Muir formalism.

This analogy can be pushed somewhat further to include the effective values for the undrained moduli \mathbf{S}_{TT}^{u*} , $\mathbf{S}_{NT}^{u*} = (\mathbf{S}_{TN}^{u*})^T$, and \mathbf{S}_{NN}^{u*} , with formulas entirely analogous to (51), (52), and (55), and undrained constants replacing drained constants everywhere. Since there is nothing subtle about this step, we leave these details to the interested reader.

REFERENCES

- Archie, G. E., 1942, The electrical resistivity log as an aid in determining some reservoir characteristics: *Trans. Am. Inst. Min. Metall. Pet. Eng.* **146**, 54–62.
- Backus, G. E., 1962, Long-wave elastic anisotropy produced by horizontal layering: *Journal of Geophysical Research* **67**, 4427–4440.
- Berryman, J. G., 1985, Measurement of spatial correlation functions using image processing techniques: *J. Appl. Phys.* **57**, 2374–2384.
- Berryman, J. G., 1992, Effective stress for transport properties of inhomogeneous porous rock: *J. Geophys. Res.* **97**, 17409–17424.

- Berryman, J. G., 1998, Transversely isotropic poroelasticity arising from thin isotropic layers: in *Mathematics of Multiscale Materials*, edited by K. M. Golden, G. R. Grimmett, R. D. James, G. W. Milton, and P. N. Sen, Springer, New York, pp. 37–50.
- Berryman, J. G., 2010, Poroelastic measurement schemes resulting in complete data sets for granular and other anisotropic porous media: *International Journal of Engineering Science* **48**, 446–459.
- Biot, M. A., 1962, Mechanics of deformation and acoustic propagation in porous media: *J. Appl. Phys.* **33**, 1482–1498.
- Biot, M. A., and D. G. Willis, 1957, The elastic coefficients of the theory of consolidation: *Journal of Applied Mechanics* **24**, 594–601.
- Brown, R. J. S., and J. Korrington, 1975, On the dependence of the elastic properties of a porous rock on the compressibility of the pore fluid: *Geophysics* **40**, 608–616.
- Cheng, A. H.-D., 1997, Material coefficients of anisotropic poroelasticity, *International Journal of Rock Mechanics* **34**, 199–205.
- Daley, T. M., M. A. Schoenberg, J. Rutqvist, and K. T. Nihei, 2006, Fractured reservoirs: An analysis of coupled elastodynamic and permeability changes from pore-pressure variation: *Geophysics* **71**, O33–O41.
- Deresiewicz, H., and R. Skalak, 1963, On uniqueness in dynamic poroelasticity: *Bull. Seismolog. Soc. Am.* **53**, 783–788.
- Gassmann, F., 1951, Über die Elastizität poröser Medien: *Vierteljahrsschrift der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft in Zürich* **96**, 1–23.
- Hashin, Z., 1962, Elastic moduli of heterogeneous materials: *J. Appl. Mech.* **29**, 143–150.
- Hasselman, D. P., 1962, On the porosity dependence of mechanical strength of brittle polycrystalline refractory materials: *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* **45**, 452–453.
- Hill, R., 1952, The elastic behaviour of crystalline aggregate, *Proceedings of the Physical Society of London* **A65** (1952) 349–354.

- Ji, S.-H., K.-K. Lee, and Y.-C. Park, 2004, Effects of correlation length on the hydraulic parameters of a fracture network: *Transport in Porous Media* **55**, 153–168.
- Jiang, X.-W., L. Wan, X.-S. Wang, S.-H. Liang, and B. X. Hu, 2009, Estimation of fracture normal stiffness using a transmissivity-depth correlation: *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min. Sci* **46**, 51–58.
- Korringa, J., R. J. S. Brown, D. D. Thompson, and R. J. Runge, 1979, Self-consistent imbedding and the ellipsoidal model for porous rocks: *J. Geophys. Res.* **84**, 5591–5598.
- Liu, H. H., and J. Rutqvist, 2010, A new coal-permeability model: Internal swelling stress and fracture-matrix interaction: *Transport in Porous Media* **82**, 157–171.
- Liu, H. H., J. Rutqvist, and J. G. Berryman, 2009, On the relationship between stress and elastic strain for porous and fractured rock: *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min. Sci.* **46**, 792–802.
- Martys, N. S., S. Torquato, and D. P. Bentz, 1994, Universal scaling of fluid permeability for sphere packings: *Phys. Rev. E* **50**, 402–408.
- Masson, Y. J., and S. R. Pride, 2007, Poroelastic finite difference modeling of seismic attenuation and dispersion due to mesoscopic-scale heterogeneity: *J. Geophys. Res.* **112**, B03204.
- Masson, Y. J., S. R. Pride, and K. T. Nihei, 2006, Finite difference modeling of Biot’s poroelastic equations at seismic frequencies: *J. Geophys. Res.* **111**, B10305.
- Neuman, S. P., 2005, Trends, prospects, and challenges in quantifying flow and transport through fractured rocks: *Hydrogeol. J.* **13**, 124–147.
- Paterson, M. S., 1983, The equivalent channel model for permeability and resistivity in fluid-saturated rocks – A reappraisal: *Mech. Mater.* **2**, 345–352.
- Postma, G. W., 1955, Wave propagation in a stratified medium: *Geophysics* **20**, 780–806.
- Pride, S. R., 2005, Relationships between seismic and hydrological properties: in *Hydrogeophysics*, edited by Y. Rubin and S. S. Hubbard, Springer, pp. 253–290.

- Pride, S. R., and J. G. Berryman, 2003a, Linear dynamics of double-porosity dual-permeability materials. I. Governing equations and acoustic attenuation: *Physical Review E* **68**, 036693.
- Pride, S. R., and J. G. Berryman, 2003b, Linear dynamics of double-porosity dual-permeability materials. II. Fluid transport equations: *Physical Review E* **68**, 036694.
- Pride, S. R., J. G. Berryman, and J. M. Harris, 2004, Seismic attenuation due to wave-induced flow: *Journal of Geophysical Research* **109**, B01201.
- Pride, S. R., E. Tromeur, and J. G. Berryman, 2002, Biot slow-wave effects in stratified rock: *Geophysics* **67**, 271–281.
- Pyrak-Nolte, L. J., and J. P. Morris, 2000, Single fractures under normal stress: The relation between fracture specific stiffness and fluid flow: *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min. Sci.* **37**, 245–262.
- Reuss, A., 1929, Berechnung der Fließgrenze von Mischkristallen: *Z. Angew. Math. Mech.* **9**, 55.
- Rice, J. R., and M. P. Cleary, 1976, Some basic stress diffusion solutions for fluid-saturated elastic porous media with compressible constituents: *Reviews of Geophysics and Space Physics* **14**, 227–241.
- Schoenberg, M., 1991, Layered permeable systems, *Geophys. Prospecting* **39**, 219–240.
- Schoenberg, M., and F. Muir, 1989, A calculus for finely layered anisotropic media: *Geophysics* **54**, 581–589.
- Skempton, A. W., 1954, The pore-pressure coefficients A and B : *Géotechnique* **4**, 143–147.
- Stoll, R. D., 1974, Acoustic waves in saturated sediments: in *Physics of Sound in Marine Sediments*, edited by L. Hampton, Plenum, New York, pp. 19–39.
- Thigpen, L., and J. G. Berryman, 1985, Mechanics of porous elastic materials containing multiphase fluid: *International Journal of Engineering Science* **23**, 1203–1210.
- Voigt, W., 1928, *Lehrbuch der Kristallphysik*, Teubner, Leipzig, p. 962.

- Walsh, J. B., and W. F. Brace, 1984, The effect of pressure on porosity and the transport properties of rocks, *J. Geophys. Res.* **89**, 9425–9431.
- Wang, H. F., 2000, *Theory of Linear Poroelasticity with Applications to Geomechanics and Hydrogeology*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Wang, X.-S., X.-W. Jiang, L. Wan, G. Song, and Q. Xia, 2009, Evaluation of depth-dependent porosity and bulk modulus of a shear using permeability-depth trends: *Int. J. Rock Mech. Min. Sci.* **46**, 1175–1181.
- Wood, A. W., 1955, *A Textbook of Sound*, Bell, London, p. 360.
- Zimmerman, R. W., 1991, *Compressibility of Sandstones*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Chapter 6.

Three-Dimensional Wave-Induced Dynamic Response in Anisotropic Poroelastic Seabed. by Cheng-Jung Hsu and Ching Hung *. Department of Civil Engineering, National Cheng Kung University, No. 1, University Road, Tainan 701, Taiwan. Ai, Z.Y.; Hu, Y.D. Multi-dimensional consolidation of layered poroelastic materials with anisotropic permeability and compressible fluid and solid constituents. *Acta Geotech.* 2015, 10, 263-273. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]. Pulko, B.; Logar, J. Fully coupled solution for the consolidation of poroelastic soil around elastoplastic stone column. *Acta Geotech.* 2017, 12, 869-882. The mechanics of vertically stratified porous media has some similarities to and some differences from the more typical layered analysis for purely elastic media. Assuming welded solid contact at the solid-solid interfaces implies the usual continuity conditions, which are continuity of the horizontal strain components and the vertical stress components. These conditions are valid for both elastic and poroelastic media. Differences arise through the conditions for the pore pressure and the increment of fluid content in the context of fluid-saturated porous media. Mechanics deformation and acoustic propagation in porous media. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 33, 1482-1498. Carcione, J. M., 1996. Wave propagation in anisotropic, saturated porous media: plane wave theory and numerical simulation. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 99, 2655-2666. Cerjan, C., Kosloff, D., Kosloff, R. and Reshef, M., 1985. The application of the nearly perfectly matched layer to numerical modeling in poroelastic media. Expanded Abstract, 81st SEG Annual International Meeting, San Antonio, 2947-2951. Chen, J. and Zhao, J., 2011. Application of the nearly perfectly matched layer to seismic-wave propagation modeling in elastic anisotropic media. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, 101, 2866-2871. The mechanics of vertically layered porous media has some similarities to and some differences from the more typical layered analysis for purely elastic media. Assuming welded solid contact at the solid-solid interfaces implies the usual continuity conditions, which are continuity of the vertical (layering direction) stress components and the horizontal strain components. These conditions are valid for both elastic and poroelastic media. Under the same assumptions for each layer, Berryman [26] studied the fluid permeability of layered anisotropic poroelastic media. Cosenza et al. [27] gave a mean to predict poroelastic properties of rocks from in situ specific storage coefficients measurements, with application to transverse isotropic rock.