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The Definition and Calculation of $Q$ from Phase Angle and Hysteresis Loop Attenuation Measurements

Karl B. Coyner
New England Research, Inc.
P.O. Box 857, Norwich, Vermont 05055

Abstract. An inconsistency in the interpretation of experimental stress-strain data for $Q$ determinations is investigated. Attenuation factors ($Q^{-1}$) calculated from the integrated areas of plotted hysteresis loops depend on the location of the origin for the hysteresis loop relative to the definition of maximum strain energy. This origin can be mislocated at one end of the hysteresis loop, as opposed to the center, resulting in $Q^{-1}$ factors approximately a factor of 4 less than those calculated from the phase angle $\phi$ measured between cycled stress and strain ($Q^{-1}=\tan\phi$). Attenuation factors calculated from the ratio of hysteresis loop areas must be carefully interpreted before application to seismic wave propagation.

Introduction

The most seismologically relevant laboratory determinations of rock attenuation and moduli involve the direct measurement of stress-strain data with an applied periodic stress. Seismic frequencies between approximately 0.01 and 500 Hz and strain amplitudes between $10^{-7}$ and $10^{-3}$ have been attained with this technique. The material properties for evaluating high strain, nonlinear attenuation (Minster and Day, 1986), and the interpretation of the physical mechanisms of attenuation, particularly frequency dependence (Toksöz et al., 1987), must eventually rely on experimental data collected with this method. There is only a limited set of laboratory data available. Much of it is contradictory and often improperly interpreted.

$Q$ factors may be calculated from either the phase angle $\phi$ between cycled stress and strain (Spencer, 1981; Jackson et al., 1984) or else from the hysteresis loops generated by...
plotting the stress versus strain data (Gordon and Davis, 1968; Walsh et al., 1970; McKavanagh and Stacey, 1974; Brennan, 1981; Liu and Peselnick, 1983). A comparison has not been made between the two methods. Presumably, they should duplicate each other since the accepted equivalency is $Q^{-1} = \tan \phi = \delta W/2\pi W$, where $\delta W$ is the amount of strain energy $W$ dissipated during a cycle. The area of the hysteresis loop is proportional to $\delta W$ and the area under the increasing load portion of the loop is proportional to $W$. $Q$ values are calculated by integrating these respective areas of the hysteresis loop.

An examination of the two procedures indicates a potential inconsistency. $Q$ values calculated from hysteresis loops can be approximately four times greater than those from the phase angle. In the analysis section of this paper the source of this inconsistency is shown to be the definition of maximum strain energy and the relative location of the origin for zero stress and strain for the hysteresis loop. The accepted definition, from which the equivalency is derived, is appropriate for sinusoidal signals centered about zero stress and strain, i.e., a rock undergoing both compression and tension, for which the origin is at the center of the hysteresis loop. Maximum strain energy calculated for the compressive portion of the loop is approximately 1/4th of the overall peak to peak energy function.

Laboratory measurements, however, are normally biased by a pre-stress. If the origin is taken at the point of lowest stress and strain the measured value for maximum energy stored under the hysteresis loop is approximately a factor of 4 greater than the above definition. This results in a $Q$ factor overestimated by a factor of 4. An accounting of this factor of 4 is significant in comparing various experimental results that have utilized either of the two techniques.

**Hysteresis Loop Analysis**

The time-varying stress $\sigma(t)$ and strain $\varepsilon(t)$ functions for a linear anelastic material deformed by a steady-state sinusoidal stress of frequency $\omega$ and amplitude $\sigma_0$ is given by

$$\sigma(t) = \sigma_0 \sin(\omega t) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon_0 \sin(\omega t - \phi).$$
Since the material is anelastic the strain lags stress in time by the phase angle $\phi$. The strain function may be expanded,

$$\varepsilon(t) = J_1 \sigma_0 \cos \phi \sin(\omega t) - J_2 \sigma_0 \sin \phi \cos(\omega t)$$

to yield "in-phase", $\sin(\omega t)$, and "out-of-phase", $\cos(\omega t)$, strain components of magnitude $J_1 \sigma_0 = J \cos \phi \sigma_0$ and $J_2 \sigma_0 = J \sin \phi \sigma_0$, respectively. The ratio of the components is $\tan \phi = J_2 / J_1$. In the absence of anelasticity the linear stress-strain relationship is $\varepsilon = J \sigma$, where $J$ is a compliance.

A plot of the stress-strain relationship described by these functions is an ellipse with the origin centered at zero stress and strain. This is often referred to as a hysteresis loop. In Fig. 1 is shown a hysteresis loop that was generated by introducing a phase angle of $0.0628$ radians between two sine waves. The maximum and minimum stresses and strains are $\pm \sigma_0$ and $\pm J \sigma_0$, respectively, and the hysteresis loop is traced out in a clockwise direction.

The phase angle and the hysteresis loop are both equivalent expressions of the same anelastic process through which energy is absorbed. A dimensionless measure of anelasticity is the $Q$ factor, which is an analogue of the $Q$ used for characterizing the efficiency of voltage transfer in electric circuits. The inverse of $Q$ may be called the attenuation factor ($Q^{-1}$), two expressions for which are

$$Q^{-1} = \tan \phi \quad \text{and} \quad Q^{-1} = \delta W / 2 \pi W.$$

The first expression is the "loss tangent" and refers to the tangent of the phase angle between stress and strain. In the second expression relative attenuation is obtained from the ratio of $\delta W$, the energy dissipated during one cycle, to the maximum strain energy $W$ introduced into the sample during one cycle.

For the sinusoidal stress and strain time functions, representative of a linear anelastic material, the two definitions are equal. This can be easily shown by considering the hysteresis loop in Fig. 1. Stress times strain is strain energy, hence the areas within the hysteresis loop plot contain all of the necessary information for calculating the relative attenuation energy ratio. The maximum energy $W$ supplied to the material is the shaded area of Fig. 1, corresponding to the
FIG. 1. Hysteresis loop derived from two sine waves offset by 0.01 cycles, or 0.0628 radians, centered at zero stress and strain. The shaded area is the maximum energy $W$ introduced into a unit volume of sample during one cycle, corresponding to the path from A to B on the hysteresis loop. The interior area of the hysteresis loop $\delta W$ is the energy dissipated per unit volume during one cycle. The attenuation factor is $Q^{-1} = \delta W/2\pi W = \tan(0.0628)$.

deformation between points A and B, or the integral

\[ W = \int_{A}^{B} \sigma \, d\varepsilon. \]

The dissipated energy $\delta W$ is the cross-hatched area contained within the hysteresis loop, or the surface integral

\[ \delta W = \oint \sigma \, d\varepsilon. \]
The integrals can be easily solved by noting from Fig. 1 that
\( W \) is approximately the area of a triangle with sides \( \sigma_0 \) and
\( J_0 \), and \( \delta W \) is the area of an ellipse with semimajor axis along
the slope \( 1/J \) and semiminor axis along the slope \(-1/J\). The
lengths of the axes can be calculated from the intersections
with the equation for the ellipse obtained from the
stress-strain relation. The two integrals can therefore be
g eo m e tr ic al ly computed for small attenuations as

\[
W \approx \frac{1}{2} J_1 \sigma_0^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \delta W = \pi \tan \beta J_2 \sigma_0^2.
\]

Substituting for the ratio \( W/\delta W \), it is found that

\[
Q^{-1} = \frac{\delta W}{2\pi W} = \tan \beta
\]

and the definitions are thereby equivalent. For the hysteresis
loop in Fig. 1, \( Q^{-1} = 0.0629 \) (\( Q = 15.9 \)).

For nonlinear materials and large attenuations the
hysteresis loop becomes nonelliptical and nonsymmetrical, with
cusped ends (McKavanagh and Stacey, 1974). In this instance it
is necessary to integrate the areas of the hysteresis loop
directly and to calculate the relative attenuation \( Q^{-1} \) from the
energy ratio. The loss tangent or phase angle between stress
and strain is not singularly defined.

Although the analysis of hysteresis loops is well-known
(see, for example, Lorrain and Corson, 1970), an essential
point is that the stress and strain functions are AC-signals,
that is, centered about zero with equal positive and negative
excursions and a hysteresis loop centered on the origin.
Consequently, the maximum strain energy \( (\approx J_0 \sigma_0^2) \) is attained in
only one-half of the overall peak-to-peak stress and strain
amplitudes \( (2\sigma_0 \text{ and } 2J_0 , \text{ respectively}) \).

If the sinusoidal stress and strain time functions are
DC-biased, i.e., offset so that they are continuously positive,
the definitions of maximum strain energy \( W \), relative
attenuation \( (Q^{-1}=\delta W/2\pi W) \), and the identity of the hysteresis
loop origin can become somewhat confusing. In Fig. 2 the same
hysteresis loop as in Fig. 1 is replotted with the origin at
zero stress and strain. The stress and strain time functions
for this hysteresis loop have been shifted by \(+\sigma_0 \) and \(+J_0 \),
although with the same peak-to-peak amplitudes of \( 2\sigma_0 \) and \( 2J_0 \).
The energy dissipated during a cycle is still the area of the
Fig. 2. Same hysteresis loop as in Fig. 1 but centered at $+\sigma_0$ stress and $+\varepsilon_0$ strain. The shaded area is the maximum energy introduced per unit volume during the hysteresis loop cycle, but this gives an incorrect relative attenuation factor ($Q^{-1}$) for the material at stress $+\sigma_0$ and $+\varepsilon_0$ strain, for which this hysteresis loop is representative (see text).

ellipse, as in Fig. 1, or $\pi \tan \phi J_1 \sigma_0^2$. Maximum strain energy, however, or the shaded area under the loading portion of the hysteresis loop in Fig. 2, is

$$W = \frac{1}{2} (2\sigma_0) (2J_1 \sigma_0) = 2J_1 \sigma_0^2,$$

a factor of 4 times greater than before. Accordingly, when $\delta W$ and $W$ are substituted into the relative attenuation definition, the result is

$$Q^{-1} = \delta W/2\pi W = \frac{1}{4} \tan \phi.$$

Since the DC-bias has not changed the phase angle between stress and strain, the "loss-tangent" definition of attenuation
remains $Q^{-1} = \tan \phi$. The immediate and perplexing result is that the attenuation factor calculated from the hysteresis loop areas is 1/4th of that calculated from the tangent of the phase angle.

This apparent inconsistency can be resolved by re-examining the maximum strain energy $W$ relative to the origin of the hysteresis loop in Fig. 2. From the external perspective of the sinusoidal stress driving the material the maximum strain energy is indeed $2J_{o}c_{o}^{2}$. For the material, however, the state of stress and strain appropriate for the hysteresis loop and energy calculation is not at the origin of zero stress and strain in Fig. 2, but at the center of the hysteresis loop, i.e., as in Fig. 1. Although stress and strain are continuously positive, the material at $+\sigma_{0}$ stress and $+J_{0}$ strain is being cyclically deformed by stress and strain functions with amplitudes of $\pm\sigma_{0}$ and $\pm J_{0}$. Once this reference at the center of the hysteresis loop in Fig. 2 is adopted, the maximum strain energy is reduced to what it was for the hysteresis loop in Fig. 1, $\frac{1}{2}J_{o}c_{o}^{2}$. The attenuation factors from the relative energy attenuation ratio and loss tangent then agree, $2^{-1}5W/2mW=\tan \phi$. This attenuation factor must be associated with the material at its stress and strain condition in the center of the hysteresis loop, $+\sigma_{0}$ and $+J_{0}$.

Discussion

Although the clarification of hysteresis loop analysis for $Q$ determination is straightforward, the inconsistency in interpreting hysteresis loops has propagated through much of the available experimental stress-strain data available, particularly at high strain amplitudes. Therefore an accounting of this factor of 4 is significant, and tends to resolve at least one outstanding discrepancy while decreasing (by a factor of 4) typical $Q$'s for rock at high strain amplitudes.

There are two techniques to measure and interpret attenuation from low-frequency stress-strain data. Either the phase angle is measured directly (Spencer, 1981; Jackson et al., 1984) or else the hysteresis loop is plotted out and the areas integrated (Gordon and Davis, 1968; Walsh et al., 1970; McKavanagh and Stacey, 1974; Brennan, 1981; Liu and Peselnick,
1983; Coyner, 1987). Hysteresis loop integration of the areas shown in Fig. 2 and discussed in the analysis section leads to a relative attenuation Q factor that is greater than the loss tangent Q (tanδ) by a factor of 4. Therefore, in most instances the Q factors obtained by analyzing the areas of hysteresis loops have to be decreased by a factor of 4. This is particularly true if they are to be interpreted and compared with the Q factor results of other experimental techniques (field observations, resonant bar, ultrasonic).

In Table 1 is a tabulation of experimental Q factors from previous, low frequency, stress-strain results on room dry and vacuum dry rocks that were measured with either the phase angle or plotted hysteresis loop technique. The list of "reported" Q factors is collected from the respective references. The list of "corrected" values is suggested from the analysis results of this paper, i.e., reported Q's divided by a factor of 4. Only Spencer (1981) and Jackson et al. (1984) measured the phase angle directly and, consequently, their results do not require correction (References 5 and 7). For all of the others (Table 1) either the plotted hysteresis loops or a statement of procedure indicates that maximum strain energy was integrated under the entire loop, thereby resulting in an overestimation of Q by a factor of 4. Walsh et al. (1970), however, report their attenuation results as relative attenuation, 5W/W, and not as Q factors. Nevertheless, in order to interpret the results as Q the relative attenuations still need to be divided by 4 * 2π.

The strain amplitude dependence of attenuation changes quite dramatically if large strain amplitude Q factors are reduced by a factor of 4. Coyner (1987) found that hysteresis loop attenuation data at large strain amplitudes (>10^-4) was essentially equal to that from the ultrasonic pulse technique. After the correction by a factor of 4, however, the hysteresis loop attenuation factors are the largest (Q's the lowest). This is a far more plausible result, and indicates the significance of strain amplitude on attenuation.

At high strain amplitudes nonlinear friction dominates attenuation, and Q factors are extremely low, on the order of 2 to 50 (Table 1, references 1, 2, 3, and 8). In this group the Q factors for typical microcracked granites cluster in the range from 9 to 12.5 (references 1, 2, 8). The Q of 2 is for a friable, weathered, Cedar City diorite (Walsh et al., 1970).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rock (Dry)</th>
<th>Frequency (Hz)</th>
<th>Strain ($10^{-6}$)</th>
<th>$Q_e$ Reported</th>
<th>$Q_e$ Corrected</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>.0005-.05</td>
<td>$10^2 - 10^3$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartzite</td>
<td>.0005-.05</td>
<td>$10^2 - 10^3$</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite (Cedar City)</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>$10^1 - 10^4$</td>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite (Westerly)</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite, basalt, and sandstone</td>
<td>.003-.1</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basalt</td>
<td>.001-.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>525 (Qs)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>.001-.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>266 (Qs)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>.001-.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>75-125 (Qs)</td>
<td>19-31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone, granite, limestone (vacuum dry)</td>
<td>.004-.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>&gt;500</td>
<td>&gt;500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite (Westerly)</td>
<td>.01-.1</td>
<td>.01-.1</td>
<td>&gt;450</td>
<td>&gt;112.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite (P $&gt; 10$ MPa)</td>
<td>.33-.003</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>400-2000 (Qs)</td>
<td>400-2000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite (Sierra White)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10-10^3</td>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One discrepancy that is resolved when hysteresis loop Q factors are reduced by a factor of 4 is the convergence of Q data of Liu and Peselnick (1983) compared to that of Spencer (1981). Both experimentally measured low frequency, low strain amplitude ($<10^{-6}$ strain), stress-strain data on cylinders of granite sinusoidally loaded at low pressure. A major concern with the results of Liu and Peselnick, however, is a large Q ($>450$) for room dry Westerly granite. This is a saturation condition that contrasts with the large Q ($>500$) observed by Spencer for vacuum dry Oklahoma granite.

These similar results seem unusual since the work of Tittmann (1973) and Clark et al. (1980) has underscored the substantial decrease in Q caused by the presence of volatiles, particularly water. Resonant bar measurements by Coyner (1987) on room dry Sierra White granite found Q factors of approximately 125, similar to those found by Winkler et al. (1979) for Sierra White and Tittmann (1984) for Westerly granite. Therefore the Liu and Peselnick data point appears anomalous because the Q factor is so high for a room-dry rock at zero confining pressure. If the hysteresis loop data of Liu and Peselnick are re-interpreted, and the Q factor decreased by a factor of 4, to Q>112, the room condition Q's for granite all fall within the same range (Q's from 67 to 125). (It must be noted, however, that several different granites are involved, and Liu and Peselnick do not show any plots of hysteresis loops.) Large Q's for typical microcracked granite are therefore preserved for vacuum conditions (Spencer, 1981) or samples under confining pressure (Jackson et al., 1984).

Although modern experimental technique and digital signal analysis favors the direct measurement of phase angle in these experiments, the hysteresis loop shape is still necessary for correct interpretation of linear behavior, i.e., elliptical versus cusped hysteresis loops. Brennan and Stacey (1977) measured the transition of loops from cusped to elliptical shapes as the strain amplitude fell to around $10^{-6}$ but do not show any plots of loop data. It seems reasonable to expect that hysteresis loops should be plotted in tandem with phase angles. The lack of this information makes it difficult to assess exactly how the attenuation from hysteresis loops has been calculated, and fails to document the hysteresis loop shape, which contains information on the nature of frictional attenuation.
Conclusions

It has been shown that direct stress-strain calculations of attenuation can lead to inconsistent results when comparing phase angle with hysteresis loop measurements. Quality factors (Q's) derived from the areas of hysteresis loops must be multiplied by a factor of 4 in order to be comparable to those from the phase angle, if the maximum strain energy is taken as the entire area under the loading portion of the hysteresis loop. Previous experimental data must be interpreted and compared in light of this correction factor. In particular, the strain amplitude dependence of Q is greater than previously realized, and room dry granite can have Q's as low as 2 to 30 at amplitudes greater than 10 microstrain.
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