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The Born and Rytov approximations, widely used for solving scattering problems, are of limited utility for low-frequency electromagnetic scattering in geophysical applications where conductivity can vary over many orders of magnitude. We present four new, relatively simple nonlinear estimators that can be used for rapid electromagnetic modeling. The first, termed the static localized nonlinear approximation, is designed specifically to correct the magnitude of the electric field internal to the scatterer. The second, termed the localized nonlinear approximation, improves the estimate of the phase of the scattered field and includes some of the cross-polarization effects due to bulk wave scattering. Two further new estimators, based on the Rytov transformation (the localized nonlinear Rytov and the static localized nonlinear Rytov approximations) are designed to further improve the estimation of the phase of the scattered field, especially at high frequency and for large scatterers.

Although these approximations are nonlinear functions in conductivity, they are generally much faster to compute than the full forward problem, and are almost as efficient as the Born or Rytov approximations. Moreover, the enhanced accuracy of the new estimators has made us optimistic about their application to low-frequency three-dimensional inverse problems in electromagnetics. The approximations developed in this paper will also be applicable to fields such as quantum mechanics, optics, ultrasonics, and seismology.

INTRODUCTION

The Born and Rytov approximations are widely used for solving scattering problems in acoustics, elastodynamics, electromagnetics and quantum mechanics. The Born approximation and the Born series were developed by M. Born in 1926 [Born, 1933] in connection with the solution of what is now known as the Lippmann-Schwinger integral equation that describes many-body scattering in quantum mechanics. The original Born approximation dealt with the scattering of a plane wave by a localized scatterer in a homogeneous medium (the background medium). Now, it has come to denote any approximation of the integral equation of scattering in which the total field in the integral over the scattering volume is approximated by the field in the background medium. When the background medium is more complex than a homogeneous medium (e.g., a layered medium), the approximation is usually called the distorted-wave Born approximation. In fact, for electromagnetic problems, an approximation using the background field as the internal electric field in the scattering integral was developed by Lord Rayleigh in 1881 [Jackson, 1975].

Approximating the total internal electric field by the background field is reasonable for small material contrasts as long as the scatterer is not too large and the frequency not too high [Born and Wolf, 1980; Nieto-Vesperinas, 1991]. However, in many low-frequency geophysical applications, moderate- and high-conductivity contrasts cause both the amplitude and phase of the internal electric field to differ greatly from background values.

The Born approximation is also popular in inverse scattering since it renders the scattering linear with respect to the material properties. When the background medium is homogeneous, the inverse problem can often be solved analytically in a form that is easy to compute [Ortizaglio, 1989]. Limitations of the Born approximation in a homogeneous background medium can be alleviated by an iterative approach, where the background medium is updated at each iteration and the distorted-wave Born approximation is used [Habashy et al., 1986]. This approach, however, does not always converge rapidly, particularly at high frequencies and for large scatterers. In electromagnetic problems, it is also less effective for transverse magnetic (TM) polarization than for transverse electric (TE) polarization problems [Habashy et al., 1986, 1990].

Related to the Born approximations is the Rytov approximation which assumes a particular functional form for the field (in terms of the exponential of a complex phase function) before linearizing the scattering problem. The Rytov approximation or transformation is widely used in problems where the length scale of fluctuation is large compared to the wavelength, since its exponential representation is thought to be more representative of wave propagation than the algebraic series representation of the Born approach.

In this paper we show that certain modifications of the Born and Rytov approximations can improve their accuracy dramatically. We present new and relatively simple approximations for the internal electric field which largely account for the full scattering. We illustrate these approximations using the electromagnetic response of a spherical scatterer. Results for the new approximations are much better than the Born and Rytov approximations for conductivity contrasts over several orders of magnitude. These new approximations are generally much faster to compute than the full forward problem and are almost as efficient as the Born or Rytov approximations. The new approximations should have wide applicability both for inverse and forward scattering problems in electromagnetics. Distorted-wave Born or Rytov algorithms will be greatly enhanced, not only in terms of speed and accuracy but also in their range of applicability.

The formulation outlined in this paper for the spherical geometry can be generalized to geometries such as rectan-
gular parallelepiped, rectangular cylinders, etc. Complex models can be constructed using these simple building blocks, i.e., rectangular prisms or cells of appropriate size. Furthermore, interactions between cells out to an appropriate distance can be readily incorporated by this formulation.

The general concept may also be readily applied to scattering problems in other fields such as quantum mechanics, optics, ultrasonics and seismology.

THE BORN APPROXIMATION IN ELECTROMAGNETICS

This section develops the integral equation for electromagnetic scattering that forms the basis for the Born and Rythov approximations. In formulating the problem as an integral equation, one assumes that the scatterer or object (of support \( V \)) is embedded inside a background medium, which is not necessarily homogeneous. Scattering from the object is described by a volume distribution of currents induced inside the scatterer. The wave equation corresponding to this representation of the electric field (in nonmagnetic media and with an \( e^{-i\omega t} \) time dependence) is

\[
\nabla \times \nabla \times \mathbf{E}(r) - k^2_b \mathbf{E}(r) = Q(r) \mathbf{E}(r)
\]

where the wavenumber \( k_b \) of the background medium is given by

\[
k_b^2 = \omega \mu_0 \sigma_b + \omega^2 \varepsilon_b \mu_0.
\]

(1)

and \( Q(r) \) is the charge in the volume properties from the background medium,

\[
\mathbf{Q}(r) = \frac{\omega \varepsilon_0}{\eta} \delta^*(r) - \frac{\omega^2 \varepsilon_0}{\mu_0} \mathbf{E}(r) - k_b^2 \mathbf{E}(r) = \omega \mu_0 \sigma(r) + k_b^2 \mathbf{E}(r).
\]

(2)

In these equations, \( \mathbf{J}_b(r) \) and \( \mathbf{M}_b(r) \) are the impressed electric and magnetic sources, \( \delta^*(r) \) and \( \delta^*(r) \) are the permittivity and conductivity distributions, while \( \varepsilon_b \) and \( \sigma_b \) are the background dielectric permittivity and electrical conductivity. In the second part of equation (3), \( \delta(r) \) and \( \sigma(r) \) are the complex conductivities which include the effects of displacement currents.

The solution of equation (1) can be expressed with a dyadic Green's function which is governed by the appropriate boundary conditions and satisfies the equation

\[
\nabla \times \nabla \times \tilde{G}(r, r') - k^2_b \tilde{G}(r, r') = \delta_b(r - r'),
\]

(4)

where \( I_b \) is the identity dyadic.

For a homogeneous background, the solution to equation (4) is [Kong, 1986]

\[
\tilde{G}(r, r') = \left[ I_b + \frac{1}{k_b^2} \nabla \nabla \right] g(r, r'),
\]

(5)

where \( g(r, r') \) is the scalar Green's function which satisfies

\[
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{g}(r, r') + k_b^2 g(r, r') = -\delta_b(r - r'),
\]

(6a)

and is given by

\[
g(r, r') = \frac{e^{ik_b |r - r'|}}{4\pi |r - r'|}.
\]

(6b)

Thus the solution of equation (1) is given by [Kong, 1986; Yaghjian, 1980]

\[
\mathbf{E}(r) = \mathbf{E}_b(r) + \frac{1}{k_b^2} \int_{V_b} d^3r' \tilde{G}(r, r') \mathbf{Q}(r') \mathbf{E}(r'), \quad r \not\in V_b
\]

(7a)

\[
\mathbf{E}(r) = \mathbf{E}_b(r) + \left( I_b + \frac{1}{k_b^2} \nabla \nabla \right) \mathbf{J}_b(r) - \int_{V_b} d^3r' g(r, r') Q(r') \mathbf{E}(r'), \quad r \in V_b
\]

(7b)

where \( V_b \) is the support of \( Q(r) \). The response of the impressed sources in the background medium, \( \mathbf{E}_b(r) \), is the solution of the wave equation

\[
\nabla \times \nabla \times \mathbf{E}_b(r) = \omega^2 \varepsilon_0 \mathbf{J}_b(r) - \omega \varepsilon_b \mathbf{M}_b(r).
\]

(8)

Care must be exercised in using equation (7b) when commuting the \( \nabla \nabla \) operator with the integral operator because of the nonintegrable singularity of the derivatives of the scalar Green's function \( g(r, r') \) at \( r' = r \).

Equation (7), for both internal and external points, can be recast in a form that separates the scattered field into components which we term inductive (due to the vector potential) and galvanic (due to the scalar potential) [Jackson, 1975]:

\[
\mathbf{E}(r) = \mathbf{E}_b(r) + \int_{V_b} d^3r' g(r, r') \mathbf{Q}(r') \mathbf{E}(r') + \frac{1}{k_b^2} \nabla \nabla \int_{V_b} d^3r' g(r, r') Q(r') \mathbf{E}(r').
\]

(9)

Any one of equations (7a), (7b), or (8) can be employed as the basic integral equation of electromagnetic scattering. In these equations, the total field is represented as the sum of the background field \( \mathbf{E}_b(r) \) and the scattered field (the integral terms). The scattered field is generated by the scattering currents (and charges) induced inside the scatterer by the interaction of the total electric field \( \mathbf{E}(r) \) with material variation \( \mathbf{Q}(r) \). These equations are nonlinear in \( \mathbf{Q}(r) \) since the total field, which multiplies \( \mathbf{Q}(r) \), also depends nonlinearly on \( \mathbf{Q}(r) \).

Under the Born approximation the total electric field in the integral terms is approximated by the background field. This approximation gives a representation of \( \mathbf{E}(r) \) that is linear in \( \mathbf{Q}(r) \). In fact, the Born approximation is the first term in a solution of equation (7) by successive iteration. The full series is called the Born or Neumann series. The convergence of this series expansion is of fundamental importance, since such expansions in perturbation series are generally either divergent or very slowly convergent for large contrasts. To analyze the convergence, we will use a dimensionless contrast defined as

\[
\delta = \frac{1}{k_b^2 \max |Q(r)|},
\]

(10)

which simplifies to \((\sigma_b - \sigma_0)/\sigma_0\) when displacement currents are neglected. If one applies the Born approximation to equation (9) one can show that, in the low-frequency
limit, the strength of the induction term in the scattered field is determined by \( k_D^2 D \delta \) (where \( D \) is the upper bound of the distance of any two points belonging to \( V_r \)), whereas the strength of the galvanic term is determined by \( \delta \) (Habashi et al., 1986). Thus the induction term can be made arbitrarily small by either lowering the frequency (lowering \( k_D \)) for a given contrast \( \delta \) or by lowering the contrast \( \delta \) for a given frequency. On the other hand, the galvanic term can only be made small by lowering the contrast \( \delta \). Thus, at a frequency that is sufficiently low, the sum of the inductive terms in the Born series can converge even for large contrasts. The galvanic terms, however, will only converge when the conductivity contrast \( \delta \) is small; that is, the background medium must have a conductivity distribution close to that of the scatterer. This requirement can be met in many cases only by using a complex background medium. If the background medium is complex, it can be difficult or costly to compute both the background field and the Green's function in equation (7). This greatly limits the usefulness of the Born approximation.

In summary, the fundamental difference between the induction and galvanic terms lies in the degree of nonlinearity associated with each term. In equation (9) both the induction and galvanic terms are nonlinear in the conductivity distribution of the scatterer \( Q(r) \), because the total internal electric field also depends nonlinearly on \( Q(r) \). However, the induction term is almost linear when \( k_D^2 D \delta \) is small, whereas the galvanic term is highly nonlinear (unless \( \delta \) is small). Thus the Born approximation, which linearizes the problem in \( Q(r) \), is expected to be much better for the induction term than for the galvanic.

In general, the Born approximation is a weak scatterer approximation that is accurate when the interaction between the internal and background electric fields are small. This restriction limits the domain of usefulness of the Born approximation. However, in cases where the scattered field consists only of inductive effects, the Born series should work well at low frequencies and will not require many terms to converge.

The Rylov Approximation in Electromagnetics

Another commonly used approximation for scattering problems is the Rylov approximation (Keller, 1969; Oxtafigalo, 1985; Samer and Vavasvari, 1970). In this section we review the Rylov approximation in electromagnetics and compare it to the Born approximation.

The vector wave equation for the electric field can be written as

\[
\nabla^2 E + k^2 E - \nabla (\nabla \cdot E) = -i \omega \mu_0 J_r + \nabla \times M_r
\]

with

\[
k^2 = \omega \mu_0 \sigma (r) - i \omega \mu_0 \sigma^*(r) - \omega^2 \mu_0 \epsilon (r).
\]

where \( k \) is the wavenumber of the scatterer. From the equation for the conservation of charge, we have

\[
\nabla \cdot E = \epsilon \nabla \phi - \nabla \cdot J_r.
\]

Thus the vector wave equation for the electric field can be written as

\[
\nabla^2 E + k^2 E - \nabla (\nabla \cdot E) = -i \omega \mu_0 J_r + \nabla \times M_r
\]

\[
- \nabla \left( \frac{1}{\sigma} \nabla \cdot J_r \right) + \nabla \times M_r.
\]

The third term in the left-hand side of equation (14) is commonly referred to as the polarization term, since it represents the effect of the polarization charges in the medium. At high frequencies, i.e., when the wavelength \( \lambda \) is small compared to the characteristic dimension \( D \) of the scatterer and when \( \epsilon \) is smoothly varying, the polarization term is of the order of \( |E|/DA \), which is small compared to the second term of the left-hand side of equation (14), which is of the order of \( |E|/\lambda^2 \). Thus, when the wavelength is much smaller than the scale size of the scatterer, the polarization term can be neglected and the vector wave equation reduces to uncoupled scalar equations for each cartesian component of \( E(\varepsilon) \) (Tanarski, 1971). Furthermore, the third term in the left-hand side of equation (14) does not contribute to the scattered field outside the support of the scatterer since it can be shown that it represents a "nonradiating" current source (Lindell, 1988). The source-free wave equation governing an arbitrary cartesian component of the electric field is

\[
\nabla^2 E(\varepsilon) + k^2 E(\varepsilon) = 0.
\]

The Rylov transformation consists of representing the solution of equation (15) in the form

\[
E(\varepsilon) = E_0(r) e^{i \phi},
\]

and developing a series expansion for the complex phase function \( \phi(r) \). The Rylov approximation is used in problems where the length scale of fluctuation is large compared to the wavelength, since its exponential representation is more representative of wave propagation than the algebraic series representation of the Born approach. Substituting equation (16) in equation (15) and rearranging terms (Kak and Slaney, 1988; Nieto-Vesperinas, 1991; Sobczyk, 1985) gives

\[
(\nabla^2 + k^2) E_0(\varepsilon) = -\frac{1}{i} |\nabla \phi|^2 = Q(r) E_0.
\]

Equation (17) is nonlinear in \( \phi \) but is linearized under the Rylov approximation by neglecting the first term on the right-hand side of equation (17) relative to the second term

\[
(\nabla^2 + k^2) E_0(\varepsilon) = -Q(r) E_0.
\]

On the other hand, the Born approximation \( E^{(B)}(r) \) of equation (15), cast as a differential equation, is

\[
(\nabla^2 + k^2) E^{(B)} = -Q(r) E_0.
\]

Thus the phase function \( \phi \) in the Rylov approximation is related to the Born approximation for the scattered wave field, \( E^{(B)}(r) \), by

\[
\phi(r) = E^{(B)}(r)/E_0(r).
\]

Clearly, when \( |E^{(B)}(r)| \ll 1 \), the Rylov approximation reduces to the Born approximation. Since equation (17) is exact, the Rylov approximation is valid when

\[
Q \gg |\nabla \phi|^2.
\]
In the previous section, we analyzed the Born approximation in the low-frequency limit. In the high-frequency limit, the Born approximation is accurate when the change in the phase between the wave propagating through the scatterer and the background medium is much less than unity [Rak and Slater, 1988; Sobczyk, 1985]. Thus, in the high frequency limit, the condition for good accuracy of the Born approximation can be expressed mathematically as

\[
|\psi - [k_0 + k_0 D](1 + i\delta) \psi| \ll 1. \tag{22}
\]

which simplifies to

\[
[k_0]D \delta \ll 1. \tag{23}
\]

Comparing equations (21) and (23) it is clear that in contrast to the Born approximation, the size of the scatterer is not a factor in determining the accuracy of the Rytov approximation. The gradient of \( \phi \) is just the change per unit distance in the complex phase of the wavefield as given by equation (16). Thus it is the change in the phase \( \phi \) that is important in determining the accuracy of the Rytov approximation and not the total phase through the scatterer as with the Born approximation.

In the high-frequency limit,

\[
\phi (r) \sim |k - k_0 | \cdot r, \tag{24}
\]

and hence

\[
|\nabla \phi | \sim |k - k_0 | = [k_0] \left| \left[ 1 + \frac{Q}{k_0^2} \right]^{1/2} - 1 \right|. \tag{25}
\]

Substituting equation (25) in equation (21) gives

\[
\left| \left[ 1 + \frac{Q}{k_0^2} \right]^{1/2} - 1 \right| \ll \frac{Q}{k_0^2}. \tag{26a}
\]

which simplifies to

\[
\frac{Q}{k_0^2} \ll 1. \tag{26b}
\]

Hence the condition for the good accuracy of the Rytov approximation becomes

\[
\delta \ll 1. \tag{27}
\]

Thus, in the high-frequency regime, the Rytov approximation is accurate only for small contrasts between the scatterers and the background medium. Moreover, comparing equations (23) and (27), one concludes that for a given contrast, the Rytov approximation is accurate over a larger range of scatterer sizes than is the Born approximation. A schematic diagram showing the range of accuracy of the Born and Rytov approximations is shown in Figure 1.

In the next sections we describe new approximations for the scattered electric field which are similar in spirit to the Born and Rytov approximations but are accurate over a much wider range of frequencies and contrasts in physical properties.

A LOCALIZED NONLINEAR APPROXIMATION FOR INTERNAL ELECTRIC FIELD

Consider again equation (7), the basic integral equation of electromagnetic scattering. For observation points \( r \in V_s \) inside the scatterer, one must be careful in defining the volume integral because of the singularity of the Dyadic Green's function. For interior points, equation (7) can be rewritten as

\[
E(r) = E_0 (r) + \frac{1}{V_s} \int_{V_s} dv' g(r, v') Q(v') E(v'). \tag{28}
\]

where the right-hand side involving \( E(v) \) cancel in the above equation, when interpreted properly according to equation (7). Thus, equation (28) is equivalent to equation (7), but the singularities in the integrands are now integrable as explicitly expressed. Indeed, the integrand of the last integral of equation (28) is now integrable since \( k_0 v' - E(r) \) vanishes as \( v' \to r \) where \( E(v, r) \) is singular.

Further algebraic manipulation of equation (28) gives the following integral equation of the internal electric field:

\[
E(r) = \hat{E}(r) \cdot E_0 (r) + \frac{1}{V_s} \int_{V_s} dv' \hat{G}(r, v') Q(r') (E(r') - E(r)). \tag{29}
\]

where \( \hat{E}(r) \) is a dyadic which we call the depolarization tensor and is given by

![Fig. 1. The range of validity of various approximations. The abscissa is \( \xi = \log (\delta) \), where \( \delta \) is the contrast in material properties (defined in equation (6)). The ordinate is the logarithm of the product of the background wavenumber and a characteristic dimension of the scatterer. The parameter \( a \) is a negative number such that \( e^a < 1 \). The Rytov approximation is valid in the range \( k_0 D \delta > 1 \) and \( a < 1 \). The Born approximation is valid in the range \( k_0 D \delta < 1 \) in the high-frequency regime \( k_0 D > 1 \), in the low-frequency regime \( k_0 D < 1 \), the galvanic part of the scattered field is valid under the Born approximation in the range \( \delta \ll 1 \), whereas the induction part is valid in the range \( k_0 D \delta \ll 1 \). The new approximations introduced in this paper have a range of validity which extends beyond the shaded zones and into the unshaded area.](image-url)
\[
\hat{\Gamma}(r) = \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{1}{k_0^2} \nabla \nabla \right) \int_{V_s} dr' \, g(r, r') Q(r') \right]^{-1}.
\]

(30)

Under the Born approximation, the electric field in the integral over the volume of the scatterer is simply approximated by the background electric field. An alternative approximation for the electric field in the integral of the electric field is given by the first term in equation (29)

\[
E(r) = \hat{\Gamma}(r) \cdot E_0(r), \quad r \in V_s.
\]

(31)

An argument in favor of this approximation is as follows: from the singular nature of \( \hat{\Gamma}(r, r') \) at \( r' = r \) one may expect that the dominant contribution to the integral in equation (7) comes from points in the vicinity of \( r' = r \). If the internal electric field \( E(r') \) is approximated by its value at \( r' = r \), the second term in equation (28) gives the full approximation of the scattered field, with an error given by the third term. This approximation is particularly appropriate if the internal electric field is a smoothly varying function of position, since the approximation in equation (31) assumes that

\[
|E_0(r)| \gg \int_{V_s} dr' \, \hat{\Gamma}(r, r') \cdot Q(r') |E(r') - E(r)|,
\]

(32)

\[ r \in V_s. \]

The right-hand side of the above inequality can be expected to be small because \( E(r') - E(r) \) is zero where \( \hat{\Gamma}(r, r') \) is singular, i.e., at \( r' = r \). Hence the accuracy of the approximation depends on \( \hat{\Gamma}(r, r') \) falling off sufficiently rapidly as \( r' \) moves away from \( r \) that variations in the internal electric field from its value at \( r' = r \) are small. We call this approximation given by equation (31) the localized nonlinear (LN) approximation. The approximation depends nonlinearly on \( Q(r) \).

If \( Q \neq 0 \), then \( \hat{\Gamma}(r) \) has a DC limit \( \hat{\Gamma}(r) \) with elements entirely real and different from \( \hat{\Gamma} \). In this DC limit, equation (31) becomes

\[
E(r) = \hat{\Gamma}(r) \cdot E_0(r), \quad r \in V_s,
\]

(33)

which we call the static localized nonlinear (SLN) approximation. It accounts for the difference in amplitude of the total internal field from background field caused by charge accumulations on the boundaries of the scatterer.

Under the localized nonlinear (LN) approximation, the electric field at points outside \( V_s \) is given by

\[
E(r) = E_0(r) + \int_{V_s} dr' \, \hat{\Gamma}(r, r') \cdot Q(r') |E(r') - E_0(r')|,
\]

(34)

\[ r \in V_s \]

and the magnetic field by

\[
\mathbf{H}(r) = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \mathbf{E}(r) = \mathbf{H}_0(r) + \frac{1}{\mu_0} \int_{V_s} \mathbf{E}(r') \times \left[ \mathbf{Q}(r') \hat{\Gamma}(r') \cdot \mathbf{E}(r') \right],
\]

(35)

For the simpler static localized nonlinear (SLN) approximation, \( \hat{\Gamma}(r) \) is replaced by \( \hat{\Gamma}_s(r) \) in equations (34) and (35).

Expanding the depolarization tensor \( \hat{\Gamma}(r) \) in equations (34) and (35) in a Taylor series expansion in \( Q \) shows that the LN approximation accounts for some of the multiple scattering within the scatterer. This is to be compared to the standard Born approximation, the first-order term in the complete Neumann (or Born) series [Newton, 1966], which ignores all multiple scattering.

Also, when applied to a conducting inhomogeneous scatterer embedded in an insulating background, the Born approximation may diverge in the zero frequency limit depending on the source excitation, since

\[
Q(r)/k_0^2 = \text{in} \mathbf{z}(r) \mathbf{E}_0 \rightarrow \infty, \quad \omega \rightarrow 0.
\]

(36)

This is a consequence of approximating the scattering currents inside the scatterer by those induced by the background field,

\[
J_n(r) = \left[ \sigma(r') - i\omega \varepsilon(r') - \varepsilon_0 \right] \mathbf{E}(r)
\]

\[
= \left[ \sigma(r') - i\omega \varepsilon(r') - \varepsilon_0 \right] \mathbf{E}_0(r)
\]

(37)

which gives rise to a charge density

\[
\rho_n(r) = \frac{1}{i\omega} \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{J}_n(r) = -\frac{1}{i\omega} \mathbf{E}_0 \cdot \mathbf{J}_n(r)
\]

(38)

that can diverge in the low-frequency limit depending on the source excitation, since

\[
\rho_n(r) \propto \frac{\mathbf{E}_0 \cdot \mathbf{J}_n(r)}{i\omega} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \omega \rightarrow 0.
\]

(39)

In the low-frequency regime, the background field is a very poor estimate of the internal fields of a conducting scatterer in an insulating background medium. This divergent behavior of the Born approximation is alleviated by the newly developed LN approximation, which produces a finite contribution from the surface charges to the scattered field in the low-frequency limit. Thus unlike the Born approximation, these new estimators should be applicable to applications where the host media is extremely resistive.

A LOCALIZED NONLINEAR RYTov APPROXIMATION

An arbitrary component of the electric or magnetic field can always be represented as the sum of a background field and a scattered field,

\[
F(r) = F(r) - F_s(r).
\]

(40)

As described earlier, the Rytov transformation consists of representing the wavefield component \( F(r) \) in the following form:

\[
F(r) = F(r) e^{i\phi(r)},
\]

(41)

and developing a series expansion for the complex phase function \( \phi(r) \). Comparing equations (40) and (41), gives

\[
\phi(r) = \ln \left( \frac{F_s(r)}{F(r)} \right).
\]

(42)
Assuming $|F_s/F_b| < 1$, invoking the Taylor series expansion of the logarithmic function, and retaining only the first term gives the following approximate representation of $\phi(r)$

$$
\phi(r) = \frac{F_s(r)}{F_b(r)}.
$$

and hence

$$
F_b(r) = F_s(r) \exp \left( \frac{F_s(r)}{F_b(r)} \right).
$$

Replacing $F_s(r)$ by its first-order Born approximation, $F_s^{(B)}(r)$, we obtain the standard Rytov approximation denoted by $F_b^{(R)}(r)$

$$
F_b^{(R)}(r) = F_s^{(B)}(r) \exp \left( \frac{F_s^{(B)}(r)}{F_b^{(B)}(r)} \right).
$$

Replacing $F_s(r)$ by its static localized nonlinear (SLN) approximation $F_s^{(SLN)}(r)$ gives a new approximation, which we call the static localized nonlinear Rytov (SLNR) approximation denoted by $F_b^{(SLNR)}(r)$

$$
F_b^{(SLNR)}(r) = F_s^{(SLN)}(r) \exp \left( \frac{F_s^{(SLN)}(r)}{F_b^{(SLN)}(r)} \right).
$$

Finally, replacing $F_s(r)$ by its localized nonlinear (LN) approximation $F_s^{(LN)}(r)$ gives another new approximation, which we call the localized nonlinear Rytov (LNR) approximation denoted by $F_b^{(LNR)}(r)$

$$
F_b^{(LNR)}(r) = F_s^{(LN)}(r) \exp \left( \frac{F_s^{(LN)}(r)}{F_b^{(LN)}(r)} \right).
$$

The accuracy of all of these approximations is tested numerically in the next two sections. We show that these approximations agree well with exact computations, even in the case when the condition $|F_s/F_b| < 1$ is not satisfied.

**APPLICATION TO A SPHERICAL SCATTERER**

The approximations developed in the previous section depend on the geometry of the scatterer. To illustrate the computation of these approximations and also to demonstrate their improvements over the Born and Rytov approximations, we study in detail a uniformly conducting spherical scatterer, of complex conductivity $\sigma_s$, embedded in a uniform whole space, of complex conductivity $\sigma_s$.

In Appendix A, we explicitly express the internal electric field, in the LN approximation, in terms of the background field and functions which are solely dependent on geometry, frequency, and the conductivity of the background medium. The expression for the internal electric field in the LN approximation is given explicitly as

$$
E(r) = \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta\sigma}{\sigma_s} h(r) \right)^{-1} \left[ E_b(r) + \frac{\Delta\sigma}{\sigma_s} p(r) \left( \frac{F_s(r)}{F_b(r)} \right) \right], \quad r \in V_s.
$$

where

$$
\Delta\sigma = \sigma_s - \sigma_b.
$$

with the prime indicating real part, and

$$
\tilde{h}(r) = k_b^2 f(r) + \frac{f'(r)}{r} = -1 + \frac{\psi(k_b \rho)}{k_b^2} \left[ \frac{\cos(k_b \rho)}{k_b^2} - \frac{\sin(k_b \rho)}{(k_b \rho)^2} \right].
$$

$$
\tilde{p}(r) = f'(r) - \frac{f''(r)}{r} = -\frac{\psi(k_b \rho)}{k_b^2} \left[ \frac{\sin(k_b \rho)}{k_b^2} - \frac{3 \cos(k_b \rho)}{(k_b \rho)^2} \right].
$$

$$
\tilde{g}(r) = \int_{V_s} d\tau' g(r, \tau') = \frac{1}{k_b^2} \left[ 1 + \frac{\psi(k_b \rho)}{k_b^2} \sin(k_b \rho) \right] \frac{1}{(k_b \rho)^2}.
$$

$$
\psi(k_b \rho) = \left( 1 - (i k_b \rho) e^{i k_b \rho} \right).
$$

The primes on the function $f$ in equation (50) denote differentiation with respect to the argument. The low-frequency asymptotes of these expressions, when $|k_b \rho| \ll 1$, are

$$
h(r) \approx -1 - \frac{1}{2} (k_b \rho)^2 = -\frac{2}{15} (k_b \rho)^2.
$$

$$
p(r) \approx -\frac{1}{3} (k_b \rho)^2.
$$

In the DC limit, we have

$$
h(r) \to -\frac{1}{3} \quad \text{as} \quad r \to 0
$$

$$
p(r) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad r \to 0
$$

and therefore from equations (A2) and (A10) of Appendix A, we obtain

$$
\tilde{f}(r) = \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta\sigma}{\sigma_s} \right) \left( \frac{3 \sigma_s}{\sigma} \right)^{-1} \tilde{E}_b(r), \quad r \in V_s.
$$

From equations (33) and (54) the internal electric field under the SLN approximation is given by

$$
E(r) = \left( \frac{3 \sigma_s}{\sigma + 2 \sigma_b} \right) \tilde{E}_b(r), \quad r \in V_s.
$$

From equation (48b) it is clear that the internal electric field, under the localized nonlinear (LN) approximation, is given by the background field modified by an additive and a multiplicative factor. The additive factor corrects mainly for the phase and slightly for the amplitude. It also estimates
cross-polarization effects due to the scatterer. The multiplicative factor corrects primarily for the amplitude and slightly for the phase. The simpler SLN estimator, with \( \phi(r) = 0 \), is only a multiplicative factor, and thus equation (35) contains no cross-polarization terms.

With the internal electric field estimated by either equation (35) or equation (48), the SLN or the LN approximations to the corresponding external scattered electric and magnetic fields follow from equations (34) and (35). This then allows the computation of the SLNR and LNR approximations from equations (46) and (47), respectively.

For most geophysical applications the fields outside the scatterer are of principle interest. We will examine the accuracy of the approximations derived above for the external scattered electric and magnetic fields and also the internal total electric field (Appendix C) by comparing the estimated solutions with an exact solution for a sphere over a wide range of conductivity contrasts between the scatterer and the background medium.

**Comparison of Approximations With Exact Solutions: External Scattered Magnetic Field**

Formulation of the depolarization tensor for a spherical scatterer in a dipolar field is straightforward. The main reason for using this configuration is that we are able to compare the approximations to an accurate benchmark solution for full-wave scattering from a sphere in a conducting background (R. W. Groom and T. M. Habashy, manuscript in preparation, 1992) for an arbitrarily positioned and oriented magnetic dipole. The formulations used to calculate the estimated scattered fields are given in Appendix B.

Figure 2 illustrates the model, coordinate system, and symbols for the models used. In most geophysical applications the magnetic field is of primary interest. Thus we begin our examination of the accuracy of the new estimators as compared to the Born and Rytov approximations by computing solutions for the scattered magnetic field \( \mathbf{H}_s(\mathbf{r}) \) external to the scatterer. In our first example (Figure 3), the source is situated at \( \mathbf{r}_s = (r_s, \theta_s, \phi_s) = (10, 90^\circ, -90^\circ) \) and the receiver at \( \mathbf{r}_r = (10, 45^\circ, 0^\circ) \). Initially, we begin with a small sphere (\( R = 1 \) m), as the Born approximation is expected to be most accurate for small scatterers. The receiver \( \mathbf{r}_r \) is in the far field relative to the sphere radius and the primary fields are relatively uniform over the scatterer. In addition, we use a moderately low frequency, \( f = 100 \) Hz, primarily to examine the ability of the static estimator (SLN) to improve the approximations of the amplitude of the scattered fields. Figure 3 compares the true solution for \( \mathbf{H}_s \) to the various approximations as a function of the conductivity ratio between the sphere and the background. At this receiver location, \( \mathbf{H}_s \) is the dominant scattered magnetic field component, and at this frequency it is essentially in-phase with the primary field. The background conductivity is kept constant at 0.1 S/m, while the conductivity of the scatterer is varied.

The SLN static approximation provides very good estimates of the true solution over 5 orders of magnitude of conductivity contrast. At this frequency, the scattered field amplitude and the amplitudes of the scattered field approximations are small compared to the background. Thus the Rytov extension to the SLN (the SLNR approximation, equation (46)) provides no additional correction, and the Rytov approximation is almost identical to the Born approximation (equation (45)). At this frequency, the full LN and SLN approximations are virtually identical as there are no phase variations within the scatterer relative to the background field. Since the LN and SLN approximations are identical, the SLNR and LNR approximations must necessarily be equivalent.

The Born and Rytov approximations, on the other hand, are inaccurate except when the conductivity contrast \( \delta \) is extremely small. In particular, both approximations very quickly overestimate the magnitude of the scattered field when the sphere is more conducting than the host. Because the scattering currents induced inside the scatterer are represented by \( (\Delta \mathbf{E}_s) \) for the Born approximation, the scattered magnetic field very quickly becomes proportional to sphere's conductivity. In the exact solution, on the other...
hand, the internal electric field eventually saturates and the scattered magnetic field does not increase linearly with $\Delta \sigma$. For a resistive sphere, under the Born approximation, the internal scattering currents are soon approximated by $(-n B_0)\delta_x \approx 0$, and the magnetic field amplitude asymptotes to a value that underestimates the true response.

The second example is a much larger sphere with 30 m radius. The sphere size is now comparable to the distance to the receiver as well as the transmitter. Measured in sphere radii, the transmitter is closer to the sphere (slightly more than 3 radii) and the receiver is also closer (only 2 radii) than in the previous example. There is now a significant scattered $H_z$ field as well as $H_y$. In Figure 4a we plot the amplitude of $H_y$ as given by the true solution (sphere), and the various approximations.

The Born approximation increases in amplitude linearly with conductivity contrast. Because of the corresponding exponential rise in amplitude in the Rylov approximation (equation 45), the total field estimate approaches a vanishing value for high values of conductivity contrast and hence the scattered field saturates to the negative of the background field (see equations 43 and 45). The Born and Rylov approximations are only accurate when the conductivity contrast $\delta$ is very small. At this relatively low frequency, the amplitudes of the scattered fields are still quite small compared to the background, and therefore there is little difference between the LN and SLN approximations and their Rylov extensions. The frequency is still low enough that there is no appreciable phase difference between the total field and the background field and thus the LN and SLN approximations are equivalent. All four new approximations match the scattered field closely for both conducting and resistive spheres. There is a small but consistent error in the approximations for conductivity ratios around 100. The discrepancy is much larger in the $H_z$ component (Figure 4b) for which there is a sharp drop in the true field amplitude for ratios around 100. The scattered $H_z$ amplitude has a minimum just outside the sphere (coinciding with a peak in the scattered $H_y$ amplitudes indicating a rotation of the vector field. The amplitude of the vector scattered field (not shown here) has a slight minimum for a ratio about 80 and then begins to rise again for larger ratios. These characteristics are not predicted by the any of the approximations. In addition, the new approximations underestimate the high conductivity asperity for the $H_z$ component.

As the sphere size becomes larger or frequencies become higher, all field components of the secondary field $H_y$ become significant, as does the quadrature scattered field. To study the approximations, we use a normalized residual between the true solution and a given approximation defined as

$$r = \frac{\|H - H_{\text{approx}}\|}{\|H_{\text{approx}}\|} \quad (56)$$

Fig. 5. The residual error norm $r = \|H - H_{\text{approx}}\|/\|H_{\text{approx}}\|$ plotted as a function of sphere radius. The sphere and background conductivities are fixed at 1.0 and 0.3 S/m, respectively, the frequency is 100 Hz, and the Rx and Tx locations are as in Figure 4. The new estimators have errors less than 0.1% for small spheres, rising to between 15% and 25% for a 58 m radius sphere.
where \( \hat{H} \) represents the estimated scattered magnetic field vector and \( k \) is the Euclidean norm. In Figure 5 we compare the approximations for a fixed frequency, background, and sphere conductivity as the sphere radius is varied. The Rx and Tx positions are as in the second example. The new approximations provide extremely good estimates for small scatterers (error less than 0.1%), but as the sphere radius becomes larger the approximations become somewhat poorer. The LN, SLN, and LNR approximations estimate the scattered field most accurately, giving an error of about 20% when the observation point is just outside the sphere (the sphere radius is 58 m). It should be noted that as the sphere size increases, the Rx position becomes progressively closer to the sphere, and thus part of the errors in the new approximations is caused by the increasing complexity of the scattered fields as the scatterer boundary is approached. The Born and Rytov approximations (not shown) overshoot the amplitude by a factor of 3, as was seen in earlier examples for this conductivity ratio.

Figure 6 examines the residual norm for the model used in Figure 4 for conductivity ratios covering five orders of magnitude. We see that the new estimators provide exceptionally good estimates for a resistive inclusion, with the localized nonlinear (LN) approximation providing a slightly better estimate (1% error) than the SLN (1.5% error) and SLN and LNR estimates (around 5% error). We have found that for resistive scatterers, the LN estimator is the best approximation, while its Rytov extension (LNR) is the worst. For a conducting inclusion the approximations provide good estimates for all three components up to contrast ratios around 20 where errors exceed 20%. Due to phase rotation of the scattered field, the LN is slightly better than the SLN, while the SLN and LN are essentially equivalent. As the contrast ratio becomes higher, we found that the approximations significantly underestimate the magnitude and phase of the scattered \( H_z \), and the norm thus approaches unity.

![Figure 6](image_url)

**Fig. 6.** The residual norm plotted as a function of conductivity ratio for a sphere of radius 30 m and a frequency of 100 Hz. The receiver and transmitter are as in Figure 4. Errors are less than 10% for conductivity ratios less than 10.

As frequency increases, the physics of the scattering changes as the effect of charges becomes less significant and induction becomes more significant. In Figures 7 and 8 we examine the accuracy of the approximations as a function of frequency. The conductivity ratio is fixed at 10, as in the previous example, and the sphere radius is 30 m. First, we examine just the SLN and LN approximations. Figure 7 compares the amplitude of the estimated solution to that of the true solution by plotting their ratio as a function of frequency. The amplitude is given very accurately by both approximations for frequencies up to 500 Hz. Thereafter the LN approximation provides a better estimate of amplitude.
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**Fig. 7.** The ratio of estimated to true amplitude of scattered \( H_z \) for the Born, SLN, and LN plotted as a function of frequency for the model in Figure 4. The new estimators are valid over a wide frequency range but become too large at high frequency. The LN provides a good estimate for this model well into the kilohertz range.
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**Fig. 8.** The difference between the phase of the scattered \( H_z \) component for the true and the estimated solution as a function of frequency for the model in Figure 4. The LN estimator provides a phase improvement of up to 15° over the Born and SLN approximation, but the phase error becomes substantial at higher frequencies.
At high frequencies, the true total field becomes small compared to the background field and thus the scattered field approaches the negative of the background. It is therefore appropriate, at such frequencies, to compare the accuracy of the approximations to the total field rather than scattered field as in the earlier figures. Since the background field decreases rapidly in amplitude as the frequency increases, we plot ratio of total field to background field. In this case, it is useful to compare the phase function estimates (equation (41)) of the various Rylov approximations to the logarithm of the ratio of the total field to the background field. The exact total field becomes small compared to the background field as the frequency increases. The Rylov approximation overestimates this decay, so that the Rylov estimate of the total field quickly vanishes with respect to the background field. The LNR and SLNR provide accurate estimates of the total field amplitude for frequencies up to several kilohertz. For two decades higher, they slightly underestimate the decay rate, and then beyond 100 kHz they overestimate the total field which decays to zero. The imaginary part of the phase function is the phase of the total field compared to the background. The Rylov approximation overestimates this phase rotation at all frequencies, while the two new Rylov approximations (SLNR and LNR) provide accurate estimates for frequencies up to several kilohertz. Therefore, the SLNR provides the best estimate of the phase rotation until the imaginary part of the exact phase function asymptotes after 10 kHz.

The phase error of the estimates is also a function of the conductivity ratio. In Figure 10, we look more closely at the phase of the scattered $\mathbf{H}$ field component for both resistive
and conductive inclusions at an excitation frequency of 1 kHz within the range of accuracy of the Rytov extensions, SLNR and LNR as demonstrated in Figure 9. The LN approximation provides extremely accurate phase estimates for resistive scatterers (conductivity ratios less than 1), while the phase of the SLN approximation becomes significant in error for large ratios. The Rytov and the SLNR approximations underestimate the phase anomaly by about 5°, while the LNR approximation overestimates the phase anomaly by about 5°. The phase anomaly is relatively small for resistive inclusions, and the mismatch is never large. The LN approximation provides the best estimates. For conducting spheres, however, the phase anomaly can become substantial. As the sphere becomes more conducting the phase of the scattered field deviates from that of the background by more than 25° for conductivity ratios larger than 30. The localized nonlinear approximation tracks this phase anomaly initially but underestimates the large-ratio asymptote by around 10°. The SLNR provides a better estimate than the SLN estimate, while the LNR approximation tracks the phase anomaly best for large ratios of conductivity, being in error by less than 5°.

The accuracy of the approximations is not only a function of conductivity ratio, frequency, and size of the scatterer but is also a function of the geometry of the exciting field and the location of the receiver. In Figure 11 we plot the residual norm for the localized nonlinear approximation as the origin of a 30-m-radius sphere is varied for fixed transmitter and receiver locations, conductivity, and frequency. The center of the spherical scatterer is moved within the plane $z = 35$ m. The transmitter is located below the white cross at $Z = 0$ and is oriented normal to the plane. Thus the spherical scatterers come within 5 m of the Tx-Rx plane. The receiver location is 200 m away from the transmitter, below the black cross. The frequency of excitation is 100 Hz so that the LN approximation is sufficient. The LNR approximation is very good over most of the region except when the sphere is
located above the transmitter, where a maximum error of 45% is obtained. Figure 12 shows a section view of the same model, with the plane of the sphere centered at \( X = 35 \) m. Again, the estimator is very good except when the source is near the scatterer and is poorest when the scatterer is near the axis of the source. The misfit of the approximations is associated, at least partly, with the geometry of the scatterer. This is directly related to the geometry of the total internal electric field which we examine more closely in Appendix C. Also, in Appendix C, we include an example of the external scattered electric field estimates from the new approximations.

**Discussion and Conclusions**

In electromagnetic scattering from a conductive inclusion, the Born and Rytov approximations give accurate estimates of the scattered field only when the contrasts in physical property and scatterer size are small. For example, at 100 Hz the Born approximation is accurate to within 20% for a 1-m sphere located 10 m from both the source and receiver for conductivity contrasts of 1:1.5. The error rises rapidly to 40% at a conductivity contrast of 1:10. The static localized nonlinear (SLN) approximation provides a significantly improved estimate of the amplitudes of the scattered fields for a wide range of conductivity contrasts, scatterer size and exciting frequency for the 1-m sphere, the error is only 0.5% for a contrast of 1:10. However, as with the traditional Born approximation, the SLN approximation does not provide a good estimate of the phase of the scattered field. The localized nonlinear approximation provides some phase correction and an additional amplitude correction to extend the range of application. These corrections have reduced accuracy for particular source-scatterer geometries, especially on the axis of the dipolar source, and are less applicable at high frequencies with large scatterers. The localized nonlinear Rytov approximation provides mainly additional phase cor-
reactions and some amplitude correction to the simpler localized nonlinear approximation at higher frequencies for larger scatterers and higher positive conductivity contrasts. In some cases, particularly at high frequencies, the static localized nonlinear Rytov approximation is superior to the full localized nonlinear Rytov approximation which is contrary to what one would expect. Detailed studies, such as those described here, should be done to select the most appropriate approximation for specific applications.

To use these approximations for forward modeling, it is first necessary to derive the depolarization tensor for elementary scatterers, such as building blocks for complex geometries such as spheres and cylinders. The formulation outlined in this paper is presently being generalized to geometries such as rectangular parallelepipeds and rectangular cylinders. Investigation of the use of the approximation in multiple scattering interactions must also be done prior to building a forward modeling tool.

The new approximations also open the possibility of fast nonlinear inversion. These new approximations can also be generalized to more complex background media, where they can significantly improve the performance of iterative inversion algorithms based on the distorted-wave Born and Rytov approximations.

APPENDIX A: DERIVATION OF THE LOCALIZED NONLINEAR APPROXIMATION OF THE INTERNAL ELECTRIC FIELD FOR A SPHERICAL SCATTERER

The new approximations depend on the geometry of the scatterer. In this appendix we derive detailed expressions for the internal electric field inside a homogeneous spherical scatterer in a uniform whole space. The technique used here is specific to a spherical geometry. For \( r \in V \), the internal electric field is approximated by equation (31):

\[
E(r) = \tilde{f}(r) \cdot E_0(r),
\]

where from equation (30),

\[
\tilde{f}(r) = \left[ 1 - \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma_0} \tilde{L}(r) \right]^{-1} \tilde{f}(r)
\]

\[
\tilde{f}(r) = \left[ -k_0^2 \tilde{L}(r) + \nabla \nabla \right] f(r),
\]

\[
\tilde{f}(r) = \int d^3 r' \tilde{g}(r, r').
\]

To obtain the depolarization tensor, we begin by expanding the scalar Green's function in terms of spherical Bessel functions and Hankel functions of the first kind [Morse and Feshbach, 1953]

\[
\tilde{g}(r, r') = \frac{i k_0}{4 \pi} \sum_{n = 0}^\infty (2n + 1) \left( \frac{r'}{r} \right)^n \frac{\sin (k_0 r')}{k_0 r'} \frac{\cos (k_0 r')}{k_0 r'}
\]

\[
\cos [m(t - t')] \left\{ \frac{1}{k_0^2} \frac{\sin (k_0 r')}{k_0 r'} \frac{\cos (k_0 r')}{k_0 r'} \right\}, \quad r > r'
\]

\[
\cos [m(t - t')] \left\{ \frac{1}{k_0^2} \frac{\sin (k_0 r')}{k_0 r'} \frac{\cos (k_0 r')}{k_0 r'} \right\}, \quad r < r'
\]

where

\[
x_n = \begin{cases} 1, & m = 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}, & m \neq 0. \end{cases}
\]

Setting the origin at the center of the sphere

\[
f(r) = \left[ k_0^2 \tilde{L}(k_0 r) \int d^3 r' r'^3 \tilde{g}(k_0 r') \right]
\]

\[
+ \left[ -k_0^2 \tilde{L}(k_0 r) \int d^3 r' r'^3 \tilde{g}(k_0 r') \right]
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{k_0^2} \left[ 1 + \frac{\sigma_0}{\epsilon_0} \right] \sin \left( \frac{k_0 \sigma_0}{k_0 r} \right)
\]

where the zero-order spherical functions are given by

\[
h_n^0(z) = -\frac{z^2}{2}, \quad j_0(z) = \sin z z
\]

and

\[
\phi(k_0) = (1 - ik_0 \epsilon_0) e^{ik_0 r}.
\]

Due to the spherical symmetry of the sphere

\[
\nabla f(r) = f'(r) \hat{r}
\]

where \( f'(r) \) is the derivative of \( f(r) \) with respect to \( r \). Thus

\[
-\tilde{F}(r) = k_0^2 \tilde{f}(r) + \frac{1}{r} \tilde{f}'(r)
\]

\[
= k_0^2 \tilde{f}(r) + \left[ f'(r) - \frac{f'(r)}{r} \right] \hat{r} - \frac{f'(r)}{r} \]

\[
= h(r) \hat{r} + p(r) \hat{r}.
\]

Evaluating the derivatives of \( f'(r) \) in equation (A10), we have

\[
h(r) = k_0^2 f'(r) + \frac{f'(r)}{r} = 1 + \frac{\phi(k_0)}{k_0 r}
\]

\[
\left[ \sin \left( \frac{k_0 r}{k_0 r} \right) \frac{\cos \left( \frac{k_0 r}{k_0 r} \right)}{k_0 r} \right]
\]

\[
p(r) = p(r) = \left[ \frac{\phi(k_0)}{k_0 r} + \frac{1}{k_0 r} \right]
\]

\[
\left[ \sin \left( \frac{k_0 r}{k_0 r} \right) + \frac{1}{k_0 r} \right]
\]

\[
\left[ \frac{\cos \left( \frac{k_0 r}{k_0 r} \right)}{k_0 r} \frac{\sin \left( \frac{k_0 r}{k_0 r} \right)}{k_0 r} \right]
\]

The low-frequency asymptotics, when \( |k_0 a| < 1 \), are given by

\[
h(r) \approx -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{k_0 a}{k_0 r} \right)^2
\]

\[
p(r) \approx \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{k_0 a}{k_0 r} \right)^2.
\]

In the DC limit,

\[
h(r) \approx -\frac{1}{3}
\]
\[ p(r) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{(A13B)} \]

and therefore from equation (A10),
\[ L(r) = \frac{1}{2}. \quad \text{(A14)} \]

and
\[ f_p(r) = \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} \right]^{-1} \left[ 1 + \frac{3 \sigma_a}{\sigma + 2 \sigma_a} \right] f. \quad \text{(A15)} \]

Thus, from (A1), the internal electric field under the SLN approximation is given by
\[ E_i(r) = \left( 1 + \frac{3 \sigma_a}{\sigma + 2 \sigma_a} \right) E_s(r), \quad r \in V_s. \quad \text{(A16)} \]

To obtain a closed form expression for the internal field for all frequencies, we invert (A1) for the spherical scatterer
\[ E_s(r) = \left( 1 + \frac{3 \sigma_a}{\sigma + 2 \sigma_a} \right) E_i(r) - \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma} \cdot E_i(r) \]
\[ = \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} h(r) \right) E_i(r) - \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} p(r) \cdot E_i(r) \quad \text{(A17)} \]

and therefore
\[ \hat{t} \cdot E_s(r) = \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} h(r) \right) \hat{t} \cdot E_i(r) - \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} \hat{t} \cdot p(r) \cdot E_i(r) \]
\[ = \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} s(r) \right) \hat{t} \cdot E_i(r). \quad \text{(A18)} \]

where
\[ s(r) = h(r) + p(r). \quad \text{(A19)} \]

Substituting \( \hat{t} \cdot E_i(r) \) from equation (A18) in equation (A17)
\[ E_s(r) = \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} h(r) \right) E_i(r) - \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} p(r) \cdot \frac{\hat{t} \cdot E_i(r)}{1 - (\Delta \sigma / \sigma) s(r)} \hat{t}, \quad \text{(A20)} \]

and thus the internal electric field can be expressed explicitly in terms of the background field and functions which are dependent on geometry, frequency, and the conductivity of the background medium.
\[ E_i(r) = \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} h(r) \right)^{-1} E_s(r) - \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} p(r) \cdot \frac{\hat{t} \cdot E_s(r)}{1 - (\Delta \sigma / \sigma) s(r)} \hat{t}, \quad r \in V_s. \quad \text{(A21)} \]

For most geophysical applications, the secondary or total fields outside the scatterer are the chief interest. The precise formulations used for calculating the fields outside the scatterer are derived in Appendix B.

### Appendix B: Derivation of the External Scattered Fields for a Spherical Scatterer Under the Localized Nonlinear Approximation

In this appendix we derive explicit expressions for the external magnetic and electric scattered fields under the localized nonlinear approximation for a spherical scatterer. The expressions are suitable for rapid numerical calculation.

#### Magnetic Field

From equation (35), the scattered magnetic field is given by
\[ H_s(r) = \Delta \sigma \int_{V_s} dr' \left[ (\hat{t} \cdot E_s(r')) \times E_i(r') \right]. \quad \text{(B1)} \]

Its component along \( \hat{n} \) is given by
\[ H_s^r(r) = \Delta \sigma \int_{V_s} dr' \left[ (\hat{t} \cdot E_s(r')) \cdot \left[ \hat{n} \times E_i(r') \right] \right] \]
\[ = \Delta \sigma \int_{V_s} dr' F_s^r(r), \quad r \notin V_s. \quad \text{(B2)} \]

where, from equation (48) for the internal electric field, we have
\[ \hat{n} \times E_i(r') = \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} h(r') \right)^{-1} \left[ \hat{n} \times E_s(r') \right] + \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} \frac{p(r') \cdot \hat{t} \cdot E_i(r')}{1 - (\Delta \sigma / \sigma) s(r')}. \quad \text{(B3)} \]

We consider an infinitesimal magnetic dipole source oriented along \( \hat{n} \) and located at \( r_s \). The background electric field is given by
\[ E_i(r') = m \hat{k} \times \nabla \cdot g(r', r_s) \quad \text{(B4)} \]

where \( m \) is the source moment. Since
\[ \hat{n} \times (\hat{k} \times \nabla \cdot g(r', r_s)) = \hat{k} \cdot \left( \hat{n} \times \nabla \cdot g(r', r_s) \right) \]
\[ - (\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}) \nabla \cdot g(r', r_s) \quad \text{(B5)} \]

and
\[ \hat{t} \cdot E_s(r') = m \hat{t} \cdot \left( \hat{k} \times \nabla \cdot g(r', r_s) \right) \]
\[ = m \hat{t} \cdot \hat{k} \cdot \nabla \cdot g(r', r_s) \quad \text{(B6)} \]

then
\[ F_s^r(r) = m \left( 1 - \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} h(r') \right)^{-1} \left[ (\hat{k} \cdot \nabla \cdot g(r', r_s)) \cdot \hat{n} \right] \]
\[ - \left[ (\hat{k} \cdot \nabla \cdot g(r, r_s)) \cdot (\hat{k} \times \hat{t}) \right] \quad \text{(B7)} \]
\[ -\nabla \cdot \left( \sigma_0 \sqrt{\sigma_0} r \cdot \mathbf{V} \mathbf{r}, r' \right) + B(x) \left( \delta^{(5)}(r' - r) \cdot \mathbf{V} \mathbf{r}, r' \right) \]  

(B7)

\[ \cdot \left( \mathbf{V} \mathbf{r}, r' \right) - \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{r}, r' \right) + \mathbf{B}(r) \left( \delta^{(5)}(r' - r) \cdot \mathbf{V} \mathbf{r}, r' \right) \]  

For the Born approximation

\[ B_0(r) = 1, \quad B_1(r) = 0 \]  

(B8)

while for the static localized nonlinear (SLN) approximation

\[ B_0(r) = \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta \sigma}{3 \sigma_0} \right)^{-1}, \quad B_1(r) = 0 \]  

(B9)

and for the localized nonlinear (LN) approximation

\[ B_0(r) = \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma_0} \right)^{-1}, \quad B_1(r) \]  

(B10)

where \( h(r'), p(r'), \) and \( s(r') \) are calculated from equation (50). As an example, consider \( \mathbf{a} = 1, \) the origin at \( r_0, \) the transmitter at \( r_1, \) and the receiver at \( r_2, \) and the probed point within the scatterer at \( r_3. \) Then

\[ F_i(r, r_i; r_3) = mB_0(r_1 - r_0) \frac{\delta \mathbf{r}(r', r') \cdot \mathbf{g}(r', r_3)}{\delta x_i} + \frac{\delta \mathbf{r}(r', r') \cdot \mathbf{g}(r', r_3)}{\delta y} \]  

\[ \frac{\delta \mathbf{r}(r', r') \cdot \mathbf{g}(r', r_3)}{\delta z} \]  

\[ = \frac{\delta \mathbf{r}(r', r') \cdot \mathbf{g}(r', r_3)}{\delta x_i} \]  

(B11)

**Electric Field**

The estimated total or scattered electric field outside the sphere are computed by numerically evaluating the volume integral of equation (7) with the internal electric field approximated by equation (51). The scattered electric field is given by

\[ E_s(r) = -i \omega \mu_0 \Delta \sigma \int \frac{dr' \cdot \mathbf{G}(r, r') \cdot E(r')}{r} \]  

(B12)

where the dyadic Green's function is given by equation (5). The contribution to the \( i \)th element of the vector integrand of (B12) from the derivative portion of the dyadic Green's function is

\[ \frac{\delta \mathbf{G}(r, r')}{\delta x_i} \]  

(B13)

where

\[ K_i(r, r') = \frac{\delta \mathbf{G}(r, r')}{\delta x_i} \]  

(B14)

The elements of the dyadic Green's function are simply

\[ G_{ij}(r, r') = g(r, r') \delta_{ij} + \frac{1}{\Delta \sigma} K_{ij}(r, r'). \]  

(B15)

To determine the \( i \)th component of the external electric field at a field point \( r, \) a numerical integration over the volume of the scatterer is performed, giving

\[ E_i(r) = -i \omega \mu_0 \Delta \sigma \int \frac{dr' \sum_{j=1}^{3} G_{ij}(r, r') \mathbf{E}(r')}{r - r'} \]  

(B16)

where the estimated internal electric field \( \mathbf{E}(r') \) is calculated either from equation (48) under the LN approximation or from equation (55) under the SLN approximation.

**APPENDIX C: ELECTRIC FIELDS OF A SPHERICAL SCATTERER—NUMERICAL RESULTS**

**Internal Electric Field**

To better understand the approximations of the fields, we examine in detail the field that is crucial to all the approximations: the total internal electric field. We begin with a
model for which the approximations give moderate accuracy. The radius of the sphere is fairly large (30 m), the frequency is moderate (100 Hz), the conductivity contrast is 10:1 (or $\sigma_r = 1.01 \text{ S/m}$). The sphere is located at the origin, the Tx is located at $\phi = 45^\circ$ and at a distance of 100 m away from the sphere center. The transmitter is pointing along the z axis.

Figure C1 compares the in-phase electric field as a function of radial distance from the sphere center along a profile with a fixed $\theta$ and $\phi$. The true solution for the total field, represented in spherical components, is compared to that of the localized nonlinear (LN) approximation. The radial component ($r, \theta$) closely matches the true solution for all radial locations, while the $\theta$ component ($\theta, \phi$) matches near the sphere center but diverges from the true solution as the surface of the sphere is approached. The $\phi$ component ($\phi, \phi$), although small, has the wrong sign (i.e., wrong direction).

For $\theta = 30^\circ$, Figure C2 examines the residual norm for the total internal field as a function of both radius and azimuthal angle. The residual error is small at the center but increases toward the surface of the sphere. The approximations are more accurate for positions on the near side of the sphere relative to the Tx ($\phi = [-15^\circ, -75^\circ]$) than on the far side ($\phi = [0^\circ, 75^\circ]$).

In general, the approximations do not determine accurately those components of the internal electrical field which become tangential to the surface of the sphere as the surface of the sphere is approached, i.e., the $\theta$ and $\phi$ components. On the other hand, the radial component, which is normal to the sphere surface, is always determined relatively accurately.

The preceding results give some insight into the comparisons made earlier on the external electromagnetic field components. The external scattered magnetic field is determined by a volume integration of the total internal field over $V_i$. Our studies have shown that the main contribution to this volume integration is mainly from internal points which are close to the surface of the sphere. In addition, the gradients in the $\theta$ and $\phi$ components increase with the size of the sphere. The poor approximation of the $\theta$ and $\phi$ components of the internal field away from the sphere center combined with the large gradients of these components for larger spheres, is responsible for the midii of the external scattered magnetic fields.

Fig. C3. The scattered electric fields external to the sphere. The model and Tx and Rx locations are the same as in Figure 4.
The orientation and location of the transmitter determine the relative importance of the tangential and normal components in the determination of the external scattered fields. For example, when the dipole axis of the source intersects the scatterer, the tangential components are relatively larger than when the center of the scatterer is on an axis perpendicular to the axis of the source. For a resistive inclusion, the internal field is only slightly larger than the background field. However, for a conductive inclusion the internal field is often significantly smaller than the external field. Thus, for the resistive inclusion the variation of the tangential components from the center to outside the scatterer is less than for the conducting case. As the frequency increases or the sphere becomes larger, gradients in the $\phi$ and $\theta$ components increase due to inductive loss and phase rotation effects, thereby increasing the inaccuracy of the internal estimates.

**External Electric Field**

For locations external to the sphere the scattered electric field $E_s$ is calculated by volume integration over the support of $\mathcal{Q}$ by the use of equations (B16) and (48).

As an example, we calculate $E_s$ for the Rx position and the model used in Figure 4. At this Rx location, there is only one component of the scattered field, $E_s$. In Figure C3 we plot the true solution and the three approximations, Born, LN, and SLN. The LN and SLN approximations to the amplitude are good to within 1.5% for conductivity ratios up to about 100, beyond which the estimated amplitude diverges from its true value. The LN estimator tracks the phase reasonably well to within $2^\circ$ up to conductivity ratios of about 25 but fails to estimate the true phase for more conductive spheres.
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