Measured Strains

$$S_X = 1.17$$

$$S_Y = 0.97$$

$$S_Z = 0.52$$

b) X-Z Section

c) Y-Z Section

d) X-Y Section

16

17

An Autocorrelation Method for Three-Dimensional Strain Analysis

18

19

20

21

Christopher J. Thissen^{1*} and Mark T. Brandon¹

22

23

24

¹Department of Geology and Geophysics, Yale University, New Haven, CT USA

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

*Corresponding author:

48

Christopher J. Thissen

49

Department of Geology and Geophysics

50

Yale University

51

PO Box 208109

52

New Haven, CT 06520

53

Phone: 612-229-9521

54

Email: christopher.thissen@yale.edu

55

56

keywords: X-ray tomography; finite strain; autocorrelation; pressure solution;

57

deformation;

58 **Abstract**

59 We present a method of finite-strain estimation using the autocorrelation properties
60 of deformed rock. Autocorrelation is the correlation of an image with itself as a
61 function of an offset or lag. In two and three dimensions, the lag has both distance
62 and direction. Many geologic materials are initially isotropic, which means that the
63 autocorrelation function (ACF) will be initially isotropic as well. Deformation
64 imposes an anisotropic distortion, which can be measured using the Ramsay and
65 Fry strain methods for example, but can also be estimated from the ACF. X-ray
66 tomography now provides a rapid way to measure the three-dimensional ACF of a
67 geologic sample. Strain parameters are estimated by using a non-linear, best-fit
68 method to minimize the anisotropy in the ACF. The ACF method works best for
69 materials where the objects are internally uniform and contrast strongly with the
70 matrix and other grains.

“So fine was the morning except for a streak of wind here and there that the sea and sky looked all one fabric....” — [Virginia Woolf, *To the Lighthouse*](#)

1. Introduction

Geologists use the term fabric to refer to the spatial organization of features in a rock (e.g., Heilbronner and Barrett, 2013). Rocks will commonly contain primary fabrics, created at the time that the rock formed (e.g., bedding, cross-bedding, cumulate layering, etc.), and secondary fabrics, formed by metamorphism and deformation (e.g., metamorphic and melt segregation, foliation, lineation, crenulation, folds, boudins, shear bands, faults, etc.). The autocorrelation function (ACF) provides a generalized method for measuring the spatial dimensions and anisotropy of almost all rock fabrics (e.g., Panozzo Heilbronner, 1992; Heilbronner and Barrett, 2013).

Many methods of deformation analysis depend on statistical estimation of rock fabrics (e.g., Ramsay and Huber, 1983). In fact, if rocks lacked spatially organized fabrics, there would be no structure to analyze. The atmosphere on a sunny day is one example of a material that exhibits a lack of contrast. The atmosphere flows as a fluid, but on a clear day, it lacks any “memory” of its deformational history because the air lacks any visible internal structure. Similarly, a material where each point is independent of all other points, such as an image of white noise, also has no information about its deformational history (Fry, 1979). An atmosphere that contains both cloudy and clear air can preserve some information about its flow

history. The reason is that the mixture of cloudy and clear air creates an internally correlated structure, in that particles within a cloud are likely to be found near other cloud particles, and clear air particles are likely to be found near other clear air particles. The ACF provides a generalized method to quantify both the magnitude and orientation of this correlation.

Our objective here is to relate ACF measurements to strain. Thus, it is important to note that the ACF method, like many strain methods, requires well-understood features that are statistically isotropic in the initial state and respond passively to deformation. As with many strain methods, the success of the measurements depends on finding samples that are consistent with these requirements.

Panozzo Heilbronner (1992) was first to propose using the ACF for measuring finite strain. The approach has become more appealing given the availability of X-ray tomography (e.g., Füsseis et al., 2014), which directly images the three-dimensional fabric of a rock. Note that we use the term "image" in a generic sense to mean any two-dimensional (2D) or three-dimensional (3D) field. In X-ray tomography, the features in the rock are represented by the spatial variation in X-ray attenuation. A 3D attenuation field provides an ideal image for estimating autocorrelation in rock samples.

For granular materials, deformation creates a directional variation in grain diameter. The ACF reveals this fabric as a directional variation in the ACF length

scale. In the simplest case, the axial ratio of the contours of the ACF equals the axial ratios of the grains (Lado and Torquato, 1990; Torquato and Lado, 1991; Panozzo Heilbronner 1992). Panozzo Heilbronner (1992) estimated finite strain by measuring the ellipticity of contours of the ACF. Others have considered how the ACF varies spatially throughout the sample and also as a function of lag (Heilbronner, 2010; Svitelman and Dinariev, 2013).

We build on this previous work in three ways. First, we introduce a generalized best-fit method for estimating the anisotropy of the ACF determined from a 2D or 3D image. Second, we develop a method for estimating the uncertainties associated with the estimated parameters. Third, we consider both theoretical and practical aspects for implementing this method to measure strain. Our analysis of the ACF depends, in part, on the type of data analyzed, and so we begin with an overview of X-ray tomography.

2. X-ray Tomography

X-ray tomography provides a 3D image of the X-ray attenuation structure of an object at a micron scale (Maire and Withers, 2014). The time required to image a sample is beam-line dependent, but ranges from several hours to 10 minutes or faster (Rivers et al., 1999). X-ray tomography requires limited sample preparation (e.g., Lindquist and Venkatarangan, 2000; Füsseis et al., 2014). It is non-destructive, which is ideal for rare or valuable samples (e.g., Rivers et al., 1999; Ketcham and Carlson, 2001; Ebel and Rivers, 2007), and for samples where other complementary

analyses are needed (e.g., figure 1 in Hu et al., 2014). The following papers provide an introduction to the method: Denison et al. (1997); Denison and Carlson, (1997); Ketcham and Carlson (2001); Sutton et al., (2002); Carlson (2006); Jerram and Higgins (2007); Baker et al. (2012); Cnudde and Boon (2013); Füsseis et al. (2014); Maire and Withers (2014). Sample preparation, experimental design, choosing an appropriate photon source, and image reconstruction are reviewed by Reeder and Lanzirotti (2006) and Füsseis et al., (2014).

X-ray attenuation is a scalar field variable, meaning it is a single quantity that varies spatially throughout the sample volume. A tomographic image, or tomogram, is represented by discrete attenuation estimates at nodes within a 3D grid. Each node lies at the center of a volume element called a voxel, which is the 3D equivalent of a pixel (Carlson, 2006). The attenuation coefficient reported in each voxel is a weighted average for material within the voxel (Hubbell and Seltzer, 2004; Gualda et al., 2010).

X-ray attenuation varies throughout a heterogeneous sample. The example shown in Figure 1 is a 1392 x 1392 x 1 voxel slice from the 1392 x 1392 x 1040 voxel grid that spans a full sample volume. Attenuation is represented by a grayscale intensity (1-256), with white (256) representing the largest attenuation. Note that the region surrounding the sample is black because air has minimal attenuation.

Figure 1 here.

The attenuation coefficient, μ , is defined by

$$\mu = -\frac{1}{I} \frac{dI}{ds} \quad (1)$$

where s is the path length of the X-ray beam, and I is the X-ray intensity (Hubble and Selzter 2004). X-ray tomography is able to easily resolve features with attenuation coefficients that differ by more than a factor of two (Ebel and Rivers, 2007; Gualda et al., 2010). The coefficient μ scales linearly with density and as a power law with atomic number (e.g., Denison et al., 1997a). Several calculators are available for estimating μ (Hubbell and Seltzer, 2004; Chantler et al., 2005; Berger et al., 2010; MuCalc spreadsheet: <http://www.crlab.geo.utexas.edu/software/index.php>). Combining X-ray attenuation with other kinds of data can further improve image resolution (Huddleston-Holmes and Ketcham, 2005; Boone et al., 2011). X-ray tomography requires that the total attenuation through the sample is no more than 80% (Gualda et al., 2010), so suitable rock samples are commonly on the order of centimeters in size. A contrast in attenuation coefficients, rather than the absolute value, is important for successfully imaging fabrics using X-ray tomography. For example, most minerals have a strong contrast with quartz except for feldspar (Fig. 2). The beam energy can be adjusted to improve the contrast for some minerals. The large jumps in the attenuation value are absorption edges, and correspond to the ejection of electrons from specific electron shells (Gualda et al., 2010).

Figure 2 here.

Many software programs have been developed to analyze 3D tomography data for geologic materials: Quant3D (Ryan and Ketcham, 2002; Ketcham and Ryan, 2004), Blob3D (Ketcham 2005a; 2005b), Ctsta (Liu et al., 2009), WinDICOM (O'Connor et al., 2009), Morpho+ (Brabant et al., 2009), Pore3D (Brun et al., 2010), PhaseQuant (Elangovan et al., 2012), YaDiv (Frieese et al., 2013). Füsseis et al. (2014) reviews these programs in more detail. In particular, Ketcham (2005a; 2005b) provides a way to isolate the shape of segmented phases and analyze them for strain estimates. Some authors have highlighted difficulties in estimating parameters using segmentation methods (e.g., Iassonov et al., 2009; Baveye et al., 2010; Iassonov and Tuller, 2010; Andrä et al., 2012). Our method avoids these problems by using a statistical description of the entire sample, independent of actual grain boundaries.

3. The Autocorrelation Function

To provide a more intuitive understanding of the ACF, we begin by considering a few qualitative examples. Fig. 3a shows an average of yearbook photos for high-school women in the 1967 class in Fort Worth, Texas (Salavon, 1998). The individuals are unrecognizable, but the average shows a clear structure that is immediately identifiable as a generic portrait. The average also shows hints about the dress and hairstyle typical for 1967.

Figure 3 here.

Similarly, Fig. 3b shows an average of 200 tomogram slices, or approximately 392 μm , for the sandstone sample in Fig. 1. If the image volume had no correlated structures (e.g., no grains or foliation), then each pixel in the image would be independent of all the other pixels, and the average image in Fig. 3b would be a statistically uniform shade of gray. However, the image shows areas with distinct pixel intensities, which indicate spatial correlations over the 200 slices.

Figure 4 here.

Considering autocorrelation more formally, the ACF is represented by the notation, $\rho(\mathbf{r})$, where the lag vector $\mathbf{r}$ indicates the offset between the image and its copy, and the autocorrelation statistic ρ is a measure of the overall similarity of the images in this offset relationship. ρ is limited to the range -1 to +1. A value of +1 means that the image and its offset copy match exactly, at a pixel or voxel level (i.e. perfect correlation). A value of 0 means that the image and its offset copy have no statistical similarity. A value of -1 means that the image and its offset copy are complete opposites (i.e., perfect anticorrelation). The ACFs for most real images usually range from 0 to +1.

Several simple examples illustrate basic features of the ACF (Fig. 4). The examples are composed of two phases, which appear as black circles surrounded by a white background. It is helpful to envision the autocorrelation at a specific lag as the overlapping area of the black circles in two identical, offset sheets (Panozzo-

231 Heilbronner, 1992). However, when the ACF is calculated, the image is rescaled so
232 that the mean and standard deviation of the intensity values are zero and one,
233 respectively. Thus, the ACF makes no distinction between the phases. Visually, we
234 might consider the white phases to be the background or the matrix in Fig. 4, but the
235 ACF is only sensitive to the contrast between the phases and the relative abundance
236 of the phases.

237

238 The first example (Fig. 4a) has a single circle, which can be viewed as a "dilute
239 phase", in that the black circle occupies a very small area in the total aggregate. This
240 example is analogous to sparse amygdules or phenocrysts in a volcanic rock. The
241 ACF for this example ("Single Circle" in Fig. 4d) starts with $\rho = 1$ at $r = 0$ and
242 decreases to zero at $r = 2R$ where R is the radius of the circle. The reason is that the
243 black phase is dilute enough that the only correlation is "self-correlation", where
244 objects still overlap with their offset copies.

245

246 The second example (Fig. 4b) has a square lattice of periodically repeating circles,
247 arranged with a uniform distance $4R$ between the centers of each circle in the
248 horizontal and vertical directions. The ACF for this example is shown only for the
249 image horizontal direction ("Square Lattice" in Fig. 4d). This example has two
250 important differences from the "Single Circle" example. First, the circles in this
251 example compose a much greater fraction of the image. As a result, the black circles
252 and white background have opposite signs in the rescaled image, and have negative
253 autocorrelation values where the circles and matrix overlap. This anticorrelation is

expressed by the shorter decay lengthscale of the “Square Lattice” ACF compared to the “Single Circle” ACF, and by the negative autocorrelation values near $r = 2R$ and $r = 6R$.

Second, the “Square Lattice” ACF also has additional maxima at $r = 4nR$, where $n = 1, 2, \dots \infty$ (Fig. 4d shows the first of these maxima at $r = 4R$). These maxima correspond to “neighbor-correlation” caused by overlap between neighboring circles (c.f., blocking-function, Torquato, 2002). For this example, the self-correlation and neighbor-correlation parts of the ACF are well separated because the lattice spacing, $4R$, is much larger than the diameter, $2R$, of the circles.

The third example (Fig. 4c) has an irregular set of anticlustered circles, which are meant to represent grains in a rock. Natural grains have an irregular (i.e., non-periodic) arrangement and are anticlustered, meaning they do not physically overlap. In addition, the shapes and placement of the objects are statistically isotropic, meaning that there is no significant dependence on direction. Thus, the ACF (“Anticlustered” in Fig. 4d) is solely dependent on the offset distance, $r = |\mathbf{r}|$.

The ACF for this example shows a shorter decay lengthscale at short lags ($r < R$) when compared to the previous examples. As before, this results from anticorrelation between the black circles and white background. This example also shows a decaying periodic pattern at long lags ($r > R$). The ACF is similar to that for the Square-Lattice example, except for the fact that the self-correlation and

neighbor-correlation parts of the ACF now overlap. This overlapping is expected in natural geologic materials, where the spacing between grain centers is similar to the diameter of the grains.

The anticlustered condition creates a decaying periodicity in the ACF, with a wavelength proportional to the diameter of the circles. In statistical mechanics, this problem is commonly treated using the pair-correlation function (Debye et al, 1957; Torquato and Stell, 1982; Torquato and Stell, 1983; Torquato and Stell, 1985). The pair-correlation function gives the probability of finding a particle center at a lag r from a reference particle center. The density of points in a Fry diagram (Fry, 1979) is proportional to the probability provided by the pair-correlation function. Note that the peak at $\frac{r}{R} = 2.5$ in the “Anticlustered” curve in Fig. 4d corresponds to the high-density girdle in the nearest-neighbor distribution of a Fry plot (Fry, 1979; Panozzo Heilbronner, 1992). Torquato (2002) has a detailed review of this topic.

In the Introduction, we mentioned that there are cases where a material might lack a spatially organized fabric. The next two examples highlight end-member cases. The examples are so simple that illustrations are not needed. The first is a material with only one phase. The image would have a uniform intensity, so ρ would be everywhere 1, regardless of the lag. This example is analogous to a monomineralic rock. Of course, a monomineralic rock might be composed of grains with different crystal orientations, as determined, for example, by electron backscatter diffraction. For this case, the “phases” could be defined on the basis of orientation, and a

standard ACF analysis would then be possible. The second example is a two-phase material, where one phase is distributed randomly as infinitesimal grains. In practical terms, infinitesimal would mean a grain that is near the size an individual pixel or voxel. For this example, $\rho = 1$ at $r = 0$, but drops to $\rho = 0$ for $r > 0$.

We now consider the effects of deformation on autocorrelation. The ACF contains information about both particle shapes and neighbor distances, and the focus here is to distinguish between the deformation of particles, as measured by the Ramsay's (1967) R_f/ϕ method, and the deformation of nearest-neighbor distances, as measured by the Fry (1979) method.

For the first example (Fig. 5a-b), consider a 2D aggregate composed of regularly spaced black ellipses with the short axis R_Y equal to half the length of the long axis R_X . The spacing is isotropic, meaning that the distances between ellipse centers is the same in both the horizontal and vertical directions. The influence of anisotropy on the ACF is indicated by different decay length scales: ρ reaches zero at lag $r/R_Y = 2$ for the Y direction, and at $r/R_Y = 4$ for the X direction. The ratio of these two decay length scales is equal to the axial ratio of the ellipses. We use the term "Ramsay effect" to describe this anisotropy of ρ associated with self-correlation of particle shapes. The ACFs for the X and Y directions show a second maxima at the same lag, $r/R_Y = 8$, which means that the neighbor correlation is isotropic. The Fry method would show zero strain for this case.

Figure 5 here.

Now consider the second anisotropic example (Fig. 5c-d), where circles with radius R are arranged on an anisotropic grid, such that the object centers are spaced $6R$ apart in the X direction, and $4R$ in the Y direction. The ACF is isotropic for self-correlation. In other words, the length scale for initial decay of ρ is the same, regardless of orientation. Ramsay's R_f/ϕ method would find zero strain for this example. Note, however, that ρ increases back to one at $r/R = 6$ in the X direction and $r/R = 4$ in the Y direction. In other words, ρ is isotropic for self-correlation but anisotropic for neighbor-correlation. Thus, we use the term "Fry effect" to describe the anisotropy of ρ due to the distribution of neighboring grains.

The last of our simple examples (Fig. 6) is a 2D aggregate made up of three phases, rendered in black, gray, and white, and assigned image intensities of 10, 1, and 0, respectively. The objective is to show how the ACF is affected when more than two phases are present. The first example (Fig. 6a-b) has large black elliptical grains with vertical long axes, and small gray elliptical grains with horizontal long axes. The full 2D ACF is shown as contours of ρ as a function of the x and y components of the lag vector. All of the ρ contours have the same elliptical shape as the black grains. The reason is that black grains are large in size and have a large contrast with the other intensities, so the ACF is strongly weighted towards the grain shapes for this phase.

The second example (Fig. 6c-d) shows what happens when the gray and black phases are exchanged. The black elliptical grains are now small, but they still have a strong contrast relative to the other two phases. The 2D ACF shows that, at short lags, the ρ contours have an elliptical shape similar to that for the black grains. As the lag distance increases, the ρ contours transition to an elliptical shape similar to that of the large gray grains. The gray grains are larger in this example, which compensates for its low contrast relative to the white phase, but only at long lengthscales.

Figure 6 here.

This example highlights a subtle feature of autocorrelation for images with a range of grayscale intensities. The ACF is more heavily weighted towards features that have a strong contrast relative to the rest of the image. As a result, image processing methods can be used to weight the ACF towards specific features of the fabric. Useful methods potentially include gamma correction or image segmentation (e.g. Barrett and Heilbronner, 2013). Remember, however, that the image is standardized before calculating the ACF. As a result, the ACF is unaffected by linear rescaling of the image intensities (Panozzo Heilbronner, 1992).

4. Estimating Grain Size in the ACF

Grain size is a significant parameter in its own right, but it is especially important for distinguishing between self-correlation and neighbor-correlation. There are

several ways to estimate the average grain radius. To guide this discussion, we generated a 3D aggregate composed of non-overlapping, close-packed, identical black spheres set in a white matrix (Fig. 7a). The circles vary in size, but this result is simply due to sectioning through the 3D spheres, which otherwise have a uniform radius $R = 1$. The ACF for the full 3D volume as a function of radial lag exhibits both self-correlation and neighbor-correlation (Fig. 7b). The spheres in this example compose 54% of the volume.

Debye and Beuche (1949) proposed an exponential model for the ACF as determined from X-ray scattering of atomic-scale vacancies

$$\rho(r) = \exp(-r/R_C) \quad (2)$$

where R_C is the characteristic lag for the decay of ρ with increasing r . Mätzler (2002) showed that the characteristic lag, R_C of the ACF for an aggregate of identical overlapping spheres is equal to the radius of the spheres. Debye et al. (1957) estimated R_C using the derivative of the ACF at $r = 0$. For (2), this estimate is

$$R_C \approx -\left(\frac{d\rho(r=0)}{dr}\right)^{-1}. \text{ The other alternative is to estimate the parameters in (2) using}$$

a least-squares fit to the ACF (Mätzler, 2002). Neither approach is satisfactory. The derivative method emphasizes only a small fraction of the ACF, and the least-squares approach has problems separating self-correlation from neighbor-correlation. This point is illustrated in Fig. 7b, which shows the poor fit of the exponential model to the ACF of the simulated aggregate. The best-fit estimate $R_C = 0.31$ is much smaller than the expected value, $R = 1$.

A different approach approximates the grain size by using a characteristic point in the short-lag part of the ACF (Panozzo Heibronner, 1992; Buscombe et al., 2010). The convention is to use the "half-height lag", r^* , which is the lag where ρ first drops to 0.5. Panozzo Heibronner (1992) estimated that the average grain radius is given by $\bar{R} \approx 1.5r^*$. Based on extensive calibration between the ACF and measurements for images of unconsolidated sediments, Buscombe et al. (2010) recommended that $\bar{R} \approx \pi r^*$.

Another approach to estimating grain size is the spherical model, which refers to the idealized ACF for self-correlation of a single sphere (p. 79 in Torquato, 2002)

$$\rho(r) = (r \leq 2R) \left(1 - \frac{3}{4} \frac{r}{R} + \frac{1}{16} \left(\frac{r}{R} \right)^3 \right) \quad (3)$$

Note that the logical expression $(r \leq 2R)$ equals 1 if true and 0 if false. Substitution of $\rho(r^*) = 0.5$ into (3) gives

$$\bar{R} = 1.44r^* \quad (4)$$

which is nearly identical to the estimate of Panozzo Heibronner (1992).

In our experience, all of these approximations work poorly for dense aggregates. As an example, the simulated aggregate has $r^* = 0.35$. Thus, the approximations above predict average grain radii of 0.50, 0.53, and 1.10. These approximations are crude, in part because they do not account for neighbor-correlation. The method suggested by Buscombe et al., (2010) gives the closest approximation to the true value of one. This is probably because our grain-supported aggregate is similar to the

unconsolidated sediments on which the recommendation is based. Buscombe et al.'s method will diverge from the true radius for materials that cannot be approximated as unconsolidated sediments.

Figure 7 here.

To overcome these issues, we propose a generalized two-component model for the isotropic ACF

$$\rho(r) = (r \leq 2R_S) \left(1 - \frac{3}{4} \frac{r}{R_S} + \frac{1}{16} \left(\frac{r}{R_S} \right)^3 \right) + f_N \exp \left(- \left(\frac{r}{R_N} \right)^\beta \right) \sin \left(\pi \frac{r}{R_N} \right) \quad (5)$$

where the self-correlation component of the ACF is represented by (3) and the neighbor-correlation component, by a sinusoid with a decaying amplitude (modified from equation 7 in Cule and Torquato, 1999). This model has four unknown parameters: R_S , f_N , R_N and β . R_S represents the average grain radius, and can be viewed as the length scale for self-correlation. f_N defines the amplitude of the neighbor component. Note that f_N can be negative for multi-phase aggregates, given that neighboring phases are likely to have different intensity values. The neighbor component has two parts. The decay of the neighbor-correlation with r is represented by a stretched exponential function, where R_N defines the decay length scale and the power β defines the amount of stretching of the exponential function. We have found that β values other than one are needed to ensure a good fit to an isotropic ACF. The periodicity for the neighbor-correlation is represented by the sin, which has a wavelength of $2R_N$. Toquato (2002, Chapter 5) discussed a variety of

analytical solution for ACFs for simple aggregates. Equation (5) does include the spherical model for self-correlation, but it is otherwise empirical in its derivation. The big advantage is that the two-component model is relatively simple and thus much easier to use for estimation.

The unknown parameters for (5) can be estimated using a nonlinear least-squares routine, such as the one discussed below for strain estimation. We have found that the analysis works best by using the Fisher transform to convert ρ to ζ , which has more uniform variance with r (see below for details). The starting estimates for R_S and R_N are set to be about five times larger than $\bar{R}$, as determined from (4). This strategy is important for avoiding local minima for the best-fit solution. Starting estimates for β and f_N are set to 1 and 0, respectively. R_S and R_N are constrained to be positive.

The two-component model gives a best-fit solution for the synthetic example of $R_S = 0.97$, which compares well with the true value of 1. The estimates for the other parameters are $f_N = -0.36$, $R_N = 1.89$, and $\beta = 3.41$. The fit has an $R^2 = 0.82$. We use the F ratio test of Bevington and Robinson (2003, p. 207) to compare the fit provided by the two-component model and the spherical model. In all cases, the two-component model provides a significantly better fit.

Fig. 7c shows the best-fit ACF, along with the predicted components for self-correlation and neighbor-correlation. The ACF is dominated by the self-correlation

component, but both components are significant at short lags, $0 < r/R < 2$. The neighbor-correlation component commonly decays to zero by $r/R = 5$. Thus there is little need to analyze the ACF beyond that point.

5. Estimating the Autocorrelation Function

Consider the general case for an image, where $U(x, y, z)$ are continuously varying scalar values within a 3D domain spanned by x, y , and z . We focus here on X-ray attenuation, but the scalar field can be anything that characterizes the material in that domain. Our objective is to estimate the autocorrelation for this field variable as a function of the components of the lag vector, r_x, r_y , and r_z . We introduce a standardized variable U_s defined by

$$U_s = \frac{U - c}{\sigma(U - c)} \quad (6)$$

where c is the mean value for U and $\sigma(U - c)$ is the standard deviation of U around the mean. The standardization in (6) ensures that ρ remains within the limits of ± 1 . The ACF is defined using U_s (Priestley, 1981),

$$\rho(r_x, r_y, r_z) = \iiint_{-\infty}^{\infty} U_s(x, y, z) U_s(x - r_x, y - r_y, z - r_z) dx dy dz. \quad (7)$$

The ACF is simply a cross-correlation of the field variable with a copy that is offset by r_x, r_y , and r_z . Equation (5) provides a formal definition, but it is too cumbersome to serve as a method of calculation.

479 The Fourier transform provides a faster way to calculate the ACF. We start with a
 480 discrete uniform grid of standardized attenuation values, $U_s(j_x, j_y, j_z)$, where Δ is the
 481 grid spacing, and $j_x = 0$ to $N_x - 1$, $j_y = 0$ to $N_y - 1$, and $j_z = 0$ to $N_z - 1$ are space-
 482 domain indices in the x, y , and z directions The Fourier transform is used to convert
 483 the grid into the wave domain. The Fourier coefficients are given by

$$484 \quad \mathcal{U}_s(k_x, k_y, k_z) = \mathcal{F} \left(U_s(j_x, j_y, j_z) \right) \quad (8)$$

485 where $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{-1}$ are operators that indicate the Fourier transform and its inverse,
 486 and $k_x = 0$ to $N_x - 1$, $k_y = 0$ to $N_y - 1$, and $k_z = 0$ to $N_z - 1$ are wave-domain
 487 indices in the x, y , and z directions. Keep in mind that the Fourier coefficients
 488 $\mathcal{U}(k_x, k_y, k_z)$ are, in general, complex valued.

489

490 The Fourier coefficients of the ACF are determined by the products

$$491 \quad \mathcal{R}(k_x, k_y, k_z) = \mathcal{U}_s(k_x, k_y, k_z) \mathcal{U}_s^*(k_x, k_y, k_z) \quad (9)$$

492 where $*$ indicates the complex conjugate. The inverse Fourier transform is used to
 493 return the ACF to the space domain,

$$494 \quad \rho(j_x, j_y, j_z) = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\mathcal{R}(k_x, k_y, k_z) \right) \quad (10)$$

495

496 Consider the following MATLAB example, where imageFile.tif is 2D grayscale image
 497 file accessible in the current directory. The image should have an odd number of
 498 pixels in each dimension.

```
499     1. U = double(imread('imageFile.tif'));
500     2. c = mean(U(:));
```

```

501     3.  Us = (U-c)/sqrt(mean((U(:)-c).^2));
502     4.  N = numel(U);
503     5.  Uscript = fftn(Us)/N;
504     6.  Rscript = Uscript.*conj(Uscript);
505     7.  Rho = fftshift(ifftn(Rscript)*N);
506     8.  [nx,ny] = size(U);
507     9.  rx = linspace(-(nx-1)/2,(nx-1)/2,nx);
508    10. ry = linspace(-(ny-1)/2,(ny-1)/2,ny);
509    11. [Ry,Rx] = ndgrid(rx,ry);
510    12. r = sqrt(Rx.^2 + Ry.^2);
511    13. figure; plot(r(:), Rho(:), '.');
512    14. figure; pcolor(Rx, Ry, Rho); shading interp; axis equal;

```

513 Line 1 loads the image into the matrix U and converts the values to double precision.
514 Lines 2 and 3 standardize the matrix. Lines 4-7 calculate the ACF, and lines 8-12
515 calculate the x and y lag components in units of pixels. Line 13 plots the ACF as a
516 function of lag distance. Line 14 plots the ACF as a 2D color map. Note that the
517 “fftshift” command in line 7 organizes the matrix Rho so that the zero lag, $r = 0$, is
518 located at the central voxel.

519
520 There has been a lot of discussion about how to reduce bias and increase precision
521 when estimating the ACF (e.g., Priestley, 1981; Broerson, 2006). For our study of
522 fabrics, we are not as interested in the true values of the autocorrelation, but rather
523 the anisotropy of the autocorrelation. As such, we have found that the Fourier

method, which has been criticized as less than optimal for estimating the true values of the ACF (Broerson, 2006), does the best job preserving sample anisotropy. Windowing functions are commonly used in conjunction with the finite Fourier transform to reduce edge effects and enhance spectral resolution (e.g., Press et al., 2007, p. 656-660). Our tests using various windowing filters have found that typical windowing functions, such as the Hann filter, generate artificial anisotropy in the sample, which causes biases in the estimated deformation parameters. Sample anisotropy is best preserved by calculating the ACF from the untreated standardized image. (Of course, the image has already been delimited (i.e., windowed) to finite dimensions.) The edges of the image do generate some ringing (i.e., the Gibbs effect), but this ringing appears to contribute relatively little to the ACF (also see Panozzo Heilbronner, 1992).

6. Estimating Deformation Parameters

To estimate the deformation parameters from a sample ACF, we search for a stretch tensor that reduces the ACF to an isotropic form. The assumption, one that is used in almost all strain methods, is that the fabric of the material was isotropic before deformation.

The deformation of a material line is defined by

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{r}_0 \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{V}$ is the left-stretch tensor, $\mathbf{R}$ is a rotation tensor, and $\mathbf{r}_0$ and $\mathbf{r}$ are vectors representing the material line before and after the deformation. For geologic

studies, there is generally little information about $\mathbf{R}$. Thus, the estimation is focused solely on the stretch tensor. The left-stretch tensor representation is preferred because it can be calculated without knowing $\mathbf{R}$. The stretch tensor is usually decomposed into its principal form

$$\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{T} \mathbf{\Lambda}_V \mathbf{T}^T \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{T}$ is the transformation matrix with column vectors that correspond to the principal stretch axes in the sample coordinate frame. The superscript T indicates the matrix transpose. The tensor $\mathbf{\Lambda}_V$ is diagonalized, with the principal stretches S_X, S_Y , and S_Z on the diagonal and zeros elsewhere else. The Hencky tensor, $\mathbf{E}$, defined by

$$\mathbf{V} = \exp(\mathbf{E}) = \mathbf{T} \exp(\mathbf{\Lambda}_E) \mathbf{T}^T \quad (13b)$$

$$\mathbf{E} = \ln(\mathbf{V}) = \mathbf{T} \ln(\mathbf{\Lambda}_V) \mathbf{T}^T \text{ and} \quad (13a)$$

provides a better formulation for statistical estimation of the stretch tensor (Brandon, 1995; Mookerjee and Peek, 2014). Like the stretch tensor $\mathbf{V}$, the Hencky tensor is symmetric, which means that it has six unique values, as indicated by $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}^T$. The transformation matrix is the same for both $\mathbf{V}$ and $\mathbf{E}$. $\mathbf{\Lambda}_E$ is a diagonal matrix with the principal natural stretches E_X, E_Y, E_Z on the diagonal. The expanded versions on the right side of (13a,b) use the matrix definitions for the natural logarithm and exponential functions (Higham, 2008). The natural volume-strain is

$$E_V = \ln(V/V_0) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{E}), \quad (14)$$

where V_0 and V are the initial and final volume of the sample, and tr is the trace (i.e. sum of the diagonal elements). The deviatoric Hencky tensor is defined by

$$\mathbf{E}' = \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{I} E_V / 3 \quad (15)$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix. Most methods of strain analysis do not provide information about the volume-strain component of the deformation (Brandon, 1995). This is also true for autocorrelation estimates of strain, given that we have no information about the length scale of the ACF for the material prior to deformation. In some cases, one can make independent estimates of volume strain (Wright and Platt, 1982; Ring and Brandon, 1999). Substitution of this information into (15) can be used to convert $\mathbf{E}'$ to $\mathbf{E}$.

We follow the usual convention where the principal values are organized as $E_X \geq E_Y \geq E_Z$, referring to the maximum extension direction X , the intermediate direction Y , and the maximum shortening direction Z .

The Hencky tensor extends the scalar concept of natural strain, $E = \ln(S)$, to a tensor representation, where stretch $S = l/l_0$ with l and l_0 representing the initial and final lengths of a material line. As proposed by Hencky (1931), natural strain scales linearly with strain rate during a finite deformation, so it provides a more natural representation of strain. In addition, natural strain also allows for a simpler representation of errors, as symmetric Gaussian variations around a mean value. In fact, the natural log is one of several power transforms that are used in statistics to transform data sets into a form where standard Gaussian statistics can be used (Box and Cox, 1964).

For our purposes, we need to specify the change in the lag vector from its present deformed state to its initial undeformed state. The ACF is assumed to have been isotropic in the initial state, so we only need the magnitude r_0 of the initial lag vector $r_0 = \|\mathbf{r}_0\|$. We define an “undeforming” function f_u (c.f. Spencer, 1980, eq. 6.21),

$$r_0 = f_u(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{E}') = \sqrt{\mathbf{r}^T \mathbf{V}'^{-2} \mathbf{r}} = \sqrt{\mathbf{r}^T \exp(-2\mathbf{E}') \mathbf{r}}. \quad (16)$$

Note that in this equation and elsewhere below, we use a semicolon to separate arguments on the left (e.g., $\mathbf{r}$), from parameters on the right (e.g., $\mathbf{E}'$). Arguments are given values, and parameters are values to be estimated.

6.1 Estimating the Initial Autocorrelation Function

Autocorrelation is limited to the range -1 to +1, which makes the variable poorly suited for statistical analysis. The Fisher transform $\zeta = \operatorname{arctanh}(\rho)$ and its inverse $\rho = \tanh(\zeta)$ link the autocorrelation variable ρ to a new variable ζ , which has a range $-\infty$ to $+\infty$. This variable ζ usually follows a Gaussian distribution (Alexander, 1997), which makes it better suited for least-squares estimation, including calculation of uncertainties for the estimated parameters.

We seek a least-squares estimate for the unknown parameters $\mathbf{E}'$ and $\mathbf{c}$. We have already introduced $\mathbf{E}'$ above, which contains 6 unique coefficients. The vector $\mathbf{c}$ contains coefficients for a spline, which is used to represent the isotropic ACF as a function of r_0 , as represented by $\zeta_0 = \zeta_0(r_0; \mathbf{c})$. We have experimented with several types of functional forms for ζ_0 , but we found that a cubic spline is both sufficiently

flexible to represent the isotropic ACF for all of our test cases and computationally fast, as needed for a nonlinear search algorithm. We would prefer to use the two-component model (5) but it is computationally too slow for our estimation here. The two-component model is used afterward to find best-fit estimates for the undeformed ACF.

For our least-squares calculation, we convert the gridded problem above into a serial list of $i = 1$ to n model equations

$$\zeta_i = \zeta_{0,i} (f_u(\mathbf{r}_i; \mathbf{E}'); \mathbf{c}) + \varepsilon_i \quad (17)$$

where $n = N_x N_y N_z$. Equation (17) shows that we are using the estimated isotropic ACF, along with the undeformed length of $\mathbf{r}$, to get predicted autocorrelation values. ε_i is a stochastic variable, and represents errors associated with the autocorrelation measurement. ε_i is assumed to be independently and identically distributed, with an expected mean of zero, and a variance of σ_ε^2 .

The best-fit estimates $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}'$ and $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$ are found numerically by searching for a candidate solution that minimizes the objective function,

$$\tilde{S} = S(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}', \tilde{\mathbf{c}}) = \frac{1}{v} \sum_{i=1}^n [\zeta(\mathbf{r}_i) - \zeta_0(f_u(\mathbf{r}_i; \tilde{\mathbf{E}}'); \tilde{\mathbf{c}})]^2 \quad (18)$$

The tilde and caret symbols are used to indicate the state of estimation for a parameter variable. The tilde indicates a candidate estimate in the search, and the caret indicates a best-fit estimate that minimizes the least-squares objective function.

636

637 The degrees of freedom, ν , for the objective function is defined by $\nu = n - m_{\mathbf{c}} - m_{\mathbf{E}}$,
638 where $m_{\mathbf{c}}$ and $m_{\mathbf{E}}$ are the number of unknown parameters in $\mathbf{c}$ and $\mathbf{E}$. The best-fit
639 solution provides an estimate for $\hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^2 = \hat{S}$.

640

641 Equation (18) is a separable least-squares problem (Moler, 2004, p 154), in that the
642 piecewise-spline estimate has a linear least-squares solution and the strain-tensor
643 estimate has a nonlinear least-squares solution. As a result, the nonlinear search is
644 focused exclusively on estimating the strain tensor. We use the "fmincon" function
645 in MATLAB to estimate the six coefficients of the Hencky tensor

$$\mathbf{E}' = \begin{bmatrix} E'_{11} & E'_{12} & E'_{13} \\ E'_{12} & E'_{22} & E'_{23} \\ E'_{13} & E'_{23} & E'_{33} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

646

647 subject to the constraint $tr(\mathbf{E}') = E'_{11} + E'_{22} + E'_{33} = 0$. Thus, the effective number of
648 unknown coefficients for $\mathbf{E}'$ is $m_{\mathbf{E}} = 5$ for a 3D data set. Note that (16-19) are easily
649 adapted to estimate a 2D strain tensor, which would have $m_{\mathbf{E}} = 2$.

650

651 Equation (18) is minimized in the following manner:

- 652 1) The search is started with a candidate solution $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}' = 0$, which corresponds to
653 zero deformation.
- 654 2) Equation (14) and $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}'$ are used to convert the observed lag vectors $\mathbf{r}_i$ to a
655 candidate estimate of their initial lag distances, $\tilde{r}_{0,i}$.

656 3) A candidate estimate for the initial isotropic autocorrelation function,
657 $\zeta_0(f_u(\mathbf{r}_i; \tilde{\mathbf{E}}'); \tilde{\mathbf{c}})$, is estimated using a spline as a model function with $\tilde{r}_{0,i}$, and ζ_i .
658 4) The objective function (18) is evaluated using the candidate estimate
659 $\zeta_0(f(\mathbf{r}_i; \tilde{\mathbf{E}}'); \tilde{\mathbf{c}})$.
660 5) The value of the objective function for the candidate estimates, $\tilde{S}(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}', \tilde{\mathbf{c}})$ is passed
661 to the nonlinear search-algorithm, which tests for convergence to a final
662 minimum value for $\tilde{S}$. If the test is positive, $\tilde{S}$ is returned as the best-fit estimate,
663 $\hat{S}$, and the routine also returns the best-fit estimates for the parameters, $\hat{\mathbf{E}}'$ and $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$.
664 If the test is negative, then the algorithm selects a new candidate estimate for
665 $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}'$ and returns to step 2 to evaluate that estimate.

666

667 With any nonlinear problem, there is always a concern that the optimization will
668 become trapped in a local minimum, resulting in a flawed estimate. Our algorithm
669 shows no sign of this kind of problem. Perhaps most telling is that the optimization
670 results in estimates that fit our different datasets very well. Thus, we suspect that
671 the objective function has a well-defined global minimum near the starting point
672 $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}' = 0$. Bootstrap experiments, discussed below, indicate that the objective function
673 has a quasi-Gaussian form around the best-fit minimum. There may be future cases
674 where the solution fails, but this should be easy to spot by a poor fit between the
675 best-fit objective function and data, or by wild, non-physical estimates for the
676 parameters and their uncertainties.

677

678 6.2 Assessment of Fit

The quality of fit can also be judged using a residuals plot, where the standardized residuals $\varepsilon_i/\sigma_\varepsilon$ are plotted on the y -axis and the estimated initial lag distance $r_{0,i}$, on the x -axis. The standardized residuals should be independently and identically distributed with a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one.

Another useful measure of the fit is the R^2 statistic, which is defined using the conventional formula

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{\text{var}(\varepsilon_i)}{\text{var}(\zeta_i)}. \quad (20)$$

The statistical independence of the residuals is tested using the Durbin-Watson statistic d (p. 68, Draper and Smith, 1998),

$$d = \frac{\sum_{j=2}^n (\varepsilon_j - \varepsilon_{j-1})^2}{\sum_{j=2}^n \varepsilon_j^2} \quad (21)$$

where the subscript j indicates the residuals in order of increasing r_0 . The null case, where there is no serial correlation, has an expectation $d = 2$.

6.3 Uncertainties for Estimated Strain Parameters

At termination, the MATLAB function “fmincon” reports the Hessian matrix $\mathbf{H}$ for the best-fit solution $\mathbf{E}'$. The Hessian is used to derive a linear approximation to the parameter covariance matrix (Press et al., 2007, p. 799-802)

$$\text{cov}(\text{vech}(\mathbf{E}')) \approx \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \mathbf{H}^{-1} \quad (22)$$

where the half-vectorization function, vech , converts $\mathbf{E}'$ into a six-component column vector for the strain parameters. As a result, $\text{cov}(\text{vech}(\mathbf{E}'))$ is a 6x6 covariance matrix for the six strain parameters in $\mathbf{E}'$.

For a nonlinear inverse, there is also a concern that approximated uncertainties may contain large errors. In a test, we found that uncertainties approximated by (22) agreed well with more accurate estimates determined by the bootstrap method (Efron, 1979). This result suggests that, near the best-fit solution, S has a quasi-linear relationship with respect to the parameters (Press et al., 2007, p. 807-818). We could use the bootstrap method to estimate all errors, but it is computationally expensive.

Given uncertainties for the coefficients in $\mathbf{E}'$, it is a simple matter to use the method of Hext (1963) to calculate uncertainties for the principal values and principal directions. This method has been used in the Yale STRAIN3D program since 1996, and works well for estimating uncertainties for strain analysis. The method is also widely used for statistical analysis of anisotropic magnetic susceptibility data (e.g., Hext, 1963; Jelinek, 1978; Owens, 2000).

We report 95 percent confidence intervals for both the estimated magnitudes and directions for the principal strains, and the isotropy test of Hext (1963), which tests if the principal strains are significantly different from each other. The uncertainty for a best-fit principal direction is represented by an elliptical cone that defines the

95 percent confidence limit for the estimated principal direction (Fig. 8). The orientation of each elliptical cone is reported as the twist, which is the azimuth of the long axis of the cone in the plane normal to the best-fit principal direction. Keep in mind that principal directions are orthogonal. So given a best-fit principal direction, the twist is defined by the azimuth from the second principal direction to the third principal direction. The order of the directions is defined by the repeating sequence +X, +Y, and +Z, which are positive axes in a right-handed coordinate frame. For example, a twist of +10 degrees for the long-axis of the α_{95} elliptical cone around the best-fit estimate for the Y principal-strain direction, would lie at 10 degrees from the +Z direction towards the +X direction. For most cases, the twist is 0 or 90 degrees, which indicates that the elliptical cone is aligned with the second and third principal directions.

Figure 8 here.

7. Strain Estimation Examples

To demonstrate the advantages and limitations of our method, we find the best-fit strain parameters for several examples. The first set of examples, called “phantoms” (e.g., Shepp and Logan, 1974; Ketcham, 2005b), are synthetic cases where numerical calculations are used to generate an isotropic aggregate of spherical grains, which is then subjected to a known homogeneous deformation. The second set of examples illustrates estimation for naturally deformed rocks.

7.1 3D Synthetic (Phantom) Material

A 3D isotropic aggregate of spherical grains was generated using an event-driven, molecular-dynamics sphere-packing code (Lubachevsky and Stillinger, 1990; Donev et al., 2005a; 2005b; Skoge et al., 2006; available at <http://cherryvit.princeton.edu/donev/Packing/PackLSD/Instructions.html>). The code begins with a set of randomly distributed spheres, each with an initial velocity. The spheres interact with each other through collisions. The diameters of the spheres grow linearly in time until the number of collisions diverges and the diameters of spheres can no longer increase (see Donev, 2006 for an excellent introduction to these algorithms). These simulations are routinely used to study packing and flow in granular materials, (e.g., Torquato 2002; Luding, 2004). This method generates aggregates that have the dense packing typical of geologic aggregates. The algorithms can also be used to create phantom materials with multiple grain sizes (Kansal et al., 2002; Donev et al., 2005a; 2005b), and non-spherical grain shapes (Donev et al., 2005a; 2005b).

Figure 9 here.

The phantom contains 1200 non-overlapping grains that are packed to an average porosity of 50 percent (Fig. 9a). Prior to deformation, the grains were identical spheres, with a radius equal to 10 voxels. This dimension is set to 100 μm for the ACF calculation. The phantom was deformed coaxially with principal stretches $S_X = 2$, $S_Y = 1$, and $S_Z = 0.5$. The X direction was rotated 30 degrees from the sample x -axis

toward the sample y -axis and the Z direction was aligned with the sample z -axes. The ACF for the deformed phantom is anisotropic, which causes a large spread in ζ , especially at $\frac{r}{R} < 1.5$ (Fig. 9b). Once the deformation is removed using the estimated best-fit strain parameters, the ACF collapses down to a single curve (Fig. 9c). The best-fit parameters agree well with those for the known deformation (Table 1). Note that the estimated grain radius, $R_S = 97 \mu\text{m}$, matches well with the known grain radius, $100 \mu\text{m}$. The standardized residuals show some structure, but otherwise appear to be fairly uniform with increasing r_0/R (Fig. 9d). The Durbin-Watson test indicates $d = 1.97$, which is consistent with our assumption that the residuals are independent.

Table 1 here.

Table 1 shows estimated deviatoric principal strains in terms of both stretches S and natural strains E , which are reported in centi-Neper (cNp). The Neper is the unit of measure for the natural-log scale (Mills, 1995), in the same sense that the Bel is the unit of measure for the base-10 log scale. A cNp is therefore equal to one hundredth of a natural strain unit, in the same way that a dB is equal to one tenth of a Bel. This scaling is convenient because, for small natural strains, in the range $-15 \text{ cNp} < E < +15 \text{ cNp}$, the cNp designation is approximately equal to percent elongation ($100 \Delta l/l_0$). This relationship results from the small-value approximation for the natural log, $\ln(1 + \epsilon) \approx \epsilon$ for $|\epsilon| \ll 1$.

The confidence intervals for the stretches become asymmetric as the stretch deviates from 1, whereas the natural log confidence intervals remain symmetric in all cases. We have shown above that the Hencky tensor, which is the tensor representation of the natural strain, provides a compact notation relating tensor properties to strain invariants (e.g., E_D and E_V in Brandon, 1995). Likewise, the natural strains provide a simpler basis for estimating and reporting uncertainties.

7.2 2D Image of Undeformed Oolite

Our first natural example is a 2D photomicrograph of undeformed ooids from the Jurassic Stump formation in Wyoming (Fig. 10; Crespi, 1986). The image is more complicated than our previous examples, in that the ooids have internal structure and varying sizes. The Ramsay effect for this image is visible in the initial decay of the ACF. The Fry effect is small for three reasons. First, the ooids are anticlustered (e.g., Fig. 4d), but they are otherwise randomly distributed. Second, the size variation of the ooids reduces the Fry effect (e.g., Erlsev, 1988). Third, resolution of the Fry effect requires averaging over a much larger set of ooids (Crespi, 1986), and thus would require a larger image.

Figure 10 here.

For this example, the strain estimates given by the ACF method (Table 1) agree with those from the R_f/ϕ method, which was calculated using outlines for 42 ooids and the R_f/ϕ estimation algorithm of Shimamoto and Ikeda (1976). Note that for the 2D

examples in Table 1, strains are reported as plane-strain deviatoric values given that we have no information about volume strain or the out-of-plane strain. The high value of R^2 indicates the best-fit solution fits the data very well. The Durbin-Watson test indicates no significant serial correlation. The residuals plot (Fig. 9d) shows some structure, but this is not unexpected given that autocorrelation estimates tend to retain some serial correlation (Priestley, 1981; Broersen, 2006).

7.3 2D Image of Deformed Oolite

A second photomicrograph example (Fig. 11a) shows deformed ironstone ooids (figure 7.7 in Ramsay and Huber, 1983). This sample is interesting because the ooid cores were deformed by an intracrystalline mechanism, whereas the rims show truncations and fiber overgrowths, consistent with pressure solution. Ramsay and Huber (1983) used the R_f/ϕ and "Nearest Neighbor" methods to estimate the within-ooid strain and the bulk strain, respectively. The R_f/ϕ results were determined by us (Table 1), using digitized outlines of laminae from the core of the ooids, where they are not truncated by pressures.. The estimates are virtually identical to those from Ramsay and Huber (1983, p. 120, axial ratio = 1.22). The "Nearest Neighbor" estimate is based on Fig. 7.18 from Ramsay and Huber (1983). All three methods give the same principal directions. The ACF and R_f/ϕ estimates are essentially identical (Table 1). The reason is that the ACF is weighted towards the high-contrast ooid cores. The "Nearest Neighbor" estimate shows more strain, but this is expected given the deformation between the grains, including dissolution and overgrowths.

Figure 11 here.

The ACF method works best where each grain has a relatively uniform intensity. The concentric rings in the ooids could cause problems. The ACF is influenced by this within-grain structure, which might cause the ACF method to give biased strain estimates (Fig. 12). The 2D image was constructed by drawing two circular rings and then deforming the rings to a strain ratio $\frac{s_x}{s_z} = 2$. At small lags, the ACF contours for this image have simple elliptical shapes, but, at larger lags, the contours take on "hot dog" shapes caused by smearing in the X direction. The smearing results from correlation between the different rings, which produces an upward bias in the strain ratio $\frac{s_x}{s_z} = 2.1$, as estimated using the ACF method. At larger lags, the correlation between the different rings is reduced, and the contour shape is more elliptical.

7.4 3D Tomograms of Pressure-Solved Sandstones

We now consider X-ray attenuation tomograms for a pressure-solved sandstone from the Olympic Subduction Complex in Washington State (Brandon et al., 1998). Sample 92810-3 is from the Grand Valley Assemblage (Tabor and Cady, 1978) and was deformed along a path that reached a maximum depth of about 12 km and a maximum temperature of 250° C at about 18 Ma (Brandon et al., 1998). The microstructure of the sample is typical of pressure-solved sandstones from this and

other subduction complexes (Tabor and Cady, 1978; Feehan and Brandon, 1999; Ring and Brandon, 1999; Ring et al., 2001; Rahl et al., 2011).

The tomogram (Fig. 13) was acquired at the X-ray computed tomography facilities at the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Labs (Beamline 13-BM-D). The voxels are cubes, measuring 7.54 μm on each side. The sample is approximately 3 x 3 x 10 mm, with *X* approximately aligned with the long dimension of the sample. The X-ray attenuation is shown by the gray scale, increasing from black to white.

Figure 13 here.

The sandstone is a turbidite and is dominated by angular, first-cycle volcanic detritus. The tomogram shows features related to both the composition of the sandstone and the fabrics resulting from the pressure-solution deformation (Fig. 14). As a reminder, X-ray attenuation increases with grain density and mean atomic number. In particular, minerals with high concentrations of Fe, Mg, Ti and Zr are bright (high attenuation). For this sample, the white grains correspond to pyrite, magnetite and zircon; the intermediate grains, to lithic rock fragments; and the dark grains, to quartz and plagioclase.

Figure 14 here.

The tomogram also resolves fabrics related to the pressure-solution deformation. Bright values on grain margins and selvages are related to residual concentrations of insoluble phases, such as Fe-Ti oxides and phyllosilicates. The fiber overgrowths are dominated by quartz and white mica, and have a fairly uniform appearance when viewed in thin section, despite the heterogeneous assortment of detrital grains. In the tomogram, the overgrowths also have a uniform appearance throughout the volume. They everywhere seem to have a higher X-ray attenuation than quartz, which might be due to the higher atomic number of potassium in the white mica.

Table 2 here.

Thin section observations indicate that the shortening was accommodated by localized dissolution between grains, and extension, by the precipitation of directed overgrowths. Grain interiors are generally undeformed. The fiber overgrowths mantle the grains in the *X* direction and are unidirectionally aligned with that direction. From these observations we conclude that the initial dimensions of the grains are preserved in the *X* direction. This conclusion holds for many pressure-solved sandstones (Feehan and Brandon, 1999; Ring and Brandon, 1999; Ring et al., 2001; Rahl et al., 2011).

Some care is needed to account for this heterogeneous intergranular deformation.

We find it useful to identify how these different components of the deformation

903 affect the bulk principal stretches. The change in grain shape, as caused by
904 dissolution, is represented by principal stretches S_{gX} , S_{gY} , and S_{gZ} . The contribution of
905 fiber overgrowth is represented by principal stretches S_{fX} , S_{fY} , and S_{fZ} . The principal
906 stretches for the bulk deformation are given by $S_X = S_{gX} S_{fX}$, $S_Y = S_{gY} S_{fY}$, and $S_Z = S_{gZ} S_{fZ}$.
907

908 Considering that the grains have uniform interiors that compose a large fraction of
909 the image, our interpretation is that the ACF method provides estimates of the
910 change in grain dimensions (Table 2). The thin section evidence indicates that the
911 grain dimensions remain unchanged in the X direction, so $S_{gX} = 1$. The other
912 principal strains for the grain shape are $S_{gY} = 0.97$ and $S_{gX} = 0.52$. The volume
913 stretch for the grains is $S_{gV} = S_{gX} S_{gY} S_{gZ}$, which for this sample is $S_{gV} \approx 0.51$, or about
914 50% loss of grain volume.

915
916 For comparison, we also used the PDS method to measure grain stretches (Table 2).
917 PDS measurements are based on microscopy measurements made in 2D thin
918 sections, but they are corrected to account for stereological effects associated with
919 2D sections through 3D volumes (Rahl et al., 2011). The PDS method indicates $S_{gV} \approx$
920 0.76. The ACF method has the advantage that it provides a full estimate in 3D, and is
921 also more precise than the PDS method.

922
923 We consider now the bulk deformation of this sample S_X , S_Y and S_Z . Modal
924 measurements indicate that fiber overgrowth composes 15 percent of the sample.
925 For unidirectional fibers, the fiber-related stretch in the X direction is $S_{fX} = 1/(1-m)$,

where m is the modal fraction of overgrowth (Feehan and Brandon, 1999). The bulk strain in the Y and Z directions is limited to dissolution of the grain boundaries, so $S_{fY} = S_{fZ} = 1$. Using the ACF results and the equations above for fiber and grain strains, we estimate that the bulk strain in this sample caused by pressure solution is $S_X = 1.17$, $S_Y = 0.97$, and $S_Z = 0.52$, with a volume stretch of $S_V = 0.59$. In other words, the pressure-solution deformation generated a net 41% volume loss from the bulk sample. Note that this analysis does not account for deformation associated with compaction of the sandstone, as selvage and overgrowth fabrics indicate that the sandstone had little porosity when pressure solution started (see Feehan and Brandon, 1999 for further discussion of this issue).

The grain size is estimated by fitting the two-component model in (5) to the estimated isotropic ACF. The grain size prior to deformation can be estimated by scaling the lags so there is no strain in the X direction. The estimated average grain radius for this sample is $149 \mu m$ (Table 2).

7.5 2D Image of Deformed Mg-Zr Alloy

Images and tomograms may also contain features that are unrelated to the deformation of the sample, so care is required for proper interpretation of results. We discuss here an example that illustrates this point.

Figure 15 here.

Figure 15a shows a hydrided Mg-Zr alloy with minor Zr grains (Harris, 1973). Such materials are commonly used in nuclear reactors due to their resistance to creep at high temperatures (e.g., Wadsworth et al., 2001). The original fabric was formed by inducing growth of Zr precipitates within the metal, and then passing the alloy through rollers, which produces a flattening fabric. Later, the alloy was subjected to a uniaxial extension, with X oriented in the image vertical. The important point is that the laminated fabric predates the extensional fabric. The alloy accommodated about half of the extension by dilational “veins” or overgrowths, and the other half by microfaulting of the rolled fabric. The overgrowth regions are called “denuded zones” because they lack the Zr precipitates that were in the original alloy. The fabric at present appears granular, but the granular structure is actually defined by microfaults.

The modal abundance of the denuded zones is 4.6 percent (Harris, 1973), which accommodated 4.6 cNp of extension in the vertical. Harris (1973) suggested the denuded zones formed by mass transfer associated with Nabarro-Herring creep (see Xu et al., 2015, for an alternative interpretation), which implies that the “grains” have internal deformation as well. The ACF method correctly estimated the principal strain directions, but failed to correctly estimate the principal strains (Table 1). This result is not surprising given that the laminar fabric has nothing to do with the extensional deformation. One might speculate that the estimated principal strains are representative of the full deformational history of the alloy, including rolling and stretching, but we have no way to test that idea.

972

973 Inspection of Fig. 15b shows that the deformed ACF field has a complicated
974 rectilinear pattern, quite different from the simple ellipsoidal pattern seen in the
975 previous examples. The ACF is clearly dominated by the Zr precipitates, which have
976 a large contrast with the other features in the image. One can see that the ACF is not
977 elliptical, which is an indication that the image is not suitable for strain estimation
978 using the ACF method.

979

980 Figure 15 here.

981

982 An alternative approach is to outline the “grains” and replace the laminated fabric
983 inside each grain with a uniform and unique grayscale value (Fig. 16). The strain
984 estimates for this example (Table 3) indicates that the “grains” are slightly elongate
985 in the vertical, but the method overestimated the principal strains. The reason that
986 this example fails to give useful strain estimates is that the "grains" are not passive
987 markers, but instead were produced by microfaulting. The ACF analysis could be
988 useful, in this case, for estimating the aspect ratio of fault-bounded domains, but it
989 cannot be expected to provide any information about strain.

990

991 Figure 16 here.

992

993 Table 3 here.

994

8. Discussion

In this paper, we started with schematic examples that help illustrate how the ACF might be used to estimate anisotropy and strain. This conceptual framework builds on the pioneering work of Panozzo Heilbronner (1992). Our main contributions are the introduction of a least-squares method for estimating anisotropy and strain from real images and tomograms, and a discussion of how different fabric features influence the ACF estimates. The examples in Tables 1-2 provide a useful test of the ACF method, and illustrate some complex cases where the method might fail or special care is required to get useful results.

We finish here with a discussion of some general issues. The first concerns the interpretation of the least-squares uncertainties. The next are three issues for future development of the ACF method.

8.1 Estimated Least-squares Uncertainties

Many readers may be skeptical of the small estimated uncertainties reported for our ACF estimates (Tables 1-2). What is important to remember is that the reported uncertainties are only representative of the uncertainty associated with the least-squares estimate. The least-squares method not only estimates a best-fit model, but also the residuals, which are the estimated errors in the data relative to that model. The uncertainties in the parameters are simply a function of how the variation in the residuals translates into variation in the estimated values of the parameters.

There may be other sources of error beyond those represented by the residuals. For example, the model may be incorrectly specified. The best check for a well-fit model is by inspection of the results, such as the deformed ACF, the undeformed ACF, and the residuals relative to the estimated isotropic lag. The R^2 and Durbin-Watson statistics provide additional diagnostic clues.

Usually, it is obvious when the model function fails. The Mg-Zr alloy provides a useful example, in that the contours of the deformed ACF are far from elliptical. Thus, we should know, long before applying the ACF method, that the method will probably not work. Yes, we have used the ACF method to calculate strain estimates (Table 1), but those estimates and their uncertainties are not useful estimates of the strain experienced by the alloy.

It might also be thought that heterogeneous strain at the grain scale may also invalidate the ACF results. The pressure-solved examples illustrate a common type of heterogeneous deformation, where the deformation is accommodated by dissolution and precipitation in different positions along grain boundaries. However, we have shown that the method seems to work well for estimating grain strain in the pressure solution examples, because the grains are the dominant features of the fabric.

8.2 Symmetry of the ACF

Our strain estimates have orthorhombic symmetry, because the model function is based on a strain tensor that cannot represent symmetry lower than orthorhombic. The ACF, however, can have lower than orthorhombic symmetry, requiring only an inversion center (Priestley, 1981; Panozzo Heilbronner, 1992). Therefore, we anticipate that the ACF method may be useful for studying low symmetry fabrics, such as those found in rocks from ductile shear zones. For example, the ellipticity of porphyroblasts may be measurably different from deformed neoblasts or micas in the surrounding matrix. Panozzo Heilbronner (1992) provided examples of ACFs with lower than orthorhombic symmetry, and some suggestions for interpreting these fabrics, such as the sense of shearing.

8.3 ACF Sensitivity

In our opinion, the most important next step for the ACF method is to characterize the sensitivity of the ACF for different fabric features. The intensity provides a clue as to what features will dominate, but as Fig. 6 demonstrates, the influence of fabric features at any particular ACF lag value is also dependent on the feature size and spacing. If the ellipses in Fig. 6 had similar intensity values, the ACF would find parameters that are some average of the anisotropy of the two elliptical phases. A method of adjusting intensity values in the image to focus the ACF estimates of strain on different fabric elements would be useful. For the Mg-Zr alloy (Figs. 15 and 16), segmenting the fault-bounded domains focused the ACF estimate of anisotropy on the fault-bounded domains, rather than the foliated Zr streaks.

For 3D objects, manual segmentation of each slice is labor intensive, and computerized segmentation methods (e.g., Ketcham, 2005b) may be especially useful. In many images, however, there may be too much overlap in the intensity values of different fabric features to allow for precise segmentation. We found this to be the case for the pressure-solved sandstone (Fig. 13). These cases require a continuous adjustment to the intensity values to emphasize different features. One approach would be to manually adjust the intensity values in Photoshop using the gamma-correction tool. The same correction can be automated and applied to each “slice” in a stack of images that makeup a tomogram. Alternatively, a statistical approach can also be used to continuously rescale the intensity values (Eisemann et al., 2011).

8.4. Dynamic Range and Neighbor Correlation

An additional objective is to allow for estimation of anisotropy as a function of lag. At present, the X-ray tomogram images of the pressure-solved sandstone examples have excellent resolution for estimating anisotropy associated with self-correlation, but they lack the sample size and dynamic range to estimate anisotropy associated with neighbor-correlation.

To explain, let's consider first the requirements for minimum resolution. In our experience, the raw image should have a voxel size smaller than about 2.5 percent of the grain diameter. This value allows for “2x2 binning”, as needed to remove aliasing errors (Rivers et al., 2010). As a result, the actual operational image should

have a voxel size smaller than 5% of the grain diameter. For comparison, the tomogram for our pressure-solved sample has voxel sizes of 7.54 μm , which works out to $\sim 3\%$ of the grain diameter ($2R_g \approx 220 \mu\text{m}$). One might consider smaller voxels if there are fine features, such as overgrowths or selvages, that need to be identified for modal analysis or removed by image processing. Accurate model analysis commonly will require a voxel resolution of 1 to 5 μm .

What we are lacking at present is sufficient dynamic range, which would allow images of larger samples while maintaining the resolution. For example, our tomogram for the pressure-solved sandstone has an average of ~ 6 grain diameters across each dimension. This size is sufficient for determining self-correlation, but it is inadequate to fully resolve neighbor-correlation. For example, Crespi (1986) estimated that for the Fry method in 2D, measurements of about 500 to 1000 grains are needed to get a successful solution. This works out to an image that has an average of 22-32 grains across each dimension. Thus, the pressure-solved sandstone, which has an average grain diameter of $\sim 220 \mu\text{m}$, would require tomograms that are 5 to 8 mm in each dimension. The raw image, after binning, would have to be 880 to 1200 voxels per dimension. For comparison, each working dimension of our cropped tomograms is about 400 to 500 voxels.

X-ray tomography imaging can be divided into two types of setups: commercially available desktop scanners and synchrotrons. Commercial scanners use X-ray tubes, in which a target, such as tungsten, is impacted by an electron beam to generate X-

rays. For synchrotrons, electrons traveling at velocities near the speed of light are accelerated in storage rings using bending magnets, undulators, and wigglers. The electrons produce X-rays as they circle through the storage ring, and those X-rays are extracted at fixed points around the ring. The main difference between commercial and synchrotron scanners is that the synchrotron has a much larger photon flux spread over a larger range of X-ray energy (Fusseis et al., 2014). As a result, the X-ray beam can be filtered to specific energy bands while maintaining a large enough photon flux for tomography. Selecting a specific energy band is useful for avoiding beam-hardening artifacts, or optimizing attenuation contrast. In addition, a large photon flux means that the tomogram can be acquired quickly, on the order of 10 minutes at present, and with low image noise. In contrast, the lower photon flux for commercial systems means acquisition times on the order of 1.5 to 4 hours for similar sample sizes.

The voxel resolution and sample size requirements also differ between commercial and synchrotron systems. The Argonne APS Beamline 13-BM D can image a cylinder with a diameter less than 50 mm and a height less than 4 mm. The CCD in use during our measurements provided 650 pixels across the radial dimension after binning for aliasing. If we consider an 8 mm diameter cylinder, the voxel resolution would be about 12 μm (see Gualda and Rivers, 2006, for further details). Commercial systems are more flexible with sample size and can provide voxel sizes down to the micron scale for small samples, but as noted above the acquisition times are much longer.

The small sample size creates another problem, in that it is challenging to keep the sample oriented relative to its geographic orientation. Given our experiences, we recommend that samples be prepared as small cores, on the order of 8 mm in diameter, which is about the diameter of a pencil, and several cm in length. The azimuthal direction of the core could be marked with a scribe. Using this approach, the orientation of the core can then be directly acquired from the tomogram. For comparison, note that a rock chip for a standard thin-section billet is about 26 mm x 46 mm x 10 mm.

9. Conclusions

We have outlined the utility of the ACF method for estimating anisotropy and deformation. Our analyses here have emphasized thin-section images and X-ray tomograms, but clearly the ACF method can be applied to other kinds of field variables, such as composition and crystal orientation. In comparison to other methods of strain estimation, the ACF method allows for more precise representations of objects, and does not require fitting ellipses to objects or abstractions of grain boundaries. The method also works equally well for both 2D and 3D images.

The method works best for images or tomograms where grains have a uniform internal intensity but a strong contrast with the intensity of other grains and matrix. For example, a tomogram of a granite or a polymictic sandstone should work well, but a tomogram of a monomineralic rock, such as a limestone, dunite, or quartzite,

would likely give poor results unless there are significant variations in attenuation between grains. It is also a challenge to work with grains that have a complicated internal structure, as illustrated by the examples of the ironstone oolite and the Mg-Zr alloy. There are ways to treat these cases, such as manually segmenting grains, as was done for the metal example. In this regard, computerized segmentation methods (Ketcham; 2005b) may prove useful, especially for 3D tomograms. Right now, our analysis is weighted towards the self-correlation component of the ACF, and thus is most sensitive to particle shapes. Further work is needed to develop methods that would be able to provide separate estimates of the anisotropies associated with self-correlation and neighbor-correlation. The method could also be generalized to give a continuous estimate of anisotropy as a function of lag.

Acknowledgements

We thank Mark Rivers for his help in imaging sample 92810-3, Jean Crespi for providing the photomicrograph of the ooids from the Jurassic Stump formation, and John Wheeler for introducing us to the Mg-Zr alloy example. We thank Kieran Mulchrone, an anonymous reviewer, and the Editor William Dunne for their constructive and helpful comments. C.J.T. acknowledges support from an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship under grant DGE-1122492 and from the Stephen E. Laubach Award in Structural Diagenesis. This research used resources of the Advanced Photon Source, a U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science User Facility operated for the DOE Office of Science by Argonne National Laboratory under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357.

References

- Alexander, T., 1997. Is AGN Variability Correlated with Other AGN Properties?—ZDCF Analysis of Small Samples of Sparse Light Curves. In: Maoz, D. Sternberg, A. Leibowitz E.M. (Eds), *Astronomical Time Series*. Springer, Netherlands, 163-166.
- Andrä, H., Combaret, N., Dvorkin, J., Glatt, E., Han, J., Kabel, M., Keehm, Y., Krzikalla, F., Lee, M., Madonna, C., Marsh, M., Mukerji, T., Saenger, E.H., Sain, R., Saxena, N., Ricker, S., Wiegmann, A., Zhan, X., 2013. Digital rock physics benchmarks—Part I: Imaging and segmentation. *Computers & Geosciences*, 50, 25-32. doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2012.09.005
- Baker, D. R., Mancini, L., Polacci, M., Higgins, M. D., Gualda, G. A. R., Hill, R. J., & Rivers, M. L., 2012. An introduction to the application of X-ray microtomography to the three-dimensional study of igneous rocks. *Lithos*, 148, 262-276. doi: 10.1016/j.lithos.2012.06.008
- Baveye, P.C., Laba, M., Otten, W., Bouckaert, L., Sterpaio, P.D., Gowami, R.R., Grinev, D., Houston, A., Hu, Y., Liu, J., Mooney, S., Pajor, R., Sleutel, S., Tarquis, A., Wang, W., Wei, Q., Sezgin, M., 2010. Observer-dependent variability of the thresholding step in the quantitative analysis of soil images and X-ray microtomography data, *Geoderma*, 157, 51-63, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2010.03.015.
- Boone, M., Dewanckele, J., Boone, M., Cnudde, V., Silversmit, G., Van Ranst, E., Jacobs, P., Vincze L., Van Hoorebeke, L., 2011. Three-dimensional phase separation and identification in granite. *Geosphere*, 7(1), 79-86. doi: 10.1130/GES00562.1
- Berger, M.J., Hubbell, J.H., Seltzer, S.M., Chang, J., Coursey, J.S., Sukumar, R., Zucker, D.S., and Olsen, K., 2010. XCOM: Photon Cross Section Database (version 1.5). [Online] Available: <http://physics.nist.gov/xcom>. National Institute of

Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD.

Bevington, P. R., & Robinson, D. K. (2003). Data reduction and error analysis. McGraw-Hill, New York.

Box, G. E., & Cox, D. R., 1964. An analysis of transformations. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological), 211-252.

Brabant, L., Vlassenbroeck, J., De Witte, Y., Cnudde, V., Boone, M. N., Dewanckele, J., Van Hoorebeke, L., 2011. Three-dimensional analysis of high-resolution X-ray computed tomography data with Morpho+. Microscopy and Microanalysis, 17(02), 252-263. doi:10.1017/S1431927610094389

Brandon, M. T., 1995. Analysis of geologic strain data in strain-magnitude space. Journal of Structural Geology, 17(10), 1375-1385. doi: 10.1016/0191-8141(95)00032-9

Brandon, M. T., Roden-Tice, M. K., Garver, J. I., 1998. Late Cenozoic exhumation of the Cascadia accretionary wedge in the Olympic Mountains, northwest Washington State. Geological Society of America Bulletin, 110(8), 985-1009. doi: 10.1130/0016-7606(1998)110<0985:LCEOTC>2.3.CO;2

Broersen, P. M., 2006. Automatic autocorrelation and spectral analysis. London: Springer.

Brun, F., Mancini, L., Kasae, P., Favretto, S., Dreossi, D., & Tromba, G., 2010. Pore3D: a software library for quantitative analysis of porous media. Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment, 615(3), 326-332. doi: 10.1016/j.nima.2010.02.063

1238 Buscombe, D., Masselink, G., 2009. Grain-size information from the statistical
 1239 properties of digital images of sediment. *Sedimentology*, 56: 421–438.
 1240 doi:10.1111/j.1365-3091.2008.00977.x
 1241
 1242 Carlson, W. D., 2006. Three-dimensional imaging of earth and planetary materials.
 1243 *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 249(3), 133-147.
 1244 doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2006.06.020
 1245
 1246 Chantler, C.T., Olsen, K., Dragoset, R.A., Chang, J., Kishore, A.R., Kotochigova, S.A.,
 1247 Zucker, D.S. (2005), X-Ray Form Factor, Attenuation and Scattering Tables (version
 1248 2.1). [Online] Available: <http://physics.nist.gov/ffast>. National Institute of Standards
 1249 and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD.
 1250
 1251 Cnudde, V., Boone, M. N., 2013. High-resolution X-ray computed tomography in
 1252 geosciences: A review of the current technology and applications. *Earth-Science*
 1253 *Reviews*, 123, 1-17. doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2013.04.003
 1254
 1255 Crespi, J. M., 1986. Some guidelines for the practical application of Fry's method of
 1256 strain analysis. *Journal of Structural Geology*, 8(7), 799-808. doi:10.1016/0191-
 1257 8141(86)90026-X
 1258
 1259 Cule, D., Torquato, S., 1999. Generating random media from limited microstructural
 1260 information via stochastic optimization. *Journal of applied physics*, 86(6), 3428-
 1261 3437. doi:10.1063/1.371225.
 1262
 1263 Debye, P., & Bueche, A. M. (1949). Scattering by an inhomogeneous solid. *Journal of*
 1264 *Applied Physics*, 20(6), 518-525.
 1265
 1266 Debye, P., Anderson Jr, H. R., Brumberger, H., 1957. Scattering by an inhomogeneous
 1267 solid. II. The correlation function and its application. *Journal of applied Physics*,
 1268 28(6), 679-683. doi:10.1063/1.1722830.

1269

1270 Denison, C., Carlson, W. D., Ketcham, R. A., 1997, Three-dimensional quantitative
 1271 textural analysis of metamorphic rocks using high-resolution computed X-ray
 1272 tomography: Part I. Methods and techniques. *Journal of Metamorphic Geology*,
 1273 15: 29–44. doi: 10.1111/j.1525-1314.1997.00006.x.

1274

1275 Denison, C., Carlson, W. D., 1997. Three-dimensional quantitative textural analysis of
 1276 metamorphic rocks using high-resolution computed X-ray tomography: Part II.
 1277 Application to natural samples. *Journal of Metamorphic Geology*, 15: 45–57,
 1278 doi:10.1111/j.1525-1314.1997.00007.x.

1279

1280 Donev, A., Torquato, S., Stillinger, F. H., 2005. Neighbor list collision-driven
 1281 molecular dynamics simulation for nonspherical hard particles. I. Algorithmic
 1282 details, *Journal of Computational Physics*, 202(2). 737-764.
 1283 doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2004.08.014

1284

1285 Donev, A., Torquato, S., & Stillinger, F. H. (2005). Neighbor list collision-driven
 1286 molecular dynamics simulation for nonspherical hard particles.: II. applications to
 1287 ellipses and ellipsoids. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 202(2), 765-793.

1288

1289 Donev, A., 2006. Jammed packings of hard particles, Ph.D. thesis. Princeton
 1290 University.

1291

1292 Draper, N. R., Smith, H., 1998. *Applied regression analysis* (3rd ed.). Wiley-
 1293 Interscience. New York. ISBN 0-471-17082-8

1294

1295 Ebel, D. S. and Rivers, M. L., 2007. Meteorite 3-D synchrotron microtomography:
 1296 Methods and applications. *Meteoritics & Planetary Science*, 42: 1627–1646.
 1297 doi:10.1111/j.1945-5100.2007.tb00595.x

1298

1299 Eisemann, M., Albuquerque, G., & Magnor, M. (2011). Data driven color mapping. In
 1300 Proceedings of EuroVA: International Workshop on Visual Analytics, Bergen,
 1301 Norway.
 1302
 1303 Elangovan, P., Hezel, D. C., Howard, L., Armstrong, R., Abel, R. L., 2012. PhaseQuant: A
 1304 tool for quantifying tomographic data sets of geological specimens. Computers &
 1305 Geosciences, 48, 323-329. doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2012.01.014
 1306
 1307 Efron, B., 1979. Bootstrap methods: another look at the jackknife. The Annals of
 1308 Statistics, 7, 1-26.
 1309
 1310 Erslev, E. A., 1988. Normalized center-to-center strain analysis of packed aggregates.
 1311 Journal of Structural Geology, 10(2), 201-209. doi: 10.1016/0191-8141(88)90117-4
 1312
 1313 Feehan, J. G., M. T. Brandon, 1999. Contribution of ductile flow to exhumation of low-
 1314 temperature, high-pressure metamorphic rocks: San Juan-Cascade nappes, NW
 1315 Washington State, J. Geophys. Res., 104(B5), 10883–10902,
 1316 doi:[10.1029/1998JB900054](https://doi.org/10.1029/1998JB900054).
 1317
 1318 Friese, K. I., Cichy, S. B., Wolter, F. E., Botcharnikov, R. E., 2013. Analysis of
 1319 tomographic mineralogical data using YaDiV—Overview and practical case study.
 1320 Computers & Geosciences, 56, 92-103, doi: 10.1016/j.cageo.2013.01.021.
 1321
 1322 Fry, N., 1979. Random point distributions and strain measurement in rocks.
 1323 Tectonophysics, 60(1), 89-105.
 1324
 1325 Füsseis, F., Xiao, X., Schrank, C., & De Carlo, F., 2014. A brief guide to synchrotron
 1326 radiation-based microtomography in (structural) geology and rock mechanics.
 1327 Journal of Structural Geology, 65, 1-16.
 1328

1329 Gualda G.A.R., Rivers M., 2006. Quantitative 3D petrography using X-ray
 1330 tomography: Application to Bishop Tuff pumice clasts. *Journal of Volcanology and*
 1331 *Geothermal Research* 154: 48-62.
 1332
 1333 Gualda, G. A., Pamukcu, A. S., Claiborne, L. L., & Rivers, M. L., 2010. Quantitative 3D
 1334 petrography using X-ray tomography 3: Documenting accessory phases with
 1335 differential absorption tomography. *Geosphere*, 6(6), 782-792. doi:
 1336 10.1130/GES00568.1
 1337
 1338 Harris, J. E., 1973. The inhibition of diffusion creep by precipitates. *Metal Science*,
 1339 7(1), 1-6. Doi: 10.1179/030634573790445514
 1340
 1341 Heilbronner, R., 2010. Mapping texture domains in quartzite microstructures.
 1342 *Journal of the Geological Society of India*, 75(1), 160-170.
 1343
 1344 Heilbronner, R., Barrett, S., 2013. Image analysis in earth sciences: microstructures
 1345 and textures of earth materials. Springer.
 1346 Hencky, H., 1931. The Law of Elasticity for Isotropic and Quasi-Isotropic Substances
 1347 by Finite Deformations. *Journal of Rheology* (1929-1932), 2(2), 169-176.
 1348 doi:/10.1122/1.2116361.
 1349
 1350 Hext, G.R., 1963. The estimation of second-order tensors, with related tests and
 1351 designs. *Biometrika*, 50(3-4), 353-373, doi:10.1093/biomet/50.3-4.353.
 1352
 1353 Higham, N. J., 2008. Functions of matrices: theory and computation. SIAM,
 1354 Philadelphia.
 1355
 1356 Hubbell, J.H. Seltzer, S.M., 2004. Tables of X-Ray Mass Attenuation Coefficients and
 1357 Mass Energy-Absorption Coefficients (version 1.4). [Online] Available:
 1358 <http://physics.nist.gov/xaamdi>. National Institute of Standards and Technology,
 1359 Gaithersburg, MD.

1360

1361 Huddleston-Holmes, C.R., Ketcham, R.A., 2005. Getting the inside story: using
1362 computed X-ray tomography to study inclusion trails in garnet porphyroblasts.
1363 American Mineralogist, November-December, v. 90, ea1-ea17,
1364 doi:10.2138/am.2005.1840

1365

1366 Hu, Q., Ley, M.R., Davis, J., Hana J.C., Frazier, R., Zhang, Y., 2014. 3D chemical
1367 segmentation of fly ash particles with X-ray computed tomography and electron
1368 probe microanalysis, Fuel, 116(15) 229-236, doi:10.1016/j.fuel.2013.07.037.

1369

1370 Iassonov, P., Gebrenegus, T., Tuller, M., 2009, Segmentation of X-ray computed
1371 tomography images of porous materials: A crucial step for characterization and
1372 quantitative analysis of pore structures, Water Resour. Res., 45, W09415,
1373 doi:[10.1029/2009WR008087](https://doi.org/10.1029/2009WR008087).

1374

1375 Iassonov, P., Tuller, M., 2010. Application of segmentation for correction of intensity
1376 bias in X-ray computed tomography images. Vadose Zone Journal, 9(1), 187-191.
1377 doi:10.2136/vzj2009.0042.

1378

1379 Jelínek, V., 1978. Statistical processing of anisotropy of magnetic susceptibility
1380 measured on groups of specimens. Studia geophysica et geodaetica, 22(1), 50-
1381 62.doi: 10.1007/BF01613632.

1382

1383 Jerram, D. A., Higgins, M. D., 2007. 3D analysis of rock textures: quantifying igneous
1384 microstructures. Elements, 3(4), 239-245, doi:10.2113/gselements.3.4.239.

1385

1386 Kansal, A. R., Torquato, S., Stillinger, F. H., 2002. Computer generation of dense
1387 polydisperse sphere packings. The Journal of chemical physics, 117(18), 8212-8218.
1388 doi:[10.1063/1.1511510](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1511510).

1389

1390 Ketcham, R. A., 2005a. Three-dimensional grain fabric measurements using high-
 1391 resolution X-ray computed tomography. *Journal of Structural Geology*, 27(7), 1217-
 1392 1228.
 1393
 1394 Ketcham, R. A., 2005b. Computational methods for quantitative analysis of three-
 1395 dimensional features in geological specimens. *Geosphere*, 1(1), 32-41.
 1396 doi:10.1130/GES00001.1
 1397
 1398 Ketcham, R.A., Carlson, W.D., 2001. Acquisition, optimization and interpretation of
 1399 X-ray computed tomographic imagery: applications to the geosciences. *Computers &*
 1400 *Geosciences* 27.4, 381-400. 10.1016/S0098-3004(00)00116-3.
 1401
 1402 Ketcham, R. A. and Ryan, T. M., 2004. Quantification and visualization of anisotropy
 1403 in trabecular bone. *Journal of Microscopy*, 213: 158–171. doi:10.1111/j.1365-
 1404 2818.2004.01277.x
 1405
 1406 Lado, F., Torquato, S., 1990. Two-point probability function for distributions of
 1407 oriented hard ellipsoids. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 93(8), 5912-5917.
 1408 doi:10.1063/1.459501
 1409
 1410 Lindquist, W. B., Venkatarangan, A., Dunsmuir, J., Wong, T., 2000. Pore and throat
 1411 size distributions measured from synchrotron X-ray tomographic images of
 1412 Fontainebleau sandstones, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 105(B9), 21509–21527,
 1413 doi:10.1029/2000JB900208.
 1414
 1415 Liu, J., Regenauer-Lieb, K., Hines, C., Liu, K., Gaede, O., Squelch, A., 2009. Improved
 1416 estimates of percolation and anisotropic permeability from 3-D X-ray
 1417 microtomography using stochastic analyses and visualization, *Geochem. Geophys.*
 1418 *Geosyst.*, 10, Q05010, doi:10.1029/2008GC002358
 1419

1420 Luding, S., 2004. Molecular Dynamics Simulations of Granular Materials. In:
 1421 Hinrichsen, H., Wolf D.E. (Eds.), The Physics of Granular Media. Wiley-VCH Verlag
 1422 GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim, FRG, doi: 10.1002/352760362X.ch13
 1423
 1424 Lubachevsky, B., Stillinger, F.H., 1990. Geometric properties of random disk
 1425 packings. Journal of Statistical Physics, 60(5-6), 561-583.
 1426
 1427 Maätzler, C., 2002. Relation between grain-size and correlation length of snow.
 1428 Journal of Glaciology, 48(162), 461-466. doi: 10.3189/172756502781831287
 1429
 1430 Maire, E., Withers, P.J., 2014. Quantitative X-ray tomography. International Materials
 1431 Reviews, 59(1), 1-43.
 1432
 1433 Mills, I. M. (1995). Unity as a Unit. Metrologia, 31(6), 537. doi:10.1088/0026-
 1434 1394/31/6/013
 1435
 1436 Moler, C. B., 2008. Numerical computing with MATLAB. SIAM. Philadelphia. ISBN
 1437 978-0-89871-660-3
 1438
 1439 Mookerjee, M., Peek, S., 2014. Evaluating the effectiveness of Flinn's k-value versus
 1440 Lode's ratio. Journal of Structural Geology. doi: 10.1016/j.jsg.2014.08.008
 1441
 1442 O'Connor, A., Mulchrone, K. F., & Meere, P. A., 2009. WinDICOM: A program for
 1443 determining inclusion shape and orientation, Computers & Geosciences 35(6):
 1444 1358-1368. [doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2008.08.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2008.08.015)
 1445
 1446 Owens, W.H., 2000. Statistical applications to second-rank tensors in magnetic
 1447 fabric analysis, Geophys. J. Int 142 (2): 527-538 doi:10.1046/j.1365-
 1448 246x.2000.00174.x
 1449

- Panozzo Heilbronner, R., 1992. The autocorrelation function: an image processing tool for fabric analysis. *Tectonophysics*, 212(3), 351-370.
- Press, W.H., Teukolsky, S.A., Vetterling, W.T., Flannery, B.P., 2007. Numerical recipes 3rd edition: The art of scientific computing. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Priestley, M.B., 1981. Spectral Analysis and Time Series. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Rahl, J. M., Brandon, M. T., Deckert, H., Ring, U., & Mortimer, N., 2011. Tectonic significance of ductile deformation in low-grade sandstones in the mesozoic Otago subduction wedge, New Zealand. *American Journal of Science*, 311(1), 27-62. doi: 10.2475/01.2011.02
- Ramsay, J. G. (1967). Folding and fracturing of rocks. McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Ramsay, J. G., Huber, M. I., 1983. The techniques of modern structural geology, Vol. 1., Academic Press, London.
- Reeder, R. J., Lanzirotti, A., 2006. Accessing user facilities and making your research experience successful. *Elements*, 2(1), 31-35. doi:10.2113/gselements.2.1.31
- Ring, U., Brandon, M. T., 1999. Ductile deformation and mass loss in the Franciscan subduction complex: implications for exhumation processes in accretionary wedges. *Special Publication-Geological Society of London*, 154, 55-86. doi:10.1144/GSL.SP.1999.154.01.03
- Ring, U., Brandon, M.T., Ramthun, A., 2001. Solution-mass-transfer deformation adjacent to the Glarus Thrust, with implications for the tectonic evolution of the Alpine wedge in eastern Switzerland. *Journal of Structural Geology* 23, 1491–1505. doi:10.1016/S0191-8141(01)00015-3.

1481 Rivers, M. L., Sutton, S. R., Eng, P. J., 1999. Geoscience applications of x-ray computed
 1482 microtomography. In SPIE's International Symposium on Optical Science,
 1483 Engineering, and Instrumentation International Society for Optics and Photonics.
 1484 78-86.
 1485
 1486 Rivers, M. L., Citron, D. T., Wang, Y., 2010. Recent developments in computed
 1487 tomography at GSECARS. In SPIE Optical Engineering+ Applications, International
 1488 Society for Optics and Photonics, 780409-780409.
 1489
 1490 Ryan, T.M., Ketcham, R.A., 2002. The three-dimensional structure of trabecular bone
 1491 in the femoral head of strepsirrhine primates. Journal of human evolution, 43(1), 1-
 1492 26, doi: 10.1006/jhev.2002.0552.
 1493
 1494 Salavon, J., 1998. The Class of 1988 & The Class of 1967. Retrieved from
 1495 <http://www.salavon.com>
 1496
 1497 Shepp, L. A., Logan, B. F., 1974. The Fourier reconstruction of a head section. Nuclear
 1498 Science, IEEE Transactions on, 21(3), 21-43. doi: 10.1109/TNS.1974.6499235.
 1499
 1500 Shimamoto, T., Ikeda, Y., 1976. A simple algebraic method for strain estimation from
 1501 deformed ellipsoidal objects. 1. Basic theory. Tectonophysics, 36(4), 315-337, doi:
 1502 10.1016/0040-1951(76)90107-4.
 1503
 1504 Skoge, M., Donev, A., Stillinger, F. H., Torquato, S., 2006. Packing hyperspheres in
 1505 high-dimensional Euclidean spaces. Physical Review E, 74(4), 041127.
 1506 doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.74.041127
 1507
 1508 Spencer, A. J. M., 1980. Continuum mechanics. Dover Publications, Mineola, N.Y.
 1509
 1510 Sutton, S. R., Bertsch, P. M., Newville, M., Rivers, M., Lanzirotti, A., Eng, P., 2002.
 1511 Microfluorescence and microtomography analyses of heterogeneous earth and

1512 environmental materials. *Reviews in Mineralogy and Geochemistry*, 49(1), 429-483.
 1513 doi:10.2138/rmg.2002.49.8.
 1514
 1515 Svitelman, V., Dinariev, O., 2013. Geostatistical approach to the anisotropy analysis
 1516 of 3D rock microtomographic models. *Computers & Geosciences*, 57, 116-123.
 1517 doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2013.04.007
 1518 Tabor, R. W., & Cady, W. M. (1978). The structure of the Olympic Mountains,
 1519 Washington: Analysis of a subduction zone (Vol. 1033). US Govt. Print. Off.
 1520
 1521 Torquato, S., 2002a. Random heterogeneous materials: microstructure and
 1522 macroscopic properties, Springer, New York.
 1523
 1524 Torquato, S., Lado, F., 1991. Trapping constant, thermal conductivity, and the
 1525 microstructure of suspensions of oriented spheroids. *The Journal of Chemical*
 1526 *Physics*, 94(6), 4453-4462. doi:10.1063/1.460635
 1527
 1528 Torquato, S., Stell, G., 1982. Microstructure of two-phase random media. I. The n-
 1529 point probability functions. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 77(4), 2071-2077.
 1530 doi:10.1063/1.444011
 1531
 1532 Torquato, S., Stell, G., 1983. Microstructure of two-phase random media. III. The n-
 1533 point matrix probability functions for fully penetrable spheres. *The Journal of*
 1534 *Chemical Physics*, 79(3), 1505-1510. doi:10.1063/1.445941
 1535
 1536 Torquato, S., Stell, G., 1985. Microstructure of two-phase random media. V. The n-
 1537 point matrix probability functions for impenetrable spheres. *The Journal of chemical*
 1538 *physics*, 82(2), 980-987.
 1539
 1540 Wadsworth, J., Ruano, O. A., Sherby, O. D., 2002. Denuded zones, diffusional creep,
 1541 and grain boundary sliding. *Metallurgical and Materials Transactions A*, 33(2), 219-
 1542 229, doi:10.1007/s11661-002-0084-7.

1543

1544 Wright, T. O., Platt, L. B., 1982. Pressure dissolution and cleavage in the Martinsburg
1545 Shale. American Journal of Science, 282(2), 122-135, doi: 10.2475/ajs.282.2.122.

1546

1547 Xu, W.F., Zhang Y., Peng, L.M., Ding, W.J., Nie, J.F., 2015. Formation of denuded zones
1548 in crept Mg-2.5Gd-0.1Zr alloy, Acta Materialia. 84(1), 317-329

1549 doi:10.1016/j.actamat.2014.10.046.

1550

1551

Figure Captions

Figure 1. X-ray tomography image of an *X-Z* section through a sandstone deformed by pressure solution (sample 92810-3 from the Olympic subduction complex in NW Washington State). A deformation fabric is indicated by detrital grains (dark gray), which are separated by anastomosing cleavage surfaces (long, thin light-gray features, approximately parallel to the *X* direction) and by directed overgrowths (thicker light-gray features, oriented in the *X* direction). The cleavages have accommodated shortening in the *Z* direction, and the overgrowths, extension in the *X* direction.

Figure 2: X-ray attenuation coefficients for various geologic materials (Chantler et al., 2005), as normalized by the coefficient for quartz. The gray regions show a "factor of two" range for an attenuation coefficient relative to that for quartz. Minerals that lie outside that range will be easily resolved relative to quartz in an X-ray tomogram.

Figure 3: Correlated structure as illustrated using averaging. (a) An average of yearbook pictures for women in the 1967 graduation class at Fort Worth High School (Salavon, 1998). (b) An average of 200 *X-Z* sections from an X-ray tomogram of deformed sandstone, representing an out-of-plane thickness of 392 μm (sample 92810-3 from the Olympic subduction complex).

Figure 4. The autocorrelation function for three examples: (a) a single circle, (b) a square lattice of circles, and (c) an anticlustered distribution of circles. (d) The autocorrelation function $\rho(r)$ for these examples is related to the change in the overlapping area of the circles, which is set to 1 when the lag $r = 0$, and decreases as the lag increases to R , the radius of the circles.

Figure 5. The Ramsay and Fry effects in the ACF. (a, b) At short lags, where $r/R < 1$, the ACF represents the correlation of features with themselves, and thus the ACF is sensitive to the anisotropy of features. The anisotropy in this range is similar to that measured by the Ramsay method, which is focused on the distortion of features. (c, d) At long lags, where $r/R > 1$, the ACF is sensitive to the anisotropic distribution of features with respect to each other. This anisotropy is similar to that measured by the Fry method, which focuses on the distribution of nearest neighbors.

Figure 6. Two examples showing how the ACF is affected by the contrast in intensity between phases. The ACFs for these examples are shown as contours of ρ in terms of x and y components of the lag vector and a contour interval of 0.1. (a) For the first example, the gray ellipses are small and have little contrast with the surrounding white phase, so (b) the ACF contours everywhere mimic the anisotropy of the larger black ellipses. (c) For the second example, the black ellipses are small, but have high contrast with respect to the other two phases. (d) As a result, the ACF

contours have the same elliptical shape as the black phase at short lags ($r/R_x \sim 0.1$), but take on the elliptical shape of the gray phase at long lags ($r/R_x > \sim 0.3$).

Figure 7. Comparison of ACF model functions. (a) A 3D synthetic aggregate composed of non-overlapping identical spheres. (b) The ACF for the synthetic aggregate (gray line) and best-fit solutions using the exponential model (dash line), the spherical model (solid line), and the 2-component model (dash-dot line). The “half-height” lag is shown by r^* . (c) The best-fit 2-component model (solid line) and the self-correlation (dash-dot line) and neighbor-correlation (dash line) components for that fit.

Figure 8. The uncertainty for a best-fit principal direction is represented by an elliptical cone (gray line) that intersects the plane normal to the direction. The radii of the cone are given by $\max \alpha_{95}$ and $\min \alpha_{95}$, and the orientation in the plane is given by the twist. This example shows the elliptical cone for the Y principal direction. Positive X and Z directions are shown for a right-handed coordinate system where Y points out of the image.

Figure 9. Synthetic example (phantom) used to test the ACF method for estimating 3D strain. (a) A 3D rendering of the phantom, which was constructed from identical non-overlapping spheres and then deformed homogenously. (b) Observed ACF in the deformed coordinate frame with lag normalized to the radius R of the

undeformed spheres. (c) Isotropic ACF, determined by removing estimated strain.
(d) Standardized residuals for the best-fit isotropic ACF as a function of lag.

Figure 10. Use of ACF method to estimate strain for (a) 2D photomicrograph of undeformed ooids from the Jurassic Stump formation in Wyoming (Crespi, 1986). See caption in Figure 8 for other details, and Table 1 for results.

Figure 11. Use of ACF method to estimate strain for (a) 2D photomicrograph of deformed ooids (figure 7.7 in Ramsay and Huber, 1983). See caption in Figure 8 for other details, and Table 1 for results.

Figure 12. The effect of internal particle structure on the ACF. (a) A test object composed of concentric rings with the same aspect ratio. (b) The ACF contours are not everywhere elliptical, but instead have "hot-dog" shapes at intermediate lags. The black line is r^* .

Figure 13. Tomogram for deformed sandstone (sample 92810-3 from the Olympic subduction complex). (a) 3D rendering showing principal strain axes sections as determined using the ACF method. (b-d) Slices through the tomogram along principal strain sections. See Table 2 for results. The black box in panel (b) outlines the region shown in Fig. 14.

Figure 14. Pressure-solution fabric elements in *X-Z* slice of sample 92810-3 tomogram. Arrows indicate quartz/feldspar and lithic grains, fibrous overgrowths, and selvages. The section area is outline by the black box in Fig. 13b.

Figure 15. A cautionary tale for using the ACF method. (a) Photomicrograph and (b) ACF of an Mg-Zr alloy that was initially formed by rolling, which produced the vertical laminar structure. The horizontal light gray zones are overgrowths that formed under high temperature conditions. During this deformation, the fabric was also broken into blocky domains by shear fractures. See Table 1 for results.

Figure 16. Segmentation of the “grains” in the Mg-Zr alloy dramatically changes the best-fit strain results. (a) The “grains” are manually segmented and assigned uniform gray scale values. (b) The ACF suggests the segmented grains are elongated in the vertical direction. Black line marks the r_0^* contour. See Table 3 for results.

Table 1: Best-fit results for phantom, ooid, and Mg-Zr alloy samples.

Table 2: Best-fit results for pressure-solved sandstone sample.

Figure 1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Figure 2

a) **Figure 3**

b)

Figure 4
a) Single Circle

b) Square Lattice

c) Anticlustered

d) Autocorrelation Functions

a) Multiphase Image

b) ACF

c) Multiphase Image

d) ACF

Figure 7

b)

c)

Figure 8

Figure 9 a) Phantom Aggregate

Figure 10) Undeformed Ooids

Figure 1a) Deformed Ooids

b) Estimated ACF

c) Isotropic ACF

d) Standardized Residuals

a) Figure 12

b)

Figure 13

b) X-Z Section

c) Y-Z Section

d) X-Y Section

Figure 14
lithic grain

selvage

fibrous
overgrowth

quartz / feldspar
grain

Figure 15
a) Mg-Zr Alloy

b) ACF

Figure 16

a) Mg-Zr Alloy, segmented

b) ACF

Table 1

Table 1: Best-fit results for phantom, ooid, and Mg-Zr alloy samples.

Sample, Method	Principal Magnitudes and Directions							Isotropy Prob. (%)	Grain Radius $R_S(\mu\text{m})$	Fit	
	Princ. Axis	S' l/l_0	E' (cNp)	Tr/Pl (deg)	max α_{95} (deg)	min α_{95} (deg)	Twist (deg)			R^2	d
Phantom Fig. 9											
ACF	X	2.00(0)	+69.21(5)	330/00	0.0	0.0	01	Y-Z: 0	97*	0.96	1.97
	Y	1.00(0)	-00.36(4)	060/00	0.0	0.0	03	X-Z: 0			
	Z	0.50(0)	-68.85(4)	234/90	0.0	0.0	90	X-Y: 0			
Undeformed Oolite Fig. 10											
ACF	X	1.02(0)	+02.12(8)	121/00	0.9	0.0	90	Y-Z: 0	160	0.93	1.99
	Z	0.98(0)	-02.12(8)	031/00	0.9	0.0	00	X-Y: 0			
R_f/ϕ	X	1.00(2)	+1(1)	098/00	21	57	—	—	—	—	—
	Z	1.00(2)	-1(1)	008/00	21	77	—	—	—	—	—
Deformed Oolite Fig. 11											
ACF	X	1.13(0)	+12.2(1)	020/00	0.3	0.0	90	Y-Z: 0	828	0.94	1.97
	Z	0.89(0)	-12.2(1)	110/00	0.3	0.0	00	X-Y: 0			
R_f/ϕ inside grain	X	1.09(3)	+8(1)	020/00	3	3	—	—	—	—	—
	Z	0.92(3)	-8(1)	110/00	3	3	—	—	—	—	—
Nearest Neighbor	X	1.34	+29.11	025/00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Z	0.75	-29.11	115/00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mg-Zr Alloy Fig. 15											
ACF	X	2.41(0)	+87.8(5)	090/00	0.1	0.0	90	Y-Z: 0	21	0.94	1.41
	Z	0.42(0)	-87.8(5)	180/00	0.1	0.0	00	X-Y: 0			
Mg-Zr Alloy, segmented Fig. 16											
ACF	X	1.18(0)	+16.1(1)	080/00	0.2	0.0	90	Y-Z: 0	20	0.99	1.84
	Z	0.85(0)	-16.1(1)	170/00	0.2	0.0	00	X-Y: 0			

Errors are reported using concise notation. For example $1.4(3) = 1.4 \pm 0.3$

Orientations are reported in sample coordinates.

*Grain radius for the Phantom example was scaled to 100 microns for this calculation.

Table 2

Table 2: Best-fit results for pressure-solved sandstone sample.

Sample, Method	Principal Magnitudes and Directions							Isotropy Prob. (%)	Grain Radius $R_S(\mu\text{m})$	Fit	
	Princ. S_g Axis	l/l_0	E_g (cNp)	Tr/Pl (deg)	max α_{95} (deg)	min α_{95} (deg)	Twist (deg)			R^2	d
92810-3 Fig. 13	ACF	X	1.00(0)	+00.00(5)	263/09	0.8	0.0	00	Y-Z: 0	149	0.97 1.97
		Y	0.97(0)	−02.68(5)	169/20	0.8	0.0	00	X-Z: 0		
		Z	0.52(0)	−64.91(5)	016/68	0.0	0.0	84	X-Y: 0		
		V	0.51(0)	−67.59(9)	—	—	—	—	—		
	PDS	X	1.00(0)	+00(0)	263/09	14	14			—	—
		Y	1.00(10)	+00(10)	169/20	14	14	—	—		
		Z	0.76(8)	−27(10)	016/68	14	14				
		V	0.76(10)	−27(13)	—	—	—				

S_{gX} is set to 1 based on observations of overgrowths in the maximum stretch direction.

Errors are reported using concise notation. For example $1.4(3) = 1.4 \pm 0.3$

Orientations are reported in geographic coordinates.

PDS measurements and errors are calculated according to Feehan and Brandon (1999). 3D correction introduced by Rahl et al. (2011).