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SUMMARY

A systematic search of short-period GDSN seismograms from 1980 to 1984 at ranges from 20° to 90° identifies two probable PKiKP arrivals. PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratios for these phases are consistent with previous studies. However, more typically PKiKP is not observed, even when clear PcP arrivals are seen. We use these data to place upper bounds on PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratios for 100 event-station pairs. These bounds indicate that most measurements of PKiKP amplitudes are biased toward large values and predict reflection coefficients at the inner core boundary (ICB) which are too high. Our upper limits on PKiKP amplitudes roughly constrain the density jump at the ICB to be less than 1.0 g cm⁻³ and the shear velocity at the top of the inner core to be greater than 2.5 km s⁻¹, assuming a sharp discontinuity at the ICB. Upper bounds on PKiKP/P amplitude ratios at ranges between 70° and 90° are consistent with these results but are less reliable due to take-off angle differences between P and PKiKP.

Approximately 50 observed free oscillations of the Earth are sensitive to the structure of the inner core. Modern models derived from these and other mode data typically have a density jump at the ICB of 0.5–0.6 g cm⁻³. An experiment in which we varied the mean density of the inner core indicates that the mode frequencies are roughly linear functionals of this parameter. The fit to the data is seriously degraded if the density jump is significantly different from 0.55 g cm⁻³. Many of the modes are also strongly sensitive to the shear velocity in the inner core, and forward modelling indicates that the average inner-core shear velocity is probably 3.45 ± 0.1 km s⁻¹.

These results are compatible with the short-period PKiKP amplitude bounds, indicating that there is no inconsistency between PKiKP and normal mode data regarding the density and shear velocity structure at the inner core boundary.
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INTRODUCTION

While the the spherically averaged P-wave velocity structure of the inner core is constrained tightly by body wave data (e.g., Johnson & Lee 1985; Stark et al. 1986), the density and shear wave structure of the inner core are known relatively poorly. The average density of the inner core can be obtained from normal mode data, but resolution at the inner core boundary (ICB) is limited. While the free-oscillation data are consistent with a density jump of 0.5–0.6 g cm⁻³ at the ICB, studies of PKiKP amplitudes have indicated that the density jump may be as high as 1.6 g cm⁻³ (e.g., Bolt & Qamar 1970; Souriau & Souriau 1989). Reliable observations of S body waves in the inner core (e.g. PKJKP) have not been made, so there are no direct traveltime measurements of inner core shear velocity. Amplitude and waveform modelling of PKP and PKiKP phases have suggested models with shear wave velocities at the top of the inner core of 0 km s⁻¹ [tentative hypothesis of Choy & Cormier (1983)], 2.5–3.0 km s⁻¹ (Häge 1983), and 3 ± 1 km s⁻¹ (Cummins & Johnson 1988a). Normal mode data constrain the average shear wave velocity of the inner core to somewhat higher values (~3.45 km s⁻¹), suggesting the possible presence of an S-wave velocity gradient near the surface of the inner core. The ICB could be a transition zone rather than a simple discontinuity, although the frequency content of short-period PKiKP waves appears to constrain such a transition zone to be less than 5 km thick (Cummins & Johnson 1988b).

Seismic constraints on inner core parameters have
important implications for physical models of the inner core. For example, the density contrast at the inner core boundary is directly related to the amount of gravitational energy that is released during any growth of the inner core (Gubbins 1977; Loper 1978; Gubbins, Masters & Jacobs 1979). Since outer core density structure is quite well constrained by the mode data and by the physical requirement that departures from adiabaticity and homogeneity be small, the density contrast at the ICB implicitly determines the density in the inner core which can be compared to values obtained from laboratory measurements of iron at high pressure (e.g., Anderson 1986; Jephcoat & Olson 1987). Similarly, measurements of the sharpness of the ICB boundary would help constrain models which hypothesize the existence of a transition zone between the inner and outer core (e.g., Loper & Fearn 1983; Morse 1986).

**PKiKP/PcP AMPLITUDE STUDIES**

In principle, direct information can be obtained regarding the density jump at the inner core boundary from observations of PKiKP. At near normal incidence, the PKiKP reflection coefficient depends mainly on the density and P-wave velocity contrast at the ICB. Since the P velocity jump at the ICB is known from PKP studies, the density contrast at the ICB can be calculated from measurements of PKiKP amplitudes. While in principle this calculation is straightforward, in practice it is difficult because PKiKP is a relatively weak phase which is rarely observed.

The calculation was first done by Bolt & Qamar (1970), who compared PcP and PKiKP amplitudes as measured at the LASA array by Engdahl, Flinn & Romney (1970). It is advantageous to compare PKiKP amplitudes with PcP amplitudes, since the phases have very similar paths in the upper mantle, and the reflection coefficient at the core–mantle boundary is relatively well known. Thus, it is only necessary to correct for differences in geometric spreading and any attenuation in the outer core in order to calculate the observed PKiKP reflection coefficient at the ICB. Bolt & Qamar calculated that a density jump at the ICB of about 1.6 g cm\(^{-3}\) would explain the observed PKiKP amplitudes. This density jump is much larger than the 0.5–0.6 g cm\(^{-3}\) found from inversions of normal mode contrasts of 0.6 g cm\(^{-3}\) [such as in the PREM model of Gubbins et al. (1981)] for the 'true' amplitude ratio. For the PREM density contrast to be correct, the observed PcP amplitudes would need to be systematically too small, rather than simply exhibiting large scatter. However, if PcP amplitudes are biased it appears more likely that they are biased toward large values (Vinnik & Dashov 1970). A more serious problem is the potential for bias in the PKiKP amplitude measurements. Since PKiKP is rarely observed above the noise, it is possible that its amplitude is only measured when it is anomalously large. Souriau & Souriau (1998) recognized this difficulty and cautioned that their PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratios may be larger than the true average value.

**SEARCHING FOR PKiKP**

We have systematically searched through short-period GDSN data between 20° and 90° from 1980 to 1984 looking

![Figure 1. Observed PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratios plotted as a function of range. Solid squares indicate LASA array data (Engdahl et al. 1970, 1974); solid circles are Warramunga array data (Souriau & Souriau 1989); open triangles are single-station data from Buchbinder et al. (1973). The stars indicate the amplitude ratios for two PKiKP arrivals which we have identified in GDSN data. The lower curve shows the theoretical amplitude ratio for PREM (inner core density contrast \(\Delta \rho = 0.6 \text{ g cm}^{-3}\)), while the upper curve shows the result for a higher density contrast \(\Delta \rho = 1.8 \text{ g cm}^{-3}\).](https://academic.oup.com/gji/article-abstract/102/2/491/657093)
for PKiKP arrivals. There are over 4900 GDSN vertical component seismograms at these ranges within this time period which were recorded during predicted arrival times of PKiKP. However, for most of these records, high noise levels prevent any chance of observing PKiKP. We scanned through the data (available on CD-ROM for these years) with a computer algorithm which saved only those events with favourable noise levels near the predicted arrival time of PKiKP. In this way we reduced the number of seismograms to about 900, which we then examined interactively on a graphics terminal. We applied a 0.7–5 Hz band pass filter in order to enhance PKiKP relative to lower frequency signals from the coda of mantle phases (Souriau & Souriau 1989). We were able to positively identify PKiKP on only two records, both recorded at station CHTO (Chiang Mai, Thailand) at a range of about 40°. These events occurred on 1980 May 23 (10:32 UT) and 1980 June 16 (20:48 UT), and are both located in the Ceram Trough (east of New Guinea).

These seismograms are shown in Figs 2 and 3. The top trace is unfiltered and shows several minutes of the record and the predicted arrival times for phases PP, PcP, S, PKiKP, and ScS. The middle and lower traces are filtered and show 1 min of data centred on the predicted arrival times of PcP and PKiKP. Note the difference in the amplitude scaling for these two plots. Because we calculated traveltimes using PREM but used the GDSN event origin time (which assumed the JB earth model), we have adjusted our predicted times by 3 s to account for this difference. PREM traveltimes are about 3 s smaller for these phases than JB traveltimes (Dziewonski & Anderson 1981). Although the signal-to-noise ratios are fairly low, distinct PKiKP arrivals can be seen at the predicted times. We computed PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratios for these seismograms by picking the largest peak-to-peak amplitude for each arrival. The resulting amplitude ratios are plotted in Fig. 1. These new points fall within the scatter of PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratios obtained from previous studies.

However, on the vast majority of the records examined, PKiKP could not be seen, even when a clear PcP arrival was present. This is illustrated in Fig. 4, which shows an example (also from station CHTO) of a distinct PcP arrival but only noise at the appropriate arrival time for PKiKP. Although PKiKP cannot be positively identified, it is possible to estimate its maximum size from records of this type. As a first-order approximation, we simply picked the largest peak-to-peak amplitude within 5 s of the predicted PKiKP arrival, and took this as an upper limit to the PKiKP amplitude. When PcP could be seen, we also measured the apparent PcP amplitude and thus computed an upper limit to the PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratio. For example, the data shown in Fig. 4 constrain the maximum PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratio to be less than 0.049. We obtained limits on
Figure 3. As Fig. 2 but for a 1980 June 16 event at a range of about 40°. The PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratio is 0.064.

Figure 4. As Fig. 2 but for a 1980 September 14 event at a range of about 35°. PKiKP cannot be seen in this record. We estimate that the PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratio must be less than 0.049.
PKiKP/PcP from 100 records at ranges between 20° and 70°. These results are listed in Table 1 and plotted in Fig. 5. The data include records from 26 stations and 81 events.

A comparison between Fig. 1 and Fig. 5 shows that in many cases PKiKP should have been observed in these data if its amplitude were as high as the few actual measurements of PKiKP amplitudes seem to indicate. This is clear evidence that existing PKiKP amplitude measurements are biased towards large values. PKiKP is observed only when it is anomalously large, probably due to focusing from heterogeneities within the Earth. Obtaining an unbiased estimate of average PKiKP/PcP amplitudes is difficult since most of the data consist only of approximate upper limits. For some of the records examined, the largest peak-to-peak amplitude measured may actually have been PKiKP. If this arrival happened to land in a 'trough' in the noise, the computed PKiKP amplitude limit could be too small by up to a factor of two. However, if this were the case for many records, it is likely that other PKiKP arrivals would land on 'peaks' in the noise and be seen clearly. The fact that only two PKiKP arrivals could be identified unambiguously indicates that these amplitude limits are reasonably accurate.

Calculated PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratios also depend upon the measured PcP amplitude and could be biased toward lower values if the PcP amplitudes selected were anomalously high. There is some evidence for bias in PcP amplitudes toward large values from analysis of Pcp/P amplitude ratios (Vinnik & Dashov 1970). This could be a problem in our analysis at ranges beyond 30° and above 60° where PcP is seen infrequently and perhaps only when it is unusually large. However, at ranges between 30° and 60° PcP can be seen fairly routinely, and it is unlikely that the average PcP amplitudes are significantly biased within this region. Most of the scatter observed in PcP and PKiKP amplitudes is probably due to focusing effects from lateral heterogeneity in the Earth. Thus it is not surprising that the only two PKiKP arrivals which we identified have nearly identical ray paths for which the focusing effects should be similar.

Table 1. A list of the events and stations for which we obtained upper limits on PKiKP/PcP amplitudes. The columns list the earthquake year, month, day, hour, minute, depth (km), magnitude, station name, range (degrees), and measured upper limit on the amplitude ratio PKiKP/PcP. These upper limits are plotted as a function of range in Fig. 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YR</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>DY</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>DEPTH</th>
<th>MAG</th>
<th>STATION</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>DIST</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>BOCO</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.2303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>0.1873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>CTAO</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0.0685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>CTAO</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>0.1662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>0.2053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>ZORO</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>0.0666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>SHIO</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>SHIO</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.1190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>CTAO</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>0.0458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>0.0518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>178.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>KAAO</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>0.0488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>0.0450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>0.0450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>238.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>0.1566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>SHIO</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>SHIO</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.1190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>178.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>KAAO</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>0.0450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>0.0450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>0.0450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>238.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>TAU</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>0.1566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>SHIO</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>SHIO</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.1190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>178.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>KAAO</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>0.0450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PKiKP AMPLITUDES AND ICB PROPERTIES**

The amplitude of PKiKP relative to PcP is controlled largely by the reflection coefficient at the ICB, because the reflection coefficient at the core–mantle boundary is known relatively well. Since the P velocity jump at the ICB is known from PKP studies (e.g., Johnson & Lee 1985; Stark et al. 1986), the reflection coefficient is effectively a function of the density and S velocity jump at the ICB. Fig. 5 shows theoretical PKiKP/PcP amplitude versus range curves for PREM (ICB $\Delta \rho = 0.6 \, \text{g cm}^{-3}$, $\Delta \beta = 3.5 \, \text{km s}^{-1}$), and additional curves which show the effect of changing these parameters. The solid curves above the PREM curve show the predicted amplitude ratios for density jumps of 1.2 $\, \text{g cm}^{-3}$ and 1.8 $\, \text{g cm}^{-3}$ (keeping $\Delta \beta$ fixed), while the dashed curves show the effect of S velocity jumps of 0, 2, and 3 km s$^{-1}$ (keeping $\Delta \rho$ fixed). These calculations assume an outer core $Q_o$ of infinity; using the actual PREM outer core $Q_o$ of 57822 does not change these results significantly. PKP traveltime studies show that it is unlikely that the P velocity jump at the inner core boundary deviates by more than 10 per cent from the PREM value of 0.67 km s$^{-1}$ (e.g., Häge 1983; Johnson & Lee 1985; Stark et al. 1986). These allowed differences are not large enough to significantly affect our conclusions concerning the more poorly known density and shear velocity contrast at the ICB.

Increasing the density jump at the ICB causes larger PKiKP amplitudes for all ranges shown in Fig. 5. Since the data points represent upper bounds, the density jump predicted by PREM clearly is compatible with these data. However, larger density jumps predict PKiKP amplitudes which are higher than our observed upper limits. We estimate that a rough upper bound on the inner core density jump is 1.0 g cm$^{-3}$, based on our observations at ranges between 30° and 60°. Decreasing the shear velocity at the surface of the inner core has little effect on PKiKP amplitudes near normal incidence (ranges less than about 20°). At larger ranges, the effect of the S velocity jump becomes more important. Based on our observations between 50° and 60°, we estimate that the shear velocity at the surface of the inner core is greater than 2.5 km s$^{-1}$. This argues against the hypothesis of zero shear velocity at the surface of the inner core, but does allow the $\Delta \beta = 2.5$–3.0 km s$^{-1}$ model proposed by Häge (1983) to explain long-period PKP amplitude data. In deriving these limits, there is a trade-off between the density jump and the S velocity jump. If the density jump at the ICB were significantly less than the PREM value of 0.6 g cm$^{-3}$, then S velocity jumps of less than 2.5 km s$^{-1}$ would be permitted by these data. Similarly, if the S velocity jump were significantly greater than 3.5 km s$^{-1}$, then larger density jumps would be permitted.

Predicted PKiKP amplitudes for PREM drop to very small values at ranges greater than 65°. Near 72° there is a node in the PKiKP reflection coefficient and predicted PKiKP amplitudes are zero. Despite this, two PKiKP observations have been reported at ranges of 72° (Yellowknife Array, Buchbinder et al. 1973), with additional observations at ranges greater than 76° (Buchbinder et al. 1973; Souriau & Souriau 1989). No PKiKP amplitudes have been published for these observations so direct comparison with theoretical amplitudes is not possible. The amplitude of PKiKP at these ranges is affected strongly by the S velocity jump at the ICB. For example, lowering the S velocity jump to 3.0 km s$^{-1}$ (from the PREM value of 3.5 km s$^{-1}$) removes the node in the PKiKP reflection coefficient and predicts much larger PKiKP amplitudes at ranges above 65°. The position of this node in PKiKP reflection coefficient depends somewhat on the P velocity contrast at the ICB. For example, for $\Delta \sigma = 0.60 \, \text{km s}^{-1}$ the node occurs at about 65°, while for $\Delta \sigma = 0.74 \, \text{km s}^{-1}$ the node is at about 80°.

We searched for PKiKP in short-period GDSN data at ranges between 70° and 90°, but did not see any clear PKiKP arrivals. At these ranges, PcP is lost in the P coda and cannot be used as a reference phase for PKiKP. As an alternative, we computed 186 maximum PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratios using the procedure described above. These points are plotted in Fig. 6. The solid curve shows the PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratio predicted by PREM, while the dashed curves show predicted ratios for S velocity jumps of 0, 2, and 3 km s$^{-1}$. The data appear to limit the shear velocity at the surface of the inner core to be greater than about 2.5 km s$^{-1}$, in agreement with the results obtained for PKiKP/PcP (See Fig. 5). However, the PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratios should be considered less reliable than the PKiKP/PcP ratios, due to the significant difference in ray take-off angles between P and PKiKP (16° at 80° range). Considering the very low PKiKP amplitudes predicted by PREM at these ranges, the fact that observations of PKiKP have been made (Buchbinder et al. 1973; Souriau & Souriau 1989), suggests that the PREM S velocity jump may be...
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Figure 6. Upper limits on PKiKP/PcP amplitude ratios obtained from 186 GDSN records at ranges between 70° and 90° in which PKiKP could not be identified clearly. The lower solid curve shows the predicted amplitude ratio versus range for PREM (ICB density contrast \( \Delta \rho = 0.6 \) g cm\(^{-3}\), shear velocity contrast \( \Delta \beta = 3.5 \) km s\(^{-1}\)). The upper, middle, and lower dashed lines show the effect of S velocity jumps of 0, 2, and 3 km s\(^{-1}\) respectively (keeping \( \Delta \rho \) fixed).

slightly too large. Alternatively, the PREM P velocity jump (\( \Delta \alpha = 0.67 \) km s\(^{-1}\)) may be too large, since slightly smaller P velocity contrasts move the node in the PKiKP reflection coefficient toward closer ranges (e.g., at 65° for \( \Delta \alpha = 0.60 \) km s\(^{-1}\), a result more consistent with the lack of any PKiKP observations between 50° and 70°. However, these conclusions are speculative until actual PKiKP/P amplitude ratios are measured at ranges above 70°.

Another factor which could influence PKiKP amplitudes is the possibility that the ICB is a transition zone rather than a sharp discontinuity. The thickness of such a transition zone is limited to less than 5 km by the frequency content of short-period data from LASA reflected at near-normal incidence (Cummins & Johnson 1988b). A transition zone 3 to 5 km thick would decrease short-period PKiKP amplitudes (relative to PREM) at ranges below 55° and increase PKiKP amplitudes at ranges greater than 55° (see Fig. 2 from Cummins & Johnson 1988b).

**NORMAL MODE RESULTS**

Inversions of an improved free-oscillation degenerate frequency data set point quite clearly to an ICB density jump of about 0.5–0.6 g cm\(^{-3}\) (Widmer, Masters & Gilbert 1988). About 50 of the modes for which we have precise measurements are sensitive to inner core structure and starting models with different density jumps converge with few exceptions to models with \( \Delta \rho \sim 0.55 \) g cm\(^{-3}\). While it must be noted that none of the models that have been found gives a statistically acceptable fit to this subset of the mode data (misfit is at roughly the two standard deviation level),

perturbing the density jump from this value causes these modes to be much worse fit (see Fig. 7). Forward calculations also indicate that the mode frequencies are nearly linear functionals of the density in the inner core so a Backus–Gilbert resolution analysis might be meaningful. Such an analysis indicates that the free-oscillation data are unable to see details with scale lengths less than about 750 km but constrain the mean density of the inner core to a precision of better than 1 per cent. Since it is virtually certain that the density does not decrease with depth in the inner core, these results are sufficient to exclude the possibility of density jumps significantly greater than 0.55 g cm\(^{-3}\) at the inner core boundary. In particular, the density jumps of 1.2–1.6 g cm\(^{-3}\) proposed by previous PKiKP amplitude studies are much too large to be compatible with the mode data.

Many of the modes are strongly sensitive to shear velocity in the inner core and models which fit the data best have a mean shear velocity of about 3.45 km s\(^{-1}\). Unfortunately, several of the modes of low harmonic degree are non-linear functionals of inner core shear velocity and change their mode characteristics dramatically with only a small change in shear velocity. This fact makes it difficult to interpret a standard resolution analysis but forward calculations indicate that the mean shear velocity in the inner core is probably 3.45 \( \pm 0.1 \) km s\(^{-1}\). As in the case with the density, details of the shear velocity structure are unresolved by the mode data so little can be said about the shear velocity immediately below the ICB. For example, a low S-wave velocity layer or gradient near the surface of the inner core boundary [such as proposed by Choy \& Cormier (1983) and Häge (1983)] would not be resolvable with these data. In contrast, the PKiKP amplitude data discussed above are directly sensitive to the shear velocity at the surface of the inner core and appear to restrict the shear velocity contrast at the ICB boundary to \( \Delta \beta > 2.5 \) km s\(^{-1}\).

\[ \chi^2 \text{ Misfit vs. density change} \]

\[ \text{ICB density change (g/cm}^2) \]

Figure 7. Misfit versus density jump at the inner core boundary for 33 normal modes sensitive to inner core density structure.
CONCLUSIONS

Upper limits on short-period PKiKP amplitudes can be obtained from seismograms which do not show clear PKiKP arrivals. These limits show that most estimates of PKiKP amplitudes are biased toward large values due to the difficulty of observing PKiKP. Upper bounds on PKiKP/PcP and PKiKP/P amplitude ratios constrain the density jump at the ICB to be less than about 1.0 g cm\(^{-3}\) and the S velocity jump to be greater than 2.5 km s\(^{-1}\), assuming a sharp discontinuity at the ICB. Normal mode analysis indicates that the average shear velocity in the inner core is 3.45 ± 0.1 km s\(^{-1}\) and the average inner core density is 12.9 ± 0.13 g cm\(^{-3}\), with a density jump at the inner core boundary of about 0.55 g cm\(^{-3}\). These results are compatible with the short-period PKiKP amplitude bounds, indicating that there is no inconsistency between PKiKP and normal mode data regarding the density and shear velocity structure at the inner core boundary.

Finally, it is interesting to note that nutation data also constrain the density structure of the inner core (Mathews et al. 1990) and are dominantly sensitive to a combination of the ellipticity of the ICB and the density jump at the ICB. The value of the density jump reported here indicates that the ICB has an ellipticity which is hydrostatic with an uncertainty of about 50 per cent (P. M. Mathews, personal communication).
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