

Waveform inversion by one-way wavefield extrapolation

Jeff Shragge*, Stanford University

SUMMARY

One-way Riemannian wavefield extrapolation (RWE) on computational meshes conforming to the direction of turning-wave propagation is presented as an alternative forward modeling procedure for waveform inversion. Forward modeling tests demonstrate that the RWE approach may be a sufficiently accurate approximation for calculating the wavefield phases important for early-arrival waveform inversion. Initial results indicate that RWE waveforms are well matched at wide offsets to finite-difference data, and can be used in a waveform inversion scheme to invert synthetic data for 1D velocity perturbations.

INTRODUCTION

Frequency-domain waveform inversion using finite-differences (FD) as the forward modeling operator has been successfully demonstrated in numerous 2D applications (Pratt and Worthington, 1989; Crase et al., 1990; Pratt and Shipp, 1999; Dessa et al., 2004); however, few 3D examples have yet to be reported. The predominant reason is the memory required to invert the large 3D FD impedance matrix through LU decomposition. For 2D inversion problems, the memory requirement for an LU decomposition using graph theoretic techniques exploiting matrix sparsity is roughly $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$, where n is the average model space dimension (Štekl and Pratt, 1998). The memory requirement for typical 3D exploration blocks, though, rises to between $\mathcal{O}(n^{4.5})$ and $\mathcal{O}(n^{4.75})$ (Operto et al., 2006), which currently is impractical for routine implementation.

An alternative to FD is to employ a forward-modeling scheme based on one-way wavefield extrapolation. Although less accurate than FD owing to the physical approximations made when deriving one-way wave-equations, the corresponding extrapolation operators can still be used to calculate phases (and perhaps the amplitudes) of the early arrivals commonly used in waveform inversion. This paper examines the idea of performing wavefield extrapolation on meshes oriented in the general direction of turning-wave propagation. By incorporating the bulk orientation directly into the coordinate system, lower-order Riemannian wavefield extrapolation operators (Sava and Fomel, 2005) can be used to calculate the early arrivals of wide-offset seismic data. Importantly, 3D forward modeling by wavefield extrapolation involves manageable memory requirements (approximately $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ for a single extrapolation step), leaving computational complexity as the main computational constraint (approximately $\mathcal{O}(n^3(\log n)^2 n_s)$, where n_s is number of sources). Thus, one-way wavefield extrapolation potentially offers computational and memory savings and is worth examining in the waveform inversion context.

FREQUENCY-DOMAIN WAVEFORM INVERSION

Prescribing a forward modeling operator is the initial step in any frequency-domain waveform inversion procedure (Pratt, 1998; Sirgue and Pratt, 2004). Assuming that wave propagation is adequately governed by an acoustic wave equation, the forward-modeling procedure generates a scalar wavefield that is a solution to the Helmholtz equation. The data residuals, or the difference between the observed and modeled data, are then used to generate velocity model updates. This is commonly accomplished by iteratively minimizing the l_2 residual misfit at each successive frequency through computing the negative gradient with respect to the variation in model parameters (Pratt and Worthington, 1989).

Methods for calculating the gradient without explicitly computing the partial derivatives of the data are well established (Lailly, 1983; Tarantola, 1984; Pratt et al., 1998). The main time-domain result is that the gradient vector can be computed in a computational domain, \mathbf{x} , by zero-lag correlation of the wavefield propagated causally from source point, \mathbf{s} , and the data residuals propagated acausally from receiver location, \mathbf{r} . In the frequency domain (ω), this involves multiplying two monochromatic wavefields: an assumed unit amplitude and zero-phase source Green's function, $G_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}; \omega)$; and a residual wavefield comprised of a collection of receiver Green's functions, $G_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}; \omega)$, individually weighted by the data residual value, $\Delta\Psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}; \omega)$. This leads to the following expression for gradient vector, $g(\mathbf{x})$,

$$g(\mathbf{x}; \omega) = -\omega^2 \sum_{\mathbf{s}} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \Re [G_0^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}; \omega) G_0^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}; \omega) \Delta\Psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}; \omega)], \quad (1)$$

where \Re indicates the real component, and $*$ represents complex conjugation (Sirgue and Pratt, 2004). The summation over sources and receivers is done for each non-linear iteration at each frequency. The bracketed expression representing the back-projected data residuals multiplied by the forward wavefield from the source may be regarded as a "migration of the residual wavefield data" (Mora, 1987). Thus, a central component of a practical waveform inversion implementation, like in any seismic migration analysis, is an accurate and efficient calculation of the source and receiver Green's functions, $G_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}; \omega)$ and $G_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}; \omega)$. The optimal trade-off between the two competing constraints of accuracy and efficiency, especially for 3D implementations, remains an open question that merits further investigation.

AN ALTERNATE FORWARD MODELING APPROACH

An alternate strategy for computing Green's functions for waveform inversion is to consider one-way propagation on coordinate systems designed especially for calculating wide-offset, early-arrival wavefields. One interesting example is a sideways-tilted, ray-like mesh with an extrapolation axis oriented pre-

Waveform Inversion by one-way WE

dominately in the direction of turning-wave propagation (see upper left panel of Figure 1). In this reference frame, the bulk of wavefield propagation occurs at low angle to the extrapolation axis where the phases and amplitudes calculated by one-way operators remain fairly accurate. One-way propagation in generalized coordinates is described by Riemannian wavefield extrapolation (RWE), which encodes the mesh geometry directly into the extrapolation operator using additional mixed-domain coefficients. The reader interested in additional information on RWE is referred to Sava and Fomel (2005) and Shragge (2006).

The utility of the RWE forward-modeling approach is illustrated in Figure 1, which shows wavefield propagation in both the Cartesian (left panels) and the “turning-wave” coordinate domains (right panels). The upper left panel shows a turning-wave mesh overlying part of the SMAART JV Pluto 1.5 P -wave velocity model. The upper right panel depicts this velocity model interpolated to a transform RWE domain parameterized by “shooting angle” and “extrapolation step” axes. The source wavefield, $G_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}; \omega)$, is generated by propagating an initially planar wavefield (as a function of shooting angle) through each successive extrapolation step. Modeled data are generated by extracting the wavefield values at the streamer depth. The lower right and left panels show the same four superimposed wavefield snapshots (at 1.0 s, 2.2 s, 3.4 s and 4.6 s) in the RWE and Cartesian domains, respectively. Note that while some wavefield energy is not modeled – e.g. near-vertical wavepaths – the bulk of the direct wavefield energy propagates throughout the model at low angles to the extrapolation axis. Numerous reflected phases, including those from the top-salt, are evident in both lower panels. These reflections are not “true-amplitude”, though, because there is no formal accounting for reflection coefficients.

One-way extrapolation results for the Pluto model using the turning-wave coordinate mesh shown in Figure 1 are presented in the right panel of Figure 2. The corresponding FD data are shown in the left panel. Although the reflections evident in the near-offset traces of the FD data are completely absent from the RWE data, the wavefields at wider offsets become increasingly similar. This observation should not be surprising: the coordinate mesh was designed specifically to calculate the wide-offset early arrivals important for the initial stages of waveform inversion. Figure 3 presents waveform comparisons at four wide offsets. The FD and RWE modeled waveforms were low-pass filtered to a frequency band typically used for exploration-scale waveform inversion. Note that the early arrivals of two sets of waveforms are well-matched in phase, though less so in amplitude. Later arrival waveforms comprised of additional reflections and higher-order scattering, though, are not well modeled by the RWE approach. Importantly, if these arrivals were included in a waveform inversion analysis, they likely would be mapped erroneously into model space and be detrimental to stability. This is the main factor why this paper concentrates on early-arrival waveform inversion.

Back-projecting wavefield residuals to form the gradient vector is accomplished with a waveform injection approach that is




Figure 1: Illustration of the RWE wavefield extrapolation forward modeling approach. The left (right) panels represent the Cartesian (Riemannian) spaces. Upper left: Pluto velocity profile overlain by ray-like mesh. Upper right: interpolated velocity profile underlying regular coordinate system mesh. Lower right: four superimposed broad-band wavefields (at 1.0s, 2.2s, 3.4s, and 4.6s) propagated through the velocity model in the upper right. Lower left: wavefields from the lower right interpolated to Cartesian.




Figure 2: Comparison of a Pluto dataset wavefield generated by fourth-order finite differences (left panel) and the wavefield generated by wavefield extrapolation (right panel).

Waveform Inversion by one-way WE




Figure 3: Examples of waveform matching at four different wide offsets and corresponding residuals for the wavefields shown in Figure 1. Top left: 5180 m offset; top right: 5950 m offset; bottom left: 6700 m offset; and bottom right: 7470 m offset.

the adjoint operation of wavefield data extraction. The residual wavefield, initially limited to the data residual from the farthest receiver, is propagated back towards the source point. As each successive receiver is reached, the data residual at that point is injected into the residual wavefield and extrapolated to the next step. The gradient vector, $g(\mathbf{x})$, is then calculated by multiplying the residual and the stored source wavefields at each step and interpolating the result back to the Cartesian domain.

Figure 4 presents a gradient vector example for an offset source-receiver pair centered in mirrored half-space velocity model (upper left panel). The upper right panel shows a monochromatic wavefield propagated outward from the source point, $G_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}; \omega)$, while the lower right panel shows a back-propagated wavefield from the single receiver, $G_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}; \omega)$. Multiplying these two wavefields generates the “wavepath” (Woodward, 1992) in the lower left panel that is central to the waveform inversion approach. Note that the locations of the source-receiver pair are non-centered with respect to the grid, which leads to the observed asymmetry of the wavepath image.

1D WAVEFORM INVERSION TEST

Figure 5 presents the results of a 1D waveform inversion test using one-way Riemannian wavefield extrapolation as the forward modeling operator. The waveform inversion goal is to reconstruct the +10% velocity perturbation shown in the right panel using the approach described in Sirgue and Pratt (2004) assuming a constant 2 km s^{-1} starting velocity model. The FD data in the left panel, generated by two-way FD, consist of a linear direct arrival and two hyperbolic reflection events of op-

posing sign from the top and bottom of the velocity perturbation. The coordinate system geometry used in the example is a single mesh similar to that shown in the upper left panel of Figure 1, except scaled to fit 4 km of source-receiver offset. The synthetic data were low-pass filtered, windowed to eliminate both boundary artifacts and all later-arriving multiple energy, and zeroed at locations less than 2 km from the source point. The frequencies selected for inversion were between 3-12 Hz at 0.25 Hz intervals.

Waveform inversion results after five non-linear iterations at each frequency are shown in the right panel of Figure 5. The recovered velocity profile perturbation is almost correctly centered, but contains significant negative side lobes both above and below the true perturbation depths. This result is similar to the 1D experiment of Sirgue and Pratt (2004), who demonstrate that the inverted velocity profiles do not contain all necessary – and especially the lower – spatial frequency components. These are likely recoverable if the inversion were to include lower (temporal) frequency data and offsets sufficiently wide to generate significant “image-stretch” phenomena.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper describes an alternate forward modeling approach for frequency-domain waveform inversion based on one-way wavefield extrapolation. The results suggest that the phases (and perhaps amplitudes) of forward modeled data are sufficiently accurate for use in early-arrival waveform inversion analysis. Importantly, 3D wavefield extrapolation is now routine in seismic exploration practice, suggesting that upscaling

Waveform Inversion by one-way WE




Figure 4: Mirrored half-space example. Top left: mirrored half-space velocity model. Top right: source wavefield $G_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}; \omega)$ from source point in left of model. Bottom right: residual wavefield $G_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}; \omega)$ back-propagated from a receiver at right of model. Bottom left: wavepath formed by multiplying wavefields in top and bottom right panels.




Figure 5: Results of a 1D waveform inversion test using one-way RWE as the forward modeling operator. Left panel: FD-generated data used in waveform inversion approach. Right panel: 1D velocity profile with step perturbation and the velocity profile recovered by waveform inversion.

this approach to 3D waveform inversion would not be too computationally restrictive. In addition, amplitude accuracy would likely be improved by incorporating the factor described by Zhang et al. (2003). Alternatively, one could consider using the “true-amplitude” one-way extrapolation operators of Thomson (2005) that provide a more formal accounting of reflection coefficients and transmission losses. Finally, performing RWE on a turning-wave coordinates generates more accurate wide-angle arrivals than could be calculated on a Cartesian mesh. Accordingly, shallow anomalies likely would be better recovered, further motivating the use of RWE rather than Cartesian coordinates when performing waveform inversion via one-way wavefield extrapolation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Drew Breeders, Colin Thomson, and Clement Kostov for helpful discussions and acknowledge Schlumberger Cambridge Research for their support during a summer internship where this research was carried out. The sponsors of the SEP are acknowledged for their continuing support. I thank the SMAART JV consortium for the Pluto 1.5 data.

EDITED REFERENCES

Note: This reference list is a copy-edited version of the reference list submitted by the author. Reference lists for the 2007 SEG Technical Program Expanded Abstracts have been copy edited so that references provided with the online metadata for each paper will achieve a high degree of linking to cited sources that appear on the Web.

REFERENCES

- Cruse, E., A. Pica, M. Noble, J. McDonald, and A. Tarantola, 1990, Robust elastic nonlinear waveform inversion: Application to real data: *Geophysics*, 55, 527–538.
- Dessa, J. X., S. Operto, A. Nakanishi, G. Pascal, J. Virieux, and Y. Kaneda, 2004, Multiscale seismic imaging of the eastern Nankai trough by full waveform inversion: *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31, L18606; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2004GL020453>.
- Lailly, P., 1983, The seismic inverse problem as a sequence of pre-stack migration, in J. B. Bednar, R. Redner, E. Robinson, and A. Weglein, eds., *Conference on inverse scattering: Theory and applications*: Society of Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- Mora, P., 1987, Nonlinear two-dimensional elastic inversion of multioffset seismic data: *Geophysics*, 52, 1211–1228.
- Operto, S., J. Virieux, P. Amestoy, L. Giraud, and J. Y. L'Excellent, 2006, 3D frequency-domain finite-difference modeling of acoustic waves using massively parallel direct solver: A feasibility study: 75th Annual International Meeting, SEG, Expanded Abstracts, 2265–2269.
- Pratt, R. G., 1998, Seismic waveform inversion in the frequency domain, part 1: Theory and verification in a physical scale model: *Geophysics*, 64, 888–901.
- Pratt, R. G., C. Shin, and G. J. Hicks, 1998, Gauss-Newton and full Newton methods in frequency space seismic waveform inversion: *Geophysical Journal International*, 133, 323–340.
- Pratt, R. G., and R. M. Shipp, 1999, Seismic waveform inversion in the frequency domain, part 2: Fault delineation in sediments using crosshole data: *Geophysics*, 64, 902–914.
- Pratt, R. G., and M. H. Worthington, 1989, The application of diffraction tomography to cross-hole seismic data: *Geophysics*, 53, 1284–1294.
- Sava, P. C., and S. Fomel, 2005, Riemannian wavefield extrapolation: *Geophysics*, 70, no. 3, T45–T56.
- Shrage, J., 2006, Non-orthogonal Riemannian wavefield extrapolation: 76th Annual International Meeting, SEG, Expanded Abstracts, 2236–2240.
- Sirgue, L., and R. G. Pratt, 2004, Efficient waveform inversion and imaging: A strategy for selecting temporal frequencies: *Geophysics*, 69, 231–248.
- Stekl, I., and R. G. Pratt, 1998, Accurate visco-elastic modeling frequency-domain finite differences using rotated operators: *Geophysics*, 63, 1779–1794.
- Tarantola, A., 1984, Linearized inversion of seismic reflection data in the acoustic approximation: *Geophysics*, 49, 998–1015.
- Thomson, C., 2005, Accuracy and efficiency considerations for wide-angle wavefield extrapolators and scattering operators: *Geophysical Journal International*, 163, 308–323.
- Woodward, M., 1992, Wave-equation tomography: *Geophysics*, 57, 15–26.
- Zhang, Y., G. Zhang, and N. Bleistein, 2003, True amplitude wave equation migration arising from true amplitude one-way wave equations: *Inverse Problems*, 19, 1113–1138.