

WAVE-EQUATION MIGRATION IN GENERALIZED  
COORDINATE SYSTEMS

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOPHYSICS  
AND THE COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES  
OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Jeffrey Shragge

March 2009

© Copyright by Jeffrey Shragge 2009  
All Rights Reserved

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

---

(Biondo Biondi) Principal Adviser

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

---

(Jon F. Claerbout)

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that, in my opinion, it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

---

(Jerry Harris)

Approved for the University Committee on Graduate Studies.



# Abstract

Wave-equation migration using one-way wavefield extrapolation operators is commonly used in industry to generate images of complex geologic structure from 3D seismic data. By design, most conventional wave-equation approaches restrict propagation to downward continuation, where wavefields are recursively extrapolated to depth on Cartesian meshes. In practice, this approach is limited in high-angle accuracy and is restricted to down-going waves, which precludes the use of some steep dip and all turning wave components important for imaging targets in such areas as steep salt body flanks.

This thesis discusses a strategy for improving wavefield extrapolation based on extending wavefield propagation to generalized coordinate system geometries that are more conformal to the wavefield propagation direction and permit imaging with turning waves. Wavefield propagation in non-Cartesian coordinates requires properly specifying the Laplacian operator in the governing Helmholtz equation. By employing differential geometry theory, I demonstrate how generalized a Riemannian wavefield extrapolation (RWE) procedure can be developed for any 3D non-orthogonal coordinate system, including those constructed by smoothing ray-based coordinate meshes formed from a suite of traced rays. I present 2D and 3D generalized RWE propagation examples illustrating the improved steep-dip propagation afforded by the coordinate transformation.

One consequence of using non-Cartesian coordinates, though, is that the corresponding 3D extrapolation operators have up to 10 non-stationary coefficients, which can lead to imposing (and limiting) computer memory constraints for realistic 3D

applications. To circumvent this difficulty, I apply the generalized RWE theory to analytic coordinate systems, rather than numerically generated meshes. Analytic coordinates offer the advantage of having straightforward analytic dispersion relationships and easy-to-implement extrapolation operators that add little computational overhead. In particular, I demonstrate that the dispersion relationship for 2D elliptical geometry introduces only an effective velocity model stretch, permitting the use of existing high-order Cartesian extrapolators. The results of elliptical coordinate shot-profile migration tests demonstrate the improvements in steep dip reflector imaging facilitated by the coordinate system transformation approach.

I extend the analytic coordinate system approach to 3D geometries using tilted elliptical-cylindrical (TEC) meshes. I demonstrate that propagation in a TEC coordinate system is equivalent to wavefield extrapolation in elliptically anisotropic media, which is easily handled by existing industry practice. TEC coordinates also allow steep dip propagation in both the inline and cross-line directions by virtue of the associated elliptical and tilting Cartesian geometries. Observing that a TEC coordinate system conforms closely to the shape of a line-source impulse response, I develop an TEC-coordinate, inline-delay-source migration strategy that enables the efficient migration of individual sail-line data. I argue that this strategy is more robust than 3D plane-wave migration because of the reduced migration aperture requirements and, commonly, a lower number of total migration runs. Synthetic imaging tests on a 3D wide-azimuth data set demonstrate the imaging advantages offered by the TEC coordinate transformation, especially in the cross-line direction. Field data tests on a Gulf of Mexico data set similarly indicate the advantage of TEC coordinates.

# Preface

The electronic version of this report<sup>1</sup> makes the included programs and applications available to the reader. The markings **ER**, **CR**, and **NR** are promises by the author about the reproducibility of each figure result. Reproducibility is a way of organizing computational research that allows both the author and the reader of a publication to verify the reported results. Reproducibility facilitates the transfer of knowledge within SEP and between SEP and its sponsors.

**ER** denotes Easily Reproducible and are the results of processing described in the paper. The author claims that you can reproduce such a figure from the programs, parameters, and makefiles included in the electronic document. The data must either be included in the electronic distribution, be easily available to all researchers (e.g., SEG-EAGE data sets), or be available in the SEP data library<sup>2</sup>. We assume you have a UNIX workstation with Fortran, Fortran90, C, X-Windows system and the software downloadable from our website (SEP makerules, SEPScons, SEPlib, and the SEP latex package), or other free software such as SU. Before the publication of the electronic document, someone other than the author tests the author's claim by destroying and rebuilding all ER figures. Some ER figures may not be reproducible by outsiders because they depend on data sets that are too large to distribute, or data that we do not have permission to redistribute but are in the SEP data library, or that the rules depend on commercial packages such as Matlab or Mathematica.

---

<sup>1</sup><http://sepwww.stanford.edu/private/docs/sep137>

<sup>2</sup><http://sepwww.stanford.edu/public/docs/sepdatalib/toc.html>

**CR** denotes Conditional Reproducibility. The author certifies that the commands are in place to reproduce the figure if certain resources are available. The primary reasons for the CR designation is that the processing requires 20 minutes or more.

**NR** denotes Non-Reproducible figures. SEP discourages authors from flagging their figures as NR except for figures that are used solely for motivation, comparison, or illustration of the theory, such as: artist drawings, scannings, or figures taken from SEP reports not by the authors or from non-SEP publications. Some 3D synthetic data examples associated with this report are classified as NR because they were generated externally to SEP and only the results were released by agreement.

Our testing is currently limited to LINUX 2.6 (using the Intel Fortran90 compiler) and the SEPlib-6.4.6 distribution, but the code should be portable to other architectures. Reader's suggestions are welcome. For more information on reproducing SEP's electronic documents, please visit <http://sepwww.stanford.edu/research/redoc/>.

# Acknowledgments

My years here at the Stanford Exploration Project and at Stanford in general have been a fantastic time in my life where I have been able to learn and grow on both a professional and personal level. I would like to acknowledge my advisor, Biondo Biondi, for his support over the years, for letting me to find my own path while exploring my thesis, and continually stressing the importance of the real 3D world. I thank Jon Claerbout for begin ahead of the curve in setting up the SEP consortium many years ago, and for setting the standard for the richness of the science and technology that continues to come out of SEP today. Bob Clapp has been a great resource for me, especially during my last few years at SEP when I became more computational. His consistently being a few steps ahead in the world of computational geophysics has greatly facilitated the completion of my 3D imaging result. I thank Diane Lau for her continual support and patience; even when bringing in buckets of receipts to her in various Slavic and Romance languages she managed to keep a smile on her face.

The majority of the time that I spent at SEP was with my fellow students, both senior and junior to me; it has been a blast. Entering into SEP and dealing with starting up research can be a daunting task, and I would like to recognize those SEPErs that helped. My early interactions with Paul Sava and Antoine Guitton led to my thesis topic and I am grateful for all those discussions. I would like to thank those SEPErs closer to my cohort, in particular Guojian Shan and Brad Artman, off whom I bounced many ideas. To those SEPErs more junior than me: it has been fun working with you and helping you choose your research paths, and I wish you all the

best.

In addition to my SEP research, I have been fortunate enough to be involved in additional multi-disciplinary projects spanning the geosciences. I would like to thank Cameron Snow for the opportunity to study geochemical discrimination, and Charles Wilson for the time spent in teleseismic imaging. I also thank Kyle Spikes, Laura Chiaramonte and Brad Artman for the happy memories of various field camps and geo-archaeology imaging projects around the world. These were made possible by grants from the SEG Foundation, the Stanford School of Earth Sciences, and the Stanford Center for Latin American Studies, all of whom are deeply thanked.

I would like to generally acknowledge all the people in the Stanford community that have helped shaped my time here, and those with whom I have helped continue old traditions and start others anew. I have a lot of great memories and am looking forward to meeting up you at various times and locations around the world in the future. Thanks also to my housemates at Maddux over the years who have helped me hone my backyard mechanical engineering abilities. Finally, thanks to my family for supporting me through thick and thin all these years.

# Contents

Abstract	v
Preface	vii
Acknowledgments	ix
1 Introduction	1
2 RWE: Non-orthogonal coordinate systems	18
3 Shot-profile migration in elliptic coordinates	46
4 Generalized-coordinate ADCIGs	63
5 Delayed-shot migration in TEC coordinates	87
A Riemannian geometry overview	121
B Generalized phase-shift operators	123
C RWE wavenumber approximations	125

<b>D Elliptic coordinate systems</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>E ADCIG coordinate transform</b>	<b>131</b>

# List of Tables

2.1	Comparison of computational costs of the split-step Fourier and phase-shift subroutines for RWE and equivalent Cartesian implementations. Results computed for the 2D example shown in Figure 2.6. . . . .	42
2.2	Comparison between performing migration with stored or locally computed coordinate system geometry information for Cartesian (CC) and Elliptic Cylindrical (EC) coordinates. . . . .	44
5.1	Coefficients used in 3D implicit finite-difference wavefield extrapolation.	99
5.2	Parameters associated with the 3D synthetic data set. . . . .	104
5.3	Run-time comparisons for the delayed-shot migration and shot-profile styles in the tilted elliptical-cylindrical and Cartesian coordinate systems.	111
5.4	Approximate acquisition parameters associated with the 3D Gulf of Mexico field data set. . . . .	113

# List of Figures

1.1	Cartoon illustrating the problems associated with wave-equation migration using downward continuation. a) Propagation angles can become too steep in Cartesian coordinates (i.e. $\theta > \theta_{max}$ ) causing the true reflector location (black) to be inaccurately imaged (gray). b) Turning waves cannot be imaged by design in Cartesian coordinates. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	3
1.2	Comparisons between four different acoustic wave-propagation techniques through the BP velocity model. a) Two-way finite-difference modeling. b) Cartesian one-way wavefield extrapolation. c) Ray-coordinate-based one-way Riemannian wavefield extrapolation. d) Analytic coordinate one-way Riemannian wavefield extrapolation. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	5
1.3	Cartoon illustrating how making the migration geometry more conformal to the wave-propagation direction can lead to imaging improvements. a) Propagating wavefields on meshes more conformal to ray-path direction reduces the relative extrapolation angle. b) Improved coordinate system designs enable turning-wave propagation with one-way wave-equations. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	6

1.4	Cartoon illustrating the problems associated with imaging substructure using wavefields with conflicting dips. a) Coordinate system where the right-hand structure can be imaged using one-way extrapolation, but the left-hand reflector cannot. b) Example where a coordinate enables imaging of part, but not all, subsurface structure. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	7
1.5	Cartoon illustrating the four-step procedure for migrating with multiple coordinate systems and decomposed data sets. a) Decide on the data-domain decomposition and migration domains to be used. b) Decompose data and set up migration domains. c) Generate partial images using data subsets and individual migration domains. d) Combine individual images into final volume. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	8
1.6	Illustration of the RWE approach using Green's functions calculated on ray-coordinate meshes through the BP velocity model. a) Velocity model with a smooth coordinate mesh overlain. b) Velocity model in a) interpolated into ray coordinates. c) Point-source Green's function in ray coordinates at four time steps. d) Wavefield in c) interpolated to Cartesian. Note the steep, vertical and overturning waves, illustrating RWE's imaging potential. <b>ER</b> . . . . .	11
2.1	Illustration of problems with partially orthogonal RWE computational grids. a) Singularities in a coordinate system generated by ray-tracing that lead to zero-division in RWE. b) Grid bunching for a topographically conformal coordinate system that causes significant lateral variation in each extrapolation step. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	21
2.2	Sheared Cartesian coordinate system test. a) Coordinate system shear angle and velocity are $\theta = 25^\circ$ and $1500 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ , respectively. b) Zero-offset data consist of four flat plane-wave impulses at $t=0.2, 0.4, 0.6,$ and $0.8 \text{ s}$ that are correctly imaged at depths $z=300, 600, 900,$ and $1200 \text{ m}$ . <b>ER</b> . . . . .	28

2.3	Stretched polar coordinate system test example. a) Velocity function $v(x_3) = 1500 + 0.35 x_3$ overlain by a stretched polar coordinate system defined by parameter $a = 1 + 0.2 \xi_3 - 0.05 \xi_3^2$ . b) Velocity model mapped in the RWE domain. c) Imaged reflectors in RWE domain. d) RWE domain image mapped to a Cartesian mesh. <b>ER</b> . . . . .	31
2.4	Example of singularity-free mesh generation. a) Velocity model with three Gaussian velocity perturbations. Overlain is a coordinate mesh generated from ray-tracing. Note the triplication to either side of the shot-point, as well as the spreading beneath the shot point. b) Velocity model overlain by isochrons of an Eikonal equation solution for same shot-point. c) Singularity-free, but weakly non-orthogonal, computational mesh generated by Eikonal mesh smoothing. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	34
2.5	Example of wave-equation-generated Green's functions on structured non-orthogonal mesh for a slice through the SEG-EAGE salt velocity model. a) Salt model in physical space with an overlain ray-coordinate mesh. b) Velocity model in the transform domain. c) Wavefield propagated in ray coordinates through velocity model shown in b). d) Wavefield in c) interpolated back to Cartesian space. <b>ER</b> . . . . .	36
2.6	Comparison between three different extrapolation methods. a) Two-way finite-difference modeling. b) Riemannian wavefield extrapolation. c) Cartesian wavefield extrapolation. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	37
2.7	Constant surfaces of the elliptic-cylindrical coordinate system Cartesian coordinate axes are given to a) Five constant $\xi_3$ surfaces forming confocal elliptic cylindrical shells. This represents the direction of extrapolation direction. b) Five constant $\xi_2$ surfaces representing folded hyperbolic planes. c) Five constant $\xi_1$ surfaces representing 2D elliptic meshes. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	40

2.8	Green's function computation test in the 3D elliptical-cylindrical analytic coordinate system for a set of five flat plane waves at time 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, and 3.0 s. Top: Elliptical-cylindrical coordinate imaging result. Bottom: Cartesian coordinate imaging result. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	41
3.1	Illustrating the elliptical coordinate system. a) Constant-velocity imaging experiment with point source and receiver wavefields (dashed lines) from locations marked $S$ and $R$ , respectively. The corresponding image is an elliptical isochron surface derived by cross-correlating the source and receiver wavefields (solid line). b) Grid rotation angles for the elliptical coordinate system with respect to the vertical Cartesian depth axis. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	51
3.2	Post-stack turning-wave data generated by two-way time-domain finite-difference modeling from all salt body edges of the velocity model in Figure 4.3a. <b>ER</b> . . . . .	55
3.3	Post-stack turning-wave model. a) Velocity model used to generate turning wave data in Figure 4.2 with coordinate system overlain. b) Effective slowness model $s_{eff}$ in elliptical coordinates. <b>ER</b> . . . . .	56
3.4	Post-stack turning-wave migration results. a) Monochromatic Cartesian image with overlain elliptical coordinates showing the wave-propagation paths. b) Monochromatic elliptical coordinate image. c) Broadband Cartesian image. d) Broadband elliptical coordinate image. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	57
3.5	Prestack migration test in elliptical coordinates. a) Benchmark synthetic velocity model with the elliptical coordinate system overlain. b) Effective slowness model in the transformed elliptical coordinate system. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	59
3.6	Synthetic migration results. a) Elliptical-coordinate migration result using finite-difference propagators. b) Cartesian migration result generated by finite-difference extrapolators of equivalent accuracy. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	60

4.1	Cartoon illustrating the geometry of the ADCIG calculation. Parameter $\gamma$ is the reflection opening angle, $\alpha$ is geologic dip. a) Cartesian geometry using coordinates $x_1, x_3$ and $h_{x_1}$ . b) Generalized geometry using coordinates $\xi_1, \xi_3$ and $h_{\xi_1}$ . Adapted from Sava and Fomel (2003). <b>NR</b> . . . . .	67
4.2	Prestack migration test in elliptical coordinates. a) Benchmark synthetic velocity model with an overlying elliptical coordinate system. b) Effective slowness model in the transformed elliptical coordinate system in a). c) Benchmark synthetic velocity model with a different overlying elliptical coordinate system. d) Effective elliptical coordinate slowness model for the coordinate system in c). <b>NR</b> . . . . .	69
4.3	Canonical coordinate system examples. a) Tilted Cartesian coordinates. b) Polar coordinates. c) elliptical coordinates. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	72
4.4	Theoretical results for an elliptical isochron for four travel times in a constant velocity medium. The elliptical surfaces are color-coded according to reflection opening angle. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	76
4.5	Elliptical reflector comparison tests between analytically (black bullets) and numerically generated ADCIG volumes. Panels a-d are computed in elliptical coordinates (EC), while panels e-h are in Cartesian coordinates (CC). a) EC image extracted at the $-24^\circ$ reflection angle. b) EC angle gather at $-1.5$ km. c) EC gather at $0.75$ km. d) EC gather at $0.0$ km. e) CC image extracted at the $-24^\circ$ reflection angle. f) CC angle gather at $-1.5$ km. g) CC gather at $0.75$ km. h) CC gather at $0.0$ km. <b>ER</b> . . . . .	77

4.6	Elliptical reflector comparison tests between analytically (black bullets) and numerically generated ADCIG volumes using a velocity scaled by factor 0.95. Panels a-d are computed in elliptical coordinates (EC), while panels e-h are in Cartesian coordinates (CC). a) EC image extracted at the $-24^\circ$ reflection angle. b) EC angle gather at -1.5 km. c) EC gather at 0.75 km. d) EC gather at 0.0 km. e) CC image extracted at the $-24^\circ$ reflection angle. f) CC angle gather at -1.5 km. g) CC gather at 0.75 km. h) CC gather at 0.0 km. <b>ER</b> . . . . .	78
4.7	Vertical elliptical and Cartesian ADCIGs slices using the correct migration velocity model. a) elliptical coordinate image with three vertical lines showing the locations of ADCIG gathers from left to right in panels b-d. e) Cartesian coordinate image with three vertical lines showing the locations of ADCIG gathers from left to right in panels f-h. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	80
4.8	Horizontal elliptical and Cartesian ADCIGs slices using the correct migration velocity model. a) elliptical coordinate image with three horizontal lines showing the locations of horizontal ADCIG gathers from top to bottom in panels b-d. e) Cartesian coordinate image with three horizontal lines showing the locations of horizontal ADCIG gathers from top to bottom in panels f-h. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	82
4.9	Vertical elliptical and Cartesian ADCIGs slices using an incorrect migration velocity model. a) elliptical coordinate image with three vertical lines showing the locations of vertical ADCIG gathers from left to right in panels b-d. e) Cartesian coordinate image with three vertical lines showing the locations of vertical ADCIG gathers from left to right in panels f-h. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	83

4.10	Horizontal elliptical and Cartesian ADCIGs slices using an incorrect migration velocity model. a) elliptical coordinate image with three horizontal lines showing the locations of horizontal ADCIG gathers from top to bottom in panels b-d. e) Cartesian coordinate image with three horizontal lines showing the locations of horizontal ADCIG gathers from top to bottom in panels f-h. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	84
5.1	Constant surfaces of the elliptical-cylindrical coordinate system (with zero inline tilt). Cartesian coordinate axes are given by the vector diagram. a) constant $\xi_3$ surfaces forming confocal elliptical-cylindrical shells that represent the direction of extrapolation direction. b) constant $\xi_2$ surfaces representing folded hyperbolic planes. c) constant $\xi_1$ surfaces representing 2D elliptical meshes. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	96
5.2	Four extrapolation steps in $\xi_3$ of an TEC coordinate system, where the $\xi_1$ and $\xi_2$ coordinate axes are oriented in the inline and crossline directions, respectively. a) $0^\circ$ tilt angle. b) $25^\circ$ tilt angle. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	97
5.3	Elliptical-cylindrical-coordinate impulse-response tests. a) Inline section. b) Crossline section. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	101
5.4	Elliptical-cylindrical impulse response at 1300 m depth. Note the circular symmetry of the impulse response indicating little-to-no numerical anisotropy. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	102
5.5	Depth section and inline crossline sections of the Gulf of Mexico velocity model through complex 3D salt bodies. Top: 3900 m depth slice. Middle: 33000 m inline section. Top: 16000 m crossline section. <b>ER</b> . . . . .	103
5.6	Sections for the 24500 m sail line at the 15400m crossline coordinate. Top: Elliptical-cylindrical coordinate image. Bottom: Cartesian coordinate image. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	105

5.7	Crossline sections through the velocity model and full image volumes at inline coordinate 33700 m. Top panel: Elliptical-cylindrical coordinate image. Bottom panel: Cartesian coordinate image. The imaging improvements for the left-hand salt flank are denoted by the oval marked A. The oval marked B illustrates a more continuous and correctly placed reflector in the TEC coordinate system. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	106
5.8	Crossline sections through the velocity model and full image volumes at inline coordinate 15100 m. Top panel: Elliptical-cylindrical coordinate image. Bottom panel: Cartesian coordinate image. The oval marked A indicates the location of the vertical salt flank that is better imaged in TEC coordinates. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	107
5.9	Inline sections through the velocity model and full image volumes at crossline coordinate 21750 m. Top panel: Velocity section. Middle panel: Elliptical-cylindrical coordinate image. Bottom panel: Cartesian coordinate image. The left-hand salt flank, shown in oval A, is more accurately positioned in the TEC coordinate image, while the right-hand flank, marked by oval B, is similarly more accurately positioned and continuous. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	109
5.10	Depth slices through the velocity model and image volumes at 6150 m depth. Top panel: Elliptical-cylindrical coordinate image. Bottom panel: Cartesian coordinate image. Oval A illustrates the improved TEC image for the vertical salt flank shown in Figure 5.8. Oval B demarcates a region where some of the smaller-scale fractures are well imaged in both images. Oval C shows the region where the near-vertical flank shown in TEC coordinate image in Figure 5.7 is better imaged. <b>NR</b> . . . . .	110
5.11	Velocity model example for Gulf of Mexico field data set. <b>ER</b> . . . . .	112
5.12	Chosen source distribution for the field data set. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	114

5.13	Chosen receiver distribution for the field data set. The missing data between offsets $\pm 2500$ -2750 m is due to a corrupted data tape. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	114
5.14	Inline sections through the migration images taken at the 8750 m crossline coordinate location. Top: TEC coordinate migration results. Bottom: Cartesian coordinate migration results. Oval A shows the imaging improvements in TEC coordinates for the left-hand flank. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	116
5.15	Crossline sections through the migration images taken at the 7100 m crossline coordinate location. Top: TEC coordinate migration results. Bottom: Cartesian coordinate migration results. Oval A shows an example of an area where the TEC coordinate image is better than the Cartesian image. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	117
5.16	Migration results for the 3D Gulf of Mexico field data set through the sedimentary section. Top: TEC coordinate migration results. Bottom: Cartesian coordinate migration results. Oval A shows an example of an area where the TEC image is better than that generated in Cartesian, including two parts of the right-hand salt flank. Oval B shows the TEC coordinate image improvements in the crossline direction. <b>CR</b> . . . . .	118