

MIGRATION-VELOCITY ANALYSIS USING IMAGE-SPACE  
GENERALIZED WAVEFIELDS

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

Claudio Guerra

October 2010

© Copyright by Claudio Guerra 2010  
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

An accurate depth-velocity model is the key for obtaining good quality and reliable depth images in areas of complex geology. In such areas, velocity-model definition should use methods that describe the complexity of wavefield propagation, such as focusing and defocusing, multiple arrivals, and frequency-dependent velocity sensitivity. Wave-equation tomography in the image space has the ability to handle these issues because it uses wavefields as carriers of information. However, its high cost and low flexibility for parametrizing the model space has prevented its routine industrial use.

This thesis aims at overcoming those limitations by using new wavefields as carriers of information: the image-space generalized wavefields. These wavefields are synthesized by using a pre-stack generalization of the exploding-reflector model. Cost of wave-equation tomography in the image space is decreased because only a small number of image-space generalized wavefields are necessary to accurately describe the kinematics of velocity errors and because these wavefields can be easily used in a target-oriented way. Flexibility is naturally incorporated into wave-equation tomography in the image space by using these wavefields because their modeling have as the initial conditions some key selected reflectors, allowing a layer-based parametrization of the model space.

To use the image-space generalized wavefields in wave-equation tomography in the image space, the method is extended from the shot-profile domain to the image-space generalized-sources domain. In this new domain, the velocity updates are very fast. Migration with the optimized velocity model provides good quality and reliable depth

images, as can be seen in a 3D-field data example.

# 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/sep141>

<sup>2</sup><http://sepwww.stanford.edu/public/docs/sepdata/lib/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

Having finished writing and defending this thesis, I look back and realize that it would not have been possible in the short (by SEP's standards) period of almost four years without the valuable help of many friends and colleagues. They provided every sort of support to help me overcome the difficulty of getting back to academia after almost 20 years working for Petrobras. By the way, the first acknowledgment goes to this company, which I call "mine." Thanks for the essential and continuous financial and moral support, the latter personified as Neiva Zago and Carlos Cunha.

I thank Biondo Biondi, my adviser, for always being a source of encouragement and a reference on academic honesty. His attitude made clearer to me both the importance of obtaining good results and the usefulness of the bad ones, which deserve to be brought to light. I thank Jon Claerbout for initiating us students into the mysteries of inverse problems and for sharing his contagious enthusiasm for doing research. I admire his energy, curiosity, and serendipity. Bob Clapp has constantly been steps ahead of everyone in looking for computational solutions that best fit the type and size of geophysical problems we propose to solve. Also, his knowledge about velocity inversion was of great help. Diane Lau, thanks for taking care of everything that makes SEP runs smoothly.

I am indebted with all SEP colleagues with whom I overlapped and shared ideas, coffee, and beer. Daniel Rosales, Gabriel Alvarez, Brad Artman, Alejandro Valenciano, Bill Curry, Guojian Shan, Jeff Shragge, Yaxun Tang, Madhav Vyas, Ben Witten, and Pierre Jouselin, arrived at SEP before me. Their hospitality and interest in teaching me the way SEP works will be remembered forever. Special thanks to

Alejandro Valenciano and Yaxun Tang with whom I shared the office and who tutored me on several aspects of seismic inversion using wavefields. Roland Gunther, Gboyega Ayeni, and I started SEP in the same year. Otunba Ayeni ìdúpèôpè fúnńítorí gbogbo òkan. Xukai Shen, Adam Halpert, Sjoerd de Ridder, Abdullah Al Theyab, Mohammad Maysami, Yunyue Li, Mandy Wong, Nader Moussa, Ohad Barak, Ali Al-momin, Yang Zhang, Chris Leader and Kittinat Taweesintananon, started SEP after me. Thanks for lending me your energy during the final sprint to finish up everything. System administrators deserve a special thank for configuring and maintaining our computers: Bill, Yaxun, and Ohad. I cannot forget the reproducibility guys: Ben, Jeff, Mohammad, Sjoerd, and Yang.

Two people were crucial to improve readability of this thesis: Dawn Burges and Professor Claude Reichards. Besides the editorial job, Claude will be remembered by his friendship and support.

Lais, Tomas, Mateus e Gabriel, muito obrigado pela compreensão e amor que pautaram nossas vidas nesses quatro anos. O que fiz foi para vocês. Merecemos todo o bem que vier. A vocês todo o meu amor e gratidão.

# Contents

Abstract	v
Preface	vii
Acknowledgments	ix
1 Introduction	1
2 Pre-Stack Exploding-Reflector Model	10
3 Image-space phase-encoded wavefields	53
4 MVA using image-space generalized sources	79
5 3D field-data example	113
6 Conclusions	162

# List of Tables

# List of Figures

1.1	Migration of the original 375 shot-profiles. . . . .	4
1.2	Horizontal plane-wave synthesis. a) generalized source function, b) generalized receiver gather, and c) areal-shot migration. . . . .	5
1.3	Horizontal plane-wave at depth 2300 m by the controlled illumination method. a) generalized source function, b) generalized receiver gather, and c) areal-shot migration. . . . .	6
1.4	Random-phase encoding combining every 20 shots. a) generalized source function, b) generalized receiver gather, and c) areal-shot migration. . . . .	7
1.5	Shot-profile migrated images of Marmousi obtained with: a) An initial velocity model, which is inaccurate below the top of the anticline at depth 1700 m, b) a velocity model optimized with ISWET, using 11 pairs of image-space generalized sources synthesized from 12 selected reflectors and collected at depth 1500 m. . . . .	8
2.1	a) Shot-profile migration of 380 off-end shots 24 m apart. b) Shot-profile migration of 23 off-end shots 384 m apart. Both images were computed with the correct velocity model. Notice slanted lines present in Figure 2.1b. . . . .	13

2.2	a) Shot-profile migration of 95 areal shots resulting from the combination of 4 shot profiles 2256 m apart. b) Shot-profile migration of 23 areal shots resulting from the combination of 16 shot profiles 564 m apart. Both images were computed with the correct velocity model. Notice crosstalk occurring periodically in the SODCIG of Figure 2.2b.	15
2.3	Angle-domain common-image gathers (top) and residual moveout panels (bottom). Left: full migration. Middle: migration of 23 sampled shots. Right: migration of the combined shots. Crosstalk resulting from the combination of many shots destroys the velocity information.	16
2.4	Shot-profile migration of 401 split-spread shots 10 m apart with a 10% slower velocity. The model consists of a horizontal reflector embedded in constant velocity of 1000 m/s. . . . .	24
2.5	Data synthesized by PERM having as the initial condition the SODCIG at $x_m = 0$ m. a) The receiver wavefield. b) The source wavefield. . . .	25
2.6	Areal-shot migration of PERM data shown in Figure 2.5 with a 10% slower velocity. By comparing with Figure 2.4 we see that far subsurface-offsets are not properly imaged. . . . .	26
2.7	Areal-shot migration of PERM data having a set of isolated SODCIGs around $x_m = 0$ m as the initial condition with a 10% slower velocity. By comparing with Figure 2.4 we see that the kinematics of far subsurface-offsets is properly recovered. . . . .	27
2.8	ADCIGs selected at $x_m = 0$ m. a) Computed from the shot-profile migration; b) computed from the areal-shot migration of one pair of PERM data modeled from the SODCIG at $x_m = 0$ m; and c) computed from the areal-shot migration of pairs of PERM data modeled from a set of SODCIGs around $x_m = 0$ m. Notice that although the kinematics are similar, the amplitudes in c) better match those of a).	27

2.9	Areal-shot migration of PERM data having a set of isolated SODCIGs around $x_m = 0$ m as the initial condition with the correct velocity. Energy nicely focuses at zero-subsurface offset. . . . .	28
2.10	Geometry for the computation of SODCIGs. Source, receiver and image points are labeled with S, R and I, respectively. The subscript $h_x$ corresponds to subsurface offsets computed with horizontal shift. The subscript $h_g$ corresponds to subsurface offsets computed by shifting along the apparent geological dip $\alpha$ . a) Underestimated velocity, and b) overestimated velocity. Modified from Biondi and Symes (2004). . . . .	32
2.11	Shot-profile migration of 801 split-spread shots 10 m apart with velocity 10% slower than the true velocity. The model is represented by a 20° dipping reflector and a horizontal reflector at a depth of 2500 m embedded in a medium with a constant velocity of 1000 m/s. . . . .	35
2.12	Data synthesized by PERM having as the initial condition the dipping reflector in the SODCIG at $x_m = 0$ m. a) The receiver wavefield. b) The source wavefield. . . . .	36
2.13	Areal-shot migration of PERM data shown in Figure 2.12 using the correct velocity. The horizontal reflector is focused at zero-subsurface offset, but the dipping reflector shows residual curvature. . . . .	37
2.14	Areal-shot migration with correct velocity of PERM data having a set of isolated SODCIGs around $x_m = 0$ m as the initial conditions. As in Figure 2.13, the horizontal reflector is focused at zero-subsurface offset, but the dipping reflector shows residual curvature. . . . .	37
2.15	Initial conditions for modeling a) source and b) receiver wavefields. The dipping reflector is oriented in opposite directions in the SODCIG. Rotation affects neither the horizontal reflector nor the-zero subsurface offset, as can be seen in the right panels. . . . .	38

2.16	Dip-independent PERM data for the dipping reflector from the rotated SODCIG at $x_m = 0$ m. a) The receiver wavefield. b) The source wavefield. . . . .	39
2.17	Areal-shot migration with the correct velocity of dip-independent PERM data having the rotated the SODCIGs at $x_m = 0$ m as the initial condition. The SODCIG on the left is selected at the horizontal position where the dipping reflector was laterally shifted to. Compare with Figure 2.13. The dipping reflector is now focused in contrast to the image in Figure 2.13, where it shows residual curvature. . . . .	40
2.18	Areal-shot migration with correct velocity of dip-independent PERM data having a set of rotated SODCIGs around $x_m = 0$ m as the initial conditions. Compare with Figure 2.14. The focusing of the dipping reflector is greatly improved when using the rotated initial conditions. . . . .	40
2.19	ADCIGs of images computed with the correct migration velocity using PERM data having: a) non-rotated initial conditions, and b) rotated initial conditions. Note the residual move-out in a) and the flatter response in b). . . . .	41
2.20	Areal-shot migration of PERM data synthesized from sets of SODCIGs selected with sampling period of 163 SODCIGs. Notice that no crosstalk is generated when the sampling period is larger than twice the subsurface-offset range. . . . .	45
2.21	The initial conditions for synthesizing PERM data from CAM images can be specified as in b) because no pre-stack information exists in the cross-line direction, in contrast with the full azimuth situation in a). . . . .	47



2.22	Common-azimuth migration of 3D-Born data modeled from a 30° dipping reflector with 45° azimuth with respect to the acquisition direction. The panel in the middle is the in-line at the zero-subsurface offset, and $y = 600$ m (Figure 2.22a) and $y = 1000$ m (Figure 2.22b). The panel on the right is the cross-line at the zero-subsurface offset, and $x = 750$ m. . . . .	48
2.23	3D-PERM receiver wavefield. The left panel is the in-line at $y = 1200$ m, the right panel is the cross-line at $x = 1400$ m, and the top panel is the time-slice at $t = 0.5$ s. . . . .	49
2.24	3D-areal-shot migration of PERM data from non stretched subsurface offset SODCIGs. The panel in the middle is the in-line at the zero-subsurface offset, and $y = 600$ m (Figure 2.22a) and $y = 1000$ m (Figure 2.22b). The panel on the right is the cross-line at the zero-subsurface offset, and $x = 750$ m. Compare with Figure 2.22 and 2.25.	50
2.25	3D-areal-shot migration of PERM data from stretched subsurface offset SODCIGs. The panel in the middle is the in-line at the zero-subsurface offset, and $y = 600$ m (Figure 2.22a) and $y = 1000$ m (Figure 2.22b). The panel on the right is the cross-line at the zero-subsurface offset, and $x = 750$ m. Compare with Figure 2.22 and 2.24. . . . .	51
3.1	Areal-shot migration of PERM data synthesized from a set of SODCIGs selected with sampling period of 163. The two reflectors are simultaneously injected to the model. Notice the reflector crosstalk, labeled with ‘C’, resulting from the cross-correlation of the wavefields from the horizontal reflector with that from the dipping reflector. . .	58

3.2	Snapshots of propagation of wavefields used to compute the image of Figure 3.1. Wavefields are labeled ‘D’ (Downgoing) for the source wavefield and ‘U’ (Upgoing) for the receiver wavefield. The panels on the left are selected at horizontal positions where the crosstalk occurs in Figure 3.1. The panels on the right are taken at the propagation time when the wavefields cross on the left panel. . . . .	59
3.3	Areal-shot migration of PERM data synthesized from sets of SODCIGs selected with sampling period of: a) 41 and, b) 81. . . . .	61
3.4	ADCIGs (top) and $\rho$ -panels (bottom) corresponding to images computed by wavefields modeled with sampling period of: a) 41, b) 81, and c) 163. Velocity information has been destroyed by the crosstalk in a) and b). . . . .	62
3.5	Areal-shot migration using the time-windowed imaging condition (equation 3.2). The reflector crosstalk is completely eliminated. . . . .	64
3.6	Velocity models for the Marmousi example: a) Smooth velocity model used to model the Born data. b) Background velocity model used to migrate the Born data, and to model and migrate PERM data. . . .	65
3.7	a) Pre-stack image computed with the background velocity model. b) Selected reflectors from the background image to perform modeling of wavefields. . . . .	66
3.8	Rotated initial conditions for modeling: a) source wavefields, and b) receiver wavefields. . . . .	67
3.9	PERM wavefields for the Marmousi example: a) Receiver wavefield. b) Source wavefield. . . . .	68

3.10	Pre-stack image computed with PERM wavefields and background velocity model using: a) the conventional imaging condition (equation 2.12), and b) the time-windowed imaging condition (equation 3.2). Reflector crosstalk is avoided when reflectors are sufficiently separated. However, some residual crosstalk is still present (RC). Notice the phase difference of the PERM image due to the squaring of the wavelet when compared to the windowed reflectors of Figure 3.7b. . . . .	69
3.11	ISPEWs from different random realizations initiated at the same SOD-CIGs for the Marmousi example: a,c) Receiver wavefields. b,d) Source wavefields. . . . .	74
3.12	Pre-stack images computed with: a) Four random realizations of ISPEWs, and b) a single random realization. . . . .	75
3.13	ADCIGs (top) and $\rho$ -panels (bottom) corresponding to images computed by: a) Shot-profile migration of 360 shot gathers, b) areal-shot migration of 35 PERM wavefields using the time-windowed imaging condition, c) areal-shot migration of 44 ISPEWs corresponding to four random realizations, and d) areal-shot migration of 11 ISPEWs corresponding to a single random realization. The moveout information is basically the same. . . . .	77
4.1	Marmousi velocity models: a) True velocity model. b) Background-velocity model computed by smoothing and scaling down the true model below the horizon indicated by the black line. . . . .	87
4.2	Snapshots of background: a) source, and b) receiver wavefields. . . . .	88
4.3	Background image and SODCIGs computed with the background wavefields of Figure 4.2. . . . .	89
4.4	Perturbed image computed with equation 4.16. . . . .	90
4.5	Snapshots of perturbed: a) source, and b) receiver wavefields. . . . .	91

4.6	Slowness perturbation from back-projected image perturbations. . . .	93
4.7	Selected reflectors used to model the image-space generalized source and receiver gathers. . . . .	94
4.8	Snapshots of image-space generalized background wavefields: a) source, and b) receiver wavefields. . . . .	96
4.9	Background image computed with the image-space generalized background wavefields of Figure 4.8. . . . .	97
4.10	Perturbed image computed with equation 4.26. . . . .	99
4.11	Snapshots of image-space generalized perturbed wavefields: a) source, and b) receiver. . . . .	100
4.12	Slowness perturbation from back-projected image perturbations computed with 35 ISPEWs. . . . .	101
4.13	a) Initial and b) final background image for the optimization with 11 ISPEWs. . . . .	105
4.14	a) Initial and b) final background image for the optimization with 35 ISPEWs. . . . .	106
4.15	Evolution of the objective function for the 11-ISPEWs case (blue diamonds) and 35-ISPEWs case (red squares). . . . .	107
4.16	Optimized velocity models for: a) the 11-ISPEWs case, and b) 35-ISPEWs case. . . . .	108
4.17	a) Smoothed version of the true velocity model, b) histogram of the velocity ratio between the smoothed true velocity model and the initial velocity model, c) histogram of the velocity ratio between the smoothed true velocity model and the 11-ISPEWs optimized velocity model, and d) histogram of the velocity ratio between the smoothed true velocity model and the 35-ISPEWs optimized velocity model. . . . .	109

4.18	Images computed with shot-profile migration using the optimized velocity models of Figure 4.16: a) the 11-ISPEWs case, and b) 35-ISPEWs case. . . . .	110
4.19	Image computed with shot-profile migration using the true velocity model. . . . .	111
5.1	a) Offset – azimuth cross-plot, b) azimuth histogram, c) in-line offset histogram, and d) cross-line offset histogram. . . . .	115
5.2	Fold of coverage plots: a) full offset, b) 0 – 1200 m offset, c) 1200 – 2400 m offset, and d) 2400 – 3600 m offset. . . . .	116
5.3	Time slices through the trace envelope for different offset cubes from the regularized data: a) offset 200m, b) offset 1200 m, c) offset 2400 m, and d) offset 3000 m. . . . .	116
5.4	Slices through the IFP velocity model. . . . .	117
5.5	Slices through the initial velocity model used in 3D-ISWET. . . . .	119
5.6	Slices through an initial velocity model generated with the same procedures as that for Figure 5.5, except for the velocity above the chalk, which is the original velocity. . . . .	121
5.7	Image computed with the velocity model of Figure 5.6. The top panel is the zero-subsurface offset section and the panel at the bottom are the SODCIGs. . . . .	122
5.8	Image computed with the velocity model of Figure 5.5. The left panel is the zero-subsurface offset section and the panels on the right are the SODCIGs. Compare with Figure 5.7. . . . .	123
5.9	Slices through the CAM image with the initial velocity model of Figure 5.5. Notice poorly collapsed diffractions close to the salt flank (A and D), and poorly imaged faults (B and C) caused by migrating with an inaccurate velocity. . . . .	125

5.10	In-line 3180 of the CAM image with the initial velocity model of Figure 5.5. On the left is the zero-subsurface offset section, and on the right ADCIGs. Notice the strong residual moveout on the ADCIGs. The continuous blue line is the top of chalk, and the dashed blue line it the base of chalk. . . . .	126
5.11	Slices through the prestack-mask operator to select the base of chalk, showing: a) the zero subsurface offset, and b) the in-line 3520. . . . .	127
5.12	A pair of 3D source (a) and receiver (b) ISPEWs computed for the base of chalk. . . . .	129
5.13	Slowness perturbation without smoothing and without extracting the signed square root from the initial conditions for the modeling of 30 pairs of ISPEWs. . . . .	130
5.14	Slowness perturbation without smoothing and extracting the signed fourth root of the gradient. . . . .	131
5.15	Slowness perturbation after B-spline smoothing the slowness perturbation of Figure 5.14. . . . .	132
5.16	Evolution of the DVSA objective function for the first run of ISWET for the base of chalk. . . . .	133
5.17	In-line 3520 of the initial background image of the first run of ISWET for the base of chalk. . . . .	134
5.18	In-line 3520 of the background image computed with the optimized velocity model of the first run of ISWET for the base of chalk. . . . .	135
5.19	Slices through the optimized velocity from the first run of ISWET for the base of chalk. The dashed white line approximately represents the base of chalk. . . . .	136

5.20	Slices through the optimized velocity from the second run of ISWET for the base of chalk. The dashed white line approximately represents the base of chalk. . . . .	137
5.21	Slices through the CAM image with the optimized velocity model of Figure 5.20. Notice the imaging of a big fault close to the salt flank (A), and the focusing of a complex fault system (B, C, and D). . . . .	138
5.22	In-line 3180 of the CAM image with the optimized velocity model of Figure 5.20. On the left is the zero-subsurface offset section, and on the right ADCIGs. Notice flatter reflectors in the ADCIGs compared to those in Figure 5.10. The continuous blue line is the top of chalk, and the dashed blue line it the base of chalk. . . . .	139
5.23	Slices through the velocity volume after salt flooding. The dashed white line approximately represents the base of chalk. . . . .	140
5.24	Slices through the CAM migrated image computed with the salt flooding velocity model of Figure 5.23. . . . .	142
5.25	Slices through the velocity volume after interpretation of the base of salt. . . . .	143
5.26	Slices through the CAM migrated image computed with the velocity model of Figure 5.25. . . . .	144
5.27	Slices through the prestack image computed with the migration velocity of Figure 5.25: a) the zero subsurface offset, and b) the in-line 3520. . . . .	145
5.28	Slices through the windowed prestack image, showing the selected reflectors for the modeling of 30 3D ISPEWs to be used in the sub-salt velocity optimization: a) the zero subsurface offset, and b) the in-line 3520. . . . .	146

5.29	Evolution of the DVSA objective function of the sub-salt velocity optimization. . . . .	147
5.30	In-line 3520 of the image of the last iteration of the sub-salt and sub-chalk velocity optimization. Notice the greater amount of dispersed crosstalk in this image than that of the Figure 5.18. . . . .	148
5.31	Slices through velocity models for: a) first iteration, b) third iteration, c) fifth iteration, and d) seventh iteration. . . . .	149
5.32	In-line 4060 of the CAM image with the final velocity model after optimization for the chalk layer, salt flooding, and sub-salt velocity optimization. On the top is the zero-subsurface offset section, and at the bottom ADCIGs. . . . .	150
5.33	In-line 4060 of the CAM image with the initial velocity model. On the top is the zero-subsurface offset section, and at the bottom ADCIGs. . . . .	151
5.34	In-line 4060 of the CAM image with the original velocity model. On the top is the zero-subsurface offset section, and at the bottom ADCIGs. . . . .	152
5.35	On the left panel is the in-line 3320 and on the right panel is the cross-line 5220 of the CAM images obtained with: a) the starting velocity model for the sub-salt and sub-chalk velocity optimization and b) the final velocity model. The oval in the in-line of b) shows better focusing for the sub-salt reflectors as well as for reflectors close to the right salt flank. In addition, to the left of the in-line, unfocused reflectors are revealed after migrating with the final velocity. In the cross-line, the final image shows flatter and more unstructured sub-salt reflectors than in a). . . . .	154



- 5.36 On the left panel is the in-line 3680 and on the right panel is the cross-line 6880 of the CAM images obtained with: a) the starting velocity model for the sub-salt and sub-chalk velocity optimization and b) the final velocity model. The oval in the in-line of the final image shows better focusing and continuity for the sub-salt and sub-chalk reflectors and better fault imaging. In the cross-line, the oval in a) shows unstructured deeper reflectors, indicating a sufficiently accurate velocity solution for the layers above. In b), these reflectors remain unstructured, but notice stronger and more focused amplitudes, indicating better velocity solution. . . . . 155
- 5.37 On the left panel is the in-line 4060 and on the right panel is the cross-line 9400 of the CAM images obtained with: a) the starting velocity model for the sub-salt and sub-chalk velocity optimization and b) the final velocity model. The oval in the in-line of the final image shows better focusing and continuity for the sub-salt reflectors. In the cross-line, the oval highlights better continuity of the reflectors and better fault imaging not clear in the starting image. . . . . 156
- 5.38 On the left panel is the in-line 3320 and on the right panel is the cross-line 5220 of the CAM images obtained with: a) the initial velocity model, b) the original velocity model, and c) the final velocity model after optimization for the chalk layer, salt flooding, and sub-salt velocity optimization. The oval in the in-line of the final image shows better focusing and continuity for the sub-salt reflectors and better delineation of the salt overhang. Besides focusing and continuity, the oval in the cross-line of the final image shows remarkably less structured sub-salt reflectors. . . . . 157

- 5.39 On the left panel is the in-line 3680 and on the right panel is the cross-line 6880 of the CAM images obtained with: a) the initial velocity model, b) the original velocity model, and c) the final velocity model after optimization for the chalk layer, salt flooding, and sub-salt velocity optimization. The oval in the in-line of the final image shows better focusing and continuity for the sub-salt reflectors. When comparing b) and c), besides better focusing and continuity, the cross-line in c) shows unstructured sub-salt reflectors not pulled up by velocity errors evidenced by migration swings clearly seen in b). . . . . 158
- 5.40 On the left panel is the in-line 4060 and on the right panel is the cross-line 9400 of the CAM images obtained with: a) the initial velocity model, b) the original velocity model, and c) the final velocity model after optimization for the chalk layer, salt flooding, and sub-salt velocity optimization. The oval in the in-line of the final image shows better focusing and continuity for the sub-salt reflectors. It is remarkable the better continuity of the reflectors intersected by the vertical line in c) than in b), indicating a much better solution for the velocity model. In the cross-line, the upper oval of the final image shows better definition of subtle faults in the chalk layer, the lower oval highlights better continuity of the reflectors, and the arrow labeled "F" indicates better fault imaging not clear in the initial and original images. . . . 159