

WAVE-EQUATION TOMOGRAPHY

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

By
Marta Jo Woodward
December 1989

© Copyright 1989
by
Marta Jo Woodward

printed as Stanford Exploration Project No. 62
by permission of the author

Copying for all internal purposes of the sponsors
of the Stanford Exploration Project is permitted

Wave-equation tomography

Marta Jo Woodward, Ph.D.
Stanford University, 1989

ABSTRACT

Seismic tomography reconstructs velocity fields from integrals over paths through the fields. Tomography is most familiar in its ray-theoretic form as traveltime inversion, where the integrals are traveltimes over raypaths. In this formulation, traveltimes are measured for each source-receiver experiment, and expected traveltimes are calculated by ray tracing through an assumed background velocity field. An updated velocity field is produced by projecting the differences between the measured and expected traveltimes (the traveltime delays) back through the medium over the traced raypaths.

Ray-trace tomography works well when two requirements are met. First, because the method relies on the high-frequency assumption of ray theory, the velocity field being examined must vary slowly on the scale of the source wavelengths. In this case, there is no scattering: phase delay is linear with frequency and the source wavelet is not distorted. Second, because without scattering rays sample very narrow regions in space, the source-receiver geometry must provide many view angles through the medium. When these requirements are not met, wave-theoretic tomography provides a better image.

Wave-theoretic tomography accommodates scattering by replacing traveltime delays with scattered wavefields. The wavefields are backpropagated through the medium, using a Born or Rytov linearization of the scalar wave equation. Wave-theoretic tomography is usually formulated in the frequency-wavenumber domain, under the title of diffraction tomography. This thesis reformulates the method in the frequency-space domain, under the title of wave-equation tomography. Wave-equation tomography is shown to project monochromatic, scattered wavefields back over source-receiver *wavepaths*, just as ray-trace tomography projects traveltime delays back over source-receiver *raypaths*.

I have two purposes in reformulating diffraction tomography in the space domain. First, the method becomes more flexible in dealing with irregularly sampled surveys and

inhomogeneous background media. Second, and more importantly, a comparison of single source-receiver wavepath and raypath backprojection patterns clarifies the relation between wave-theoretic and ray-theoretic techniques. The comparison shows that wave-theoretic tomography is closely related to migration under the Born approximation, and to ray-theoretic transmission tomography under the Rytov approximation. Examined under the linear-phase-delay assumption of ray theory, Rytov wavepaths are identified as monochromatic raypaths, and traditional raypaths as wavepaths averaged over an infinite bandwidth. *Bandlimited raypaths* are introduced as wavepaths averaged over a finite bandwidth, graphically linking rays and waves through the uncertainty relation.

Approved for publication:

By Jon F. Claerbout

For Major Department

By _____

Dean of Graduate Studies & Research

Acknowledgments

Many people made this work possible. First, I want to thank the faculty, staff and sponsors of the Stanford Exploration Project. By accepting me into the SEP, Jon Clærbout welcomed me into an exceptional research environment. He furnished me with the best hardware and software tools available and gave me the freedom to grow and develop at my own pace. Francis Muir proved an invaluable friend and mentor, guiding me through my early research and later offering sage advice on everything from geophysics to life in general. Fabio Rocca most directly influenced the substance of this dissertation. He first intuited the existence of a link between my early fat-ray ideas and Rytov diffraction tomography, and then pushed me hard to accomplish what I did. His enthusiasm and encouragement were indispensable in the formalization and completion of this research. Pat Bartz smoothed over all the administrative problems that came my way and was always willing to listen. The generous sponsors of the SEP provided the financial backing that supported both me and the tools I required for my work.

Second, I want to thank all my fellow students in the SEP. They offered not only the goodwill and camaraderie that made my stay here pleasant, but also the daily consultations on practical and theoretical problems that enabled me to progress. While all of them helped make my SEP experience what it was, a few require special mention. Kamal Al-Yahya strongly advised me that tomography would make a good thesis topic. Joe Dellinger helped me master *vplot* and produce the pictures which were so important in my research. Biondo Biondi, Steve Cole, John Etgen, Paul Fowler, Stew Levin, Dave Nichols and Jos van Trier all answered more than their share of questions with more than their share of enthusiasm in many enlightening discussions.

Finally, I want to thank my parents. Without their patience, love, emotional and material support, I would have given up years ago. All those bag lunches you packed for me paid off, Mom.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	v
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Motivation	1
1.2 Organization	2
1.2.1 Ray-theoretic vs. wave-theoretic tomography: equations	3
1.2.2 Raypaths vs. wavepaths	3
1.2.3 Ray-trace vs. wave-equation tomography: inversion	3
1.2.4 Bandlimited raypaths	4
2 Ray-theoretic vs. wave-theoretic tomography: equations	5
2.1 Ray-theoretic tomography	5
2.1.1 Step one: traveltimes picks	5
2.1.2 Steps two and three: traveltimes delays and linear theory	6
2.1.3 Step four: backprojection	6
2.2 Wave-theoretic tomography	7
2.2.1 Step one: wavefield measurements	7
2.2.2 Steps two and three: wavefield perturbations and linear theory	8
2.2.3 Step three: backprojection	10
3 Raypaths vs. Wavepaths	13
3.1 Wavepaths: frequency-space domain	13
3.1.1 Homogeneous background velocity field	13
3.1.2 Inhomogeneous background velocity field	18

3.2	Wavepaths vs. raypaths: space domain	23
3.3	Wavepaths vs. raypaths: wavenumber domain	24
3.3.1	Propagating energy	25
3.3.2	Evanescent energy	27
4	Ray-trace vs. wave-equation tomography: inversion	31
4.1	Forward modeling	31
4.1.1	The experiment	32
4.1.2	The data	32
4.2	Inversion	36
4.2.1	Singular value decomposition	37
4.2.2	Results	40
5	Bandlimited raypaths	45
5.1	Theory	45
5.2	Example	49
5.2.1	Backprojection patterns	51
5.2.2	Inversions	51
A	A qualitative comparison of the first-order Born and Rytov approximations	57
A.1	Introduction	57
A.2	Born Approximation	59
A.2.1	Velocity inversions	59
A.2.2	Error term	64
A.3	Rytov Approximation	65
A.3.1	Velocity inversions	65
A.3.2	Error term	65
A.4	Conclusion	68
B	Bandlimited-ray width	69
	Bibliography	71

List of Figures

1.1	Hagedoorn's beams	2
3.1	Frequency-space domain wavepaths for a constant-velocity background field	14
3.2	Time-space domain wavepaths for a constant-velocity background field . . .	18
3.3	Frequency-space domain wavepath for refraction through a vertical gradient	19
3.4	Frequency-space domain wavepath for transmission through layers	20
3.5	Frequency-space domain wavepath for reflection above an interface	21
3.6	Time-space domain wavepaths for inhomogeneous background velocity fields	23
3.7	Two-dimensional wavenumber-amplitude spectra	25
3.8	Plane-wave scattering: propagating energy	26
3.9	Propagating wavepath scattering ellipses and spatial-amplitude spectra . . .	27
3.10	Evanescent energy: 5 Hz wavepath and spatial-amplitude spectrum	28
3.11	Plane-wave scattering: evanescent energy	29
3.12	Evanescent wavepath scattering ellipses and spatial-amplitude spectra . . .	29
4.1	2-d transmission experiment	33
4.2	Rytov data	34
4.3	Wavepath diagrams: first-Fresnel zones	34
4.4	Wavepath diagrams: first five Fresnel zones	35
4.5	Accuracy of the Rytov approximation	36
4.6	Ray-trace data and raypath diagram	37
4.7	10 Hz wavepaths in the space and wavenumber domains	38
4.8	Singular values	39
4.9	Inversion results	41
4.10	Raypath model-space eigenvectors	42
4.11	Wavepath model-space eigenvectors: 5 Hz and 10 Hz	43

4.12	5 and 10 Hz model-resolution vectors	44
5.1	2-d bandlimited raypaths $L_{\Delta\omega}$	47
5.2	Bandlimited-raypath width	49
5.3	VSP traces	50
5.4	Average amplitude spectrum	50
5.5	Backprojection patterns	51
5.6	Ray and 10-50 Hz bandlimited-ray coverage and inversion	52
5.7	Ray and 10-50 Hz bandlimited-ray prediction errors	53
5.8	25-35 Hz bandlimited-ray inversion	54
A.1	Born and Rytov data	60
A.2	Born- and Rytov-approximation velocity inversion	62
A.3	Born and Rytov error terms	66
A.4	Maximum values in Born and Rytov error terms	68