

# Data-driven imaging with second-order traveltime approximations

Jürgen Mann and Yonghai Zhang

Geophysical Institute University of Karlsruhe Germany





### Motivation & data examples

8th SBGf International Conference, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 2003



- Motivation & data examples
- Basic concepts

8th SBGf International Conference, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 2003



- Motivation & data examples
- Basic concepts
- Possible derivations



- Motivation & data examples
- Basic concepts
- Possible derivations
- Hypothetical experiments



- Motivation & data examples
- Basic concepts
- Possible derivations
- Hypothetical experiments
- Applications of wavefield attributes



- Motivation & data examples
- Basic concepts
- Possible derivations
- Hypothetical experiments
- Applications of wavefield attributes
- Conclusions



- Motivation & data examples
- Basic concepts
- Possible derivations
- Hypothetical experiments
- Applications of wavefield attributes
- Conclusions
- Outlook



#### Model-based approaches:

8th SBGf International Conference, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 2003



Model-based approaches:

sensitive to model errors



- sensitive to model errors
- migration velocity analysis is costly



- sensitive to model errors
- migration velocity analysis is costly
- Data-driven approaches:



- sensitive to model errors
- migration velocity analysis is costly
- Data-driven approaches:
  - interval velocity model determination is postponed



- sensitive to model errors
- migration velocity analysis is costly
- Data-driven approaches:
  - interval velocity model determination is postponed
  - robust methods



- sensitive to model errors
- migration velocity analysis is costly
- Data-driven approaches:
  - interval velocity model determination is postponed
  - robust methods
  - however, classic data-driven approaches



- sensitive to model errors
- migration velocity analysis is costly
- Data-driven approaches:
  - interval velocity model determination is postponed
  - robust methods
  - however, classic data-driven approaches
    - use only a subset of available data, thus no optimum S/N ratio



#### Model-based approaches:

- sensitive to model errors
- migration velocity analysis is costly

Data-driven approaches:

- interval velocity model determination is postponed
- robust methods
- however, classic data-driven approaches
  - use only a subset of available data, thus no optimum S/N ratio
  - provide little information for later inversion



### Model-based approaches:

- sensitive to model errors
- migration velocity analysis is costly

Data-driven approaches:

- interval velocity model determination is postponed
- robust methods
- however, classic data-driven approaches
  - use only a subset of available data, thus no optimum S/N ratio
  - provide little information for later inversion
  - data-driven aspects usually not fully exploited





### Common-Reflection-Surface (CRS) stack:

 extension of concepts of classic data-driven approaches



- extension of concepts of classic data-driven approaches
- full use of available data



- extension of concepts of classic data-driven approaches
- full use of available data
- minimum a priori information required



- extension of concepts of classic data-driven approaches
- full use of available data
- minimum a priori information required
- fully data-driven application





2-D NMO/DMO/stack – from Müller (1999)

8th SBGf International Conference, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 2003





#### 2-D CRS stack – from Müller (1999)





NMO/DMO/stack/poststack migration – from Müller (1999)





#### 2-D CRS/poststack migration – from Müller (1999)





NMO/DMO/stack vs. CRS stack – 3-D data, inline From Bergler et. al (2002). Data courtesy of ENI E & P Division.





#### Conventional 3-D prestack depth migration Courtesy of ENI E & P Division

8th SBGf International Conference, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 2003





#### 3-D poststack depth migration of CRS stack Courtesy of ENI E & P Division

8th SBGf International Conference, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 2003





depth slices of coherence images: conventional vs. CRS-based Courtesy of ENI E & P Division



 Derive an approximation of the kinematic reflection response for a reflector segment in depth characterized by its



- Derive an approximation of the kinematic reflection response for a reflector segment in depth characterized by its
  - local dip and
  - local curvature,



- Derive an approximation of the kinematic reflection response for a reflector segment in depth characterized by its
  - local dip and
  - Jocal curvature,
  - i.e., the reflector properties up to second order.



- Derive an approximation of the kinematic reflection response for a reflector segment in depth characterized by its
  - local dip and
  - Jocal curvature,
  - i.e., the reflector properties up to second order.
- Use parameters defined either



- Derive an approximation of the kinematic reflection response for a reflector segment in depth characterized by its
  - local dip and
  - Jocal curvature,
  - i.e., the reflector properties up to second order.
- Use parameters defined either
  - in the time domain
    - traveltime derivatives


- Derive an approximation of the kinematic reflection response for a reflector segment in depth characterized by its
  - local dip and
  - Jocal curvature,
  - i.e., the reflector properties up to second order.
- Use parameters defined either
  - in the time domain
    - traveltime derivatives
  - or in the depth domain at the acquisition surface
     properties of hypothetical wavefronts,



- Derive an approximation of the kinematic reflection response for a reflector segment in depth characterized by its
  - local dip and
  - local curvature,
  - i.e., the reflector properties up to second order.
- Use parameters defined either
  - in the time domain
    - traveltime derivatives
  - or in the depth domain at the acquisition surface
     properties of hypothetical wavefronts,

both linked by the near-surface velocity  $v_0$ .



- Determine optimum stacking operator by means of coherence analysis in the data.
  - generalized multi-dimensional velocity analysis



- Determine optimum stacking operator by means of coherence analysis in the data.
  - generalized multi-dimensional velocity analysis
- Stack along the determined stacking operator.



- Determine optimum stacking operator by means of coherence analysis in the data.
  - generalized multi-dimensional velocity analysis
- Stack along the determined stacking operator.



- Determine optimum stacking operator by means of coherence analysis in the data.
   generalized multi-dimensional velocity analysis
- Stack along the determined stacking operator.

#### Results:

 a simulated section for an arbitrarily chosen configuration



- Determine optimum stacking operator by means of coherence analysis in the data.
   generalized multi-dimensional velocity analysis
- Stack along the determined stacking operator.

- a simulated section for an arbitrarily chosen configuration
- a set of associated wavefield attribute sections



- Determine optimum stacking operator by means of coherence analysis in the data.
   generalized multi-dimensional velocity analysis
- Stack along the determined stacking operator.

- a simulated section for an arbitrarily chosen configuration
- a set of associated wavefield attribute sections
   subsequent applications like velocity determination



- Determine optimum stacking operator by means of coherence analysis in the data.
   generalized multi-dimensional velocity analysis
- Stack along the determined stacking operator.

- a simulated section for an arbitrarily chosen configuration
- a set of associated wavefield attribute sections
   subsequent applications like velocity determination
- an associated coherence section



- Determine optimum stacking operator by means of coherence analysis in the data.
   generalized multi-dimensional velocity analysis
- Stack along the determined stacking operator.

- a simulated section for an arbitrarily chosen configuration
- a set of associated wavefield attribute sections
   subsequent applications like velocity determination
- an associated coherence section
   identification of events, reliability of attributes



Possible ways to derive an approximation of the kinematic reflection response:



Possible ways to derive an approximation of the kinematic reflection response:

paraxial ray theory, i. e., assumption of a linear relation between the properties of neighboring rays



Possible ways to derive an approximation of the kinematic reflection response:

- paraxial ray theory, i. e., assumption of a linear relation between the properties of neighboring rays
- geometrical optics using the concept of object and image points (2-D case only)



Possible ways to derive an approximation of the kinematic reflection response:

- paraxial ray theory, i. e., assumption of a linear relation between the properties of neighboring rays
- geometrical optics using the concept of object and image points (2-D case only)
- pragmatic way: second-order expansion of traveltime, initially without physical interpretation



Prestack data:

#### (hyper-)volume $p(t, \vec{m}, \vec{h})$ with up to five dimensions

WIT.

Prestack data:

(hyper-)volume  $p(t, \vec{m}, \vec{h})$  with up to five dimensions

a 🗉

t time  

$$\vec{m} = \begin{pmatrix} m_x \\ m_y \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} g_x + s_x \\ g_y + s_y \end{pmatrix}$$
 midpoint vector  
 $\vec{h} = \begin{pmatrix} h_x \\ h_y \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} g_x - s_x \\ g_y - s_y \end{pmatrix}$  half-offset vector

8th SBGf International Conference, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 2003

WIT.

Prestack data:

(hyper-)volume  $p(t, \vec{m}, \vec{h})$  with up to five dimensions

t time  

$$\vec{m} = \begin{pmatrix} m_x \\ m_y \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} g_x + s_x \\ g_y + s_y \end{pmatrix}$$
 midpoint vector  
 $\vec{h} = \begin{pmatrix} h_x \\ h_y \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} g_x - s_x \\ g_y - s_y \end{pmatrix}$  half-offset vector

Reflection event:

(hyper-)surface 
$$t\left(\vec{m},\vec{h}\right)$$
 in the prestack data

# Central and paraxial rays



Assumed to be known: traveltime  $t\left(\vec{m},\vec{h}\right)$  along central ray (SRG)



$$\Delta \vec{h} = \vec{h}^* - \vec{h}$$

8th SBGf International Conference, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 2003

# Central and paraxial rays

Assumed to be known: traveltime  $t\left(\vec{m},\vec{h}\right)$  along central ray (SRG)

How to approximate  $t\left(\vec{m} + \Delta \vec{m}, \vec{h} + \Delta \vec{h}\right)$  along paraxial ray (S\*R\*G\*)?

$$\Delta \vec{h} = \vec{h}^* - \vec{h}$$



# Central and paraxial rays

Assumed to be known: traveltime  $t\left(\vec{m},\vec{h}\right)$  along central ray (SRG)

How to approximate  $t\left(\vec{m} + \Delta \vec{m}, \vec{h} + \Delta \vec{h}\right)$  along paraxial ray (S\*R\*G\*)?

➡ Taylor expansion

$$\Delta \vec{h} = \vec{h}^* - \vec{h}$$







 $t\left(\vec{m}+\Delta\vec{m},\vec{h}+\Delta\vec{h}\right) \approx$ 



 $t\left(\vec{m}+\Delta\vec{m},\vec{h}+\Delta\vec{h}\right) \approx$  $t\left(\vec{m},\vec{h}\right)$ 

WIT.

$$t\left(\vec{m} + \Delta \vec{m}, \vec{h} + \Delta \vec{h}\right) \approx t\left(\vec{m}, \vec{h}\right) + \frac{\partial t}{\partial m_x} \Delta m_x + \frac{\partial t}{\partial m_y} \Delta m_y + \frac{\partial t}{\partial h_x} \Delta h_x + \frac{\partial t}{\partial h_y} \Delta h_y$$

$$t\left(\vec{m} + \Delta \vec{m}, \vec{h} + \Delta \vec{h}\right) \approx t\left(\vec{m}, \vec{h}\right) + \frac{\partial t}{\partial m_x} \Delta m_x + \frac{\partial t}{\partial m_y} \Delta m_y + \frac{\partial t}{\partial h_x} \Delta h_x + \frac{\partial t}{\partial h_y} \Delta h_y + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial m_x^2} \Delta m_x^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial m_y^2} \Delta m_y^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h_x^2} \Delta h_x^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h_y^2} \Delta h_y^2\right)$$



Special case: Marine acquisition, single azimuth



Special case: 2-D acquisition

 $t\left(\vec{m}+\Delta\vec{m},\vec{h}+\Delta\vec{h}\right) \approx$  $t\left(\vec{m},\vec{h}\right) + \frac{\partial t}{\partial m_{x}}\Delta m_{x} + \frac{\partial t}{\partial m_{y}}\Delta m_{y} + \frac{\partial t}{\partial h_{x}}\Delta h_{x} + \frac{\partial t}{\partial h_{y}}\Delta h_{y}$  $+\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial m_x^2}\Delta m_x^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial m_y^2}\Delta m_y^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h_x^2}\Delta h_x^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h_y^2}\Delta h_y^2\right)$  $+\frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial m_x \partial m_y} \Delta m_x \Delta m_y + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial m_x \partial h_x} \Delta m_x \Delta h_x + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial m_x \partial h_y} \Delta m_x \Delta h_y$  $+\frac{\partial^{2}t}{\partial m_{y}\partial h_{x}}\Delta m_{y}\Delta h_{x}+\frac{\partial^{2}t}{\partial m_{y}\partial h_{y}}\Delta m_{y}\Delta h_{y}+\frac{\partial^{2}t}{\partial h_{x}\partial h_{y}}\Delta h_{x}\Delta h_{y}$ 

**General case** 

$$t\left(\vec{m} + \Delta \vec{m}, \vec{h} + \Delta \vec{h}\right) \approx t\left(\vec{m}, \vec{h}\right) + \frac{\partial t}{\partial m_x} \Delta m_x + \frac{\partial t}{\partial m_y} \Delta m_y + \frac{\partial t}{\partial h_x} \Delta h_x + \frac{\partial t}{\partial h_y} \Delta h_y + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial m_x^2} \Delta m_x^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial m_y^2} \Delta m_y^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h_x^2} \Delta h_x^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h_y^2} \Delta h_y^2\right) + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial m_x \partial m_y} \Delta m_x \Delta m_y + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial m_x \partial h_x} \Delta m_x \Delta h_x + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial m_x \partial h_y} \Delta m_x \Delta h_y + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial m_y \partial h_x} \Delta m_y \Delta h_x + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial m_y \partial h_y} \Delta m_y \Delta h_y + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h_x \partial h_y} \Delta h_x \Delta h_y$$

Special case: zero-offset simulation



Special case: zero-offset simulation, marine case



Special case: zero-offset simulation, 2-D acquisition



Special case: ZO simulation, 2-D, CMP gathers only



Preliminary conclusions:

WIT.

Preliminary conclusions:

In some cases, not all derivatives are independent in the context of paraxial ray theory. This is not evident at this stage!

#### Preliminary conclusions:

- In some cases, not all derivatives are independent in the context of paraxial ray theory. This is not evident at this stage!
- Hyperbolic approximations can be obtained by squaring and neglecting higher order terms.


- In some cases, not all derivatives are independent in the context of paraxial ray theory. This is not evident at this stage!
- Hyperbolic approximations can be obtained by squaring and neglecting higher order terms.
- We need a physical interpretation of the derivatives

- In some cases, not all derivatives are independent in the context of paraxial ray theory. This is not evident at this stage!
- Hyperbolic approximations can be obtained by squaring and neglecting higher order terms.
- We need a physical interpretation of the derivatives
  to identify hidden dependencies,

- In some cases, not all derivatives are independent in the context of paraxial ray theory. This is not evident at this stage!
- Hyperbolic approximations can be obtained by squaring and neglecting higher order terms.
- We need a physical interpretation of the derivatives
  - to identify hidden dependencies,
  - to understand which values are physically reasonable,

WIT.

- In some cases, not all derivatives are independent in the context of paraxial ray theory. This is not evident at this stage!
- Hyperbolic approximations can be obtained by squaring and neglecting higher order terms.
- We need a physical interpretation of the derivatives
  - to identify hidden dependencies,
  - to understand which values are physically reasonable,
  - and to make use of the derivatives for various purposes.

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \left( x_m - x_0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \left( x_m - x_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \left( x_m - x_0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \left( x_m - x_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} (x_m - x_0) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} (x_m - x_0)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

#### Horizontal slowness:

$$p_x = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \Big|_{(x_m = x_0, h = 0)}$$

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} (x_m - x_0) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} (x_m - x_0)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

Horizontal slowness:

$$p_x = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \bigg|_{(x_m = x_0, h = 0)} = |\vec{p}| \sin \alpha$$

- $\vec{p}$  slowness vector
- $\alpha$  emergence angle
- $v_0$  near-surface velocity

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} (x_m - x_0) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} (x_m - x_0)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

Horizontal slowness:

$$p_{x} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_{m}} \bigg|_{\left(x_{m} = x_{0}, h = 0\right)} = |\vec{p}| \sin \alpha = \frac{\sin \alpha}{v_{0}}$$

- $\vec{p}$  slowness vector
- $\alpha$  emergence angle
- $v_0$  near-surface velocity

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \left( x_m - x_0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \left( x_m - x_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \left( x_m - x_0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \left( x_m - x_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

Curvature of "zero-offset wavefront":

$$K_{N} = \frac{\partial^{2} t}{\partial x_{m}^{2}} \bigg|_{(x_{m} = x_{0}, h = 0)}$$

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \left( x_m - x_0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \left( x_m - x_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

Curvature of "zero-offset wavefront":

$$K_N = \frac{v_0}{2} \qquad \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \bigg|_{(x_m = x_0, h = 0)}$$

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \left( x_m - x_0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \left( x_m - x_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

Curvature of "zero-offset wavefront":

$$K_N = \frac{v_0}{2} \frac{1}{\cos^2 \alpha} \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \bigg|_{(x_m = x_0, h = 0)}$$

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \left( x_m - x_0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \left( x_m - x_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

Curvature of "zero-offset wavefront":

$$K_N = \frac{v_0}{2} \frac{1}{\cos^2 \alpha} \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \bigg|_{(x_m = x_0, h = 0)}$$

A "zero-offset wavefront", also called normal wavefront, can be obtained from an exploding reflector experiment.

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \left( x_m - x_0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \left( x_m - x_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \left( x_m - x_0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \left( x_m - x_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

Curvature of "common-midpoint (CMP) wavefront":

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \left( x_m - x_0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \left( x_m - x_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

Curvature of "common-midpoint (CMP) wavefront": **Problem:** no simple physical experiment available!

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \left( x_m - x_0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \left( x_m - x_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

Curvature of "common-midpoint (CMP) wavefront": **Problem:** no simple physical experiment available! However: up to second order, CMP traveltimes and zero-offset diffraction traveltimes coincide (NIP wave theorem, Hubral 1983).

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \left( x_m - x_0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \left( x_m - x_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

Curvature of "common-midpoint (CMP) wavefront": **Problem:** no simple physical experiment available! However: up to second order, CMP traveltimes and zero-offset diffraction traveltimes coincide (NIP wave theorem, Hubral 1983).

In analogy to the exploding reflector experiment, a exploding reflection point experiment approximates the "CMP wavefront".

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \left( x_m - x_0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \left( x_m - x_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

Curvature of "common-midpoint (CMP) wavefront":

$$K_{NIP} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{v_0}{\cos^2 \alpha} \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} \bigg|_{(x_m = x_0, h = 0)}$$

$$t(x_m,h) = t_0 + \frac{\partial t}{\partial x_m} \left( x_m - x_0 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial x_m^2} \left( x_m - x_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} h^2 \right]$$

Curvature of "common-midpoint (CMP) wavefront":

$$K_{NIP} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{v_0}{\cos^2 \alpha} \frac{\partial^2 t}{\partial h^2} \Big|_{(x_m = x_0, h = 0)}$$

An exploding reflection-point experiment yields the so-called normal-incidence-point (NIP) wavefront.

# Physical interpretation

Replacing all derivatives, we obtain

$$t(x_m, h) = t_0 + \frac{2\sin\alpha}{v_0} (x_m - x_0) + \frac{\cos^2\alpha}{v_0} \left[ K_N (x_m - x_0) + K_{NIP} h^2 \right]$$

in terms of kinematic wavefield attributes.

Replacing all derivatives, we obtain

$$t(x_m, h) = t_0 + \frac{2\sin\alpha}{v_0} (x_m - x_0) + \frac{\cos^2\alpha}{v_0} \left[ K_N (x_m - x_0) + K_{NIP} h^2 \right]$$

in terms of *kinematic wavefield attributes*. Accordingly, the hyperbolic counterpart reads

$$t^{2}(x_{m},h) \approx \tilde{t}^{2}(x_{m},h) = \left[t_{0} + \frac{2\sin\alpha}{v_{0}}(x_{m} - x_{0})\right]^{2} + \frac{2t_{0}\cos^{2}\alpha}{v_{0}}\left[K_{N}(x_{m} - x_{0})^{2} + K_{NIP}h^{2}\right].$$





#### 2-D CRS stack – from Müller (1999)

WIT-

CMP



### Emergence angle $\alpha$ [°]

WIT.

CMP



### Radius of curvature of NIP wavefront [m]



CMP



### Radius of curvature of normal wavefront [m]





 Construction of interval velocity models based on picked zero-offset traveltimes and attributes with



- Construction of interval velocity models based on picked zero-offset traveltimes and attributes with
  - a generalized Dix-type inversion:



- Construction of interval velocity models based on picked zero-offset traveltimes and attributes with
  - a generalized Dix-type inversion:
    - layer stripping approach



- Construction of interval velocity models based on picked zero-offset traveltimes and attributes with
  - a generalized Dix-type inversion:
    - Jayer stripping approach
    - downward propagation of NIP wavefronts until  $R_{NIP} = 0 \land t_0 = 0$



- Construction of interval velocity models based on picked zero-offset traveltimes and attributes with
  - a generalized Dix-type inversion:
    - Jayer stripping approach
    - downward propagation of NIP wavefronts until  $R_{NIP} = 0 \land t_0 = 0$
  - a tomographic approach:



- Construction of interval velocity models based on picked zero-offset traveltimes and attributes with
  - a generalized Dix-type inversion:
    - layer stripping approach
    - downward propagation of NIP wavefronts until  $R_{NIP} = 0 \land t_0 = 0$
  - a tomographic approach:
    - initial model of interval velocity and reflector segments



- Construction of interval velocity models based on picked zero-offset traveltimes and attributes with
  - a generalized Dix-type inversion:
    - layer stripping approach
    - downward propagation of NIP wavefronts until  $R_{NIP} = 0 \land t_0 = 0$
  - a tomographic approach:
    - initial model of interval velocity and reflector segments
    - forward modeling of NIP wavefronts



- Construction of interval velocity models based on picked zero-offset traveltimes and attributes with
  - a generalized Dix-type inversion:
    - layer stripping approach
    - downward propagation of NIP wavefronts until  $R_{NIP} = 0 \land t_0 = 0$
  - a tomographic approach:
    - initial model of interval velocity and reflector segments
    - forward modeling of NIP wavefronts
    - iterative model updates to minimize misfit
### Reconstructed vs. original model

Reconstructed velocity and reflector elements



Original velocity and reconstructed reflector elements





- Construction of interval velocity models based on picked zero-offset traveltimes and attributes with
  - a generalized Dix-type inversion:
    - layer stripping approach
    - downward propagation of NIP wavefronts until  $R_{NIP} = 0 \land t_0 = 0$
  - a tomographic approach:
    - initial model of interval velocity and reflector segments
    - forward modeling of NIP wavefronts
    - iterative model updates to minimize misfit



- Construction of interval velocity models based on picked zero-offset traveltimes and attributes with
  - a generalized Dix-type inversion:
    - Jayer stripping approach
    - downward propagation of NIP wavefronts until  $R_{NIP} = 0 \land t_0 = 0$
  - a tomographic approach:
    - initial model of interval velocity and reflector segments
    - forward modeling of NIP wavefronts
    - iterative model updates to minimize misfit

oral presentation on Wednesday afternoon



8th SBGf International Conference, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 2003



WIT.

Based on approximation of diffraction traveltimes:

approximation of geometrical spreading factor

WIT.

- approximation of geometrical spreading factor
- approximation of projected Fresnel zone

wir.

- approximation of geometrical spreading factor
- approximation of projected Fresnel zone
- data-driven time migration

WIT.

- approximation of geometrical spreading factor
- approximation of projected Fresnel zone
- data-driven time migration
- identification of diffraction events

WIT

Based on approximation of diffraction traveltimes:

- approximation of geometrical spreading factor
- approximation of projected Fresnel zone
- data-driven time migration
- identification of diffraction events

Based on moveout-corrected CRS super gathers:

WIT.

Based on approximation of diffraction traveltimes:

- approximation of geometrical spreading factor
- approximation of projected Fresnel zone
- data-driven time migration
- identification of diffraction events

Based on moveout-corrected CRS super gathers:

residual statics correction



8th SBGf International Conference, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 2003





Extensions based on attribute extrapolation at surface:

CRS stack for smooth topography



- CRS stack for smooth topography
  - considers dip and cuvature of acquisition surface



- CRS stack for smooth topography
  - considers dip and cuvature of acquisition surface
  - same traveltime formula as without topography



- CRS stack for smooth topography
  - considers dip and cuvature of acquisition surface
  - same traveltime formula as without topography
  - poster presentation on Tuesday afternoon



- CRS stack for smooth topography
  - considers dip and cuvature of acquisition surface
  - same traveltime formula as without topography
  - poster presentation on Tuesday afternoon
- CRS stack for rugged topography



- CRS stack for smooth topography
  - considers dip and cuvature of acquisition surface
  - same traveltime formula as without topography
  - poster presentation on Tuesday afternoon
- CRS stack for rugged topography
  - direct use of source and receiver elevations

WIT.

- CRS stack for smooth topography
  - considers dip and cuvature of acquisition surface
  - same traveltime formula as without topography
  - poster presentation on Tuesday afternoon
- CRS stack for rugged topography
  - direct use of source and receiver elevations
  - wavefield attributes as if recorded on plane surface

WIT.

- CRS stack for smooth topography
  - considers dip and cuvature of acquisition surface
  - same traveltime formula as without topography
  - poster presentation on Tuesday afternoon
- CRS stack for rugged topography
  - direct use of source and receiver elevations
  - wavefield attributes as if recorded on plane surface
- Redatuming



#### Synthetic example with topography



#### **Optimized CRS stack**



#### **Redatumed CRS stack section**



 consequent generalization of classic data-driven approaches



- consequent generalization of classic data-driven approaches
- requires minimum interaction



- consequent generalization of classic data-driven approaches
- requires minimum interaction
- provides wavefield attributes for various applications



- consequent generalization of classic data-driven approaches
- requires minimum interaction
- provides wavefield attributes for various applications
- allows consistent processing workflow



- consequent generalization of classic data-driven approaches
- requires minimum interaction
- provides wavefield attributes for various applications
- allows consistent processing workflow
  - CRS stack



- consequent generalization of classic data-driven approaches
- requires minimum interaction
- provides wavefield attributes for various applications
- allows consistent processing workflow
  - CRS stack
  - attribute-based velocity determination



- consequent generalization of classic data-driven approaches
- requires minimum interaction
- provides wavefield attributes for various applications
- allows consistent processing workflow
  - CRS stack
  - attribute-based velocity determination
  - poststack migration of CRS result and/or



- consequent generalization of classic data-driven approaches
- requires minimum interaction
- provides wavefield attributes for various applications
- allows consistent processing workflow
  - CRS stack
  - attribute-based velocity determination
  - poststack migration of CRS result and/or
  - prestack migration based on inversion result



#### implementation of 3-D inversion (in progress)

8th SBGf International Conference, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 2003



- implementation of 3-D inversion (in progress)
- implementation of finite-offset inversion (in progress)



- implementation of 3-D inversion (in progress)
- implementation of finite-offset inversion (in progress)
- application of complete workflow to real data



- implementation of 3-D inversion (in progress)
- implementation of finite-offset inversion (in progress)
- application of complete workflow to real data
- use of approximated projected Fresnel zone for limited aperture migration
## Outlook



- implementation of 3-D inversion (in progress)
- implementation of finite-offset inversion (in progress)
- application of complete workflow to real data
- use of approximated projected Fresnel zone for limited aperture migration
- data regularization

## Acknowledgments





This work was supported by the sponsors of the Wave Inversion Technology Consortium.