

The concept of model rays in domain conversion

Eduardo Filpo (Petrobras) and Rodrigo Portugal (Landmark | Halliburton)

Copyright 2019, SBGf - Sociedade Brasileira de Geofísica

This paper was prepared for presentation during the $16th$ International Congress of the Brazilian Geophysical Society held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 19-22 August 2019.

Contents of this paper were reviewed by the Technical Committee of the 16th
International Congress of the Brazilian Geophysical Society and do not necessarily represent any position of the SBGf, its officers or members. Electronic reproduction or storage of any part of this paper for commercial purposes without the written consent of the Brazilian Geophysical Society is prohibited.

 $_$, and the set of th

Abstract

In this work we present the concept of model rays which can be seen as the dual of image rays, but traced in time domain. We present the system of first order differential equations which permit to numerically compute the model rays using a velocity field in time domain. We demonstrate with a synthetic example that model rays traced with this system of equations are identical to others traced with two different methods. Among other geometrical interpretations, the model rays can be seen as the instrument to perform the time-to-depth conversion of seismic images. Time-to-depth conversion algorithms which make use of model rays are much simpler than those one based on image rays. Image rays are more suitable to perform depth-to-time conversion.

Introduction

Time migration based methods are still widely used in the industry not only because they are more robust and f aster than depth domain ones, but also because shifts in technology paradigms take longer to happen in the oil industry . The conv ersion of seismic domains f rom time to depth, has been possible af ter the introduction of the concept of image ray (Hubral, 1977), which v alidity is subject to the same conditions of v alidity of time migration methods. Subsequently, the use of image rays was extended to the conv ersion of seismic images (Silv a et al 2009, Filpo et al 2016) and time migration v elocity models (Silv a et al, 2009; Cameron et al 2007 and Iv ersen et al 2008).

In general, time-to-depth conv ersion algorithms based on image ray tracing, or equiv alently based on image wav ef ront construction, inv olve mapping of values distributed along a regular grid in the time domain into another regular grid in the depth domain. This mapping is constructed with rays traced in depth, using velocity inf ormation in depth or either in time domain. Howev er, no matter which approach is taken, mapping domains using image ray s results in an irregular distribution of points in the depth domain. This is not the ideal because multiplicity or v oids of can happen and also.

Figure 1 shows a v elocity model in depth superimposed by a set of image ray s and its corresponding wav ef ronts. This curves forms a curvilinear grid directly associated with a cartesian grid in time domain, being seismic traces mapped into image ray s and time slices into wav ef ronts. The v elocity spatial distribution in this model is given by the equation:

$V(x, z) = 1.95 + 0.1z + 0.15x$,

being x and z in kilometers and V in kilometers per second.

Figure 1 - Velocity model in depth superimposed by a set of rays and its corresponding wavefronts.

Filpo et al (2016) presented a solution to that problem of spreading properties in the time-depth conv ersion with image ray s that is the use of the Tay lor series. Such a strategy became feasible from the formulation of time-todepth conv ersion as a change of coordinates problem, where v ertical lines in the time domain are mapped to image ray s at depth, and the horizontal lines on originally flat wave that emerge from the datum. The required deriv ativ es to apply the Tay lor series are obtained by finite differences along the wav ef ronts, For simplicity, we ref er to this domain conv ersion process just as spreading algorithm. Remember that to trace image ray s a v elocity model in depth is required.

Figures 2-a and 2-b show an example of the spreading algorithm application. The input section is an artif icial time migrated section which contains just a circular f eature (time axis is upwards). The v elocity model used to trace image ray s and wav ef ronts is the same of the Figure 1. Note that there are no caustics and neither shadow zones in this model, that is a necessary condition for the perfect working of the spreading algorithm, which is based in a coordinate transf ormation approach.

The same kind of trouble does not happen with the use of image rays in the conversion from depth to time, where the regular grid of output is directly f illed with v alues collected in the depth domain through a simple interpolation. This kind of transf ormation is ref erred just as gathering algorithm in this text. For example, to conv ert a v elocity model f rom depth to time, we just trace image ray s with a desired sample rate and collect v elocity v alues along them.

The concept of model rays arose when we start to observ e some f eatures of seismic images conv erted f rom depth to time by collecting amplitudes along image ray s. Figure 3a shows an image in depth domain with horizontal and v ertical ev ents, while Figure 3b shows the time-conv erted image by means of the gathering algorithm. The observ ation of the conv erted section clearly shows that the v ertical lines in depth are transf ormed into curv es in the time domain with a behav ior v ery similar to the image ray s. Note that the time axis is upwards in the conv erted image.

The similarity between the curv es def ined by the conv erted f eatures and the image ray s instigate us to understand them and to figure out if they are rays (Silva et al, 2009). The name model ray s was giv en because they are associated with v ertical lines in the model space (depth domain), while image ray a are associated with v ertical lines in the image space (time domain).

Equations

The search for equations to trace these curves led us to f ind

$$
\left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial \xi}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{v^2} \left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial \tau}\right)^2 = 1
$$
 (1)

which is the first-order non-linear partial differential equation that gov erns the wav ef ronts propagation in time domain. In this equation ξ is the CMP coordinate, τ is time, v is v elocity and $z = z(\xi, \tau)$ is the wav ef ront in time domain. This equation is of the eikonal ty pe and the ray theory say s that the ray s are characteristic curv es of an eikonal equation. This is why led us to name the curv es as model ray s.

The first step is to write the eikonal equation (1) in the f orm of a Hamiltonian:

$$
H(\xi, q) = \frac{1}{2} \left[q_{\xi}^{2} + \frac{1}{v^{2}} q_{\tau}^{2} - 1 \right]
$$
 (2)

where H is the Hamiltonian, $q = (q_{\xi}, q_{\tau})$ is the slowness v ector, $\xi = (\xi, \tau)$ is the position v ector in time domain.

Following Cerveny (2001), given any Hamiltonian, a solution can be f ound using the method of characteristics, which are the solutions of the system of first-order dif f erential equation

$$
\begin{cases}\n\frac{dx}{ds} = \nabla_p H \\
\frac{dp}{ds} = -\nabla_x H \\
\frac{dt}{ds} = p^T \nabla_p H\n\end{cases}
$$
\n(3)

where H is a real v alued function, called the Hamiltonian, $p = (p_x, p_y)$ is the slowness vector, $x = (x, y)$ is the position vector in time domain, t is the traveltime and s is an integration parameter. Theref ore, the model ray equations are

$$
\begin{cases}\n\frac{d q_{\xi}}{dz} = \frac{1}{v^3} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \xi} q_{\xi}^2 \\
\frac{d q_{\tau}}{dz} = \frac{1}{v^3} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \tau} q_{\tau}^2 \\
\frac{d t}{dz} = \frac{1}{v^2} q_{\tau} \\
\frac{d \xi}{dz} = q_{\xi}\n\end{cases}
$$
\n(4)

where t is the traveltime and z (depth) is the integration parameter.

As we saw earlier, the inv erse transf ormation f rom depth to time can be easily performed from gathering amplitudes along image ray s. In the same way , time-todepth conv ersion can be carried out by means of collecting v alues along model ray s. Simply speaking, algorithms inv olv ing collection of v alues are generally much simpler than those inv olv ing scattering. Another adv antage of using model rays is that they require v elocity f ield in time domain, which can be obtained directly f rom time-migration v elocity analy sis.

Experiment

Figure 4 summarizes the results of a simple experiment designed to validate the system of model ray equations. The idea is to compare the trajectory of a model ray traced by solving the system 4, with other two different methods. The f irst method tracks the model ray trajectory

by tracing sev eral image ray s, whose initial conditions are defined by paraxial theory. The second method uses a finite-difference algorithm to solve an Huygens type equation to trace pseudo wav ef ronts and its orthogonal lines, which corresponds to model ray s. Both methods are described in Silva et al, 2009. Note that there are no significant differences between the three plotted curves. It is possible to observ e that exist more than one curv e just because they are plotted with different line width.

The first step to solve the model ray tracing sy stem is to create a v elocity f ield in time domain. In this case, we just conv ert from depth to time the v elocity model of Figure 1 with the image ray collecting algorithm. Then, the model ray is traced, step by step, solv ing the sy stem 4 by means of the f ourth order Runge Kutta method.

Figure 4 - Velocity model in time superimposed by three model rays traced with different methods: 1) two-point image rays tracing, the wider line plotted in blue, 2) wavefront construction using Huygens principle, regular line plotted in red, and 3) the Runge Kutta method, the thinner line plotted in yellow. Note that time axis is upwards.

Conclusions

Starting from a first-order non-linear partial differential equation in time, we use the zero-order ray theory to derive a kinematic ray tracing system for model rays.

We validate the equations system by comparing its trajectories with others obtained with two different methods.

We demonstrate that model rays are more suitable than image ray s to perf orm time-to-depth conv ersion, because it permits the use of gathering algorithms which are much simpler than the spreading ty pes. In this approach, amplitudes in time can be uniquely transf erred to conv erted position in depth.

Another adv antage of the use of model ray s is that they make use of v elocity f ield in time, which can be obtained directly from MVA for time migration.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Petrobras and Halliburton for the support.

References

Cameron, M., S. Fomel, and J. Sethian, 2008, Time-todepth conv ersion and seismic v elocity estimation using time migration v elocity. Geophy sics, 73(5), VE205-VE210. doi: 10.1190/1.2967501.

Červ ený, V., 2001, Seismic ray theory : Cambridge Univ ersity Press.

Iv ersen, E. and Ty gel, M., 2008, Image-ray tracing f or joint 3D seismic v elocity estimation and time-to-depth conv ersion. Geophy sics, 73(3), S99–S114.

Hubral, P., 1977, Time migration: some ray theoretical aspects: Geophy sical Prospecting, 25, 738-745. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2478.1977.tb01200

Filpo, E., R. Portugal, N. Zago, P. M. Cunha, A. Vicentini, and J. L. Carbonesi, 2016, Image-ray concept as the key to 20 y ears of success of time-to-depth conv ersion in Petrobras: The Leading Edge, 35, 323–328, doi: 10.1190/tle35040323.1

Silv a, E. F. F., Portugal, R., and Vicentini, A., 2009, Model ray s for depth-to-time conversion. In 11th International Congress of the Brazilian Geophy sical Society & EXPOGEF 2009. doi: 10.1190/sbgf 2009-213.