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## Model for Seismic Transition

Causal: $\chi_{+}^{\alpha}(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}0 & \text { if } x<0 \\ \frac{x^{\alpha}}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)} & \text { if } x \geq 0\end{array}\right.$, Anticausal: $\chi_{-}^{\alpha}(x)= \begin{cases}\frac{(-x)^{\alpha}}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)} & \text { if } x \leq 0 \\ 0 & \text { if } x>0\end{cases}$


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \longrightarrow \alpha=0 \\
& \longrightarrow \alpha=0.5 \\
f(z) & =\sum_{i} a_{i} \chi_{ \pm}^{\alpha_{i}}\left(z-z_{i}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

$\bigcirc \longrightarrow \alpha=1$

## Reflectivity Models

$$
r(z)=\sum_{i \in \Lambda_{C}} K_{i} \chi_{+}^{\alpha_{i}-1}\left(z-z_{i}\right)-\sum_{i \in \Lambda_{A}} K_{i} \chi_{-}^{\alpha_{i}-1}\left(z-z_{i}\right)
$$




$$
s(t)=(r * \psi)(z)
$$
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## Detection-Estimation method


$\square$ Characterize windowed events ( $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{E}}$ )
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## Brief history

$\square$ Introduced a two-stage detection-estimation approach [c.м. Dupuis \& . Herrmann'05]

Detection $\Leftrightarrow$ spiky decon. for non-spiky reflectivity
$\square$ detect and isolate the main reflection events

- Estimation $\Leftrightarrow$ characterization of reflectors
$\square$ scale exponents
- elastic properties end-members binary members
$\square$ percolation threshold and exponent
$\square$ Worked on new estimation methods to characterize the fine-structure of reflectors
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## Sparse Spike Deconvolution <br> [Dossal and Mallat ${ }^{\text {2 }} 05$ ]

## for Detection

## [ChaRM]

## Utilizing Spike Decon.

$\square$ Used as a part of our Detection-Estimation approach
$\square$ Need of accurate (not exact) recovery

- Detecting major events (main cluster)
$\square$ fractional order of differentiation
- two wavelet next to each other
- one derivative of wavelet


Singuarities with order ( $\alpha$ ) of 0 to 2


Time sample

## Deconvolution Method

$\square$ Widely used in geophysical inversion
$\square$ Singularity order of one ( $\alpha=0$ )
$\square$ Efficiency analysis for seismic data [Dossal-Mallat]

$$
\begin{gathered}
Y=\psi \star R+W . \\
R=\sum_{i \in S} a_{i} \delta_{i}
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
R=\arg \min _{f} \frac{1}{2}\|Y-\psi \star f\|_{2}^{2}+\gamma\|f\|_{1} .
$$
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## Efficiency Analysis

$\square$ Deconvolution without noise

- Similar analysis for noisy data
$\square$ Minimum scale

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Delta=\min _{(i, j) \in S^{2}}\|i-j\| . \\
R=\arg \min \|f\|_{1} \quad \text { with } \quad \psi \star f=Y .
\end{gathered}
$$



## Efficiency Analysis

$\square$ Dictionary $=$ Matrix whose Columns are:

$$
\mathbf{D}=\left[g_{i}=\psi \star \delta_{i} \quad \text { for } \quad 1 \leqslant i \leqslant N\right] .
$$

$\square$ Weak Exact Recovery Coefficient (WERC)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& W E R C(S)=\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha}, \text { where } \quad S \subset\{1, \ldots, N\} . \\
& \alpha(S)=\sup _{i \in S} \sum_{k \in S, k \neq i}\left|<g_{k}, g_{i}>\right| \leqslant 2 \sum_{k} \phi\left(k \Delta_{0}\right) \\
& \beta(S)=\sup _{j \notin S} \sum_{k \in S}\left|<g_{k}, g_{j}>\right| \leqslant \max _{j \leqslant \Delta_{0}}\left(\phi(j)+\phi\left(\Delta_{0}-j\right)\right)+\alpha(S)
\end{aligned}
$$

# StOMP: <br> a fast L1 solver 

[Donoho et. al. 06]

## L0 - L1 Equivalency

$\square$ Strong equivalence ofPfo ${ }_{0}$ andPf ${ }_{1}$

- for given $\mathbf{A}, \forall \mathrm{X}_{0} \mathrm{P} 1(\mathrm{y}, \mathbf{A}) \rightarrow$ Unique sparsest Solution
$\square$ Weak equivalence ofPfo andPf $_{1}$
- equivalence holds for the typical sparse xo

$$
\|x\|_{0}<\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{N}
$$

## StOMP Solver

$\square$ For (under)determined systems of equations
$\square$ Assumes additive Gaussian noise for non-zero entries
$\square$ Numerous terms enter at each thresholding stage and have fixed number of staged.
$\square$ Approximation to the sparsest solution over a region of the sparsity/indeterminacy plane

* Our Case
- Determined System : $\mathrm{A}_{(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N})}$
- Mixing by random spike train
- Random locations
- Random amplitudes


## Algorithm Flowchart



$$
\mathbf{J}_{s}=\left\{j:\left|c_{s}(j)\right|>t_{s} \sigma_{s}\right\}
$$
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## Recovery Phase Diagram

$\square$ Test Settings:

- A: Convolution with cosine bump
- Signal length : 512
- No. of spikes (K) : 20
- Dynamic range setting
- $\Delta$ values : 13
- scale values : 30
$\square$ L0 norm to show the error
- L2 could also be used





## 1: Accurate Recovery

Cosine Bump Convolution with Spike Train (StOMP), N=512


```
Length of Signal : 512
Number of Spikes : 30
Min & Max Spacing : 5,74
Bump/Wavelet Scale : 1
Regular , Uniform : 0,0
```

StOMP Solving Time : 1.6
StOMP Stage : 12
L2 Nrom(x) : 31.13
\% LO Error : 1.867
\% L2 Error : 0.07104

## 2 : Partial Recovery

Cosine Bump Convolution with Spike Train (StOMP), N=512


```
Length of Signal : 512
Number of Spikes : 30
Min & Max Spacing : 6,57
Bump/Wavelet Scale : 0.85
Regular , Uniform : 0,0
StOMP Solving Time : 1.75
StOMP Stage : 10
L2 Nrom(x) : 30.47
% LO Error : 2.3
% L2 Error : 0.5451
```

Cosine Bump Convolution with Spike Train (StOMP), N=512


```
Length of Signal : 512
Number of Spikes : 40
Min & Max Spacing : 8,20
Bump/Wavelet Scale : 0.65
Regular , Uniform : 0,0
StOMP Solving Time : 0.01
StOMP Stage : 2
L2 Nrom(x) : 38.67
% LO Error : 1
% L2 Error : 1
```


## Spike Decon. Analysis Scheme

Analysis w.r.t.

- wavelet type
- wavelet width/scale
- Minimum distance ( $\Delta$ )
- Solver
- Stagewise Orthogonal Matching Pursuit (StOMP)
- Basis Pursuit (BP)
- Different synthesis and analysis wavelets


Cosine Bump Convolution with Spike Train (StOMP), N=512


```
Length of Signal : 512
Number of Spikes : 30
Min & Max Spacing : 5,74
Bump/Wavelet Scale : 1
Regular , Uniform : 0,0
```

StOMP Solving Time : 1.6
StOMP Stage : 12
L2 Nrom(x) : 31.13
\% LO Error : 1.867
\% L2 Error : 0.07104


Ricker Wavelet Conv. with Spike Train (StOMP), N=512


```
Length of Signal : 512
Number of Spikes : 30
Min & Max Spacing : 5,60
Bump/Wavelet Scale : 1
Regular , Uniform : 0,0
```

```
StOMP Solving Time : 0.55
StOMP Stage : 5
L2 Nrom(x) : 34.48
% LO Error : 0.8667
% L2 Error : 4.568e-16
```

Ricker wavelet Conv. with Spike Train (Scaled BP), N=512


| Length of Signal : 512 | BP Solving Time : 0.34 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of Spikes : 30 | L2 Nrom(x) : 34.48 |
| Min \& Max Spacing : 5,60 | $\%$ LO Error : 16.07 |
| Bump/Wavelet Scale : 1 | $\%$ L2 Error : 0.9993 |
| Regular , Uniform : 0,0 |  |

Cosine Bump Convolution with Spike Train (StOMP), N=512


| Length of Signal : 512 <br> Number of Spikes : 30 | StOMP Solving Time : 1.45 StOMP Stage : 12 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Min \& Max Spacing : 7, 8 | L2 Nrom(x) : 31.83 |
| Bump/Wavelet Scale : 1 | \% L0 Error : 1.467 |
| Regular , Uniform : 1,0 | \% L2 Error : 0.05429 |



Cosine Bump Convolution with Spike Train (StOMP), N=512


```
Length of Signal : 512
Number of Spikes : 30
Min & Max Spacing : 5,46
Bump/Wavelet Scale : 1
Regular , Uniform : 0,1
StOMP Solving Time : 0.01
StOMP Stage : 2
L2 Nrom(x) : 54.77
% LO Error : 1
% L2 Error : 1
```



Cosine Bump Convolution with Spike Train (StOMP), N=512


```
Length of Signal : 512
Number of Spikes : 12
Min & Max Spacing : 5, 89
Bump/Wavelet Scale : 1
Regular , Uniform : 0,1
```

```
StOMP Solving Time : 0.08
StOMP Stage : 3
L2 Nrom(x) : 34.64
% LO Error : 0.5
% L2 Error : 8.075e-14
```



| Length of Signal : 512 <br> Number of Spikes : 12 <br> Min \& Max Spacing : 5, 89 <br> Bump/Wavelet Scale : 1 <br> Regular , Uniform : 0, 1 | BP Solving Time : 0.11 <br> L2 Nrom(x) : 34.64 <br> \% LO Error : 41.67 <br> \% L2 Error : 0.9992 |
| :---: | :---: |

Cosine Bump Convolution with Spike Train (StOMP), N=512


```
Length of Signal : 512 StOMP Solving Time : 1.43
Number of Spikes : 25 StOMP Stage : 9
Min & Max Spacing : 13,37 L2 Nrom(x) : 28.35
Bump/Wavelet Scale : 0.667% LO Error : 3.16
Regular , Uniform : 0,0 % L2 Error : 0.1873
```


Length of Signal : 512 BP Solving Time : 0.13
Length of Signal : 512 BP Solving Time : 0.13
Number of Spikes : 25
Number of Spikes : 25
Min \& Max Spacing : 13,37 % LO Error : 19.48
Min \& Max Spacing : 13,37 % LO Error : 19.48
Bump/Wavelet Scale : 0.667% L2 Error : 0.9992
Bump/Wavelet Scale : 0.667% L2 Error : 0.9992
Regular , Uniform : 0,0
Regular , Uniform : 0,0

## Deconv. Summary

$\square$ Signal with length of 512 samples

| Wavelet | Scale | K | $\Delta$ | Recovery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cosine Bump | 1 | 30 | 5 | + |
| Ricker wavelet | 1 | 30 | 5 | + |
| Cosine Bump, <br> Regularly spaced | 1 | 30 | 7 | + |
| Cosine Bump, <br> Uniform Amp. | 1 | 30 | 5 | 0 |
| Cosine Bump, <br> Uniform Amp. | 1 | 12 | 5 | + |
| Cosine Bump | $2 / 3$ | 25 | 13 | 0 |
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## Multiscale Newton Method

## GhaRM Estimation

## Mohammad Maysami

## Image Manifolds [Wakin'06]

$\square$ Varying Parameter: $\theta \in \Theta$ (Dimension: d)
$\square$ Image function model: $f_{\theta}: \mathbb{R}^{d} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$
$\square$ IAM : $\mathbf{F}=\left\{f_{\theta}: \theta \in \Theta\right\}$

- 1-to-1 $\theta \mapsto f_{\theta}$ Relation
- F is Square integrable: $\mathrm{F} \subset L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{2}\right)$
$\square$ Non-Lipschitz relation $\rightarrow$ manifolds with $\Phi_{\mathrm{s}}, \mathrm{s}>0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F_{s}=\left\{\Phi_{s} f_{\theta}: \theta \in \Theta, s>0\right\} \\
& \Phi_{s} f=\phi_{s} * f, \text { where } \phi_{s}(x)=\frac{1}{2 \pi s^{2}} \exp \left\{\frac{-\|x\|^{2}}{2 s^{2}}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
T\left(s, \theta^{(0)} ; \mathbf{F}\right)=T_{f_{\theta^{(0)}, s}}\left(\mathbf{F}_{s}\right)
$$

## Multiscale Newton Method

$\square$ Local tangent vectors on $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{k}}}$

$$
\tau_{\theta^{(k)}, s_{k}}^{i}=\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{i}} f_{\theta, s_{k}}\right|_{\theta=\theta^{(k)}}, \quad i=0,1, \ldots, d-1
$$

$\square$ Project estimation error

$$
J_{i}=2\left\langle f_{\theta^{(k)}, s_{k}}-I_{s_{k}}, \tau_{\theta^{(k)}, s_{k}}^{i}\right\rangle
$$

$\square$ products of tangent vectors

$$
\begin{gathered}
H_{i j}=2\left\langle\tau_{\theta^{(k)}, s_{k}}^{i}, \tau_{\theta(k), s_{k}}^{j}\right\rangle \\
\left\langle\tau_{s_{0}}^{i}, \tau_{s_{1}}^{j}\right\rangle=c_{s_{0}, s_{1}} \delta_{i, j}
\end{gathered}
$$

$\square$ Update estimation

$$
\theta^{(k+1)} \longleftarrow \theta^{(k)}+H^{-1} J
$$

## Form IAM for Gaussians




## Result statistics - Case 1

|  | Actual | Initial <br> Guess | Estimated |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sigma | 2 | 4 | 2.0142 |
| Tau | 0 | 5 | 0.0636 |
| Alpha | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.1869 |


| Noise Variance | $8.01 \mathrm{E}-06$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Iter. No. | 14 |
| MSE | $9.20 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| Elapsed Time | 0.42 |



## Result statistics - Case 2

|  | Actual | Initial <br> Guess | Estimated |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sigma | 7 | 0.5 | 6.6911 |
| Tau | -15 | 2 | -14.025 |
| Alpha | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.8066 |


| Noise Level | $3.522 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Iter. No. | 14 |
| MSE | $1.06 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| Elapsed Time | 0.31 |

## Multiscale Newton method

$\square$ Replace the slow redundant dictionary technique with a multiscale Newton method
$\square$ Resolve problem with the non-differentiability of the parametrization => stable
$\square$ Good initial guess provided by detection step
$\square$ Convergence rate
$\square$ robust under noise and incomplete data
$\square$ Smoothing Sensitivity

# Percolation model and 

 Well tieHermann-Bernabe051
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## Discontinuity modeling

 binary mixtures

HP: high porosity
volume fraction
LP: low porosity

## Discontinuity modeling

 binary mixtures

HP: high porosity
volume fraction
LP: low porosity

## Upscaling: EM upscaled reflectivity

Reflectivity for the Equivalen medium model


1
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## Upscaling: Perc. upscaled reflectivity

Reflectivity for the Percolation model


SLIM
Seismic Laboratory for

## Upscaling: lithology

$\square$ Use the volume fractions, p, to compute

- density via a linear relation
- velocity via a nonlinear \& singular (switch) relation
$\square$ Upscaling by smoothing p and not the velocity
$\square$ preserves singularities because of the switch
$\square$ singularities from $\boldsymbol{p}$ or switch


## Using IAMs for Well tie

$\square$ Percolation Model

- $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{c}}$
- $\beta$
$\square$ Match well-log (P) to seismic reflectivity
- Parametrizing by IAM
- solve for inverse problem
$\square$ Model mixtures as binary mixtures



## ChaRM Detection

$\square$ Use recent results on spiky decon (Mallat) to make the detection unique given minor information on the seismic wavelet

- insensitivity to estimated wavelet and spike assumption
$\square$ Extend these results to higher dimensions
- multidimensional reflector detection
- solve spike decon. for curvelet
$\square$ Joint work with Yilmaz, Jaffard, Vedel
$\square$ Characterization depends on an sufficiently accurate event detection
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## ChaRM Characterization

$\square$ Develop the multiscale Newton method
$\square$ Extend to higher dimensions
$\square$ Make robust under noise and missing data
$\square$ Extend the multiscale Newton technique to invert for (given the end members)

- the percolation threshold and exponent
- the extend of the lithological transition (the width of a layer in the composition)
$\square$ Joint work with Yves Bernabé


## ChaRM Upscaling and well tie

$\square$ Study well-defined binary mixtures (e.g. Opal, gas-hydrates etc.)
$\square$ Develop upscaling techniques that preserve singularities
$\square$ Provide new insights in the well-seismic tie
$\square$ Joint work with Yves Bernabé

## Questions?

## Comments ?

