# Sensitivity Analysis and Uncertainty in EFWI Using the Hessian Matrix ROSE meeting, 24th April 2018

Vegard S. Hagen<sup>\*†</sup>, Børge Arntsen<sup>†</sup> & Espen B. Raknes<sup>‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup>NTNU - Department of Geoscience and Petroleum, <sup>‡</sup>Aker BP

#### Outline

- Brief introduction to (Elastic) Full Waveform Inversion
- Present the Frechét derivative
- Adjoint theory for calculating the Hessian
- Calculate the Hessian
  - Gradient model
  - Gullfaks model

#### **Motivation**

- Measure the resolution of FWI
- Quantify parameter cross-talk
- Investigate possibility of a Newton solver

#### Elastic wave propagation

Elastic waves can be described by the wave-operator L(u, m):

$$\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{m}) = \rho(\mathbf{x})\ddot{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x},t) - \nabla \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{x},t) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x},t), \tag{1}$$

- Space-coordinates  $\mathbf{x} \in G \subset \mathbb{R}^3$
- Time  $t \in [0, T] \subset \mathbb{R}$
- **b** Displacement field  $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$
- Driving force f(x, t)

- Model  $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}, t)$
- ► Density *ρ*
- Stress tensor  $\sigma(\mathbf{x}, t)$
- Stiffness tensor  $\sigma_{ij} = C_{ijkl} \partial_k u_l$

1. Guess a starting model (m) based on other information.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Tarantola 1984; Mora 1987.

- 1. Guess a starting model (m) based on other information.
- 2. Do a synthetic run.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Tarantola 1984; Mora 1987.

- 1. Guess a starting model (m) based on other information.
- 2. Do a synthetic run.
- 3. Compare the synthetic recording to the real.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Tarantola 1984; Mora 1987.

- 1. Guess a starting model (m) based on other information.
- 2. Do a synthetic run.
- 3. Compare the synthetic recording to the real.
- 4. Use this information to calculate a gradient update.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Tarantola 1984; Mora 1987.

- 1. Guess a starting model (m) based on other information.
- 2. Do a synthetic run.
- 3. Compare the synthetic recording to the real.
- 4. Use this information to calculate a gradient update.
- 5. Apply the model update.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Tarantola 1984; Mora 1987.

- 1. Guess a starting model (m) based on other information.
- 2. Do a synthetic run.
- 3. Compare the synthetic recording to the real.
- 4. Use this information to calculate a gradient update.
- 5. Apply the model update.
- 6. Repeat.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Tarantola 1984; Mora 1987.

A measure of how our model performs compared to a reference model, the misfit function

.

$$\Psi = \Psi(\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{x}_r), \mathbf{d}_0) \tag{2}$$

- Receiver location x<sub>r</sub>
- Reference recording d<sub>0</sub>

#### Misfit

#### Introduce the Jacobian ${\boldsymbol{\mathsf{J}}}$ as

$$\nabla_m \Psi(\mathbf{m} + \delta \mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{m} + \delta \mathbf{m}) \tag{3}$$

Linearise around **m** resulting in

$$\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{m} + \delta \mathbf{m}) \simeq \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{m}) + \nabla_m \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{m}) \delta \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{0}.$$
 (4)

Thus introducing the Hessian

$$\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{m}) = \nabla_m \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{m}) = \nabla_m \nabla_m \Psi(\mathbf{m}). \tag{5}$$

# Iterative methods<sup>2</sup>

> The model update  $\delta \mathbf{m}$  can then be obtained by solving

$$\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{m})\delta\mathbf{m} = -\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{m}) \tag{6}$$

Iff H is invertible we can "simply" solve

$$\delta \mathbf{m} = -\mathbb{H}^{-1}\mathbf{J}.$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Virieux and Operto 2009; Métivier et al. 2012; Epanomeritakis et al. 2008.

# Iterative methods<sup>2</sup>

> The model update  $\delta \mathbf{m}$  can then be obtained by solving

$$\mathbb{H}(\mathbf{m})\delta\mathbf{m} = -\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{m}) \tag{6}$$

Iff H is invertible we can "simply" solve

$$\delta \mathbf{m} = -\mathbb{H}^{-1}\mathbf{J}.$$

A common approximation is

 $\delta \mathbf{m} \simeq \alpha \mathbf{J},$ 

and a line search for the optimal  $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Virieux and Operto 2009; Métivier et al. 2012; Epanomeritakis et al. 2008.

#### Jacobian

By backward propagating the misfit kernels we can obtain the adjoint field  $\mathbf{u}^{\dagger}$  which we can use to calculate the Jacobian using the Frechét derivative

$$\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{u}^{\dagger}, \mathbf{u}) = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{u}^{\dagger} \nabla_m \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{m}) \, \mathrm{d}t, \tag{7}$$

which boils down to cross-correlating the adjoint and forward fields.

#### Perturbed wavefields

Perturbed forward field

$$\delta \mathbf{u} = \lim_{\nu \to 0} \frac{1}{\nu} \Big[ \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{m} + \nu \delta \mathbf{m}) - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{m}) \Big], \tag{8}$$

Perturbed adjoint field

$$\delta \mathbf{u}^{\dagger} = \lim_{\nu \to 0} \frac{1}{\nu} \Big[ \mathbf{u}^{\dagger} (\mathbf{m} + \nu \delta \mathbf{m}) - \mathbf{u}^{\dagger} (\mathbf{m}) \Big], \tag{9}$$

# Hessian<sup>3</sup>

The Hessian acting on a model perturbation  $\delta \mathbf{m}$  can be split up into three components

$$\mathbb{H}\delta\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{H}_{1}(\mathbf{u}^{\dagger}, \delta\mathbf{u}) + \mathbf{H}_{2}(\delta\mathbf{u}^{\dagger}, \mathbf{u}) + \mathbf{H}_{3}(\mathbf{u}^{\dagger}, \mathbf{u}).$$
(10)

These components can be written out as

$$\mathbf{H}_{1}(\mathbf{u}^{\dagger}, \delta \mathbf{u}) = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{u}^{\dagger} \nabla_{m} \mathbf{L}(\delta \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{m}) \, \mathrm{d}t, \qquad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{H}_{2}(\delta \mathbf{u}^{\dagger}, \mathbf{u}) = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \delta \mathbf{u}^{\dagger} \nabla_{m} \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{m}) \, \mathrm{d}t, \qquad (12)$$

$$\mathbf{H}_{3}(\mathbf{u}^{\dagger},\mathbf{u}) = \int_{T} \mathbf{u}^{\dagger} \nabla_{m} \nabla_{m} \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{m})(\delta \mathbf{m}) \,\mathrm{d}t. \tag{13}$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Fichtner and Trampert 2011.

#### Hessian

The first two terms  $\mathbf{H}_1$  and  $\mathbf{H}_2$  can be calculated in a similar way as the Jacobian by replacing the relevant fields.

The last term  $H_3$  can be calculated by recycling the Jacobian calculations as

$$\mathbf{H}_{3} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \rho^{-1} J_{\nu_{\rho}} & \rho^{-1} J_{\nu_{s}} \\ \rho^{-1} J_{\nu_{\rho}} & \nu_{\rho}^{-1} J_{\nu_{\rho}} & 0 \\ \rho^{-1} J_{\nu_{s}} & 0 & \nu_{s}^{-1} J_{\nu_{s}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta \rho \\ \delta \nu_{\rho} \\ \delta \nu_{s} \end{bmatrix}$$
(14)

#### Construcing the Hessian

 $\mathbf{H}^m(x_i)\delta m(x_j) = \mathbf{H}^m_i \delta^m_j$ 

| ${ m H}_0^ ho { m \delta}_0^ ho$            | $\mathbf{H}_{0}^{ ho} {\mathbf{\delta}}_{1}^{ ho}$ | ••• | $\mathbf{H}_{0}^{ ho} \delta_{0}^{m{v}_{ ho}}$ | ••• | ${f H}_0^ ho {f \delta}_0^{{m v}_s}$        | ]   |
|---|--|-----|--|-----|---|-----|
| $\mathbf{H}_{1}^{ ho} \delta_{0}^{ ho}$     | $\mathbf{H}_{1}^{ ho} {\delta}_{1}^{ ho}$          | •.  | ÷  | ••• | ÷   | ·   |
| ${f H}_2^ ho {\delta}_0^ ho$                | ÷  | ·   | ÷  | ·   | ÷   | •   |
| ÷   | ÷  | ·   | ÷  | ·   | ÷   | ·   |
| $\mathbf{H}_{0}^{V_{ ho}} \delta_{0}^{ ho}$ | •••  | ••• | $\mathbf{H}_{0}^{v_{p}}\delta_{0}^{v_{p}}$     | ••• | $\mathbf{H}_{0}^{v_{p}} \delta_{0}^{v_{s}}$ | ••• |
|   | :  | ·   | ÷  | ·   | :   | ••• |
| $\mathbf{H}_{0}^{V_{s}}\delta_{0}^{ ho}$    |  |     | $\mathbf{H}_{0}^{v_{s}}\delta_{0}^{v_{p}}$     |     | $\mathbf{H}_{0}^{v_{s}}\delta_{0}^{v_{s}}$  |     |
|   | ÷  | ·   | :  | ·   |   | ·   |

(15)

#### Gradient model



# Gradient model



#### Gradient model



# Gullfaks model



#### Gullfaks model



# Gullfaks model























#### Gullfaks model — Shot 1































































































Gradient recording shot 1, perturbation at 1500 m



Gullfaks recording shot 1, perturbation at 1500 m



# Gradient Hessian shot 1, perturbation at 1500 m



# Gullfaks Hessian shot 1, perturbation at 1500 m



# Gradient Hessian shot 1, perturbation at 2500 m



# Gullfaks Hessian shot 1, perturbation at 2500 m



Gradient recording shot 2, perturbation at 1500 m



Gullfaks recording shot 2, perturbation at 1500 m



# Gradient Hessian shot 2, perturbation at 500 m



# Gullfaks Hessian shot 2, perturbation at 500 m



# Gradient Hessian shot 2, perturbation at 1000 m



# Gullfaks Hessian shot 2, perturbation at 1000 m



# Gradient Hessian shot 2, perturbation at 1500 m



# Gullfaks Hessian shot 2, perturbation at 1500 m



# Gradient Hessian shot 2, perturbation at 2000 m



# Gullfaks Hessian shot 2, perturbation at 2000 m



# Gradient Hessian shot 2, perturbation at 2500 m



# Gullfaks Hessian shot 2, perturbation at 2500 m



# Gradient Hessian shot 2, perturbation at 3000 m



# Gullfaks Hessian shot 2, perturbation at 3000 m



#### Gradient model Hessian constructed from shot 1



#### Gradient model Hessian constructed from shot 1



#### Gullfaks model Hessian constructed from shot 1



#### Gullfaks model Hessian constructed from shot 1



#### Gradient model Hessian constructed from shot 1 - 1km-2km zoom


Gullfaks model Hessian constructed from shot 1 - 1km-2km zoom



# Gradient model Hessian constructed from shot 2



# Gradient model Hessian constructed from shot 2



# Gullfaks model Hessian constructed from shot 2



# Gullfaks model Hessian constructed from shot 2



### Gradient model Hessian constructed from shot 2 - 1km-2km zoom



Gullfaks model Hessian constructed from shot 2 - 1km-2km zoom



• We are able to construct the Hessian in a constrained area.

- ▶ We are able to construct the Hessian in a constrained area.
- Still computationally expensive.

- ▶ We are able to construct the Hessian in a constrained area.
- Still computationally expensive.
- Illustrates the influence zone.

- We are able to construct the Hessian in a constrained area.
- Still computationally expensive.
- Illustrates the influence zone.
- From the constructed Hessian we can see a strong cross-talk between parameters.

- We are able to construct the Hessian in a constrained area.
- Still computationally expensive.
- Illustrates the influence zone.
- From the constructed Hessian we can see a strong cross-talk between parameters.
- Low recovery of density in the given geometries.

### Future work

- Explore different shot-receiver geometries.
  - Sum over shots.

### Future work

- Explore different shot-receiver geometries.
  - Sum over shots.
- Implement a full-Newton solver.

## References

- Tarantola, A. (1984) Inversion of seismic reflection data in the acoustic approximation in: Geophysics, 49:8, 1259 doi: 10.1190/1.1441754
- Mora, P. (1987) Nonlinear two-dimensional elastic inversion of multioffset seismic data in: Geophysics, 52:9, 1211 doi: 10.1190/1.1442384
- Virieux, J. and S. Operto (2009) An overview of full-waveform inversion in exploration geophysics in: *Geophysics*, 74:6, WCC1 doi: 10.1190/1.3238367
- Métivier, L, R Brossier, J Virieux and S Operto (2012) The truncated Newton method for Full Waveform Inversion in: Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 386:2, 012013 doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/386/1/012013
- Epanomeritakis, I, V Akçelik, O Ghattas and J Bielak (2008) A Newton-CG method for large-scale three-dimensional elastic full-waveform seismic inversion doi: 10.1088/0266-5611/24/3/034015
- Fichtner, A. and J. Trampert (2011) Hessian kernels of seismic data functionals based upon adjoint techniques in: Geophysical Journal International, 185: 775–798 doi: 10.1111/j.1365-246X.2011.04966.x

- This slide left unintentionally blank (oops!) -

### Gradient model Hessian slice shot 1 - 1500m



### Gullfaks model Hessian slice shot 1 - 1500m



### Gradient model Hessian slice shot 2 - 1500m



### Gullfaks model Hessian slice shot 2 - 1500m

