CONTESTS

Page

Acknowle	dgements	с
Abstract in	n Thai	d
Abstract in	n English	f
List of fig	ures	j
Chapter 1	Introduction	1
1.1	Research objectives	1
1.2	Literature review	1
1.3	FWI challenges	4
	1.3.1 High computational cost	4
	1.3.2 Non unique solution	4
1.4	Thesis overview	5
Chapter 2	General Theory	7
2.1	General Theory of Full Waveform Inversion	7
2.2	Gradient of misfit function	8
2.3	Partial derivative wave field	9
2.4	Finite difference modelling for acoustic wave	11
Chapter 3	Methodology	13
3.1	Data generating and calculating residual data	14
3.2	Effect of model boundary	14
3.3	Data misfit function	15
3.4	Calculating partial derivative wavefield	15
3.5	Calculating gradient of misfit function	16
3.6	Estimation of scale for model perturbation	17

4.1	Applic	cation of Full Waveform Inversion	28	
	4.1.1	True and initial velocity model	28	
	4.1.2	Gradient of misfit function	31	
	4.1.3	Model perturbation and updating	31	
	4.1.4	Monitoring with misfit function	32	
	4.1.5	Monitoring with synthetic data and data residual	32	
4.2	Discus	ssion	43	
	4.2.1	Estimation of scaling	43	
	4.2.2	Resolution	44	
	4.2.3	Runtime	44	
	4.2.4	Real data and synthetic data	44	
	4.2.5	Local minima problem	45	
Chapter 5 Conclusions				
5.1	Conclu	usions	49	
5.2	Future	work	50	
Appendix		120 Barbon	51	
App	endix A	AI UNIVER	51	
App	endix B		53	
Reference	ຄີຍສີ	สิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่	66	
Curriculum Vitae				
	ΑÌ	l rights reserved		

28

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 1.1	Simple sketch showing a relationship between forward modeling and inverse problem	2
Figure 1.2	Marmousi model of P-wave velocity	3
Figure 1.3:	Schematic of the local minima problem for FWI. The misfit function has several local minimum because the non-linear in the forward modelling	6
Figure 1.4	The synthetic monochromatic seismogram with time period T illustrates the cycle skip problem in FWI.	6
Figure 2.1	$Nx \times Nz$ grid of earth model with n sources and receivers distributed along surface, f(i) indicates a virtual source according to node ith model parameter	10
Figure 2.2	The computational grid of the second order finite difference approximation	12
Figure 2.3	Time stepping Finite difference workflow	12
Figure 3.1	Workflow of Full Waveform Inversion (FWI)	13
Figure 3.2	Ormsby wavelet with frequency 0 5 35 55 Hz and frequency spectrum	14
Figure 3.3	The example of shot gathers generated form model (A) and (D), shot records (B) and (E) were generated without model extension, creating reflection energy in seismic records. Shot records (C) and (F) were generated with model extension, preventing the boundary effect from shot records	18

- Figure 3.4 The example of synthetic shot gather, (C) and (D) generated 19 from true velocity models (A), initial velocity model (B). The data was then subtracted to generate the residual data show on (E) which shown the missing information between (C) and (D)
- Figure 3.5 Figure 3.1: (A) and (D) represent the partial derivative wave 20 filed with respect to model m_i . (B) and (E) show the diagram and calculated delay time for wave travel from surface to model m_i . (C) and (F) the virtual source term with respect to m_i . The partial derivative wave field showed on (D) is equivalence to time convolution between response (E) and virtual source term (F).
- Figure 3.6 (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E) are the partial derivative wave field 21 with respect to different model location (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) show on Figure 3.3(A) compare to the residual data (F)
- Figure 3.7 seismic trace examples (trace number 20, 50 and 80) for the 22 partial derivative wave field show on Figure 3.5(A) overlay with the residual data show on Figure 3.5(F) together with the cross-correlation result.
- Figure 3.8 seismic trace examples (trace number 20, 50 and 80) for the 22 partial derivative wave field show on Figure 3.5(B) overlay with the residual data show on Figure 3.5(F) together with the cross-correlation result.
- Figure 3.9 seismic trace examples (trace number 20, 50 and 80) for the 23 partial derivative wave field show on Figure 3.5(C) overlay with the residual data show on Figure 3.5(F) together with the cross-correlation result.

k

- Figure 3.10 seismic trace examples (trace number 20, 50 and 80) for the 23 partial derivative wave field show on Figure 3.5(D) overlay with the residual data show on Figure 3.5(F) together with the cross-correlation result
- Figure 3.11 seismic trace examples (trace number 20, 50 and 80) for the 24 partial derivative wave field show on Figure 3.5(E) overlay with the residual data show on Figure 3.5(F) together with the cross-correlation result
- Figure 3.12 cross correlation between partial derivative wave field and 25 residual data. (C) and (D) are the partial derivative wave field with respect to (A) and (B). (E) and (F) are the residual data from shot gather 50 overlay with partial derivative wave field show on (C) and (D). (G) and (H) show the cross-correlation result between partial derivative wave field and residual data
- Figure 3.13 example of the individual gradient of misfit function calculated 26 (A) shot at 100m (B) shot at 900m, (C) shot at 300m, (D) shot at 70m and (E) shot at 500m
- Figure 3.14 comparing between the true velocity model and the global 27 gradient of misfit function result from the zero-lag cross-correlation between partial derivative wave field and residual data
- Figure 3.15 Schematic for scale search. Several points were computed to 27 determine an optimal scaling (α optimal)
- Figure 4.1 Original Marmousi model with selected area, 3.2 km long by 1.0 29 km depth with 10m by 10m cell size for test model
- Figure 4.2 (A) true velocity model and (B) smoothed version of Marmousi 29 model used as initial velocity model

Page

Figure 4.3	the velocity function at 320m, 960m, 1600m, 2240m and 2880m	30
	offset, comparing between true velocity function and initial	
	velocity function on Figure 4.2	
Figure 4.4	the gradient of misfit function calculation (A) from iteration 01,	33
	(B) from iteration 02 and (C) from iteration 05	
Figure 4.5	he gradient of misfit function calculation (A) from iteration 10,	
	(B) from iteration 15 and (C) from iteration 20	
Figure 4.6	example of scale searching for calculates model perturbation.	35
	The estimating is searching for the scale that minimise the misfit	
	function calculated from 9 sample shot gathers	
Figure 4.7	plot of the scaling used to calculate the model perturbation on	35
	different iteration	
Figure 4.8	(A) the initial velocity model, the recovered velocity model from	36
	(B) iteration 001, and (C) iteration 002	
Figure 4.9	the recovered velocity model from (A) iteration 005, (B)	37
	iteration 010 and (C) iteration 020	
Figure 4.10	comparing between true velocity model (black), initial velocity	38
	model (blue) and updated velocity model from iteration 020 at	
	distance (A) 960m, (B) 1600m and (C) 2240m	
Figure 4.11	misfit function plots with respect to iterations of the inversion	38
Figure 4.12	synthetic shot gather 160 generated from (A) true velocity	39
C	model, (B) initial velocity model, (C) updated velocity model	
A	iteration001 and (D) updated velocity model iteration002	
Figure 4.13	synthetic shot gather 160 generated from (A) updated velocity	
	model iteration003, (B) updated velocity model iteration005, (C)	
	updated velocity model iteration010 and (D) updated velocity	
	model iteration020	

- Figure 4.14 residual data from (A) updated velocity model iteration001, (B) 41 updated velocity model iteration002, (C) updated velocity model iteration003, and (D) updated velocity model iteration005
- Figure 4.15 residual data from (A) updated velocity model iteration010, (B) 42 updated velocity model iteration015, and (C) updated velocity model iteration020
- Figure 4.16 the residual velocity model on 20th iteration (blue), compare with 46 perturbation model calculated from gradient of misfit function and (A) with scale 10, (B) with scale 500 and (C) with scale 1000. The arrow indicated the overestimate of the perturbation model with high scaling value
- Figure 4.17 comparing the true, initial and final velocity function at 1600m 47
- Figure 4.18 compare runtime for each of FWI process from iteration 01 to 48 05. The table summarises runtime for each of process for iteration 01

VG MAI

<mark>ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่</mark> Copyright[©] by Chiang Mai University All rights reserved