<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Type</th>
<th>Article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Feng, Zongcai; Schuster, Gerard T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eprint version</td>
<td>Publisher’s Version/PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI</td>
<td>10.1190/GEO2016-0254.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Society of Exploration Geophysicists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>GEOPHYSICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>Archived with thanks to GEOPHYSICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Download date</td>
<td>2023-11-01 11:56:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to Item</td>
<td><a href="http://hdl.handle.net/10754/623002">http://hdl.handle.net/10754/623002</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elastic least-squares reverse time migration

Zongcai Feng and Gerard T. Schuster

ABSTRACT

We use elastic least-squares reverse time migration (LSRTM) to invert for the reflectivity images of P- and S-wave impedances. Elastic LSRTM solves the linearized elastic-wave equations for forward modeling and the adjoint equations for backpropagating the residual wavefield at each iteration. Numerical tests on synthetic data and field data reveal the advantages of elastic LSRTM over elastic reverse time migration (RTM) and acoustic LSRTM. For our examples, the elastic LSRTM images have better resolution and amplitude balancing, fewer artifacts, and less crosstalk compared with the elastic RTM images. The images are also better focused and have better reflector continuity for steeply dipping events compared to the acoustic LSRTM images. Similar to conventional least-squares migration, elastic LSRTM also requires an accurate estimation of the P- and S-wave migration velocity models. However, the problem remains that, when there are moderate errors in the velocity model and strong multiples, LSRTM will produce migration noise stronger than that seen in the RTM images.

INTRODUCTION

Conventional seismic processing is based on the acoustic approximation. However, the real earth is viscoelastic and allows for the propagation of P- and S-waves. The S-waves are commonly recorded by multicomponent receivers in land or marine (ocean bottom) seismic experiments. For acoustic migration, the elastic characteristics of the wavefield, such as P-wave radiation patterns and mode-converted events, are treated as coherent noise rather than an additional source of information of the subsurface parameters (Sears et al., 2010).

For elastic imaging, elastic Kirchhoff migration and reverse time migration (RTM) are typically used for migrating multicomponent data. Elastic Kirchhoff migration (Kuo and Dai, 1984; Hokstad, 2000) calculates PP- and PS-traveltimes, and then it sums the multicomponent data along the travelttime moveout curves. It is equivalent to applying two acoustic Kirchhoff migrations after separating the PP- and PS-reflections according to the moveout differences in the PP- and PS-arrival times (Yan and Sava, 2008). Similarly, other conventional migration methods can be applied to PP- and PS-wavefields after their separation. Usually, the P- and S-waves can be approximated by the vertical- and horizontal-component data (Granli et al., 1999) or separated by using approximations such as elastic potentials (Etgen, 1988; Zhe and Greenhalgh, 1997; Sun and McMechan, 2001; Stanton and Sacchi, 2014). The separation of P- and S-waves is not always accurate because it will generate crosstalk artifacts between the unseparated wave modes in the migration images (Du et al., 2012).

An alternative elastic-imaging method is elastic RTM, in which a numerical solution to the elastic-wave equation is used to extrapolate the P- and S-wave wavefields at the same time, without prior separation of wave modes. In this case, an imaging condition is used such as computing the ray-based excitation time of the reflection at the reflector (Chang and McMechan, 1987) or calculating the zero-lag crosscorrelation of the vector and scalar potentials (Yan and Sava, 2008; Du et al., 2012; Duan and Sava, 2015) to get the migration images. The benefit of elastic RTM is that it uses the correct kinematics to handle multicomponent data and migrates different wave modes to their correct subsurface positions (Lu et al., 2009; Jiao et al., 2012).

For least-squares migration, we seek the earth’s reflectivity image from the seismic reflection data that minimizes the $l_2$ norm of the data residuals (Lailly, 1984; Tarantola, 1984; Chavent, 1999). It can be implemented with Kirchhoff’s migration (Nemeth et al., 1999; Duquet et al., 2000) or phase-shift migration algorithms (Kuhl and Sacchi, 2003; Kaplan et al., 2010; Huang and Schuster, 2012). When implemented with the acoustic RTM method, acoustic least-squares reverse time migration (LSRTM) can be applied to acoustic data to improve its amplitude balancing and image resolution (Tang, 2009; Dai et al., 2012; Dai and Schuster, 2013; Zeng et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2015), and it can be adapted to the viscoacoustic-wave equation (Dutta and Schuster, 2014; Dai et al., 2015) to compensate for
phase distortion and amplitude losses from attenuation. The results can be validated by comparing the observed traces to the synthetic pressure data generated by an acoustic- or viscoacoustic-wave equation. Such pressure data have neither a correct P-wave amplitude-variation-with-offset (AVO) effect (Virieux and Operto, 2009; Sears et al., 2010) nor S-wave events as generated in the elastic modeling or collected in the field. Recently, Stanton and Sacchi (2015) combine wavefield separation and split-step wave-equation migration to improve the ability of least-squares migration to fit elastic data. We now adapt LSRTM to the elastic-wave equation to directly take care of this elastic characteristic.

The theory of elastic waveform inversion dates back to the works of Tarantola (1986) and Mora (1987). It is a nonlinear waveform inversion method that iteratively updates the background elastic parameters using transmission and reflection data (Mora, 1988). We now use the elastic gradient formula of waveform inversion (Crase et al., 1990) to compute the least-squares migration image (Nemeth et al., 1999; Duquet et al., 2000; Valenciano, 2006), and we do not update the smooth background velocity. This method is referred to as elastic LSRTM.

In our elastic LSRTM algorithm, we choose to invert for the reflectivity images of P- and S-wave impedances but not the P- and S-wave velocities or the Lamé parameters \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \) for two reasons (Tarantola, 1986). First, the P- and S-wave impedances give scattering radiation patterns that are more dissimilar than those associated with the Lamé parameters \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \). Such parameterization reduces the crosstalk due to the weak coupling between parameters and speeds up the convergence. Second, when the P- and S-wave impedances are selected, the density perturbations scatter little energy at a short aperture. This gives reflectivity images with better quality, even though density is not inverted for. After choosing the elastic parameters in inversion, elastic LSRTM uses a linearized iterative approach to reduce the coupling effect between elastic parameters, which is similar to that described in Anikiev et al. (2013). Here, the scattering radiation patterns are referred to as the scattering characteristics of elastic waves (Wu and Aki, 1985; Tarantola, 1986). However, the crosstalk caused by the coupling between parameters in multiparameter inversion is still a problem.

In this paper, we use the elastic-wave equations for wavefield extrapolation and use the linearized least-squares inversion method (Lailly, 1984) to invert for the reflectivity images of the P- and S-wave impedances. For elastic LSRTM, the linearized elastic modeling operator is based on the perturbations of the Lamé parameters \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \). We derive the adjoint equations and imaging conditions to calculate the gradients with respect to \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \). The gradients are then transformed into gradients with respect to updating the reflectivity images of the P- and S-wave impedances. Numerical tests on synthetic data show that elastic LSRTM provides P- and S-images with fewer artifacts, better amplitude balancing, and higher resolution than does elastic RTM if the velocity model is well-known and the multiples are not too strong. In addition, crosstalk noise between the P- and S-images can be mitigated by the least-squares iterations for our examples. When compared with acoustic LSRTM, elastic LSRTM images are more focused and have fewer artifacts because LSRTM accurately accounts for the P-wave radiation pattern. In addition, elastic LSRTM improves the imaging of steeply dipping structures using S-wave reflections. The disadvantage is that elastic LSRTM is an order-of-magnitude more expensive than acoustic LSRTM, relies on an accurate estimation of the P- and S-wave migration velocity models, and it is sensitive to the presence of strong multiples.

This paper is organized into five sections. After the Introduction, the second section describes the theory and the implementation of elastic LSRTM. Numerical results on the synthetic and field data are presented in the third section. The field data are from a crosswell survey in West Texas, where there is good coverage in the source and receiver distributions. Finally, discussions and conclusions are presented in the last two sections.

**THEORY OF ELASTIC LEAST-SQUARES REVERSE TIME MIGRATION**

The 2D velocity-stress elastic-wave equation can be written as (Levander, 1988)

\[
\rho \frac{\partial u_x}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial \sigma_{sx}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \sigma_{sz}}{\partial z} = 0,
\]

\[
\rho \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial \sigma_{sz}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \sigma_{sz}}{\partial z} = 0,
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \sigma_{sx}}{\partial t} - \lambda \left( \frac{\partial u_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} \right) - 2\mu \frac{\partial u_x}{\partial x} = S_{xx},
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \sigma_{sz}}{\partial t} - \lambda \left( \frac{\partial u_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} \right) - 2\mu \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} = S_{zz},
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \sigma_{sx}}{\partial z} - \mu \left( \frac{\partial u_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} \right) = 0,
\]

where \( u_x \) and \( u_z \) are the horizontal- and vertical-particle velocities, \( \sigma_{sx} \), \( \sigma_{sz} \), and \( \sigma_{sz} \) are the stresses, \( S_{xx} \) and \( S_{zz} \) denote the source time histories of “xx” and “zz” stress components, respectively, \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \) are the Lamé parameters, and \( \rho \) is the density. The P-wave velocity is given by \( V_p = \sqrt{\lambda + 2\mu}/\rho \) and the S-wave velocity is \( V_S = \sqrt{\mu/\rho} \). The P-wave impedance is given by \( I_p = \rho V_p = \sqrt{\rho(\lambda + 2\mu)} \) and the S-wave impedance is \( I_S = \rho V_S = \sqrt{\rho \mu} \).

Let \( \lambda_0 \) and \( \mu_0 \) be the background medium parameters. Perturbing them by \( \delta\lambda \) and \( \delta\mu \), respectively, while keeping \( \rho \) unchanged, gives the new medium parameters as

\[
\lambda = \lambda_0 + \delta\lambda, \quad \mu = \mu_0 + \delta\mu.
\]

The perturbed wavefields can thus be written as

\[
\rho \frac{\partial \delta u_x}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial \delta \sigma_{sx}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \delta \sigma_{sz}}{\partial z} = 0,
\]

\[
\rho \frac{\partial \delta u_z}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial \delta \sigma_{sz}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \delta \sigma_{sz}}{\partial z} = 0,
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \delta \sigma_{sx}}{\partial t} - \lambda \left( \frac{\partial \delta u_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \delta u_z}{\partial z} \right) - 2\mu \frac{\partial \delta u_x}{\partial x} = \delta\lambda \left( \frac{\partial u_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} \right) + 2\delta\mu \frac{\partial u_x}{\partial x},
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \delta \sigma_{sz}}{\partial t} - \lambda \left( \frac{\partial \delta u_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \delta u_z}{\partial z} \right) - 2\mu \frac{\partial \delta u_z}{\partial z} = \delta\lambda \left( \frac{\partial u_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} \right) + 2\delta\mu \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z},
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \delta \sigma_{sx}}{\partial z} - \mu \left( \frac{\partial \delta u_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \delta u_z}{\partial z} \right) = \delta\mu \left( \frac{\partial u_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} \right).
\]

In the context of least-squares migration, the variables in equation 3 are related to the matrix-vector operation \( d = Lm \) (Nemeth et al., 1999). Here, \( d = (\delta u_x, \delta u_z)^T \) represents the Born-modeled particle...
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\[ \delta m = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \sigma_x}{\partial t} \\ \frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial t} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\int_0^T \left( \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z} \right) \delta \rho dt \\ -\int_0^T 2 \left( \frac{\partial \sigma_x}{\partial x} \delta \sigma_x + \frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial z} \delta \sigma_z \right) dt \end{pmatrix}, \]

where \( \epsilon \) is the misfit function defined in equation 7, and \( (\partial \epsilon / \partial \sigma_x) \) and \( (\partial \epsilon / \partial \rho) \) are the gradients with respect to perturbations in \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \). Their derivation is shown in Appendix A. Equations 5 and 6 are equivalent to the gradient operation \( g = L^T \Delta \mathbf{d} \) used in conventional least-squares migration (Nemeth et al., 1999). The algorithm for numerical implementation of elastic LSRTM is discussed in the next subsection.

Elastic least-squares reverse time migration algorithm

Elastic LSRTM is implemented by a preconditioned conjugate gradient method (Nocedal and Wright, 1999) based on the following:

\[ \tilde{\mathbf{m}} = \mathbf{L}_m \tilde{\mathbf{m}} \]

\[ \mathbf{L}_m = \mathbf{L}_m(\mathbf{d}) \]

\[ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{L}_m^{-1} \mathbf{g} \]

where \( \mathbf{d} \) is the initial estimate, \( \mathbf{L}_m \) is the preconditioner, and \( \mathbf{g} \) is the gradient vector. The algorithm iteratively updates the estimate \( \mathbf{d} \) until convergence is achieved.

The perturbation in the image \( \delta \mathbf{m} \) is related to the perturbations of the Lamé parameters \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \), which are zero at zero lag and cross-correlation of the adjoint fields from equation 5 with the background wavefields from equation 1:

\[ \delta \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{L}_m \tilde{\mathbf{m}} \]

\[ \tilde{\mathbf{m}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \sigma_x}{\partial t} \\ \frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial t} \end{pmatrix} \]

\[ \mathbf{L}_m = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \sigma_x}{\partial \sigma_x} & \frac{\partial \sigma_x}{\partial \sigma_z} \\ \frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial \sigma_x} & \frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial \sigma_z} \end{pmatrix} \]

\[ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{L}_m^{-1} \mathbf{g} \]

where \( \mathbf{d} \) is the initial estimate, \( \mathbf{L}_m \) is the preconditioner, and \( \mathbf{g} \) is the gradient vector. The algorithm iteratively updates the estimate \( \mathbf{d} \) until convergence is achieved.

The perturbation in the image \( \delta \mathbf{m} \) is related to the perturbations of the Lamé parameters \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \), which are zero at zero lag and cross-correlation of the adjoint fields from equation 5 with the background wavefields from equation 1:

\[ \delta \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{L}_m \tilde{\mathbf{m}} \]

\[ \tilde{\mathbf{m}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \sigma_x}{\partial t} \\ \frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial t} \end{pmatrix} \]

\[ \mathbf{L}_m = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \sigma_x}{\partial \sigma_x} & \frac{\partial \sigma_x}{\partial \sigma_z} \\ \frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial \sigma_x} & \frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial \sigma_z} \end{pmatrix} \]

\[ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{L}_m^{-1} \mathbf{g} \]

where \( \mathbf{d} \) is the initial estimate, \( \mathbf{L}_m \) is the preconditioner, and \( \mathbf{g} \) is the gradient vector. The algorithm iteratively updates the estimate \( \mathbf{d} \) until convergence is achieved.

The perturbation in the image \( \delta \mathbf{m} \) is related to the perturbations of the Lamé parameters \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \), which are zero at zero lag and cross-correlation of the adjoint fields from equation 5 with the background wavefields from equation 1:

\[ \delta \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{L}_m \tilde{\mathbf{m}} \]

\[ \tilde{\mathbf{m}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \sigma_x}{\partial t} \\ \frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial t} \end{pmatrix} \]

\[ \mathbf{L}_m = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \sigma_x}{\partial \sigma_x} & \frac{\partial \sigma_x}{\partial \sigma_z} \\ \frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial \sigma_x} & \frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial \sigma_z} \end{pmatrix} \]

\[ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{L}_m^{-1} \mathbf{g} \]

where \( \mathbf{d} \) is the initial estimate, \( \mathbf{L}_m \) is the preconditioner, and \( \mathbf{g} \) is the gradient vector. The algorithm iteratively updates the estimate \( \mathbf{d} \) until convergence is achieved.
ing steps. Our work flow is similar to that of Dutta and Schuster (2014), except the parameters and data are multicomponent. In this work, source-side illumination (Plessix and Mulder, 2004) is used as the diagonal preconditioner C.

- Form the misfit function $e$ as

$$ e = \frac{1}{2} \| Lm^{i+1} - d^{\text{obs}} \|^2, $$

where $L$ represents a linear modeling operator and $Lm^{i+1}$ is the predicted data given by the solution to equation 3; $d^{\text{obs}}$ represents the recorded vertical- and horizontal-particle-velocity seismograms, $m$ represents the perturbations of the Lamé parameters computed from the reflectivity images of P- and S-wave impedances using equation 4, and $i$ represents the iteration index.

- Compute the gradient

$$ g^{(i+1)} = L^T (Lm^{i+1} - d^{\text{obs}}) = L^T \Delta d^{(i+1)}, $$

where $\Delta d$ represents the data residual for the predicted and observed data, which is back propagated using the adjoint equations in equation 5. The adjoint wavefields are crosscorrelated with the background fields, given in equation 1, to give the gradients related to the Lamé parameters in equation 6 at each iteration. The gradients are then used to calculate the gradients related to the reflectivity images by

$$ \frac{\partial e}{\partial m_p} = 2V_p \frac{\partial e}{\partial \alpha}, \quad \frac{\partial e}{\partial m_s} = 2V_S I_s \left( -2 \frac{\partial e}{\partial \mu} + \frac{\partial e}{\partial \mu} \right). $$

The gradient transformation for reflectivity images is similar to the transformation for P- and S-wave impedances (Crase et al., 1990), except it is scaled by the background P- and S-wave impedances.

- Update the gradient related to reflectivity images using the conjugate gradient formula as

$$ dk^{(i+1)} = Cg^{(i+1)} + \beta dk^{(i)}, $$

where $\beta$ is given by

$$ \beta = \frac{(g^{(i+1)})^T Cg^{(i+1)}}{(g^{(i)})^T Cg^{(i)}}. $$

In this work, we use the sum of the square of the horizontal- and vertical-particle velocities for source-side illumination

$$ [C]_{ii} = 1/\int_0^T (u_x(x_i)^2 + u_z(x_i)^2) dt. $$

where $[C]_{ii}$ indicates the $i$th diagonal term of $C$ and $x_i$ indicates the wavefield location.

- Compute the step length $\alpha$ as

$$ \alpha = \frac{(dk^{(i+1)})^T g^{(i+1)}}{(Ldk^{(i+1)})^T (Ldk^{(i+1)})}. $$

- Iteratively update the reflectivity images as

$$ m^{(i+2)} = m^{(i+1)} - \alpha dk^{(i+1)}, $$

until the length of the residual vector falls below a specified threshold.

### NUMERICAL RESULTS

The application of elastic LSRTM is now demonstrated with synthetic and field data examples. The synthetic examples are for three land models: (1) a layered model with different P- and S-wave velocity anomalies, (2) a portion of the Marmousi2 model, and (3) a modified cross section of the SEG/EAGE salt model. The field data are from a crosswell experiment in McElroy, Texas.

In the synthetic examples, the observed 2C data are generated by an $O(2, 8)$ time-space-domain staggered-grid solution of the elastic-wave equations in equation 1 without a free-surface condition. The data are then migrated using elastic RTM and elastic LSRTM for the reflectivity images of P- and S-wave impedances. Here, the reflectivity images of the P- and S-wave impedances are denoted as the P- and S-images, respectively. The elastic RTM refers to the first iteration of elastic LSRTM. Source-side illumination is used as the preconditioning factor during the least-squares iterations for elastic LSRTM. The elastic RTM and acoustic LSRTM results are also illumination compensated.

#### Layered velocity model

We first demonstrate the advantages of elastic LSRTM using the flat-layered model in Figure 2 with shallow anomalies. The density is homo-
geneous and equal to 1 g/cm³; thus, the P- and S-wave impedances
as well as density models are not shown here. To generate the
synthetic data, equation 1 is solved for 92 shots evenly spaced at 50 m
on the surface. Here, 230 receivers are evenly distributed at 20 m
intervals on the surface. The P-wave point source uses a Ricker
wavelet with a 7.5 Hz peak frequency, and the total recording time
is 5.6 s.

Figure 3 compares the elastic RTM and LSRTM images. In both
cases, the S-images have higher resolution than the P-images because of the shorter wavelength
of S-waves. The elastic LSRTM images have fewer artifacts, better amplitude balancing, and
higher resolution compared with the elastic RTM images. In addition, the P- and S-images of elas-
tic RTM contain false reflectivity images of P- and S-wave velocity anomalies. Note that the
crosstalk noise exists at the flat-layered interfaces
in the images, but it overlaps the true images. The
crosstalk problem in elastic RTM is mitigated by
elastic LSRTM.

Source-type test

In our previous synthetic example, we used a
P-wave source, which is common in elastic mi-
gration or inversion of marine (ocean-bottom)
data, including synthetic data (Lu et al., 2009;
Guasch et al., 2012; Raknes and Aamtsen,
2014) and field data (Sears et al., 2008, 2010;
Jiao et al., 2012). The recorded wavefield thus
contains only PP- and converted PS-reflections.
If the correct velocity models are used, the cross-
correlation of the source- and receiver-side wave-
fields relocates the reflection events back to their
place of origin along the reflecting interfaces,
even though there is crosstalk generated by the
coupling between parameters. However, if the
source contains P- and S-waves, the recorded
data will contain PP-, PS-, SS-, and SP-reflec-
tions. In this case, the crosscorrelation between
different wave modes will generate migration ar-
tifacts between different wave modes.

We now use the same layered velocity model
in the synthetic example, except now only 23 shots are used, with a shot spacing of 200 m.
The elastic LSRTM images using a normal stress source σₜ, are shown in Figure 4a and 4b. The
images contain obvious wave-mode crosstalk
noise especially in the shallow part of the P-image,
compared with the elastic LSRTM images
using the P-wave source shown in Figure 4c
and 4d. This wave-mode crosstalk is difficult
to eliminate with more iterations of elastic
LSRTM. However, if a denser distribution of
shots is used, the wave-mode crosstalk is miti-
gated as shown in Figure 4e and 4f. This is be-
cause the location of the wave-mode crosstalk and artifacts varies with shot location, and there-
fore, stacking the images cancels the artifacts for
a dense shot distribution.

Marmousi2 velocity model

We also demonstrate the advantages of elastic LSRTM using a
portion of the Marmousi2 model with a homogeneous solid layer
added on the top. Figure 5a, 5c, and 5e shows the true P- and S-
wave velocities as well as density models, respectively. The models
for migration are shown in Figure 5b, 5d, and 5f. The true P- and
S-wave impedance models, calculated from the true velocity and
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density models, are shown in Figure 6a and 6b, respectively. The 478 shots are evenly spaced at 12.5 m, and the 1195 receivers are evenly distributed at 5.0 m intervals on the surface. The P-wave point source uses a Ricker wavelet with a 30-Hz peak frequency, and the total recording time is 3 s.

The elastic RTM and LSRTM images are displayed in Figure 7. Similar to the previous example, the S-images have higher resolution than the P-images. The elastic LSRTM images also have fewer artifacts, better amplitude balancing, and higher resolution compared with elastic RTM. In addition, the false sand structure appearing in the RTM P-image is much weaker in the LSRTM P-image (shown by the black arrows in Figure 7 and in the magnified views in Figure 8). The S-images for elastic RTM and LSRTM show a consistent structure in the sand layer.

**SEG/EAGE salt model**

Elastic LSRTM is now tested on the SEG/EAGE salt model for comparison with acoustic LSRTM. Figure 9a and 9b shows the true P- and S-wave velocity models, respectively. The S-wave velocity is obtained by scaling the P-wave velocity by half. The density is homogeneous and equal to 1 g/cm³; thus, the P- and S-wave impedances as well as density models are not shown here. The P- and S-wave velocity models for migration are shown in Figure 9c and 9d, respectively. Equation 1 is solved to generate traces with two particle-velocity components for elastic LSRTM and the pressure component (the negative of the average of the normal stress components) for acoustic LSRTM. The 258 shots are evenly spaced at 50 m, and 644 receivers are evenly distributed at 20 m intervals on
the surface. The P-wave point source uses a Ricker wavelet with a 7.5 Hz peak frequency, and the total recording time is 5 s.

Acoustic and elastic LSRTM images are displayed in Figure 10. The elastic LSRTM images show better resolution and fewer artifacts. Profiles of the true and migration P-reflectivity images at \( x = 0.80 \text{ km} \) are shown in Figure 11. Although acoustic LSRTM image achieves the same resolution as the P-image of elastic LSRTM, it generates significant wiggle-shape artifacts around the true reflecting interfaces. In addition, elastic LSRTM produces better images of the salt and subsalt structures compared with the acoustic LSRTM image. The magnified views in Figure 12 show that in elastic LSRTM, the images of the salt interface are more continuous and distinct. The magnified views in Figure 13 show that elastic LSRTM improves the subsalt imaging, especially along the steeply dipping events in the S-image.

LSRTM provides more accurate images than acoustic LSRTM because of two fundamental limitations in migrating elastic data with the acoustic-wave equation: the amplitude of the reflections and the geometry of the converted-wave raypaths. Acoustic LSRTM, although kinematically correct, fails to invert for a reflectivity image that best predicts the amplitude of pressure data generated in an elastic medium, as shown in Figure 11. This is because the acoustic-wave equation incorrectly models the P-wave wavefield by ignoring the AVO effect (Virieux and Operto, 2009; Sears et al., 2010). This P-wave amplitude error will generate artifacts in acoustic least-squares migration. This problem can be mitigated by applying specific waveform-inversion data processing designed to account for the amplitude errors introduced by acoustic modeling (Ravaut et al., 2004; Brenders and Pratt, 2007; Virieux and Operto, 2009), or using a crosscorrelation objective function for acoustic least-squares migration (Zhang et al., 2013; Dutta et al., 2014b; Sinha and Schuster, 2015).

Another reason of better imaging is that elastic LSRTM can migrate different wave-mode events, especially the converted waves, into the proper position. For highly dipping events, the PP-reflections may not be recorded due to the limited recording aperture, whereas the PS-reflections, which have smaller reflection angles, are easier to record and use for migration (Stewart et al., 2002, 2003), as shown in Figure 14. In elastic LSRTM, the PS-reflections mainly contribute to construct the S-image, which helps to identify complex structures. However, the elastic LSRTM S-image is noisier than the elastic LSRTM P-image, as shown in Figure 10. This is because the S-image uses both the P- and S-reflections whereas the P-image only uses the P-reflections, according to the scattering radiation pattern shown in Figure 1.

**McElroy crosswell field data**

Elastic LSRTM is now applied to the McElroy crosswell data (Harris et al., 1995; Zhou et al., 1997). The source and receiver wells are 152 m deep and are separated by 56 m. Two hundred and one shots are evenly distributed at a depth interval of 0.76 m from 0 to 152 m in the source well, and the receiver well has 178 receivers placed at a depth interval of 0.76 m between the depths 11.4 and 146 m. The data were recorded with a sampling interval of 0.2 ms for a total recording time of 0.05 s.

A 200–1400 Hz band-pass filter is applied to the field data to filter out the high- and low-frequency noise, and a median filter is applied to the common-shot gathers to filter out the tube waves generated in the source and receiver wells. Figure 15 shows a common-shot gather before and after data processing. The elastic P- and S-wave velocity tomograms (Zhou et al., 1997) shown in Figure 16 are used as the migration velocity models for the elastic LSRTM. The source and receiver wells are located at \( x = 0 \) and 56 m, respectively. The data are resampled at the time interval of 0.01 ms, and the direct P-waves are muted out before migration. The borehole effects (Zhou et al., 1997) are accounted for by adjusting the elastic LSRTM algorithm with the following procedure:

---

**Figure 7.** Migration images of the Marmousi2 model: elastic RTM reflectivity images of (a) \( I_P \) and (b) \( I_S \), elastic LSRTM reflectivity images of (c) \( I_P \) and (d) \( I_S \).
The data contain strong S-wave events, such as SS- and SP-
reflections (Harris et al., 1995; Zhou et al., 1997), and thus,
the P-wave source is no longer suitable. We use an analytical
source (White and Lessenger, 1988; Kurkjian et al., 1992;
Zhou et al., 1997):

\[
S_{xx}(t) = -2\pi a^2 \alpha \frac{\alpha^2}{\beta^2} S(t),
\]

\[
S_{zz}(t) = -2\pi a^2 \alpha \frac{\alpha^2}{\beta^2} S(t) + 4\pi a^2 \alpha \beta S(t),
\]

(15)

Figure 8. Magnified views showing the sand
structure in Figure 7, in which all the images have
been normalized. (a and b) True reflectivity images
used only for comparison, (c and d) elastic RTM
images, and (d and e) elastic LSRTM images.

Figure 9. The SEG/EAGE salt models: (a) true \(V_P\),
(b) true \(V_S\), (c) migration \(V_P\), and (d) migration \(V_S\)
models.
where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are the P- and S-wave velocities, respectively. The factor $2\pi\alpha^2\alpha_T$ can be ignored when doing forward modeling because it merely scales the migration images. A Ricker wavelet with a 1200-Hz peak frequency is used to approximate $S(t)$ in equation 15.

- The pressure field generated in the receiver well can be approximated from the stress components on the well wall by (White and Lessenger, 1988; Zhou et al., 1997)

$$P = K(\sigma_{xx} - \nu \sigma_{zz}), \quad (16)$$

where $K$ is an unknown scaling factor that can be ignored, and $\nu$ is the Poisson’s ratio approximated from the velocity tomograms. The pressure residual is calculated by

$$\Delta d = P - P_{\text{obs}}, \quad (17)$$

where $P_{\text{obs}}$ is the pressure recorded by the hydrophones in the receiver well.

- The back-propagation of the pressure residual uses the adjoint operator in equation 16:

$$\Delta d_{\text{adj}} = \left( \begin{array}{c} \Delta \sigma_{xx} \\ \Delta \sigma_{zz} \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ -\nu \end{array} \right) K(P - P_{\text{obs}}). \quad (18)$$

This equation transforms the pressure residual to a stress residual, and then $g = L^T\Delta d_{\text{adj}}$ is used to calculate the gradients in elastic LSRTM.

The elastic RTM and LSRTM images are shown in Figure 17. The P-image computed by elastic LSRTM has better amplitude balancing and higher resolution compared with the P-image calculated with elastic RTM. Elastic LSRTM also improves the continuity of the reflectors close to the wells. Other structures become more noticeable in the P-image of elastic LSRTM, especially in the red and blue boxes in Figure 17. Magnified views of the red and blue boxes

![Figure 10](https://example.com/seg10.png)

**Figure 10.** Migration images of the SEG/EAGE salt model: (a) acoustic LSRTM image, elastic LSRTM reflectivity images for (b) $I_P$ and (c) $I_S$.

![Figure 11](https://example.com/seg11.png)

**Figure 11.** Profiles from the (a) true reflectivity image for $I_P$, (b) acoustic LSRTM image, and (c) elastic LSRTM reflectivity image for $I_P$ at 0.80 km in the x-direction, in which the amplitudes have been normalized.
are shown in Figure 18. To verify the accuracy of the elastic LSRTM images, the sonic logs are compared with the elastic RTM and LSRTM image reflectivity profiles at the receiver well, as shown in Figure 19. The reflectivity profiles are taken 2 m away from the well at the depth range of the red and blue boxes. Figure 19 shows an acceptable match between the sonic logs and elastic LSRTM image reflectivity profiles, and the elastic LSRTM P-image reveals a more accurate reflectivity profile than that taken from the elastic RTM P-image.

The S-image of elastic LSRTM has no significant improvement, except for a slight amplitude balancing compared with elastic RTM, which is also shown in the reflectivity profiles. We think this is mainly caused by inaccurate estimations of the source radiation patterns and S-wave migration velocity, and by not taking into account attenuation effects in the elastic LSRTM algorithm (Zhou et al.,

Figure 12. Magnified views of the red boxes showing the salt interface in Figure 10.

Figure 13. Magnified views of the blue boxes showing the subsalt structures in Figure 10.

Figure 14. Schematic diagrams of reflection wavepaths from dipping structures for unconverted PP- and converted PS-reflections, in which the reflected S-wave angle \( \phi \) is smaller than the incident P-wave angle \( \theta \).
Figure 15. A raw common-shot gather (a) before and (b) after data processing.

Figure 16. The elastic waveform tomograms for (a) the P- and (b) S-wave velocity distributions.

Figure 17. Migration images from elastic RTM (a) for $V_P$ and (b) for $V_S$, elastic LSRTM (c) for $V_P$ and (d) for $V_S$. 
1997). Also, the P- and S-images suffer from unexpected discontinuity of reflectors and edge effects commonly associated with migrating real crosswell data (Li, 1994; Byun et al., 2002).

**DISCUSSION**

Previous research has shown that least-squares migration can be quite sensitive to velocity errors (Dutta et al., 2014a; Dutta and Schuster, 2014). This is because the model dimension is smaller than the data dimension, and the data can only be fitted when the background velocity allows for the correct positioning of structures in the image (Hou and Symes, 2016). In the context of elastic LSRTM, accurate background P- and S-wave velocities are needed to relocate the P- and S-wave reflection events back to the correct reflecting interfaces.

In the McElroy crosswell data example, the discontinuity of reflectors in the LSRTM P- and S-images might be caused by an inaccurate estimate of the P- and S-wave velocities. Because the scattering radiation pattern for $\delta I_S$ is complex (as shown in Figure 1), the S-image is more sensitive to the velocity errors than the P-image. In addition, the wave-mode crosstalk may degrade the image because the source contains the P- and S-waves, as shown in our source type test. In the crosswell case, the SS reflections are noisy as shown in Figure 15, which hamper the improvement in the S-image. The P-image is improved because $\delta I_P$ is mostly sensitive to the PP-scattering radiation pattern (as shown in Figure 1), and, compared with the S-image, is less sensitive to noisy data and errors in the assumed velocity model and source-radiation patterns. But still, the S-image can be used to complement the P-image for interpretation purposes.

Another disadvantage of elastic LSRTM is that the computational cost per iteration is an order-of-magnitude more expensive than acoustic RTM. This cost increases linearly with the number of least-squares iterations, but it can be reduced by the multisource migra-

Figure 18. Magnified views of (a and b) the red boxes and (c and d) the blue boxes, in Figure 17a and 17c.

Figure 19. Elastic LSRTM reflectivity profiles (solid red lines) and elastic RTM reflectivity profiles (dotted black line) compared with the P- and S-sonic logs (dashed blue lines) in the receiver well. The profiles are extracted from the elastic LSRTM images (shown in Figures 17c and 19d) 2 m away from the well (a and c) at the depth range of the red boxes and (b and d) at the depth range of the blue boxes, in which the amplitudes have been normalized.

CONCLUSION

We presented an elastic LSRTM technique to invert for reflectivity images of P- and S-wave impedances. The proposed formulation can be applied to multicomponent data and can be suitably adjusted to both surface seismic data and crosswell pressure data. It differs from previous formulations of acoustic migration in that elastic LSRTM can handle radiation patterns and migrate events of different wave modes at the same time. Numerical results show that elastic LSRTM can generate images with fewer artifacts, better amplitude balancing, and higher resolution compared with elastic RTM and acoustic LSRTM. Another advantage of elastic LSRTM is that it mitigates the crosstalk problem in elastic RTM. Elastic LSRTM can also improve the imaging of steeply dipping events and generate images with better reflector continuity. Similar to other least-squares migration methods, elastic LSRTM requires an accurate estimation of the P- and S-wave velocity models for migration. Elastic LSRTM also suffers from problems of incorrect estimation of the source radiation patterns.
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APPENDIX A

ADJOINT EQUATION AND GRADIENTS FOR ELASTIC LEAST-SQUARES REVERSE TIME MIGRATION

In matrix-vector notation, equation 1 can be written as (Schuster, 2017)

\[ \mathbf{Sw} = \mathbf{F}, \]  

(A-1)

where

\[ \mathbf{S} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & 0 \\ -\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & -\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & -\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & -\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \]

\[ \mathbf{w} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{u}_x \\ \hat{u}_z \\ \sigma_{xx} \\ \sigma_{zz} \\ \sigma_{xz} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{F} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ S_{xx} \\ S_{zz} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \]  

(A-2)

where \( \mathbf{w} \) represents the state variables and \( \mathbf{S} \) represents the forward modeling operator. The adjoint operator \( \mathbf{S}' \) of \( \mathbf{S} \) is given by

\[ \mathbf{S}' = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \rho & 0 & \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\lambda + 2\mu) & \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \lambda & \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \mu \\ 0 & -\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \lambda & \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\lambda + 2\mu) & \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \mu \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & 0 & -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & 0 & -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} & 0 \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \end{pmatrix}. \]  

(A-3)

The \( L_2 \) misfit function \( \epsilon(\mathbf{m}) \) for a model parameter \( \mathbf{m} \) can be written as

\[ \epsilon(\mathbf{m}) = \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{m}) - \mathbf{d} \right\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{m}) - \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{m}) - \mathbf{d} \rangle, \]  

(A-4)

where \( \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{m}) \) and \( \mathbf{d} \) represent the predicted and recorded data, respectively, and \( \mathbf{m} \) is the predicted model. For a elastic medium, the model parameter \( \mathbf{m} \) can be \( \lambda, \mu, \text{or} \rho \). The gradient of \( \epsilon \) is given by

\[ \frac{\partial \epsilon(\mathbf{m})}{\partial \mathbf{m}} = \left\langle \frac{\partial \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{m})}{\partial \mathbf{m}}, \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{m}) - \mathbf{d} \right\rangle. \]  

(A-5)

Taking the derivative of equation A-1, we get

\[ \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{m})}{\partial \mathbf{m}} \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{m}) + \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{m}) \frac{\partial \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{m})}{\partial \mathbf{m}} = 0, \]  

(A-6)

which can be rearranged to give

\[ \frac{\partial \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{m})}{\partial \mathbf{m}} = -\mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{m}) \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{m})}{\partial \mathbf{m}} \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{m}). \]  

(A-7)

Plugging equation A-7 into equation A-5, we get

\[ \frac{\partial \epsilon(\mathbf{m})}{\partial \mathbf{m}} = -\left\langle \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{m})}{\partial \mathbf{m}} \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{m}), (\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{m})^{-1})^* \mathbf{d} \right\rangle, \]  

(A-8)

where * denotes the adjoint, \( \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{m}) - \mathbf{d} \) is the residual vector. In the context of elastic LSRTM, we denote \( \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{m})^* = (\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{m})^{-1})^* \mathbf{d} \) as the solution of the adjoint equations with the residual seismograms acting as virtual sources

\[ \mathbf{S}' \mathbf{w}^* = \mathbf{d}. \]  

(A-9)

where \( \mathbf{w}^* = (\hat{u}_x, \hat{u}_z, \hat{s}_{xx}, \hat{s}_{zz}, \hat{s}_{xz})^T \) is also known as the adjoint-state variables of \( \mathbf{w} \) as used in equation 5. If we record the vertical- and horizontal-particle-velocity seismograms, the residual vector \( \mathbf{d} \) can be written as \( (\Delta d_x, \Delta d_z, 0, 0, 0)^T \).
For $m = (\lambda, \mu)^T$, the gradient in equation A-8 can be written as

$$
\frac{\partial e}{\partial \lambda} = \left( \begin{array}{c}
\frac{\partial S}{\partial u_x} w_x + \frac{\partial S}{\partial u_z} w_z \\
\frac{\partial S}{\partial \sigma_{xx}} + \frac{\partial S}{\partial \sigma_{zz}}
\end{array} \right).$$

(A-10)

and

$$
\frac{\partial e}{\partial \mu} = -\left( \begin{array}{c}
-\frac{\partial S}{\partial u_x} \frac{\partial u_x}{\partial \sigma_{xx}} + \frac{\partial S}{\partial u_z} \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial \sigma_{xx}} \\
-\frac{\partial S}{\partial \sigma_{xx}} + \frac{\partial S}{\partial \sigma_{zz}}
\end{array} \right) dt.
$$

(A-11)
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