

## 1 Summary

We derive a new generalized imaging condition based on time shifts between source and receiver wavefields. This imaging condition contrasts with other imaging techniques requiring space shifts between the two wavefields. This imaging condition is applicable to both Kirchhoff and wave-equation migrations. The transformation allows us to generate common-image gathers presented as function of either time-shift or pseudo-angle at every location in space. Inaccurate migration velocity is revealed by common-image gathers with non-flat events.

## 2 Introduction

A key challenge for imaging in complex areas is accurate determination of a velocity model that describes with sufficient precision wave propagation in the area under investigation. Migration velocity analysis is based on image accuracy indicators that are optimized when data are correctly imaged. A common procedure for velocity analysis is based on alignment of images created with multi-offset data. An optimal choice of image analysis can be done in the angle domain which is free of some of the complicated artifacts present in offset gathers in complex areas (Stolk and Symes, 2002).

Migration velocity analysis after migration by wavefield extrapolation requires image decomposition function of scattering angles relative to reflector normals. Several methods have been proposed for such decompositions (de Bruin et al., 1990; Prucha et al., 1999; Mosher and Foster, 2000; Rickett and Sava, 2002; Sava and Fomel, 2003; Soubaras, 2003; Biondi and Symes, 2004). These procedures require decomposition of extrapolated wavefields in components that are related to the reflection angle.

A key component of such image decompositions is the imaging condition. A careful implementation of this imaging condition preserves all information necessary to decompose images in their angle-dependent components. The challenge is not only to use these angle-dependent images for velocity or amplitude analysis, but also to construct them cheaply, reliably and with direct access to velocity information.

This paper presents a different form of imaging condition. The key idea of this new imaging condition is to use time-shifts instead of space-shifts between wavefields computed from sources and receivers. This imaging concept is applicable to both Kirchhoff migration and migration by wavefield extrapolation. We present a brief theoretical analysis of this new imaging condition, followed by examples illustrating the main features of this new technique.

## 3 Imaging condition in wave-equation migration

### 3.1 No shift imaging condition

A traditional imaging condition for shot-record migration, also known as  $U\bar{D}$  imaging condition (Claerbout, 1985), consists of time cross-correlation at every image location between the source and

receiver wavefields, followed by image extraction at zero time:

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{m}, t) = \mathbf{u}_s(\mathbf{m}, t) \star \mathbf{u}_r(\mathbf{m}, t) , \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{m}, t = 0) . \quad (2)$$

Here,  $\mathbf{m} = [m_x, m_y, m_z]$  is a vector describing the locations of image points,  $\mathbf{u}_s(\mathbf{m}, t)$  and  $\mathbf{u}_r(\mathbf{m}, t)$  are source and receiver wavefields respectively, and  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{m})$  denotes the migrated image. The symbol  $\star$  denotes cross-correlation in time.

### 3.2 Space-shift imaging condition

Another generalized imaging condition (Sava and Fomel, 2005) estimates image reflectivity using the expressions:

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{h}, t) = \mathbf{u}_s(\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{h}, t) \star \mathbf{u}_r(\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{h}, t) , \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{h}, t = 0) . \quad (4)$$

Here,  $\mathbf{h} = [h_x, h_y, h_z]$  is a vector describing the local source-receiver separation in the image space. Special cases of this imaging condition were presented by (Rickett and Sava, 2002) for horizontal space-shift, and by (Biondi and Symes, 2004) for vertical space-shift. Angle-domain common-image gathers can be obtained by a simple slant-stack operation on migrated images:  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{h}) \implies \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{m}, \tan\theta)$ , where  $\tan\theta$  is the dimensionless slant-stack parameter.

### 3.3 Time-shift imaging condition

Another possible imaging condition involves cross-correlation of the source and receiver wavefields in time, as opposed to space:

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{m}, t, \tau) = \mathbf{u}_s(\mathbf{m}, t - \tau) \star \mathbf{u}_r(\mathbf{m}, t + \tau) , \quad (5)$$


$$\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{m}, \tau) = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{m}, \tau, t = 0) . \quad (6)$$

Here,  $\tau$  is a time shift between the source and receiver wavefields prior to imaging. This imaging condition can be implemented in the Fourier domain using the expression

$$\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{m}, \tau) = \sum_{\omega} \mathbf{U}_s(\mathbf{m}, \omega) \overline{\mathbf{U}_r(\mathbf{m}, \omega)} e^{2i\omega\tau} , \quad (7)$$

which simply involves a phase-shift applied to the wavefields prior to summation over frequency  $\omega$  for imaging at zero time. The over-line represents a complex conjugate applied on the receiver wavefield  $\mathbf{U}_r$  in the Fourier domain. Pseudo angle-domain common-image gathers can be obtained by a simple slant-stack operation on migrated images:  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{m}, \tau) \implies \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{m}, \nu)$ , where  $\nu$  is the slant-stack parameter with velocity units.

Figure 1: An image is formed when the Kirchoff stacking curve (dashed line) touches the true reflection response. Left: the case of under-migration; right: over-migration.



## 4 Moveout analysis

We can use the Kirchoff formulation to analyze the moveout behavior for time-shift imaging condition in the simplest case of a flat reflector in a constant-velocity medium. Let  $s_0$  and  $z_0$  represent the

true slowness and reflector depth, and  $s$  and  $z$  stand for the corresponding quantities used in migration. An image is formed when the Kirchoff stacking curve  $t(\hat{h}) = 2s\sqrt{z^2 + \hat{h}^2} + 2\tau$  touches the true reflection response  $t_0(\hat{h}) = 2s_0\sqrt{z_0^2 + \hat{h}^2}$  (Figure 1). Eliminating  $\hat{h}$  from the conditions  $t(\hat{h}) = t_0(\hat{h})$  and  $t'(\hat{h}) = t_0'(\hat{h})$ , we find that the reflection response maps into two images in the  $\{z, \tau\}$  space. The first image is a straight line

$$z(\tau) = \frac{z_0 s_0 + \tau}{s}, \quad (8)$$

and the second image is a segment of the second-order curve

$$z(\tau) = \sqrt{z_0^2 + \frac{\tau^2}{s^2 - s_0^2}}. \quad (9)$$

Applying a slant-stack transformation with  $z = z_1 + \nu \tau$  turns line (8) into a point  $\{z_0 s_0/s, 1/s\}$  in the  $\{z_1, \nu\}$  space, while curve (9) turns into the curve

$$z_1(\nu) = z_0 \sqrt{1 + \nu^2 (s_0^2 - s^2)}. \quad (10)$$

The curvature of the  $z_1(\nu)$  curve at  $\nu = 0$  is a clear indicator of the migration velocity errors.

By contrast, the moveout shape  $z(h)$  appearing in wave-equation migration with the lateral-shift imaging condition is (Bartana et al., 2005)

$$z(h) = s_0 \sqrt{\frac{z_0^2}{s^2} + \frac{h^2}{s^2 - s_0^2}}. \quad (11)$$

After the slant transformation  $z = z_1 + h \tan \theta$ , the moveout curve (11) turns into the curve

$$z_1(\theta) = \frac{z_0}{s} \sqrt{s_0^2 + \tan^2 \theta (s_0^2 - s^2)}, \quad (12)$$

which is applicable for velocity analysis. Curves of shape (10) and (12) are plotted on top of the experimental moveouts in Figures 4 and 5, respectively.

Figure 2: Common-image gathers for time-shift imaging.





Figure 3: Common-image gathers for space-shift imaging.



## 5 Example

We exemplify the method with a simple flat reflector in a constant velocity medium. The synthetic data are imaged using shot-record wavefield extrapolation migration. Figures 2 and 3 show common-offset gathers for three different migration slownesses  $s$ , one of which is equal to the modeling slowness  $s_0$ . For the time-offset CIGs imaged with correct slowness, Figure 2, the energy is distributed along a line with a slope equal to the local velocity at the reflector position, but it spreads around this region when the slowness is wrong. Slant-stacking produces the images in Figure 4. For the space-shift CIGs imaged with correct slowness, Figure 3, the energy is focused at zero offset, but it spreads in a region of offsets when the slowness is wrong. Slant-stacking produces the images in Figure 5.

Figure 4: Common-image gathers after slant-stack in time-offset.  $\nu$  is the slant-stack parameter in the  $\{\mathbf{m}, \tau\}$  space. The vertical line indicates the migration velocity.





Figure 5: Common-image gathers after slant-stack in space-offset.  $\tan\theta$  is the slant-stack parameter in the  $\{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{h}\}$  space.



## 6 Conclusions

We introduce a new imaging condition based on time-shifts between source and receiver wavefields. This method is applicable to both Kirchhoff and wave-equation migration and produces common-image gathers that indicate velocity errors. In wave-equation imaging, time-shift imaging is more efficient than space-shift imaging, since it only involves a phase shift applied prior to the usual imaging cross-correlation. More research is needed to investigate how this new information can be used for velocity and amplitude analysis.

## 7 REFERENCES

- Bartana, A., Kosloff, D., and Ravve, I., 2005, On angle-domain common-image gathers by wavefield continuation methods: *Geophysics*, submitted.
- Biondi, B., and Symes, W. W., 2004, Angle-domain common-image gathers for migration velocity analysis by wavefield-continuation imaging: *Geophysics*, **69**, 1283–1298.
- de Bruin, C. G. M., Wapenaar, C. P. A., and Berkhout, A. J., 1990, Angle-dependent reflectivity by means of prestack migration: *Geophysics*, **55**, 1223–1234.
- Claerbout, J. F., 1985, *Imaging the Earth's Interior*: Blackwell Scientific Publications.
- Mosher, C., and Foster, D., 2000, Common angle imaging conditions for prestack depth migration in 70th Ann. Internat. Mtg. Soc. of Expl. Geophys., 830–833.
- Prucha, M., Biondi, B., and Symes, W., 1999, Angle-domain common image gathers by wave-equation migration in 69th Ann. Internat. Mtg. Soc. of Expl. Geophys., 824–827.
- Rickett, J. E., and Sava, P. C., 2002, Offset and angle-domain common image-point gathers for shot-profile migration: *Geophysics*, **67**, 883–889.
- Sava, P., and Fomel, S., 2005, Coordinate-independent angle-gathers for wave equation migration in 75th Ann. Internat. Mtg. Soc. of Expl. Geophys.
- Sava, P. C., and Fomel, S., 2003, Angle-domain common-image gathers by wavefield continuation methods: *Geophysics*, **68**, 1065–1074.
- Soubaras, R., 2003, Angle gathers for shot-record migration by local harmonic decomposition in 73rd Ann. Internat. Mtg. Soc. of Expl. Geophys., 889–892.
- Stolk, C., and Symes, W., 2002, Artifacts in Kirchhoff common image gathers in 72nd Ann. Internat. Mtg. Soc. of Expl. Geophys., 1129–1132.