

Lessons in Spatial Sampling

Or ... "Does Anybody Know the Shape of a Wavefield?"

Norm Cooper - Mustagh Resources Ltd., Calgary, Canada

In a homogeneous, isotropic, infinite half space (remember those regimes from Geophysics 101?) a propagating wavefield from a simple impulsive source will be spherical. If we introduce velocity gradients or layers, the wavefield becomes elliptical. Further perturbations of the subsurface create additional complexities in the shape of a wavefield. Our job as exploration geophysicists is to observe those complexities when and where portions of the wavefield return to the earth's surface. From these observations we attempt to infer what subsurface geologic features may exist that caused the irregularities. In a realistic setting, this is a formidable task.





The topic of spatial sampling addresses the requirements for discretely sampling a wavefield in order to preserve sufficient information to resolve features of importance to us. This means we must sample our data appropriately, not just in the common source domain, but also in the receiver, offset and CDP domains.

Note in figure 2 that a 2D seismic line recorded with 20-meter group intervals does not necessarily result in CDP's with 20 meter sampling of offset. Noise not properly sampled will not behave the way we might think. If 2D programs present such problems, imagine the complexity due to irregular offset sampling in 3D programs.



Spatial resolution is integrally tied to temporal (or vertical) resolution. Figure 3 demonstrates this concept. The left column of figures represents data sampled at just 20 Hz for three different spatial sample intervals. Sampling at 10 m and 20 m intervals provides adequate imaging, but the 40 m version is aliased (note the "checkerboard" pattern and the ambiguity as to dip direction). The right column represents data sampled at 40 Hz for the same spatial sample intervals. Note that aliasing now begins at 20 m sampling and the 40 m version is 100 percent aliased (dips now appear flat).

Events that may be appropriately sampled in space for one bandwidth of data may not be sufficiently sampled in space for higher frequencies. Required spatial sampling is determined by wavefield complexity as well as expected imaging bandwidth. Both parameters must be carefully and realistically considered.





What about spatial prediction filters and interpolations? Can we reconstruct or simulate smaller spatial samples by techniques such as mid-point scatter and re-binning in 3-D's or by using FX Prediction filters? The answer is definitely yes ... or no ... depending on a variety of factors. Mother nature allows us to cheat under favorable circumstances, but penalizes us heavily if we are reckless about our application of such methods.

Our final processed image quality depends on the statistical significance of our patterns of measurement. Can't we just hit a zoom/sharpen button on a computer console and have our images instantly enhanced . . . just like they do in the movies?

Maybe.

If you don't understand the concept of aliasing, you should probably attend this tutorial. If you *think* you do understand it, you should definitely attend !!



Lessons in Spatial Sampling

Or ... Does Anybody Know the Shape of a Wavefield ??

Norm Cooper (Mustagh Resources)







































































































































	Full I	Mega	aBin -	- 2 x	1 wi	ith ½	offse	et	
•	•	•	•	-	•	•	•	•	1 .
1		•	•	1	•	1	•	1	5
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
1	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	
:	:	:	•	1	•	1	•	1	
· .	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
1	1			1	1		1	1	
1	•	:	•	1	•	1	1	1	
-		-	1	-	1	1	-	-	
	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	

	Half	Mega	aBin	- 2 x	t 1 di	agon	alized	1	
	:	1	1	1	:	-	:	1	an an E
:	•	:	÷		÷	-	÷		
:	-	Ē	•		:	÷	-		
:	1	÷	1	÷	1	:	•	÷	
1	:	÷	:	÷	:	÷	:	÷	
•		:		•	:	:	:	:	
	:		÷	•	:	1	:	-	
:	:	-	:		:	:	:		



	Orthogonal -4×3 with offset							
^	•	^	•	•	•			
1		1	1	1	<u>.</u>	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
• • • • •	· • • • •	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	-	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	• • • • •	• 1		
•	•	•	•	•	•			
·• • • •			· • • •	· • • • •	• • • •			
		2	-	2	- 2			
				•				
· · • ·		.		^	•			
^	•	•	•	^	^	1		
	•	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	•	<u> </u>			







Full WaveField	(0-1500 m) Fold = 494
* * * * * * * * * * *	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Fu	11 Me	egaB	in ((0-15	00 m) Fo	ld =	240-2	250
-	-		-		-	-	-	-	•
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
÷	÷	÷	÷	•	÷	÷	-	÷	+
-	1		-	:	-	-		-	
-	÷		-		-	+	-	-	
÷	:	÷	1	•	:	÷	1	1	-
1	-	-		-	-	-			-
-	-		+	-	-	-	-	-	+
÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷
	:	:		1	1	1	1		



Ha	lf M	egaB	sin ((0-1500 m) Fold = 120-126					
	ė		i				ė		
	i		i		ė		ė		ė
	ė		ė		ė		į.		
	i		i		i		i		
	ė		i		i		i		
Ŕ	ė		ė		ė		i		
					-		-		 /



Sta	ck Array 2D	(0-1500 m) Fold = 75	
+ + + +	* * * * * * * * *		





























































































Conclusions

Preserving details of reflected wavefield

- > Source, Receiver and CDP sampling
 - Sparse approximations
 - Spatial Anti-Alias filtering
 - Line or Grid regularity
- Interpolation (cheating Mother Nature)



Acknowledgements

Tesseral

Petro Canada

Rozsa Petroleum

Sensor Geophysical Ltd.

