Multiples: signal or noise?

Journal:	*Geophysics*
Manuscript ID:	GEO-2014-0486.R1
Manuscript Type:	Technical Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Weglein, Arthur; University of Houston, Physics;
Keywords:	multiples, noise, processing, imaging
Area of Expertise:	Tutorials and Expository Discussions, Seismic Migration
Note: The following files were submitted by the author for peer review, but cannot be converted to PDF. You must view these files (e.g. movies) online.	
Figures-for-Geophysics.zip	

Multiples: signal or noise?

Arthur B. Weglein

M-OSRP/Physics Dept./University of Houston

March 13, 2015

Abstract

In this paper, we examine the topic of whether multiples are signal or noise. A seismic event is considered 'signal' if it intrinsically useful for the purposes of petroleum exploration. Since migration and migration-inversion are the methods used to extract subsurface information from seismic reflection data (events), we review the different wave propagation and imaging condition reside ingredients that behind our migration methods. That examination identifies a migration algorithm for locating and delineating targets in a finite volume with two way propagating waves and with the most advanced and physically meaningful and amplitude interpretable of the various imaging condition.

That migration algorithm allows an unequivocal response to the question at whether multiples are signal or noise. It is obvious that only primaries contribute to imaging. For an accurate discontinuous velocity multiples don't contribute to imaging, and for a continuous velocity, they will cause false images. However, we also show that when you have unrecorded primaries that multiples can be useful and

can provide an approximate image corresponding to the migration of the missing primary. To perform the latter process requires a velocity model, and all velocity analysis methods (e.g., tomography, CIG flatness, and FWI) assume that multiples have been removed.

Migration and migration velocity analysis require primaries, and only primaries are migrated. Multiples can be useful to provide the approximate image due to an unrecorded primary, but multiples need to be removed for velocity analysis and as events they are never migrated, that is they are not moved from their location in time to where they belong as a structure map in space.

Introduction

To begin, "signal" within the context of exploration seismology, and for the purpose of this paper, refers to the **events** in seismic recorded data used for extracting subsurface information. Migration and migration-inversion are the methods used to determine subsurface information from recorded seismic data. Methods that employ the wave equation for migration have two ingredients: (1) a wave propagation concept and (2) an imaging condition. Claerbout (1971) pioneered and developed three imaging conditions for seismic migration. He combined these imaging conditions with one-way wave propagation concepts to determine structure at depth. Claerbout's three landmark imaging conditions are: (1) the exploding reflector model, (2) the space and time coincidence of up and down waves, and (3) the predicted coincident source and receiver experiment at depth, at time equals zero. The third imaging condition stands alone for clarity and definitive-

ness and in its potential to be extended (by Stolt and his colleagues) for detailed angle dependent amplitude analysis at the target and for specular and non-specular reflection. The third imaging condition predicts an actual seismic experiment at depth, and that predicted experiment consists of all the events that experiment would record, if you had a source and receiver at that subsurface location. That experiment would have its own recorded events, the primaries and multiples for that predicted experiment. Stolt and his colleagues (Clayton and Stolt, 1981; Stolt and Weglein, 1985; Stolt and Benson, 1986; Weglein and Stolt, 1999; Stolt and Weglein, 2012) then provided the extension, for one way waves, of the Claerbout source and receiver experiment imaging condition (Imaging condition III) to allow for non coincident source and receiver at time equals zero, to realize both structural and inversion objectives. Due to causality, the offset dependence, at time equals zero, is highly localized about zero offset. The character of that singular function, sharply peaked in offset, is smooth in the Fourier conjugate space of offset wave-number, where the extraction of angle dependent plane wave reflection information naturally occurs. The latter extension and generalization produced migration-inversion (Stolt and Weglein, 1985), or first determining where anything changed (migration) followed by what specifically changed (inversion) at the image location. Recently, several papers by Weglein and his colleagues (Weglein et al., 2011a,b; Liu and Weglein, 2014) provided the next step in the evolution of migration based on the Claerbout predicted source and receiver experiment imaging condition (Imaging condition III), extending the prediction of the source and receiver experiment in a volume within which there are two way propagating waves. The latter

method of imaging based on Imaging condition III for a medium with two way propagating waves, plays a central role in the analysis of this paper. The predicted experiment, in the volume is realized by calling upon Green's theorem and a Green's function that along with its normal derivative vanishes on the lower portion of the closed surface.

All current RTM methods, for two way waves, are extensions and/or variants of the second of Claerbout's imaging conditions, and do not correspond to Claerbout's imaging condition III, a source and receiver experiment at depth.

Migration of two-way propagating waves

One doesn't have to look very far to find an example of the need for a predicted experiment at depth at points in a volume where there is two way wave propagation. Imaging from above or below a single horizontal reflector requires that two way wave propagation and Claerbout's predicted experiment imaging condition. Predicting a source and receiver experiment to locate and to determine the reflection coefficient from above, and, separately, from below, a single reflector requires predicting a source and receiver experiment inside a volume with two way propagating waves, two way wave migration, since the reflection data is upgoing (to a source and receiver experiment located) above the reflector and is downgoing (to that experiment when the source and receiver are located) below the reflector. Of course, the addition of, for example, multiples and/or diving waves also represent examples of two way wave propagation in the region where you want to

predict the seismic experiment at depth.

As we mentioned, migration methods that employ the wave equation have two ingredients: (1) a wave propagation or prediction model and (2) an imaging condition.

For the purposes of this discussion, we are going to adopt the Claerbout predicted coincident source and receiver experiment at time equals zero imaging condition for its peerless clarity, generality and quantitative information value. In the next section, we describe the evolution of the prediction of the source and receiver experiment component of Claerbout imaging condition III.

To predict the source and receiver experiment at depth

The elastic well established mathematical physics foundation for predicting a wavefield inside a volume from (measured) values on the surface surrounding the volume was provided by Green (1828) as variants of what we now call Green's theorem. In the next several sections, we describe the evolution and application of Green's theorem for predicting the source and receiver experiment at depth, since that is an essential step in tracing the realization and application of Claerbout's imaging condition III. In that evolution, we will begin with: (1) the original infinite hemisphere volume model, then (2) the reasoning, need for, and description of the finite volume model for one way waves, and finally, (3) the need for and description of the finite volume model prediction of the source and receiver experiment for two way waves.

The material presented below on the evolution of the predicted source and receiver experiment has been published previously in the cited references. We cite and follow those references, but include that in this paper, for: (1) ease of the references, and (2) to make this paper self contained, and (3) because it plays such a critical role in Claerbout imaging III, which in turn is essential to understand the new message that this paper is communicating.

The infinite hemispherical migration model

The earliest wave equation migration pioneers considered the subsurface volume where the source and receiver experiment would be predicted as an infinite hemispherical half space with known mechanical properties, whose upper plane surface corresponded to the measurement surface, as in, *e.g.*, Schneider (1978) and Stolt (1978). See Figure 1.

Those two papers each made a tremendous conceptual and practical contribution to seismic imaging and exploration seismology. However, there are several problems with the infinite hemispherical migration model. That model assumes: (1) that all subsurface properties beneath the measurement surface (MS) are known, and (2) that an anticausal Green's function (*e.g.*, Schneider (1978)), with a Dirichlet boundary condition on the measurement surface, would allow measurements (MS) of the wavefield, P, on the upper plane surface of the hemisphere to determine the value of P within the hemispherical volume, V. The first assumption leads to the contradiction that we have not allowed for anything that is unknown to be determined

in our model, since everything within the closed and infinite hemisphere is assumed to be known. Within the infinite hemispherical model there is nothing and/or nowhere below the measurement surface where an unknown scattering point or reflection surface can serve to produce reflection data whose generating reflectors are initially unknown and being sought by the migration process.

The second assumption, in early infinite hemispherical wave equation migration, assumes that Green's theorem with wavefield measurements on the upper plane surface and using an anticausal Green's function satisfying a Dirichlet boundary condition can determine the wavefield within V. That conclusion assumes that the contribution from the lower hemispherical surface of S vanishes as the radius of the hemisphere goes to infinity. That is not the case, as we explicitly demonstrate below. To examine the various large radius hemispherical surface contributions to Green's theorem wave prediction in a volume, it is instructive to review the relationship between Green's theorem and the Lippmann-Schwinger scattering equation.

Green's theorem review

We begin with a space and time domain Green's theorem. Consider two wavefields P and G_0 that satisfy

$$(\nabla^2 - \frac{1}{c^2}\partial_t^2)P(\mathbf{r},t) \quad = \quad \rho(\mathbf{r},t) \tag{1}$$

and

$$(\nabla^2 - \frac{1}{c^2}\partial_t^2)G_0(\mathbf{r}, t, \mathbf{r}', t') \quad = \quad \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')\delta(t - t'), \tag{2}$$

where we assume 3D wave propagation and the wavefield velocity c is a constant. ρ is a general source, *i.e.*, it represents both active sources (air guns, dynamite, vibrator trucks) and passive sources (heterogeneities in the earth). The causal solution to equation 1 can be written as

$$P(\mathbf{r}, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{t^+} dt' \int_{\infty} d\mathbf{r}' \rho(\mathbf{r}', t') G_0^+(\mathbf{r}, t, \mathbf{r}', t'), \tag{3}$$

where G_0^+ is the causal whole space solution to equation 2 and $t^+ = t + \epsilon$ where ϵ is a small positive quantity. The integral from t^+ to ∞ is zero due to the causality of G_0^+ (please see Morse and Feshbach, 1981, page 836). Equation 3 represents the linear superposition of causal solutions G_0^+ with weights $\rho(\mathbf{r}', t')$ summing to produce the physical causal wavefield solution to equation 1. Equation 3 is called the scattering equation and represents an all space and all time causal solution for $P(\mathbf{r}, t)$. It explicitly includes all sources and produces the field at all points of space and time. No additional boundary or initial conditions are required in equation 3.

Now consider the integral

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{t^+} dt' \int_V d\mathbf{r}' (P\nabla'^2 G_0 - G_0 \nabla'^2 P) \\ &= \int_0^{t^+} dt' \int_V d\mathbf{r}' \nabla' \cdot (P\nabla' G_0 - G_0 \nabla' P), \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

and we rewrite equation 4 using Green's theorem

$$\int_0^{t^+} dt' \int_V d\mathbf{r}' \nabla' \cdot (P\nabla' G_0 - G_0 \nabla' P)$$
$$= \int_0^{t^+} dt' \int_S dS' \hat{n} \cdot (P\nabla' G_0 - G_0 \nabla' P). \quad (5)$$

This is essentially an identity, within the assumptions on functions and surfaces, needed to derive Green's theorem. Now choose $P = P(\mathbf{r}', t')$ and $G_0 = G_0(\mathbf{r}, t, \mathbf{r}', t')$ from equations 1 and 2. Then replace $\nabla'^2 P$ and $\nabla'^2 G_0$ from the differential equations 1 and 2.

$$\nabla'^2 G_0 = \frac{1}{c^2}\partial_t'^2 G_0 + \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')\delta(t - t') \quad (6)$$
$$\nabla'^2 P = \frac{1}{c^2}\partial_t'^2 P + \rho(\mathbf{r}', t'), \quad (7)$$

and assume that the output variables $(\mathbf{r}, t)$ are in the intervals of integration: $\mathbf{r}$ in V, $t > 0$. The left hand side of equation 4 becomes:

$$\int_0^{t^+} dt' \int_V d\mathbf{r}' \frac{1}{c^2}(P\partial_{t'}^2 G_0 - G_0 \partial_{t'}^2 P) + P(\mathbf{r}, t)$$
$$- \int_0^{t^+} dt' \int_V d\mathbf{r}' \rho(\mathbf{r}', t') G_0(\mathbf{r}, t, \mathbf{r}', t'). \quad (8)$$

The expression inside the first set of parentheses is a perfect derivative

$\partial_{t'}(P\partial_{t'}G_0 - G_0\partial_{t'}P)$ integrated over t'. The result is (for $\mathbf{r}$ in V and $t > 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathbf{r},t) = &\int_V d\mathbf{r}' \int_0^{t^+} dt' \rho(\mathbf{r}',t') G_0(\mathbf{r},t,\mathbf{r}',t') \\ &- \frac{1}{c^2}\Big|_{t'=0}^{t^+} \int_V d\mathbf{r}' [P\partial_{t'}G_0 - G_0\partial_{t'}P] \\ &+ \int_0^{t^+} dt' \int_S dS' \hat{n} \cdot (P\nabla' G_0 - G_0 \nabla' P). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

We assumed differential equations 6 and 7 in deriving equation 9 and G_0 can be any solution of equation 6 in the space and time integrals in equation 4, causal, anticausal, or neither. Each term on the right hand side of equation 9 will differ with different choices of G_0, but the sum of the three terms will always be the same, $P(\mathbf{r},t)$.

If we now choose G_0 to be causal ($= G_0^+$) in equation 9, then in the second term on the right hand side the upper limit gives zero because G_0^+ and $\partial_{t'}G_0^+$ are zero at $t' = t^+$. The causality of G_0^+ and $\partial_{t'}G_0^+$ causes only the lower limit $t' = 0$ to contribute in

$$-\frac{1}{c^2}\Big|_{t'=0}^{t^+} \int_V d\mathbf{r}' [P\partial_{t'}G_0^+ - G_0^+\partial_{t'}P]. \tag{10}$$

If we let the space and time limits in equation 9 both become unbounded, *i.e.*, $V \to \infty$ and the t' interval becomes $[-\infty, t^+]$, and choose $G_0 = G_0^+$, the whole space causal Green's function, then by comparing equations 3 and 9 we see that for $\mathbf{r}$ in V and $t > 0$ that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{t^+} dt' \int_S dS' \hat{n} \cdot (P \nabla' G_0^+ - G_0^+ \nabla' P)$$
$$- \frac{1}{c^2} \Big|_{-\infty}^{t^+} \int_\infty d\mathbf{r}' [P \partial_{t'} G_0^+ - G_0^+ \partial_{t'} P] = 0. \quad (11)$$

$V = \infty$ means a volume that spans all space, and $\infty - V$ means all points in ∞ that are outside the volume V.

The solution for $P(\mathbf{r}, t)$ in equation 3 expresses the fact that if all of the factors that both create the wavefield (active sources) and that subsequently influence the wavefield (passive sources, *e.g.*, heterogeneities in the medium) are explicitly included in the solution as in equation 9, then the causal solution is provided explicitly and linearly in terms of those sources, as a weighted sum of causal solutions, and no surface, boundary or initial conditions are necessary or required.

If all sources for all space and all time are explicitly included as in equation 3, then there is no need for boundary or initial conditions to produce the physical/causal solution derived from a linear superposition of elementary causal solutions.

In the $(\mathbf{r}, \omega)$ domain equations 1 and 2 become

$$(\nabla^2 + k^2) P(\mathbf{r}, \omega) = \rho(\mathbf{r}, \omega) \quad (12)$$
$$(\nabla^2 + k^2) G_0(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega) = \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'), \quad (13)$$

where $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(\mathbf{r}, t) e^{i\omega t} dt = P(\mathbf{r}, \omega)$ and $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_0(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', t) e^{i\omega t} dt = G_0(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega)$, t' is chosen to be zero in equation 2. The causal all space and temporal

frequency solution analogous to equation 3 is

$$P(\mathbf{r},\omega) = \int_{\infty} d\mathbf{r}' \rho(\mathbf{r}',\omega) G_0^+(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega), \tag{14}$$

and Green's second identity is

$$\int_V d\mathbf{r}' (P\nabla'^2 G_0 - G_0 \nabla'^2 P) = \oint_S dS'\, \hat{n} \cdot (P\nabla' G_0 - G_0 \nabla' P). \tag{15}$$

Substituting $\nabla^2 G_0 = -k^2 G_0 + \delta$ and $\nabla^2 P = -k^2 P + \rho$ in Green's theorem where $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(\mathbf{r},t) e^{i\omega t} dt = P(\mathbf{r},\omega)$ we find

$$\left.\begin{matrix} P(\vec{r},\omega) \\ {\scriptstyle \vec{r}\, in\, V} \\ \\ 0 \\ {\scriptstyle \vec{r}\, out\, V} \end{matrix}\right\} = \int_V d\mathbf{r}' P(\mathbf{r}',\omega)\delta(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')$$
$$= \int_V \rho(\vec{r}',\omega) G_0(\vec{r},\vec{r}',\omega)\, d\vec{r}' + \oint_S (P\nabla' G_0 - G_0 \nabla' P)\cdot \hat{n}\, dS. \tag{16}$$

There are no initial conditions (temporal boundary conditions), since in $\mathbf{r},\omega$ we have already explicitly included all time in Fourier transforming from t to ω. The contributions from sources for all times are explicitly included in the $(\vec{r},\omega)$ formulation of Green's Theorem, equation 16. In $\mathbf{r},\omega$ the only issue is whether sources are inside or outside V. The Lippmann-Schwinger equation (14) provides the causal physical solution for P for all $\mathbf{r}$ due to the sources in all space. Equation 14 is the $\mathbf{r},\omega$ version of equation 3 and must choose $G_0 = G_0^+$ (causal) to have P as the physical solution built

from the superposition (and linearity of weighted elementary causal solution, $G_0^+(\vec{r},\vec{r}',\omega)$). In contrast, equation 16 (as in equation 9) will produce the physical solution, P, with any solution for G_0 that satisfies equation 13.

Equation 14 can be written as:

$$\int_V \rho G_0^+ + \int_{\infty - V} \rho G_0^+. \tag{17}$$

For $\mathbf{r}$ in V, the second term on the right hand side of equation 16 (with choosing $G_0 = G_0^+$ in equation 16) equals the second term in equation 17, *i.e.*,

$$\int_{\infty - V} d\mathbf{r}' \rho G_0^+ = \oint_S dS' \hat{n} \cdot (P \nabla' G_0^+ - G_0^+ \nabla' P). \tag{18}$$

Thus, the first term in equation 17 gives contribution to P, for $\mathbf{r}$ in V due to sources in V, and the second term in equation 17 gives contribution to P, for $\mathbf{r}$ in V due to sources not in V. With $G_0 = G_0^+$

$$\oint_S dS' \hat{n} \cdot (P \nabla' G_0^+ - G_0^+ \nabla' P), \tag{19}$$

provides the contribution to the field, P, inside V due to sources outside the volume V.

What about the large $|\mathbf{r}|$ contribution of the surface integral to the field inside the volume? We use Green's theorem to predict that the contribution to the physical/causal solution P in V from the surface integral in Green's

theorem, in general, and also

$$\oint_S \{P\frac{\partial G_0^+}{\partial n} - G_0^+\frac{\partial P}{\partial n}\}dS, \tag{20}$$

vanishes as $|\mathbf{r}| \to \infty$ and in contrast the contribution to P in V from

$$\oint_S \{P\frac{\partial G_0^-}{\partial n} - G_0^-\frac{\partial P}{\partial n}\}dS, \tag{21}$$

does not vanish as $|\mathbf{r}| \to \infty$.

We begin with equation 16

$$\left.\begin{matrix} P(\vec{r},\omega) \\ \vec{r}\, in\, V \\ \\ 0 \\ \vec{r}\, out\, V \end{matrix}\right\} = \int_V d\mathbf{r}'\rho(\mathbf{r}',\omega)G_0^{\pm}(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega) + \oint_S dS'\{P\frac{\partial G_0^{\pm}}{\partial n} - G_0^{\pm}\frac{\partial P}{\partial n}\} \tag{22}$$

with G_0 either causal G_0^+ or anticausal G_0^-. Taking the limit $|\mathbf{r}| \to \infty$, then for $G_0 = G_0^+$ in 22, the contribution from the second term on the right hand side of equation 22 to P in V must go to zero, following a comparison with

$$P(\mathbf{r},\omega) = \int_\infty d\mathbf{r}'\rho(\mathbf{r}',\omega)G_0^+(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega), \tag{23}$$

(the Lippmann-Schwinger equation). However, with $G_0 = G_0^-$, and as $|\mathbf{r}| \to$

∞,

$$\oint_{S\to\infty} dS'\{P\frac{\partial G_0^-}{\partial n} - G_0^-\frac{\partial P}{\partial n}\} + \int_{V\to\infty} d\mathbf{r}'\rho(\mathbf{r}',\omega)G_0^-(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega)$$
$$= \int_{V\to\infty} d\mathbf{r}'\rho(\mathbf{r}',\omega)G_0^+(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega) + 0, \tag{24}$$

so

$$\oint_{S\to\infty} \{P\frac{\partial G_0^-}{\partial n} - G_0^-\frac{\partial P}{\partial n}\}dS$$
$$= \int_{\infty} [G_0^+(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega) - G_0^-(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega)]\rho(\mathbf{r}',\omega)d\mathbf{r}' \neq 0 \tag{25}$$

for all $\vec{r}$. Hence, the large distance surface contribution to the physical field, P, within V with the surface values of the physical field P and $\partial P/\partial n$ and an anticausal Green's function G_0^- will not vanish as $|\mathbf{r}| \to \infty$. As we mentioned earlier, this will be chosen to be one of the two problems with the infinite hemisphere model of seismic migration.

Although

$$P(\mathbf{r},\omega) = \int_{\infty} d\mathbf{r}'\rho(\mathbf{r}',\omega)G_0^-(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}',\omega), \tag{26}$$

would be a solution to equations 12 for all $\mathbf{r}$, it would not be the causal/physical solution to equations 12. And hence, in summary the contribution to the causal/physical solution for $P(\mathbf{r},\omega)$ for $\mathbf{r}$ in V from

$$\int_S dS' \left(P\frac{dG_0^+}{dn} - G_0^+\frac{dP}{dn}\right), \tag{27}$$

goes to zero as $|R| \rightarrow \infty$ where P and dP/dn corresponds to physical/causal boundary values of P and dP/dn, respectively. Physical measurements of P and dP/dn on S are always causal/physical values. The integral

$$\int_S dS' \left(P \frac{dG_0^-}{dn} - G_0^- \frac{dP}{dn} \right), \tag{28}$$

does not go to zero for anti-causal, G_0^-, and causal/physical P and dP/dn. The latter fact bumps up against a key assumption in the infinite hemisphere models of migration. That combined with the fact the infinite hemisphere model assumes the entire subsurface, down to "infinite" depth is known, suggests the need for a different model. That model is the finite volume model (see, e.g., Weglein et al., 2011a,b).

Finite volume model for migration

The finite model for migration assumes that we know or can adequately estimate earth medium properties (e.g., velocity) down to the reflector we seek to image. The finite volume model assumes that beneath the sought after reflector the medium properties are, and will remain, unknown. The "finite volume model" corresponds to the volume within which we assume the earth properties are known and within which we predict the wavefield from surface measurements. We have addressed the two issues of the infinite hemisphere model, *i.e.*, (1) the assumption we know the subsurface to all depths and (2) the contribution from the lower surface of the closed surface (as $|\mathbf{r}| \rightarrow \infty$) to the surface integral with an anticausal Green's function has

no contribution to the field being predicted in the volume.

The finite volume model removes both of the problematic assumptions behind the infinite hemisphere model. However, we are now dealing with a finite volume V, and with a surface S, consisting of upper surface S_U, lower surface S_L and walls, S_W (Figure 2). We only have measurements on S_U. In the following sections on: (1) Green's theorem for one-way propagation; and (2) Green's theorem for two-way propagation we show how the choice of Green's function allows the finite volume migration model to be realized. The construction of the Green's function that can accommodate two-way propagation in V, from contributions only on S_U, is a new contribution (Weglein et al., 2011a,b) that allows Claerbout Imaging III to be realized in a volume with two-way propagating waves. That places RTM on a firm wave theoretical Green's theorem basis, for the first time, with algorithmic consequence and with a clear mathematical physics understanding of the amplitude of the RTM image. The new Green's function is neither causal, anticausal, nor a combination of causal and/or anticausal Green's functions. In the important paper by Amundsen (1994), a finite volume model for wavefield prediction is developed which requires knowing (*i.e.*, predicting through solving an integral equation) for the wavefield at the lower surface. In parts I and II we show that for one and two-way propagation, respectively, that with a proper and distinct choice of Green's function, in each case, that absolutely no wavefield measurement information on the lower surface is required or needs to be estimated/predicted. Below, we review how to choose the Green's functions that allow for two-way propagation (for RTM application) without the need for measurements on the lower boundary of

the closed surface in Green's theorem.

Finite volume model for migration (Claerbout Imaging Condition III): Green's theorem for predicting the source and receiver experiment for one way waves

Consider a 1D upgoing plane wavefield $P = Re^{-ikz}$ propagating upward through the 1D homogeneous volume without sources between $z = a$ and $z = b$ (Figure 3). The wave P inside V can be predicted from

$$P(z,\omega) \;=\; \Big|_{z'=a}^{b} \{P(z',\omega)\;\frac{dG_0}{dz'}(z,z',\omega) - G_0(z,z',\omega)\frac{dP}{dz'}(z',\omega)\} \qquad (29)$$

with a Green's function, G_0, that satisfies

$$\left(\frac{d^2}{dz'^2} + k^2\right)\; G_0(z,z',\omega) \;=\; \delta(z-z') \qquad (30)$$

for z and z' in V. To be more precise in our language, we want to predict what a receiver at depth would record in terms of what a surface receiver records. We can easily show that for an upgoing wave, $P = Re^{-ikz}$, that if one chooses $G_0 \;=\; G_0^+$ (causal, $e^{ik|z-z'|}/(2ik)$), the lower surface (i.e. $z' = b$) constructs P in V and the contribution from the upper surface vanishes. On the other hand, if we choose $G_0 = G_0^-$ (anticausal solution $e^{-ik|z-z'|}/(-2ik)$), then the upper surface $z = a$ constructs $P = Re^{-ikz}$ in V and there is no contribution from the lower surface $z' = b$. The

effective sources $(P(b), P'(b))$ on the lower surface $z' = b$ with a causal Green's function, G_0^+, will produce a wave moving away from the source at $z = b$, hence upward in the region between $a < z < b$. At the upper surface $z' = a$, the anticausal G_0^- will produce waves moving towards the source at $z = a$ and hence moving upward for $a < z < b$. Also, using the anticausal Green's function, G_0^-, takes the wavefield (and its derivative) at $z = a$, and predict where it was previously at earlier time. For an upwave at $z = a$, that prediction of where it was previously is between $z = a$ and $z = b$.

Since in exploration seismology the reflection data is typically upgoing, once it is generated at the reflector, and we only have measurements at the upper surface $z' = a$, we choose an anticausal Green's function G_0^- in one-way wave prediction in the finite volume model. If ,in addition, we want to remove the need for dP/dz' at $z' = a$ we can impose a Dirichlet boundary condition on G_0^-, to vanish at $z' = a$. The latter Green's function is labeled G_0^{-D},

$$G_0^{-D} = -\frac{e^{-ik|z-z'|}}{2ik} - \left(-\frac{e^{-ik|z_I-z'|}}{2ik}\right), \tag{31}$$

where z_I is the image of z through $z' = a$. It is easy to see that $z_I = 2a - z$ and that

$$P(z) = -\frac{dG_0^{-D}}{dz'}(z, z', \omega)\Big|_{z'=a} P(a) = e^{-ik(z-a)}P(a), \tag{32}$$

in agreement with a simple Stolt FK phase shift for predicting an upward

propagating wave in a volume, that is between $a < z < b$ in terms of the wavefield at $z = a$. Please note that $P(z,\omega) = -dG_0^{-D}/dz'(z,z',\omega)|_{z'=a}P(a,\omega)$ back propagates $P(z' = a,\omega)$, not G_0^{-D}. The latter thinking that G_0^{-D} back propagates (or G_0^{+D} forward propagates) data is a fundamental mistake/flaw in many seismic back propagation migration and inversion theories (and in feedback multiple attenuation methods), that harkens back to the historically earlier and qualitative Huygens principle concepts that preceded Green's theorem and (as is clear in this example) can lead to amplitude issues and errors.

The Green's theorem 3D generalization that predicts an experiment with both sources and receivers at depth for a one way propagating wavefield in the volume is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \frac{dG_0^{-D}}{dz_s}(x'_s,y'_s,z'_s,x_s,y_s,z_s;\omega) \\ & \times \left[\int \frac{dG_0^{-D}}{dz_g}(x'_g,y'_g,z'_g,x_g,y_g,z_g;\omega)D(x'_g,y'_g,z'_g,x'_s,y'_s,z'_s;\omega)dx'_g dy'_g\right] dx'_s dy'_s \\ = \; & M(x_s,y_s,z_s,x_g,y_g,z_g;\omega) \\ = \; & M(x_m,y_m,z_m,x_h,y_h,z_h;\omega), \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where $x_g + x_s = x_m$, $y_g + y_s = y_m$, $z_g + z_s = z_m$, $x_g - x_s = x_h$, $y_g - y_s = y_h$, and $z_g - z_s = z_h$. In the space and time domain, equation 33 corresponds to "uncollapsed migration", $M(x_m,y_m,z_m,x_h,y_h,z_h = 0;t = 0)$ that extends and generalizes the original Imaging Condition III, to non-zero offset at time equals zero. The retaining of k_h information (rather than stacking over k_h, for $x_h = 0$, hence, uncollapsed) allows for imaging and subsequent AVO

analysis in a multi-D subsurface (see *e.g.* Clayton and Stolt (1981), Stolt and Weglein (1985), Weglein and Stolt (1999)).

For one way propagating wavefields in the finite volume, choosing an anticausal Green's function allows only wavefield measurements on the upper surface to be sufficient to predict the wavefield in the volume. For two way propagating wavefields in a finite volume an anticausal Green's function will not allow for measurements on the upper surface to be sufficient to predict the wavefield in the volume. The Green's function for two-way propagation that will eliminate the need for data at the lower surface of the closed Green's theorem surface is found by finding a general solution to the Green's function for the medium in the finite volume model and imposing both Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions at the lower surface.

Predicting the source-receiver experiment at depth where the velocity configuration is $c(x, y, z)$

For a receiver predicted at a point (x, y, z) for determining $P(x, y, z, x_s, y_s, z_s, \omega)$, call on the Green's function, G_0, that satisfies

$$\left\{\nabla'^2 + \frac{\omega^2}{c^2(x', y', z')}\right\} G_0(x', y', z', x, y, z, \omega)$$
$$= \delta(x - x')\delta(y - y')\delta(z - z') \tag{34}$$

for a source at (x, y, z). P is the physical/causal solution satisfying

$$\left\{\nabla'^{\,2} + \frac{\omega^2}{c^2(x', y', z')}\right\} P(x', y', z', x_s, y_s, z_s, \omega)$$
$$= A(\omega)\delta(x' - x_s)\delta(y' - y_s)\delta(z' - z_s). \quad (35)$$

As a first step, we want to predict P for a point (x, y, z) in the volume V, for the actual/original source at (x_s, y_s, z_s). For (x, y, z) in V, arrange for G_0 and $\nabla' G_0 \cdot \hat{n}'$ to be zero for (x', y', z') on the lower surface S_L and the walls S_W of the finite volume. The solution for G_0 in V and on S can be found by a numerical modeling algorithm where the "source" is at (x, y, z) and the field, G_0, and $\nabla G_0 \cdot \hat{n}$ at (x', y', z') are both imposed to be zero on S_L and S_W. Once that model is run for a source at (x, y, z) for $G_0(x', y', z', x, y, z, \omega)$ [for every eventual predicted receiver point, (x, y, z), for P] where G_0 satisfies Dirichlet and Neumann conditions for (x', y', z') on S_L and S_W we output $G_0(x', y', z', x, y, z, \omega)$ for (x', y', z') on S_U (the measurement surface).

With that G_0, use Green's theorem to predict the receiver experiment at depth (with the original/actual source at (x_s, y_s, z_s))

$$P(x, y, z, x_s, y_s, z_s, \omega)$$
$$= \int_{S_g} \left\{ \frac{\partial G_0^{DN}}{\partial z'}(x, y, z, x', y', z', \omega) P(x', y', z', x_s, y_s, z_s, \omega) \right.$$
$$\left. - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z'}(x', y', z', x_s, y_s, z_s, \omega) G_0^{DN}(x, y, z, x', y', z', \omega) \right\} dx' dy', \quad (36)$$

where z' = fixed depth of the cable and (x_s, y_s, z_s) = fixed location of the source. S_g is the upper (measurement) surface containing receivers for a

fixed shot on the measurement surface. This predicts the receiver at (x, y, z), a point below the measurement surface in the volume V (for a source on the upper (measurement) surface) in terms of measurements on the upper surface, S_u.

Now predict the experiment corresponding to both the receiver and the source at depth, by invoking reciprocity and performing a Green's theorem surface integral over sources

$$\begin{aligned} & P(x_g, y_g, z, x, y, z, \omega) \\ = & \int_{S_s} \left\{ \frac{\partial G_0^{DN}}{\partial z_s}(x, y, z, x_s, y_s, z_s, \omega) P(x_g, y_g, z, x_s, y_s, z_s, \omega) \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z_s}(x_g, y_g, z, x_s, y_s, z_s, \omega) G_0^{DN}(x, y, z, x_s, y_s, z_s, \omega) \right\} dx_s dy_s. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

S_s is the upper (measurement) surface consisting of shots for a predicted receiver point at depth. The original/actual receiver locations on the upper surface are labeled (x', y', z') and the coordinates of the predicted receiver at depth is now relabeled (x_g, y_g, z) in equation 37, whereas it was (x, y, z) in equation 36. $P(x_g, y_g, z, x, y, z, \omega)$ is the field corresponding to a predicted receiver at (x_g, y_g, z) and the source to (x, y, z) and change to midpoint offset $P(x_m, x_h, y_m, y_h, z_m, z_h = 0, \omega)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_s} \int \int dx_s \, dy_s \, d\omega & \left\{ \frac{\partial G_0^{DN}}{\partial z_s}(x, y, z, x_s, y_s, z_s, \omega) P(x_g, y_g, z, x_s, y_s, z_s, \omega) \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z_s}(x_g, y_g, z, x_s, y_s, z_s, \omega) G_0^{DN}(x, y, z, x_s, y_s, z_s, \omega) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

and Fourier transform over x_m, x_h, y_m, y_h to find $\widetilde{P}(k_{x_m}, k_{x_h}, k_{y_m}, k_{y_h}, k_{z_m}, z_h =$

$0, t = 0$). Equation 38 corresponds to Claerbout imaging condition III migration for a general $v(x, y, z)$ velocity configuration, within a volume that allows two way wave propagation in terms of data only on the upper surface.

Summary of wave equation migration for one way and two way propagating waves

Green's theorem based migration and migration-inversion require velocity information for location and velocity, density, absorption... for amplitude analyses at depth. When we say the medium is "known," the meaning of known depends on the goal: migration or migration-inversion. Backpropagation and imaging each evolved and then extended/generalized and merged into migration-inversion (Figure 4).

For one-way wave propagation the double downward continued data, D is

$$D(\text{at depth}) = \int_{S_s} \frac{\partial G_0^{-D}}{\partial z_s} \int_{S_g} \frac{\partial G_0^{-D}}{\partial z_g} D \, dS_g \, dS_s, \tag{39}$$

where D in the integrand $= D$(on measurement surface), $\partial G_0^{-D}/\partial z_s =$ anticausal Green's function with Dirichlet boundary condition on the measurement surface, $s =$ shot, and $g =$ receiver. For two-way wave double

downward continuation:

$$D(\text{at depth}) = \int_{S_s} \left[\frac{\partial G_0^{DN}}{\partial z_s} \int_{S_g} \left\{ \frac{\partial G_0^{DN}}{\partial z_g} D + \frac{\partial D}{\partial z_g} G_0^{DN} \right\} dS_g \right. \\ \left. + G_0^{DN} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_s} \int_{S_g} \left\{ \frac{\partial G_0^{DN}}{\partial z_g} D + \frac{\partial D}{\partial z_g} G_0^{DN} \right\} dS_g \right] dS_s, \quad (40)$$

where D in the integrands $= D$(on measurement surface). G_0^{DN} is *neither* causal nor anticausal. G_0^{DN} is not an *anti*causal Green's function; it is not the inverse or adjoint of any physical propagating Green's function. It is the Green's function needed for WEM RTM, that is RTM based on Claerbout Imaging Condition III. G_0^{DN} is the Green's function for the model of the finite volume that vanishes along with its normal derivative on the lower surface and the walls. If we want to use the anticausal Green's function of the two-way propagation with Dirichlet boundary conditions at the measurement surface then we can do that, but we will need measurements at depth and on the vertical walls. To have the Green's function for two-way propagation that doesn't need data at depth and on the vertical sides/walls, that requires a non-physical Green's function that vanishes along with its derivative on the lower surface and walls. Green's functions called upon in Green's theorem applications for migration are auxiliary functions and are specific point source wavefield solutions that satisfy the medium properties in the finite volume, and whose other properties are chosen for the convenience of the application. The commitment within Green's theorem applications is for the physical wavefield, $P(x, y, z, x_s, y_s, z_s)$, to relate to the physical reality and to have physical properties and boundary conditions.

In the next section, we take another step closer to our goal and objective. Having established a Claerbout imaging III methodology (please see equations 38 and 40) for a medium (a finite volume) with two way propagating waves, we are in a position to predict source and receiver experiments at depth and then a Claerbout III imaging result for data consisting of primaries and multiples. For the 1D layered medium, and a normal incident wave that we are examining, the data (consisting of primaries and internal multiples) and the predicted source and receiver experiment at depth results and the migration algorithm's results are analytic, transparent and the conclusions unambiguous. The role of recorded primaries and multiples in contributing first to the predicted source and receiver experiment at depth, and then to the (Claerbout Imaging III) coincident source and receiver experiment at time equals zero provides a definitive response to whether or not multiples contribute to seismic imaging. Understanding the physics behind the mathematics for the case of primaries and internal multiples, allows for an immediate set of similar conclusions to be drawn for the role of free surface multiples in migration. In the section below, we provide the explicit Green's theorem source and receiver at depth prediction and then Claerbout III imaging for a general layered medium where the velocity and density vary and where the data consists of primaries and internal multiples.

Green's theorem wavefield prediction in a 1D layered medium with velocity and density variation

First, let us assume the wave propagation problem in a (one dimensional) volume V bounded by a shallower depth a and deeper depth b to be governed by the differential equation:

$$\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z'}\frac{1}{\rho(z')}\frac{\partial}{\partial z'}+\frac{\omega^2}{\rho(z')c^2(z')}\right\}D(z',\omega)=0, \tag{41}$$

where $a \leq z' \leq b$ is the depth, and $\rho(z')$ and $c(z')$ are the density and velocity fields, respectively. In exploration seismology, we let the shallower depth a be the measurement surface where the seismic acquisition takes place (please see equation 29). The volume V is the finite volume defined in the "finite volume model" for migration, the details of which can be found in Weglein et al. (2011a). We measure D at the measurement surface $z' = a$, and the objective is to predict D anywhere between the shallower surface and another surface with greater depth, $z' = b$. This can be achieved via the solution of the wave-propagation equation in the same medium by an idealized impulsive source or Green's function:

$$\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial z'}\frac{1}{\rho(z')}\frac{\partial}{\partial z'}+\frac{\omega^2}{\rho(z')c^2(z')}\right\}G_0(z,z',\omega)=\delta(z-z'), \tag{42}$$

where z is the location of the source, and $a < z' < b$ and z increases in a downward direction. Abbreviating $G_0(z, z', \omega)$ as G_0, the solution for D in the interval $a < z < b$ is given by Green's theorem (the generalization of

equation 29 for the case of variable velocity and density):

$$D(z,\omega) = \frac{1}{\rho(z')}\left\{D(z',\omega)\frac{\partial G_0}{\partial z'} - G_0\frac{\partial D(z',\omega)}{\partial z'}\right\}\Bigg|_{z'=a}^{z'=b}, \qquad (43)$$

where a and b are the shallower and deeper boundaries, respectively, of the volume to which the Green's theorem is applied. It is identical to equation (43) of Weglein et al. (2011a), except for the additional density contribution to the Green's theorem. Interested readers may find the derivation of equation (43) in section 2 of Liu and Weglein (2014).

Note that in equation (43), the field values on the closed surface of the volume V are necessary for predicting the field value inside V. The surface of V contains two parts: the shallower portion $z' = a$ and the deeper portion $z' = b$. In seismic exploration, the data at $z' = b$ is not available. For example, one of the significant artifacts of the current RTM procedures is caused by this phenomenon: there are events necessary for accurate wavefield prediction that reach $z' = b$ but never return to $z' = a$, as is demonstrated in Figure 5. The solution, based on Green's theorem without any approximation, was first published in Weglein et al. (2011a) and Weglein et al. (2011b). The basic idea is summarized below.

Since the wave equation is a second-order differential equation, its general solution has a great deal of freedom/flexibility. In other words, for a wave equation with a specific medium property, there are an infinite number of solutions. This freedom in choosing the Green's function has been taken advantage of in many seismic-imaging procedures. For example, the most popular choice in wavefield prediction is the physical solution G_0^+. In

downward continuing a one way propagating upgoing wavefield to a point in the subsurface, the anti-causal solution G_0^- is often used in equation 43 (as we have shown in the earlier sections, i.e., equations 31 and 32).

Weglein et al. (2011a,b) show that (with the G_0^- choice), the contribution from $z' = B$ will be zero under one way wave assumptions, and only measurements are required at $z' = A$. For two way propagating waves, G_0^- will not make the contribution for $z' = B$ vanish. However, if both G_0 and $\partial G_0/\partial z'$ vanish at the deeper boundary $z' = b$, where measurements are not available, then only the data at the shallower surface (i.e., the actual measurement surface) is needed in the calculation. We use G_0^{DN} to denote the Green's function with vanishing Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions at the deeper boundary.

Predicting the source and receiver at depth in a 1D layered medium

The original Green's theorem in equation (43) is derived to predict the wavefield (i.e., receivers) in the subsurface. It can also be used to predict the sources in the subsurface by taking advantage of reciprocity: the recording is the same after the source and receiver locations are exchanged.

Assuming we have data on the measurement surface: $D(z_g, z_s)$ (the ω dependency is ignored), we can use $G_0^{DN}(z, z_g)$ to predict it from the receiver

depth z_g to the target depth z:

$$D\left(z,z_s\right)=\frac{1}{\rho(z_g)}\left\{\frac{\partial D\left(z_g,z_s\right)}{\partial z_g}G_0^{DN}\left(z,z_g\right)-D\left(z_g,z_s\right)\frac{\partial G_0^{DN}\left(z,z_g\right)}{\partial z_g}\right\}. \tag{44}$$

Taking the $\frac{\partial}{\partial z_s}$ operation on equation (44), we have a similar procedure to predict $\partial D(z_g,z_s)/\partial z_s$ to the subsurface:

$$\frac{\partial D\left(z,z_s\right)}{\partial z_s}=\frac{1}{\rho(z_g)}\left\{\frac{\partial^2 D\left(z_g,z_s\right)}{\partial z_g\partial z_s}G_0^{DN}\left(z,z_g\right)-\frac{\partial D\left(z_g,z_s\right)}{\partial z_s}\frac{\partial G_0^{DN}\left(z,z_g\right)}{\partial z_g}\right\}. \tag{45}$$

Equations 44 and 45 are the 1D versions of equations 36 and 37.

With equations (44) and (45), we predict the data D and its partial derivative over z_s to the subsurface location z. According to reciprocity, $D\left(z,z_s\right)=E\left(z_s,z\right)$, where $E\left(z_s,z\right)$ is resulted from exchanging the source and receiver locations in the experiment to generate D at the subsurface. The predicted data $E\left(z_s,z\right)$ can be considered as the recording of receiver at z_s for a source located at z.

For this predicted experiment, the source is located at depth z, according to the Green's theorem, we can downward continue the recording at z_s to any depth shallower than or equal to z.

In seismic migration, we predict $E\left(z_s,z\right)$ at the same subsurface depth z

Depth Range	Velocity	Density
$(-\infty, a_1)$	c_0	ρ_0
(a_1, a_2)	c_1	ρ_1
(a_2, ∞)	c_2	ρ_2

Table 1: The properties of an acoustic medium with two reflectors, at depth a_1 and a_2.

with $G_0^{DN}(z, z_s)$ to have an experiment with coincident source and receiver:

$$\begin{aligned} E(z,z) &= \frac{1}{\rho(z_s)} \left\{ \frac{\partial E(z_s,z)}{\partial z_s} G_0^{DN}(z,z_s) - E(z_s,z) \frac{\partial G_0^{DN}(z,z_s)}{\partial z_s} \right\}, \\ &= \frac{1}{\rho(z_s)} \left\{ \frac{\partial D(z,z_s)}{\partial z_s} G_0^{DN}(z,z_s) - D(z,z_s) \frac{\partial G_0^{DN}(z,z_s)}{\partial z_s} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Equation 46 is the 1D version of equation 38.

If $z_s < z_g$ and we assume the data is deghosted, the $\frac{\partial}{\partial z_s}$ operation on $D(z_g, z_s)$ is equivalent to multiplying $-ik$, in this case, equation (46) can be further simplified:

$$E(z,z) = -\frac{1}{\rho(z_s) D(z,z_s)} \left\{ \frac{\partial G_0^{DN}(z,z_s)}{\partial z_s} + ikG_0^{DN}(z,z_s) \right\}. \quad (47)$$

Analytic examples (for a 1D layered medium)

As an example, for a 2-reflector model (with an ideal impulsive source located at z_s, the depth of receiver is $z_g > z_s$, the geological model is listed in Table 1), the data and its various derivatives can be expressed as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
D(z_g, z_s) &= \frac{\rho_0 x^{-1}}{2ik}\left\{y + \alpha y^{-1}\right\}, \\
\frac{\partial D(z_g, z_s)}{\partial z_g} &= \frac{\rho_0}{2} x^{-1}\left\{y - \alpha y^{-1}\right\}, \\
\frac{\partial D(z_g, z_s)}{\partial z_s} &= -\frac{\rho_0}{2} x^{-1}\left\{y + \alpha y^{-1}\right\}, \\
\frac{\partial^2 D(z_g, z_s)}{\partial z_g \partial z_s} &= \frac{\rho_0 k}{2i} x^{-1}\left\{y - \alpha y^{-1}\right\},
\end{aligned}
\tag{48}
$$

where $x = e^{ikz_s}$, $y = e^{ikz_g}$, $\sigma = e^{ikz}$, $\alpha = e^{ik(2a_1)}\left(R_1 + (1 - R_1^2)\beta\right)$, and $\beta = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(-1)^n R_1^n R_2^{n+1} e^{ik_1(2n+2)[a_2 - a_1]}$. And $R_1 = \frac{c_1\rho_1 - c_0\rho_0}{c_1\rho_1 + c_0\rho_0}$, and $R_2 = \frac{c_2\rho_2 - c_1\rho_1}{c_2\rho_2 + c_1\rho_1}$ are the reflection coefficients from geological boundaries.

The predicted experiment above the first reflector for Claerbout Imaging Condition III

For $z < a_1$, the boundary values of the Green's function are:

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_0^{DN}(z, z_g) &= \rho_0 \frac{e^{ik(z - z_g)} - e^{ik(z_g - z)}}{2ik} = \rho_0 \frac{\sigma y^{-1} - \sigma^{-1} y}{2ik}, \\
G_0^{DN}(z, z_s) &= \rho_0 \frac{\sigma x^{-1} - \sigma^{-1} x}{2ik}, \\
\frac{\partial G_0^{DN}(z, z_g)}{\partial z_g} &= \rho_0 \frac{\sigma y^{-1} + \sigma^{-1} y}{-2}, \\
\frac{\partial G_0^{DN}(z, z_s)}{\partial z_s} &= \rho_0 \frac{\sigma x^{-1} + \sigma^{-1} x}{-2}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{49}
$$

After substituting equation (48) into equation (47), we have:

$$
E(z, z) = \frac{1 + e^{ik(2a_1 - 2z)}\left(R_1 + (1 - R_1^2)\beta\right)}{2ik/\rho_0}. \tag{50}
$$

The result above can be Fourier transformed into the time domain to

have:

$$\frac{E(z,z,t)}{-\rho_0 c_0/2} = H(t) + R_1 H\left(t - t_1\right) + (1 - R_1^2) \times \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n R_1^n R_2^{n+1} H\left(t - t_1 - (2n+2)t_2\right), \tag{51}$$

where $t_1 = \frac{2a_1 - 2z}{c_0}$ and $t_2 = \frac{(a_2 - a_1)}{c_1}$. Balancing out the $-\frac{\rho_0 c_0}{2}$ factor*, the data after removing the direct wave is denoted as $\hat{D}(z,t) = \frac{-2}{\rho_0 c_0} E(z,z,t) - H(t)$:

$$\hat{D}(z,t) = R_1 H\left(t - t_1\right) + (1 - R_1^2) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n R_1^n R_2^{n+1} H\left(t - t_1 - (2n+2)t_2\right). \tag{52}$$

We take the imaging condition as first letting $z \to a_1$ through values smaller that a_1, and then (subsequently) taking the limit as $t \to 0^+$, that is, approaching zero from positive values, we find:

$$\lim_{t \to 0^+} \left(\lim_{z \to a_1^-} \hat{D}(z,t) \right) = R_1, \tag{53}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_1^- &= a_1 - \epsilon_1 \qquad & \epsilon_1 > 0, \\ 0^+ &= 0 + \epsilon_2 \qquad & \epsilon_2 > 0, \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

and we obtained the image of the first reflector at the actual depth a_1 with the correct reflection coefficient as amplitude.

*This factor is present in the incident wave, i.e., causal Green's function for a homogeneous medium with density ρ_0 and velocity c_0.

Predicting the source and receiver experiment between the first and second reflectors

For $a_1 < z < a_2$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} G_0^{DN}(z, z_g) &= [(R_1\lambda - \lambda^{-1})\mu + (\lambda - R_1\lambda^{-1})\mu^{-1}]/[2ik_1(1+R_1)/\rho_1], \\ \frac{\partial G_0^{DN}(z, z_g)}{\partial z_g} &= [(R_1\lambda - \lambda^{-1})\mu - (\lambda - R_1\lambda^{-1})\mu^{-1}]/[2k_1(1+R_1)/(k\rho_1)], \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

where $\lambda = e^{ik_1(z-a_1)}$, $\mu = e^{ik(z_g-a_1)}$, $k_1 = \frac{\omega}{c_1}$. Substituting equation (55) into equation (48), and transforming the aforementioned result into the time domain, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E(z,z,t)/(-\rho_1 c_1/2) = H(t) &+ 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(-1)^n R_1^n R_2^n H\{t - [2n(a_2-a_1)/c_1]\} \\ &+ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(-1)^{n+1} R_1^{n+1} R_2^n H\{t - [2z + 2na_2 - 2(n+1)a_1]/c_1\} \\ &+ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(-1)^n R_1^n R_2^{n+1} H\{t - [2(n+1)a_2 - 2na_1 - 2z]/c_1\}. \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Balancing out the $-\rho_1 c_1/2$ factor, the data after removing the direct wave is denoted as $\hat{D}(z,t) = \frac{-2}{\rho_1 c_1}E(z,z,t) - H(t)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{D}(z,t) =& 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(-1)^n R_1^n R_2^n H\{t - [2n(a_2-a_1)/c_1]\} \\ &+ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(-1)^{n+1} R_1^{n+1} R_2^n H\{t - [2z + 2na_2 - 2(n+1)a_1]/c_1\} \\ &+ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(-1)^n R_1^n R_2^{n+1} H\{t - [2(n+1)a_2 - 2na_1 - 2z]/c_1\}, \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

and after taking the $t = 0^+$ imaging condition, we have:

$$\hat{D}(z,t) = \begin{cases} -R_1 & \texttt{if } (z = a_1 + \epsilon_1) \\ 0 & \texttt{if } (a_1 < z < a_2) \\ R_2 & \texttt{if } (z = a_2 - \epsilon_2) \end{cases}, \tag{58}$$

where $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \to 0$ and then $t \to 0^+$. Note that in the previous section, i.e., to image above the first reflector at a_1, we obtain the amplitude R_1 when z approach a_1 from above. In this section we image below the first reflector at a_1, the amplitude of the image is $-R_1$ when z approaches a_1 from below, as it should.

Predicting the source and receiver experiment below the second reflector

For $z > a_1$, the boundary value of the Green's function is:

$$G_0^{DN}(z, z_g) = \frac{1}{2ik_2(1+R_1)(1+R_2)/\rho_2} \tag{59}$$
$$\times \{[\nu^{-1}(R_2\lambda - \lambda^{-1}) + R_1\nu(\lambda - R_2\lambda^{-1})]\mu + [R_1\nu^{-1}(R_2\lambda - \lambda^{-1}) + \nu(\lambda - R_2\lambda^{-1})]\mu^{-1}\},$$

where $\lambda = e^{ik_2(z-a_2)}$, $\mu = e^{ik(z_g-a_1)}$, and $\nu = e^{ik_1(a_2-a_1)}$, $k_2 = \omega/c_2$.

The result of the predicted experiment can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} E(z,z) =& (\rho_2/2ik_2)[1 - R_2 e^{ik_2(2z-2a_2)} + (1-R_2^2)e^{ik_2(2z-2a_2)} \\ & \times \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{n+1} R_1^{n+1} R_2^n e^{ik_1(2n+2)(a_2-a_1)}]. \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

The time domain counterpart of the equation above is:

$$E(z,z,t) = -(\rho_2 c_2/2)\{H(t) - R_2 H[t-(2z-2a_2)/c_2] + (1-R_2^2)H[t-(2z-2a_2)/c_2-(2n+2)(a_2-a_1)/c_1]. \quad (61)$$

Balancing out the $-\rho_2 c_2/2$ factor, the data after removing the direct wave is denoted as $\hat{D}(z,t) = (-2/\rho_2 c_2)E(z,z,t) - H(t)$:

$$\hat{D}(z,t) = -R_2 H[t-(2z-2a_2)/c_2] + (1-R_2^2)H[t-(2z-2a_2)/c_2-(2n+2)(a_2-a_1)/c_1], \quad (62)$$

and after taking the $t = 0^+$ imaging condition, we have:

$$\hat{D}(z,t) = \begin{cases} -R_2 & \texttt{if } (z = a_2 + \epsilon) \\ 0 & \texttt{if } (a_2 < z) \end{cases}, \quad (63)$$

where $\epsilon \to 0^+$. Note that in the previous section, i.e., to image between the first and second reflectors, we obtain the amplitude R_2 when z approach a_2 from above. In this section we image below the second reflector at a_2, the amplitude of the image is $-R_2$ when z approaches a_2 from below, as it should. Please see Figure 6.

This analysis allows us to see how the recorded events contribute to the image for source and receiver experiments above and below each reflector.

Multiples: do they contribute to the image?

How do the recorded events (primaries and free surface and internal multiples) contribute to: (1) the predicted source and receiver experiment at depth and (2) the image at depth that locates and identifies the reflector (the reflection coefficient)?. In this section, we examine, follow and report (for the latter two way-wave wave migration examples) how the individual events (primaries, free surface multiples and internal multiples) each contribute to: (1) the predicted coincident source and receiver experiment at each depth, and then (2) the time equals zero imaging condition evaluation of that experiment.

The example we present provides for the first time an analysis that starts with and follows how surface recorded data (with primaries and free surface and internal multiples) influences and contributes to the subsequent coincident source and receiver experiment at depth and then imaging at each depth level, and specifically: (1) how each individual recorded event in the surface data is involved and contributes to the new individual "events" of the predicted source and receiver experiment at each different depth, and then (2) what happens to the recorded surface event's individual contribution for the predicted experiment at each depth and then how the surface recorded events contribute when applying the time equals zero imaging condition. Please see three cases we examine in the three videos (http://mosrp.uh.edu/events/event-news/multiples-signal-noise-a-clear-example-with-a-definitive-conclusion) and corresponding slide snapshots. In the three examples a unit amplitude plane wave is normal incident on a one-D earth. The first case (please see Figures 7-9) is the example of a single reflector and a single primary, with no free surface or internal multiples. That single

primary is the sole contributor to the events in the experiment above and below that single reflector. When the time equals zero condition is applied, the recorded primary is the only recorded event contributing to the experiment at depth and to the image, both below and above the reflector. For the case of primaries and internal multiples, the detailed mathmatical analysis based on the new two way (Claerbout Imaging III) migration behind these figures is found in equation 49 - 63, in the previous section.

The second case has a single primary and a free surface multiple (please see Figures 10-12). The predicted experiment above the reflector has two surface event contributions, from the primary and the free surface multiple. When the time equals zero imaging condition is applied then only the recorded primary contributes to the image. Below the reflector the predicted experiment has two events, a primary that has a downward reflection at the reflector, and a primary from the source to the free surface and then down to the predicted receiver. The original free surface multiple in the recorded data became a primary in the predicted experiment below the reflector. Hence, the primary and free surface multiple in the recorded data became two primaries for the experiment below the reflector. However, once the time equals zero imaging condition is applied to the predicted experiment, only the recorded primary contributes to the image and the recorded multiple does not.

In the third case (please see Figures 13-17), we consider a subsurface with two reflectors and two recorded primaries and one internal multiple. As you focus on the history that each individual event in the recorded data follows and then contributes to, first in the experiment at depth and then

to the image at each depth, you reach the following conclusion. Recorded primaries and free surface multiples and internal multiples all contribute to events for the predicted experiment at depth. Sometimes multiples in the recorded data even become primaries in the predicted experiment at depth. However, only the recorded primaries contribute to the image at every depth. If you removed the multiples in the recorded data, the coincident source and receiver experiment at depth would change, but once the $t = 0$ imaging condition is applied, the image's location at the correct depth or its amplitude, the reflection coefficient, will not be affected. If, in these examples, your data consisted of only multiples, you would have no image at any depth.

Hence, for the purposes of imaging and inversion, primaries are signal and multiples are not. Multiples are not evil, or bad or irresponsible, but as events they are simply not needed for locating and identifying targets.

The methods that seek to use multiples today as "signal" are really seeking to approximate images due to primaries that have not been recorded, due to limitations in acquisition, and to address the subsequent limited illumination that missing primaries can cause. They are not really using the multiple itself as an event to be followed into the subsurface for imaging purposes. The figure (18) illustrates the idea.

Assume a multiple is recorded, and a long offset primary that is a subevent is also recorded. The idea is to extract and predict the image due to an unrecorded primary, smaller offset, from the recorded multiple and the recorded longer offset primary. All the various incarnations that are using multiples as "signal" are actually, and entirely after removing a recorded

longer offset primary to have the output as a shorter offset unrecorded primary. It's the missing image of unrecorded primaries that the method is seeking to produce and to utilize.

The recipe of taking the multiples back in time and the primaries forward in time and arranging for Imaging Condition II (not III) produces that output. However, that procedure is not migrating the multiples, in the sense of the multiple as an event.

In a Recent Advances and the Road Ahead presentation, "Multiples: signal or noise?", Weglein (2014) (please see `https://vts.inxpo.com/scripts/Server.nxp?LASCmd=L:0&AI=1&ShowKey=21637&LoginType=0&InitialDisplay=1&ClientBrowser=0&DisplayItem=NULL&LangLocaleID=0&RandomValue=1415030021699`) showed a field data example, from PGS, where there was clear added-value demonstrated from beyond actual primaries, plus the approximate images of primaries predicted from multiples, compared to the image from the original primaries.

There is another issue: in order to predict a free surface or internal multiple, the primary sub-events that constitute the multiple must be in the data, for the multiple prediction method to recognize an event as a multiple. If the short offset primary is not recorded, the multiple that is composed of the short and long offset multiple will not be predicted as a multiple. That issue and basic contradiction within the method is recognized by those who practice this method, and instead of predicting the multiple, they use all the events in the recorded data, primaries and multiples, and the multiples can be useful for predicting approximate images of missing primaries but the primaries in the data will cause artifacts. There are other artifacts that

also come along with this method that have been noted in the literature.

The reality of today's methods for using multiples to predict missing "primaries" are aimed at structural improvement, at best, and are not claiming, seeking or delivering the amplitude and phase fidelity of the predicted primary. Those who go so far as to advocate using fewer sources and/or more widely separated cables because recorded multiples can produce "something like" a missing primary need to understand the deficits and costs including generating artifacts, less effectiveness with deeper primaries and the amplitude fidelity of the predicted primary. Whether the tradeoff makes sense ought to depend on, in part, the depth of the target, the type of play, and whether a structural interpretation or amplitude analysis is planned within a drilling program and decision.

By the way, this entire wave equation migration analysis (Claerbout Imaging Condition III) is ultimately based on the idea from Green (1828) that to predict a wave (an experiment) inside a volume you need to know the properties of the medium in the volume.

There is an alternative view: The inverse scattering series methods communicates that all processing objectives can be achieved directly and without subsurface information. The inverse scattering series treat multiples as a form of coherent noise, and provide distinct subseries to remove free surface and internal multiples before the inverse scattering subseries for imaging and inversion achieve their goals using only primaries Weglein et al. (2003) and Weglein et al. (2012). If the inverse scattering series needed multiples to perform migration and inversion, it would not have provided subseries that remove those multiply reflected events. With a velocity model (wave

equation migration) or without a velocity model (inverse scattering series imaging) only primaries are signal , in the sense that they are the events need to locate and delineate targets. If you want to consider a multiple as a conditional 'signal', that can at times enhance imaging, there is no harm in that. But to say that multiples are being migrated, and/or are the same footing as primaries, is simply not ture and relates more to marketing, than to a realistic view of the role that primaries and multiples play in seismic exploration. A complete set of recorded primaries, processed with a wave theory migration (versus asymptotic or ray migration) would not need or benefit from multiples. Multiples need to be removed before performing a velocity analysis using, e.g., tomography, CIG flatness or FWI. And a velocity model is required by all the methods that seek to use multiples to enhance imaging. Another question: what if the assumed unrecorded primary event in the method is actually recorded. Will the image of the recorded primary and the image of the approximate version of the recorded primary from the multiple damaged the image of the actual primary, that has been assumed to not have been recorded?

Conclusions

Hence, primaries are signal and multiples can be useful, at times, for predicting the image of missing primaries. But it's primaries that are signal, that we use for structure and inversion.

Primaries are signal for all methods that seek to locate and identify targets.

The above three examples assumed you had an accurate **discontinu-**

ous velocity and density model. Given an accurate discontinuous velocity and density model, and data with primaries and multiples, then we have convincingly demonstrated that only primaries contributed to the images at every depth. If you predicted the source and receiver experiment at depth with a **smooth** velocity, it is possible to correctly locate (but not invert) each recorded primary event—but with a smooth velocity model every free surface and internal multiple will then produce a false image/artifact/event. If you removed the multiples first you can correctly locate structure from recorded primaries using a smooth velocity model.

Hence, we conclude that the inability, in practice, to provide an accurate discontinuous velocity model is why multiples need to be removed before imaging. That reality has been the case, is the case, and will remain true for the foreseeable future. Multiples need to be removed before velocity analysis and they need to be removed before imaging.

Many things are useful for creating primaries: money, the seismic boat, the air-guns, the observer, the cable, computers, etc., but we don't call all useful things signal.

Methods to provide a more complete set of primaries are to be supported and encouraged. Those methods include: (1) advances in and more complete acquisition, (2) interpolation and extrapolation methods, and (3) using multiples to predict missing primaries. However, a recorded primary is still the best and most accurate way to provide a primary, and the primary is the seismic signal.

A multiple can be useful, at times, for providing an unrecorded synthesized primary that is a subevent of the multiple. Given a data set consist-

ing of: (1) the recorded primaries, (2) the synthesized primaries, (3) the free surface multiples, and (4) internal multiples, the practical necessity of using a smooth continuous velocity for migration demands that all multiples be removed before migration. In exploration seismology, migration and migration-inversion are methods we employ to locate and identify structure. Claerbout Imaging Condition III is the most definitive and quantitative migration concept and procedure. This paper demonstrated that Claerbout Imaging Condition III clearly communicates that primaries are signal and multiples are noise. The original and intuitive migration idea that takes events in time traces to the location of structure in space, only has meaning for primaries. The most sophisticated and physically well-founded migration theory, beased on Claerbout Imaging Condition III, agrees with that assessment and conclusion.

Acknowledgements

M-OSRP sponsors are thanked for their encouragement and support. The author would like to thank Nizar Chemingui, Dan Whitmore and Alejandro Valenciano (PGS), Robert H. Stolt (ConocoPhillips, retired), Clement Kostov and Richard Coates (Schlumberger), Scott Morton (Hess) and Fred Hoffman (Shell, retired) for constructive and worthwhile discussions that benefited this paper. The author gratefully acknowledges PGS for showing how multiples can be used to predict unrecorded primaries, and Lundin Malaysia and PETRONAS for showrights. I would like to thank Yi Luo and Tim Keho (Saudi Aramco) and David Monk and Bill Goodway (Apache

Corp.) for stimulating and useful discussions that motivated and benefited this paper. The author would also thank Fang Liu, Chao Ma, Jim Mayhan, Jinlong Yang and Yanglei Zou for assistance in preparing this paper.

References

Amundsen, L., 1994, The propagator matrix related to the Kirchhoff-Helmholtz integral in inverse wavefield extrapolation: Geophysics, **59**, 1902–1910.

Claerbout, J. F., 1971, Toward a unified theory of reflector mapping: Geophysics, **36**, 467–481.

Clayton, R. W., and R. H. Stolt, 1981, A Born-WKBJ inversion method for acoustic reflection data: Geophysics, **46**, 1559–1567.

Green, G., 1828, An essay on the application of mathematical analysis to the theories of electricity and magnetism: Privately published. (Available at `http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.yl131n;view=1up;seq=9`).

Liu, F., and A. B. Weglein, 2014, The first wave equation migration RTM with data consisting of primaries and internal multiples: theory and 1D examples: Journal of Seismic Exploration, **23**, 357–366.

Morse, P. M., and H. Feshbach, 1981, Methods of theoretical physics: Feshbach Publishing, LLC. (Original publication 1953 by The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.).

Schneider, W. A., 1978, Integral formulation for migration in two and three dimensions: Geophysics, **43**, 49–76.

Stolt, R. H., 1978, Migration by Fourier transform: Geophysics, **43**, 23–48.

Stolt, R. H., and A. K. Benson, 1986, Seismic migration: theory and practice: Geophysical Press.

Stolt, R. H., and A. B. Weglein, 1985, Migration and inversion of seismic data: Geophysics, **50**, 2458–2472.

———, 2012, Seismic imaging and inversion: Application of linear inverse theory: Cambridge University Press.

Weglein, A. B., 2014, Multiples: Signal or noise?: 84th Annual International Meeting, SEG, Expanded Abstracts, 4393–4399.

Weglein, A. B., F. V. Araújo, P. M. Carvalho, R. H. Stolt, K. H. Matson, R. T. Coates, D. Corrigan, D. J. Foster, S. A. Shaw, and H. Zhang, 2003, Inverse scattering series and seismic exploration: Inverse Problems, **19**, R27–R83.

Weglein, A. B., F. Liu, X. Li, P. Terenghi, E. Kragh, J. D. Mayhan, Z. Wang, J. Mispel, L. Amundsen, H. Liang, L. Tang, and S.-Y. Hsu, 2012, Inverse scattering series direct depth imaging without the velocity model: first field data examples: Journal of Seismic Exploration, **21**, 1–28.

Weglein, A. B., and R. H. Stolt, 1999, Migration-inversion revisited (1999): The Leading Edge, **18**, 950–952, 975.

Weglein, A. B., R. H. Stolt, and J. D. Mayhan, 2011a, Reverse-time migration and Green's theorem: Part I — The evolution of concepts, and setting the stage for the new RTM method: Journal of Seismic Exploration, **20**, 73–90.

———, 2011b, Reverse time migration and Green's theorem: Part II — A new and consistent theory that progresses and corrects current RTM

concepts and methods: Journal of Seismic Exploration, **20**, 135–159.

Figures

Figure 1: *The infinite hemispherical migration model. The measurement surface is denoted by MS.*

Figure 2: *A finite volume model.*

Figure 3: *1D upgoing plane wavefield.*

Figure 4: *Backpropagation model evolution.*

Figure 5: *Green's theorem predicts the wavefield at an arbitrary depth z between the shallower depth a and deeper depth b.*

Figure 6: *Imaging with primaries and internal multiples. A double Green's theorem is utilized with the data, and a Green's function that along with its normal derivative vanishes on the lower surface (and on the walls, in multi-D). That is what wave-equation migration means for waves that are two-way propagating in the medium.*

Figure 7:

Figure 8:

Figure 9:

Figure 10:

Figure 11:

Figure 12:

Figure 13:

Figure 14:

Figure 15:

Figure 16:

Figure 17:

Figure 18:



Figure 1: *The infinite hemispherical migration model. The measurement surface is denoted by MS.*



Figure 2: *A finite volume model.*



Figure 3: *1D upgoing plane wavefield.*

Figure 4: *Backpropagation model evolution.*



Figure 5: *Green's theorem predicts the wavefield at an arbitrary depth z between the shallower depth a and deeper depth b. The experiment illustrated here corresponds to a plane wave normal incident on a layered medium with two reflectors. The measurement coordinates are z_g and z_s, the coincident source and receiver depths. $a-\varepsilon$, $a+\varepsilon$, $b-\varepsilon$, $b+\varepsilon$ are the depth of the predicted source and receiver experiment at depths above and below the first reflector at $z=a$ and the second reflector at $z=b$.*



Figure 6: *Imaging with primaries and internal multiples. A double Green's theorem is utilized with the data, and a Green's function that along with its normal derivative vanishes on the lower surface (and on the walls, in multi-D). That is what Claerbout imaging III migration means for waves that are two-way propagating in the medium.*

Case 1: a primary from a single reflector (recorded data)
Reflector

Figure 7:

Case 1: a primary from a single reflector
Above the reflector (predicted experiment at depth)
Coincident source and receiver at depth for all times
Blue event: primary
Coincident source and receiver at depth for t = 0
R_1
Blue event: primary

Figure 8:

Case 1: a primary from a single reflector
Below the reflector (predicted experiment at depth)
Coincident source and receiver at depth for all times
Blue event: primary
Coincident source and receiver at depth for t = 0
$-R_1$
Blue event: primary

Figure 9:

Case 2: a primary and a free-surface multiple
(recorded data)
Free surface
Reflector
Red event: primary
Blue event: free-surface multiple

Figure 10:

Case 2: a primary and a free-surface multiple
Above the reflector (predicted experiment at depth)
Coincident source and receiver at depth for all times
Coincident source and receiver at depth for t = 0
R_1
Red event: primary
Blue event: free-surface multiple
Red event: primary

Figure 11:

Case 2: a primary and a free-surface multiple
Below the reflector (predicted experiment at depth)
Coincident source and receiver at depth for all times
Red event: primary (downward reflection at the reflector)
Blue event: primary (downward reflection at the free surface)
Coincident source and receiver at depth for t = 0
$-R_1$
Red event: primary (downward reflection at the reflector)

Figure 12:

Case 3: two primaries and an internal multiple
(recorded data)
Reflector 1
Reflector 2
Red event: primary from the first reflector
Black event: primary from the second reflector
Blue event: internal multiple

Figure 13:

Case 3: two primaries and an internal multiple
Above the first reflector (predicted experiment at depth)
Coincident source and receiver at depth for all times
Coincident source and receiver at depth for t = 0
R_1
Red event: primary from the first reflector
Black event: primary from the second reflector
Blue event: internal multiple
Red event: primary from the first reflector

Figure 14:

Case 3: two primaries and an internal multiple
Below the first reflector (predicted experiment at depth)
Coincident source and receiver at depth for all times
Coincident source and receiver at depth for t = 0
$-R_1$
Red event: primary from the first reflector
Black event: primary from the second reflector
Blue event: internal multiple
Red event: primary from the first reflector

Figure 15:

Case 3: two primaries and an internal multiple
Above the second reflector (predicted experiment at depth)
Coincident source and receiver at depth for all times
Coincident source and receiver at depth for t = 0
R_2
Red event: primary from the first reflector
Black event: primary from the second reflector
Blue event: internal multiple
Black event: primary from the second reflector

Figure 16:

Case 3: two primaries and an internal multiple
Below the second reflector (predicted experiment at depth)
Coincident source and receiver at depth for all times
Coincident source and receiver at depth for t = 0
$-R_2$
Blue event: primary from the first reflector
Black event: primary from the second reflector
Black event: primary from the second reflector

Figure 17:

Using Multiples for Imaging



- The multiple is used to find a missing primary.
- Primaries are what migration and inversion call for and utilize.
- For the mathematical details, please see Weglein, A. B., Multiples: Are they signal or noise? TLE, 2015, special issue on "Multiples from attenuation to imaging".

Figure 18: