


2014-01-01

# Why Ricker Wavelets Are Successful In Processing Seismic Data: Towards A Theoretical Explanation

Afshin Gholamy Salehabady

University of Texas at El Paso, agholamysalehabady@miners.utep.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/open\\_etd](https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/open_etd)

 Part of the [Geology Commons](#), [Geophysics and Seismology Commons](#), and the [Geotechnical Engineering Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Gholamy Salehabady, Afshin, "Why Ricker Wavelets Are Successful In Processing Seismic Data: Towards A Theoretical Explanation" (2014). *Open Access Theses & Dissertations*. 1247.

[https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/open\\_etd/1247](https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/open_etd/1247)

This is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UTEP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UTEP. For more information, please contact [lweber@utep.edu](mailto:lweber@utep.edu).

WHY RICKER WAVELETS ARE SUCCESSFUL IN PROCESSING SEISMIC DATA:  
TOWARDS A THEORETICAL EXPLANATION

AFSHIN GHOLAMY, M.S.

Department of Geological Sciences

APPROVED:

---

Laura Serpa, Chair, Ph.D.

---

Aaron Velasco, Ph.D.

---

Vladik Kreinovich, Ph.D.

---

Charles Ambler, Ph.D.  
Dean of the Graduate School

to my

MOTHER and FATHER

with love

WHY RICKER WAVELETS ARE SUCCESSFUL IN PROCESSING SEISMIC DATA:  
TOWARDS A THEORETICAL EXPLANATION

by

AFSHIN GHOLAMY, M.S.

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at El Paso

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Geological Sciences

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

December 2014

# Acknowledgements

First, and foremost, I would like to express my profound gratitude to my mentor Professor Laura Serpa. I thank you for all your support, guidance, and friendship over the last two years. You took a chance on me during a time in my life when I was anything but a sure bet. For that, I am forever in your debt. I wish to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Aaron Velasco and Dr. Vladik Kreinovich from Computer Science Department, for their support, encouragement, and insightful comments.

I would like to thank all the faculty, staff, and students of the Department of Geological Sciences at The University of Texas at El Paso for all their hard work, dedication, and help. My acknowledgements also goes to Dr. Reza Ashtiani from the Department of Civil Engineering for his invaluable help.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family – my mother and my brothers – for the endless support throughout my life.

NOTE: This thesis was submitted to my Supervising Committee on November 27, 2014.

# Abstract

In many engineering applications ranging from engineering seismology to petroleum engineering and civil engineering, processing seismic data plays a key role. In processing seismic data, it turns out to be very efficient to describe the signal's spectrum as a linear combination of Ricker wavelet spectra. In this thesis, we provide a possible theoretical explanation for this empirical efficiency. Specifically, signal propagation through several layers is discussed, and it is shown that the Ricker wavelet is the simplest non-trivial solution for the corresponding data processing problem, under the condition that the described properties of the approximation family are satisfied.

# Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Acknowledgements . . . . .	iv
Abstract . . . . .	v
Table of Contents . . . . .	vi
<b>Chapter</b>	
1 Formulation of the Problem . . . . .	1
1.1 Seismic data is very useful . . . . .	1
1.2 Ricker wavelet: reminder . . . . .	1
1.3 Ricker wavelets have been empirically successful . . . . .	2
1.4 Need for a theoretical explanation . . . . .	3
1.5 Structure of the thesis . . . . .	3
2 Seismic Waves and the Empirical Success of Ricker Wavelets . . . . .	5
2.1 Seismic waves are important: a brief reminder . . . . .	5
2.2 Wavelets as a way to describe seismic waves . . . . .	5
2.3 Ricker wavelet: a wavelet most frequently used to describe seismic waves . . . . .	6
2.4 Geophysical applications of Ricker wavelets: classification . . . . .	6
2.5 Ricker wavelets are useful in simulating the original earthquakes . . . . .	7
2.6 Ricker wavelets are useful in simulating source signals . . . . .	8
2.7 Ricker wavelets are useful in simulating seismic waves . . . . .	8
2.8 Ricker wavelets are useful in processing seismic signals . . . . .	8
2.9 Geophysical applications beyond seismic waves . . . . .	9
2.10 Ricker wavelets are often empirically the best . . . . .	10
2.11 Resulting question . . . . .	10
3 Analysis of the Problem . . . . .	11
3.1 How each propagation layer affects the seismic signal . . . . .	11

3.2	What is the joint effect of propagating the signal through several layers? .	12
3.3	How to describe convolutions of several functions? Let us use the fact that a similar problem has been solved in probability theory . . . . .	13
3.4	Fourier transform helps to compute convolution . . . . .	14
3.5	Relation between power spectra . . . . .	16
3.6	Let us list reasonable requirement for an approximating function . . . . .	16
3.7	The approximating function should be non-negative . . . . .	16
3.8	The approximating functions should be differentiable . . . . .	17
3.9	We should select a family of approximating functions . . . . .	17
3.10	The approximating family should allow different time scales . . . . .	18
3.11	Propagation of the seismic signal should keep us within the approximating family . . . . .	18
4	Main Result . . . . .	20
4.1	Definitions . . . . .	20
4.2	Main result . . . . .	21
4.3	Proof . . . . .	21
5	Conclusions and Future Work . . . . .	23
5.1	Conclusions . . . . .	23
5.2	Future work . . . . .	23
	References . . . . .	24
	Curriculum Vitae . . . . .	27



# Chapter 1

## Formulation of the Problem

### 1.1 Seismic data is very useful

Already ancient scientists noticed that earthquakes generate waves which can be detected at large distances from their origin. These waves were called *seismic waves*, after the Greek word “seismos” meaning an earthquake.

After a while, scientists realized that from the seismic waves, we can extract not only important information about earthquakes, but also information about the media through which these waves propagate. Different layers reflect, refract, and/or delay signals differently, so by observing the coming waves, we can extract a lot of information about these layers. Since earthquakes are rare, geophysicists set up small artificial explosions or vibrations that also serve as a source of seismic waves.

The resulting *seismic* information helps geophysicists, petroleum and mining engineers, hydrologists to find mineral deposits and underground water reservoirs, helps civil engineers get a good understanding of the stability of the underground layers below the future structure (e.g., a building, a tunnel, a dam, or a landfill) [1, 5, 22], etc.; see, e.g., [16].

In particular, computational intelligence techniques are actively used in processing seismic data; see, e.g., [6] and references therein.

### 1.2 Ricker wavelet: reminder

The seismic data consists of seismic signals detected at different spatial locations. At each location, the corresponding seismic record describes how the corresponding displacement

$x(t)$  changes with time  $t$ . To properly process seismic data, it is important to have an adequate mathematical model accurately describing such signals.

One of the most widely used models of this type was described by Norman Ricker in his 1953 paper [18]. Specifically, he showed that in many cases, to describe how the amplitude  $x(t)$  of a seismic signal changes with time  $t$ , we can use a linear combination of functions of the type

$$x_0(t) = \left(1 - \frac{(t - t_0)^2}{\sigma^2}\right) \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(t - t_0)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

corresponding to different moments of time  $t_0$  and different values of the parameter  $\sigma$  describing the duration of this function. From the physical viewpoint, each such function describes a wave of finite duration; in mathematics, such functions are known as *wavelets*. The functions  $x_0(t)$  proposed by Ricker are therefore known as *Ricker wavelets*.

The power spectrum  $S(\omega)$  of a Ricker wavelet  $x_0(t)$  has the form

$$S(\omega) = K \cdot \omega^2 \cdot \exp(-c \cdot \omega^2),$$

where  $c = \sigma^2$  and  $K$  is a constant.

### 1.3 Ricker wavelets have been empirically successful

Since the original Ricker's paper, Ricker wavelets have been successfully used in processing seismic signal; see, e.g., [2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 21, 23] (see especially [4]). Ricker wavelet are also actively used when computational intelligence techniques are used for processing seismic data; see, e.g., [6].

Specifically, in line with Ricker's suggestion, the power spectrum  $S(\omega)$  of the seismic signal is represented as a linear combination of power spectra corresponding to Ricker wavelets:

$$S(\omega) \approx \sum_{i=1}^n K_i \cdot \omega^2 \cdot \exp(-c_i \cdot \omega^2). \quad (1)$$

To describe each spectrum term  $K_i \cdot \omega^2 \cdot \exp(-c_i \cdot \omega^2)$ , we need to use two parameters:  $K_i$

and  $c_i$ . Thus, overall, we need  $2n$  parameters in the above approximation (1), where  $n$  is the number of terms used in this approximation.

This Ricker wavelet approximation is often empirically successful in the sense that for the same approximation accuracy, it usually requires fewer parameters than other possible approximations; see, e.g., [4, 11].

## 1.4 Need for a theoretical explanation

Empirical studies have shown that Ricker wavelets, in general, lead to a better approximation of the seismic spectra than other families of approximating functions. However, in principle, there are many possible families of approximating functions, and only few of these families were actually tested.

So, a natural question arises: are Ricker wavelets indeed the best or are they just a good approximation to some even better (not yet known) family of approximating functions?

To answer this question, we will perform a theoretical analysis of the problem, and we will show that Ricker wavelets are the best. Specifically, our analysis of the problem of approximating seismic spectra will lead us to several reasonable properties that the approximating family must satisfy; then, we will show that Ricker wavelets are the only approximating family which satisfies these properties.

## 1.5 Structure of the thesis

In Chapter 2, we describe successful geophysical applications of Ricker wavelets and the results of empirical studies that show the advantages of these wavelets – studies that give rise to the main problem that we solve in this thesis. In Chapter 3, we provide the analysis of this problem. Based on this analysis, in Chapter 4, we formulate our main result – a theorem explaining why Ricker wavelets are empirically optimal. This chapter also contains a proof of this result. Finally, Chapter 5 contains conclusions and the description of possible

future work.

The main result of this thesis was published in peer-refereed proceedings of an IEEE conference; see [7].

# Chapter 2

## Seismic Waves and the Empirical Success of Ricker Wavelets

### 2.1 Seismic waves are important: a brief reminder

Earthquakes generate *waves* which can be detected at large distances from their origin. These waves were called *seismic waves*, after the Greek word “seismos” meaning an earthquake.

Studying seismic waves is very important. First, these waves yield information about the origin and nature of earthquakes. This information helps us to come up with measures that minimize the damage caused by the earthquakes, by deducing possible earthquake locations and magnitude. In the earthquake-prone areas, we can then make sure that buildings, roads, and other infrastructure will withstand the possible earthquakes.

Seismic waves also carry important information about the media through which these waves propagate. Different layers and interfaces between the layers reflect, refract, and/or delay the seismic waves differently. So, by observing the incoming waves, we can extract a lot of information about these layers. This information is extremely useful for mineral and hydrocarbon exploration, hydrogeophysics, etc.

### 2.2 Wavelets as a way to describe seismic waves

Waves are ubiquitous in nature, from the ocean waves to electromagnetic waves. In most physical examples, waves last for many periods. Such waves are well described by the

traditional sine and cosine functions – or, more generally, by a linear combination of sines and cosines.

In contrast, earthquakes usually have a reasonably short duration, as a result of which related seismic waves also have a short duration. Such short-duration waves also happen in other physical situations, e.g., during the floods. Sines and cosines are not a very adequate tool for describing such short-duration waves. To describe such “small waves” (“wavelets”) more adequately, researchers use special approximating functions called *wavelets*. Thus, due to the short-duration nature of seismic waves, it is natural to use wavelets (and linear combinations of wavelets) to describe and analyze these waves.

## 2.3 Ricker wavelet: a wavelet most frequently used to describe seismic waves

In geosciences, the most frequently used wavelet is *Ricker wavelet*, i.e., an expression of the form

$$x(t) = \left(1 - \frac{(t - t_0)^2}{\sigma^2}\right) \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(t - t_0)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right).$$

These wavelets were first proposed by Norman Ricker in his 1953 paper [18], and are not a standard tool in seismic data processing; see, e.g., [19]. It should be mentioned that, vice versa, seismic data processing is one of the main applications of Ricker wavelets.

Other types of wavelets are also effectively used in geosciences (see, e.g., [8]), but in most cases, Ricker wavelets turn out to be the most adequate in seismic data processing.

## 2.4 Geophysical applications of Ricker wavelets: classification

Ricker wavelets are used in all aspects of seismic data processing.

First, Ricker wavelets are used to *simulate*:

- the original earthquakes,
- the explosions set up by the geoscientists, and
- the seismic waves generated by these earthquakes and explosions.

Second, Ricker wavelets are used to *process* the observed seismic waves, by representing them as linear combinations of Ricker wavelets.

Third, Ricker wavelets are also used to process other geophysical signals.

## 2.5 Ricker wavelets are useful in simulating the original earthquakes

In many cases, Ricker wavelets provide the best description of the near-fault ground motion; see, e.g., [1, 6]. As a result, in these papers, Ricker wavelets are used to simulate the effect caused by earthquakes. Specifically, these papers study the overturning response of two types of structures:

- “block-size” structures, in which the height is commensurable with width, and
- tall structures – like high-rise building and tall bridge piers – in which height is much larger than the width.

The paper [22] uses Ricker wavelet to simulate the earthquake pulse when analyzing the effect of earthquakes on waste landfills. The importance of this study is due to the fact that several major earthquakes such as the 1994 Northridge earthquake and the 1995 Kobe earthquake caused serious damage to geostuctures isolating local landfills. This unexpected damage made it necessary to revisit the way landfill structures are designed.

## 2.6 Ricker wavelets are useful in simulating source signals

Ricker wavelets are also often the best in simulating the *source signal*, i.e., the explosion set up by geoscientists; see, e.g., [3, 15, 23].

In [3, 23], such a simulation is used to select the best method for processing seismic data.

## 2.7 Ricker wavelets are useful in simulating seismic waves

Linear combinations of Ricker wavelets provide a good description of the actual seismic signals; see, e.g., [10]. As a result, such linear combinations are used to select the best methods for processing seismic data. For example:

- the paper [14] uses such simulations to compare different algorithms for picking the first-break refraction event;
- the paper [2] uses such simulations to illustrate and select signal processing techniques in reflection seismology.

## 2.8 Ricker wavelets are useful in processing seismic signals

Ricker wavelets are also effectively used in processing seismic signals. For example, the paper [11] shows that the decomposition of the spectrum into Ricker wavelets leads to a good data processing, especially when, in order to improve the quality of geophysical data processing, we perform a joint inversion of seismic data of different type: e.g., when we simultaneously use the P-wave (PP) and S-wave (converted S) signals.



The paper [21] shows that if we represent the seismic data as a linear combination of Ricker wavelets and then visualize the resulting data, this indirect visualization makes it easier for a professional seismologist to interpret this data. This fact is illustrated on the example of an oil-rich area in the North Sea near the Scottish coast known as the “Golden Block”

## 2.9 Geophysical applications beyond seismic waves

In addition to their use for simulating and processing seismic waves, Ricker wavelets are also effectively used to simulate and process other types of geophysical data. For example, Ricker wavelets are very useful in analyzing the signal recorded by the Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR); see, e.g., [5]. This paper shows that if we use Ricker wavelets, then we can either achieve higher temporal resolution (and thus, higher vertical resolution) with the same number of antennas or, alternatively, we can decrease the number of antennas without sacrificing the vertical resolution. The effectiveness of methods using Ricker wavelets is illustrated on the example of two types of civil engineering applications:

- in construction of public buildings, to locate possible fracture zones and voids; this is illustrated by the example of constructing a university building in Crete, where the main geology is karstic carbonates – a landscape formed from the dissolution of soluble rocks such as limestone, dolomite, and gypsum; this landscape is characterized by underground drainage systems with sinkholes, dolines, and caves
- in road monitoring, to measure the thickness of different layers and to look for possible underground defects and voids; on the example of an airport auxiliary road (= road that leads to a freeway) in Greece and on the example of a highway connecting Polidrosso (Central Greece) with Attica (region containing Athens)

## 2.10 Ricker wavelets are often empirically the best

In all these applications, Ricker wavelets turned out to be efficient – usually, more efficient than other processing techniques. Several papers provide an explicit comparison between Ricket wavelets and other techniques and show that Ricker wavelets are indeed the best.

For example, [4] and [11] show that we need fewer parameters to accurately represent a seismic signal as a linear combination of Ricker wavelets than to get a similarly accurate representation in terms of wavelets of other type. A similar conclusion is made in [5] for representing the Ground Penetrating Radar data.

## 2.11 Resulting question

Empirical studies have shown that Ricker wavelets, in general, lead to a better approximation of the seismic spectra than other families of approximating functions. However, in principle, there are many possible families of approximating functions, and only few of these families were actually tested.

So, a natural question arises: are Ricker wavelets indeed the best or are they just a good approximation to some even better (not yet known) family of approximating functions?

This is the question that we will try to answer in this thesis.

# Chapter 3

## Analysis of the Problem

### 3.1 How each propagation layer affects the seismic signal

Layers are not homogeneous. As a result, the same seismic signal, when passing through different locations on the same layer, can experience different time delays. Hence, even when we start with a pulse signal, a signal which is different from 0 only at one moment of time  $t$ , this pulse comes to the next point via several possible trajectories on each of which the time delay is slightly different. Thus, a unit pulse signal at moment 0 is transformed into a signal  $m(t)$  which is distributed in time.

Seismic signals are weak. For weak signals, we can expand the dependence of the output on the input in Taylor series and keep only linear terms in this expansion. Thus, the output signal linearly depends on the input one. Hence, if a unit pulse gets transformed into a signal  $m(t)$ , a pulse of size  $x$  get transformed into a signal  $m(t) \cdot x$ .

In seismic measurements, the media does not change with time. So, if we shift the original pulse signal  $s$  seconds in time, making it a unit pulse at size  $x$  at moment  $s$ , the transformed signal will also be equal to the similar shift of the signal

$$m(t) \cdot x,$$

i.e., to the signal  $m(t - s) \cdot x$ .

In the discrete-time approximation, with a time step  $\Delta t$ , an arbitrary signal  $x(t)$  can be represented as a sum of pulses of size  $x(s)$  occurring at different moments of time  $s$ . Each such pulse leads to the transformed signal  $m(t - s) \cdot x(s)$ . Thus, due to linearity,

the sum of the pulses gets transformed into the sum of such transformed signals, i.e., into  $\sum_s m(t-s) \cdot x(s)$ , when the sum is taken over the grid with width  $\Delta t$ . In the limit when  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ , we get a more and more accurate representation of the original signal  $x(t)$  and thus, a more and more accurate representation of the transformed signal.

One can easily see that the sum  $\sum_s m(t-s) \cdot x(s)$  is an integral sum for an integral  $\int m(t-s) \cdot x(s) ds$ , and the limit  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ , the sum does tends to the integral. Thus, each layer transforms the original signal  $x(t)$  into the new signal

$$\int m(t-s) \cdot x(s) ds; \quad (2)$$

for details, see, e.g., [9, 16].

### 3.2 What is the joint effect of propagating the signal through several layers?

Let us assume that we started with the signal  $x_0(t)$ . This signal passes through the first layer, and is thus transformed into

$$x_1(t) = \int m_1(t-s) \cdot x_0(s) ds. \quad (3)$$

The resulting signal  $x_1(t)$  then passes through the second layer, and is, thus, transformed into

$$y(t) = \int m_2(t-s) \cdot x_1(s) ds. \quad (4)$$

Substituting the expression (3) into the formula (4), we conclude that

$$y(t) = \int m_2(t-s) \cdot m_1(s-u) \cdot x_0(u) ds du,$$

i.e., that

$$y(t) = \int m(t-u) \cdot x_0(u) du, \quad (5)$$

where we denoted

$$m(t) = \int m_1(s) \cdot m_2(t-s) ds. \quad (6)$$

The formula (6) is known as the *convolution* of two functions  $m_1(t)$  and  $m_2(s)$  corresponding to the two layers.

Similarly, the joint effect of several layers can be described by a formula (5) in which the corresponding function  $m(t)$  is a convolution of functions  $m_i(t)$  corresponding to all the layers. So, to describe the joint effect of propagating the signal through several layers, we need to describe convolutions of several functions.

### 3.3 How to describe convolutions of several functions?

#### Let us use the fact that a similar problem has been solved in probability theory

To describe the convolution of several functions, we can use the fact that a similar problem has already been solved in another area of applied mathematics – namely, in probability theory; see, e.g., [20].

Namely, it is known that if we have two independent random variables  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  described by the probability density functions (pdf's)  $\rho_1(x_1)$  and  $\rho_2(x_2)$ , then the probability density function  $\rho(x)$  describing their sum  $x = x_1 + x_2$  is equal to the convolution of the probability density functions corresponding to these variables:

$$\rho(x) = \int \rho_1(x_1) \cdot \rho_2(x - x_1) dx_1.$$

Similarly, the probability distribution function  $\rho(x)$  corresponding to the sum  $x = x_1 + \dots + x_N$  of a large number  $N$  of independent random variables described by pdf's  $\rho_i(x_i)$  is equal to the convolution of all  $n$  pdf's  $\rho_i(x_i)$ .

So, from the mathematical viewpoint, analyzing the effect of propagating a signal through many layers is equivalent to analyzing the distribution of the sum of several random variables. For the sum of random variables, the distribution is known: namely, according to the Central Limit Theorem, if we have a large number of small independent random

variables, then the distribution for their sum is close to Gaussian (normal) – and the more variables we add, the closer it is to normal.

The zone through which a seismic signal propagates can be divided into as many layers as we want – by simply considering narrower and narrower layers. When the layer is very thin, it practically does not affect the signal, i.e., its effect  $m_i(t)$  is located in the close vicinity of 0. In probabilistic terms, if the non-zero values of a pdf  $\rho_i(x_i)$  are located mostly in the vicinity of  $x_i \approx 0$ , this means that the corresponding random variable is indeed small. Thus, the desired convolution is equivalent to the sum of large number independent small random variables – and hence, the joint effect is indeed described by the Gaussian formula

$$m(t) = C \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \quad (7)$$

for appropriate values  $C$  and  $\sigma$ ; see, e.g., [17].

### 3.4 Fourier transform helps to compute convolution

According to the formula (5), the observed signal  $y(t)$  is the convolution of the original signal  $x(t)$  and the functions  $m(t)$  describing the layers through which the signal propagates.

From the computational viewpoint, computing the convolution directly is rather time-consuming: if we know the values  $x(t)$  and  $m(t)$  at  $n$  moments of time, then, to compute each of  $n$  values  $y(t)$  corresponding to these moments of time, we need to perform  $n$  multiplications  $m(t-s) \cdot x(s)$  and  $n$  additions adding these products together. Since we need  $n$  computational steps for each of  $n$  values  $y(t)$ , we thus need  $n \cdot n = n^2$  computational steps to compute all the values  $y(t)$ , i.e., to compute the entire transformed signal. For large  $n$ , this may take too long.

We can, however, speed up computations by taking into account that the Fourier transform of the convolution is simply equal to the product of Fourier transforms. This fact is the easiest to illustrate on the example of convolution of pdfs. A Fourier transform of a

function  $f(x)$  is defined as the integral

$$F(\omega) = \int \exp(-i \cdot \omega \cdot x) \cdot f(x) dx,$$

where we denoted  $i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{-1}$ . In particular, when  $f(x)$  is the probability density function  $\rho(x)$ , we get

$$F(\omega) = \int \exp(-i \cdot \omega \cdot x) \cdot \rho(x) dx.$$

One can see that this integral is equal to the expected value of the corresponding exponential function:

$$F(\omega) = E[\exp(-i \cdot \omega \cdot x)].$$

Similarly, the Fourier transforms  $F_1(\omega)$  and  $F_2(\omega)$  of the probability density functions  $\rho_1(x)$  and  $\rho_2(x)$  can be described as

$$F_1(\omega) = E[\exp(-i \cdot \omega \cdot x_1)] \text{ and}$$

$$F_2(\omega) = E[\exp(-i \cdot \omega \cdot x_2)].$$

When  $x = x_1 + x_2$ , then

$$\exp(-i \cdot \omega \cdot x) = \exp(-i \cdot \omega \cdot x_1) \cdot \exp(-i \cdot \omega \cdot x_2).$$

Since  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are independent, the expected value of the product is equal to the product of expected values:

$$E[\exp(-i \cdot \omega \cdot x)] = E[\exp(-i \cdot \omega \cdot x_1)] \cdot E[\exp(-i \cdot \omega \cdot x_2)],$$

i.e., indeed,  $F(\omega) = F_1(\omega) \cdot F_2(\omega)$ .

Thus, in terms of the Fourier transforms  $\hat{x}(\omega)$  of the original signal  $x(t)$  and  $\hat{y}(\omega)$  of the propagated signal  $y(t)$ , the relation (5) takes the form  $\hat{y}(\omega) = \hat{m}(\omega) \cdot \hat{x}(\omega)$ , where  $\hat{m}(\omega)$  is the Fourier transform of the Gaussian function (7). It is known that the Fourier transform of the Gaussian function (7) is also Gaussian,

$$\hat{m}(\omega) = \text{const} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \cdot \sigma^2 \cdot \omega^2\right).$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$\hat{y}(\omega) = \text{const} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \cdot \sigma^2 \cdot \omega^2\right) \cdot \hat{x}(\omega). \quad (8)$$

### 3.5 Relation between power spectra

We are interested in the power spectrum, which is the square of the absolute value of Fourier transform. The power spectra for the original and the propagated signals are, by definition, equal to  $X(\omega) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\hat{x}(\omega)|^2$  and  $Y(\omega) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\hat{y}(\omega)|^2$ . By taking the absolute value of both sides of the formula (8) and squaring the results, we conclude that the power spectrum  $X(\omega)$  of the original signal and the power spectrum  $Y(\omega)$  of the propagated signal are connected by a formula

$$Y(\omega) = \text{const} \cdot \exp(-\alpha \cdot \omega^2) \cdot X(\omega), \quad (9)$$

where we denoted  $\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma^2$ .

### 3.6 Let us list reasonable requirement for an approximating function

We are now ready to formulate the requirements on the approximating function.

We want to select a function  $F(\omega)$  that describes observed power spectrum of the seismic signal  $x(t)$ .

### 3.7 The approximating function should be non-negative

First, by definition, power spectrum  $X(\omega)$  is always non-negative:  $X(\omega) \geq 0$ .

It is therefore reasonable to require that the approximating function should also be non-negative:  $F(\omega) \geq 0$ .



### 3.8 The approximating functions should be differentiable

A single seismic signal comes from a single event – be it an earthquake or an artificially set explosion. This signal quickly fades with time. It is known that when a signal  $x(t)$  is limited in time, its Fourier transform  $\hat{x}(\omega)$  is differentiable infinite many times. Thus, its power spectrum  $X(\omega) = \hat{x}(\omega) \cdot (\hat{x}(\omega))^*$ , where  $z^*$  means complex conjugation, is also differentiable.

It is therefore reasonable to require that the approximating function  $F(\omega)$  be differentiable infinitely many times.

### 3.9 We should select a family of approximating functions

A seismic signal can have different amplitude. So, if  $x(t)$  is a reasonable seismic signal, then  $C \cdot x(t)$  is also a reasonable seismic signal, for any constant  $C$ .

For the signal  $x(t)$ , the power spectrum is equal to  $X(\omega) = |\hat{x}(\omega)|^2$ . When we replace the signal  $x(t)$  with the new signal  $x'(t) = C \cdot x(t)$ , the Fourier transform is multiplied by the same constant  $C$  and thus, the power spectrum is multiplied by  $C^2$ . So, if  $X(\omega)$  is a reasonable power spectrum, then  $C^2 \cdot X(\omega)$  is also a reasonable power spectrum. Any positive real number can be represented as  $C^2$ ; thus, we can describe this property in a simpler way: if  $X(\omega)$  is a reasonable power spectrum, and  $K > 0$ , then  $K \cdot X(\omega)$  is also a reasonable power spectrum.

If a function  $F(\omega)$  is a good approximation to the power spectrum  $X(\omega)$ , then for the spectrum  $K \cdot X(\omega)$ , it is reasonable to use an approximation  $K \cdot F(\omega)$ . In these terms, what we want to select is not a single approximating function  $F(\omega)$ , but rather a *family* of functions  $\{K \cdot F(\omega)\}_K$  corresponding to different values  $K > 0$ .

### 3.10 The approximating family should allow different time scales

Similarly, some seismic events are happening faster, some are happening slower. If we simply “slow down” or “speed up” a reasonable seismic signal, by replacing  $t$  with  $t/c$  for some  $c > 0$ , then we should also get a reasonable seismic signal. In other words, if  $x(t)$  is a reasonable seismic signal, then  $x(t/c)$  is also a reasonable seismic signal, for any constant  $c > 0$ .

For the signal  $x(t/c)$ , its Fourier transform is equal to  $\text{const} \cdot X(c \cdot \omega)$ . Thus, if  $X(\omega)$  is a reasonable power spectrum, and  $c > 0$ , then  $\text{const} \cdot X(c \cdot \omega)$  is also a reasonable power spectrum. We already know that multiplication also leads to a reasonable power spectrum, so we conclude that  $X(c \cdot \omega)$  is also a reasonable power spectrum.

If a function  $F(\omega)$  is a good approximation to the power spectrum  $X(\omega)$ , then for the spectrum  $X(c \cdot \omega)$ , it is reasonable to use an approximation  $F(c \cdot \omega)$ . Because of this, what we really want to select is a family of functions

$$\{K \cdot F(c \cdot \omega)\}_{K,c}$$

corresponding to different values  $K > 0$  and  $c > 0$ .

### 3.11 Propagation of the seismic signal should keep us within the approximating family

We want to approximate observed energy spectra. Different observed energy spectra  $Y_i(\omega)$  are obtained from the energy spectrum  $X(\omega)$  by the formula (9) corresponding to different values  $\alpha$ :

$$Y_1(\omega) = \text{const} \cdot \exp(-\alpha_1 \cdot \omega^2) \cdot X(\omega); \tag{10a}$$

$$Y_2(\omega) = \text{const} \cdot \exp(-\alpha_2 \cdot \omega^2) \cdot X(\omega). \tag{10b}$$

Without losing generality, we can assume that  $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ . In this case, from formulas (10a) and (10b), we conclude that

$$Y_2(\omega) = \exp(-\alpha \cdot \omega^2) \cdot Y_1(\omega), \quad (11)$$

where  $\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha_2 - \alpha_1$ .

So, if  $X(\omega)$  is a reasonable power spectrum, then the function

$$\exp(-\alpha \cdot \omega^2) \cdot X(\omega)$$

(corresponding to additional propagation) is also a reasonable power spectrum of the seismic signal.

It is therefore reasonable to require that if  $F(\omega)$  is an approximating function, then, for every  $\alpha > 0$ , this approximation  $\exp(-\alpha \cdot \omega^2) \cdot F(\omega)$  should also belong to the approximating family  $\{K \cdot F(c \cdot \omega)\}_{K,c}$ , i.e., that for every  $\alpha$ , there should be values  $K(\alpha)$  and  $c(\alpha)$  (depending on  $\alpha$ ) for which

$$\exp(-\alpha \cdot \omega^2) \cdot F(\omega) = K(\alpha) \cdot F(c(\alpha) \cdot \omega). \quad (12)$$

Since the function  $F(\omega)$  is differentiable, it is reasonable to require that the functions  $K(\alpha)$  and  $c(\alpha)$  should also be differentiable.

For  $\alpha = 0$ , there is no need for changing anything, so we should have  $K(0) = 1$  and  $c(0) = 1$ .

We are now ready to formulate our problem in precise terms.

# Chapter 4

## Main Result

### 4.1 Definitions

**Definition 1.** *By an approximating family, we mean a family of functions*

$$\{K \cdot F(c \cdot \omega)\}_{K,c},$$

where  $F(\omega) \geq 0$  is a non-negative function which is differentiable infinitely many times, and  $K$  and  $c$  can be any positive numbers.

*Comment.*

- The condition that  $F(\omega) \geq 0$  comes from the fact that we want to approximate power spectra, and power spectrum is, by definition, non-negative.
- The condition that the function  $F(\omega)$  be differentiable comes from the fact that we are approximating a wavelet, i.e., a signal which is bounded in time.
- The requirement that the approximating family contain functions  $K \cdot F(\omega)$  comes from the fact that seismic signals can have different amplitude.
- The requirement that the approximating family contain functions  $F(c \cdot \omega)$  comes from the fact that seismic signals can describe slower or faster processes.

**Definition 2.** *We say that an approximating family*

$$\{K \cdot F(c \cdot \omega)\}_{K,c}$$

is propagation invariant if for every  $\alpha > 0$ , the equality (12) is satisfied for some differentiable functions  $K(\alpha)$  and  $c(\alpha)$  for which  $K(0) = c(0) = 1$ .

*Comment.* This requirement means that if the approximating family is good for approximating signals coming after the first propagation stage, then this same family should also adequately describe signals which emerge from further propagation stages.

**Discussion.** One can check that the family corresponding to the Ricker wavelet function  $F(\omega) = \omega^2 \cdot \exp(-\omega^2)$  is propagation invariant: namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-\alpha \cdot \omega^2) \cdot F(\omega) &= \omega^2 \cdot \exp(-(1 + \alpha) \cdot \omega^2) = \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + \alpha} \cdot ((1 + \alpha) \cdot \omega^2 \cdot \exp(-(1 + \alpha) \cdot \omega^2)) = \\ &= K(\alpha) \cdot F(c(\alpha) \cdot \omega), \end{aligned}$$

for  $K(\alpha) = \frac{1}{1 + \alpha}$  and  $c(\alpha) = \sqrt{1 + \alpha}$ . Let us now show that the Ricker wavelet is (almost) uniquely determined by the property of propagation invariance: namely, that it is one of the simplest approximating families with this property.

## 4.2 Main result

**Proposition.** *Every propagation-invariant approximating family corresponds to the function  $F(\omega) = \omega^{2n} \cdot \exp(-\omega^2)$  for some natural number  $n = 0, 1, \dots$*

**Discussion.** The simplest case is  $n = 0$ . In this case, we get the signals which correspond to a propagation of a simple pulse – and thus, does not reflect the specifics of the original signal.

The simplest non-trivial case is  $n = 1$ , which is exactly the Ricker wavelet.

## 4.3 Proof

We know that all the functions  $F(\omega)$ ,  $K(\alpha)$ , and  $c(\alpha)$  are differentiable. Thus, we can differentiate both sides of the formula (12) with respect to  $\alpha$ . As a result, we get the

following equality:

$$\begin{aligned} -F(\omega) \cdot \exp(-\alpha \cdot \omega^2) \cdot \omega^2 = \\ K'(\alpha) \cdot F(c(\alpha) \cdot \omega) + K(\alpha) \cdot F'(c(\alpha) \cdot \omega) \cdot c'(\alpha) \cdot \omega, \end{aligned}$$

where  $K'(\alpha)$  denotes the derivative.

In particular, for  $\alpha = 0$ , we use the fact that  $K(0) = c(0) = 1$  to get

$$-F(\omega) \cdot \omega^2 = k \cdot F(\omega) + F'(\omega) \cdot c \cdot \omega, \quad (13)$$

where we denoted  $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K'(0)$  and  $c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} c'(0)$ . By moving all the terms proportional to  $F(\omega)$  to the left-hand side, we get

$$F \cdot (-k - \omega^2) = c \cdot \frac{dF}{d\omega} \cdot \omega. \quad (14)$$

To solve this differential equation, let us separate the variables, i.e., by multiplying both sides by appropriate factors, let move all the terms  $dF$  and  $F$  to the right-hand side and all the other terms (including the terms related to  $\omega$  and  $d\omega$ ) to the left-hand side. Then, we get:

$$\frac{1}{c} \cdot \frac{-k - \omega^2}{\omega} = \frac{dF}{F}, \quad (15)$$

i.e.,

$$-\frac{k}{c} \cdot \frac{1}{\omega} - c \cdot \omega = \frac{dF}{F}, \quad (16)$$

Integrating both sides, we get

$$C - \frac{k}{c} \cdot \ln(\omega) - \frac{c}{2} \cdot \omega^2 = \ln(F), \quad (17)$$

for some integration constant  $C$ . By exponentiating both sides, we conclude that

$$F(\omega) = A \cdot \omega^b \cdot \exp(-B \cdot \omega^2), \quad (18)$$

where  $A = \exp(C)$ ,  $b = -\frac{k}{c}$ , and  $B = \frac{c}{2}$ .

The requirement that this function be differentiable for  $\omega = 0$  leads to the conclusion that  $b$  is a natural number. The requirement that  $F(\omega)$  is non-negative means that  $b$  is an even natural number, i.e., that  $b = 2n$  for some natural number  $n$ .

The proposition is proven.

# Chapter 5

## Conclusions and Future Work

### 5.1 Conclusions

A natural way to process dynamic signals is to approximate these signals with functions from an appropriate family. In this paper, we consider the problem of processing seismic data. For this problem, we formulated reasonable requirements for approximating functions, and we showed that the simplest family of functions satisfying these requirements is the family of Ricker wavelets. This theoretical result is in good accordance with empirical findings – that in many cases, the use of Ricker wavelets enables us to use fewer parameters to approximate the same seismic signals with the given accuracy.

### 5.2 Future work

While in many cases, Ricker wavelet provide a very good approximation for seismic data, in some cases, the approximation quality of Ricker wavelets needs improvement. Such cases seem to indicate that it is not always sufficient to use the simplest possible approximate family of functions, that more complex approximating functions are sometimes needed. It is therefore desirable to find the best of such *more complex* approximating families – similar to how we found that the best of the *simplest* approximating families consists of Ricker wavelets.

# References

- [1] M. Apostolou, G. Gazetas, and E. Garini, “Seismic response of slender rigid structures with foundation uplifting”, *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, 2007, Vol. 27, pp. 642–654.
- [2] A. E. Barnes, “Instantaneous spectral bandwidth and dominant frequency with applications to seismic reflection data”, *Geophysics*, 1993, Vol. 58, No. 3, pp. 419–428.
- [3] A. Chakraborty and D. Okaya, “Frequency-time decomposition of seismic data using wavelet-based methods”, *Geophysics*, 1995, Vol. 60, No. 6, pp. 1906–1916.
- [4] X. Deng, Y. Li, and B. Yang, “Ricker wavelet LS-SVM and its parameter setting for seismic prospecting signals denoising”, In: C. Wang, S. Zhong, and J. Wei (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Space information Technology*, SPIE Proceedings, 2007, Vol. 6795, Paper 1H.
- [5] N. Economou, A. Vafidis, H. Hamdan, G. Kritikakis, N. Andronikidis, and K. Dimitriadis, “Time-varying deconvolution of GPR data in civil engineering”, *Nondestructive Testing and Evaluation*, 2012, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 285–292.
- [6] N. Gerolymos, M. Apostolou, and G. Gazetas, “Neural network analysis of overturning response under near-fault type excitation”, *Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration*, 2005, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 213–228.
- [7] A. Gholamy and V. Kreinovich, “Why Ricker wavelets are successful in processing seismic data: towards a theoretical explanation”, *Proceedings of the IEEE Series of Symposia on Computational Intelligence SSCI’2014*, Orlando, Florida, December 9–12, 2014, to appear.



- [8] P. Hubral and M. Tygel, “Analysis of the Rayleigh pulse”, *Geophysics*, 1989, Vol. 54, pp. 654–658.
- [9] O. Kosheleva, S. D. Cabrera, G. A. Gibson, and S. Cherukuri, “Interval estimates for signal processing: special purpose hardware”, *Reliable Computing*, 1999, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 175–196.
- [10] R. B. Latimer, R. Davison, and P. van Riel, “An interpreter’s guide to understanding and working with seismic-derived acoustic impedance data”, *The Leading Edge*, 2000, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 242–255.
- [11] J. Liu, Y. Wu, D. Han, and X. Li, “Time-frequency decomposition based on Ricker wavelets”, *Proceedings of the 74th Annual International Meeting of the Society of Exploratory Geophysicists SEG’2004*, Denver, Colorado, October, 10–15, 2004, pp. 1937–1940.
- [12] Y. Liu and S. Fomel, “Seismic data analysis using local time-frequency transform”, *Geophysical Prospecting*, 2013, Vol. 61, pp. 516–525.
- [13] M. Loli, I. Anastasopoulos, J. A. Knappett, and M. J. Brown, “Use of Ricker wavelet ground motions as an alternative to push-over testing”, *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Physical Modelling in Geotechnics ICPMG’2014*, Perth, Australia, January 14–17, 2014, pp. 1073–1078.
- [14] M. D. McCormack, D. E. Zaucha, and D. W. Dushek, “First-break refraction event picking and seismic data trace editing using neural networks”, *Geophysics*, 1993, Vol. 58, No. 1, pp. 67–78.
- [15] J. M. Mendel, “White-noise estimators for seismic data processing in oil exploration”, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 1977, Vol. AC-22, No. 5, pp. 694–706.

- [16] W. Menke, *Geophysical Data Analysis: Discrete Inverse Theory*, Academic Press, Waltham, Massachusetts, 2012.
- [17] O. Ochoa, M. Ceberio, and V. Kreinovich, “How to describe spatial resolution: an approach similar to the central limit theorem”, *Applied Mathematical Sciences*, 2010, Vol. 4, No. 63, pp. 3153–3160.
- [18] N. Ricker, “The form and laws of propagation of seismic wavelets”, *Geophysics*, 1953, Vol. 18, pp. 10–40.
- [19] E. A. Robinson and S. Treitel, *Digital Imaging and Deconvolution: The ABCs of Seismic Exploration and Processing*, Society of Exploration Geophysicists, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 2008.
- [20] D. J. Sheskin, *Handbook of Parametric and Nonparametric Statistical Procedures*, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, Florida, 2011.
- [21] R. H. Wolfe and C. N. Liu, “Interactive visualization of 3D seismic data: a volumetric method”, *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*, 1988, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 24–30.
- [22] V. Zania, P. N. Psarropoulos, Y. Karabatsos, and Y. Tsompanakis, “Inertial distress of waste landfills”, *Computers & Structures*, 2008, Vol. 86, No. 7, pp. 642–651.
- [23] C. Zhang and T. J. Ulrych, “Estimation of quality factors from CMP records”, *Geophysics*, 2002, Vol. 67, No. 5, pp. 1542–1547.

# Curriculum Vitae

Afshin Gholamy was born in Tehran, Iran on July 24, 1982. He obtained his Bachelor's degree in Mining Engineering from the University of Tehran in February 2004, and a Master's degree in Exploration Seismology from the University of Tehran in July 2010.

He joined the graduate program in geological sciences at the University of Texas at El Paso in September 2012.

Permanent address: 3500 Sunbowl Drive Apt. 32

El Paso, Texas 79902

This thesis was typed by the author.