



**HAL**  
open science

# Full Waveform Inversion Adjoint Studies MATHIAS 2018

Pierre Jacquet, H el ene Barucq, Julien Diaz, Henri Calandra

► **To cite this version:**

Pierre Jacquet, H el ene Barucq, Julien Diaz, Henri Calandra. Full Waveform Inversion Adjoint Studies MATHIAS 2018. MATHIAS 2018 - Computational Science Engineering & Data Science by TOTAL, Oct 2018, Serris, France. hal-01907804

**HAL Id: hal-01907804**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01907804v1>**

Submitted on 29 Oct 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destin ee au d ep ot et  a la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publi es ou non,  emanant des  tablissements d'enseignement et de recherche fran ais ou  trangers, des laboratoires publics ou priv es.

# Full Waveform Inversion Adjoint Studies

MATHIAS 2018

Pierre Jacquet

pierre.jacquet@inria.fr

Barucq H el ene, Diaz Julien, Calandra Henri

First year PhD Student

Inria - Magique 3D - DIP

Pau, FRANCE



## The acoustic model

- The continuous model

- The discretized problem

- Assets of Bernstein polynomials

## Adjoint Studies

- FWI Introduction

- Adjoint then Discretized

- Discretize then Adjoint

## Some Results

- Consistency of the Adjoint Solution

- FWI Preliminary test

- Qualitative Cost Function Gradient Study

## The acoustic model

The continuous model

The discretized problem

Assets of Bernstein polynomials

## Adjoint Studies

FWI Introduction

Adjoint then Discretized

Discretize then Adjoint

## Some Results

Consistency of the Adjoint Solution

FWI Preliminary test

Qualitative Cost Function Gradient Study

Continuous Problem:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{\rho_0 \mathbf{v}_p^2} \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} = f_p \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ \rho_0 \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} = f_v \quad \text{in } \Omega \end{array} \right.$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(t=0) = 0 \\ v(t=0) = 0 \\ \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}_p \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma \end{array} \right.$$




Figure: 1D Domain Model

Discretized Problem:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \bar{\mathbf{P}}}{\partial t} = A_{pv} \bar{\mathbf{V}} + A_{pp} \bar{\mathbf{P}} + \bar{\mathbf{F}}_p \\ \frac{\partial \bar{\mathbf{V}}}{\partial t} = A_{vp} \bar{\mathbf{P}} \end{cases}$$




Figure: 1D Discretized Domain

- ▶ **Discontinuous Galerkin** space discretization
- ▶ Different **time-schemes** (RK4, AB3)
- ▶ Two polynomial basis (**Lagrange** and **Bernstein**)
- ▶ Constant velocity ( $\mathbf{v}_p$ ) per cells
- ▶ Constant density ( $\rho_0$ ) per cells

Bernstein formulation:

$$B_{ijkl}^N = C_{ijkl}^N \lambda_0^i \lambda_1^j \lambda_2^k \lambda_3^l \quad \text{with: } C_{ijkl}^N = \frac{N!}{i!j!k!l!}$$




$P[X^5]$  Bernstein basis

Bernstein formulation:

$$B_{ijkl}^N = C_{ijkl}^N \lambda_0^i \lambda_1^j \lambda_2^k \lambda_3^l \quad \text{with: } C_{ijkl}^N = \frac{N!}{i!j!k!l!}$$

Easy Derivative expression:

$$\frac{\partial B_{\alpha}^N}{\partial \lambda_p} = N B_{\alpha - e_p}^{N-1} \quad \text{with: } \alpha = (i, j, k, l)$$



$P[X^5]$  Bernstein basis



Bernstein formulation:


$$B_{ijkl}^N = C_{ijkl}^N \lambda_0^i \lambda_1^j \lambda_2^k \lambda_3^l \quad \text{with: } C_{ijkl}^N = \frac{N!}{i!j!k!l!}$$

Easy Derivative expression:

$$\frac{\partial B_{\alpha}^N}{\partial \lambda_p} = N B_{\alpha - e_p}^{N-1} \quad \text{with: } \alpha = (i, j, k, l)$$


Sparse Degree Elevation operator:

$$B_{\alpha}^{N-1} = \sum_{p=0}^d \frac{\alpha_p + 1}{N} B_{\alpha + e_p}^N$$




P[X<sup>5</sup>] Bernstein basis

Unique boundary condition values :




$P(X^5)$  Lagrange basis




$P(X^5)$  Bernstein basis

⇒ Same Flux Management

# Derivative-Operator Analysis



3D Lagrange D matrix



3D Bernstein D matrix

- [1] Chan J. and Warburton T.  
GPU-Accelerated Bernstein Bézier Discontinuous Galerkin Methods for Wave Problems  
*SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 2017

# 1D Results




Figure: Operators NZVs as a function of the order

## The acoustic model

- The continuous model

- The discretized problem

- Assets of Bernstein polynomials

## Adjoint Studies

- FWI Introduction

- Adjoint then Discretized

- Discretize then Adjoint


## Some Results




- Consistency of the Adjoint Solution

- FWI Preliminary test

- Qualitative Cost Function Gradient Study

# FWI Introduction






$$J(p) = \frac{1}{2} \|Rp - \text{data}\|^2$$


- Find  $v_p$  and  $\rho_0$  to minimize  $J$


*Continuous  
Direct Problem*











$$J(p) = \frac{1}{2} \|Rp - data\|^2$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{\rho_0 \mathbf{v}_p^2} \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = f_p \\ \rho_0 \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} + \nabla p = 0 \\ p(t=0) = 0 \\ \mathbf{v}(t=0) = 0 \\ \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}_p \nabla p \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma \end{array} \right.$$

$$t \in [0, T]$$


$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{\rho_0 \mathbf{v}_p^2} \frac{\partial \lambda_1}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \lambda_2 = \frac{\partial J}{\partial p} \\ \rho_0 \frac{\partial \lambda_2}{\partial t} + \nabla \lambda_1 = 0 \\ \lambda_1(t=T) = 0 \\ \lambda_2(t=T) = 0 \\ \frac{\partial \lambda_1}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}_p \nabla \lambda_1 \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma \end{array} \right.$$

$$t \in [T, 0]$$

$$J(\bar{\mathbf{P}}) = \frac{1}{2} \|R\bar{\mathbf{P}} - data\|^2$$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \bar{\mathbf{P}}^n}{\partial t} = A_{pv} \bar{\mathbf{V}}^n + A_{pp} \bar{\mathbf{P}}^n + \bar{\mathbf{F}}_p^n \\ \frac{\partial \bar{\mathbf{V}}^n}{\partial t} = A_{vp} \bar{\mathbf{P}}^n \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \bar{\Lambda}_1^n}{\partial t} = +A_{pv} \bar{\Lambda}_2^n + A_{pp} \bar{\Lambda}_1^n + \bar{\mathbf{D}}_p^n \\ \frac{\partial \bar{\Lambda}_2^n}{\partial t} = A_{vp} \bar{\Lambda}_1^n \end{cases}$$



$$\frac{\partial \bar{\mathbf{U}}^n}{\partial t} = A \bar{\mathbf{U}}^n + \bar{\mathbf{F}}^n \quad \text{With : } \bar{\mathbf{U}} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{P}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{V}} \end{pmatrix}, A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{pp} & A_p \\ A_v & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \bar{\mathbf{F}} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{F}}_p \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

All time scheme can be summed-up such as :

$$L\bar{\mathbf{U}} = E\bar{\mathbf{F}}$$

We are looking for a Discrete Adjoint state satisfying :

$$L^* \bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = -R^*(R\bar{\mathbf{U}} - data)$$

# DtA : Discretize then Adjoint Strategy

Example with RK4



RK4 time-scheme leads to :

$$\bar{U}^{n+1} = B\bar{U}^n + C_0\bar{F}^n + C_{\frac{1}{2}}\bar{F}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} + C_1\bar{F}^{n+1}$$

$$L\bar{U} = E\bar{F} = \bar{G}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} I & & & & \\ -B & I & & & \\ & -B & I & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & -B & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{U}^0 \\ \bar{U}^1 \\ \bar{U}^2 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{U}^n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{G}^0 \\ \bar{G}^1 \\ \bar{G}^2 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{G}^n \end{pmatrix}$$

So :

$$L^* = \begin{pmatrix} I & -B^* & & & \\ & I & -B^* & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & I & -B^* \\ & & & & I \end{pmatrix}$$





$$\langle L\bar{U}, \bar{\Lambda} \rangle = \langle \bar{U}, L^*\bar{\Lambda} \rangle$$

$$\langle L\bar{U}, \bar{\Lambda} \rangle = \langle \bar{U}, L^*\bar{\Lambda} \rangle$$

$$\begin{cases} L\bar{U} = E\bar{F} = \bar{G} \\ \bar{U}(t=0) = 0 \end{cases}$$



$$\begin{cases} L^*\bar{\Lambda} = -R^*(R\bar{U} - data) = \bar{D} \\ \bar{\Lambda}(t=T) = 0 \end{cases}$$



$$\langle L\bar{U}, \bar{\Lambda} \rangle = \langle \bar{U}, L^*\bar{\Lambda} \rangle$$

$$\begin{cases} L\bar{U} = E\bar{F} = \bar{G} \\ \bar{U}(t=0) = 0 \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} L^*\bar{\Lambda} = -R^*(R\bar{U} - data) = \bar{D} \\ \bar{\Lambda}(t=T) = 0 \end{cases}$$




$$\langle E\bar{F}, \bar{\Lambda} \rangle = \langle \bar{U}, -R^*(R\bar{U} - data) \rangle$$

$$\langle L\bar{U}, \bar{\Lambda} \rangle = \langle \bar{U}, L^*\bar{\Lambda} \rangle$$

$$\begin{cases} L\bar{U} = E\bar{F} = \bar{G} \\ \bar{U}(t=0) = 0 \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} L^*\bar{\Lambda} = -R^*(R\bar{U} - data) = \bar{D} \\ \bar{\Lambda}(t=T) = 0 \end{cases}$$



$$\langle E\bar{F}, \bar{\Lambda} \rangle = \langle \bar{U}, -R^*(R\bar{U} - data) \rangle$$

$$\langle \bar{G}, \bar{\Lambda} \rangle = \langle \bar{U}, \bar{D} \rangle$$

**Adjoint test succeeds  $\iff$  operator  $L^*$  well established**

## The acoustic model

- The continuous model

- The discretized problem

- Assets of Bernstein polynomials

## Adjoint Studies

- FWI Introduction

- Adjoint then Discretized

- Discretize then Adjoint

## Some Results

- Consistency of the Adjoint Solution

- FWI Preliminary test

- Qualitative Cost Function Gradient Study

Adjoint test passed for :


- ▶ Lagrange Operators
- ▶ Bernstein Operators
- ▶ Runge Kutta 4 time-scheme
- ▶ Adams Bashforth 3 time-scheme
- ▶ With a canonical space inner-product  
 $\langle u, v \rangle_X = \sum_i u_i v_i$
- ▶ With a M-space inner product  
 $\langle u, v \rangle_X^M = \langle Mu, v \rangle_X$

Adjoint test passed for :


- ▶ Lagrange Operators
- ▶ Bernstein Operators
- ▶ Runge Kutta 4 time-scheme
- ▶ Adams Bashforth 3 time-scheme
- ▶ With a canonical space inner-product  
( $\langle u, v \rangle_X = \sum_i u_i v_i$ )
- ▶ With a M-space inner product  
( $\langle u, v \rangle_X^M = \langle Mu, v \rangle_X$ )

```
./run
--- Adjoint test ----
inner product UP/DUDP 553123.57586755091
inner product GPGU/QPQU 553123.57586756046
./run
--- Adjoint test ----
inner product UP/DUDP -75077.332007383695
inner product GPGU/QPQU -75077.332007386358
./run
--- Adjoint test ----
inner product UP/DUDP 125669.89223600870
inner product GPGU/QPQU 125669.89223600952
./run
--- Adjoint test ----
inner product UP/DUDP -132852.64215701097
inner product GPGU/QPQU -132852.64215701059
```

# Non consistency of the Adjoint solution



With the AtD strategy




With the DtA strategy using the canonical inner-product (Lagrange+RK4)

Adjoint test succeeds !


- [1] Sei Alain and Symes William  
A Note on Consistency and Adjointness for Numerical Schemes  
1997



# FWI Preliminary test (for all strategies)







Target model



Initial model (iter=0)


# FWI Preliminary test (for all strategies)



Intermediate model (iter=20)


Final model (iter=50)

# Qualitative Cost Function Gradient Study




**Figure:** Comparison between a Reference Gradient and the FWI Gradient with AtD strategy (Bernstein elements and RK4 time scheme)

# Qualitative Cost Function Gradient Study




**Figure:** Comparison between a Reference Gradient and the FWI Gradient with DtA strategy (Bernstein elements and RK4 time scheme)

# Qualitative Cost Function Gradient Study



**Figure:** Comparison between a Reference Gradient and the FWI Gradient with AtD strategy (Lagrange elements and RK4 time scheme)

# Qualitative Cost Function Gradient Study



**Figure:** Comparison between a Reference Gradient and the FWI Gradient with DtA strategy (Lagrange elements and RK4 time scheme)

## Conclusion :

- ▶ Adjoint then Discretized strategy works
- ▶ Discretized then Adjoint strategy has unexpected results (Gradient formulation ? Bug ?)
- ▶ The adjoint state is not consistent by using the Discretized and Adjoint strategy (but Adjoint test succeeds)

## Conclusion :

- ▶ Adjoint then Discretized strategy works
- ▶ Discretized then Adjoint strategy has unexpected results (Gradient formulation ? Bug ?)
- ▶ The adjoint state is not consistent by using the Discretized and Adjoint strategy (but Adjoint test succeeds)

## Perspectives :

- ▶ Complementary 1D tests
- ▶ 2D FWI + tests
- ▶ 3D FWI + tests
- ▶ Coupling SEM/DG elements (Aurélien Citrain's thesis)