# 2D and 3D multichannel seismic method: Deep imaging, amplitudes and velocities

#### Mutter & Carton (2013); History of Moho reflection imaging across ocean basins since 1970s

Early 2D imaging of reflection Moho; East Pacific Rise from R/V *Conrad* 

- (a) Herron et al. (1980), 1976 survey
- (b) Stoffa et al. (1980), 1976 survey



Barth & Mutter (1996), 1985 survey







Early 3D imaging of reflection Moho; East Pacific Rise from R/V *Ewing* 

Singh et al. (2006), 1997 survey

(a,b) Same view into 3D cube but with different color scales

(c,d) Cross-axis and along-axis sections from 3D cube, respectively





Image slices from 3D prestack migrated cube

2

#### Picked seafloor, AML, OAMLs and Moho surfaces





#### **3D prestack time migration**



Common image gathers (CIGs) before (a) and after (b) LIFT filtering (Choo et al., 2004)

## **2D prestack depth migration**



#### Summary (direct method)

2D/3D MCS data collection & processing to from reflection images of oceanic crust have greatly improved since the first 1976 EPR survey

- Powerful tuned source = increased vertical resolution
- Denser observation = increased lateral resolution
- Longer streamers = higher fold = higher signal2noise ratio
- Longer streamers = better velocity model = better imaging
- Longer streamers = seismic attributes = rock properties

-1976/1985 EPR 9% 13% surveys:~55% 30% Moho imaging-1991 EPR 14% survey:~30% Moho imaging-2002 JDF survey:>60% Moho imaging-2008 EPR 3D survey:~89/92% Moho imaging

### Summary (indirect method)

Petroleum industry standard today are 3D wide-azimuth multi ship long streamer multichannel seismic surveys

Reflection imaging is the last tool they would let go