

Applications of Regional Geophysics and Geochemistry Paper 113



# Euler Deconvolution, Past, Present and Future: A Review

Reid, A.B.<sup>[1]</sup>

1. GETECH, c/o Department of Earth Sciences, Leeds University, Leeds, United Kingdom

# INTRODUCTION

Euler's homogeneity relation has attracted sporadic interest from geophysicists over the years. It may be stated succinctly in the form

$$(x - x_0)\frac{\partial T}{\partial x} + (y - y_0)\frac{\partial T}{\partial y} + (z - z_0)\frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = N(B - T)$$
[1]

where  $(x_o, y_o, z_o)$  is the position of a source whose total field *T* is detected at (x, y, z). The total field has a regional or background value *B*. *N* is the degree of homogeneity, interpreted physically as the fall-off rate with distance and geophysically as a structural index (*SI*: Thompson, 1982).

## **Profile analysis**

Hood (1963) showed that Euler's relation could be used to calculate depth to point pole (*SI*=2) or point dipole (*SI*=3), given a measured vertical gradient. Ruddock *et al.* (1966) were awarded a U.S. patent describing the use of a vertical gradiometer and Euler's relation to determine the depth of and fall-off rate (*SI*) from a magnetic discontinuity. They recognized *SIs* of 1, 2 and 3 as corresponding to sheets, line sources and point sources, respectively.

The relation was subsequently employed to estimate source type, given position and depth known or estimated by other methods (Slack *et al.*, 1967; Barongo, 1984). Steenland (1968) has pointed out that fall-off rate (*SI*) is only approximately a constant for real source bodies over particular distance ranges.

Thompson (1982) developed the profile technique quite fully, named it EULDPH, and suggested that SIs between 0.5 and 3 were useful on pole reduced magnetic data. The fault model (*SI* 0.5) required some empirically based corrections to obtain depth. Soon thereafter it was applied to data from the Witwatersrand Basin (Durrheim, 1983; Wilsher, 1987; Corner and Wilsher, 1989). Wilsher also showed, by application of Poisson's relation, that the vertical gradient of gravity (i.e.,

pseudo-magnetic field) could be expected to behave like magnetic field and could benefit from EULDPH methods.

## Grid analysis

Reid *et al.* (1990) followed up a suggestion in Thompson's paper and developed the equivalent method operating on gridded magnetic data. They also introduced the concept of the zero *SI* for contacts. Finally, they suggested that the technique could be expected to work on gravity data by showing that Euler's equation was approximately obeyed by the gravity anomaly over a finite step using an *SI* of 1.0. They coined the term "Euler deconvolution" by analogy with "Werner deconvolution".

Paterson *et al.* (1991) showed that an *SI* value of 2.0 was of practical use in locating kimberlite pipes. Since then, SIs between 2 and 3 have found environmental application in drum location (Yaghoobian *et al.*, 1992).

#### **Regional studies**

Euler deconvolution has found wide application to regional studies. These include the Witwatersrand Basin (Durrheim, 1983; Corner and Wilsher, 1989), the Ashanti Gold Belt of Ghana (Beasley and Golden, 1993), Wales (McDonald *et al.*, 1992), and the Sudbury structure (Hearst and Morris, 1993).

#### Gravity deconvolution

Because vertical gradient of gravity is effectively a pole reduced pseudo-magnetic field, Euler deconvolution should be directly applicable to vertical gravity gradient (Wilsher, 1987). Marson and Klingele (1993) have shown excellent examples of this on both model and smallscale archeological data.

In "Proceedings of Exploration 97: Fourth Decennial International Conference on Mineral Exploration" edited by A.G. Gubins, 1997, p. 861–864

## **RECENT DEVELOPMENTS**

## **Defocused solutions**

The clean-up of sprays of defocused solutions, to which the method seems prone, has been addressed with some success by Fairhead *et al.* (1994) who applied a Laplacian filter to obtain those portions of the grid that showed significant curvature and restricted the deconvolution to those areas, so eliminating most spurious solutions. Kuttikul (1995) has shown that the sprays contain information about interface dip (to which Euler deconvolution is otherwise insensitive). He also showed that positive curvature of the Analytic Signal is a useful discriminator against such sprays. Featherstone (Featherstone, P.S., pers. comm., 1995) has suggested that the sprays may be regarded as diffractions and may possibly be collapsed onto their prime points using seismic migration techniques. Huang (Huang, D., pers. comm., 1996) has shown that it is possible to improve solution clustering by exploiting the clustering of gradient vector intersections.

#### Solution for SI and multiple sources

The choice of structural index remains a vexing problem, because structures are poorly imaged and depths are biased if the wrong index is used for any given feature (Reid *et al.*, 1990). In any real geological situation, features representing more than one structural index are likely to be present. Neil (1990) and Neil *et al.* (1991) had some success in deriving structural indices as well as positions from the data themselves, using statistical methods that normalised the uncertainties on each position and depth solution. Stavrev (1997) has demonstrated the use of Similar Transformations to reduce ambiguity in choosing *SI* and in locating multiple sources.

It may be possible to avoid the issue by using a multiple source approach. Hansen (Hansen, R.O., pers. comm., 1995) recently produced a theoretical treatment of this fairly intractable problem. Although it may not be simple to implement, it offers the possibility of viewing all bodies as composites of the contact (SI = 0) case. If this approach is successful, it could address the additional problems of fractional and variable *SI* posed by many real cases (Steenland, 1968; Ravat, 1994). A multiple source approach also offers the possibility of dealing with higher order backgrounds.

#### Fractal dimension

Ravat (1994) has pointed out that the definitions of *SI* and Fractal Dimension are effectively identical. He has exploited this to examine problems of variable *SI*, but the insight may lead to other developments.

#### Other fields

Huang (1996) shows that Euler deconvolution can be applied to any field or function displaying Euler Homogeneity. This includes the Analytic Signal and Horizontal Gradient of gravity or magnetic fields when they are themselves homogeneous. The appropriate *SI* will be that applicable to the gravity or magnetic case, plus unity.

### Visualisation

Useful work was done on visualising the results on a graphics workstation by Allsop *et al.* (1991). The 3-D feel of a rotating cloud of points was displayed in real time and captured on video. A graphics workstation approach using visualisation tools such as AVS offers obvious further benefits which are being investigated.

#### Abuse of Euler deconvolution

I have observed a great many examples of abuse of the method, arising from naive use of both commercial and home-written software. The main problems seem to be poor gradient grids and a lack of understanding of the meaning of *SI*. Poor gradient grids frequently occur when they are derived using Fourier methods without due care to avoid the ringing to which the methods are prone. The only necessary precaution is critical imaging of the gradient grids before use. Some workers appear to regard *SI* as a "Fudge Factor" completely at the choice of the experimenter, without any consideration of the implicit physical and geological meaning of any particular choice. Misleading results are the inevitable consequence.

## THE FUTURE

- Develop a reliable method of estimating structural index or avoiding the problem.
- 2. Discover the meaning and uses of the background value, B.
- 3. Develop a better understanding of the deconvolution of gravity.
- Investigate multiple source deconvolution or other means of dealing with higher order backgrounds.
- 5. Develop visualisation and on-screen interpretation using modern graphics workstations.
- 6. Explore the use of Euler deconvolution on other homogeneous fields.

We are presently working on these topics and hope to have results to report before long.

#### REFERENCES

- Allsop, J.M., Evans, C.J., and McDonald, A.J.W., 1991, Visualizing and interpreting 3-D Euler solutions using enhanced computer graphics: Surveys in Geophysics, v 12, p 553-564.
- Barongo, J.O., 1984, Euler's differential equation and the identification of the magnetic point-pole and point-dipole sources: Short Note, Geophysics, v 49, p 1549-1553.
- Beasley, C.W., and Golden, H.C., 1993, Application of Euler Deconvolution to Magnetics Data from the Ashanti Belt, Southern Ghana: Extended Abstract GM1.6, p417-420, SEG Annual Meeting, Washington DC.
- Corner, B., and Wilsher, W.A., 1989, Structure of the Witwatersrand Basin derived from interpretation of the aeromagnetic and gravity data: in Garland, G.D., ed., Proceedings of Exploration '87: Third decennial international conference on geophysical and geochemical exploration for minerals and groundwater. Ontario Geological Survey, Special Volume 3, 960p.
- Durrheim, R.J., 1983, Regional-residual separation and automatic interpretation of aeromagnetic data: Unpublished M.Sc. thesis, University of Pretoria, 117 p.

- Fairhead, J.D., Bennett, K.J., Gordon, D.R.H and Huang, D., 1994, Euler: beyond the "Black Box": Extended Abstract GM1.1, p 422-424, SEG Annual Meeting, Los Angeles.
- Hearst, R.B., and Morris, W.A., 1993, Interpretation of the Sudbury Structure through Euler Deconvolution: Extended Abstract GM1.7, p 421-424, SEG Annual Meeting, Washington DC.
- Hood, P.J., 1963, Gradient measurements in aeromagnetic surveying: Geophysics, v 30, p 891-902.
- Huang, D., 1996, Enhancement of automatic interpretation techniques for recognising potential field sources. Ph.D. Thesis, Dept of Earth Sciences, Univ. of Leeds.
- Kuttikul, P., 1995, Optimization of 3D Euler deconvolution for the interpretation of potential field data: Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, International Training Centre, Delft.
- Marson, I., and Klingele, E.E., 1993, Advantages of using the vertical gradient of gravity for 3-D interpretation: Geophysics v 58, p 1588-1595.
- McDonald, A.J.W., Fletcher, C.J.N., Carruthers, R.M., Wilson, D., and Evans, R.B., 1992, Interpretation of the regional gravity and magnetic surveys of Wales, using shaded relief and Euler deconvolution techniques: Geol. Mag., v 129, p 523-531.
- Neil, C., 1990. A computer program to interpret automatically potential field data using Euler's equation of homogeneity: Unpublished M.Sc. thesis, University of Leeds, 72p.
- Neil, C., Whaler, K.A., and Reid, A.B., 1991, Extensions to Euler's method for three-dimensional potential field interpretation: (Abstract) Presented at EAEG, Florence.
- Paterson, N. R., Kwan, K.C.H., and Reford, S.W., 1991, Use of Euler Deconvolution in Recognizing Magnetic Anomalies of Pipelike Bodies: Extended Abstract G/M2.6, p 642-645, SEG Annual Meeting, Houston.

- Ravat, D, 1994, Use of fractal dimension to determine the applicability of Euler's homogeneity equation for finding source locations of gravity and magnetic anomalies: *in* Proc. of the Symposium on the Application of Geophysics to Engineering and Environmental problems, Boston, March 1994, Environmental and Engineering Geophysical Society, Englewood, CO, p 41-53.
- Reid, A.B., Allsop, J.M., Granser, H., Millett, A.J., and Somerton, I.W., 1990, Magnetic interpretation in three dimensions using Euler deconvolution: Geophysics, v 55, p 80-91.
- Ruddock, K.A., Slack, H.A., and Breiner, S, 1966, Method for determining depth and fall-off rate of subterranean magnetic disturbances utilising a plurality of magnetometers: U.S. Patent 3,263,161, filed Mar. 26, 1963, awarded July 26, 1966, assigned to Varian Associates and Pure Oil Company.
- Slack, H.A., Lynch, V.M., and Langan, L., 1967, The geomagnetic gradiometer: Geophysics, v 32, p 877-892.
- Stavrev, P., 1997, Euler deconvolution using differential similarity transformations of gravity or magnetic anomalies: Geophys. Prosp., v 45, p 207-246.
- Steenland, N.C., 1968, Discussion on "The geomagnetic gradiometer" by H.A Slack, V.M. Lynch, and L. Langan (Geophysics, October 1967, p.877-892). Geophysics, v 323, p681-684.
- Thompson, D.T., 1982, EULDPH—a new technique for making computerassisted depth estimates from magnetic data: Geophysics, v 47, p 31-37.
- Wilsher, W.A., 1987, A structural interpretation of the Witwatersrand Basin through the application of automated depth algorithms to both gravity and aeromagnetic data: Unpubl. M.Sc. dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 70 p.
- Yaghoobian, A., Boustead, G.A., and Dobush, T.M., 1992, Object delineation using Euler's Homogeneity Equation. Location and Depth Determination of Buried Ferro-Metallic Bodies: Proceedings of SAGEEP 92, San Diego, California.