

Automatic Seismic Interpretation Networks FORCE ML symposium 2019

Dimitrios Oikonomou*, Giorgos Stefos, Thodoris Papadopoulos, Steve Purves, Nan Duan Chalong Jaruwattanasaku, Behzad Alaei, Eirik Larsen



The Geoscience Problem

Interpret complex 3D geobodies fast with minimal human input



Manual (point) interpretation:

- time consuming
- prone to errors

Manual 2D interpretation on 18 crosslines



Automatic Seismic Interpretation

Earth Science Analytics acknowledge New Zealand Petroleum and Minerals (NZPM) for providing Parihaka 3D data



Methodology followed

Methods & Parameters controlled:

- Train Split Blind
- Training slices: 18 crosslines
- Blind slices: 2 crosslines
- Patch size: 256 x 256
- Random Noise: 1%
- Dropout: 0.2
- Epochs: 100

Architectures tested:

- Unet Light Unet
- Segnet Light Segnet
- PSP Light PSP
- DeepLab3+ Light DeepLab3+

Loss functions:

- Weighted cross entropy
- Dice
- Jaccard



Segnet

Classic Segnet Architecture [1]



<u>Light - Segnet</u>

- Add/remove any number of layers
- Respectively customize filters on convolution layers

This results in full control over network depth and number of training parameters.

Year released: 2015 Benchmarks (VOC2012)[5] -Mean IOU: 0.599



Unet



Classic Lipst Arabitastura [2]

Year released: 2015 Benchmarks (ISBI cell tracking challenge) -Mean IOU: 0.775

<u>Light Unet</u>

- Add/remove any number of layers
- Respectively customize filters on convolution layers

This results in full control over network depth and number of training parameters.



Pyramid Scene Parsing Network (Psp Net)



Light PSP

- During Feature Map phase usually a Resnet (huge) is used so we:
 - Reduce Resnet's overall size
- During Pyramid Pooling Module one can modify the dimensions of the sub-regions

Year released: 2017 Benchmarks (VOC2012) -Mean IOU: 85.4

DeepLab v3+

Classic DeepLabV3+ architecture [4]



EARTH SCIENCE ANALYTICS

<u>Light Deeplab</u>

Same as the Psp Net one can use smaller CNN's as feature extractors and different Convolution dilation rates (Atrous Conv)

Year released: 2018 Benchmarks (VOC2012) -Mean IOU: 87.8



Truth Labels on Blind Test Slices

Blind 1

Blind 2



Human expert's seismic interpretation (labels) are regarded as ground truth



Segnet results

Blind 1

























IoU: 0.624



Full Segnet (~29M parameters)

Truth









Light Segnet (~2M parameters)

IoU: 0.701



Light Segnet (~300K parameters)









IoU: 0.704











Segnet results





Light Segnet results against loss functions

Blind 2









Unet results





Light Unet results against loss functions

Blind 1

Blind 2









Psp net results





Light PSP results against loss functions





DeepLabv3+ results (Xception feature extractor)





DeepLabv3+ results





Light DeepLabv3+ results against loss functions

Blind 2





Comparison of light networks vs Loss





Conclusions Architectures, Data driven

- On limited dataset large (public) networks tend to overfit
- Large networks do not guarantee better performance
- Revisit results obtained by Segnet architectures
- Smaller networks easier (and cheaper) to train
- Weighted Cross Entropy Loss slightly tends to overestimate volumes of unbalanced class (channels in the specific problem)
- Dice and Jaccard Loss slightly tends to underestimate volumes of unbalanced class

It is important to check network size with respect of the available labels



Conclusions, G&G



- ASI reduces interpretation cycle time
- ASI can improve quality of interpretation of very complex geological objects
- ASI 3D output can be used in for 3D geological models



Conclusions, G&G



Interactive labeling

- Model seems to predict 'better' than the labeler in some slices
- Obtaining True labels is a challenge, but key in order to train properly
- Interactive approach gives an effective suggestion for the labeller to make a decision.
- With the real time helping from DNN, the labeller can resolve challenges in complex areas
- DNN architectures smooth out possible inconsistency in labels by minimizing a global loss



References

- 1. Vijay Badrinarayanan, Alex Kendall, Roberto Cipolla. SegNet: A Deep Convolutional Encoder-Decoder Architecture for Image Segmentation. arXiv:1511.00561v3, 2015
- 2. Olaf Ronneberger, Philipp Fischer, Thomas Brox. U-Net: Convolutional Networks for Biomedical Image Segmentation. arXiv:1505.04597, 2015
- 3. Hengshuang Zhao, Jianping Shi, Xiaojuan Qi, Xiaogang Wang, Jiaya Jia. Pyramid Scene Parsing Network. arXiv:1612.01105, 2017
- 4. Liang-Chieh Chen, Yukun Zhu, George Papandreou, Florian Schroff, Hartwig Adam. Encoder-Decoder with Atrous Separable Convolution for Semantic Image Segmentation. arXiv:1802.02611, 2018
- 5. PASCAL VOC Challenge performance evaluation, <u>Leaderboard link</u>

We greatly appreciate and acknowledge the contributions of our Petromaks2 Project Partners: **The Research Council of Norway, WintershallDEA, Spirit Energy, Lundin,ConocoPhillips**