Paper Number: 5357 A Bayesian approach to geophysical inversion for quantifying geological uncertainty

Gibson, H.J.¹, FitzGerald, D.J.¹ and Paterson, R.¹

¹Intrepid Geophysics, Suite 110, 3 Male Street, Brighton, Victoria, Australia <u>helen@intrepid-geophysics.com</u>

Performing inversion on gravity or magnetic data sets may have multiple goals, but here we outline a Bayesian inversion workflow which usefully provides, amongst other products from posterior models, a quantifiable outcome for uncertainty surrounding geological boundaries within solid geology models. The workflow begins with building a 3D reference geology model (Figure 1), constrained by both contact data points (formation boundaries from mapping or drilling), and structural orientation data (dip, azimuths from bedding). Rock property tables are then created per geological unit in the model (densities and magnetic susceptibilities).

Using observed geophysical data sets for gravity and magnetics, the workflow then proceeds. We advocate a Bayesian-style litho-constrained inversion, based on a Markov Chain Monte Carlo formulation, in which model perturbations from 'beginning' to 'end' of iterations progressively explore potentially millions of valid models rather than iterations ceasing when misfits reach a specified low limit (alternatively a 'Deterministic ' approach).

Workflow

- 1. Build a reference 3D geology model
- Load density and magnetic susceptibility properties i.e., Probability Distribution Functions (PDFs) per geology unit in your 3D model
- 3. Run a **property optimization** to determine optimum starting properties (or utilize measured data if available)
- Calibration phase: check different model discretisation schemes and their effective resolution for geology (includes several forward modelling runs)
- Prior only inversion runs to check the effective set-tolerances in the movability of geology boundaries within the reference model
- Perform the final inversions at optimum discretisation / resolution

Figure 2 (right): Posterior models including the lithology voxet shown, are fully attributed in 3D and can be queried for volume, likelihood probabilities, etc. Their metadata can be compared against those of the reference model. Figure 1 (left): Inversion workflow best applied to the joint inversion of gravity and magnetic survey data combined.

Step 1: Build a reference geology model, constrained by observed dips and contacts





Inversion outcomes include a set of geology models which honour the geology observations (contacts and dips, fixed during inversion) *and* geophysical data, to within user-set tolerances of all 3 independent data sets.

References:

[1] Lane R. and Guillen, A. (2005) Proceedings of IAMG'05: GIS and Spatial Analysis, Vol. 1 181-186.