Surface-wave tomography: Europe



Lapo Boschi ETH Zürich (with Bill Fry)

Tomography results are non-unique

over-regularized

under-regularized



Tomography results are non-unique







Correlation between two Vs models, as a function of depth and harmonic degree

ngrand vs. s20rts, $\langle r_{20} \rangle = 0.66$, $\langle r_8 \rangle = 0.78$



Becker and Boschi, 2002-present

surface-wave tomography



surface-wave tomography





surface-wave tomography



Ekström & Dziewonski, 1998

Vsv at 150 km: Anisotropic models from Harvard database



Vsv at 150 km: Anisotropic models from Harvard database





Vsv at 150 km: Anisotropic models from Harvard database







improvement in database





₽

180.

checkerboard test (SV)



checkerboard test (SH)



new model, global view



new model, global view



new model, continental-scale view





























Voigt



















Comparison with body-wave tomography



Piromallo & Morelli 2005



Sensitivity kernels (Fréchet derivatives, partial derivatives, banana-doughnuts...)

We assume a function K exists such that phase anomaly is linearly related to phase velocity perturbations:

 $\frac{\delta \phi}{\phi} = \int_{\Omega} K(\theta, \varphi) \frac{\delta v}{v}(\theta, \varphi) d\Omega$

Phase velocity perturbations (unknown):

$$rac{\delta\phi}{\phi} = \int_{\Omega} K(heta, arphi) rac{\delta v}{v}(heta, arphi) d\Omega$$

Sensitivity kernel (can be calculated):

$$\frac{\delta\phi}{\phi} = \int_{\Omega} K(\theta,\varphi) \frac{\delta v}{v} (\theta,\varphi) d\Omega$$

Peter, Tape, Boschi, Woodhouse, 2007



Sensitivity kernels: how they look like

Love waves, 150 s period. Source and receiver on the equator, 90° apart. Reference model is PREM.



"benchmark" test: long spatial wavelength anomalies

maps-2percentL9M5/L0150.jwkb.3.lsgr-0.-10.0

L 9 - M 5 checkerboard



maps-2percentL9M5/L0150.born.3.lsqr-0.-10.0



Peter, Boschi & Woodhouse, 2008

"benchmark" test: shorter spatial wavelength anomalies

L 13 - M 7 checkerboard



maps-2percentL13M7/L0150.jwkb.3.lsqr-0.-10.0

maps-2percentL13M7/L0150.born.3.lsqr-0.-10.0





2



Peter, Boschi & Woodhouse, 2008



Ray and adjoint-method modeling of European upper mantle SV velocity



Peter, Fry, Boschi, Deschamps, Ekström, Giardini 2008

RAY

<u>RI50</u>

RYTOV





model complexity

European tomography: state of the art















BEK04, SV, 150 km











hmid et al.: 2008, 150 km











eter et al., 2008, 150 km







-5



SV: 150 km

this study, SV, 100 km

this study



this study, SV, 300 km



this study, SV.

-5

-2 % w/r/t PREM

% w/r/t PREM

O

-5

10

-10

-0.3 -0.2 -0.1 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 -10 km/s

% w/r/t PREM

10

-10

% w/r/t PREM

10







Rayleigh 75s and thermal thickness of lithosphere





identifying temperature and density distributions

150 km depth







collaboration with F. Cammarano

contribution from ambient noise data



contribution from body-wave data



Amaru, Kissling and others 2008

contribution from surface-wave overtone data





collaboration with J. Trampert

Thank you

additional slides

ray and adjoint-method modeling of European upper mantle SV velocity



Peter, Fry, Boschi, Deschamps, Ekström, Giardini 2008

Correlation between two Vs models, as a function of depth and harmonic degree

ngrand vs. s20rts, $\langle r_{20} \rangle = 0.66$, $\langle r_8 \rangle = 0.78$



Becker and Boschi, 2002-present

Next Up Previous

Next: 6. Summary of average Up: Becker & Boschi: Comparison Previous: 4. Radial correlation

5. Cross-model correlation plot matrix

The following matrix makes all combinations of cross-model correlation plots available. Click on the icons to bring up the corresponding correlation plot.

	pmean	nwe97p	KHUUP	bup 20	bupoo	0010110	smean	granu	ngranu	520115	Saw24010	5010110	504110	<u>820a</u>	<u>\$50201</u>	<u>r um</u>	<u>11190u</u>	stbood
<u>pmean</u>	-																	
<u>hwe97p</u>	<u>plot</u>	- 1				6 1		1	ä 🎆 -		- <mark>1</mark> .	ā 🚺			1			
<u>kh00p</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>		-									- 1					
<u>bdp98</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>															
<u>bdp00</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	-							ê 🚺	- 100		-75	-		
<u>pb10118</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>													10
<u>smean</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	- 1									1.00		
grand	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	-			- 1					PROFILE		
<u>ngrand</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	plot	-		1							
s20rts	<u>plot</u>	-																
saw24b16	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	-	ē 🚺						
<u>sb10l18</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	-					- 100	
<u>sb4l18</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	-			10000											
<u>s20a</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	-		Karm											
<u>s362d1</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>				
<u>rum</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	plot	-	-	•										
<u>lrr98d</u>	<u>plot</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	<u>plot</u>	plot	<u>plot</u>	1-1	
stb00d	plot	plot	plot	plot	plot	plot	plot	-										

(C) Thorsten Becker, Harvard Geodynamics, Cambridge MA, USA, 2002-01-14

Becker and Boschi, 2002-present

contribution from surface-wave overtone data



collaboration with J. Trampert

Radial coherence of tomographic images





RYTOV

8

2.5

2.5





LI 50

RYTOV





Ray and adjoint-method modeling of European upper mantle SV velocity



Peter, Fry, Boschi, Deschamps, Ekström, Giardini 2008





Vp, Vsv at 150 km depth









Lithospheric thickness?



comparison w/ work of Perez, Artemieva

checkerboard test (SV)





isolines represent crustal thickness (crustal model: EuCRUST-07, Tesauro, 2008) correlation with crustal properties

0.2 normalized image roughness

normalized image roughness

checkerboard test















-0.500

contribution from ambient noise data

Tomography of the Alpine Region from Observations of Seismic Ambient Noise



Figure 1. Map showing the location of broadband recorders used for this study.

Stehly, Fry, Campillo, Shapiro, Boschi, Giardini 2009