JOURNAL OF GEOSCIENCES INSIGHTS
Oct-Dec 2025, VOL. 3, ISSUE 4, pp. 21 - 23
https://doi.org/10.61577/jgi.2025.1000018

RESEAPRO JOURNALS

MINI REVIEW

OPEN ACCESS

Advanced geophysical tools: The peril of ignorance and obsession

Satyesh Bhandari

Department of GIS Analyst, New Town, Kolkata, India

ABSTRACT

The hydrocarbon exploration industry has undergone significant evolution in geophysical technologies, such as Full Waveform Inversion (FWI), Amplitude Variation with Offset (AVO), and AI-based modeling, which have fundamentally improved subsurface imaging capabilities. Despite this technological progress, the industry continues to encounter persistent challenges and failures, including expensive deepwater dry holes, which have led to these powerful tools being undervalued and discredited. However, the issue does not seem to lie in the technology but in the human element of its application, specifically through two distinct forms of misuse. First, the "blind application" by non-specialists who ignore underlying physics, and the second, the "over-optimism" of specialists who become obsessed with single models while neglecting contradictory multidisciplinary data. To restore credibility and improve exploration outcomes, the industry must adopt a standardized framework that integrates these advanced tools into a holistic Shared Earth Model rather than treating them as isolated "silver bullets". A proposed workflow necessitates rigorous "physics of the inputs" auditing, the use of Rock Physics Modeling (RPM) to constrain seismic anomalies to physical reality, and a move toward probabilistic inversion approaches validated by AI. Ultimately, this paper also advocates for a multidisciplinary "gating"process involving other disciplines to ensure structural sanity and dynamic consistency, shifting the focus from tool obsession to integrated, data-driven decision-making.

KEY WORDS

Geophysical technologies; Hydrocarbon exploration; Full waveform inversion; Amplitude variation with offset; Shared earth model; Rock physics modeling

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 24 October 2025; Revised 12 November 2025; Accepted 30 November 2025

Introduction

The past few decades have witnessed remarkable advances in geophysical technologies and their application in hydrocarbon exploration and development. Innovations such as AVO, Pre-stack Seismic Inversion, FWI, multi-attribute analysis, and AI-based predictive Modeling have fundamentally changed the ability to image the Earth's subsurface with unprecedented clarity [1,2]. These technologies have revolutionized subsurface analysis and hydrocarbon exploration.

However, despite these significant advancements and their inherent potential, these technologies often fail to receive the credit they deserve. The industry continues to face persistent challenges, including costly deepwater and ultra-deepwater dry holes and missed targets. The issue is not the technology itself, but rather its application and the human element involved. The reputation of these powerful tools is being undermined by two specific types of misuse: one, the ignorant application by non-specialists, and the other, the overzealous application by obsessed specialists [3,4].

The Peril of Ignorance: Non-Geophysicists Using Advanced Tools

The first major source of discredit comes from non-geophysicists, including some geologists, engineers, and management personnel, who use these sophisticated techniques unquestioningly, without a proper understanding of the underlying physics and limitations.

Blind application

Lacking the technical background to quality-control the inputs and outputs, these users often treat advanced software as a "black box" [5].

Misinterpretation

They may misinterpret the results, confusing a high-probability output from a model with a certain fact about the subsurface.

Ignoring the physics

The fundamental principles of wave propagation, data acquisition parameters, and processing assumptions are ignored, leading to decisions based on flawed data.

This type of "use and abuse" creates a significant risk profile, as critical, multi-million- dollar drilling decisions are made using powerful tools wielded by those ignorant of their proper application [6].

The Trap of Over-Optimism: Geophysicists Obsessed with Their Models

The second form of abuse, perhaps more treacherous, is committed by geophysicists who become obsessed and over-reliant on a single technique.

Preoccupied minds

These specialists become preoccupied with the output of their particular model or algorithm, ignoring other crucial data and inputs from geology, petrophysics, or reservoir engineering.

Confirmation bias

They may inadvertently manipulate parameters or ignore dissenting data that contradicts their initial hypothesis or their model's output.

Siloed thinking

This over-reliance leads to siloed thinking, where the integration

***Correspondence:**Dr. Satyesh Bhandari, Department of GIS Analyst, New Town, Kolkata, India. e-mail: satyesh.bhandari@gmail.com

of multidisciplinary data, essential for accurate exploration, is neglected.

This over-optimism leads to poor outcomes, as the integrated Earth model (the holistic view of the subsurface) is compromised by a narrow, technology-centric perspective, ultimately leading to a poor reputation for the very techniques they champion.

To move from "using and abusing" toward a culture of scientific credibility, the industry requires a standardized framework. This framework ensures that high-end technologies like FWI or AVO or simultaneous inversion or stochastic inversion or other technologies are not treated as isolated "silver bullets" but as integrated components of a multidisciplinary Shared Earth Model [7,8].

The "Antidote" to Ignorance: Integrated Data Auditing & QC

Before running any advanced algorithm, the user must understand the "physics of the inputs".

Seismic conditioning

Verify if the data underwent proper Pre-stack Time/Depth Migration (PSTM/PSDM). For AVO, specifically ensure amplitudes were preserved and noise (like multiples) was attenuated without distorting the signal.

Well-Log calibration

Perform rigorous Synthetic-to-Seismic ties or well to seismic ties. If the synthetic trace doesn't match the real seismic data at the well location, any subsequent FWI or inversion will likely produce a false image of the reservoir.

The "Cure" for Over-Optimism: Petrophysical & Rock Physics Constraints

The obsessed geophysicist must anchor their seismic "anomalies" in physical reality through RPM.

Sensitivity analysis

Use well data to create cross-plots (e.g., Vp/Vs vs. Acoustic Impedance) to see if the target reservoir (e.g., hydrocarbon bearing sands) is actually distinguishable from the background shale [9].

Feasibility testing

If rock physics shows that a reservoir and a wet sand have the same seismic signature, even the best FWI cannot distinguish them. Admitting this limitation early prevents "over-optimistic" dry holes.

Multi-Scenario Inversion & AI Validation

Instead of a single "correct" answer, use a probabilistic approach to capture uncertainty.

Stochastic inversion

Generate multiple equiprobable realizations of the subsurface to identify high-risk vs. low-risk zones.

AI Cross-validation

Use Machine Learning (ML) to classify seismic facies by integrating multiple attributes (spectral decomposition, coherence, curvature) simultaneously. The ML output should complement, not replace, the geophysical inversion result.

The "Gating" Process: Multidisciplinary Peer Review

Final interpretation must pass through a "Gating" committee of including experienced Geophysicists, a Geologist (for structural sanity), a Petrophysicist (for fluid/rock reality), and a Reservoir Engineer (for dynamic flow consistency) [10].

Structural sanity

Does the FWI image make geological sense? For example, are fault geometries physically possible?

Dynamic consistency

If 4D seismic is used, does the observed fluid movement align with pressure and production data from the engineers?

Summary of the Integrated Approach

Table 1. Integrated workflow linking seismic physics, inversion, and AI validation.

Stage	Key Action	Goal
Preliminary Analysis	Well-to-Seismic Ties & Wavelet Extraction	Ensure the "Physics" is correct
Modeling	Rock Physics Diagnostics	Link seismic bits to real rock properties
Execution	Probabilistic Inversion (AVO/FWI)	Avoid "Preoccupied" single- model bias.
Validation	AI-driven Facies Classification	Use modern tools to cross- verify.

Conclusion

Geophysical technologies are not crystal balls; they are sophisticated tools that require expertise, critical thinking, and integrated application. The discredit they receive is not a failure of innovation, but a failure of process and professionalism. To restore the reputation of these breakthrough techniques, the industry must emphasize interdisciplinary collaboration, rigorous training, and a healthy scepticism of all model outputs. True success lies not in the power of the technology, but in the wisdom of its use by qualified users.

Disclosure Statement

The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

1. Pramanik AG, Painuly PK, Singh V, Katiyar R. Geophysical technology integration in hydrocarbon exploration and production: an overview. Geohorizons. 2001;6(2):1-24.
2. Smith J, Szafian P. Rapid play evaluation through AI interpretation. The APPEA Journal. 2023;63(2):275-279. https://doi.org/10.1071/AJ22026
3. Onita FB, Ochulor OJ. Geosteering in deep water wells: A theoretical review of challenges and solutions. World J Eng Tech Res. 2024;3(1):46-54. https://doi.org/10.53346/wjetr.2024.3.1.0054
4. Scarton G, Formentini M, Romano P. Automating quality control through an expert system. Electronic Markets. 2025;35(1):14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-025-00766-y
5. Bhandari S. How Misuse Undermines Advanced Geophysical Technologies. https://doi.org/10.1130/GSAT01711A.1
6. Nas A. Bridging the quantum divide: Global and corporate strategies in the age of quantum technology. Available at: https://polen.itu.edu.tr/server/api/core/bitstreams/fe4115aa-5a4f-418d-8310-0209dca3411f/content

https://doi.org/10.61577/jgi.2025.1000018

7. Wang B, He Y, Mao J, Liu F, Hao F, Huang Y, et al Inversion-based imaging: from LSRTM to FWI imaging. First Break. 2021;39(12):85-93. https://doi.org/10.3997/1365-2397.fb2021096

8. Murtaza G, Ali N, Hussain W, Iqbal SM, Azhar MU, Ahmad T, et al. Integrating Petrophysical, seismic and rock physics analyses for precise reservoir characterization. Earth Syst Environ. 2025;9(3):2165-2187. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41748-025-00654-7

9. Rasool MH, Ridha S, Krishna S, Swadesi B, Pramana AA, Yusuf M, et al. A Review on Distributed Acoustic Sensing for Monitoring Geological Carbon Dioxide Storage: Deployment, Field Learnings, and Challenges. Acoustics Australia. 2026:1-34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40857-025-00376-w

10. Scoz J, Luppino L, LapaccianaD N. Sustainable, Mindful, and Reflective Digital Workflows for Archaeological. InTransforming Heritage Research in a Transforming World: 5th CAA-GR Conference; 2024; Springer Nature; 2026. 55p. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-06389-2_6

https://doi.org/10.61577/jgi.2025.1000018