The computation aspects of the equivalent-layer technique: review and perspective

Diego Takahashi [1,*]**, André L. A. Reis** [2]**, Vanderlei C. Oliveira Jr.** [1] **and Valéria C. F. Barbosa** [1]

[1]*Observatório Nacional, Department of Geophysics, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil*
[2]*Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Department of Applied Geology, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil*

Correspondence*:
Valéria C.F. Barbosa
valcris@on.br

1 FUNDAMENTALS

2 Let $\mathbf{d}$ be a $D \times 1$ vector, whose i-th element d_i is the observed potential field at the position (x_i, y_i, z_i),
3 $i \in \{1 : D\}$. Consider that d_i can be satisfactorily approximated by a harmonic function

$$f_i = \sum_{j=1}^{P} g_{ij}\, p_j\,, \quad i \in \{1 : D\}\,, \tag{1}$$

4 where, p_j represents the scalar physical property of a virtual source (i.e., monopole, dipole, prism) located
5 at (x_j, y_j, z_j), $j \in \{1 : P\}$ and

$$g_{ij} \equiv g(x_i - x_j, y_i - y_j, z_i - z_j)\,, \quad z_i < \min\{z_j\}\,, \quad \forall i \in \{1 : D\}\,, \tag{2}$$

6 is a harmonic function, where $\min\{z_j\}$ denotes the minimum z_j, or the vertical coordinate of the shallowest
7 virtual source. These virtual sources are called *equivalent sources* and they form an *equivalent layer*. In
8 matrix notation, the potential field produced by all equivalent sources at all points (x_i, y_i, z_i), $i \in \{1 : D\}$,
9 is given by:

$$\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{p}\,, \tag{3}$$

10 where $\mathbf{p}$ is a $P \times 1$ vector with j-th element p_j representing the scalar physical property of the j-th
11 equivalent source and $\mathbf{G}$ is a $D \times P$ matrix with element g_{ij} given by equation 2.

12 The equivalent-layer technique consists in solving a linear inverse problem to determine a parameter
13 vector $\mathbf{p}$ leading to a predicted data vector $\mathbf{f}$ (equation 3) *sufficiently close to* the observed data vector $\mathbf{d}$,
14 whose i-th element d_i is the observed potential field at (x_i, y_i, z_i). The notion of *closeness* is intrinsically
15 related to the concept of *vector norm* (e.g., Golub and Van Loan, 2013, p. 68) or *measure of length* (e.g.,
16 Menke, 2018, p. 41). Because of that, almost all methods for determining $\mathbf{p}$ actually estimate a parameter
17 vector $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ minimizing a length measure of the difference between $\mathbf{f}$ and $\mathbf{d}$ (see subsection 1.3). Given an
18 estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$, it is then possible to compute a potential field transformation

$$\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{p}}\,, \tag{4}$$

19 where $\mathbf{t}$ is a $T \times 1$ vector with k-th element t_k representing the transformed potential field at the position
20 (x_k, y_y, z_k), $k \in \{1 : T\}$, and

$$a_{kj} \equiv a(x_k - x_j, y_k - y_j, z_k - z_j)\,, \quad z_k < \min\{z_j\}\,, \quad \forall k \in \{1 : T\}\,, \tag{5}$$

21 is a harmonic function representing the kj-th element of the $T \times P$ matrix $\mathbf{A}$.

1.1 Spatial distribution and total number of equivalent sources

23 There is no well-established criteria to define the optimum number P or the spatial distribution of the
24 equivalent sources. We know that setting an equivalent layer with more (less) sources than potential-field
25 data usually leads to an underdetermined (overdetermined) inverse problem (e.g., Menke, 2018, p. 52–53).
26 Concerning the spatial distribution of the equivalent sources, the only condition is that they must rely on a
27 surface that is located below and does not cross that containing the potential field data. Soler and Ueida
28 (2021) present a practical discussion about this topic.

29   From a theoretical point of view, the equivalent layer reproducing a given potential field data set cannot
30   cross the true gravity or magnetic sources. This condition is a consequence of recognizing that the equivalent
31   layer is essentially an indirect solution of a boundary value problem of potential theory (e.g., Roy, 1962;
32   Zidarov, 1965; Dampney, 1969; Li et al., 2014; Reis et al., 2020). In practical applications, however, there
33   is no guarantee that this condition is satisfied. Actually, its is widely known from practical experience (e.g.,
34   Gonzalez et al., 2022) that the equivalent-layer technique works even for the case in which the layer cross
35   the true sources.

36   CRITÉRIOS PARA DEFINIR A PROFUNDIDADE DA CAMADA: DAMPNEY (ESPAÇAMENTO
37   DO GRID) E REIS (ESPAÇAMENTO DAS LINHAS)

1.2   Matrix G

39   Generally, the harmonic function g_{ij} (equation 2) is defined in terms of the inverse distance between the
40   observation point (x_i, y_i, z_i) and the j-th equivalent source at (x_j, y_j, z_j),

$$\frac{1}{r_{ij}} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{(x_i - x_j)^2 + (y_i - y_j)^2 + (z_i - z_j)^2}} \, , \tag{6}$$

41   or by its partial derivatives of first and second orders, respectively given by

$$\partial_\alpha \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \equiv \frac{-(\alpha_i - \alpha_j)}{r_{ij}^3} \, , \quad \alpha \in \{x, y, z\} \, , \tag{7}$$

42   and

$$\partial_{\alpha\beta} \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \equiv \begin{cases} \frac{3(\alpha_i - \alpha_j)^2}{r_{ij}^5} \, , & \alpha = \beta \, , \\ \frac{3(\alpha_i - \alpha_j)(\beta_i - \beta_j)}{r_{ij}^5} - \frac{1}{r_{ij}^3} \, , & \alpha \neq \beta \, , \end{cases} \quad \alpha, \beta \in \{x, y, z\} \, . \tag{8}$$

43   In this case, the equivalent layer is formed by punctual sources representing monopoles or dipoles (e.g.,
44   Dampney, 1969; Emilia, 1973; Leão and Silva, 1989; Cordell, 1992; Oliveira Jr. et al., 2013; Siqueira et al.,
45   2017; Reis et al., 2020; Takahashi et al., 2020; Soler and Uieda, 2021; Takahashi et al., 2022). Another
46   common approach consists in not defining g_{ij} by using equations 6–8, but other harmonic functions
47   obtained by integrating them over the volume of regular prisms (e.g., Li and Oldenburg, 2010; Barnes and
48   Lumley, 2011; Li et al., 2014; Jirigalatu and Ebbing, 2019). There are also some less common approaches
49   defining the harmonic function g_{ij} (equation 2) as the potential field due to plane faces with constant
50   physical property (Hansen and Miyazaki, 1984), doublets (Silva, 1986) or by computing the double
51   integration of the inverse distance function with respect to z (Guspí and Novara, 2009).

52   A common assumption for most of the equivalent-layer methods is that the harmonic function g_{ij}
53   (equation 2) is independent on the actual physical relationship between the observed potential field and
54   their true sources (e.g., Cordell, 1992; Guspí and Novara, 2009; Li et al., 2014). Hence, g_{ij} can be
55   defined according to the problem. The only condition imposed to this function is that it decays to zero
56   as the observation point (x_i, y_i, z_i) goes away from the position (x_j, y_j, z_j) of the j-th equivalent source.
57   However, several methods use a function g_{ij} that preserves the physical relationship between the observed
58   potential field and their true sources. For the case in which the observed potential field is gravity data, g_{ij}
59   is commonly defined as a component of the gravitational field produced at (x_i, y_i, z_i) by a point mass or
60   prism located at (x_j, y_j, z_j), with unit density. On the other hand, g_{ij} is commonly defined as a component

61 of the magnetic induction field produced at (x_i, y_i, z_i) by a dipole or prism located at (x_j, y_j, z_j), with unit
62 magnetization intensity, when the observed potential field is magnetic data.

63   For all harmonic functions discussed above, the sensitivity matrix $\mathbf{G}$ (equation 3) is always dense. For
64 scattered potential-field data, $\mathbf{G}$ does not have a well-defined structure, regardless of whether the spatial
65 distribution of the equivalent sources is set. Nevertheless, for the particular case in which (i) there is a
66 single equivalent source right below each potential-field datum and (ii) both data and sources rely on
67 planar and regularly spaced grids, Takahashi et al. (2020, 2022) show that $\mathbf{G}$ assumes a block-Toeplitz
68 Toeplitz-block (BTTB) structure. In this case, the product of $\mathbf{G}$ and an arbitrary vector can be efficiently
69 computed via 2D fast Fourier transform as a discrete convolution.

1.3 General formulation

71   A general formulation for almost all equivalent-layer methods can be achieved by first considering that
72 the $P \times 1$ parameter vector $\mathbf{p}$ (equation 3) can be reparameterized into a $Q \times 1$ vector $\mathbf{q}$ according to:

$$\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{H}\,\mathbf{q}\,, \tag{9}$$

73 where $\mathbf{H}$ is a $P \times Q$ matrix. The predicted data vector $\mathbf{f}$ (equation 3) can then be rewritten as follows:

$$\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{G}\,\mathbf{H}\,\mathbf{q}\,. \tag{10}$$

74 Note that the original parameter vector $\mathbf{p}$ is defined in a P-dimensional space whereas the reparameterized
75 parameter vector $\mathbf{q}$ (equation 9) lies in a Q-dimensional space. For convenience, we use the terms P-space
76 and Q-space to designate them.

77   In this case, the problem of estimating a parameter vector $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ minimizing a length measure of the difference
78 between $\mathbf{f}$ (equation 3) and $\mathbf{d}$ is replaced by that of estimating an auxiliary vector $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ minimizing the goal
79 function

$$\Gamma(\mathbf{q}) = \Phi(\mathbf{q}) + \mu\,\Theta(\mathbf{q})\,, \tag{11}$$

80 which is a combination of particular measures of length given by

$$\Phi(\mathbf{q}) = (\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{f})^\top \mathbf{W}_d\,(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{f})\,, \tag{12}$$

81 and

$$\Theta(\mathbf{q}) = (\mathbf{q} - \bar{\mathbf{q}})^\top \mathbf{W}_q\,(\mathbf{q} - \bar{\mathbf{q}})\,, \tag{13}$$

82 where the regularization parameter μ is a positive scalar controlling the trade-off between the data-misfit
83 function $\Phi(\mathbf{q})$ and the regularization function $\Theta(\mathbf{q})$; $\mathbf{W}_d$ is a $D \times D$ symmetric matrix defining the relative
84 importance of each observed datum d_i; $\mathbf{W}_q$ is a $Q \times Q$ symmetric matrix imposing prior information on $\mathbf{q}$;
85 and $\bar{\mathbf{q}}$ is a $Q \times 1$ vector of reference values for $\mathbf{q}$ that satisfies

$$\bar{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{H}\,\bar{\mathbf{q}}\,, \tag{14}$$

86 where $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$ is a $P \times 1$ vector containing reference values for the original parameter vector $\mathbf{p}$.

87   After obtaining an estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ for the reparameterized parameter vector $\mathbf{q}$ (equation 9), the estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ for
88 the original parameter vector (equation 3) is computed by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{H}\,\tilde{\mathbf{q}}\,. \tag{15}$$

89   The reparameterized vector $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ is obtained by first computing the gradient of $\Gamma(\mathbf{q})$,

$$\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Gamma(\mathbf{q}) = -2\,\mathbf{H}^{\top}\mathbf{G}^{\top}\mathbf{W}_d\,(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{f}) + 2\,\mu\,\mathbf{W}_q\,(\mathbf{q} - \bar{\mathbf{q}})\,. \tag{16}$$

90 Then, by considering that $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Gamma(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}) = \mathbf{0}$ (equation 16), where $\mathbf{0}$ is a vector of zeros, as well as adding and
91 subtracting the term $\left(\mathbf{H}^{\top}\mathbf{G}^{\top}\mathbf{W}_d\mathbf{G}\,\mathbf{H}\right)\bar{\mathbf{q}}$, we obtain

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_q = \mathbf{B}\,\boldsymbol{\delta}_d\,, \tag{17}$$

92 where

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_q = \tilde{\mathbf{q}} - \bar{\mathbf{q}}\,, \tag{18}$$

93

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}_d = \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{G}\,\mathbf{H}\,\bar{\mathbf{q}}\,, \tag{19}$$

94

$$\mathbf{B} = \left(\mathbf{H}^{\top}\mathbf{G}^{\top}\mathbf{W}_d\,\mathbf{G}\,\mathbf{H} + \mu\,\mathbf{W}_q\right)^{-1}\mathbf{H}^{\top}\mathbf{G}^{\top}\mathbf{W}_d\,, \tag{20}$$

95 or, equivalently (Menke, 2018, p. 62),

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{W}_q^{-1}\,\mathbf{H}^{\top}\mathbf{G}^{\top}\left(\mathbf{G}\,\mathbf{H}\,\mathbf{W}_q^{-1}\,\mathbf{H}^{\top}\mathbf{G}^{\top} + \mu\mathbf{W}_d^{-1}\right)^{-1}\,. \tag{21}$$

96 Evidently, we have considered that all inverses exist in equations 20 and 21.

97   Matrix $\mathbf{B}$ defined by equation 20 is commonly used for the cases in which $D > P$, i.e., when there are
98 more data than parameters (overdetermined problems). In this case, we consider that the estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ is
99 obtained by solving the following linear system for $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_q$ (equation 18):

$$\left(\mathbf{H}^{\top}\mathbf{G}^{\top}\mathbf{W}_d\,\mathbf{G}\,\mathbf{H} + \mu\,\mathbf{W}_q\right)\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_q = \mathbf{H}^{\top}\mathbf{G}^{\top}\mathbf{W}_d\,\boldsymbol{\delta}_d\,. \tag{22}$$

100   On the other hand, for the cases in which $D < P$ (underdetermined problems), matrix $\mathbf{B}$ is usually
101 defined according to equation 21. In this case, the general approach involves estimating $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ in two steps. The
102 first consists in solving a linear system for a dummy vector, which is subsequently used to compute $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ by a
103 matrix-vector product as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\mathbf{G}\,\mathbf{H}\,\mathbf{W}_q^{-1}\,\mathbf{H}^{\top}\mathbf{G}^{\top} + \mu\mathbf{W}_d^{-1}\right)\mathbf{u} &= \boldsymbol{\delta}_d \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_q &= \mathbf{W}_q^{-1}\,\mathbf{H}^{\top}\mathbf{G}^{\top}\mathbf{u}\end{aligned}\,, \tag{23}$$

104 where $\mathbf{u}$ is a dummy vector. After obtaining $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_q$ (equations 22 and 23), the estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ is computed with
105 equation 18.

1.3.1   Optional normalization strategy

107   Setting the regularization parameter μ (equation 11) can be very difficult due to scale differences between
108   $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{p}$ (equation 3) or $\mathbf{GH}$ and $\mathbf{q}$ (equation 9. When faced with this scenario, a popular strategy (e.g., Li
109   and Oldenburg, 2010; Soler and Uieda, 2021) involves creating the linear system (equations 22 and 23) by
110   substituting $\mathbf{GH}$ and $\mathbf{q}$ with

$$\mathbf{G}_n = \mathbf{G}\,\mathbf{H}\,\mathbf{N}\,, \quad \mathbf{q}_n = \mathbf{N}^{-1}\mathbf{q}\,, \tag{24}$$

111   and then finding the solution $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}_n$ for the normalized parameter vector $\mathbf{q}_n$. The estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ for the
112   reparameterized parameter vector $\mathbf{q}$ (equation 9) is subsequently obtained by removing the normalization
113   as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{q}} = \mathbf{N}\,\tilde{\mathbf{q}}_n\,, \tag{25}$$

114   where $\mathbf{N}$ is an invertible normalization matrix. This strategy usually constrains the practical range of the
115   regularization parameter μ (equation 11).

2   COMPUTATIONAL STRATEGIES

116   COMEÇAR EXPLICANDO AS LIMITAÇÕES DA SOLUÇÃO OBTIDA PELA FORMULAÇÃO
117   GERAL

118   Two important factors affecting the efficiency of a given matrix algorithm are the storage and amount of
119   required arithmetic. Here, we quantify this last factor by counting flops. A flop is a floating point addition,
120   subtraction, multiplication or division (Golub and Van Loan, 2013, p. 12–14).

121   To investigate the efficiency of equivalent-layer methods, we consider how they:

122   (i) set up the linear system (equations 22 and 23);

123   (ii) solve the linear system (equations 22 and 23);

124   (iii) perform potential-field transformations (equation 4).

125   We focus on the overall strategies used by the selected methods.

2.1   Notation for subvectors and submatrices

Here, we use a notation inspired on that presented by (Van Loan, 1992, p. 4) to represent subvectors and submatrices. Subvectors of $\mathbf{d}$, for example, are specified by $\mathbf{d}[\mathbf{i}]$, where $\mathbf{i}$ is a list of integer numbers that "pick out" the elements of $\mathbf{d}$ forming the subvector $\mathbf{d}[\mathbf{i}]$. For example, $\mathbf{i} = (1, 6, 4, 6)$ gives the subvector $\mathbf{d}[\mathbf{i}] = [d_1 \ d_6 \ d_4 \ d_6]^\top$. Note that the list $\mathbf{i}$ of indices may be sorted or not and it may also have repeated indices. For the particular case in which the list has a single element $\mathbf{i} = (i)$, then it can be used to extract the i-th element $d_i \equiv \mathbf{d}[i]$ of $\mathbf{d}$. Regular lists can be represented by using the colon notation. For example,

$$\mathbf{i} = (3:8) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{d}[\mathbf{i}] = [d_3 \ d_4 \ \dots \ d_8]^\top$$
$$\mathbf{i} = (:8) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{d}[\mathbf{i}] = [d_1 \ d_2 \ \dots \ d_7]^\top \quad,$$
$$\mathbf{i} = (3:) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{d}[\mathbf{i}] = [d_3 \ d_4 \ \dots \ d_D]^\top$$

127   where D is the number of elements forming $\mathbf{d}$.

The notation above can also be used to define submatrices of the $D \times P$ matrix $\mathbf{G}$. For example, $\mathbf{i} = (2, 7, 4, 6)$ and $\mathbf{j} = (1, 3, 8)$ lead to the submatrix

$$\mathbf{G}[\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}] = \begin{bmatrix} g_{21} & g_{23} & g_{28} \\ g_{71} & g_{73} & g_{78} \\ g_{41} & g_{43} & g_{48} \\ g_{61} & g_{63} & g_{68} \end{bmatrix} .$$

Note that, in this case, the lists $\mathbf{i}$ and $\mathbf{j}$ "pick out", respectively, the rows and columns of $\mathbf{G}$ that form the submatrix $\mathbf{G}[\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}]$. The i-th row of $\mathbf{G}$ is given by the $1 \times P$ vector $\mathbf{G}[i, :]$. Similarly, the $D \times 1$ vector $\mathbf{G}[:, j]$ represents the j-th column. Finally, we may use the colon notation to define the following submatrix:

$$\mathbf{G}[2 : 5, 3 : 7] = \begin{bmatrix} g_{23} & g_{24} & g_{25} & g_{26} & g_{27} \\ g_{33} & g_{34} & g_{35} & g_{36} & g_{37} \\ g_{43} & g_{44} & g_{45} & g_{46} & g_{47} \\ g_{53} & g_{54} & g_{55} & g_{56} & g_{57} \end{bmatrix} ,$$

which contains the contiguous elements of $\mathbf{G}$ from rows 2 to 5 and from columns 3 to 7.

2.2 Moving window

The initial approach to enhance the computational efficiency of the equivalent-layer technique is commonly denoted *moving window* and involves first splitting the observed data d_i, $i \in \{1 : D\}$, into M overlapping subsets (or data windows) formed by D^m data each, $m \in \{1 : M\}$. The data inside the m-th window are usually adjacent to each other and have indices defined by an integer list $\mathbf{i}^m$ having D^m elements. The number of data D^m forming the data windows are not necessarily equal to each other. Each data window has a $D^m \times 1$ observed data vector $\mathbf{d}^m \equiv \mathbf{d}[\mathbf{i}^m]$. The second step consists in defining a set of P equivalent sources with scalar physical property p_j, $j \in \{1 : P\}$, and also split them into M overlapping subsets (or source windows) formed by P^m data each, $m \in \{1 : M\}$. The sources inside the m-th window have indices defined by an integer list $\mathbf{j}^m$ having P^m elements. Each source window has a $P^m \times 1$ parameter vector $\mathbf{p}^m$ and is located right below the corresponding m-th data window. Then, each $\mathbf{d}^m \equiv \mathbf{d}[\mathbf{i}^m]$ is approximated by

$$\mathbf{f}^m = \mathbf{G}^m \mathbf{p}^m , \tag{26}$$

where $\mathbf{G}^m \equiv \mathbf{G}[\mathbf{i}^m, \mathbf{j}^m]$ is a submatrix of $\mathbf{G}$ (equation 3) formed by the elements computed with equation 2 using only the data and equivalent sources located inside the window m-th. The main idea of the moving-window approach is using the $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^m$ estimated for each window to obtain (i) an estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ of the parameter vector for the entire equivalent layer or (ii) a given potential-field transformation $\mathbf{t}$ (equation 4). The main advantages of this approach is that (i) the estimated parameter vector $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ or transformed potential field are not obtained by solving the full, but smaller linear systems and (ii) the full matrix $\mathbf{G}$ (equation 3) is never stored.

Leão and Silva (1989) presented a pioneer work using the moving-window approach. Their method requires a regularly-spaced grid of observed data on a horizontal plane z_0. The data windows are defined by square local grids of $\sqrt{D'} \times \sqrt{D'}$ adjacent points, all of them having the same number of points D'. The equivalent sources in the m-th data window are located below the observation plane, at a constant vertical distance Δz_0. They are arranged on a regular grid of $\sqrt{P'} \times \sqrt{P'}$ adjacent points following the same grid pattern of the observed data. The local grid of sources for all data windows have the same number

154 of elements P'. Besides, they are vertically aligned, but expands the limits of their corresponding data
155 windows, so that $D' < P'$. Because of this spatial configuration of observed data and equivalent sources,
156 we have that $\mathbf{G}^m = \mathbf{G}'$ (equation 26) for all data windows (i.e., $\forall\, m \in \{1 : M\}$), where $\mathbf{G}'$ is a $D' \times P'$
157 constant matrix.

158 By omitting the normalization strategy used by Leão and Silva (1989), their method consists in directly
159 computing the transformed potential field t_c^m at the central point $(x_c^m, y_c^m, z_0 + \Delta z_0)$ of each data window
160 as follows:

$$t_c^m = \left(\mathbf{G}'\mathbf{a}'\right)^\top \left[\mathbf{G}' \left(\mathbf{G}'\right)^\top + \mu\,\mathbf{I}_{D'}\right]^{-1} \mathbf{d}^m\,, \quad m \in \{1 : M\}\,, \tag{27}$$

161 where $\mathbf{I}_{D'}$ is the identity matrix of order D' and $\mathbf{a}'$ is a $P' \times 1$ vector with elements computed by equation
162 5 by using all equivalent sources in the m-th subset and only the coordinate of the central point in the
163 m-th data window. Due to the presumed spatial configuration of the observed data and equivalent sources,
164 $\mathbf{a}'$ is the same for all data windows. Note that equation 27 combines the potential-field transformation
165 (equation 4) with the solution of the undetermined problem (equation 23) for the particular case in which
166 $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{W}_q = \mathbf{I}_{P'}$ (equations 9 and 13), $\mathbf{W}_d = \mathbf{I}_{D'}$ (equation 12), $\bar{p} = \mathbf{0}$ (equation 14), where $\mathbf{I}_{P'}$ and $\mathbf{I}_{D'}$
167 are identity matrices of order P' and D', respectively, and $\mathbf{0}$ is a vector of zeros.

168 The method proposed by Leão and Silva (1989) can be outlined by the Algorithm 1. Note that Leão and
169 Silva (1989) directly compute the transformed potential t_c^m at the central point of each data window without
170 explicitly computing and storing an estimated for $\mathbf{p}^m$ (equation 26). It means that their method allows
171 computing a single potential-field transformation. A different transformation or the same one evaluated at
172 different points require running their moving-data window method again.

Algorithm 1: Generic pseudo-code for the method proposed by Leão and Silva (1989).

Initialization :
1 Set the indices $\mathbf{i}^m$ for each data window, $m \in \{1 : M\}$;
2 Set the indices $\mathbf{j}^m$ for each source window, $m \in \{1 : M\}$;
3 Set the constant depth $z_0 + \Delta z_0$ for all equivalent sources ;
4 Compute the vector $\mathbf{a}'$ associated with the desired potential-field transformation ;
5 Compute the matrix $\mathbf{G}'$;
6 Compute $\left(\mathbf{G}'\mathbf{a}'\right)^\top \left[\mathbf{G}' \left(\mathbf{G}'\right)^\top + \mu\,\mathbf{I}_{D'}\right]^{-1}$;
7 $m = 1$;
8 **while** $m < M$ **do**
9 $\quad$ Compute t_c^m (equation 27) ;
10 $\quad$ $m \leftarrow m + 1$;
11 **end**

---

173 Soler and Uieda (2021) generalized the method proposed by Leão and Silva (1989) for irregularly spaced
174 data on an undulating surface. A direct consequence of this generalization is that a different submatrix
175 $\mathbf{G}^m \equiv \mathbf{G}[\mathbf{i}^m, \mathbf{j}^m]$ (equation 26) must be computed for each window. Differently from Leão and Silva
176 (1989), Soler and Uieda (2021) store the computed $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^m$ for all windows and subsequently use them to obtain
177 a desired potential-field transformation (equation 4) as the superposed effect of all windows. The estimated
178 $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^m$ for all windows are combined to form a single $P \times 1$ vector $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$, which is an estimate for original
179 parameter vector $\mathbf{p}$ (equation 3). For each data window, Soler and Uieda (2021) solve an overdetermined
180 problem (equation 22) for $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^m$ by using $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{W}_q = \mathbf{I}_{P^m}$ (equations 9 and 13), $\mathbf{W}_d^m$ (equation 12) equal to

181 a diagonal matrix of weights for the data inside the m-th window and $\bar{p} = \mathbf{0}$ (equation 14), so that

$$\left[(\mathbf{G}^m)^\top \mathbf{W}_d^m \mathbf{G}^m + \mu \mathbf{I}_{P'} \right] \tilde{\mathbf{p}}^m = (\mathbf{G}^m)^\top \mathbf{W}_d^m \mathbf{d}^m \,. \tag{28}$$

182 It is important to stress here that Soler and Uieda (2021) used the normalization strategy described in
183 section 1.3.1, but we have conveniently omitted here. The overall steps of their method are defined by the
184 Algorithm 2. Note that this algorithm starts with a residuals vector $\mathbf{r}$ that is iteratively updated. At each
185 iteration, the potential field predicted a source window is computed at all observation points and removed
186 from the residuals vector $\mathbf{r}$.

Algorithm 2: Generic pseudo-code for the method proposed by Soler and Uieda (2021).

   Initialization :
1   Set the indices $\mathbf{i}^m$ for each data window, $m \in \{1 : M\}$;
2   Set the indices $\mathbf{j}^m$ for each source window, $m \in \{1 : M\}$;
3   Set the depth of all equivalent sources ;
4   Set a $D \times 1$ residuals vector $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{d}$;
5   Set a $P \times 1$ vector $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{0}$;
6   $m = 1$;
7   **while** $m < M$ **do**
8   Set the matrix $\mathbf{W}_d^m$;
9   Compute the matrix $\mathbf{G}^m$;
10   Compute $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^m$ (equation 28) ;
11     $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}[\mathbf{j}^m] \leftarrow \tilde{\mathbf{p}}[\mathbf{j}^m] + \tilde{\mathbf{p}}^m$;
12     $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{G}[:, \mathbf{j}^m] \tilde{\mathbf{p}}^m$;
13     $m \leftarrow m + 1$;
14   **end**

2.3 Column update

188   Cordell (1992) proposed a computational strategy that was later used by Guspí and Novara (2009) and
189 relies on first defining one equivalent source located right below each observed data d_i, $i \in \{1 : D\}$, at
190 a vertical coordinate $z_i + \Delta z_i$, where Δz_i is proportional to the distance from the i-th observation point
191 (x_i, y_i, z_i) to its closest neighbor. The second step consists in updating the physical property p_j of a given
192 equivalent source, $j \in \{1 : D\}$ and remove its predicted potential field from the observed data vector $\mathbf{d}$,
193 producing a residuals vector $\mathbf{r}$. Then, the same procedure is repeated for other sources with the purpose of
194 iteratively updating $\mathbf{r}$ and the $D \times 1$ parameter vector $\mathbf{p}$ containing the physical property of all equivalent
195 sources. At the end, the algorithm produces an estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ for the parameter vector yielding a predicted
196 potential field $\mathbf{f}$ (equation 3) satisfactorily fitting the observed data $\mathbf{d}$ according to a given criterion. Note
197 that the method proposed by Cordell (1992) iteratively solves the linear $\mathbf{G}\tilde{\mathbf{p}} \approx \mathbf{d}$ with a $D \times D$ matrix $\mathbf{G}$.
198 At each iteration, only a single column of $\mathbf{G}$ (equation 3) is used. An advantage of this *column-update*
199 *approach* is that the full matrix $\mathbf{G}$ is never stored.

200   Algorithm 3 delineates the Cordell's method. Note that a single column $\mathbf{G}[:, i_{\mathtt{max}}]$ of the $D \times D$ matrix $\mathbf{G}$
201 (equation 3) is used per iteration, where $i_{\mathtt{max}}$ is the index of the maximum absolute value in $\mathbf{r}$. As pointed out
202 by Cordell (1992), the method does not necessarily decrease monotonically along the iterations. Besides,
203 the method may not converge depending on how the vertical distances Δz_i, $i \in \{1 : D\}$, controlling the
204 depths of the equivalent sources are set. According to Cordell (1992), the maximum absolute value $r_{\mathtt{max}}$

---

205 in **r** decreases robustly at the beginning and oscillates within a narrowing envelope for the subsequent
206 iterations.

Algorithm 3: Generic pseudo-code for the method proposed by Cordell (1992).

Initialization :
1 Compute a $D \times 1$ vector $\boldsymbol{\Delta z}$ whose i-th element Δz_i is a vertical distance controlling the depth of the i-th equivalent source, $i \in \{1 : D\}$;
2 Set a tolerance ϵ ;
3 Set a maximum number of iteration `ITMAX` ;
4 Set a $D \times 1$ residuals vector $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{d}$;
5 Set a $D \times 1$ vector $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{0}$;
6 Define the maximum absolute value $r_{\texttt{max}}$ in $\mathbf{r}$;
7 $m = 1$;
8 **while** $(r_{\texttt{max}} > \epsilon)$ **and** $(m < \texttt{ITMAX})$ **do**
9   Define the coordinates $(x_{\texttt{max}}, y_{\texttt{max}}, z_{\texttt{max}})$ and index $i_{\texttt{max}}$ of the observation point associated with $r_{\texttt{max}}$;
10     $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}[i_{\texttt{max}}] \leftarrow \tilde{\mathbf{p}}[i_{\texttt{max}}] + (a_{\texttt{max}} \boldsymbol{\Delta z}[i_{\texttt{max}}])$;
11     $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbf{r} - (\mathbf{G}[:, i_{\texttt{max}}] \tilde{\mathbf{p}}[i_{\texttt{max}}])$;
12   Define the new $r_{\texttt{max}}$ in $\mathbf{r}$;
13     $m \leftarrow m + 1$;
14 **end**

2.4 Row update

208   Mendonça and Silva (1994) proposes an algebraic reconstruction technique (ART) (e.g., van der Sluis
209 and van der Vorst, 1987, p. 58) to estimate a parameter vector $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ for a regular grid of P equivalent sources
210 on a horizontal plane z_0. Such methods iterate on the linear system rows to estimate corrections for the
211 parameter vector, which may substantially save computer time and memory required to compute and store
212 the full linear system matrix along the iterations. The convergence of such *row-update methods* depends on
213 the linear system condition. The main advantage of such methods is not computing and storing the full
214 linear system matrix, but iteratively using its rows. The particular ART method proposed by Mendonça and
215 Silva (1994) considers that

$$\mathbf{d} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}_e \\ \mathbf{d}_r \end{bmatrix} , \quad \mathbf{G} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_e \\ \mathbf{R}_r \end{bmatrix} , \tag{29}$$

216 where $\mathbf{d}_e$ and $\mathbf{d}_r$ are $D_e \times 1$ and $D_r \times 1$ vectors and $\mathbf{G}_e$ and $\mathbf{G}_r$ are $D_e \times P$ and $D_r \times P$ matrices,
217 respectively. Mendonça and Silva (1994) designate $\mathbf{d}_e$ and $\mathbf{d}_r$ as, respectively, *equivalent* and *redundant*
218 data. With the exception of a normalization strategy, Mendonça and Silva (1994) calculate a $P \times 1$ estimated
219 parameter vector $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ by solving an underdetermined problem (equation 23) involving only the equivalent
220 data $\mathbf{d}_e$ (equation 29) for the particular case in which $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{W}_p = \mathbf{I}_P$ (equations 9 and 13), $\mathbf{W}_d = \mathbf{I}_{D_e}$
221 (equation 12) and $\bar{p} = \mathbf{0}$ (equation 14), which results in

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{F} + \mu \, \mathbf{I}_{D_e}) \, \mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{d}_e \\ \tilde{\mathbf{p}} &= \mathbf{G}_e^\top \mathbf{u} \end{aligned} , \tag{30}$$

222 where $\mathbf{F}$ is a $P \times P$ matrix that replaces $\mathbf{G}_e\,\mathbf{G}_e^\top$. Mendonça and Silva (1994) presume that the estimated
223 parameter vector $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ obtained from equation 30 leads to a $D_r \times 1$ residuals vector

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{d}_r - \mathbf{G}_r\tilde{\mathbf{p}} \tag{31}$$

224 having a maximum absolute value $r_{\texttt{max}} \leq \epsilon$, where ϵ is a predefined tolerance.

225   The overall method of Mendonça and Silva (1994) is defined by Algorithm 4. It is important noting
226 that the number D_e of equivalent data in $\mathbf{d}_e$ increases by one per iteration, which means that the order
227 of the linear system in equation 30 also increases by one at each iteration. Those authors also propose
228 a computational strategy based on Cholesky factorization (e.g., Golub and Van Loan, 2013, p. 163) for
229 efficiently updating $(\mathbf{F} + \mu\,\mathbf{I}_{D_e})$ at a given iteration (line 16 in Algorithm 4) by computing only its new
230 elements with respect to those computed in the previous iteration.

Algorithm 4: Generic pseudo-code for the method proposed by Mendonça and Silva (1994).

Initialization :
1 Set a regular grid of P equivalent sources at a horizontal plane z_0 ;
2 Set a tolerance ϵ ;
3 Set a $D \times 1$ residuals vector $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{d}$;
4 Define the maximum absolute value $r_{\texttt{max}}$ in $\mathbf{r}$;
5 Define the index $i_{\texttt{max}}$ of $r_{\texttt{max}}$;
6 Define the list of indices $\mathbf{i}_r$ of the remaining data in $\mathbf{r}$;
7 Define $\mathbf{d}_e = \mathbf{d}[i_{\texttt{max}}]$;
8 Compute $(\mathbf{F} + \mu\,\mathbf{I}_{D_e})$ and $\mathbf{G}_e$;
9 Compute $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ (equation 30) ;
10 Compute $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{d}[\mathbf{i}_r] - \mathbf{G}[\mathbf{i}_r, :]\,\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$;
11 Define the maximum absolute value $r_{\texttt{max}}$ in $\mathbf{r}$;
12 **while** $(r_{\texttt{max}} > \epsilon)$ **do**
13 $\quad$ Define the index $i_{\texttt{max}}$ of $r_{\texttt{max}}$;
14 $\quad$ Define the list of indices $\mathbf{i}_r$ of the remaining elements in $\mathbf{r}$;
15 $\quad$ $\mathbf{d}_e \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}_e \\ \mathbf{d}[i_{\texttt{max}}] \end{bmatrix}$;
16 $\quad$ Update $(\mathbf{F} + \mu\,\mathbf{I}_{D_e})$ and $\mathbf{G}_e$;
17 $\quad$ Update $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ (equation 30) ;
18 $\quad$ Update $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{d}[\mathbf{i}_r] - \mathbf{G}[\mathbf{i}_r, :]\,\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$;
19 $\quad$ Define the maximum absolute value $r_{\texttt{max}}$ in $\mathbf{r}$;
20 **end**

2.5 Reparameterization

232   Another approach for improving the computational performance of equivalent-layer technique consists
233 in setting a $P \times Q$ reparameterization matrix $\mathbf{H}$ (equation 9) with $Q << P$. This strategy has been used
234 in applied geophysics for decades (e.g., Skilling and Bryan, 1984; Kennett et al., 1988; Oldenburg et al.,
235 1993; Barbosa et al., 1997) and is known as *subspace method*. The main idea relies in reducing the linear
236 system dimension from the original P-space to a lower-dimensional subspace (the Q-space). An estimate
237 $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ for the reparameterized parameter vector $\mathbf{q}$ is obtained in the Q-space and subsequently used to obtain
238 an estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ for the parameter vector $\mathbf{p}$ (equation 3) in the P-space by using equation 9. Hence, the key
239 aspect of this *reparameterization approach* is solving an appreciably smaller linear inverse problem for $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$
240 than that for the original parameter vector $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ (equation 3).

Oliveira Jr. et al. (2013) have used this approach to describe the physical property distribution on the equivalent layer in terms of piecewise bivariate polynomials. Specifically, their method consists in splitting a regular grid of equivalent sources into source windows inside which the physical-property distribution is described by bivariate polynomial functions. The key aspect of their method relies on the fact that the total number of coefficients required to define the bivariate polynomials is considerably smaller than the original number of equivalent sources. Hence, they formulate a linear inverse problem for estimating the polynomial coefficients and use them later to compute the physical property distribution on the equivalent layer.

The method proposed by Oliveira Jr. et al. (2013) consists in solving an overdetermined problem (equation 22) for estimating the polynomial coefficients $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ with $\mathbf{W}_d = \mathbf{I}_D$ (equation 12) and $\bar{q} = \mathbf{0}$ (equation 14), so that

$$\left(\mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{G} \mathbf{H} + \mu \, \mathbf{W}_q \right) \tilde{\mathbf{q}} = \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{d} \,, \tag{32}$$

where $\mathbf{W}_q = \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{W}_p \mathbf{H}$ is defined by a matrix $\mathbf{W}_p$ representing the zeroth- and first-order Tikhonov regularization (e.g., Aster et al., 2019, p. 103). Note that, in this case, the prior information is defined in the P-space for the original parameter vector $\mathbf{p}$ and then transformed to the Q-space. Another characteristic of their method is that it is valid for processing irregularly-spaced data on an undulating surface.

Mendonça (2020) also proposed a reparameterization approach for the equivalent-layer technique. Their approach, however, consists in setting $\mathbf{H}$ as a truncated singular value decomposition (SVD) (e.g., Aster et al., 2019, p. 55) of the observed potential field. Differently from Oliveira Jr. et al. (2013), however, the method of Mendonça (2020) requires a regular grid of potential-field data on horizontal plane. Another difference is that these authors uses $\mathbf{W}_q = \mathbf{I}_Q$ (equation 13), which means that the regularization is defined directly in the Q-space.

Before Oliveira Jr. et al. (2013) and Mendonça (2020), Barnes and Lumley (2011) also proposed a computationally efficient method for equivalent-layer technique based on reparameterization. A key difference, however, is that Barnes and Lumley (2011) did not set a $P \times Q$ reparameterization matrix $\mathbf{H}$ (equation 9) with $Q << P$. Instead, they used a matrix $\mathbf{H}$ with $Q \approx 1.7\,P$. Their central idea is setting a reparameterization scheme that groups distant equivalent sources into blocks by using a bisection process. This scheme leads to a quadtree representation of the physical-property distribution on the equivalent layer, so that matrix $\mathbf{G}\mathbf{H}$ (equation 10) is notably sparse. Barnes and Lumley (2011) explore this sparsity in solving the overdetermined problem for $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}$ (equation 32) via conjugate-gradient method (e.g., Golub and Van Loan, 2013, sec. 11.3).

2.6 Wavelet compression

Previously to Barnes and Lumley (2011), the idea of transforming the dense matrix $\mathbf{G}$ (equation 3) into a sparse one has already been used in the context of equivalent-layer technique. Li and Oldenburg (2010) proposed a method that applies the discrete wavelet transform to introduce sparsity into the original dense matrix $\mathbf{G}$. Those authors approximate a planar grid of potential-field data by a regularly-spaced grid of equivalent sources, so that the number of data D and sources P is the same , i.e., $D = P$. Specifically, Li and Oldenburg (2010) proposed a method that applies the wavelet transform to the original dense matrix $\mathbf{G}$ and sets to zero the small coefficients that are below a given threshold, which results in an approximating sparse representation of $\mathbf{G}$ in the wavelet domain. They first consider the following approximation

$$\mathbf{d}_w \approx \mathbf{G}_s \, \mathbf{p}_w \,, \tag{33}$$

280 where
$$\mathbf{d}_w = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}\,\mathbf{d}\,, \quad \mathbf{p}_w = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}\,\mathbf{p}\,, \tag{34}$$

281 are the observed data and parameter vector in the wavelet domain; $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$ is a $D \times D$ orthogonal matrix
282 defining a discrete wavelet transform; and $\mathbf{G}_s$ is a sparse matrix obtained by setting to zero the elements of

$$\mathbf{G}_w = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}\,\mathbf{G}\,\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} \tag{35}$$

283 with absolute value smaller than a given threshold.

284 Li and Oldenburg (2010) apply the normalization strategy defined in section 1.3.1 to equation 33 by using
285 a diagonal normalization matrix $\mathbf{N}$ (equation 24) and then formulate an overdetermined problem (equation
286 22) with $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I}_P$ (equations 9), $\mu = 0$ (equation 11), $\mathbf{W}_d = \mathbf{I}_D$ (equation 12) and $\bar{p} = \mathbf{0}$ (equation 14) so
287 that

$$\left(\mathbf{G}_n^\top \mathbf{G}_n\right) \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_n = \mathbf{G}_n^\top \mathbf{d}_w\,, \tag{36}$$

288 where $\mathbf{G}_n$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_n$ are defined according to equation 24 in terms of the sparse matrix $\mathbf{G}_s$ (equation 33).
289 They solve this linear system (equation 36) with the conjugate-gradient method (e.g., Golub and Van Loan,
290 2013, sec. 11.3) and use it to obtain an estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ for the parameter vector given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}^\top \left(\mathbf{N}\,\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_n\right)\,, \tag{37}$$

291 where the term within parentheses removes the normalization (equation 25) and matrix $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}^\top$ applies an
292 inverse wavelet transform.

293 PAREI AQUI

2.7 Iterative methods using the original G

Algorithm 5: Generic pseudo-code for the iterative methods proposed by Xia and Sprowl (1991) and Siqueira et al. (2017).

Initialization :
1 Set the auxiliary vector $\mathbf{s}$;
2 Set a tolerance ϵ ;
3 Compute $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{s} \circ \mathbf{d}$;
4 Compute $\mathbf{G}$;
5 Compute $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{G}\,\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$;
6 Compute $\|\mathbf{r}\|$;
7 **while** $(\|\mathbf{r}\| > \epsilon)$ **do**
8 $\quad$ $\boldsymbol{\Delta}\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{s} \circ \mathbf{r}$;
9 $\quad$ $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} \leftarrow \tilde{\mathbf{p}} + \boldsymbol{\Delta}\mathbf{p}$;
10 $\quad$ $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{G}\,\boldsymbol{\Delta}\mathbf{p}$;
11 $\quad$ Compute $\|\mathbf{r}\|$;
12 **end**

---

295 Jirigalatu and Ebbing (2019): $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \omega\,\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{r}$

296 Xia et al. (1993) - Fourier

2.8 Discrete convolution

Takahashi et al. (2020)

Takahashi et al. (2022)

3 TEXTO ANTIGO

3.0.1 The wavelet compression and lower-dimensional subspace

For large data sets, the sensitivity matrix $\mathbf{A}$ (equation 3) is a drawback in applying the equivalent-layer technique because it is a large and dense matrix.

? transformed a large and full sensitivity matrix into a sparse one by using fast wavelet transforms. In the wavelet domain, **?** applyied a 2D wavelet transform to each row and column of the original sensitivity matrix $\mathbf{A}$ to expand it in the wavelet bases. This operation can be done by premultiplying the original sensitivity matrix $\mathbf{A}$ by a matrix representing the 2D wavelet transform $\mathbf{W_2}$ and then the resulting is postmultiplied by the transpose of $\mathbf{W_2}$ (i.e., $\mathbf{W_2}^\top$).

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{W_2}\,\mathbf{A}\,\mathbf{W_2}^\top\,, \tag{38}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ is the expanded original sensitivity matrix in the wavelet bases with many elements zero or close to zero. Next, the matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ is replaced by its sparse version $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\mathbf{s}$ in the wavelet domain which in turn is obtained by retaining only the large elements of the $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$. Thus, the elements of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ whose amplitudes fall below a relative threshold are discarded. In **?**, the original sensitivity matrix $\mathbf{A}$ is high compressed resulting in a sparce matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\mathbf{s}$ with a few percent of nonzero elements and the the inverse problem is solved in the wavelet domain by using $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\mathbf{s}$ and a incomplete conjugate gradient least squares, without an explicit regularization parameter and a limited number of iterations. The solution is obtained by solving the following linear system

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\mathbf{L}^\top\,\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\mathbf{L}\,\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_\mathbf{L}^* = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\mathbf{L}^\top\,\tilde{\mathbf{d}}^o\,, \tag{39}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_\mathbf{L}^*$ is obtained by solving the linear system given by equation 39,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\mathbf{L} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\mathbf{s}\,\tilde{\mathbf{L}}^{-1}, \tag{40a}$$
$$\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_\mathbf{L} = \tilde{\mathbf{L}}\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \tag{40b}$$
$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}^o = \mathbf{W_2}\,\mathbf{d}^o, \tag{40c}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$ is a diagonal and invertible weighting matrix representing the finite-difference approximation in the wavelet domain. Finally, the distribution over the equivalent layer in the space domain $\mathbf{p}$ is obtained by applying an inverse wavelet transform in two steps, i.e.:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mathbf{L}}^{-1}\,\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_\mathbf{L}^*\,, \tag{41}$$

and

$$\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{W_2}\,\tilde{\mathbf{p}}\,. \tag{42}$$

Although the data misfit quantifying the difference between the observed and predicted data by the equivalent source is calculated in the wavelet domain, we understand that the desired transformation is calculated via equation **??** which uses a full matrix of Green's functions $\mathbf{T}$.

324 **?** used the equivalent-layer technique with a wavelet compression to perform an upward continuation
325 of total-field anomaly between uneven surfaces. For regularly spaced grid of data, **?** reported that high
326 compression ratios are achived with insignificant loss of accuracy. As compared to the upward-continued
327 total-field anomaly by equivalent layer using the dense matrix, **?**'s (**?**) approach, using the Daubechies
328 wavelet, decreased CPU (central processing unit) time by up to two orders of magnitude.

329 **?** overcame the solution of intractable large-scale equivalent-layer problem by using the subspace method
330 (e.g., Skilling and Bryan, 1984; Kennett et al., 1988; Oldenburg et al., 1993; Barbosa et al., 1997). The
331 subspace method reduces the dimension of the linear system of equations to be solved. Given a higher-
332 dimensional space (e.g., M-dimensional model space, $\mathbb{R}^M$), there exists many lower-dimensional subspaces
333 (e.g., Q-dimensional subspace) of $\mathbb{R}^M$. The linear inverse problem related to the equivalent-layer technique
334 consists in finding an M-dimension parameter vector $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ which adequately fits the potential-field
335 data. The subspace method looks for a parameter vector who lies in a Q-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^M$
336 which, in turn, is spanned by a set of Q vectors $\mathbf{v}_i = 1, ..., Q$, where $\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathbb{R}^M$ In matrix notation, the
337 parameter vector in the subspace method can be written as

$$\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{V}\,\boldsymbol{\alpha}\,, \tag{43}$$

338 where $\mathbf{V}$ is an $M \times Q$ matrix whose columns $\mathbf{v}_i = 1, ..., Q$ form a basis vectors for a subspace Q of $\mathbb{R}^M$.
339 In equation 43, the parameter vector $\mathbf{p}$ is defined as a linear combination in the space spanned by Q basis
340 vectors $\mathbf{v}_i = 1, ..., Q$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is a Q-dimensional unknown vector to be determined. The main advantage of
341 the subspace method is that the linear system of M equations in M unknowns to be originally solved is
342 reduced to a new linear system of Q equations in Q unknowns which requires much less computational
343 effort since $Q << M$, i.e.:

$$\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^* = \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{d}^o\,. \tag{44}$$

344 To avoid the storage of matrices $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{V}$, **?** evaluates an element of the matrix $\mathbf{AV}$ by calculating the dot
345 product between the row of matrix $\mathbf{A}$ and the column of the matrix $\mathbf{B}$. After estimating $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*$ (equation 44)
346 belonging to a Q-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^M$, the distribution over the equivalent layer $\mathbf{p}$ in the $\mathbb{R}^M$ is
347 obtained by applying equation 43. The choice of the Q basis vectors $\mathbf{v}_i = 1, ..., Q$ (equation 43) in the
348 subspace method is not strict. **?**, for example, chose the eigenvectors yielded by applying the singular value
349 decomposition of the matrix containing the gridded data set. The number of eigenvectors used to form
350 basis vectors will depend on the singular values.

351 The proposed subspace method for solving large-scale equivalent-layer problem by **?** was applied to
352 estimate the mass excess or deficiency caused by causative gravity sources.

3.0.2 The quadtree discretization

354 To make the equivalent-layer technique tractable, **?** also transformed the dense sensitivity matrix $\mathbf{A}$
355 (equation 3) into a sparse matrix. In **?**, a sparce version of the sensitivity matrix is achived by grouping
356 equivalent sources (e.g., they used prisms) distant from an observation point together to form a larger prism
357 or larger block. Each larger block has averaged physical properties and averaged top- and bottom-surfaces
358 of the grouped smaller prisms (equivalent sources) that are encompassed by the larger block. The authors
359 called it the 'larger averaged block' and the essence of their method is the reduction in the number of
360 equivalent sources, which means a reduction in the number of parameters to be estimated implying in
361 model dimension reduction.

362   The key of the **?**'s (**?**) method is the algorithm for deciding how to group the smaller prisms. In
363   practice, these authors used a recursive bisection process that results in a quadtree discretization of the
364   equivalent-layer model.

365   By using the quadtree discretization, **?** were able to jointly process multiple components of airborne
366   gravity-gradient data using a single layer of equivalent sources. To our knowledge, **?** are the pioneers on
367   processing full-tensor gravity-gradient data jointly. In addition to computational feasibility, **?**'s (**?**) method
368   reduces low-frequency noise and can also remove the drift in time-domain from the survey data. Those
369   authors stressed that the $G_{zz}-$component calculated through the single estimated equivalent-layer model
370   projected on a grid at a constant elevation by inverting full gravity-gradient data has the low-frequency error
371   reduced by a factor of 2.4 as compared to the inversion of an individual component of the gravity-gradient
372   data.

373 3.0.3   The reparametrization of the equivalent layer

374   Oliveira Jr. et al. (2013) reparametrized the whole equivalent-layer model by a piecewise bivariate-
375   polynomial function defined on a set of Q equivalent-source windows. In Oliveira Jr. et al.'s (2013)
376   approach, named polynomial equivalent layer (PEL), the parameter vector within the kth equivalent-source
377   window $\mathbf{p}^k$ can be written in matrix notation as

$$\mathbf{p}^k = \mathbf{B}^k\,\mathbf{c}^k\,, \qquad k\,=\,1\ldots Q\,, \tag{45}$$

378   where $\mathbf{p}^k$ is an M_w-dimensional vector containing the physical-property distribution within the kth
379   equivalent-source window, $\mathbf{c}^k$ is a P-dimensional vector whose lth element is the lth coefficient of the
380   αth-order polynomial function and $\mathbf{B}^k$ is an $M_w \times P$ matrix containing the first-order derivative of the
381   αth-order polynomial function with respect to one of the P coefficients.

382   By using a regularized potential-field inversion, Oliveira Jr. et al. (2013) estimates the polynomial
383   coefficients for each equivalent-source window by solving the following linear system

$$\left(\mathbf{B}^\top\,\mathbf{A}^\top\,\mathbf{A}\,\mathbf{B} + \mu\mathbf{I}\right)\,\mathbf{c}^* \,=\, \mathbf{B}^\top\,\mathbf{A}^\top\,\mathbf{d}^o\,, \tag{46}$$

384   where μ is a regularizing parameter, $\mathbf{c}^*$ is an estimated H-dimensional vector containing all coefficients
385   describing all polynomial functions within all equivalent-source windows which compose the entire
386   equivalent layer, $\mathbf{I}$ is an identity matrix of order $H(H = P\dot{Q})$ and $\mathbf{B}$ is an $M \times H$ block diagonal matrix
387   such that the main-diagonal blocks are $\mathbf{B}^k$ matrices (equation 45) and all off-diagonal blocks are zero
388   matrices. For ease of the explanation of equation 46, we keep only the zeroth-order Tikhonov regularization
389   and omitting the first-order Tikhonov regularization (**?**) which was also used by Oliveira Jr. et al. (2013).

390   The main advantage of the PEL is solve H-dimensional system of equations (equation 46), where H
391   totalizes the number of polynomial coefficients composing all equivalent-source windows, requiring a
392   lower computational effort since $H <<< N$. To avoid the storage of matrices $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, Oliveira Jr. et al.
393   (2013) evaluate an element of the matrix $\mathbf{AB}$ by calculating the dot product between the row of matrix $\mathbf{A}$
394   and the column of the matrix $\mathbf{B}$. After estimating all polynomial coefficients of all windows, the estimated
395   coefficients ($\mathbf{c}^*$ in equation 46) are transformed into a single physical-property distribution encompassing
396   the entire equivalent layer.

397   As stated by Oliveira Jr. et al. (2013), the computational efficiency of PEL approach stems from the fact
398   that the total number of polynomial coefficients H required to depict the physical-property distribution

399　within the equivalent layer is generally much smaller than the number of equivalent sources. Consequently,
400　this leads to a considerably smaller linear system that needs to be solved. Hence, the main strategy of
401　polynomial equivalent layer is the model dimension reduction.

402　　The polynomial equivalent layer was applied to perform upward continuations of gravity and magnetic
403　data and reduction to the pole of magnetic data.

3.0.4　The iterative scheme without solving a linear system

405　　There exists a class of methods that iteratively estimate the distribution of physical properties within an
406　equivalent layer without the need to solve linear systems. The method initially introduced by Cordell (1992)
407　and later expanded upon by Guspí and Novara (2009) updates the physical property of sources, located
408　beneath each potential-field data, by removing the maximum residual between the observed and fitted data.
409　In addition, Xia and Sprowl (1991) and Xia et al. (1993) have developed efficient iterative algorithms for
410　updating the distribution of physical properties within the equivalent layer in the wavenumber and space
411　domains, respectively. Specifically, in Xia and Sprowl's (1991) method the physical-property distribution is
412　updated by using the ratio between the squared depth to the equivalent source and the gravitational constant
413　multiplied by the residual between the observed and predicted observation at the measurement station.
414　Neither of these methods solve linear systems.

415　　Following this class of methods of iterative equivalent-layer technique that does not solve linear systems,
416　Siqueira et al. (2017) developed a fast iterative equivalent-layer technique for processing gravity data in
417　which the sensitivity matrix $\mathbf{A}$ (equation 3) is replaced by a diagonal matrix $N \times N$, i.e.:

$$\tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}} = 2\,\pi\,\gamma\,\mathbf{\Delta S^{-1}}\,, \tag{47}$$

418　where γ is Newton's gravitational constant and $\mathbf{\Delta S^{-1}}$ is a diagonal matrix of order N whose diagonal
419　elements Δs_i, $i = 1, ..., N$ are the element of area centered at the ith horizontal coordinates of the ith
420　observation point. The physical foundations of Siqueira et al.'s (2017) method rely on two constraints: i) the
421　excess of mass; and ii) the positive correlation between the gravity observations and the mass distribution
422　over the equivalent layer.

423　　Although Siqueira et al.'s (2017) method does not solve any linear system of equations, it can be
424　theoretically explained by solving the following linear system at the kth iteration:

$$\tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}^{\top}\,\tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}\mathbf{\Delta}\,\hat{\mathbf{p}}^k \;=\; \tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}^{\top}\,\mathbf{r}^k\,, \tag{48}$$

425　where $\mathbf{r}^k$ is an N-dimensional residual vector whose ith element is calculated by subtracting the ith
426　observed data d_i^o from the ith fitted data d_i^k at the kth iteration, i.e.,

$$r_i^k = d_i^o \;-\; d_i^k\,. \tag{49}$$

427　and $\mathbf{\Delta}\,\hat{\mathbf{p}}^k$ is an estimated N-dimensional vector of parameter correction.

428　　Because $\tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}$, in equation 48, is a diagonal matrix (equation 47), the parameter correction estimate is
429　directly calculated without solving system of linear equations, and thus, an ith element of $\mathbf{\Delta}\,\hat{\mathbf{p}}^k$ is directly
430　calculated by

$$\Delta\hat{p}^k_{\ i} = \frac{\Delta s_i\,r_i^k}{2\,\pi\,\gamma}\,. \tag{50}$$

The mass distribution over the equivalent layer is updated by:

$$\hat{p}_i^{k+1} = \hat{p}_i^k \; + \; \Delta\hat{p}^k{}_i \, . \tag{51}$$

Siqueira et al.'s (2017) method starts from a mass distribution on the equivalent layer, whose ith mass p_i^o is proportional to the ith observed data d_i^o, i.e.,

$$p_i^o = \frac{\Delta s_i \, d_i^o}{2 \, \pi \, \gamma} \, . \tag{52}$$

Siqueira et al. (2017) applied their fast iterative equivalent-layer technique to interpolate, calculate the horizontal components, and continue upward (or downward) gravity data.

For jointly process two gravity gradient components, Jirigalatu and Ebbing (2019) used the Gauss-FFT for forward calculation of potential fields in the wavenumber domain combined with Landweber's iteration coupled with a mask matrix $\mathbf{M}$ to reduce the edge effects without increasing the computation cost. The mask matrix $\mathbf{M}$ is defined in the following way: if the corresponding pixel does not contain the original data, the element of $\mathbf{M}$ is set to zero; otherwise, it is set to one. The kth Landweber iteration is given by

$$\mathbf{p}_{k+1} = \mathbf{p}_k + \omega \left[\mathbf{A_1}^\top (\mathbf{d_1} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{A_1}\mathbf{p}_k) + \mathbf{A_2}^\top (\mathbf{d_2} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{A_2}\mathbf{p}_k) \right] , \tag{53}$$

where ω is a relaxation factor, $\mathbf{d_1}$ and $\mathbf{d_2}$ are the two gravity gradient components and $\mathbf{A_1}$ and $\mathbf{A_2}$ are the corresponding gravity gradient kernels. Jirigalatu and Ebbing (2019) applied their method for processing two horizontal curvature components of Falcon airborne gravity gradient.

3.0.5 The convolutional equivalent layer with BTTB matrices

? (**?**, **?**) introduced the convolutional equivalent layer for gravimetric and magnetic data processing, respectively.

? demonstrated that the sensitivity matrix $\mathbf{A}$ (equation 3) associated with a planar equivalent layer formed by a set of point masses, each one directly beneath each observation point and considering a regular grid of observation points at a constant height has a symmetric block-Toeplitz Toeplitz-block (BTTB) structure. A symmetric BTTB matrix has, at least, two attractive properties. The first one is that it can be defined by using only the elements forming its first column (or row). The second attractive property is that any BTTB matrix can be embedded into a symmetric Block-Circulat Circulant-Block (BCCB) matrix. This means that the full sensitivity matrix $\mathbf{A}$ (equation 3) can be completely reconstruct by using the first column of the BCCB matrix only. In what follows, **?** computed the forward modeling by using only a single equivalent source. Specifically, it is done by calculating the eigenvalues of the BCCB matrix that can be efficiently computed by using only the first column of the BCCB matrix via 2D fast Fourier transform (2D FFT). By comparing with the classic approach in the Fourier domain, the convolutional equivalent layer for gravimetric data processing proposed by **?** performed upward- and downward-continue gravity data with a very small border effects and noise amplification.

By using the original idea of the convolutional equivalent layer proposed by **?** for gravimetric data processing, **?** developed the convolutional equivalent layer for magnetic data processing. By assuming a regularly spaced grid of magnetic data at a constant height and a planar equivalent layer of dipoles, **?** proved that the sensitivity matrix linked with this layer possess a BTTB structure in the specific scenario where each dipole is exactly beneath each observed magnetic data point. **?** used a conjugate gradient

465 least-squares (CGLS) algorithm which does not require an inverse matrix or matrix-matrix multiplication.
466 Rather, it only requires matrix-vector multiplications per iteration, which can be effectively computed using
467 the 2D FFT as a discrete convolution. The matrix-vector product only uses the elements that constitute the
468 first column of the associated BTTB matrix, resulting in computational time and memory savings. **?** (**?**)
469 showed the robustness of the convolutional equivalent layer in processing magnetic survey that violates the
470 requirement of regular grids in the horizontal directions and flat observation surfaces.

471   The matrix-vector product in **?** (**?**, **?**) (e.g., $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{p}$, such as in equation 3) is the main issue to be solved.
472 To solve it efficiently, these authors involked the auxiliary linear system

$$\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{v}\,, \tag{54}$$

473 where $\mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are, respectively, vectors of data and parameters completed by zeros and $\mathbf{C}$ is a BCCB
474 matrix formed by $2Q \times 2Q$ blocks, where each block $\mathbf{C}_q$, $q = 0, \ldots, Q-1$, is a $2P \times 2P$ circulant matrix.
475 The first column of $\mathbf{C}$ is obtained by rearranging the first column of the sensitivity matrix $\mathbf{A}$ (equation 3).
476 Because a BCCB matrix is diagonalized by the 2D unitary discrete Fourier transform (DFT), $\mathbf{C}$ can be
477 written as

$$\mathbf{C} = \left(\mathbf{F}_{2Q} \otimes \mathbf{F}_{2P}\right)^* \mathbf{\Lambda} \left(\mathbf{F}_{2Q} \otimes \mathbf{F}_{2P}\right)\,, \tag{55}$$

478 where the symbol "$\otimes$" denotes the Kronecker product (**?**), $\mathbf{F}_{2Q}$ and $\mathbf{F}_{2P}$ are the $2Q \times 2Q$ and $2P \times 2P$
479 unitary DFT matrices (**?**, p. 31), respectively, the superscriptpt "$*$" denotes the complex conjugate and $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is
480 a $4QP \times 4QP$ diagonal matrix containing the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{C}$. Due to the diagonalization of the matrix
481 $\mathbf{C}$, the auxiliary system (equation 54) can be rewritten by using equation 55 and premultiplying both sides
482 of the result by $\left(\mathbf{F}_{2Q} \otimes \mathbf{F}_{2P}\right)$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} \left(\mathbf{F}_{2Q} \otimes \mathbf{F}_{2P}\right) \mathbf{v} = \left(\mathbf{F}_{2Q} \otimes \mathbf{F}_{2P}\right) \mathbf{w}\,. \tag{56}$$

483 By applying the vec-operator (**?**) to both sides of equation 56, by premultiplying both sides of the result by
484 $\mathbf{F}_{2Q}^*$ and then postmultiplying both sides of the result by $\mathbf{F}_{2P}^*$

$$\mathbf{F}_{2Q}^* \left[\mathbf{L} \circ \left(\mathbf{F}_{2Q}\, \mathbf{V}\, \mathbf{F}_{2P}\right)\right] \mathbf{F}_{2P}^* = \mathbf{W}\,, \tag{57}$$

485 where "$\circ$" denotes the Hadamard product (**?**, p. 298) and $\mathbf{L}$, $\mathbf{V}$ and $\mathbf{W}$ are $2Q \times 2P$ matrices obtained
486 by rearranging, along their rows, the elements forming the diagonal of matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda}$, vector $\mathbf{v}$ and vector $\mathbf{w}$,
487 respectively. The left side of equation 57 contains the 2D Inverse Discrete Fourier Transform (IDFT) of the
488 term in brackets, which in turn represents the Hadamard product of matrix $\mathbf{L}$ and the 2D DFT of matrix $\mathbf{V}$.
489 Matrix $\mathbf{L}$ contains the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ (equation 55) and can be efficiently computed by using only the
490 first column of the BCCB matrix $\mathbf{C}$ (equation 54).

491   Actually, in **?** (**?**, **?**) a fast 2D discrete circular convolution (Van Loan, 1992) is used to process very
492 large gravity and magnetic datasets efficiently. The convolutional equivalent layer was applied to perform
493 upward continuation of large magnetic datasets. Compared to the classical Fourier approach, **?**'s (**?**) method
494 produces smaller border effects without using any padding scheme.

495   Without taking advantage of the symmetric BTTB structure of the sensitivity matrix (**?**, **?**) that arises
496 when gravimetric observations are measured on a horizontally regular grid, on a flat surface and considering
497 a regular grid of equivalent sources whitin a horizontal layer, **?** explored the symmetry of the gravity
498 kernel to reduce the number of forward model evaluations. By exploting the symmetries of the gravity

499 kernels and redundancies in the forward model evaluations on a regular grid and combining the subspace
500 solution based on eigenvectors of the gridded dataset, **?** estimated the mass excess or deficiency produced
501 by anomalous sources with positive or negative density contrast.

3.0.6 The deconvolutional equivalent layer with BTTB matrices

503 To avoid the iterations of the conjugate gradient method in **?**, we can employ the deconvolution process.
504 Equation 57 shows that estimate the matrix $\mathbf{V}$, containing the elements of parameter vector $\mathbf{p}$, is a
505 inverse problem that could be solved by deconvolution. From equation 57, the matrix $\mathbf{V}$ can be obtain by
506 deconvolution, i.e.

$$\mathbf{V} \;=\; \mathbf{F}_{2Q}^{*} \left[\frac{\left(\mathbf{F}_{2Q}\mathbf{W}\,\mathbf{F}_{2P}\right)}{\mathbf{L}} \right] \mathbf{F}_{2P}^{*}\,. \tag{58}$$

507 Equation 58 shows that the parameter vector (in matrix $\mathbf{V}$) can be theoretically obtain by dividing each
508 potential-field observations (in matrix $\mathbf{W}$) by each eigenvalues (in matrix $\mathbf{L}$). Hence, the parameter vector
509 is constructed by element-by-element division of data by eigenvalues.

510 However, the deconvolution often is extremely unstable. This means that a small change in data can lead
511 to an enormous change in the estimated parameter. Hence, equation 58 requires regularization to be useful.
512 We usede wiener deconvolution to obtain a stable solution, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{V} \;=\; \mathbf{F}_{2Q}^{*} \left[\left(\mathbf{F}_{2Q}\mathbf{W}\,\mathbf{F}_{2P}\right) \frac{\mathbf{L}^{*}}{\left(\mathbf{L}\,\mathbf{L}^{*} + \mu\right)} \right] \mathbf{F}_{2P}^{*}\,, \tag{59}$$

513 where the matrix $\mathbf{L}^{*}$ contains the complex conjugate eigenvalues and μ is a parameter that controls the
514 degree of stabilization.

3.1 Solution stability

516 The solution stability of the equivalent-layer methods is rarely addressed. Here, we follow the numerical
517 stability analysis presented in Siqueira et al. (2017).

518 Let us assume noise-free potential-field data $\mathbf{d}$, we estimate a physical-property distribution $\mathbf{p}$ (estimated
519 solution) within the equivalent layer. Then, the noise-free data $\mathbf{d}$ are contaminated with additive D different
520 sequences of pseudorandom Gaussian noise, creating different noise-corrupted potential-field data $\mathbf{d}_{\ell}^{o}$,
521 $\ell = 1, ..., D$. From each $\mathbf{d}_{\ell}^{o}$, we estimate a physical-property distribution $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{\ell}$ within the equivalent layer.

522 Next, for each noise-corrupted data $\mathbf{d}_{\ell}^{o}$ and estimated solution $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{\ell}$, the ℓth model perturbation δp_{ℓ} and the
523 ℓth data perturbation δd_{ℓ} are, respectively, evaluated by

$$\delta p_{\ell} = \frac{\|\, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{\ell} - \mathbf{p}\, \|_{2}}{\|\, \mathbf{p}\, \|_{2}}, \quad \ell = 1, ..., D, \tag{60}$$

524 and

$$\delta d_{\ell} = \frac{\|\, \mathbf{d}_{\ell}^{o} - \mathbf{d}\, \|_{2}}{\|\, \mathbf{d}\, \|_{2}}, \quad \ell = 1, ..., D. \tag{61}$$

525 Regardless of the particular method used, the following inequality (**?**, p. 66) is applicable:

$$\delta p_{\ell} \leq \kappa\, \delta d_{\ell}, \quad \ell = 1, ..., D, \tag{62}$$

526 where κ is the constant of proportionality between the model perturbation δp_ℓ (equation 60) and the data
527 perturbation δd_ℓ (equation 61). The constant κ acts as the condition number of an invertible matrix in a
528 given inversion, and thus measures the instability of the solution. The larger (smaller) the value of κ the
529 more unstable (stable) is the estimated solution.

530   Equation 62 shows a linear relationship between the model perturbation and the data perturbation. By
531 plotting δp_ℓ (equation 60) against δd_ℓ (equation 61) produced by a set of D estimated solution obtained by
532 applying a given equivalent-layer method, we obtain a straight line behaviour described by equation 62.
533 By applying a linear regression, we obtain a fitted straight line whose estimated slope (κ in equation 62)
534 quantifies the solution stability.

535   Here, the analysis of solution stability is numerically conducted by applying the classical equivalent-
536 layer technique with zeroth-order Tikhonov regularization, the convolutional method for gravimetric and
537 magnetic data, the deconvolutional method (equation 58) and the deconvolutional method with different
538 values for the Wiener stabilization (equation 59).

4   NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

539   We investigated different computational algorithms for inverting gravity disturbances and total-field
540   anomalies. To test the capability of the fast equivalent-layer technique for processing that potential field
541   data we measure of the computational effort by counting the number of floating-point operations (*flops*),
542   such as additions, subtractions, multiplications, and divisions (Golub and Van Loan, 2013) for different
543   number of observation points, ranging from $10,000$ up to $1,000,000$. The results generated when using
544   iterative methods are set to *it* $= 50$ for the number of iterations.

4.1   Floating-point operations calculation

546   To measure the computational effort of the different algorithms to solve the equivalent layer linear system,
547   a non-hardware dependent method can be useful because allow us to do direct comparison between them.
548   Counting the floating-point operations (*flops*), i.e., additions, subtractions, multiplications and divisions
549   is a good way to quantify the amount of work of a given algorithm (Golub and Van Loan, 2013). For
550   example, the number of *flops* necessary to multiply two vectors $\mathbb{R}^N$ is $2N$. A common matrix-vector
551   multiplication with dimension $\mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and $\mathbb{R}^N$, respectively, is $2N^2$ and a multiplication of two matrices
552    $\mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is $2N^3$. Figure **??** shows the total flops count for the different methods presented in this review
553   with a crescent number of data, ranging from $10,000$ to $1,000,000$ for the gravity equivalent layer and
554   figure **??** for magnetic data.

4.1.1   Normal equations using Cholesky decomposition

556   The equivalent sources can be estimated directly from solving the normal equations 3. In this work we
557   will use the Cholesky decompositions method to calculate the necessary *flops*. In this method it is calculated
558   the lower triangule of $\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{A}$ $(1/2N^3)$, the Cholesky factor $(1/3N^3)$, a matrix-vector multiplication $(2N^2)$
559   and finally solving the triangular system $(2N^2)$, totalizing

$$f_{classical} = \frac{5}{6}N^3 + 4N^2 \tag{63}$$

4.1.2   Window method (Leão and Silva, 1989)

561   The moving data-window scheme (Leão and Silva, 1989) solve N linear systems with much smaller
562   sizes (equation **??**). For our results we are considering a data-window of the same size of wich the authors
563   presented in theirs work ($N_w = 49$) and the same number of equivalent sources ($M_w = 225$). We are doing
564   this process for all the other techniques to standardize the resolution of our problem. Using the Cholesky
565   decomposition with this method the *flops* are

$$f_{window} = N\frac{5}{6}M_wN_w^2 + 4N_wM_w \tag{64}$$

4.1.3   PEL method (Oliveira Jr. et al., 2013)

567   The polynomial equivalent layer uses a simliar approach od moving windows from Leão and Silva (1989).
568   For this operations calculation (equation 46) we used a first degree polynomial (two variables) and each
569   window contains $N_s = 1,000$ observed data and $M_s = 1,000$ equivalent sources. Following the steps
570   given in (Oliveira Jr. et al., 2013) the total *flops* becomes

$$f_{pel} = \frac{1}{3}H^3 + 2H^2 + 2NM_sH + H^2N + 2HN + 2NP \tag{65}$$

where H is the number of constant coefficients for the first degree polynomial ($P = 3$) times the number of windows ($P \times N/N_s$).

4.1.4 Conjugate gradient least square (CGLS)

The CGLS method is a very stable and fast algorithm for solving linear systems iteratively. Its computational complexity envolves a matrix-vector product outside the loop ($2N^2$), two matrix-vector products inside the loop ($4N^2$) and six vector products inside the loop ($12N$) (**?**)

$$f_{cgls} = 2N^2 + it(4N^2 + 12N) \tag{66}$$

4.1.5 Wavelet compression method with CGLS (**?**)

For the wavelet method (equation 39) we have calculated a coompression rate of 98% ($C_r = 0.02$) for the threshold as the authors used in **?** and the wavelet transformation requiring $\log_2(N)$ *flops* each (equations 38 and 40c), with its inverse also using the same number of operations (equation 42). Combined with the conjugate gradient least square necessary steps and iterations, the number of *flops* are

$$f_{wavelet} = 2NC_r + 4N \log_2(N) + it(4N \log_2(N) + 4NC_r + 12C_r) \tag{67}$$

4.1.6 Fast equivalent layer for gravity data (Siqueira et al., 2017)

The fast equivalent layer from Siqueira et al. (2017) solves the linear system in *it* iterations. The main cost of this method (equations 48,49, 50 and 51)is the matrix-vector multiplication to asses the predicted data ($2N^2$) and three simply element by element vector sum, subtraction and division ($3N$ total)

$$f_{siqueira} = it(3N + 2N^2) \tag{68}$$

4.1.7 Convolutional equivalent layer for gravity data (**?**)

This methods replaces the matrix-vector multiplication of the iterative fast-equivalent technique (Siqueira et al., 2017) by three steps, involving a Fourier transform, an inverse Fourier transform, and a Hadamard product of matrices (equation 57). Considering that the first column of our BCCB matrix has $4N$ elements, the flops count of this method is

$$f_{convgrav} = \kappa 4N \log_2(4N) + it(27N + \kappa 8N \log_2(4N)) \tag{69}$$

In the resultant count we considered a *radix-2* algorithm for the fast Fourier transform and its inverse, which has a κ equals to 5 and requires $\kappa 4N \log_2(4N)$ flops each. The Hadarmard product of two matrices of $4N$ elements with complex numbers takes $24N$ flops. Note that equation 69 is different from the one presented in **?** because we also added the flops necessary to calculate the eigenvalues in this form. It does not differentiate much in order of magnitude because the iterative part is the most costful.

596 4.1.8 Convolutional equivalent layer for magnetic data (**?**)

597 The convolutional equivalent layer for magnetic data uses the same flops count of the main operations as
598 in the gravimetric case (equation 57), the difference is the use of the conjugate gradient algorithm to solve
599 the inverse problem. It requires a Hadamard product outside of the iterative loop and the matrix-vector and
600 vector-vector multiplications inside the loop as seem in equation 66.

$$f_{convmag} = \kappa 16N \log_2(4N) + 24N + it(\kappa 16N \log_2(4N) + 60N) \tag{70}$$

601 4.1.9 Deconvolutional method

602 The deconvolution method does not require an iterative algorithm, rather it solves the estimative of the
603 physical properties in a single step using the $4N$ eigenvalues of the BCCB matrix as in the convolutional
604 method. From equation 58 it is possible to deduce this method requires two fast Fourier transform
605 ($\kappa 4N \log_2(4N)$), one for the eigenvalues and another for the data transformation, a element by element
606 division ($24N$) and finally, a fast inverse Fourier transform for the final estimative ($\kappa 4N \log_2(4N)$).

$$f_{deconv} = \kappa 12N \log_2(4N) + 24N \tag{71}$$

607 Using the deconvolutional method with a Wiener stabilization adds two multiplications of complex
608 elements of the conjugates eigenvalues ($24N$ each) and the sum of $4N$ elements with the stabilization
609 parameter μ as shown in equation 59

$$f_{deconvwiener} = \kappa 12N \log_2(4N) + 76N \tag{72}$$

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

610 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
611 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

612 The Author Contributions section is mandatory for all articles, including articles by sole authors. If an
613 appropriate statement is not provided on submission, a standard one will be inserted during the production
614 process. The Author Contributions statement must describe the contributions of individual authors referred
615 to by their initials and, in doing so, all authors agree to be accountable for the content of the work. Please
616 see here for full authorship criteria.

FUNDING

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

623 The datasets generated for this study can be found in the frontiers-paper Github repository link:
624 https://github.com/DiegoTaka/frontiers-paper.

REFERENCES

625 Aster, R. C., Borchers, B., and Thurber, C. H. (2019). *Parameter Estimation and Inverse Problems*
626   (Elsevier), 3 edn.
627 Barbosa, V. C. F., Silva, J. B., and Medeiros, W. E. (1997). Gravity inversion of basement relief using
628   approximate equality constraints on depths. *Geophysics* 62, 1745–1757
629 Barnes, G. and Lumley, J. (2011). Processing gravity gradient data. *GEOPHYSICS* 76, I33–I47. doi:10.
630   1190/1.3548548
631 Cordell, L. (1992). A scattered equivalent-source method for interpolation and gridding of potential-field
632   data in three dimensions. *Geophysics* 57, 629–636
633 Dampney, C. N. G. (1969). The equivalent source technique. *GEOPHYSICS* 34, 39–53. doi:10.1190/1.
634   1439996
635 Emilia, D. A. (1973). Equivalent sources used as an analytic base for processing total magnetic field
636   profiles. *GEOPHYSICS* 38, 339–348. doi:10.1190/1.1440344
637 Golub, G. H. and Van Loan, C. F. (2013). *Matrix Computations*. Johns Hopkins Studies in the Mathematical
638   Sciences (Johns Hopkins University Press), 4 edn.

639 Gonzalez, S. P., Barbosa, V. C. F., and Oliveira Jr., V. C. (2022). Analyzing the ambiguity of the remanent-
640 magnetization direction separated into induced and remanent magnetic sources. *Journal of Geophysical*
641 *Research: Solid Earth* 127, 1–24. doi:10.1029/2022JB024151

642 Guspí, F. and Novara, I. (2009). Reduction to the pole and transformations of scattered magnetic data using
643 Newtonian equivalent sources. *GEOPHYSICS* 74, L67–L73. doi:10.1190/1.3170690

644 Hansen, R. O. and Miyazaki, Y. (1984). Continuation of potential fields between arbitrary surfaces.
645 *GEOPHYSICS* 49, 787–795. doi:10.1190/1.1441707

646 Jirigalatu, J. and Ebbing (2019). A fast equivalent source method for airborne gravity gradient data.
647 *Geophysics* 84, G75–G82. doi:10.1190/GEO2018-0366.1

648 Kennett, B., Sambridge, M., and Williamson, P. (1988). Subspace methods for large inverse problems with
649 multiple parameter classes. *Geophysical Journal International* 94, 237–247

650 Leão, J. W. D. and Silva, J. B. C. (1989). Discrete linear transformations of potential field data. *Geophysics*
651 54, 497–507. doi:10.1190/1.1442676

652 Li, Y., Nabighian, M., and Oldenburg, D. W. (2014). Using an equivalent source with positivity for low-
653 latitude reduction to the pole without striation. *GEOPHYSICS* 79, J81–J90. doi:10.1190/geo2014-0134.
654 1

655 Li, Y. and Oldenburg, D. W. (2010). Rapid construction of equivalent sources using wavelets.
656 *GEOPHYSICS* 75, L51–L59. doi:10.1190/1.3378764

657 Mendonça, C. A. (2020). Subspace method for solving large-scale equivalent layer and density mapping
658 problems. *GEOPHYSICS* 85, G57–G68. doi:10.1190/geo2019-0302.1

659 Mendonça, C. A. and Silva, J. B. C. (1994). The equivalent data concept applied to the interpolation of
660 potential field data. *Geophysics* 59, 722–732. doi:10.1190/1.1443630

661 Menke, W. (2018). *Geophysical data analysis: Discrete inverse theory* (Elsevier), 4 edn.

662 Oldenburg, D., McGillivray, P., and Ellis, R. (1993). Generalized subspace methods for large-scale inverse
663 problems. *Geophysical Journal International* 114, 12–20

664 Oliveira Jr., V. C., Barbosa, V. C. F., and Uieda, L. (2013). Polynomial equivalent layer. *GEOPHYSICS* 78,
665 G1–G13. doi:10.1190/geo2012-0196.1

666 Reis, A. L. A., Oliveira Jr., V. C., and Barbosa, V. C. F. (2020). Generalized positivity constraint on
667 magnetic equivalent layers. *Geophysics* 85, 1–45. doi:10.1190/geo2019-0706.1

668 Roy, A. (1962). Ambiguity in geophysical interpretation. *GEOPHYSICS* 27, 90–99. doi:10.1190/1.
669 1438985

670 Silva, J. B. C. (1986). Reduction to the pole as an inverse problem and its application to low-latitude
671 anomalies. *GEOPHYSICS* 51, 369–382. doi:10.1190/1.1442096

672 Siqueira, F., Oliveira Jr., V. C., and Barbosa, V. C. F. (2017). Fast iterative equivalent-layer technique for
673 gravity data processing: A method grounded on excess mass constraint. *GEOPHYSICS* 82, G57–G69.
674 doi:10.1190/GEO2016-0332.1

675 Skilling, J. and Bryan, R. (1984). Maximum entropy image reconstruction-general algorithm. *Monthly*
676 *Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, Vol. 211, NO. 1, P. 111, 1984* 211, 111

677 Soler, S. R. and Uieda, L. (2021). Gradient-boosted equivalent sources. *Geophysical Journal International*
678 227, 1768–1783. doi:10.1093/gji/ggab297

679 Takahashi, D., Oliveira Jr., V. C., and Barbosa, V. C. (2022). Convolutional equivalent layer for magnetic
680 data processing. *Geophysics* 87, 1–59

681 Takahashi, D., Oliveira Jr., V. C., and Barbosa, V. C. F. (2020). Convolutional equivalent layer for gravity
682 data processing. *GEOPHYSICS* 85, G129–G141. doi:10.1190/geo2019-0826.1

683 van der Sluis, A. and van der Vorst, H. A. (1987). Numerical solution of large, sparse linear algebraic
684 systems arising from tomographic problems. In *Seismic tomography with applications in global
685 seismology and exploration geophysics*, ed. G. Nolet (D. Reidel Publishing Company), chap. 3. 49–83
686 Van Loan, C. F. (1992). *Computational Frameworks for the fast Fourier transform*. Frontiers in Applied
687 Mathematics (SIAM)
688 Xia, J. and Sprowl, D. R. (1991). Correction of topographic distortion in gravity data. *Geophysics* 56,
689 537–541
690 Xia, J., Sprowl, D. R., and Adkins-Heljeson, D. (1993). Correction of topographic distortions in potential-
691 field data; a fast and accurate approach. *Geophysics* 58, 515–523. doi:10.1190/1.1443434
692 Zidarov, D. (1965). Solution of some inverse problems of applied geophysics. *Geophysical Prospecting*
693 13, 240–246. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2478.1965.tb01932.x