A Critical Review of Halliburton's EarthStar 3D Ultra-Deep Resistivity Service: Inversion Architecture, Forward Modeling, and Future Directions

Project BigHeadFish Technical Report
Computational Geophysics Division

January 30, 2026

Abstract

Halliburton's EarthStar ultra-deep resistivity (UDR) service represents the current industrial benchmark for reservoir mapping, offering boundary detection capabilities extending beyond 225 feet (68 meters). Recent literature (Wu et al., 2022; Al-Lawati et al., 2023) highlights the transition from 1D pixel-based inversions to full 3D deterministic inversions capable of resolving complex structural features such as faults, fluid contacts, and pinch-outs in real-time. This review deconstructs the underlying physics and numerical architecture of the EarthStar system. We hypothesize that its core engine relies on a hybrid Integral Equation (IE) or Domain Decomposition approach to achieve speed, contrasting with the Finite-Difference methods used in academic research. We critically analyze the limitations of these approximations in high-contrast media and propose improvements via GPU-accelerated full-wave solvers and physics-informed deep learning.

1 Introduction: The Ultra-Deep Frontier

The evolution of Logging-While-Drilling (LWD) has shifted from petrophysical evaluation (inches of depth of investigation) to reservoir-scale mapping (hundreds of feet). The EarthStar service utilizes tilted-antenna loop designs operating at low frequencies (typically 1 kHz to 32 kHz) to achieve this range. The primary innovation described in recent works [1, 2] is not merely the hardware, but the algorithmic leap allowing for the inversion of Tilted Transverse Isotropy (TTI) parameters in a 3D space while drilling.

2 The Forward Simulation Engine

The "Forward Model" is the mathematical engine that calculates expected sensor responses from a proposed earth model. For real-time 3D inversion, this engine must be exceptionally fast, precluding the use of standard Finite-Difference (FD) or Finite-Element (FE) methods that mesh the entire formation. Based on the constraints of real-time inversion and the physics described in the literature, we deduce the likely architecture of the EarthStar forward engine.

2.1 Hypothesized Methodology: Integral Equations (IE)

Unlike the differential approach (FDFD) used in our *BigHeadFish* solver, EarthStar likely employs a Volume Integral Equation (VIE) approach or a Hybrid IE-FD method.

2.1.1 Green's Function Background

The IE method decomposes the total electric field $\mathbf{E}$ into a background field $\mathbf{E}_b$ (usually a 1D layered earth) and a scattered field $\mathbf{E}_s$:

$$\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{E}_b(\mathbf{r}) + \int_V \bar{\mathbf{G}}_b(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \cdot \Delta\hat{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}') \cdot \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}')\, dV' \qquad (1)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{G}}_b$ is the Dyadic Green's function for the layered background, and $\Delta\hat{\sigma}$ is the conductivity contrast of the anomaly (e.g., a salt dome or fault) against the background.

- **Advantage:** Only the anomalous volume V (the target) needs to be discretized. The infinite background is handled analytically by the Green's function.
- **Speed:** For sparse targets (e.g., a fault plane), this reduces the unknowns from millions (in FD) to thousands, enabling sub-second forward calls.

2.2 Approximations for Real-Time Speed

To solve the nonlinear inverse problem, the forward engine must be called thousands of times. Full solution of the IE (via Method of Moments) can still be slow.

- **Born Approximation:** It is likely that the initial iterations utilize the Born approximation, which assumes the internal field inside the scatterer is equal to the background field ($\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}') \approx \mathbf{E}_b(\mathbf{r}')$). This linearizes the problem.
- **Extended Born / Quasi-Linear:** For high-contrast targets (e.g., oil-water contacts), a non-linear approximation (like the Extended Born) is required to correct for depolarization effects inside the conductive anomaly.

3 The 3D Inversion Algorithm

Wu et al. (2022) describe a deterministic inversion framework, likely based on the Gauss-Newton or Levenberg-Marquardt method.

3.1 Cost Function

The inversion minimizes a Tikhonov-regularized cost function:

$$\phi(\mathbf{m}) = ||\mathbf{W}_d(\mathbf{d}_{obs} - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{m}))||^2 + \lambda||\mathbf{W}_m(\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}_{ref})||^2 \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{m})$ is the forward modeling operator. The complexity lies in the Jacobian calculation $\mathbf{J} = \partial\mathbf{F}/\partial\mathbf{m}$.

3.2 Optimization Strategy

- **Moving Window:** The 3D model is not solved globally for the whole well. Instead, a sliding window moves with the bit, solving for the formation ahead and to the sides.
- **Parametric vs. Voxel:** While early versions used parametric inversion (solving for distance D and resistivity R), the 3D capability implies a transition to voxel-based or coarse-grid inversion to allow for arbitrary shapes (channels, pinch-outs).

4 Limitations of the Current Approach

Despite its success, the reliance on IE-based or approximate 3D solvers introduces specific physical limitations:

4.1 The "Background" Problem

Integral Equation methods rely heavily on the availability of a known Green's function. This works well if the background is a simple 1D layered medium. **Limitation:** If the background geology itself is complex (e.g., turbulent injectites, heavily faulted carbonates, or cross-bedding), the background cannot be analytically defined. The IE method then requires discretizing the *entire* volume, negating its speed advantage and causing memory usage to explode (dense matrix scaling).

4.2 High-Contrast Validity

Approximations like the Born series degrade rapidly when the conductivity contrast $\Delta\sigma$ is high or the scattering body is electrically large (large size relative to skin depth). While EarthStar detects boundaries, accurately resolving the *internal* resistivity of a massive salt body or a very distinct water zone behind a barrier may be compromised by the linearization of the scattering physics.

4.3 Shadowing Effects

In multi-body scenarios (e.g., stacked channel sands), the "shadowing" effect—where a conductive body creates a field null behind it—is difficult to model accurately without full-wave physics. Simplified forward engines may misinterpret the geometry of the second (shadowed) body.

5 Possible Improvements & Future Work

Our project, *BigHeadFish*, suggests a divergent path that could address these limitations.

5.1 GPU-Accelerated FDFD (The BigHeadFish Approach)

Instead of relying on Green's functions, moving to a pure Finite-Difference Frequency-Domain (FDFD) solver on GPUs offers a robust alternative.

- **Arbitrary Backgrounds:** FDFD does not care about the background complexity. It solves the physics rigorously for every voxel.
- **Direct Solvers:** As demonstrated in our work, GPU-based Sparse QR solvers allow for direct solution of the Maxwell system. While currently memory-limited, multi-GPU clusters could enable real-time FDFD inversion, removing the errors associated with Born approximations.

5.2 Hybrid Solver Architectures

A hybrid approach could define the best of both worlds:

- Use **IE** for the far-field (boundary detection ¿ 100 ft).
- Use **FDFD** for the near-field (borehole corrections, invasion zones) and complex local geology.
- Couples them via Domain Decomposition, using the IE solution as a boundary condition for the FDFD domain.

5.3 Physics-Informed Neural Networks (PINNs)

To bypass the computational cost of the forward model entirely during inversion, a neural network could be trained to approximate the 3D EM response. However, standard "black box" AI fails in unseen geology. **PINNs** incorporate Maxwell's equations into the loss function, potentially offering the speed of an approximation with the rigor of a full-wave solver.

References

[1] H. Wu, A. Cull, L. Pan, et al., "A New Generation of LWD Geosteering Electromagnetic Resistivity

Tool Providing Multi-Layered Bed Boundary Detection, Anisotropy Determination, and Azimuthal Resistivity Measurements," *SPWLA 63rd Annual Logging Symposium*, Stavanger, Norway, 2022.

[2] R. Al-Lawati, M. Viandante, J. A. Donald, et al., "First Multi-Physics Integration of 3D Resistivity Mapping with 3D Sonic Imaging to Characterize Reservoir Fluids and Structural Elements," *SPWLA 64th Annual Logging Symposium*, 2023.

[3] M. S. Zhdanov, *Geophysical Electromagnetic Theory and Methods*, Elsevier, 2009.