Decentralized Multigrid for In-situ Big Data Computing

Abstract—Modern seismic sensors are capable of recording high precision vibration data continuously for several months. Seismic raw data consists of information regarding earthquake’s origin time, location, wave velocity, etc. Currently, these high volume data are gathered manually from each station for analysis. This process restricts us from obtaining high-resolution images in real-time. A new in-network distributed method is required that can obtain a high-resolution seismic tomography in real-time. In this paper, we present a distributed multigrid solution to reconstruct seismic image over large dense networks. The algorithm performs in-network computation on large seismic samples and avoids expensive data collection and centralized computation. Our evaluation using synthetic data shows that the proposed method accelerates the convergence and reduces the number of messages exchanged. The distributed scheme balances the computation load and is also tolerant to severe packet loss.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Current volcano monitoring systems lack the capability of obtaining real-time information and recover the physical dynamics of seismic activity with sufficient resolution. At present, the seismic tomography process involves aggregation of raw seismic data to centralized server for post-processing and analysis. To give some perspective on the volume, the raw seismic data are sampled with 16 – 24 bit precision at 50 – 200Hz. These high-fidelity samples are generally primary (p) or secondary (s) wave, that contains information such as earthquake origin time, location, wave velocity, etc. This high frequency sampling at each node makes it extremely difficult to transmit the data over a dense sensor network due to severe limitations on energy and bandwidth. Due to these restrictions, many of the most threatening active volcanoes worldwide use fewer than 20 nodes [26]. The existing scheme also requires months to generate satisfactory tomography images. This limits our ability to understand volcano dynamics and physical processes in real-time. The centralized solution also introduces a bottleneck in computation. The risk of data loss also increases in case of node failures, especially at the base station. The centralized algorithm for these battery powered nodes, which have high risk of failures, are not suitable for volcano monitoring.

The high volume raw samples consists of sparse earthquake information, however current technology requires station to transfer all the raw samples of p and s wave to centralized station for post processing. In [29] the data collected from 1980 - 2004 consists only of 19379 useful earthquake events and in addition 6916 events from october 2004 - december 2005. Fig. 1 shows the parse distribution of earthquake events obtained from 78 station placed on Mt St Helens (MSH).

Few stations receive as few as 10 events while others receive more than 900. This sparse feature of raw samples have led researchers to adopt distributed techniques to perform in-network processing and avoid centralized computation. The advancement in current wireless sensor technology makes it possible to deploy and maintain a large-scale network for environmental monitoring and surveillance. However, seismic tomography algorithms commonly in use today cannot be easily implemented under this distributed scenario as it relies on centralized processing. Thus, real-time volcano tomography requires a practical approach which is distributed, scalable, and efficient with respect to tomography computation.

![Fig. 1. Non-uniform distribution of rays and events at Mt St Helens.](image)

Seismic tomography can be broadly classified into two main categories: active and passive tomography. In active seismic tomography, earth’s interior is studied by sending p-wave signal through external source such as vibrator, however in passive tomography, measurements are taken based on p-wave generated by natural sources such as earthquake. Since late 70’s active tomographic inversion of 2D and 3D structures have been studied widely both theoretically and also experimentally by applying it to oil field exploration and volcanoes [13]. Only in recent years, passive seismic tomography has been studied and the data obtained from few tens of nodes are being used to study seismic activities. As mentioned earlier these inversion methods rely on centralized data gathering scheme and has been implemented on volcanoes such as Mount St. Helens [17], Mount Rainier [19] as well as many others. The resolution of such inversions are typically in tens of km’s and higher resolutions are hard to obtain from the existing systems as the number of sensors are not sufficient to cover the entire region of interest. Deploying large sensor nodes using the current data gathering network is also not feasible as these networks do not scale and sometimes it becomes impossible due to data load. To overcome this, we developed a method called Component Average- Distributed Multiresolution Evolving Tomography (CA-DMET) which computes the tomography over sensor networks [15]. In this method each sensor nodes were responsible to calculate partial solution by solving large sparse linear equation available to them using
Bayesian ART(BART) [18]. The partial solution obtained from each node was later combined with others to obtain the next iterate. Convergence of this algorithm was proved to be better than other distributed methods. In this paper we try to accelerate its convergence and improve the performance of the reconstruction using multigrid approach.

Typically when solving large sparse linear systems, iterative methods tend to reduce high-frequency (oscillatory) components directly while not lower the errors caused due to low-frequency. Multigrid methods are often used to mitigate these low-frequency errors, as they reduce them by transferring the problem to lower grids. We investigated our seismic tomography inversion problem and found that multigrid could be used to accelerate the convergence. In this paper, we propose Distributed MultiGrid Tomography (DMGT) algorithm which accelerates the convergence rate of CA-DMET. Our contribution in the proposed approach differs from our previous algorithm CA-DMET in three ways: firstly we prove that BART satisfies the smoothing property and can be used as a smoother in multigrid. Secondly, we show that multigrid with BART as smoother when applied on each node converge faster than applying only BART as used in CA-DMET. Thirdly, we show that multigrid can be applied on each node distributedly and the intermediate result can be combined using the component average method. This paper mainly focuses on the distributed tomography algorithm, while assuming the arrival time of events at each node has been extracted from the raw seismic data by each node itself [24], [27]. The algorithm proposed here has application to fields far beyond the specifics of volcanology, e.g., oil field explorations have similar problems and needs.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section II we provide background on seismic tomography inversion and present the problem formulation. Section III presents related work on distributed least squares, and distributed multigrid methods. In section IV we first discuss mathematical developments that lead to the design of DMGT and then present the DMGT algorithm in detail. Simulation results are shown in section V. Finally we conclude the paper in section VI.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Seismic Tomography: The methodology used in seismic tomography is borrowed from medical tomography where the travel time of elastic wave is used to probe internal structure. Although this idea is common in these two applications, there are significant differences, mainly pertaining to size of the structures and to event generation. The velocity model used in seismic tomography is non-linear and the ray path of the waves traveling through the ground may be highly curved due to the size and complexity of the volcano. Typically, the ray source in volcano tomography is an earthquake event where the distribution of the ray path is highly non-uniform unlike uniform short distance rays generated in medical imaging. These differences indicate that special care must be taken when techniques borrowed from medical tomography are applied to seismic data.

The basic principle behind 2D or 3D seismic tomography is to use the arrival time of the P-wave to derive the internal velocity structure of the volcano. This approach is called travel-time seismic tomography and the model here is continuously evolving and refined as more earthquakes are recorded. Below we explain the three basic principles involved in travel-time seismic tomography.

i) Event Location: Once an earthquake occurs, seismic disturbances are detected by sensor nodes and arrival times are recorded. Using these estimated arrival times, Geiger [8] introduced a technique to estimate the earthquake location and origin time. This is a classic and widely used event localization scheme generally using Gauss-Newton optimization.

ii) Ray Tracing: This is the technique of finding the ray paths from the seismic source locations to the sensor nodes with minimum travel time. Given the source location of the seismic events and the current velocity mode of the volcano, ray tracing finds the ray paths from the event source location to the nodes as shown in Fig. 2(b).

iii) Tomographic Inversion: The ray paths traced in turn are used to estimate the velocity model of the volcano. The volcano is partitioned into small blocks as shown in Fig. 2(c). This allows us to formulate the tomography problem as a system of sparse linear equations. Suppose there are $N$ sensor nodes and $E$ earthquakes and $x^*$ denotes the reference slowness (reciprocal of velocity) model of the volcano with resolution $M$ blocks (eg. $32 \times 32$). Let $x^*$ denote the sum of $x^0$, unperturbed model and $x$ a small perturbation i.e., $x^* = x^0 + x$.

Let $b^e_i = [b^e_{i1}, b^e_{i2}, \cdots, b^e_{iE}]^T$, where $b^e_i$ be the travel time experienced by node $i$ in the $e^{th}$ event. Based on the ray paths traced in step (2), the travel time of a ray is the sum of the slowness in each block times the length of the ray within that block, i.e., $b^e_i = A_i[e,m] \cdot x^* [m]$ where $A_i[e,m]$ is the length of the ray from the $e^{th}$ event to node $i$ in the $m^{th}$ block and $x^*$ is the slowness of the $m^{th}$ block. Let $b^0_i = [b^0_{i1}, b^0_{i2}, \cdots, b^0_{iE}]^T$ be the unperturbed travel times where $b^0_i = A_i[e,m] \cdot x^0 [m]$.

In the matrix notation we have following equation,

$$A_ix^* - A_ix^0 = A_ix$$

(1)

where $A_i \in R^{E \times M}$. Let $b_i = [b_{i1}, b_{i2}, \cdots, b_{iE}]^T$ be the travel time residual such that $b_i = b^e_i - b^0_i$, equation (1) can be rewritten as,

$$A_ix = b_i$$

(2)

Since each ray path intersects the model at a small number of blocks, the design matrix, $A_i$, is sparse. For the system with $N$ sensor nodes, the equation of the entire system would be,

$$Ax = B$$

(3)

where $B = [b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_N]^T$, $b_i = [b_{i1}, b_{i2}, \ldots, b_{iE}]^T$ and $A = [A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_N]^T$.

Now from the above equation, each seismic sensor $i \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$ contains at least $E$ rows, i.e., earthquake events and travel time information. The column size of $A$ denotes the resolution of the slowness model $x$ being calculated. Our goal is to obtain the slowness model $x$ without collecting the event information from each node in a centralized server, but only by exchanging partial slowness between the sensors.
III. RELATED WORK

Distributed Linear Least Squares: The tomography inversion process mainly involves solving large sparse overdetermined systems of linear equations (3) and iterative methods are commonly used. Several parallel and distributed iterative methods have been developed and are currently being used to solve a large variety of problems [11], [1]. Consensus-based methods are the most widely used distributed algorithm for wireless sensor networks, e.g., [23]. These algorithms use a weighted sum of local estimates to achieve consensus. Each sensor node maintains its own local estimates and exchanges information locally to achieve consensus. These methods are primarily designed for estimation of low-dimensional vectors typically in a parallel environment. To achieve global convergence, consensus protocols generally require repeated high execution time and frequent communication between neighbors. In seismic tomography networks, this approach not only means high communication overhead but also longer delays involving many multi-hop communications. Therefore, the consensus-based distributed least square algorithms are not suitable for high-resolution seismic tomography in sensor networks.

Another method originally proposed for parallel computing is the multi-splitting solution of the least squares problem [22]. This method partitions the system into columns instead of rows, letting each processor compute a partial solution. These partial solutions are exchanged iteratively to obtain global convergence. Column splitting of equation (3) in seismic tomography means splitting the travel time $\vec{B}$. Since we only have the information of total travel time from event source to node, we cannot divide $\vec{B}$ exactly and any heuristic approach will add error in addition to existing system noise. Apart from that, this method is only linearly convergent and the communication cost is very expensive as it requires exchanging $\vec{B}$ which in our case increases with occurrences of earthquake events. Due to these reasons, column partitioning is not suitable for seismic tomography.

A popular iterative method for solving overdetermined systems was proposed by Kaczmarz (KACZ) [14] which is an alternating projection method. This method is also known under the name Algebraic Reconstruction Technique (ART) in computer tomography [12]. This algorithm does not require the full matrix to be in memory at one time and can incorporate new information (ray paths), on the fly. The vectors of unknowns are updated after processing each equation of the system and this cycle repeats until convergence. These iterative algorithms are distributed by averaging the boundary information, e.g., Component Averaging (CAV) [4], Block Iterative-Component Averaging (BI-CAV) [3] and Component-Averaged Row Projections (CARP) [9]. A survey paper comparing various block parallel methods based on their performance on GPU’s is [7]. CA-DMET [15] involved modification of these algorithms for seismic tomography. The convergence of the iterative method used depends on spectral properties of the iteration matrix. Generally in iterative methods, convergence stalls once the error is smooth i.e. high-frequency errors are reduced. Multigrid methods provide a great tool to prevent stagnation by transferring smooth errors from fine grids to coarse grids, resulting in overall acceleration of convergence [28], however, it cannot be applied to solve all the problems arising from systems of linear equations [2]. In this paper, we analyze the tomography problem carefully and develop tools such as smoothers, intergrid operator etc satisfying the requirements of multigrid.

Distributed Multigrid: Multigrid has been parallelized on multicore computers and distributed memory clusters [30], [5]. To perform multigrid in distributed networks, many new considerations arise, including high communication cost and the possibility of packet loss. For example, some existing parallel and distributed multigrid algorithms partition the multigrid levels among different cores/nodes and the intergrid operators communicate between each other to perform a multigrid cycle [25], [31]. In case of seismic tomography, exchanging the rows of matrix A (ray information) between each node is expensive and defeats the whole purpose of the distributed approach. Thus, we cannot adopt all previous techniques for parallelizing multigrid and apply them to volcano tomography over sensor networks.

Iterative methods such as Jacobi, Gauss-Seidel, and SOR for many problems have the property of smoothing the error and are used as the “smoother” in multigrid methods [28]. However, for solving overdetermined systems, it is more natural to use Kaczmarz or ART as the smoother. This appears to be first considered in [20], [16] for multigrid in medical image tomography in a centralized setup. For inconsistent overdetermined systems, Extended Kaczmarz (KE) was introduced [21] which performs column operations at each iteration to manipulate the right hand side of the linear equation. However in our case, since information over sensors are split row wise, column operations over the entire network will add significant communication. In this paper we propose Distributed Multi-Grid Tomography (DMGT) which accelerates the convergence of seismic tomography inversion over a network and balances the computation cost with reduced communication. DMGT
uses Bayesian ART (BART) as a smoother and we prove that BART satisfies the smoothing property. We also show that DMGT is applicable to seismic tomography. To the best of our knowledge, this work is the first attempt to distribute the multigrid computation of seismic tomography in sensor networks.

IV. DISTRIBUTED ALGEBRAIC MULTIGRID FOR TOMOGRAPHY

This section is divided into two sub-sections. In sub-section (A) we present mathematical developments and algorithm setup, where we give the mathematical tools that are required for designing the algorithm. Later in sub-section (B) we give a detailed explanation of the design of the DMGT algorithm.

A. Mathematical developments

1) Bayesian ART: The tomography inverse problem involves finding a solution \( x \) which satisfies equation (3). Typically, the seismic tomography equation is quasi-overdetermined, inconsistent and contains measurement noise. Therefore, we need to use some form of regularization to avoid strong, undesired influence of small singular values dominating the solutions. This can be achieved by using a regularization parameter for the least-squares solution \( x_{LS} \), i.e.,

\[
x_{LS} = \arg \max_x \| B - Ax \|^2 + \lambda^2 \| x \|^2
\]

where \( \lambda \) is the trade-off parameter that regulates the relative importance we assign to models that predict the data versus models that have a characteristic, a priori variance.

A variant of ART called Bayesian ART (BART) can be used for solving equation (3) by minimizing equation (4). Suppose the system \( Ax = b \) is inconsistent, then we have \( Ax + y = b \) where \( y \) is chosen from any given \( x \). Then the system is transformed to a well-posed problem. Now \( x \) and \( y \) can be solved simultaneously using the following iterative algorithm [1], where \( \epsilon_i \) is a unit vector with the \( i \)th component equal to one, and \( \lambda \) is the regularization parameter.

**Algorithm 1 Bayesian ART**

1. for \( k \leftarrow 0 \) until convergence or maximum number of iteration do
2. \( k \leftarrow i \mod m + 1 \)
3. \( d^{(k)} = \rho^{(k)} \lambda b_i - \gamma_i^{(k)} + \lambda \alpha_i \) \( x^{(k)} \)
4. \( x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + \lambda d^{(k)} \alpha_i \)
5. \( y^{(k+1)} = y^{(k)} + d^{(k)} \epsilon_i \)
6. end

Note that in the Bayesian ART method, we need an additional vector \( y \) of length \( E \), but in the \( k \)th step only one component of \( x^{(k)} \) needs to be updated. This method has been used for seismic imaging in [18].

2) Multigrid: Multigrid methods are among the most efficient methods for solving the very large sparse system of linear equations \([28],[2]\). The core idea of multigrid is to reduce the error via transferring the problem between multiple levels and solving them over these levels. The residual equation is transferred to coarser grids and its solution is used to correct the finer resolution solution. This is performed recursively until convergence is met. The idea of multigrid aligns with multi-resolution techniques and we have shown in [15] that multi-resolution is essential in estimating volcano tomography.

The main components of multigrid are the smoother, prolongation and restriction operators, and wide variety of these are used in different scenarios. These components are chosen based on the type of the problem to optimize convergence. Prolongation and restriction operators mainly decide the construction of finer and coarser grids. In case of tomography the grids are constructed based on the principle of ray tracing and here we will show that ray tracing can be used for prolongation and restriction in multigrid. Prolongation and restriction are generally termed as intergrid operators as they define the transfer process between the grids. As mentioned earlier, the tomography problem has a geometric structure and here we exploit this structure to define the intergrid operators. However, these intergrid operators must have certain properties and in this section we will show that our ray tracing satisfies these properties.

![Fine Grid](a)
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Fig. 3. Relation between fine and coarse grid

Let \( n \) be the number of columns in \( A \) and suppose that \( n = 4p \) and let \( P_1, \cdots, P_n \) be the pixels on the fine grid. The **coarse grid** is obtained by combining its 4 adjacent pixels of the fine grid as shown in Fig 3(a). Let \( S(j), j \in 1, \cdots, p \) be the set of indices of the fine grid that form the coarse grid \( P_j^H \), i.e.,

\[
S(j) = \{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4\} \quad \forall j = 1, \cdots, p
\]

where

\[
j_1 < j_2 < j_3 < j_4
\]

such that

\[
P_j^H = \{P_{j_1} \cup P_{j_2} \cup P_{j_3} \cup P_{j_4}\}
\]

From the above equation the coarse grid matrix \( A_p \) will be

\[
A_p^{ij} = \sum_{k \in S(j)} A_{ik}, \forall i = \{1, \cdots, m\}, \quad j = \{1, \cdots, p\}
\]

Now the interpolation operator \( f_p^{ij} \) is given by

\[
f_p^{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \in S(j) \\ 0 & \text{if } i \notin S(j) \end{cases}
\]
We now see that $A = A_p \times I_p^a$ satisfying the interpolation property. We also observe that $I_p^a$ has full column rank.

**Remark 1.** Notice that the interpolation operator only increases the number of columns in matrix $A$. We can also consider a similar operator which also reduces the rows by weighting them, however this is beyond the scope of this paper.

**Remark 2.** The above multigrid operators are designed for 2D cases, however 3D case can be easily derived using $n = 8p$ i.e. cuboid.

We have now shown that the interpolation operator formed by using the property of ray tracing can be used as an intergrid operator in multigrid. We also saw that Bayesian ART (BART) can be used for solving tomography problems. Next we show how BART can act as a smoother and prove it satisfies the smoothing property of multigrid.

3) **Bayesian ART as smoother:** For seismic tomography, BART is commonly used rather than ART or Gauss-Seidel. The problem being inconsistent and ill-posed, BART outperforms other standard iterative algorithms in terms of convergence and solution [18]. However, BART has not been proven as a smoother in a multigrid setup and in this section we will prove that BART satisfies the smoothing property.

**Definition 1.** The smoothing property is satisfied by the relaxation scheme if there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$ (independent of size or eigenvalues of $A$) such that

$$\|\tilde{e}\|^2_A \leq \|e\|^2_A - \alpha \|r\|^2_{D-1} + \|y\|^2_{D-1}$$

where, $e = x - x^*$, $r = Ae = Ax - b$, $\tilde{e} = \bar{x} - x^*$, $D = \text{diag}(\Lambda)$, $\|x\|_A = \sqrt{\langle Ax, x \rangle}$ and $\|r\|_{D-1} = \sqrt{\langle D^{-1}r, r \rangle}$

With respect to the above definitions and notation, Theorem 6 in [20] shows that Kaczmarz relaxation for consistent systems satisfies the following smoothing property

$$\|\tilde{e}\|^2 \leq \|e\|^2 - \tilde{\gamma} \|D^{\frac{1}{2}}r\|^2$$

where

$$\tilde{D} \frac{1}{2} = \text{diag}(\frac{1}{\|A_1\|^2}, \cdots, \frac{1}{\|A_n\|^2})$$

$$\tilde{\gamma} = \frac{1}{(1 + \gamma_-(A))(1 + \gamma_+(A))}$$

and

$$\gamma_-(A) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{j \leq i} |\langle A_i, A_j \rangle| / \|A_i\|^2; \gamma_+(A) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{j > i} |\langle A_i, A_j \rangle| / \|A_i\|^2$$

**Theorem 1.** Bayesian ART (algorithm 1) as a relaxation scheme for inconsistent system (3) satisfies the smoothing property if there exists,

$$\|\tilde{e}\|^2 \leq \|e\|^2 - \tilde{\gamma} \|\tilde{D}^{\frac{1}{2}}r\|^2 + \|\tilde{D}^{\frac{1}{2}}y\|^2$$

**Proof:** Shown in Appendix A

4) **Three-Grid V Cycle:** Here we describe the three-grid correction scheme used in our algorithm. If the finest resolution of our system to solve is of dimension $32 \times 32$, then resolution $16 \times 16$ is used as an intermediate grid and resolution $8 \times 8$ the coarsest grid. The coarsest grid is solved directly as the dimension is small, however we can also solve it by certain sweeps/iteration of BART. Later, the fine grid correction step is applied. The total number of iterations for one three-grid V-cycle will be equal to $4 \times l_1$. The three-grid V-cycle scheme is represented diagrammatically in Fig. 4.

**Algorithm 2** $v^h \leftarrow V\text{cycle}(v^h, b^h)$

1. $v^h = \text{BART}(A^h, b^h, v^h)$ % Relax using $l_1$ sweeps of BART
2. $r^h = b^h - A^h v^h$ % Compute fine-grid residual
3. $r^{2h} = I_h^{2h} v^h$ % Restrict the residual to coarse grid
4. $v^{2h} = \text{BART}(A^{2h}, r^{2h}, 0)$ % Solv directly
5. $r^{4h} = r^{2h} - A^{2h} v^{2h}$
6. $r^{4h} = I_h^{2h} v^{2h}$
7. $A^{4h} v^h = r^{4h}$
8. $e^{4h} = (A^{4h})^{-1} v^h$
9. $e^{2h} = I_h^{2h} e^{4h}$ % Interpolate coarse grid error to fine grid
10. $v^{2h} = v^{2h} + e^{2h}$ % Correct the fine-grid approximation
11. $v^h = \text{BART}(A^{2h}, e^{2h}, b^{2h})$ % Relax using $l_1$ sweeps of BART
12. $e^h = I_h^{2h} v^{2h}$
13. $v^h = v^h + e^h$
14. $v^h = \text{BART}(A^h, b^h, v^h)$

**Fig. 4.** V Cycle Scheme for three levels

B. **Design of DMGT algorithm**

In the previous sub-section, we discussed separately the components of multigrid suitable for tomography. In this subsection we will put these ideas together to design a distributed multigrid scheme that can balance the computation load and compute the least-square solution for seismic tomography inversion over a sensor network. The seismic sensors are deployed on top of the volcano and each sensor gathers ray information after detecting earthquake events and forms a partial set of linear equations. Later, each sensor performs DMGT locally to obtain the partial slowness model ($\tilde{x}^h$) which is then combined with the partial slowness model obtained from other nodes using component averaging as shown in Fig. 5 to obtain the next iterate ($x^{h+1}$). This process is repeated until it converges to a threshold after which we obtain the global slowness model ($x$). Here, we first show how component averaging can be used to combine the partial slowness from each node to form the next iterate. Later we discuss the working of distributed multigrid algorithm in detail.

Suppose there are $N$ sensor nodes in the network and $E$ ray paths are traced on each sensor node, following some
earthquake events. From section II the seismic tomography model will be of the form

\[ Ax = B \]

where \( B = [b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_N]^T, b_i = [b_{i1}, b_{i2}, \ldots, b_{iE}]^T \) and \( A = [A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_N]^T \).

Let the size of \( A \) be \( m \times n \), where \( \sqrt{n} \) denotes the resolution we are calculating in case of 2-D. Let \( A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_N \) each contain \( m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_E \) number of rows. Now in each node, we calculate the number of non-zero coefficients \( \forall j \) where \( 1 \leq j \leq n \). Let \( I_j \) denote the index set of the blocks that contain an equation with a non-zero coefficient of \( x_j \). Let \( s_j = \left| I_j \right| \) (size of \( I_j \)).

We first show how the partial slowness obtained from each node can be combined with others using an averaging lemma. Let \( A = A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_N \) and \( \bar{x}_j \) denote the \( j^{th} \) component of partial slowness obtained from \( j^{th} \) node. The component averaging operator relative to \( A \) is transfer operator \( CA_A : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n \) and defined as follows: Let \( \bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_N \in \mathbb{R}^n \) be partial solution from all \( N \) sensor nodes. Then \( CA_A(\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_N) \) is the point in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) whose \( j^{th} \) component is given by

\[
CA_A(\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_N) = \frac{1}{s_j} \sum_{t=1}^{N} \bar{x}_j
\]

Assume that for some \( 1 \leq r \leq n \) the partial slowness \( \bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_r \) are shared by two or more nodes i.e., \( s_1, \ldots, s_r \geq 2 \) and \( s_{r+1}, \ldots, s_n = 1 \). For simplicity, denote \( y \) as the components of \( \mathbb{R}^s \), and index vectors of \( \mathbb{R}^s \) is given by:

\[
y = (y_1, \ldots, y_{s_1}, \ldots, y_r, \ldots, y_{s_r}, \ldots, y_n)
\]

Now we map the space from \( E : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^s \):

\[
E(\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_n) = (y_1, \ldots, y_{s_1}, \ldots, y_r, \ldots, y_{s_r}, \ldots, y_{s_r}, \ldots, y_n)
\]

we can see from the above equation that \( (y_1, \ldots, y_{s_1}, \ldots, y_r, \ldots, y_{s_r}) \) contains \( s_1 \) elements, \( (y_{s_1}, \ldots, y_{s_r}) \) contains \( s_r \) elements. Now after taking averages component-wise, we have our new update as follows:

\[
\bar{x}_1 = \frac{1}{s_1}(y_{11} + \cdots + y_{s_1}) ; \quad \bar{x}_r = \frac{1}{s_r}(y_{r1} + \cdots + y_{s_r})
\]

\[
\bar{x}_{r+1} = y_{r+1} ; \quad \bar{x}_n = y_n
\]

**Remark 3.** We notice that, number of nodes \( N \) in component average scheme theoretically has no upper limit and can be very large. It should be noted that increasing \( N \) will increase the communication cost to carry out the summation over the network. This might also effect the rate of convergence and is shown in the simulation result.

Now we give the formal description of Distributed Multigrid Tomography (DMGT) algorithm, see Algorithm [3].

**Initialize line 1-4:** Suppose there are \( N \) sensors and each sensor initializes its ID and starting resolution \( d \). Let \( Q = d \times d \) be the current tomography resolution where \( d \) is the initial resolution dimension. A slowness model \( x' \) of resolution \( Q \) is used as an initial guess for ray tracing.

**Algorithm 3 Distributed Multigrid Tomography**

initialize
1: Node ID \( id \),
2: Initialize the starting resolution dimension \( d \)
3: Initialize the number of seismic sensors \( N \)
4: Current resolution dimension \( Q = d \times d \)
5: Initial slowness model for ray tracing \( x' \)

repeat
1: Upon the detection of an event
2: Trace the ray path \( a_{k, l} \) for every node
3: Upon the reception of \( a_{k, l} \) and \( b_{k, l} \) at each node start performing
4: calculation at each node
5: For each \( 1 \leq j \leq Q \), calculate \( s_j \)
6: Where \( s_j = \left| I_j \right| = \{1 \leq t \leq N | x_t \} \) has nonzero
7: coefficient in some equation of node \( N \)
8: \( k \leftarrow 0 \), \( x^k \leftarrow 0 \)
9: while not converged do
10: In Every node \( t \) \( 1 \leq t \leq N \) do in parallel
11: \( x^k \leftarrow V cycle(x^k, b^k) \)
12: Aggregate the partial slowness \( \bar{x}^k \)
13: from all nodes and find the next iterate:
14: \( x^{k+1}_j = \frac{1}{s_j} \sum_{t=1}^{N} \bar{x}^k_j \) if \( s_j = 1 \)
15: \( x^{k+1}_j \) to all the node \( N \)
16: \( k \leftarrow k + 1 \)
17: end while
18: \( x^{k-1} \leftarrow x^k \)
19: Upon the convergence obtaining final \( x^k \)
20: Update slowness model: \( x^{k+1} = x^k \)
21: terminate

**Repeat line 1-2:** After the initialization, each node will perform specific tasks based on the event detection and message reception. Once an event is detected by some node, the node will compute the ray tracing algorithm (assuming each node aware of event location) and obtain the ray path. Then each node will compute the ray information forming a set of linear equation,

\[
[A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_N] \cdot [x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_q]^T = [b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_N]
\]

where rows in \( A_1 \) represents the ray information in each node, \( b_i \) represents the travel time residual of rays obtained by that node and \( x_j \) denotes the slowness of the \( j^{th} \) grid in a 2D tomographic cube of dimension \( Q \).

**Repeat line 3-18:** Once all nodes compute the ray information, a parameter \( s_j \) for all \( 1 \leq j \leq Q \) is calculated by each of them. \( s_j \) is the number of nodes which has nonzero coefficient of particular \( x_j \). Once \( s_j \) is calculated, each node simultaneously performs some finite number of Multigrid VCycle (algorithm 2.). The next iterate is determined by component averaging technique given by \( x^{k+1}_j = \frac{1}{s_j} \sum_{t=1}^{N} \bar{x}^k_j \). Here a tree based aggregation protocol is used calculate the sum and broadcast \( x^{k+1}_j \) to all the nodes. The updated \( x^{k+1}_j \) is used as an initial guess for the next iteration. A stopping criteria is used to stop distributed multigrid and the final slowness is sent to all the sensor nodes.

**Repeat line 19-21:** Once a sensor node receives the final slowness model \( x^{k+1}_j \) from all \( N \) nodes it will update the previous slowness model \( x'^{k+1}_j = x^k \). The algorithm will TERMINATE if obtained result is satisfactory for the volcanologists to
interpret. Otherwise the process is repeated with $x^{(i+1)}$ as the slowness model to do ray tracing with same resolution or with higher depending upon the quality needed.

C. Communication Cost

From the above algorithm we see that the actual communication in the network occurs in line 12 – 15 which involves aggregation of partial slowness data of size $n$ from all the nodes and then broadcast the component averaged result back to each node. The communication scheme is shown in Fig. 5. Let $x^i$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$ be the partial solution of node $i$. Let $|x^i|$ denote the size of $x^i$ given by $n$. Then the worst case communication cost involved would be $N \sum_i |x^i| = Nn$. Similarly after calculation of the component average, each node needs to flood the information to all other nodes which involves another $Nn$ communication. Since this algorithm converges after $k$ iterations, the worst case communication cost will be $2knN$.

In case of centralized computation we need to transfer the information from all the nodes to centralized server. Let $m$ be average size of rows in each node, then the worst case communication cost involved for transferring data over the networks will be $Nmn$. The average events each node detects i.e. $m$ will be of the order thousands or tens of thousands. Moreover, $m$ is not constant and increases with occurrence of earthquake, therefore we see that $m \gg 2k$. Also, in line 12 – 15 the communication involved is summation of partial slowness over the network and the size of $x^i$ i.e $n$ remains constant and is cheaper than passing all the node information to a base station. Moreover, in centralized scenario if a node close to base station fail then lots of packets will be dropped making reconstruction impossible. While node failure in distributed case will only lead to loss of part of $A$ and reconstruction is still possible using $A$’s on remaining nodes.

V. EVALUATION AND VALIDATION

In this section, we evaluate the DMGNT algorithm and present the simulation results. Typically, to test tomography inversion algorithm a synthetic model is used. This serves two purpose: a) the real data set such as from Mt. St. Helens do not have a ground truth and it is still uncertain which model is reliable. b) the simulation using synthetic model enables us to investigate individually various phenomena which cannot be separated physically. For example, p-wave data always contain noise due to measurement and scattering, but simulation can indicate the specific effect separately. For this reason, we adopt a synthetic data of a fault model from [10] which has been widely used for cross bore-hole tomography [6]. This fault model is created with velocities of $0.75V$ for the right fault and $1.0V$ for the left fault as shown in the Fig. 6(a). We perform the simulation in a customized simulator where we have implemented event detection, ray tracing, etc, for the fault model. The test cases and convergence measure used in computerized tomography are adopted to measure the volcano tomography as these two processes are similar.

A. Synthetic Fault Model

Our experiment setup has a network of 64 nodes which detects the earthquake event and traces the ray as shown in the Fig. 6(b). A total of 512 earthquake events are generated at random and a data generator traces the ray to obtain the travel time at each node. In practice these processes are independent and can be performed at each node distributedly. After this, we obtain $A$ and $b$ on each sensor node and we add Gaussian noise to $b$ to simulate the measurement noise. We perform experiments for the finest resolution of dimension $32 \times 32$ with the three-grid Vcycle scheme. For the iterative methods, the selection of relaxation and regularization parameters $\rho$ and $\lambda$ respectively are critical and in all of our experiments these parameters remain constant throughout the iterations, i.e., $\rho^k = \rho = 0.25$ and $\lambda^k = \lambda = 5$ for all $k \geq 0$.

In the implementation, 5 sweeps of BART are performed at each level except the coarsest where it is solved directly. This adds up to a total of 20 iterations for a single Vcycle. For fair comparison we run 20 iterations at each node for CA-DMET. We use the relative slowness updates of the estimation between the two sweeps (one sweep means that all partial slowness are averaged to calculate the next iterate) as the stopping criteria. Rate of convergence of different algorithms are compared using relative updates ($\phi$), residuals ($\chi$) and absolute error ($\epsilon$) given by

$$\phi = \frac{|x^{(k+1)} - x^{(k)}|}{|x^{(k)}|}$$
$$\chi = \|Ax^k - b\|$$
$$\epsilon = \|x^* - x^k\|$$

where $x^*$ is the ground truth.
TABLE I. ROBUSTNESS OF DMGT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Relative Error (φ)</th>
<th>Absolute Error (ε)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Packet Loss</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td>3.4606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Packet Loss</td>
<td>0.0386</td>
<td>3.2821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% Packet Loss</td>
<td>0.0612</td>
<td>3.7411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Correctness and Accuracy

Firstly, we compare the relative performance of DMGT with two different algorithms: CA-DMET and MG-ART [16]. We use residuals and absolute error as the parameters for comparison and results are shown in Fig. 7. These plots demonstrate that there is a difference in the initial convergence behavior in these algorithms. Although the residuals of CA-DMET and MG-ART decrease at a similar rate, the absolute error of MG-ART tends to diverge from ground truth. This behavior is due to the lack of regularization parameter in this algorithm to handle inconsistent systems, whereas BART in DMGT takes care of this using appropriate λ. The iterations on x-axis denote the number of component averages required over a network i.e k as discussed earlier. We can see that DMGT converges faster (lesser k) compared to CA-DMET which means it requires lesser communication over the network.

A visual verification of these three algorithms is shown in Fig. 8. All the algorithms are run for the same number of iterations. The reconstructed images from different algorithms reveal that DMGT is able to obtain better reconstruction compared to other algorithms. We also observed that CA-DMET and DMGT algorithms continued to improve its image reconstruction with further increase in iterations, however MG-ART’s reconstruction deteriorated with increase in iterations. This is also because of the inconsistent system as mentioned earlier.

![Residuals and Error Plots](image1)

Fig. 7. Comparing CA-DMET, MG-ART and DMGT

C. Loss Tolerance and Performance

In the next set of experiments, loss tolerance and robustness of DMGT are evaluated. The algorithm runs with the same configuration for two different packet loss ratio of 10% and 40% in the simulator and the results are tabulated in Table I. Fig. 9 gives the 2D tomography with packet loss and we can see that with 10% or even 40% packet loss, there is no significance difference in terms of the image reconstruction when compared to the results with no packet loss. Since the computation is distributed and all the nodes are involved in slowness calculation, the proposed algorithm is tolerant to a severe packet loss.

We also compare the efficiency of the algorithm by creating partitions and varying its size. Simulation results shown in

![DMGT under Packet Loss](image2)

Fig. 9. DMGT under Packet Loss

![DMGT with Different Partition Size](image3)

Fig. 10. DMGT with Different Partition Size

Fig. 10 are run for total of 64 nodes, with partition number varying from 8 (each partition having 8 nodes) through 64 (each partition having one node). We can see that as partition number increases the convergence rate decreases. This is mainly due to the type of linear system each node has and the coefficient shared among the nodes. From this we can conclude that there is an optimal partition for a given set of nodes and given set of events. Also, in Fig. 10(b) we notice that for $P = 8$ case the solution diverges from ground truth. This phenomena is due to over smoothing/relaxation and to overcome this we need to dynamically select the parameters such as λ and ρ for a given partition size. We address these questions in our future work and it is beyond the scope of this paper.

D. Tomography with Magma Model

Finally, we test the performance of DMGT using different synthetic model as shown in Fig. 11(a). In this model we have magma with velocity $4.5V$ on top right, $3.5V$ in the bottom left and $4.0V$ everywhere else. The difference in slowness is kept 15% compared to its surrounding value. This is because even in real nature the slowness does not vary more than $10 - 15\%$ and difference more than this is treated to be an anomaly by geophysicists. Similar network comprising of 64 nodes are deployed which detects the earthquake event and traces the ray as shown in the Fig. 11(b). We compare the performance of DMGT with CA-DMET and CAV and the results are shown in Fig. 12. CAV was chosen over MG-ART as we saw earlier that MG-ART was not suitable in case of inconsistent systems. These plots again demonstrate that DMGT converges faster than CA-DMET and CAV because of the v-cycle scheme in DMGT. The convergence of absolute errors also show that DMGT gives result close to the ground truth. By testing DMGT on two different synthetic model and comparing its performance with other distributed algorithms we can say that it has accelerated convergence and requires relatively less number of communication to achieve similar results.
VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we presented a new algorithm to solve the seismic tomography problem over the sensor network. We also proved that BART satisfies the smoothing property and can also be used as smoother in multigrid. We have also described the novel technique of performing multigrid in a distributed manner altogether forming the DMGT algorithm. This algorithm can distribute and balance the tomographic inversion computation load over the network, while computing real-time high-resolution tomography. The experimental evaluation also showed that our proposed method balances the computation load and is tolerant to data loss. Further enhancement of this algorithm can be done by applying the Full Approximation Scheme (FAS) and Full Multigrid (FMG). Dynamic partitioning of clusters based on number of nodes and events can also be considered to improve the existing algorithm. With the introduction of embedded devices like raspberry pi and beagleboards which have computational power equivalent to a computer, we are now able to run these complex algorithms easily. Until now we have managed to build a mesh network with 20 sensors (beagleboards) and test the basic version of this algorithm and in future we will focus on using real data set for validation.
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APPENDIX A

PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Proof: From the previous notations we have:

\[ e^k = x^k - s(x^m), \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, \quad \tilde{e} = e^m \]

\[ e^k = x^{(k-1)} + \lambda \rho^{(k-1)} \frac{1}{1 + \lambda^2 \|a_i\|^2} a_i \]

\[ e^k = e^{(k-1)} - \lambda \rho^{(k-1)} \frac{1}{1 + \lambda^2 \|a_i\|^2} a_i - \lambda \rho^{(k-1)} \frac{y_i^{(k-1)}}{1 + \lambda^2 \|a_i\|^2} a_i \]

\[ \|e^k\|^2 = \|e^{(k-1)}\|^2 - 2 \lambda \rho^{(k-1)} \frac{r_i^{(k-1)}}{1 + \lambda^2 \|a_i\|^2} a_i + \lambda \rho^{(k-1)} \frac{y_i^{(k-1)}}{1 + \lambda^2 \|a_i\|^2} a_i \]

Therefore

\[ e^k \leq \|e^{(k-1)}\|^2 - \|\tilde{D} \|r_i^{(k-1)}\|^2 + \|\tilde{D} y_i^{(k-1)}\|^2 \]

We have now shown that BART satisfies the smoothing property and can be used as smoother in multigrid to solve the tomography problem.