End-to-End Autoencoder for Drill String Acoustic Communications

Iurii Lezhenin^{1*}, Aleksandr Sidnev¹, Vladimir Tsygan¹ and Igor Malyshev¹

^{1*}Institute of Computer Science and Cybersecurity, Peter the Great St. Petersburg Polytechnic University, Polytechnicheskaya 29, St.Petersburg, 195251, Russia.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): lezhenin.yu@edu.spbstu.ru; Contributing authors: sidnev_ag@spbstu.ru; tsygan_vn@spbstu.ru; malyshev_ia@spbstu.ru;

Abstract

Drill string communications are important for drilling efficiency and safety. The design of a low latency drill string communication system with high throughput and reliability remains an open challenge. In this paper a deep learning autoencoder (AE) based endto-end communication system, where transmitter and receiver implemented as feed forward neural networks, is proposed for acoustic drill string communications. Simulation shows that the AE system is able to outperform a baseline non-contiguous OFDM system in terms of BER and PAPR, operating with lower latency.

Keywords: neural network, autoencoder, acoustic communications, drill string, measurement while drilling

1 Introduction

During drilling a borehole for oil or gas extraction, a large amount of data, acquired from the drilling rig sensors, has to be transmitted to the surface in real-time. This process is known as measurement while drilling (MWD). Nowadays, the most promising method for high speed MWD communications is acoustic drill string transmission [1].

Drill string acoustic channel has frequency-selective fading and a long impulse response [2, 3]. Orthogonal frequency-division multiplexing (OFDM) is widely used for MWD communications [4–6], as it is robust to frequencyselective fading. OFDM based MWD systems provide good throughput and reliability, but have poor latency because of a long impulse response of the channel. A cyclic prefix (CP) which is required to mitigate the intersymbol interference (ISI) should be as long as channel impulse response and, consequently, to achieve the acceptable CP overhead, OFDM operates with symbols of long duration. For drill string acoustic communications a design of low latency system with respect to reliability and throughput requirements remains an open challenge.

Deep learning autoencoder (AE) based end-to-end communication systems are the current state-of-the-art, where transmitter and receiver are implemented by neural networks (NN). They are trained as an autoencoder to adapt to a specific communication channel. During training transmitter and receiver are optimized jointly for end-to-end performance. As a result autoencoder learns signal waveforms, which are resistant to channel impairments.

It was shown that AE systems are able to perform as good as uncoded quadrature amplitude modulation (QAM) and Hamming coded QAM modulation schemes under additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) and flat Rayleigh fading channels [7, 8]. Under certain fading channels AE outperforms QAM scheme with minimum mean square error (MMSE) equalization [9], and bi-directional recurrent NN based AE is comparable with QAM with maximum-likelihood sequence estimation (MLSE) equalizer [10].

In real-world applications, when channel model is known, but is too complicated to derive an optimal modulation scheme, AE is able to provide a better solution than conventional systems. Much attention is payed to AE systems in context of optical communications [11-13] including those using nonlinear dispersive channels; an AE system was designed and applied for human body communications [14]; AE is applicable for molecular communications [15] as well.

In this paper the perspective of applying AE for acoustic drill string communications is studied. An AE communication system is proposed and evaluated. Its performance in terms of bit error rate (BER) and signal peak-to-average power (PAPR) is compared with a baseline OFDM system. Simulation shows that for drill string communications AE may provide reliable transmission with lower latency at the same throughput.

2 Drill String Communication Channel

In acoustic MWD system a downhole transmitter generates mechanical longitudinal waves, which propagate along a drill string to a surface receiver. In the conventional acoustic channel model of a drill string (e.g. [1]) the transmitted signal x(t) with the added downhole drill bit noise $n_d(t)$ flows through acoustic channel with an impulse response h(t). Then the signal is affected by the surface noise $n_s(t)$ produced by drilling equipment. Thus, at the receiver side the signal y(t) is given as

$$y(t) = x(t) * h(t) + n_d(t) * h(t) + n_s(t).$$

2.1 Frequency Response of Drill String

A drill string consists of alternating drill pipes and tool joints. Such structure results in multiple reflections of acoustic waves and, therefore, channel response (Fig. 1) is similar to a comb filter. A frequency response of a geometrically ideal drill string is obtained using transfer matrix method [2].



Fig. 1 A frequency response and impulse response obtained using transfer matrix method for a drill string composed of 10 pipes and 9 joints (Table 3).

Suppose, a drill string consists of N tube elements, d_n and a_n are the length and the crossectional area of the *n*-th element, respectively, for n = 1...N. The mass density of the drill string is ρ , and the velocity of longitudinal waves is c. The longitudinal waves are projected on the right surface of the N-th element and arrive on the left surface of the first element.

The potential function of the n-th element is expressed as

$$\Phi^{(n)}(x) = \Phi_I^{(n)} e^{jkx} + \Phi_R^{(n)} e^{-jkx},$$

where $\Phi_I^{(n)}$ and $\Phi_R^{(n)}$ are the amplitudes of potential functional of incident and reflected waves, respectively, and k is the longitudinal wave number. Let the reflection coefficient R and transmission coefficient T be defined as

$$T = \Phi_I^{(1)} / \Phi_I^{(N)}, \ R = \Phi_R^{(N)} / \Phi_I^{(N)}.$$

For the whole drill string there is a matrix equation

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{N}(0) \begin{bmatrix} 1+R\\1-R \end{bmatrix} = \boldsymbol{M}\boldsymbol{A}_{1}(0) \begin{bmatrix} T\\T \end{bmatrix},$$

where A_n is a 2 × 2 matrix function defined as

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{n}(x) = \begin{bmatrix} -k\sin(kx) & jk\cos(kx) \\ \rho a_{n}c^{2}k^{2}\cos(kx) & j\rho a_{n}c^{2}k^{2}\sin(kx) \end{bmatrix},$$

and \boldsymbol{M} is a 2 × 2 matrix given by

$$\boldsymbol{M} = \boldsymbol{A}_{N}(d_{N})\boldsymbol{A}_{N}^{-1}(0)\boldsymbol{A}_{N-1}(d_{N-1})\boldsymbol{A}_{N-1}^{-1}(0)\ldots\boldsymbol{A}_{1}(d_{1})\boldsymbol{A}_{1}^{-1}(0).$$

This equation can be solved about R and T numerically for certain drill string.

The transmission coefficient T can be seen as a function of the wave number k. The wave number is obtained as

$$k = \frac{2\pi f}{c},$$

where f is the longitudinal wave frequency. Thus, there is a relationship between T and f, which is the frequency response H(f) of a drill string channel. The impulse response h(t) of the channel is obtained by using inverse Fourier transform.

2.2 Drill Noise

The channel model includes two kinds of noise: drill bit noise $n_d(t)$ and surface noise $n_s(t)$. The both can be understood as overall drill noise

$$n(t) = n_d(t) * h(t) + n_s(t).$$

The overall noise is Gaussian and fairly stationary, but its spectrum is not flat. Since true spectral shape depends on the surface equipment and, therefore, is usually unknown, it is common to use white Gaussian noise assumption.

3 Autoencoder Communication System

The AE communication system consists of three parts: the encoder, the decoder, and the channel (Fig. 2). Suppose, the sequence of m bits $\boldsymbol{b} \in \{0, 1\}^m$



Fig. 2 Architecture of the autoencoder communication system.

is transmitted. The encoder constructs the signal of n complex samples $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n$, an AE symbol, by mapping $f_{\theta_e} : \{0, 1\}^m \to \mathbb{C}^n$, where θ_e are the encoder trainable parameters. Hence, the communication rate of the system is r = m/n (bits per channel use). At the receiver side the noisy and distorted signal $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ is observed. The channel may be described by conditional distribution $P(\boldsymbol{y} \mid \boldsymbol{x})$. The decoder provides the estimation of original bit sequence $\tilde{\boldsymbol{b}} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ by mapping $g_{\theta_d} : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$, where θ_d are the decoder trainable parameters. This estimation can be viewed as $\tilde{b}_i = P(b_i = 1 \mid \boldsymbol{y})$, and $1 - \tilde{b}_i = P(b_i = 0 \mid \boldsymbol{y})$, respectively.

The average power constraint $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{-i}^{2i} = 1$ is imposed on the transmitted signal to make the implementation of such a system feasible.

3.1 Encoder and Decoder

The encoder and decoder are implemented as feedforward fully connected (dense) NNs (Table 1). The both consist of three layers. A rectified linear unit (ReLU) activation function is used to build an inner data representation, a linear activation allows to construct a signal of arbitrary form, a sigmoid maps logits to output probabilities. The proposed structure was optimized for the specific bit sequence length m and symbol length n (see Sec. 4). For larger values the structure should be increased to keep the performance.

Autoencoder is trained to minimize the loss function

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta_e, \theta_d) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{b} \in |\mathcal{S}|} \left(\ell_{BCE}(\boldsymbol{b}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{b}}) + \alpha \, \ell_{PAPR}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right),$$

where S is the training set and |S| is the cardinality of S. The term ℓ_{BCE} is the binary cross-entropy loss defined as

$$\ell_{BCE}(\boldsymbol{b}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{b}}) = -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{m} b_i \log(\tilde{b}_i) + (1 - b_i) \log(1 - \tilde{b}_i).$$

It measures the accuracy of bit sequence estimation. The term ℓ_{PAPR} is the signal PAPR defined as

$$\ell_{PAPR}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{\max_{i=1,...,n} |x_i|^2}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2} = \max_{i=1,...,n} |x_i|^2.$$

	Layer	Activation	Output Size
oder	Input Dense Batch Normalization Dense	ReLU ReLU	${m} \\ 512 \\ 512 \\ 1024$
Enc	Batch Normalization Dense To Complex Power Normalization	Linear	$ \begin{array}{c} 1024\\ n\times 2\\ n\\ n \end{array} $
Channel	Input Modulation Convoltion and AWGN Demodulation		p imes n pun pun p imes n
Decoder	Input From Complex Dense Batch Normalization Dense Batch Normalization Dense	ReLU ReLU Sigmoid	$n \\ n \times 2 \\ 1024 \\ 1024 \\ 512 \\ 512 \\ m$

Table 1 The structure of proposed autoencoder system.

Including PAPR into the loss function is the common approach of PAPR reduction for AE systems. In order to estimate true PAPR of continuous signal, in the above equation \boldsymbol{x} is upsampled by a factor of 4. The parameter α regulates the tradeoff between PAPR and transmission reliability.

3.2 Channel

A signal \boldsymbol{x} constructed by the encoder is baseband. First, \boldsymbol{x} is upsampled by a factor u and modulated by a carrier frequency f_c . Then a sequence of p constructed independently signal frames are concatenated into a packet $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathbb{C}^{pun}$. The whole packet is fed into the channel in order to simulate ISI distortions. At the receiver side a distorted packet $\bar{\boldsymbol{y}} \in \mathbb{C}^{pun}$ is split into separate signal frames. Then each frame is converted into baseband signal \boldsymbol{y} which is processed by the decoder.

The packet transmission through the channel is modeled as

$$ar{m{y}}=ar{m{x}}*m{h}+m{n}_{2}$$

where $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{C}^{l}$ is a vector of l discrete samples of the channel complex impulse response, and $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{C}^{pun}$ is complex AWGN, i.e., $n_i \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, pun$. Since the convolution result is a vector of length pun+l-1, the last l-1 elements are discarded. The variance of noise $\sigma^2 = (rE_b/N_0)^{-1}$, where the communication rate r and energy per bit E_b are defined by transmitter design, and the noise spectral density N_0 is a property of the channel. N_0 is accounted as a hyperparameter and remains constant during training.

4 Simulation

In order to estimate the performance of the AE for drill string communications, its BER, PAPR and power spectral density (PSD) were evaluated under a drill string channel. For comparison, an non-contiguous OFDM (NC-OFDM) was taken as a baseline.

4.1 Setup

The simulation was carried out with complex signals at a sample rate $f_s = 2048$ Hz (Table 2). The AE and baseline NC-OFDM operate in a frequency band which starts at $f_c = 848$ Hz and has a width of $f_s/u = 512$ Hz. Both were configured to have equal communication rate r = m/n = 1.125, which leads to the total throughput of 576 bits/s, given the specified bandwidth. But the latency of the AE system is 9 times lower, since its symbol length is 64/(512+64) = 1/9 of the NC-OFDM symbol length. In both cases p is chosen so as to give equal packet length of $pun = 36 \cdot 4 \cdot 64 = 4 \cdot 4 \cdot (512+64) = 9216$ samples. The channel impulse response was modeled using transfer matrix method (Sec. 2) for a drill string composed of 10 pipes and 9 joints (Table 3).

Table 2 Parameters of simulation.

	m	n	p	u	l	f_c (Hz)	f_s (Hz)
AE NC-OFDM	72 648	$64 \\ 512 + 64$	$\frac{36}{4}$	4	2048	848	2048

Table 3 Properties of pipes (p) and joints (j).

$d_p \ (\mathrm{mm})$	d_j (mm)	$a_p \ (\mathrm{cm}^2)$	$a_j \ (\mathrm{cm}^2)$	c (m/s)	$\rho~(\rm kg/m^3)$
8760	240	52.276	248.186	$5.13\cdot 10^3$	$7.87\cdot 10^3$

The baseline NC-OFDM system is a simplified version of a system proposed in [6]. The PAPR reduction and pilot based channel estimation were omitted. Channel state information was assumed to be known at the receiver side. For the baseline NC-OFDM system n denotes the length of OFDM symbol with CP, while m is the number of bits carried by OFDM symbol. It uses QPSK bit mapping over 324 of 512 subcarries, which were non-contiguously selected within the two channel passbands ([878, 1049] Hz and [1169, 1320] Hz). The length of CP is 64 complex samples or 0.125 s after upsampling. The shorter CP leads to noticeable BER performance degradation.

The AE was trained for 256 epochs using Adam optimizer with initial learning rate 0.001. The training and test datasets contain 192 and 64 minibatches, respectively. Each minibatch consists of 128 packets, i.e., 128pm = 331776 bits.

For performance evaluation a distinct dataset of 256 minibatches was used for both the AE and the baseline NC-OFDM. All the data were sampled randomly from uniform distribution.

4.2 Results

The performance of the AE depends on the N_0 and α taken for training. For BER evaluation α was set to 0. In this case the AE ignores PAPR and tries to reconstruct input bit sequence as accurate as possible. PAPR reduction was investigated for $\alpha = 0.001$ and 0.005. For each α the AE was trained at $1/N_0 = 3$ dB, 5 dB and 7 dB.

4.2.1 Power Spectral Density

While the PSD of the NC-OFDM signal is roughly constant within selected subbands, the PSD of the AE signal varies in accordance to the channel frequency response (Fig. 3). It illustrates how the AE adapts to the channel.



Fig. 3 PSD of signal for the NC-OFDM and the AE trained at $1/N_0 = 3$ dB and $\alpha = 0$.

4.2.2 BER Performance

The AE is able to outperform the baseline in terms of BER for wide E_b/N_0 range (Fig. 4). AE trained at $1/N_0 = 3$ dB or 5 dB perform better for midrange E_b/N_0 , but yet suffers from ISI at higher E_b/N_0 , so there is a BER floor. At high N_0 AWGN causes the majority of errors, therefore AE learns a signal that robust to AWGN and pays less attention to ISI. Conversely, AE trained $1/N_0 = 7$ dB is more robust to ISI at high E_b/N_0 , but performs worse at



Fig. 4 BER performance of the baseline NC-OFDM and the AE trained at different N_0 and $\alpha = 0$.

lower E_b/N_0 . For low N_0 ISI causes the majority of errors, and the situation is symmetrically similar.

4.2.3 PAPR Performance

PAPR minimization during training results in a PAPR reduction (Fig. 5), but leads to a little degradation of BER performance (Fig. 6). For $\alpha = 0.005$ the system is more robust at low E_b/N_0 . In this case PAPR loss acts as a regularization, it helps AE to learn to perform better in a wider E_b/N_0 range.



Fig. 5 PAPR CCDF for the baseline NC-OFDM and the AE trained at $1/N_0 = 3$ dB and different α .



Fig. 6 BER performance of the baseline NC-OFDM and the AE trained at $1/N_0 = 3$ dB with different α .

5 Conclusion

Simulation shows that AE is a perspective approach for acoustic drill string communications. In comparison with the baseline NC-OFDM the AE is able to provide better BER and PAPR, operating at the same throughput and 9 times lower latency. The AE adapts to the drill string channel during training and, thus, outperforms the baseline NC-OFDM, which is adapted manually by selecting non-contiguous carriers.

However, AE has poor scalability in contrast to NC-OFDM. Increasing of transmission bandwidth or symbol duration, i.e., larger m and n, may require a larger AE structure. As a result the curse of dimensionality is arisen. However, it is still possible but less efficient to use a batch of small AE systems multiplexed in frequency.

References

- Gao, L., Gardner, W., Robbins, C., Memarzadeh, M., Johnson, D.H.: Limits on data communication along the drillstring using acoustic waves. SPE Reservoir Evaluation and Engineering 11(1), 141–146 (2008). https: //doi.org/10.2118/95490-PA
- [2] Wang, C.Y., Qiao, W.X., Zhang, W.Q.: Using transfer matrix method to study the acoustic property of drill strings. Sixth IEEE International Symposium on Signal Processing and Information Technology, ISSPIT (2), 415–419 (2007). https://doi.org/10.1109/ISSPIT.2006.270837
- [3] Han, J., Kim, Y.J., Karkoub, M.: Modeling of wave propagation in drill strings using acoustic transfer matrix method. Proceedings of Meetings on

Acoustics 19(3), 1920–1931 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4799689

- [4] Gutierrez-Estevez, M.A., Krueger, U., Krueger, K.A., Manolakis, K., Jungnickel, V., Jaksch, K., Krueger, K., Mikulla, S., Giese, R., Sohmer, M., Reich, M.: Acoustic broadband communications over deep drill strings using adaptive OFDM. IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference, WCNC, 4089–4094 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1109/WCNC. 2013.6555232
- [5] Ma, D., Shi, Y., Zhang, W., Liu, G.: Performance analysis of V-OFDM for acoustic communication along drill strings. IET Communications 11(4), 576–583 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1049/iet-com.2016.0979
- [6] Ma, D., Shi, Y., Zhang, W., Liu, G.: Design of acoustic transmission along drill strings for logging while drilling data based on adaptive NC-OFDM. AEU - International Journal of Electronics and Communications 83, 329–338 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aeue.2017.08.035
- [7] O'Shea, T., Hoydis, J.: An Introduction to Deep Learning for the Physical Layer. IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking 3(4), 563–575 (2017) https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.00832. https://doi.org/ 10.1109/TCCN.2017.2758370
- [8] Wu, N., Wang, X., Lin, B., Zhang, K.: A CNN-Based End-to-End Learning Framework Toward Intelligent Communication Systems. IEEE Access 7, 110197–110204 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019. 2926843
- [9] Zhu, B., Wang, J., He, L., Song, J.: Joint transceiver optimization for wireless communication phy using neural network. IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications 37(6), 1364–1373 (2019). https://doi.org/10. 1109/JSAC.2019.2904361
- [10] Wu, H., Zhang, Y., Zhao, X., Zhu, N., Coates, M.: End-to-end Physical Layer Communication using Bi-directional GRUs for ISI Channels (2020). https://doi.org/10.1109/gcwkshps50303.2020.9367429
- [11] Karanov, B., Chagnon, M., Thouin, F., Eriksson, T.A., Bulow, H., Lavery, D., Bayvel, P., Schmalen, L.: End-to-End Deep Learning of Optical Fiber Communications. Journal of Lightwave Technology 36(20), 4843– 4855 (2018) https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.04097. https://doi.org/10.1109/ JLT.2018.2865109
- [12] Karanov, B., Lavery, D., Bayvel, P., Schmalen, L.: End-to-end optimized transmission over dispersive intensity-modulated channels using bidirectional recurrent neural networks. Opt. Express 27(14), 19650–19663 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1364/OE.27.019650

- [13] Zhu, Z.-R., Zhang, J., Chen, R.-H., Yu, H.-Y.: Autoencoder-Based Transceiver Design for OWC Systems in Log-Normal Fading Channel. IEEE Photonics Journal 11(5), 1–12 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1109/ jphot.2019.2938231
- [14] Ali, A., Inoue, K., Shalaby, A., Sayed, M.S., Ahmed, S.M.: Efficient Autoencoder-Based Human Body Communication Transceiver for WBAN. IEEE Access 7, 117196–117205 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1109/ ACCESS.2019.2936796
- [15] Mohamed, S., Dong, J., Junejo, A.R., Zuo, D.C.: Model-Based: Endto-End Molecular Communication System Through Deep Reinforcement Learning Auto Encoder. IEEE Access 7, 70279–70286 (2019). https: //doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2916701