Light field moment imaging : comment

Zuo, Chao; Chen, Qian; Asundi, Anand

2014

Zuo, C., Chen, Q., & Asundi, A. (2014). Light field moment imaging: comment. *Optics Letters*, 39(3), 654.

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/104016>

<https://doi.org/10.1364/OL.39.000654>

© 2014 Optical Society of America. This paper was published in *Optics Letters* and is made available as an electronic reprint (preprint) with permission of Optical Society of America.

The paper can be found at the following official DOI:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1364/OL.39.000654>. One print or electronic copy may be made for personal use only. Systematic or multiple reproduction, distribution to multiple locations via electronic or other means, duplication of any material in this paper for a fee or for commercial purposes, or modification of the content of the paper is prohibited and is subject to penalties under law.

Downloaded on 26 Apr 2023 23:22:15 SGT

Light field moment imaging: comment

Chao Zuo,^{1,2,3} Qian Chen,^{1,*} and Anand Asundi²

¹Jiangsu Key Laboratory of Spectral Imaging & Intelligence Sense, Nanjing University of Science and Technology, Nanjing, Jiangsu Province 210094, China

²Centre for Optical and Laser Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 639798

³e-mail: surpasszuo@163.com

*Corresponding author: chenq@njust.edu.cn

Received October 10, 2013; accepted November 29, 2013;
posted December 18, 2013 (Doc. ID 199206); published January 29, 2014

We comment on the recent Letter [Opt. Lett. **38**, 2666 (2013)], in which the authors presented an imaging technique called light field moment imaging. We wish to show that this method can be associated with transport of intensity equation at the geometric optics limit. © 2014 Optical Society of America

OCIS codes: (110.1758) Computational imaging; (180.6900) Three-dimensional microscopy; (100.5070) Phase retrieval; (100.3010) Image reconstruction techniques.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1364/OL.39.000654>

In a recent Letter, Orth and Crozier [1] reported a method termed light field moment imaging (LMI) to extract the first angular moment of the light field by solving a partially differential equation (PDE) with only a pair of images exhibiting a slight defocusing. With the moment retrieved, one can readily reconstruct perspective-shifted views of the original scene under the empirical assumption that the angular distribution of the light field is Gaussian. The main purpose of this Letter is not to discuss the reasonability or to improve this empirical assumption. In fact, we want to establish the relation between LMI and the deterministic phase retrieval method—transport of intensity equation (TIE) [2]. Starting with the more rigorous wave optics, we represent the paraxial quasi-monochromatic partially coherent stochastic field $u(\mathbf{x})$ using Wigner distribution function (WDF) [3]:

$$W(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = \int \Gamma(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}'/2, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'/2) \exp(-i2\pi\mathbf{u}\mathbf{x}') d\mathbf{x}', \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{u}$ are the two-dimensional (2D) spatial and spatial frequency vectors and Γ is the mutual intensity. The paraxial propagation of WDF takes the form $W(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, z) = W(\mathbf{x} - \lambda z\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}, 0)$, where z is the propagation distance [3]. Combining the representation of intensity—a projection of the WDF onto $\mathbf{u}$ plane $I(\mathbf{x}) = \int W(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}$, we obtain the TIE for the partially coherent field [4]:

$$\frac{\partial I(\mathbf{x})}{\partial z} = -\lambda \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \int \mathbf{u} W(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}, \quad (2)$$

where $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the gradient operator over $\mathbf{x}$. In the coherent limit $u(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{I(\mathbf{x})} \exp[i\phi(\mathbf{x})]$, Eq. (2) reduces to Teague's TIE [2], and the normalized spatial frequency moment of WDF relates to the phase gradient:

$$\frac{\int \mathbf{u} W(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}}{\int W(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi. \quad (3)$$

The formal resemblance between TIE [Eq. (2)] and the PDE [Eq. (3) in [1]] of LMI implies the equivalence of the WDF and the light field; that is, the physically

measurable light field $L(\mathbf{x}, \theta)$ approaches WDF at geometric optics limit [5]. Applying the approximation $L(\mathbf{x}, \theta) \approx W(\mathbf{x}, \lambda\mathbf{u})$ to Eq. (3),

$$\frac{\partial I(\mathbf{x})}{\partial z} \approx -\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \int \theta L(\mathbf{x}, \theta) d\theta. \quad (4)$$

Invoking the paraxial approximation $\theta \approx (\tan \theta_x, \tan \theta_y)$ to eliminate the illumination factor $\cos^4 \theta$ [1], the “recorded light field” reduces to the $L(\mathbf{x}, \theta)$ and then Eq. (4) reduces to Eq. (3) in [1]. Therefore, the PDE of LMI is equal to partially coherent TIE at the geometric optics limit. It is seen from Eq. (3) that the “phase” measured by TIE is a scalar potential whose gradient yields the (irrotational component of) normalized first-order local moment of WDF, which describes exactly the normalized ensemble-averaged transverse energy flux density (Poynting vector). Under the geometric optics assumption, the Poynting vector propagates in the Eikonal way; thus, the ensemble-averaged transverse Poynting vector is equal to the angular moment of the light field in LMI.

For a partially coherent field, the 4D WDF is generally non-redundant, and two projections of WDF are insufficient to fully recover the field. The empirical Gaussian angular distribution assumption in [1] seems not physically founded, but it raises an interesting question: is there any other situation (except the coherent case) that we can fully characterize the optical field without measuring the whole phase-space distribution? The answer, apparently, is yes. However, this question is not trivial, but of great practical importance, because identifying the phase-space redundancies explicitly enables the derivation of more-efficient computational schemes for specific problems. We leave this for future investigations.

References

1. A. Orth and K. B. Crozier, Opt. Lett. **38**, 2666 (2013).
2. M. R. Teague, J. Opt. Soc. Am. **73**, 1434 (1983).
3. M. J. Bastiaans, J. Opt. Soc. Am. A **3**, 1227 (1986).
4. A. Semichayevsky and M. Testorf, J. Opt. Soc. Am. A **21**, 2173 (2004).
5. Z. Zhengyun and M. Levoy, in *International Conference on Computational Photography (ICCP)* (IEEE, 2009), pp. 1–10.