

Phd Thesis

M.C. Orlando Miguel Medina Cázares

July 11, 2014

Contents

1	Regularized iterative least-squares algorithm for phase-shifting interferometry	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Classical Least-Squares	2
1.3	Full-field 2D least-squares method	3
1.4	Numerical Experiments	5
1.5	Experimental Results	6
1.6	Comments and conclusions	6
2	Regularized self-tuning phase demodulation for phase-shifting interferome try with arbitrary phase shifts	11
2.1	Abstract	11
2.2	Introduction	12
2.3	Method	13
2.4	Numerical experiments and results	15
2.5	Conclusions	17
3	Removing detuning distortions of wrapped phase by using robust quadrature filters	21
3.1	abstract	21
3.2	Introduction	21
3.3	Phase detuning correction method (PDCM)	23
3.4	A priori local frequency calculation	25
3.5	Tests and experimental examples	26
3.6	Discussion and commentaries	28
3.7	Appendix. Local frequency calculation in presence of noise . .	29

Chapter 1

Regularized iterative least-squares algorithm for phase-shifting interferometry

1.1 Introduction

Phase Shifting Interferometry (PSI) demodulation methods are useful 1D temporal linear systems that allow us to recover the modulating phase of the PSI sequence. When the number of samples is small, typically between 3 and 15, we speak of PSI methods [1, 2], but they require a constant phase and do not tolerate missing data. On the other hand, when the number of samples is large, between 10^2 and 10^3 , we speak of temporal analysis methods [15, 3, 4] which have many problems with the interferogram borders and missing data. Another possibility for analyzing the temporal signal is the use of a running PSI method tuned at the carrier frequency [15, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8]. For example if we use a three step PSI method we could demodulate the phase locally for each of three consecutive samples. Although this method will deal well with borders, missing data cannot be handled and can even impede the use of this strategy. In experimental methods missing data appear in the case of a saturated signal and also in heterodyne temporal speckle-pattern interferometry when temporal decorrelation appears. Also missing data and discontinuities due to occlusions or shadows are very common in projected fringe profilometry. Besides these problems, noise is another important issue to solve; for example, in speckle techniques [1, 4] noisy interferograms are obtained, in consequence, recovered phase have to be treated to obtain a clean phase easy to unwrap.

Hence, in this paper we are going to present a full-field 2D linear demodulation method that uses in conjunction the temporal and spatial information in order to recover a clean phase, while interpolates empty small sections of missing data from the image space all with low computational time and in the same process.

1.2 Classical Least-Squares

Each (x, y) pixel of the PSI sequence is a 1D temporal discrete interferometric signal modeled in the following way,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{x,y}(k) &= a_{x,y} + b_{x,y} \cos(\phi_{x,y} + k\alpha) \\ &= a_{x,y} + c_{x,y} \sin(k\alpha) - s_{x,y} \cos(k\alpha), \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

where $c_{x,y} = b_{x,y} \cos(\phi_{x,y})$ and $s_{x,y} = b_{x,y} \sin(\phi_{x,y})$ are the quadrature components of the 1D temporal interferometric signal, k is the discrete temporal variable, $a_{x,y}$ the background illumination, $b_{x,y}$ the modulation term, α the phase step or temporal carrier, and $\phi_{x,y}$ the modulating phase sought at the (x, y) pixel; note that all these variables are scalars. The independent temporal variable k represents the k -frame of the PSI sequence. In this context, knowing the temporal carrier α (phase step as known in PSI), the objective of the PSI demodulation methods is to estimate the quadrature components $c_{x,y}$ and $s_{x,y}$ of the interferometric signal at the (x, y) pixel. Then, the phase at (x, y) is obtained as:

$$\phi_{x,y} = \arctan \left(\frac{s_{x,y}}{c_{x,y}} \right). \quad (1.2)$$

Scanning all pixels in this way, we obtain the wrapped phase image of the PSI sequence. One of the first approaches to demodulate a PSI sequence was the least-squares model for PSI [9, 10, 11, 12]. The least-squares model (cost function) for PSI is the following,

$$U(a_{x,y}, c_{x,y}, s_{x,y}) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} [a_{x,y} + c_{x,y} \sin(k\alpha) - s_{x,y} \cos(k\alpha) - I_{x,y}(k)]^2, \quad (1.3)$$

where $I_{x,y}(k)$ is the observed value of the k -frame at the (x, y) pixel modeled as in Eq. (1.1). To have a well-posed mathematical model for Eq. (1.3), it is necessary to have at least three interferograms in the PSI sequence; that

is, $N \geq 3$. The parameters $c_{x,y}$ and $s_{x,y}$ that minimize Eq. (1.3) are the quadrature components used in Eq. (1.2) to obtain the phase. To minimize Eq. (1.3), we solve a 3×3 linear equation system where $a_{x,y}$, $c_{x,y}$ and $s_{x,y}$ are the unknowns. As the temporal interferometric signal of each pixel has the same model [see Eq. (1.1)], the solution of the linear equation system is always the same. This allows us to demodulate the interferogram sequence using very simple closed mathematical forms [1]. However, as shown in Eq. (1.3), this system never uses the spatial information but the temporal one; in fact, not one of the temporal PSI demodulation methods uses the spatial information [2]. Reason why, using temporal PSI demodulation methods we filter only through the interferogram sequence, but not through the interferogram image space. As a consequence, temporal PSI demodulation methods can not remove unwanted spatial harmonics or noise that may be introduced while recording the interferograms.




Figure 1.1: Numerical examples. a) One of four simulated interferogram sequences. b) Recovered phase map using classic least-squares. c) Recovered phase map using our proposed *Full-field 2D least-squares*.

1.3 Full-field 2D least-squares method

Regularization systems are very useful full-field systems that can use all the information needed to obtain the data sought as expected. In PSI, we can use these techniques to include the temporal and spatial information to recover the modulating phase as a smooth 2D function, removing unwanted harmonics and noise. Actually, regularization techniques have been used before in PSI for these purposes, the first were Marroquin et al. [15, 13, 14] and more recently others [15, 16, 17, 6, 18, 7, 8]. However, the approach used in those works obtained non-linear systems with a considerable computational work load. Besides, these algorithms need a pre-processing method

to remove background illumination in order to demodulate a correct phase. In our case, this preprocess is not needed and, also and more important, we will maintain the linearity of the least-squares cost function (1.3), adding spatial constraints to recover the wrapped modulating phase while removing noise and unwanted harmonics present in the interferograms [15], besides interpolating small sections of missing data. These constraints will penalize the spatial variations of the quadrature components $c_{x,y}$ and $s_{x,y}$ by using first order potentials as regularization terms. Proceeding in this way, the *Full-field 2D least-squares* cost function for PSI is the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 U(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{s}) = & \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{x,y \in L} [a_{x,y} + c_{x,y} \sin(k\alpha) - s_{x,y} \cos(k\alpha) - I_{x,y}(k)]^2 M_{x,y} \\
 & + \lambda \sum_{x,y \in L} [(c_{x,y} - c_{x-1,y})^2 + (s_{x,y} - s_{x,y-1})^2] \\
 & + \mu \sum_{x,y \in L} (a_{x,y} - a_{x-1,y})^2,
 \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where $M_{x,y}$ is a binary mask with valid measurement, λ is the regularization parameter that penalizes the spatial variations of quadrature components \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{s} , and μ penalizes the spatial variations of background illumination \mathbf{a} . Note that in this case, the parameters $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{s})$ of the cost function in Eq. (1.4) are scalar fields with dimensions $L_x \times L_y$ and elements $a_{x,y}$, $c_{x,y}$ and $s_{x,y}$, respectively, while the parameters $(a_{x,y}, c_{x,y}, s_{x,y})$ of the cost function in Eq. (1.3) are just scalars. As with the least-squares cost function of Eq. (1.3), here, at least three interferograms are needed in the sequence in order to have a well-posed mathematical model. To minimize Eq. (1.4), in order to obtain the quadrature components \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{s} that will give us the modulating phase, we need to solve a linear equation system of $3(L_x \times L_y)$ equations and $3(L_x \times L_y)$ unknowns. Compared with the 3×3 linear equation system of Eq. (1.3), the linear equation system of Eq. (1.4) is larger; however, solving this linear equation system is not so complicated when using numerical methods such as *Gauss-Seidel*. One of the advantages of the *Gauss-Seidel* method is that it is numerically stable, and it is not necessary to build the associated matrix of the linear equation system; besides, the *Gauss-Seidel* method can be programmed for today's modern parallel processors, such as the *Graphics Processing Unit* (GPU), speeding up the minimization process. For illustration purposes, in this paper we programmed the algorithm in *C++* language.




Figure 1.2: Experimental results. a) One of four experimental interferogram sequences. b) Recovered phase map using classic least-squares. c) Recovered phase map using our proposed *Full-field 2D least-squares*.

1.4 Numerical Experiments

To show the performance of the *Full-field 2D least-squares* algorithm, we simulated a PSI sequence of four interferograms of 512×512 pixels in the following way: $I_{x,y}(k) = a_{x,y} + b_{x,y} \cos(\phi_{x,y} + k\alpha) + \eta_{x,y}$, for $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and $\alpha = \pi/2$. The modulated phase ϕ was modeled as a plane using the following expression: $\phi_{x,y} = 0.05x + 0.05y$. The background illumination term a was modeled as a parabola centered at pixel (256,256) of the image frames with a dynamic range between 0 and 1. The b term was set to 1. Last, we added a random field of white noise η , with mean $\gamma = 0$ and variance $\sigma^2 = 1$. In Fig. 1.1(a), we see the first interferogram of the simulated sequence. Figures 1.1(b) and 1.1(c) show the wrapped phase using classic least-squares [10] and the *Full-field 2D least-squares* method, respectively. To estimate the wrapped phase in Fig. 1.1(c), we solve the linear system in Eq. (1.4) using the Gauss-Seidel method and setting λ and μ to 50. The number of iterations was 500. For this example, the mask $M_{x,x}$ in Eq. (1.4) is one over all the image; since all the image it is valid information. Computational time was 4.6934 seconds, on a PC with an Intel Core i7 processor and 8 GB RAM memory. We can see in these figures that our proposed method recovers a phase with much less noise than the classic least-squares method, given the regularization terms in Eq. (1.4).

1.5 Experimental Results

Now, we are going to show the performance of our method with experimentally obtained interferograms and compare it qualitatively with the classical least-squares method. The interferogram sequence was generated using an ESPI technique, and the wave-front under test was modified applying pressure. For the phase step, a phase-shift of $\pi/2$ radians was introduced. The object under test was a circular metal plate with circular perforations all along its edge. In order to increase reflexion, we coated the plate with white powder, except for a small part, as can be seen in Fig. 1.2(a). Fig. 1.2(a) shows the first experimental phase-shifting interferogram of a 4 samples sequence. In Fig. 1.2(b), we show the wavefront estimation of the classic least-squares method, while in Fig. 1.2(c), we see the wave-front estimation of the *Full-field 2D least-squares* method proposed here. Computational time in this case was 7.6483 seconds using the PC described above. As we can see, the proposed method was able to estimate a phase free of noise. Another significant feature of this algorithm is that in sections where there is no information, such as black circles and scratches, the algorithm was able to fill-up the empty spaces satisfactorily; this is because it takes into account the neighboring pixel information and the regularization terms; very useful feature in the aforementioned cases.

1.6 Comments and conclusions

The calculation of a free-noise phase in PSI is very useful, since it allows us to use simple algorithms to unwrap the phase. Normally, to get a soft phase, we need to filter the interferogram samples or the output phase to remove the noise. The problem of this process is that we may be removing important information during the filtering. For this reason, the *Full-field 2D least-squares* algorithm represents a significant improvement to the classical least-squares method. Besides, as we have seen before, the presented algorithm is capable of interpolating small empty spaces of missing data, since it takes into account the temporal and spatial information. Therefore, all results presented in this paper can be directly applied to the spatial case where missing data and discontinuities are present. Examples of this are occlusions or shadows in projected fringe profilometry, temporal decorrelation and saturated signal in heterodyne temporal speckle-pattern interferometry.

Previous to this work, all phase-shifting algorithms only use a single pixel signal to estimate the wave-front under test, regardless of adjacent

information. This paper presents the usefulness of taking into account the temporal and spatial information in conjunction to estimate a best phase map. It is important to highlight that the functional of Eq. (1.4) is a linear system; therefore, it is stable and easy to compute. In conclusion, we present a full-field 2D linear demodulation algorithm able to recover a clean phase and also able to interpolate small empty sections of information, all with low computational time and in the same process.

Bibliography

- [1] D. Malacara, M. Servin, and Z. Malacara, *Interferogram Analysis for Optical Testing* (Taylor & Francis, CRC, 2005).
- [2] M. Servin, J. C. Estrada, and J. A. Quiroga, "The general theory of phase shifting algorithms," *Opt. Express* **17**(24), 21867-21881 (2009) doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1364/OE.17.021867>.
- [3] P. D. Ruiz, J. M. Huntley, and G. H. Kaufmann, "Adaptive phase-shifting algorithm for temporal phase evaluation," *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A* **20**(2), 325-332 (2003).
- [4] P. Haible, M. P. Kothiyal, and H. J. Tiziani, "Heterodyne temporal speckle-pattern interferometry," *Appl. Opt.* **39**(1), 114-117 (2000).
- [5] J. Marroquin, J. Figueroa, and M. Servin, "Robust quadrature filters," *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A* **14**, 779-791 (1997).
- [6] M. Rivera, R. Bizuet, A. Martinez, and J. Rayas, "Half-quadratic cost function for computing arbitrary phase shifts and phase: Adaptive out of step phase shifting," *Opt. Express* **14**, 3204-3213 (2006). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1364/OE.14.003204>
- [7] Orlando Medina, Julio C. Estrada and Manuel Servin "Regularized self-tuning phase demodulation for phase-shifting interferometry with arbitrary phase shifts", *Proc. SPIE* **8493**, Interferometry XVI: Techniques and Analysis, 84930K (September 13, 2012); doi:10.1117/12.929756.
- [8] F. Zeng, Q. Tan, H. Gu, and G. Jin, "Phase extraction from interferograms with unknown tilt phase shifts based on a regularized optical flow method," *Opt. Express* **21**, 17234-17248 (2013).
- [9] C. Morgan, "Least-squares estimation in phase-measurement interferometry," *Opt. Lett.* **7**, 368-370 (1982).

-
- [10] J. E. Greivenkamp "Generalized Data Reduction For Heterodyne Interferometry", Opt. Eng. **23(4)**, 234350 (Aug 01, 1984).; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1117/12.7973298>
 - [11] K. Okada, A. Sato, and J. Tsujiuchi, "Simultaneous calculation of phase distribution and scanning phase shift in phase shifting interferometry," Opt. Commun. **84**, 118-124 (1991).
 - [12] I.-B. Kong. "General algorithm of phase-shifting interferometry by iterative least-squares fitting". Opt. Eng., **34**:183, 1995.
 - [13] J. Marroquin, M. Servin, and R. Rodriguez-Vera, "Adaptive quadrature filters and the recovery of phase from fringe pattern images," J. Opt. Soc. Am. A **14**, 1742-1753 (1997).
 - [14] J. Marroquin, M. Servin, and R. Rodriguez Vera, "Adaptive quadrature filters for multiple phase-stepping images," Opt. Lett. **23**, 238-240 (1998).
 - [15] M. Servin, J. Marroquin, and F. Cuevas, "Fringe-follower regularized phase tracker for demodulation of closed-fringe interferograms," J. Opt. Soc. Am. A **18**, 689-695 (2001).
 - [16] M. Servin, J. Marroquin, and J. Quiroga, "Regularized quadrature and phase tracking from a single closed-fringe interferogram," J. Opt. Soc. Am. A **21**, 411-419 (2004).
 - [17] R. Legarda-Saenz and M. Rivera, "Fast half-quadratic regularized phase tracking for nonnormalized fringe patterns," J. Opt. Soc. Am. A **23**, 2724-2731 (2006).
 - [18] J. Vargas, J. Quiroga, C. Sorzano, J. Estrada, and J. Carazo, "Two-step interferometry by a regularized optical flow algorithm," Opt. Lett. **36**, 3485-3487 (2011).

Chapter 2

Regularized self-tuning phase demodulation for phase-shifting interferometry with arbitrary phase shifts

2.1 Abstract

In this work, we develop a regularization technique to demodulate a phase-shifting interferogram sequence with arbitrary inter-frame phase shifts. With this method, we can recover the modulating phase and inter-frame phase shifts in the same process. As all phase-shifting algorithms, the assumption is that the wavefront under test does not change over time but the phase-shifting introduction can vary in a non constant way. A notable characteristic of this demodulation method is that it not only can recover the modulating phase, but also it is capable of filtering-out large quantities of corrupting noise. We will show numerical experimental results and comparisons with other already published method to see the performance of the herein developed demodulation technique.

2.2 Introduction

Nowadays, Phase Shifting Interferometry (PSI) techniques are one of the most used techniques in optical metrology [1]. In PSI, one obtains a small sequence of at least 3 interferograms with a phase-shifting among them [1]. To recover the modulating phase there are standard demodulation PSI methods; the well known 3-, 4-, and 5-steps phase-shifting algorithms. Knowing the inter-frame phase-shifts (or temporal carrier) the standard methods recover the modulus 2π phase map with the minimum possible error [1, 2, 3]. If we do not know the phase-shifts exactly, we obtain a phase map with an unavoidable detuning error whose magnitude depends on the number of interferograms employed and how far we are from the actual phase-shifts [3, 4, 5, 6]. This unfortunate case can occur when the optical interferometer setup is uncalibrated or perturbations from the environment affect the interferometer's optical path. For example, for most phase shifters such as a PZT there is a repeatability problem from hysteresis, non linearity, and temperature linear drift [5, 7]. Curiously, first phase-shifting algorithms where self-tuning nonlinear algorithms [8, 9]. Other approaches, propose error compensating algorithms to reduce detuning errors that basically use redundant data such as the Schwider-Hariharan 5-steps algorithm [4, 10, 11], and more recently by constructing a wide-band frequency response of the phase-shifting algorithm as the 7-steps algorithm shown in [12]. Further methods use the Fourier transform in order to estimate the inter-frame phase-shifts [6, 13], and other are based on the least-squares scheme estimating iteratively the inter-frame phase-shifts and phase [14, 15]. In Ref. 16[16], we presented an approach that estimates the local temporal carrier (the phase-shift) as the average of the phase difference between two consecutive phase maps obtained from two realizations of the tunable 3-steps algorithm. What we are going to show in this work, is a regularized self-tuning demodulation technique that obtains the analytical image (complex interferogram) and inter-frame phase-shifts from an interferogram sequence. Thus, we can recover the modulating phase modulus 2π and the inter-frame phase shifts in the same process. Here, it is not necessary to know the inter-frame phase-shifts. This inter-frame phase-shifts can vary arbitrary. The main difference between the demodulation method presented here, and the reported in [14, 15, 17], is that the herein demodulation method is based on a regularization technique that is able to remove noise from its input and is robust to non constant modulation variations, which is an issue that introduce errors in methods of works [14, 15]. Besides, we do not require estimate the fringe orientation as the method of work [17].

2.3 Method

In general, an interferogram sequence with arbitrary inter-frame phase-shifts can be modeled as

$$I_k(x, y) = a(x, y) + b(x, y)\cos(\phi(x, y) + \alpha_k), \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1, \quad (2.1)$$

where $I_k(x, y)$ is the intensity at the site (x, y) of the k -interferogram in a sequence of $N-1$ interferograms, being $a(x, y)$ its background illumination, $b(x, y)$ its contrast or modulation, $\phi(x, y)$ the modulating phase under test and α_k the phase-shifting of the k -interferogram. We can remove the background illumination of each interferogram in the following way:

$$I'_k(x, y) = I_k(x, y) - [I_k * h](x, y), \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1, \quad (2.2)$$

where $h(x, y)$ is the impulse response of a low-pass filter such as a Gaussian or mean filter and $*$ is the convolution operator[20]. Making this, the new interferogram sequence looks like

$$I'_k(x, y) = b'(x, y)\cos(\phi(x, y) + \alpha_k), \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1. \quad (2.3)$$

The main idea of the regularized self-tuning demodulation method that we show here comes from the article of Marroquin et al. [18]. The demodulation process presented by Marroquin et al., minimizes a nonlinear system that estimates the complex field of the first interferogram and its local spatial frequencies. We, unlike the Marroquin et al. work, estimate the inter-frame phase-shifts from the interferogram sequence. Therefore, our demodulation method minimizes the following quadratic functional

$$\begin{aligned} U(f, \alpha) = & \sum_{(x,y)} (\varphi(x, y) - I'_0(x, y))^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{(x,y)} \left[\frac{1}{2} [f(x, y)e^{i\alpha_k} + f^*(x, y)e^{-i\alpha_k}] - I'_k(x, y) \right]^2 \\ & + \lambda \sum_{(x,y)} [||D_x[f(x, y)]||^2 + ||D_y[f(x, y)]||^2], \quad nonumber \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

where $f = \{f(x, y) = \varphi(x, y) + i\psi(x, y) : (x, y) \in L\}$ is the complex field, $i = \sqrt{-1}$, and f^* its complex conjugated. The sums with the notation (x, y) underneath, runs over all valid sites (x, y) of the interferograms. Operators $D_x[\cdot]$ and $D_y[\cdot]$ takes the first order differences along x and y direction, as follows:

$$D_x[f(x, y)] = f(x, y) - f(x-1, y) + f(x, y) - f(x+1, y), \quad (2.6)$$

$$D_y[f(x, y)] = f(x, y) - f(x, y - 1) + f(x, y) - f(x, y + 1). \quad (2.7)$$

The regularization parameter λ controls the smoothness of the complex field [18, 19]. The first and second terms are the data terms, and the third term is the regularization term. Our reference is the first interferogram, therefore, we consider that its phase-shifting is $\alpha_0 = 0$. This is the reason of the first data term, which results when $k = 0$, and therefore, the second data term starts in $k = 1$. The minimization process of the functional (4) leads to a robust to noise nonlinear phase-shifting algorithm of N-steps that can recover the modulating phase and inter-frame phase shifts. With the complex field \hat{f} and phase-shifts α that minimize (4), the modulating phase is recovered as

$$\phi(x, y) = \arg[\hat{f}(x, y)] = \arctan \left[\frac{\hat{\psi}(x, y)}{\widehat{\text{varphi}}(x, y)} \right]. \quad (2.8)$$

The minimization of functional (4), turns us to a nonlinear system that mathematically is impossible to solve by a direct numerical method. The dimension problem is $m \times n \times N$, where $m \times n$ is the interferogram dimension and N is the number of interferograms. For nonlinear systems, the iterative steepest-descent algorithm can converge to local minimums if its parameters are set adequately [21], but its converge speed results very slow in this case. Then, we split the problem in two: the linear part and the nonlinear part. The linear part are the equations that result by making zero the following partials: $\frac{\partial U}{\partial \varphi(x, y)}$ and $\frac{\partial U}{\partial \psi(x, y)}$, for all $(x, y) \in L$. The nonlinear part are the equations that result by making zero the following partial: $\frac{\partial U}{\partial \alpha_k}$, for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$. Thus, to speed up the minimization process, our iterative minimization strategy combines in each iteration the Gauss-Seidel update for the linear part, and the steepest-descent update for the nonlinear part. Then, the iterations of our minimization strategy are given with the following updates:

$$\varphi^{n+1}(x, y) = \text{Solve for } \varphi^n(x, y) \text{ Eq. } \left[\frac{\partial U(\text{varphi}^n + i\psi^n, \alpha^n)}{\partial \varphi(x, y)} = 0 \right]; \forall (x, y) \text{ in } L \quad (2.9)$$

$$\psi^{n+1}(x, y) = \text{Solve for } \psi^n(x, y) \text{ Eq. } \left[\frac{\partial U(\varphi^n + i\psi^n, \alpha^n)}{\partial \psi(x, y)} = 0 \right]; \forall (x, y) \in L \quad (2.10)$$

$$\alpha_k^{n+1} = \alpha_k^n - \mu \frac{\partial U(\varphi^n + i\psi^n, \alpha^n)}{\partial \alpha_k}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1. \quad (2.11)$$

Equations (8) and (9) correspond to the Gauss-Seidel update, and equation (10) is the steepest-descent update. In the appendix at the end of this paper, we show the explicit formulas of these equations. To see this implementation, the reader can download the source code following the web link of Ref. 22. Note: the provided source code of Ref. 22 is for illustration purposes, and it is no optimized as the C-language code used for our numerical experiments.

2.4 Numerical experiments and results

To obtain the results presented here, the minimization process described here made 1000 iterations to reach a relative convergence error of 1.322×10^{-4} . This relative convergence error is calculated as $\sqrt{\sum (\alpha_k^n - \alpha_k^{n+1})^2}$, where the sum runs over $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N-1$, α_k^n is the k -phase-shift estimated in the current iteration and α_k^{n+1} is the k -phase-shift of the next iteration. This minimization process, coded and compiled in C-language, took a time of 11.310 seconds for these 512×512 interferogram frames in a computer with a 8-cores CPU of 1.73GHz having 8GB of memory RAM. The regularization parameter λ (see Eq. (4)) was set to $\lambda = 10$, and the parameter μ of the steepest-descent update was $\mu = \frac{1.2}{512 \times 512}$ (see Eq. (10)). Actually, choosing $\mu = \frac{1.2}{512 \times 512}$ is a very good parameter for the steepest-descent update of Eq. (10), where $m \times n$ is the dimension of the interferogram frames. In our numerical experiments, we start always the minimization process with initial values of $f = 0$, and $\alpha_k = k\frac{\pi}{2}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1$. The interferogram sequence was generated as follows: The k -frame is given as $I_k = b(x, y)\cos(\phi(x, y) + \alpha_k) + \eta(x, y)$, being $\eta(x, y)$ a random field of white noise with mean $\gamma = 0$ and variance $\sigma^2 = 4.84$ radians. The modulation, or contrast term $b(x, y)$, was modeled as a parabola centered at pixel (256, 256) of the image frames with a dynamic range between 1 and 3. The inter-frame phase-shifts were generated as $\alpha_k = \pi + 0.4 \times \varepsilon$, where ε_k is a random scalar with a uniform distribution between $-\pi$ and π radians. Here, we compare our results with the so called Advanced Iterative Algorithm (AIA) presented in Ref. [15] because this method estimates the phase and inter-frame phase-shifts as well, but using other approach. In Table. 1, we show the errors values of the estimated phase-shifts using our regularized method and the estimated using the AIA method. This errors are calculated as $|\alpha_k - \alpha_k|$,

Steps	Proposed Method	AIA Method
0	0	0
1	0.0766	0.0904
2	0.0637	0.7146
3	0.0569	0.7083
4	0.0569	0.5520

Table 2.1: This table shows the error obtained between the phase-shift estimation and the actual phase-shift.




Figure 2.1: Interferogram sequence and the recovered phase. (A) shows the recovered phase and error using the regularized self-tuning method proposed here. (B) shows the recovered phase and error using the AIA method[15]. The error shown (in radians) is the standard deviation respecting the true phase map. The interferogram frames has a size of 512×512 .

where $\hat{\alpha}_k$ and α_k are the values of the estimated and actual phase-shifts for the k -frame, respectively. There we can see that our method estimates the inter-frame phase-shifts with less error. On the other hand, in Fig. 1, we show the interferogram sequence and the recovered phase. Fig. 1.(A) shows the recovered phase using the regularized self-tuning demodulation method presented here, while Fig. 1.(B) shows the recovered phase using the AIA method. We can see in this figure that our proposed regularized self-tuning demodulation method recovers the phase with less noise and error than with the AIA method. The errors shown in Fig. 1.(A) and Fig. 1.(B) are calculated as standard deviation of the difference between the recovered phase map and the true phase map used to generate the interferograms.

2.5 Conclusions

We have presented a regularized self-tuning phase-shifting demodulation method for interferogram sequences having arbitrary variations of the inter-frame phase-shifts. This method is robust to non constant spatial modulations. As shown in the results, our demodulation method is able to filter-out noise, and recover the modulating phase and the inter-frame phase-shifts with a minimum error. The demodulation method presented here is a non-linear demodulation method, however, we innovate the minimization strategy by mixing the steepest-descent update with the Gauss-Seidel update. In this way, we were able to speed up the minimization process and obtain the expected results.

APPENDIX

The iteration updates shown in Eqs. (8), (9) and (10) are given by taking the gradient of (4) and solving in the following way:

$$\varphi^{n+1}(x, y) = \frac{F_r(\varphi^n + i\psi^n, \alpha^n)}{H_r(\alpha^n)} \quad (2.12)$$

$$\psi^{n+1}(x, y) = \frac{F_i(\varphi^n + i\psi^n, \alpha^n)}{H_i(\alpha^n)} \quad (2.13)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_r(\varphi^n + i\psi^n, \alpha^n) &= I_0(x, y) + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} [I_k \cos(\alpha) - \psi(x, y) \sin(\alpha_k) \cos(\alpha_k)] \\ &\quad + \lambda [\varphi(x-1, y)s(x-1, y) + \varphi(x+1, y)s(x+1, y) \\ &\quad + \varphi(x, y-1)s(x, y-1) + \varphi(x, y+1)s(x, y+1)], \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(\varphi^n + i\psi^n, \alpha^n) &= \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} [I_k \cos(\alpha) - \varphi(x, y) \sin(\alpha_k) \cos(\alpha_k)] \\ &\quad + \lambda [\psi(x-1, y)s(x-1, y) + \psi(x+1, y)s(x+1, y) \\ &\quad + \psi(x, y-1)s(x, y-1) + \psi(x, y+1)s(x, y+1)], \end{aligned}$$

$$H_r(\alpha) = \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \cos^2(\alpha_k) + \lambda [s(x-1, y) + s(x+1, y) + s(x, y-1) + s(x, y+1)] \quad (2.16)$$

$$H_i(\alpha) = \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sin^2(\alpha_k) + \lambda[s(x-1, y) + s(x+1, y) + s(x, y-1) + s(x, y+1)] \quad (2.17)$$

The function $s(x_0, y_0)$ is an indicator function that is 1 if the point (x_0, y_0) is into the spatial domain of the interferograms, otherwise it is zero. Now, for the steepest-descent update (the phase-shifts α) the iteration update is:

$$\alpha_0^{n+1} = 0 \quad (2.18)$$

$$\alpha_k^{n+1} = \alpha_k^n - \mu \sum_{\forall(x,y) \in L} [\varphi^n(x, y) \cos(\alpha_k^n) + \psi^n(x, y) \sin(\alpha_k^n) - I_k(x, y)] \quad (2.19)$$

$$[\psi^n(x, y) \cos(\alpha_k^n) - \varphi^n(x, y) \sin(\alpha_k^n)]. \text{ nonumber} \quad (2.20)$$

Note: suppose that α has the inter-frame phase-shifts that minimize (4). Its negative values minimize (4) as well. Then, while minimizing (4) it is possible obtain phase-shift values that looks different to the actual phase-shift values. This is not a problem, since we actually are interested in the modulating phase of the interferograms. However, it is always worth fix the inter-frame phase-shifts obtained in the following way:

$$\hat{\alpha}_k = \begin{cases} \hat{\alpha}_k & \text{if } |\hat{\alpha}_k - \hat{\alpha}_{k-1}| < \pi \\ \hat{\alpha}_k - 2\pi & \text{if } \hat{\alpha}_k - \hat{\alpha}_{k-1} > \pi \\ \hat{\alpha}_k + 2\pi & \text{if } \hat{\alpha}_k - \hat{\alpha}_{k-1} < -\pi \end{cases} \quad (2.21)$$

for $k = 1, 2, 3 \dots N-1$, in order to have our inter-frame phase-shifts within the variation range $(-\pi, \pi)$.

Bibliography

- [1] D. Malacara, M. Servin, and Z. Malacara, *Interferogram Analysis for Optical Testing*(CRC, 2005), 2nd ed.
- [2] K. Freischlad and C. L. Koliopoulos, "Fourier description of digital phase-measuring interferometry," *Journal of the Optical Society of America A* 7, 542 (1990).
- [3] M. Servin, J. C. Estrada, J. A. Quiroga, J. F. Mosino, and M. Cywiak, "Noise in phase shifting interferometry," *Opt. Express* 17, 8789–8794 (2009).
- [4] J. Schwider, R. Burow, K. E. Elssner, J. Grzanna, R. Spolaczyk, and K. Merkel, "Digital wave-front measuring interferometry: some systematic error sources." *Applied optics* 22, 3421 (1983).
- [5] C. Ai and J. C. Wyant, "Effect of piezoelectric transducer nonlinearity on phase shift interferometry," *Appl. Opt.* 26, 1112–1116 (1987).
- [6] K. Larkin, "A self-calibrating phase-shifting algorithm based on the natural demodulation of two-dimensional fringe patterns." *Optics express* 9, 236–253 (2001).
- [7] Y.-Y. Cheng and J. C. Wyant, "Phase shifter calibration in phase-shifting interferometry," *Appl. Opt.* 24, 3049– 3052 (1985).
- [8] W. R. C. Rowley and J. Hamon, "Quelques mesures de dyssymetrie de profils spectraux," *Revue d'Optique* 9, 519–531 (1963).
- [9] P. Carre, "Installation et utilisation du comparateur photoelectrique et interferentiel du Bureau International des Poids et Mesures," *Metrologia* 2, 13–23 (1966).

-
- [10] P. Hariharan, B. F. Oreb, and T. Eiju, “Digital phase-shifting interferometry: a simple error-compensating phase calculation algorithm,” *Appl. Opt.* 26, 2504–2506 (1987).
 - [11] Y. Surrel, “Phase stepping: a new self-calibrating algorithm.” *Applied optics* 32, 3598–3600 (1993).
 - [12] J. C. Estrada, M. Servin, and J. A. Quiroga, “Easy and straightforward construction of wideband phase-shifting algorithms for interferometry,” *Opt. Lett.* 34, 413–415 (2009).
 - [13] G. Lai and T. Yatagai, “Generalized phase-shifting interferometry,” *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A* 8, 822–827 (1991).
 - [14] I.-B. Kong, “General algorithm of phase-shifting interferometry by iterative least-squares fitting,” *Opt. Eng.* 34, 183 (1995).
 - [15] Z. Wang and B. Han, “Advanced iterative algorithm for phase extraction of randomly phase-shifted interferograms,” *Optics letters* 29, 1671–3 (2004).
 - [16] Julio C. Estrada, M. Servin, and J. A. Quiroga, “A self-tuning phase-shifting algorithm for interferometry,” *Opt. Express* 18, 2632–2638 (2010).
 - [17] K. G. Larkin, D. J. Bone, and M. a. Oldfield, “Natural demodulation of two-dimensional fringe patterns. I. General background of the spiral phase quadrature transform.” *J Opt Soc Am A Opt Image Sci Vis* 18, 1862–70 (2001).
 - [18] J. L. Marroquin, J. E. Figueroa, and M. Servin, “Robust quadrature filters,” *Journal of the Optical Society of America A* 14, 779 (1997).
 - [19] J. L. Marroquin, M. Servin, and R. Rodriguez Vera, “Adaptive quadrature filters for multiple phase-stepping images.” *Optics letters* 23, 238–40 (1998).
 - [20] B. Jahne, *Digital Image Processing* (Springer, 2005).
 - [21] J. Nocedal and S. JW, *Numerical Optimization, Operations Research* (Springer, 2006).
 - [22] Orlando Medina and Julio C. Estrada. Source code for Matlab, <https://sites.google.com/site/juliocestradarico/academic-notes/source-code01>

Chapter 3

Removing detuning distortions of wrapped phase by using robust quadrature filters

3.1 abstract

One of the most common and least desirable problems with the demodulated phase in interferometry is the detuning error. Detuning error is the distortion that we obtain when the demodulation algorithm is not well calibrated, or when the object under test is not completely static. In this paper, we propose an interesting method to remove the detuning distortions from the wrapped phase obtained by the uncalibrated phase interferometry demodulation methods. The method presented here takes the local frequencies as a priori knowledge from the wrapped phase, and uses an iterative approach to refine the phase. Here, we show that with this practical strategy we are able to remove detuning distortions from the demodulated wrapped phase. Tests and results from simulated and experimental data will be shown.

3.2 Introduction

In optical interferometry tests, the modulating phase has the information of interest. Therefore, estimating the phase with the least possible error is the most important task in interferometry. However, this is not always possible,

and one of the most common errors of phase interferometry demodulation algorithms (PIDA) is the so-called detuning error [1, 2, 3, 4]. In literature, we can find several works that study and measure the effects of the detuning error and the factors that cause it [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. For example, in phase shifting interferometry, if the object under test is not static or the piezoelectric transducer used to introduce the phase shifts is incorrectly calibrated, the PIDA produces a detuning error. Another example where this detuning error commonly occurs is in dynamic interferometry. In dynamic interferometry, detuning error occurs when we do not have fast enough cameras or high repetition lasers with long coherence lengths, or a combination of both. In the Fourier method, the detuning error is present when the filtering process can not be performed properly, since the carrier is not enough to separate the complex signal in the Fourier domain. Therefore, in general, when the PIDA does not receive the interferogram or interferograms as expected, it recovers a modulating phase with detuning error.

This detuning error is present in the demodulated phase as a low powered signal having twice the frequency than the interferograms under analysis. Mosiño et al. [3] demonstrate that this detuning error can be described by the following expression:

$$\Delta\phi \approx -\frac{\varepsilon}{c} \sin(2\phi), \quad (3.1)$$

where $\Delta\phi$ is the difference between the desired phase ϕ and the erroneous spurious phase ϕ^ε , ε is the erroneous spurious signal that our PIDA does not remove properly, and c is the complex desired signal we want to recover. This detuning effect is graphically shown in the unwrapped phase of Fig. 3.3(a). As we see, the distorted phase has a double frequency component mounted, while the desired unwrapped phase has to look like the one in Fig. 3.3(b). Therefore, removing the detuning error from the wrapped phase without affecting the information is not a trivial problem, and, as far as we know, there is no published work on processing the distorted wrapped phase in order to reduce this detuning error.

Hence, in this paper, we are going to show how we can reduce this detuning error from the demodulated wrapped phase by using a variant of the Robust Quadrature Filters (RQF) [15]. The variant that we implement here is such that the RQF use the gradient of the distorted demodulated wrapped phase as *a priori* local frequency information. As we work with a wrapped phase, the data term of the RQF compares the complex signal of this wrapped phase with the signal that we are expecting to obtain; that

is, the one without distortions. To show the performance of the **phase detuning correction method (PDCM)** presented here, we will present test and results from simulated and experimentally obtained data.




Figure 3.1: Simulated wrapped phase comparison. (a) Synthetic input wrapped phase with detuning error. (b) Recovered wrapped phase map using the proposed PDCM.

3.3 Phase detuning correction method (PDCM)

As we said above, our PDCM uses a specially tuned RQF system to process a complex signal generated by the given demodulated wrapped phase. The energy function of this specially tuned RQF is the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 U(f) = & \sum_{x,y \in L} |f_{x,y} - 2g_{x,y}|^2 + \lambda \sum_{x,y \in L} |f_{x,y} - f_{x-1,y} \exp(\imath u_{x,y})|^2 \\
 & + \lambda \sum_{x,y \in L} |f_{x,y} - f_{x,y-1} \exp(\imath v_{x,y})|^2,
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where $g_{x,y} = \exp(\imath \phi_{x,y}^\varepsilon)$ is the complex signal generated by the demodulated wrapped phase $\phi_{x,y}^\varepsilon$ that we are going to process, $f_{x,y}$ is the independent complex value that minimizes Eq. (3.2) (and hence, the output of our PDCM), λ is the regularization parameter that controls the bandwidth of the quadrature filter, and $u_{x,y}$ and $v_{x,y}$ are the a priori local frequency information obtained from the wrapped phase; that is, $u_{x,y}$ and $v_{x,y}$ are the




Figure 3.2: Comparison between an unwrapped row of the distorted input and the enhanced phase; the dashed line is the unwrapped phase with detuning error, and the solid line is the unwrapped phase processed with the PDCM. Note: The noise had been removed from the original distorted wrapped phase in Fig. 3.1(a) for clarity and comparison purposes.

x and y components of the gradient of $\phi_{x,y}^\varepsilon$. Below, we will show how this prior information is obtained from the wrapped phase $\phi_{x,y}^\varepsilon$. The sums run over all valid sites x, y in L , being L the lattice domain of the demodulated wrapped phase. To minimize Eq. (3.2), one could use any method for solving systems of linear equations; in particular, we use the *Gauss-Seidel* method. Having the complex field \hat{f} that minimizes Eq. (3.2), the refined demodulated wrapped phase is obtained as

$$\hat{\phi}_{x,y} = \angle[\hat{f}_{x,y}]; \quad (3.3)$$

that is, as the angle of the complex signal \hat{f} obtained by the minimization process.

The new wrapped phase $\hat{\phi}$, estimated with Eq. (3.3), is an improved version of our input wrapped phase ϕ^ε ; i.e., the detuning error has been lessened. If we use this process recursively, we can refine the wrapped phase until we obtain an almost error free enhanced wrapped phase. Using this approach, we ensure that the new calculated phase is almost free of detuning errors. Then, this recursive process can be given as:




Figure 3.3: Unwrapped simulated phase comparison of Fig. 3.1. (a) Shows the unwrapped phase with detuning error of Fig. 3.1(a). (b) Shows the recovered unwrapped phase of Fig. 3.1(b) after using the proposed PDCM. Note: The noise had been removed from the original distorted wrapped phase in Fig. 3.1(a) for clarity and comparison purposes.

- 1.- Estimate local frequencies u and v taking the wrapped gradient of the input wrapped phase ϕ^ε [Eqs. (3.6) and (3.7)].
- 2.- Take \hat{f} that minimizes Eq. (3.2) using u , v and $g = \exp(\imath\phi^\varepsilon)$ as data input.
- 3.- Calculate an enhanced ϕ using \hat{f} with Eq. (3.3).
- 4.- Recalculate local frequencies u and v with the new wrapped phase ϕ .
- 5.- Repeat steps 2 to 4 until a desired convergence point.

This convergence point can be given as the relative error between the former and the new wrapped phases in the following way:

$$\varepsilon = \sum_{x,y} |\phi_{x,y}^+ - \phi_{x,y}^-|, \quad (3.4)$$

where $\phi_{x,y}^+$ and $\phi_{x,y}^-$ are the wrapped phases obtained in the current and previous iterations, respectively. At the end of this iterative process, the new wrapped phase ϕ will be a wrapped phase without detuning distortions and without noise.

3.4 A priori local frequency calculation

Since in order to calculate the local frequencies we have a wrapped phase, we can not use finite differences directly due to the 2π phase jumps of the

wrapped phase. To estimate the local frequencies correctly, we propose taking the gradient in an explicit way from the complex field as follows:

$$\nabla \phi_{x,y} = \nabla \left[\arctan \left(\frac{\sin \phi_{x,y}}{\cos \phi_{x,y}} \right) \right]. \quad (3.5)$$

Therefore, differentiating Eq. (3.5) and simplifying, we obtain the following mathematical expression for local frequencies $u_{x,y}$ as

$$u_{x,y} = \frac{\sin \phi \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \cos \phi - \cos \phi \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \sin \phi}{\cos^2 \phi + \sin^2 \phi}, \quad (3.6)$$

and in a similar way, the local frequencies $v_{x,y}$ are estimated as follows

$$v_{x,y} = \frac{\sin \phi \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \cos \phi - \cos \phi \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \sin \phi}{\cos^2 \phi + \sin^2 \phi}. \quad (3.7)$$

The spatial dependence of the input wrapped phase map was omitted for clarity in the notation. The partial differentials $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \phi_{x,y}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \phi_{x,y}$ of Eqs. (3.6) and (3.7) are calculated as finite differences as follows

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \cos \phi_{x,y} = \cos \phi_{x,y} - \cos \phi_{x+1,y}, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \sin \phi_{x,y} = \sin \phi_{x,y} - \sin \phi_{x,y+1}. \quad (3.9)$$

It is important to note that on the borders, it is not possible to calculate the frequencies as Eqs. (3.8) and (3.9) propose; for this reason, we propose using the value of a correctly calculated adjacent local frequency.

3.5 Tests and experimental examples

To verify the efficiency of the PDCM, we simulated four interferograms of 256×256 pixels with phase shifts of $\pi/5$, and demodulated them with a 4- step algorithm tuned at $\pi/2$. In Fig. 3.1(a), we can see the distorted wrapped phase map obtained by the PIDA. The phase was simulated using the peaks function of Matlab. Using this distorted wrapped phase map and the proposed PDCM, we obtain the enhanced wrapped phase map displayed in Fig. 3.1(b). As it can be seen, the detuning distortions have been notably reduced as well as noise. To obtain the result in Fig. 3.1(b), the regularized parameter λ of the energy function of Eq. (3.2) was $\lambda = 5$, and the number




Figure 3.4: Experimental wrapped phase comparison. (a) Shows the experimental input wrapped phase with detuning error. (b) Shows the recovered wrapped phase map using the proposed PDCM.

of iterations of the algorithm described above was 10. The computational time for this phase estimation was 0.3932 seconds, in a PC with an Intel Core i7 processor and 8 GB RAM memory. To minimize Eq. (3.2), we used the Gauss-Seidel method. For clarity and comparison purposes, in Fig. 3.2 we plot the central row of both unwrapped phases without noise; the dashed curve is the erroneous phase, while in the solid curve, we have the corrected phase map. This graph lets us see that the detuning error has been fairly lessened. For best viewing, Fig. 3.3 shows both unwrapped phases. Fig. 3.3(a) is the unwrapped phase with the detuning error shown in Fig. 3.1(a), while Fig. 3.3(b) shows the unwrapped phase obtained using the proposed PDCM. For clarity and comparison purposes of the detuning distortion, the noise was removed from the unwrapped phase shown in Fig. 3.3(a).

Finally, we show the performance in an experimental wrapped phase map. This experimental wrapped phase map corresponds to a vibration mode of a latex membrane excited with a horn at 1.6 kHz and with an amplitude of 1.8 V [Fig. 3.4(a)]. Given that the object was vibrating during the capture, it was not possible to correctly tune up the phase shift steps to $\pi/2$; as a consequence, the four step algorithm obtains a distorted wrapped phase map caused by the detuning. This distorted wrapped phase map is shown in Fig. 3.4(a). In Fig. 3.4(b), we show the performance of the proposed PDCM. The processing time for this phase estimation was 1.3447




Figure 3.5: Comparison between an unwrapped row of the distorted input and the enhanced phase; the dashed line is the phase with detuning error, and the solid line is the phase processed by the PDCM.

seconds using the same PC described above. As well as shown in the simulations, in Fig. 3.5 we can see the central row of both unwrapped phases. As it is evident, the noise was removed and detuning distortions have almost disappeared.

3.6 Discussion and commentaries

Accuracy of the wave-front estimation is the most important issue in optical tests. When using phase interferometry techniques, estimation accuracy depends on the stability of the object under test and the right calibration of the phase interferometry set-up. When the wave-front under test is moving, be it because of environmental perturbations or its own nature, and / or the phase interferometry set-up is not properly calibrated, PIDA introduce an unavoidable detuning error. Previous to this work, as far as we know, all PIDA have done their best to avoid this detuning error by means of applying different strategies; instead of that, here we present a method to process the distorted wrapped phase in order to reduce the detuning distortions introduced by the PIDA.

As shown in the results of this paper, the presented PDCM considerably removes detuning errors using the gradient of the distorted wrapped phase as a priori information about the local frequencies, generating a complex signal

with the demodulated wrapped phase, and processing it with a variant of the RQF to obtain a more refined demodulated wrapped phase. This process of refinement is carried out using the linear system of Eq. (3.2) iteratively. The proposed system looks very similar to the one used in [15], but there are differences in the proposal of this paper. Instead of using a global carrier for the entire image as in [15], here, each pixel has its own frequency, in a way that the filter is locally tuned. The functional in [15] is non-linear, while the proposed functional [Eq. (3.2)] is a linear system. Another difference is that the proposed functional is constructed using the demodulated wrapped phase and its local frequencies as a priori information. These two differences result in a stable method that converges in a few iterations.

Note that using Eqs. (3.6) and (3.7), it is not necessary to unwrap the phase map to calculate the local frequencies u and v . This way of calculating the local frequencies on each iteration speeds up the global process.

Summing up, we have presented a method capable of reducing the detuning distortions of the demodulated wrapped phase from the PIDA. This method is an iterative process that uses the distorted wrapped phase and its local frequencies as a priori information. This method is stable and converges after a few iterations. The main contribution of the presented method is that it is capable of removing detuning distortions without eliminating wrapped phase information, which is very hard to do with simple low-pass filters. As it is evident in the results, the proposed method obtains a smooth wrapped phase map with very attenuated detuning distortions. The practical use of this method is that it allows one to avoid complex PIDA in order to obtain a wrapped phase fairly free of detuning distortions, or even avoid the need to recalibrate and repeat the optical set-up.

3.7 Appendix. Local frequency calculation in presence of noise

In presence of noise in our input wrapped phase, the local frequencies could be erroneously calculated given that Eqs. 3.6 and 3.7 are essentially high pass filters. For example, Fig. 3.7 is the output of our proposed PDCM when the local frequencies are miscalculated. As we can notice, the detuning distortion and the noise were removed, but the recovered wrapped phase has certain spurious errors product of the miscalculated local frequencies. To avoid this problem, we propose applying a low-pass filter to our noisy input wrapped phase. It is important to say that if we apply the low-pass filter directly to our wrapped phase, we will lose fringe phase information. For




Figure 3.6: Recovered wrapped phase using the proposed PDCM with miscalculated frequencies.

this reason, we propose filtering the wrapped phase as follows:

$$\hat{\phi} = \arctan \left[\frac{\sin(\phi^\eta) * h}{\cos(\phi^\eta) * h} \right], \quad (3.10)$$

where $*$ is the convolution operator, h is a low-pass convolution kernel, ϕ^η is the noisy wrapped phase, and $\hat{\phi}$ is the filtered wrapped phase, both with detuning distortions; this way of doing the filtering allows us to keep the 2π jumps in our wrapped phase map. In Fig. 3.7 we show the difference between these two approaches. Fig. 3.7(a) is the result of applying the low-pass filter directly to our noisy wrapped phase in Fig. 3.1(a), while Fig. 3.7(b) is the outcome of filtering using Eq. 3.10. As it can be seen, using the proposed approach we are able to maintain the 2π jumps, and therefore, the fringe phase information.

It is important to note that this process does not affect the phase information, given that the enhanced wrapped phase is calculated using the original noisy wrapped phase map. Also and more important, the local frequencies are a signal with very small variations, whereas the noise signal is the opposite.

After having removed the noise from the noisy wrapped phase, the local frequencies can be correctly calculated. To illustrate, Fig. 3.7 shows a sequence of the calculation of three different local frequencies during the wrapped phase refinement process.




Figure 3.7: Wrapped phase comparison after applying a low-pass filter to the noisy wrapped phase in Fig. 3.1(a). (a) Shows the result of applying a gaussian filter directly to our wrapped phase, while in (b) we see the result of applying Eq. 3.10.




Figure 3.8: Example of the frequency change along the refinement process of the distorted wrapped phase. For this sequence, we show the $u(x, y)$ frequency calculation using Eq. 3.6.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the financial support of the Mexican Science Council CONACYT.

References

Bibliography

- [1] D. Malacara, M. Servin, and Z. Malacara, *Interferogram Analysis for Optical Testing* (Taylor & Francis, CRC, 2005).
- [2] M. Servin, J. C. Estrada, and J. A. Quiroga, "The general theory of phase shifting algorithms," *Opt. Express* **17**(24), 21867-21881 (2009)
- [3] J. Mosiño, M. Servin, J. Estrada, and J. Quiroga, "Phasorial analysis of detuning error in temporal phase shifting algorithms," *Opt. Express* **17**, 5618-5623 (2009).
- [4] M. Servin, J. Antonio Quiroga and M. Padilla, *Fringe Pattern Analysis for Optical Metrology: Theory, Algorithms and Applications*, (Wiley-VCH, 2014).
- [5] J. E. Hernández and D. Malacara, "Exact linear detuning error in phase shifting algorithms," *Opt. comm.* **180**, 9-14 (2000).
- [6] M. Servin, and M. Kujawinska, *Modern fringe pattern analysis in Interferometry* in Handbook of Optical Engineering, D. Malacara and B. J. Thompson eds., (Marcel Dekker, 2001).
- [7] D. Malacara, M. Servin, and Z. Malacara, *Phase Detection Algorithms, in Interferogram Analysis for Optical Testing*, D. Malacara ed., (Taylor & Francis Group, 2005).
- [8] J. Mosiño, D. Doblado, and D. Hernández, "Calculus of exact detuning phase shift error in temporal phase shifting algorithms," *Opt. Express* **17**, 15766-15771 (2009).
- [9] H. Schreiber and J. H. Brunning, *Phase shifting interferometry, in Optical Shop Testing*, D. Malacara ed., (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey 2007).

-
- [10] J. Van Wingerden, H. Frankena, and C. Smorenburg, "Linear approximation for measurement errors in phase shifting interferometry," *Appl. Opt.* **30**, 2718-2729 (1991)
 - [11] P. Groot, "Phase-shift calibration errors in interferometers with spherical Fizeau cavities," *Appl. Opt.* **34**, 2856-2863 (1995)
 - [12] J. Schmit and K. Creath, "Extended averaging technique for derivation of error-compensating algorithms in phase-shifting interferometry," *Appl. Opt.* **34**(19), 3610-3619 (1995).
 - [13] B. Gutmann and H. Weber, "Phase-Shifter Calibration and Error Detection in Phase-Shifting Applications: A New Method," *Appl. Opt.* **37**, 7624-7631 (1998).
 - [14] M. Servin, J. C. Estrada, and J. A. Quiroga, "Spectral analysis of phase shifting algorithms," *Opt. Express* **17**(19), 16423-16428 (2009).
 - [15] J. Marroquin, J. Figueroa, and M. Servin, "Robust quadrature filters," *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A* **14**, 779-791 (1997) doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1364/JOSAA.14.000779>.