

# Semiclassical Theory of Superresolution for Two Incoherent Optical Point Sources

Mankei Tsang,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> Ranjith Nair,<sup>1</sup> and Xiao-Ming Lu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering,*

*National University of Singapore, 4 Engineering Drive 3, Singapore 117583*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, National University of Singapore, 2 Science Drive 3, Singapore 117551*

(Dated: March 7, 2022)

Using a semiclassical model of photodetection with Poissonian noise and insights from quantum metrology, we prove that linear optics and photon counting can optimally estimate the separation between two incoherent point sources without regard to Rayleigh's criterion. The model is applicable to weak thermal or fluorescent sources as well as lasers.

Lord Rayleigh suggested in 1879 that two incoherent optical point sources should be separated by a diffraction-limited spot size for them to be resolved [1]. This criterion has since become the most influential measure of imaging resolution. Under the modern advent of rigorous statistics and image processing, Rayleigh's criterion remains a curse. When the image is noisy, necessarily so owing to the quantum nature of light [2], and Rayleigh's criterion is violated, it becomes much more difficult to estimate the separation accurately by conventional imaging methods [3–5]. Modern superresolution techniques in microscopy [6–8] can circumvent Rayleigh's criterion by making sources radiate in isolation, but such techniques require careful control of the fluorescent emissions, making them difficult to use for microscopy and irrelevant to astronomy.

Here we show that, contrary to conventional wisdom, the separation between two incoherent optical sources can be estimated accurately via linear optics and photon counting (LOPC) even if Rayleigh's criterion is severely violated. Our theoretical model here is based on the semiclassical theory of photodetection with Poissonian noise, which is a widely accepted statistical model for lasers [2] as well as weak thermal [9, 10] or fluorescent [5, 11] light in astronomy and microscopy. The semiclassical model is consistent with the quantum model proposed in Ref. [12] for weak incoherent sources and the mathematical formalisms are similar, but the semiclassical model has the advantage of being applicable also to lasers, which are important sources for remote-sensing, testing, and proof-of-concept experiments. The semiclassical theory also avoids a quantum description of light and offers a more pedagogical perspective. Compared with the full semiclassical theory in Ref. [13], the Poissonian model is invalid for strong thermal sources but more analytically tractable.

Consider  $J$  optical modes and a column vector of complex field amplitudes  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_J)^\top$  within one coherence time interval. The amplitudes are normalized such that  $|\alpha_j|^2$  is equal to the energy in each mode in units of quanta. The central quantity in statistical optics is the mutual coherence matrix [2, 9]

$$\Gamma \equiv \mathbb{E}(\alpha\alpha^\dagger), \quad (1)$$

where  $\dagger$  denotes the complex transpose and  $\mathbb{E}$  denotes the statistical expectation. We also define  $\varepsilon \equiv \mathbb{E}(\alpha^\dagger\alpha) = \text{tr}\Gamma$  as the

mean total energy,  $\text{tr}$  as the trace, and

$$g \equiv \frac{\Gamma}{\text{tr}\Gamma} \quad (2)$$

as the correlation matrix.  $g$  is positive-semidefinite with unit trace and typically called  $g^{(1)}$  in statistical optics.

Suppose that we process the optical fields with lossless passive linear optics, the input-output relations of which are characterized by a unitary scattering matrix  $F$ . The output mutual coherence matrix becomes  $F\Gamma F^\dagger$  [2, 9]. The average energy in the  $j$ th output optical mode accumulated over  $M$  coherence intervals is the  $j$ th diagonal component of  $F\Gamma F^\dagger$  times  $M$ , which can be written as

$$\bar{n}_j = M e_j^\dagger F \Gamma F^\dagger e_j = N p_j, \quad N \equiv M\varepsilon, \quad p_j \equiv \text{tr}\Pi_j g, \quad (3)$$

where  $e_j$  is a column unit vector with  $e_{jk} = \delta_{jk}$ ,  $N$  is the average total energy,  $p_j$  is a normalized output energy distribution with  $\sum_j p_j = 1$ , and  $\Pi_j = F^\dagger e_j e_j^\dagger F$  is a projection measure with the completeness property  $\sum_j \Pi_j = I$ ,  $I$  being the identity matrix.

Consider photodetection at the output modes. Assume that the probability distribution of the  $n \equiv (n_1, \dots, n_J)^\top$  photoelectrons is Poissonian:

$$P(n) = \prod_j \exp(-\bar{n}_j) \frac{\bar{n}_j^{n_j}}{n_j!}. \quad (4)$$

This is the standard shot-noise model for weak thermal [9, 10] or fluorescent [5, 11] sources with  $\varepsilon \ll 1$ , in which case it is also consistent with the quantum model in Ref. [12]. Bunching or antibunching effects would lead to slightly non-Poissonian statistics, but they are negligible for typical sources [2, 9, 10]. Beyond weak sources, the Poissonian model is also applicable to ideal lasers with arbitrary  $\varepsilon$  [2]. This is convenient not only for laser sensing applications, but also for testing and proof-of-concept purposes in telescopy and microscopy.

Suppose that  $g$  depends on a vector of unknown parameters  $\theta \equiv (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_R)^\top$ . Given a measurement record  $n$ , define the estimator vector as  $\check{\theta}(n)$  and the mean-square-error matrix as  $\Sigma \equiv \mathbb{E}(\check{\theta} - \theta)(\check{\theta} - \theta)^\top$ , where the expectation is with respect to  $P(n)$ . The Cramér-Rao bound is given by the matrix

inequality [14]

$$\Sigma \geq \mathcal{J}^{-1}, \quad \mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu} \equiv \sum_n \frac{1}{P(n)} \frac{\partial P(n)}{\partial \theta_\mu} \frac{\partial P(n)}{\partial \theta_\nu}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{J}$  is the Fisher information matrix. For the Poissonian model given by Eq. (4), the matrix can be significantly simplified as

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu} = \sum_j \frac{1}{\bar{n}_j} \frac{\partial \bar{n}_j}{\partial \theta_\mu} \frac{\partial \bar{n}_j}{\partial \theta_\nu} = N \sum_j \frac{1}{p_j} \frac{\partial p_j}{\partial \theta_\mu} \frac{\partial p_j}{\partial \theta_\nu}. \quad (6)$$

Notice that Eq. (6) has the same expression as the Fisher information with respect to a probability distribution. Since  $p_j$  can be expressed in terms of a projection measure  $\Pi_j$  and a unit-trace positive-semidefinite matrix  $g$  according to Eq. (3), we can borrow the mathematical formalism from quantum metrology [15, 16] to write immediately

$$\mathcal{J} \leq \mathcal{H}(g), \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu} \equiv N \text{Re tr} \mathcal{L}_\mu \mathcal{L}_\nu g, \quad \frac{\partial g}{\partial \theta_\mu} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{L}_\mu g + g \mathcal{L}_\mu), \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}(g)$  is the Helstrom-Fisher information matrix in terms of  $g$ . This upper bound quantifies the maximum information that can be extracted from the light source via any LOPC with Poissonian noise. A connection with the quantum model in Ref. [12] can be made by observing that the one-photon density matrix in the quantum model is approximately  $g$  under the  $\varepsilon \ll 1$  assumption, although the quantum description and the  $\varepsilon \ll 1$  assumption are unnecessary here, as long as the Poissonian model holds. This demonstrates the power of quantum metrology for an essentially classical problem.

The rest of the theory is almost the same as that in Ref. [12] mathematically, with identical physical conclusions. Taking the continuous-space limit for a one-dimensional image plane,  $g$  becomes the correlation function  $g(x, x')$  with normalization  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx g(x, x) = 1$ , and the intensity distribution for direct imaging is  $N g(x, x)$ . For a diffraction-limited point-spread function  $\psi(x)$  and two point sources at  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  with random relative phase,  $g(x, x') = [\psi(x - X_1) \psi^*(x' - X_1) + \psi(x - X_2) \psi^*(x' - X_2)]/2$ . In terms of the separation parameter  $\theta_2 = X_2 - X_1$ ,  $\mathcal{J}_{22}^{(\text{direct})}$  for direct imaging suffers from Rayleigh's curse and approaches zero for  $\theta_2 \rightarrow 0$  [3–5]. Meanwhile, the Helstrom-Fisher information  $\mathcal{H}_{22}$  is constant for a real  $\psi(x)$  and given by  $\mathcal{H}_{22} = N \Delta k^2$ , with  $\Delta k^2$  being the momentum-space variance of  $\psi(x)$ .

Assuming a Gaussian  $\psi(x)$  with width  $\sigma = 1/(2\Delta k)$ , spatial-mode demultiplexing (SPADE) of the image-plane fields in the Hermite-Gaussian modes leads to  $\mathcal{J}_{22}^{(\text{HG})} = N/(4\sigma^2) = \mathcal{H}_{22}$ , which overcomes Rayleigh's curse and attains the maximal information. Figure 1 compares the Cramér-Rao bounds for SPADE and direct imaging, demonstrating the substantial improvements deliverable by SPADE. The other discussions and simulations in Ref. [12] concerning binary SPADE, maximum-likelihood estimation, and misalignment remain valid here. The formalism is also applicable

to the SLIVER scheme in Ref. [13], meaning that the scheme must also work for incoherent laser sources, and generalizable to any parameter estimation problem.

This work is supported by the Singapore National Research Foundation under NRF Grant No. NRF-NRFF2011-07.




FIG. 1. Cramér-Rao bounds for SPADE and direct imaging with a Gaussian point-spread function.

\* mankei@nus.edu.sg

- [1] L. Rayleigh, *Philosophical Magazine Series 5* **8**, 261 (1879).
- [2] L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995).
- [3] E. Bettens, D. Van Dyck, A. J. den Dekker, J. Sijbers, and A. van den Bos, *Ultramicroscopy* **77**, 37 (1999).
- [4] S. Van Aert, A. J. den Dekker, D. Van Dyck, and A. van den Bos, *Journal of Structural Biology* **138**, 21 (2002).
- [5] S. Ram, E. S. Ward, and R. J. Ober, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **103**, 4457 (2006).
- [6] S. W. Hell, *Science* **316**, 1153 (2007).
- [7] E. Betzig, G. H. Patterson, R. Sougrat, O. W. Lindwasser, S. Olenych, J. S. Bonifacino, M. W. Davidson, J. Lippincott-Schwartz, and H. F. Hess, *Science* **313**, 1642 (2006).
- [8] W. E. Moerner, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **104**, 12596 (2007).
- [9] J. W. Goodman, *Statistical Optics* (Wiley, New York, 1985).
- [10] A. Labeyrie, S. G. Lipson, and P. Nisenson, *An Introduction to Optical Stellar Interferometry* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006).
- [11] J. B. Pawley, ed., *Handbook of Biological Confocal Microscopy* (Springer, New York, 2006).
- [12] M. Tsang, R. Nair, and X.-M. Lu, ArXiv e-prints (2015), [arXiv:1511.00552](https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.00552) [quant-ph].
- [13] R. Nair and M. Tsang, *Opt. Express* **24**, 3684 (2016).
- [14] H. L. Van Trees, *Detection, Estimation, and Modulation Theory, Part I*. (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2001).
- [15] C. W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
- [16] M. Hayashi, ed., *Asymptotic Theory of Quantum Statistical Inference: Selected Papers* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2005).