Analysis and improvement of direct sampling method in mono-static configuration
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Abstract

The recently introduced non-iterative imaging method entitled "direct sampling method" (DSM) [1] is known to be fast, robust, and effective for inverse scattering problems in the multi-static configuration but fails when applied to the mono-static one. To the best of our knowledge no explanation of this failure has been provided yet. Thanks to the framework of the asymptotic and the far-field hypothesis in the 2D scalar configuration an analytical expression of the DSM indicator function in terms of the Bessel function of order zero and sizes, shapes and permittivities of the inhomogeneities is obtained and the theoretical reason of the limitation identified. A modified version of DSM is then proposed in order to improve the imaging method. The theoretical results are supported by numerical results using synthetic data.
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1. Introduction

The 2D inverse scattering problem is an important topic due to its potential applications in modern human life [2, 3, 4, 5]. However, because of its inherent non-linearity and ill-posedness, it is difficult to solve. Among the various imaging methods, the non-iterative type algorithm is one of significant families due to its numerical simplicity, low computational cost. For example, MUltiple SIgnal Classification (MUSIC), linear sampling method (LSM), topological derivative, Kirchhoff migration, direct sampling method (DSM), etc. Related works can be found in [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. Even though these methods can provide good results with multi-static data, they may fail with mono-static ones due to lack of information arising from its inherent limitation. However, since the mono-static configuration is of great interest in various applications such as ground-penetrating radar (GPR), synthetic-aperture radar (SAR), etc., a deep understanding and development of effective algorithms is still needed.

In the present work, we focus only on DSM in the mono-static configuration because of its various advantages such that (i) it only need a few (e.g. one or two) incident fields, and (ii) it does not need any additional operation (singular value decomposition, defining an orthogonal projection operator and solving ill-posed linear integral equations, etc.). We refer to [1, 2] for details. Though, a new intuitive indicator function of DSM in the mono-static configuration has already been proposed in [12], no theoretical explanation...
has been given yet to explain the failure of the classical DSM approach for the mono-static configuration. Recently, the authors have investigated the mathematical structure of the DSM indicator function in the multi-static configuration using near-field data, proposed an improved version and confirmed its linkage with the classical Kirchhoff migration technique [13, 14]. Following a similar path but under the far-field hypothesis the mathematical structure of the indicator functions of DSM based on the asymptotic formula of the scattered fields is proposed and the limitation of traditional DSM in the mono-static configuration is identified. According to our analysis, a new indicator function of the direct sampling method is proposed and analyzed in order to retrieve the exact location of the targets in mono-static configuration.

In § 2, the 2D direct scattering problem and its far-field pattern are presented. Traditional DSM with far-field pattern and its application to the mono-static configuration are introduced in § 3. § 4 is dedicated to the mono-static configuration, the mathematical structure of DSM being shown and the modified DSM (MDSM) proposed. Numerical simulations illustrating our theoretical results are presented in § 5. Conclusions and perspectives follows in § 6.

2. Two-dimensional direct scattering problem and far-field pattern

In this section, the two-dimensional direct scattering problem (Fig. 1(a)) is sketched in the presence of a set of small dielectric inhomogeneities. We denote \( \tau_m \) a small dielectric inhomogeneity defined as \( \tau_m = r_m + \alpha_m \mathbf{D}_m \), where \( r_m \) is the location of \( \tau_m \), \( \mathbf{D}_m \) its simply connected domain with smooth boundary and \( \alpha_m \) its characteristic size (Fig. 1(b)). We denote \( \tau = \bigcup_{m=1}^{M} \tau_m \), \( M \) a collection of \( \tau_m \) and \( \Omega \) the region of interest (ROI) such that \( \tau_m \subset \Omega \) for all \( m \). We assume that \( \tau_m \) are well-separated small balls with radius \( \alpha_m \), i.e., there exists \( d_0 \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( 0 < d_0 < |r_m - r_{m'}| \) for all \( m \neq m', m = 1, 2, \cdots, M \).

Here, we assume that every material is non-magnetic (\( \mu_m \equiv \mu_0 \), \( \mu_0 \) being the \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) permeability) and is characterized by its dielectric permittivity at the angular frequency of operation \( \omega \). Let \( \varepsilon_m \) and \( \varepsilon_0 \) be the electrical permittivity of \( \tau_m \) and \( \mathbb{R}^2 \), respectively. The following piecewise constant electrical permittivity at \( \omega \) is then defined:

\[
\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) := \begin{cases} 
\varepsilon_m & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \tau_m, \\
\varepsilon_0 & \text{for } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \tau.
\end{cases}
\]

Let \( k_0 = \omega \sqrt{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0} = 2\pi/\lambda \) be the wavenumber with positive wavelength \( \lambda \), satisfying \( \alpha_m \sqrt{\varepsilon_m/\varepsilon_0} \ll \lambda/2 \) for all \( m = 1, 2, \cdots, M \), refer to [15].

In this contribution, the incident field is defined as a plane-wave, i.e., \( u'(\mathbf{x}) = e^{ik_0 \hat{d} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \) with a direction of propagation \( \hat{d} \in S^1 \), where \( S^1 \) denotes the two-dimensional unit circle. Let \( u(\mathbf{x}, \hat{d}) \) be the time-harmonic total field that satisfies the Helmholtz equation

\[
\Delta u(\mathbf{x}, \hat{d}) + \omega^2 \mu_0 \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) u(\mathbf{x}, \hat{d}) = 0
\]
with transmission conditions at the boundaries \( \partial \tau_m \). The total field is expressed as the sum of the incident field \( u^i(x, \hat{d}) \) and the scattered field \( u^s(x, \hat{d}) \), where \( u^i(x, \hat{d}) \) is required to satisfy the Sommerfeld radiation condition

\[
\lim_{|x| \to \infty} \sqrt{|x|} \left( \frac{\partial u^i(x, \hat{d})}{\partial |x|} - i k_0 u^i(x, \hat{d}) \right) = 0
\]

equally into all directions \( \hat{x} = x/|x| \). We denote \( u_\infty(\hat{x}, \hat{d}) \) the far-field pattern of \( u^s(x, \hat{d}) \) defined on \( S^1 \) that satisfies

\[
u^s(x, \hat{d}) = \frac{\epsilon_{i\hat{d}x} \hat{x}}{|x|} \left[ u_\infty(\hat{x}, \hat{d}) + O \left( \frac{1}{|x|} \right) \right]
\]
equally into all directions \( \hat{x} = x/|x| \) and \( |x| \to \infty \). Based on \( [16] \), \( u_\infty(\hat{x}, \hat{d}) \) can be represented as

\[
u_\infty(\hat{x}, \hat{d}) = \frac{k_0^2(1 + i)}{4\sqrt{|x|}} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \alpha_m^2 \left( \frac{\epsilon_m - \epsilon_0}{\sqrt{\epsilon_m \mu_0}} \right) |D_m| e^{i\hat{d} \cdot \hat{x} - \alpha_m} + O(\alpha_m^2).
\]

Note that in the mono-static configuration (Figure [1]) we have \( \hat{x} = -\hat{d} \).

3. Introduction of direct sampling method and its application in mono-static configuration

According to \([3]\), the DSM indicator with far-field data \( \mathcal{F} = \{ u_\infty(\hat{x}_n, \hat{d}) : n = 1, 2, \cdots, N \} \) for fixed incident direction \( \hat{d} \) is defined by

\[
I_{DSM}(\mathbf{z}, \hat{d}) := \frac{|\langle u_\infty(\hat{x}_n, \hat{d}), e^{-ik_0 \hat{x}_n \cdot \mathbf{z}} \rangle|_{L^2(S^1)}}{|\langle u_\infty(\hat{x}_n, \hat{d}) \rangle|_{L^2(S^1)}|e^{-ik_0 \hat{x}_n \cdot \mathbf{z}}|_{L^2(S^1)}}
\]

where

\[
(\langle a(\hat{x}_n), b(\hat{x}_n) \rangle)_{L^2(S^1)} := \sum_{n=1}^{N} a(\hat{x}_n)b(\hat{x}_n) \approx \int_{S^1} a(\hat{x}) \overline{b(\hat{x})} d\hat{x} \quad \text{and} \quad \|a(\hat{x}_n)\|_{L^2(S^1)} := \langle a(\hat{x}_n), a(\hat{x}_n) \rangle_{L^2(S^1)}.
\]

Based on \([14]\) Theorem 4.1 and its proof \( I_{DSM}(\mathbf{z}, \hat{d}) \) can be represented by

\[
I_{DSM}(\mathbf{z}, \hat{d}) := \frac{\|\psi_1(\mathbf{z}, \hat{d})\|}{\max_{\mathbf{z} \in \Omega} \|\psi_1(\mathbf{z}, \hat{d})\|}, \quad \text{where} \quad \psi_1(\mathbf{z}, \hat{d}) := \sum_{m=1}^{M} \alpha_m^2 (\epsilon_m - \epsilon_0) e^{ik_0 \hat{d} \cdot \mathbf{r}_m} J_0(k_0 |\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{r}_m|).
\]

Thanks to \([3]\) we can observe that \( I_{DSM}(\mathbf{z}) \) exhibits a maximum when \( \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{r}_m \) and \( 0 < I_{DSM}(\mathbf{z}) < 1 \) at \( \mathbf{z} \notin \tau \) so that the location \( \mathbf{r}_m \) of \( \tau_m \) is identified. For multiple impinging directions \( L \), the indicator function \( I_{DSM}(\mathbf{z}) \) is defined by

\[
I_{DSM}(\mathbf{z}) := \max \left\{ I_{DSM}(\mathbf{z}, \hat{d}_l) \mid \hat{d}_l \mid \mathbf{z} \in \Omega \right\},
\]

where \( I_{DSM}(\mathbf{z}, \hat{d}_l) \) is the indicator function for the direction of incident field \( \hat{d}_l \), as defined in \([2]\). Note that \([4]\) is equivalent to \([2]\) if \( L = 1 \).

According to \([12]\), the direct sampling method was applied with far-field mono-static \( \mathcal{F}_{mono} = \{ u_\infty(\hat{x}_n, \hat{d}_n) : n = 1, 2, \cdots, N \} \), \( \hat{d}_n = -\hat{x}_n \) such that

\[
I_{DSM}(\mathbf{z}) := \frac{|\langle u_\infty(\hat{x}_n, \hat{d}_n), e^{-ik_0 \hat{x}_n \cdot \mathbf{z}} \rangle|_{L^2(S^1)}}{|\langle u_\infty(\hat{x}_n, \hat{d}_n) \rangle|_{L^2(S^1)}|e^{-ik_0 \hat{x}_n \cdot \mathbf{z}}|_{L^2(S^1)}}.
\]

However, it fails to provide a proper localization of the defect (see Fig. [2]) via \( I_{DSM}^{mono}(\mathbf{z}) \). In the next section the theoretical reason of this miss-localization is proposed and a modified version of the DSM is introduced.
4. Analysis and improvement of direct sampling method in mono-static configuration

Let us analyze the indicator function $T_{\text{DSM}}^{\text{mono}}(z)$ to explain the inaccurate localization in mono-static configuration.

**Theorem 4.1.** Assume that the total number $N$ of incident and observation directions is sufficiently large. Then, $T_{\text{DSM}}^{\text{mono}}(z)$ can be represented as:

$$T_{\text{DSM}}^{\text{mono}}(z) \approx \frac{\left|\Psi_1(z)\right|}{\max_{z \in \Omega} \left|\Psi_1(z)\right|}, \quad \text{where} \quad \Psi_1(z) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \alpha_m^2 (\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_0) |D_m| |J_0(k_0|2r_m - z)|. \quad (6)$$

**Proof.** By combining (1) with (2), we can evaluate

$$\langle u_\infty(\hat{x}_n, \hat{d}_n), e^{-ik_0\hat{x}_n \cdot z} \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)} \approx \frac{k_0^2 (1 + i)}{4 \sqrt{k_0 \pi}} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \alpha_m^2 \frac{(\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_0)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0}} |D_m| \left(\sum_{n=1}^{N} e^{-ik_0x_n (2r_m - z)} \right) \approx \frac{k_0^2 (1 + i)}{2 \sqrt{k_0 \pi}} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \alpha_m^2 \frac{(\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_0)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0}} |D_m| |J_0(k_0|2r_m - z)|. \quad (7)$$

To go from (7) to (8) the following relation which stands for $N$ large enough has been used (see [11])

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} e^{ik_0x_n \cdot z} \approx \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} e^{ik_0x \cdot z} d\mathbf{x} \approx 2\pi J_0(k_0|z|).$$

Finally, applying Hölder’s inequality, leads to (6) which completes the proof. \hfill \Box

$T_{\text{DSM}}^{\text{mono}}(z)$ \text{(6)} shows that DSM within the mono-static configuration is no longer proportional to $|J_0(k_0|2r_m - z)|$ but to $|J_0|(|2r_m - z)|$ which reaches its maximum value at shifted locations $z = 2r_m$ leading to the miss-localization of the defects if not taken into account.

Thanks to (6), we propose an alternative indicator function of DSM $T_{\text{MDSM}}^{\text{mono}}(z)$ with which the identification of the location of the inhomogeneities is possible

$$T_{\text{MDSM}}^{\text{mono}}(z) := \frac{\langle u_\infty(\hat{x}_n, \hat{d}_n), e^{-2ik_0\hat{x}_n \cdot z} \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)}}{|u_\infty(\hat{x}_n, \hat{d}_n)||L^1(\mathbb{S}^1)||e^{-2ik_0\hat{x}_n \cdot z}||_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)}}. \quad (9)$$

**Theorem 4.2.** (Its derivation being similar to the one of Theorem 4.1 the proof is omitted) Assume that the total number $N$ of incident and observation directions is sufficiently large. Then, $T_{\text{MDSM}}^{\text{mono}}(z)$ can be represented as:

$$T_{\text{MDSM}}^{\text{mono}}(z) = \frac{\left|\Psi_2(z)\right|}{\max_{z \in \Omega} \left|\Psi_2(z)\right|}, \quad \text{where} \quad \Psi_2(z) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \alpha_m^2 (\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_0) |D_m| |J_0(2k_0|2r_m - z)|. \quad (10)$$

Based on the result in Theorem 4.2, $T_{\text{MDSM}}^{\text{mono}}(z)$ \text{(10)} is proportional to $|J_0(2k_0|2r_m - z)|$ which, on the contrary of \text{(6)}, reaches its maximum values at $z = r_m, m = 1, 2, \cdots, M$. It is interesting to observe that according to \text{(6)} \text{(8)} \text{id} \text{id} \text{id} \text{id} \text{id} and as recalled in \text{(6)}, the traditional DSM in the multi-static configuration is proportional to $|J_0(k_0|2r_m - z)|$. By comparing the oscillation property of $J_0(k|x|$ and $J_0(2k|x|)$, it can be shown that $T_{\text{DSM}}^{\text{mono}}(z)$ will contain more artifacts than $T_{\text{DSM}}^{\text{mono}}(z)$.

5. Numerical experiments

Numerical experiments are provided here to support the results in Theorem 4.1 and 4.2. For simulation, a fixed frequency $f = c_0/\lambda \approx 749.481$ MHz where $c_0 = 1/\sqrt{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0}$ is the speed of light and $\lambda = 0.4$ m is considered. The total number of incident and observation directions is set to $N = 36$ and they are uniformly distributed on $\mathbb{S}^1$. We set $\Omega$ as a square of side length 4A uniformly discretized with $50 \times 50$ pixels. The far-field patterns $u_\infty(\hat{x}_n, \hat{d}_n)$ are generated via FEKO (EM simulation software). A 20 dB white Gaussian random noise is added to unperturbed data using MATLAB function awgn included in signal processing package.
To compare the accuracy of results the notion of Jaccard index \[19\] is used. It measures the similarity of two finite sample sets \(A\) and \(B\) and is defined as
\[
J(A, B)(\%) := \frac{|A \cap B|}{|A \cup B|} \times 100.
\]
In our work, the Jaccard index is calculated by comparing \(I_{\text{EXACT}}(z)\) with an index map \(I^\kappa(z)\) defined for threshold \(\kappa \in [0, 1]\) as
\[
I_{\text{EXACT}}(z) := \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{for } z \in \tau \\
0 & \text{for } z \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \tau
\end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad I^\kappa(z) := \begin{cases} 
I(z) & \text{if } I(z) \geq \kappa \\
0 & \text{if } I(z) < \kappa,
\end{cases}
\]
respectively. Here, \(I(z)\) is either \(I_{\text{mono}}^{\text{DSM}}(z)\) or \(I_{\text{mono}}^{\text{MDSM}}(z)\).

**Example 5.1 (Small disks with same radii and permittivity).** First, we consider small dielectric disks \(\tau_m\) with \(\alpha_m \equiv 0.075\lambda\) and \(\varepsilon_m \equiv 5\varepsilon_0, m = 1, 2, 3\). The locations \(r_m\) of \(\tau_m\) are \(r_1 = (0.75\lambda, -0.75\lambda), r_2 = (-\lambda, -0.5\lambda)\), and \(r_3 = (-0.75\lambda, \lambda)\). According to the results in Figure 2, the location of \(r_m \in \tau_m\) cannot be accurately identified via the map of \(I_{\text{mono}}^{\text{DSM}}(z)\) whereas accurate locations of \(r_m \in \tau_m\) are retrieved via the map of \(I_{\text{mono}}^{\text{MDSM}}(z)\). As expected in the mono-static configuration a number of artifacts is also included in the map as discussed in the previous section.

**Figure 2:** (Example 5.1) Maps of \(I_{\text{mono}}^{\text{DSM}}(z)\) (left) and \(I_{\text{mono}}^{\text{MDSM}}(z)\) (center), and Jaccard index (right).

**Example 5.2 (Large disk).** In order to verify that our proposal still behaves properly when the small obstacle hypothesis is no longer verified, we are considering the identification of an extended target designed as a single disk circle \(\tau\) located at \(r = (-0.75\lambda, -0.75\lambda)\) with radius \(\alpha \equiv 1\lambda\) and permittivity \(\varepsilon = 5\varepsilon_0\). Here also the shifting problem still occurred in \(I_{\text{mono}}^{\text{DSM}}(z)\) and a more accurate location is obtained via the map of \(I_{\text{mono}}^{\text{MDSM}}(z)\), refer to Fig. 3. However, only the center of target is identified.

6. Conclusion and perspective

In this study, the application of DSM in the mono-static configuration for finding the location of small targets is considered in a 2D scalar configuration. Thanks to the use of the asymptotic expansion formula in the presence of small inhomogeneities and the far-field hypothesis, a mathematical structure of the indicator function of the traditional DSM is established and the reason for which this DSM indicator function fails to image the defects is clearly identified. To overcome this miss-localization a modified DSM (MDSM) is proposed and its efficiency is theoretically shown. Numerical simulations are provided to support our theoretical results for various obstacles. Nevertheless, some improvements are still required, e.g., when the size of inhomogeneity is large enough. Development of an improved indicator function will be an interesting topic.

For a more realistic problem, an extension of the theory to the mono-static configuration for line sources will be the forthcoming subject. The extension of the approach to the 3D vectorial case will then be dealt with.
Figure 3: (Example 5.2) Same as Fig. 2 except the target is a large disk.
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