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Abstract

This paper proposes a systematic mathematical analysis of both the direct and inverse acoustic scattering problem given the source in Radon measure space. For the direct problem, we investigate the well-posedness including the existence, the uniqueness, and the stability by introducing a special definition of the weak solution, i.e. very weak solution. For the inverse problem, we choose the Radon measure space instead of the popular $L^1$ space to build the sparse reconstruction, which can guarantee the existence of the reconstructed solution. The sparse reconstruction problem can be solved by the semismooth Newton method in the dual space. Numerical examples are included.

1 Introduction

Inverse acoustic scattering is very important in a lot of applications including sonar imaging, oil prospecting, non-destructive detection and so on [14]. In lots of applications, we only need a sparse acoustic source to produce a certain scattering field for detection and imaging. In image and signal processing, one popular way is using $L^1(\Omega)$ norm as a sparse regularized term in finite dimensional space, where $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded and compact domain with boundary $\partial \Omega$ of class $C^3$ and contains the sources. However, for the Helmholtz equation associated with acoustic scattering, it is hard to guarantee the existence of a reconstructed solution $f$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ space, due to the lack of weak completeness in $L^1(\Omega)$ (see Chapter 4 of [7]). Instead, we turn to a larger space $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$, which is the Radon measure space and is a Banach space, where the existence of the reconstructed sparse solution $f$ can be guaranteed. Furthermore, if $f \in L^1(\Omega)$, we also have $f \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$, since $L^1(\Omega)$ can be embedded in $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$. Henceforth, we would focus on the analysis and reconstruction of the following inverse scattering problem:

Reconstructing a sparse source $f$ in the Radon measure space $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ for a given scattered field in $\Omega$.
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Actually, there are already a lot of studies on inverse source problem for acoustic problems. Mathematical analysis and various efficient numerical reconstruction algorithms with multi-frequency scattering data are developed in [2, 3]. The $L^2$ regularization, which is a Tikhonov regularization, is also analyzed and used in [17, 19] with single frequency or multiple frequencies. These works are mainly focused on $L^2$ source case.

For elliptic equations with sources in the measure space, there is detailed analysis in bounded domain [26]. We also refer to the celebrated book [25]. Studies on nonlinear elliptic equations can be found in [30]. However, we did not found a systematic analysis for the Helmholtz equation as for the elliptic equations, especially for the radiating solution with Sommerfeld radiating condition.

Our contributions are three-fold. First, we give a sparse regularization framework in functional spaces. The Banach space setting with the Radon measure is self-consistent and is necessary for the existence of the reconstructed solution. Second, since we did not find a systematic and elementary analysis of the direct scattering problems with inhomogeneous background medium, we give a detailed analysis instead. To this end, we first propose a definition of the very weak radiating solution of the direct problem. Furthermore, since the direct scattering problem is essentially an open domain problem, we truncate the domain by the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map outside the measurable sources. The proposed very weak solution can capture the properties of the solution including the fundamental solutions of inhomogeneous acoustic equations, which is less regular around the measurable sources and is analytic away from the sources. Third, we use the semismooth Newton method [8, 11] to solve the sparse reconstruction problem. Our iterative method is different from the analytic methods including linear sampling method and factorization method [13, 27]. Although we need to solve linear equation for Newton update during each iteration, the iteration solution would converge to the reconstructed solution superlinearly with the semismooth Newton method, since it is proved to be superlinear convergent with mild condition [24]. The iterative process thus can be accelerated.

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we discuss the well-posedness including the existence, the uniqueness, the stability of the direct scattering problem within the definition of the proposed very weak solution. In section 3, we discuss the sparse regularization in the Radon measure space. We study the existence of the minimizer in Radon measure space $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$. With the Fenchel duality theory, we use the semismooth Newton method to solve the predual problem to get the sparse solution. Numerical experiments show the semismooth Newton method is effective and efficient. In the last section, we conclude our study with relevant discussion.
2 Well-posedness of the Direct Scattering Problem

The acoustic scattering problems with source in the frequency domain under inhomogeneous medium of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) with \( d = 2 \) or \( d = 3 \) is governed by the following equation

\[
\begin{cases}
-\Delta u - k^2 n(x)u = \mu, & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\
\lim_{|x| \to \infty} \frac{u}{|x|^{d-1}} \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial |x|} - i \nu u \right) = 0,
\end{cases}
\]

(2.1)

where \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \) is a Radon measure, and \( n(x) \) is the refraction index. Henceforth, we assume \( n(x) \) is real and smooth, i.e., \( \exists n = 0 \). Throughout this paper, we assume \( \mu \) is a real measure which is reasonable in physics and \( \Omega \) is large enough such that the Radon measure \( \mu \) or the smooth function \( n(x) - 1 \) is compactly supported in \( \Omega \), i.e.,

\[
\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq \Omega, \quad \text{supp}(n(x) - 1) \subseteq \Omega.
\]

While \( n(x) \equiv 1 \), the equation (2.1) reduces to the Helmholtz equation. Actually, \( \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \) can be characterized by its dual space \( C(\Omega) \) through the Riesz representation theorem (see Chapter 4 of [7]),

\[
\|\mu\|_{\mathcal{M}(\Omega)} = \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega} u d\mu : u \in C(\Omega), \|u\|_{C(\Omega)} \leq 1 \right\}.
\]

(2.2)

This is also equivalent to \( \mathcal{M}(\Omega) = C(\Omega)' \), which means that \( \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \) is weakly compact by the Banach-Alaoglu theorem since \( C(\Omega) \) is a separable Banach space [7].

Since the source term \( \mu \) is only a measure, the regularity of the solution for (2.1) would be very weak. The following definition of very weak solution of (2.1) can help find the solution we need. We assume \( \Omega \subset B_{R_0} \subset B_{R_1} \subset B_{R_2} \) with \( B_{R_i} \) denoting a ball of radius \( R_i \) centered at origin in \( \mathbb{R}^d \), \( i = 0, 1, 2 \). Henceforth, we choose \( B_{R_2} \) or \( B_{R_1} \) such that \( 0 \) are not Dirichlet eigenvalue of \( -\Delta - k^2 n(x) \) in \( B_{R_2} \) or \( B_{R_1} \), which is reasonable.

**Definition 2.1.** Let’s introduce the bilinear form \( a(u, \varphi) \) and linear form \( b(\varphi) \) for \( u \in W^{1,p}(B_{R_2}) \cap H^{1}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{B}_{R_1}) \) with \( p \in [1, \frac{d}{2} - 1] \), \( \varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}(B_{R_2}) \) and \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) as follows,

\[
a(u, \varphi) := \int_{B_{R_2}} (-u \Delta \varphi - k^2 n(x)u \varphi) dx - \int_{\partial B_{R_2}} (Tu \varphi - u \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \nu}) ds,
\]

(2.3a)

\[
b_{\mu}(\varphi) := \int_{B_{R_2}} \varphi d\mu,
\]

(2.3b)

where \( \varphi \) denotes the complex conjugate of \( \varphi \), \( \nu \) denotes the exterior unit normal vector to \( \partial B_{R_2} \) and the linear operator \( T \) is the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map (see [9] for 2D case and Chapter 5 of [14] for 3D case),

\[
T : H^{1/2}(\partial B_{R_2}) \to H^{-1/2}(\partial B_{R_2}), \quad Tu|_{\partial B_{R_2}} := \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial B_{R_2}}, \quad \forall u \in H^{1/2}(\partial B_{R_2}).
\]

(2.4)

With these preparations, we define the very weak solution of (2.1) in \( B_{R_2} \) as follows, for any \( \varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}(B_{R_1}) \), finding \( u \in W^{1,p}(B_{R_2}) \cap H^{1}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{B}_{R_1}) \) such that

\[
a(u, \varphi) = b_{\mu}(\varphi).
\]

(2.5)
The definition (2.1) is motivated by the properties of the fundamental solutions of Helmholtz equation in the free spaces. It can be derived by multiplying by test functions and integration by parts or with the generalized Green’s Theorem involving with distributions; see Theorem 2.2 of [16]. Now, let’s define the Green’s function $G(x, y)$ of the background as the radiating solution [15]

$$
\begin{align*}
-\Delta_x G(x, y) - k^2 n(x)G(x, y) &= \delta(x - y), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \\
\lim_{|x| \to \infty} \frac{1}{|x|^{d-1}} \left( \frac{\partial G(x, y)}{\partial |x|} - ikG(x, y) \right) &= 0.
\end{align*}
$$

Denoting $m(x) = 1 - n(x)$, we thus can construct $G(x, y)$ by the Lippmann-Schwinger integral equation [15]

$$
G(x, y) = \Phi(x, y) + u^s(x, y) = \Phi(x, y) - k^2 \int_{\Omega} \Phi(x, z)m(z)G(z, y)dz. \quad (2.7)
$$

where $\Phi(x, y)$ is the fundamental solution of the Helmholtz equation, i.e., $\Phi(x, y) = \frac{1}{4}H_0^{(1)}(k|x-y|)$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and $\Phi(x, y) = \frac{e^{ik|x-y|}}{4\pi |x-y|}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Although $\Phi(x, y)$ are weakly singular, they have certain regularity; see the following remark.

**Remark 2.2.** While $n(x) \equiv 1$, we get the fundamental solution of the Helmholtz equation $G(x, y) = \Phi(x, y)$ in (2.6). The feasibility of the definition 2.1 while $n(x) \equiv 1$ is followed by $\Phi(x, y) \in W^{1, p}(B_{R_2}) \cap H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{R_1})$ with $p < \frac{d}{d-1}$ for any fixed $y \in \Omega$.

For the Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps of the Helmholtz equation, we refer to [14]. The 2D case is as follows.

**Remark 2.3.** For any radiating solution $u \in H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{R_1})$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$

$$
u(r, \theta) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{H_0^{(1)}(kr)}{H_1^{(1)}(kR_2)} \hat{u}_n e^{in\theta}, \quad \hat{u}_n = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u(R_2, \theta)e^{-in\theta} d\theta,$$

$Tu|_{\partial B_{R_2}}$ is defined as

$$
Tu = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{kH_0^{(1)}(kR_2)}{H_1^{(1)}(kR_2)} \hat{u}_n e^{in\theta}.
$$

For the regularity of $u^s(x, y)$, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.4.** The scattering solution $u^s(x, y)$ belongs to $H^2(\Omega)$ for any fixed $y \in \Omega$.

**Proof.** Let’s define $(\mathcal{V}_m u)(x) := \int_\Omega \Phi(x, y)m(y)u(y)dy$ and it is know that $I + k^2 \mathcal{V}_m$ is bounded and invertible from $L^2(\Omega)$ to $L^2(\Omega)$ [32]. Therefore, we can reformulate the equation (2.7) as

$$(I + k^2 \mathcal{V}_m)G(x, y) = \Phi(x, y), \quad \forall y \in \Omega.$$ 

Since $\Phi(x, y) \in L^2(\Omega), \forall y \in \Omega$, we thus get

$$
G(x, y) = (I + k^2 \mathcal{V}_m)^{-1}\Phi(x, y) \in L^2(\Omega).
$$

4
Furthermore, by the mapping property of the volume potential with integral kernel \( \Phi(x,y) \) which is bounded from \( L^2(\Omega) \) to \( H^2(\Omega) \), we have \( u^s(x,y) \in H^2(\Omega) \) since \( m(y)G(x,y) \) belongs to \( L^2(\Omega) \).

We shall verify \( G(x,y) \) satisfying equation (2.7). By direct calculation, we obtain

\[
-(\Delta + k^2)G(x,y) = -(\Delta_x + k^2)\Phi(x,y) - (\Delta_x + k^2)u^s(x,y),
\]

\[
= -(\Delta_x + k^2)\Phi(x,y) + k^2(\Delta + k^2)\int_{\Omega} \Phi(x,z)m(z)G(z,y)dy,
\]

\[
\delta(x-y) - k^2m(x)G(x,y),
\]

where the second equality follows from \( u^s(x,y) \in H^2(\Omega) \) and the mapping property of volume potential \([14]\). We thus verified \( G(x,y) \) in (2.7) is the Green's function of (2.6).

It is known that \( G(x,y) = G(y,x) \) \([22]\). Actually, the formal transpose operator of \(-\Delta - k^2n\) is also itself \([16]\), we thus get \( u^s(x,y) = u^s(y,x) \) with \( u^s(y,x) \in H^2(\Omega) \) for any fixed \( x \in \Omega \). Now we turn to the well-posedness of the solution of (2.1) and we will prove the uniqueness, existence and stability consecutively. Before the discussion of the uniqueness, let’s give the following embedding lemma for convenience.

**Lemma 2.5.** For any bounded domain \( D \subset B_{R_2} \) with \( C^2 \) boundary, the solution \( u \) under definition 2.1 belongs to \( L^2(D) \) for \( d = 2 \) or \( d = 3 \).

**Proof.** For \( p \in [1, \frac{d}{d-1}) \), by Sobolev compact embedding theorem,

\[
W^{1,p}(D) \hookrightarrow L^q(D),
\]

with \( 1 \leq q < p^* := \frac{dp}{d-p} \). For \( p^* > 2 \) and \( n = 2 \), we have \( p > 1 \); for \( p^* > 2 \) and \( d = 3 \), we have \( p > \frac{6}{5} \). Hence, we can choose \( p \in (1,2) \) in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) or \( p \in \left(\frac{6}{5}, \frac{3}{2}\right) \) in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \), to get

\[
W^{1,p}(D) \hookrightarrow L^2(D).
\]

What follows is \( u \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) for any bounded \( C^2 \) subdomain by (2.32) for \( d = 2 \) and \( d = 3 \). \( \square \)

The definition of the very weak solution of (2.1) belongs to \( L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) coincides with the finite energy of scattered waves from physics. Actually, the solution is unique with definition 2.1.

**Theorem 2.6.** Assuming there exists a solution of (2.1) within the definition 2.1, the solution is unique under definition 2.1.

**Proof.** Supposing there are two solutions \( u_1 \) and \( u_2 \) corresponding to the same measure \( \mu \), let’s denote \( u = u_1 - u_2 \). Therefore, \( u \) belongs to \( W^{1,p}(B_{R_2}) \cap H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{R_1}) \) satisfying the following equation with definition (2.1),

\[
\int_{B_{R_2}} -u(\Delta + k^2n(x))\varphi dx = 0, \quad \forall \varphi \in C^2_0(B_{R_2}). \tag{2.9}
\]
For any $g \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_{R_2})$, since 0 is not a Dirichlet eigenvalue of the operator $-\Delta - k^2 n(x)$ in $B_{R_2}$, the following problem is well-posed with a unique solution $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}_0(B_{R_2})$ (see Chapter 8 of [14] and $L^2$ case by Theorem 6 in section 6.23 of [20])
\[
\begin{cases}
\Delta \varphi + k^2 n(x) \varphi = g, & x \in B_{R_2}, \\
\varphi|_{\partial B_{R_2}} = 0
\end{cases}
\] (2.10)
and there exists a constant $C$ such that for any $g \in C^{0,\alpha}$, we have
\[
\|\varphi\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} \leq C \|g\|_{C^{0,\alpha}}.
\]
What follows is the mapping $\Delta + k^2 : C^{2,\alpha} \rightarrow C^{0,\alpha}$ is surjective. With (2.9), we have
\[
\int_{B_{R_2}} u g \, dx = 0, \quad \forall g \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_{R_2}).
\] (2.11)
Furthermore $C^{\infty}_0(B_{R_2}) \subseteq C^{0,\alpha}(B_{R_2})$ is dense in $W^{-1,p}(B_{R_2})$ with $1 \leq p < \infty$. We see
\[
u = 0, \quad \text{in} \quad W^{1,p}(B_{R_2}), \quad 1 \leq p < \frac{d}{d-1}.
\]
With Lemma 2.5, we have $u = 0$ in $L^2(B_{R_2})$. We get the uniqueness. Since $u$ satisfies the homogeneous Helmholtz equation in $B_{R_2} \setminus \bar{B}_{R_0}$, by the interior estimate (section 6.3 of [20]), we have $u \in H^1(E)$ and $u = 0$, where $E$ is chosen such that $B_{R_1+\epsilon} \setminus \bar{B}_{R_1-\epsilon} \subseteq E$ and $E \Subset B_{R_2} \setminus \bar{B}_{R_0}$ with small $\epsilon > 0$. Furthermore, by the uniqueness of the following exterior scattering problem in $H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{B}_{R_1})$ [14]
\[
\begin{cases}
\Delta u + k^2 u = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{B}_{R_1}, \\
u|_{\partial B_{R_1}} = 0, \\
\lim_{|x| \to \infty} |x|^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial |x|} - i ku \right) = 0,
\end{cases}
\] (2.12)
we have $u = 0$ in $W^{1,p}(B_{R_2}) \cap H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{B}_{R_1})$.

Before the discussion of the existence and stability, we will discuss the mapping properties of the volume potential first, which is closely connected to the solution. The singularities of the Green’s function $G(x, y)$ in (2.6) and its gradient play the most important role. For the singularity of the Green function $G(x, y)$, it is known that (see [31] for the three dimensional space case and [16] for the two dimensional space case),
\[
|G(x, y)| \leq \frac{C}{|x-y|}, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3, \tag{2.13}
\]
\[
|G(x, y)| \leq C \ln |x-y|, \quad |x-y| \to 0, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{2.14}
\]
For the gradients of the Green’s functions in $\Omega$, we have the following Lemma.
Lemma 2.7. Under the assumption on \( n(x) \) being real and \( n(x) - 1 \) being a smooth function with compact support in \( \Omega \), we have
\[
|\nabla_x G(x, y)| \leq \frac{C}{|x - y|^2}, \quad \forall x \neq y, x, y \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3, \tag{2.15}
\]
\[
|\nabla_x G(x, y)| \leq \frac{C}{|x - y|}, \quad \forall x \neq y, x, y \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{2.16}
\]

**Proof.** We mainly make use of the Lippmann-Schwinger equation (2.7). We will first discuss the three dimensional case. Actually, the singularity of \( G(x, y) \) coincides with the fundamental solution of the Helmholtz equation, since for \( \Phi(x, y) = e^{ik|x-y|} / (4\pi|x-y|) \) in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \), we have
\[
|e^{ik|x-y|}| = \frac{1}{4\pi|x-y|}, \tag{2.17}
\]
\[
|\nabla_x e^{ik|x-y|}| = \frac{|x - y| |\Phi(x, y)|}{|x - y|^3} \leq \frac{C(\Omega, k)|x - y|^{-2}}{4\pi|x-y|^2}. \tag{2.18}
\]

Now, we turn to the singularity of the gradient of \( G(x, y) \). Henceforth, we assume \( \text{diam}(\Omega) = L \) and \( |n(x)| \leq n_0 \) for both \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) and \( \mathbb{R}^3 \). By the Lippmann-Schwinger equation (2.7) and Lemma 2.4, we know \( u^s(x, y) \in \mathcal{H}^2(\Omega) \) for any fixed \( y \in \Omega \). Hence, we get
\[
|\nabla_x G(x, y)| \leq |\nabla_x \Phi(x, y)| + |\nabla_x u^s(x, y)|
\leq C(\Omega, k)|x - y|^{-2} + k^2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla_x \Phi(x, z)||m(z)||G(z, y)|dz
\leq C(\Omega, k)\frac{|x - y|^{-2}}{4\pi} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{|x - z|^2} \frac{1}{|z - y|} dz. \tag{2.19}
\]

Let’s focus on the integral in (2.19). Denoting \( r = |x - y| \), we split the domain \( \Omega \) into the following three parts
\[
\Omega_1 = B_r^+ (x) \cap \Omega, \quad \Omega_2 = B_r^+ (y) \cap \Omega, \quad \Omega_3 = \Omega \setminus (\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2).
\]

Denoting \( F(x, y, z) = \frac{1}{|x-z|^2} \frac{1}{|z-y|} \), we thus have
\[
\int_{\Omega} F(x, y, z)dz = \int_{\Omega_1} F(x, y, z)dz + \int_{\Omega_2} F(x, y, z)dz + \int_{\Omega_3} F(x, y, z)dz. \tag{2.20}
\]

Let’s discuss these integrals in \( \Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3 \). Actually, in \( \Omega_1 \), noticing
\[
|y - z| \geq \frac{r}{2} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{|y - z|} \leq \frac{2}{r} = \frac{2}{|x - y|}, \tag{2.21}
\]
we arrive at
\[
\int_{\Omega_1} F(x, y, z)dz \leq \frac{2}{|x - y|} \int_{\Omega_1} \frac{1}{|x - z|^2} dz
\leq \frac{2}{|x - y|} \int_{B_r^+(x)} \frac{1}{|x - z|^2} dz \leq \frac{2}{|x - y|} 2\pi^2 |x - y| = 4\pi^2.
\]
For integral in \( \Omega_2 \), similarly,

\[
|x - z| \geq \frac{r}{2} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{|x - z|^2} \leq \frac{4}{r^2} = \frac{4}{|x - y|^2},
\]

we get

\[
\int_{\Omega_2} F(x, y, z) dz \leq \frac{4}{|x - y|^2} \int_{\Omega_2} \frac{1}{|y - z|} dz \leq \frac{4}{|x - y|^2} \int_{B_2(y)} \frac{1}{|y - z|} dz \leq 2\pi^2.
\]

For integral in \( \Omega_2 \), still by (2.21), we see

\[
\int_{\Omega_2} F(x, y, z) dz \leq \frac{2}{|x - y|} \int_{\Omega_3} \frac{1}{|x - z|^2} dz \leq \frac{2}{|x - y|} 4\pi^2 \int_{\frac{r}{2}}^{L} \frac{1}{r^2} r^2 dr = \frac{8\pi^2 L}{|x - y|} - 4\pi^2.
\]

Combining the above results, we have

\[
\int_{\Omega} F(x, y, z) dz \leq \frac{8\pi^2 L}{|x - y|} + 2\pi^2 \leq \frac{8\pi^2 L}{|x - y|} + \frac{2\pi^2 L}{|x - y|} = \frac{10\pi^2 L}{|x - y|},
\]

Together with (2.19), we obtain

\[
|\nabla_x G(x, y)| \leq \frac{C(\Omega, k)}{|x - y|^2} + k^2 n_0 C(k, \Omega) \frac{10\pi^2 L}{4\pi|x - y|} \leq \frac{C(\Omega, k)(4\pi + k^2 n_0 10\pi^2 L)}{4\pi|x - y|^2},
\]

which leads to (2.15) finally.

For the \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) case, since \( G(x, y) \) is smooth for \( |x - y| \geq \delta \) with arbitrary \( \delta > 0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \), we thus get there exists constants \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) such that

\[
|G(x, y)| \leq C_1 |\ln |x - y|| + C_2, \quad x, y \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2.
\]  

(2.23)

For \( \Phi(x, y) = \frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k|x - y|) \) for \( d = 2 \), by Chapter 9 of [1], we have

\[
\frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k|x - y|) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \ln k|x - y| J_0(k|x - y|) + h(k|x - y|),
\]

(2.24)

\[
\nabla_x \frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k|x - y|) = -k \frac{x - y}{|x - y|} H_1^{(1)}(k|x - y|)
\]

(2.25)

\[
= -ki \frac{x - y}{|x - y|} \left[ -\frac{2}{\pi k|x - y|} + \frac{2}{\pi} \ln \frac{k|x - y|}{2} J_1(k|x - y|) + h_1(k|x - y|) \right],
\]

(2.26)

where \( h(r) \) and \( h_1(r) \) are smooth functions of \( r \). By the asymptotic behaviors of Bessel functions \( J_0(r) \sim 1 \) and \( J_1(r) \sim r/2 \) while \( r \to 0 \) (see Chapter 9 of [1]), there exist constants \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) such that

\[
|\frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k|x - y|)| \leq C_1 \ln k|x - y| + O(1),
\]  

(2.27)

\[
|\nabla_x \frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k|x - y|)| \leq C_2 |x - y|^{-1}.
\]  

(2.28)
Still with Lippmann-Schwinger integral equation (2.7) and (2.28), we just need to estimate the integral
\[ \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{|z - x|} \ln |y - z| dz. \]
The remaining proof is quite similar to the case in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) and we omit here. 

**Theorem 2.8.** Assuming \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \), for the following volume potential in \( \mathbb{R}^d \)
\[ w(x) = V(\mu)(x) := \int_{\Omega} G(x,y) d\mu(y), \quad (2.29) \]
we have the following estimates,
\[ \|w\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \| \mu \|_{\mathcal{M}(\Omega)}, \quad 1 \leq p < \frac{d}{d - 2}, \quad d \geq 3, \quad (2.30) \]
\[ \|w\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_2 \| \mu \|_{\mathcal{M}(\Omega)}, \quad 1 \leq p < +\infty, \quad d = 2, \quad (2.31) \]
and
\[ \|w\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_3 \| \mu \|_{\mathcal{M}(\Omega)}, \quad 1 \leq p < \frac{d}{d - 1}, \quad d \geq 2, \quad (2.32) \]

**Proof.** We begin with the discussions of the \( L^p \) estimates (2.30) and (2.31). Considering the case \( d = 3 \) first, by (2.13), we have
\[ |w(x)| = \left| \int_{\Omega} G(x,y) d\mu(y) \right| \leq \int_{\Omega} |G(x,y)||d\mu(y)| \leq C \int_{\Omega} |x - y|^{2-d} d|\mu|(y). \]
Therefore, the function \( |x - y|^{2-d} \) belongs to \( L^p(\Omega) \) for \( 1 \leq p < \frac{d}{d - 2} \). By the Minkowski’s inequality for integrals (see Theorem 6.19 of [21]) or Theorem 2.4 of [29], we arrive at
\[ \left\| \int_{\Omega} |x - y|^{2-d} d|\mu|(y) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \left\| | - y|^{2-d} \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \| \mu \|_{\mathcal{M}(\Omega)} \leq C(\Omega, p) \| \mu \|_{\mathcal{M}(\Omega)}, \quad (2.33) \]
which leads to (2.30). For \( d = 2 \), the proof of the estimate (2.31) is similar. With (2.14) and (2.16) in Lemma 2.7, there exist two constants only depending on \( \Omega \) and \( \alpha [30, 36] \), such that in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \)
\[ |G(x,y)| \leq C_3(\Omega, \alpha) |x - y|^{-\alpha}, \quad \alpha > 0, \quad (2.34) \]
\[ |\nabla_x G(x,y)| \leq C_4(\Omega, \alpha) |x - y|^{-1-\alpha}, \quad \alpha > 0. \quad (2.35) \]

For arbitrary \( p \in [1, +\infty) \), choosing \( \alpha > 0 \) such that \( \alpha p < 2 \), we have \( |x - y|^{-\alpha} \in L^p(\Omega) \). For the \( W^{1,p} \) estimate, let’s take the three dimensional case for example. It can be checked that the weak derivative \( D_i w \) in the direction \( x_i \) exists, and for any \( \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \) belonging to the test function space \( \mathcal{D}(\Omega) \), we have
\[ \int_{\Omega} D_i w \varphi dx = \int_{\Omega} \left( \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} G(x,y) d\mu(y) \right) \varphi(x) dx. \]
Thus $D^i w = \int_\Omega \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} G(x,y) d\mu(y)$ a.e. in distributional sense, by Du Bois-Raymond Lemma. This leads to

$$|\nabla w| = |\int_\Omega \nabla_x G(x,y) d\mu(y)| \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla_x G(x,y)| |d\mu(y)| \leq C \int_\Omega |x-y|^{1-d} |d\mu(y)|.$$

Still with the gradient estimate (2.15) in Lemma 2.7 and the Minkowski’s inequality for integrals, we have

$$||\nabla w||_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C ||\mu||_{\mathcal{M}(\Omega)}, \quad 1 \leq p < \frac{d}{d-1}.$$

For the two dimensional case, the proof is similar which we omit here.

For the volume potential $V\mu$, we have the following property.

**Lemma 2.10.** The volume potential (2.29) belongs to $H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{B}_{R_1})$. Furthermore, for any bounded $C^2$ domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{B}_{R_1}$, we have $V(\mu) \in H^2(D)$.

**Proof.** Since $G(x,y)$, $\nabla_x G(x,y)$, $\frac{\partial^2 G(x,y)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$ are smooth functions while $x \in D \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{B}_{R_1}$ and $y \in \Omega \Subset \Subset B_{R_0} \Subset \Subset B_{R_1}$, they are uniformly bounded in $D$ [16]. These yield the existence a constant $C$, such that

$$|G(x,y)| \leq C, \quad |\nabla_x G(x,y)| \leq C, \quad \left| \frac{\partial^2 G(x,y)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right| \leq C, \quad x \in D, \quad y \in \Omega.$$

These lead to

$$|V(\mu)(x)| \leq C ||\mu||_{\mathcal{M}(\Omega)}, \quad |\int_\Omega \nabla_x G(x,y) d\mu(y)| \leq C ||\mu||_{\mathcal{M}(\Omega)}, \quad \forall x \in D, \quad \text{(2.36)}$$

$$|\int_\Omega \frac{\partial^2 G(x,y)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} d\mu(y)| \leq C ||\mu||_{\mathcal{M}(\Omega)}, \quad \forall x \in D. \quad \text{(2.37)}$$

What following is $V(\mu) \in H^2(D)$, and there exists a constant $c_0$ such that

$$||V(\mu)||_{H^2(D)} \leq c_0 ||\mu||_{\mathcal{M}(\Omega)}.$$
in the topology of $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$ (see Proposition 9.5 of [21]). We conclude $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ is also dense in $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$. Therefore, for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$, there exists a sequence $\{\mu_n\} \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$, such that
\[
\int_{\Omega} \mu_n v dx \to \int_{\Omega} v d\mu,
\] (2.38)
for any $v \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$. Because $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$ is dense in $C(\Omega)$, we also have (2.38) for any $v \in C(\Omega)$. Since $\{\mu_n\}$ also belong to $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ as linear functionals on $C(\Omega)$, by uniform bounded principle, the norms of $\mu_n$ are uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ norm. Let $u_n$ be the solution of the following scattering problem
\[
\begin{cases}
-\Delta u_n - k^2 n(x)u_n = \mu_n, & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\
\lim_{|x| \to \infty} |x|^\frac{d-1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial |x|} - iku_n \right) = 0.
\end{cases}
\] (2.39)

**Theorem 2.11.** There exists a “very” weak solution $u \in W^{1,p}(B_{R_2}) \cap H^1(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1})$ of (2.1) as in definition 2.1. Furthermore, we have $u^n \rightharpoonup u \in W^{1,p}(B_{R_2}) \cap H^1(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1})$.

**Proof.** Since $\mu_n \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega)$, we have the volume integral representation $u_n = \int_{B_{R_2}} \Phi(x,y)\mu_n(y) dy$ [14]. By Theorem 2.8 and Lemma 2.10, we see $\{u_n\}$ are bounded in $W^{1,p}(B_{R_2})$ and in $H^2(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1})$. Thus we can choose a subsequence $\{u_{n_k}\}$ of $\{u_n\}$ such that it is weakly convergent in $W^{1,p}(B_{R_2})$ with weak limit $u$, i.e.,
\[
u_{n_k} \rightharpoonup u, \text{ in } W^{1,p}(B_{R_2}) \text{ as } k \to +\infty.
\]
Since the sequence $\{u_{n_k}\}$ are also bounded in $H^2(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1})$, we can choose another subsequence $\{u_{n_k'}\}$ of $\{u_{n_k}\}$ that is weakly convergent in $H^2(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1})$ with weak limit $u_p$, i.e.,
\[
\nu_{n_k} \rightharpoonup u_p \text{ in } H^2(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1}), \quad \nu_{n_k'} \rightharpoonup u, \text{ in } W^{1,p}(B_{R_2}).
\]
Noticing $1 \leq p < 2$, we have $H^2(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1}) \hookrightarrow W^{1,p}(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1})$. What follows is
\[
\nu_{n_k'} \rightharpoonup u_p \text{ in } W^{1,p}(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1}).
\]
By the uniqueness of the weak limit of $\nu_{n_k'}$ in $W^{1,p}(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1})$, we have
\[
u_{n_k'} = u_p \text{ in } W^{1,p}(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1}).
\]
Since $H^2(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1}) \subset W^{1,p}(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1})$, again by the uniqueness of the weak limit, we see
\[
u_{u_{n_k'}} = u_p \text{ in } W^{1,p}(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1}).
\]
Now, we claim that there exist $\{u_{n_k'}\}$ and $u \in W^{1,p}(B_{R_2}) \cap H^2(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1})$, such that
\[
u_{u_{n_k'}} \rightharpoonup u, \text{ in } W^{1,p}(B_{R_2}) \cap H^2(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1}).
\]
Because of the boundedness of the trace operators
\[
T_i : H^2(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1}) \to H^{\frac{3}{2} - i}(\partial B_{R_2}), \quad i = 0, 1, \quad T_0 u_{n_k'} = u_n|_{\partial B_{R_2}}, \quad T_1 u_{n_k'} = \frac{\partial u_{n_k'}}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial B_{R_2}}.
\]
are linear and bounded, we have $T_0u_n^k \to T_0u$ and $T_1u_n^k \to T_1u$ (see Proposition 2.1.27 of [18]). By the following compact embedding

$$W^{1,p}(B_{R_2}) \hookrightarrow L^p(B_{R_2}), \quad H^s(\partial B_{R_2}) \hookrightarrow H^{s-1}(\partial B_{R_2}), \quad s = \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2},$$

we have

$$u_n^k \to u \text{ in } L^p(B_{R_2}), \quad T_0u_n^k \to T_0u \text{ in } H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial B_{R_2}), \quad Tu_n^k \to Tu \text{ in } H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial B_{R_2}). \quad (2.40)$$

Actually, for $u_n^k$, it can be verified that for any $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}(B_{R_2})$, we have

$$a(u_n^k, \varphi) = b_{\mu_n^k}(\varphi). \quad (2.41)$$

By (2.38) and the discussion after, we see $b_{\mu_n^k}(\varphi) \to b_\mu(\varphi)$. For $a(u_n^k, \varphi)$, with the embedding $L^p(B_{R_2}) \hookrightarrow L^1(B_{R_2})$,

$$\lim_{k' \to \infty} \int_{B_{R_2}} (k^2 n(x)(u_n^k - u)\bar{\varphi} + (u_n^k - u)\Delta \bar{\varphi}) \, dx = 0.$$

For the boundary integral equations in the definition 2.1, we have

$$\lim_{k' \to \infty} \int_{\partial B_{R_2}} |(Tu_n^k - Tu)\bar{\varphi} - (u - u_n^k)\frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial \nu}| \, ds = 0.$$

Taking $k' \to \infty$, what follows is that for all $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}(B_{R_2})$, we have

$$a(u, \varphi) = b_\mu(\varphi). \quad (2.42)$$

which concludes that $u$ is a very weak solution of (2.1) in $B_{R_2}$. By the uniqueness of the solution $u$ in $W^{1,p}(B_{R_2}) \cap H^1(B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1})$ with Lemma 2.6, thus every weakly convergent subsequence $\{u_n^k\}$ of $\{u_n\}$ must have the same weak limit. These lead to

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u, \quad \text{in } W^{1,p}(B_{R_2}) \cap H^2(\bar{B}_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1}).$$

Actually, for the relation between the constructed solution $u$ and the volume potential $w$ in (2.29). We have the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.12.** We have $u = w$ where $w$ is as in (2.29) and $u$ is the weak limit constructed in Theorem 2.11, i.e.,

$$u = \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{B_{R_2}} G(x, y)\mu_n(y) \, dy. \quad (2.43)$$

The stability of the solution (2.1) in definition 2.1 is followed by Theorem 2.8.
Proof. The proof is similar to [30,36] for the cases of elliptic equations. For completeness, we prove it as follows. We just prove the case while \( \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) \) is a positive measure. For general \( \mu \), since \( \mu = \mu^+ - \mu^- \), the \( \mu^- \) part could be proved similarly. Therefore, we can choose the sequence \( \{\mu_n : \mu_n \geq 0\} \). Given \( \varepsilon > 0 \), let \( \phi_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \) such that

\[
0 \leq \phi_\varepsilon \leq 1, \quad \phi_\varepsilon = 0, \text{ in } B_{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(0), \quad \phi_\varepsilon = 1 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_\varepsilon(0).
\]

Then we have

\[
u_n(x) = \int_{B_R^2} G(x,y)\mu_n(y)dy = \int_{B_R^2} G(x,y)\phi_\varepsilon(|x-y|)\mu_n(y)dy + \int_{B_R^2} G(x,y)(1 - \phi_\varepsilon(|x-y|))\mu_n(y)dy = u_{n,1}(x) + u_{n,2}(x).
\]

It can be seen that \( G(x,y)\phi_\varepsilon(x,y) \) is continuous in \( B_{R_2} \), the weak convergence of \( \mu_n \) leads to

\[
u_{n,1}(x) = \int_{B_R^2} G(x,y)\phi_\varepsilon(|x-y|)\mu_n(y)dy \to \int_{B_R^2} G(x,y)\phi_\varepsilon(|x-y|)d\mu(y), \quad x \in B_{R_2}.
\]

This gives

\[
u(x) - w(x) = -\int_{B_R^2} G(x,y)(1 - \phi_\varepsilon(|x-y|))d\mu(y) + \lim_{n \to \infty} u_{n,2}(x). \tag{2.44}
\]

Let \( F \) be an arbitrary compact set of \( B_{R_2} \), \( \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(F, \partial B_{R_2}) \) and

\[
F_\varepsilon := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \text{dist}(x,F) < \varepsilon \}.
\]

This yields

\[
\int_F |\nu_{n,2}|dx \leq \int_{B_{R_2}} \int_F |G(x,y)|(1 - \phi_\varepsilon(|x-y|))d\mu_n(y)dy \leq \int_{B_{R_2}} \mu_n dy \sup_{y \in F_{\varepsilon}} \int_{|x-y|<\varepsilon} |G(x,y)|dx.
\]

Together with the uniform boundedness of \( \|\mu_n\|_{\mathcal{M}(\Omega)} \), there exists \( C_0 \), such that \( \|\mu_n\|_{\mathcal{M}(B_{R_2})} \leq C_0 \). We thus get

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{y \in F_{\varepsilon}} \int_{|x-y|<\varepsilon} |G(x,y)|dx,
\]

and the last term tends to zeros while \( \varepsilon \to 0 \). Similarly, we also have

\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_{B_{R_2}} G(x,y)(1 - \phi_\varepsilon(|x-y|))d\mu(y) \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_{B_{R_2}} |G(x,y)|(1 - \phi_\varepsilon(|x-y|))d\mu(y) = 0.
\]

Since

\[
|\nu(x) - w(x)| = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left| -\int_{B_{R_2}} G(x,y)(1 - \phi_\varepsilon(|x-y|))d\mu(y) + u_{n,2}(x) \right|,
\]
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by Fatou’s Lemma, we arrive at
\[
0 \leq \left| \int_{F} (u - w) dx \right| \leq \int_{F} |u - w| dx
\]
\[
\leq \int_{B_{R_{2}}} |G(x, y)| (1 - \phi_{\varepsilon}(|x - y|)) d\mu(y) + \lim_{n \to \infty} \inf \int_{F} |u_{n, 2}(x)| dx,
\]
where the right-hand side tends to zeros as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \). It follows \( u = w \) a.e. in arbitrary compact set \( F \subset B_{R_{2}} \). Finally, by Du Bois-Raymond Lemma, we see that \( u = w \) a.e. in \( B_{R_{2}} \).

The stability of (2.1) follows by Theorem 2.8 and Theorem 2.12.

**Remark 2.13.** For the solution of (2.1) under definition (2.1), we have the following regularity estimate,
\[
\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_3 \|\mu\|_{M(\Omega)}, \quad 1 \leq p < \frac{d}{d - 1}, \quad d \geq 2.
\]
Here \( C_3 \) is the same as in Theorem 2.8.

### 3 Sparse Regularization and Semismooth Newton Method

#### 3.1 Sparse Regularization in Measure Space

In order to reconstruct the sparse source \( \mu \in M(\Omega) \) numerically, we will make use of the following sparse regularization functional,
\[
\min_{\mu \in M(\Omega)} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{V}\mu - u_{0}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^2 + \alpha \|\mu\|_{M(\Omega)}, \quad (3.1)
\]
where \( \alpha \) is the regularization parameter and \( u_{0} \) is the measured scattered fields. \( \mathcal{V}\mu \) satisfies equation (2.1) as discussed. We choose \( L^{2} \) norm in the data term of (3.1), since \( \mathcal{V}\mu \in L^{2}(\Omega) \) with Lemma 2.5.

**Theorem 3.1.** There exists a solution \( \mu \in M(\Omega) \) of the regularization functional (3.1).

**Proof.** The proof is similar to [11] and [6]. Since the energy in (3.1) is \( \frac{1}{2} \|u_{0}\|_{2}^2 \) while \( \mu = 0 \). Thus we can find a minimizing sequence \( \{\mu_{n}\} \) in \( M(\Omega) \) which are bounded by \( \frac{1}{2r} \|u_{0}\|_{2}^2 \). Since \( M(\Omega) \) is a weakly sequentially compact [7] (see Chapter 4), there exists a weakly convergent subsequence \( \mu_{n,k} \) converging to \( \mu^{*} \in M(\Omega) \) weakly.

Denoting \( u_{n,k} = \mathcal{V}(\mu_{n,k}) \), we see \( u_{n,k} \in W^{1,p}(\Omega) \) with \( p < \frac{d}{d - 1} \). By Theorem 2.12, \( u_{n,k} \) weakly converges to \( \mathcal{V}(\mu^{*}) \) and \( \mathcal{V}(\mu^{*}) \) is a solution (2.1) within definition 2.1. By the weak lower semicontinuity of the norms in \( L^{2}(\Omega) \) and \( M(\Omega) \), we conclude that \( \mu^{*} \) is a minimizer of (3.1) and the existence follows. \( \square \)
For the non-smooth minimization problem (3.1), the functional does not have semismooth Newton derivative because of $|| \cdot ||_M$ norm. To this end, it is convenient to consider the predual problem under the powerful Fenchel duality theory; see [8,11,12,24] for various optimal control problems including the elliptic problems, where all the involved functions are real-valued functions. Semismooth Newton method is employed for computing the dual problems efficiently. However, the problem (3.1) is with complex-valued function. To the best of our knowledge, there is no systematic study on the Fenchel duality for complex-valued functions. Fortunately, for the case $n(x) \equiv 1$ at least, we found that the real part of the wave fields also carries very important information, which can also benefit the fast semismooth Newton methods. We will first introduce the real parts of the wave fields and discuss the property. Let’s define

$$U(x) := \Re(\mathcal{V}(\mu)(x)) = \mathcal{V}_R(\mu)(x) = \int_{\Omega} \Re G(x,y) d\mu(y). \quad (3.2)$$

For $n(x) \equiv 1$, we know $G(x,y) = \Phi(x,y)$, $\Re \Phi(x,y) = -\frac{1}{4} Y_0(k|x-y|)$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with $Y_0(k|x-y|)/(4\pi|x-y|)$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Here and in the following, we assume $n(x) \equiv 1$. Actually, numerical tests would show that our algorithm also gives effective reconstruction for the inhomogeneous case.

**Lemma 3.2.** $\mathcal{V}_R(\mu)(x) = 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{V}(\mu)(x) = 0$ in $B_{R_2}$.

**Proof.** If $\mathcal{V}(\mu)(x) = 0$, since $\mu$ is a real Radon measure, we have $\mathcal{V}_R(\mu)(x) = \Re \mathcal{V}(\mu)(x) = 0$. Now we turn to $\mathcal{V}_R(\mu)(x) = 0$ case. We first prove the case in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Let’s introduce

$$\mathcal{V}_I(\mu)(x) = 3 \mathcal{V}(\mu)(x) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\Omega} J_0(k|x-y|) d\mu(y).$$

It can be seen that $\mathcal{V}_I(\mu)(x)$ is an entire solution of Helmholtz equation in $\mathbb{R}^2$,

$$-\Delta \mathcal{V}_I(\mu)(x) - k^2 \mathcal{V}_I(\mu)(x) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

by the smoothness of the kernel $J_0(k|x-y|)$. It can also be seen from the following additional formulas (Chapter 5.12 of [28]), i.e., for arbitrary $x$ and $y$

$$J_0(k|x-y|) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} J_n(k|x|) J_n(k|y|) e^{in(\theta_x - \theta_y)},$$

where $\theta_x$ and $\theta_y$ are the angles of $x$ and $y$. What follows are the integral representations of $\mathcal{V}(\mu)$ and $\mathcal{V}_R(\mu)$,

$$\mathcal{V}_I(\mu)(x) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} J_n(k|y|) e^{-in\theta_y} d\mu(y) J_n(k|x|) e^{in\theta_x}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \backslash \bar{\Omega}. \quad (3.3)$$

$J_n(k|x|) e^{in\theta_x}$ is entire solution in $\mathbb{R}^2$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. $\mathcal{V}_R(\mu)(x)$ is also a Herglotz wave function by the representation of (3.3). Thus if $\mathcal{V}_R(\mu)(x) = 0$, we have $u = \mathcal{V}(\mu)(x) = \mathcal{V}_R(\mu)(x) +$
\(iV_I(\mu)(x)\) is also a radiating solution of (2.1) with \(\mu = 0\). However, \(V(\mu)(x) u = V_I(\mu)(x)\) is also an entire solution. Thus \(u\) must be zero (see Chapter 2.2 of [14]).

For the case in \(\mathbb{R}^3\), the proof is similar. We need to introduce smooth \(V_I(x)\) satisfying homogeneous Helmholtz equation. We introduce \(\Phi_-(x, y) = \frac{e^{-ik|x-y|}}{4\pi|x-y|}\) which is the incoming fundamental solution and

\[V_I(\mu)(x) = \Re V(\mu)(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\sin(k|x-y|)}{4\pi|x-y|} d\mu(y).\]

We see

\[\frac{\cos(k|x-y|)}{4\pi|x-y|} = \frac{1}{2} (\Phi(x, y) + \Phi_-(x, y)), \quad \frac{\sin(k|x-y|)}{4\pi|x-y|} = \frac{1}{2i} (\Phi(x, y) - \Phi_-(x, y)).\]

It can be seen that \(\frac{\sin(k|x-y|)}{4\pi|x-y|}\) is smooth and satisfy the homogeneous Helmholtz equation. While \(V_R(\mu)(x) = 0\), we still have \(u = V(\mu)(x) = V_R(\mu)(x) + iV_I(\mu)(x)\) is both the radiating solution of (2.1) and entire wave function in \(\mathbb{R}^3\) which must be 0. \(\square\)

By Lemma 3.2, we have the following remark.

**Remark 3.3.** The kernel of \(V\) and \(V_R\) satisfy \(\text{Ker}(V) = \text{Ker}(V_R)\), which means \(\text{Ker}(V_R) = \{0\}\) when \(\text{Ker}(V) = \{0\}\).

For the inverse source problem, because of the following non-radiating source which is the kernel for the source to far fields mapping [35],

\[K = \{g|g = (\Delta + k^2)\varphi, \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\};\]

there are no uniqueness for the inverse scattering with far fields. However, for point sources there is uniqueness [5]. Henceforth, we use near scattering fields instead of far fields here. By Lemma 3.2 and Remark 3.3, we see \(V\) and \(V_R\) are both invertible for point sources scatterers case. We only use scattering fields instead of far fields. We consider the following model

\[
\min_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)} \frac{1}{2} \|V_R \mu - \Re u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_0)}^2 + \alpha \|\mu\|_{\mathcal{M}(\Omega_0)}.
\]

(P)

Let’s denote \(D_R := V_R^{-1}\) and \(u_R := \Re u_0\). We can get a predual problem of (P) as the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4.** The predual problem of (P) can be

\[
\min_{y \in H^2(\Omega)} \frac{1}{2} \|D_R^* y + u_R\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|u_R\|_2^2, \quad \|y\|_{\mathcal{C}_0} \leq \alpha.
\]

(D)

**Proof.** We first introduce the Fenchel duality theory briefly (see Chapter 4.3 of [24]). Let \(V\) and \(Y\) be Banach spaces with topological duals denoted by \(V^*\) and \(Y^*\). Furthermore, suppose \(\Lambda\) be a linear, bounded operator from \(V\) to \(Y\) and \(F : V \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}, G : Y \to \mathbb{R}\).
\( \mathbb{R} \cup \{ \infty \} \) be convex, lower semi-continuous functionals not identically equal to \( \infty \). We assume that there exists \( v_0 \in V \) such that \( F(v_0) < \infty, G(\Lambda v_0) < \infty \) and \( G \) is continuous at \( \Lambda v_0 \). The Fenchel duality theory tells that
\[
\inf_{u \in V} F(u) + G(\Lambda u) = \sup_{p \in Y^*} -F^*(\Lambda^* p) - G^*(-p),
\]
where \( F^*: V^* \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{ \infty \} \) denotes the conjugate of \( F \) defined by \( [4, 24] \)
\[
F^*(v^*) := \sup_{v \in V} \langle v, v^* \rangle - F(v).
\]
Assuming there exist a solution \((u^*, p^*)\) of (3.4), the optimality conditions of (3.4) can be obtained as
\[
\Lambda^* p^* \in \partial F(u^*), \quad -p^* \in \partial G(\Lambda u^*),
\]
which connect the primal solution \( u^* \) and the dual solution \( p^* \). We would use this relation to recover the primal solution for the dual solution.

We prove it by using the Fenchel duality directly. Let \( V = H^2(\Omega), Y = C(\Omega) \) and \( \Lambda \) be the embedding from \( H^2(\Omega) \) to \( C(\Omega) \). \( F \) and \( G \) are as follows,
\[
F(y) = \frac{1}{2} \| D_R y + u_R \|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2} \| u_R \|_2^2, \quad G(y) = I\{\|y\|_{C(\Omega)} \leq \alpha\}(y),
\]
where the indicator function
\[
I\{\|y\|_{C(\Omega)} \leq \alpha\}(y) := \begin{cases} 0, & \|y\|_{C(\Omega)} \leq \alpha, \\ \infty, & \text{else}. \end{cases}
\]
With direct calculation, we have the Fenchel dual function of \( G \) is \( G^*(\mu) = \alpha \| \mu \|_{M(\Omega)} \) and the Fenchel dual function of \( F \) is \( \frac{1}{2} \| D_R^{-1} \mu - u_R \|_2^2 \). By Fenchel duality theory, we get the predual functional (D).

**Remark 3.5.** The existence of a solution of the predual functional (D) follows similarly to Theorem 3.1.

**Remark 3.6.** It would be very interesting to consider using less or sparse scattering data of \( \Omega \) as in (3.1) for the reconstruction of the sparse sources, i.e., assuming \( \Omega_0 \subset \Omega \),
\[
\min_{\mu \in M(\Omega)} \frac{1}{2} \| V \mu - u_0 \|_{L^2(\Omega_0)}^2 + \alpha \| \mu \|_{M(\Omega)}.
\]
We leave it for the future study and we mainly focus on the theoretical analysis and the effectiveness of our algorithm here.
3.2 Semismooth Newton Method

We use semismooth Newton method to solve the predual problem (D). We use Moreau-Yosida regularization to dual with the constraint \( \|y\|_{C_0} \) in (D), i.e.,

\[
\min_{y \in H^2(\Omega)} \frac{1}{2} \|D^* y + u_R\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|u_R\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \|\max(0, \gamma(y - \alpha))\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \|\min(0, \gamma(y + \alpha))\|_2^2.
\] (3.8)

Similar to the proof in [11], we have the following remark to the asymptotic relation between the solution of (3.8) and (D).

**Remark 3.7.** Denoting the solution of (3.8) as \( y_{\gamma} \), it can be proved that \( y_{\gamma} \to y^* \) where \( y^* \) is the solution of (D) while \( \gamma \to +\infty \).

Now, we turn to semismooth Newton method for solving (3.8). The optimality condition of (3.8) is

\[
\mathcal{F}(y^*) := D_R(D^* R y^* + u_R) + \max(0, \gamma(y^* - \alpha)) + \min(0, \gamma(y^* - \alpha)) = 0.
\] (3.9)

In order to use semismooth Newton method to solve this nonlinear equation. We choose the Newton derivatives of \( \max(0, c(p - \beta)) \) and \( \min(0, c(p + \beta)) \) as follows

\[
\partial_y \max(0, \gamma(y - \beta))(y, \tilde{y}) \ni \gamma \chi_{A^+} + \tilde{y}, \quad \partial_y \min(0, \gamma(y + \beta))(y, \tilde{y}) \ni \gamma \chi_{A^-} - \tilde{y},
\] (3.10)

where \( \chi_{A^+} \) and \( \chi_{A^-} \) depend on \( y \) defined by

\[
\chi_{A^+} = \begin{cases} 1, & y \geq \beta, \\ 0, & y < \beta, \end{cases} \quad \chi_{A^-} = \begin{cases} 1, & y \leq -\beta, \\ 0, & y > -\beta. \end{cases}
\] (3.11)

The semismooth Newton method for solving the nonlinear system \( \mathcal{F}(y) = 0 \) reads as,

\[
y^{k+1} = y^k - N(y^k)^{-1} \mathcal{F}(y^k),
\] (3.12)

where \( N(y^k) \in \partial \mathcal{F}(y^k) \) is the semismooth Newton derivative of \( \mathcal{F} \) at \( y^k \), and \( N(y^k)^{-1} \) exist and uniformly bounded in a small neighborhood of the solution \( y^* \) of \( \mathcal{F}(y^*) = 0 \). In our case, the semismooth Newton iterations (3.12) can be reformulated as

\[
N(y^k)y^{k+1} = N(y^k)y^k - \mathcal{F}(y^k).
\] (3.13)

Denoting \( \chi_{A_k} = \chi_{A_k^+} + \chi_{A_k^-} \) and choosing \( N(y^k) = D_R D^*_R + \gamma \chi_{A_k} \) with (3.10), the Newton update (3.13) becomes

\[
(D_R D^*_R + \gamma \chi_{A_k})y^{k+1} = -D_R u_R + \gamma \alpha (\chi_{A_k^+} - \chi_{A_k^-}),
\] (3.14)

where \( \chi_{A_k^+} \) and \( \chi_{A_k^-} \) are defined the same as in (3.11) with \( y \) replaced by \( y^k \).
3.3 Discretization and the Finite Dimensional Spaces Setting

Henceforth we put our discussion in the finite dimensional spaces. In numerical tests, we use the finite difference discretization and the radiating condition is realized with PML (perfectly matched layer) absorbing boundary condition. Now we just consider the 2D problem, i.e. \( d = 2 \). The domain \( \Omega \) is chosen as \((0, 1) \times (0, 1)\). Now we give the discretized version of the operators \( \mathcal{V}^{-1} \) in (2.29).

Firstly, we give a brief introduction of the PML used in the discretization, see [10] for details. Let \( \alpha_i(x_i) = 1 + i \sigma(x_i), i = 1, 2 \) be the model medium property, where \( \sigma(t) \) is a piecewise smooth function concentrated on point \( t = 0.5 \) and \( \sigma(t) = 0, t \in (\lambda, 1 - \lambda) \), where \( \lambda = 2\pi/k \) is the wavelength. For \( x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \), denote by \( \tilde{x} \) the complex coordinate, where

\[
\tilde{x}_i = \int_0^{x_i} \alpha_i(t)dt = x_j + i \int_0^{x_i} \sigma(t)dt, \quad i = 1, 2.
\]  

(3.15)

Define \( \tilde{u}(x) = u(\tilde{x}) \). Obviously \( \tilde{u} = u \) in \((\lambda, 1 - \lambda) \times (\lambda, 1 - \lambda)\) and \( \tilde{u} \) satisfies \(-\tilde{\Delta}\tilde{u} - k^2 n(x)\tilde{u} = f \) in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \), where \( \tilde{\Delta} \) is the Laplacian with respect to the stretched coordinate \( \tilde{x} \). This yields by the chain rule that \( \tilde{u} \) satisfies the PML equation

\[
-J^{-1} \nabla \cdot (B\nabla \tilde{u}) - k^2 (x) n(x) \tilde{u} = f \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2,
\]  

(3.16)

where \( B(x) = \text{diag} \left( \frac{\alpha_2(x_2)}{\alpha_1(x_1)}, \frac{\alpha_1(x_1)}{\alpha_2(x_2)} \right) \) is a diagonal matrix and \( J(x) = \alpha_1(x_1)\alpha_2(x_2) \). Then the truncated PML problem can be defined as

\[
-J^{-1} \nabla \cdot (B\nabla \tilde{u}) - k^2 (x) n(x) \tilde{u} = f \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega,
\]  

(3.17)

and

\[
\tilde{u} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega.
\]  

(3.18)

Then we use the finite difference method to discretize the above PML problem and suppose the algebraic system is \( A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \). We can assume \( A^{-1} = \mathcal{V} \) and thus get \( \mathcal{V}_R \) and \( \mathcal{D}_R \) as follows.

**Lemma 3.8.** Under assumption \( \mu \) being a real Radon measure, \( A \) being invertible and \( Au = \mu \) in the discretization sense, we have

\[
\mathcal{V}_R = \mathbb{R}(A^{-1}).
\]  

(3.19)

Furthermore, if \( \text{Ker}(\mathcal{V}) = \text{Ker}(\mathcal{V}_R) \) while \( n(x) \equiv 1 \), we have

\[
\mathcal{D}_R = \mathcal{V}_R^{-1}.
\]  

Proof. Through \(-\Delta - k^2 n(x)\) with PML is an indefinite linear operator, it is reasonable to assume its discretized operator is invertible. Denoting \( \mathcal{V}_R = A^{-1} = L_1 + iL_2 \) where \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \) are both real matrix, we have

\[
u_R + i\nu_I = A^{-1}\mu = (L_1 + iL_2)\mu = L_1\mu + iL_2\mu.
\]

What follows is \( u_R = L_1\mu \). While \( \text{Ker}(\mathcal{V}) = \text{Ker}(\mathcal{V}_R) \) when \( n(x) \equiv 1 \), by Remark 3.3, since \( \text{Ker}(A^{-1}) = \text{Ker}(L_1) \), we have \( L_1 = \mathcal{V}_R = \mathbb{R} \mathcal{V} \) is also invertible. We thus get

\[
\mu = L_1^{-1} u_R = \mathcal{V}_R^{-1} u_R = \mathcal{D}_R u_R.
\]

\[\blacksquare\]
Now we turn to the semismooth Newton method again. We need to recover the primal solution $\mu$ after solving $y^*$ of (3.9) with the semismooth Newton method. Actually, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.9.** The solution $\mu^*$ corresponding to (3.8) is recovered by

$$
\mu^* = -\max(0, \gamma(y^* - \alpha)) - \min(0, \gamma(y^* + \alpha)).
$$

(3.20)

**Proof.** The primal solution $\mu^*$ is still calculated from the Fenchel duality theory. Let

$$
F(y) := \frac{1}{2}\|D_R^*y + u_R\|^2_2 - \frac{1}{2}\|u_R\|^2_2, \quad G(y) = \frac{1}{2\gamma}\max(0, \gamma(y - \alpha))\|\|^2_2 + \frac{1}{2\gamma}\min(0, \gamma(y + \alpha))\|\|^2_2.
$$

By direct calculation with definition (3.5), one can readily verify the dual function $F^*$ and $G^*$ are as follows [11,12]

$$
F^*(\mu) = \frac{1}{2}\|D_R^{-1}\mu - u_R\|^2_2, \quad G^*(-\mu) = \alpha\|\mu\|_L^1 + \frac{1}{2\gamma}\mu\|\|_L^2, \quad \Lambda = I.
$$

By the optimality condition of the Fenchel duality (3.6), $-\mu^* \in \partial G(y^*)$, we get (3.20). \qed

In order to approximate the original dual problem (D) by its Moreau-Yosida regularization (3.8), we need to let $\gamma \to +\infty$ by Remark (3.7). We do it through continuation strategy. With these preparations, we get the following semismooth Newton algorithm for (3.8); see algorithm 1.

**Algorithm 1** Semismooth Newton Method with continuation strategy for (3.8)

**Input:** $y^0 \in V$, $\gamma_0 > 0$

**Output:** $y$, $\mu$

1. **Initialization** $y^{0}_{\gamma_0} = y^0$

2. **while** $0 \leq i \leq I$, $\gamma_i = \gamma^i$

3. **while** $k \leq K$

4. Set $A^+_k = \{x \in \Omega: y^k_{\gamma_i}(x) > \alpha\}$, $A^-_k = \{x \in \Omega: y^k_{\gamma_i}(x) < -\alpha\}$, $A_k = A^+_k \cup A^-_k$

5. Solve for $y^k_{\gamma_i} \in V$: $D_R^*D_Ry^{k+1}_{\gamma_i} + \gamma\chi_k y^{k+1}_{\gamma_i} = -D_Ru_R + \gamma\alpha(\chi_k - \chi_k^-)$

6. Update $A^+_k$, $A^-_k$, $A_k$

7. Until $A^+_k = A_{k-1}^+$, $A^-_k = A_{k-1}^-$, set $y^{0}_{\gamma_{i+1}} = y^k_{\gamma_i}$

8. **end while**

9. **end while**

10. $y^* = y^k_{\gamma_i}$

11. $\mu = -\max(0, \gamma^i(y^* - \alpha)) - \min(0, \gamma^i(y^* + \alpha))$.

We will compare the sparse regularization (3.1) with the following Tikhonov regularization

$$
\min_{\mu \in L^2(\Omega)} \frac{1}{2}\|V_R\mu - u_R\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|\mu\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.
$$

(3.21)

By the Tikhonov regularization theory, the minimizer of (3.21) exists, and is

$$
\mu^*_T = (\alpha I + V^*_R V_R)^{-1}(V^*_R u_R).
$$
3.4 Numerical Tests

For the choice of the regularization parameter $\alpha$ in (P), we choose it according to [37]

$$\alpha < \|V^*_R u_R\|_{\infty}.$$ 

Otherwise $\mu$ would be 0 if $\alpha \geq \|V^*_R u_R\|_{\infty}$. We choose $\alpha = 10^{-5}$ for all the following three examples. For the homogeneous medium, we consider the following two examples. Here and in the following, we use the usual Cartesian coordinates system in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with $(x, y)$ instead of $(x_1, x_2)$.

Example 1: Supposing $a = 1000$, $b = 3000$, $k = 6$, $\alpha = 10^{-5}$ and noise level $\epsilon = 0.001$, we choose the following sparse sources with 4 peaks; see Figure 1(a),

$$f_4(x, y) = -ae^{-b((x-1/4)^2+(y-1/4)^2)} - ae^{-b((x-3/4)^2+(y-1/4)^2)} - ae^{-b((x-1/2)^2+(y-1/4)^2)} + ae^{-b((x-1/2)^2+(y-3/4)^2)}.$$ 

Example 2: Supposing $a = 1000$, $b = 3000$, $k = 24$, $\alpha = 10^{-5}$ and noise level $\epsilon = 0.01$,
\[
\gamma = 10^5 \quad \gamma = 10^6 \quad \gamma = 10^7 \quad \gamma = 10^8 \quad \gamma = 10^9 \quad \gamma = 10^{10}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k)</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: SSN iteration number with different wave numbers for example 2. The sizes of matrix \(A\) are \(576 \times 576\) for \(k = 6\), \(2304 \times 2304\) for \(k = 12\) and \(9216 \times 9216\) for \(k = 24\).

we choose the following sparse sources with 12 peaks; see Figure 2(a),

\[
f_9(x, y) = -ae^{-b((x-1/4)^2+(y-1/4)^2)} - ae^{-b((x-3/4)^2+(y-3/4)^2)} - ae^{-b((x-1/2)^2+(y-3/4)^2)} + ae^{-b((x-3/4)^2+(y-1/2)^2)} + a^{-b((x-1/4)^2+(y-1/2)^2)} + ae^{-b((x-1/4)^2+(y-3/4)^2)} - ae^{-b((x-3/4)^2+(y-1/4)^2)} - a^{-b((x-1/2)^2+(y-1/4)^2)} + ae^{-b((x-1/2)^2+(y-1/2)^2)}.
\]

(a) Original source
(b) Tikhonov regularization
(c) Sparse Regularization

(d) Original source: position
(e) Tikhonov regularization: position
(f) Sparse Regularization: position

Figure 2: Sparse sources of 9 peaks.

For the inhomogenous medium case, we choose the velocity field \(c(x, y) = 1.0 + 10I_{\{(x,y)\in\Omega: x>0.3\}}(x, y) + 20I_{\{(x,y)\in\Omega: y<0.3\}}(x, y)\) such that \(n(x, y) = \frac{1}{c(x, y)}\), where \(I_{\{\cdot\}}(x, y)\) is the indicator function in measure theory. Still, supposing \(a = 1000\), \(b = 3000\), \(k = 12\), \(\alpha = 10^{-5}\) and noise level \(\epsilon = 0.01\), we choose the following sparse sources with 7 peaks;
see Figure 3(a),

\[ f_7(x, y) = -ae^{-b((x-1/4)^2+(y-1/4)^2)} - ae^{-b((x-3/4)^2+(y-3/4)^2)} + ae^{-b((x-1/4)^2+(y-1/2)^2)} \]
\[ - ae^{-b((x-1/2)^2+(y-3/4)^2)} - ae^{-b((x-3/4)^2+(y-1/4)^2)} + ae^{-b((x-1/4)^2+(y-3/4)^2)} \]
\[ + ae^{-b((x-1/2)^2+(y-1/2)^2)}. \]

From Figure 1, 2, 3, we see that the sparse regularization can get better reconstructions with more accurate reconstructed positions and approximate shapes than the usual Tikhonov regularization no matter the background medium is homogeneous or inhomogeneous. Moreover, the sparse reconstructions are more sound with higher frequency, while the Tikhonov regularization does not work then.

From Table 1, we see the mesh independent property, i.e., the iteration number of the semismooth Newton method is independent with the mesh size once the mesh size is small enough [23].

4 Conclusions

We first studied the well-posedness of the direct acoustic scattering problem with sparse sources in the Radon measure space. We gave a definition of the very “weak” solution
considering the Sommerfeld radiating boundary condition. The well-posedness of the
direct scattering problem can guarantee the existence of the inverse reconstruction in
measure space. Sparse regularization is employed for the sparse reconstructions. For the
non-smooth regularization functional, we use the semismooth Newton method to the
predual problem for solving it. We found that the real part the scattering field is also
important for our reconstruction. Numerical experiments show our method can locate
the sparse sources and approximate the amplitude. Moreover, the reconstruction with
high frequency is more robust the noise level and is of high resolution. However, the
computation of the direct problem is quite challenging. It would be interesting to analyse
the high frequency case along with efficient newly developed computational algorithms
for the high frequency case [10].
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