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Abstract

We present the Simplified Lissajous Ellipse Fitting (SLEF) method for the calculation of the random phase step and the phase distribution from two phase-shifted interferograms. We consider interferograms with spatial and temporal dependency of background intensities, amplitude modulations and noise. Given these problems, the use of the Gabor Filter Banks (GFB) allows us to filter-out the noise, normalize the amplitude and eliminate the background. The normalized patterns allow to implement the SLEF algorithm, which is based on reducing the number of estimated coefficients of the ellipse equation, from five terms to only two. Our method consists of three stages. First, we preprocess the interferograms with GFB methodology in order to normalize the fringe patterns. Second, we calculate the phase step by using the proposed SLEF technique and third, we estimate the phase distribution using a state of the art two–steps algorithm. For the calculation of the phase step, we present two alternatives: the use of the Least Squares (LS) method to approximate the values of the coefficients and, in order to improve the LS estimation, a robust estimation based on the Leclerc’s potential. The SLEF method’s performance is evaluated through synthetic experiments to demonstrate its feasibility.
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1. Introduction

Phase shifting interferometry is widely used to obtain the phase distribution in interferometric measurements \[1-3\]. Even though the calculation can be performed in a single shot \[4\], the use of several phase shifted interferograms proved to make the measurement more robust to environmental variations \[4\]. Nowadays, the tendency has been to reduce the number of steps in order to measure dynamic events \[6-11\].

One of the main challenges in interferometry is the variation of the parameters of the intensity map. The spatial and temporal dependency of the background intensity, the amplitude modulation and noise are common in non-aligned arrangements \[1\]. These issues also apply to one-shot interferometry, where the use of optical components such as diffractive devices or polarizers disturb the captured interferograms \[9,11\].

Mathematically, the intensity model of these variable phase–shifted interferograms is given by

\[
I_k(x) = a_k(x) + b_k(x) \cos[\phi(x) + \delta_k] + \eta_k(x),
\]

where \(k \in 1, 2\) is the interferogram index, \(x = (x_1, x_2)\) is the vector of the pixel coordinates, \(a\) is the background component, \(b\) is the fringe’s amplitude function, \(\phi\) is the phase to be recovered, \(\delta_k\) is the random phase step and \(\eta_k\) is additive noise. For the case of two–step algorithms, we can assume that \(\delta_1 = 0\) and \(\delta_2 = \delta\). The \(a\) and \(b\) dependencies on \(k\) do not allow one to use the known algorithms of phase extraction since they assume temporally constant the background intensity and the amplitude modulation. In such cases, a preprocess is needed in order to normalize the patterns and compute the phase.

In this paper we propose a novel, simplified and more robust version of the Lissajous Ellipse Fitting (LEF) method for estimating the arbitrary phase step between two phase–shifted fringe patterns with variable parameters. There are
several proposals based on the LEF method designed to improve the estimation of the phase step and the phase distribution, such as: iterative processes based on the least square technique \[12\], the use of the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization to transforms the ellipse into a circle \[13\], the application of a Hilbert-Huang pre-filtering with the LEF algorithm \[14\] or the computation of the Euclidean distance from the points to the ellipse \[15\]; just to mention some of the novel techniques.

We named our proposed method as Simplified Lissajous Ellipse Fitting (SLEF). Our algorithm reduces the number of estimated coefficients of the ellipse equation, from five terms to only two. Consequently, it is improved the accuracy on the estimation of the relevant parameters by reducing the overfitting of the ellipse to residual noise. Our method consists of three stages: First, we preprocess the fringe patterns using a Gabor Filter Bank (GFB) in order to remove the background variation, normalize the amplitude modulation and filter-out noise \[16\]. Second, we calculate the phase step through the two term expression of the ellipse equation by using the Least Square (LS) method; alternatively, by minimizing a cost function based on the Leclerc’s potential to define a Robust Estimator (RE) of the coefficients. Third, we calculate the phase distribution using the two–steps algorithm reported in Ref. \[17\].

We will demonstrate that the use of GFB as a filtering preprocess does not only improves the robustness of the phase extraction, but also, as it will be
demonstrated in Section 4, it simplifies the computation of the ellipse coefficients and consequently the phase step estimation. We remark that we can replace the GFB based preprocessing with other normalization techniques that provide the elimination of the background component, normalize the amplitude modulation and filter-out the noise; for example the Windowed Fourier Transform 18.

2. Brief review of Lissajous ellipse fitting method

The Lissajous Ellipse Fitting (LEF) method consists on using the Lissajous figure to detect the phase step between two interferograms and estimate the phase 12-15 19.

Two phase-shifted interferograms can be represented as the Lissajous figure by plotting their pixel-wise corresponding intensities, see Figure 1. The relation between the major and the minor axes is the result of the phase-shift 19: if \( \delta = \pi/2 \), the ellipse would become a circle.

For the case of two-step interferometry, one can consider that the background intensity and the amplitude term are spatially constant and timely invariant, , \( a_1(x) = a_2(x) = a \) and \( b_1(x) = b_2(x) = b \), and that the noise \( \eta_k(x) \) is filtered-out. Then, by performing the addition and subtraction of these interferograms, one obtains:

\[
I_{\text{add}} = I_1 + I_2 = 2a + 2b \cos \left( \phi + \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \cos \left( \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \tag{2}
\]

\[
I_{\text{sub}} = I_1 - I_2 = 2b \sin \left( \phi + \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \sin \left( \frac{\delta}{2} \right), \tag{3}
\]

where the spatial dependency of \( \phi \) is omitted in order to simplify the notation.

By solving equations (2) and (3) for \( \cos(\phi+\delta/2) \) and \( \sin(\phi+\delta/2) \) respectively, and considering that \( \cos^2(x) + \sin^2(x) = 1 \), one obtains the expression of an ellipse represented as:

\[
\left( \frac{I_{\text{add}} - x_0}{\alpha_x} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{I_{\text{sub}} - y_0}{\alpha_y} \right)^2 = 1 \tag{4}
\]
where \( x_0 = 2a, y_0 = 0, \alpha_x = 2b \cos(\delta/2) \) and \( \alpha_y = 2b \sin(\delta/2) \).

Then, one can rewrite (4) in the conical equation of the ellipse:

\[
\theta_1 x^2 + \theta_2 y^2 + \theta_3 x + \theta_4 y + \theta_5 = 0
\]

(5)

where \( \theta_1 = \frac{1}{\alpha_x^2}, \theta_2 = \frac{1}{\alpha_y^2}, \theta_3 = -\frac{x_0}{\alpha_x^2}, \theta_4 = -\frac{y_0}{\alpha_y^2} \), and \( \theta_5 = \frac{x_0^2}{\alpha_x^2} + \frac{y_0^2}{\alpha_y^2} - 1 \). Thus, by solving the coefficients (vector \( \theta \)) by the least square method, the phase step is computed as

\[
\delta = 2 \arctan \left( \sqrt{\frac{\theta_1}{\theta_2}} \right).
\]

(6)

Hence, the phase distribution is calculated with

\[
\phi = \arctan \left( \frac{I_{\text{sub}}}{I_{\text{add}} + \frac{y_0}{\alpha_y} \sqrt{\frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1}}} \right) - \frac{\delta}{2}.
\]

(7)

In this work, we present a simplified extension of the LEF method and demonstrate its reliability with complex fringe pattern sets.

3. Gabor Filter Bank (GFB)

As described by Rivera et al. [16, 20], a Gabor filter (GF) is a complex band-pass filter created from the modulation of a complex sinusoidal function with a Gaussian filter (G). The complex response from this filter is modeled as:

\[
GF\{I\}(x, \omega) = I(x) \otimes [e^{-i\omega x}G(x, \sigma)]
\]

(8)

where \( I \) is the signal to be filtered, in this case the fringe patterns, \( \omega \) is the tuned frequency of the filter, \( \sigma \) is the Gaussian filter width (window size) and \( \otimes \) denotes the convolution of the functions. In terms of frequency, the window size \( \sigma \) of the filter, represents the width of the band-pass filter centered at the \( \omega \) frequency.

A GFB is a set of GFs defined by a set of frequencies \( \{\omega_k\}_{k=1,2,...} \) and windows sizes \( \{\sigma_k\}_{k=1,2,...} \). Hence, for a given neighborhood around a pixel \( \hat{x} \), the GF with the maximal magnitude of \( GF\{I\}(\hat{x}, \omega_k) \) is obtained when the
filter frequency approximates the local frequency of the signal, in this case the image $I$.

4. Proposal: SLEF method using Gabor Filter Banks

4.1. Least Square based solution method

Herein we introduce our extension to the LEF algorithm for estimating the actual phase step. We named our variant as SLEF. For this purpose, we will consider the intensity model of the interferograms expressed in (1).

The objective of using a GFB based preprocessing, as proposed in Ref. [16], is to eliminate the background variation, normalize the amplitude modulation and remove the noise. This pre-filtering makes the algorithm more robust regardless of the conditions of the interferogram. The GFB’s normalized two-step interferograms are:

\[
\hat{I}_1 = \cos[\phi(x)] \tag{9}
\]

\[
\hat{I}_2 = \cos[\phi(x) + \delta], \tag{10}
\]

where we set $a_1(x) = a_2(x) = 0$ because of the background elimination, $b_1(x) = b_2(x) = 1$ because of the amplitude normalization, and $\eta_1(x) = \eta_2(x) = 0$ because of the filtering process. For the two-step algorithm, $\delta_1 = 0$ and $\delta_2 = \delta$.

Since we remove the background illumination component, we are using normalized fringe patterns, the center of the ellipse is at the origin because $x_0 = 2a = 0$ and the eccentricity terms are given by

\[
\alpha_x = 2 \cos \left( \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \tag{11}
\]

\[
\alpha_y = 2 \sin \left( \frac{\delta}{2} \right). \tag{12}
\]

Thus, we can simplify the equation (11) of the ellipse for the Lissajous pattern as

\[
\left( \frac{\hat{I}_{add}}{\alpha_x} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\hat{I}_{sub}}{\alpha_y} \right)^2 = 1, \tag{13}
\]
which corresponds to the equation of the ellipse centered at the origin. Hence, the ellipse’s conical expression is given by

\[ \theta_1 x^2 + \theta_2 y^2 - 1 = 0. \]  

(14)

In Figure 2c we present a sample of the effects of the filtering process on noisy and non-normalized patterns. The Lissajous ellipse, the line in red, can be considered as the mean of the observed values. For this reason, we model such variations with an \( \varepsilon \) term in equation (14) associated to the residual noise that results from applying the GFB process:

\[ \theta_1 x^2 + \theta_2 y^2 - 1 = \varepsilon(x, y). \]  

(15)

Our SLEF method is based in this simplified equation with only two free parameters, \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \). Then, because the presence of the residual \( \varepsilon \), we choose to solve the system by the Least Square (LS) method of the overdetermined system

\[
\arg\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\theta_1 x_i^2 + \theta_2 y_i^2 - 1)^2,
\]

(16)

where \( N \) is the total number of pixels. This expression can be rewritten as

\[
\arg\min_{T} \frac{1}{2} \|XTT - I\|_2^2
\]

(17)

where

\[
T \overset{\text{def}}{=} [\theta_1, \theta_2]^T
\]

(18a)

\[
XT \overset{\text{def}}{=} \begin{bmatrix} x_1^2 & y_1^2 \\ x_2^2 & y_2^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ x_N^2 & y_N^2 \end{bmatrix}
\]

(18b)

and \( I \) is a vector of \( N \) terms of value 1. Thus, the solution to (17) is given by

\[
T = (XTT)^{-1}XT.
\]

(19)
Once we have solved system (17) for $\theta_1$ and $\theta_2$, we are in condition to calculate the phase step $\delta$ with (6). Finally, we compute the phase distribution with the formula for two-step phase shifting reported in Ref. [17]:

$$
\phi(x, y) = \arctan \left[ \frac{\hat{I}_1(x, y) \cos(\delta) - \hat{I}_2(x, y)}{\hat{I}_1(x, y) \sin(\delta)} \right].
$$

(20)

4.2. Robust SLEF Estimator

In the previous subsection we estimate the parameters $\theta_1$ and $\theta_2$ with the LS method. This corresponds to assume a Gaussian distribution for the residual $\varepsilon$. By the examination of Figure 2c, we noted that such residual is, in fact, non-Gaussian. Therefore, here we propose a robust procedure to improve the estimation of $\theta_1$ and $\theta_2$. Such robust estimator relies on the fact that the residual distribution has heavy tails [16, 21]. In general, the robust procedure can be formulated as the optimization problem:

$$
\arg\min_{\theta_1, \theta_2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \rho(\theta_1 x_i^2 + \theta_2 y_i^2 - 1; \kappa)
$$

(21)

where $\rho$ is a robust potential and $\kappa$ is a positive parameter that controls the outlier rejection sensitivity. In this paper we use the Leclerc’s potential [22]:

$$
\rho(z; \kappa) = 1 - \frac{1}{k} \exp(-kz^2)
$$

(22)

and we set $\kappa = 0.1$.

According to [21, 23], the optimization can be obtained by the iteration of the solution of a weighted linear system; i.e.,

$$
T = (XWX^T)^{-1}XW\mathbb{1}
$$

(23)

where $W$ is the diagonal matrix of weights

$$
W = \text{diag}[w(x_1, y_1), w(x_2, y_2), \ldots, w(x_N, y_N)]
$$

(24)
with
\[ w(x_i, y_i) = \exp(-2k[\theta_1 x_i^2 + \theta_2 y_i^2 - 1]^2). \] (25)

The solution \( T^* \) is obtained by iterating (23) and (25). The initial conditions for the weight matrix is set \( W = \text{diag}[1, 1, \ldots, 1] \). We observe that the system converged after just 3 iterations.

5. Experiments and results

In order to evaluate the proposed algorithms performance, we will use ten sets of simulated patterns with different phase steps (\( \delta = [\pi/10, 3\pi/10, \pi/2, 7\pi/10, 9\pi/10] \)) and five different Gaussian noise levels (\( \sigma = [0.0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0] \)). These patterns present spatial and temporal dependency of background intensities, amplitude modulations and noise. According to references [16, 24], the normalization process through linear spectral filters such as Windowed Fourier Transform (WFT) or Gabor Filter Banks (GFB) present better results than the use of Empirical Mode Decomposition (EMD) using the Hilbert–Huang transform [14]. For this reason, we perform a filtering preprocess using GFB for a fair comparison. The methods to be compared are: the SLEF algorithm solved by the Least Square method (SLEF–LS), described in section 4.1; the SLEF algorithm solved with the Robust Estimator (SLEF–RE), described in section 4.2; and the algorithm proposed by Liu et al. in [14], but using GFB as filtering preprocess (LEF–GFB) for the reasons mentioned before, nevertheless, the rest of the calculus are performed as published.

Figure 2a depicts the Lissajous Pattern (LP) for noiseless and normalized fringe patterns with a random phase shift; in this case, the LP is centered at the origin. In order to remove the rotation of the ellipse, as seen in Figure 1, the LP is computed using the addition and the subtraction of the fringe patterns [19]. In Figure 2b we show an example of the simulated patterns to be used. These fringe patterns present spatial and temporal dependency of the background and amplitude modulation, Gaussian noise of \( \sigma = 0.5 \) and a phase
step of \( \delta = \pi/3 \). It is clear that a LP is not appreciated from the original data given the disturbances previously mentioned.

The first step of our method consists on the preprocessing of the fringe patterns using a GFB. In Figure 2c we present the filtered patterns as well as their LP. In these patterns the noise is filtered-out, the background is retrieved and the modulation is normalized. From obtained LP of the filtered patterns,
it is important to emphasize the following:

1. The LP center is at the origin.
2. The approximation of the points is close to the ideal ellipse.
3. The spread points are due to the residuals of the preprocess.

The second step is the estimation of the phase step $\delta$ using equation (6). To evaluate the feasibility of our proposed methods, we calculated the phase step estimation comparing them with the preprocessed LEF algorithm proposed in [14]. The first comparison consists on calculating the phase step at different Gaussian noise levels. For this analysis, we used ten different sets of images with five different Gaussian noise levels ($\sigma = [0.0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0]$), with spatial–temporal variations in their background intensity as well as the amplitude modulation. The phase step between the patterns was set to $\pi/3$. Each pattern was preprocessed using the GFB and the calculation of the phase step was using the same equation (6) using the computed parameters of each method: SLEF–LS, SLEF–RE and LEF–GFB.

![Figure 3](image)

**Figure 3**: Mean Absolute Error of the phase step calculation for the LEF–GFB SLEF–LS and SLEF–RE algorithms at different noise levels.

Figure 3 depicts the computed Mean Absolute Error (MAE) of the analyzed sets of patterns. The MAE’s means of the algorithms are $MAE_{LEF-GFB} = \ldots$
0.0869 rad, $MAE_{SLEF-LS} = 0.0871 rad$ and $MAE_{SLEF-RE} = 0.0204 rad$. It can be appreciated that the well-known LEF algorithm and the proposed SLEF–LS algorithm have practically the same behavior. However, SLEF–RE is a more accurate (less error) and precise (less error variance) phase step estimator, regardless of the noise presented considering that the MAE is smaller than 0.02 rad.

The second comparison consists on calculating the phase step with different phase steps $\delta$. For this analysis, we used the same images with a fixed Gaussian noise of $\sigma = 0.5$. The phase steps between the patterns were $\delta = [\pi/10, \pi/6, \pi/4, \pi/3, \pi/2]$. As before, each pattern was preprocessed using the GFB and the calculation of the phase step was using the same equation (6) with the computed parameters of each method: SLEF–LS, SLEF–RE and LEF–GFB.

![Figure 4: Mean Absolute Error of the phase step calculation for the LEF–GFB SLEF–LS and SLEF–RE algorithms at different phase steps.](image)

Figure 4 shows the MAE resulted of the analyzed patterns. It can be observed that the LEF–GFB and SLEF–LS algorithms present a similar behavior, while SLEF–RE have smaller variance and error. It is important to notice that the error increases for small phase steps, and it decreases as the step approaches to $\delta = \pi/2$. The error for phase steps in the interval $\delta \in (\pi/2, \pi)$ is the same.
as the presented in Figure 4 since the error tends to increase as the step gets closer to \( \pi \).

Finally, the third stage is the calculation of the phase using Eq. \( (7) \) for the LEF–GFB algorithm and Eq. \( (20) \) for the SLEF algorithms. To evaluate the phase error, we used the pattern presented in Figure 2. In this case, the phase shift is \( \delta = \pi/3 \) and the Gaussian noise presents a \( \sigma = 0.5 \).

![Figure 5: Phase estimation using LEF-GFB, SLEF-LS and SLEF-RE algorithms.](image)

In Figure 5 we present the calculation of one of the simulated patterns shown in Figure 2b. For this particular experiment, the error of the estimation of the
step using the LEF–FB algorithm was $\delta_{error} = 0.05677\text{rad}$ while the error for the SLEF–LS algorithm was $\delta_{error} = 0.05675\text{rad}$ and the SLEF–RE was $\delta_{error} = 0.02194\text{rad}$.

Figures 5a, 5b and 5c present the estimated phases using the LEF–GFB, SLEF–LS and SLEF–RE, respectively. In Figures 5d, 5e and 5f are shown the wrapped errors of the recovered phases with respect to the ideal phase. The MAEs of the error surfaces is $\text{MAE}_{\text{LEF–GFB}} = 1.0013\text{rad}$, $\text{MAE}_{\text{SLEF–LS}} = 0.37\text{rad}$ and $\text{MAE}_{\text{SLEF–RE}} = 0.3569\text{rad}$. It is important to note that the high amount of harmonics in Figures 5d and 5g is due to used phase extraction equation, in this case Eq. (7). If the phase was recovered by Eq. (20), the MAE would be reduced to $0.37\text{rad}$ which is the same as the presented by the SLEF–LS algorithm.

6. Discussions

As mentioned in section 2, two phase-shifted interferograms can be represented as the Lissajous figure by plotting their pixel–wise corresponding intensities. Nevertheless, this algorithm requires at least that the background intensity as well as the amplitude modulation to be temporary constants [12–15, 19]. If this condition is not presented, it is required a preparation process for the interferograms in order to accomplish a constant modulation of the fringes. Pre-processing techniques such as Windowed Fourier Transform [18], GFB [17], the Hilbert–Huang Transform (HHT) [25] or isotropic normalization [26] allow to eliminate such variations. Our work presents the advantage of using normalized fringe patterns since it allows us to simplify the solution of the ellipse equation from a 5–terms equation to a 2–terms form. Liu et. al [14] present a similar approach even though, they still solve a 5–terms equation. We compare our approach with theirs in order to prove the equivalency of our 2–terms SLEF–LS algorithm with the 5–term pre–filtered technique. On the other hand, the proposals presented by Zhang et. al do not fit with our approach: First, they use of the LEF method to calculate a first approximation of the phase distribu-
tion and then iterate the solution using a LS technique [12]. Second, they use the Gram–Schmidt orthonormalization proposed in reference [27] in order to transform the ellipse into a circle, and then, obtain the parameters to calculate the phase distribution. These proposals only use the LEF algorithm as a tool, but they are not based on the algorithm. For this reason we do not include a comparison with them.

7. Conclusions

We introduced a simplified model of the Lissajous ellipse fitting to calculate the phase step and phase distribution of two randomly shifted interferograms. We focused on solving the problem of obtaining the phase of interferograms with spatial–temporal dependencies on their background intensities, amplitude modulations and noise. The main advantages of use of the GFB is that the phase estimation is robust to the mentioned issues since it filters–out the noise, normalizes the amplitude and eliminates the background. Given the normalized patterns, the ellipse equation can be simplified to a two–unknowns system instead of a five–unknowns system, we name this the SLEF algorithm. Our method consists of three stages: the preprocess the fringe patterns using a GFB, the estimation of the phase step through the estimation of the coefficients of the ellipse’s equation and the calculation the phase distribution. We remark that we can replace the GFB based preprocessing with other normalization techniques that provide the elimination of the background component, normalize the amplitude modulation and filter–out the noise. As presented, the estimation of the two terms of the ellipse equation can be done by the well–known LS method, which results are the same as the 5–terms. Also, introduced a novel implementation of a robust estimator such as the Leclerc’s potential in order to improve the accuracy of the phase step estimation, this is mainly cause because of the residuals of the filtering process. The experimental results of the calculation of our algorithms to 100 pairs of images (10 different patterns with 5 different levels of noise and 5 different phase steps) prove that SLEF–LS is equivalent to
the pre–filtered 5–term LEF algorithm and our SLEF–RE algorithm improves significantly the accuracy of the phase step estimation.
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