Dynamic Mode Decomposition for Aero-Optic Wavefront Characterization
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Abstract. Aero-optical beam control relies on the development of low-latency forecasting techniques to quickly predict wavefronts aberrated by the Turbulent Boundary Layer (TBL) around an airborne optical system. We leverage the forecasting capabilities of the \textit{Dynamic Mode Decomposition} (DMD) – an equation-free, data-driven method for identifying coherent flow structures and their associated spatiotemporal dynamics – in order to estimate future state wavefront phase aberrations to feed into an adaptive optic (AO) control loop. We specifically leverage the \textit{optimized DMD} (opt-DMD) algorithm on a subset of the Airborne Aero-Optical Laboratory Transonic (AAOL-T) experimental dataset. Critically, opt-DMD allows for de-biasing of the forecasting algorithm in order to produce a robust, stable, and accurate future-state prediction, and the underlying DMD algorithm provides a highly interpretable spatiotemporal decomposition of the TBL and the resulting aberrations to the wavefront dynamics.
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1 Introduction

In numerous applications, high-fidelity laser beam propagation hinges on mitigating phase distortions to the outgoing wavefront, often via an adaptive optic (AO) control system of deformable mirrors. In airborne optical systems, wavefront distortions result from three primary sources: via mechanical jitter of the platform, in the near-field where the Turbulent Boundary Layer (TBL) around the airborne platform rapidly alters the refractive index, and in the atmosphere where inhomogeneities and turbulence alter the propagation medium. This paper focuses on the near-field wavefront distortions that are referred to as aero-optical effects. The term aero-optics refers to the intersection of optical and aerodynamic phenomena, such as the effects on the optical field from a high-speed turbulent flow, where air is forced over and around the optical system and can result in flow separation and shock formation. Characterizing these rapid wavefront aberrations is the focus of this study.

The motivation for higher-fidelity computational fluid dynamics (CFD) models and experimental techniques in the study of aero-optics is due to the effects of aerodynamic environments on airborne-based laser platforms. The high-speed, high Reynolds number compressible flows around airborne platforms can contain TBLs, shear layers, and wakes, as well as shock waves in the case of transonic and supersonic flows. As a laser beam propagates through this turbulent flow surrounding the aperture, refractive index fluctuations cause phase aberrations, and the resulting distortions of the optical field are referred to as aero-optical effects.\textsuperscript{1} The index of refraction, $n$, is
Fig 1: AAOL-T aircraft with hemispherical laser turret. The turret geometry produces a turbulent flow field in the few centimeters surrounding the sensors. This flow dynamics must be accounted for in order to properly produce high-fidelity, coherent transmission of the electric field.

directly linked to air density fluctuations by

\[ n(r) = 1 + K_{GD}(\lambda_0)\rho(r), \]  

(1)

where \( K_{GD} \) is the wavelength-dependent Gladstone-Dale factor, \( \lambda_0 \) is the wavelength, and \( \rho(r) \) is the air density as a function of the spatial variable \( r \).

Characterizing propagating beam wavefront dynamics in the TBL is critical to correcting the outgoing phase profile of the beam. From an applied standpoint, despite the relatively short distance traveled in the TBL, the beam quality is immediately and often heavily degraded within this region. A typically used method to quantify the aero-optic wavefront aberrations from a given refractive index field is by calculating optical path difference (OPD). OPD is computed by first calculating the optical path length (OPL), which is proportional to the travel time for corresponding rays. OPL is often computed as the integral of the index of refraction along the propagation direction,

\[ \text{OPL}(x, y, t) = \int_{0}^{z_1} n(x, y, z, t) \, dz. \]  

(2)

Subtracting the mean OPL over the spatial coordinates of the aperture produces the OPD,

\[ \text{OPD}(x, y, t) = \text{OPL}(x, y, t) - \langle \text{OPL}(x, y, t) \rangle. \]  

(3)

Here we have let \( z \) be the optical axis of the beam with \( x \) and \( y \) coordinates covering the aperture as seen in Figure 2. Assuming the dominant contribution to the OPD occurs within the TBL over short transmission distances, we may let the upper bound of integration, \( z_1 \), match the extent of the TBL. The root mean square of OPD across each dataset provides a metric to assess the severity of wavefront distortions for the given experiment. To compare OPD across experiments, we then normalize it as a dimensionless quantity, computing

\[ \text{OPD}_{\text{rms}} = \frac{\text{OPD}_{\text{rms}}}{M^2 D \rho/\rho_0}, \]  

(4)

where \( M \) is the Mach number as a ratio of the speed of sound, \( D \) is the turret diameter, and \( \rho/\rho_0 \) is a ratio of in-flight air density to sea-level air density. For the AAOL-T data, we analyze a subset such that each trial is taken at \( M = 0.6 \) and \( \rho = 0.812 \text{ kg/m}^3 \). The sea level air density is set to the
Fig 2: Detail of the turret geometry. The wavefronts aberrated by the turbulent boundary layer are imaged through the wavefront aperture for different imaging angles $\alpha$ and $\beta$. Wavefront corrections are significantly different depending on the flow regime. Specifically, large scale turbulent coherent structures develop as the flow separates for $\alpha > \pi/2$.

standard $\rho_0 = 1.225 \text{ kg/m}^3$, and the AAOL-T turret diameter is $D = 0.3048 \text{ m}$. When referring to $\text{OPD}_{\text{rms}}$ in figures and elsewhere in this paper, we imply the normalized formulation.

The analysis of aero-optical wavefront reconstruction leverages time-series measurements collected through the TBL. Here we highlight the measurement and sensor technologies exploited for characterizing aero-optic interactions. Further, we highlight the underlying mathematical architecture that leverages these measurements in order to construct dynamic models for wavefront reconstruction.

The AAOL-T experiment, the aircraft and hemispherical laser turret of which are depicted in Figures 1 and 2, has produced a database of aero-optic disturbance measurements obtained from in-flight measurements. Canonically, atmospheric aberrations are often characterized by Zernike modes, an orthogonal sequence of polynomials that span the unit disk and possess odd or even radial symmetries. Zernike modes offer interpretability to optical dynamics and can yield insights where radially symmetric aberrations are concerned, yet this is often not the case for aero-optical disturbances prone to quickly-varying nonlinearities in the index of refraction. An analysis of the temporal phase structure function and other statistics of AAOL-T wavefront data was performed by Brennan and Wittich in 2013. Proper Orthogonal Decomposition (POD) and Dynamic Mode
2 Sensors and Data Acquisition

A Shack-Hartmann wavefront sensor (SH WFS) is used to capture wavefront phase aberrations between the source and destination of the beam from the two AAOL-T aircraft. A lenslet array in the pupil plane and at a focal distance away from an optical sensor focuses an incoming wavefront into sub-regions on the detector plane. Any deviations from a planar wavefront manifest as displacements, $\Delta x_i$ and $\Delta y_i$, from the optical axis in the $i^{th}$ sub-region. The shape of the wavefront can then be reconstructed by computing the resulting tilt for each sub-region.\cite{6}

A 3-D representation of the SH WFS on the AAOL-T laser turret is depicted in Figure 3a. The incoming beam’s aberrated wavefront is focused from the gridded lenslet array onto sub-regions on the detector plane as depicted by the larger green dots. The displacements, $\Delta x_i$ and $\Delta y_i$, of each focused sub-beam from the centroid of the sub-region, shown by the smaller black dot, is used to compute the local tilt of the incoming wavefront, from which the wavefront may be reconstructed. With a planar, unaberrated incoming wavefront, the focused spots would be in a perfect grid matching the lenslet array geometry. The central circular region in Figure 3b represents the secondary mirror obscuration, which includes a telescope used to align the turret on one AAOL-T aircraft to the incoming beam from the other and is not an explicit feature of a general SH WFS. Because of the obscuration, the unprocessed SH data is taken as a set of points lying in an annulus.

Figure 3b shows a single frame of unprocessed SH WFS data from the AAOL-T platform used in this study. The data were acquired using a v1610 Vision Research Phantom camera at 30 kHz for a total of 21,504 frames captured per dataset. Figure 3c is an example of the processed data and the wavefront from the local tilts of the SH WFS that we use in our analysis. As will be described
in the upcoming sections, this study investigated 23 sets of data with varying \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) angles, as defined in Figure 2.

3 Optimized Dynamic Mode Decomposition

DMD was an algorithm developed by Schmid\(^\text{10,11}\) in the fluid dynamics community to identify spatio-temporal coherent structures from high-dimensional data. DMD is based on POD, which utilizes the computationally efficient singular value decomposition (SVD) so that it scales well to provide effective dimensionality reduction in high-dimensional systems. DMD provides a modal decomposition where each mode consists of spatially correlated structures that have the same linear behavior in time (e.g., oscillations at a given frequency with growth or decay). Thus, DMD not only provides dimensionality reduction in terms of a reduced set of modes, but also provides a model for how these modes evolve in time.

Several algorithms have been proposed for DMD, with the exact DMD framework developed by Tu et al.\(^\text{12}\) being the simplest, least-squares regression to produce the decomposition. DMD is inherently data-driven, and the first step is to collect a number of pairs of snapshots of the state of a system as it evolves in time. These snapshot pairs may be denoted by \( \{x(t_k), x(t'_k)\}_{k=1}^m \), where \( t'_k = t_k + \Delta t \), and the timestep, \( \Delta t \), must be sufficiently small to resolve the highest frequencies in the dynamics. As before, a snapshot may be the state of a system, such as a three-dimensional fluid velocity field sampled at a number of discretized locations that is reshaped into a high-dimensional column vector. These snapshots are then arranged into two data matrices, \( X \) and \( X' \),

\[
X = \begin{bmatrix} x(t_1) & x(t_2) & \cdots & x(t_m) \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
X' = \begin{bmatrix} x(t'_1) & x(t'_2) & \cdots & x(t'_m) \end{bmatrix}.
\]

If we assume uniform sampling in time, we will adopt the notation \( x_k = x(k\Delta t) \).

The DMD algorithm seeks the leading spectral decomposition (i.e. eigenvalues and eigenvectors) of the best-fit linear operator, \( A \), that relates the two snapshot matrices in time by

\[
X' \approx AX.
\]

The best-fit operator, \( A \), then establishes a linear dynamical system that best advances snapshot measurements forward in time. If we assume uniform sampling in time, this becomes

\[
x_{k+1} \approx Ax_k.
\]

Mathematically, the best-fit operator \( A \) is defined as

\[
A = \arg\min_A \|X' - AX\|_F = X'X^+ \tag{8}
\]

where \( \| \cdot \|_F \) is the Frobenius norm and \( ^+ \) denotes the Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse. The matrix \( A \) is an operator that advances the measurements in \( x \) forward in time. It is often helpful to convert the
eigenvalues of this discrete-time operator into continuous time, resulting in eigenvalues \( \lambda = \mu + i\omega \).

Alternative and better approaches are available\(^{13-15}\) to the exact DMD algorithm. The optimized DMD algorithm generalizes the optimization framework of exact DMD to perform a regression on exponential time dynamics, thus providing an improved computation of the DMD modes and their eigenvalues.\(^{16}\) Thus, the data matrix, \( X \), may be reconstructed as

\[
X \approx \Phi \text{diag}(b) T(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix}
\phi_1 & \ldots & \phi_r \\
| & \cdots & |
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
b_1 \\
| \\
b_r
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
e^{\lambda_1 t_1} & \ldots & e^{\lambda_1 t_m} \\
| & \cdots & |
\end{bmatrix},
\]

(9)

where the \( i^{th} \) eigenmode, \( \phi_i \), has a corresponding mode amplitude \( b_i \) and eigenvalue \( \lambda_i \).

Bagheri\(^{17}\) first highlighted that DMD is particularly sensitive to the effects of noisy data, with systematic biases introduced to the eigenvalue distribution.\(^{18-21}\) For example, when additive white noise is present in the measurements of an \( n \)-dimensional system with \( m \) snapshots, the bias in exact DMD will be the dominant component of DMD error whenever \( \sqrt{m/n} \) exceeds the signal-to-noise ratio.\(^{20}\) As a result, a number of methods have been introduced to stabilize performance, including total least-squares DMD,\(^{21}\) forward-backward DMD,\(^{20}\) variational DMD,\(^{22}\) subspace DMD,\(^{23}\) time-delay embedded DMD\(^{24}\) and robust DMD methods.\(^{15, 25}\)

However, the \textit{optimized DMD} algorithm of Askham and Kutz,\(^{15}\) which uses a variable projection method for nonlinear least squares to compute the DMD for unevenly timed samples, provides the best and optimal performance of any algorithm currently available. This is not surprising given that it actually is constructed to optimally satisfy the DMD problem formulation. Specifically, the optimized DMD algorithm directly solves the exponential fitting problem,

\[
\arg\min_{\lambda, \Phi b} \| X - \Phi b T(\lambda) \|_F,
\]

(10)

where \( \Phi b \) is the product \( \Phi b \). This has been shown to provide a superior decomposition due to its ability to optimally suppress bias and handle snapshots collected at arbitrary times. The disadvantage of optimized DMD is that one must solve a nonlinear, nonconvex optimization problem.

4 AAOL-T Experimental Data

The AAOL-T was run by researchers at the University of Notre Dame to obtain live aero-optical data in flight. A 532 nm source beam propagates from a hemispherical laser turret of diameter 0.3048 m mounted on a Falcon 10 aircraft, as depicted in Figure 1. The beam overfills the pupil aperture on the receiver laboratory aircraft.

A SH WFS is used to capture phase aberrations. Depicted in Figure 3a, the sensor uses a lenslet array in the pupil plane and at a focal distance away from an optical device. These lenslets focus an incoming wavefront into regions on the detector plane. Any deviations from a planar wavefront become displacements, \( \Delta x_i \) and \( \Delta y_i \), from the optical axis. The shape of the wavefront can then be reconstructed by computing the resulting tilt for each sub-region.

The AAOL-T dataset involves measurements up to Mach 0.8. The distance between source and receiver is approximately 50 m. The beam direction is recorded in terms of its azimuth and
Fig 4: (a) The OPD\textsubscript{rms} characterizes each \((\alpha, \beta)\) experiment in our subset of the AAOL-T data set. OPD increases as the turret direction \(\alpha\) looks to the trailing edge of the flow field. The inclination angles that lie in the range \(60^\circ \lesssim \beta \lesssim 80^\circ\) are subject horn vortices interrupting the boundary layer flow resulting in greater OPD. (b) The experimental trials are plotted for \((\alpha, \beta)\) to depict OPD\textsubscript{rms} (color) as it changes for various flow features. The light red shaded region indicates the backward facing angles of the laser turret. The dark red region approximate where horn vortices form.

elevation angles, as visualized in Figure 2, with respect to the hemisphere and is later considered in terms of a “look-back” angle and inclination angle, \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) respectively, where

\[
\alpha = \cos^{-1}(\cos(Az) \cos(El))
\]

(11)

\[
\beta = \tan^{-1}(\tan(El)/\sin(Az))
\]

(12)

Figure 4a measures the effects of \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) on OPD\textsubscript{rms} for all 23 data sets. For backwards looking angles \(\alpha > 90^\circ\), an increasing OPD indicates a heightening level of aberrations in the wavefront. With Figure 4b, we can visualize the effects of this look-back angle when also considering \(\beta\). The dark red region indicates angles that lie where horn vortices exist; OPD\textsubscript{rms} tends to be greatest for these data points.

5 Results and Analysis

Figures 5-7 show the result of an opt-DMD analysis for a total of nine different turret angles \((\alpha, \beta)\): \((95^\circ, 83^\circ)\), \((127^\circ, 81^\circ)\), and \((153^\circ, 83^\circ)\) in Figure 5; \((88^\circ, 65^\circ)\), \((119^\circ, 70^\circ)\), and \((141^\circ, 65^\circ)\) in Figure 6; and \((82^\circ, 50^\circ)\), \((94^\circ, 52^\circ)\), and \((108^\circ, 53^\circ)\) in Figure 7.

The figures are separated into sets of similar inclination angle, \(\beta\), and sweep across three available look-back angles, \(\alpha\). Each row represents an individual \((\alpha, \beta)\) data set’s opt-DMD analysis, showing the dominant eight eigenvalues and then showing modes 1, 3, 5, and 7 from which the even numbered modes may be inferred as complex conjugates. Note in all cases, the eigenvalue spectrum is completely de-biased, lying along the imaginary axis. This is the critical takeaway of opt-DMD: with nearly perfect imaginary eigenvalues, the presented modes experience little time decay, allowing for longer lasting forecasts.

To compare with the precision of opt-DMD, we consider in Figure 8 an exact DMD analysis of the \((\alpha = 153^\circ, \beta = 83^\circ)\) dataset. As shown by the turret geometry Figure 2, this angle is roughly along the mid-line of the turret with a high look-back angle, pointing into the turbulent region.
Fig 5: Experiments with $\beta \approx 80^\circ$ for various $\alpha$, all in degrees. Each row depicts the truncated eigenvalue spectrum and first eight modes. Note that even modes are not shown but are complex conjugates of the displayed images.

Fig 6: Experiments with $\beta \approx 65^\circ$, where the turret is facing into the horn vortex region, for various $\alpha$, all in degrees. Each row depicts the truncated eigenvalue spectrum and first eight modes. Note that even modes are not shown but are complex conjugates of the displayed images.
Fig 7: Experiments with $\beta \approx 50^\circ$ for various $\alpha$, all in degrees. Each row depicts the truncated eigenvalue spectrum and first eight modes. Note that even modes are not shown but are complex conjugates of the displayed images.

prone to aero-optical effects but just outside regions with prominent horn vortices. The singular value spectrum and corresponding cumulative energy plots in Figure 8a suggest an optical rank truncation $r = k = 296$, which is typically an overwhelming amount of modal detail to retain.

Figure 8b shows the continuous-time eigenvalue spectrum of the system at the given rank truncation. The parabolic envelope $\mu(\omega) = -0.11\omega^2 - 0.09$ of the continuous-time eigenvalues ought to be compared with the spectrum of opt-DMD in Figures 5-7, which lie on the imaginary axis. The deformed envelope here is consistent with weak noise on self-sustaining oscillating flow fields. While truncating the exact DMD analysis at a lower rank may produce modes closer to the imaginary axis, a parabolic envelope remains and the performance of opt-DMD remains superior by construction.

The mean half-life is found to be

$$\langle t_{1/2} \rangle = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{j=1}^{r} -\frac{\log(2)\Delta t}{\mu_j} = 104 \mu s \quad (13)$$

and amplitude-weighted mean half-life is

$$\langle t_{1/2}^b \rangle = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{r} |b_i|} \sum_{j=1}^{r} -\frac{|b_j| \log(2)\Delta t}{\mu_j} = 138 \mu s \quad (14)$$

of the modes gives us a window into the shortcomings of exact DMD. The modal half-life indicates a window of opportunity for a predictor to interact with an AO control loop. Because these half-lives are on the order of a hundred microseconds, pertinent coherent turbulent structures may be treated as transient effects, diminishing the ability of DMD to forecast the dominant spatiotemporal
Fig 8: Demonstration of bias in the exact DMD algorithm for $\alpha = 153^\circ, \beta = 83^\circ$. The bias produces a half-life decay for the forecast on the order of a hundred microseconds. (a) SVD and cumulative energy of singular values. (b) Continuous-time eigenvalue spectrum. The orange dashed parabola which forms an envelope around the DMD eigenvalues is characteristic of noisy bias. In the opt-DMD spectra this curve becomes a vertical line. The blue dash-dotted line represents a cutoff to the left of which exist modes whose half-life exceeds the mean half-life. (c) One-sided power spectrum of the DMD modes. Colors here match those in (b).

structures on a long horizon. Furthermore, Figure 8c characterizes the power spectrum of the exact DMD modes. Note that many powerful modes have lower than average half-lives, further compromising the ability of exact DMD to forecast turbulent flow dynamics.

6 Conclusion

Data-driven methods are becoming increasingly important to model complex spatio-temporal systems whose evolution dynamics are not well known or only characterized by time-series measurements. In the case of aero-optic interactions, modeling the induced turbulent wake from a turret is exceptionally challenging. Unless the dynamics is characterized in an appropriate manner, the wavefront aberrations cannot be corrected in the AO system. We proposed a data-driven algorithmic architecture which aims to model the aero-optic interactions in an an adaptive and real-time manner. Specifically, we introduced the opt-DMD algorithm to produce an unbiased modal analysis of the AAOL-T dataset which captures the wavefront aberrations induced by a turbulent flow around a turret. The imaginary-valued eigenspectrum of the opt-DMD operator permits longer forecasting in an AO loop when compared to an exact DMD algorithm that suffers from modal decay rates due to the real components introduced in the spectrum. Indeed, traditional DMD algorithms have forecasting horizons which decay on the order of hundreds of microseconds whereas opt-DMD allows for forecasting on scales required for control algorithms for AO corrections. The need for a responsive AO system is essential in the rapid and reliable transmission of airborne directed energy systems, something the opt-DMD algorithm is shown to handle effectively in the analysis provided. Further studies ought to assess the performance of opt-DMD on turret geometries beyond hemispherical and compare opt-DMD’s forecasting ability to existing POD-based and neural network aero-optical predictors. Importantly, opt-DMD’s minimal bias as well as its
freedom in sampling variable time steps both make it a promising predictors for aero-optical phenomena.

Acknowledgments
SLB acknowledges funding support from the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR FA9550-19-1-0386) and the Army Research Office (ARO W911NF-19-1-0045).

Disclosures
Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited. Public Affairs release approval #AFRL-2021-3106.

References