Inverse acoustic obstacle problems with sparse multi-frequency backscattering data

Xia Ji∗, Xiaodong Liu†

Abstract

The inverse acoustic obstacle problems using multi-frequency backscattering far field patterns at isolated directions are studied. The obstacle could be sound soft or sound hard. We show that the smallest strip containing the obstacle can be uniquely determined by the backscattering far field patterns for all frequencies in a bounded interval at two observation directions. Thus, a support of the obstacle can be determined with multi-frequency far field patterns at 2n observation directions. Here, n is the spatial dimension. The key ingredients are the Kirchhoff approximation and the Fourier transform. Some direct sampling methods using a few multi-frequency backscattering far field patterns are then proposed to reconstruct the obstacle. An important feature of these direct sampling methods is that the indicators are computed only at the sampling points on a line parallel to the observation direction. With the increase of the observation directions, the location and shape can be well captured, even the obstacle has concave part or multiple multi-scalar components. The point like scatterers are also considered. We show that the multi-frequency backscattering far field patterns at a single observation direction are enough to determining the hyper planes containing the point like scatterers. The indicators used for extended obstacles are also applicable for point like scatterers. As an extension, a novel direct sampling method is proposed for phaseless inverse problem with sparse phaseless backscattering data. Numerical examples in two dimensions are presented to validity the effectiveness and robustness of the proposed direct sampling methods.
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1 Introduction

The inverse scattering theory has been a fast-developing area for the past forty years. Applications of inverse scattering problems occur in many areas such as radar, nondestructive testing, medical imaging, geophysical prospection and remote sensing. We refer to the standard monograph [9] for a research statement on the significant progress both in the mathematical theories and the numerical approaches.
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Majority of studies focuses on inverse time harmonic wave scattering problems at a fixed frequency. Uniqueness for the inverse obstacle or medium scattering problems can be established if the measurements are taken for all observation directions and all incident directions. Besides the traditional iterative methods, many non-iterative methods have also been proposed for shape reconstructions, see e.g., the well developed linear sampling method [8], the factorization method [23, 25], and various type of recently proposed direct sampling methods [7, 13, 30, 31, 33, 36]. The direct sampling method is introduced independently in the mathematical community by Ito, Jin and Zou [18] and Potthast [36]. They inherit many advantages of the classical linear sampling method and factorization method, e.g., they are independent of any a priori information on the geometry and physical properties of the unknown objects. The main feature of these direct sampling methods is that only the inner product of the measurements with some suitably chosen functions is involved in the computation of the indicator. Thus these direct sampling methods are robust to noises and computationally faster than the classical sampling methods. We refer to [7, 28, 30, 31, 33] for recent developments in this direction. In particular, their connection with the classical sampling methods has been pointed out in [33]. However, up to now, the mathematical basis for the direct sampling methods is far less developed than the classical sampling methods. The basic theoretical basis is the well known Funk-Hecke formula or the Helmholtz-Kirchhoff identity. Thus, the same as the classical sampling methods, full-aperture data are needed for computation. However, it is difficult to conduct an experiment to take measurements in all observation directions around an unknown scatterer. From the practical point of view, we have only limited aperture data [34]. In limited aperture problem, the backscattering scenario is of particular interest, where one receiver and one transmitter with a fixed location is used to collect data. The inverse backscattering problem has attracted the attention of many researchers [6, 10, 12, 11, 17, 26, 27, 29, 38].

To make the inverse backscattering problem solvable, measurements should be taken with multiple frequencies. Actually, in the last two decades, different multi-frequency methods have been proposed for inverse scattering problem. These methods can be classified into two categories: iterative methods and direct methods. The recursive linearization method (RLM) is an iterative method, which proceed via a continuation procedure with respect to frequency from low to high [2, 3, 4, 5, 37]. An important feature of the RLM is that a fine reconstruction can be obtained without the need of a good initial guess. A survey on the state of the art of the RLM can be found in [3]. There are also many direct methods without using direct solvers, see e.g., the MUSIC algorithm [14] for locating small inhomogeneities, the Fourier method [10], the multi-frequency factorization method [15], and the direct sampling method [1] for source reconstructions, the multi-frequency linear sampling method [16], the eigenvalue method [39] and an eigenfunction based scheme [32] for obstacle reconstructions.

This paper is dedicated to several direct sampling methods for inverse acoustic obstacle problem with multi-frequency sparse backscattering far field patterns. The frequency is located in some bound band and the observation directions are sparse. Of particular interest is what kind of information of the underlying scatterer can be recovered from the measurement at a single observation direction. Both the point like scatterers and the extended scatterers are considered. Our method is motivated by a recent work [1], where a direct sampling method for source support reconstruction is proposed. The key observation for the source problem is that the far field measurement is just the Fourier transform of the unknown source term. We also refer to [19, 20, 21] for the extensions to the inverse elastic and electromagnetic source problems with sparse phased or phaseless data. Difficulties arise for the obstacle problems due to the nonlinearity between
the measurement and the unknown scatterer. To overcome the nonlinearity property, a possible way is to consider the Kirchhoff approximation with high frequency waves. The well known Bojarski identity [6] indicates that, in the Kirchhoff approximation, the Fourier transform of the characteristic function of the scatterer can be completely determined from the backscattering far field patterns for all observation directions and all positive wave numbers. Then, by inverting the Fourier transform one can determine the location and shape of the scatterers. However, this procedure suffers from two difficulties. Firstly, the Kirchhoff approximation is valid for high frequencies only, whereas the inverse Fourier transform requires integration over all frequencies. Secondly, the inverse Fourier transform requires all observation directions, whereas in most practical situations, measurements are only available for incomplete set of observation directions. We refer to [6, 10, 27] for the numerical implementations and more discussions.

The remaining part of the work is organized as follows. In the next section, we recall the physical optics approximation and introduce several direct sampling methods for location and shape reconstruction of extended sound-soft or sound-hard obstacles. To do so, we first show that the smallest strip containing the obstacle with observation direction as the normal can be uniquely determined by the multi-frequency backscattering far field patterns at two opposite observation directions. A generalized backscattering case is also considered. We then proceed in the Section 3 to study the scattering by point like scatterers and show a unique result with multi-frequency far field pattern at a single observation direction for a single incident direction. The same indicators for extended obstacle can also be used for multi-scalar scatterers. As an extension, we also introduce a novel direct sampling method with sparse phaseless backscattering data. These algorithms are then verified in Section 4 by extensive examples in two dimensions. Finally, in Section 5, we draw some conclusions and discuss further works.

2 Inverse acoustic scattering with backscattering data

We begin with the formulations of the acoustic scattering problem. Let $k = \omega/c > 0$ be the wave number of a time harmonic wave, where $\omega > 0$ and $c > 0$ denote the frequency and sound speed, respectively. Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n (n = 2, 3)$ be an open and bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary $\partial D$ such that the exterior $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus D$ is connected. Furthermore, let the incident field $u^{in}$ be a plane wave of the form

$$u^{in}(x) = u^{in}(x, \theta, k) = e^{ikx \cdot \theta}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\theta \in S^{n-1}$ denotes the direction of the incident wave and $S^{n-1} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| = 1\}$ is the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then the scattering of plane waves by impenetrable obstacle $D$ is to find the total field $u = u^{in} + u^s$ such that

$$\Delta u + k^2 u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus D,$$  \tag{2.2}

$$B(u) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial D,$$  \tag{2.3}

$$\lim_{r := |x| \to \infty} r^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \left( \frac{\partial u^s}{\partial r} - iku^s \right) = 0,$$  \tag{2.4}

where $B$ denotes one of the following two boundary conditions

$$(1) \ B(u) := u \quad \text{on } \partial D; \quad (2) \ B(u) := \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} \quad \text{on } \partial D$$
corresponding to the case when the scatterer $D$ is sound-soft and sound-hard, respectively. Here, $\nu$ is the unit outward normal to $\partial D$. The well-posedness of the direct scattering problem (2.2)–(2.4) have been established and can be found in [9, 35]. Every radiating solution of the Helmholtz equation has the following asymptotic behavior at infinity [25, 33]

$$u^s(x, \theta, k) = \frac{e^{\frac{i \pi}{4}}}{\sqrt{8k\pi}} \left( \frac{k}{2\pi} \right)^{n-2} \frac{e^{ikr}}{r^{\frac{n-2}{2}}} \left\{ u_D^{\infty}(\hat{x}, \theta, k) + O\left(\frac{1}{r}\right) \right\} \quad \text{as} \quad r := |x| \to \infty, \quad (2.5)$$

uniformly with respect to all directions $\hat{x} := x/|x| \in S^{n-1}$. The complex valued function $u^{\infty} = u^{\infty}(\hat{x}, \theta, k)$ defined on $S^{n-1}$ is known as the far field pattern with $\hat{x} \in S^{n-1}$ denoting the observation direction.

For some positive integer $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, define

$$\Theta_l := \{\theta_1, \theta_2, \ldots, \theta_l \mid \theta_j \in S^{n-1}, j = 1, 2, \ldots, l\},$$

which is a subset of $S^{n-1}$ with finitely many directions. **The inverse backscattering problem consists in the determination of $D$ from $u^{\infty}(-\theta, \theta, k)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta_l$ and all $k$ in a bounded band.** That is, roughly speaking, whether we can determine the location and shape of the obstacle $\partial D$ by measuring the echoes produced by an incident plane wave in the direction $\theta \in \Theta_l$.

### 2.1 Kirchhoff approximation

It is well known that the inverse problem to determine the obstacle $D$ from a knowledge of the far field pattern is a nonlinear problem. In this subsection, we recall a linearized method based on the Kirchhoff or physical optics approximation.

Let

$$\partial D^-(\theta) := \{x \in \partial D \mid \nu(x) \cdot \theta < 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial D^+(\theta) := \{x \in \partial D \mid \nu(x) \cdot \theta \geq 0\} \quad (2.6)$$

be the illuminated region and shadow region, respectively, with respect to the plane wave in the incident direction $\theta$. For large wave number $k$, i.e., for small wavelengths, an obstacle $D$ locally may be considered at each point $x \in \partial D$ as a hyperplane with normal $\nu(x)$. This leads to setting [9, 29]

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{\nu}(\nu \cdot \partial u) & \text{on } \partial D^-(\theta); \\ 0 & \text{on } \partial D^+(\theta). \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

if $D$ is sound soft, and

$$u = \begin{cases} 2u^\infty & \text{on } \partial D^-(\theta); \\ 0 & \text{on } \partial D^+(\theta). \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

if $D$ is sound hard. Let $k_0 > 0$ be large enough such that the Kirchhoff approximation (2.7)-(2.8) holds.

It is well known that the far field pattern has the following representation [25]

$$u^{\infty}(\hat{x}, \theta, k) = \int_{\partial D} \left\{ u(y, \theta) \frac{\partial e^{-ik\hat{x} \cdot y}}{\partial \nu(y)} - \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(y, \theta)e^{-ik\hat{x} \cdot y} \right\} ds(y), \quad \hat{x}, \theta \in S^{n-1}, \quad k > 0. \quad (2.9)$$
Inserting the Kirchhoff approximations (2.7)-(2.8) into the above far field representation (2.9), with the help of the boundary condition (2.3), the far field pattern in the back scattering direction is approximately given by \[9\]

\[ u^\infty(-\theta, \theta, k) = \gamma_D \int_{\partial D_{-}(\theta)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu(y)} e^{2ik\theta \cdot y} ds(y), \quad \theta \in S^{n-1}, \quad k > k_- \tag{2.10} \]

where

\[ \gamma_D := \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } D \text{ is sound soft;} \\ 1, & \text{if } D \text{ is sound hard.} \end{cases} \]

Replacing \( \theta \) by \(-\theta\), we have

\[ u^\infty(\theta, -\theta, k) = \gamma_D \int_{\partial D_{+}(\theta)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu(y)} e^{-2ik\theta \cdot y} ds(y), \quad \theta \in S^{n-1}, \quad k > k_- \]

Combining the last two equations we find

\[ u^\infty(-\theta, \theta, k) + u^\infty(\theta, -\theta, k) = \gamma_D \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu(y)} e^{2ik\theta \cdot y} ds(y), \quad \theta \in S^{n-1}, \quad k > k_- \]

Furthermore, by the Gauss divergence theorem, we deduce that

\[ u^\infty(-\theta, \theta, k) + u^\infty(\theta, -\theta, k) = \gamma_D \int_{D} \Delta e^{2ik\theta \cdot y} d(y) \]

\[ = -4k^2 \gamma_D \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \chi(y) e^{2ik\theta \cdot y} d(y), \quad \theta \in S^{n-1}, \quad k > k_- \]

where \( \chi \) is the characteristic function of the domain \( D \). We rewrite this equation in the form

\[ U^\infty(\theta, k) := \frac{1}{-4k^2 \gamma_D} \left\{ u^\infty(-\theta, \theta, k) + u^\infty(\theta, -\theta, k) \right\} \]

\[ = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \chi(y) e^{2ik\theta \cdot y} d(y), \quad \theta \in S^{n-1}, \quad k > k_- \tag{2.11} \]

which is known as the Bojarski identity [6].

In physical optics approximation, the Fourier transform of the characteristic function of the scatterer, in principle, can be completely obtained from measurements of the back scattering far field data with all incident direction \( \theta \in S^{n-1} \) and all wave numbers \( k > 0 \). Then, one can determine \( \chi \) and therefore \( D \) by inverting the Fourier transform. However, this procedure suffers from two difficulties. The first, a theoretical difficulty, is that the physical optics approximation is valid only for large wave numbers, whereas the inverse Fourier transform requires integration over all frequencies, including the low frequency and resonance regimes, for which the physical optics approximation does not hold. The second, a practical difficulty, is that the inverse Fourier transform requires integration over all directions, whereas in most practical applications, the far field data are measurable only in finitely many directions. We refer to [6][27] for the corresponding numerical simulations.
2.2 Inverse acoustic scattering with sparse backscattering data

We consider the following sparse backscattering far field pattern over some band of frequencies

\[ u^\infty(-\theta, \theta, k), \quad \theta \in \Theta_l, \quad k \in (k_-, k^+). \]

For any fixed direction \( \theta \in \Theta_l \), the \( \theta \)-strip hull of \( D \) is defined by

\[ S_D(\theta) := \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \inf_{z \in D} z \cdot \theta \leq y \cdot \theta \leq \sup_{z \in D} z \cdot \theta \}, \]

which is the smallest strip (region between two parallel hyper-planes) with normals in the directions \( \pm \theta \) that contains \( D \).

![Figure 1: The \( \theta \)-strip \( S_D(\theta) \), illuminated part \( \partial D_- (\theta) \) and shadow region \( \partial D_+ (\theta) \).](image)

An interesting observation from (2.10) is that the shadow region \( \partial D_+ (\theta) \) gives no contribution to the backscattering far field data \( u^\infty(-\theta, \theta, k) \). Thus, it is impossible to reconstruct the shadow region \( \partial D_+ (\theta) \) from the backscattering far field data \( u^\infty(-\theta, \theta, k) \), in particular for high frequency case. It is natural to use both \( u^\infty(-\theta, \theta, k) \) and \( u^\infty(\theta, -\theta, k) \) to look for the information of the underlying scatterer \( D \). The following theorem gives an uniqueness result based on the backscattering far field data

\[
U^\infty(\theta, k) = \frac{1}{-4k^2 \gamma_D} \left\{ u^\infty(-\theta, \theta, k) + u^\infty(\theta, -\theta, k) \right\}, \quad k \in (k_-, k^+). \tag{2.12}
\]

**Theorem 2.1.** For any fixed \( \theta \in \Theta_l \), the corresponding \( \theta \)-strip \( S_D(\theta) \) is uniquely determined by the backscattering data \( U^\infty(\theta, k) \) for all \( k \in (k_-, k^+) \).

**Proof.** For the fixed \( \theta \in \Theta_l \), define

\[ \Pi_\alpha := \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid 2y \cdot \theta + \alpha = 0 \} \]

to be a hyperplane with normal \( \theta \). Recall the Bojarski identity \( \tag{2.11} \), we have

\[
U^\infty(\theta, k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \chi(y) e^{2ik\theta \cdot y} d(y)
\]
\[
\begin{split}
S_{D}^{\theta}(\theta) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\Pi_{\theta}} \chi(y) e^{2ik\theta \cdot y} ds(y) d\alpha \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{\chi}(\alpha) e^{-ik\alpha} d\alpha, \quad k \in (k_-, k^+),
\end{split}
\] (2.13)

where
\[
\hat{\chi}(\alpha) := \int_{\Pi_{\theta}} \chi(y) ds(y).
\] (2.14)

Note that the backscattering data \(U^\infty(\theta, k)\) is an analytic function with respect to the wave number \(k\). Thus we have the data \(U^\infty(\theta, k)\) for all \(k \in \mathbb{R}\) by analytic. The inequality \(2.13\) implies that \(U^\infty(\theta, k)\) is the Fourier transform of \(\hat{\chi}\). Using inverse Fourier transform, we deduce that \(\hat{\chi}\) can be uniquely determined. Note that
\[
S_{D}(\theta) = \bigcup_{\alpha \in R} \{\Pi_{\alpha}\mid \hat{\chi}(\alpha) \neq 0\},
\]
which implies that the strip \(S_{D}(\theta)\) is uniquely determined by \(\hat{\chi}\), and thus by the backscattering data \(U^\infty(\theta, k)\) for all \(k \in (k_-, k^+)\) at a fixed direction \(\theta \in \Theta_t\). The proof is complete. \(\square\)

Recall the partition of the boundary in terms of the direction \(\theta\), we correspondingly introduce the partition of the strip \(S_{D}(\theta)\) by
\[
S_{D}(\theta) = S_{D}^{-}(\theta) \cup S_{D}^{+}(\theta),
\]
where \(S_{D}^{-}(\theta)\) and \(S_{D}^{+}(\theta)\) are the two components containing \(\partial D_\theta\) and \(\partial D_+\), respectively. We call \(S_{D}^{-}(\theta)\) and \(S_{D}^{+}(\theta)\) the \(\theta\)-strip and \(\theta\)-strip hull of \(D\), respectively. A challenging open problem is to determine if the backscattering far field pattern \(u^\infty(-\theta, \theta, k)\) for all \(k \in (k_-, k^+)\) completely determines the \(\theta\)-strip \(S_{D}^{-}(\theta)\). Denote by \(y_0 \in \partial D\) such that \(\theta \cdot v(y_0) = 0\). Let \(\Pi_{\alpha_{0}}\) be the hyperplane with normal \(\theta\) passing through the point \(y_0\). Define \(\Gamma_0 := \Pi_{\alpha_{0}} \cap D\). Then, with the help of \(2.10\), by the similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, one can show that the \(\theta\)-strip \(S_{D}^{-}(\theta)\) can be uniquely determined by the data \(u^\infty(-\theta, \theta, k) + 2ike^{-ik\alpha_{0}}|\Gamma_0|\) for all \(k \in (k_-, k^+)\). Unfortunately, both the two constants \(\alpha_{0}\) and \(\Gamma_0\) are not known in advance.

Theorem 2.1 implies that the backscattering data at two linearly independent directions are enough to give a support of the underlying obstacle \(D\). In the following, we consider the following two indicators
\[
I_1(z) := \sum_{\theta \in \Theta_t} I_1(z, \theta) := \sum_{\theta \in \Theta_t} \left| \int_{k_-}^{k_+} u^\infty(-\theta, \theta, k)e^{-2ikz \cdot \theta} dk \right|, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^{n},
\] (2.15)
and
\[
I_2(z) := \sum_{\theta \in \Theta_t} I_2(z, \theta) := \sum_{\theta \in \Theta_t} \left| \int_{k_-}^{k_+} \left( u^\infty(-\theta, \theta, k) + u^\infty(\theta, -\theta, k) \right)e^{-2ikz \cdot \theta} dk \right|, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^{n}. \] (2.16)

Straightforward calculation shows that
\[
I_j(y, \theta) = I_j(z, \theta) \quad \text{if} \ y, z \in \Pi_{\alpha}, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \ j = 1, 2,
\]
where $\Pi_\alpha$ is the hyperplane with normal $\theta$ as introduced in the proof of Theorem 2.1. This implies that the indicator $I_j(z, \theta)$ takes the same value for all sampling points in the hyperplane $\Pi_\alpha$. Inserting (2.10) into $I_1(z, \theta)$ and interchanging the order of integration, we have

$$I_1(z, \theta) = \left| \int_{k_-}^{k_+} \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu(y)} e^{2ik\theta \cdot y} ds(y) e^{-2ikz \cdot \theta} dy dk \right|$$

$$= 2 \int_{\partial D} \theta \cdot \nu(y) \int_{k_-}^{k_+} ke^{-2ik(z-y) \cdot \theta} dk ds(y)$$

$$= \left| \int_{\partial D} \theta \cdot \nu(y) f(y, z, \theta) \frac{1}{(z-y) \cdot \theta} dy \right|, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^n, \theta \in \Theta_l \quad (2.17)$$

with

$$f(y, z, \theta) := ke^{-2ik(z-y) \cdot \theta} \int_{k_-}^{k_+} e^{-2ik(z-y) \cdot \theta} dk.$$ 

Similarly, using the Bojarski identity (2.11) and interchanging the order of integration, we have

$$I_2(z, \theta) = \left| \int_{k_-}^{k_+} 4k^2 \int_D \chi(y) e^{2ik(z-y) \cdot \theta} dy dk \right|$$

$$= 4 \int_D \chi(y) \int_{k_-}^{k_+} k^2 e^{2ik(z-y) \cdot \theta} dk dy$$

$$= \left| \int_D g(y, z, \theta) \frac{1}{(z-y) \cdot \theta} dy \right|, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^n, \theta \in \Theta_l \quad (2.18)$$

with

$$g(y, z, \theta) := 2k^2 e^{2ik(z-y) \cdot \theta} \int_{k_-}^{k_+} e^{-2ik(z-y) \cdot \theta} dk.$$ 

Clearly, both $f(y, z, \theta)$ and $g(y, z, \theta)$ are uniformly bounded function with respect to the sampling point $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus, we expect the indicators $I_1(z, \theta)$ and $I_2(z, \theta)$ decay like

$$\frac{1}{|\theta \cdot (z-y)|}$$

when the sampling point $z$ moves away from the strips $S_D^{-}(\theta)$ and $S_D(\theta)$, respectively.

### 2.3 A generalized backscattering case

In this subsection, we consider a generalized form of the Bojarski identity that is not limited to the traditional backscattering data. Specifically, for any fixed observation direction $\hat{x} \neq \theta$ for a fixed incident direction $\theta$, we consider the following generalized backscattering data

$$V^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta, k) := \frac{1}{-2k^2 \gamma D \cdot (\theta - \hat{x})} \left\{ u^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta, k) + u^\infty(-\hat{x}, -\theta, k) \right\}, \quad k \in (k_-, k_+), \quad (2.19)$$

which reduces to $U^\infty(\theta, k)$ if $\hat{x} = -\theta$. 
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From (2.9)-(2.8), with the help of the Gauss divergence theorem, we deduce the generalized Bojarski identity

\[ V^\infty(\theta, k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \chi(y) e^{ik(\theta - \hat{x}) \cdot y} d(y), \quad \theta \in S^{n-1}, \quad k > k_-, \tag{2.20} \]

The analogous result of Theorem 2.1 is formulated in the following theorem

**Theorem 2.2.** For any fixed incident direction \( \theta \in S^{n-1} \) and fixed observation direction \( \hat{x} \in S^{n-1} \) such that \( \hat{x} \neq \theta \), define

\[ \phi := \frac{\theta - \hat{x}}{|\theta - \hat{x}|}. \]

Then the corresponding \( \phi \)-strip \( S_D(\phi) \) is uniquely determined by the generalized backscattering data \( V^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta, k) \) for all \( k \in (k_-, k^+) \).

Correspondingly, the indicators \( I_1 \) in (2.15) and \( I_2 \) in (2.16) are modified, respectively, by

\[
I'_1(z) := \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} I'_1(z, \hat{x}, \theta) := \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \int_{k_-}^{k^+} u^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta, k)e^{-ikz(\theta-\hat{x})} dk \right\|, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{2.21}
\]

and

\[
I'_2(z) := \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} I'_2(z, \hat{x}, \theta) := \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \int_{k_-}^{k^+} \left( u^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta, k) + u^\infty(-\hat{x}, -\theta, k) \right)e^{-ikz(\theta-\hat{x})} dk \right\|, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{2.22}
\]

In the above two indicators, we remark that the observation direction \( \hat{x} = \hat{x}(\theta) \) depends only the incident direction \( \theta \).

## 3 Inverse scattering by multiscalar scatterers and its application for phaseless problem

### 3.1 Point like scatterers

We first consider \( M \) point like scatterers located at \( z_1, z_2, \cdots, z_M \in \mathbb{R}^n \) in the homogeneous space \( \mathbb{R}^n, n = 2, 3 \). Recall the fundamental solution \( \Phi(x, y), x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, x \neq y \), of the Helmholtz equation, which is given by

\[
\Phi_k(x, y) := \begin{cases} 
\frac{ik}{4\pi} h^{(1)}_0(k|x-y|) = \frac{e^{ik|x-y|}}{4\pi|x-y|}, & n = 3, \\
i \frac{i}{4} H^{(1)}_0(k|x-y|), & n = 2.
\end{cases} \tag{3.1}
\]
Here, \( h_0^{(1)} \) and \( H_0^{(1)} \) are, respectively, spherical Hankel function and Hankel function of the first kind and order zero. By neglecting all the multiple scattering between the scatterers, the scattered field \( u^s \) is given by \[ u^s(x, \theta, k) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \tau_m u_i^m(z_m, \theta, k) \Phi_k(x, z_m). \] (3.2)

Here, \( \tau_m \in \mathbb{C} \) is the scattering strength of the \( m \)-th target, \( m = 1, 2, \cdots, M \). From the asymptotic behavior of \( \Phi_k(x, y) \) we deduce that the corresponding far field pattern is given by

\[
 u^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta, k) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \tau_m u_i^m(z_m, \theta, k) e^{-ikz_m \cdot \hat{x}} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \tau_m e^{ikz_m \cdot (\theta - \hat{x})}, \quad \hat{x}, \theta \in S^{n-1}, k \in \{k_-, k_+\}. \quad (3.3)
\]

Figure 2: Inverse scattering with the multi-frequency far field pattern \( u^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta, k) \) for fixed \( \hat{x}, \theta \).

**Theorem 3.1.** The hyperplanes

\[ \Gamma_m := \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid (z - z_m) \cdot (\theta - \hat{x}) = 0 \}, \quad m = 1, 2, \cdots, M \]

are uniquely determined by the far field pattern \( u^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta, k) \) at one fixed observation direction \( \hat{x} \in S^{n-1} \), one fixed incident direction \( \theta \in S^{n-1} (\theta \neq \hat{x}) \), and all frequencies in a bounded band \((k_-, k_+)\).

**Proof.** Note that the far field pattern is an analytic function with respect to the wave number, thus we have the far field pattern for all frequency in \( \mathbb{R}^+ \). Define

\[
 I_p(z, \hat{x}, \theta) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} u^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta, k) e^{-ikz \cdot (\theta - \hat{x})} dk, z \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (3.4)
\]

Inserting (3.3) into (3.4), we find that

\[
 I_p(z, \hat{x}, \theta) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \tau_m \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} e^{ik(z_m - z) \cdot (\theta - \hat{x})} dk = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \tau_m \delta[(z_m - z) \cdot (\theta - \hat{x})], \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^n,
\]

where \( \delta \) is the Dirac delta function. Thus the hyperplane \( \Gamma_m \) are uniquely determined by the far field pattern \( u^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta, k) \) for all \( k \in \mathbb{R}^+ \) and thus for all \( k \in (k_-, k_+) \) by analytic.
Motivated by the arguments given in the proof of the previous Theorem 3.1, we introduce the following indicator

\[ I_p(z) := \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \int_{k_-}^{k_+} u^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta, k)e^{-ikz(\theta - \hat{x})} dk, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^n. \]  

(3.5)

where \( \hat{x} = \hat{x}(\theta) \) is the observation direction depending only on the incident direction \( \theta \). Of particular interest is the backscattering data, i.e., \( \hat{x} = -\theta \).

### 3.2 Extensions: multiscalar scatterers and phaseless problems

In this subsection, we consider the case where the underlying object is composed of the extend obstacles and some well separated point like scatterers. It is shown in [22] that the multiple scattering effect between the extended obstacles and the point like scatterers is very weak, in particular if the locations of the point scatterers are far away from the extended obstacles. Thus we expect that the indicators \( I_1 \) and \( I_2 \) given in (2.15) and (2.16), respectively, can be used to reconstruct the extended obstacles and locate the point like scatterers simultaneously.

The Kirchhoff approximation holds for high frequency waves. For the high frequency waves, the phase of the far field pattern is difficult to retrieve, while the modulus of the far field pattern is closely related to the outward energy flux, which is easily measured in practice. Denote by \( u^\infty_D(\hat{x}, \theta, k) \) the far field pattern for an extended obstacle \( D \). Unfortunately, it is well known that the phaseless data \( |u^\infty_D(\hat{x}, \theta, k)| \) is invariant under the translation of the obstacle \( D \), and thus can not be used to determine the location of the obstacle \( D \). Following [22], we introduce a point like scatterer located at \( z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \backslash D \) with strength 1 into the scattering system. We then proceed to take the phaseless backscattering far field pattern \( |u^\infty_{D \cup \{z_0\}}(-\theta, \theta, k)| \) and consider the following indicator

\[ I_{\text{phaseless}}(z) := \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \int_{k_-}^{k_+} \left[ |u^\infty_{D \cup \{z_0\}}(-\theta, \theta, k)|^2 - |u^\infty_D(-\theta, \theta, k)|^2 - 1 \right] \cos[2k\theta \cdot (z - z_0)] dk \right|, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^n. \]

It is shown in [22] that the effect of the multiple scattering between the extended obstacle and the point like scatterer is very weak, i.e.,

\[ u^\infty_{D \cup \{z_0\}}(-\theta, \theta, k) \approx u^\infty_D(-\theta, \theta, k) + e^{2ikz_0 \cdot \theta}, \quad \theta \in S^{n-1}, k > 0. \]

Inserting this into the above indicator, straightforward calculation shows that

\[ I_{\text{phaseless}}(z) \approx \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| A(z, -\theta, \theta) + A(2z_0 - z, -\theta, \theta) + A(z, -\theta, -\theta) + A(2z_0 - z, -\theta, -\theta) \right|, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^n, \]

where

\[ A(z, -\theta, \theta) := \int_{k_-}^{k_+} u^\infty_D(-\theta, \theta, k)e^{-2ikz \cdot \theta} dk, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^n. \]

Thus we could expect that the indicator \( I_{\text{phaseless}}(z) \) has similar behaviour as the indicator \( I_1 \). Let \( D(z_0) \) be the point symmetric domain of \( D \) with respect to \( z_0 \). The indicator \( I_{\text{phaseless}}(z) \) gives a reconstruction of both \( D \) and \( D(z_0) \). This problem can be easily overcome by choosing a different location of the point like scatterer.
4 Numerical examples and discussions

In this section, a variety of numerical examples are presented in two dimensions to illustrate the applicability and effectiveness of our sampling methods. The boundaries of the scatterers used in our numerical experiments are parameterized as follows

\[
\text{Kite: } x(t) = (a, b) + (\cos t + 0.65 \cos 2t - 0.65, 1.5 \sin t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq 2\pi, \quad (4.1)
\]

\[
\text{Circle: } x(t) = (a, b) + r (\cos t, \sin t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq 2\pi, \quad (4.2)
\]

with \((a, b)\) be the location of the scatterer which may be different in different examples and \(r\) be the radius of the circle.

In our simulations, if not stated otherwise, we will always consider 20 equally distributed wave numbers in the frequency band \([10, 20]\) (so the wavelength is in \([0.314, 0.628]\)). The far field patterns are obtained by using the boundary integral equation method. We further perturb these synthetic data with 10\% relative random noise. With these perturbed data, we solve the inverse problems using indicators proposed in the previous section with 0.1 as the sampling space.

**Example-1:** We start with the well known bench example with a sound soft kite. In this example, we compare the behaviors of our indicators using different number of the wave numbers, i.e., 10, 20, 40, respectively. Fig. 3 gives the reconstructions of kite shaped domain with 32 incident directions using \(I_1\) and \(I_2\), respectively. We observe that the location and shape of the kite can be well captured with 20 wavenumbers.

**Example-2:** This example is designed to verify the validity of the indicators \(I_1, I_2, I'_1\) and \(I'_2\) with sparse observation directions. Fig. 4 gives the reconstructions using \(I_1\). As shown in Fig. 4(c), with two opposite observation directions, a strip containing the underlying obstacle can be roughly reconstructed. The location and shape information are clearer and clearer as the number of observation directions increases. In particular, the concave part of the kite is well reconstructed when we use 16 observation directions. Of course, the resolution of the reconstruction can be improved with more observation directions.

Fig. 5 shows the reconstructions using the indicator \(I_2\). In particular, Fig. 5(a)-(b) show that two observation directions are enough to give a reconstruction of the smallest strip containing the underlying obstacle. This is in accordance with the uniqueness theory result provided in Theorem 2.1. We also find from Fig. 5(c) that four observation directions are enough to give a support reconstruction. The same as the behavior of the indicator \(I_1\), more details on the shape can be observed with the increase of the number of the observation directions. Comparing Figures 4(d-e) and 5(d-e), both the indicators \(I_1\) and \(I_2\) produce fine shape reconstructions.

As a comparison, we consider the indicators \(I'_1\) and \(I'_2\) with the generalized backscattering data. Fig. 6 shows the results with \(\hat{x} = \theta^\perp\), where \(\theta^\perp\) is obtained by rotating \(\theta\) anticlockwise by \(\pi/2\). As shown in Figures 6(a) and 6(d), a strip containing the kite can be well captured. However, different to Figures 4(c) and 5(a,b), the normal of the strip changes accordingly. This is due to the generalized backscattering observation direction \(\hat{x} = \theta^\perp\). Such a numerical result is also in accordance with the uniqueness result given in Theorem 2.2. The same as the indicators \(I_1\) and \(I_2\), both the indicators \(I'_1\) and \(I'_2\) can also produce the shape reconstruction of the kite with enough observation directions. This can be found in Figures 6(c) and 6(f).
Figure 3: **Example-1.** Reconstructions using $I_1$ (top) and $I_2$ (bottom), respectively, with different number of wave numbers.
Figure 4: Example-2. Reconstructions using $I_1$ with different number of observation directions.
Figure 5: Example-2. Reconstructions using $I_2$ with different number of observation directions.
Figure 6: **Example-2.** Reconstructions using $I'_1$ (top) and $I'_2$ (bottom), respectively, with different number of observation directions.
Example-3: Note that our indicators $I_1, I_2, I'_1$ and $I'_2$ make no use of boundary conditions or topological properties of the underlying obstacles. In this example, we verify the validity of our indicators for some other cases with Neumann boundary condition, multiple multi-scalar components. In the previous example, we find that all the indicators $I_1, I_2, I'_1$ and $I'_2$ produce similar shape reconstructions. For simplicity, here we only show the results using the indicator $I_1$.

Fig. 7 gives the reconstruction for a sound hard kite. The same as the sound soft case, we obtain a rough support with only four observation directions and find similar shape reconstruction using 32 observation directions. Fig. 8 shows the reconstruction for a scatterer with two disjoint components. The underlying scatterer is a sound soft kite with $(a, b) = (2, 0)$ and a sound soft circle with $(a, b) = (-1.5, 0)$. Fig. 9 shows the reconstructions for the multi-scalar case. The underlying scatterer is a sound soft kite with $(a, b) = (0, 0)$ and a small sound soft circle with $(a, b) = (2.5, 2.5)$ and $r = 0.1$. To enhance the resolution, 40 wave numbers are used in Figures 8 and 9. All the numerical results shown in Figures 7-9 are satisfactory.

Figure 7: Example-3. Reconstruction of sound hard kite shaped domain with different incident directions using $I_1$.

Figure 8: Example-3. Reconstruction of multiple scatterers using $I_1$. 
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Example-4: In this example, we consider the reconstruction of point-like scatterers. 160 equally distributed wave numbers in $[20, 100]$ are used. Fig 12 gives the reconstruction of four points $(1, 1), (-1, 1), (1, -1), (-1, -1)$ with at most two observation directions. Fig. 13 gives the reconstruction of the word CAS, 32 directions are used.

Example-5: In this example, we consider two extensions. In the first extension, the underlying scatterer is a sound soft kite with $(a, b) = (0, 0)$ and three point-like scatterers located at $(2.5, 2), (2.5, 0)$ and $(2.5, -2)$, 40 wave numbers are used in this example. Fig. 12 gives the reconstruction. In the second extension, we consider the phaseless case. We still consider the benchmark example with sound soft kite shaped obstacle. Fig. 13 gives the reconstruction with the help of different locations of the reference point-like scatterer, 64 observation directions and 40 wave numbers.

5 Concluding remarks

In this paper we propose some novel sampling methods for shape identification in inverse acoustic scattering problem with multi-frequency backscattering far field patterns at sparse observation directions. Both the theory foundation and numerical simulations are presented. In particular, we find that at most $2n$ observation directions are enough to reconstruct a support of the underlying scatterers. The numerical results show further that both the location and shape of the scatterer can be well captured with the increase of the number of the observation directions, even the underlying scatterer has concave part or multiple multi-scalar components.

This paper focuses on the scattering by sound-soft and sound-hard obstacles. We have also done some numerical examples for other cases, e.g., impedance boundary conditions, penetrable medium. Numerical experiments indicate that the indicators still work but the corresponding theoretical basis is not known. Similar techniques can also be applied to inverse scattering of elastic waves or electromagnetic waves, which shall be addressed in a forthcoming work.
Figure 10: **Example-4.** Reconstruction of four point like scatterers with different incident directions. Top: backscattering data with $\hat{x} = -\theta$; Bottom: generalized backscattering data with $\hat{x} = \theta^\perp$.

Figure 11: **Example-4.** Reconstruction of the word **CAS**, which is the abbreviation for Chinese Academy of Sciences.
Figure 12: **Example-5.** Reconstruction with different incident directions using $I_1$. 

Figure 13: **Example-5.** Reconstruction using different locations $z_0$ of point like scatterers.
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