

Super-resolution far-field ghost imaging via compressive sampling

Wenlin Gong and Shensheng Han*

*Key Laboratory for Quantum Optics and Center for Cold Atom Physics of CAS,
Shanghai Institute of Optics and Fine Mechanics,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shanghai 201800, China*

(Dated: April 15, 2021)

For classical source, the uncertainty relation involving the product of conditional variances in position and momentum limits the imaging resolution of optical system. Based on ghost imaging (GI) and compressive sampling (CS) theory, an imaging approach called ghost imaging via compressive sampling (GICS) with thermal light is reported. For the first time, a super-resolution image with high quality is obtained in the far field by GICS reconstruction. Physical principle of GICS and the resolution limit of conventional imaging, GI and GICS are also discussed.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Ar, 42.50.Dv, 42.30.Wb

Physically, super-resolution is realized when much more image details can be extracted from a low-resolution image cased by Abbe-Rayleigh Diffraction Limit (ARDL) of optical system. The past decades have seen numerous efforts to achieve imaging resolution beyond that of ARDL. The main direction of research alining to break this limit seeks to exploit the evanescent components containing fine detail of the electromagnetic field distribution at the immediate proximity of the object [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. However, super-resolution obtained by evanescent wave is only achieved in the near field, for example scanning near-field optical microscopy (SNOM) [1, 2] and negative refractive index imaging [4, 5]. Recently, ghost imaging (GI), which is based on two-photon interference and can nonlocally image an object by transmitting pairs of photons through a test and a reference paths, respectively [22, 23], has realized sub-wavelength Fourier-transform imaging with both entangled source and thermal source [7, 8] and can enhance the imaging resolution via N th-order intensity correlation of light fields [9]. In information science, exploiting the optical transfer function of known imaging system, although modern digital image processing technique can also improve the image's resolution by the approaches such as deconvolution, analytical continuation and so on, the improvement degree of the image is restricted by the signal-to-noise ratio [10, 11, 12, 13].

In the far field, for conventional imaging based on single-photon interference, the resolution of imaging system is determined by the receiving system's numerical aperture while by the transmitting aperture in the case of scanning imaging [13], and quantum resolution limit of single-photon imaging depends on the uncertainty principle [14]. Quantum entangled two-photon pairs provide perfect correlation both in photon position and in momentum and has verified experimentally the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR)-type inequalities, thus GI with entangled photons can achieve high spatial res-

olution simultaneously in the near and in the far fields [16, 17, 18, 19]. Compared with entangled source, GI with thermal light is subject to an uncertainty relation involving the product of conditional variances in position and momentum [15] and presents more potential in practical applications [22, 23, 24, 25], but we can only obtain high spatial resolution in the near field. Recently, compressive sampling (CS) theory, which is based on random orthogonal projection measurements, has asserted that one can recover certain signals and images from far fewer samples or measurements than traditional methods use [26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32] and CS reconstruction also offers great potential for better resolution over classical imaging [32]. However, for CS theory, the test detector should collect all the intensity from the object, thus the test detector is usually fixed in the near field relative to the object. In practical imaging applications, it is impossible to collect all the intensity from the object especially when the test detector is located in the far field, but the complete image of an object can still be realized by GI even if the test detector is a single pointlike detector and fixed in the far field [18, 22, 23, 24]. So combining the characteristic of GI and perfect property of CS theory, an image with high resolution may be quickly obtained by ghost imaging via compressive sampling (GICS). In this letter, super-resolution far-field GICS with thermal light is investigated, both its physical principle and resolution limit are also discussed.

Fig. 1 presents experimental schematic for far-field GICS with thermal light. The thermal source S , which is obtained by passing a focused laser beam (with the wavelength $\lambda=650\text{nm}$ and the source's transverse size D) through a slowly rotating ground glass disk [23], is divided by a beam splitter into a test and a reference paths. In the test path, low spatial-frequency information transmitted through a double-slit (slit width $a=100\mu\text{m}$, slit height $h=500\mu\text{m}$ and center-to-center separation $d=200\mu\text{m}$) is collected by a detector D_t . In the reference path, the light propagates directly to a CCD camera D_r . Moreover, except that both the object and the CCD camera D_r are fixed in the far field relative to the source (namely $z > \frac{2D^2}{\lambda}$), the detector D_t , rela-

*Electronic address: sshan@mail.shcnc.ac.cn




FIG. 1: Schematics of far-field ghost imaging with thermal light by compressive sampling.

tive to the object, is also located in the far field (namely $z_1 > \frac{2d^2}{\lambda}$).

By optical coherence theory [20], the intensity distribution on the detection plane at a certain time s is:

$$I_s(x, y) = \int dx_1 \int dy_1 \int dx_2 \int dy_2 E_s(x_1, y_1) E_s^*(x_2, y_2) \times h^*(x, y; x_2, y_2) h(x, y; x_1, y_1). \quad (1)$$

where $E_s(x_1, y_1)$ denotes light field on the source plane at a certain time s , $h(x, y; x_1, y_1)$ and $h^*(x, y; x_2, y_2)$ are the impulse function of optical system and its phase conjugate, respectively.

Exploiting two-photon interference [20, 21, 22], we can obtain the correlation function between two paths:

$$\Delta G^{(2,2)}(x_r, y_r; x_t, y_t) = \left| \int dx_1 \int dy_1 \int dx_2 \int dy_2 \times G^{(1,1)}(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2) h_r^*(x_r, y_r; x_1, y_1) h_t(x_t, y_t; x_2, y_2) \right|^2. \quad (2)$$

where $G^{(1,1)}(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2)$ is the first-order correlation function on the source plane, $h_t(x_t, y_t; x_2, y_2)$ is the impulse function in the test path whereas $h_r^*(x_r, y_r; x_1, y_1)$ denotes phase conjugate of the impulse function in the reference path.

Based on the work described by Ref. [23], after the integral of x_t and y_t , then the correlation function for GI can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta G^{(2,2)}(x_r, y_r) &= \int dx_t \int dy_t \Delta G^{(2,2)}(x_r, y_r; x_t, y_t) \\ &\sim \int dx' \int dy' |T(x', y')|^2 \sin^2 \left[\frac{D}{\lambda z} (x_r - x') \right] \\ &\quad \times \sin^2 \left[\frac{D}{\lambda z} (y_r - y') \right]. \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

where $T(x, y)$ and D , respectively, are the object's transmission function and the source's transverse size, $\sin c(x) = \frac{\sin(\pi x)}{\pi x}$ and $\sin c(y) = \frac{\sin(\pi y)}{\pi y}$. From Eq. (3),

using the intensity correlation measurements, the best resolution of GI is determined by the size of the speckle placed on the object plane (namely $\Delta x_s \approx \frac{\lambda z}{D}$), which has already been demonstrated experimentally in Ref. [23].

For GI, a single pointlike detector far from the object in the test path has recorded the complete object's information and random intensity distribution from the thermal source is registered by the CCD camera D_r . Although two-photon coherence effects are a quantum phenomenon and not caused by the statistical correlation of the intensity fluctuations, they are observed in the intensity fluctuations [6]. And using the intensity correlation measurements in time-space domain, the image of an object can be reconstructed by scanning the position of the photons on the CCD camera D_r . However, the intensity correlation measurements is still based on classical "point-by-point" scanning measurements thus has low image extraction efficiency, which is similar to conventional imaging. By the fundamental principle of quantum mechanics, because quantum state is collapsed by quantum orthogonal measurements (or general measurement), quantum effect can be observed and high image extraction efficiency can be achieved especially for entangled multi-photon pairs. Interestingly, random orthogonal measurements in time domain, for example CS theory, have also proved mathematically that "global random" measurements have much higher image extraction efficiency than "point-by-point" scanning measurements [26, 27, 28, 29, 30]. GI originates from statistical properties of indistinguishable photons and the object's image can be reconstructed by random measurements of light field in the reference path, which means that GI may also be quickly reconstructed by random orthogonal measurements.

For the schematic of GICS shown in Fig. 1, the measurement matrix A for CS theory can be obtained by sequences of intensity distributions recorded with the CCD camera D_r in the reference path. Because each of the speckle fields registered by the CCD camera D_r is random and any two of them is independent, the property of incoherence sampling among the m vectors of matrix A is obviously satisfied. Similarly, the observation vector y for CS theory is corresponded to the sequence of intensities registered by the test detector D_t . Thus, physically, GI has perfectly described the process of CS theory. If the speckle field which impinges on the object is described by $I_r(x, y)$ and B_r denotes the intensity recorded by the test detector D_t , then GICS can be reconstructed by solving the following convex optimization program [30]:

$$\begin{aligned} |T_{GICS}| &= |T'|; \text{ subject to : } \min_x \frac{1}{2} \left\| B_r - \int dx \int dy \right. \\ &\quad \times I_r(x, y) |T'(x, y)|^2 \left. \right\|_2^2 + \tau \left\| |T'(x, y)|^2 \right\|_1, \forall_r = 1 \cdots m. \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

where τ is a nonnegative parameter, $\|V\|_2$ denotes the Euclidean norm of V , and $\|V\|_1 = \sum_i |v_i|$ is the ℓ_1 norm

of V . Moreover,

$$I_r(x, y) \propto \int dx_1 \int dy_1 \int dx_2 \int dy_2 E_r(x_1, y_1) E_r^*(x_2, y_2) \times \exp\left\{-\frac{2j\pi}{\lambda z}[(x_1 - x_2)x + (y_1 - y_2)y]\right\} \times \exp\left\{\frac{j\pi}{\lambda z}(x_1^2 + y_1^2 - x_2^2 - y_2^2)\right\}. \quad (5)$$

$$B_r = \int dx_t \int dy_t I_t(x_t, y_t) \propto \int dx_1 \int dy_1 \int dx_2 \int dy_2 \times \int dx' \int dy' \int dx'' \int dy'' E_r(x_1, y_1) E_r^*(x_2, y_2) \times T(x', y') T(x'', y'') \exp\left\{\frac{j\pi}{\lambda z}[(x_1 - x')^2 - (x_2 - x'')^2]\right\} \times \exp\left\{\frac{j\pi}{\lambda z}[(y_1 - y')^2 - (y_2 - y'')^2]\right\} \sin c\left[\frac{L_1}{\lambda z_1}(x' - x'')\right] \times \sin c\left[\frac{L_1}{\lambda z_1}(y' - y'')\right] \exp\left\{\frac{j\pi}{\lambda z_1}[(x'^2 - x''^2) + (y'^2 - y''^2)]\right\}. \quad (6)$$

and $|T_{GICS}|$ is the object's transmission function recovered by GICS reconstruction algorithm, L_1 is effective collecting aperture of the test detector D_t .

Figs. 2-3, respectively, present experimental results for the images recovered via GI and GICS reconstructions in different collecting areas $L_1 \times L_1$ and in different distances z_1 using the schematic shown in Fig. 1. For the GICS reconstruction, we have utilized the gradient projection for sparse reconstruction (GPSR) algorithm [30] and $\tau=0.005$ in Eq. (4). From Eq. (3), the resolution of ghost images recovered by GI reconstruction is restricted by diffraction effect of the source's aperture, which is also demonstrated in Fig. 2(b) and Fig. 3(a). However, ghost images with the resolution beyond that of $\frac{1}{6}$ ARDL (Fig. 2(c-e)) and $\frac{1}{15}$ ARDL (Fig. 3(b-d)) can be obtained by GICS reconstruction. From Eq. (6) and Fig. 2(a), the aperture of the test detector is equivalent to a low-pass filter. As the collecting areas of the detector D_t is increased or the distance between the object and the detector D_t is decreased, then more high spatial frequencies from the object are collected by the test detector, so the quality of GICS will be enhanced (Fig. 2(c,e) and Fig. 3(b-d)). These results can be explained by Eqs. (4-6) because the quadratic term in Eq. (4) will be close to zero as the increase of L_1 or the decrease of z_1 . But the imaging quality can be also improved by increasing the acquisition numbers even if only low spatial-frequency information from the object is collected by the detector D_t (Fig. 2 (a,d)). However, the object's image can not be recovered by GI reconstruction because the size of the speckle fixed on the object plane is much larger than the center-to-center separation of the object (Fig. 2 (b) and Fig. 3(a)). Moreover, because $I_r(x, y)$ in Eq. (4) is similar to the microprobe of SNOM and the minimum resolved scale of optical system is determined by the microprobe, the resolution of GICS is closely related to the resolution of the CCD camera D_r , which is also demonstrated in Fig. 2(c-e).




FIG. 2: Experimental reconstruction of a double-slit (100×100 pixels) in different collecting areas with $z=1200$ mm, $z_1=500$ mm and $D=0.6$ mm when the size of the speckle placed on the object plane is $l_c=1280 \mu\text{m}$. (a) The intensity distribution on the test detector plane; (b) GI reconstruction; (c,d) and (e) are GICS when the resolution of the CCD camera D_r is 1 pixel and 5 pixels, respectively (with 2000 realizations for (a-c) and 500 realizations for (e); using 5000, 3000, and 2000 measurements for (d-1,2,3), respectively). The collecting areas of the test detector D_t with the sizes $L_1 \times L_1$ shown in (1-3) are $1.6 \text{ mm} \times 1.6 \text{ mm}$, $3.2 \text{ mm} \times 3.2 \text{ mm}$, and $6.4 \text{ mm} \times 6.4 \text{ mm}$.




FIG. 3: Experimental results of the same double-slit recovered via GI and GICS reconstructions in different distances z_1 with $z=1200$ mm and $D=0.25$ mm when the size of the speckle placed on the object plane is $l_c=3120 \mu\text{m}$ (using 20000 measurements). (a) GI reconstruction; (b-d) are GICS with $z_1=180$ mm, 90 mm and 10 mm, respectively when the resolution of the CCD camera D_r is 2 pixels and the collecting area of the test detector D_t is $6.4 \text{ mm} \times 6.4 \text{ mm}$.

For two-photon systems, because of the uncertainty relation, pairs of photons having a perfect classical correlation in momentum (or position) cannot exhibit any correlation in position (or momentum), thus the quantum resolution limit of GI with thermal light is determined by the uncertainty relation involving in the inequality for independent particles [15, 16, 17]. Different from classical correlation, entangled two-photon pairs exhibit both momentum-momentum and position-position EPR-type correlations, then the uncertainties of momentum and position can be independent of each other and indefinitely small, even zero, so entangled two-photon systems can overcome ARDL and generates superresolved images [16]. Here, by GICS reconstruction with thermal light, super-resolution images beyond the resolution of $\frac{1}{6}$ ARDL can still be obtained even if ARDL caused by both limited

transmitting aperture and constrained receiving numerical aperture of optical system are much larger than the characteristic scale of the object (Figs. 2 and 3). Most importantly, the resolution ($< \frac{1}{15}$ ARDL) of GICS shown in Fig. 3(b-d) can break through that of quantum diffraction limits ($\sim \frac{1}{4\pi}$ ARDL) of both conventional imaging and GI with thermal light, which obviously violates the uncertainty relation for independent particles. Moreover, for GI, the image of an object is nonlocally achieved by classical “point-by-point” scanning measurements of photons in the reference path, which is similar to conventional imaging. Thus the image extraction efficiency for both conventional imaging and GI is low because they are all based on the principle of single-photon collapse. Different from conventional imaging and GI, GICS is based on “global random” measurements, which means that multiple photons are simultaneously collapsed by single measurement, so we can obtain high image extraction efficiency and GICS can be considered as multi-photon imaging (at least two photons in the reference path for every measurement). However, lots of physical questions should be further investigated. For example, are the more the photons obtained in the reference path for every measurement, the higher the image extraction efficiency is?

What are the differences between GICS with quantum source and GICS with classical source? Moreover, what are the uncertainty relation and the quantum resolution limit for GICS? And random orthogonal measurements are classical or quantum measurements?

In conclusion, we formulated a novel-band imaging theory called GICS, which is the result of combining quantum optics with information theory. Based on GICS reconstruction, super-resolution ghost images in the far field can be obtained even if the test detector only collect low-frequency information from the object. Furthermore, our experimental results show that the imaging resolution obtained by GICS can break through that of quantum diffraction limits of both single-photon imaging and two-photon imaging with thermal light. In practical applications, GICS is very useful to imaging in the long-wavelength radiation band and in the far field, microscopy, astronomy and so on.

We thank Igor Carron for helpful discussions, and for support from Hi-Tech Research and Development Program of China under Grant Project No. 2006AA12Z115, National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Project No. 60877009, and Shanghai Natural Science Foundation under Grant Project No. 09JC1415000.

-
- [1] E. A. Ash, and G. Nicholls, *Nature*, **237**, 510-512 (1972).
 - [2] E. Betzig, J. K. Trautman, T. D. Harris, S. J. Weiner, and R. L. Kostelak, *science*, **251**, 1468-1470 (1991).
 - [3] Y. Ben-Aryeh, *J. Opt. B: Quantum semiclass. Opt.* **5**, S553-S556 (2003).
 - [4] S. A. Ramakrishna, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **68**, 449-521 (2005).
 - [5] J. B. Pendry, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 3966-3969 (2000).
 - [6] G. Scarcelli, V. Berardi, and Y. Shih, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 063602 (2006).
 - [7] M. D’Angelo, M. V. Chekhova, and Y. Shih, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 013602 (2001).
 - [8] M. Zhang, Q. Wei, X. Shen, Y. Liu, H. Liu, Y. Bai, and S. Han, *Phys. Lett. A* **366**, 569-574 (2007).
 - [9] D. Cao, J. Xiong, S. Zhang, L. Lin, L. Gao, and K. Wang, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **92**, 201102 (2008).
 - [10] J. L. Harris, *J. Opt. Soc. Am.* **54**, 931-936 (1964).
 - [11] B. R. Hunt, *International Journal of Imaging Systems and Technology*, **6**, 297-304 (1995).
 - [12] H. Guo, and S. S. Han, *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **23**, 12 (2006).
 - [13] J. W. Goodman. *Introduction to Fourier Optics*. Mc Graw-Hill, New York (1968).
 - [14] W. Heisenberg, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, **43**, 172-198 (1927).
 - [15] R. S. Bennink, S. J. Bentley, R. W. Boyd and J. C. Howell, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 033601 (2004).
 - [16] M. D’Angelo, A. Valencia, M. H. Rubin, and Y. Shih, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 013810 (2005).
 - [17] M. D’Angelo, Y. Kim, S. P. Kulik, and Y. Shih, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 233601 (2004).
 - [18] A. Gatti, E. Brambilla, and L. A. Lugiato, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 133603 (2003).
 - [19] F. Ferri, D. Magatti, A. Gatti, M. Bache, E. Brambilla, and L. A. Lugiato, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 183602 (2005).
 - [20] R. J. Glauber, *Phys. Rev.* **130**, 2529 (1963).
 - [21] A. Gatti, E. Brambilla, M. Bache, and L. A. Lugiato, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 093602 (2004).
 - [22] J. Cheng and S. Han, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 093903 (2004).
 - [23] W. Gong, P. Zhang, X. Shen, and S. Han, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **95**, 071110 (2009).
 - [24] M. Zhang, Q. Wei, X. Shen, Y. Liu, H. Liu, J. Cheng, and S. Han, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 021803(R) (2007).
 - [25] W. Gong, P. Zhang, X. Shen, and S. Han, *arXiv. Quant-ph/0908.0185v1* (2009).
 - [26] E. J. Candes, J. Romberg, and T. Tao, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, **52**, 5406-5425 (2006).
 - [27] D. L. Donoho and Y. Tsaig, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, **54**, 4789-4812 (2006).
 - [28] E. J. Candes and M. B. Wakin, *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.* **25**, 21 (2008).
 - [29] J. Romberg, *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.* **25**, 14 (2008).
 - [30] M. A. T. Figueiredo, R. D. Nowak, and S. J. Wright, *IEEE J. Sel. Top. in Sig. Proc.* **1**, 586-597 (2007).
 - [31] O. Katz, Y. Bromberg, and Y. Silberberg, *Appl. phys. Lett.* **95**, 131110 (2009).
 - [32] M. A. Herman and T. Strohmer, *IEEE Trans. Sig. Process.* **57**, 2275-2284 (2009).