

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Tradeoffs in Polarimeter Design

J. Scott Tyo

ECE Department, University of New Mexico

Albuquerque, NM 87131-1356

tyo@ece.unm.edu

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 00 MAR 2003		2. REPORT TYPE N/A		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Tradeoffs in Polarimeter Design				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) ECE Department, University of New Mexico Albuquerque, NM 87131-1356				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES See also ADM201529., The original document contains color images.					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 38	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Presentation Outline

- System Dimensionality
 - Example Applications and Methods
- Data Collection Strategies
 - Serial -vs- Parallel
 - Rotating -vs- Non-Rotating Optics
 - Active -vs- Passive
- System Optimization

Multi-Dimensional Stokes Polarimetry

1-D Polarimetry

Contrast Enhancement in
Photography
(e.g. Duntley, 1974; Gilbert, 1964)

2-D Polarization Difference

Scatter Mitigation,
Contrast Enhancement
(Tyo, *et al.*, 1996;
Silverman and Strange, 1996)

3-D Linear Polarimetry


Target Identification
(Halaijan and Hallock, 1972;
Walraven, 1977; Duggin 2002;
Wolff, *et al.*, 1994; etc.)

4-D Stokes Vector Imaging

Target Identification
(Soloman, 1981;
Chipman, *et al.*, 1997; etc.)

1-D Polarimetry - Photography

Partially Linearly Polarized
Skylight (Rayleigh Scattering)



Observer with
Vertical Polarizer

- Linear polarization filters are used extensively in photography to maximize the contrast between the subject and the background

- Maximum utility when the scattering background provides a high degree of linear polarization, as when a scattering medium is illuminated at right-angles to the direction of observation

- Beneficial with sky-background, underwater, in fog or dust, etc.

Tradeoffs for 1-D Polarimetry


pros

- No images to register
- Can be optimized in near-real time
- Linear or circular

cons


- 3 dimensions of polarization blindness
- Image features vary as system is tuned
- No quantitative polarization result

Experimental Setup for 2-D PDI




Prepared Targets

A



B





Step-by-Step PDI (2-D)



8-bit Images

Line Scans across Center



vert/horiz



PS/PD



amplified



Tradeoffs for 2-D Polarimetry




pros

- 2 images to register
- Can be optimized in near-real time
- Linear polarization (can be used with circular too)
- Projects noise into orthogonal dimension, suppresses biases


cons

- 2 dimension of polarization blindness
- Image Registration
- Image features vary as system is tuned


2-D Polarization Images



Polarization Bias




3-D Linear Polarimetry





- Measures the first three Stokes parameters
- Needs 3 or more measurements
- Can physically or electro-optically rotate

3-D Polarimetric Images



Back-Illuminated dielectric sphere with
full 3-D colorimetric representation



Revisiting the earlier scene
(Note – color axis reversed)

Tradeoffs for 3-D Polarimetry

pros

- Linear polarization (can be used with circular as s_0, s_1, s_3)
- Provides angle of polarization, DOLP



cons

- 1 dimension of polarization blindness
- Image Registration
- Image features vary as system is tuned
- 3-D noise can corrupt data presentation



Benefits of 2-D -vs- 3-D

Robust Representations in Scattering Media



2-D



3-D




Full Stokes Vector Polarimeter Design



Data Collection can be either SERIAL or PARALLEL

Polarimetric images of sphere and cylinder

Variable Retardance Polarimetry



Tradeoffs for 4-D Polarimetry


pros

- Provides full Stokes Vector Information
- No polarization blindness

cons


- Must collect at least 4 images (registration, spatiotemporal resolution)
- Requires circular polarization optics (expensive, difficult)

And What About Spectropolarimetry?




- Optical layout of a full Stokes vector, hyperspectral polarimeter for use in the visible
- Coupled a spatial shear modified Sagnac interferometer with a variable retardance polarimeter
- Approximately 80 bands across 450 – 750 nm

Experimental Images




Spatio-Spectral s_0 “Images”

Stack of Cylinders




Blue

S_0 - Position 1




Clear

S_0 - Position 2




Red


S_0 - Position 3




S_0 - Position 1



S_0 - Position 2










S_0 - Position 3



Spatio-Spectral Stokes “Images”

Clear Cylinder



Tradeoffs for Spectropolarimetry

pros

- Provides Stokes vector information *at all wavelengths*
- Can calibrate out spectral dependence of optics
- Can be used as a spectrometer

cons

- Huge data storage and alignment issues
- Requires circular polarization optics (expensive, difficult)
- Major spatio-temporal resolution bottleneck
- Extremely low optical throughput
- Little or no evidence for highly spectrally resolved polarization information

Active Polarimetry

pros

- Can use polarization even when signature is depolarizing
- Can use in any wavelength regime (radar, lidar, etc.)
- Provides up to 16 dimensional information
- Can control illumination to maximize utility

cons

- System complexity
- Very low spatiotemporal resolution
- Difficult to do “broadband”
- Provides up to 16 dimensional information

Polarimeter Optimization

- There is an optimum configuration for *every* 2-D, 3-D, and 4-D polarimeter design, as well as active systems
- Depends on the strategy used and the number of measurement made
- Improper design of system can provide unnecessarily low SNR and oversensitivity to optical calibration issues

How Do We Detect Stokes Vector?

- Problem: Optical detectors are typically photon counters – Generally Pol-insensitive
 - We can only measure s_0 !
- Solution: Design an optical system that modifies s_0 based on the input polarization
 - Infer $s_0 - s_3$ from intensity measurements

Polarimetric analysis – Variable Retardance

The Stokes vector of the emergent light is

$$\mathbf{S}_o = \mathbf{M}_{LP}(\theta) \mathbf{M}_{VR}(\phi_2, \delta_2) \mathbf{M}_{VR}(\phi_1, \delta_1) \mathbf{S}_i$$

With Intensity $I = \mathbf{M}_1^T \cdot \mathbf{S}_i$

Vary parameters to form a linear system:

$$\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{S}_i$$

Polarimetric analysis (cont.)


The input Stokes vector is obtained by inversion:

$$\mathbf{S}_i = \mathbf{A}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{I} = \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{I}$$



B is termed the “Synthesis Matrix” as it is used to reconstruct the Stokes Parameters

Simulated Images



$$\mathbf{S} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{3} \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$



Simulated Images - Original Parameters





$$\langle \mathbf{S} \rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 1.74 \\ 0.99 \\ 0.98 \\ 1.00 \end{bmatrix}$$





$$\text{var}(\mathbf{S}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.59 \\ 0.43 \\ 1.93 \\ 0.60 \end{bmatrix}$$

Simulated Images - Optimized System




$$\langle \mathbf{S} \rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 1.73 \\ 1.00 \\ 1.00 \\ 1.00 \end{bmatrix}$$



$$\text{var}(\mathbf{S}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.10 \\ 0.29 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.30 \end{bmatrix}$$


General Optimization

Maximum Possible Separation of Measurements
in Subspace of Poincaré Sphere




2-D Linear Polarization

Maximum Possible Separation of Measurements
in Subspace of Poincaré Sphere




3-D Linear

Maximum Possible Separation of Measurements
in Subspace of Poincaré Sphere




3-D Linear, 4 Measurements

Maximum Possible Separation of Measurements
in Subspace of Poincaré Sphere



4-D Stokes Vector

Maximum Possible Separation of Measurements
in Subspace of Poincaré Sphere



References for Optimization

1. Azzam, *et al.*, “General analysis and optimization of the four-detector photopolarimeter,” *JOSA A* **5**:681 (1988)
2. Ambirijan and Look “Optimum angles for a polarimeter: Part I,” *Opt. Eng.* **34**: 1651 (1995)
3. Ambirijan and Look “Optimum angles for a polarimeter: Part I,” *Opt. Eng.* **34**: 1655 (1995)
4. Tyo, “Optimum Linear Combination Strategy For A N -Channel Polarization Sensitive Vision Or Imaging System,” *JOSA A* **15**:359 (1998)
5. @ARTICLE{sabatke_ol,
6. Sabatke, *et al.*, “Optimization of Retardance for a Complete Stokes
7. Polarimeter,” *Opt. Lett.* **25**:802 (2000)
8. Tyo, “Noise equalization in Stokes Parameter Images obtained by use of variable retardance polarimeters,” *Opt. Lett.* **25**: 1198 (2000)
9. Tyo, “Design of optimal polarimeters: maximization of SNR and minimization of systematic errors,” *Appl. Opt.* **41**:619 (2002)
10. Smith, “Optimization of a dual-rotating-retarder Mueller matrix polarimeter,” *Appl. Opt.* **41**:2488 (2002)

Design of Optimum Polarimeters

- The optimum set of parameters provides maximum information per measurement, i.e. these measurements are maximally decorrelated
- For Variable Retardance Polarimetry, a non-unique optimum parameter set will equalize the noise in the three Stokes images
- Rotating retarder systems - the optimum retardance is 132° - not 90°
- Rotating retarder systems – the optimum angles are at $\pm 15.1^\circ, \pm 51.7^\circ$
- A new set of optimum settings must be computed for situations with a polarization bias (Työ, *et al.*, 1996)
- In principle, such a set of optimum parameters exists for *any* polarimetry strategy
 - *N*-channel Linear Polarimetry (Työ, 1998)
 - Variable Retardance Polarimetry (Työ and Turner, 1999)
 - Rotating Compensator (Ambirajan and Look, 1995; Sweatt, *et al.*, 1999)