Multiple-Incidence/Multi-Frequency for Profile Reconstruction of Random Rough Surfaces Using the Three-Dimensional Electromagnetic Fast Multipole Model

Magda El-Shenawee¹ and Eric Miller² ¹Department of Electrical Engineering University of Arkansas, Fayetteville AR 72701 <u>magda@uark.edu</u> ²Center for Subsurface Sensing and Imaging Systems Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115 <u>elmiller@ece.neu.edu</u>

Abstract

A fast algorithm for reconstructing the profile of random rough surfaces using electromagnetic scattering data is presented. The algorithm is based on merging a fast forward solver and an efficient optimization technique. The steepest descent fast multipole method (SDFMM) is used as the three-dimensional (3-D) fast forward solver. A rapidly convergent descent method employing a "*marching-on*" strategy for processing multi-frequency and multi-incidence angle data is introduced to minimize an underlying cost function. The cost function represents the error between true (synthetic) and simulated scattered field data. Several key issues impact the accuracy in reconstructing the rough profile are examined in this work, e.g., the location and number of receivers, the incident and scattered directions, the surface roughness, and details regarding the manner in which sensitivity information is computed in the inversion scheme. The results show that using the multiple-incidence (*one angle at a time*) and the multi-frequency (*one frequency at a time*) strategies lead to improve the profile reconstruction.

I. INTRODUCTION

The presence of rough ground surface is considered a major source of clutter in subsurface sensing applications. The ground roughness causes considerable distortion to ground penetrating radar response (GPR), which makes it difficult for conventional signal processing techniques to be of use in processing the received GPR data. In some cases, it could be life threatening to experimentally measure the roughness of the ground profile (e.g., landmine fields). This is a significant challenge for subsurface sensing researchers, therefore the motivation of this work is to predict the random rough profile of the ground using a fast inversion algorithm.

The work we present here is related to two broad topics currently addressed in the literature: (i) forward scattering of electromagnetic fields from rough surfaces without or with buried targets [1-24], and (ii) estimating the surface profile or roughness statistics based on theoretical, experimental or computational techniques [25-38]. Several works have been published to analyze the electromagnetic field scattered from one- (1-D) and two-dimensional (2-D) random rough surfaces without and with buried targets [1-14] and [15-24], respectively. However, less has appeared on reconstructing the profile of rough surfaces especially the 2-D random rough dielectric surfaces [25-38]. The work in [25-26] presents methods for inferring roughness parameters of 1-D surfaces from the average electromagnetic data. The work in [27-28] discusses some analytical and experimental methods to determine the roughness statistics of 1-D and 2-D surface profiles using electromagnetic data. All work in [29-37] present methods for reconstructing the profile of 1-D rough surfaces, either perfect electric conducting (PEC) surfaces [29-33] or dielectric surfaces [34-37]. The work in [38] presents a technique for 2-D PEC rough profile reconstruction. In reality, the ground is randomly rough in two dimensions (i.e. *x* and *y* directions) with non-perfect conducting material (e.g., soil, sand, vegetation, water, etc), which makes it more challenging to reconstruct its profile.

Our algorithm is based on combining a 3-D fast forward solver with nonlinear programming technique, which uses electromagnetic waves scattered from the rough ground surface (GPR-type data). The well-developed steepest descent fast multipole method (SDFMM) will be used here as the fast forward solver [39-41], [14-19]. Briefly, the SDFMM is a hybridization of the fast multipole method (FMM) [39-41], the method of moments (MoM) [42-43], and the steepest descent integration rule (SD) [41]. This fast forward solver is combined with the efficient optimization technique of Fletcher and Powell [44-46] to minimize a cost function relating parameters of the unknown surface structure to the observed field data. Although real collected GPR-data should be used in the reconstruction process, for simplicity in this work, synthetic data, generated using the 3-D SDFMM computer code, will be used to test the reconstruction algorithm. Several key issues will be examined such as the reconstruction accuracy, the influence of number and locations of receivers, the computational expenses of the algorithm, the type of cost function (e.g., complex or amplitude error of electric field), and the surface roughness.

It is important to emphasize that the concept of combining a forward scattering solver with an optimization technique is similar to the concept used in [34-38]. The current work is based on integral-equation-FMM computational technique which accounts for all multiple scattering mechanisms from the surface, however, the work in [34-38] was based on Kirchhoff approximation which accounts only for the single scatter and not the multiple scattering [13].

Our inversion technique uses *marching-on* schemes of the incident angle and frequency. One issue often arises with *marching-on* methods, is how to choose the criteria for deciding the order and length of each scheme. In this work, we present results indicating that *marching-on* methods

offer a feasible approach to provide high quality reconstruction of rough surfaces. We consider, beyond the scope of this work, the more general questions concerning synthesizing specific iterative strategies for nonlinear problems to guarantee some level of convergence (e.g. data ordering, number of iterations per data subset, etc). Such problems are difficult as generally discussed, but not dealt with, by Natterer *et al* [47] and Dorn *et al* [48]. The application-oriented work presented here is an attempt to answer some of these questions.

This paper is organized as follows; the methodology of the algorithm and mathematical formulations are summarized in Section II and in Appendices A and B, the numerical results are presented and discussed in Section III, and the concluding remarks are given in Section IV.

II. METHODOLOGY

The reconstruction algorithm of the rough surface profile begins with assuming a mathematical model of the surface that can approximately define its height variation. This surface model includes a number of unknown parameters that need to be recovered during the reconstruction process. For example, the surface profile can be assumed deterministic (e.g., sinusoidal), similar to the work reported in [38], or random based on the B-spline function, similar to the work reported in [34-37]. The second key issue of the algorithm is to define an appropriate cost function to be minimized. This cost function represents the error between true data (GPR-type data) and simulated data generated during the searching process. The third key issue is computing the synthetic and simulated data using the direct method based on a 3-D fast forward solver of the electromagnetic waves. In this work, we examine the utility of two cost functions $C(\theta)$ defined as:

$$C_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} \left\| \overline{E}_i^{True} \right\| - \left| \overline{E}_i^{Sim}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right\|^2 \text{ and } C_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} \left| \overline{E}_i^{True} - \overline{E}_i^{Sim}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \right|^2$$
(1)

in which, \overline{E}_i^{True} and \overline{E}_i^{Sim} represent the scattered complex electric fields for true-data (GPR-type data) and simulated data, respectively. The subscript *i* represents the receiver's number, where N_r is the total number of receivers located above the ground. The vector θ represents the unknown parameters to be recovered in order to reconstruct the profile of the rough surface. The number of elements of vector θ varies according to the assumed mathematical model of the surface profile. For example, θ includes 2 parameters in case of sinusoidal surfaces, but it could include more parameters in case of using B-spline functions, as will be discussed in Section III. The cost function in (1) will be minimized until an acceptable error is achieved as discussed later in this Section.

A. Forward scattering (direct) method:

All field computations, either to generate synthetic data \overline{E}_i^{True} or simulated fields \overline{E}_i^{Sim} at each receiver, are obtained using the 3-D SDFMM fast forward solver [41]. The SDFMM accelerates the method of moments (MoM) solution of the surface integral equations given by [41-43]:

$$\overline{E}^{inc}\left(\overline{r}\right)_{tang.} = \left[\left(L_1 + L_2\right)\overline{J} - \left(K_1 + K_2\right)\overline{M}\right]_{ang.}$$
(2a)

$$\overline{H}^{inc}\left(\overline{r}\right)_{\text{tang.}} = \left[\left(K_1 + K_2\right)\overline{J} + \left(\frac{L_1}{\varsigma_1^2} + \frac{L_2}{\varsigma_2^2}\right)\overline{M}\right]_{\text{tang.}}$$
(2b)

where *tang.* refers to tangent to the scatterer's surface S_1 , \overline{J} and \overline{M} are the surface electric and magnetic currents, respectively, \overline{r} is the position vector, and η_1 and η_2 are the intrinsic impedances of the air and the ground, respectively. The expressions of the integro-differential operators $L_{1,2}$ and $K_{1,2}$ are given in Appendix A. Upon discretizing the surface S_1 using the RWG triangular patches (Raw, Wilton, Glisson), the surface currents, \overline{J} and \overline{M} , are approximated by [41-43]:

$$\overline{J}(\overline{r}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} I_{1n} \overline{j}_n(\overline{r}), \quad \overline{M}(\overline{r}) = \varphi_1 \sum_{n=1}^{N} I_{2n} \overline{j}_n(\overline{r}), \quad \overline{r} \in S_1$$
(3)

in which \overline{j} is a vector basis function and $I = \begin{bmatrix} I_1 & I_2 \end{bmatrix}$ is the current unknown coefficient vector. After some algebraic manipulations, a linear system of equations is obtained, $\overline{\overline{ZI}} = \overline{V}$. The expression of the impedance matrix $\overline{\overline{Z}}$ is given in Appendix A, the vector \overline{V} is the tested tangential incident electric field \overline{E}^{inc} and normalized magnetic field $\eta_1 \overline{H}^{inc}$ on the scatterer's surface S_1 [41-43]. As well known, using the MoM to solve this system of equations is computationally expensive either for large-scale scatterers or when the scatterer is involved in inversion techniques. Therefore the fast forward solver, the SDFMM, is employed in the current inversion algorithm. Basically, when using the FMM [39-41], the matrix $\overline{\overline{Z}}$ is expressed as: $\overline{\overline{Z}}^{NF} + \overline{\overline{Z}}^{FF}$, where $\overline{\overline{Z}}^{NF}$ and $\overline{\overline{Z}}^{FF}$ represent the near field (NF) and the far field (FF) parts, respectively [39-41]. The elements of $\overline{\overline{Z}}^{NF}$ are computed directly and are multiplied by the vector \overline{I} similar to the standard MoM, while the elements of $\overline{\overline{Z}}^{FF}$ are not directly computed nor stored, but their contribution to the matrix vector multiplication is conducted in one step using the inhomogeneous plane wave expansions [39-41]. The interaction decomposition into near field, NF, and far field, FF, is implemented according to the distance, in free space wavelength, between the interacting elements on the scatterer's surface [39-41]. As reported by Jandhyala et al in [41], the computational complexity of the SDFMM is O(K), for the CPU time and computer memory requirements per iteration, while it is $O(K^2)$ for the MoM, where K is the total number of surface current unknown coefficients. Once, the surface currents are computed, the scattered

(radiated) electric fields \overline{E}_i^{Sim} can be easily obtained in both the near- and/or the far- zone similar to the work reported in [14-19].

B. Optimization method:

The estimated vector $\hat{\theta}$ will be obtained upon minimizing the cost function $C(\theta)$ in (1) as:

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg(\min_{\theta} (C(\theta))) \tag{4}$$

A rapid steepest decent optimization approach, developed by Fletcher and Powell [44-46], is implemented here. For faster and more efficient computations, the elements of the unknown vector θ will be restricted to certain limits, i.e., upper and lower bound constraints will be *a priori* provided ($\theta_{LB} \le \theta \le \theta_{UB}$). In its most basic form (without the constraints) the iterative inversion technique to search for the unknown vector θ is given by [44-46]:

$$\hat{\theta}_{k+1} = \hat{\theta}_k + \alpha_k d_k \tag{5a}$$

in which k is the iteration index, α_k is the k-step, and the vector d_k is the vector that minimizes the quadratic equation q(d) as (see details of Fletcher and Powell algorithm in [44-46]):

$$q(d) = 0.5d^T H_k d + c_k^T d, \quad d \in \mathbb{R}^n$$
(5b)

in which *R* is the real domain, $c_k = \nabla C(\hat{\theta}_k)$ is the gradient of the cost function $C(\theta)$, and the matrix *H* contains the true curvature information for the feasible region and can be regarded as a reduced inverse Hessian matrix (see [44-46] for details including a discussion concerning the manner in which bound constraints are incorporated into the processing).

Computationally, a key component of this approach is the calculation of the gradient of the cost function. In this work, we make use of finite difference approximations for the required sensitivity analysis [49]. Although such methods are somewhat less efficient than adjoint field techniques, they are more straightforward to code (especially given the SDFMM forward model)

and provide the necessary proof-of-principle results for this work. Indeed, the strong performance of the method obtained in this work provides motivation for developing the required adjoint field computational tools based on the SDFMM forward model.

To be specific, the gradient of the cost function is evaluated numerically using the central or the forward difference equations [49]. Equation (5a) shows that solving the inverse problem requires solving the forward problem large number of times, either to compute \overline{E}_i^{Sim} at each receiver in (1) or to compute the gradient c_k in (5b) with respect to each parameter of vector θ . Notice that the mathematical model assumed for the unknown rough surface profile determines the number of associated parameters of θ , consequently it determines the number of derivatives involved in the gradient $c_k = \nabla C(\hat{\theta}_k)$. It is also important to emphasize that each iteration of the Fletcher and Powell search algorithm involves studying the behavior of the cost function in order to determine the best possible search direction (see details in [44-46]). This implies that for each iteration k, several runs of the 3-D forward solver are required. This scenario necessitates using an efficient and fast forward solver, such as the SDFMM, to retrieve the surface profile in realistic time. The geometry of the problem is shown in Fig. 1a, while the flowchart of the inversion algorithm is shown in Fig. 1b.

When using a gradient descent method to solve nonlinear inverse problems, several important issues arise including: (i) the mathematical model of the unknown rough surface profile with its unknown parameters, (ii) the behavior of cost functions with respect to variations in these parameters, and (iii) the convergence of the algorithm with respect to the initial guess of these parameters. In addressing (i), we make use of a number of well-studied parametric models for the roughness profile. Unfortunately, issues (ii) and (iii) are less amenable to meaningful, closed form analysis. Thus, we present here a number of numerical examples which illustrate

the general behavior of the cost function and convergence of the inversion method which we see across the range of examples provided in Section III.

The results, for investigating the above issues, are obtained using the fast forward solver SDFMM for a surface size 1.224×1.224 m² at f = 1GHz. The incident electromagnetic wave is represented by a Gaussian beam normally incident to the surface with horizontal polarization [14-19]. The incident beam illuminates a circular spot on the ground of diameter ~49cm. In this Section, the relative dielectric constant of the ground is assumed $\varepsilon_r = 2.5 - i0.18$ (Bosnian dry soil [14]). The horizontal electric field scattered from the ground in the far-zone at normal incidence is calculated to obtain the cost function $C(\theta)$. This implies that the co-polarized waves (*HH*) are obtained at single receiver, i.e., $N_r = 1$, in this example. In all results presented in this work, the interactions between elements on the scatterer's surface are considered *FF* when their FMM blocks are separated by 2 or more finest blocks, where each block has dimensions of $0.32\lambda_0 \times 0.32\lambda_0$ [41].

C. Rough surface models:

To investigate the above issues, two rough surface models are used as follows:

(*i*) 2-D sinusoidal rough surface: in Example 1, the surface is assumed sinusoidal similar to Harada *et al* [38], $h(x, y) = H \cos(2\pi x/L)\cos(2\pi y/L)$, where H and L are the surface maximum height and period, respectively. The behavior of the cost function $C_1(\theta)$ in (1) is plotted versus the surface parameters H and L as shown in Fig. 2a. The results show a pronounced local minimum point for $L=1\lambda_0$ and $H=0.15\lambda_0$. The inversion algorithm is tested to recover the unknown parameter H, assuming, for simplicity, that the surface period is known ($L = 1\lambda_0$), as shown in Fig. 2b. Zero initial value of H (i.e., flat surface) is used in the algorithm recovering a sinusoidal surface with relative error less than 3% with respect to the true surface.

(*ii*) 2-D B-spline rough surface: in Example 2, the previous test is repeated for a 2-D rough surface approximated by a tensor-product B-spline function as follows [50-51], [34]:

$$h(x,y) \approx \sum_{n=-4}^{N_n-1} \sum_{m=-4}^{N_m-1} \alpha_{n,m} S_n(x) S_m(y)$$
(6a)

in which $\alpha_{n,m}$ are the unknown coefficients with total numbers of $N_n + 4$ and $N_m + 4$ in x and ydirections, respectively, and $S_n(x)$ and $S_m(y)$ are equally spaced knots *fifth*-order B-spline functions for x and y, respectively, given by (Eq. 6 in [34]), and Appendix B:

$$S_{n}(x) = s^{(5)}(x - x_{n}), \quad S_{m}(y) = s^{(5)}(y - y_{m}),$$

$$x_{\min} \le x \le x_{\max}, \quad y_{\min} \le y \le y_{\max}$$
(6b)

Notice that a *fifth*-order B-spline function is represented by a piecewise fourth-order polynomial [50]. The expressions for $s^{(5)}$, x_n and y_m are given in Appendix B.

In this Example, the true surface is modeled using the B-spline function of (6a), with all coefficients $\alpha_{n,m}$ as random numbers generated using a computer random generator from uniform distribution. The produced random rough surface is enforced to have a zero mean height. The total number of coefficients is $16 \times 16 = 256$, assuming $N_n = N_m = 12$. For simplicity, 254 coefficients are assumed known, while only two coefficients are unknown. The inversion algorithm is tested to recover the unknown coefficients, $\alpha_{7,15}$ and $\alpha_{11,2}$, as shown in Fig. 2c. Zero initial values of $\alpha_{7,15}$ and $\alpha_{11,2}$ are used in the inversion algorithm.

D. Computational requirements:

In Examples 1 and 2, the inversion algorithm required 76 and 88 runs of the 3-D SDFMM forward solver to achieve 10^{-6} error in the cost function, for the sinusoidal and tensor-product B-

spline surface, respectively. Each run required 231 MB computer memory and approximately 15 CPU minutes, to achieve tolerance of 10^{-3} of the TFQMR iterative solver (transpose-free quasiminimal residual algorithm). A surface discretization distance of $0.08\lambda_0$ is used for all the cases in this work at f = 1GHz. All computational work is conducted using the COMPAQ ALPHA server 667 MHz server.

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this Section, several numerical examples of reconstructing the profile of groove-like random rough surfaces are presented (see Fig. 3a). All results presented in this section are for ground surface of dimensions $1.0 \times 1.0 \text{ m}^2$ and relative dielectric constant $\varepsilon_r = 4.0 - i0.01$ (realistic dry soil [34-37]). The incident wave is a Gaussian beam illuminating a circular spot of diameter 40cm in the x-y plane on ground (see Fig. 3a). This implies that a 3-D scattering mechanism is involved in the inversion algorithm, where all fields are computed using the SDFMM code. The random rough surface is approximated by the 1-D B-spline function, $h(x) \approx \sum_{n=1}^{N_n-1} \alpha_n S_n(x)$, where $S_n(x)$ is a *fifth*-order B-spline function given in (6b) and in Appendix B, with $N_n = 12$ leading to a number of unknown coefficients $\alpha_n = 16$, as discussed in Section II. In all results presented here, true surfaces are generated using the above B-spline function, with 16 random number coefficients obtained using a computer random generator from uniform distribution. Also, all true random rough surfaces are enforced to have zero mean height. The random coefficients are appropriately normalized to generate rough surfaces with a priori assumption of the surface height range, i.e., minimum to maximum heights. The height ranges considered here are 6cm in Figs. 3-8 (similar to the work reported in [34-37]), 12cm in Figs. 9a-b and 15cm in Figs. 9b-c.

These values are used to define the lower and upper constraints, $\theta_{LB} \le \theta \le \theta_{UB}$, e.g. for the 6cm surface height case, the lower and upper limits are -3 and 3cm, respectively, for all coefficients.

In Figs. 3b-f, the inversion algorithm is tested to reconstruct the profile of the rough surface based on received data with y-polarized fields at 11 receivers located at 15cm above the ground mean plane and separated by 6cm (between x=20.4 cm and x=80.4 cm). The gradient of the cost function c in (5b) is evaluated in this example using the central difference equation [49]. The cost function $C_1(\theta)$ in (1) is used in this example. Data obtained based on multiple incidence strategy at single frequency (f=1GHz) is employed in the inversion algorithm. Instead of using the data at all receivers and all incident angles simultaneously, we only use the data at all receivers simultaneously, but for one incident angle at a time, while updating the cost function after each determination of the parameters corresponding to each incident angle. This procedure can be considered as marching on in angle and it is, in a way, similar to the nonlinear Kaczmarztype approach used by Dorn et al in [48]. Our algorithm begins with zero initial values of the unknown coefficients (i.e., flat surface) at normal incidence for 2 inversion iterations as shown in Fig. 3b. The output values of the coefficients are then used as initial values in the algorithm at $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ, \phi^i = 0$ for 2 inversion iterations, as shown in Fig. 3c. This process is repeated at the incident angles $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ, \phi^i = \pi$, followed by $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ, \phi^i = 0$, and $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ, \phi^i = \pi$, as shown in Fig. 3d-f, respectively. The estimated spline coefficients at one angle are used to manually update the initial guess at the succeeding angle. Two iterations were chosen at each angle, based on several numerical results (not presented here), showing slight improvement in the reconstruction when more iterations are used. Figs. 3b-f show good results in the profile reconstruction upon implementing the multiple-incidence strategy. In addition, the results of Fig. 3 show that the small roughness features of the surface were not accurately recovered, as will be

discussed later in this section. In the current example (f=1GHz), each inversion iteration required 56-65 runs of the 3-D SDFMM forward solver, where each run required, on the average, 11 CPU minutes, to achieve a TFQMR tolerance of 10^{-2} , and 165 MB computer memory.

In Figs. 4a-e, a comparison between the magnitude and phase of the electric field scattered from the true surface and from the estimated surface is shown, for the same data of Fig. 3 where the cost function $C_1(\theta)$ was used. Notice that the error in the phase (dashed line) is always larger than the error in the magnitude (solid line), as will be discussed later in this section. Also, notice that the error in the amplitude is diminishing in Fig. 4e compared with Fig. 4a. In this example, the beam width limits are *x*=30cm-70cm, and the 11 receivers are located between *x*=20.4cm-80.4cm.

A comparison between the single- and multiple-incidence strategies at f=1GHz is shown in Fig. 5a. These results are obtained using total 10 inversion iterations for the same cost function and central-difference gradient formula of Fig. 3. The results of Fig. 5a clearly show that the multiple-incidence strategy provides a better reconstruction of the surface profile. Another important issue in the inversion algorithm is the required CPU time, which can be tremendously improved by implementing the forward-difference formula for the gradient, as shown in Fig. 5b. The results are obtained upon running the inversion algorithm for total 10 iterations at f=1GHz, using the same multiple-incidence strategy of Fig. 3. The results show insignificant difference between the reconstructed surface profile based on the central-difference formula compared with that based on the forward-difference formula, especially within the beam width limits (x=0.3-0.7m). Notice that, the central-difference formula of the gradient required evaluating the 3-D scattering problem 56-65 times/inversion iteration, compared with 27-34 runs upon

implementing the forward-difference formula. This approach has lead to substantial saving in the CPU time. Therefore, the forward-difference formula is adopted in the remainder of this work.

To demonstrate the enhancement in profile reconstructions, upon using the multipleincidence strategy, in Figs. 3 and 5, an error criterion defined by the quantity $||h_{re} - h_{true}||_2 / ||h_{true}||_2$ is adopted. The error is plotted in Fig. 5c vs the incident angle, following the same order of angles used in the strategy. The quantities h_{re} and h_{true} represent the reconstructed and the true surface profiles, respectively. Notice that each point in the plot represents the error when that incident angle is used in *a marching-on* scheme in conjunction with all the other incident angles to the left of that point. The positive and negative signs of the incident angles in Fig. 5c indicate to $\varphi^i = 0$, and $\varphi^i = \pi$, respectively. In addition, Fig. 5c shows a comparison between the gradient central formula of Figs. 3b-f, and the gradient forward formula of Figs. 5a-b, for the multiple incidence case. The results of Fig. 5c clearly show the reduction in the error upon using the forward versus the central formula, except at normal incidence. The forward formula, unexpectedly, shows better results than the central formula at normal incidence.

As mentioned earlier, the results of Figs. 3-4, show inaccurate reconstruction of the surface small-scale roughness, implying the need for higher frequencies, to be demonstrated in Figs. 6-7. In addition, using the cost function $C_2(\theta)$ instead of $C_1(\theta)$, given in (1), has shown better profile reconstruction, since it implicitly accounts for the phase information of the scattered electric fields. Therefore the function $C_2(\theta)$ will be adopted in the remainder of this work. However, the numerical results show that using $C_1(\theta)$ or $C_2(\theta)$ still demonstrate smaller error in the electric field amplitudes compared with the phase, similar to Fig. 4. This issue may be resolved by using

a new cost function of appropriate weights of the phase and magnitude, which is not in the scope of this work.

The results of Fig. 6a-d, demonstrate the reconstruction of four different rough surfaces with profiles dominated by small-scale roughness. Single-incidence in the normal direction is used here at f=2GHz. The number of receivers is increased to 29 instead of 11 receivers. In Fig. 6a, the 29 receivers are located between x=8.4cm and x=92.4cm while the 11 receivers are located between x=35.4 and x=65.4cm. In both cases, the receivers are located at 7.5cm above the ground mean plane with separation distance of 3cm. The results of Figs. 6a-c show good agreement with the true surface profile, even outside the limits of the beam width (i.e., outside x=0.3-0.7m). Also, the profile-reconstruction obtained using the 11 receivers is compared with using the 29 receivers in Fig. 6a, demonstrating the improvement obtained by increasing the number of receivers. However, the profile reconstruction in Fig. 6d does not show good agreement with the true profile, almost everywhere.

In this case, the multiple-incidence strategy at single-frequency (2GHz) is implemented trying to improve the profile reconstruction, as shown in Fig. 7a. Similar to Fig. 3, the reconstruction algorithm begins at normal incidence with zero initial values of the coefficients (i.e., flat surface). The algorithm is executed for 2 inversion iterations at $\vartheta^i = 0$, followed by 2 iterations at each of the angles; $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ, \varphi^i = 0$, $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ, \varphi^i = \pi$, $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ, \varphi^i = 0$, and $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ, \varphi^i = \pi$ (marching-on in angle). The estimated coefficients at each incident angle are used as initial values for the succeeding angle, etc. The results in Fig. 7a show better profile reconstruction, upon implementing the multiple-incidence strategy. To achieve realistic CPU time, a range of surface discretization distances of $0.08\lambda_0-0.12\lambda_0$, was experimented at f = 1.5-2GHz, leading to use $0.12\lambda_0$ discretization for the 1.5-2GHz cases. In Fig. 6d, each inversion iteration involved 30 runs of the 3-D SDFMM forward solver, where each run required, on the average, 18 CPU minutes, to achieve a TFQMR tolerance of 10^{-2} , and 148 MB computer memory.

To improve the results of Fig. 7a, instead of using the data at all receivers, all incident angles and all frequencies simultaneously, we only use the data at all receivers simultaneously, but for one frequency at a time followed by one incident angle at a time. The cost function $C_2(\theta)$ is updated after each determination of the coefficients corresponding to each frequency and each incident angle. This combined approach, multi-frequency/multiple-incidence, can be referred to as marching-on in frequency/angle, and is implemented again for the profile of Fig. 6d. The scheme begins with running the inversion algorithm using data at 1GHz and normal incidence for 2 iterations (Fig. 7b), followed by using data at 1.5GHz and normal incidence for 2 iterations (Fig. 7c), then data at 2GHz and normal incidence for 2 iterations (Fig. 7c). Zero initial guess of the spline coefficients is assumed in Fig. 7b, then after 2 inversion iterations at 1GHz, the estimated coefficients are used as initial guess in Fig. 7c, and again after 2 inversion iterations at 1.5GHz, the estimated coefficients are used as initial guess in Fig. 7d for 2 inversion iterations at 2GHz. Then, in Fig. 7e, the multiple-incidence is implemented with initial guess equal to the estimated coefficients of Fig. 7d at normal incidence, followed by the same sequence of incident angles as used in Fig. 7a (5 points). The results of Fig. 7e show good agreement with the true surface profile upon implementing the multi-frequency strategy, followed by the multipleincidence strategy (same 5 points of Fig. 7a), all at 2GHz. In addition, comparing the results of Fig. 7d (multi-frequency at normal incidence) with those of Fig. 6d (single frequency at normal incidence) apparently shows reconstruction improvement due to the multi-frequency strategy.

Fig. 7f, shows the error $||h_{re} - h_{true}||_2 / ||h_{true}||_2$ for the results of Fig. 7a (or Fig. 6d), when implementing the single frequency/multiple-incidence (dashed-line), demonstrating the error reduction upon *marching-on in angle*. The results show additional error reduction upon implementing the multi-frequency followed by the multiple-incidence (solid-line), shown in Fig. 7e. Notice that in Fig. 7f, the error is slightly changing between the fourth and fifth incident angles, i.e., $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ$, $\varphi^i = 0$ and $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ$, $\varphi^i = \pi$, respectively. In Fig. 7f, each point in the plot represents the error when that incident angle is used in *a marching-on* scheme in conjunction with all the other incident angles to the left of that point.

In the above results of Figs. 3, 5, 6d and 7a, consistent errors were observed near the edges of the surface. In some cases the error is more pronounced near one edge more than the other, e.g., in Figs. 3b-f, the error is larger between x = 0.8-1.0m, while in Fig. 7a, it is larger between x=0-0.3m. The same observation was reported by Galdi *et al* [34-37]. This is due to using numerical methods for profile reconstruction, where the incident waves near the edges are deliberately minimized to eliminate artificial edge effects (~-30dB here). This approach leads to minimize the scattered waves from the near edge regions, and consequently to produce inaccurate retrieval of the profile at these regions. In some cases, these errors are reduced upon increasing the number of receivers, as shown in Fig. 6a, where the number of receivers is increased from 11 to 29. The results of Fig. 6d show inaccurate reconstruction almost everywhere, but more pronounced near the left edge (x=0-0.3m). As mentioned earlier, Fig. 7a shows improved profile reconstruction than Fig. 6d, upon applying the multiple-incidence, except near the right edge (x=0.8-1.0m). Although, these errors are minimized in Fig. 7e, but are not completely eliminated [34-37].

Our ultimate goal of estimating the unknown profile of the rough ground surface is to remove the clutter due to the rough surface from the data, for example, in the mine detection application. The upper plot in Fig. 8 shows a 3-D spheroid target of dimensions $9 \times 9 \times 4.5$ cm³, buried at z = -4.5cm under the rough profile of Fig. 6a. In this figure, there are only 11 receivers located at z = 7.5cm above ground with separation of 3cm, between x=35.4cm and x=65.4cm. All results here are at normal incidence. The lower plot shows the target signature obtained by subtraction. The electric field scattered from the true-surface with the buried target represents the true-data. The electric field scattered from the true-surface or from the estimated surface profile, with no buried target, is subtracted from the true-data. The solid line in Fig. 8b represents the ideal target signature (i.e., surface known), while the dash-dot line represents the estimated target signature (i.e., surface estimated). The estimated profile is obtained based on the single-frequency strategy (2GHz) and single incidence ($\vartheta^i = 0^\circ$). The results show that the estimated signature is in reasonable agreement with the ideal signature only at receivers # 5, 6 and 7, located right above the target. The target signature looks asymmetric in Fig. 8b due to the asymmetry of the random rough surface profile.

In all the cases shown in Figs. 3-8, the surface height ranges from minimum ~-3cm to maximum ~3cm (i.e. 6cm height range), which is increased to 12cm range in Figs.9a-b and 15cm range in Figs. 9c-d. The 29 receivers are positioned above the ground, between x=8.4cm and x=92.4cm, at z=10cm in Figs. 9a-b and at z=15cm in Figs. 9c-d, with separation distance of 3cm. Fig. 9a shows the reconstruction results for the 12cm height surface at 1GHz using the marchingon in angles at 7 points ($\vartheta^i = 0^\circ$, $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ$ and $\varphi^i = 0$, $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ$ and $\varphi^i = \pi$, $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ$ and $\varphi^i = 0$, $\vartheta^i = 30^\circ, \varphi^i = \pi$). In Fig. 9a, the surface height range is ~12cm with f= 1GHz and zero initial guess of the coefficients at $\vartheta^i = 0^\circ$. The same strategy, discussed earlier, for updating the initial guess of the coefficients at each succeeding angle is implemented. In Fig. 9b, the frequency is increased to 2GHz and the *marching-on* in

angle is repeated using the same data of Fig. 9a. In Fig. 9c, the surface height range is increased to ~15cm with f= 1GHz and zero initial guess of the coefficients at $\vartheta^i = 0^\circ$. The marching-on in angle using the same 7 points of Fig. 9a is repeated. In Fig. 9d, the frequency is increased to 2GHz and the marching-on in angle is repeated using the same data of Fig. 9c. The error criterion $\|h_{re} - h_{true}\|_2 / \|h_{true}\|_2$ for the cases shown in Figs. 9a-d is presented in Fig. 9e. The reconstructed profiles in Figs. 9a-d are shown for $\vartheta^i = 30^\circ$ and $\phi^i = 0$. Although reasonable reconstruction of the surface is still observed in Figs. 9c-d at the 15cm height case, especially at 2GHz, however, the results are not as good as those for the 6cm (shown earlier) or the 12cm height case shown in Figs. 9a-b. This could be interpreted due to a non-negligible amount of multiple scattering associated with rougher surfaces. In the current work, both the synthetic and simulated data are obtained using the SDFMM, which accounts for all multiple scattering mechanisms form the rough surface. This was not the case in the work reported in [34-37] or [38], where the synthetic and simulated data were obtained using the Kirchhoff approximation, which accounts only for the single scatter from rough surface [13]. The influence of increasing surface roughness on deteriorating profile reconstruction or inferring of surface parameters, using other techniques, were also reported in the literature [25], [29], [30-33]. In Fig. 9e, the results show that for the 12cm at 1GHz case the error is slightly fluctuating upon marching-on in angle, while at 2GHz the error is also fluctuating but with a tendency to decrease with angle. For the 15cm at 1GHz case, more fluctuations in the error is observed but with tendency to increase upon marching-on in angle, while at 2GHz the error is still fluctuating but with tendency to decrease with angle. The required computer memory in Figs. 9a-d is 165MB and 157MB for the 1 and 2GHz cases, as previously discussed. The average CPU time per run for the cases shown in

Figs. 9a-d is 8.4, 16, 8.6, and 18 minutes, respectively. On the average, 32-35 SDFMM runs were required per inversion iteration.

Although all examples shown in this paper are for the horizontal co-polarized waves, the presented algorithm can handle the fully polarimteric case, where any of the co- or cross-polarized waves can be employed in the inversion technique (i.e. *HH*, *VV*, *HV*, *VH*) [52]. The fully polarimetric capability of the inversion algorithm will be helpful in imaging small targets buried under the rough ground, which will be the subject of a future work.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

A fast computational inversion algorithm is presented in this work based on the SDFMM fast forward solver combined with the Fletcher and Powell searching technique. The issues of wave direction, computational aspects, receiver locations and number, gradient numerical formula and surface roughness are investigated. The results show that implementing the multi-frequency strategy, demonstrates good improvement in the surface profile reconstruction. In addition, the profile reconstruction has been improved upon implementing the multiple-incidence strategy even at single frequency. Deterioration in surface reconstruction is observed as surface roughness increases, which could be due to a non-negligible amount of surface multiple scattering. The results presented in this work, were produced in realistic time because of two main factors; (i) the efficient 3-D fast forward solver (SDFMM), and (ii) the optimized Fletcher and Powell searching algorithm.

In this work, we presented results indicating that *marching-on* methods offer a feasible approach to provide high quality reconstruction of rough surfaces. More future investigations are needed to address the more general questions concerning synthesizing specific iterative strategies for nonlinear problems to guarantee some level of convergence.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was sponsored by the National Science Foundation (NSF)-Center for Subsurface Sensing and Imaging Systems (CenSSIS) at Northeastern University in Boston, award No. EEC-9986821 as well as NSF Awards No. 0208548 and No. 0139968.

Appendix A

The integro-differential operators are given by [41-43]:

$$L_{1,2}\overline{X}(\overline{r}) = \int_{S_1} \left\{ i\omega\mu_{1,2}\Phi_{1,2}\overline{X}(\overline{r}') + \frac{i}{\omega\varepsilon_{1,2}}\nabla\nabla'\cdot\overline{X}(\overline{r}')\Phi_{1,2} \right\} ds', \overline{r} \in S_1$$
(A1)

$$K_{1,2}\overline{X}(\overline{r}) = \int_{S_1} \overline{X}(\overline{r}') \times \nabla \Phi_{1,2} \, ds', \, \overline{r} \in S_1$$
(A2)

The vector $\overline{X}(\cdot)$ represents the surface electric or magnetic currents, \overline{J} and \overline{M} , respectively. The intrinsic impedances $\eta_1 = \sqrt{\mu_1/\varepsilon_1}$ and $\eta_2 = \sqrt{\mu_2/\varepsilon_2}$ are for the air and ground material, respectively. The permittivity and permeability are $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_0$ and $\mu_1 = \mu_0$ for the air and ε_2 and μ_2 , for the ground. The 3-D scalar Green's function is:

$$\Phi_i = \exp\left(-ik_i |\overline{r} - \overline{r'}|\right) 4\pi |\overline{r} - \overline{r'}|, \quad i = 1, 2$$
(A3)

where $k_i = \omega \sqrt{\varepsilon_i \mu_i}$ is the wave number, and \overline{r}' and \overline{r} are the source and observation points, respectively. The impedance matrix $\overline{\overline{Z}}$ is given by [41-43]:

$$\overline{\overline{Z}} = \begin{pmatrix} \langle \overline{j}, (L_1 + L_2) \overline{j} \rangle_{S_1} & \langle \overline{j}, -\eta_1 (K_1 + K_2) \overline{j} \rangle_{S_1} \\ \langle \overline{j}, \eta_1 (K_1 + K_2) \overline{j} \rangle_{S_1} & \langle \overline{j}, \eta_1^2 \left(\frac{L_1}{\eta_1^2} + \frac{L_2}{\eta_2^2} \right) \overline{j} \rangle_{S_1} \end{pmatrix}$$
(A4)

The symbol $\langle \overline{A}, \overline{B} \rangle_{S} = \int_{S} \overline{A}^{*} \cdot \overline{B} ds$ denotes the complex inner product between vector functions \overline{A}

and \overline{B} on a surface S. The matrix $\overline{\overline{Z}}$ in (A4) is a $2N \times 2N$ matrix, where 2N is the total number of unknown surface current coefficients \overline{I} [41-43].

Appendix B

The equally-spaced knots *fifth*-order B-spline function $s^{(5)}(X)$ is given by ([34]), [50]-[51]:

$$s^{(5)}(X) = \begin{cases} (8/115)X^4, & 0 \le X < 1\\ (-8/115)(5-20X+30X^2-20X^3+4X^4), & 1 \le X < 2\\ (8/115)(155-300X+210X^2-60X^3+6X^4), & 2 \le X < 3\\ (-8/115)(655-780X+330X^2-60X^3+4X^4), & 3 \le X < 4\\ (8/115)(X-5)^4, & 4 \le X < 5 \end{cases}$$
 (B1)

in which X is $(x - x_n)/\Delta x$ or $(y - y_m)/\Delta y$, and x_n and y_m are given by:

$$x_n = x_{\min} + n\Delta x, \quad y_m = y_{\min} + m\Delta y,$$

$$\Delta x = (x_{\max} - x_{\min}) / N_n, \quad \Delta y = (y_{\max} - y_{\min}) / N_m$$
(B2)

The minimum and maximum values of x and y in (B2) are $x_{\min} = y_{\min} = -0.5$, $x_{\max} = y_{\max} = 0.5$.

References

- [1] A. Ishimaru and J. S. Chen, "Scattering from very rough metallic and dielectric surfaces: a theory based on the modified Kirchhoff approximation," *Waves in Random Media*, pp. 21-34, January 1991.
- [2] P. Tran and A. A. Maradudin, "Scattering of a scalar beam from a two-dimensional randomly rough hard wall: enhanced backscatter," *Phy. Rev. B*, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 3936-3939, February 1992.
- [3] M. Nieto-Vesperinas and J. A. Sánchez-Gil, "Intensity angular correlations of light multiply scattered from random rough surfaces," *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 150-157, January 1993.

- [4] M. El-Shenawee and E. Bahar, "Numerical method to compute TE and TM multiple scatter from rough surfaces exhibiting backscatter enhancement," *IEEE Trans. on Magnetics*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 3140-3143, September 1994.
- [5] K. Fung, M. R. Shah and S. Tjuatja, "Numerical simulations of scattering from threedimensional randomly rough surfaces," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. & Remote Sensing*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 986-994, September 1994.
- [6] L. Tsang, C. H. Chan, K. Pak, H. Sangani, A. Ishimaru and P. Phu, "Monte Carlo simulations of large-scale composite random rough-surface scattering based on the bandedmatrix iterative approach," *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 691-696, February 1994.
- [7] E. Bahar and M. El-Shenawee, "Enhanced backscatter from one dimensional random rough surfaces-stationary phase approximations to full wave solutions," *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 151-161, January 1995.
- [8] F. D. Hastings, J. B. Schneider and S. L. Broschat, "A Monte Carlo FDTD technique for rough surface scattering," *IEEE Trans. Antennas & Prop.*, vol. 43, pp. 1183-1191, November 1995.
- [9] D. A. Kapp and G. S. Brown, "A new numerical method for rough surface scattering calculations," *IEEE Trans. Antennas & Prop.*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 711-721, May 1996.
- [10] J. T. Johnson, L. Tsang, R. T. Shin, K. Pak, C. H. Chan, A. Ishimaru and Y. Kuga, "Backscattering enhancement of electromagnetic waves from two-dimensional perfectly conducting random rough surfaces: A comparison of Monte Carlo simulations with experimental data," *IEEE Trans. Antennas & Prop.*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 748-756, May 1996.

- [11] R. L. Wagner, J. Song and W. C. Chew, "Monte Carlo simulation of electromagnetic scattering from two-dimensional random rough surfaces," *IEEE Trans. Antennas & Prop.*, vol. 45, pp. 235-245, February 1997.
- [12] C. H. Chan, L. Tsang and Q. Li, "Monte Carlo simulations of large-scale one dimensional random rough-surface scattering at near grazing incidence: Penetrable case," *IEEE Trans. Antennas & Prop.*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 142-149, January 1998.
- [13] E. Thorsos, "The validity of the Kirchhoff approximation for rough surface scattering using a Gaussian roughness spectrum," J. Acoust. Soc. Am., vol. 83, no. 1, pp. 78-92, 1988.
- [14] M. El-Shenawee and C. Rappaport, "Modeling Clutter from Bosnian and Puerto Rican Rough Ground Surfaces for GPR Subsurface Sensing Applications Using the SDFMM Technique," J. Subsurface Sensing Technologies and Applications, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 249-264, July 2001.
- [15] M. El-Shenawee, C. Rappaport, E. Miller and M. Silevitch, "Three-dimensional subsurface analysis of electromagnetic scattering from penetrable/PEC objects buried under rough surfaces: Use of the steepest descent fast multipole method (SDFMM)," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. & Remote Sensing*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 1174-1182, June 2001.
- [16] M. El-Shenawee, C. Rappaport and M. Silevitch, "Monte Carlo simulations of electromagnetic wave scattering from random rough surface with 3-D penetrable buried object: Mine detection application using the SDFMM," *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, vol.18, no. 12, pp. 3077-3084, December 2001.
- [17] M. El-Shenawee, "Scattering from multiple objects buried under two-dimensional randomly rough surface using the steepest descent fast multipole method," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Prop.*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 802-809, April 2003.

- [18] M. El-Shenawee and C. Rappaport, "Monte Carlo simulations for the statistics of clutter in minefields: AP mine-like target buried near a dielectric object beneath two-dimensional randomly rough ground," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. & Remote Sensing*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1416-1426, June 2002.
- [19] D. Jiang, W. Meleis, M. El-Shenawee, E. Mizan, M. Ashouei and C. Rappaport, "Parallel implementation of the steepest descent fast multipole method (SDFMM) on a Beowulf cluster for subsurface sensing applications," *Microwave Wireless Component Letters* (MWCL), vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 24-26, January 2002.
- [20] T. Dogaru, L. Collins and L. Carin, "Optimal time-domain detection of a deterministic target buried under a randomly rough interface," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propagat.*, vol 49, no. 3, pp. 313-326, March 2001.
- [21] J. T. Johnson and R. J. Burkholder, "Coupled canonical grid/discrete dipole approach for computing scattering from objects above or below a rough interface," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. & Remote Sensing*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 1214-1220, June 2001.
- [22] K. O'Neill, "Broadband bistatic coherent and incoherent detection of buried objects beneath randomly rough surfaces," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sensing*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 891-898, March 2000.
- [23] G. Zhang, L. Tsang and K. Pak, "Angular correlation function and scattering coefficient of electromagnetic waves scattered by a buried object under a two-dimensional rough surface," J. Opt. Soc. Am. A, vol. 15, no. 12, pp. 2995-3002, December 1998.
- [24] J. R. Arias-Gonzalez, M. Nieto-Vesperinas, and A. Madrazo, "Morphology-dependent resonances in the scattering of electromagnetic waves from an object buried beneath a plane or a random rough surface," *J. Opt. Soc. Am.*, A, vol. 16, no. 12, pp. 2928-2934, December 1999.

- [25] Roger R. Marchand and Gary Brown, "Inferring rough surface parameters from average scattering data approximate scattering models; 1. Gaussain spectrum," *Radio Science*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 821-834, July-August 1998.
- [26] Roger R. Marchand and Gary Brown, "Inferring rough surface parameters from average scattering data approximate scattering models; 2. Pierson-Moskowitz spectrum," *Radio Science*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 835-843, July-August 1998.
- [27] V. Malyshkin, S. Simeonov, A. R. McGurn, and A. A. Maradudin, "Determination of surface profile statistics from electromagnetic scattering data," *Optics Letters*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 58-60, January 1997.
- [28] John C. Stover, Steven A. Serati and Calvin H. Gillespie, "Calculation of surface statistics from light scatter," *Optical Engineering*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 406-412, July/August 1984.
- [29] Richard J. Wombel and John A. DeSanto, "The reconstruction of shallow rough-surface profiles from scattered field data," *Inverse problems*, vol. 7, pp. 7-12, 1991.
- [30] Richard J. Wombell and John A. DeSanto, "Reconstruction of rough-surface profiles with the Kirchhoff approximation," *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, vol. 8, no. 12, pp.1892-1897, 1991.
- [31] J. C. Quartel and C. J. R. Sheppard, "A surface reconstruction algorithm based on confocal interferometric profiling," *J. of Modern Optics*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 591-605, 1996.
- [32] J. C. Quartel and C. J. R. Sheppard, "Surface reconstruction using an algorithm based on confocal imaging," *J. of Modern Optics*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 469-468, 1996.
- [33] D. Macias, E. R. Mendez and V. Ruiz-Cortes, "Inverse scattering with a wave-frontmatching algorithm," J. Opt. Soc. Am. A, vol. 19, no. 10, October 2002.

- [34] Vincenzo Galdi, David A. Castanon and Leopold B. Felsen, "Multifrequency reconstruction of moderately rough interfaces via quasi-ray Gaussian beams," *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sensing*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 453-460, February 2002.
- [35] Vincenzo Galdi, Julia Pavlovich, W. Clem Karl, David A. Castanon and Leopold B. Felsen, "Moderately rough dielectric interface profile reconstruction via short-pulse quasi-ray Gaussian beams," *IEEE Trans. Antenna and Prop.*, vol 51, no. 3, pp. 672-677, 2003.
- [36] Vincenzo Galdi, Haihua Feng, David A. Castanon, William Clem Karl and Leopold B. Felsen, "Moderately rough surface underground imaging via short-pulse quasi-ray Gaussian beams," *IEEE Trans. Antenna and Prop.*, vol 51, no. 9, pp. 2304-18, 2003.
- [37] Vincenzo Galdi, Haihua Feng, David A. Castanon, W. Clem Karl and Leopold B. Felsen, "Multifrequency subsurface sensing in the presence of a moderately rough air-soil interface via quasi-ray Gaussian beams," Radio Science, vol. 38, no. 2, 8007, 2003.
- [38] K. Harada and A. Noguchi, "Reconstruction of two-dimensional rough surface with Gaussian beam illumination," *IEICE Trans. Electron*, vol. E79 no. 10, pp. 1345-49, 1996.
- [39] V. Rokhlin, "Rapid solution of integral equations of scattering theory in two dimensions," *J. Comput. Phys.*, vol. 36, pp. 414-439, 1990.
- [40] C. C. Lu and W. C. Chew, "A multilevel fast-algorithm for solving a boundary integral equation of wave scattering," *Microwave Opt. Tech. Let.*, vol. 7, pp. 466-470, July 1994.
- [41] V. Jandhyala, Fast Multilevel Algorithms for the Efficient Electromagnetic Analysis of Quasi-Planar Structures, Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1998.

- [42] L. Medgyesi-Mitschang, J. Putnam and M. Gedera, "Generalized method of moments for three–dimensional penetrable scatterers," J. Opt. Soc. Am. A, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 1383-1398, October 1994.
- [43] S. Rao, D. Wilton and A. Glisson, "Electromagnetic scattering by surfaces of arbitrary shape," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propagat.*, vol. AP 30, no. 3, pp.409-418, May 1982.
- [44] R. Fletcher and M. J. D. Powell, "A rapidly descent method for minimization," *The Computer Journal*, vol. 6, pp. 163-168, 1963.
- [45] R. Fletcher, "A new approach to variable metric algorithms," *The Computer Journal*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 317-322, August 1970.
- [46] R. Fletcher, Practical Methods of Optimization, volume 2, John Wiley & Son, 1981.
- [47] F. Natterer and F. Wubbeling, Mathematical methods in image reconstruction, Siam 2001.
- [48] Oliver Dorn, Eric Miller and Carey Rappaport, "A shape reconstruction method for electromagnetic tomography using adjoint fields and level sets," Inverse Problems (16), pp. 1119-1156, 2000.
- [49] Matthew N. O. Sadiku, Numerical Techniques in Electromagnetics, 2nd. Ed., CRC Press LLC, Boca Raton, FL, 2001
- [50] Larry L. Schumaker, Spline Functions Basic Theory, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1981.
- [51] Carl de Boor, Applied Mathematics Sciences Volume 27; A Practical Guide to Splines, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1978.
- [52] Magda El-Shenawee, "Remote sensing of objects buried beneath 2-D random rough surfaces using the modified Mueller matrix elements," *J. Optical Society of America A*, (*JOSA*), vol 20, pp. 183-194, January 2003.

List of Figures

Fig. 1 (a) Problem configuration (cross section), (b) Flowchart of inversion algorithm.

Fig. 2 (a) cost function behavior for 2-D sinusoidal surface, (b) convergence of inversion algorithm of 2-D sinusoidal surface, assuming a surface period of $L = 1\lambda_0$, (c) Convergence of inversion algorithm for 2-D tensor-product spline-function model with 2 unknown coefficients ($\alpha_{7,15}$ and $\alpha_{11,2}$). True values are represented by the diamond shape in (b) and (c).

Fig. 3 (a) Groove-like rough surface illuminated in the *x*-*y* plane by a 2-D Gaussian beam.

Fig. 3b-f Reconstruction of rough surface using 5 points of multiple-incidence strategy at f = 1GHz, (b) normal incidence, (c) $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ, \varphi^i = 0$, (d) $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ, \varphi^i = \pi$, (e) $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ, \varphi^i = 0$, (f) $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ, \varphi^i = \pi$. Each incident angle was run for 2 inversion iterations.

Fig. 4 Absolute error between electric field scattered from true surface and electric field scattered from reconstructed surface of Figs. 3a-e, (a) normal incidence, (b) $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ, \varphi^i = 0$, (c) $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ, \varphi^i = \pi$, (d) $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ, \varphi^i = 0$, $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ, \varphi^i = \pi$. Solid line is for amplitude and dotted line is for the phase.

Fig. 5a-b Surface profile reconstruction, (a) comparison between single-incidence at normal and multiple-incidence. (b) comparison between central-formula and forward-formula gradients (multiple-incidence of Fig. 3). f=1GHz and 10 total number of inversion iterations used in case.

Fig. 5c Error criterion, $||h_{re} - h_{true}||_2 / ||h_{true}||_2$, vs the incident angle for the multiple-incidence results shown in Figs. 3b-f and Figs. 5a-b for the gradient central formula (solid line) and forward formula (dashed line), respectively, at f=1GHz. Notice that each point in the plot represents the error when that incident angle is used in *a marching-on* scheme in conjunction with all the other incident angles to the left of that point. The positive and negative incident angles indicate to $\varphi^i = 0$, and $\varphi^i = \pi$, respectively.

Fig. 6 Reconstruction of 4 surface profiles using single-incidence ($\vartheta^i = 0$) and single-frequency (2GHz). The 29 receivers are located at 7.5 cm above the ground mean plane separated by 3cm. All results are obtained after total of 10 inversion iterations.

Fig. 7a Reconstruction of surface profile in Fig. 6d using 5 points of multiple-incidence strategy at $\vartheta^i = 0$, $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ$ and $\phi^i = 0$, $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ$ and $\phi^i = \pi$, $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ$ and $\phi^i = 0$, $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ$ and $\phi^i = \pi$ at 2GHz. The 29 receivers are located at 7.5 cm above the ground mean plane separated by 3cm.

Fig. 7b-e Reconstruction of surface profile in Fig. 6d using multiple-frequency strategy at (b) 1GHz, (c) 1.5GHz, (d) 2GHz at $\vartheta^i = 0$, followed by 5 points of multiple-incidence strategy at (e) $\vartheta^i = 0$, $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ$ and $\phi^i = 0$, $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ$ and $\phi^i = \pi$, $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ$ and $\phi^i = 0$, $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ$ and

 $\phi^i = \pi$ at 2GHz. The 29 receivers are located at 7.5 cm above the ground mean plane separated by 3cm.

Fig. 7f Error criterion, $||h_{re} - h_{true}||_2 / ||h_{true}||_2$, vs the incident angle when using multiple incidence at single frequency 2GHz (dashed line) as shown in Fig. 7a or Fig. 6d, and when using the multi-frequency followed by multiple-incidence (solid line) as shown in Fig. Notice that each point in the plot represents the error when that incident angle is used in *a marching-on* scheme in conjunction with all the other incident angles to the left of that point. The positive and negative incident angles in Fig. 5c indicate to $\varphi^i = 0$, and $\varphi^i = \pi$, respectively.

Fig. 8 (a) 3-D spheroid target of dimensions $9 \times 9 \times 4.5$ cm³, buried at z = -4.5cm under the rough surface of Fig. 6a., (b) ideal and estimated target signatures, where total of 11 receivers are used here.

Fig. 9 Reconstruction of rougher surface profiles using 7 points of multiple-incidence strategy, $\vartheta^i = 0$, $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ$ and $\phi^i = 0$, $\vartheta^i = 10^\circ$ and $\phi^i = \pi$, $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ$ and $\phi^i = 0$, $\vartheta^i = 20^\circ$ and $\phi^i = \pi$, $\vartheta^i = 30^\circ$ and $\phi^i = 0$, $\vartheta^i = 30^\circ$ and $\phi^i = \pi$ for surface height range as: (a) ~12cm, 1GHz, zero initial guess, (b) ~12cm, 2GHz, with initial guess equal to the estimated coefficients in Fig. 9a, (c) ~15cm, 1GHz with zero initial guess, and (d) ~15cm, 2GHz with initial guess equal to the estimated coefficients in Fig. 9c. (e) error criterion $\|h_{re} - h_{true}\|_2 / \|h_{true}\|_2$ for the cases shown in Figs. 9a-d. The positive and negative signs of incident angles indicate $\varphi^i = 0$ and $\varphi^i = \pi$, respectively. The results in Figs. 9a-d are for $\vartheta^i = 30^\circ$ and $\varphi^i = 0$.



Fig. 1a



Fig. 1b





Fig. 2a-b



Fig. 2 c



Fig. 3a





Fig. 3 b-f



Fig. 4a-e





Fig. 6 a-d

Fig. 7a

Fig. 7b-f

X (m) (Beam width 0.3-0.7m)

Fig. 8 a-b

Fig. 9 a-e