



Design and evaluation of a monolithic optical element for task-specific compressive classification

Brian J Redman: Org. 6751, Tu-Thach Quach: Org. 5853, Meghan Galiardi: Org. 5821, Charles LaCasse: Org. 6772, Amber Dagel: Org. 5228, Daryl Dagel: Org. 5264, Bryan Kaehr: Org. 1815, Gabriel Birch: Org. 6514

Compressive sensing

Traditional optical systems create human interpretable images that contain more information than is required for many applications such as automated classification. Compressive sensing can reduce size weight and power of the systems by only recording the information required to make the classification decision.

MNIST dataset

2 → 2
9 → 9
0 → 0
5 → 5

Imaging system

Compressive sensing system

Sensing matrix

A sensing matrix describes which parts of the scene are mapped to each detector element. Imaging systems create 1:1 mappings whereas compressive sensing allows for arbitrary mappings.

The sensing matrices for this project were constrained to be nonnegative, sparse, and binned to discrete weights.

Imaging System Object Image

Sensing matrix Object Machine learning

Compressed data classifier Result

Classification of image

Design

Physical properties were added to the images of the MNIST dataset. Then a prism array was created to physically realize the sensing matrix mapping input angles onto detector locations

Object space Prism Array Detectors

$W_p = 130 \mu\text{m}$ $W_g = 1.6 \text{ mm}$ $W_d = 100 \mu\text{m}$

HFOV = 5° $z_d = 9 \text{ mm}$ $z_{\text{scene}} = \infty$

Sensing matrix

Position prisms

Optimize prism angle

Create physical model

Detector $(x_{\text{det}}, y_{\text{det}})$

Input angle (θ_x, θ_y)

Prism angle (α_x, α_y)

Example prism arrays

Raytrace simulation

We simulated the system response with OpticStudio non-sequential raytracing to determine the sensitivity of each detector from each input angle.

Sensing Matrix 9 detectors

Simulated System Response

Classification accuracy

Classification accuracy was the ultimate performance metric of the system. We classified the MNIST dataset using a random forest classifier. The dataset was compressed using the simulated system response matrices.

Classification of MNIST dataset

Classification accuracy relative to sensing matrix

Additive manufacturing

The prism array was fabricated using the Nanoscribe Photonics Professional GT1. This uses two photon polymerization to achieve submicron resolution.

slice 0.1 μm

slice 0.5 μm

Nanoscribe

Physical characterization

The surface profile of the fabricated prism arrays were measured using a Keyence VKX250 Violet Laser System confocal microscope. The largest sources of error were the stitch lines seen as a hexagonal pattern.

Measurement Deviation from design

Z slice 0.1 μm

Z slice 0.5 μm

Design

Hardware response function

The hardware response function is measured by scanning a collimated light through all of the 28 by 28 input angles and recording the detector values.

Sensing Matrix Simulation Measured