Noninterferometric phase retrieval using a fractional Fourier system
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The signal extraction method based on intensity measurements in two close fractional Fourier domains is examined by using the phase space formalism. The fractional order separation has a lower bound and an upper bound that depend on the signal at hand and the noise in the optical system used for measurement. On the basis of a theoretical analysis, it is shown that for a given optical system a judicious choice of fractional order separation requires some a priori knowledge of the signal bandwidth. We also present some experimental results in support of the analysis. © 2007 Optical Society of America

1. INTRODUCTION

Noninterferometric deterministic phase retrieval methods have received considerable attention since the work by Teague [1,2] and Streibl [3]. These methods have been used for a broad range of applications from microscopy [4,5] to astronomy [6], with both fully [7,8] and partially coherent sources [9,10] and wavelengths ranging from the visible to x rays [11]. In a broad sense, all of these methods extract the phase and thereby the complete signal information from single or multiple intensity measurements by using a deterministic algorithm based on the underlying physical model. Most of the deterministic phase retrieval methods are based on the transport of intensity model including the methods of Teague and Streibl.

Another class of methods reconstructs the signal by sampling phase space distribution functions like the ambiguity function (AF) [12–15]. The underlying philosophy of these approaches, generically referred to as phase space tomography, is that the phase space distribution functions such as the AF contain the entire signal information. Some methods reconstruct the signal by sampling the entire phase space distribution function in a grid. Semichaevsky and Testorf [16] and Nugent [11] have presented a description of the various deterministic phase retrieval techniques using phase space distribution functions.

Methods have been proposed to extract signal information from the intensity of the fractional Fourier transform (FRT) of the signal. Alieva and co-workers [17–19] proposed a method to reconstruct the signal from two close fractional Fourier power spectra. In the context of metrology, intensity measurements in FRT domains have been used to extract information regarding object tilt and translation [20–22]. Lohmann et al. [23] have pointed out that for lossless transmission of information the system space–bandwidth product should encompass the signal space–bandwidth product, with both signal and system space–bandwidth products being represented as an area in the Wigner domain. Depending on the signal at hand and detector used, FRT systems will provide different quality results as compared with Fresnel transform systems based on free-space propagation as we move from one domain to another [24].

In this paper, we use the phase space formalism to examine the signal recovery methods where the signal is captured in two FRT domains in which the orders of the two optical implementations of the FRT differ by very little. In this case we can describe the two resulting FRT domains, into which the Wigner distribution function (WDF) of the signal has been projected, as being close, since their angular separation in phase space is small. Such a treatment helps us in comparing these methods with the phase space tomographic methods that are based on sampling the entire phase space [12–15]. From the literature it appears that the signal extraction methods based on output intensity measurements at two close FRT domains lead to a lesser number of necessary samples. However, we show that the choice of the necessary fractional order separation needs some a priori knowledge of the input signal bandwidth and noise in the optical system. This is because (i) the bandwidth of the signal results in an upper bound on the fractional order separation and, (ii) more important, in a differential method the effect of noise in the system is deleterious and leads to a lower bound on the fractional order separation. Using the example of a quadratic phase signal (which can easily be generated experimentally by using a thin lens), it is shown that for a given noise level in the system a signal with a lower rate of change of spatial frequency has a higher upper bound and can be estimated by using a larger difference in FRT order.
We use an optical system that performs a scale-invariant FRT to experimentally estimate the spatial frequency distribution (local spatial frequency [25]) of input quadratic phase signals generated by two lenses of focal length 8 mm and 20 cm. We use the same fractional order separation to characterize the spatial frequency distribution of both lenses. It is seen that for the 20 cm focal length lens the spatial frequency distribution estimated is erroneous, as the fractional order separation is inadequate to accommodate the measurement of this signal.

2. PROJECTION SLICES IN PHASE SPACE

Let us consider a one-dimensional signal $f(\cdot)$. Let $f_\alpha(\cdot)$ represent the FRT of $f(\cdot)$, defined as

$$f_\alpha(x) = \int f(x_0)K_\alpha(x,x_0)dx_0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where

$$K_\alpha(x,x_0) = \frac{\exp(i\alpha/2)}{\sqrt{i\sin \alpha}} \exp \left[ i\pi \left( \frac{x^2}{\tan \alpha} - \frac{2xx_0}{\sin \alpha} + \frac{x_0^2}{\tan \alpha} \right) \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

The integrals, unless otherwise specified, run from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$. When $\alpha=0$, the kernel $K_\alpha(x,x_0)$ reduces to $\delta(x-x_0)$, and we have $f_\alpha(x)=f(x)$. When $\alpha=\pi$, the kernel $K_\alpha(x,x_0)$ reduces to $\delta(x+x_0)$, and we have $f_\alpha(x)=f(-x)$. When $\alpha=\pi/2$ and $\alpha=-\pi/2$, we have the Fourier transform (FT) and inverse FT of the input signal, respectively.

In the following analysis, we use two phase space distributions [25] of the signal—the WDF and the AF. The WDF of $f(\cdot)$, $W(x, \nu)$ is defined as

$$W(x, \nu) = \int f(x + \frac{x'}{2})f'(x - \frac{x'}{2})\exp(-i2\pi\nu x')dx',$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

while the AF, $A(\bar{x}, \bar{\nu})$ is

$$A(\bar{x}, \bar{\nu}) = \int f(\bar{x} + \bar{x'})f'(\bar{x} - \bar{x'})\exp(-i2\pi\bar{\nu}\bar{x})d\bar{x}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

The AF is related to the WDF through the FT and inverse FT,

$$A(\bar{x}, \bar{\nu}) = \int \int W(x, \nu)\exp[-i2\pi(\bar{x}x - \bar{\nu}x)]dxd\nu.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

The zeroth-order moment of the WDF is related to the AF through the FT:

$$A(0, \bar{\nu}) = \int m_0(x)\exp(-i2\pi\bar{\nu} x)dx,$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where

$$m_0(x) = \int W(x, \nu)d\nu = I_0(x).$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

In Eq. (7), $I_0(x)=|f(x)|^2$ is the intensity of signal $f(x)$. In a similar way the derivative of AF is related to the first-order moment of the WDF:

$$\frac{\partial A(\bar{x}, \bar{\nu})}{\partial \bar{x}} \bigg|_{\bar{x}=0, \bar{\nu}=0} = 2\pi i \int m_1(x)\exp(-i2\pi\bar{\nu}x)dx,$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where

$$m_1(x) = \int \nu W(x, \nu)d\nu = vI_1(x).$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

The fractional power spectrum $|f_\alpha(x)|^2$, denoted $I_\alpha(x)$, is equivalent to the radon Wigner transform of the signal-projection of the WDF $W(x, \nu)$ of the signal rotated by an angle $\alpha$. This equivalence between the radon Wigner transform and the FRT power spectrum was pointed out by Lehmans et al. [26] and is written as

$$I_\alpha(x) = \int W(x \cos \alpha - \nu \sin \alpha, x \sin \alpha + \nu \cos \alpha) d\nu.$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

We now proceed to relate the fractional power spectrum, which can be measured by using an optical system performing an FRT, to the AF of the signal. Let $I_\alpha(\bar{\nu})$ denote the FT of $I_\alpha(x)$:

$$\bar{I}_\alpha(\bar{\nu}) = \int I_\alpha(x)\exp(-i2\pi\bar{\nu} x)dx.$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

Using Eqs. (10) and (11), one can relate $\bar{I}_\alpha(\bar{\nu})$ to the $A(\bar{x}, \bar{\nu})$ as follows:

$$\bar{I}_\alpha(\bar{\nu}) = A(\bar{x}, \bar{\nu})|_{\bar{x}=x_0, \bar{\nu}=\nu \cos \alpha}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

Taking the FT of the fractional power spectrum of the signal is equivalent to taking a slice through the AF of the signal along $\bar{x} = -\nu \sin \alpha$ and $\bar{\nu} = \nu \cos \alpha$. To reconstruct the AF, one needs to measure the fractional power spectrum of the signal at all orders. By piecing together the FT of the entire fractional power spectrum at appropriate angles, one can reconstruct the AF and thereby the corresponding signal. Since AF representation has redundancy, it is not necessary to exactly reconstruct the entire AF for signal recovery. Dragoman [27] has shown that the section $\bar{x}=x_0$ parallel to the $\bar{x}$ plane contains the entire signal information. However, it is not always possible to access this plane by using optical systems based on linear canonical transforms [24].

For most real-world signals, it may be sufficient to recover the signal by measuring the zeroth- and first-order moments of the WDF as given by Eqs. (6) and (8). Equivalently, one may also use $A(0, \bar{\nu})$ and $\partial A(0, \bar{\nu})/\partial \bar{x}$. In the analysis that follows it may be seen that the latter quantity can be extracted from two intensity measurements in two close FRT domains $\alpha_0$ and $\alpha_0 + \Delta \alpha$. This is the philosophy underlying the signal recovery approach using two optical implementations of close-fractional-order systems. For the following analysis and without loss of generality we take $\alpha_0 = 0$. Hence, we can write

$$\bar{I}_\alpha(\bar{\nu}) = \bar{I}_{\alpha_0}(\bar{\nu})|_{\alpha_0=0} = A(\bar{x}, \bar{\nu})|_{\bar{x}=0, \bar{\nu}=\nu \cos \alpha}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)
where \( sgn \) denotes the signum function, one obtains an equal to 
\[
\left[ \begin{array}{c}
I_{\Delta}(\tilde{v}) = I_{\Delta}(\tilde{v}) |_{|\Delta\tilde{v}|=0} = A(\tilde{x}, \tilde{v}) + \frac{\partial A(\tilde{x}, \tilde{v})}{\partial \tilde{v}} \Delta \tilde{v}
\end{array} \right] .
\]

Then using Eqs. (15), (13), and (14), we can write
\[
\frac{\Delta \tilde{v}}{\Delta \alpha} = \left. \frac{\partial A(\tilde{x}, \tilde{v})}{\partial \tilde{v}} \right|_{x=\hat{x}, v=\tilde{v}},
\]
and therefore, in the limit \( \Delta \alpha \to 0 \),
\[
\frac{\partial A(\tilde{x}, \tilde{v})}{\partial \tilde{v}} \bigg|_{x=0} = \int_{0}^{1} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{dI_{\tilde{v}}(\hat{x})}{d \alpha} \bigg|_{x=0} \exp(-i2\pi \tilde{v} \hat{x}) d\hat{x}.
\]

From Eqs. (8) and (9), we know the relation between the local spatial frequency \( \nu(x) \) and the first-order derivative of the signal's AF,
\[
\nu(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{l_{\tilde{v}}(x)} \int_{x=0}^{1} \frac{dA(\tilde{x}, \tilde{v})}{d \tilde{v}} \bigg|_{x=0} \exp(i2\pi \tilde{v} \hat{x}) d\tilde{v}.
\]

Substituting Eq. (17) into Eq. (18) and using the mathematical identity
\[
- \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1}{u} \exp(-i2\pi u(x - \hat{x})) du = sgn(\hat{x} - x),
\]
where \( sgn \) denotes the signum function, one obtains an equation [17–19] relating the local spatial frequency \( \nu(\cdot) \) to the measured quantity \( dI/d\alpha \),
\[
\nu(x) = \frac{1}{2I_{\tilde{v}}(x)} \int_{x=0}^{1} \frac{dI_{\tilde{v}}(\hat{x})}{d \alpha} \bigg|_{x=0} \sgn(\hat{x} - x) d\hat{x}.
\]

In the above discussion, we have assumed the initial FRT order \( \alpha_0 = 0 \) for simplicity of analysis. A similar analysis can be done for other values of \( \alpha_0 \) in a rotated coordinate system to obtain
\[
\nu(x) = \frac{1}{2I_{\tilde{v}}(x)} \int_{x=0}^{1} \frac{dI_{\tilde{v}}(\hat{x})}{d \alpha} \bigg|_{x=0} \sgn(\hat{x} - x) d\hat{x}.
\]

It may be noted that in the above case the \( \alpha_0 \)th FRT of the signal is extracted, from which the signal may be derived by performing an FRT of order \( -\alpha_0 \). Extending Eq. (20) to two dimensions, it can be shown that
\[
\nu_{x}(x,y) = \nu_{y}(x,y) = \frac{1}{2I_{\tilde{v}}(x,y)} \int_{x=0}^{1} \frac{dI_{\tilde{v}}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})}{d \alpha} \bigg|_{x=0, \alpha_0 = 0}
\]
\[
\times \sgn(x - \hat{x}) \delta(y - \hat{y}) d\hat{x} dy
\]
for the case when \( \alpha_x \neq \alpha_y \) (anamorphic systems) and

\[
\nu_{x}(x,y) = \nu_{y}(x,y) = - \frac{1}{2I_{\tilde{v}}(x,y)} \int_{x=0}^{1} \frac{dI_{\tilde{v}}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})}{d \alpha} \bigg|_{\alpha = 0}
\]
\[
\times \sgn(x - \hat{x}) \delta(y - \hat{y}) d\hat{x} dy
\]

3. CHOICE OF FRACTIONAL ORDERS

For practical purposes, how close should the two FRT orders be? To answer this question, we refer to Fig. 1, where a top view of the AF \( A(\tilde{x}, \tilde{v}) \) of a one-dimensional signal, as given by Eq. (4), is presented to illustrate sampling considerations. Shown in the figure are samples (indicated by dots) of two slices of the AF. One slice is along the \( \tilde{v} \) axis, and the second passes through the origin and is at an angle \( \alpha = \Delta \alpha \) to the \( \tilde{v} \) axis. The samples correspond to the FT of the two intensity measurements at FRT orders \( \alpha = 0 \) and \( \alpha = \Delta \alpha \) [See Eqs. (13) and (14)]. For Eq. (16) to be satisfied for all values of \( \tilde{v} \),
The input plane and output planes are at distances \(d \Delta v\) and \(d \Delta v + \Delta v\), respectively, where \(d\) is the distance between the two measurements \(I_0(x)\) and \(I_{\Delta \alpha}(x)\) in Eq. (16) should satisfy the inequality

\[
\int_{-\Delta v/2}^{\Delta v/2} \left| \tilde{I}_{\Delta \alpha}(\nu) - \tilde{I}_0(\nu) \right|^2 d\nu > N_0 \Delta \bar{v}. \tag{31}
\]

Equation (31) states that the choice of \(\Delta \alpha\) should be such that the energy of the difference signal \(\left| I_{\Delta \alpha} - I_0 \right|\) is greater than the noise power \(N_0 \Delta \bar{v}\). Taking the example discussed in the previous section, \(f(x) = \exp\left[2\pi i (b_{x2} x + b_{y2} y)\right]\), let us calculate the upper bound and the lower bound on \(\Delta \alpha\). If \(W\) is the width of the detector array used, then the bandwidth \(\Delta \bar{v} = b_{y2} W\). The upper bound on \(\Delta \alpha\) may be written as

\[
\Delta \alpha < 2/b_{y2}^2 W^2. \tag{32}
\]

From Eq. (25), we can write the FT of the measured signals \(I_0(x)\) and \(I_{\Delta \alpha}(x)\) as

\[
\tilde{I}_0(\nu) = \exp\left(\frac{i \pi \nu b_1}{b_2}\right) \Re(\nu),
\]

and

\[
\tilde{I}_{\Delta \alpha}(\nu) = \frac{1}{2b_2 \Delta \alpha + 1} \exp\left(\frac{i 2 \pi \nu b_1}{2b_2 - \Delta \alpha}\right) \Re(\nu). \tag{33}
\]

Substituting Eq. (33) into Eq. (31) and after some algebraic manipulations we obtain

\[
\left[ \frac{1}{1 + (2b_2 \Delta \alpha)^{-1}} \right]^2 > N_0 \Delta \bar{v}. \tag{34}
\]

Therefore,

\[
\Delta \alpha > \frac{1}{2b_2 [N_0 b_2 W^{-1/2} - 1]}. \tag{35}
\]

Equation (35) suggests that \(N_0 = 0\), i.e., when there is no noise, \(\Delta \alpha\) can take arbitrarily low values. As \(N_0\) increases, the lower bound of \(\Delta \alpha\) increases. In the above example, the lower bound on \(\Delta \alpha\) also depends on the rate of change of frequency \(b_2\) of the chirp signal. From Eq. (34) it may be seen that for a given noise level in the system the signal-to-noise ratio is higher for a signal with a larger value of \(b_2\). In other words, the effects of noise become more pronounced as the signal frequency becomes lower. Thus, for a given system noise, a fractional order separation that is suitable for a quadratic phase signal with a high value of \(b_2\) may lead to erroneous results for a signal with a low value of \(b_2\). This prediction is experimentally validated in Section 5. Equations (30) and (31) act so as to limit the range of values \(\Delta \alpha\) can assume, which allows accurate measurements to be performed given a priori knowledge of the signal bandwidth. Thus the optimal choice of \(\Delta \alpha\) requires some a priori knowledge of the signal bandwidth and the noise in the system. Though this method requires only \(2N\) samples as compared with \(N^2\) samples required for methods that sample the entire phase space, more a priori knowledge of the signal is required, as compared with these latter methods, for the judicious choice of FRT orders \(a_0\) and \(a_0 + \Delta \alpha\).

Equation (21) exhibits singularity behavior when \(I_{a_0} = 0\). This can be avoided by choosing FRT domains close to orders \(\alpha = 0\) or \(\alpha = \pi\). As suggested by Teague [2], the sharp irradiance nulls are filled in by defocusing. Also, the choice of \(a_0\) is dictated by practical considerations like walk-off in the system due to apertures.

\section{4. SLICES IN PHASE SPACE USING A SCALE-INvariant FRT SYSTEM}

The quantity \(d I_{a}(\cdot)/d\alpha\) in Eq. (23) can be measured by using a scale-invariant FRT system [28] comprising two spherical lenses of focal length \(f\) separated by a distance \(d_2\). The input plane and output planes are at distances \(d_1\) from the first and second lenses, respectively. The optical fields in the input and output planes of the optical system are related by a two-dimensional scale-invariant FRT given by

\[
f_a(sx, sy) = \int \int f(s\vec{x}, s\vec{y})K_a(x, y; \vec{x}, \vec{y})d\vec{x}d\vec{y}, \tag{36}
\]

where
\[ K_\alpha(x, y; \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = \exp \left[ i \pi \left( \frac{x^2 + y^2}{\tan \alpha} - \frac{2x\tilde{x} + 2y\tilde{y}}{\sin \alpha} + \frac{\tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2}{\tan \alpha} \right) \right] \]

where \((x, y)\) and \((\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})\) are coordinates in the output and input planes, respectively, \(\alpha\) is the FRT order, and \(s\) is a scaling factor. If the distances \(d_1\) and \(d_2\) are related by

\[ d_2 = 2f \left( \frac{d_1(d_1 - f) + f^2}{(f - d_1)^2 + f^2} \right), \]

then the system performs a FRT of order \(\alpha\) given by...
\[ \alpha = \cos^{-1} \left[ \frac{d_1(d_1 - 2f)}{(f - d_1)^2 + f^2} \right]. \]  

The scale factor \( s \) in Eq. (36) is given by \( s = \sqrt{f} \), where \( \lambda \) is the wavelength of the light. It may be seen that \( d_1 = f \) and \( d_2 = 2f \) give \( \alpha = 2 \), corresponding to imaging with a magnification \(-1\), while setting \( d_1 = 0 \) and \( d_2 = f \) gives \( \alpha = 0 \), corresponding to imaging with magnification \( 1 \).

To estimate the quantity \( dI_0(\cdot)/d\alpha \), the FRT system is configured to perform FRT of orders \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) separated by a small value \( \Delta \alpha \). The orders are so chosen that \((\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)/2 = 0\). The corresponding intensities, \( I_{\alpha_1} \) and \( I_{\alpha_2} \), are measured at the output of the optical system. Then the rate of change is approximated by

\[
\frac{dI_0(x)}{d\alpha} \Bigg|_{\alpha=0} \approx \frac{I_{\alpha_1}(x) - I_{\alpha_2}(x)}{\Delta \alpha}, 
\]

and

\[
I_0(x) \approx \frac{I_{\alpha_1}(x) + I_{\alpha_2}(x)}{2}. 
\]

By measuring \( I_{\alpha_1} \) and \( I_{\alpha_2} \), the local spatial frequency components in the \( x \) and \( y \) directions, \( \nu_x(\cdot) \) and \( \nu_y(\cdot) \), can be estimated by using Eqs. (22) and (41).

5. EXPERIMENT

We estimated the curvature of the field created by a thin spherical lens [29] of focal length 8 mm and clear aperture 3 mm. The lens was placed in the input plane of an FRT system and illuminated by a collimated laser beam (\( \lambda = 633 \) nm). For a plane-wave input, under the paraxial approximation the field immediately after the spherical lens is given by \( f(x, y) = \exp[j\pi(x^2 + y^2)/\lambda f_i] \), where \( f_i \) is the focal length of the lens in the two orthogonal \( x \) and \( y \) directions. This is the two-dimensional extension of the one-dimensional chirp signal discussed in Sections 2 and 3 with \( b_2 = 1/2\lambda f_i \) and \( b_1 = 0 \). If the lens is tilted with respect to the optical axis of the system, the value of \( b_1 \) is non-zero. The optical system performs a scale-invariant optical FRT with the input and output coordinates scaled by a factor \( s = \sqrt{f} \), where \( f \) is the focal length of the lens used in the FRT system [see Eq. (36)]. Accounting for this scaling, \( b_2 = f_i/f \), and the spatial frequency as measured by the system is \( f/f_i \).

With the 8 mm lens placed at the input, the optical system is first configured to obtain a FRT order \( \alpha = \pi \) (if \( f = 160 \) mm, \( d_1 = 160 \) mm, and \( d_2 = 320 \) mm), and the first intensity measurement is performed. This is preferred, for practical reasons, to the \( \alpha = 0 \) system configuration, where the input and output planes coincide with the plane of the lenses. The second intensity measurement is done by perturbing the fractional order by a small value \( \Delta \alpha = 0.006 \) corresponding to a perturbation in \( d_1 \) by 0.5 mm and \( d_2 \) by 1 mm. The intensity measurements were performed with a CCD (Imperx Model, 1024 \times 1024 pixels, 7.6 \( \mu \)m square pixel). The width of the sensor array is \( W = \)8 mm in both \( x \) and \( y \) directions. Figure 2(a) shows the value of \( \nu_x \) estimated by using Eq. (22). Figure 2(b) shows \( \nu_y \) averaged along the \( y \) direction. Plotted as the dashed-dotted line is the theoretically expected curve with the value \( b_2 = 20 \) and \( b_1 = 0 \) for \( f = 160 \) mm and \( f_i = 8 \) mm. The difference in the experimentally deter-
mined curve and the theoretically expected curve may be attributed to various experimental errors. The main sources of experimental errors are the positioning errors of the lenses leading to errors in the distances $d_1$ and $d_2$, errors in collimation of the beam, and tilt of components with respect to the optical axis of the system. The estimated values of the focal length from the experimentally determined curve were $f_y = 8.36$ mm and $f_x = 8.3$ mm. Figure 3 shows the phase estimated from the spatial frequency shown in Fig. 2.

Figure 4 shows the plots corresponding to a lens of focal length 20 cm. The measurements were carried out for the same FRT order separation, $\Delta \alpha = 0.006$, used in the previous case. As can be seen from the plots, this fractional order separation leads to an erroneous detection of spatial frequency. For this case, the value of $b_2 = 0.8$ leads to a higher value of the lower bound than predicted by Eq. (35).

For completeness, in Fig. 5 we show the results for the case when there is no input signal. The measurements were carried out for the same FRT order separation, $\Delta \alpha = 0.006$, used in the previous case and collimated illumination. The result therefore corresponds to noise and drifts in the system and places a lower threshold on performance.

6. CONCLUSION
In this paper, we examined the signal recovery methods that use two intensity measurements in two close FRT domains, using the phase space formalism. Although these methods require fewer samples than phase tomographic methods that sample the entire phase space, the choice of the fractional order separation needs a priori knowledge of the signal bandwidth and noise level of the optical system used for measurement. This is because (i) the bandwidth of the signal results in an upper bound on the fractional order separation and, furthermore and very significantly, (ii) the noise in the system leads to a lower bound on the FRT order separation. Using the example of a quadratic phase signal, we have shown that for a given noise level in the system, signals with a lower rate of change of spatial frequency have a higher upper bound.

We used a scale-invariant fractional Fourier optical system to experimentally estimate the spatial frequency distribution of quadratic phase signals generated by two lenses of focal length 8 mm and 20 cm. Using the same fractional order separation for both the lenses, it was found that for the case of the 20 cm focal length lens the spatial frequency estimated is erroneous, as the fractional order separation is inadequate to extract this signal.
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