HAL open science

Underwater acoustic imaging: sparse models and implementation issues

Valentin Emiya, Nikolaos Stefanakis, Jacques Marchal, Nancy Bertin, Rémi Gribonval, Pierre Cervenka

To cite this version:

Valentin Emiya, Nikolaos Stefanakis, Jacques Marchal, Nancy Bertin, Rémi Gribonval, et al.. Underwater acoustic imaging: sparse models and implementation issues. International Travelling Workshop for Interacting Sparse Models and Technology, May 2012, Marseille, France. 2012. hal-00677287

HAL Id: hal-00677287

https://inria.hal.science/hal-00677287

Submitted on 4 Jun 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Underwater acoustic imaging: physically-motivated sparse models and validation on real data

N. Stefanakis, R. Gribonval – Inria, Rennes
V. Emiya – CNRS LIF, Aix-Marseille Univ., Marseille
N. Bertin – CNRS IRISA, Rennes
J. Marchal, P. Cervenka – CNRS IJLRA, Paris

I-TWIST12
May 9, 2012
CIRM, Marseille, France

Supports:
ANR ASAP

Outline

Problem statement

From synthetic to real data imaging

New sparse models and model validation

Conclusion

Outline

Problem statement

From synthetic to real data imaging

New sparse models and model validation

Conclusion

Underwater acoustic imaging (UWA)



Underwater acoustic imaging: direct problem



- Successive emission sequences, or *pings*, indexed by p.
- $\mathbf{e}_{p,i}$: emission at emitter i, ping p.
- $\mathbf{m}_{p,j}$: measurement at receiver j, ping p.
- b_k : backscattering coefficient at position k.
- $\tau_{ik} + \tau_{kj}$: propagation delay.

Direct problem:

$$\forall p, j, t,\ m_{p,j}(t) = \sum_k b_k \sum_i e_{p,i}\left(t - \tau_{ik} - \tau_{kj}\right)$$

In a matrix form,

$$\mathbf{m} = \Phi \mathbf{b}$$

Underwater acoustic imaging (inverse) problem

$$\mathbf{m} = \Phi \mathbf{b}$$

Goal: estimate vector $\mathbf{b}$ from measurement vector $\mathbf{m}$ and known matrix Φ (made with delayed versions of the emitted signals).

Classical approach to sonar: beamforming (BF)



Beam at emission (E(θ))



Beam at reception (R(ϕ))

In a nutshell:

- A beam = focus on a quasi-planar region (θ or ϕ).
- Forming E or R beams = apply gains/delays to transducers.
- E(θ) beam $\cap$ R(ϕ) beam = image point in direction (θ, ϕ).
- Successive pings = successive beams with varying angles.
- BF imaging = linear estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{b}}^{\mathrm{BF}} \triangleq \mathbf{W}\mathbf{m}$ for some $\mathbf{W}$.

Limit.: resolution (primary lobe), artifacts (sidelobes), not 3D imaging.

Sparse approaches to sonar: state of the art

Physically-motivated sparsity: most of the points in the 3D space are not scatterers (air, water).



$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{m} = \Phi \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{b} \text{ sparse} \end{cases} \Rightarrow \quad \widehat{\mathbf{b}}^{\mathrm{CS}} = \arg\min_{\mathbf{b}} \|\mathbf{b}\|_1 + \mu \|\mathbf{m} - \Phi \mathbf{b}\|_2^2$$

From:

P. Boufounos, Compressed sensing for over-the-air ultrasound, ICASSP 2011.

But: tests are on simple synthetic data.

Our focus

- Challenges when moving from synthetic to real data.
- New sparse model, validity of the sparse models on real data.

Outline

Problem statement

From synthetic to real data imaging

New sparse models and model validation

Conclusion

From tic to real data: challenges

Processing real data implies:

- Handling a 3D grid with a higher number of points;
- Detecting targets that are not located on the grid points;
- Detecting complex-shape objects rather than a simple pattern like a square;
- Using non-ideal transducers with directivity patterns and calibration issues;
- Handling phase issues: propagation, modulation by a carrier frequency;
- Processing noisy measurements.







Experimental features

General settings

- 64 emission channels
- 64 reception channels
- 128 transducers (E or R each) along 2 26cm line arrays
- Carrier frequency: 480 kHz
- Bandwidth: 160 kHz
- Sampling @ 2 MHz

Current choices

- One 64-E line array
- One 64-R line array
- $\mathbf{e}_{i,p} \triangleq \delta_{i,p}\mathbf{e}$
- $\mathbf{e}$: pure sine+truncated Gauss envelope (10 periods)
- Target: ∅52cm wheel, plywood+sand, 1m away.



Discretization & dimensionality issues

Full tank discretized with step λ: $K = 48.10^6$ voxels in the grid.
Measurement length: 13.10^6 samples.

Problem size

$$\begin{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{m} \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \\ \\ \Phi \\ \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \\ \\ \mathbf{b} \\ \\ \\ \end{bmatrix}$$

$\in \mathbb{C}^{13.10^6}$ $\qquad \in \mathbb{C}^{13.10^6 \times 48.10^6}$ $\qquad \in \mathbb{C}^{48.10^6}$

Size reduction: $\Phi \in \mathbb{C}^{13.10^6 \times 48.10^6} \rightarrow \Phi \in \mathbb{C}^{1,327,104 \times 70,272}$

OMP: naive $\rightarrow$ efficient implementation

OMP implementation

Residue initialization: $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbf{m}$;
Sparse support initialization: $\Omega \leftarrow \emptyset$;
for $K = 1$ to $K_{\max}$ **do**
  Atom selection: $\widehat{k} \leftarrow \arg\max_k |\langle \mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{r} \rangle|$
    $O\left(N_T N_R N_P \times K\right) \rightarrow O\left(N_T \log N_e + N_R N_P K\right)$
  Sparse support update: $\Omega \leftarrow \Omega \cup \left\{\widehat{k}\right\}$
  Sparse representation update: $\widehat{\mathbf{b}}_\Omega \leftarrow \Phi_\Omega^+ \mathbf{m}$ (adaptive update)
  Residue update: $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbf{m} - \Phi_\Omega \widehat{\mathbf{b}}_\Omega$
end for
Output: $\widehat{\mathbf{b}}^{\mathrm{OMP}} \leftarrow \widehat{\mathbf{b}}_\Omega$.

Results



Stefanakis et al., *Sparse Underwater Acoustic Imaging: A Case Study*, ICASSP 2012.

Outline

Problem statement

From synthetic to real data imaging

New sparse models and model validation

Conclusion

Directional scattering model: principle

In the standard (omnidirectional) scattering model, b_k depends on position k only:



$$m_{p,j}(t) = \sum_k b_k \sum_i e_{p,i}\left(t - \tau_{ik} - \tau_{kj}\right)$$

New directional scattering model: b_{ikj} depends on the incoming direction from emitter i and outgoing direction to receiver j,

$$m_{p,j}(t) = \sum_k \sum_i b_{ikj} e_{p,i}\left(t - \tau_{ik} - \tau_{kj}\right)$$

Directional scattering model: physically-motivated



$$m_{p,j}(t) = \sum_k \sum_i b_{ikj} e_{p,i}\left(t - \tau_{ik} - \tau_{kj}\right)$$

Motivations:

- scatterers are not omnidirectional
- transducers may not be calibrated: $b_{ikj} = \gamma_i b_k \gamma_j$

Directional scattering model: validation



Directional scattering model as a sparse model

$$m_{p,j}(t) = \sum_k \sum_i b_{ikj} e_{p,i}\left(t - \tau_{ik} - \tau_{kj}\right)$$

Sparsity in the omnidirectional scattering model: $\forall k \in \Omega^c, b_k = 0$
Sparsity in the directional scattering model: $\forall k \in \Omega^c, \forall i, j, b_{ikj} = 0$

The resulting model is a mixture of:

- a *joint sparse model* (Duarte et al., 2005)
  due to the dependance on receiver j
- a kind of *harmonic sparse model* (Gribonval and Bacry, 2003)
  due to the dependance on emitter i

Fresh results...

Calibrated beamforming



Calibrated omnidirectional sparse model



Variant of the directional sparse models



Outline

Problem statement

From synthetic to real data imaging

New sparse models and model validation

Conclusion

Conclusion

- Proposed physically-motivated sparse models
- Designed tractable algorithms
- Designed a new device
- Got new measurements
- Obtained promising results

Many perspectives

- New models: attenuation/propagation, transducer calibration, directivity
- New settings: antenna random geometry, random sequences
- Fast algorithms
- Performance assessment

Thanks!

N. Stefanakis, J. Marchal, V. Emiya, N. Bertin, R. Gribonval, P. Cervenka, *Sparse Underwater Acoustic Imaging: A Case Study*, submitted to ICASSP 2012.

New papers in preparation