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Characterising a Spatial Light Modulator using Ptychography
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Ptychography is used to characterise the phase response of a Spatial Light Modulator (SLM). We use the technique to measure and correct the optical curvature and the gamma curve of the device. Ptychography’s unique ability to extend field-of-view is then employed to test performance by mapping the phase profile generated by a test image to sub-pixel resolution over the entire active region of the SLM. © 2016 Optical Society of America
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In recent years, phase-only Spatial Light Modulators (SLMs) have become a popular way to shape light in a range of applications, from holographic displays [1] to structured illumination microscopy [2] and quantitative phase imaging [3]. The ideal phase-only SLM operates as an addressable phase mask that can program an arbitrary profile onto a coherent beam; in practice, the degree of control is limited by the SLM’s physical properties: its pixel fill factor, number of quantisation levels, the imprecise mapping of voltages onto phase shifts, and optical distortions such as the curvature of the device’s surface. Characterising these features is an important step toward successfully incorporating an SLM into an optical system, and a number of characterisation techniques have been demonstrated previously. Examples include using a Mach-Zehnder interferometer [4], a Twyman-Green interferometer [5], and digital holography [6]. A grating-based instrument has been used to obtain a large field-of-view (FoV) phase image of an SLM [7], but only at a resolution limited by the system’s NA of 0.0075. Conversely, Kohler et al. employed a novel phase retrieval algorithm to characterise an SLM [8], obtaining sub-pixel-resolution phase images of the device, but only over a small FoV.

Some of the approaches described above are aimed exclusively at extracting the phase response of the SLM, outputting a plot of the average phase change the device produces at each phase level that it can be programmed to display. Those that image the SLM either do so over small areas or over large areas at low resolution. All of the methods are susceptible to errors resulting from imperfect optical components in the characterisation setup, and those based on interference with a reference beam involve careful alignment and calibration. In this paper we use ptychography [9]–with its ability to realise precise, high resolution phase images over extremely large FoV—to overcome these drawbacks.

For those unfamiliar with ptychography, the concept is as follows. A localized coherent ‘probe’ beam illuminates a small region of a specimen. The specimen is translated laterally relative to the beam through a discrete grid of positions, so that the set of illuminated areas together form an overlapping patchwork that covers a region of interest. At each specimen position a diffraction pattern is recorded by a detector placed some distance downstream. The overlap between the areas illuminated by the probe allows iterative algorithms to solve the inverse problem of determining the complex transmissivity or reflectivity of the specimen, and the probe wavefront, that must have given rise to the recorded data.

Our setup to implement a reflection-mode, lens-free imaging version of ptychography is shown in Figure 1 (and see [10]). To form the probe, a 675 nm laser was coupled through a single-mode fibre and polarised along the long axis of our Liquid Crystal on Silicon (LCOS) phase-only SLM to align with its liquid crystal orientation. The beam was then passed through a weak diffuser (to reduce internal reflections in our setup) and brought to a focus by a lens. The specimen was positioned slightly downstream of the beam’s tightest focal point, where the probe’s diameter was 1 mm. This was the maximum size allowed by the need to sample intensity fringes in the diffraction data above the Nyquist rate. (Note that randomizing the probe by introducing a diffuser does not compromise the reconstructed specimen image, since ptychographic algorithms solve for the probe and remove its influence.) The scattered probe reflected from the specimen was directed onto an Allied Vision Pike 16-bit CCD detector (2048 × 2048 pixels on a 7.4 µm pitch) via a non-polarising beam-splitter. The NA of our lensless imaging system was kept as large as possible by minimizing the distance between the specimen and the detector; after correcting for the refractive index of the beam-splitter, this resulted in an effective camera length of 4.6 cm and an NA of 0.16, corresponding to an expected resolution in our reconstructed images of approximately 2.8 µm (by Sparrow’s criterion [11]).

In each of our experiments the specimen, either a test sample or the SLM itself, was translated by a Newport XPS-Q4 x-y translation stage through a rectangular grid of positions with a pitch of 200 µm. To avoid reconstruction artefacts associated with a perfectly regular translation grid [12], random x/y offsets within the range ±40 µm were added to each position. At each
position in the grid, a diffraction pattern was recorded with a
detector binning of two and an exposure time of 1.8 s. These
lengthy exposures helped average out phase flicker—a problem
of phase-modulating SLMs [13]—from our final reconstructions,
although they did have the side-effect of prolonging data col-
lection for our larger scan patterns to over an hour. This and
the long reconstruction time for larger scans (several hours)
are the main weaknesses of our method in comparison to the alter-
vatives, so an interesting follow up to this work would be
to significantly improve data collection time using multi-mode
ptychographic reconstruction [14].

The SLM we used was a Holoeye PLUTO. This is a reflective,
phase-only LCoS device with $1920 \times 1080$ pixels on a pitch of
8.0 µm, and a fill-factor of 90%. The phase of each pixel can be
programmed to 256 phase levels ($0 \rightarrow 255$), with full $2\pi$ opera-
tion possible up to a wavelength of 800 nm.

Images were reconstructed from diffraction data using the
ePIE approach with the addition of position correction [15]—a
necessary inclusion because the large translations involved
in our extended FoV experiments caused backlash positioning
efforts of the order of 20 µm. We also modified the standard
‘modulus constraint’ in our reconstruction algorithm to account
for background noise (resulting from detector readout and stray
light) and for an unmodulated reflection from the SLM.

The ePIE begins with arbitrary initial estimates of the speci-
men and of the probe beam, then uses each recorded diffraction
pattern in turn to update them. During each update step, the
current estimates of the probe and specimen are used to pre-
dict the wavefront, $\psi_u$, that was incident at the detector when
the diffraction pattern intensity currently under consideration,
$I_u$, was recorded. ($u = [j,k]$ indexes the pixels of the detector.)
The modulus constraint refines the predicted wavefront to agree
with the measured data by replacing its modulus with $\sqrt{I}$ whilst leaving its phase unchanged. This revised wavefront
is propagated back to the specimen plane where it is used to
update the probe and specimen estimates, before moving on to
consider the next diffraction pattern. The algorithm termina-
tes when a prescribed error level is reached or, as here, after a
determined number of iterations have been completed—more
detail can be found in [15]. To include a background signal,
$B_u$, in this update step, we adopt an approach similar to that
of multi-mode ptychography, revising the modulus constraint
according to equation 1:

$$\psi'_u = \psi_u \sqrt{\frac{I_u}{|\psi_u|^2 + B_u}} \quad (1)$$

where the prime denotes the updated wavefront. This assumes
a model for our recorded diffraction pattern that is the inco-
herent sum of the wavefront propagated from the SLM and a
background that does not change from recording to recording.
We begin with a constant-valued estimate for $B_u$ then update it
along with $\psi_u$ using equation 2:

$$B'_u = B_u \left(1 - \delta \right) + \frac{I_u}{|\psi_u|^2 + B_u} \quad (2)$$

Here $\delta$ is an adjustable constant that governs the update rate; it
was set to 0.01 in the reconstructions undertaken for this work.
$B_u$ was initialised to 5000 counts at every pixel, or around 10% of
the maximum pixel value in $I_u$.

We have found this background correction approach works
well with simulated data, and it visibly improves our recon-
structions here by reducing noise and reflection-like artefacts
that we attribute to the unmodulated polarisation state in the
illumination.

The accuracy of phase images reconstructed by ptychography
is now well-established, e.g. [16]. To reinforce this previous work
and to establish the accuracy of our reflection-mode experiments,
we used a gold-covered silicon chip, originally part of a CMOS
image sensor, as a calibration sample. The chip was mounted
on the x-y stage in place of the SLM, 225 diffraction patterns
over a $15 \times 15$ position grid were recorded as detailed above,
the data fed to the ePIE, and after 300 iterations of the algorithm
the image shown in Figure 2a was obtained (the phase has been
mapped to feature height). A cross-section of the surface fea-
tures on the chip was then measured using a diamond stylus
profiler and compared to data taken from approximately the
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**Fig. 1.** The experimental setup for observing an SLM using
ptychography. The SLM is mounted on a mechanical x-y
stage and moves independently to the rest of the components.
(Pol = linear polariser; Diff = weak diffuser; Ap = circular ap-
erture; L = lens, focal length = 75mm).
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**Fig. 2.** Comparison of ptychographical reconstruction and
surface profile of a silicon chip. (a) Ptychographic phase recon-
struction of the silicon chip. The red line indicates the ap-
proximate location of the cross-section through the sample. Scale
bar 0.1mm. (b) Comparison of profile heights from the surface
profiler and ptychography.
phase levels, from 0 through the full range of programmable phase-level blocks, each of 16 × 16 pixels, with assigned phases that stepped through the full range of programmable phase levels, from 0 – 255. The four grids were flipped and rotated relative to each other so that blocks with the same programmed phase-level were not symmetrically arranged around the SLM centre–averaging blocks with the same programmed phase thereby compensated for a background curvature in the reconstructed phase image (discussed below). A set of diffraction patterns was collected and a reconstruction carried out as for the calibration sample, resulting in the image shown in Figure 3c; extracting the mean phase levels of the blocks from this image and plotting against the programmed phases clearly shows that the default gamma curve produces a non-linear phase response. (The regular kinks in the plot result from the curvature of the device surface, the effect of which was not completely removed by our flip and rotation strategy.) We computed a best fit from the phase response plot and used it to produce a revised look-up table aimed at linearising the response. This was loaded onto the SLM and a repeat of the ptychographic scan and reconstruction produced Figure 3d. Plotting the mean phase levels extracted from this images shows successful linearisation of the phase response over the required 0 – 2π phase range.

A further issue with SLMs results from finite manufacturing tolerances, which lead to a slight curvature across the face of the device. According to the manufacturer of our SLM, this deformation can be considered spherical and results in not more than a few microns height difference between the centre and edges [17]. Our second calibration step involved measuring this curvature and correcting for it by adding a compensating phase onto images displayed by the device. To accomplish the measurement the SLM was loaded with a pattern consisting of random one-pixel-wide, π phase-level lines covering the whole display, which gave sufficient structure to the diffraction data to condition the inverse problem solved by the reconstruction algorithm. Upon reconstruction (using the same routine as previously) we obtained the image shown in Figure 4, where the spherical deformation can be seen and a shallow phase ramp is also apparent. This ramp could have resulted from a number of sources: there is the possibility that it is an artefact of the reconstruction, it could arise from a misalignment of the optical axis and the detector, or it could be from a slight tilt to the SLM mount [19]. To compensate, we applied a counter ramp to the reconstruction before measuring the radius of each of the phase rings, from which the curvature of the device surface, \( R \), was calculated from equation 3:

\[
R = \frac{r^2 + \left( \frac{n\lambda}{2} \right)^2}{n\lambda}
\]

where \( r \) is the radius of a 2π-phase wrap in the reconstruction, \( n \) is the order of that wrap, and \( \lambda \) is the wavelength of light used. Averaging over several wraps, we extracted a radius of curvature of 7.9 μm, which corresponds to a maximum height discrepancy of 4.9 μm between the edge and centre of the SLM.

To test the performance of our SLM, and the effectiveness of our calibration, we carried out a ptychographic scan over the whole device area whilst it displayed a static HD phase image (inset of Figure 5). The gamma curve derived from Figure 3 was loaded onto the device driver and a spherical phase mask, of opposite sign to that measured in the calibration step, was added to the displayed image to compensate for the surface curvature (Figure 5). We collected a set of 2800 diffraction patterns, over a randomly disturbed grid of 70 × 40 stage translations, giving a total FoV of 9 × 15 mm². 300 iterations of the ePIE were used to reconstruct a phase image from the diffraction data, with the inclusion of position correction and the background compensation scheme detailed above.
Figure 5. The curvature correction added to an image before display on the SLM. The inset shows the original image.

Figure 6 shows the resulting (unwrapped) phase image. The pixel pitch in the reconstruction is 2.04 µm, and the image contains 4500 × 7500 pixels. The spherical correction has created a reasonably flat background to the image, but some distortion remains: a low spatial frequency ripple, around a wavelength in amplitude, which together with small unwrap errors accounts for the extension of the phase range beyond 2π. The concentric rings visible in the image correspond to phase wraps in the profile used to compensate for the SLM’s surface curvature, since the strong scatter from these phase edges goes beyond the NA of our imaging system. The inset of Figure 6 shows a zoom that demonstrates the sub-pixel resolution of our final image, with each pixel of the SLM corresponding to approximately 16 pixels in the reconstruction (a slight moiré effect is present because our image pixel pitch is not an exact multiple of the SLM pitch). In the centre of the frame, the reconstruction shows excellent agreement with the intended phase profile: the programmed image had a phase difference between the light and dark stripes on the lighthouse building of 1.89 rad, calculated by averaging over a region on each stripe, whilst the difference in the same regions of the reconstructed phase was 1.91 rad.

We have demonstrated in this paper that ptychography is an excellent tool for the characterization of optical components. Its advantages include an essentially unlimited FoV, obtainable even at high image resolutions; an easy experimental setup, without need for a reference arm or imaging lenses; excellent phase accuracy; and the ability to algorithmically remove the illumination system’s influence from the reconstructed image, along with any aberrations or artefacts that it may introduce.
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