

George W. Kattawar Department of Physics and Institute for Quantum Science and Engineering Texas ALM University Research Colleagues: Meng Gao, Ping Yang, and Yu You



Electromagnetic waves were first postulated by James Clerk Maxwell in 1862 and subsequently confirmedbyHeinrichHeinrichHertzin1887.

In 1864, Maxwell wrote "A dynamical theory of the electromagnetic field", where he first proposed that light was in fact undulations in the same medium that is the cause of electric and magnetic phenomena.

Maxwell derived a wave form of the electric and magnetic equations, revealing the wave-like nature of electric and magnetic fields, and their symmetry. His work in producing a unified model of electromagnetism is considered to be one of the greatest advances in physics.

#### And God

 $\mathbf{\mathcal{F}} \mathbf{\mathcal{A}} = c\nabla \times \mathbf{B} - 4\pi \mathbf{j}$  $\mathbf{\mathcal{B}} / \mathbf{\mathcal{A}} = -c\nabla \times \mathbf{E}$  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = 4\pi\rho$  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$ 

#### And then there was light



#### What is refractive index?

The refractive index n (or index of refraction) of a medium is a measure of how much the velocity of a wave is reduced inside that medium.

Wavefronts from a point source in the context of Snell's law. The region below the gray line has a higher index of refraction and proportionally lower wave velocity than the region above it.

vacuum

nedium

C



### **Component decomposition of linear Polarization**















## **Stokes vector-Mueller matrix formulation**

The electric field can be resolved into components.  $E_1$  and  $E_r$  are complex oscillatory functions.

The four component Stokes vector can now be defined.

They are all real numbers and satisfy the relation

 $I^2 = Q^2 + U^2 + V^2$ 

 $\vec{E} = E_1 \hat{l} + E_r \hat{r}$ 

 $I = I_1 + I_r$  $Q = I_1 - I_r$  $U = I_{45^0} - I_{135^0}$  $V = I_R - I_L$ 

The Mueller matrix relates the incident and scattered Stokes vectors

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}^{\mathbf{S}} \\ \mathbf{Q}^{\mathbf{S}} \\ \mathbf{U}^{\mathbf{S}} \\ \mathbf{V}^{\mathbf{S}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} & M_{13} & M_{14} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} & M_{23} & M_{24} \\ M_{31} & M_{32} & M_{33} & M_{34} \\ M_{41} & M_{42} & M_{43} & M_{44} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}^{\mathbf{i}} \\ \mathbf{Q}^{\mathbf{i}} \\ \mathbf{U}^{\mathbf{i}} \\ \mathbf{V}^{\mathbf{i}} \end{pmatrix}$$



Stokes vector and polarization parameters I is the radiance (this is what the human eye sees) Q is the amount of radiation that is polarized in the  $0/90^{\circ}$  orientation U is the amount of radiation polarized in the  $+/-45^{\circ}$  orientation V is the amount of radiation that is right or left circularly polarized DOP= Degree of polarization=  $\sqrt{Q^2 + U^2 + V^2} / I$ DOLP = Degree of linear polarization =  $\sqrt{Q^2 + U^2} / I$ DOCP = Degree of circular polarization = |V|/IOrientation of plane of polarization =  $\chi = \tan^{-1}(U/Q)/2$ 

Ellipticity= Ratio of semiminor to semimajor axis of polarization ellipse = b/a=tan[(sin<sup>-1</sup>(V/I))/2]



This data was collected using an Amber MWIR InSb imaging array 256x256. The polarization optics consisted of a rotating quarter wave plate and a linear polarizer. Images were taken at eight different positions of the quarter wave plate (22.5 degree increments) over 180 degrees. The data was reduced to the full Stokes vector using a Fourier transform data reduction technique.

# Haidinger's Brush

Direction of polarization

![](_page_15_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_0.jpeg)

## **Brewster's Angle θ**<sub>B</sub>

### $\tan \theta_{\rm B} = n$

![](_page_17_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### Nwater=1.33

## **Brewster's Angle θ**<sub>B</sub>

### $\tan \theta_{\rm B} = n$

![](_page_18_Figure_2.jpeg)

### Nwater=1.33

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Contrast enhancement using polarization**

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_2.jpeg)

Photo taken with a flash lamp and no polarization optics

Photo taken with circular polarized light for illumination and a circular analyzer for viewing The single-scatter reduced Mueller matrix for ocean water is basically Rayleigh scattering:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{M}}(180^{\circ}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

![](_page_22_Picture_0.jpeg)

Albert Abraham Michelson

"The aesthetic side of the subject is by no means the least attractive to me. I hope the day is near when a Ruskin will be found equal to the description of the beauties of coloring, the exquisite gradations of light and shade, and the intricate wonders of symmetrical forms and combinations which are encountered everywhere."

"On Metallic Colouring in Birds and Insects", Philos. Mag. 21, 554-567, (1911)

![](_page_23_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_2.jpeg)

Figure 1. Circular Polarizing Signals and General Eye Anatomy in Stomatopods

(A) The stomatopod crustacean Odontodactylus cultrifer (male). The scale bar represents 1 cm.(Photograph by Chrissy Huffard.)

(B) Detail of telson keel (inset in [A]) photographed through a left-handed circular polarizing filter.

(C) As (B) except photographed through a righthanded circular polarizing filter. Note the striking contrast difference compared to (B).

(D) The eye of Odontodactylus scyllarus, a close relative of O. cultrifer, seen from the front. The vertical line is section direction and extent in (E).

The following abbreviations are used: midband (MB), dorsal hemisphere (DH), and ventral hemisphere (VH). The scale bar represents 800 mm.

(E) Diagrammatic representation of a sagittal section (line in [D]) of rows five and six of the midband of the eye of a generalized gonodactyloid stomatopod.

Chiou et al., Current Biology, 18, 429-434 (2008)

![](_page_27_Picture_0.jpeg)

The Crustacean Wars Clip Show

![](_page_29_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Figure_0.jpeg)

Polarized Light and Skin Cancer Detection Skin cancer, most common of all cancers ( $\sim 50\%$ ) >1M cases of basal and squamous cell carcinomas in the R US/year Melanomas account for 5% of all skin cancers If detected early, over 99% cure rate Visual inspection is only way to diagnose, but one-third are misdiagnosed Subsequent biopsy of the lesion - invasive, expensive, and time-consuming process There is a need for the development of accurate, non-L invasive skin cancer detection or facilitated biopsy Ref: American Cancer Society web site. http://www.cancer.org (updated on 05/06/2009)

![](_page_38_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_0.jpeg)

Optical Bio-Sensing Laboratory

at Texas A&M University

![](_page_41_Picture_3.jpeg)

Interpretation Mueller matrix images based on polar decomposition and statistical discriminators to distinguish skin cancer

J.R. Chung<sup>1</sup>, A.M. Baldwin<sup>1</sup>, J.S. Baba<sup>1</sup>, C.H. Spiegelman<sup>2</sup>, M.S. Amoss<sup>3</sup>, and G.L. Coté<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biomedical Engineering
<sup>2</sup>Department of Statistics
<sup>3</sup>Department of Veterinary Physiology & Pharmacology

![](_page_42_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Pig Skin – In Vivo

- Used Sinclair swine model
  - 85% incidence of Melanoma
- Imaged 3 types of tissue
  - Normal Skin
  - Benign mole
  - Cancerous Skin
- Three types of analysis
  - Mueller matrix
  - CART analysis
  - Polar Decomposition

![](_page_42_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_0.jpeg)

- Depolarization Index(DI): To discriminate between cancerous and normal tissue
  - DI = 0 (no depolarized)
  - DI = 1 (completely depolarized)
  - -0 < DI < 1(partially depolarized)
- The benign mole is indistinguishable from the normal tissue.
- The cancerous tissue depolarizes light less than the non-cancerous tissue.
- But, not visible the boundary of cancer lesions.

![](_page_44_Picture_0.jpeg)

- The diattenuation and retardance images contain information about complex refractive index of the tissue
- The benign mole is distinguishable from the normal tissue
- But, not visible the boundary of cancer lesions.

![](_page_45_Figure_0.jpeg)

- No change for non-cancerous samples (normal, benign mole)
- The cancerous lesion is distinguishable from surrounding tissue.
- These retardance images are useful
  - for differentiating between samples
  - for boundary identification

![](_page_46_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Conclusion

From Mueller matrix images, there is a noticeable difference between non-cancerous and cancerous tissue. - Underlying structure

- From Depolarization images, cancerous tissue depolarizes less than non-cancerous tissues.
- From Diattenuation images, the benign mole can be distinguished from the normal tissues.
- From Retardance images, not only differentiating between samples, but also for boundary identification.

### Plankton as viewed by a squid

![](_page_47_Picture_1.jpeg)

Planktonic animal as seen through "regular" vision As seen when placed between two crossed linear polarizing filters As seen by putting the two polarizers at 45° to each other

![](_page_48_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_0.jpeg)