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ABSTRACT

This paper introduces a novel deep neural network architecture for solving the inverse scattering problem in frequency domain with wide-band data, by directly approximating the inverse map, thus avoiding the expensive optimization loop of classical methods. The architecture is motivated by the filtered back-projection formula in the full aperture regime and with homogeneous background, and it leverages the underlying equivariance of the problem and compressibility of the integral operator. This drastically reduces the number of training parameters, and therefore the computational and sample complexity of the method. In particular, we obtain an architecture whose number of parameters scale sub-linearly with respect to the dimension of the inputs, while its inference complexity scales super-linearly but with very small constants. We provide several numerical tests that show that the current approach results in better reconstruction than optimization-based techniques such as full-waveform inversion, but at a fraction of the cost while being competitive with state-of-the-art machine learning methods.

1 Introduction

Inverse wave scattering is a classical inverse problem that utilizes the scattered wave from an impinging probing signal to infer the acoustic properties of the object being probed. The problem finds wide applications in radar imaging [1], sonar imaging [2], seismic exploration [3], geophysics exploration [4], medicine imaging [5] and so on.

At the theoretical level, the well studied single-frequency (or monochromatic) inverse wave scattering problem has been proved to produce a unique reconstruction of the media: if the full incoming-to-scattered wave map is given for a fixed frequency, the data can uniquely determine the underlying object, when the media is assumed to be smooth [6]. Unfortunately, this mathematical statement finds little use in computation. The inversion problem, when studied in the theoretical setting requires the knowledge of the full map, while the numerical implementation only exploits a data set of usually very large but finite size. In addition, it is known that inverse scattering problem is severely ill-posed and the reconstruction quality highly depends on the precision of the collected data, particularly, when the data is finite dimensional. Thus, inverse scattering in the numerical setting is often confronted with two issues: its sample complexity, i.e., the amount of the data required, and the lack of stability of the reconstruction.

The sample complexity is usually related to the parametrization of the medium to be reconstructed. While the mathematical PDE statement guarantees the reconstruction of a function, numerically one needs to represent this function using a finite, but often very large, number of parameters, particularly when the media is expected to have fine-grained structures. This calls for a large amount of data for the reconstruction, which in return requires both the probing and scattering waves to be collected on similar scales in order to capture the features in the media at the target...
resolution. Qualitatively, in two dimensions the amount of data per needed scales proportionally to the square of the inverse of the characteristic length of the smallest feature one seeks to recover.

The lack of stability has been mathematically proved \[7\] for monochromatic data: a small perturbation in the collected data leads to disastrous inaccuracies in the reconstruction of the media \[8\]. To overcome such a difficulty, within the classical computational pipelines of optimization-based reconstruction techniques, one typically uses wide-band data, i.e., using different frequencies for the probing waves. Unfortunately this brings two other issues, first, the cost of simulating the wave propagation is prohibitive, particularly at high-frequency, due to combination of the Shannon-Nyquist sampling criterion and a strict CFL condition, and second, the problem is still highly non-convex, so non-physical local minima are abundant. During the past decades, multiple numerical strategies have been taken to ease these difficulties, including fast PDE solvers \[9,10\] that seek to alleviate the computational costs, and new optimization pipelines such as recursive linearization \[11\] and full wave inversion \[12\] that seek to avoid some of the spurious local minima in the optimization loop by a hierarchical processing of the data.

In a nutshell, in order to reconstruct fine-grained details one needs higher frequency data; however, as the frequency increases, each step in the optimization procedure becomes increasingly expensive, and the optimization loss becomes increasingly non-convex.

Instead of using an iterative method to reconstruct the media, one alternative is to approximate the map between the to-be-reconstructed media, and the data directly, which would allows us to circumvent some of the issues mentioned above. In fact, if the relation between the media and the data-map is entirely known, then for any given data, one can read this relation to quickly identify the media. Thus driven by the empirical success of deep learning in approximating high-dimensional, highly non-linear maps in a myriad of applications \[13,14,15\], we investigate whether it is possible to efficiently approximate this map by leveraging the power of deep learning, when the to-be-reconstructed medium is parametrized by an unknown but relatively low-dimensional manifold.

In our setting, the concrete problem that we study in this paper is:

**Are neural networks capable of efficiently approximate the map between media and data?**

The answer is high-likely to be positive as operator neural networks \[16,17\] have been developed by a growing number of researchers. Under this big theme, we specifically study if one can build certain properties of this relation into the design of the architecture of the NN, so to enforce the properties and to reduce the computational cost, resulting in an efficient method. Specifically, we look into the equivariant property and butterfly structure of the media-data relation, and we design an NN that has these features built in. Such architecture not only respects the underlying physics, interpreted through the PDE (Helmholtz equation), but also helps to reduce the overall computational cost.

The main contribution this work is a model that is able reconstruct relatively fine-grained features accurately such that:

- has considerable fewer training parameters, which is achieved by leveraging the underlying the equivariance of the problem with a more detailed description of the linearized operator coupled with a compression technique tailored for oscillatory phenomena,
- experimentally, requires much smaller training datasets to achieve high-validation accuracy, particularly when compared to existing approaches \[18,19,20\].

There are several new developments for leveraging ML techniques for inverse problems. In \[21\] the authors used the recently introduced paradigm of physics informed neural networks (PINN) to solve for inverse problems in optics. Aggarwal et al. introduce a model-based image reconstruction framework \[22\] for MRI reconstruction. The formulation contains a novel data-consistency step that performs conjugate gradient iterations inside the unrolled algorithm. Gilton et al. proposed in \[23\] a novel network based on Neumann series coupled with a hand-crafted pre-conditioner for linear inverse problems, which recast an unrolled algorithm as elements of the Neumann series. In \[24\] Mao et al. use a deep encoder-decoder network reminiscent of U-nets \[25\] for image de-noising, using symmetric skip connections. Networks based on the scattering transform has been proposed \[26\] to take in account translation equivariance in images. In \[27\] the authors introduced another framework based on frames for inverse problems, which was applied to computer tomography de-noising \[28\]. These works pioneered the application of deep learning and explored the possibility of integrating physics of inverse scattering with novel machine learning algorithms.

Two particular features of inverse scattering that we specifically focus in this paper are the integration of complementary low-rank property in the inversion formula, and the exploit of equivariance. Both features have been separately studied in literature already. To embed the network with properties from the differential operator while mimicking algebraic structures for such as H-matrices \[29\], Fast Fourier Transforms \[30,31\] or butterfly algorithms \[32,18,33,34,20\].
were studied. In [35], the authors proposed a network that is rotationally equivariant, which allows them to reduce the number of degrees of freedom but only using monochromatic data.

Our current approach exploits both traits: our design of the NN architecture relies on equivariant formulation of the linearized operator, and we then further compress it using a Butterfly-type structure, while processing several frequencies simultaneously.

We organize our paper as follows. In Section 2 we present the problem setup and explain the details of the media-data relation. We introduce the equivariant property and the butterfly structure of the media-data relation inherited from the PDE. The embedding of these properties into the design of NN architectures will be discussed in Section 3.1 and 3.2 respectively. The final section contains several numerical experiments showcasing the properties of the proposed method.

### 2 Problem setup

The inverse scattering problem, at large, is the inverse problem associated with the Helmholtz equation, one of the simplest models for time-harmonic wave propagation. Despite its simplicity, it retains the core difficulties of models with more complex physics such as seismic or electromagnetic waves, thus making it an ideal test bed for new algorithms.

The Helmholtz equation is the Fourier-in-time transform of the constant-density acoustic wave equation and it reads:

\[ \Delta u(x) + \omega^2 n(x) u(x) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \]  

where \( u \) is the total wave field, \( \omega \) is the probing wave frequency, and \( n \) is the refractive index that encodes the wave speed’s dependence on the media. The domain of interest is denoted by \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \). We assume that the background media is homogeneous and equal to one, i.e., \( n(x) = 1 \) for \( x \notin \Omega \). For simplicity we denote the perturbation \( \eta(x) = n(x) - 1 \), thus we have \( \text{supp}(\eta(x)) \subset \Omega \).

For a given \( n \) (or equivalently \( \eta \)), the forward problem amounts to solving for the scattered wave field under the Sommerfeld radiation condition when the media is impinged by a probing wave. Due to the homogeneous background assumption we consider probing waves as plane waves:

\[ u^\text{in} = e^{i\omega s \cdot x}, \]

where \( s \in S^1 \) is a unitary vector denoting the direction of the incoming plane wave. When injected into (1), it triggers the scattered wave field \( u^\text{sc} \). Define

\[ u^\text{sc} = u - u^\text{in}. \]

Utilizing the fact that \( u^\text{in} \) solves the Helmholtz equation with trivial media \( n(x) = 1 \), it is straightforward to show that \( u^\text{sc}(x; s) \) solves:

\[ \begin{align*}
\Delta u^\text{sc}(x) + \omega^2 (1 + \eta(x)) u^\text{sc}(x) &= -\omega^2 \eta(x) u^\text{in}, \\
\frac{\partial u^\text{sc}}{\partial |x|} - i\omega u^\text{sc} &= \mathcal{O}(|x|^{-3/2}) \text{ uniformly in } \frac{x}{|x|} \in S^1 \text{ as } |x| \to \infty.
\end{align*} \]

The second row in the equation is termed the Sommerfeld radiation condition. It is imposed at the infinity to ensure the well-posedness of the equation (2), which further guarantees the uniqueness of the solution to (1).
The measurements are taken at the circle $R$ away from the origin, i.e., we measure the value of $u^\omega(Rr)$ with $R > \text{radius}(\Omega)$ and $r \in \mathbb{S}^1$. We define the continuous far field pattern (the data) as $\Lambda^\omega(s, r)$, namely:

$$\Lambda^\omega(s, r) = u^\omega(Rr; s).$$

Since this data is uniquely determined by the configuration of $\eta(x)$, we define the map from media $\eta$ to the data $\Lambda^\omega$ as

$$\Lambda^\omega = F^\omega[\eta].$$

While the forward problem is to compute $\Lambda^\omega$ for the given $\eta$ (or equivalently to apply $F$), the inverse problem is to infer $\eta$ from the measured data $\Lambda^\omega$ (or equivalently, to invert $F$ for $\eta$). We note that even though the PDE itself is linear, $F^\omega$ is a nonlinear map.

One of the classical way to numerically invert this operator is to recast this problem as a PDE-constrained optimization [56]. It seeks the configuration of $\eta$ so that the synthetic data generated by $\eta$ (by solving the PDE (2)) minimizes the mismatch with respect to the data $\Lambda$. Such procedure is formulated as

$$\eta^* = \arg\min_{\eta} \|F^\omega[\eta] - \Lambda^\omega\|_2.$$

This problem is usually solved using gradient-based optimization techniques. In such case the gradient is computed using adjoint state methods.

Instead of using optimization to solve the problem, we consider, as a motivation for our architecture, a classical strategy that hinges on the linearization of the problem using the Born-approximation. In that regime we study the impulse response for a perturbation of the input $\eta = \eta_0 + \delta\eta$, with respect to a reference $\eta_0$. The operator is then accordingly linearized to:

$$F^\omega(\eta + \delta\eta) \approx F^\omega(\eta) + F^\omega\delta\eta,$$

where $F^\omega$ is a linear operator that maps media perturbation to data perturbation. Under the assumption that $\eta_0 = 0$, $F$ can be computed explicitly using the free-space Green’s function of the two-dimensional Helmholtz equation. A classical computation omitting the higher order terms in the far-field asymptotics for the Green’s function yields:

$$\Lambda^\omega = F^\omega \eta, \quad \text{with} \quad \Lambda^\omega(s, r) = C_{\text{nor}} \int_{\Omega} e^{-i\omega(\rho - s) \cdot y} \eta(y) \, dy,$$

where $C_{\text{nor}} = \frac{e^{i\omega R}}{\sqrt{8\pi\omega}} \frac{e^{i\omega R}}{\sqrt{2}}$ is a normalization constant, which we omit from future discussions for the sake of brevity.

We stress that according to the formula (3), the data can be viewed as a first-type Fredholm integration over $\eta$, the perturbation in media. In this perturbed setting, we hope to find $\eta$ that minimize the error between $\Lambda^\omega$ and $F^\omega\eta$:

$$\min_{\eta} \|\Lambda^\omega - F^\omega\eta\|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1} |\Lambda^\omega(s, r) - (F^\omega\eta)(s, r)|^2 \, ds \, dr.$$

Given that $F^\omega$ is a linear operator on $\eta$, the objective function has a quadratic dependence on the unknown variable $\eta$, and thus, formally, the solution is explicitly given by

$$\eta = (F^\omega)^* \Lambda^\omega \quad \text{with} \quad (F^\omega)^* = ((F^\omega)^* F^\omega)^{-1} (F^\omega)^*,$$

where $(F^\omega)^*$ is the adjoint operator of $F^\omega$ that maps data back to the media. This operator is typically called the back-scattering operator.

It can be proved that the operator $(F^\omega)^* F^\omega$ is compact thus its numerical inverse will be ill-conditioned. A classical technique to circumvent this issues is to apply the Tikhonov regularization. This is to add $\epsilon\|\eta\|^2$ in the objective function, whose solution is given by

$$\eta^* = \min_{\eta} \|\Lambda^\omega - F^\omega\eta\|^2 + \epsilon\|\eta\|^2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \eta^* = ((F^\omega)^* F^\omega + \epsilon I)^{-1} (F^\omega)^* \Lambda^\omega.$$

Due to this extra regularization term, this strategy is termed the filtered back-projection [37].

We should stress that one derives this formula [5] only in the linearized setting under the assumption that $\eta \approx 0$. It is not valid when $\eta$ is significant, and the formula only serves as the guidance for the actual inversion. In this paper, we are interested in lifting this formula up to the nonlinear setting, and use it as a base to obtain numerical representation of the nonlinear map between data and the media. Mathematically, this is translated to replacing the linear operators [3] by nonlinear maps that will be represented by neural networks. In particular, we intend to label $\Lambda^\omega$ and $\eta^*$ as the input and output of the neural network, and simulate their relation using a specially designed NN architecture.

Despite [5] not being directly applicable, the format nevertheless provides insightful guidelines in designing NNs. It suggests that the relation between the data and the media is composed of two compartments: The inner layer operator is
the simple adjoint operator \((F^\omega)^*\) (or termed the back-scattering operator). The outer-layer, \((F^\omega)^*F^\omega + \epsilon I\), is termed the filtering operator. When one designs NN to represent the inversion, both operators need to be integrated. They each enjoy some unique features, and these features should be respected and therefore encoded in the NN architectures. In particular, the filtering operator is a pseudo-differential operator and we recognize that it is translation equivariant. As a consequence, the NN ansatz is also of convolution-type and should respect this translational equivariance property. Indeed, we choose to represent it using a few two-dimensional convolutional layers as its discretization, as was studied in \([20, 19]\).

The presentation of the back-scattering operator \((F^\omega)^*\) in the nonlinear setting is more involved. One can prove that this operator satisfies the rotational equivariance. This property should be respected by its NN representation. Furthermore, this operator satisfies the complementary low-rank property, thus it is expected to be well approximated by the butterfly factorization. Accordingly, the NN representation could incorporate the butterfly structure as well. In Section 2.3 and 2.4 respectively, we will study in depth these two properties, and investigate how to encode these features in the NN architecture to achieve both inversion accuracy and efficiency through enforcing this particular type of compressibility.

### 2.1 Discretization

Computationally, the discussion from the previous section should be all translated to the discrete setting. To preserve the notation, quantities in curly fonts, such as \(F^\omega\), \(\Lambda^\omega\), \(\omega\), are used to denote nonlinear maps, and the ones in regular fonts, such as \(\tilde{F}^\omega\) and \(\tilde{\Lambda}^\omega\), are used to denote the linearized version. The quantities written in serif font, such as \(\hat{F}^\omega\) and \(\hat{\Lambda}^\omega\), are used to present the discretized version of the associated linear operators.

Our method relies on particular choices of the discretization, and we described them here. Throughout the paper, we parametrize the incoming direction and the sampling point, \(s, r \in S^1\), by their associated angles

\[
s = (\cos(s), \sin(s)) \quad \text{and} \quad r = (\cos(r), \sin(r)),
\]

and correspondingly, we denote the continuous normalized far-field pattern as

\[
\Lambda^\omega_{\text{nor}}(r, s) := u^\omega(Rr; s) / C_{\text{nor}},
\]

and the normalized operator \(F^\omega\) by \(F^\omega_{\text{nor}}\). Upon the normalization, the equation (3) becomes

\[
\Lambda^\omega_{\text{nor}} = F^\omega_{\text{nor}} \eta, \quad \text{with} \quad \Lambda^\omega_{\text{nor}}(r, s) = \int e^{-i\omega(r-s)} \eta(y) dy.
\]

which leads to the filtered back-projection

\[
\eta^* = ((F^\omega_{\text{nor}})^* F^\omega_{\text{nor}} + \epsilon I)^{-1}(F^\omega_{\text{nor}})^* \Lambda^\omega_{\text{nor}}.
\]

For the conciseness of the notation, we drop the subindex \(\text{nor}\). Numerically, the directions of sources and detectors are represented by the same uniform grid in \(S^1\) with \(n_{sc}\) grid points:

\[
s_j, r_j = 2\pi j / n_{sc}, \quad j = 0, \ldots, n_{sc} - 1.
\]

Using this setting, the discrete data \(\Lambda^\omega\) takes its values on the tensor product of both grids with complex values, which are decomposed in their real and imaginary parts

\[
\Lambda^\omega = \Lambda^\omega_{\text{Re}} + i \Lambda^\omega_{\text{Im}} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_{sc} \times n_{sc}}.
\]

For the discretization of \(\Omega\), we have two competing possible discretizations. On the one hand, as it will be shown in the sequel, the back-scattering operator \((F^\omega)^*\) enjoys the rotational equivariance property 2.3 and naturally should be represented on the polar coordinates. On the other hand, filtering operator \(((F^\omega)^*F^\omega + \epsilon I)^{-1}\) enjoys the translational equivariance and should be represented on a Cartesian grid. Both equivariances will be justified in Section 2.3.

As a consequence, in the algorithmic pipeline we need to express intermediate representation in both polar and Cartesian meshes on the physical domain, which in return requires the translation of data from one form to another between the application of the two operators. We denote the discrete intermediate field that is obtained upon the application of the discretized back-scattering operator \((F^\omega)^*\) by \(\alpha\):

\[
\alpha := (F^\omega)^* \Lambda^\omega,
\]

It lives in the range of \((F^\omega)^*\) and is represented in polar coordinates. It needs to be mapped to a Cartesian mesh before the application of the filtering operator in

\[
\eta = ((F^\omega)^*F^\omega + \epsilon I)^{-1}\alpha.
\]
Throughout the paper, we set the physical domain to be $\Omega = [-0.5, 0.5]^2$. We first equip it with cartesian mesh using $n_\theta \times n_\rho$ grids. Simultaneously, the physical space is also discretized using the polar coordinates. As such, we note $\Omega \subset B_{1/2}(0)$, and define
\[
(\theta_j, \rho_i) = \left( \frac{2\pi j}{n_\theta}, \frac{i}{2n_\rho} \right), \quad \text{with} \quad j = 0, \ldots, n_\theta - 1, i = 0, \ldots, n_\rho - 1. \quad (11)
\]
With this notation, $\eta(x)$ is represented as a vector: $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta \times n_\rho}$ with its values being $\eta(x)$ evaluated on the Cartesian mesh, while $\alpha$ is presented as a vector of $n_\theta n_\rho$ on the polar coordinates. The translation between two sets of coordinates is conducted through a polynomial interpolation with order 2. We point out that we assume $n_\theta = n_{\text{sc}}$ so that $s_j, r_j$ and $\theta_j$ are sampled on the same mesh.

### 2.2 Computation of $(F^\omega)^*$

We claim that this back-scattering operator enjoys both compressibility through the butterfly structure and the rotational equivariance property. To do so, we are to compute an explicit formulation for this operator. Noting that using the standard inner product, we can flip $(F^\omega)^*$ to its dual space:
\[
\langle \eta, \alpha \rangle_\Omega = \langle \eta, (F^\omega)^* \Lambda^\omega \rangle_{\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1}.
\]
With straightforward calculation, recalling (3), the right hand side becomes:
\[
\langle \eta, \alpha \rangle_\Omega = \langle \eta, (F^\omega)^* \Lambda^\omega \rangle_\Omega = \int \Lambda^\omega(r,s) \int e^{-i\omega(r-s) \cdot \eta(y)} dy \, dr,
\]
\[
= \int \eta(y) \int e^{i\omega(r-s) \cdot \eta} \Lambda^\omega(r,s) \, ds \, dy,
\]
suggesting
\[
(F^\omega)^* \Lambda^\omega(y) = \int e^{i\omega(r-s) \cdot \eta} \Lambda^\omega(r,s) \, ds \, dr. \quad (12)
\]
To view it in polar coordinates, we denote that $y = (\rho \cos \theta, \rho \sin \theta)$ and have
\[
i\omega(r - s) \cdot y = i\omega \rho (\cos(r - \theta) - \cos(s - \theta)).
\]
Injecting it back to the formula above, the calculation becomes
\[
\alpha(\theta, \rho) = ((F^\omega)^* \Lambda^\omega)(\theta, \rho) = \int \int e^{i\omega \rho \cos(r - \theta)} e^{-i\omega \rho \cos(s - \theta)} \Lambda^\omega(r,s) \, ds \, dr,
\]
\[
= \int \left[ \int e^{i\omega \rho \cos(r)} e^{-i\omega \rho \cos(s)} \Lambda^\omega(r + \theta, s + \theta) \, ds \right] \, dr,
\]
\[
= \int e^{i\omega \rho \cos(r)} \left( \int e^{-i\omega \rho \cos(s)} \Lambda^\omega(r + \theta, s + \theta) \, ds \right) \, dr. \quad (14)
\]
The formula suggests that the adjoint operator $(F^\omega)^*$ can be decomposed in two-integral operators, both of which involves the integration kernel
\[
K^\omega(\rho, t) := e^{-i\omega \rho \cos(t)}. \quad (15)
\]

### 2.3 Equivariance

Both the back-scattering operator and the filtering operator in (5) enjoy certain equivariances and the design of NN should respect these features. We summarize the two equivalence that will be incorporated in our studies.

---

1. $\Lambda^\omega$ is extended periodically outside the domain $(r, s) \in [0, 2\pi]^2$.
We claim the integrating kernel $K\tilde{\theta}$ can be seen as a convolution with the kernel defined as:

$$r_\theta[\Lambda^{\omega}](r, s) = \Lambda^{\omega}(r - \tilde{\theta}, s - \tilde{\theta}),$$

which rotates by $\tilde{\theta}$ the data. Then we expect

$$(F^{\omega})^* r_\theta[\Lambda^{\omega}](\theta, \rho) = r_\theta[(F^{\omega})^* \Lambda^{\omega}](\theta, \rho) = [(F^{\omega})^* \Lambda^{\omega}](\theta - \tilde{\theta}, \rho),$$

in which the operator only acts on the angular inputs. This property can be easily checked by examining the explicit expression (14). Considering that neither integral kernel has $\tilde{\theta}$ dependence and by trivially rearranging terms:

$$(F^{\omega})^* r_\theta[\Lambda^{\omega}](\theta, \rho) = \int_{[0,2\pi]} e^{i\omega \rho \cos(r)} \left( \int_{[0,2\pi]} e^{-i\omega \rho \cos(s)} \Lambda^{\omega}(r - \tilde{\theta}, s - \tilde{\theta} + \theta) \, ds \right) \, dr,$n

$$= \int_{[0,2\pi]} e^{i\omega \rho \cos(r)} \left( \int_{[0,2\pi]} e^{-i\omega \rho \cos(s)} \Lambda^{\omega}(r + (\theta - \tilde{\theta}), s + (\theta - \tilde{\theta})) \, ds \right) \, dr,$n

$$= (F^{\omega})^* [\Lambda^{\omega}](\theta - \tilde{\theta}, \rho) = r_\theta[(F^{\omega})^* \Lambda^{\omega}](\theta, \rho),$$

proving (17).

**Translation equivariance** Using the explicit formulas of $F^{\omega}$ in (3) and $(F^{\omega})^*$ in (13), we can also verify the translational equivariance of $((F^{\omega})^* F^{\omega} + \epsilon I)^{-1}$. Using the Fubini’s theorem, we have

$$(F^{\omega})^* F^{\omega}(\eta)(y) = \int_{[0,2\pi]^2} e^{i\omega (r-s)} y \left( \int_{\Omega} e^{-i\omega (r-s) \cdot x} \eta(x) \, dx \right) \, ds \, dr,$n

$$= \int_{[0,2\pi]^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i\omega (r-s)} y e^{-i\omega (r-s) \cdot x} \eta(x) \, dx \, ds \, dr,$n

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left( \int_{[0,2\pi]^2} e^{i\omega (r-s)} \eta(x) \, ds \right) \eta(x) \, dx.$$n

This can be seen as a convolution with the kernel defined as

$$p(x) := \int_{[0,2\pi]^2} e^{i\omega (r-s) \cdot x} \, ds \, dr,$n

and the function $\eta$ extended by zero on $\Omega^{c}$. This convolution feature justifies that $(F^{\omega})^* F^{\omega}$ is translation equivariant. The same property also holds when we add it with an identity, and take its inversion.

### 2.4 Compression of the kernel $K^{\omega}$

The back-scattering operator (14) presents two levels of integration against the oscillatory integral kernel $K^{\omega}(\rho, t) = e^{-i\omega \rho \cos(t)}$ (or its complex conjugate). A brute-force integration of such an oscillatory integrand typically calls for very fine discretization and high cost. However, following [20], one can argue that its associated discretized form $K^{\omega}$ can be compressed through the butterfly factorization [38] by leveraging the complimentary low-rank property [38]. In this section we provide an overview of and the intuition to the butterfly factorization algorithm.

For one-dimensional problems the complementary low-rank property can be stated as follows: any block of the matrix with constant surface, i.e., the multiplication of its heights by its width, has its numerical rank bounded by a constant. For example, in the family of partitions depicted in Figure 2 each block has the same area, and therefore in order to satisfy the complimentary low-rank condition, each block should have the same numerical rank.

We claim the integrating kernel $K^{\omega}(\rho, t) = e^{-i\omega \rho \cos(t)}$ satisfies complementary low-rank property. Indeed, the claim can be broadened to any function in the form of $e^{i\omega \phi(\rho,t)}$. To see it, we perform Taylor expansion in the neighborhood of $(\rho_0, t_0)$. Let $|\rho - \rho_0| < d_\rho$ and $|t - t_0| < d_t$, we can approximate $\phi(\rho, t)$ up to the second order expansion as below:

$$\phi(\rho, t) = \phi(\rho_0, t_0) + \partial_\rho \phi(\rho_0, t_0) \cdot (\rho - \rho_0) + \partial_t \phi(\rho_0, t_0) \cdot (t - t_0) + (\rho - \rho_0)^T \cdot \partial_\rho^2 \phi(\rho_0, t_0) \cdot (t - t_0) + O(d_\rho d_t).$$
Since the first five terms are separable and the reminder term is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(d_{\rho}d_{t})$, we have
\[
e^{i\omega\phi(\rho, t)} = e^{i\omega\psi(\rho)}e^{i\omega\xi(t)}e^{i\omega\mathcal{O}(d_{\rho}d_{t})} = e^{i\omega\psi(\rho)}e^{i\omega\xi(t)}(1 + \mathcal{O}(\omega d_{\rho}d_{t})) ,
\]
where $\psi(\rho) = \phi(\rho_{0}, t_{0}) + \partial_{\rho}\phi(\rho_{0}, t_{0}) \cdot (\rho - \rho_{0}) + (\rho - \rho_{0})^T \cdot \partial_{t}^{2}\phi(\rho_{0}, t_{0}) \cdot (\rho - \rho_{0}) + (t - t_{0})^T \cdot \partial_{t}^{2}\phi(\rho_{0}, t_{0}) \cdot (t - t_{0})$. Therefore, when $d_{\rho}d_{t} < \omega^{-1}$, $e^{i\omega\phi(\rho, t)}$ can be locally approximated by separable functions. See details in [20].

We note that the error term from a separable form is a product of two terms, the size of interval in $\rho$ and the size of interval in $t$. If the product of these two distances is small, the integral kernel can be approximated by a separable function, hence becoming low-rank. This resonates the requirement of complementary low-rank property where the size of column indexing and that of row indexing in a given submatrix need to complement each other, so the total number of entries in this submatrix is controlled.

![Figure 2: Sketch of a family of partitions of a matrix exhibiting the complementary low-rank property. Each sub-matrix induced by the different partition has the same numerical rank.](image)

A matrix satisfying complementary low-rank property can be expanded on both sides using smaller-sized matrix-matrix products with operations on rows/columns respectively, as illustrated in [2]. This multiplication strategy is termed butterflying. It allows a lower complexity matrix-vector product, reducing the cost of from $N^2$ to $O(N \log N)$ [38]. In our case, it is $K$, a matrix of size $N \times N$ that is complementary low-rank and thus is butterflying [38]. To be more specific, the butterfly algorithm should find an expansion of the matrix by a product of $L + 3$ sparse matrices, each of which having only $O(N)$ entries:
\[
K \approx U^L G^{L-1} \cdots G^{L/2} M^{L/2} (H^{L/2})^* \cdots (H^{L-1})^* (V^L)^* .
\]

This formula approximately expand $K$ into the multiplication of a series of matrix products. Denoting $L$ the number of “levels” in the factorization, $U^L$ and $V^L$ will be block diagonal matrices, and $M^{L/2}$ is a weighted permutation matrix, which is usually called a switch matrix. The structures of the factors in the butterfly factorization provide acute intuition into their interpretations. For example, when a vector is right multiplied by the matrix, $U^L$ extracts a local representation of the vector, and then each $G$’ compresses two adjacent local representations. Upon the application of the switch matrix $M^{L/2}$ that redistributes the representations from the previous step by permuting the vector, each $H^i$ decompress the representation by splitting it into two, which increases the resolution of the representation. Finally, $V^L$ converts the local representations to sampling points.

Algorithmically, this decomposition is achieved in two stages. In the first, one would perform a singular value decomposition (SVD) for submatrices at level $L/2$. This step is composed of SVDs for $N$ submatrices, with each submatrix of size $m \times m$, where $m = \sqrt{N}$. For the moment, we unify the rank for each SVD decomposition to be $r$. Denoting $U_{i,j}^{L/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$, $S_{i,j}^{L/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, and $V_{i,j}^{L/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$ the left singular vectors, singular values and right singular vectors, we stack them up as
\[
K \approx U^L M^{L/2} (V^L)^* = \\
\begin{pmatrix}
U_{0,0}^{L/2} & U_{0,1}^{L/2} & \cdots & U_{0,m-1}^{L/2} \\
U_{1,0}^{L/2} & U_{1,1}^{L/2} & \cdots & U_{1,m-1}^{L/2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
U_{m-1,0}^{L/2} & U_{m-1,1}^{L/2} & \cdots & U_{m-1,m-1}^{L/2}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
S_{0,0}^{L/2} & S_{0,1}^{L/2} & \cdots & S_{0,m-1}^{L/2} \\
S_{1,0}^{L/2} & S_{1,1}^{L/2} & \cdots & S_{1,m-1}^{L/2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
S_{m-1,0}^{L/2} & S_{m-1,1}^{L/2} & \cdots & S_{m-1,m-1}^{L/2}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
V_{0,0}^{L/2} & \cdots & V_{0,m-1}^{L/2} \\
V_{1,0}^{L/2} & \cdots & V_{1,m-1}^{L/2} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
V_{m-1,0}^{L/2} & \cdots & V_{m-1,m-1}^{L/2}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]
The approximation sign takes into account that SVD cuts off small singular values, and

$$ U^{L/2} = \begin{pmatrix} U_0^{L/2} & U_1^{L/2} & \cdots & U_{m-1}^{L/2} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad (V^{L/2})^* = \begin{pmatrix} (V_0^{L/2})^* & (V_1^{L/2})^* & \cdots & (V_{m-1}^{L/2})^* \end{pmatrix}. $$

(24)

with

$$ U_i^{L/2} = \begin{pmatrix} U_{i,0}^{L/2} & U_{i,1}^{L/2} & \cdots & U_{i,m-1}^{L/2} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad V_i^{L/2} = \begin{pmatrix} V_{i,0}^{L/2} & V_{i,1}^{L/2} & \cdots & V_{i,m-1}^{L/2} \end{pmatrix}. $$

(25)

Note that the diagonal blocks of $U_i$ denote $U_i$ stores left (column) singular vectors for the $i$-th row block, and the total size of $U_i^{L/2}$ is $m \times mr$. Similarly, diagonal blocks of $V_i$ stores right (column) singular vectors of size $m$. In the second stage, one expands these vectors in $U$ and $V$ recursively, by partitioning them in half, while expanding them in the opposite direction to connect parallel blocks. In particular, for each diagonal block $U_i$, we split it in top and bottom halves

$$ U_i^{L/2} = \begin{pmatrix} U_i^{L/2, t} & U_i^{L/2, b} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} U_{i,0}^{L/2, t} & U_{i,1}^{L/2, t} & \cdots & U_{i,m-1}^{L/2, t} \\ U_{i,0}^{L/2, b} & U_{i,1}^{L/2, b} & \cdots & U_{i,m-1}^{L/2, b} \end{pmatrix}. $$

Noting that $(U_{i,2j}^{L/2, t}, U_{i,2j+1}^{L/2, t})$ form the column space of $K_{2i,j}^{L/2+1}$, the $(2i, j)$-block of $K$ decomposed at $(L/2 + 1)$-th level for row, and $(L/2 - 1)$-th level for column. Similarly $(U_{i,2j}^{L/2, b}, U_{i,2j+1}^{L/2, b})$ form the column space of $K_{2i+1,j}^{L/2+1}$, there are translation matrix $G_{2i,j}^{L/2}$ and $G_{2i+1,j}^{L/2}$ so that:

$$ (U_{i,2j}^{L/2, t}, U_{i,2j+1}^{L/2, t}) = U_{i,2j}^{L/2+1} G_{2i,j}^{L/2}, \quad (U_{i,2j}^{L/2, b}, U_{i,2j+1}^{L/2, b}) = U_{i,2j}^{L/2+1} G_{2i+1,j}^{L/2}. $$

Using the same definition as in (24) and (25) to stack up the matrices, we accordingly define $U_{i}^{L/2+1}$ and $U_{i}^{L/2}$. These definitions also allow us to write the transform in a concise form with properly stacked up $G^{L/2}$:

$$ U^{L/2} = U_{i}^{L/2+1} G_{i}^{L/2}. $$

Viewing these transformation, it is clear that the row size of $U_{2i,j}^{L/2+1}$ is that of $U_{i,2j}^{L/2, t}$, which is half of that of $U_{i,2j}^{L/2}$. Similarly, $U_{2i,j}^{L/2+1}$ has the same rank $r$, and thus $U_{2i,j}^{L/2+1}$ is of size $\frac{m}{2} \times \frac{mr}{2}$. As a summary, when one changes from $L$-th iteration to $L + 1$, the number of blocks double in both row and column, while the rank of each sub-block is kept as $r$.

Perform this iteration recursively by $L/2$ steps, we finally arrive at the formulation of (24). At the final stage of the iteration, $U^L$ as defined in the same way as in (24) is composed with $N$ blocks along its diagonal, with each block being of $1 \times r$. As an illustration, a rank 1 approximation using the butterfly algorithm can shown visualized in Fig. 3.

![Figure 3: An illustration of the matrix factors in the butterfly factorization. In the illustration, $L = 6$, $r = 1$, and $N = 64$.](image)

### 3 Neural Network Architecture

We briefly provide a general overview of the neural architecture, and we explain each of the components in what follows.

Our architecture follows closely the filtered back-projection with a change of variables as described in Alg. [1]. In practice we modify the application of $F^\omega$ by a neural network that mimics the butterfly structure, and we replaced the filtering by several layers of convolutional networks. As discussed in the introduction, the implementation of $(F^\omega)^*$
and \((F^\omega)^* F^\omega + \epsilon I)^{-1}\) should honor the operators’ own properties. In particular, we used convolutional NN to lift the filtering operator so it satisfies the translational equivariance. As argued before the back-scattering operator has rotational equivariance, and it is possible to compress it via a butterfly structure. We will discuss these properties in this section, and present how they get integrated in the design of NN in Section 3.1 and 3.2 respectively.

**Algorithm 1** Filtered Back-Projection.

**Input:** \(\Lambda^\omega \in \mathbb{C}^{n_{sc} \times n_{sc}}\)

**Output:** \(\eta = ((F^\omega)^* F^\omega + \epsilon I)^{-1}(F^\omega)^* \Lambda^\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\eta} \times n_{\rho}}\)

1: Preparation of the normalized data (6);
2: Computation of back-projection \(\alpha(\theta, \rho) = (F^\omega)^* \Lambda^\omega\) using (9);
3: Change of variables of \(\alpha\) to Cartesian coordinates \(\alpha(\theta, \rho) \rightarrow \alpha(x, y)\) through polynomial interpolation;
4: Computation of the filtering operation \(\eta = ((F^\omega)^* F^\omega + \epsilon I)^{-1}\alpha\) using (10).
5: return \(\eta\)

**Figure 4:** An illustration of the architecture of the model. The shape of each tensor at each step is labelled on the top. Convolutional NN is used to lift the filtering operator.

### 3.1 Application of equivariance

Recall the formula (14), the backscattered data \(\alpha\) comes from two layers of integral operators, both of which involves the integration kernel \(K^\omega(\rho, t) := e^{-i\omega \rho \cos(t)}\). Using the discretization introduced in section 2.1 this function is presented using the matrix form as \(K^\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{sc} \times n_\rho}\), with \(K^\omega_{mn} = e^{-i\omega \rho_n \cos(t_m)} = K^\omega(\rho_n, t_m)\).

Recalling the discrete form of data (8), to fully implement the back-scattering operator (14), one can rewrite (14), for any \(\theta_j\) as:

\[
\alpha(\theta_j, \cdot) = ((F^\omega)^* \Lambda^\omega)(\theta_j, \cdot) = \text{ones}(1, n_{sc}) \cdot \begin{bmatrix} K^\omega \circ (\Lambda^\omega_{\theta_j} \cdot K^\omega) \end{bmatrix} = \text{diag}((K^\omega)^* \cdot \Lambda^\omega_{\theta_j} \cdot K^\omega) \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \cdot \end{bmatrix}.
\]

(26)

Here \(\cdot\) denotes the matrix multiplication and \(\circ\) denotes the element-wise Hadamard multiplication. \(^*\) is the notation for conjugate transpose. \(\Lambda^\omega_{\theta_j}\) is the discrete shifting of \(\Lambda^\omega(r + \theta, s + \theta)\). Considering \(\{\theta_j\} = \{r_j\}\), for the matrix, we directly shift all rows/columns by \(j\):

\[
\Lambda^\omega_{\theta_j}(m, n) = \Lambda^\omega(m + j, n + j).
\]

(27)

It should be noted that the two forms are mathematically equivalent, but they carry different computational meaning. The choice of the form determines the compressing procedure for \(K^\omega\). In particular, Form I replaces the first matrix-matrix-product using a Hadamard entry-wise product and thus reduces the cost from \(o(n^3)\) to \(n^2\), and thus is preferred.
On the other hand, this form is unfriendly to encode the butterfly structure. The butterfly structure requires the to-be
examined matrix to be expanded from both sides into many smaller-sized matrix products, and this is incompatible to
the Hadamard product. As a consequence, when the butterfly-structure is used for compression, we turn to Form II.

Both forms move the dependence on \( \theta_j \) onto the data \( \Lambda^\omega \). This naturally sets the fact that the integral kernel \( K^\omega \) is
shared across \( \theta_j \). This observation lies at the core of the success of our algorithm. It not only automatically enforces
the equivariance property, respecting (17), but also significantly reduces the computational cost. Indeed, with this
approach, the to-be-trained parameters are all encoded in \( K^\omega \), a small matrix of size \((n_{\text{sc}} \times n_\rho)\). This is a significant saving compared with a brute-force computation. Starting from (14), \( \alpha \) is written as a linear operator acting on the
data \( \Lambda^\omega \) through an integral kernel. With a brute-force approach, \( \Lambda^\omega \) will be flattened into a vector of size \( n_{\text{sc}}^2 \), and \( \alpha \) is
flattened into a vector of \( n_\eta n_\rho \), the integral kernel is represented by a significantly larger matrix of size \((n_{\eta}n_\rho) \times n_{\text{sc}}^2 \).
This procedure not only loses the fact that the kernel is independent of \( \theta \), but also requires \( n_\eta n_{\text{sc}} \) times more unknowns,
bringing much heavier numerical cost.

In Figure 5 we visualize the application of the underlying equivariance on the back-scattering operator, using \( n_{\text{sc}} = n_\rho = n_\theta = 4 \) as an example.

Figure 5: The visualization of the application of the underlying equivariance. In the first step, the data matrix \( \Lambda^\omega \) is
shifted to generate the other four \( \Lambda^\omega_{\theta_j} \) for \( j = 0, 1, 2, 3 \). Then, the second form \( x \mapsto \text{diag}((K^\omega)^* \cdot x \cdot K^\omega) \) is applied to all
four \( \Lambda^\omega_{\theta_j} \), each of which outputs a row vector. Finally, they are concatenated to form the intermediate representation \( \alpha \).

In order to implement numerically Form I of (24), we note that
\[
K^\omega = C^\omega - i S^\omega, \quad \text{with} \quad C^\omega(\rho, t) = \cos(\rho \omega \cos(t)) \quad \text{and} \quad S^\omega(\rho, t) = \sin(\rho \omega \cos(t)).
\]  

(28)

In this form, we have
\[
((F^\omega)^*\Lambda^\omega)(\theta, \rho) = \int_{[0,2\pi]^2} C^\omega(\rho, r)C^\omega(\rho, s)\Lambda^\omega_R(r + \theta, s + \theta) \, ds \, dr + \int_{[0,2\pi]^2} S^\omega(\rho, r)S^\omega(\rho, s)\Lambda^\omega_R(r + \theta, s + \theta) \, ds \, dr + \int_{[0,2\pi]^2} C^\omega(\rho, r)S^\omega(\rho, s)\Lambda^\omega_I(r + \theta, s + \theta) \, ds \, dr - \int_{[0,2\pi]^2} S^\omega(\rho, r)C^\omega(\rho, s)\Lambda^\omega_I(r + \theta, s + \theta) \, ds \, dr,
\]
with \( \Lambda^\omega \) periodically extended outside the domain \( (r, s) \in [0, 2\pi]^2 \) box.

As such, the training of \( K^\omega \) can be translated to the training of \( C^\omega \) and \( S^\omega \), which are the discrete forms of \( S^\omega \) and \( C^\omega \)
using the same discretization as \( K^\omega \). Following the the first form (26), we find:
\[
\alpha(\theta_j, \cdot) = \text{ones}(1, n_{\text{sc}}) \cdot [C^\omega \odot (\Lambda^\omega_{\theta_j, R} \cdot C^\omega) + S^\omega \odot (\Lambda^\omega_{\theta_j, R} \cdot S^\omega) + C^\omega \odot (\Lambda^\omega_{\theta_j, I} \cdot S^\omega) - S^\omega \odot (\Lambda^\omega_{\theta_j, I} \cdot C^\omega)],
\]  

(29)
where $\Lambda^\omega_{ij,R}$ are shifted real/imaginary parts of the data as defined in (27). Clearly, the execution of $(F^\omega)^*$ is written as the summation of four terms that have exactly the same format. Each term is composed with one vector-matrix product, one Hadamard product, and one matrix-matrix product with the shifted data.

We summarize the implementation of (29), in which the parameters $C$ and $S$, instead of being constant matrices given by (28), are to be trained using data. Also, we replace the constant matrix $\text{ones}(1,n_{sc})$ by trainable weights $O^j$ for $j=1,2,3,4$ of the same size, so that we can get rid of the negative sign. We name the model as the uncompressed model.

**Algorithm 2** The application of $(F^\omega)^*$ in the uncompressed model

Input: $\Lambda^\omega \in \mathbb{C}^{n_{sc} \times n_{sc}}$
Output: $(F^\omega)^*\Lambda^\omega \in \mathbb{C}^{n_{sc} \times n_{sc}}$
1: Split the data in real and imaginary parts: $\Lambda^\omega = \Lambda^\omega_R + i\Lambda^\omega_I$
2: for $j < n_{sc}$ do
3: \[ \alpha[j,:) \leftarrow O^1 \cdot (C \odot (\Lambda^\omega_R \cdot C)) + O^2 \cdot (S \odot (\Lambda^\omega_R \odot S)) + O^3 \cdot (C \odot (\Lambda^\omega_I \cdot S)) + O^4 \odot (S \odot (\Lambda^\omega_I \cdot C)) \]
4: end for
5: return $\alpha$

We note that the model presented in this section only utilizes the underlying equivariance. In the application of $(F^\omega)^*$, we represent the functions $C$ and $O$ directly as $n_{sc} \times n_{sc}$ matrices consisting of trainable weights. Hence, the number of trainable weights scales as $O(n^2_{sc})$, and the inference complexity is dominated by the computations of $n_{sc} \times n_{sc}$ matrices productions for a total of $4n_{sc}$ times, which scales $O(n_{sc}^3)$.

Since the filtering operator is approximated by a 2-dimensional convolutional NN with constant kernel, for which the size of filters and the number of layers scale at most linearly with respect to $n_{sc}$, the number of trainable parameters scales $O(n_{sc})$, and the inference complexity is $O(n_{sc}^3)$.

Therefore, for the uncompressed model, the total number of parameters scales $O(n^2_{sc})$ and the inference complexity is $O(n_{sc}^3)$.

### 3.2 Application of butterfly factorization

For the application of butterfly factorization, we adopt Form II in (26) of the discretized adjoint operator $(F^\omega)^*$, which results on the formula

\[ \alpha(\theta_j,\cdot) = ((F^\omega)^*\Lambda^\omega)(\theta_j,\cdot) = \text{diag}([K^\omega]^* \cdot \Lambda^\omega_R \cdot K^\omega). \]

Notice that in (21) we have shown that $K^\omega$ admits a butterfly factorization, namely, it can be factorized as in (22). As a direct consequence, $(K^\omega)^* \cdot \Lambda^\omega_R \cdot K^\omega$ is expanded as:

\[ V^L \cdot H^{L-1} \cdots H^{L/2} (M^{L/2})^* (G^{L/2})^* \cdots (G^{L-1})^* (U^L)^* \cdot \Lambda^\omega \cdot U^L \cdot G^{L-1} \cdots G^{L/2} M^{L/2} (H^{L/2})^* \cdots (H^{L-1})^* (V^L)^*. \quad (30) \]

The form of (30) suggests the overall structure of the operator is composed of taking actions on the data $\Lambda^\omega_R$ using $L + 3$ layers:

- **Layer $U_{layer}(x)$**: In this layer, we apply the most internal action on the data: we sandwich the original data $\Lambda^\omega_R$ by $U^L$, namely:
  \[ x \rightarrow (U^L)^* \cdot x \cdot U^L. \]

- **Layer $G_{layer}(x,\ell)$**: there are $L/2$ $G_{layer}(x,\ell)$ layers corresponding to $\ell = L/2, \cdots, L-1$, each of which sandwich the given data by the associated $G^\ell$:
  \[ x \rightarrow (G^\ell)^* \cdot x \cdot G^\ell, \quad \ell = L/2, \cdots, L-1. \]

- **Layer SwitchResnet(x)**: In the middle layer, we are supposed to sandwich the given data by $M^{L/2}$:
  \[ x \rightarrow (M^{L/2})^* \cdot x \cdot M^{L/2}. \]

  Additionally, inspired by (20), we also lift the middle layer by integrating a Resnet structure into it. We call it a SwitchResnet. The rational will be explained in the description of the implementation later in this section.

- **Layer $H_{layer}(x,\ell)$**: similar to the $G_{layer}(x,\ell)$ layer.
• Layer $V_{layer}(x)$: similar to the $U_{layer}(x)$ layer.

We note that the application of $K^\omega$ assumes small perturbation around $\eta_0$ in the linearized setting, and to lift it up to deal with nonlinear inverse scattering, we still would like to honor these symmetries. In computation, we keep the linearity of every action except lifting the application of $M^{L/2}$ and its adjoint $(M^{L/2})^*$ to the nonlinear setting and representing them by a ResNet. This is summarized in the pseudo-code in Algorithm 3 see also [20]. We name the corresponding model as the compressed model.

Algorithm 3 The application of $(F^\omega)^*$ in the compressed model

```
Input: $A^\omega \in \mathbb{C}^{n_o \times n_c}$
Output: $(F^\omega)^* A^\omega \in \mathbb{C}^{n_o \times n_o}$
1: $x \leftarrow U_{layer}(A^\omega)$
2: while $\ell$ in range($((L-1), L/2 - 1, -1)$) do:
3:   $x \leftarrow G_{layer}(x, \ell)$
4: end while
5: $x \leftarrow \text{SwitchResnet}(x)$
6: while $\ell$ in range($L/2, L + 1, +1$) do:
7:   $x \leftarrow H_{layer}(x, \ell)$
8: end while
9: $x \leftarrow V_{layer}(x)$
10: return $x$
```

The reasoning for choosing everything linear but lifting the middle layer to SwitchResnet stems from the fact different layers are in charge of exchanging information at different levels. In particular, seen from Figure 2, $U^L$ and $V^L$ are block-diagonal matrices and thus are automatically in charge of local information change. $G^r$ and $H^r$ are in charge of exchanging information across neighboring blocks and thus the action is also local. $M^{L/2}$ finally is responsible for capturing the inherent non-locality of wave scattering. Since this action is taken on the condensed representation of the measured data, we choose to represent it using a non-linearly process.

There are multiple tricks in the implementation of different layers, and we glean through them below. As an example, we assume $A^\omega_R$ is an $80 \times 80$ matrix. As implied by the Form II of (26), $(K^\omega)^*$ (and similarly $K^\omega$) is applied on each individual column (row) of $A^\omega_R$ viewed as an independent vector, so below we describe the application of the network on one of the columns of the data matrix, which is an 80 dimensional vector. To deal with this vector, we divide it into $2^4$ chunks with each chunk containing 5 entries. As a result, calling $80 = 2^4 \times 5$, we set $L = 4$ and $s = 5$.

• Implementing the $U_{layer}$ and $V_{layer}$ layers: As shown in Figure 2, in the $U_{layer}$ and $V_{layer}$ layers, we sandwich the data by the block matrices $U^L$ and $V^L$. In the $U_{layer}$ layer, each block of $U^L$, denoted as $U^L_i$ with $i = 1, \ldots, 2^L = 16$ extracts a local representation of the $i$-th section of the vector (an $s$-dimensional vector) and represent it by a $r$-dimensional vector. Used in our setting, each of $U^L_i$, when applied to the $s = 5$-dimensional vector (the $i$-th section of the vector), produces a $r$-dimensional vector. In total, the procedure generates a $2^L r = 16r$-dimensional vector. The number of trainable weights in the matrix is therefore $2sr2^L$ after separating the real and complex channels. Similarly for the $V_{layer}$ layer, each block of $V$ transforms an $r$-dimensional local representation to a $s$-dimensional sampling points, which also requires $2sr2^L$ trainable weights.

• Implementing the $G_{layer}$ and $H_{layer}$ layers: In the $G_{layer}(x, \ell)$ layer, $(G^r)^*$ and $G^r$ are applied to $x$, and in the $H_{layer}(x, \ell)$ layer, $(H^r)^*$ and $H^r$ are applied to $x$. Observing the Figure 2, we see that in the $G_{layer}$ layer, two neighboring local representations are assimilated. Similarly, in the $H_{layer}$ layer, information in the representations will be decompressed by being splitted in two and locally redistributed. To implement the $G_{layer}$ and $H_{layer}$ layers, we decompose the corresponding matrices into row or column transformations and block matrices, so that after the row or column transformations, the application of the block matrices can be implemented the same way as in $U_{layer}$ and $V_{layer}$ layers. The number of trainable weights in both of the layers is therefore $4sr2^L$.

• Implementing the $M_{layer}$ layer: In the $M_{layer}$ layer, information are redistributed globally by the matri12ces $(M^{L/2})^*$ and $M^{L/2}$. The application of $M_{layer}$ layer is essentially the same as the $G_{layer}$ and $H_{layer}$ layers, where we apply the corresponding row or column transformations following by block matrices. Inspired by [20], we also integrate
a non-linearity module into the model by adding a ResNet of depth \( n_{SR} \) in the \( M \) layer. Hence, we have a total of \( 2n_{SR}^22^L \) trainable weights.

Compared to the uncompressed model, the compressed model exhibits slower scaling of the number of trainable parameters and the lower inference complexity. As explained at the end of Section 3.1, the number of trainable parameters of the filtering operator scales \( \mathcal{O}(n_{sc}^3) \) and the inference complexity of the filtering operator is \( \mathcal{O}(n_{sc}^2) \). Nevertheless, for the application of \((F^w)^*\) in the compressed model, the number of parameters scales \( 4sr^22^L + 8Lr^22^L + 2n_{SR}^22^L = \mathcal{O}(r^2n_{sc} \log n_{sc}) \), and the inference complexity is \( \mathcal{O}(r^2n_{sc} \log n_{sc}) \).

Therefore, for the compressed model, the complexity of the number of trainable parameters is \( \mathcal{O}(r^2n_{sc} \log n_{sc}) \) and the inference complexity is \( \mathcal{O}(r^2n_{sc}^2 \log n_{sc}) \). In Table 1 we present the complexity of the trainable parameters and the inference time complexity for the compressed model and the uncompressed model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>Compressed model</th>
<th>Uncompressed model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameters</td>
<td>( \mathcal{O}(r^2n_{sc} \log n_{sc}) )</td>
<td>( \mathcal{O}(n_{sc}^3) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference time</td>
<td>( \mathcal{O}(r^2n_{sc} \log n_{sc}) )</td>
<td>( \mathcal{O}(n_{sc}^2) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Complexity of the number of trainable parameters and inference complexity between the uncompressed and the compressed models. The complexity of the uncompressed model was discussed in the Section 3.1 and that of the compressed model was discussed in the Section 3.2.

4 Numerical Results

In this section, we provide numerical experiments to showcase the capabilities of the current algorithm. In summary, what to be presented below suggest two findings:

- Uncompressed model has the equivariance built in the formulation, leading to fewer trainable parameters. The amount of data needed for the training is consequently reduced. The performance of the numerical results are competitive compared to classical FWI and other NN models (such as wide-band butterfly network and Fourier neural operator) even with smaller amount of training points.
- Compressed model further reduces the number of trainable parameters by building in the butterfly structure. The performance of the model is biased towards media that are relatively smooth: The reconstruction of smooth media is accurate while the model loses the capability of capturing sub-Nyquist features.

We first discuss data structure in subsection 4.1. These will be followed by subsection 4.2 that discusses the uncompressed models. In subsections 4.3 we systematically compare reconstruction using various of means: The uncompressed model, the compressed model, the classical FWI and two other well-accepted NN models.

The data was generated using Matlab on a MacBook Air (M1, 2020). The algorithm usually took about 12 hours to generate a multi-frequency datasets of dimension \( n_{sc} = 80 \), of size 10000, and with source frequencies 2.5, 5.0, and 10.0 Hz. We coded the models presented in this paper using Tensorflow (2.4.1) and ran it on a PNY NVIDIA Quadro RTX 6000 graphics card. The training stage usually took about 5 minutes for 50 to 100 epochs, and the inference takes a fraction of a second, which is recorded in Table 3.

4.1 Datasets

The datasets consist of media and corresponding wide-band far-field patterns of three different frequencies. The far-field patterns as the data were generated by solving (2) using numerical finite difference method in Matlab. The computational domain was \([-0.5, 0.5]^2\) discretized with an equispaced mesh of \( 80 \times 80 \) points for medias of resolution \( 80 \times 80 \) pixels \( (n_y = 80) \). The radiation boundary conditions was implemented using the perfectly matched layer (PML) with order 2 and intensity 80. The wide-band data was sampled with a homogeneous background wave field \( \phi \) at source frequencies 2.5, 5, and 10 Hz, for which the effective wavelength is 8 points per wavelength (PPW). In particular, we use \( n_{sc} = 80 \) receivers and sources, where receivers geometry are aligned with the directions of sources, i.e. 80 equiangular directions. For media of different resolutions, we generate their far-field patterns by sampling at proportionally scaled frequencies.

In our experiments we use 5 different categories of media:

- The well-known Shepp-Logan phantom, which was created in 1974 by Larry Shepp and Benjamin F. Logan to represent a human head. The medium has a strong discontinuity modeling an uneven skull,
produced a strong reflection, which in return renders the recovery of the interior features challenging for classical methods.

- Random smooth perturbations, which are generated by smoothing out some randomly distributed points of some random values by a Gaussian kernel. They are used to study the behavior of the algorithm in the case of diffraction.
- Media consisting of triangles of different sizes, in particular, triangles of size 3, 5 and 10 number of pixels, which are randomly located and oriented, and it is possible for them to overlap with each other. In this case we test the capacity of the algorithm to image consisting of small scatterers that are below slightly sub-Nyquist in size. For clarity we name the dataset following the sizes of the triangles, e.g., '10h triangles' are composed of triangles with side length of 10 pixels.

In Figure 6, we provide one example for each of the five category. The training and the test are all conducted within one category.

Figure 6: Examples of the five different media used to bechmark the model (from left to right) Shepp-Logan phantom, smooth random perturbation, and the rotating triangles of different sizes.

4.2 Uncompressed Model

The uncompressed model has the equivariance built in. As a consequence, only a small number of parameters need to be trained, which in return requires fewer numbers of samples for the training. In what follows we demonstrate a few properties of uncompressed model. In particular, we will show

1. The sample complexity is rather low. The validation error quickly saturates as we increase the number of training points;
2. Similar as the classical FWI method, which produces better reconstruction with wide-band data, we observe similar performance using the uncompressed model;
3. Trained on media of finer resolution and scattered data of higher dimension that are generated by probing waves of higher frequencies produces more accurate results.

In Table 2, we show how the relative validation error depends on the number of training data points, and probing wave frequency for different media. The scattered field is generated using \( n_{sc} = 80 \) and the media in a domain is discretized with an equispaced mesh of \( n_\eta = 80 \). The number of trainable parameters for reconstruction with one frequency is 46530 and that for reconstruction with three frequencies is 99010. Clearly seen in the table, the wide-band data consistently produces more accurate reconstructions; the equivariance property helps to drastically reduce the number of training points (the accuracy has already stagnated using a few thousands training points). The illustration of the reconstruction is plotted in Figure 7 where we use wide-band frequency datasets and present results trained with different numbers of training points.

Moreover, we also observe the unstable behavior of the reconstruction for the random smooth perturbations, particularly in the diffractive regime, in the sense that the error of reconstruction increases as the frequency increases for a single frequency, which is often a sign of cycle-skipping. This is solved by using wide-band data. The model is able to super-resolve some simple geometrical figures, such as the small rotating triangles, which is often a challenging problem using classical optimization/signal processing tools. We are able to reconstruct triangles of size 3 pixels, even if the wavelength is around 8 pixels.

We also investigate how the number of trainable parameters scale according to the dimension of the data \( (n_{sc}) \). Richer data is expected to produce better reconstruction. In our setting, as the data increases its dimension \( (n_{sc}) \) becomes big, we expect the model to produce better results. To do so, we first randomly generate 1024 samples of media at a native resolution with \( n_\eta = 480 \) and downsample them to a coarser resolution using \( n_\eta = 60, 80, 120 \) and 160.
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Table 2: Relative test error of reconstruction given by the equivariant uncompressed model for different media, using data at different frequencies, and with different sizes of training set. Each experiment consisted of #Sample training points as recorded in the leftmost column and was tested against an independent testing dataset with 200 points. Each table denotes a set of experiments with the type of media indicated by the table’s name. Experiments on the first three column use monochromatic data sampled at source frequencies 2.5, 5, or 10 Hz, and experiments on the last column use wide-band data sampled consisting of data sampled at all three source frequencies.

At each coarse level of the media, we view the media as the reference and generate the wide-band far-field patterns using $n_{sc} = n_{tr}$, so that the frequencies of the probing waves scale proportionally to $n_{sc}$. This builds the dataset for the training. Upon validation, one projects the reconstruction back to the native resolution at $n_{tr} = 480$. In Table 3 we present at different coarse resolution, the number of trainable parameters, the average relative validation error at the training resolution level, and the relative validation error when the reconstruction gets interpolated back to the finest level (termed Rel err native res). In Figure 8 we plot one example of the reconstruction at different resolution levels.

It is clear that if the datasets are prepared at a finer resolution, the number of trainable parameters increases accordingly, and so does the training time. The validation errors, both the relative error on the training resolution, and the relative error when projected back to the native resolution, also decrease.

### 4.3 Compressed Model

The numerical performance of the uncompressed model established a baseline for our expectation. In this section we present the numerical results produced by the compressed model. Since the compressed model calls for the construction of the butterfly factorization, the number of trainable parameters is reduced.
Throughout our simulation, we use training points of resolution at $n_\eta = 80$. This translates to, using the notation from section 3.2, $L = 4$ and $s = 5$. In Figure 9 we compare the uncompressed model, compressed model results with the classical full-wave inversion that is performed by running the optimization with the lowest frequency first and using the previous results for the optimizations with the higher frequencies iteratively. It is clear that:

1. Both the uncompressed model and the compressed model both achieve higher accuracy on all five kinds of media than the classical FWI;

2. The compressed model has difficulty capturing super-resolution. It performs relatively well for 5h triangles, but lost the super-resolution for 3h triangle cases.

We also compare both the uncompressed and the compressed model with two widely accepted NN models: the wide-band butterfly network (WBBN) from [20], and the Fourier neural operator (FNO) from [16]. In the simulation, the datasets consisting of 2048 training points of resolution $n_\eta = 80$ are used to train the Uncompressed, the Compressed models. The wide-band butterfly network and the Fourier neural operator include more trainable parameters and thus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution \ Attributes</th>
<th>#Parameters</th>
<th>Av inference time</th>
<th>Rel err train res</th>
<th>Rel err native res</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>70906</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>9.623 %</td>
<td>27.719 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>88186</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>7.286 %</td>
<td>22.854 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>137146</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>6.370 %</td>
<td>11.192 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>205306</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>5.886 %</td>
<td>7.223 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Statistics of the equivariant models for different resolutions of the Shepp-Logan dataset. The table shows the number of trainable parameters and the average inference time for the uncompressed model for Shepp-Logan phantom training points of resolution $n_\eta = 60, 80, 120, $ and $160$. The last two columns records relative errors at the training resolution and at the native resolution for each test.

Figure 8: Instances of the reconstruction of the Shepp-Logan phantom at different resolutions using the uncompressed method. In particular, the back-scattering operation of the method has more trainable weights catering to the larger input size, and the filtering operation, approximated by the 2D convolutional NN, has the same kernel size, number of filters and depth for all experiments. The left to right: the original Shepp-Logan phantom at its native resolution $n_\eta = 480$, the other four pictures are reconstructions of the downsampled media of size: $n_\eta = 60, 80, 120$ and $160$ using training points of corresponding dimension: $n_{sc} = 60, 80, 120$ and $160$, respectively. The training points of higher resolutions are generated with probing wave of higher frequencies: $\frac{2.5}{80} n_{sc}$, $\frac{5}{80} n_{sc}$, and $\frac{10}{80} n_{sc}$ Hz.

we use a larger datasets. The number of trainable parameters and the validation errors are listed in Table 4. In the case of Shepp-Logan phantom and the smooth perturbations, the performance of all four NN models is comparable even though the numbers of trainable parameters are drastically smaller for the compressed and uncompressed models. The compressed model, however, is not capable to super-resolve sub Nyquist features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media \ Model</th>
<th>Uncompressed</th>
<th>Compressed</th>
<th>WBBN</th>
<th>FNO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#parameters</td>
<td>88186</td>
<td>73210</td>
<td>1914061</td>
<td>1188385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepp-Logan</td>
<td>5.124 %</td>
<td>8.306 %</td>
<td>6.803 %</td>
<td>7.981 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random smooth</td>
<td>3.957 %</td>
<td>6.866 %</td>
<td>4.290 %</td>
<td>4.289 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10h triangles</td>
<td>7.068 %</td>
<td>15.751 %</td>
<td>2.858 %</td>
<td>42.633 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5h triangles</td>
<td>6.061 %</td>
<td>16.144 %</td>
<td>3.521 %</td>
<td>47.692 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3h triangles</td>
<td>5.902 %</td>
<td>38.651 %</td>
<td>5.119 %</td>
<td>49.348 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Comparison of the relative validation errors for various NN models in the five different media categories. The medias reconstructed have resolution $n_\eta = 80$. The data is generated using probing wave of frequencies 2.5, 5, and 10 Hz.

5 Conclusion

In this manuscript, we perform numerical study on using various neuron networks to solve the 2D inverse scattering problem. In particular, we propose to build equivariance properties and the butterfly structures in the NN architecture design. By leveraging the underlying equivariance of the problem, we propose a model (termed the uncompressed model) that respects the equivariance of the back-scatter operator and reduces the number of trainable parameters, and by incorporating butterfly expansion structure we propose the second model (termed the compressed model) that further reduces the number of trainable parameters. The two models both outperform the classical FWI. For smooth media, they perform equally well as other NN architectures with fewer trainable parameters and smaller training sets, but the compressed model lost the super-resolution on sub-Nyquist features during the compression procedure.
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Figure 9: Comparisons of reconstructions of various media by the uncompressed model, the compressed model, and the classical FWI. The media used are the Shepp-Logan phantom (the first row), the random smooth perturbations (the second row), and rotating triangles of different sizes.