

# Inverse medium scattering problems with Kalman filter techniques I. Linear case

Takashi Furuya<sup>1</sup> and Roland Potthast<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics, Hokkaido University, Japan

<sup>1</sup>Email: takashi.furuya0101@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Data Assimilation Unit, Deutscher Wetterdienst, Germany

<sup>1</sup>Email: Roland.Potthast@dwd.de

## Abstract

In this paper, we study the inverse acoustic medium scattering problem to reconstruct the unknown inhomogeneous medium from far field patterns of scattered waves. We propose the reconstruction scheme based on the Kalman filter, which becomes possible to sequentially estimate the inhomogeneous medium. We also show that in the linear inverse problem, the estimation for the Kalman filter is equivalent to that for the Tikhonov regularization. Finally, we give numerical examples to demonstrate our proposed method.

**Key words.** Inverse acoustic scattering, Inhomogeneous medium, Far field pattern, Tikhonov regularization, Kalman filter.

## 1 Introduction

The inverse scattering problem is the problem to determine unknown scatterers by measuring scattered waves that is generated by sending incident waves far away from scatterers. It is of importance for many applications, for example medical imaging, nondestructive testing, remote exploration, and geophysical prospecting. Due to many applications, the inverse scattering problem has been studied in various ways. For further readings, we refer to the following books [7, 9, 12, 27, 33], which include the summary of classical and recent progress of the inverse scattering problem.

We begin with the mathematical formulation of the scattering problem. Let  $k > 0$  be the wave number, and let  $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$  be incident direction. We denote the incident field  $u^{inc}(\cdot, \theta)$  with the direction  $\theta$  by the plane wave of the form

$$u^{inc}(x, \theta) := e^{ikx \cdot \theta}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (1.1)$$

Let  $Q$  be a bounded domain and let its exterior  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{Q}$  be connected. We assume that  $q \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ , which refers to the inhomogeneous medium, satisfies  $\text{Im} q \geq 0$ , and its support  $\text{supp } q$  is embed into  $Q$ , that is  $\text{supp } q \Subset Q$ . Then, the direct scattering problem is to determine the total field  $u = u^{sca} + u^{inc}$  such that

$$\Delta u + k^2(1 + q)u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (1.2)$$

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{r} \left( \frac{\partial u^{sca}}{\partial r} - ik u^{sca} \right) = 0, \quad (1.3)$$

where  $r = |x|$ . The *Sommerfeld radiation condition* (1.3) holds uniformly in all directions  $\hat{x} := \frac{x}{|x|}$ . Furthermore, the problem (1.2)–(1.3) is equivalent to the *Lippmann-Schwinger integral equation*

$$u(x, \theta) = u^{inc}(x, \theta) + k^2 \int_Q q(y)u(y, \theta)\Phi(x, y)dy, \quad (1.4)$$

where  $\Phi(x, y)$  denotes the fundamental solution to Helmholtz equation in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , that is,

$$\Phi(x, y) := \frac{i}{4}H_0^{(1)}(k|x - y|), \quad x \neq y, \quad (1.5)$$

where  $H_0^{(1)}$  is the Hankel function of the first kind of order one. It is well known that there exists a unique solution  $u^{sca}$  of the problem (1.2)–(1.3), and it has the following asymptotic behaviour,

$$u^{sca}(x, \theta) = \frac{e^{ikr}}{\sqrt{r}} \left\{ u^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta) + O(1/r) \right\}, \quad r \rightarrow \infty, \quad \hat{x} := \frac{x}{|x|}. \quad (1.6)$$

The function  $u^\infty$  is called the *far field pattern* of  $u^{sca}$ , and it has the form

$$u^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta) = \frac{k^2}{4\pi} \int_Q e^{-ik\hat{x}\cdot y} u(y, \theta) q(y) dy =: \mathcal{F}_\theta q(\hat{x}), \quad (1.7)$$

where the far field mapping  $\mathcal{F}_\theta : L^2(Q) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)$  is defined in the second equality for each incident direction  $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ . For further details of these direct scattering problems, we refer to Chapter 8 of [12].

We consider the inverse scattering problem to reconstruct the function  $q$  from the far field pattern  $u^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta_n)$  for all directions  $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{S}^1$  and several directions  $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^N \subset \mathbb{S}^1$  with some  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , and one fixed wave number  $k > 0$ . It is well known that the function  $q$  is uniquely determined from the far field pattern  $u^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta)$  for all  $\hat{x}, \theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$  and one fixed  $k > 0$  (see, e.g., [6, 34, 37]), but the uniqueness for several incident plane wave is an open question. For impenetrable obstacle scattering case, if we assume that the shape of scatterer is a polyhedron or ball, then the uniqueness for a single incident plane wave is proved (see [2, 10, 31, 30]). Recently in [1], they showed the Lipschitz stability for inverse medium scattering with finite measurements  $\{u^\infty(\hat{x}_i, \theta_j)\}_{i,j=1,\dots,N}$  for large  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  under the assumption that the true function belongs to some compact and convex subset of finite-dimensional subspace.

Our problem for equation (1.7) with finite measurements  $\{u^\infty(\cdot, \theta_n)\}_{n=1}^N$  is not only ill-posed, but also nonlinear, that is, the far field mappings  $\mathcal{F}_\theta$  is nonlinear because  $u(\cdot, \theta)$  in (1.7) is a solution for the Lippmann-Schwinger integral equation (1.4), which depends on  $q$ . Existing methods for solving nonlinear inverse problem can be roughly categorized into two groups: iterative optimization methods and qualitative methods. The iterative optimization method (see e.g., [4, 12, 15, 19, 25]) does not require many measurements, however it require the initial guess which is the starting point of the iteration. It must be appropriately chosen by a priori knowledge of the unknown function  $q$ , otherwise,

the iterative solution could not converge to the true function. On the other hand, the qualitative method such as the linear sampling method [11], the no-response test [20], the probe method [21], the factorization method [28], and the singular sources method [36], does not require the initial guess and it is computationally faster than the iterative method. However, the disadvantage of the qualitative method is to require uncountable many measurements. For the survey of the qualitative method, we refer to [33]. Recently in [22, 32], they suggested the reconstruction method from a single incident plane wave although the rigorous justifications are lacked.

If the total field  $u$  in (1.7) is replaced by the incident field  $u^{inc}$ , the nonlinear equation (1.7) is transformed into the linear equation

$$u_B^\infty(\hat{x}, \theta) = \frac{k^2}{4\pi} \int_Q e^{-ik\hat{x}\cdot y} u^{inc}(y, \theta) q(y) dy =: \mathcal{F}_{B, \theta} q(\hat{x}), \quad (1.8)$$

which is known as the *Born approximation*. The function  $u_B^\infty$  is a good approximation of the far field pattern  $u^\infty$  when  $k > 0$  and the value of  $q$  are very small (see (1.4)). Another interpretation is that the Born approximation is the Fréchet derivative of the far field mapping  $\mathcal{F}$  at  $q = 0$ . For further readings of the inverse scattering problem with the Born approximation, we refer to [4, 5, 12, 26, 38]. In this paper, we study the linear integral equation (1.8) instead of the nonlinear one (1.7). This paper is the first part of our works, and in the forthcoming paper, we will study the nonlinear integral equation (1.7).

Although the inverse scattering problem become linear by the Born approximation, the linear equation (1.8) is ill-posed, which means that there does not generally exist the inverse  $\mathcal{F}_{B, \theta}^{-1}$  of the operator  $\mathcal{F}_{B, \theta}$ . A common technique to solve linear and ill-posed inverse problems is the *Tikhonov regularization method* (see e.g., [7, 18, 29, 33]). A natural approach applying regularization method to our situation is to put all available measurements  $\{u_B^\infty(\cdot, \theta_n)\}_{n=1}^N$  and all far field mappings  $\{\mathcal{F}_{B, \theta_n}\}_{n=1}^N$  into one long vectors  $\vec{u}_B^\infty$  and  $\vec{\mathcal{F}}_B$ , respectively, and to apply the Tikhonov regularization method to the big system equation  $\vec{u}_B^\infty = \vec{\mathcal{F}}_B q$ . We shall call this way the *Full data Tikhonov*.

In this paper, we propose the reconstruction scheme based on *Kalman filter*. The Kalman filter (see the original paper [24]) is the algorithm to estimate the unknown state in the dynamics system by using the time sequential measurements. It has many applications such as navigations and tracking objects, and for further readings, we refer to [16, 23, 24, 33].

The contributions of this paper are the following.

- (A) We propose the reconstruction algorithm for solving the linear inverse scattering problem (1.8) based on the Kalman Filter (see (4.21)–(4.23)).
- (B) We show that in the linear problem, the Full data Tikhonov is equivalent to the Kalman Filter (see Theorem 4.3).

(A) means that we can estimate the unknown function  $q$  by updating every time to give the far field pattern  $u_B^\infty(\cdot, \theta_n)$  with one incident direction  $\theta_n$  without waiting for

all measurements  $\{u_B^\infty(\cdot, \theta_n)\}_{n=1}^N$ . Furthermore, (B) means that the final solution of the Kalman filter coincides with the solution  $q_N^{FT}$  of the Full data Tikhonov when the same initial guess is employed. The advantage of the Kalman filter over the Full data Tikhonov is that we do not require to construct the big system equation  $\vec{u}_B^\infty = \vec{\mathcal{F}}_B q$ , which reduces computational costs. Instead, we update not only state, but also the weight of the norm for the state space, which is associated with the update of the covariance matrices of the state in the statistical viewpoint (see Section 5).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly recall the Tikhonov regularization theory. In Sections 3, we give the algorithm of the Full data Tikhonov. In Section 4, we give the algorithm of the Kalman filter, and show that it is equivalent to the Full data Tikhonov. In section 5, we discuss the stochastic viewpoints of Kalman filter. Finally in Section 6, we give numerical examples to demonstrate our theoretical results.

## 2 Tikhonov regularization method

Tikhonov regularization is the method to provide the stable approximate solution for linear and ill-posed inverse problem. In this section, we briefly recall the regularization approach. For further readings, we refer to e.g., [7, 18, 29, 33]. In Sections 2–5, we consider the general functional analytic situation of our inverse scattering problem.

Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Hilbert spaces over complex variables  $\mathbb{C}$ , which are associated with the state space  $L^2(Q)$  of the inhomogeneous medium function  $q$ , and the observation space  $L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)$  of the far field pattern  $u^\infty$ , respectively, and let  $A : X \rightarrow Y$  be a compact linear operator from  $X$  to  $Y$ , which is associated with the observation operator  $\mathcal{F}_B : L^2(Q) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)$  defined in (1.8) as the far field mapping. We consider the following problem to determine  $\varphi \in X$  given  $f \in Y$ .

$$A\varphi = f. \quad (2.1)$$

Since the observation operator  $A$  is not generally invertible, the equation (2.1) is replaced by

$$\alpha\varphi + A^*A\varphi = A^*f, \quad (2.2)$$

which was derived from the multiplication with the adjoint  $A^*$  of the operator  $A$  and the addition of  $\alpha\varphi$  where the regularization parameter  $\alpha > 0$  in (2.1). We call the solution  $\varphi_\alpha$  of the equation (2.2) the regularized solution of (2.1). The following lemma is well known as the properties of the regularized solution  $\varphi_\alpha$  (see e.g., Chapter 4 of [12], Section 4 of [17], and Chapter 3 of [33]).

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Hilbert spaces and let  $A : X \rightarrow Y$  be a compact linear operator from  $X$  to  $Y$ . Then, followings hold.*

- (i) *(Theorems 4.13 in [12]) The operator  $(\alpha I + A^*A)$  is bounded invertible.*
- (ii) *(Theorem 4.14 in [12]) There exists a unique  $\varphi_\alpha$  such that*

$$\alpha \|\varphi\|_X^2 + \|f - A\varphi\|_Y^2 = \inf_{\varphi \in X} \left\{ \alpha \|\varphi\|_X^2 + \|f - A\varphi\|_Y^2 \right\}. \quad (2.3)$$

The minimizer  $\varphi_\alpha$  is given by the unique solution of (2.2) which has the form

$$\varphi_\alpha = (\alpha I + A^* A)^{-1} A^* f, \quad (2.4)$$

and depends continuously on  $f$ .

- (iii) (Lemma 3.2.2 in [33] and Section 4.3 of [17]) Let  $X$  be finite-dimensional. Then, we have

$$\varphi_\alpha \rightarrow A^\dagger f, \quad \alpha \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.5)$$

if  $f \in \text{R}(A)$  where the operator  $A^\dagger$  is the pseudo inverse of the operator  $A$  defined by  $A^\dagger := (A^* A)^{-1} A^*$ . Furthermore,  $A^\dagger f$  is the least squares solution, which is minimizer of the following problem

$$\|A\varphi - f\| = \min_{\varphi \in X} \{\|A\varphi - f\|_Y\}. \quad (2.6)$$

- (iv) (Theorem 3.1.8 in [33]) Let  $A$  be injective, and let  $f$  be of the form  $f = A\varphi^*$ . Then, we have

$$\varphi_\alpha \rightarrow \varphi^*, \quad \alpha \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.7)$$

- (v) (Theorem 3.1.10 in [33]) Let  $A$  be injective. If  $f \in \text{R}(A)$ , then there exists  $C = C_f$  such that

$$\|\varphi_\alpha\| \leq C, \quad \alpha > 0, \quad (2.8)$$

and if  $f \notin \text{R}(A)$ , then  $\|\varphi_\alpha\|_X \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ .

**Remark 2.2.** We observe from (iii) that if  $X$  is finite-dimensional and  $f = A\varphi_{true}$  where  $\varphi_{true}$  is the true solution of (2.1), the regularized solution  $\varphi_\alpha$  converges to the least squares solution  $A^\dagger A\varphi_{true}$ . We remark that the operator  $A^\dagger A$  is an orthogonal projection onto  $\text{R}(A^*) = \text{N}(A)^\perp$  (see Lemma 3.2.3 in [33]). Therefore, in addition if the operator  $A$  is injective, then the least squares solution  $A^\dagger A\varphi_{true}$  coincides with the true solution  $\varphi_{true}$ .

### 3 Full data Tikhonov

The natural approach for solving the equation (1.8) is to put all available measurements  $\{u_{B,n}^\infty\}_{n=1}^N$  and all far field mappings  $\{\mathcal{F}_{B,n}\}_{n=1}^N$ , where the index  $n$  is associated with some incident angle  $\theta_n \in \mathbb{S}^1$ , into one long vector  $\vec{u}_B^\infty$  and  $\vec{\mathcal{F}}_B$ , respectively, and to employ the regularized approach discussed in the Section 2. In order to study the above general situation, let  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in Y$  be measurements, let  $A_1, \dots, A_N$  be observation operators, and let us consider the problem to determine  $\varphi \in X$  such that

$$A_n \varphi = f_n, \quad (3.1)$$

for all  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . Now, we assume that we have the initial guess  $\varphi_0 \in X$ , which is the starting point of the algorithm, and is appropriately determined by a priori information

of the true solution  $\varphi^{true}$ . Then, we consider the minimization problem of the following functional.

$$\begin{aligned} J_{Full,N}(\varphi) &:= \alpha \|\varphi - \varphi_0\|_X^2 + \left\| \vec{f} - \vec{A}\varphi \right\|_{Y^N, R^{-1}}^2 \\ &= \alpha \|\varphi - \varphi_0\|_X^2 + \sum_{n=1}^N \|f_n - A_n\varphi\|_{Y, R^{-1}}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where  $\vec{f} := \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ \vdots \\ f_N \end{pmatrix}$ , and  $\vec{A} := \begin{pmatrix} A_1 \\ \vdots \\ A_N \end{pmatrix}$ . The norm  $\|\cdot\|_{Y, R^{-1}}^2 := \langle \cdot, R^{-1}\cdot \rangle_Y$  is a weighted norm with a positive definite symmetric invertible operator  $R : Y \rightarrow Y$ , which is interpreted as the covariance matrices of the observation error distribution from a statistical viewpoint in the case when  $Y$  is the Euclidean space (see Section 5). With  $\tilde{\varphi} = \varphi - \varphi_0$ , the problem (3.1) is transformed into

$$\tilde{J}_{Full,N}(\tilde{\varphi}) := \alpha \|\tilde{\varphi}\|_X^2 + \left\| (\vec{f} - \vec{A}\varphi_0) - \vec{A}\tilde{\varphi} \right\|_{Y^N}^2. \quad (3.3)$$

By Lemma 2.1, the minimizer  $\tilde{\varphi}_\alpha$  of (3.3) is given by

$$\tilde{\varphi}_\alpha = (\alpha I + \vec{A}^* \vec{A})^{-1} \vec{A}^* (\vec{f} - \vec{A}\varphi_0), \quad (3.4)$$

which implies that

$$\varphi_N^{FT} := \varphi_0 + (\alpha I + \vec{A}^* \vec{A})^{-1} \vec{A}^* (\vec{f} - \vec{A}\varphi_0), \quad (3.5)$$

is the minimizer of (3.2). We call this the *Full data Tikhonov*. Here,  $\vec{A}^*$  is the adjoint operator with respect to  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X$  and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{Y^N, R^{-1}}$ . We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \vec{f}, \vec{A}\varphi \rangle_{Y^N, R^{-1}} &= \sum_{n=1}^N \langle f_n, R^{-1} A_n \varphi \rangle_Y \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \langle A_n^H R^{-1} f_n, \varphi \rangle_X = \langle \vec{A}^H R^{-1} \vec{f}, \varphi \rangle_X \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

which implies that

$$\vec{A}^* = \vec{A}^H R^{-1} \quad (3.7)$$

where  $A_n^H$  and  $\vec{A}^H$  are the adjoint operator with respect to usual scalar products  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X$ ,  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_Y$  and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X$ ,  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{Y^N}$ , respectively. Then, the Full data Tikhonov solution in (3.5) is of the form

$$\varphi_N^{FT} = \varphi_0 + \left( \alpha I + \vec{A}^H R^{-1} \vec{A} \right)^{-1} \vec{A}^H R^{-1} (\vec{f} - \vec{A}\varphi_0). \quad (3.8)$$

However, the solution (3.8) of the Full data Tikhonov is computationally expensive when the number  $N$  of measurements is increasing in which we have to construct the bigger system  $\vec{A}\varphi = \vec{f}$ . So, let us consider the alternative approach based on the Kalman filter in the next section.

## 4 Kalman filter

The Kalman filter is the algorithm to estimate the unknown state in the dynamics system by using the sequential measurements over time. In the usual Kalman filter, the model operator to describe the process of the state in the dynamics system is defined (see e.g., Chapter 5 of [33]). In our problem, it corresponds to the identity mapping because unknown function  $q$  does not develop over time.

Let us formulate the Kalman filter algorithm based on the functional analytic situation using the same notations described in Sections 2 and 3. In [13, 33], the similar arguments of the following was discussed in the special case when  $X$  and  $Y$  are the Euclidean spaces. In this section, we discuss more general situation, that is, the Hilbert space over complex variables  $\mathbb{C}$ , which is applicable to our inverse scattering problem.

First, we consider the following minimization problem when one measurement  $f_1 \in Y$ , observation operator  $A_1$ , and the initial guess  $\varphi_0 \in X$  are given.

$$J_1(\varphi) := \alpha \|\varphi - \varphi_0\|_X^2 + \|f_1 - A_1\varphi\|_{Y,R^{-1}}^2. \quad (4.1)$$

By using a weighted norm  $\|\cdot\|_{X,B_0^{-1}}^2 := \langle \cdot, B_0^{-1} \cdot \rangle_X$  where  $B_0 := \frac{1}{\alpha}I$ , the functional  $J_1$  can be of the form

$$J_1(\varphi) = \|\varphi - \varphi_0\|_{X,B_0^{-1}}^2 + \|f_1 - A_1\varphi\|_{Y,R^{-1}}^2, \quad (4.2)$$

and its unique minimizer  $\varphi_1$  is given by

$$\varphi_1 := \varphi_0 + (I + A_1^* A_1)^{-1} A_1^* (f_1 - A_1 \varphi_0), \quad (4.3)$$

where  $A_1^*$  is the adjoint operator with respect to weighted scalar products  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{X,B_0^{-1}}$  and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{Y,R^{-1}}$ . We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f_1, A_1 \varphi \rangle_{Y,R^{-1}} &= \langle f_1, R^{-1} A_1 \varphi \rangle_Y \\ &= \langle A_1^H R^{-1} f_1, \varphi \rangle_X \\ &= \langle B_0 A_1^H R^{-1} f_1, \varphi \rangle_{X,B_0^{-1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

which implies that

$$A_1^* = B_0 A_1^H R^{-1}, \quad (4.5)$$

where  $A_1^H$  is the adjoint operator with respect to usual scalar products  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X$  and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_Y$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_1 &= \varphi_0 + (I + B_0 A_1^H R^{-1} A_1)^{-1} B_0 A_1^H R^{-1} (f_1 - A_1 \varphi_0) \\ &= \varphi_0 + (B_0^{-1} + A_1^H R^{-1} A_1)^{-1} A_1^H R^{-1} (f_1 - A_1 \varphi_0). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Next, we assume that one more measurement  $f_2 \in Y$  and observation operator  $H_2$  are given. The functional for two measurements is given by

$$\begin{aligned} J_{Full,2}(\varphi) &:= \|\varphi - \varphi_0\|_{X,B_0^{-1}}^2 + \|f_1 - A_1\varphi\|_{Y,R^{-1}}^2 + \|f_2 - A_2\varphi\|_{Y,R^{-1}}^2 \\ &= J_1(\varphi) + \|f_2 - A_2\varphi\|_{Y,R^{-1}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

The question is whether we can find  $B_1$  such that  $J_{Full,2}(\varphi) = J_2(\varphi) + c$  where  $c$  is a constant number independently of  $\varphi$ , and the functional  $J_2(\varphi)$  is defined by

$$J_2(\varphi) = \|\varphi - \varphi_1\|_{X,B_1}^2 + \|f_2 - A_2\varphi\|_{Y,R^{-1}}^2, \quad (4.8)$$

where  $\varphi_1$  is defined by (4.6). To answer this question, we show the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Set  $B_1 := (B_0^{-1} + A_1^H R^{-1} A_1)^{-1}$ . Then,*

$$J_1(\varphi) = \|\varphi - \varphi_1\|_{X,B_1}^2 + c, \quad (4.9)$$

where  $c$  is some constant independently of  $\varphi$ .

*Proof.* We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(\varphi) &= \langle \varphi - \varphi_0, B_0^{-1}(\varphi - \varphi_0) \rangle_X + \langle f_1 - A_1\varphi, R^{-1}(f_1 - A_1\varphi) \rangle_Y \\ &= \langle \varphi, B_0^{-1}\varphi \rangle_X - 2\operatorname{Re} \langle \varphi, B_0^{-1}\varphi_0 \rangle_X + \langle \varphi_0, B_0^{-1}\varphi_0 \rangle_X \\ &\quad + \langle f_1, R^{-1}f_1 \rangle_Y - 2\operatorname{Re} \langle \varphi, A_1^H R^{-1}f_1 \rangle_X + \langle \varphi, A_1^H R^{-1}A_1\varphi \rangle_X \\ &= \langle \varphi, B_0^{-1}\varphi \rangle_X - 2\operatorname{Re} \langle \varphi, B_0^{-1}\varphi_0 \rangle_X - 2\operatorname{Re} \langle \varphi, A_1^H R^{-1}f_1 \rangle_X \\ &\quad + \langle \varphi, A_1^H R^{-1}A_1\varphi \rangle_X + c_0 \\ &= \langle \varphi, B_1^{-1}\varphi \rangle_X - 2\operatorname{Re} \langle \varphi, B_0^{-1}\varphi_0 \rangle_X - 2\operatorname{Re} \langle \varphi, A_1^H R^{-1}f_1 \rangle_X + c_0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where we used  $B_1^{-1} = (B_0^{-1} + A_1^H R^{-1} A_1)$ . By (4.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_1^{-1}(\varphi - \varphi_1) &= B_1^{-1}\varphi - B_1^{-1}\varphi_1 \\ &= B_1^{-1}\varphi - (B_0^{-1} + A_1^H R^{-1} A_1)\varphi_0 - A_1^H R^{-1}(f - A_1\varphi_0) \\ &= B_1^{-1}\varphi - B_0^{-1}\varphi_0 - A_1^H R^{-1}f_1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

By using (4.11) and the self-adjointness of  $B_1^{-1}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \varphi - \varphi_1, B_1^{-1}(\varphi - \varphi_1) \rangle_X \\ &= \langle \varphi - \varphi_1, B_1^{-1}\varphi - B_0^{-1}\varphi_0 - A_1^H R^{-1}f_1 \rangle_X \\ &= \langle B_1^{-1}(\varphi - \varphi_1), \varphi \rangle_X - \langle \varphi, B_0^{-1}\varphi_0 \rangle_X - \langle \varphi, A_1^H R^{-1}f \rangle_X + c_1 \\ &= \langle B_1^{-1}\varphi - B_0^{-1}\varphi_0 - A_1^H R^{-1}f, \varphi \rangle_X \\ &\quad - \langle \varphi, B_0^{-1}\varphi_0 \rangle_X - \langle \varphi, A_1^H R^{-1}f \rangle_X + c_1 \\ &= \langle \varphi, B_1^{-1}\varphi \rangle_X - 2\operatorname{Re} \langle \varphi, B_0^{-1}\varphi_0 \rangle_X - 2\operatorname{Re} \langle \varphi, A_1^H R^{-1}f_1 \rangle_X + c_1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

With (4.10) and (4.12),  $J_1(\varphi)$  is of the form

$$J_1(\varphi) = \langle \varphi - \varphi_1, B_1^{-1}(\varphi - \varphi_1) \rangle_X + c_2. \quad (4.13)$$

where  $c_0$ ,  $c_1$ , and  $c_2$  are some constant numbers independently of  $\varphi$ . Lemma 4.1 has been shown.  $\square$



This lemma tells us that  $J_{Full,2}(\varphi)$  is equivalent to  $J_2(\varphi)$  in the sense of minimization with respect to  $\varphi$ . By the same argument in (4.2)–(4.6), its unique minimizer  $\varphi_2$  is given by

$$\varphi_2 := \varphi_1 + (B_1^{-1} + A_2^H R^{-1} A_2)^{-1} A_2^H R^{-1} (f_2 - A_2 \varphi_1). \quad (4.14)$$

We can repeat the above arguments (4.1)–(4.14) until all measurements  $f_1, \dots, f_n$  and all observation operators  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  are given. Then, we have following algorithms

$$\varphi_n := \varphi_{n-1} + K_n (f_n - A_n \varphi_{n-1}), \quad (4.15)$$

where the operator

$$K_n := (B_{n-1}^{-1} + A_n^H R^{-1} A_n)^{-1} A_n^H R^{-1}, \quad (4.16)$$

is called the *Kalman gain matrix*, and  $B_n$  is defined by

$$B_n := (B_{n-1}^{-1} + A_n^H R^{-1} A_n)^{-1}. \quad (4.17)$$

Since we have

$$\begin{aligned} (B_{n-1}^{-1} + A_n^H R^{-1} A_n) B_{n-1} A_n^H &= A_n^H + A_n^H R^{-1} A_n B_{n-1} A_n^H \\ &= A_n^H R^{-1} (R + A_n B_{n-1} A_n^H), \end{aligned}$$

the Kalman gain matrix  $K_n$  can be of the form

$$K_n = B_{n-1} A_n^H (R + A_n B_{n-1} A_n^H)^{-1}.$$

Here, we show the following lemma that the operator  $B_n$  has another form.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $K_n$  be the Kalman gain matrix defined in (4.16). Then, the operator  $B_n$  has the following form*

$$B_n = (I - K_n A_n) B_{n-1}. \quad (4.18)$$

*Proof.* By multiplying (4.16) by  $(B_{n-1}^{-1} + A_n^H R^{-1} A_n)$  from the left hand side, and by  $A_n$  from right hand side, we have

$$(B_{n-1}^{-1} + A_n^H R^{-1} A_n) K_n A_n = A_n^H R^{-1} A_n, \quad (4.19)$$

which implies that by using (4.17)

$$\begin{aligned} B_n^{-1} (I - K_n A_n) &= (B_{n-1}^{-1} + A_n^H R^{-1} A_n) (I - K_n A_n) \\ &= (B_{n-1}^{-1} + A_n^H R^{-1} A_n) - A_n^H R^{-1} A_n \\ &= B_{n-1}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

Multiplying (4.20) by  $B_n$  from the left hand side, and by  $B_{n-1}$  from the right hand side, we finally get (4.18).  $\square$

We summarize the update formula in the following.

$$\varphi_n^{KF} := \varphi_{n-1}^{KF} + K_n (f_n - A_n \varphi_{n-1}^{KF}), \quad (4.21)$$

$$K_n := B_{n-1} A_n^H (R + A_n B_{n-1} A_n^H)^{-1}, \quad (4.22)$$

$$B_n := (I - K_n A_n^H) B_{n-1}, \quad (4.23)$$

for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ , where  $\varphi_0^{KF} := \varphi_0$  and  $B_0 := \frac{1}{\alpha} I$ . We call this the *Kalman filter*.

We observe the above algorithm. It means that we can estimate the state  $\varphi$  every time  $n$  to observe one measurement  $f_n$  without waiting all measurements  $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^N$ . It includes not only the update (4.21) of the state  $\varphi$ , but also the update (4.23) of the weight  $B$  of the norm, which plays the role of keeping the information of the previous state. In finite dimensional setting, the weight  $B$  is also interpreted as the covariance matrices of the state error distribution from statistical viewpoint (see Section 5).

Finally in this section, we show the equivalence of Full data Tikhonov and Kalman filter when all observation operators  $A_n$  are linear.

**Theorem 4.3.** *For measurements  $f_1, \dots, f_N$ , linear operators  $A_1, \dots, A_N$ , and the initial guess  $\varphi_0 \in X$ , the final state of the Kalman filter given by (4.21)–(4.23) is equivalent to the state of the Full data Tikhonov given by (3.8), that is*

$$\varphi_N^{KF} = \varphi_N^{FT}. \quad (4.24)$$

*Proof.* It is sufficient to show that

$$J_{Full,N}(\varphi) = \|\varphi - \varphi_N^{KF}\|_{X, B_N^{-1}}^2 + c_N, \quad (4.25)$$

where  $c_N$  is some constant independently of  $\varphi$ . We will prove (4.25) by the induction. The case of  $N = 1$  has already been shown in Lemma 4.1.

We assume that (4.25) in the case of  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $1 \leq n \leq N - 1$  holds, that is,

$$J_{Full,n}(\varphi) = \|\varphi - \varphi_n^{KF}\|_{X, B_n^{-1}}^2 + c_n, \quad (4.26)$$

where  $c_n$  is some constant. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_{Full,n+1}(\varphi) &= J_{Full,n}(\varphi) + \|f_{n+1} - A_{n+1}\varphi\|_{Y, R^{-1}}^2 \\ &= \|\varphi - \varphi_n^{KF}\|_{X, B_n^{-1}}^2 + \|f_{n+1} - A_{n+1}\varphi\|_{Y, R^{-1}}^2 + c_n. \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

By the same argument in Lemma 4.1 replacing  $B_0, \varphi_0, f_1, A_1$  by  $B_n, \varphi_n, f_{n+1}, A_{n+1}$ , respectively, we have that  $J_{Full,n+1}(\varphi) = \|\varphi - \varphi_{n+1}^{KF}\|_{X, B_{n+1}^{-1}}^2 + c_{n+1}$ . Theorem 4.3 has been shown.  $\square$

**Remark 4.4.** If  $\vec{f}$  is true measurement, i.e.,  $\vec{A}\varphi_{true} = \vec{f}$  and  $\vec{A}$  is injective, then our Kalman filter solution  $\varphi_N^{KF} = \varphi_N^{FT}$ , which is equal to the Full data Tikhonov solution  $\varphi_N^{FT}$ , converges to true  $\varphi_{true}$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$  (see (iv) in Lemma 2.1). The injectivity of  $\vec{A}$  would be expected when the number  $N$  of measurement is large enough.

## 5 Stochastic viewpoints of Kalman filter

In this section, we observe the Kalman filter (4.21)-(4.23) from Bayesian viewpoints. For simplicity, we assume that  $X = \mathbb{C}^m$  and  $Y = \mathbb{C}^l$ ,  $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$ , and we treat the state  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathbb{C}^m$  and the measurement  $\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathbb{C}^l$  as complex random vectors. We recall that Bayes' theorem

$$p(\boldsymbol{\varphi}|\boldsymbol{f}) \propto p(\boldsymbol{f}|\boldsymbol{\varphi})p(\boldsymbol{\varphi}) \quad (5.1)$$

where  $p(\boldsymbol{\varphi})$  is the prior probability of the state  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$  before the measurement  $\boldsymbol{f}$  which is modeled by information of the current state  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ ,  $p(\boldsymbol{f}|\boldsymbol{\varphi})$  is the probability of observing  $\boldsymbol{f}$  given  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$  which is called the likelihood, and  $p(\boldsymbol{\varphi}|\boldsymbol{f})$  is the posterior probability of the state  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$  given the measurement  $\boldsymbol{f}$ . Bayesian theory is a simple and generic approach which can be applied to inverse and ill-posed problems (see e.g., [3, 8, 13, 33, 39]).

Here, we recall that complex Gaussian distribution (see e.g., [14, 35, 40]). Let us first remind that a complex random variable  $\boldsymbol{z}$  of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  is a pair of real random variable of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $\boldsymbol{z} = \boldsymbol{x} + i\boldsymbol{y}$ . A complex random variable  $\boldsymbol{z}$  is said to be Gaussian if its real and imaginary parts  $\boldsymbol{x}$  and  $\boldsymbol{y}$  are jointly Gaussian. Its distribution with zero mean is

$$p(\boldsymbol{z}) = p(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{2n}|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2n}|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{v}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2n}^{-1} \boldsymbol{v}}, \quad (5.2)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  such that  $\boldsymbol{v}^T = (\boldsymbol{x}^T, \boldsymbol{y}^T)$ , and  $\boldsymbol{T}$  means transposition, and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2n} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}$  is the covariance matrix defined by

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2n} = \begin{pmatrix} E(\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}^T) & E(\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{y}^T) \\ E(\boldsymbol{y}\boldsymbol{x}^T) & E(\boldsymbol{y}\boldsymbol{y}^T) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.3)$$

If real and imaginary parts are independent Gaussian distributed random variables with mean zero and same covariance  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , then (5.2) can be computed as

$$p(\boldsymbol{z}) = \frac{1}{(\pi)^n |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|} e^{-\boldsymbol{z}^H \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{z}}. \quad (5.4)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{H}$  means transposition and complex conjugation. This distribution is referred to as *circularly-symmetric (central) complex Gaussian distribution*, and is denoted by  $\mathcal{CN}(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ .

We assume that complex vector  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{n-1}^{KF} \in \mathbb{C}^m$  and the positive definite matrix  $\boldsymbol{B}_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  are determined in some way, and the prior  $p(\boldsymbol{\varphi})$  is modeled by a circularly-symmetric complex Gaussian distribution  $\mathcal{CN}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{n-1}^{KF}, \boldsymbol{B}_{n-1})$ , that is,

$$p(\boldsymbol{\varphi}) = \frac{1}{(\pi)^m |\boldsymbol{B}_{n-1}|} e^{-(\boldsymbol{\varphi} - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{n-1}^{KF})^H \boldsymbol{B}_{n-1}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\varphi} - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{n-1}^{KF})}. \quad (5.5)$$

Furthermore, we assume that the observation error  $\boldsymbol{f} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{\varphi}$  is distributed from  $\mathcal{CN}(0, \boldsymbol{R})$  where the  $\boldsymbol{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}$  is some positive definite matrix. Then, the likelihood  $p(\boldsymbol{f} = \boldsymbol{f}_n | \boldsymbol{\varphi})$  is modeled by

$$p(\boldsymbol{f} = \boldsymbol{f}_n | \boldsymbol{\varphi}) = \frac{1}{(\pi)^l |\boldsymbol{R}|} e^{-(\boldsymbol{f}_n - \boldsymbol{A}_n \boldsymbol{\varphi})^H \boldsymbol{R}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{f}_n - \boldsymbol{A}_n \boldsymbol{\varphi})} \quad (5.6)$$

Then by Bayes' theorem, the posterior  $p(\varphi|\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{f}_n)$  can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} p(\varphi|\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{f}_n) &\propto e^{-\{(\varphi - \varphi_{n-1}^{KF})^H \mathbf{B}_{n-1}^{-1} (\varphi - \varphi_{n-1}^{KF}) + (\mathbf{f}_n - \mathbf{A}_n \varphi)^H \mathbf{R}^{-1} (\mathbf{f}_n - \mathbf{A}_n \varphi)\}} \\ &\propto e^{-(\varphi - \varphi_n^{KF})^H \mathbf{B}_{n-1}^{-1} (\varphi - \varphi_n^{KF})} \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where  $\varphi_n^{KF}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_n$  is defined by (4.21) and (4.23), respectively. This computation is guaranteed by the same argument in Section 4. Therefore, posterior distribution is a circularly-symmetric complex Gaussian distribution  $\mathcal{CN}(\varphi_n^{KF}, \mathbf{B}_n)$  with mean  $\varphi_n^{KF} \in \mathbb{C}^m$  and covariance matrix  $\mathbf{B}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ , which means that the Kalman filter update in (4.21)-(4.23) can be interpreted as updating mean and covariance matrix of Gaussian distribution of the state in the case that the prior and likelihood are assumed to be Gaussian.

## 6 Numerical examples

In this section, we provide numerical examples for the Kalman filter algorithm. Our inverse scattering problem is to solve the linear integral equation

$$\mathcal{F}_{B,n} q = u_B^\infty(\cdot, \theta_n), \quad (6.1)$$

for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  where the operator  $\mathcal{F}_{B,n} : L^2(Q) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^1)$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_{B,n} q(\hat{x}) := \mathcal{F}_B q(\hat{x}, \theta_n) = \frac{k^2}{4\pi} \int_Q e^{ik(\theta_n - \hat{x}) \cdot y} q(y) dy, \quad (6.2)$$

where the incident direction is given by  $\theta_n := (\cos(2\pi n/N), \sin(2\pi n/N))$  for each  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . We assume that the support  $Q$  of the function  $q$  is included in the square  $[-S, S]^2$  with some  $S > 0$ .

The linear integral equation (6.1) is discretized by

$$\mathcal{F}_n \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{u}_n^\infty, \quad (6.3)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_n = \frac{k^2 S^2}{4\pi M^2} \left( e^{ik(\theta_n - \hat{x}_j) \cdot y_{i,l}} \right)_{j=1, \dots, J, -M \leq i, l \leq M-1} \in \mathbb{C}^{J \times (2M)^2}. \quad (6.4)$$

where  $y_{i,l} := \left( \frac{(2i+1)S}{2M}, \frac{(2l+1)S}{2M} \right)$ , and  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  is a number of the division of  $[0, S]$  (i.e., the function  $q$  is discretized by piecewise constant on  $[-S, S]^2$  which is decomposed by squares with the length  $\frac{S}{M}$ ), and  $\hat{x}_j := (\cos(2\pi j/J), \sin(2\pi j/J))$ , and  $J \in \mathbb{N}$  is a number of the division of  $[0, 2\pi]$  and

$$\mathbf{q} = (q(y_{i,l}))_{-M \leq i, l \leq M-1} \in \mathbb{C}^{(2M)^2}, \quad (6.5)$$

and

$$\mathbf{u}_n^\infty = (u_B^\infty(\hat{x}_j, \theta_n))_{j=1, \dots, J} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_n \in \mathbb{C}^J. \quad (6.6)$$

The noise  $\epsilon_n \in \mathbb{C}^J$  is sampling from a complex Gaussian distribution  $\mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$ , which is equivalent to  $\epsilon_n = \epsilon_n^{re} + i\epsilon_n^{im}$  where  $\epsilon_n^{re}, \epsilon_n^{im} \in \mathbb{R}^J$  are independently identically distributed from Gaussian distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$  with mean zero and covariance matrix  $\sigma^2 \mathbf{I}$  where  $\sigma > 0$ .

Here, we always fix discretization parameters as  $J = 30$ ,  $M = 8$ ,  $S = 3$ , and weight  $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{J \times J}$ , which is the covariance matrix of the observation error distribution, as  $R = r^2 \mathbf{I}$ , and  $r = 1$ . From Remarks 4.4 and 2.2, in order to converge to true

solution, the matrix  $\vec{\mathcal{F}} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{F}_N \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{NJ \times (2M)^2}$  should be injective. The necessary

condition is  $JN > (2M)^2$ , so we choose the parameter  $N = 30$  ( $NJ = 30 \times 30 = 900 > (2M)^2 = 256$ ).

We consider true functions as the characteristic function

$$q_j^{true}(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } x \in B_j \\ 0 & \text{for } x \notin B_j \end{cases}, \quad (6.7)$$

where the support  $B_j$  of the true function is considered as the following two types.

$$B_1 := \{(x_1, x_2) : x_1^2 + x_2^2 < 1.5\}, \quad (6.8)$$

$$B_2 := \left\{ (x_1, x_2) : \begin{array}{l} (x_1 + 1.5)^2 + (x_2 + 1.5)^2 < (1.0)^2 \text{ or} \\ 1 < x_1 < 2, -2 < x_2 < 2 \text{ or} \\ -2 < x_1 < 2, -2.0 < x_2 < -1.0 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (6.9)$$

In Figure 1, the blue closed curve is the boundary  $\partial B_j$  of the support  $B_j$ , and the green brightness indicates the value of the true function on each cell divided into  $(2M)^2 = 256$  in the sampling domain  $[-S, S]^2 = [-3, 3]^2$ . Here, we always employ the initial guess  $q_0$  as

$$q_0 \equiv 0. \quad (6.10)$$

Figure 2 shows the reconstruction by the Kalman filter (KF) and the Full data Tikhonov (FT) discussed in (4.21)–(4.23) and (3.8), respectively. The first and second column correspond to visualization of the updated state  $q$  in the case when four measurements  $\{u_B^\infty(\cdot, \theta_n)\}_{n=1}^4$  and twenty measurements  $\{u_B^\infty(\cdot, \theta_n)\}_{n=1}^{20}$  are given, respectively, for different methods KF and FT, and for two different shapes  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ . In Figure 2, the wave number and the regularization parameter are fixed as  $k = 3$  and  $\alpha = 1$ , respectively, and the measurements are noisy free. The third column corresponds to the graph of the Mean Square Error (MSE) defined by

$$e_n := \|\mathbf{q}^{true} - \mathbf{q}_n\|^2, \quad (6.11)$$

where  $\mathbf{q}_n$  is associated with the updated state given  $n$  measurements. The horizontal axis is with respect to number of given measurements, and the vertical axis is the value of MSE. We observe that in Figure 2, KF and FT are equivalent, which coincides with the theoretical result in Theorem 4.3.

Figures 3 and 4 show the reconstruction by the Kalman filter (KF) with  $\sigma = 0.1, 0.5$ , respectively, for two different wave numbers  $k = 5$  and  $k = 1$  and two different shape  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ . The first and second columns correspond to visualization of the final state given full measurements ( $n = 30$ ) for different regularization parameters  $\alpha = 10$  and  $1e - 1$ , respectively. The third column corresponds to graphs of MSE, which have three evaluations with respect to  $\alpha = 10, 1, 1e - 1$ . The case of  $k = 1.0$  fails to reconstruct even with small noise (see Figures 3), that is, the state does not converge to zero even with increasing the number of measurements and decreasing regularization parameters.

This ill-posedness is because the rank of the full far field mapping  $\vec{\mathcal{F}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{F}_N \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{NJ \times (2M)^2}$  ( $NJ = 30 \times 30 = 900$ ,  $(2M)^2 = 256$ ) degenerates when the wave number  $k$  decreases. Figure 5 shows its degeneracy. The horizontal axis is with respect to wave numbers, and the vertical axis is the number of the rank of full far field mappings  $\vec{\mathcal{F}}$  (Maximum of rank is 256).

## Acknowledgments

This work of the first author was supported by Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows (No.21J00119), Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

## References

- [1] Giovanni S. Alberti and Matteo Santacesaria. Infinite-dimensional inverse problems with finite measurements, 2020.
- [2] Giovanni Alessandrini and Luca Rondi. Determining a sound-soft polyhedral scatterer by a single far-field measurement. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 133(6):1685–1691, 2005.
- [3] Simon Arridge, Peter Maass, Ozan Öktem, and Carola-Bibiane Schönlieb. Solving inverse problems using data-driven models. *Acta Numerica*, 28:1–174, 2019.
- [4] Anatolii Borisovich Bakushinsky and M Yu Kokurin. *Iterative methods for approximate solution of inverse problems*, volume 577. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- [5] Gang Bao and Faouzi Triki. Error estimates for the recursive linearization of inverse medium problems. *Journal of Computational Mathematics*, pages 725–744, 2010.
- [6] Alexander L Bukhgeim. Recovering a potential from cauchy data in the two-dimensional case. 2008.
- [7] Fioralba Cakoni and David Colton. *Qualitative methods in inverse scattering theory: An introduction*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.

- [8] Daniela Calvetti and Erkki Somersalo. *An introduction to Bayesian scientific computing: ten lectures on subjective computing*, volume 2. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [9] Xudong Chen. *Computational methods for electromagnetic inverse scattering*. John Wiley & Sons, 2018.
- [10] Jin Cheng and Masahiro Yamamoto. Uniqueness in an inverse scattering problem within non-trapping polygonal obstacles with at most two incoming waves. *Inverse Problems*, 19(6):1361, 2003.
- [11] David Colton and Andreas Kirsch. A simple method for solving inverse scattering problems in the resonance region. *Inverse problems*, 12(4):383, 1996.
- [12] David Colton and Rainer Kress. *Inverse Acoustic and Electromagnetic Scattering Theory*, volume 93. Springer Nature, 2019.
- [13] Melina A Freitag and Roland WE Potthast. Synergy of inverse problems and data assimilation techniques. In *Large scale inverse problems*, pages 1–54. De Gruyter, 2013.
- [14] Robert G Gallager. Circularly-symmetric gaussian random vectors. 2008.
- [15] Giovanni Giorgi, Massimo Brignone, Riccardo Aramini, and Michele Piana. Application of the inhomogeneous lippmann–schwinger equation to inverse scattering problems. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 73(1):212–231, 2013.
- [16] Mohinder S Grewal and Angus P Andrews. *Kalman filtering: Theory and Practice with MATLAB*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- [17] Charles W Groetsch and CW Groetsch. *Inverse problems in the mathematical sciences*, volume 52. Springer, 1993.
- [18] Martin Hanke. *A Taste of Inverse Problems: Basic Theory and Examples*. SIAM, 2017.
- [19] Thorsten Hohage. On the numerical solution of a three-dimensional inverse medium scattering problem. *Inverse Problems*, 17(6):1743, 2001.
- [20] Naofumi Honda, Gen Nakamura, Roland Potthast, and Mourad Sini. The no-response approach and its relation to non-iterative methods for the inverse scattering. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, 187(1):7–37, 2008.
- [21] Masaru Ikehata. Reconstruction of an obstacle from the scattering amplitude at a fixed frequency. *Inverse Problems*, 14(4):949–954, aug 1998.
- [22] Kazufumi Ito, Bangti Jin, and Jun Zou. A direct sampling method to an inverse medium scattering problem. *Inverse Problems*, 28(2):025003, 2012.

- [23] Andrew H Jazwinski. *Stochastic processes and filtering theory*. Courier Corporation, 2007.
- [24] RE Kalman. A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems. *trans. asme. ser. D: J. Basic Eng.*, 82(1960), 1960.
- [25] Barbara Kaltenbacher, Andreas Neubauer, and Otmar Scherzer. *Iterative regularization methods for nonlinear ill-posed problems*. de Gruyter, 2008.
- [26] Andreas Kirsch. Remarks on the born approximation and the factorization method. *Applicable Analysis*, 96(1):70–84, 2017.
- [27] Andreas Kirsch et al. *An introduction to the mathematical theory of inverse problems*, volume 120. Springer, 2011.
- [28] Andreas Kirsch and Natalia Grinberg. *The factorization method for inverse problems*. Number 36. Oxford University Press, 2008.
- [29] Rainer Kress. *Linear Integral Equations*, volume 82. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [30] Changmei Liu. Inverse obstacle problem: local uniqueness for rougher obstacles and the identification of a ball. *Inverse Problems*, 13(4):1063, 1997.
- [31] Hongyu Liu and Jun Zou. Uniqueness in an inverse acoustic obstacle scattering problem for both sound-hard and sound-soft polyhedral scatterers. *Inverse Problems*, 22(2):515, 2006.
- [32] Juan Liu and Jiguang Sun. Extended sampling method in inverse scattering. *Inverse Problems*, 34(8):085007, jun 2018.
- [33] Gen Nakamura and Roland Potthast. *Inverse modeling*. IOP Publishing, 2015.
- [34] Roman G Novikov. Multidimensional inverse spectral problem for the equation  $-\delta\psi + (v(x) - Eu(x))\psi = 0$ . *Functional Analysis and Its Applications*, 22(4):263–272, 1988.
- [35] Bernard Picinbono. Second-order complex random vectors and normal distributions. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 44(10):2637–2640, 1996.
- [36] Roland Potthast. *Point sources and multipoles in inverse scattering theory*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2001.
- [37] Alexander G Ramm. Recovery of the potential from fixed-energy scattering data. *Inverse problems*, 4(3):877, 1988.
- [38] Pierre Célestin Sabatier and Edward Roy Pike. *Scattering: scattering and inverse scattering in pure and applied science*. Academic Press, 2002.



- [39] Andrew M Stuart. Inverse problems: a bayesian perspective. *Acta numerica*, 19:451–559, 2010.
- [40] Adriaan van den Bos. The multivariate complex normal distribution-a generalization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 41(2):537–539, 1995.




Figure 1: true functions




Figure 2: the comparison of KF and FT,  $k = 3$ ,  $\alpha = 1$  (true data)




Figure 3: KF reconstruction for different  $k$  and  $\alpha$  (noisy  $\sigma = 0.1$ )




Figure 4: KF reconstruction for different  $k$  and  $\alpha$  (noisy  $\sigma = 0.5$ )




Figure 5: the graph of the rank of  $\vec{\mathcal{F}}_B$