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1. INTRODUCTION

Calculating through-focus characteristics of the human eye’s optical system has a wide variety of important applications including assessing the efficacy of intraocular lenses [1–3], studying the depth-of-field and the sensitivity to optical blur [4–6], assessing the role of higher order aberrations [7, 8], assessing the optical changes induced by a refractive surgery [9], and studying the role of retinal image quality in refractive error development [10].

The results of the assessment of the depth-of-field strongly depend on the measurement methodology and whether it is performed subjectively or objectively [5, 11]. Also, the procedures are lengthy, tedious, and require a certain degree of cooperation from the measured subject, as it is the case in the assessment of just detectable image blur. On the other hand, an objectively measured wavefront aberration contains information from which one can derive through-focus characteristics of the eye’s optical system through the so-called virtual refraction paradigm [12, 13] and derive the dioptric estimate of the depth-of-field using an appropriately selected threshold to a through-focus characteristic function of the retinal image quality [4, 14–16].

In the virtual refraction paradigm a through-focus characteristic is sequentially evaluated by adding or subtracting various amounts of spherical or cylindrical wavefronts to the measured aberration. This can be achieved by either varying the quadratic component of the Zernike polynomial expansion using the dioptric equivalent of defocus [17] or the so-called paraxial curvature matching, which include higher than the second order Zernike polynomial terms [18]. Alternatively, one can employ the concept of Zernike refractive power polynomials [16, 19] or the Zernike radial slope polynomials [20] and perform the arithmetics in the refractive power domain. All of those numerical procedures are computationally cumbersome and require substantial computational resources.

Ideally, a closed-form expression of the optical characteristic of the eye’s optical system as a function of defocus should be devised. Such attempts have been made with the introduction of the defocus transfer function [21–23] and the extended Nijboer-Zernike (ENZ) approach [24, 25]. Although both methodologies are attractive for man-made optical systems, they have substantial limitations when it comes to utilizing them to study the eye’s optical system because the defocus transfer function is limited to circularly symmetric aberrations while the ENZ approach is valid only for the even terms of Zernike polynomial expansion. The latter is related to the specific way the even-term Zernike polynomial expansion of the wavefront error leads itself to a Bessel-series representation of the diffraction integral. A way to deal with this problem is to seek alternative
wavefront error representations that, on one hand, fully
describe the optical aberrations of the human eye and,
on the other hand, would lead to computationally simple
mathematical expressions.

To overcome the limitations described above we have
developed a technique for calculating through-focus
characteristics of the human eye by combining the phi-
esis of the ENZ approach with the flexibility of the
radial basis functions approximation, in which the com-
plex pupil function containing both amplitude apodiza-
tion and phase wavefront components is described by a
series of Gaussian radial basis functions. As a result, we
obtain a simple expression for the diffraction integral in
terms of a very rapidly converging power series. This
allows a parallel implementation of the computation of
the through-focus characteristics.

2. METHODS

The complex-valued pupil function $P(\rho, \theta)$, which in-
dicates the relative change in amplitude and phase of the
light wave transmitted through the pupil, is an essential
element in describing the eye’s optical system. For a
regular pupil, normalized polar coordinates in the pupil
plane are used, $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$, $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$, in which a pupil
function is expressed as

$$P(\rho, \theta) = A(\rho, \theta) \exp(i\Phi(\rho, \theta)),$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where the factor $A(\rho, \theta)$ is the aperture or apodization,
and $\Phi(\rho, \theta)$ is the real-valued phase describing the wave-
front error. More precisely, function $\Phi(\rho, \theta)$ is equal to
the wavefront error $W(\rho, \theta)$ times the constant $2\pi n/\lambda$,
where $n$ is the refractive index and $\lambda$ stands for the wave-
length of the light.

According to Fourier optics, the complex-valued point-spread function of such a system is given by the
diffraction integral [25]

$$U(r, \phi; f) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \left[ \exp(i f \rho^2) \right] P(\rho, \theta) \times \exp((2\pi i \rho \cos(\theta - \phi))) \rho d\theta d\rho$$ \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $f$ is the defocus parameter and $(r, \phi)$ denote the polar
coordinates in the image plane. This function is also related to the monochromatic point spread function
(PSF), defined as $PSF = |U|^2$. The defocus parameter $f$
can be related to a wavelength dependent defocus mea-
sured in diopters, $D(\lambda)$, as $f = \pi D(\lambda)/1000\lambda$, provided
that $\rho$ and $\lambda$ are given in mm [23].

Our main goal is to develop a new approach to an
effective (i.e., fast and reliable) computation of these
diffraction integrals. It involves approximation by Gauss-
ian radial basis functions (GRBF), which are a standard
tool in the solution of a variety of practical purposes,
ranging from engineering to numerical analysis of partial
derivative equations. Recently, they also found applica-
tion in the context of ophthalmic optics [26]. A more
general version of this type of functions (using the so-
called anisotropic radial basis functions) was developed
for fitting corneal elevation data [27, 28].

Each GRBF is determined by its center, given by polar
coordinates $(q, \alpha)$, and by its shape parameter $L > 0$;
the expression which evaluates it at a point with polar
coordinates $(\rho, \theta)$ is

$$GRBF(\rho, \theta) = \exp\{-L(q^2 + \rho^2 - 2pqq \cos(\theta - \alpha))\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Thus, as a first step we fix a number of centers,
$\{(q_k, \alpha_k) : k = 1, \ldots, N\}$, $(q_k \geq 0, 0 \leq \alpha_k \leq 2\pi)$
and a common value of the shape parameter $L > 0$, and fit
the complex pupil function (1) by a linear combina-
tion of GRBF (see Appendix A), obtaining an expression of
the form

$$P(\rho, \theta) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} c_k \exp\{-L(q_k^2 + \rho^2 - 2pqq \cos(\theta - \alpha_k))\},$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where for each $k = 1, \ldots, N$, $c_k$ are complex coefficients.
Clearly, it is an approximate formula, but we will con-
tinue using the sign “≈” instead of “≈”, assuming that
the complex pupil function is actually given by the right
hand side of this formula.

By introducing expression (3) in the diffraction inte-
gral (2), an analytic closed form expression for $U$ can be
obtained in the following way:

$$U(r, \phi; f) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} c_k U_k(r, \phi; f),$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $U_k$ is the contribution of each GRBF to $U$. Simple
calculations show that it is explicitly given by

$$U_k(r, \phi; f) = \exp\{-Lq_k^2\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Omega^s}{(s!)^2} m_s(i f - L),$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

with

$$\Omega = \frac{\Omega L(r, \phi, q_k, \alpha_k)}{L^2 q_k^2 + 2\pi v L q_k \cos(\phi - \alpha_k) - \pi^2 r^2},$$

and $m_s(\xi)$ being the moments of the positive function $e^{\xi \rho}$ on $[0, 1]$:

$$m_s(\xi) = \int_0^1 \rho^s e^{\xi \rho} d\rho, \hspace{0.5cm} s = 0, 1, \ldots.$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

Coefficients $m_s(\xi)$ satisfy the following recurrence for-
mulas,

$$m_0(\xi) = \frac{e^{\xi} - 1}{\xi}, \hspace{0.5cm} m_{s+1}(\xi) = \frac{e^{\xi} - (s + 1)m_s(\xi)}{\xi}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

Observe that $\Omega$ does not depend on the defocusing pa-
parameter $f$, while the sequence $m_s(i f - L)$ is indepen-
dent from the centers $(q_k, \alpha_k)$ and evaluation coordinates
$(\rho, \theta)$.
Formulas above can be combined into a single analytic explicit expression for $U$:

$$U(r, \phi; f) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} c_k \exp \{-Lq_k^2\}$$

$$\times \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \frac{m_s(if-L)}{(s!)^2} \left(L^2q_k^2 + 2\pi irLq_k \cos(\phi - \alpha_k) - \pi^2r^2\right)^s. \tag{9}$$

By the observation above, coefficients $m_s(if-L)$ need to be evaluated only once, as they do not depend on the individual parameters of each GRBF, and the cost of their computation is independent of the number of functions $N$ in the expansion of the complex pupil function (3). Moreover, due to the presence of the square of a factor in the denominator, the series in (9) converges very quickly, so that only a small number of terms are needed in practice for its evaluation. Coefficients $m_s(if-L)$ can be efficiently computed in many ways: by definition (7) (using FFT or quadratures) or by the recurrence (8). This last method is very fast, but can show numerical instability for large values of $f$.

The formulas above remain valid if a different shape parameter is taken for each GRBF, i.e., substituting $L$ by $L_k$ in the expressions. However, for most practical applications a single value $L$ can be chosen for all GRBF and this assumption has been made for the sake of simplicity.

The final step for the efficient implementation of these formulas is based on the observation that $\Omega_L$ in (6) can be easily evaluated by vector-vector multiplication if both the evaluation point and the center of the GRBF are given in the Cartesian coordinates. Moreover, all the computations can be vectorized and parallelized, allowing for a fast evaluation of the diffraction integral simultaneously in a grid of points in the image domain, and for an array of values of the defocus parameter $f$.

3. COMPARISON OF PROCEDURES

Since the closed analytic expression for a Fourier transform type integral (2) is possible only for most elementary pupil functions $P$, for its computation we must rely either on numerical or on semi-analytical methods (or analytical approximations). In the first group we find different direct numerical procedures in which the integration over a 2D domain is replaced by evaluation of a discrete sum, with the particular challenge of integrating a highly oscillatory function. In the best known implementation this leads to the bi-dimensional discrete Fourier transform (we will refer to it as the FFT2-based approach), calculated via the Fast Fourier Transform algorithm. Its efficiency can be substantially enhanced using the fractional Fourier transform [29] or a “butterfly diagram” ideas [30], see also [31].

In the second group we can include the so-called Extended Nijboer–Zernike (ENZ) theory [24, 25], based on an observation that the main component of (2) for many Zernike polynomials can be expressed as series of Bessel functions.

In this section, these alternatives are discussed and compared with our method, paying special attention to their computational complexity, precision, accuracy and speed. We use the “naive” notion of complexity, understanding by this the number of real floating point operations (flops) needed to run the algorithm. Since the exact number of flops is in general difficult or not feasible to calculate, the leading term for large values of the parameters is used.

A comparison between two methods is a delicate task due to their different inherent characteristics. Thus, we tried to make the analysis based on some reasonable assumptions and estimates.

Recall that we want to evaluate $U$ in (2) in a grid of points (either in polar or cartesian coordinates) and for a vector of values of the defocus parameter $f$. All three approaches are inexact in nature and contain some kind of approximation step.

In the FFT2-based scheme, the value of $U(r, \phi; f)$ is computed by means of the bi-dimensional fast Fourier transform. The crucial step is the substitution of the double integral in (2) by a discrete sum. Additionally, this method presents some other drawbacks. First, each new value of the defocus parameter $f$ obliges to calculate the values of $U$ completely, at a computationally high cost. Second, the use of the FFT requires re-sampling the wavefront at a regular Cartesian grid covering the pupil; for convenience, the length of the grid $M$ should be an integer power of 2 in each direction.

Another remarkable problem of the FFT2 scheme are numerical issues, especially the aliasing. Figure 1 (lower left) shows the aliasing, a typical phenomenon that appears when a careless FFT approach is used. In order to prevent this, the pupil must be small in comparison with the sampled area (or in other words, we must extend the pupil to a larger region, setting the pupil function to zero in the complementary domain), resulting in a large area where $U(r, \phi; f)$ is negligible [31]. Thus, a big portion of the computational load of this scheme is useless, and in general the spatial resolution needed with this method will be much higher than that required for explicit expressions like (9). This is the common approach used in commercial ray tracing packages, such as Zemax or Code V. The minimal estimated computational complexity of this method for a single value of $f$, even for optimal implementation, is of $O(M^2 \log(M))$, which corresponds to the cost of the FFT, the most computationally demanding part.

The advantage of the semi-analytic approaches, such as the ENZ theory or the method proposed here, is that they reduce the computation of $U$ in (2) to evaluation of more or less complex explicit expressions in terms of some elementary or special functions. One of the benefits of having these formulas is a better control of the image domain being computed, increasing the precision. However, the real advantage of a formula like (9) or the
ENZ-based equivalent is the huge boost in performance gained when a parallelization of calculations is done for multiple values of the defocus parameter \( f \).

The ENZ-theory, although representing a big step forward, has some limitations that must be taken into account. The obvious one is the use of only even terms in the Zernike expansion of the complex pupil function, which restricts it to the symmetric wavefront errors. Some other, less evident, problems lie in the core of the mathematical properties of the ENZ explicit formula for \( U(r, \phi; f) \). This is an infinite series of terms, each of them a finite linear combination of Bessel functions, and each new Zernike term added to the expansion of the pupil function (1) increases the complexity of the terms. The series is slowly convergent, especially for larger values of \( f \), requiring a truncation with a large number of terms depending on \( f \) (it is recommended to use 3\(|f| + 5 \) terms, according to [24, 25]).

Another issue in evaluating the ENZ expressions is the accuracy. The terms of the infinite series with even and odd orders form sign-changing sequences, which increases the risk of the cancellation errors. This phenomenon can be illustrated by the following experiments: in the case when the wavefront is given only by a positive \( Z_2^2 \) horizontal astigmatism, the evaluation of, say, the imaginary part of \( U \) at a point with radial coordinate \( r = 0.9 \) consists in adding a finite alternating sequence, with two dominant terms of approximately 0.423, but whose absolute values differ in \( 3 \times 10^{-5} \). This shows that these calculations, if not well organized, can yield a loss of precision in about 5 significant digits. Last but not least, the ENZ formulas contain binomial numbers that must be evaluated with care in order to avoid overflow.

In comparison, in expression (9) based on GRBF an infinite series appears, but its convergence is extremely fast, and only a few terms are required for a precise evaluation. Indeed, since \(|m_s| \leq 1\) for all \( s \), and also \(|\Omega|^2 \leq L^2 + \pi^2 \leq 15\) for any reasonable value of the shape parameter of the Gaussian RBFs. Thus, the \( s \)-th term in the series in (9) is bounded by \( (15)^s/(s!)^2 \), independently of the value of \( f \). This shows that, in the worst case scenario, we need at most \( N = 15 \) terms to achieve accuracy of about \( 10^{-7} \). In practice, the value of \( N \) can be taken significantly smaller.

The complexity of the evaluation is also constant for each new Gaussian function added, as they are obtained by the shift of the same base function. We have estimated that with the rest of parameters fixed, the cost of evaluating \( U \) with a total of \( N \) Zernike polynomials using the ENZ theory grows as \( \mathcal{O}(N^{3/2}) \), while for the new scheme with GRBF, with \( N \) Gaussian functions, the cost is \( \mathcal{O}(N) \).

We summarize the computational cost for each method in Table 1 showing the leading terms in the expression of the estimated complexity. Comparison between rows two and three shows that the GRBF approach is much more efficient than the ENZ theory, especially for a large amount of values for \( f \). The FFT2-based method seems to be of similar complexity with respect to GRBF, but in practice the value of \( M \) for FFT2 will be much larger than that required for GRBF, and the number of functions \( N \) will be small (as maximum, 400).

The reader should bear in mind that the complexity estimates give only a rough idea of the computational demand of a method. In general, the execution time is a simpler and a more informative tool. Thus, we run the ENZ and GRBF algorithms evaluating \( U \) at an \( 100 \times 100 \) mesh of nodes for a single value of the parameter \( f \), recording the execution time in dependence of the value \( N \) of functions used in the corresponding series expansions. Figure 2 shows the results, along with the corresponding regression lines. The values of the slopes of these lines are approximately 0.021 seconds/function for ENZ and 0.0028 seconds/function for GRBF. This gives a ratio of about 7.5 times faster for the GRBF approach, with the same number of functions, or reversely, one can

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Complexity (single ( f ))</th>
<th>Complexity (vector of ( f ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFT2</td>
<td>( \mathcal{O}(M^2 \log(M)) )</td>
<td>( \mathcal{O}(FM^2 \log(M)) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENZ</td>
<td>( \mathcal{O}(M^2 N + MN^{3/2}) )</td>
<td>( \mathcal{O}(M^2 F + M^2 NF + MN^{3/2}) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRBF</td>
<td>( \mathcal{O}(M^2 N) )</td>
<td>( \mathcal{O}(M^2 F + M^2 N) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
use 7.5 times more functions in the GRBF scheme, for the same execution time. For comparative purposes, the execution time to evaluate function $U$ numerically making use of the two-dimensional fast Fourier transform was of approximately 0.25 seconds, matching the execution time for ENZ using about 12 Zernike terms, or for GRBF with approximately 90 Gaussian RBFs.

In another experiment we compared the execution time of the three methods as a function of the length of the vector of defocus parameters. The number of functions is fixed to $N = 400$ for the GRBF approach and to $N = 45$ for ENZ-theory (8th order polynomials). The evaluation of $U$ is made at an $100 \times 100$ mesh of nodes for the two semi-analytic methods, and at an $512 \times 512$ mesh for the FFT2-approach (this is a realistic size to overcome aliasing and obtain accurate results). Then, the execution time of each method is measured, as the length of the vector of values for the defocus parameter $f$ grows. The results appear in Figure 3, along with the regression lines for each scheme. The values of the slopes are approximately 0.24 for FFT2, 0.16 for ENZ and 0.003 for GRBF, all in seconds per value of $f$. This means FFT2 is about 75 times slower than GRBF when calculating $U$ for many of values of $f$ at the same time, and ENZ is about 50 times slower than GRBF too, even when the number of Gaussian functions used ($N = 400$) is much higher than the number of Zernike polynomials ($N = 45$).

From the experiments above we can conclude that, roughly speaking, the efficiency of GRBF is at least one order of magnitude higher than of ENZ.

In order to assess accuracy, we first calculated $U$ for the ideal wavefront ($\Phi = 0$) and zero defocus ($f = 0$), in which case the closed analytic expression is known,

$$U(r, \phi; 0) = \frac{J_1(2\pi r)}{\pi r},$$

where $J_1$ is the Bessel function [32, Ch. 10]. Figure 1 shows the $PSF = |U|^2$ for each of the methods discussed here, as well as the one given by the closed formula. Visually, the two semi-analytic methods perform similarly. In order to support this impression quantitatively, we calculated also the root mean square (RMS) for each approach, which renders approximately $2.5 \times 10^{-8}$ for GRBF, $2.5 \times 10^{-17}$ for ENZ, and $7.6 \times 10^{-3}$ for FFT2.

We observe that in this ideal situation the number of accurate digits for GRBF is about a half of those given by ENZ, but still of order of 8 digits, which is usually sufficient for applications. However, GRBF calculations are done at a much lower cost: the computation times were approximately 1.53 seconds for GBRF vs. almost 52 seconds for ENZ. This interval includes obviously both steps: fitting the wave front or the pupil function and the subsequent calculation of $U$ at a grid of $128 \times 128$ nodes.

In another experiment we used a synthetic wavefront (see Figure 4) described by a combination of Zernike polynomial terms and exponentials

$$\Phi(\rho, \theta) = -0.5 Z_4^1(\rho, \theta) + 0.3 Z_3^3(\rho, \theta) + 0.3 Z_5^3(\rho, \theta) + 3 g(\rho \cos \theta, \rho \sin \theta; 0.5, 0.3, 5) + 3 g(\rho \cos \theta, \rho \sin \theta; 0.5, -0.3, 5) + 0.2 g(\rho \cos \theta, \rho \sin \theta; -0.3, 0, 15),$$

where $Z_m^n$ are the (orthonormal) Zernike polynomials...
Fig. 4. 3D plot of the synthetic wavefront function defined in (11).

Table 2. Maximum absolute error and root-mean-square error corresponding to the PSF residual distributions shown in Figure 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>GRBF</th>
<th>ENZ</th>
<th>FFT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max. error</td>
<td>5.00 $\times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS error</td>
<td>6.92 $\times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and

$$g(x, y; a, b, L) = \exp \{ -L[(x - a)^2 + (y - b)^2] \}.$$  

For this wavefront we calculated the diffraction integral (2) for different values of $f$ by quadrature using the scientific software Mathematica with extended precision (with the options PrecisionGoal set to 8 and WorkingPrecision to 16). These values of $U$ (regarded as “exact”) were compared with the calculations performed by FFT2 and by two semi-analytic approaches discussed here. For the ENZ we fitted the pupil function using the first 200 Zernike polynomials, while for the GRBF the approximation was performed by the linear combination of $20 \times 20$ Gaussian functions, with the parameter $L = 16$. Then the diffraction integral was evaluated by all methods in a grid of $256 \times 256$ equally spaced points in the square $[-2, 2] \times [-2, 2]$.

In order to assess accuracy, we computed for each method the real-valued point-spread function $PSF = |U|^2$ taking first $f = 0$. Figure 5 shows the density plot of the normalized PSF calculated by quadrature and using the three alternative methods (FFT2, ENZ and GRBF). The corresponding absolute errors with respect to the computation by quadratures is depicted in Figure 6. More quantitative comparison was made using several quality of approximation metrics, such as those gathered in Table 2.

With the purpose of comparing performance of the computation methods for different values of the defocus parameter $f$ we plot in Figure 7 the values of the normalized PSF along the horizontal line ($\phi = 0, \pi$ and $r \in [0, 1]$).

As a partial conclusion we see that for the simulated wavefront (11) the GRBF method outperforms the other two in several significant digits.
that the increase of the computational cost for a vector of values of the defocus parameter is practically negligible, providing a substantial increase in the performance with respect to the other techniques. This is a reliable and efficient way of obtaining the through-focus characteristics of the eye at higher resolutions in reasonable time.

Additionally, the GRBF approach allows for a straightforward implementation of the multi-resolution scheme. Since each function used for approximation of the pupil function enters the final expression linearly, and taking into account the computational speed of the method, one can use two or more layers of GRBF to fit the residual error consecutively using different sets of centers and different shape parameters in order to improve the accuracy of the results. This idea being currently tested is beyond the scope of this paper and will be discussed in a future paper.

In the virtual refraction paradigm [12, 13], the proposed GRBF approach allows calculating through-focus characteristic of the human eye at a very low computational cost for an arbitrarily selected set of the defocus parameters, making it particularly attractive in the studies of dynamic wavefront aberrometry and accommodation.

**APPENDIX A: OBTAINING THE PARAMETERS IN (3)**

The goal is expressing the complex pupil functions as a linear combination of GRBF functions, to obtain a expression of the type of (3). Suppose that the wavefront values are known in a discrete and finite set of points at the unit disk (if they are in a bigger disk, they may be rescaled easily). Hence, we have the data set \((x_j, y_j, w_j), j = 1, \ldots, M\), with \(w_j = W(x_j, y_j)\). Values \(w_j\) can be directly measured or obtained from another set of functions, such as the Zernike polynomials.

**Choosing the basis**

A GRBF can be expressed in Cartesian coordinates as \(g_k(x, y) = \exp\left[-L_k(x-a_k)^2 + (y-b_k)^2\right]\), where \((a_k, b_k)\) are the Cartesian coordinates of its center, and \(L_k > 0\) is its shape parameter, which sets the “scale” of the function \(g_k\) (and is directly related to the variance of the Gaussian distribution). Transforming it to polar coordinates yields the set of basis functions

\[
g_k(\rho, \theta) = \exp\left\{-L_k(q_k^2 + \rho^2 - 2\rho q_k \cos(\theta - \alpha_k))\right\},
\]

(12) with \((q_k, \alpha_k)\) being the polar coordinates of the corresponding centers; \(a_k = q_k \cos(\alpha_k)\) and \(b_k = q_k \sin(\alpha_k)\). Thus, we fix this basis, \(\{g_k\}_{k=1}^N\), choosing the parameters \(a_k, b_k\) and \(L_k\), or equivalently, \(q_k, \alpha_k\) and \(L_k\), for each \(1 \leq k \leq N\).

Choosing the same shape parameter \(L > 0\) for all basis functions simplifies the computations greatly, so we will follow this convention, which can be modified for a multi-resolution scheme, as explained above. We can use

**4. CONCLUSIONS**

A new formula for computing the diffraction integral with variable defocus has been developed. The proposed approach has been compared with the two existing procedures, i.e., the bi-dimensional fast Fourier transform and the extended Nijboer-Zernike theory. The former is a standard numerical procedure, and the latter provides also analytical formulas to evaluate the diffraction integral. The results of the comparison show that the new scheme is very competitive, providing higher accuracy and speed. The main advantage of the new approach is

![Fig. 7. Values of the normalized PSFs of Figure 5 along the horizontal diameter of the unit disk, calculated for each method, for \(f = 1\) (top), \(f = 3\) (middle) and \(f = 10\) (bottom).](image-url)
some statistical criteria for its selection, such as cross-validation, or even trial and error [33]. In practice, a value between 1 and 20 is satisfactory. Then, taking $N = r^2$, we create a grid of $r \times r$ GRBF centers covering the unit disk. Usually, a regular grid on the square $[-1.2, 1.2]^2$ yields good results. This square covers the unit disk and some peripheral area, which can smooth the Gibb’s phenomenon at the boundary of the disk.

**Computing the coefficients**

For a fixed set of GRBF functions the purpose is to compute coefficients $c_k$ in such a way that their linear combination reproduces the complex pupil function

$$
\sum_{k=1}^{N} c_k g_k(x_j, y_j) \approx P(x_j, y_j) = A(x_j, y_j) \exp \{iw_j\}.
$$

Notice that the fitting procedure is in practice unavoidable regardless the used approach. It should be pointed out however that the problem of computation of $U$ is ill-conditioned: the values of $U$ are highly sensitive to small oscillations in $\Phi$, so the quality of approximation of the pupil function is critical. The standard procedure is the linear least-squares fit (with complex values), see e.g. [34].

This idea can actually be applied to any set of functions, so the complex pupil function can be expressed in a similar way as a linear combination of other basis functions (for instance, the Zernike polynomials).

**APPENDIX B: DERIVATION OF (9)**

Expression (2) shows that $U$ is linear for $P$, so that it is sufficient to find an analytic expression for $U$ when the pupil function is

$$
P(\rho, \theta) = \exp \{-L(q^2 + \rho^2 - 2\rho q \cos (\theta - \alpha))\}.
$$

From a direct substitution in (2) we see that we need to calculate integrals of the form

$$
I = \int_0^{2\pi} \exp(2L_i \rho \cos(\theta - \alpha)) \exp(2\pi i r \rho \cos(\theta - \phi)) d\theta,
$$

which can be evaluated analytically:

$$
I = 2\pi I_0 \left(2\sqrt{\Omega} \rho\right),
$$

where $I_0$ is the modified Bessel function [32, Ch. 10], and

$$
\Omega = \frac{L^2 g_k^2}{\rho_k^2} + \frac{2\pi i r L_k g_k}{\rho} \cos(\phi - \alpha_k) - \pi^2 r^2. \quad (13)
$$

It remains to use the series expansion for $I_0$ to arrive at (5)–(6), and in consequence, at (9).
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