Wigner Distribution Moments Measured as Intensity Moments in Separable First-Order Optical Systems
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It is shown how all global Wigner distribution moments of arbitrary order can be measured as intensity moments in the output plane of an appropriate number of separable first-order optical systems (generally anamorphic ones). The minimum number of such systems that are needed for the determination of these moments is derived.
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1. INTRODUCTION

After the introduction of the Wigner distribution (WD) [1] for the description of coherent and partially coherent optical fields [2], it became an important tool for optical signal/image analysis and beam characterization [3, 4, 5]. The WD completely describes the complex amplitude of a coherent optical field (up to a constant phase factor) or the mutual coherence function of a partially coherent field. As the WD of a two-dimensional optical field is a function of four variables, it is difficult to analyze. Therefore, the optical field is often represented not by the WD itself, but by its global moments. Beam characterization based on the second-order moments of the WD thus became the basis of an International Organization for Standardization standard [6]. Some of the WD moments can directly be determined from measurements of the intensity distributions in the image plane or the Fourier plane, but most of the moments cannot be determined in such an easy way. In order to calculate such moments, additional information is required. Since first-order optical systems [7]—also called ABCD systems—produce affine transformations of the WD in phase space, the intensity distributions measured at the output of such systems can provide such additional information. The application of ABCD systems for the measurements of the second-order WD moments has been reported in several publications [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. It is the aim of this paper to show how all global WD moments can be measured as intensity moments only. We show that not only the second-order moments, but also all other moments of the four-dimensional WD can be obtained from measurements of only intensity distributions in an appropriate number of (generally anamorphic) separable first-order optical systems.

2. WIGNER DISTRIBUTION

Let partially coherent light be described by a temporally stationary stochastic process \( f(x, y; t) \); as far as the time dependence is concerned, the ensemble average of the product \( f(x_1, y_1; t_1)f^*(x_2, y_2; t_2) \), where the asterisk denotes complex conjugation, is then only a function of the time difference \( t_1 - t_2 \):

\[
E \left\{ f(x_1, y_1; t_1)f^*(x_2, y_2; t_2) \right\} = y(x_1, x_2; y_1, y_2; t_1 - t_2) \tag{1}
\]

The function \( y(x_1, x_2; y_1, y_2; \tau) \) is known as the mutual coherence function [14, 15, 16, 17] of the stochastic process \( f(x, y; t) \). The mutual power spectrum [16, 17] or cross-spectral density function [18] \( \Gamma(x_1, x_2; y_1, y_2; \omega) \) is defined as the temporal Fourier transform of the mutual coherence function:

\[
\Gamma(x_1, x_2; y_1, y_2; \omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y(x_1, x_2; y_1, y_2; \tau) \exp(j\omega\tau) d\tau. \tag{2}
\]
For \( x_1 = x_2 = x, y_1 = y_2 = y \), the cross-spectral density function reduces to the (auto) power spectrum \( \Gamma(x, x_1 y_1 y; \omega) \), which represents the intensity distribution of the light for the temporal frequency \( \omega \). Since in the present discussion the explicit temporal-frequency dependence is of no importance, we will, for the sake of convenience, omit the temporal-frequency variable \( \omega \) from the formulas in the remainder of the paper.

The Wigner distribution of partially coherent light is defined in terms of the cross-spectral density function by

\[
W(x, u; y, v) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Gamma\left(x + \frac{1}{2}x', x - \frac{1}{2}x'; y + \frac{1}{2}y', y - \frac{1}{2}y'\right) \times \exp\left[-j2\pi(u x' + v y')\right] dx' dy'.
\]

A distribution function according to definition (3) was first introduced in optics by Walther [19, 20], who called it the generalized radiance. The WD \( W(x, u; y, v) \) represents partially coherent light in a combined space/spatial-frequency domain, the so-called phase space, where \( u \) is the spatial-frequency variable associated to the space variable \( x \), and \( v \) the spatial-frequency variable associated to the space variable \( y \).

In this paper we consider the normalized moments of the WD, where the normalization is with respect to the total energy \( E \) of the signal:

\[
E = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W(x, u; y, v) dx \, du \, dy \, dv = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Gamma(x, x; y, y) dx \, dy.
\]

These normalized moments \( \mu_{pqrs} \) of the WD are thus defined by

\[
\mu_{pqrs} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{q+s}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^p y^r W(x, u; y, v) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} \right) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} - \frac{\partial}{\partial y_2} \right) \Gamma(x_1, x_2; y_1, y_2) \, dx \, dy,
\]

(5)

Note that for \( q = s = 0 \) we have intensity moments, which can easily be measured:

\[
\mu_{p0r0} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W(x, u; y, v) \times x^p y^r \, dx \, dy \, dv \quad (p, r \geq 0)
\]

(6)

The WD moments \( \mu_{pqrs} \) provide valuable tools for the characterization of optical beams, see, for instance [21]. First-order moments yield the position of the beam (\( \mu_{1000} \) and \( \mu_{0010} \)) and its direction (\( \mu_{0100} \) and \( \mu_{0001} \)). Second-order moments give information about the spatial width of the beam (the shape \( \mu_{2000} \) and \( \mu_{0200} \) of the spatial ellipse and its orientation \( \mu_{0020} \)) and the angular width in which the beam is radiating (the shape \( \mu_{0200} \) and \( \mu_{0020} \) of the spatial-frequency ellipse and its orientation \( \mu_{0010} \)); moreover, they provide information about its curvature (\( \mu_{1100} \) and \( \mu_{0101} \)) and its twist (\( \mu_{1010} \) and \( \mu_{0110} \)). Many important beam characterizers, like the overall beam quality [12]

\[
(\mu_{2000} \mu_{0200} - \mu_{1100}^2) + (\mu_{0200} \mu_{0002} - \mu_{0011}^2) + 2(\mu_{1010} \mu_{0110} - \mu_{1001} \mu_{0011}),
\]

(7)

are based on second-order moments. Higher-order moments are used, for instance, to characterize the beam’s symmetry and its sharpness [21].

### 3. SEPARABLE FIRST-ORDER OPTICAL SYSTEMS

It is well known that the input-output relationship between the WD \( W_{\text{in}}(x, u; y, v) \) at the input plane and the WD \( W_{\text{out}}(x, u; y, v) \) at the output plane of a separable first-order optical system reads [3, 4, 5]

\[
W_{\text{out}}(x, u; y, v) = W_{\text{in}}(d_x x - b_x u_x - c_x x + a_x u_x; d_y y - b_y v_y, -c_y y + a_y v_y).
\]

(8)

The coefficients \( a_x, b_x, c_x, d_x \) and \( a_y, b_y, c_y, d_y \) are the matrix entries of the symplectic ray transformation matrix [7] that relates the position \( x, y \) and direction \( u, v \) of an optical ray in the input and the output plane of the first-order optical system:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  x_{\text{out}} \\
  y_{\text{out}} \\
  u_{\text{out}} \\
  v_{\text{out}}
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
  a_x & 0 & b_x & 0 \\
  0 & a_y & 0 & b_y \\
  c_x & 0 & d_x & 0 \\
  0 & c_y & 0 & d_y
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
  x_{\text{in}} \\
  y_{\text{in}} \\
  u_{\text{in}} \\
  v_{\text{in}}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

(9)
For separable systems, symplecticity simply reads \( axdx - bydy = 1 \) and \( axdy - bydx = 1 \). Note that in a first-order optical system, with such a symplectic ray transformation matrix, the total energy \( E \), see (4), is invariant.

As examples of first-order optical systems we mention the following in particular:

(i) a section of free space in the paraxial approximation, or “parabolic” system [22] (with \( a = d = 1, c = 0 \), and \( b \) proportional to the propagation distance \( z \)),

(ii) a fractional Fourier transform system [23], or “elliptic” system [22] (with \( a = d = \cos \alpha \) and \( b = -c = \sin \alpha \)),

(iii) a “hyperbolic” system [22] (with \( a = d = \cosh \alpha \) and \( b = c = \sinh \alpha \)).

These three systems are characterized by one parameter. Other one-parameter first-order optical systems are

(i) a thin lens (with \( a = d = 1, b = 0 \), and \( c \) inverse proportional to the focal distance),

(ii) an ideal magnifier (with \( a = m, d = 1/m, b = c = 0 \)).

The latter systems however—like all systems for which the input and output planes are conjugate planes—cannot be used to determine the moments, as we will see later, because they have the property \( E \equiv 0 \).

The normalized moments \( \mu_{pqrs}^{\text{out}} \) of the output WD

\[
W_{\text{out}}(x, u, y, v)
\]

are related to the normalized moments \( \mu_{pqrs}^{\text{in}} \) of the input WD

\[
W_{\text{in}}(x, u, y, v)
\]

as

\[
\mu_{pqrs}^{\text{out}} E = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W_{\text{out}}(x, u, y, v) \times x^p u^q y^r v^s dxdudydv
\]

\[
\mu_{pqrs}^{\text{in}} E = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W_{\text{in}}(x, u, y, v) (a_x x + b_x u)^p (a_y y + b_y v)^q (a_z z + b_z u)^r (a_w w + b_w v)^s dxdudydv
\]

\[
E \sum_{k=0}^{p} \sum_{l=0}^{q} \sum_{m=0}^{r} \sum_{n=0}^{s} \left( \begin{array}{c} p \\ k \\ l \\ m \\ n \end{array} \right) \frac{a_x^k b_x^l a_y^m b_y^n a_z^s b_z^t}{k! l! m! n!} x^{p-k} y^{q-l} z^{r-m} w^{s-n} x^{k} y^{l} z^{m} w^{n}
\]

\[
\mu_{pqrs}^{\text{out}} = \mu_{pqrs}^{\text{in}} \sum_{k=0}^{p} \sum_{l=0}^{q} \sum_{m=0}^{r} \sum_{n=0}^{s} \left( \begin{array}{c} p \\ k \\ l \\ m \\ n \end{array} \right) \frac{a_x^k b_x^l a_y^m b_y^n a_z^s b_z^t}{k! l! m! n!} x^{p-k} y^{q-l} z^{r-m} w^{s-n} x^{k} y^{l} z^{m} w^{n}
\]

and for the intensity moments in particular (i.e., \( q = s = 0 \)) we have

\[
\mu_{pqrs}^{\text{out}} = \mu_{pqrs}^{\text{in}} \sum_{k=0}^{p} \sum_{l=0}^{q} \sum_{m=0}^{r} \left( \begin{array}{c} p \\ k \\ l \\ m \end{array} \right) x^{p-k} y^{q-l} z^{r-m} w^{s-n} x^{k} y^{l} z^{m} w^{n}
\]

The remainder of this paper is based on (11), in which the output intensity moments \( \mu_{pqrs}^{\text{out}} \) are expressed in terms of the input moments \( \mu_{pqrs}^{\text{in}} \) and the system parameters \( a_x, a_y, b_x, \) and \( b_y \). Note that only the parameters \( a \) and \( b \) enter this equation; the parameters \( c \) and \( d \) can be chosen freely, as long as the symplecticity condition \( a_x d_x - b_x c_x = a_y d_y - b_y c_y = 1 \) is satisfied.

4. RELATIONS BETWEEN INPUT AND OUTPUT MOMENTS

4.1. First-order moments

For the first-order moments, the following two equations are relevant:

\[
\mu_{0000}^{\text{out}} = a_x \mu_{0000}^{\text{in}} + b_x \mu_{0100}^{\text{in}}, \quad (12)
\]

\[
\mu_{0010}^{\text{out}} = a_y \mu_{0010}^{\text{in}} + b_y \mu_{0001}^{\text{in}}, \quad (13)
\]

which correspond to (11) with \( pqrst = 1000 \) and \( pqrst = 0010 \), respectively, and the four input moments \( \mu_{0000}^{\text{in}}, \mu_{0100}^{\text{in}}, \mu_{0010}^{\text{in}}, \) and \( \mu_{0001}^{\text{in}} \) can be determined by measuring the intensity moments \( \mu_{0000}^{\text{out}}, \mu_{0100}^{\text{out}}, \mu_{0010}^{\text{out}}, \) and \( \mu_{0001}^{\text{out}} \) in the output planes of two systems with different values of \( a \) and \( b \), see (12) and (13), respectively.

In the case of a fractional Fourier transform system we can choose, for instance, [24, 25], the fractional angles \( a_x = \alpha_x = 0 \) (leading to \( a_x = a_y = 1 \) and \( b_x = b_y = 0 \)) and \( a_x = \alpha_x = \pi/2 \) (leading to \( a_x = a_y = 0 \) and \( b_x = b_y = 1 \)), but any other choice could be made as well, as long as it leads to the four independent equations. In the case of free space propagation, we simply choose two different values of the propagation distance \( z \), corresponding to two different values of \( b_x \) and \( b_y \) (with \( a_x = a_y = 1 \), of course).

Note that the two first-order optical systems can always be chosen such that they are isotropic, \( a_x = a_y = 1, b_x = b_y = 1 \), and so forth (\( i = 1, 2 \)), with identical behavior in the \( x \) and \( y \) direction.

4.2. Second-order moments

For the \( 3 + 4 + 3 = 10 \) second-order moments, the following equations are relevant:

\[
\mu_{2000}^{\text{out}} = a_x^2 \mu_{2000}^{\text{in}} + 2a_x b_x \mu_{1100}^{\text{in}} + b_x^2 \mu_{0200}^{\text{in}}, \quad (14)
\]

\[
\mu_{0101}^{\text{out}} = a_y a_x \mu_{0101}^{\text{in}} + a_y b_y \mu_{1001}^{\text{in}} + b_x a_y \mu_{1010}^{\text{in}} + b_x b_y \mu_{0101}^{\text{in}}, \quad (15)
\]

\[
\mu_{0020}^{\text{out}} = a_y^2 \mu_{0020}^{\text{in}} + 2a_y b_y \mu_{0011}^{\text{in}} + b_y^2 \mu_{0002}^{\text{in}}, \quad (16)
\]

which equations correspond to (11) with \( pqrst = 2000, \) \( pqrst = 1010, \) and \( pqrst = 0020 \), respectively.

The three input moments \( \mu_{2000}^{\text{in}}, \mu_{1100}^{\text{in}}, \) and \( \mu_{0200}^{\text{in}} \) can be determined by measuring the intensity moment \( \mu_{2000}^{\text{out}} \) in the output planes of three systems with different values of \( a_x \) and \( b_x \), see (14). Likewise, with the transversal coordinate \( x \) replaced by \( y \), the three input moments \( \mu_{0020}^{\text{in}}, \mu_{0011}^{\text{in}}, \) and \( \mu_{0002}^{\text{in}} \) can be determined by measuring the intensity moment \( \mu_{0020}^{\text{out}} \).
in the output planes of three systems with different values of \( a_y \) and \( b_y \), see (15). Note that we can choose \( a_x = a_y = a_i \) and \( b_x = b_y = b_i \) (\( i = 1, 2, 3 \)) for these three systems, in which case we are obviously using isotropic systems.

The other four input moments \( \mu_{0101}, \mu_{1011}, \mu_{0110}, \) and \( \mu_{0101} \) follow from measuring the intensity moment \( \mu_{0101}^{\text{out}} \) in the output planes of four different systems, see (15). However, if we would use only isotropic systems, like we could do for (14) and (16), (15) would reduce to

\[
\mu_{0101}^{\text{out}} = a^2 \mu_{1010} + ab \left( \mu_{1001} + \mu_{0110} \right) + b^2 \mu_{0101}
\]  

(17)

and we can only determine the combination \( \mu_{1001} + \mu_{0110} \). Hence, while three systems may be isotropic again—and, for instance, be identical to the ones that we used when we were dealing with (14) and (16)—at least one system should be anamorphic.

We conclude that all ten second-order moments can be determined from the knowledge of the output intensities of four first-order optical systems, where one of them has to be anamorphic. In the case of fractional Fourier transform systems we could choose, for instance [24, 25], the fractional angles \( a_x = a_y = 0 \) (leading to \( a_x = a_y = 1 \) and \( b_x = b_y = 0 \)), \( a_x = a_y = \pi/4 \) (leading to \( a_x = a_y = b_x = b_y = \sqrt{2}/2 \), \( a_x = a_y = \pi/2 \) (leading to \( a_x = a_y = 0 \) and \( b_x = b_y = 1 \)), and the anamorphic combination \( a_x = \pi/2 \pi \) and \( a_y = 0 \) (leading to \( a_x = b_y = 0 \) and \( a_y = b_x = 1 \)). If we decide to determine the moments using free space propagation, we should be aware of the fact that an anamorphic free space system cannot be realized by mere free space, but can only be simulated by using a proper arrangement of cylindrical lenses.

Of course, optical schemes to determine all ten second-order moments have been described before, see, for instance [8, 9, 11, 12, 13], but the way to determine these moments as presented in this paper is based on a general scheme that can also be used for the determination of arbitrary higher-order moments.

### 4.3 Higher-order moments

For higher-order moments we can proceed analogously. For the \( 4 + 6 + 6 + 4 = 20 \) third-order moments, the following equations are relevant:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mu_{3000}^{\text{out}} &= a_i^3 \mu_{3000} + 3a_i^2 b_i^j \mu_{2100} + 3a_i b_i^2 \mu_{1200} + b_i^3 \mu_{0300}, \\
\mu_{2100}^{\text{out}} &= a_i^2 a_j^0 \mu_{2100} + a_i^2 b_j^j \mu_{2001} + 2a_i b_j \mu_{1110} + 2a_j \mu_{1110}, \\
\mu_{1200}^{\text{out}} &= a_i b_j a_i \mu_{1200} + 2a_i a_j \mu_{1200} + a_j b_j \mu_{0201} + 2b_j^2 \mu_{0201}, \\
\mu_{0300}^{\text{out}} &= a_i b_j a_j \mu_{0300} + 3a_i a_j b_j \mu_{0201} + a_i b_j b_j \mu_{0102} + 3b_j^2 \mu_{0102}.
\end{align*}
\]

(18)

Note again that these equations correspond to (11) with \( pqrst = 3000, pqrst = 2100, pqrst = 1200, \) and \( pqrst = 0300 \), respectively. The 20 third-order moments can be determined from the knowledge of the output intensities of six first-order optical systems, where two of them have to be anamorphic.

We consider in more detail how the third-order moments could be determined.

(i) The four input moments \( \mu_{3000}, \mu_{2100}, \mu_{1200}, \) and \( \mu_{0300} \) can be determined by measuring the intensity moment \( \mu_{3000}^{\text{out}}, (i = 1, 2, 3, 4) \) in the output planes of four systems with different values of \( a_x \) and \( b_x \), see (18). Likewise, with the transversal coordinate \( x \) replaced by \( y \), the four input moments \( \mu_{0030}, \mu_{0201}, \mu_{0012}, \) and \( \mu_{0003} \) can be determined by measuring the intensity moment \( \mu_{3000}^{\text{out}}, (i = 1, 2, 3, 4) \) in the output planes of four systems with different values of \( a_y \) and \( b_y \), see (21). Note that we can choose \( a_x = a_y = a_i \) and \( b_x = b_y = b_i \) (\( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \)) for these four different systems, in which case we are obviously using isotropic systems. This then leads to the set of four equations

\[
\begin{align*}
a_i^3 \mu_{3000} + 3a_i^2 b_i^j \mu_{2100} + 3a_i b_i^2 \mu_{1200} + b_i^3 \mu_{0300} &= \mu_{3000}^{\text{out}}, \quad (i = 1, 2, 3, 4), \\
b_i^3 \mu_{0030} + 3a_i^2 b_i^j \mu_{0201} + 3a_i b_i^2 \mu_{0102} + b_i^3 \mu_{0003} &= \mu_{0030}^{\text{out}}, \quad (i = 1, 2, 3, 4),
\end{align*}
\]

(22)

based on (18) and a similar set of four equations

\[
\begin{align*}
a_i^3 \mu_{0030} + 3a_i^2 b_i^j \mu_{0201} + 3a_i b_i^2 \mu_{0102} + b_i^3 \mu_{0003} &= \mu_{0030}^{\text{out}}, \quad (i = 1, 2, 3, 4), \\
\end{align*}
\]

(23)

based on (21). Possible system choices are, for instance, four sections of free space, with \( a_i = 1 \) and \( b_i \) proportional to the four different propagation distances \( z_i (i = 1, 2, 3, 4) \); or four isotropic fractional Fourier transform systems with \( a_i = \cos \alpha_i \) and \( b_i = \sin \alpha_i \) and \( \alpha_i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \) four different fractional angles.

(ii) Using the same four isotropic systems as above, the two input moments \( \mu_{2010} \) and \( \mu_{0201} \), together with the two moment combinations \( \mu_{2011} + \mu_{0110} \) and \( \mu_{1200} + \mu_{0210} \), follow from measuring the intensity moment \( \mu_{3000}^{\text{out}}, (i = 1, 2, 3, 4) \) in the output planes of these four systems, see (19), while the two input moments \( \mu_{2010} \) and \( \mu_{0201} \), together with the two moment combinations \( \mu_{2011} + \mu_{0110} \) and \( \mu_{1200} + \mu_{0210} \), follow from measuring the intensity moment \( \mu_{2010}^{\text{out}}, (i = 1, 2, 3, 4) \), see (20). This leads to the set of four equations

\[
\begin{align*}
a_i^3 \mu_{2010} + a_i^2 b_i^j (\mu_{2001} + \mu_{1110}) + a_i b_i^2 (\mu_{2101} + \mu_{0210}) &= \mu_{2010}^{\text{out}}, \quad (i = 1, 2, 3, 4), \\
\end{align*}
\]

(24)

based on (19) and a similar set of four equations

\[
\begin{align*}
a_i^3 \mu_{2010} + a_i^2 b_i^j (\mu_{2110} + \mu_{0110}) + a_i b_i^2 (\mu_{2011} + \mu_{0211}) &= \mu_{2010}^{\text{out}}, \quad (i = 1, 2, 3, 4), \\
\end{align*}
\]

(25)

based on (20).

(iii) Twelve of the 20 input moments (together with four moment combinations) can thus be determined by using four isotropic systems. To determine the remaining eight moments, we need four more equations based on (19) and (20), for which we have to use two more systems (labeled \( i = 5 \) and \( i = 6 \)), which should now
be anamorphic. Among the many possibilities, an easy choice would be a system with $a_x = b_y = 0, a_y \neq 0, a_y \neq 0$, leading to

$$b_{21}^2 a_y \mu_{0210} = \mu_{21015}^{\text{out}},$$

(26)

and a system with $b_x = a_y = 0$, $a_x \neq 0$, $b_y \neq 0$, leading to

$$a_{21}^2 a_y^2 \mu_{2010} = \mu_{21015}^{\text{out}},$$

(27)

The former system may be an anamorphic fractional Fourier transform system with fractional angles $a_x = \pi/2$ and $a_y = 0$ (and hence $a_x = b_y = 0$ and $b_x = a_y = 1$), while the latter may be an anamorphic fractional Fourier transform system with $a_x = 0$ and $a_y = \pi/2$ (and hence $b_x = a_y = 0$ and $b_y = a_x = 1$).

Altogether we have thus constructed 20 equations for the 20 third-order moments, using a total of six first-order systems: four isotropic systems where we measure the 16 output intensity moments $\mu_{2001,0}, \mu_{0030,0}, \mu_{2101,0}$, and $\mu_{0102,0}$ ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$), and two anamorphic systems where we measure the four output intensity moments $\mu_{2010,1}^{\text{out}}$ and $\mu_{1020,1}^{\text{out}}$ ($i = 5, 6$).

For the $5 + 8 + 9 + 8 + 5 = 35$ fourth-order moments, the relevant equations follow from (11) with $pqrs = 4000, pqrs = 3010, pqrs = 2020, pqrs = 1030$, and $pqrs = 0040$, respectively. The 35 fourth-order moments can be determined from the knowledge of the output intensities of nine first-order optical systems spectra, where four of them have to be anamorphic. Constructing a measuring scheme along the lines described above for the second-order case and the third-order case, is rather straightforward.

To find the number of $n$th-order moments $N_n$ and the total number of first-order optical systems $N_e$ (with $N_e$ the number of anamorphic ones) that we need to determine these $N_n$ moments, use can be made of the triangle presented in Table 1, which can easily be extended to higher order.

Note that $N_n$ (the number of $n$th-order moments) is equal to the sum of the values in the $n$th row of the triangle, $N_n = (n+1)(n+2)(n+3)/6$; that $N_e$ (the total number of first-order optical systems) is equal to the highest value that appears in the $n$th row of the triangle, $N_e = (n+2)^2/4$ for $n$ even, and $N_e = (n+3)(n+1)/4$ for $n$ odd; that the number of isotropic systems is $n + 1$; and that $N_N$ (the number of anamorphic systems) follows from $N_N = N_e - (n + 1)$.

5. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown how all global WD moments of arbitrary order can be measured as intensity moments in the output planes of an appropriate number of first-order optical systems (separable, but generally anamorphic ones), and we have derived the minimum number of such systems that are needed for the determination of these moments. The results followed directly from the general relationship (11) that expresses the intensity moments in the output plane of a separable first-order optical system in terms of the moments in the input plane and the system parameters $a_x, b_x, c_x, d_x$ and $a_y, b_y, c_y, d_y$.
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