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ABSTRACT
As an essential processing step in many disciplines, signal denoising efficiently improves data quality without extra cost. However, it is relatively under-utilized for terahertz spectroscopy. The major technique reported uses wavelet denoising in the time-domain, which has a fuzzy physical meaning and limited performance in low-frequency and water-vapor regions. Here, we work from a new perspective by reconstructing the transfer function to remove noise-induced oscillations. The method is fully objective without a need for defining a threshold. Both reflection imaging and transmission imaging were conducted. The experimental results show that both low- and high-frequency noise and the water-vapor influence were efficiently removed. The spectrum accuracy was also improved, and the image contrast was significantly enhanced. The signal-to-noise ratio of the leaf image was increased up to 10 dB, with the 6 dB bandwidth being extended by over 0.5 THz.
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I. INTRODUCTION
Spectroscopy at terahertz (THz) frequencies has been extensively studied in the last three decades since the invention of THz time-domain spectroscopy (TDS). The straightforward extraction of material properties enables applications in physics, chemistry, and biology. To adapt to these applications, system developments have been focused on improving the acquisition speed, operational bandwidth, and functional devices and reducing the cost. Nowadays, a typical TDS system can provide a peak signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of 60–80 dB. Photoconductive antenna based systems typically provide a usable bandwidth below 4 THz, but this can be greatly extended to over 30 THz using optical rectification or air-plasma, reaching the mid-infrared regime. However, the picosecond-short time-domain pulse dictates that the SNR must exponentially decrease toward the lower and upper bandwidth. The actual effective bandwidth in a specific experiment could be a lot shorter than the system’s spectral range, depending mainly on the signal attenuation and the available integration time. A longer integration time is essential to improve the SNR by suppressing the white noise. However, this is inefficient in TDS measurements as the longer time-constant has to be applied for all sampling points in the time-domain, instead of only the low SNR region. The SNR and the effective bandwidth are especially limited in applications where a fast acquisition is favorable or necessary, such as raster-scan imaging or monitoring a fast dynamic process. In many other studies, numerical signal denoising could be an efficient approach to improve the SNR. Unfortunately, it has been left as a relatively blank space for THz spectroscopy.

The simplest denoising techniques for TDS signals are time-domain windowing and Fourier filtering. The former only removes noise outside the main pulse region by smoothing the wings of the signal to zero. The main pulse is not denoised and can even be mis-shaped. The window function is subjectively selected and restricts many applications, of which multiple reflections are considered. Fourier filtering usually applies a low-pass or band-pass filter to remove noise outside the effective bandwidth. It improves the time-domain signal quality but has no improvement to the useful spectrum at all. Wavelet denoising is almost the only useful technique for THz spectroscopy. Unlike Fourier transform that
represents a time-domain signal by infinitely long sinusoidal waves. The wavelets are shifted and scaled to decompose a THz signal. The resulting wavelet coefficients are distributed in a 2D wavelet-domain, representing the frequency compositions varying with time. To denoise a signal, a threshold value needs to be defined to set coefficients below that threshold to zero. Using wavelet denoising for THz signals was first proposed by Mittleman et al. for gas sensing.16 After that, successful applications in tomography and imaging were also reported.17,18 Apart from denoising, it has also been applied for THz deconvolution.19,20 The limitations of the wavelet technique, however, have seldom been discussed. An obvious point is the abstract physical meaning. Unlike Fourier coefficients, which stand for the physical properties of an electromagnetic wave, the processing of the wavelet coefficients is mainly numerically based with little physical meaning. Furthermore, it also has a limited performance at low frequencies and in the regions with dense water-vapor absorptions. Low-frequency wavelet components are usually greater than the threshold and are not filtered. Water vapors generate echoes that weakly oscillate in the time-domain. Some of them could be mistakenly classified as redundant noise in the wavelet coefficients and removed, altering the spectrum profile near the water-vapor lines. These can be seen from the examples in the work by Kim et al.21 and will also be demonstrated in our later comparison. From this point, wavelet denoising works better in the time-domain, such as the ECG (electrocardiography) signals.22 Last, the denoising performance also relies on the proper selection of the wavelet function, decomposition level, and filtering threshold. They should be carefully optimized to avoid shaping the signal or suppressing peaks in the spectrum, which makes the processing very subjective.22

Apart from direct denoising, Pupeza et al. proposed a Spatially Variant Moving Average Filter (SVMAF) to reduce the influence of noise. The material properties are smoothed with the restriction that the transfer function falls within the confidence interval.23 Noise-induced oscillations on the characterized sample properties were efficiently removed. This also limits its versatility as it is not applicable when the sample properties are not extracted in a measurement. Another technique of autoregressive extrapolation reported by Dong et al. extends the effective bandwidth by predicting values of the transfer function from a high-SNR region.24 Although the work is demonstrated for depth-resolution enhancement, it can be viewed as a denoising approach to improve the data quality in the low SNR region. The major limitation is that a continuous high-SNR interval should be provided. A signal may need to be measured in low humidity as noisy fluctuations induced by the water vapor, if included in the utilized high-SNR bandwidth, will not be denoised and may affect the prediction accuracy.

In this work, we propose a denoising method from a totally different perspective. Instead of directly processing the time-domain or frequency-domain of a signal, we denoise by objectively reconstructing the transfer function (i.e., the complex ratio between the sample and reference signals in the frequency-domain). We remove noise-induced spikes and oscillations in the transfer function by using a genetic algorithm (GA). Both reflection imaging and transmission imaging were conducted to verify the denoising performance. Water–IPA (isopropanol) mixtures were imaged to show a greatly enhanced contrast and reduced spatial variation, as well as the improved characterization accuracy. A fresh leaf was also scanned by transmission to demonstrate the improvement in the image quality and the effective bandwidth.

II. METHOD

A typical THz-TDS measurement computes the transfer function \( M \) by comparing the sample signal to the reference signal in the frequency-domain as the first step for further data processing. Theoretically, this is expressed as

\[
M_{\text{theory}}(\omega) = \frac{E_{\text{sample}}(\omega)}{E_{\text{reference}}(\omega)} = \prod_i R_i(\omega) \frac{R_{\text{sample}}(\omega)}{R_{\text{reference}}(\omega)}
\]

where \( E_{\text{sample}}(\omega) \) and \( E_{\text{reference}}(\omega) \) are the detected sample and reference signals in the frequency-domain. \( R_i(\omega) \) may represent any systematic response that occurs in both the sample and reference measurements, for example, the emitted signal, the detector response, the reflection/transmission of any intermediate optical components, and the water-vapor absorptions. \( R_{\text{sample}}(\omega) \) and \( R_{\text{reference}}(\omega) \) are the response from the sample and the reference medium, respectively, with the latter already known for its optical properties. The division removes all the common terms, and \( M_{\text{theory}}(\omega) \) only contains the sample response normalized to the reference. By establishing a proper optical model, \( M_{\text{theory}}(\omega) \) can be expressed by a series of Fourier transmission and/or reflection coefficients, represented as \( g \), a function of the sample optical properties (e.g., refractive index \( n \) and absorption coefficient \( \alpha \)). In the case of no resonance arising from the sample, \( M_{\text{theory}}(\omega) \) should be smooth in the frequency-domain without oscillations.25,26 Fabry–Perot resonance from a thick substrate may generate periodic variations in \( M_{\text{theory}}(\omega) \). However, this can be mostly avoided in TDS by temporally removing the secondary reflection pulses. Thin-film samples only produce mild variations in the spectrum and do not affect the “smoothness.” In a practical measurement, however, considerable oscillations would occur to \( M(\omega) \) due to the existence of noise, especially in low SNR regions. This can be seen from the following equation:

\[
M_{\text{raw}}(\omega) = \frac{E_{\text{raw}}^{\text{sample}}(\omega)}{E_{\text{raw}}^{\text{reference}}(\omega)} = \frac{E_{\text{sample}}(\omega) + N_{\text{sample}}(\omega)}{E_{\text{reference}}(\omega) + N_{\text{reference}}(\omega)}
\]

where \( M_{\text{raw}}(\omega) \) represents the sample/reference ratio from the raw data without denoising processing. \( N_{\text{sample}}(\omega) \) and \( N_{\text{reference}}(\omega) \) are the noise in the sample and reference signals. In most cases, a long integration time can be practically achieved for the reference signal, and thus, the equation can be simplified to the lower form by neglecting the reference noise. Compared to Eq. (1), as \( N_{\text{sample}}(\omega) \) randomly changes for every frequency, it makes \( M_{\text{raw}}(\omega) \) oscillate around \( M_{\text{theory}}(\omega) \), especially when \( N_{\text{sample}}(\omega) \) is comparable to \( E_{\text{sample}}(\omega) \). Our denoising is based on the expectation that \( M_{\text{raw}}(\omega) \) should be smooth in the absence of noise. The algorithm reconstructs a smooth transfer function \( M_{\text{smooth}}(\omega) \) around \( M_{\text{raw}}(\omega) \). Of course, not every \( M_{\text{smooth}}(\omega) \) approximates \( M_{\text{theory}}(\omega) \). To ensure
this, we compare the time-domain sample signal reconstructed from $M_{\text{smooth}}(\omega)$ and the detected sample signal,

$$E_{\text{diff}}(t) = E_{\text{raw}}^\text{sample}(t) - E_{\text{reconstructed}}(t) = E_{\text{raw}}^\text{sample}(t) - \text{iFFT}(M_{\text{smooth}}(\omega) \cdot E_{\text{reference}}(\omega)).$$

(3)

Theoretically, if $M_{\text{smooth}} = M_{\text{theory}}$, we have $E_{\text{diff}}(t) = N_{\text{sample}}(t)$. In contrast, if any point of $M_{\text{smooth}}$ deviates away from $M_{\text{theory}}$, the smooth profile will drag the neighboring ± span region to be all away from $M_{\text{theory}}$, resulting in a large $E_{\text{diff}}(t)$. Therefore, the evaluation function $f_{\text{eval}}$ can be set to minimize the standard deviation of the absolute difference,

$$f_{\text{eval}} = \text{std}(E_{\text{diff}}(t)).$$

(4)

We optimize $M_{\text{smooth}}$ until $f_{\text{eval}}$ is below the noise level $N_{\text{level}} = \text{std}(N_{\text{sample}}(t))$. $N_{\text{sample}}$ can be estimated by many approaches, such as by measuring the signal with the light being blocked. The above optimization filters solutions $M$ that are smooth, close to $M_{\text{raw}}$, and result in a reconstructed sample signal having difference from the detected sample signal in a noise level. A solution satisfying these criteria would have a high probability to approximate $M_{\text{theory}}$, which is then regarded as the denoised version of $M_{\text{raw}}$. We point out that a noiseless reference is ideal to support the above theory, but it is not compulsory. In case the reference is noisy, $E_{\text{diff}}(t)$ by Eq. (3) (with $M_{\text{smooth}} = M_{\text{theory}}$) is changed to

$$E_{\text{diff}}(t) = N_{\text{sample}}(t) - \text{iFFT}(M_{\text{theory}}(\omega) \cdot E_{\text{reference}}(\omega)) \leq 2 \times N_{\text{sample}}(t), \quad \text{if } |M_{\text{theory}}(\omega)| \leq 1.$$

In this case, the stopping criterion should be changed to $f_{\text{eval}} < \text{std}(2N_{\text{sample}}(t))$. $M_{\text{smooth}}$ can still be found theoretically, while the accuracy could be reduced due to the weaker stopping criterion. In addition, the reconstructed sample signal in the time-domain will be as noisy as the reference signal.

As $M(\omega)$ usually contains hundreds of complex data points to be optimized, denoising is realized by using the GA. The GA is powerful in multiple-domain optimization problems and can provide a fast convergence to approach the global minimum. It mimics the evolution in nature by following a major iteration process of initialization–evaluation–crossover–mutation. The detailed steps are shown in Algorithm 1.

In step 1, a band-pass filter is applied to the sample and reference signals to remove the useless noise outside the effective bandwidth. $M_{\text{raw}}$ is calculated according to Eq. (2) and decomposed into its magnitude $|M_{\text{raw}}|$ and phase $\text{Arg}(M_{\text{raw}})$ for later processing.

**Algorithm 1.** Genetic algorithm steps.

1. Band-pass filter pre-processing. Calculate $M_{\text{raw}}(\omega)$
2. **Initialization.** Randomly initialize $M_i(\omega)$, $0 \leq i \leq \text{NumPop}$
3. **Evaluation.** Calculate $f_{\text{eval}}$ by Eq. (4) and rank
4. **Crossover.** Select the top half to generate new populations
5. **Mutation.** Mutate $p_{\text{mut}}$ percent of the crossover population
6. If $f_{\text{eval}, i} < N_{\text{level}}$ or Iteration > NumIter
   Go to step 7 if yes. Go to step 3 if no.
7. Output the top ranked $M_i$ in the last iteration

Step 2 initializes $M_0$. To build $M_i$ with a higher chance of approximating $M_{\text{theory}}$, the key issue is to keep $M_i$ close to $M_{\text{raw}}$ and smooth. The simplest example is directly applying a smooth function to $M_{\text{raw}}$. Mathematically, this is represented by

$$\text{Smooth}(M_{\text{raw}}, \text{span}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{p=1}^{\text{span}} M_{\text{raw}}(p)}{2\cdot\text{span}}, & p = \text{span} < 1 \\ \frac{\sum_{p=\text{span}}^{p_{\text{max}}} M_{\text{raw}}(p) - \sum_{p=1}^{\text{span}-1} M_{\text{raw}}(p)}{2\cdot\text{span} - 2}, & 1 + \text{span} < p < p_{\text{max}} - \text{span} \\ \frac{\sum_{p=p_{\text{max}}-\text{span}}^{p_{\text{max}}} M_{\text{raw}}(p)}{2\cdot\text{span} - 2}, & p + \text{span} > p_{\text{max}}. \end{cases}$$

(5)

This Smooth function is the same as the one used in Matlab. Here, $p$ is the index and $p_{\text{max}}$ denotes the length of $M_{\text{raw}}$. The Smooth function averages $M_{\text{raw}}$ in every ± span. The span at the start and the end of the $M_{\text{raw}}$ array was reduced to adapt to the available data points. The length should be selected such that the smoothed curve can maintain the dispersion profile. An example is shown in Fig. 1. Here, $M_{\text{raw}}$ is the ratio between a quartz-water (sample) and a quartz-air (reference) reflection, with the magnitude $|M_{\text{raw}}|$ shown as the gray curve. The dispersive properties of water result in a frequency-dependent curve. Noise-induced oscillations are mostly distributed in the high-frequency region where the SNR is low. The span is set to be the length of 0.05 THz, and the curve is smoothed for every 0.1 THz range, as shown in the black curve. The oscillations have been greatly suppressed, but the dispersion is maintained. However, it may not approximate $M_{\text{theory}}$. We initialize a large number of $M_i$ and find out the best one. This is done by randomly sampling every 0.1 THz (=2span). At every sampled point, a value was randomly assigned in-between $|M_{\text{raw}}|$ and $|\text{Smooth}(M_{\text{raw}})|$. Two examples are shown as the red dots and blue triangles in Fig. 1.

**FIG. 1.** An example of initializing $|M_i|$ from $|M_{\text{raw}}|$ and $|\text{Smooth}(M_{\text{raw}})|$.
A spline interpolation is applied to the assigned points to obtain values at all frequencies, shown as the red and blue solid curves. Such initialization ensures curves have good smoothness and are close to $M_{\text{raw}}$. The values in the high-SNR regions are very close to $M_{\text{raw}}$ because they have a narrow assigning range, while they have large reconstructive flexibilities where noisy oscillations occur. Similar initialization was also applied to $\text{Arg}(M_{\text{raw}})$ to get the complex arrays of $M_i = |M_{\text{raw}}| \exp(\text{i} \text{Arg}(M_{\text{raw}}))$. The number of populations (i.e., the total number of $M_i$) was set as $\text{NumPop}$.

The initialized $M_i$ were substituted into Eqs. (3) and (4) to calculate $f_{\text{eval}}$, and they were ranked from low to high in step 3. The top half represents a higher chance to approximate $M_{\text{theory}}$. They were kept for crossover in step 4. The lower half is abandoned.

The crossover in step 4 calculates the average of every two adjacent populations. As the remaining populations could be close to $M_{\text{theory}}$, their averages may inherit some features from their parent population and could also have a high chance to approximate $M_{\text{theory}}$.

To avoid being trapped in local minima, the mutation process in step 5 is set to increase the optimization divergency. In detail, $P_{\text{mut}}$ percentage of the crossover populations was selected. A frequency point in the effective bandwidth region of the selected population was randomly picked, and the corresponding value was randomly changed by less than 5%. Directly doing this generates a spike to break the smoothness. Therefore, the values at a span distance [same as the span in Eq. (5)] from the mutation point were abandoned, with a spline interpolation used to reassign their values. This can be expressed as

$$M_{i_{\text{mut}}}^\text{mut} = y_i = \text{Interpolate}(x, y, x', \text{spline})$$

where

$$x = (1 : p - \text{span}), p, (p + \text{span}),$$

$$y = M_i(x),$$

$$x_i = 1 : \text{p}_{\text{max}},$$

where $p$ denotes the index of the point being mutated. The smoothness was maintained by the spline interpolation. The mutation in step 5 creates new genes to improve the optimization divergency and accuracy.

Step 6 checks the iteration condition. $f_{\text{eval}, 1}$ represents the top ranked evaluation value. If $f_{\text{eval}, 1} < N_{\text{level}}$, or the iteration has reached the maximum iteration number $\text{NumItp}$ specified, the program stops and outputs the top ranked $M_i$ in the last generation in step 7. Otherwise, steps 3–5 iterate to keep optimizing $M_i$.

In our experiments, the GA parameters were set as $\text{NumPop} = 200$, $\text{NumItp} = 50$, and $P_{\text{mut}} = 0.1$. These parameters are different from the thresholds in wavelet denoising that conclusively affect the denoising results. They are adjusted only to balance the processing speed and accuracy without affecting the objective evaluation principle.

### III. EXPERIMENTS

Two measurements were conducted to verify the algorithm performance. First, water–IPA mixture solutions of different volume fractions were imaged in reflection under 70% relative humidity. The measurement was performed using the Menlo K15 reflection THz-TDS system as described in our previous work,\(^1\) with a quartz window above the scanning THz optics and samples being placed on top of the window. In the second experiment, a fresh leaf was scanned in a free-space transmission TDS system with a 4.5% relative humidity.

#### A. Water–IPA imaging

In the first imaging experiment, we raster scanned a square area of $30 \times 30$ mm$^2$ using a step of 0.5 mm in both directions. The THz waveforms were acquired at a rate of 4 Hz, which in the frequency-domain give an SNR = [40, 24, 12] dB at [0.4, 1.0, 1.4] THz, respectively. Measurements were conducted in a relative humidity of 70%, which introduces many water-vapor-absorption lines. Liquid samples were placed on the quartz window and contained by a rubber ring, indicated by the circle in Fig. 2. At first, 1.5 ml pure water was in the circular area. The THz optics started at the original point $(x, y) = (0, 0)$ and scanned along the $y$-direction to $(0, 30)$. It then moved to the next line to make a Z-route scan. Right before scanning the line of $x = 7.5$ mm, 0.27 ml IPA was added and mixed with the water in the circle, resulting in a solution with an IPA volume fraction of 15%. Similarly, right before the lines of $x = 15$ mm and $x = 22.5$ mm, 0.36 ml and 0.6 ml of IPA were mixed with the previous solution and increased the IPA volume fraction to be 30% and 45%, respectively.

By doing this, we manually create three sharp boundaries in-between the four mixtures, as shown in the four separated regions inside the

![FIG. 2](https://example.com/figure2)

(a) Refractive index and (b) absorption coefficient images from the raw and denoised data at 0.15 THz, 0.4 THz, 1.16 THz, 1.3 THz, and 1.41 THz. The labels 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 in (a) indicate the region of air and IPA–water mixtures with IPA volume fractions of 0%, 15%, 30%, and 45%, respectively. The dot in (a) indicates the data at $(14, 15)$, which are shown as an example in Fig. 3.
circle, labeled as 1, 2, 3, and 4 in Fig. 2(a). The area outside the circle is ambient air and labeled as 0. \( n \) and \( \alpha \) at different frequencies without and with denoising processing are shown in the upper and lower parts of Figs. 2(a) and 2(b), respectively.

The presented five frequencies have different SNRs. 0.15 THz locates at the lowest effective bandwidth with a relatively low SNR. The raw data have a certain level of noise but do not obviously affect the image quality because the contrast among different volume fractions was very large at low frequencies. We can observe the improvement by the algorithm from the more uniform color distribution. 0.4 THz has the best SNR of the spectrum. The contrast of the denoised images is only slightly improved. It is more important that consistent colors are found for the raw and denoised images, verifying that the accuracy was well maintained after denoising. 1.16 THz locates at a deep water-vapor line and thus is strongly attenuated. Both \( n \) and \( \alpha \) of the raw data are very noisy and can barely display the boundaries. Promisingly, denoising was able to retrieve the noiseless values, and the four regions are clearly separated. 1.3 THz was less affected by water vapor but was closer to the upper bandwidth limit. The boundaries of \( \alpha \) are barely noticeable, while they can still be clearly seen after denoising. 1.41 THz has a very weak SNR due to both the system bandwidth and the water-vapor. In addition, the difference among different volume fractions at high frequencies is much smaller. The raw images are extremely noisy, and \( \alpha \) can even be negative. Even in this case, one can still easily distinguish the four regions in the denoised images. The comparison demonstrates the efficient denoising in the full bandwidth. The successful application to the four mixtures and the outside air regions shows the good adaptability to various types of signals.

In Fig. 3, we show the denoising detail of the middle point at (14, 15). The red curves in Fig. 3(a) show the magnitude and phase of the reconstructed \( M\text{smooth} \) output from the algorithm. Compared to \( M\text{raw} \) shown in the blue curves, the noise-induced oscillations were obviously removed. To evaluate the accuracy, Fig. 3(b) shows the corresponding reconstructed and raw sample signals (they are offset for clarity). The greatly reduced noise can be clearly observed from the flat region before the main pulse. Note that the raw signal has been processed with the band-pass filter to remove the meaningless spectrum range, and the improvement here is solely from denoising the effective bandwidth. Their absolute difference \( |E_{\text{diff}}| \) multiplied by a factor of 100 is shown as the gray curve. The dashed purple line calculates its standard deviation, which is slightly lower than the noise level shown as the dashed black line. This indicates that the optimization of this point was stopped by the condition of \( f_{\text{eval}} < N_{\text{level}} \).

To quantitatively compare the contrast enhancement, we plot \( n \) and \( \alpha \) at 1.16 THz and 1.41 THz along the x-direction with and without denoising in Fig. 4. Each symbol represents the average of the data in every three lines (\( \Delta x = 1.5 \text{ mm} \) and \( y = 10–20 \text{ mm} \)). The error bars are given by their standard deviation. Figure 4(a) shows that, at 1.16 THz, a clear stair-shape is resolved in the denoised data, with the error bars of different regions separated from each other. In contrast, the boundaries in the raw data cannot be recognized, and the error bars of different regions are all vastly overlapped. We can even observe a small increasing trend in each region from the denoised results. This is due to slight IPA evaporation during the image scanning, which can also be verified from the tiny color variation in Fig. 2. This tiny variation is not observable in the raw data. Figure 4(b) gives the results at 1.41 THz. Due to the lower SNR and sample contrast, we can only observe an overall decreasing trend in the raw data. After denoising, the standard deviation was significantly reduced by a factor of about 7, providing a stair-shape.
distribution. For both frequencies, obvious changes in both $n$ and $\alpha$ are noticed after denoising. This is due to the inaccurate raw data at these two frequencies affected by the intense water-vapor attenuation. The accuracy is greatly improved after denoising. This is verified by the following full spectrum comparison.

We take $n$ and $\alpha$ of the 30% IPA–water mixture (i.e., region 3 in Fig. 2) as an example. The data in $x = 15–22$ mm and $y = 5–25$ mm were averaged and are shown as a function of frequency in Fig. 5. Figures 5(a) and 5(b) compare the raw data with the reported wavelet denoising and the proposed denoising method, respectively. The error bars stand for the standard deviation, and the bright green, orange, and purple lines on the background indicate the water-vapor absorption lines at 0.56 THz, 1.16 THz, and 1.41 THz, respectively. The raw data show increasing errors toward higher frequencies. However, the errors in the water-vapor regions are much higher than the neighboring values, indicating an extra influence by the water vapor. This results in an accuracy that is greatly affected, as evidenced by the abrupt spikes that are not expected as both water and IPA contain no resonance in the studied frequency range. The wavelet denoising obviously reduces the standard deviations; however, the accuracy is also significantly affected. This is in line with our discussion in the Introduction. In contrast, the denoised results are all within the error bars of the raw data. The curves present reasonable continuity without spikes. This is especially noticeable in water-vapor regions, showing a consistent variation and unchanged error bars with the neighboring values. The significantly improved accuracy by denoising well explains the change in $n$ and $\alpha$ in Fig. 4. It is an outstanding ability of being able to remove the influence of water-vapor absorptions in the THz range, as this has barely been realized in an effective way. The only reported work on removing water-vapor effects by using deconvolution was done by Withayachumnankul et al. However, the method relies on an accurate water-vapor model under the specific humidity, temperature, and pressure and requires a high frequency resolution and SNR to resolve the water-vapor lines. Here, the proposed denoising algorithm does not depend on any physical circumstance or spectrum resolution, providing a much better versatility.

B. Leaf transmission imaging

To demonstrate the practical application of the algorithm, we scanned a fresh leaf in transmission under a low relative humidity of 4.5%. As one of the first THz imaging examples, Hu and Nuss demonstrated an impressive THz leaf image in 1995 showing the capability of using THz to investigate the water-content in biological samples. Since then, many water-sensitive studies were reported, such as skin and breast cancer detection. The study of leaves was also further extended to more practical applications such as monitoring the water dynamics and exploring the leaf permittivity model. Here, we show how our algorithm can efficiently improve the image SNR and extend the effective bandwidth to assist these applications.

The leaf transmittance at 0.6 THz, 1.45 THz, 1.67 THz, 2.1 THz, and 2.5 THz is shown in Fig. 6(a), with the raw and denoised images shown in the upper and lower parts, respectively. A homogeneous area of the leaf and air regions was labeled with red and blue rectangles, respectively. The SNRs of these two areas were calculated by the ratio between their average E-field and their standard deviation, represented by $\text{SNR} = 20 \log_{10} \frac{\text{mean}(E(\omega))}{\text{std}(E(\omega))}$. The results of the raw and denoised data are given in Fig. 6(b). Due to the large water content, the signals of the leaf region at high frequencies are strongly attenuated, reflected by the darker color in Fig. 6(a) and the low SNR of the red curves in Fig. 6(b). Both images at 0.6 THz provide a relatively high 20 dB SNR in the leaf region. The algorithm only makes a little improvement in the SNR. The image resolution was poor due to the diffraction limit at this long wavelength. The raw images at 1.45 THz and 1.67 THz show obvious noise due to the water-vapor absorption, as can be seen from the dashed red curves in Fig. 6(b). The denoised algorithm fully eliminated the water-vapor influence and reconstructed clear images to resolve the veins on the leaf. This is also reflected by the red solid curve in Fig. 6(b) where the SNR was improved by 6.5 dB and is smooth over these water-vapor regions. These two examples show that water vapor still affects the SNR at the humidity as low as 4.5%, and the ability to remove water-vapor effects is important even in a dry-air environment. The raw image at 2.1 THz only has a 6 dB SNR in the leaf region. The veins are barely noticeable. The denoising algorithm reduces the noise to 4.4 dB and can clearly resolve the veins with a high resolution. The last raw image at 2.5 THz has the SNR less than 0 dB in the leaf region. Even the highly opaque stem was fully merged in noise. The denoised image clearly displays the stem and some blurry features of the veins by increasing the SNR to over 10 dB. We can also observe the noise reduced in the air region, as the SNR was also obviously increased from 17.3 dB to 24.2 dB. One may also notice the SNR improvement outside of the effective bandwidth in Fig. 6(b) (e.g., $>3$ THz of the red curves). This is because the GA initializes $M_{\text{smooth}}(\omega)$ in between $M_{\text{raw}}(\omega)$ and $\text{Smooth}(M_{\text{raw}}(\omega))$, making $\text{std}(M_{\text{smooth}})$
FIG. 6. (a) Transmittance images of the leaf without and with denoising at 0.6 THz, 1.45 THz, 1.67 THz, 2.1 THz, and 2.5 THz. (b) SNR of the leaf and air regions labeled with the red and blue rectangles in (a), calculated by $\text{SNR} = 20 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\text{mean}(E(\omega))}{\text{std}(E(\omega))} \right)$.

IV. DISCUSSION

In this article, we propose a denoising method by reconstructing the transfer function using the GA. The method is built on the expectation that the transfer function should be smooth over the effective bandwidth in the absence of noise and resonance. The GA objectively optimizes the smooth transfer function by minimizing the difference between the reconstructed signal and the detected signal. Two experiments were conducted to verify the performance and demonstrate the application capabilities. The water–IPA reflection imaging shows the greatly enhanced contrast and improved image quality. Further analysis shows that both low- and high-frequency noise and the water-vapor effect were successfully removed by the algorithm. The data accuracy in both the spatial domain and frequency-domain was obviously improved. The leaf imaging demonstrates the application in transmission and low humidity. The SNR of the images was clearly improved up to 10 dB. The water-vapor influence is still obvious at the very low humidity and was fully eliminated by the algorithm. The 6 dB bandwidth was extended by over 0.5 THz. The demonstrated performance would be very helpful in THz imaging, especially in biomedical studies, such as cancer, scar, and diabetic diagnosis. It would also be very useful in many studies demanding a rapid data acquisition that cannot provide a high SNR, for example, the degradation of perovskite, the skin occlusion, and the fast phase transition of vanadium dioxide. Similar to the autoregressive technique, the functionality of extending the effective bandwidth can also enhance the temporal resolution in THz deconvolution, which may further benefit biomedical or industrial applications that demand a good depth-resolving ability.

The cross points between the 6 dB line and curves also demonstrate a broadened effective bandwidth. The upper frequency limit of the leaf and air regions was extended from 2.075 THz to 2.6 THz and from 3.275 THz to 3.95 THz, corresponding to a bandwidth extension of 0.525 THz and 0.675 THz, respectively. The broadened bandwidth effectively enriches the spectrum information for spectroscopic studies.

The denoising method is effective for white noise as it removes the random oscillations in the frequency-domain induced by white-noise. Statistical errors introduced by laser instability and temperature or humidity variations cannot be eliminated by this approach because these errors modulate the whole spectrum without producing random oscillations. However, such statistical errors can be accounted for if the sample is placed on an imaging window rather than in free space, as the initial reflection of the imaging window can be used for calibration. Despite this, the proposed method objectively and efficiently eliminates the noise in the whole effective bandwidth. The ability of removing low-frequency and water-vapor noise is superior than the existing technique of wavelet denoising. The proposed method improves the SNR and extends the bandwidth, which also allows a faster acquisition rate to be used. For example, it may accelerate the imaging speed or increase the sampling rate in monitoring a fast variation process. The processing of the transfer function is independent of the system types and signal profile, making it widely adaptive to all types of THz-TDS systems such as those based on air-plasma that have bandwidths up to 30 THz. It may also be applied in other interference based techniques such as Fourier-transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy. This denoising algorithm can therefore serve as a powerful tool in various photonics based spectroscopy applications.
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