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REDUCTION OF SOLAR GLINTS FROM THE SEA WITH A LINEAR POLARIZER

1.0
INTRODUCTION

Shipboard defense systems employing infrared warning receivers have experienced saturation of threat detection processing circuits due to the signal resulting from solar reflection (glints) from the rough sea surface. The saturation has made it necessary to blank the threat sector below the horizon for an azimuth extent of up to ± 23° either side of the azimuth of the sun. It is desirable to reduce the angular extent of the glint region over which saturation occurs. The polarization of visible sunlight reflected from water is a familiar phenomenon, and polarization in the infrared is completely similar [1]. The purpose of this technical note is to discuss the potential effectiveness of using a linear polarizer to reduce the magnitude of the solar glint in the infrared.

The analysis shows that the use of a linear polarizer with a shipboard IR warning receiver can typically be expected to increase the number of daylight hours that the sensor can be operated without any blanking, and to narrow the azimuth sector for which blanking is required for low sun angles. The linear polarizer will be most effective during the middle of the day during the spring, summer, and fall. The unpolarized receiver typically may have to be blanked over a ± 23° segment of its azimuth search below the horizon nine to eleven hours per day. With a linear polarizer the number of hours for which blanking will be necessary can typically be reduced to six to eight hours per day and the azimuthal extent of the blanking during the remaining hours reduced to ± 12°.

The objective of this analysis has been to investigate the potential for reducing the time and azimuth dimension of the search volume blanked due to solar specular reflection from the sea surface by using a linear polarizer with the receiver. The results are encouraging and thus provide justification for a more in-depth study for the use of polarization techniques to improve the effectiveness of the IR warning receivers in the presence of strong solar reflection from the sea. Further consideration is needed of Navy operational practices and types and frequencies of occurrence of various sea states encountered at various latitudes, a wave slope model valid for high slopes and wind speeds, and a simulation in which the ship defense sensor system noise, threshold, and spatial resolution are parameters.
2.0

BACKGROUND THEORY

Reflection of solar energy from a smooth surface such as water, the windshield of a car, or a metal roof, produces a high intensity signal, commonly referred to as a glint, which can compete with or even mask the signal intensity of a target. Furthermore, the reflection of unpolarized energy from the sun by a smooth surface produces a reflected radiance component which can be unpolarized, partially polarized, or completely polarized. The unpolarized condition exists for reflection at normal and grazing incidence, the complete polarization condition occurs for an angle of incidence equal to the Brewster angle, and the partially polarized condition exists for all other angles of incidence. The magnitude of the solar glint can be partially attenuated using a linear polarizer. The amount of attenuation is dependent upon the angle of incidence and the orientation of the linear polarizer.

2.1 Reflectance From Water

The Fresnel reflection coefficients for water as a function of incidence angle, $\theta$, are shown in Figure 1 for a wavelength of 4 $\mu$m. In this spectral region, the absorption coefficient (imaginary of the index of reflection) is small so that the perpendicular component of reflection goes to zero at the Brewster angle ($\theta_B = 53^\circ$ for water at 4 $\mu$m).

In general, the energy reflected by a smooth surface from an unpolarized source such as the sun can be thought of as the sum of an unpolarized component and a linearly polarized component. If the surface is assumed to be illuminated by an unpolarized source of unit irradiance and the surface is larger than the incident beam, then the unpolarized component of reflected energy is equal to the parallel reflection coefficient, $r_{||}$. The linear polarized component is equal to one half of the difference between the perpendicular and parallel reflection.
FIGURE 1. FRESNEL REFLECTION COEFFICIENTS
FOR WATER AT 4 μm
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coefficients, $0.5(r_\perp - r_\parallel)$. A linear polarization analyzer aligned orthogonal to the linearly polarized component will attenuate this component completely, and it will transmit one half of the unpolarized component. Thus the fraction of energy that is transmitted by the linear polarizer, $\tau_{\text{pol}}$, is equal to the ratio of one half of the unpolarized component, $0.5r_\parallel$, to the total reflection coefficient, $r = 0.5(r_\perp + r_\parallel)$,

$$\tau_{\text{pol}} = \frac{0.5r_\parallel}{r} = \frac{r_\parallel}{r_\perp + r_\parallel}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

A plot of $\tau_{\text{pol}}$ is shown in Figure 2. At grazing and normal incidence, $\tau_{\text{pol}} = 0.5$ and at the Brewster angle $\tau_{\text{pol}} = 0$.

For an unpolarized target viewed against a solar glint at an angle of incidence equal to the Brewster angle, the glint may be completely eliminated and the target power reduced by only a factor of two with a properly oriented linear polarizer. In general, the glint can always be reduced by a factor larger than two, but it must be remembered that the target will always be reduced by a factor of two unless it also produces a partially polarized radiant intensity.

2.2 Sun and View Angle Considerations

Figure 3 describes the geometrical parameters used here. They include the zenith angle to the detector line of sight, $\theta_d$, the solar zenith angle, $\theta_s$, and the relative azimuth angle between the solar direction and the detector line of sight, $\phi$. The value of $\theta_d$ is typically 89° and this value has been used in the analyses that follow.

For any $\theta_s$, $\theta_d$, and $\phi$, the orientation of a surface which will produce a specular reflection can be evaluated. The orientation of such a surface is defined by the zenith angle, $\theta_n$, and azimuth angle, $\phi_n$, of the normal to that surface. These two angles are given by the expressions

$$\theta_n = \arccos \left\{ \frac{\cos \theta_d + \cos \theta_s}{\left[ (\sin \theta_s + \sin \theta_d \cos \phi)^2 + (\sin \theta_d \sin \phi)^2 + (\cos \theta_d + \cos \theta_s)^2 \right]^{1/2}} \right\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

Equation (2)
FIGURE 2. GLINT SIGNAL POLARIZER TRANSMITTANCE FOR WATER AT 4 \mu m

\[ \lambda = 4.0 \, \mu m \]

Smooth Water

\[ n = 1.347 \]
FIGURE 3. SHIP DEFENSE GEOMETRY, $\theta_d = 89^\circ$ TYPICALLY
The local angle of incidence to the surface, $\theta$, is given by the expression

$$\theta = \arccos \left\{ \frac{\left[ \sin \theta_s + \sin \theta_d \cos \phi \right]^2 + \sin^2 \theta_s + \cos^2 \theta_d}{2} \right\}^{1/2}$$

(4)

Figure 4 is a plot of the unpolarized and the polarized reflection coefficient of water, sloped to produce specular glints, for $\theta_d = 89^\circ$ for various solar zenith angles, $\theta_s$, and azimuth angles, $\phi$. The results are only presented for azimuth angles between $0$ and $180^\circ$ because the results are the same for the $360$ to $180^\circ$ range due to symmetry.

Figure 5 is a plot of $\tau_{pol}$ (Equation 1) for $\theta_d = 89^\circ$ for various values of $\theta_s$ and $\phi$. Both of Figures 4 and 5 show that the highest values of glint extinction occur for moderately high sun positions, i.e., for low values of $\theta_s$. As the sun approaches the horizon, the total signal becomes more unpolarized so that extinction of the glint using a polarizer becomes less effective.

Figure 6 is a plot of the ratio of polarized target signal transmission to polarized glint signal transmission for $\theta_d = 89^\circ$ for various $\theta_s$ and $\phi$. When this ratio is $1.0$, the target signal and the glint signal transmissions are the same and the polarization analyzer is of no benefit. In fact, the use of a polarizer is detrimental in this case since it serves no purpose other than to reduce the system signal-to-noise ratio. A polarizer is least effective when the system is looking right into the sun.

It should be emphasized here, for Figures 4, 5 and 6, that it has been assumed that a reflecting surface with the necessary value of $\theta_n$ and $\phi_n$ exists. Realistic slope distributions of the sea are accounted for in Section 2.3. Figure 7 shows the slope angle, $\theta_n$, required to
FIGURE 4. GLINT REFLECTANCE WITH AND WITHOUT POLARIZER AT 4 \( \mu \text{m} \) FOR SHIP DEFENSE GEOMETRY
**Figure 5.** Glint Signal Polarizer Transmittance for water at 4 μm for ship defense geometry.
FIGURE 6. RATIO OF TARGET TO GLINT SIGNAL POLARIZATION TRANSMITTANCE AT 4 \( \mu \)m FOR SHIP DEFENSE GEOMETRY
FIGURE 7. POTENTIAL GLINT REGION AS A FUNCTION OF WAVE SLOPE FOR SHIP DEFENSE GEOMETRY
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produce a glint for $\theta_d = 89^\circ$ for various solar zenith angles, $\theta_s$, and azimuth angles, $\phi$. It is apparent that the surface slope has to be large to produce glints in any geometry other than a forward scattering geometry. To obtain the glint region which is $40^\circ$ wide in azimuth surface slopes of $30^\circ$ are required for reasonable solar zenith angles, $\theta_s$.

Figure 7 shows that the sea must be fairly rough to produce a sizable glint region. As the sea surface becomes smooth, the glint region becomes small and occurs only for large solar zenith angles, in which case the glint is reasonably unpolarized and polarization techniques can be expected to be ineffective. Figure 7 also makes it apparent that the full $360^\circ$ of azimuth need not be considered when evaluating the potential occurrence of glints.

To place better perspective on the usefulness of the polarization concept, Figure 8 presents a combination of Figure 6 and 7 for the azimuth region of interest $130^\circ < \phi < 180^\circ$. The solid curves in Figure 8 are the target to glint signal ratios of Figure 6 (other values of $\theta_s$ have been included). The dashed curves are the potential glint regions of Figure 7. The intersection of the solid and dashed curves define the glint width for a particular solar zenith angle. For example, the intersection of the $\theta_n = 35^\circ$ and $\theta_s = 30^\circ$ curves occurs at $\phi = 150^\circ$; hence with slopes to $\theta_n = 35^\circ$, specular reflections can be expected over an azimuth range $60^\circ$ in extent, $(180 - 150) \times 2$. The use of a polarizer would provide a target to glint transmission ratio of 40 at $\phi = 150$ and 17 at $\phi = 180$. For calm seas, glints will occur only for sun position near the horizon and the glint extinction by use of a polarization analyzer will then not be effective and may even be detrimental. The horizontal line drawn at 1.414 ($\sqrt{2}$) (see Figure 8) represents the improvement necessary to counterbalance the signal-to-noise loss assuming target or glint noise limited case.

The analysis presented thus far has been qualitative: The potential usefulness of a polarizer increases for larger $\theta_n$ (rough sea) and smaller $\theta_s$ (high sun). In addition, because the reflectances are smaller for
Ratio of target signal transmittance to glint signal transmittance:

\[
\frac{t_{p01}}{t_{p01}^{\text{Glint}}}
\]

**Figure 8. Definition of Potential Glint Region for Various \( \theta_s, \theta_n \) as a Function of \( \psi \).**
small $\theta_s$, there is a better chance that the polarizer will reduce the
glint below the sensor threshold. For example, at $\phi = 180$, the reflect-
tance coefficients of potential glint areas for $\theta_s = 80^\circ$, $60^\circ$, $40^\circ$, $20^\circ$
and $0^\circ$ are respectively $r = .56$, .2, .088, .044, and .029. Thus magni-
tude of the glints, assuming equal glint areas, are an order of magni-
tude lower for the $\theta_s = 20^\circ$ as compared to $\theta_s = 80^\circ$. To complete the
analysis, data concerning the area of glint surfaces as a function of
surface slope are required so that the radiance value associated
with the glints can be determined. It does not require a very large glint
area to produce a significant glint signal. For example, only 15 cm$^2$
of surface area necessary to produce a 1 w·ster$^{-1}$ solar glint at 4 $\mu$m
in a 0.2 $\mu$m spectral bandwidth;

$$1 \text{ w·ster}^{-1} = r \times A \cos \theta L_s (4 \text{ $\mu$m}) \Delta\lambda$$

(5)

where $L_s =$ spectral solar radiance (w·cm$^{-2}$·ster$^{-1}$·$\mu$m$^{-1}$)
$\Delta\lambda =$ the spectral bandpass
$A =$ the surface area of the glint
$\theta =$ the angle of incidence (assumed to be 45$^\circ$)
$r =$ the reflection coefficient.

At 4 $\mu$m $L_s = 16$ w·cm$^{-2}$·ster$^{-1}$·$\mu$m$^{-1}$
r = .03 at $\theta = 45^\circ$
therefore

$$A = \frac{1}{(.707) (.03) (16)(.2)} = 15 \text{ cm}^2$$

Hence an area 3.9 cm square (a little over 1.5 inches on a side) will
produce a radiance intensity of 1 w·ster$^{-1}$ in a 0.2 $\mu$m spectral band.
Atmospheric attenuation might double the required area. The value of
area computed was for a reflectance value that would occur for $\theta_s = 0$,
\( \phi = 180 \). For larger solar zenith angles, the angle of incidence becomes larger, thus the reflectance is larger, and the area required to produce \( 1 \) wave\(^{-1} \) decreases.

2.3 Realistic Slope Distributions and Glint Reduction with a Polarizer

To become more quantitative in the evaluation of the usefulness of the polarization technique, data relating the probable sea surface slopes is necessary. Several researchers [2, 3, 4] have investigated the distribution of sea surface slopes as a function of wind velocity and direction. The model of Cox and Munk [3] will be used here to evaluate the relative glint surface area as a function of slope and geometry to estimate the amount by which the potential glint region may be reduced using a linear polarizer.

Cox and Munk provide an analytical expression \( p(z_x, z_y) \), based on experimental data, which defines the probability for slopes \( z_x \) and \( z_y \) as a function of wind speed and wind direction. This formulation does not account for shadowing and obscuration amongst waves which will occur for the shipboard observation geometry. Thus the Cox and Munk will predict a value of area which is larger than will occur.

\[
p(z_x, z_y) = \left( \frac{2\pi \sigma_c \sigma_d}{c} \right)^{-1} e^{-1/2(\xi^2 + \eta^2)} \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{2} C_{21}(\xi^2 - 1) \eta 
\right. 
\left. - \frac{1}{6} C_{03}(\eta^3 - 3\eta) + \frac{1}{24} C_{40}(\xi^4 - 6 \xi^2 + 3) 
\right. 
\left. + \frac{1}{4} C_{22}(\xi^2 - 1)(\eta^2 - 1) + \frac{1}{24} C_{04}(n^4 - 6 n^2 + 3) \right\} \tag{6}
\]

where \( z_x = -\tan \theta_n \sin (\phi_n - \omega) \)
\( z_y = -\tan \theta_n \cos (\phi_n - \omega) \)
\( \xi = \frac{z_x}{\sigma_c} \)
\( \eta = \frac{z_y}{\sigma_u} \)

\[ \sigma_c^2 = 0.003 + 1.92 \times 10^{-3} W \]
\[ \sigma_u^2 = 0.000 + 3.16 \times 10^{-3} W \]

\( C_{21} = 0.01 - 0.0086 W \)
\( C_{03} = 0.04 - 0.033 W \)
\( C_{40} = 0.40 \)
\( C_{22} = 0.12 \)
\( C_{04} = 0.22 \)

\( W = \text{wind speed (m/sec)} \)
\( \omega = \text{azimuth of wind vector from the sun (Figure 3)} \)

Expression 6 for \( p(z_x, z_y) \) provides a reasonable estimate of slope distributions within limits defined by \( |\xi| \leq 2.5 \) and \( |\eta| \leq 2.5 \). For a given wind speed, \( W \), and wind direction, \( \omega \), these limits define a range of \( \theta_n \) and \( \phi_n \) for which the Cox and Munk distribution is valid. The range of \( \theta_n \) along wind, with \( (\phi_n - \omega) = 0 \) and 180, and cross wind, with \( (\phi_n - \omega) = 90 \), and 270, are shown in Figure 9 for various \( W \). To use the slope distributions of Cox and Munk for \( \theta_n \) as large as 30°, we should limit our analyses to cross winds of \( \leq 17 \text{ m/sec} \) and along winds of \( \leq 27 \text{ m/sec} \).

For the glint reduction analyses that follows, the following assumptions have been made:
\[(\phi_n - \omega) = 180 \Rightarrow \text{the wind direction is always aligned with}
\]
\[\text{the azimuth direction of the reflecting facet.}\]
\[W = 16 \text{ m/sec} \Rightarrow \text{the } p(x, y) \text{ are valid for all slopes from}
\]
\[0^\circ \text{ to } 30^\circ \text{ with } \theta_d = 89^\circ, \text{ this corresponds to}
\]
\[\text{glints produced with } \theta_s \geq 30.\]

With the slope distribution \(p(x, y)\), Cox and Munk show that the
radiance from the sun, reflected by the water, is
\[L = \frac{p(x, y) r(\theta) E}{4 \cos^4 (\theta_n) \cos (\theta_d)} \tag{7}\]

where \(E\) is the solar irradiance normal to the sun's rays. Glints tend to
saturate ship defense sensors within an angular range of approximately \(\pm 20^\circ\).

For purposes of illustration we will assume that the threshold value of sun-
glint radiance with \(\theta_d = 89^\circ\), \(L_t\), occurs at \(\theta_s = 40^\circ\) and \(\phi = 160^\circ\) looking
into a 16 m/sec wind. \(L_t\) can be determined from Equation 7, and then
the conditions for which \(L \leq L_t\) using a polarizer (range of azimuth
angles, \(\phi\), for each solar zenith, \(\theta_s\)) can be determined. This is done
by determining the value of \(\phi\) for each \(\theta_s\) for which
\[L (\theta_s, \phi) \leq L_t (40^\circ, 160^\circ)\]

or equivalently
\[
pol (\phi, \theta_s) \frac{p(0, z_y) r(\theta)}{\cos^4 (\theta_n)} < \frac{p(0, z_y) r(\theta)}{\cos^4 (\theta_n)} = 0.0311 \tag{8}\]

The right hand side of the inequality has been evaluated as follows:
\[\theta_n^t = 30.0235^\circ \text{ from Equation 2 with } \theta_s^t = 40^\circ, \phi^t = 160^\circ, \theta_d = 89^\circ\]
\[\theta_n^t = 63.0984^\circ \text{ from Equation 4 with } \theta_s^t = 40^\circ, \phi^t = 160^\circ, \theta_d = 89^\circ\]
\[ r(\theta^c) = 0.08^\circ \text{ from Figure 4 and defined by } \theta^c_g = 40^\circ, \phi^c = 160^\circ, \theta_d = 89^\circ \]

\[ z_y = \tan \theta_a = 0.5779 \]

\[ p(0, z_y) = 0.2183 \]

The left hand side has been evaluated as a function of \( \phi \) for various \( \theta_s \) with \( \theta_d = 89^\circ \) \( \tau_{pol}(\phi, \theta_s) \) can be determined from Figure 5). Shown in Figure 10 are the values of \( \phi \) for each \( \theta_s \) for which \( L \leq L_t \). For example with \( \theta_s = 50^\circ \), and in fact for all \( \theta_s \leq 52^\circ \) \( L \leq L_t \) for all \( \phi \). At \( \theta_s = 60^\circ \), \( L \leq L_t \) for \( \phi \leq 168^\circ \); at \( \theta_s = 70^\circ \), \( L \leq L_t \) for \( \phi \leq 169^\circ \) etc. As \( \theta_s \) approaches 90\(^\circ\), the range of \( \phi \) for which \( L \leq L_t \) about \( \phi = 180^\circ \) becomes very small, not so much because of the polarizer but because the angular extent of the glint about \( \phi = 180^\circ \) is small at \( \theta_s = 90^\circ \) anyhow.

The data in Figure 10 show that whenever the sun zenith angles \( \theta_s \) is less than 30\(^\circ\), for the \( W = 16 \text{ m/sec} \) sea state considered, the unpolarized receiver does not have to be blanked because the intensity of the sunglint is below the threshold value \( L_t \). Typically the sun zenith \( \theta_s \) is less than 30\(^\circ\) for only one to two hours per day, and then only during the summer months at the midlatitudes. Figure 10 also shows that, under the same wind condition, the polarized receiver does not need to be blanked whenever the sun zenith angle \( \theta_s \) is less than about 50\(^\circ\). Typically the sun zenith \( \theta_s \) is less than 50\(^\circ\) for a period lasting about three hours longer than \( \theta_s \) less than 30\(^\circ\). This means a longer time window in which an IR shipboard warning receiver can give complete azimuthal coverage. Further, Figure 10 shows that the azimuth sector below the horizon which needs to be blanked for the lower sun elevation angles (larger \( \theta_s \)) can be reduced from approximately \( \pm 25^\circ \) to \( \pm 12^\circ \).

The result of the fact that glints can be reduced to a level lower than \( L_t \) whenever \( \theta_s \leq 50^\circ \) is shown in Figure 11. At 40\(^\circ\)N latitude, \( \theta_s \leq 50^\circ \) for more than 40\% of the daylight hours from early April until mid-September. Hence during these months glint levels can be reduced by
FIGURE 10. DEFINITION OF $\theta_s$ AND $\theta$ OF GLINT SATURATION WITH POLARIZER
Figure 11. Fraction of daylight time that the zenith angle of the sun is less than 50° for 30°N and 40°N latitude.
using a polarizer to below the threshold level $L^t$ during 40% of the daylight hours; the region for blanking can be narrowed from $\pm 23^\circ$ to no more than $\pm 12^\circ$ the rest of the time.

The results presented here show that the potential glint area can be significantly reduced using a polarizer; however, a rather special case was evaluated and assumptions were made concerning the system parameters. The results presented here however are encouraging and should provide justification for a more in depth study of the feasibility of using a polarizer to extinguish glints. If further study is undertaken, consideration should be given to the following:

- A realistic simulation of the effects of wind relative to viewing geometry;
- A wave slope model which is valid for high slopes and wind speeds; and
- A simulation in which the ship defense system noise threshold and spatial resolution are parameters.
HARDWARE CONSIDERATIONS

It was shown in Section 2 that there is merit to considering polarization techniques to reduce the effects of solar glints. Here the implementation of such techniques is briefly discussed to provide some insight into the type of system modification that are required if polarization techniques are used.

Since the polarization content of the solar glint is linear plus random polarization, a linear polarizer is required. Maximum extinction of the solar glint is achieved when the linear polarization analyzer is aligned orthogonal to the linear polarization component of the solar glint. The linear polarization of the solar glint varies with solar elevation, $\theta_s$, and azimuth angle, $\phi$. The plane of polarization is defined by a polarization azimuth angle, $\alpha$ [5]. The polarization azimuth angle is $\alpha = 0$ looking straight into the sun where the polarization is horizontal. In general the polarization is perpendicular to the plane defined by the sun - glint - viewer plane. $\alpha$ will be CW in the glint to the left of the sun, CCW to the right. Figure 12 shows the behavior of the polarization angle, $\alpha$, as a function of solar azimuth, $\phi$, and solar zenith angle, $\theta_z$, for the azimuth angles of interest. The hatched region delineates the angular range of $\theta_z$ and $\phi$ where polarization techniques have been shown to be most effective (the region defined by $\theta_z \leq 53^\circ$ and $\theta_n \leq 30^\circ$). In this region polarization azimuth angle varies between 0 and 23°. The average angle is on the order of 8 to 9°.

To obtain maximum glint extinction, the polarization analyzer would have to vary as a function azimuth angle for a given solar zenith angle. However, since a polarization analyzer extinction varies as the cosine squared of the angle between the axis of polarizer and the linear polarization component, a linear polarizer with its polarization axis oriented

Figure 12. Polarization Azimuth as a Function of Solar Geometry
vertically would, on the average, be 98% as effective as an analyzer optimally oriented. Therefore, a system using a polarization analyzer oriented vertically, covering the necessary field-of-view, will perform almost as well as the optimum system and of course will be much easier to implement.

The field-of-view for which the polarizer is needed is small. The polarizer would be needed over ~2° in elevation and ~46° in azimuth to effectively reduce the solar glint. The elevation range should be slightly above the horizon to about 2° below the horizon; the azimuth range should be centered ± 23° about the azimuth direction to the sun. The elevation aspect could remain fixed, but provision would have to be made to move the polarization analyzer in azimuth to off-set ship maneuvers relative to the sun.