

---

# AWFSD: Accelerated Wirtinger Flow with Score-based Diffusion Image Prior for Poisson-Gaussian Holographic Phase Retrieval

---

Zongyu Li\*, Jason Hu\*, Xiaojian Xu, Liyue Shen, and Jeffrey A. Fessler

EECS Department

University of Michigan

zonyul, jashu, xjxu, liyues, fessler@umich.edu\*

## Abstract

Phase retrieval (PR) is an essential problem in a number of coherent imaging systems. This work aims at resolving the holographic phase retrieval problem in real world scenarios where the measurements are corrupted by a mixture of Poisson and Gaussian (PG) noise that stems from optical imaging systems. To solve this problem, we develop a novel algorithm based on **Accelerated Wirtinger Flow** that uses **Score-based Diffusion** models as the generative prior (AWFSD). In particular, we frame the PR problem as an optimization task that involves both a data fidelity term and a regularization term. We derive the gradient of the PG log-likelihood function along with its corresponding Lipschitz constant, ensuring a more accurate data consistency term for practical measurements. We introduce a generative prior as part of our regularization approach by using a score-based diffusion model to capture (the gradient of) the image prior distribution. We provide theoretical analysis that establishes a critical-point convergence guarantee for the proposed AWFSD algorithm. Our simulation experiments demonstrate that: 1) The proposed algorithm based on the PG likelihood model enhances reconstruction compared to that solely based on either Gaussian or Poisson likelihood. 2) The proposed AWFSD algorithm produces reconstructions with higher image quality both qualitatively and quantitatively, and is more robust to variations in noise levels when compared with state-of-the-art methods for phase retrieval.

## 1 Introduction

Poisson-Gaussian phase retrieval (PR) is a nonlinear inverse problem, where the goal is to recover a signal from the (square of) magnitude-only measurements that are corrupted by both Poisson and Gaussian noise [1]. This problem is crucial in numerous applications across various fields such as astronomy [2], X-ray crystallography [3], optical imaging [4], Fourier ptychography [5–8] and coherent diffractive imaging (CDI) [9]. In CDI, a coherent beam source illuminates a sample of interest and a reference. When the beam hits the sample, it generates secondary electromagnetic waves that propagate until they reach a detector. By measuring the photon flux, the detector can capture and record a diffraction pattern. This pattern is roughly proportional to the square of Fourier transform magnitude of electric field associated with the illuminated objects [10, 11]. Recovering the structure of the sample from its diffraction pattern is a non-linear inverse problem known as holographic PR. To solve this problem, the maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimate can be conducted

---

\*Z. Li and J. Hu contribute equally to this work.




Figure 1: Illustration of Poisson and Gaussian noise statistics in holographic phase retrieval.

with the following form:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N} p(\boldsymbol{x} | \boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{r}) = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N} g(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{r}) + h(\boldsymbol{x}), \quad (1)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{x}$  denotes the image to recover,  $\boldsymbol{y}$  is the measurement collected,  $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times N}$  denotes the corresponding system matrix in holographic PR where  $M$  denotes the number of measurements and  $N$  denotes the dimension of  $\boldsymbol{x}$ . The known reference image  $\boldsymbol{r}$  provides additional information to reduce the ambiguity of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ ; using an extended reference is a common technique in Holographic CDI [12, 13]. Following Bayes' rule, we denote  $g(\boldsymbol{x}) = -\log p(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{r} | \boldsymbol{x})$  and  $h(\boldsymbol{x}) = -\log p(\boldsymbol{x})$  as the data-fidelity term and the regularization term, respectively.

In practical scenarios, the measurements  $\boldsymbol{y}$  are contaminated by both Poisson and Gaussian (PG) noise. The Poisson distribution is due to the photon counting and dark current [14]. The Gaussian statistics stem from the readout structures (e.g., analog-to-digital converter (ADC)) of common cameras. Fig. 1 illustrates the PG mixed noise statistics in the holographic PR. Because the PG likelihood is complicated (see (4)), most previous works [4, 5, 7, 15–41] approximate the Poisson noise statistics by the central limit theorem and work with a substitute Gaussian log-likelihood estimate problem; or use the Poisson maximum likelihood model but simply disregards Gaussian readout noise. Besides, other more complicated approximation methods have also been proposed, such as shifted Poisson model [42], the unbiased inverse transformation of a generalized Anscombe transform [8, 43] and the majorize-minimize algorithm [44]. However, these approximate methods can lead to a suboptimal solution after optimization that results in a lower-quality reconstruction.

Apart from the likelihood modeling, the regularizer  $h(\boldsymbol{x})$  provides prior information about underlying object characteristics that may aid in resolving ill-posed inverse problems. Beyond simple choices of  $h(\boldsymbol{x})$  such as total variation (TV) or the L1-norm of coefficients of wavelet transform [45], deep learning (DL)-integrated algorithms for solving inverse problems in computational imaging have been reported to be the state-of-the-art [46]. The trained networks can be used as an object prior for regularizing the reconstructed image to remain on a learned manifold [47]. Incorporating a trained denoising network as a regularizer  $h(\cdot)$  led to methods such as plug-and-play (PnP) [48–50], and regularization by denoising (RED) [51]. In contrast to training a denoiser using clean images, there is growing popularity of self-supervised image denoising approaches that do not require clean data as the training target [52–54].

In addition to training a denoiser as regularizer, generative model-based priors are also proposed [55, 56]. Recently, diffusion models have gained significant attention for image generation [57–60]. These probabilistic image generation models start with a clean image and gradually increase the level of noise added to the image, resulting in white Gaussian noise. Then in the reverse process, a neural network is trained to learn the noise in each step to generate or sample a clean image as in the original data distribution. The score-based diffusion models estimate the gradients of data distribution and can be used as plug-and-play priors for the inverse problem solving [61] such as image delurring, MRI and CT reconstruction [62–67]. However, the realm of using score-based models to perform phase retrieval is relatively unexplored; previous relevant works [61, 68] applied denoising diffusion probabilistic modeling (DDPM) to PR but with less realistic system models and under solely Gaussian or Poisson noise statistics. This paper considers a more realistic scenario and shows that the proposed AWFSD algorithm outperforms methods used in previous works.

In summary, our contribution is in three-fold:

- We present a new algorithm known as **Accelerated Wirtinger Flow with Score-based Diffusion models (AWFSD)** as image priors (i.e.,  $\nabla h(\mathbf{x})$  in (1)) to address the challenge of Holographic phase retrieval (PR) problem in the presence of Poisson and Gaussian (PG) noise statistics.
- Theoretically, we derive a Lipschitz constant for the Holographic PR’s PG log-likelihood and subsequently demonstrate the critical points convergence guarantee of our proposed AWFSD algorithm.
- Simulation experiments demonstrate that: 1) Algorithms with the PG likelihood model yield superior reconstructions in comparison to those relying solely on either the Poisson or Gaussian likelihood models. 2) With the proposed score-based prior as regularization, the AWFSD approach generates higher quality reconstructions and is more robust to variation of noise levels without any parameter tuning, when compared to alternative state-of-the-art methods.

## 2 Background

This section reviews holographical phase retrieval and machine learning-based regularizers for inverse problem solving.

### 2.1 Phase Retrieval (PR)

**Gaussian PR.** By assuming the elements of  $\mathbf{y}$  follow independent Gaussian distributions  $\mathbf{y} \sim \mathcal{N}(|\mathbf{Ax}|^2 + \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$ , the data fidelity term  $g(\mathbf{x})$  in (1) becomes  $g_{\text{Gau}}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \|\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{b}} - |\mathbf{Ax}|^2\|_2^2$ . To solve the corresponding MAP optimization problem, a popular method is Wirtinger flow (WF) [23, 37–39] using the Wirtinger gradient:  $\nabla g_{\text{Gau}}(\mathbf{x}) = 4\mathbf{A}' \text{diag}\{|\mathbf{Ax}|^2 - \mathbf{y} + \bar{\mathbf{b}}\} \mathbf{Ax}$ . To determine an appropriate step size for the Wirtinger gradient, one can utilize the Lipschitz constant, or consider using methods such as empirical trial and error, backtracking line search or observed Fisher information [32]. To further accelerate the WF, one can use Nesterov’s momentum methods [69] or optimized gradient methods [70], leading to the accelerated Wirtinger flow (AWF) [7, 71–73] that is commonly used in solving PR problems. Apart from WF, other methods such as matrix-lifting [4, 15, 26], Gerchberg-Saxton [41], majorize-minimize [40] and alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) [20] have also been proposed.

**Poisson PR.** The Poisson ML model assumes  $\mathbf{y} \sim \text{Poisson}(|\mathbf{Ax}|^2 + \bar{\mathbf{b}})$ , so that  $g(\mathbf{x})$  in (1) has the form:  $g_{\text{Pois}}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \mathbf{1}'(|\mathbf{Ax}|^2 + \bar{\mathbf{b}}) - \mathbf{y}' \log(|\mathbf{Ax}|^2 + \bar{\mathbf{b}})$ . Similar to the Gaussian case, one can also apply WF [74] with  $\nabla g_{\text{Pois}}(\mathbf{x}) = 2\mathbf{Ax} \odot (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{y} \oslash (|\mathbf{Ax}|^2 + \bar{\mathbf{b}}))$ , where  $\odot$  and  $\oslash$  denote element-wise multiplication and division, respectively.

The Gaussian and Poisson models are both suboptimal for practical scenario where the measurements are corrupted with Poisson plus Gaussian noise. Furthermore, many previous works [15, 17–19, 21, 22, 24, 26, 35, 37–39, 44, 68, 74] modeled the system matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  (in (1)) as i.i.d. random Gaussian or randomly masked Fourier transform; these assumptions simplify the PR problem and lead to elegant mathematical derivations (e.g., spectral initialization [23, 75]), but they are less related to optical imaging systems used in practical PR [76]. Practical PR involves canonical Fourier transform-based system matrices such as Fresnel PR [77, 78], holographic PR [79], ptychographic PR [80, 81] and Fraunhofer PR [76, 82]. Some previous works also remove the square of the Fourier transform magnitude (see (3)) [22, 24, 35, 68]. However, this square of magnitude indicates the amount of wavelength-weighted power emitted by a light source per unit area, so its removal reduces the practicality.

## 2.2 Deep Learning-based Regularizers

**PnP and RED.** Both PnP and RED are widely adopted in a variety of inverse problems [83–86]. By implicitly representing the prior  $h(\cdot)$  in (1) by an image denoiser, plug-and-play (PnP) methods [87, 88] were proposed to allow the integration of the physical measurement models and powerful DL-based denoisers as image priors [50]. The model-agnostic nature of the denoiser allows PnP methods to be applied to multiple imaging problems using a single DL denoiser simply by changing the imaging model. Regularization by denoising (RED) [89, 90] is an algorithm closely related to PnP that uses denoising engine in defining the regularization of the inverse problems.

**Score Function.** Let  $p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$  denote a model for the prior distribution of the latent image  $\mathbf{x}$ ; the score function is then defined as<sup>2</sup>  $s_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ . Consider a sequence of positive noise scales (for white Gaussian  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_k^2 \mathbf{I})$ ):  $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < \dots < \sigma_K$ , with  $\sigma_1$  being small enough so that noise of this level does not visibly affect the image, and  $\sigma_K$  depending on the application. Score matching can be used to train a noise conditional score network (NCSN) [57, 91] as follows:

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p(\mathbf{x})} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \sim \mathbf{x} + \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_k^2 \mathbf{I})} \left[ \left( s_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \sigma_k) - \frac{\mathbf{x} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}}{\sigma_k^2} \right)^2 \right]. \quad (2)$$

With enough data, the neural network  $s_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \sigma)$  is expected to learn the distribution  $p_\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = \int p(\mathbf{x}) p_\sigma(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$  where  $p_\sigma(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  is defined in (1). To sample from the prior, the method of Langevin dynamics is frequently used [57].

## 3 Methods

This section provides a detailed explanation of the AWFS algorithm.

### 3.1 Wirtinger Flow (WF)

Based on the physical model as demonstrated in Fig. 1, we model the system matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  by the (oversampled and scaled) discrete Fourier transform applied to a concatenation of the sample  $\mathbf{x}$ , a blank image (representing the holographic separation condition [30]) and a known reference image  $\mathbf{r}$ , so that  $\mathbf{y}$  follows the following distribution:

$$\mathbf{y} \sim \mathcal{N}(\text{Poisson}(|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x})|^2 + \bar{b}), \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}), \quad \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \alpha \mathcal{F}\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{r}\}. \quad (3)$$

Here  $\bar{b}$  denotes the mean of background measurements,  $\sigma^2$  denotes the variance of Gaussian noise, and  $\alpha$  denotes a scaling factor (being quantum efficiency, conversion gain, etc) after applying the Fourier transform. Plugging the negative log-likelihood of (3) into (1) leads to

$$g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^M g_i(\mathbf{x}), \quad g_i(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq -\log \left( \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-(|\mathbf{a}'_i \mathbf{x}|^2 + \bar{b}_i)} \cdot (|\mathbf{a}'_i \mathbf{x}|^2 + \bar{b}_i)^n}{n!} \cdot \frac{e^{-\left(\frac{y_i - n}{\sqrt{2\sigma}}\right)^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \right). \quad (4)$$

Here  $M$  denotes the length of  $\mathbf{y}$ ,  $\mathbf{a}'_i$  denotes the  $i$ th row of  $\mathbf{A}$  (since  $\mathbf{A}$  is linear). We opt to use WF for estimating  $\mathbf{x}$  because it is commonly used in practice due to its simplicity and efficiency [23]. The WF algorithm is based on the gradient of (4):

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x}) &= 2\mathbf{A}' \text{diag}\{\phi_i(|\mathbf{a}'_i \mathbf{x}|^2 + b_i; y_i)\} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}, \\ \phi(u; v) &\triangleq 1 - \frac{s(u, v-1)}{s(u, v)}, \quad s(a, b) \triangleq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a^n}{n!} e^{-\left(\frac{b-n}{\sqrt{2\sigma}}\right)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

**Theorem 1.** Assume  $|x_j|$  is bounded above by  $C$  for each  $j$ , a Lipschitz constant of  $\nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x})$  is

$$\mathcal{L}(\nabla g_{\text{PG}}) \triangleq 2\|\mathbf{A}\|_2^2 \left( 2C^2 \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty^2 \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{1}{\sigma^2}} \right) e^{\frac{2y_{\max}-1}{\sigma^2}} + \left| 1 - C^2 \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty^2 \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{1}{\sigma^2}} \right) e^{\frac{2y_{\max}-1}{\sigma^2}} \right| \right), \quad (6)$$

where  $y_{\max}$  is  $\max_i \{y_i\}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, M$ .

<sup>2</sup>This definition differs from the score function in statistics where the gradient is taken w.r.t.  $\theta$  of  $\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ .



---

**Algorithm 1** Poisson-Gaussian phase retrieval via AWFSD.

---

**Require:** Measurement  $\mathbf{y}$ , system matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , momentum factor  $\eta_0 = 1$ , step size factor  $\epsilon$ , weighting factor  $\gamma$ , truncation operator  $\mathcal{P}_C(\cdot) \rightarrow [0, C]$ ; initial image  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , initial auxiliary variables  $\mathbf{z}_0 = \mathbf{w}_0 = \mathbf{v}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0$ , initialize  $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \dots > \sigma_K$ .

**for**  $k = 1 : K$  **do**

**for**  $t = 1 : T$  **do**

    Set step size  $\mu = \epsilon\sigma_k^2$ .

    Set  $\mathbf{w}_{t,k} = \mathcal{P}_C\left(\mathbf{x}_{t,k} + \frac{\eta_{t-1,k}}{\eta_{t,k}}(\mathbf{z}_{t,k} - \mathbf{x}_{t,k}) + \frac{\eta_{t-1,k}-1}{\eta_{t,k}}(\mathbf{x}_{t,k} - \mathbf{x}_{t-1,k})\right)$ .

    Compute  $s_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{t,k}, \sigma_k)$  and  $s_\theta(\mathbf{w}_{t,k}, \sigma_k)$ .

    Set  $\mathbf{z}_{t+1,k} = \mathbf{w}_{t,k} - \mu(\nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{w}_{t,k}) + s_\theta(\mathbf{w}_{t,k}, \sigma_k))$ .

    Set  $\mathbf{v}_{t+1,k} = \mathbf{x}_{t,k} - \mu(\nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x}_{t,k}) + s_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{t,k}, \sigma_k))$ .

    Set  $\eta_{t+1,k} = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\eta_{t,k}^2}\right)$ .

    Set  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1,k} = \mathcal{P}_C(\gamma_{t,k}\mathbf{z}_{t+1,k} + (1 - \gamma_{t,k})\mathbf{v}_{t+1,k})$ .

**end for**

**end for**

Return  $\mathbf{x}_{T,K}$ .

---

Theorem 1 gives the Lipschitz constant of  $\nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x})$  (Proof is given in the Appendix A.1). We extended the analysis of [92] that considers a linear transformation model to a non-linear transformation ( $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \rightarrow |\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}|^2$ ) and with a different system matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ .

### 3.2 Accelerated Wirtinger Flow with Score-based Diffusion (AWFSD) Image Prior

For the acceleration scheme in the WF algorithm, we followed the implementation of [93] as its convergence guarantee was proved. Under the assumption that the true score function can be learned properly, when we have a trained score function  $s_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \sigma)$  by applying (2), the gradient descent algorithm for MAP estimation (1) has the form:  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{x}_t - \mu(\nabla g(\mathbf{x}_t) + s_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, \sigma_k))$ . Algorithm 1 summarizes our proposed AWFSD algorithm (the vanilla version without acceleration is given in Appendix A.3). In a similar fashion as Langevin dynamics, we choose  $\sigma_k$  to be a descending scale of noise levels. In practice, we generally use each noise level a fixed number of times, with geometrically spaced noise levels between some lower and upper bound. The stepsize factor  $\epsilon$  in Algorithm 1 can be selected empirically, but we show that the Lipschitz constant of the gradient  $\nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x}_t) + s_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, \sigma_k)$  exists as demonstrated in Theorem 2 (the proof is given in the Appendix A.2); hence with sufficiently small step size  $\epsilon$ , the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 will converge to a critical point of the posterior distribution in (1).

**Theorem 2.** *With a smooth density function  $p(\mathbf{x})$  that has finite expectation, the Lipschitz constant of  $\nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x}_{t,k}) + s_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{t,k}, \sigma_k)$  exists when each element in  $\mathbf{x}_{t,k}$  satisfy  $0 < |x_j| < C$  for each  $j$ . Furthermore, if the weighting factor  $\gamma \in \{0, 1\}$  is chosen appropriately following [93], i.e., according to whichever higher posterior probability between  $p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{r})$  and  $p(\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{r})$ ; then with sufficiently small  $\epsilon$ , the sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_{t,k}\}$  generated by Algorithm 1 is bounded, and any accumulation point of  $\{\mathbf{x}_{t,k}\}$  is a critical point of the posterior distribution  $p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{r})$  in (1).*

Theorem 2 states that  $\gamma \in \{0, 1\}$  is needed to achieve convergence; nevertheless, we empirically discovered that setting  $\gamma = 0.5$  also led to a convergent sequence of  $\mathbf{x}_{t,k}$ . Alternatively, one can use DDPM to learn to correct the error of a noisy image [58]. However, this approach cannot be incorporated directly with a data fidelity gradient term as the DDPM method does not capture the image prior explicitly, so the diffusion step and the data-fitting step must be performed separately. We implemented a DDPM version of the algorithm following [68] (Details are given in Appendix A.3).

## 4 Experiment

### 4.1 Experiment Settings

**Dataset.** The main dataset we have selected consists of 162 histopathology images related to breast cancer [94]. We opted for this particular dataset owing to its relevance in the context of X-ray imaging that both image the structure of objects at the organ level. We randomly divided this dataset in proportions of 122/20/20 for training, validation and testing, respectively. Although the size of training dataset is relatively small compared to typical datasets such as ImageNet or LSUN [58, 60] that have millions of images, histopathology datasets of this size are not readily available. Furthermore, we do not require the score functions to learn image priors strong enough to generate realistic images from white Gaussian noise; rather, it is sufficient for the priors to be able to denoise moderately noisy images.

**System Model.** The system matrix is based on discrete Fourier transform of the concatenation of the true image  $\mathbf{x}$ , a blank image  $\mathbf{0}$  and a reference image  $\mathbf{r}$  with scaling and oversampling. We set the scaling factor  $\alpha$  to be in the range  $[0.02, 0.035]$  so that the average counts per pixel range from 6 to 25; the oversampled ratio is set to 2. We set  $\mathbf{r}$  to be a binary random image similar to what was used in [30]. The standard deviation of the Gaussian read noise added to the measurements  $\mathbf{y}$  was set as  $\sigma \in [0.5, 1.5]$ .

**Implemented Algorithms.** For unregularized algorithms, we implemented Gaussian WF, Poisson WF and Poisson-Gaussian WF. For regularized algorithms, we implemented smoothed total variation (TV) based on the Huber function [95, p. 184] and PnP/RED methods with the DnCNN denoiser [96]: PnP-ADMM [87], PnP-PGM [88], and RED-SD [51]. We also implemented the RED-SD algorithm with “Noise2Self” zero-shot image denoising network [53] (RED-SD-SELF). For diffusion-based models, we implemented DDPM [68] and our proposed AWFSD. The Appendix A.3 shows the implementation details of each algorithm. We used spectral initialization [75] for the Gaussian PR and Poisson PR methods; we then used the output results from Poisson PR to initialize other algorithms. We ran all algorithms until convergence in normalized root mean squared error (NRMSE) or reached the maximum number of iterations (e.g., 50).

To evaluate the robustness and limitation of these algorithms, we first tuned the parameters for each algorithm at the noise level when  $\alpha = 0.030$  and  $\sigma = 1$ , and then held them fixed throughout all experiments (Table 1, Table 2, Fig. 3 and Fig. 4). This is because in practice the ground truths are unknown so that it is impossible to tune parameters on each testing data. Though the numbers reported can fluctuate after careful refinement, e.g., by performing grid search on tuning parameters, such techniques would potentially impede the algorithm’s practical use.

**Network Training.** For PnP denoising networks, we trained all denoisers on different noise levels  $\sigma \in \{9, 11, 13, 15\}$  and found that  $\sigma = 15$  worked the best on our data. We also used the denoiser scaling technique from [97] to dynamically adjust the performance of all PnP methods. To performing score matching, we applied 20 geometrically spaced noise levels between 0.005 and 0.1 on each of the training images. All networks were implemented in PyTorch and trained on an NVIDIA Quadro RTX 5000 GPU using the ADAM optimizer [98] for 1000 epochs with the best one being selected based off the validation error, i.e., the mean squared error (MSE) loss.

### 4.2 Results

We compared all implemented algorithms both qualitatively, by visualizing the reconstructed images and residual errors, and quantitatively, by computing the NRMSE and structural similarity index measure (SSIM). Due to the global phase ambiguity, i.e., all the algorithms can recover the signal only to within a constant phase shift due to the loss of global phase information, we corrected the phase of  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  by  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{corrected}} \triangleq \text{sign}(\langle \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{true}} \rangle) \hat{\mathbf{x}}$ .

Fig. 2 visualizes reconstructed images generated by algorithms mentioned in the previous section. Our proposed WF with PG likelihood outperforms other unregularized algorithms with a higher SSIM (0.46) and lower NRMSE (41.0%) when compared to that of the Poisson WF with an SSIM




Figure 2: Reconstructed images by different algorithms. The bottom left/right subfigures correspond to the zoomed in area and the error map for each image.  $\alpha$  and  $\sigma$  were set to 0.02 and 1, respectively.

Table 1: SSIM and NRMSE for different likelihoods tested on dataset [94], averaged across 7 different noise levels by varying  $\alpha \in 0.02 : 0.005 : 0.035$  in (3).

Likelihood	Unregularized (SSIM/NRMSE)	DDPM (SSIM/NRMSE)	AWFSD (SSIM/NRMSE)
Gaussian	$0.26 \pm 0.16$	N/A	N/A
Poisson	$0.54 \pm 0.18$	$0.72 \pm 0.13$	$0.83 \pm 0.06$
Poisson-Gaussian	$0.57 \pm 0.18$	$0.80 \pm 0.06$	<b><math>0.85 \pm 0.05</math></b>

value of 0.42 and NRMSE percentage of 45.9%. We found unregularized Gaussian WF failed to reconstruct similar to what was reported in [40]. Of the regularized algorithms, our proposed AWFSD had less visual noise and achieved greater detail recovery compared to other methods, as evidenced by the zoomed-in area in Fig. 2.

For quantitative evaluations, Table 1 exemplifies the effect of using our proposed PG likelihood as compared to the simpler Gaussian or Poisson likelihoods. We did not run the Gaussian likelihood with DDPM or AWFSD due to the abysmal performance with this likelihood. In all cases, usage of the PG likelihood results in improved image quality in terms of both metrics. Table 2 consists of experiments using the PG likelihood and shows the efficacy of the proposed AWFSD method over other methods. In particular, our AWFSD had superior quantitative performance over all other compared methods, as evidenced by its SSIM score of 0.85 and NRMSE value of 15.4%, when compared to PnP-PGM (with an SSIM score of 0.78 and NRMSE value of 16.5%) and PG-DDPM (with an SSIM score of 0.80 and NRMSE value of 16.0%).

Table 2: SSIM and NRMSE using Poisson Gaussian likelihood with different regularization/image prior approaches. Results were tested on dataset [94], and were averaged across 7 different noise levels by varying  $\alpha \in 0.02 : 0.005 : 0.035$  in (3).

Methods	SSIM $\uparrow$	NRMSE (%) $\downarrow$
Unregularized	$0.57 \pm 0.18$	$28.9 \pm 9.0$
RED-SD-SELF	$0.66 \pm 0.13$	$21.9 \pm 4.5$
PnP-ADMM	$0.71 \pm 0.11$	$20.7 \pm 4.2$
TV regularizer	$0.72 \pm 0.11$	$18.2 \pm 3.9$
RED-SD	$0.76 \pm 0.09$	$16.8 \pm 3.6$
PnP-PGM	$0.78 \pm 0.11$	$16.5 \pm 4.5$
DDPM	$0.80 \pm 0.06$	$16.0 \pm 2.9$
AWFSD (Proposed)	<b><math>0.85 \pm 0.05</math></b>	<b><math>15.4 \pm 3.7</math></b>




Figure 3: Comparison of SSIM and NRMSE varying scaling factor  $\alpha \in [0.02, 0.035]$  and STD of Gaussian noise  $\sigma \in [0.25, 1.5]$  defined in (3).




Figure 4: Reconstructed images by DDPM and AWFSD under different  $\sigma$  values. Scaling factor  $\alpha$  was set to 0.02 (defined in (3)).

We also tested the robustness of the leading algorithms in Table 2, by varying both scaling factor  $\alpha$  and STD of Gaussian noise  $\sigma$ . Results are illustrated in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, where our AWFSD algorithm had the highest SSIM and lowest NRMSE. In Fig. 4, AWFSD demonstrated minimal variations in SSIM and NRMSE metrics than DDPM as evidenced by the smaller discrepancies in SSIM (0.17 vs. 0.23) and NRMSE (12.6% vs. 18.2%) when  $\sigma$  varies from 0.75 to 1.5.

## 5 Conclusion

We proposed a novel algorithm known as Accelerated Wirtinger Flow with Score-based Diffusion models (AWFSD) for Poisson-Gaussian holographic phase retrieval. With evaluation on simulated experiments, we demonstrated that our proposed AWFSD algorithm had the best performance both qualitatively and quantitatively and was more robust to various noise levels, compared to other state-of-the-art methods. Furthermore, we proved that our proposed algorithm has a critical-point convergence guarantee. Therefore, our approach has much promise for translation in real-world applications encountering phase retrieval problems.

## Appendix

This is the appendix of the paper ‘‘AWFSD: Accelerated Wirtinger Flow with Score-based Diffusion Image Prior for Poisson-Gaussian Holographic Phase Retrieval’’.

### A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

**Lemma 1.1:** The function  $\phi(u)$  is Lipschitz differentiable ( $\phi$  is defined in (5)). The Lipschitz constant for  $\dot{\phi}(u)$  is:

$$\max\{|\ddot{\phi}(u)|\} \triangleq \mu = \left(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{\sigma^2}}\right) e^{\frac{2y_{\max}-1}{\sigma^2}}, \quad \text{where } y_{\max} = \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \{y_i\}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The proof is given in [92].

To clarify the notation, function  $g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x})$  maps a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$  to a scalar; it is the sum of each  $g_i(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \phi_i(|\mathbf{a}'_i \mathbf{x}|^2 + b_i; y_i)$  over  $i = 1, \dots, M$ . The function  $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$  maps a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$  to the measurement space  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ ; it is the concatenation of each  $g_i(\mathbf{x})$ . So  $\nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ,  $\nabla^2 g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ , and  $\nabla \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ .

By the chain rule, the Hessian of  $g_{\text{PG}}$  is

$$\nabla^2 g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x}) = 2\mathbf{A}' (\text{diag}\{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\} \nabla \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) + \text{diag}\{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})\} \mathbf{A}). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Assume  $|x_j|$  is bounded above by  $C$  for each  $j$ . Then it follows that  $\|\text{diag}\{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\}\|_2 \leq C\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty$  by the construction of matrix-vector multiplication, leading to a Lipschitz constant for  $\nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x})$ :

$$\mathcal{L}(\nabla g_{\text{PG}}) = 2C\|\mathbf{A}\|_2 \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \|\nabla \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})\|_2 + 2\|\mathbf{A}\|_2^2 \|\text{diag}\{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})\}\|_2. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Here  $\mathcal{L}(\nabla g_{\text{PG}})$  denotes a Lipschitz constant for  $\nabla g_{\text{PG}}$ , not necessarily the best one. To compute  $\|\nabla \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})\|_2$ , we substitute the Lipschitz constant of  $\dot{\phi}(u)$  into (5) and apply Lemma 1.1, leading to

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})\|_2 \leq 2C\|\mathbf{A}\|_2 \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \left(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{\sigma^2}}\right) e^{\frac{2y_{\max}-1}{\sigma^2}}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

To compute  $\|\text{diag}\{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})\}\|_2$ , let

$$t \in [b, \max_i \{|\mathbf{a}'_i \mathbf{x}|^2\} + b] \subseteq \mathcal{T} \triangleq [b, C^2 \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty^2 + b]. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

From the fact that  $\dot{\phi}(t) \leq 1$  by its construction, one can derive that

$$\|\text{diag}\{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})\}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})\|_\infty \leq \max_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \{|\dot{\phi}(t)|\} \leq \left|1 - C^2 \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty^2 \max\{|\ddot{\phi}(t)|\}\right|. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Combining the above derivations, we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\nabla g_{\text{PG}}) &= 4C^2 \|\mathbf{A}\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty^2 \left(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{\sigma^2}}\right) e^{\frac{2y_{\max}-1}{\sigma^2}} \\ &\quad + 2\|\mathbf{A}\|_2^2 \left|1 - C^2 \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty^2 \left(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{\sigma^2}}\right) e^{\frac{2y_{\max}-1}{\sigma^2}}\right|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

### A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

It was already shown that  $\nabla g_{\text{PG}}$  is Lipschitz continuous, so the remaining problem is to find a Lipschitz constant for  $s(\mathbf{x}, \sigma)$ . We assume that the data allows the neural network to learn the score function well, i.e.,  $p_\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{x}) \otimes \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ , where  $\otimes$  denotes convolution.

**Lemma 2.1:** The Fourier transform (and inverse transform) of an absolutely integrable function is continuous.

**Proof of lemma 2.1:** Let  $f$  be absolutely integrable and let  $\tilde{f}$  be its Fourier transform. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{f}(w+h) - \tilde{f}(w)| &= \left| \int f(x) (e^{-2\pi j x(w+h)} - e^{-2\pi j x w}) dx \right| \leq \int |f(x)| |e^{2\pi j x h} - 1| dx \\ &\leq \max(|e^{2\pi j x h} - 1|) \int |f(x)| dx \leq 2 \int |f(x)| dx. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Using absolute integrability of  $f$ , we see  $|\tilde{f}(w+h) - \tilde{f}(w)|$  tends to 0 as  $h$  tends to 0, so  $\tilde{f}$  is uniformly continuous, which also implies it is continuous.

The proof of the inverse transform follows similarly.

**Lemma 2.2:** Suppose a sequence of functions  $f_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  converges in the  $L^1$  to some function  $f$ , and that each  $f_i$  is absolutely integrable. Then  $f$  is also absolutely integrable.

**Proof:** Because

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f_i(x) - f(x)| dx = 0 \quad (\text{A.9})$$

and that  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f_i(x)| dx < \infty$ . It follows that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(x)| dx < \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(x) - f_i(x)| dx + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f_i(x)| dx, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

for any  $i$ . The second integral is always finite, and for sufficiently large  $i$ , the first integral must be finite as it converges to 0. Hence it is possible to find  $i$  such that both integrals converge, so  $f$  is absolutely integrable.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.1:** The derivative of  $\log(p(x) \otimes \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2))$  is bounded on the interval  $[-C, C]$ .

**Proof:** We start by dropping constant factors and using derivative of a convolution, we have

$$\frac{d}{dx} (\log(p(x) \otimes \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2))) \sim \frac{\mathcal{F}^{-1}(ix \mathcal{F}(p(x)) \cdot \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)))}{p(x) \otimes \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)} \sim \frac{\mathcal{F}^{-1}(xe^{-x^2} \cdot \mathcal{F}(p(x)))}{p(x) \otimes \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where  $\mathcal{F}$  denotes Fourier transform. The denominator is continuous and since  $x$  lies in a closed interval by assumption, has a lower bound  $M > 0$  by the extreme value theorem. We next consider the numerator.

By [99, pp. 65], a sequence of Gaussian mixture models (GMMs) can be used to approximate any smooth probability distribution in  $L^2$  convergence. Furthermore,  $L^2$  convergence implies  $L^1$  convergence. Hence, consider a sequence of GMMs  $f_i$  that converge in  $L^1$  to  $p(x)$ . By linearity of Fourier transform,  $\mathcal{F}(f_i(x))$  must be a linear combination of terms of the form  $e^{-(x-\mu_i)^2/c_i}$  for some  $c_i$ . Thus, the numerator  $xe^{-x^2} \cdot \mathcal{F}(f_i(x))$  is a finite linear combination of terms of the form  $xe^{-(x-\mu_i)^2/c_i}$ , each of which are absolutely integrable. Therefore, we have a sequence of functions, each of which are absolutely integrable, that converge in  $L^1$  to  $xe^{-x^2} \cdot \mathcal{F}(p(x))$ , so by Lemma 2.2, this is also absolutely integrable. By Lemma 2.1, the inverse Fourier transform of this is continuous. Finally, again by the extreme value theorem and using the boundedness of  $x$ , the numerator is bounded above by some  $M' > 0$ . Hence, the entire expression (A.11) is bounded above by  $M'/M$ .

**Lemma 2.4:** Suppose we have an everywhere twice differentiable function of two variables  $f(x, y) : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y} \log f(x, y)$  is bounded if the following three conditions are met:

1.  $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y} f(x, y)$  is bounded.
2.  $f$  itself is bounded below by a positive number and also bounded above.
3.  $\nabla f$  is bounded.

**Proof:** Suppose we have  $f(x, y)$  satisfying those three conditions. We compute the second partial derivative of its log:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \log f(x, y) = \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x, y)}{f(x, y)}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y} \log f(x, y) = \frac{(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y} f(x, y))f(x, y) - (\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x, y))(\frac{\partial}{\partial y} f(x, y))}{f(x, y)^2}. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

From the second condition, the denominator is bounded below by a positive number, so it suffices to consider the boundedness of the numerator. The first term of the numerator is a product of two

quantities, the first of which is bounded by the first condition and the second of which is bounded by the second condition. The second term of the numerator is also a product of two quantities, both of which are bounded by the third condition. Thus, this shows  $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y} \log f(x, y)$  is bounded.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.2:** The gradient of  $p_\sigma(\mathbf{x})$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $[-C, C]^N$ .

**Proof:** By the definition of Lipschitz continuity, it suffices to show the Hessian of  $p_\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{x}) \otimes \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$  has bounded entries. By renaming the variables, and redefining  $f(x, y) = p(x, y, \dots)$ , we may consider the boundedness of  $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y} (\log f(x, y) \otimes \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}))$  on  $[-C, C]^2$ . To apply Lemma 2.4 to remove the log, we need to verify the three conditions. Define  $g(x, y) = f(x, y) \otimes \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$ . The second condition is readily verified to be true: By assumption,  $x$  and  $y$  take values on a closed interval, thus by the extreme value theorem, so does  $g(x, y)$ . Further,  $g$  is a convolution of positive numbers and so the output is always positive, hence, the lower bound of this closed interval is a positive number, verifying this condition.

For the third condition, we need to consider boundedness of  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x, y) \otimes \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$ . This is nearly identical to Lemma 2.3, with the only difference being we have some general function in terms of only  $x$   $f(x, y)$  instead of a probability distribution  $p(x)$ . The proof of that lemma is readily adapted for this case with the only condition needing verification being the absolute integrability over  $x$  of  $f(x, y)$ . In fact, this is clear because  $f$  is always positive; hence, integrating over  $f$  with respect to  $x$  must yield a finite number as integrating a second time over  $y$  yields 1.

It thus suffices to consider boundedness of  $h(x, y) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y} (f(x, y) \otimes \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}))$ . It is assumed that  $f$  is smooth and the convolution of smooth functions is smooth, which implies  $f(x, y) \otimes \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$  is smooth. Hence  $h$  is differentiable, so it is continuous. Once again by the EVT, as  $x$  and  $y$  take values on a closed interval,  $h$  must be bounded. By Lemma 2.4, the entries of the Hessian of the score function are bounded. Therefore, a Lipschitz constant of  $s_\theta(\mathbf{x})$  exists.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 2:** By Proposition 2.2, and from the design of Algorithm 1,  $\mathbf{x}_{t,k}$  and  $\mathbf{w}_{t,k}$  are both bounded between  $[0, C]$  for all  $t, k$ , so the Lipschitz constant  $\mathcal{L}^*$  of  $\nabla_{g_{\text{PG}}}(\cdot) + s_\theta(\cdot)$  exists. With the stepsize  $\mu$  satisfying  $0 < \mu < \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^*}$ , and the weighting factor  $\gamma \in \{0, 1\}$  being chosen according to whichever higher posterior probability between  $p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{r})$  and  $p(\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{r})$  (see [93]), then we satisfy all conditions in Theorem 1 of [93], which establishes the critical-point convergence of Algorithm 1. Similar convergence analysis can be found in [100].  $\square$

### A.3 Algorithm Implementation

**Wirtinger Flow.** WF is a popular algorithm for phase retrieval. It first computes the Wirtinger gradient (an ascending direction) and then applies gradient descent. Perhaps the most critical step is to find an appropriate step size. In this work, we used backtracking line search for Gaussian WF, and the observed Fisher information [32] for Poisson WF and Poisson-Gaussian WF. Due to the infinite sum in Poisson-Gaussian WF, we approximate the  $s(a, b)$  in (5) according to [92]:

$$s(a, b) \approx \sum_{n=0}^{n^+} \frac{a^n}{n!} e^{-\left(\frac{b-n}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right)^2}, \quad n^+ = \lceil n^* + \delta\sigma \rceil, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

with  $n^*$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} n^* &= \sigma \mathcal{W}\left(\frac{a}{\sigma^2} e^{b/\sigma^2}\right) \approx \sigma \left( \frac{b}{\sigma^2} \log\left(\frac{a}{\sigma^2}\right) - \log\left(\frac{b}{\sigma^2} \log\left(\frac{a}{\sigma^2}\right)\right) \right) \\ &= \frac{b}{\sigma} \log\left(\frac{a}{\sigma^2}\right) - \sigma \log\left(\frac{b}{\sigma^2} \log\left(\frac{a}{\sigma^2}\right)\right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

where  $\mathcal{W}(\cdot)$  denotes the Lambert function. The accuracy of this approximation is controlled by  $\delta$ . A comprehensive analysis on the maximum error value can be found in [92]. To further accelerate the computing (and avoid floating point overflow) of  $\nabla_{g_{\text{PG}}}$ , we observed it effective to use the gradient of Poisson PR for large  $y_i$ , e.g.,  $y_i \geq 100$ . We used this ‘‘trick’’ in our experiments; additionally, one can also use ‘‘defocus’’ to deal with large  $y_i$  [101]. Algorithm A.1 summarizes the WF algorithm for

---

**Algorithm A.1** Phase retrieval via Wirtinger Flow
 

---

**Require:** Measurement  $\mathbf{y}$ , system matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , initialization of image  $\mathbf{x}_0$ .

```

for  $k = 1 : K$  do
  if Gaussian noise model is used then
    Compute  $\nabla g_{\text{Gau}}(\mathbf{x}_k) = 4\mathbf{A}' \text{diag}\{|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_k|^2 - \mathbf{y} + \bar{\mathbf{b}}\} \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_k$ .
  else if Poisson noise model is used then
    Compute  $\nabla g_{\text{Pois}}(\mathbf{x}_k) = 2\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_k \odot (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{y} \oslash (|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_k|^2 + \bar{\mathbf{b}}))$ .
  else if Poisson-Gaussian noise model is used then
    Compute  $\nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x}_k)$  via (5).
  end if
  Compute gradient of the regularizer  $\nabla h(\mathbf{x}_k)$ .
  Compute step size  $\mu_k$ .
  Set  $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k - \mu_k (\nabla g(\mathbf{x}_k) + \nabla h(\mathbf{x}_k))$ .
end for
Return  $\mathbf{x}_K$ 

```

---



---

**Algorithm A.2** Poisson-Gaussian phase retrieval via WFSD.
 

---

**Require:** Measurement  $\mathbf{y}$ , system matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , step size factor  $\epsilon$ , truncation operator  $\mathcal{P}_C(\cdot) \rightarrow [0, C]$ ; initial image  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , initialize  $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \dots > \sigma_K$ .

```

for  $k = 1 : K$  do
  for  $t = 1 : T$  do
    Set step size  $\mu = \epsilon\sigma_k^2$ .
    Compute  $s_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{t,k}, \sigma_k)$ .
    Set  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1,k} = \mathcal{P}_C(\mathbf{x}_{t,k} - \mu (\nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x}_{t,k}) + s_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{t,k}, \sigma_k)))$ .
  end for
end for
Return  $\mathbf{x}_{T,K}$ .

```

---

phase retrieval. By replacing  $\nabla h(\mathbf{x})$  with the trained score function  $s_\theta$ , one can derive the vanilla gradient-descent version (Algorithm A.2) of the AWFSD algorithm.

**PnP-ADMM.** The plug-and-play ADMM first derives a Lagrangian using variable splitting and then applies alternating minimization [48]. In this work, let  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{x}$ , and the Lagrangian is

$$L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\eta}; \rho) = g_{\text{PG}}(|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}|^2 + \mathbf{b}) + R(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{\rho}{2} (\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2). \quad (\text{A.16})$$




Figure A.1: The architecture of the adopted DnCNN network [96].

Algorithm A.3 summarizes the PnP-ADMM algorithm for phase retrieval. In this work, we trained the denoiser  $h_\theta$  using the network DnCNN [96]. As shown in Fig. A.1, the architecture of DnCNN consists of convolution (Conv), Rectified Linear Unit (ReLU), and batch normalization (BN). The network was trained with residual learning where the output is the noise residual and the clean image was obtained by subtracting the noisy output. We trained all denoisers for 400 epochs with image patches of size  $40 \times 40$  on each given dataset.

**PnP-PGM.** Similar to PnP-ADMM, one can also derive a proximal gradient method as shown in Algorithm A.4. Here we assume the denoising of  $h_\theta$  is a proximal operation.



---

**Algorithm A.3** Poisson-Gaussian phase retrieval via PnP-ADMM

---

**Require:** Measurement  $\mathbf{y}$ , system matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , initialization of image  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , initialization of auxiliary variable  $\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0$ , initialization of dual variable  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ , pre-trained denoiser  $h_\theta$ , Lagrangian penalty parameter  $\rho$ .

```
for  $k = 1 : K$  do
  for  $t = 1 : T$  do
    Compute step size  $\mu_{t,k}$ .
    Set  $\mathbf{u}_{t+1,k} = \mathbf{u}_{t,k} - \mu_{t,k} (\nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{u}_{k,t}) + \rho(\mathbf{u}_{t,k} - \mathbf{x}_k - \boldsymbol{\eta}_k))$ .
  end for
  Set  $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = h_\theta(\mathbf{x}_k)$ .
  Set  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_k + \mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{u}_{k+1}$ .
end for
```

Return  $\mathbf{x}_K$ .

---

---

**Algorithm A.4** Poisson-Gaussian phase retrieval via PnP-PGM

---

**Require:** Measurement  $\mathbf{y}$ , system matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , initialization of image  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , pre-trained denoiser  $h_\theta$ , averaging factor  $\beta$ .

```
for  $k = 1 : K$  do
  Compute step size  $\mu_k$ .
  Set  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k = \mathbf{x}_k - \mu_k \nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x}_k)$ .
  Set  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k = h_\theta(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k)$ .
  Set  $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = (1 - \beta)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k + \beta\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$ .
end for
```

Return  $\mathbf{x}_K$ .

---

**SD-RED.** Regularization by denoising (RED) is an alternative to PnP methods that is based on an explicit image-adaptive regularization functional:  $\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}'(\mathbf{x} - h_\theta(\mathbf{x}))$ . This regularizer reflects the cross-correlation between the image and its denoising residual [51].

Algorithm A.5 summarizes the RED approach for phase retrieval.

---

**Algorithm A.5** Poisson-Gaussian phase retrieval via RED

---

**Require:** Measurement  $\mathbf{y}$ , system matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , initialization of image  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , pre-trained denoiser  $h_\theta$ , regularization factor  $\beta$ .

```
for  $k = 1 : K$  do
  Compute stepsize  $\mu_k$ .
  Set  $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k - \mu_k (\nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x}_k) + \beta(\mathbf{x}_k - h_\theta(\mathbf{x}_k)))$ .
end for
```

Return  $\mathbf{x}_K$ .

---

**SD-RED-SELF.** Other than supervised denoising approaches, we also implemented a self-supervised denoising method known as “noise2self” [53], which designed a neural network to be  $\mathcal{J}$ -invariant so that the self-supervised loss can be represented as the sum of supervised loss and the variance of noise. The “SD-RED-SELF” algorithm refers to training  $h_\theta$  in Algorithm A.5 in such self-supervised fashion on each test data.

**DDPM.** The derivation of the DDPM model follows [58]. We first gradually add Gaussian noise to data according to a variance schedule  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_T$  so that  $q(\mathbf{x}_t|\mathbf{x}_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_t; \sqrt{1 - \beta_t}\mathbf{x}_{t-1}, \beta_t\mathbf{I})$ , as illustrated in Fig. A.2. Using the notation  $\alpha_t = 1 - \beta_t$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_t = \prod_{s=1}^t \alpha_s$ , we have

$$q(\mathbf{x}_t|\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_t; \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t}\mathbf{x}_0, (1 - \bar{\alpha}_t)\mathbf{I}). \quad (\text{A.17})$$

It can be shown [58] that the appropriate loss function to use is

$$L(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{t, \mathbf{x}_0, \epsilon} [\|\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_t}\mathbf{x}_0 + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_t}\epsilon, t)\|^2], \quad (\text{A.18})$$




Figure A.2: The DDPM framework, adopted from [58].

where  $\epsilon$  is selected from  $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$ . The sampling and reconstruction algorithm requires the addition of noise each step as shown in the following algorithm. Experimentally, however, we found that setting  $\sigma_t = 0$  results in higher quality reconstructed images. Furthermore, we choose  $T = 100$ ,  $\beta_1 = 10^{-4}$ , and  $\beta_T = 0.3$ . For the theory to hold,  $\mathbf{x}_T$  should be indistinguishable from white Gaussian noise, which is readily verified to be true for these parameters. Finally, the stepsize  $\mu_k$  of the gradient descent step can be chosen according to the Lipschitz constant of the Poisson-Gaussian likelihood to ensure convergence, or empirically, as is done in the experiments.

---

**Algorithm A.6** Poisson-Gaussian phase retrieval via DDPM

---

**Require:** Measurement  $\mathbf{y}$ , system matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , initialization of image  $\mathbf{x}_T$ , pre-trained DDPM denoiser  $s_\theta$ , and  $T$

**for**  $t = T : 1$  **do**

Set  $\mathbf{z}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$  if  $t > 1$  and  $\mathbf{z}_t = 0$  otherwise

Set  $\mathbf{x}_{t-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t}} \left( \mathbf{x}_t - \frac{1-\alpha_t}{\sqrt{1-\alpha_t}} s_\theta(\mathbf{x}_t, t) \right) + \sigma_t \mathbf{z}_t$

Determine stepsize  $\mu_k$

Set  $\mathbf{x}_{t-1} = \mathbf{x}_{t-1} - \mu_k \nabla g_{\text{PG}}(\mathbf{x}_{t-1})$

**end for**

Return  $\mathbf{x}_1$ .

---

## Acknowledgement

The authors appreciate thoughtful discussions with Arian Eamaz and Farhang Yeganegi from the University of Illinois Chicago (UIC).

## References

- [1] K. Jaganathan, Y. C. Eldar, and B. Hassibi. *Phase retrieval: an overview of recent developments*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1510.07713>. 2015.
- [2] J. Dainty and J. Fienup. “Phase retrieval and image reconstruction for astronomy”. In: *Imag. Recov. Theory Appl.* 13 (Jan. 1987), pp. 231–275.
- [3] R. P. Millane. “Phase retrieval in crystallography and optics”. In: *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A* 7.3 (Mar. 1990), 394–411. DOI: 10.1364/JOSAA.7.000394.
- [4] Y. Shechtman, Y. C. Eldar, O. Cohen, H. N. Chapman, J. Miao, and M. Segev. “Phase Retrieval with Application to Optical Imaging: A contemporary overview”. In: *IEEE Sig. Proc. Mag.* 32.3 (2015), pp. 87–109. DOI: 10.1109/MSP.2014.2352673.
- [5] L. Bian, J. Suo, J. Chung, X. Ou, C. Yang, F. Chen, and Q. Dai. “Fourier ptychographic reconstruction using Poisson maximum likelihood and truncated Wirtinger gradient”. In: *Nature Sci. Rep.* 6.1 (2016). DOI: 10.1038/srep27384.
- [6] Y. Zhang, P. Song, and Q. Dai. “Fourier ptychographic microscopy using a generalized Anscombe transform approximation of the mixed Poisson-Gaussian likelihood”. In: *Optics Express* 25.1 (Jan. 2017), 168–79. DOI: 10.1364/OE.25.000168.
- [7] R. Xu, M. Soltanolkotabi, J. P. Haldar, W. Unglaub, J. Zusman, A. F. J. Levi, and R. M. Leahy. *Accelerated Wirtinger Flow: A fast algorithm for ptychography*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1806.05546>. 2018.
- [8] X. Tian. “Fourier ptychographic reconstruction using mixed Gaussian-Poisson likelihood with total variation regularisation”. In: *Electronics Letters* 55.19 (Sept. 2019), 1041–3. DOI: 10.1049/el.2019.1141.
- [9] T. Lатышевская. “Iterative phase retrieval in coherent diffractive imaging: practical issues”. In: *Appl. Opt.* 57.25 (2018), pp. 7187–7197. DOI: 10.1364/AO.57.007187.
- [10] D. A. Barmherzig, J. Sun, E. J. Candes, T. Lane, and P.-N. Li. “Dual-Reference Design for Holographic Phase Retrieval”. In: *2019 13th International conference on Sampling Theory and Applications (SampTA)*. 2019, pp. 1–4. DOI: 10.1109/SampTA45681.2019.9030848.
- [11] J. Barmherzig David A. and Sun, P.-N. Li, T. Lane, and E. J. Candès. “Holographic phase retrieval and reference design”. In: *Inverse problems* 35.9 (), pp. 94001–. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6420/ab23d1.
- [12] M. Saliba, T. Lатышевская, J. Longchamp, and H. Fink. “Fourier Transform Holography: A Lensless Non-Destructive Imaging Technique”. In: *Microsc. Microanal.* 18.S2 (2012).
- [13] M. Guizar-Sicairos and J. R. Fienup. “Holography with extended reference by autocorrelation linear differential operation”. In: *Opt. Express* 15.26 (2007), pp. 17592–17612.
- [14] L. Wang. “The Poisson Channel With Varying Dark Current Known to the Transmitter”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 65.8 (2019), pp. 4966–4978. DOI: 10.1109/TIT.2019.2911474.
- [15] E. J. Candès, T. Strohmer, and V. Voroninski. “PhaseLift: Exact and Stable Signal Recovery from Magnitude Measurements via Convex Programming”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 66.8 (2013), pp. 1241–1274. DOI: 10.1002/cpa.21432.
- [16] P. Netrapalli, P. Jain, and S. Sanghavi. “Phase Retrieval Using Alternating Minimization”. In: *IEEE Trans. Sig. Proc.* 63.18 (2015), pp. 4814–4826. DOI: 10.1109/TSP.2015.2448516.
- [17] I. Waldspurger. “Phase Retrieval With Random Gaussian Sensing Vectors by Alternating Projections”. In: *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory* 64.5 (2018), pp. 3301–3312. DOI: 10.1109/TIT.2018.2800663.
- [18] B. Gao and Z. Xu. “Phaseless Recovery Using the Gauss-Newton Method”. In: *IEEE Trans. Sig. Proc.* 65.22 (2017), pp. 5885–5896. DOI: 10.1109/TSP.2017.2742981.
- [19] L. Ji and Z. Tie. “On gradient descent algorithm for generalized phase retrieval problem”. In: *2016 IEEE 13th International Conference on Signal Processing (ICSP)* (2016), pp. 320–325. DOI: 10.1109/ICSP.2016.7877848.
- [20] J. Liang, P. Stoica, Y. Jing, and J. Li. “Phase Retrieval via the Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers”. In: *IEEE Sig. Proc. Letters* 25.1 (2018), pp. 5–9. DOI: 10.1109/LSP.2017.2767826.
- [21] Y. Yang, M. Pesavento, Y. C. Eldar, and B. Ottersten. “Parallel Coordinate Descent Algorithms for Sparse Phase Retrieval”. In: *ICASSP 2019 - 2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. 2019, pp. 7670–7674. DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.2019.8683363.
- [22] J. Sun, Q. Qu, and J. Wright. “A geometric analysis of phase retrieval”. In: *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. 2016, pp. 2379–2383. DOI: 10.1109/ISIT.2016.7541725.
- [23] E. Candès, X. Li, and M. Soltanolkotabi. “Phase Retrieval via Wirtinger Flow: Theory and Algorithms”. In: *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory* 61.4 (Apr. 2015), pp. 1985–2007. DOI: 10.1109/TIT.2015.2399924.

- [24] Z. Wu, Y. Sun, J. Liu, and U. Kamilov. “Online Regularization by Denoising with Applications to Phase Retrieval”. In: *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision Workshop (ICCVW)*. 2019, pp. 3887–3895. DOI: 10.1109/ICCVW.2019.00482.
- [25] P. Thibault and M. Guizar-Sicairos. “Maximum-likelihood refinement for coherent diffractive imaging”. In: *New J. of Phys.* 14.6 (June 2012), p. 063004. DOI: 10.1088/1367-2630/14/6/063004.
- [26] E. J. Candes, Y. C. Eldar, T. Strohmer, and V. Voroninski. “Phase retrieval via matrix completion”. In: *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.* 6.1 (2013), 199–225. DOI: 10.1137/110848074.
- [27] A. Goy, K. Arthur, S. Li, and G. Barbastathis. “Low photon count phase retrieval using deep learning”. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 121.24 (Dec. 2018), p. 243902. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.243902.
- [28] D. A. Barmherzig and J. Sun. “Low-Photon Holographic Phase Retrieval”. In: *Imaging and Applied Optics Congress*. Optica Publishing Group, 2020. DOI: 10.1364/COSI.2020.JTu4A.6.
- [29] I. Vazquez, I. E. Harmon, J. C. R. Luna, and M. Das. “Quantitative phase retrieval with low photon counts using an energy resolving quantum detector”. In: *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A* 38.1 (Jan. 2021), 71–9. DOI: 10.1364/JOSAA.396717.
- [30] H. Lawrence, D. Barmherzig, H. Li, M. Eickenberg, and M. Gabriele. “Phase Retrieval with Holography and Untrained Priors: Tackling the Challenges of Low-Photon Nanoscale Imaging”. In: *Proceedings of the 2nd Mathematical and Scientific Machine Learning Conference*. Vol. 145. Aug. 2022, pp. 516–567.
- [31] A. Gnanasambandam and S. H. Chan. “Image Classification in the Dark Using Quanta Image Sensors”. In: *Computer Vision – ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference*. 2020, pp. 484–501. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-58598-3\_29.
- [32] Z. Li, K. Lange, and J. A. Fessler. “Poisson Phase Retrieval in Very Low-Count Regimes”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Computational Imaging* 8 (2022), pp. 838–850. DOI: 10.1109/TCI.2022.3209936.
- [33] G. Fatima, Z. Li, A. Arora, and P. Babu. “PDMM: A novel Primal-Dual Majorization-Minimization algorithm for Poisson Phase-Retrieval problem”. In: *IEEE Trans. Sig. Proc.* (2022), pp. 1–1. DOI: 10.1109/TSP.2022.3156014.
- [34] Y. Chen and E. J. Candes. “Solving random quadratic systems of equations is nearly as easy as solving linear systems”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 70.5 (May 2017), 822–83. DOI: 10.1002/cpa.21638.
- [35] H. Zhang, Y. Liang, and Y. Chi. “A nonconvex approach for phase retrieval: Reshaped Wirtinger flow and incremental algorithms”. In: *J. Mach. Learning Res.* 18.141 (2017), 1–35.
- [36] H. Chang, Y. Lou, Y. Duan, and S. Marchesini. “Total variation-based phase retrieval for Poisson noise removal”. In: *SIAM J. Imag. Sci.* 11.1 (2018), pp. 24–55. DOI: 10.1137/16M1103270.
- [37] X. Jiang, S. Rajan, and X. Liu. “Wirtinger Flow Method With Optimal Stepsize for Phase Retrieval”. In: *IEEE Sig. Proc. Letters* 23.11 (2016), pp. 1627–1631. DOI: 10.1109/LSP.2016.2611940.
- [38] T. T. Cai, X. Li, and Z. Ma. “Optimal Rates of Convergence for Noisy Sparse Phase Retrieval via Thresholded Wirtinger Flow”. In: *Annals Stat.* 44.5 (2016), pp. 2221–2251. DOI: 10.1214/16-AOS1443.
- [39] M. Soltanolkotabi. “Structured Signal Recovery From Quadratic Measurements: Breaking Sample Complexity Barriers via Nonconvex Optimization”. In: *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory* 65.4 (2019), pp. 2374–2400. DOI: 10.1109/TIT.2019.2891653.
- [40] T. Qiu, P. Babu, and D. P. Palomar. “PRIME: phase retrieval via majorization-minimization”. In: *IEEE Trans. Sig. Proc.* 64.19 (Oct. 2016), 5174–86. DOI: 10.1109/TSP.2016.2585084.
- [41] R. W. Gerchberg and W. O. Saxton. “Practical Algorithm for Determination of Phase from Image and Diffraction Plane Pictures”. In: *OPTIK* 35.2 (1972), 237–246.
- [42] D. L. Snyder, A. M. Hammoud, and R. L. White. “Image recovery from data acquired with a charge-coupled-device camera”. In: *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A* 10.5 (May 1993), 1014–23. DOI: 10.1364/JOSAA.10.001014.
- [43] M. Makitalo and A. Foi. “Optimal Inversion of the Generalized Anscombe Transformation for Poisson-Gaussian Noise”. In: *IEEE Trans. Imag. Proc.* 22.1 (2013), pp. 91–103. DOI: 10.1109/TIP.2012.2202675.
- [44] G. Fatima and P. Babu. “PGPAL: A monotonic iterative algorithm for Phase-Retrieval under the presence of Poisson-Gaussian noise”. In: *IEEE Sig. Proc. Letters* (2022), pp. 1–1. DOI: 10.1109/LSP.2022.3143469.
- [45] I. Daubechies. *Ten Lectures on Wavelets*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1992. DOI: 10.1137/1.9781611970104.
- [46] G. Ongie, A. Jalal, C. A. Metzler, R. Baraniuk, A. G. Dimakis, and R. M. Willett. “Deep Learning Techniques for Inverse Problems in Imaging”. In: *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory* 1 (2020), pp. 39–56.
- [47] A. Bora, A. Jalal, E. Price, and A. G. Dimakis. “Compressed Sensing using Generative Models”. In: *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*. Vol. 70. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2017, pp. 537–546.

- [48] S. H. Chan, X. Wang, and O. A. Elgandy. “Plug-and-Play ADMM for Image Restoration: Fixed-Point Convergence and Applications”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Computational Imaging* 3.1 (2017), pp. 84–98. DOI: 10.1109/TCI.2016.2629286.
- [49] K. Zhang, Y. Li, W. Zuo, L. Zhang, L. Van Gool, and R. Timofte. “Plug-and-Play Image Restoration With Deep Denoiser Prior”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 44.10 (2022), pp. 6360–6376. DOI: 10.1109/TPAMI.2021.3088914.
- [50] U. S. Kamilov, C. B. Bouman, G. T. Buzzard, and B. Wohlberg. “Plug-and-Play Methods for Integrating Physical and Learned Models in Computational Imaging”. In: *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.* 40.1 (Jan. 2023), pp. 85–97.
- [51] Y. Romano, M. Elad, and P. Milanfar. “The Little Engine That Could: Regularization by Denoising (RED)”. In: *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences* 10.4 (2017), pp. 1804–1844. DOI: 10.1137/16M1102884.
- [52] J. Lehtinen, J. Munkberg, J. Hasselgren, S. Laine, T. Karras, M. Aittala, and T. Aila. “Noise2Noise: Learning Image Restoration without Clean Data”. In: *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 2971–2980.
- [53] J. Batson and L. Royer. “Noise2Self: Blind Denoising by Self-Supervision”. In: *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*. Ed. by K. Chaudhuri and R. Salakhutdinov. Vol. 97. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, June 2019, pp. 524–533.
- [54] Z. Wang, J. Liu, G. Li, and H. Han. “Blind2Unblind: Self-Supervised Image Denoising with Visible Blind Spots”. In: *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2022, pp. 2017–2026. DOI: 10.1109/CVPR52688.2022.00207.
- [55] M. Asim, M. Daniels, O. Leong, A. Ahmed, and P. Hand. “Invertible generative models for inverse problems: mitigating representation error and dataset bias”. In: *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning* 119 (2020).
- [56] X. Wei, H. van Gorp, L. Gonzalez-Carabarin, D. Freedman, Y. C. Eldar, and R. J. G. van Sloun. “Deep Unfolding With Normalizing Flow Priors for Inverse Problems”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 70 (2022), pp. 2962–2971. DOI: 10.1109/TSP.2022.3179807.
- [57] Y. Song and S. Ermon. “Generative Modeling by Estimating Gradients of the Data Distribution”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 32. 2019.
- [58] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel. “Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Models”. In: 33 (2020). Ed. by H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, and H. Lin, pp. 6840–6851.
- [59] P. Dhariwal and A. Nichol. “Diffusion Models Beat GANs on Image Synthesis”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 34. 2021, pp. 8780–8794.
- [60] Y. Song, J. Sohl-Dickstein, D. P. Kingma, A. Kumar, S. Ermon, and B. Poole. “Score-Based Generative Modeling through Stochastic Differential Equations”. In: *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. 2021.
- [61] A. Graikos, N. Malkin, N. Jovic, and D. Samaras. “Diffusion Models as Plug-and-Play Priors”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2022.
- [62] S. Lee, H. Chung, J. Kim, and J. C. Ye. *Progressive Deblurring of Diffusion Models for Coarse-to-Fine Image Synthesis*. 2022.
- [63] A. Jalal, M. Arvinte, G. Daras, E. Price, A. G. Dimakis, and J. Tamir. “Robust Compressed Sensing MRI with Deep Generative Priors”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 34. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021, pp. 14938–14954.
- [64] H. Chung and J. C. Ye. “Score-based diffusion models for accelerated MRI”. In: *Medical Image Analysis* 80 (2022), p. 102479. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.media.2022.102479>.
- [65] Z.-X. Cui, C. Cao, S. Liu, Q. Zhu, J. Cheng, H. Wang, Y. Zhu, and D. Liang. *Self-Score: Self-Supervised Learning on Score-Based Models for MRI Reconstruction*. 2022.
- [66] Y. Long, J. A. Fessler, and J. M. Balter. “A 3D forward and back-projection method for X-ray CT using separable footprint”. In: *Proc. Intl. Mtg. on Fully 3D Image Recon. in Rad. and Nuc. Med.* Winner of poster award. 2009, 146–9.
- [67] Y. Song, L. Shen, L. Xing, and S. Ermon. “Solving Inverse Problems in Medical Imaging with Score-Based Generative Models”. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2022.
- [68] S. Shoushtari, J. Liu, and U. S. Kamilov. *DOLPH: Diffusion Models for Phase Retrieval*. 2022.
- [69] Y. Nesterov. “Smooth Minimization of Non-Smooth Functions”. In: *Math. Program.* 103.1 (May 2005), pp. 127–152. DOI: 10.1007/s10107-004-0552-5.
- [70] D. Kim and J. A. Fessler. “Optimized first-order methods for smooth convex minimization”. In: *Math Program* 159.1 (2016). DOI: 10.1007/s10107-015-0949-3.
- [71] E. Bostan, M. Soltanolkotabi, D. Ren, and L. Waller. “Accelerated Wirtinger Flow for Multiplexed Fourier Ptychographic Microscopy”. In: *2018 25th IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*. 2018, pp. 3823–3827. DOI: 10.1109/ICIP.2018.8451437.

- [72] Z. Fabian, J. Haldar, R. Leahy, and M. Soltanolkotabi. “3D Phase Retrieval at Nano-Scale via Accelerated Wirtinger Flow”. In: *2020 28th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*. 2021, pp. 2080–2084. DOI: 10.23919/Eusipco47968.2020.9287703.
- [73] Y. Gao, F. Yang, and L. Cao. “Pixel Super-Resolution Phase Retrieval for Lensless On-Chip Microscopy via Accelerated Wirtinger Flow”. In: *Cells* 11.13 (2022). DOI: 10.3390/cells11131999.
- [74] Z. Li, K. Lange, and J. A. Fessler. “Poisson Phase Retrieval With Wirtinger Flow”. In: *2021 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*. 2021, pp. 2828–2832. DOI: 10.1109/ICIP42928.2021.9506139.
- [75] W. Luo, W. Alghamdi, and Y. M. Lu. “Optimal Spectral Initialization for Signal Recovery With Applications to Phase Retrieval”. In: *IEEE Trans. Sig. Proc.* 67.9 (2019), pp. 2347–2356. DOI: 10.1109/TSP.2019.2904918.
- [76] Z. Zhuang, D. Yang, F. Hofmann, D. Barmherzig, and J. Sun. *Practical Phase Retrieval Using Double Deep Image Priors*. 2022.
- [77] F. Wang, Y. Bian, H. Wang, et al. “Phase imaging with an untrained neural network”. In: *Light, science & applications* 9.1 (2020), pp. 77–77. DOI: 10.1038/s41377-020-0302-3.
- [78] Y. Zhang, M. A. Noack, P. Vagovic, K. Fezzaa, F. Garcia-Moreno, T. Ritschel, and P. Villanueva-Perez. “PhaseGAN: a deep-learning phase-retrieval approach for unpaired datasets”. In: *Opt. Express* 29.13 (June 2021), pp. 19593–19604. DOI: 10.1364/OE.423222.
- [79] D. A. Barmherzig and J. Sun. “Towards practical holographic coherent diffraction imaging via maximum likelihood estimation”. In: *Opt. Express* 30.5 (Feb. 2022), pp. 6886–6906. DOI: 10.1364/OE.445015.
- [80] P. Thibault, M. Dierolf, A. Menzel, O. Bunk, C. David, and F. Pfeiffer. “High-Resolution Scanning X-ray Diffraction Microscopy”. In: *Science* 321.5887 (2008), pp. 379–382. DOI: 10.1126/science.1158573.
- [81] S. Marchesini, A. Schirotzek, C. Yang, H.-t. Wu, and F. Maia. “Augmented projections for ptychographic imaging”. In: *Inverse Problems* 29.11 (Oct. 2013), p. 115009. DOI: 10.1088/0266-5611/29/11/115009.
- [82] K. K.-W. Siu, A. Y. Nikulin, and P. Wells. “Unambiguous x-ray phase retrieval from Fraunhofer diffraction data”. In: *Journal of Applied Physics* 93.5161 (2003). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1565674>.
- [83] S. Sreehari, S. V. Venkatakrisnan, B. Wohlberg, G. T. Buzzard, L. F. Drummy, J. P. Simmons, and C. A. Bouman. “Plug-and-Play Priors for Bright Field Electron Tomography and Sparse Interpolation”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Computational Imaging* 2.4 (Dec. 2016), pp. 408–423.
- [84] R. Ahmad, C. A. Bouman, G. T. Buzzard, S. Chan, S. Liu, E. T. Reehorst, and P. Schniter. “Plug-and-Play Methods for Magnetic Resonance Imaging: Using Denoisers for Image Recovery”. In: *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* 37.1 (2020), pp. 105–116.
- [85] K. Zhang, W. Zuo, S. Gu, and L. Zhang. “Learning Deep CNN Denoiser Prior for Image Restoration”. In: *Proc. IEEE Conf. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. July 2017, pp. 3929–3938.
- [86] K. Zhang, W. Zuo, and L. Zhang. “Deep Plug-and-Play Super-Resolution for Arbitrary Blur Kernels”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. Long Beach, CA, USA, 2019, pp. 1671–1681.
- [87] S. V. Venkatakrisnan, C. A. Bouman, and B. Wohlberg. “Plug-and-Play Priors for Model Based Reconstruction”. In: *Proc. IEEE Global Conf. Signal Process. and Inf. Process.* Austin, TX, USA, Dec. 2013, pp. 945–948.
- [88] U. S. Kamilov, H. Mansour, and B. Wohlberg. “A Plug-and-Play Priors Approach for Solving Nonlinear Imaging Inverse Problems”. In: *IEEE Signal. Proc. Let.* 24.12 (Dec. 2017), pp. 1872–1876.
- [89] Y. Romano, M. Elad, and P. Milanfar. “The Little Engine That Could: Regularization by Denoising (RED)”. In: *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences* 10.4 (2017), pp. 1804–1844.
- [90] E. T. Reehorst and P. Schniter. “Regularization by Denoising: Clarifications and New Interpretations”. In: *IEEE Trans. Comput. Imag.* 5.1 (Mar. 2019), pp. 52–67.
- [91] P. Vincent. “A Connection Between Score Matching and Denoising Autoencoders”. In: *Neural Computation* 23.7 (2011), pp. 1661–1674. DOI: 10.1162/NECO\_a\_00142.
- [92] E. Chouzenoux, A. Jeziarska, J.-C. Pesquet, and H. Talbot. “A Convex Approach for Image Restoration with Exact Poisson–Gaussian Likelihood”. In: *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences* 8.4 (2015), pp. 2662–2682. DOI: 10.1137/15M1014395.
- [93] H. Li and Z. Lin. “Accelerated Proximal Gradient Methods for Nonconvex Programming”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 28. 2015.
- [94] A. Aksac, D. Demetrick, T. Ozyer, et al. “BreCaHAD: a dataset for breast cancer histopathological annotation and diagnosis”. In: *MC Res Notes* 12.82 (2019). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-019-4121-7>.

- [95] P. J. Huber. *Robust statistics*. New York: Wiley, 1981.
- [96] K. Zhang, W. Zuo, Y. Chen, D. Meng, and L. Zhang. “Beyond a Gaussian Denoiser: Residual Learning of Deep CNN for Image Denoising”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 26.7 (2017), pp. 3142–3155. DOI: 10.1109/TIP.2017.2662206.
- [97] X. Xu, J. Liu, Y. Sun, B. Wohlberg, and U. S. Kamilov. “Boosting the Performance of Plug-and-Play Priors via Denoiser Scaling”. In: *54th Asilomar Conf. on Signals, Systems, and Computers*. 2020, pp. 1305–1312. DOI: 10.1109/IEEECONF51394.2020.9443410.
- [98] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba. “Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization”. In: *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*. 2015.
- [99] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville. *Deep Learning*. <http://www.deeplearningbook.org>. MIT Press, 2016.
- [100] S. Ghadimi and G. Lan. “Accelerated gradient methods for nonconvex nonlinear and stochastic programming”. In: *Math. Program.* 156 (2016). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-015-0871-8>.
- [101] Q. Ye, L.-W. Wang, and D. P. K. Lun. “SiSPRNet: end-to-end learning for single-shot phase retrieval”. In: *Opt. Express* 30.18 (2022), pp. 31937–31958. DOI: 10.1364/OE.464086.