

AA Station Beam Accuracy

AAVP Workshop 2011

Stefan J. Wijnholds

15 December 2011

- field-of-view / station size [1,3]
- sensitivity / aperture efficiency [1,2,3]
- side lobe level [1,3]
- beam accuracy / beam stability [4]

[1] Wijnholds, Bregman & Van Ardenne, Radio Science, 2011

[2] Wijnholds, Grainge, Nijboer & Bregman, URSI, Aug. 2011

[3] Wijnholds, SKA Cal. & Imaging Workshop, Sept. 2011

[4] Wijnholds, 3GC-II Workshop, Sept. 2011

“What station beam accuracy do we need to achieve > 70 dB dynamic range”

- effective noise [1] consists of
 1. thermal noise
 2. calibration & imaging artefacts
 3. confusion noise
- the first two sources should be balanced
- the third should not play a role

[1] Wijnholds & Van der Veen, IEEE JSTSP, Oct. 2008

Results with SAGEcal with LOFAR HBA [1][2]

- three 6-h observations on 3C196 and NCP
- DDE solutions in ~ 150 directions
- update rate: 20 minutes, 195 KHz
- dynamic range 1:700.000 (3C196)
- noise level 1.2 – 1.5 times thermal noise

[1] Yatawatta, EoR plenary meeting, 29 Nov. 2011

[2] Labropoulos, EoR plenary meeting, 29 Nov. 2011

Model based imaging (OMM, ML, LS) regard imaging as an inversion problem:

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\sigma}$$

where

\mathbf{v}	$NP^2 \times 1$ visibility vector
\mathbf{M}	$NP^2 \times Q$ measurement model matrix
$\boldsymbol{\sigma}$	$Q \times 1$ image vector
N	number of snapshots (correlator dumps)
P	number of stations
Q	number of image values

$$\frac{\|\Delta\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|} = \kappa(\mathbf{M}) \left(\frac{\|\Delta\mathbf{M}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{M}\|_2} + \frac{\|\Delta\mathbf{v}\|}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \right)$$

in which we recognize three components

1. condition number, noise amplification
2. modeling errors
3. thermal noise

We want

$$\frac{\|\Delta\mathbf{M}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{M}\|_2} \leq \frac{\|\Delta\mathbf{v}\|}{\|\mathbf{v}\|}$$

$$\|\mathbf{M}\|_2 := \max \left\{ \frac{\|\mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}\|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^Q, \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0} \right\} = \sigma_{\max}$$

is hard to compute, so we use

$$\|\mathbf{M}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{M}\|_F \leq \sqrt{Q} \|\mathbf{M}\|_2$$

to reformulate our requirement to

$$\frac{\|\Delta\mathbf{M}\|_F}{\|\mathbf{M}\|_F} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{Q}} \frac{\|\Delta\mathbf{v}\|_F}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_F}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta \mathbf{M}\|_{\text{F}} &= \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{NP^2} \sum_{j=1}^Q |\Delta M_{ij}|^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\mathbf{1}^T \text{diag}(\text{cov}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{M})))},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\text{cov}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{M})) = \left(\frac{\partial \text{vec}(\mathbf{M})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} \right) \text{cov}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \left(\frac{\partial \text{vec}(\mathbf{M})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} \right)^T$$

tedious route, so let's try some clever estimates...

- assume relative error ϵ , i.e., $\Delta M_{ij} = \epsilon |M_{ij}|$
- we get

$$\|\Delta\mathbf{M}\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{NP^2} \sum_{j=1}^Q \epsilon^2 |M_{ij}|^2} = \epsilon \|\mathbf{M}\|_F$$

- independent and same relative errors for all stations: $\epsilon = \sqrt{2}\epsilon_{\text{stat}}$

- source statistics: $\rho \propto S^\alpha \Leftrightarrow S \propto \rho^{1/\alpha}$
- this implies $\sigma_q = S_{\max} q^{1/\alpha}$
- homogenous noise: $\Delta \sigma_q = \Delta S_0 / \sqrt{B\tau} \quad \forall q$
- assume $\kappa(\mathbf{M}) = 1$ (DFT matrix)
- in this ideal case, after a little mathematics

$$\frac{\|\Delta \mathbf{v}\|}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} = \frac{\|\Delta \boldsymbol{\sigma}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|} = \frac{\Delta S_0}{S_{\max}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{B\tau}} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{Q}}{\sqrt{\sum_{q=1}^Q q^{2/\alpha}}}$$

$$\epsilon_{\text{stat}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot \frac{\Delta S_0 / \sqrt{B\tau}}{S_{\text{max}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{q=1}^Q q^{2/\alpha}}}$$

Interpretation

- dynamic range after integration (B, τ)
- impact of total observed flux

- SAGEcal: $B = 2 \cdot 10^5$ Hz, $\tau = 1200$ s
- $\Delta S_0 = (k/10^{-26}) \cdot (T_{\text{sys}}/A_{\text{eff}}) = 1.64$ kJy
(24-tile, 150 MHz, [1])
- $S_{\text{max}} = 14.5$ Jy ($\rho = 150S^{-1.5}$ [2])
- This gives: $\epsilon_{\text{stat}} < 0.27$ %
- This allows for $\epsilon_{\text{stat}} \sqrt{24} = 1.3\%$ error per tile.
- stat. cal.: electronics stable within 1%

[1] Wijnholds & Van Cappellen, IEEE TAP, June 2011

[2] Bregman, NFRA Symposium, April 1999

Forward prediction only for SKA ASTRON

- assume 74 dB DR with 100 stations
- $\Delta S_0 / \left(S_{\max} \sqrt{B\tau} \right) = 10^{-5.4}$ per station
- $\alpha = -1.2$ gives $\sqrt{\sum_{q=1}^{10^6} q^{2/\alpha}} \approx 1.45$
- $\epsilon_{\text{stat}} < 1.9 \cdot 10^{-6}$
- **This is not going to happen!**
- **We need to estimate and correct DDEs**

- 30 dB DR ensures 200 5σ sources ($\alpha = -1$)
- sufficient for accurate beam prediction (200 directions)
- achievable with $\epsilon_{\text{stat}} < 0.05 \%$
- since

$$\text{DR} = \frac{S_{\text{max}}(\text{FoV}, A_{\text{eff}}/T_{\text{sys}}, f)}{\Delta S_0(A_{\text{eff}}/T_{\text{sys}}, f)} \cdot \sqrt{B\tau},$$

requirements on electronic stability can be derived from this requirement on beam accuracy

Conclusions

- open loop DR of 30 dB needed
- this should be achievable
- if SKA is calibratable, > 70 dB DR is possible
- calibration approach demonstrated by LOFAR

Future work

- verify analysis by refinement and simulation
- improve source statistics

- use

$$\|\Delta\mathbf{M}\|_2 = \sigma_{\max} = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\Delta\mathbf{M}^H \Delta\mathbf{M})}$$

- assume $\Delta M \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \epsilon^2 \mathbf{I})$
- then [1]

$$\lim_{P, Q \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{\max} = 2\epsilon^2 Q \left(1 + \sqrt{Q/P^2}\right)^2 \text{ for } \frac{Q}{P^2} \in [0, 1]$$

- assume $Q \approx P^2$, so $\lambda_{\max} = 8\epsilon^2 Q$.

[1] Edelman, Ph.D. Thesis, MIT, 1999

- we found $\|\Delta\mathbf{M}\|_2 = \sqrt{8\epsilon^2 Q} = \epsilon\sqrt{8Q}$
- independent and same relative errors for all stations: $\epsilon = \sqrt{2}\epsilon_{\text{stat}}$
- assume \mathbf{M} resembles the $Q \times Q$ DFT matrix
- this gives $\|\mathbf{M}\|_2 = \sqrt{Q}$
- therefore

$$\frac{\|\Delta\mathbf{M}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{M}\|_2} = \frac{\epsilon_{\text{stat}}\sqrt{16Q}}{\sqrt{Q}} = 4\epsilon_{\text{stat}}$$

- note $\text{var}(\mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{B\tau}} \mathbf{v} \odot \bar{\mathbf{v}}$
- hence

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{v}\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{NP^2} \sigma(v_i)^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{NP^2} \frac{|v_i|^2}{B\tau}} = \frac{\|\mathbf{v}\|}{\sqrt{B\tau}}$$

- thus $\|\Delta \mathbf{v}\| / \|\mathbf{v}\| = 1/\sqrt{B\tau}$
- deconvolution of system noise is not useful
- therefore...

- source statistics: $\rho \propto S^\alpha \Leftrightarrow S \propto \rho^{1/\alpha}$
- this implies $\sigma_q = S_{\max} q^{1/\alpha}$
- putting it all together:

$$\epsilon_{\text{stat}} \leq \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{\Delta S_0 / \sqrt{B\tau}}{S_{\max}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{q=1}^Q q^{2/\alpha}}}$$

- dynamic range after integration (B, τ)
- impact of total observed flux