

Input Data

- raw pixel data
 - pixel values
 - bias, gain setting, CCD ID (filter), ...
- raw calibration data
 - flats = f (filter, amplifier, time)
 - CCD (radiation) damage history
- PSF library
- Input Catalog
 - color or spectral type
 - star identification, FOV identification
 - (brightness)
 - (flags: multiple, confusion ...)
- satellite status
 - spin information (smearing)
 - near Earth / eclipse ?
 - scattered light sources (bright objects nearby)
 - access to wider area of Input Catalog

Subtasks

→ 1-dim profiles

⇒ 2-dim postage stamps

- raw data calibration (bias, flat)
- initial steps
 - locate peak
 - check: location w.r.t. window boundaries
 - check: saturation? no star?
 - determine start parameters (moments)
- fit (several models, methods)
astrometry might use different procedure as photometry
- analyze fit parameters and fit errors
 - profile width → ssmmeeaarriinngg
 - multiple? defects?
 - check background, confusion
 - (compare to input catalog expectation)
 - classify object, set flags
- ITERATIONS with new PSF's ...

Output Parameters

- event by event fit results
 - fit parameters (astrometry & photometry)
 - fit errors, χ^2
 - flags, object classification
- empirical PSF data
 - select suitable candidates
 - pixel values scaled to PSF template requirement
- "going through" data, tag on to output files or use DB
 - raw data items: time (row numbers), CCD ID, ...
 - input catalog data for later comparison

Relationship to other components

← Input Catalog (tiles)

↔ PSF library (new module: determine PSF's)

⇒ FIRST LOOK

⇒ SPIRAL REDUCTION (1 FOV crossing, spiral)

← final iteration after all PSF's available ?

(depending on time-scale of variability,
this could be completed in sections)

Approaches, models, algorithms

- moments / center of mass \longrightarrow start parameters
- astrometric fit: 4 approaches investigated so far
 - A) Gauss model \longrightarrow large pixel phase errors
 - B) determine and use perfect PSF ($\approx 0.2\%$ level) \longrightarrow NO pixel phase error
 - C) simultaneously estimate fit parameters and PSF for group of stars
 - D) use approximate PSF \longrightarrow small pixel phase errors, calibrate out in spiral reduction step
- photometry (total flux vs. model result) \longrightarrow Rob Olling for more details
- PSF characterization: option Hermite polynomials

No – Problems

- CPU time requirement o.k. ($\approx 1/10$ of real time) even some test code already available for various approaches
- still enough photons, $1/500$ pixel *random* error possible (if PSF \approx symmetric), about 1 magnitude "slack"

Problems

- PSF fits
 - too many PSFs: approach **B**) seems not feasible
 - numerical stability: approach **C**) seems not to work
 - remains approach **A**) and **D**):
 - some pixel phase error will need calibration
 - aperture effects: smearing = $f(\dots)$
 - different amount of charge lost from window
- optical distortion
 - current design: 3.6 ''/deg^3 (3 pixel at edge of FOV)
 - in-scan smearing ≈ 0.2 to 1.7 pixels = $f(\text{CCD})$
 - non-linear effect up to $1/4$ pixel
 - asymmetric profiles
- optical fabrication errors, alignment tolerances
 - asymmetric profiles
 - instrumental PSF is undersampled
 - need for movable optical component
 - stability problems
 - no clear idea about how to "focus"

Problems ... (continued)

- other systematic errors as a function of ...
 - magnitude (detector is not perfectly linear, digitization effects on asymmetry in wings ...)
 - color (spectral type)
 - CCD gain setting, filters ...
 - scattered light from Earth, Moon, planets, bright stars
- effects of radiation damage
 - will charge injection work ?
 - changes on what time scale ?
- need to calibrate position offsets for each PSF
 - definition of "center" needs to be related
- normal geometric mapping calibration
 - 3rd order optical distortion, filters

We are almost still in the feasibility study phase, various instrument design options are under consideration.