

Thoughts on Systematic Errors for a CMB Polarization space mission

Brendan Crill (Jet Propulsion Laboratory / California Institute of
Technology)

20 March 2018


© 2018 California Institute of Technology. All rights reserved. Government sponsorship acknowledged.
Cleared for public release CL#18-1469

The decision to implement PICO will not be finalized until NASA's completion
of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. This document is being made available
for information purposes only.

PICO study


- PICO is a NASA-chartered “probe study” (PI Shaul Hanany) : one of ~1 dozen selected for study ahead of 2020 Decadal Survey
- Major boundary conditions:
 - cost constrained to be < \$1B: does not include fast modulator like a half-wave plate
 - Mission assumed to consist of imaging focal plane with polarization sensitive detectors
 - Polarization reconstructed using combination of an array of $O(10^3 \text{ to } 10^4)$ detectors with individual polarization sensitivity
- PICO Systematics Working Group gathered list of known systematic errors
https://zzz.physics.umn.edu/ipsig/preliminary_list_of_systematic_effects_to_consider
- The group also prioritized the list:
 - “Systematics Risk Factor” was defined: includes impact on science results, difficulty in mitigating through instrument/mission design or analysis, and whether the particular systematic is well understood.
 - Highest SRF systematics are ones that are design-driving and/or not well understood
 - Each identified systematic error was assigned an SRF
 - Many of these systematics could be reduced with a fast modulator, though with possible introduction of additional modulator-synchronous systematics
- Top three priority systematics are now under more detailed study through detailed simulation
 - Detector Gain mismatch
 - Far Sidelobes
 - Polarization Angle Calibration

Detector gain mismatch/stability



A&A 596, A107 (2016)

Planck HFI



No correction for Variable gains

After correction

- Drifts in time in relative gain of detectors leaks temperature signal to polarization
- Planck (both LFI and HFI) gained experience correcting time-variable gain
 - A relevant note: HFI “gain variation” was never actually detector response variation, it was always something else (in particular, ADC nonlinearity)
- Simulations underway given PICO scan strategy, will measure S/N of gain reconstruction (mainly using CMB dipole) using Planck code.
 - What is the level to which the gain can be measured on ~ 1 day time scales?
 - set limits in B-mode spectra on how well we can hope to correct any gain drifts in a PICO mission
- NOTE: fast modulation helps with relative gain mismatch but not at an individual detector level

Far sidelobes

- Difficult to measure accurately on ground: may need to rely on models (i.e. GRASP or other physical optics code)
- Very low level compared to main beam (though large solid angle)
- Typically highly polarized
- Picks up bright far off-axis signals, i.e. galaxy in a scan-synchronous way
- PICO study using GRASP simulations to estimate FSLs of telescope, and use Planck simulation tools to compute sky signal pickup with PICO's scan, map making, etc.
- Room for improvement with design
- NOTE: fast modulation doesn't completely mitigate this effect. It helps with any differential FSLs





Fig. 14. Azimuthally averaged profiles of measured beams of channel 353-1 compared to the azimuthal average of the far sidelobe physical optics model.

Planck Collaboration: *Planck* 2013 results. VII.



Polarization Angle Calibration

- Refers to knowledge of angle of sensitivity of detectors
- Relative angle between the different photometers can be calibrated to high precision in the limit that single photometers are independent, but absolute angle
- With Planck, we were never successful at finding an astrophysical source for polarization angle calibration that is free from systematics. Great effort went into characterizing the Crab nebula (Tau A).
- HFI confirmed ground calibration results (Rosset et al 2010) to ~ 0.2 degrees by checking whether TB, EB are zero. (Planck Intermediate results XLVI 2016) No additional rotation needed.
 - Typical scheme for ground-based instruments as well
 - ***Of course... maybe cosmological TB and EB are not zero***
 - Spectral shape of angle error may not be completely degenerate with scientific signal in TB or EB
- NOTE: fast modulation doesn't help with this: must calibrate absolute angle of modulator.
- Other ideas: external calibration satellite...?