

# ShOpt.jl | A Julia Library for Empirical Point Spread Function Characterization of JWST NIRCам Images

Edward Berman<sup>1</sup> and Jacqueline McCleary<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Northeastern University, USA ¶ Corresponding author

DOI: [10.xxxxxx/draft](https://doi.org/10.xxxxxx/draft)

## Software

- [Review](#)
- [Repository](#)
- [Archive](#)

Editor: [Open Journals](#)

## Reviewers:

- [@openjournals](#)

Submitted: 01 January 1970

Published: unpublished

## License

Authors of papers retain copyright and release the work under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License ([CC BY 4.0](#))

## Summary

When cosmologists try to take pictures of space, a combination of the photometry of the camera and atmospheric affects distort the light that comes from stars. Stars are examples of what Astronomers call point sources, and so the aptly named Point Spread Function (PSF) is a mathematical model that quantifies exactly how the light is being distorted. The point spread function takes as input a delta function and a position and outputs a lensed image. The goal of empirical point spread function characterization is to be able to point to any position on your camera and predict what the lensed star looks like. Once we have a model that can do this well, we can deconvolve our images with the point spread function to obtain what the image would look like in the absense of lensing. The empirical way to do this is to take our images of lensed stars and seperate them into training and validation set. Our point spread function will be found by interpolating the training stars across the field of view of the camera and validated by comparing the reserved stars to the point spread function's prediction.

Shear Optimization with ShOpt.jl introduces modern techniques for empirical Point Spread Function characterization across the Full Field of View tailored to the data captured by the James Webb Space Telescope. To first order, we can approximate our images with analytic profiles. We adopt a multivariate gaussian because it is cheap to fit to an image. This function is parameterized by three variables,  $[s, g_1, g_2]$ , where  $s$  corresponds to size and  $g_1, g_2$  correspond to shear. After we fit this function to our stars with `Optim.jl` and `ForwardDiff.jl` ([Mogensen & Riseth, 2018](#); [Revels et al., 2016](#)), we interpolate the parameters across the field of view according to position. Essentially, each star is a datapoint, and the three variables are given polynomials in focal plane coordinates of degree  $n$ , where  $n$  is supplied by the user. For a more precise model, we also give each pixel in our images a polynomial and interpolate it across the field of view. This is referred to in the literature as a pixel grid fit ([Jarvis et al., 2020](#)).

ShOpt.jl takes inspiration from a number of algorithms outside of astronomy. Mainly, SE-Sync ([Rosen et al., 2019](#)), an algorithm that provides a certifiably correct solution to a robotting mapping problem by considering the manifold properites of the data. We borrow this idea to put a constraint on the solutions we obtain to  $[s, g_1, g_2]$ . ([Bernstein & Jarvis, 2002](#)) outlined the manifold properties of shears for us, so we knew from the get go that our solution was constrained to the manifold  $B_2(r) \times \mathbb{R}_+$ . While it was known that this constrain existed in the literature, the parameter estimation tasked had been framed as an unconstrained problem prior to our work ([Jarvis et al., 2020](#)). For a more rigorous treatment of optimization on manifolds see ([Absil et al., 2008](#)) and ([Boumal, 2023](#)). Julia has lots of support for working with manifolds with `Manopt`, which we may leverage in future releases ([Bergmann, 2022](#)).

ShOpt.jl provides two modes for pixel grid fits, PCA mode and Autoencoder mode. Each mode provides the end user with tunable parameters that allow for both perfect reconstruction of the model vignets and low dimensional representations. The advantage of these modes is that they provide good reconstructions of the lensed images while fixating on the actual star and

44 not the background noise. In this way it generates a datapoint for our empirical point spread  
45 function to learn and denoises the image in one step.

46 PCA mode, outlined here, reconstructs it's images using the first n principal components.

```
function pca_image(image, ncomponents)
  #Load img Matrix
  img_matrix = image

  # Perform PCA
  M = fit(PCA, img_matrix; maxoutdim=ncomponents)

  # Transform the image into the PCA space
  transformed = MultivariateStats.transform(M, img_matrix)

  # Reconstruct the image
  reconstructed = reconstruct(M, transformed)

  # Reshape the image back to its original shape
  reconstructed_image = reshape(reconstructed, size(img_matrix)...)
end
```

47 Autoencoder mode uses a neural network to reconstruct the image from a lower dimensional  
48 latent space. The network code written with Flux.jl is below (Innes, 2018)

```
# Encoder
encoder = Chain(
    Dense(r*c, 128, leakyrelu),
    Dense(128, 64, leakyrelu),
    Dense(64, 32, leakyrelu),
)

#Decoder
decoder = Chain(
    Dense(32, 64, leakyrelu),
    Dense(64, 128, leakyrelu),
    Dense(128, r*c, tanh),
)

#Full autoencoder
autoencoder = Chain(encoder, decoder)

#x_hat = autoencoder(x)
loss(x) = mse(autoencoder(x), x)

# Define the optimizer
optimizer = ADAM()
```

## 49 Statement of need

50 While there are many existing empirical PSF fitters, they were created as apart of the efforts  
51 of other collaborations with their own cameras and science goals. Mainly, The Dark Energy  
52 Survey and DESCam (Flaugher et al., 2015; Jarvis et al., 2020). The recent data from the  
53 James Webb Space Telescope poses new challenges.

- 54 (1) The James Webb PSFs are not well approximated by analytic profiles. This calls for well  
55 thought out parametric free models that can capture the full dynamic range of the Point  
56 Spread Function without fixating on the noise in the background.

(2) The NIRCam detectors measure  $0.03''/\text{pix}$  (Gardner et al., 2006). To capture an accurate description of the Point Spread Function at this scale we need images that are 131 by 131 to 261 by 261 pixels across. These vignette sizes are much larger in comparison to the sizes needed for previous large scale surveys such as DES (Jarvis et al., 2020) and SuperBIT (McCleary et al., 2023) and forces us to evaluate how well existing PSF fitters scale to this size.

## State of the Field

There are several existing empirical PSF fitters in addition to a theoretical prediction of the James Webb PSFs developed by STScI (Jarvis et al., 2020; Bertin, 2011; Perrin et al., 2014; Perrin et al., 2012). We describe them here and draw attention to their strengths and weaknesses to motivate the development of ShOpt.jl. The first empirical PSF fitter developed was PSFex. It used statistical methods that were natural starting points for the problem at hand and prove to be sufficient in many cases to this day. However, as Mike Jarvis and his collaborators with DES noticed, PSFex produced a systematic size bias of the Point Spread Function with how it calculated spatial variation across the field of view (Jarvis et al., 2020).

PIFF (Point Spread Functions in the Full Field of View) followed PSFex in the effort to correct this issue. The DES camera was 2.2 degrees across, which was large enough for the size bias to become noticeable for their efforts. PIFF works in focal plane coordinates as opposed to sky coordinates which fixes the systematic size bias. Jarvis and DES also used the Python libraries of astropy (Astropy Collaboration et al., 2022) and Galsim (Rowe et al., 2015) to make the software more accessible than PSFex. PSFex was written in C and had been active for more than 20 years before the systematic size bias was discovered. Due to being so old and written in a low level language it is much less approachable. One of the motivations of ShOpt was to write astrophysics specific software in Julia, because Julia provides a nice balance of readability and speed with its high level functional paradigm and just in time compiler.

While we do have theoretical models of the James Webb PSF, there is yet to be any validation of these models on real data in the literature. Additionally, these models are for single exposure images. The James Webb images have both single exposure and mosaiced images (Perrin et al., 2014, 2012). Mosaiced images are essentially single exposure detector images concatenated together side by side. The PSF models for single exposures do not generalize to the mosaics, so empirical models are all we have for those images.

The COMOS-Web survey is the largest extragalactic survey according to area and prime time allocation (Casey et al., 2023), and takes up  $0.54\text{deg}^2$  (Beichman et al., 2012; Rieke et al., 2023). This is a large enough portion of the sky that we should prepare to see a lot of variation across the field of view. This gives ShOpt the opportunity to validate PIFF's correction for handling PSF variations and underscore just how impactful (or not impactful) PSFex's size bias is.

## Acknowledgements

This project was made possible by The Northeastern Physics Department and Northeastern Undergraduate Research and Fellowships via the Physics Research Co-Op Fellowship and PEAK Ascent Award respectively.

## References

Absil, P.-A., Mahony, R., & Sepulchre, R. (2008). *Optimization algorithms on matrix manifolds* (p. xvi+224). Princeton University Press. ISBN: 978-0-691-13298-3

- 101 Astropy Collaboration, Price-Whelan, A. M., Lim, P. L., Earl, N., Starkman, N., Bradley, L.,  
 102 Shupe, D. L., Patil, A. A., Corrales, L., Brasseur, C. E., Nöthe, M., Donath, A., Tollerud,  
 103 E., Morris, B. M., Ginsburg, A., Vaher, E., Weaver, B. A., Tocknell, J., Jamieson, W., ...  
 104 Astropy Project Contributors. (2022). The Astropy Project: Sustaining and Growing a  
 105 Community-oriented Open-source Project and the Latest Major Release (v5.0) of the Core  
 106 Package. *935*(2), 167. <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac7c74>
- 107 Beichman, C. A., Rieke, M., Eisenstein, D., Greene, T. P., Krist, J., McCarthy, D., Meyer, M.,  
 108 & Stansberry, J. (2012). Science opportunities with the near-IR camera (NIRCam) on the  
 109 James Webb Space Telescope (JWST). In M. C. Clampin, G. G. Fazio, H. A. MacEwen, &  
 110 J. M. O. Jr. (Eds.), *Space telescopes and instrumentation 2012: Optical, infrared, and*  
 111 *millimeter wave* (Vol. 8442, p. 84422N). International Society for Optics; Photonics; SPIE.  
 112 <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.925447>
- 113 Bergmann, R. (2022). Manopt.jl: Optimization on manifolds in Julia. *Journal of Open Source*  
 114 *Software*, *7*(70), 3866. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.03866>
- 115 Bernstein, G. M., & Jarvis, M. (2002). Shapes and shears, stars and smears: Optimal  
 116 measurements for weak lensing. *The Astronomical Journal*, *123*(2), 583. <https://doi.org/10.1086/338085>
- 117
- 118 Bertin, E. (2011). Automated Morphometry with SExtractor and PSFEx. In I. N. Evans, A.  
 119 Accomazzi, D. J. Mink, & A. H. Rots (Eds.), *Astronomical data analysis software and*  
 120 *systems XX* (Vol. 442, p. 435).
- 121 Boumal, N. (2023). *An introduction to optimization on smooth manifolds*. Cambridge  
 122 University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009166164>
- 123 Casey, C. M., Kartaltepe, J. S., Drakos, N. E., Franco, M., Harish, S., Paquereau, L., Ilbert, O.,  
 124 Rose, C., Cox, I. G., Nightingale, J. W., Robertson, B. E., Silverman, J. D., Koekemoer, A.  
 125 M., Massey, R., McCracken, H. J., Rhodes, J., Akins, H. B., Amvrosiadis, A., Arango-Toro,  
 126 R. C., ... Zavala, J. A. (2023). *COSMOS-web: An overview of the JWST cosmic origins*  
 127 *survey*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.07865>
- 128 Flaughner, B., Diehl, H. T., Honscheid, K., Abbott, T. M. C., & others. (2015). The dark  
 129 energy camera. *AJ*, *150*, 150. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-6256/150/5/150>
- 130 Gardner, J. P., Mather, J. C., Clampin, M., Doyon, R., Greenhouse, M. A., Hammel, H. B.,  
 131 Hutchings, J. B., Jakobsen, P., Lilly, S. J., Long, K. S., Lunine, J. I., Mccaughrean, M. J.,  
 132 Mountain, M., Nella, J., Rieke, G. H., Rieke, M. J., Rix, H.-W., Smith, E. P., Sonneborn,  
 133 G., ... Wright, G. S. (2006). The james webb space telescope. *Space Science Reviews*,  
 134 *123*(4), 485–606. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-006-8315-7>
- 135 Innes, M. (2018). Flux: Elegant machine learning with julia. *Journal of Open Source Software*.  
 136 <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00602>
- 137 Jarvis, M., Bernstein, G. M., Amon, A., Davis, C., Lé get, P. F., Bechtol, K., Harrison, I., Gatti,  
 138 M., Roodman, A., Chang, C., Chen, R., Choi, A., Desai, S., Drlica-Wagner, A., Gruen, D.,  
 139 Gruendl, R. A., Hernandez, A., MacCrann, N., Meyers, J., ... and, R. D. W. (2020). Dark  
 140 energy survey year 3 results: Point spread function modelling. *Monthly Notices of the*  
 141 *Royal Astronomical Society*, *501*(1), 1282–1299. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa3679>
- 142 McCleary, J. E., Everett, S. W., Shaaban, M. M., Gill, A. S., Vassilakis, G. N., Huff, E. M.,  
 143 Massey, R. J., Benton, S. J., Brown, A. M., Clark, P., & others. (2023). Lensing in the  
 144 blue II: Estimating the sensitivity of stratospheric balloons to weak gravitational lensing.  
 145 *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2307.03295*.
- 146 Mogensen, P. K., & Riseth, A. N. (2018). Optim: A mathematical optimization package for  
 147 julia. *Journal of Open Source Software*, *3*(24), 615. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00615>

- 148 Perrin, M. D., Sivaramakrishnan, A., Lajoie, C.-P., Elliott, E., Pueyo, L., Ravindranath, S., &  
149 Albert, Loic. (2014). Updated point spread function simulations for JWST with WebbPSF.  
150 In Jr. Oschmann Jacobus M., M. Clampin, G. G. Fazio, & H. A. MacEwen (Eds.), *Space*  
151 *telescopes and instrumentation 2014: Optical, infrared, and millimeter wave* (Vol. 9143, p.  
152 91433X). <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2056689>
- 153 Perrin, M. D., Soummer, R., Elliott, E. M., Lallo, M. D., & Sivaramakrishnan, A. (2012).  
154 Simulating point spread functions for the James Webb Space Telescope with WebbPSF. In  
155 M. C. Clampin, G. G. Fazio, H. A. MacEwen, & Jr. Oschmann Jacobus M. (Eds.), *Space*  
156 *telescopes and instrumentation 2012: Optical, infrared, and millimeter wave* (Vol. 8442, p.  
157 84423D). <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.925230>
- 158 Revels, J., Lubin, M., & Papamarkou, T. (2016). Forward-mode automatic differentiation in  
159 Julia. *arXiv:1607.07892 [Cs.MS]*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.07892>
- 160 Rieke, M. J., Kelly, D. M., Misselt, K., Stansberry, J., Boyer, M., Beatty, T., Egami, E., Florian,  
161 M., Greene, T. P., Hainline, K., Leisenring, J., Roellig, T., Schlawin, E., Sun, F., Tinnin,  
162 L., Williams, C. C., Willmer, C. N. A., Wilson, D., Clark, C. R., ... Young, E. T. (2023).  
163 Performance of NIRCcam on JWST in flight. *Publications of the Astronomical Society of*  
164 *the Pacific*, 135(1044), 028001. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1538-3873/acac53>
- 165 Rosen, D. M., Carlone, L., Bandeira, A. S., & Leonard, J. J. (2019). SE-sync: A certifiably cor-  
166 rect algorithm for synchronization over the special euclidean group. *The International Jour-*  
167 *nal of Robotics Research*, 38(2-3), 95–125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0278364918784361>
- 168 Rowe, B., Jarvis, M., Mandelbaum, R., Bernstein, G. M., Bosch, J., Simet, M., Meyers, J.  
169 E., Kacprzak, T., Nakajima, R., Zuntz, J., Miyatake, H., Dietrich, J. P., Armstrong, R.,  
170 Melchior, P., & Gill, M. S. S. (2015). *GalSim: The modular galaxy image simulation*  
171 *toolkit*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1407.7676>