# A User's Guide to Lucky Imaging (With a focus on mosaic cameras)

### Tim Staley,

### Craig Mackay & the Cambridge LI Group

Southampton



RS Lucky Imaging Meeting Chicheley Hall, April 2013

WWW: timstaley.co.uk

## OUTLINE

#### WHY MOSAIC?

### LUCKYCAM 2009 & THE NOT

#### REDUCTION

#### Performance

#### TRADEOFFS, RECOMMENDATIONS

## OUTLINE

### WHY MOSAIC?

### LUCKYCAM 2009 & THE NOT

#### REDUCTION

Performance

TRADEOFFS, RECOMMENDATIONS

### Spatial sampling

- High spatial resolution surveys require many pixels on sky.
- At the frame rates lucky imaging requires, it becomes difficult to run a 1Kx1K CCD without getting swamped by readout noise.
- Unfortunately, current generation of EMCCDs cannot be abutted (though this is changing).

### Dynamic range

- Independent gain control is a bonus.
- Dynamic range on a single EMCCD is limited to about 10 magnitudes by electron well depth in multiplication register. (Disclaimer: back of envelope calculation.)
- Can't guide well on a saturated star.
- ► Ok if GS is Mag ≈ 16. Potentially problematic if GS is Mag ≈ 10.

### But...

- Significant hardware challenge alignment, synchronisation, multiple control systems...
- High data rates.
- More calibration.(See below...)

## OUTLINE

#### WHY MOSAIC?

### LUCKYCAM 2009 & THE NOT

#### REDUCTION

PERFORMANCE

TRADEOFFS, RECOMMENDATIONS



n Perfor

TRADEOFFS, RECOMMENDATIONS

## A HARDWARE IMPLEMENTATION



I PERFORM

TRADEOFFS, RECOMMENDATIONS

## A HARDWARE IMPLEMENTATION



Perform

TRADEOFFS, RECOMMENDATIONS

## A HARDWARE IMPLEMENTATION





### Visitor Instrument @ 2.5m Nordic Optical Telescope

- Awarded 8 nights on sky, + technical time for setup and take-down.
- Off we went to La Palma.





# **RESULTS?**



- Minor software glitches slowed progress for first couple of days.
- Overall, system performed very well.
- Some good weather.
- Now, we hads lots of data to reduce (~ 8TB).

## OUTLINE

#### WHY MOSAIC?

### LUCKYCAM 2009 & THE NOT

### REDUCTION

#### PERFORMANCE

#### TRADEOFFS, RECOMMENDATIONS

## PHOTOMETRIC CALIBRATION

### Specific to EMCCDs:

- Accurate on-sky gain calibration via pixel histograms is desirable (CCDs independently adjustable).
- Histogram based bias map estimation is the most robust way to separate bias pedestal and internally generated signal (i.e. dark current + clock induced charge).

## PHOTOMETRIC CALIBRATION



- Custom pipeline written in C++.
- A 2 stage process, comprising evaluation and reduction. Almost always I/O limited (~60–80MB/sec).
- Make use of thread-friendly STL based containers and Intel Thread Building Blocks library to implement a 'pipeline of filters' pattern.

### First, frame evaluation:

- Load frame, debias, gain normalize, subtract internally generated signal (DC + CIC).
- Interpolate GS region, cross-correlate with Airy core to estimate tip-tilt and (relative) Strehl.
- Save position and quality estimates to file.

### Second, selection and recombination:

- Sort frames by estimated quality, selecting according to user-criteria.
- Load and calibrate, optionally applying thresholding to a copy.
- Drizzle to create final image, writing to file whenever a user-selection criteria is met.





- Using standard binaries would take at least (2n-1) pointings per focal lens.
- ► So we observe a crowded field.

- Using standard binaries would take at least (2n-1) pointings per focal lens.
- ► So we observe a crowded field.
- But: standard catalogues (2MASS, USNO) do not have the resolution (2MASS pixels are 2 arcseconds width).

- Using standard binaries would take at least (2n-1) pointings per focal lens.
- ► So we observe a crowded field.
- But: standard catalogues (2MASS, USNO) do not have the resolution (2MASS pixels are 2 arcseconds width).
- Solution: Create own catalogues from HST/WFPC fields, cross match using custom code.





## OUTLINE

#### WHY MOSAIC?

### LUCKYCAM 2009 & THE NOT

#### REDUCTION

### Performance

#### TRADEOFFS, RECOMMENDATIONS

What resolution improvement do we obtain?

# PSF profiles



WHY MOSAIC? LUCKYCAM 2009 & THE NOT REDUCTION

ON PERFORMANCE

TRADEOFFS, RECOMMENDATIONS

## FWHM ACROSS THE FIELD



## FWHM ACROSS THE FIELD



### ► How faint can we go?

WHY MOSAIC? LUCKYCAM 2009 & THE NO

ON PERFORMANCE

## FAINT LIMITS: GUIDE STARS



### (Simulated)

## FAINT LIMITS: GUIDE STARS

### A real world example: the Einstein Cross.



### (Left: HST. Right: LI. GS $M_i \approx 17$ )

## FAINT LIMITS: SCIENCE TARGETS

### 3C 405 (Cygnus-A)



### Left: HST. Right: LI.

## FAINT LIMITS: SCIENCE TARGETS

### 3C 405 (Cygnus-A)



### Left: HST. Right: LI.

- One hour observation, 50% selection, ~0.5" seeing.
- ▶ Galaxy approx 30″ from guide star.
- Weakly detect stars of estimated  $M_i \ge 23$ .
- Can do better with latest hardware.

## OUTLINE

#### WHY MOSAIC?

### LUCKYCAM 2009 & THE NOT

#### REDUCTION

#### PERFORMANCE

#### TRADEOFFS, RECOMMENDATIONS

# OPTIMAL PIXEL SIZE AND FRAMERATE TRADE-OFFS

- Spatial sampling vs detector noise.
  (Old issue with a new twist: Drizzle many frames with subpixel offsets.)
- Longer exposures for faint targets vs atmospheric blurring above coherence time.
- Data rates.

## OBSERVATION PLANNING

- Will there be a close / bright enough guide star?
- Will de-saturating my guide star ruin my faint limit? (Can I position the mosaic to avoid this?)
- What resolution / magnitude depth do I need to achieve, and what weather conditions / selection criteria does this require?
- (For very bright sources:) Would I be better off turning off the EM amplifier altogether?

- This is non-trivial!
- Worth investigating: http://www.astromatic.net/ software/scamp (Cannot read custom catalogues when I last checked, but this is probably an easy feature to add.)

# OPEN QUESTIONS / RESEARCH PROBLEMS

- Use of multiple guide stars.
- Crowded field photometry with a slowly varying PSF.