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The Need for Precision Photometry

• Recent discovery of accelerated expansion of universe has started revolution in cosmology
  – evidence from SNe, galaxies, galaxy clusters and CMB
  – implication: ~70% of universe is made of “Dark Energy”
    – very little is known about nature of Dark Energy:
      ▪ Λ, quintessence, GR break down, higher dim, axions, etc
      ▪ any option has profound implications
• To determine nature of Dark Energy is difficult task
  – dark energy programs measure W(a) and its evolution with time
  – combination of several observational techniques are needed:
    ▪ SNe (standard candles), weak lensing, galaxy clusters, BAO
• Must rely of accurate distance measurements over cosmic scales
  → rely on precise photometry (1%-2% level)
• An example:
  – failure to measure peak brightness of type-Ia SNe at % level would not allow to constrain cosmological parameters at required levels!
NIR Precision Photometry

• Precision photometry is essential to the science goals of any Dark Energy mission and will require low noise, high QE detectors with a high degree of sub-pixel uniformity and stability.

• Precision photometry at the 1% level presents new challenges for an undersampled survey telescope:
  – Intra-pixel variation (Spot-o-Matic: <2% for any PSF)
  – Pixel size variation and flat-fielding (<1% in HgCdTe)
  – Reciprocity failure (count rate non-linearity: ~5%/dex)

• What is needed to close the chapter on NIR precision photometry?
  – Potentially large count rate non-linearity in 1.7 μm cut-off HgCdTe detectors
    • Not observed in CCDs (<1% ?)
  – Determine pixel size variation and effect from flat-fielding
Count Rate Non-linearity

- Photometry calibration for DE missions requires observation of many standardized stars (and internal ref. syst.) over a wide range of magnitude
- NICMOS arrays (2.5 μm cut-off HgCdTe) on HST exhibit a 15%-25% flux- and wavelength-dependent non-linearity

- exhibits power law behavior, with pixels with high count rates detecting slightly more flux than expected for a linear system (and vice-versa)
- effect strongly reduced at higher wave lengths
Classic Well Depth Nonlinearity

- NICMOS nonlinearity distinctly different from well-known total count dependent nonlinearity for NIR detectors (due to saturation as well is filled)

- full integration capacity (RSC FPA H2RG-32-040) is $1.17 \times 10^5$ e-
- linearity is maintained within ±3% up to 80% of the full integration capacity
NICMOS Reciprocity Failure

- NICMOS is known to have a flux dependent non-linearity (15-25% effect) (ISR 2005-002)
- This is correctable assuming power law

\[ \text{count rate} \propto \text{flux}^{\alpha(\lambda)}_{\text{tot}} \]

- for non-linearity \( \sim 5\%/\text{dex} \):
  \( \alpha=1.02 \rightarrow \Delta m=2.5(\alpha-1)/\text{dex} \)

- Corrections known to within 10% (ISR 2006-003)
- Further efforts to reduce from 10% \( \rightarrow \) 5% (ISR 2007-004)
- These pixel level uncertainties impact photometry, as they directly propagate into estimated uncertainties on derived magnitudes
UM Reciprocity Setup
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Reciprocity Measurement Scheme

- use fixed geometry
- dynamic range: $10^5$ w/ six pinholes (10$\mu$m – 3.3mm)
- aperture calibration at $\sim$120 K (not temperature stabilized)
- PD linearity: take ratios of aperture pairs vs light source intensity
- repeat for various band pass filters
- adjust light source intensity with ND filters to operational range of detector

- Reciprocity measurement:
  - keep detector at 140 K
  - cycle through pin holes
  - adjust exposure time to keep $N_\gamma$ constant
  - no shutter needed for HgCdTe
  - for CCDs shutter is important
• Dewar extension temperature drops slowly with time
The PD displays a temperature dependence of 0.2%/K → long exposures need to be corrected for change in PD temperatures → add temperature control to PD
• quartz tungsten halogen lamp shows instabilities of ~0.5% over a 30 min time interval (constant current mode) → can be reduced to ~0.1% with active feedback
Reciprocity Measurements: To do

• Now that stability of the reciprocity setup is characterized, need to:
  – do aperture calibration
  – check PD linearity
  – do reciprocity measurements

• Can be preformed on HgCdTe, CCDs, ...
  – a detector specific mounting plate needs to be machined
    → allow for fast turn around time if detectors available only for short time
Pixel Size Variation and Flat-fielding

- Are percent level variations on pixel scale seen in QE data caused by pixel area variations or pixel sensitivity variations?
- If due to pixel area variations standard flat-fielding will degrade photometry precision for point sources in an undersampled telescope.
- Low pass spatial filter preserves large scale sensitivity variations while eliminating small scale variations.
- Combine QE and Spot-o-Matic data to resolve this issue.
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Pixel Size Variation?

- single spectrum (15x15 px):
  pixel response: $\sigma \sim 1.8\%$ (expected from Poisson stat: $\sim 1.6\%$)
  $\rightarrow$ due to area variations?

- 100 spectra (15x15 px):
  pixel response: $\sigma \sim 0.8\%$ (expected from $1/\sqrt{N}$: 0.18%)

- pixel response variations: pixel size, QE, gain, ... variations?
  $\rightarrow$ pixel area variations: $\sigma < 0.8\%$ ($\sim 0.4\%$ in linear dim)
  $\rightarrow$ effect on flat-fielding needs to be quantified