Handling Systematic Errors II

Herman L. Marshall
(MIT Kavli Institute)

Summary: IACHEC-1

- Goal: avoid two problems
  - A: claims of new physics due to calibration errors
  - B: features ignored due to presumed systematics
- Triage for handling systematic errors
  - Easy and hard cases are clear
    - line fluxes, energies, ratios should be easy
    - separating source and instrument edges may need PI help
  - Middle ground requires new tools
    - Multiple adjustment functions (HLM) — bad
    - Vary instrument models (Drake et al.) — good

Summary: IACHEC-1

- Recommendations to Cal scientists
  - Tell users to avoid xspec syserr generally
  - Try a (Drake-type) multi-RF method
  - Publish methods to estimate parameter errors using simulated data
  - Maintain user feedback and post as needed
- Recommendations to missions
  - Develop caveats or "watch out" pages
  - Provide standard reductions
  - Provide background models
  - Provide examples of handling systematic errors

Adjustment Method

- Method proposed: Use penalty function
  - Minimize $\Lambda = \sum_j A_j^2 + \exp(\frac{(\chi^2_{\nu j} - 1)^2}{\nu_j})$
  - where $\chi^2_{n\nu} = \frac{1}{\nu_n} \sum_{i=1}^{I_n} \frac{[y_{in} - f(x_{in};\vec{\alpha})(1 + \sum_j A_{nj} g(x_{in};\vec{\beta_j}))]^2}{s^2_{in}}$
- Problems:
  - min χ^2/ν achieved jointly: 2.62, 1.48
  - Model is "ugly"
- Solutions?
  - Different basis functions
  - Evolve toward Drake et al. method

Example: Mk 421 LETGS

- Gaussian normalizations computed
- Not consistent between LETGS observations



Example: Mk 421 LETGS



Example: Mk 421 LETGS



Example: Mk 421 LETGS



Multiple Fit Methods

- Monte Carlo method (Drake et al. 2006)
  - Systematic errors assigned to each component of the effective area (mirror, detector, filter, ...)
  - EAs are perturbed within bounds in piecewise continuous fashion, weighted by truncated Gaussian
  - RMFs also adjustable via a separate model
  - Run model fits with many EAs
- Library method (Drake et al., in prep.)
  - Use PCA to make EA perturbation basis vectors
  - Proceed as in MC method



Uses of MC/PCA Method

- Calibration work is setting bounds
  - Adjust bounds until $\chi^2/\nu = 1$ for bright sources
  - Still requires expert knowledge of source
- Observation planning
  - Observer guide gives bounds on systematic errors
  - Users may try out different systematic errors before proposing
- Analysis would be "correct"
  - Can detect model errors if $\chi^2/\nu > 1$
  - Parameter error estimates are valid

Systematic Error Spec

- Several entries for each system component
- 5 values for each energy range

Component	E_{lo} Edge	E_{lo} [keV]	E_{hi} [keV]	σ_{lo}	σ_{hi}	σ_{edge}
HRMA Effective Area	...	0.05	2.156	0.07	0.06	0.02
	Ir M_4 $3d_{3/2}$	2.156	3.183	0.05	0.05	0.01
	Ir M_1 $3s$	3.183	6.400	0.05	0.05	0.005
	...	6.400	12.0	0.05	0.20	...
OBF Contamination	...	0.05	0.284	0.50	0.08	0.04
	C K $1s$	0.284	0.410	0.08	0.05	0.03
	N K $1s$	0.410	0.543	0.05	0.03	0.01
	O K $1s$	0.543	0.697	0.03	0.03	0.01
	F K $1s$	0.697	12.0	0.01	0.005	...
OBF Transmittance	...	0.05	0.284	0.15	0.07	0.03
	C K $1s$	0.284	0.543	0.05	0.04	0.02
	O K $1s$	0.543	1.560	0.03	0.03	0.02
	Al K $1s$	1.560	12.0	0.03	0.01	...
ACIS-S3 QE	...	0.05	0.543	0.10	0.05	0.03
	O K $1s$	0.543	1.839	0.03	0.03	0.03
	Si K $1s$	1.839	12.0	0.03	0.03	...

Multiple Fit Results





Drake et al. 2006



PCA of Effective Areas



Multiple Fit Issues

- Currently implemented in perl scripts
  - Library of RMFs created with calcrmf2
  - Could use MC-based ACIS model to make RMFs
  - Discussions started to implement in ISIS
- Background model should be included
- Each component adjustment should be physically based
- Users don't know which EA or RMF was "right"
  - Feedback to cal scientists may be unhelpful
  - Still need to fit data without systematic errors