

LAT Data Simulation and Likelihood Analysis

Jim Chiang

NASA/GSFC, Code 661, Greenbelt MD 20771

JCA/Physics Dept., University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore MD 21250

SLAC, 2575 Sand Hill Rd, Menlo Park CA 94025

Observation Simulation

- Time scales:
 - orbital/rocking — 95 min (\sim 30–40 min chunks of continuous exposure to a single sky position)
 - SAA passages — 24 hrs
 - orbit precession — \sim 55 days
- IRFs (GLAST25)
 - PSF: $\sigma \sim 10^\circ (E/30 \text{ MeV})^{-3/4}$ (with long tails)
 - eff. area (for $i = 0$): $\sim 10^3 \text{ cm}^2$ at 30 MeV, $\sim 10^4 \text{ cm}^2$ at 30 GeV
- Other effects included: inclination and zenith angle cuts
- Not simulated: changing detector modes, live-time effects, energy dispersion

Observation Simulation (cont.)

- 3EG sources — 3C 279, 3C 273, Crab, Vela
- Galactic and extragalactic diffuse ($\Gamma = 2.1$)
- periodic variability — $P = 10^4$ sec (non-pulsar)
- “flares” — triangle & step functions
- spectral models: power-laws only (so far)
- Method:
 - Compute orbit solution with 35° step rocking, 28.5° orbital inclination
 - Loop over (point) sources and for each time step compute i , A_{eff} , psf, #photon events
 - Draw apparent event energies and positions

Likelihood Calculation

- “This is not X-ray astronomy” (PLN)
<http://giants.stanford.edu/~pln/glastlike-paper.pdf>:
 paucity of photons, scanning, ~ 2 sr FOV, $\sigma_{\text{psf}} \sim 0.1\text{--}10^\circ$
 \Rightarrow each photon has its own response
- Likelihood model and total response R

$$M(E', \hat{p}', t) = \int dE d\hat{p} D(E'; E, \hat{p}, \vec{L}(t)) P(\hat{p}'; E, \hat{p}, \vec{L}(t)) A(E, \hat{p}, \vec{L}(t)) S(E, \hat{p}) \quad (1)$$

$$\equiv \int dE d\hat{p} R(E', \hat{p}', t; E, \hat{p}) S(E, \hat{p}). \quad (2)$$

- Source model

$$S(E, \hat{p}) = \sum_i s_i(E) \delta(\hat{p} - \hat{p}_i) + S_G(E, \hat{p}) + S_{\text{eg}}(E, \hat{p}). \quad (3)$$

Likelihood Calculation (cont.)

- Need to maximize

$$\log \mathcal{L} = \sum_j \log M(E'_j, \hat{p}'_j, t_j) - N_{\text{pred}}, \quad (4)$$

where the predicted number of photons is

$$N_{\text{pred}} = \int dE' d\hat{p}' dt M(E', \hat{p}', t). \quad (5)$$

- Storage requirements for the total response may require ~ 40 GB storage (PLN)
 \Rightarrow compute $R_k(E', \hat{p}', t; E, \hat{p})$ on the fly

Decomposing $\log \mathcal{L}$

- The *abc*'s (and *d*'s) of computing $\log \mathcal{L}$:

$$a_{ij} \equiv \int dE s_i(E) R(E'_j, \hat{p}'_j, t_j; E, \hat{p}_i) \quad (6)$$

$$b_j \equiv \int dE d\hat{p} [S_G(E, \hat{p}) + S_{\text{eg}}(E, \hat{p})] R(E'_j, \hat{p}'_j, t_j; E, \hat{p}) \quad (7)$$

$$c_i \equiv \int dE s_i(E) \int dE' d\hat{p}' dt R(E', \hat{p}', t; E, \hat{p}_i) \quad (8)$$

$$d \equiv \int dE d\hat{p} [S_G(E, \hat{p}) + S_{\text{eg}}(E, \hat{p})] \int dE' d\hat{p}' dt R(E', \hat{p}', t; E, \hat{p}). \quad (9)$$

The log-likelihood is

$$\log \mathcal{L} = \sum_j \log \left(\sum_i a_{ij} + b_j \right) - \sum_i c_i - d. \quad (10)$$

- 10^6 photons \times 10^2 point sources $\sim 10^8$ terms
- If only parameters of one or two sources are varied for each trial value of $\log \mathcal{L}$, then only $\lesssim 2\%$ of terms need to be recomputed for each function evaluation
- Angular integrals — ROI (\hat{p}') $\sim 15^\circ$ radius; Source Region (\hat{p}) $\gtrsim 30^\circ$ radius
- Time integrals \Rightarrow decomposing *c*'s and *d*'s further

Preliminary Likelihood Results: 3C 279 and 3C 273

- Two steady point sources, no background, 55 days of data, 7500 events
- No diffuse emission (only a 's and c 's computed)
- $\sigma_{\text{psf}} \propto E^{-3/4}$
 - \Rightarrow fitted spectral index depends on psf accuracy
 - $\sigma_{\text{psf}}(10\text{GeV}) \lesssim 0.1 \Rightarrow 10^3$ abscissa points per 30°
 - Quantify sensitivity ($\Gamma_1 = 1.96$; $\Gamma_2 = 2.58$):

	Γ_1	Γ_2	$\langle N_{\text{eval}}(\text{tol} = 10^{-2}) \rangle$
0.95 σ_{psf}	1.91 \pm 0.01	2.33 \pm 0.04	74
σ_{psf}	1.93 \pm 0.01	2.37 \pm 0.05	72
1.05 σ_{psf}	1.95 \pm 0.01	2.41 \pm 0.05	71

Optimization Issues

- Poisson statistics \Rightarrow Levenberg-Marquardt is out
- Non-derivative methods
 - Nelder-Mead, Powell (both inefficient)
 - Require careful parameter scaling
- Derivative methods
 - Newton, Quasi-Newton, etc.
 - Analytic derivatives available for fluxes and spectral indices, but not for positions
 \Rightarrow LIKE's "fine" TS maps
 - How can we fit for positions and spectral parameters simultaneously? (evaluate derivatives numerically?)
- Need methods for dealing with *a priori* constraints, e.g., non-negative fluxes
 - Enforce maximum step size
 - Penalty functions ($+\log \mathcal{L}$) outside boundaries

To Do

- Restrict to ROI and Source Region (i.e., do angular integrals)
- Diffuse emission
- More point sources (i.e., allow for freezing and thawing of parameters, etc.)
- Find a good optimization package
- User interface (Pat's `glike.py` GUI)



