

- Review team consisted of Burst Working Group (Lichti, Gehrels, Dingus, Band, Norris) plus Ed Fenimore, Scott Barthelmy, Julie McEnery, Steve Ritz
- ▲ Held in two telecons, Aug. 31 and Sept. 2
- Topics reviewed:
 - **λ** Burst trigger, location, classification algorithms
 - **λ** Requirements on sensitivity and FoV
 - **λ** Calibration plans (pre-launch and on-orbit)
 - **λ** Detector Response Matrices
 - **λ** Spectral Deconvolution
- Fifteen suggestions submitted
- Review Website is http://f64.nsstc.nasa.gov/gbm/temp/bwgreview/



- 1) Need a way to test the trigger algorithms. Particular concern is trends on background, as for example entering or exiting the SAA. A closed-loop simulator is very beneficial.
- 2) A GRB rate of 200 yr-1 for GBM seems too large given the 300 yr-1 rate of BATSE.
- 3) Need to define the criteria for the on-board decision to perform a s/c slew for a GRB.
- 4) Need plan for choosing trigger parameters.
- 5) Investigate if corrections for changing atmospheric scattering component due to s/c rocks and rolls can improve the GBM localization performance.



- 6) Think ahead of flight if the quadratic background fits will improve the trigger and work on-orbit.
- 7) Please send report on Bayesian trigger classification to S. Ritz.
- 8) Consider doing an end-to-end "imaging" test with a radioactive source burst simulator and multiple detectors.
- Consider having a radioactive source that can be used during thermal vac testing for ease of instrument characterization.
- 10) Investigate if non-linearities at low energies and across the iodine K-edge vary from detector to detector.



- 11) Determine what calibrations are really needed.
- 12) Provide documentation on on-board gain stabilization system.
- 13) Consider feeding GRB simulation output into the response simulation software system to check if the output matches the input.
- 14) Consider effects of continuous roll of GLAST observatory on GBM observations.
- 15) Provide a list of the on-board trigger parameters.