





The output image is calculated as:

$$I(l) = \int V(u)e^{i2p \, ul} du$$

Because we have N(N-1)/2 discrete measures, the integral becomes a sum. For each 'good' baseline, the contribution to the output image is:

 $2\cos(2\mathbf{p}u_k l)$

(the factor of two arises because each measure is counted twice – once in its 'correct' location, $u = u_k$, and once, with its complex conjugate, at $u = -u_k$). But for the 'bad' baseline, the contribution becomes:

 $2\cos(2\mathbf{p}u_0l - \mathbf{f}) \approx 2[\cos(2\mathbf{p}u_0l) + \mathbf{f}\sin(2\mathbf{p}u_0l)]$

Where the approximation is valid for a small ($\phi \ll 1$) error. Adding them all up, we get:













For VLA 'continuum' data, the resulting dynamic ranges after self-calibration are typically a few tens of thousands. For strong sources, the remaining errors are definitely not due to thermal noise, so other error sources are responsible.

Experience shows that often the culprit is 'non-closing' errors – baselinebased errors which cannot be removed through antenna-based calibration techniques.

In some circumstances, these errors can be calculated and removed, resulting in images with dynamic ranges exceeding a few hundred thousand. Note that residual errors less than 0.1% (1/20 degree of phase) are needed to reach this level of accuracy.



3 Closing and Non-Closing Errors

A 'closing' error is one which can be identified with an antenna. Its effect thus occurs equally on all baselines which use that antenna. A 'non-closing' error cannot be separated into a pair of antenna-based errors – it is identified with a particular baseline.

Formally, we write:

$$\tilde{V}_{ii}(t) = g_i(t) g_i^*(t) G_{ii}(t) V_{ii(t)} + e_{ii}(t) + d_{ii}(t)$$

Here, the term on the LHS is the measured estimate of the visibility while V_{ij} is the true visibility. The g_i are the antenna-based (closing) gain errors, while G_{ij} is the baseline-based (non-closing) error which cannot be factored into a product of two antenna-based gains. The additive errors, ϵ and δ are baseline-based errors, representing an offset, and thermal noise, respectively. All quantities are considered complex.





4 Origins of Residual Errors

The list of potential sources of errors which limit the accuracy of synthesis imaging is very long! Here I list a few of them that we have thought of, and which might be important. There are undoubtedly others that we haven't thought of, and which are important!

4.1 Thermal Noise.

This is the ultimate source of error. Because it is due to very fast fluctuations within the electronics which cannot be resolved by the correlator, it is a nonclosing error – independent on each baseline. From the 'noise' lecture, we find:

$$=\frac{C}{\sqrt{N(N-1)\Delta Bt}}$$

dI

Where C is a constant depending on the antenna size and efficiency, the system noise, and type of correlator.



System noise will affect gain solutions. The error in the estim ated gain is: $S_G \sim \frac{S_V}{c_1 V_1}$

$$S_G \sim \frac{1}{S\sqrt{N}}$$

he numerator is the rms of the noise on one baseline, in

In this expression, the numerator is the rms of the noise on one baseline, i the time over which a solution is to be calculated, S is the calibrator flux density (in the same units as the rms noise), and N is the number of antennas.

An example: A 10-second solution on a 1 Jy object with the VLA will give an error in the estimate of the gain of each antenna of about 0.4% (or 0.2 degrees), which will limit the dynamic range to a few tens of thousands.

Improving the accuracy by increasing the solution time will eventually fail – when the change in the gain exceeds the error of the estimate.













Nowadays, digital correlators (and digital electronics in general) are much preferred, due to their flexibility and precision. But they are not perfect! Replacement of a smoothly varying voltage with a discretely chan ging voltage results in (amongst other things) an error in the estimate of the complex visibility.

This error is non-linear (i.e. it is not proportional to the visibility magnitude) and acts independently on the COS and SIN correlators The error rapidly diminishes with multi-bit sampling, and can be generally be ignored with (say) 4-bit (16-level) sampling, or better.

The error can be corrected for at the correlator level – this is done with the VLBA correlator, but is not (properly) done on the VLA.

For the VLA, this error reaches about 0.1% for a source of ~50Jy .







4.8 Far-Out Effects. Many of the assumptions used in generating those beautiful Fourier relationships shown in Lecture 1 break down at larger angles. Here is a short list. 4.8.1 Non-Coplanar Baselines. As covered in Lecture 1, many real interferometers (including the VLA) measure the visibility in a threedimensional volume, while most imaging software employs a twodimensional grid, after a phase adjustment which is valid for a single direction - and is incorrect for every other direction. If the field of view roughly exceeds: $q_{FOV} \geq \sqrt{q_{res}}$ then notable imaging errors can be expected. This geometry -based error can be overcome through '3-dimensional' imaging techniques - to be covered in a later lecture. Rick Perley 24 Synthesis Imaging Summer School '02





4.9 Computational Problems.









Coverage Errors 5 Conclusion (of sorts) Finally - one last source of errors to worry about. The purpose of this lecture is not to instill depression, or to convince you to change fields. Observations of a very extended object with the VLA's 'A'-configuration will result in incomplete sampling of the visibility function, with the most The principles of synthesis imaging are well established, and the process notable effect being that the total flux will be seriously underestimated. In works beautifully! simple terms, the short spacing visibilities (which are by far the largest in magnitude) will be missed, with an obvious 'bowl' being the visible Users must understand the limitations of the methodologies, in order to make manifestation. the best use of it. Missing information can, in some cases, be guessed or interpolated in by The major sources of error are well-understood, and we have good methods clever algorithms. But the best remedy is to get the missing information from for correction. a smaller 'configuration', or array, or a 'single-dish'. Most minor sources of error are understood (we think!), and correction methods are under development (or should be!) . The next generation of radio arrays will need to make these corrections. Helmi Rick Perley Rick Perley 33 New Mexico Tech Synthesis Imaging Summer School '02 Synthesis Imaging Summer School '02