#### Developments below the Survey Threshold

#### Mario Santos for Jonathan Zwart, Song Chen, Eliab Malefahlo, Russ Taylor & Matt Jarvis mariogrs@gmail.com

5 November, 2016

www.uwcastro.org

- Why bother?
- Ways to beat the survey threshold
- Bayesian approach to modelling the data
- Activity report 2015/2016
- The threat of confusion
- Some caveats

## What's on offer?

- ► Counts → effects of confusion on arrays + surveys (cf. 4C)
- For example, MIGHTEE will be confusion-limited (return to later)
- We are also seeing confusion effects in e.g. MWA/GLEAM eventually SKA1-LOW....
- But there's a tonne of science to be done with these data, especially when we have ancilliary (optical/nir) data in hand
- $\blacktriangleright$  Typically, photo-z's and stellar masses  $\rightarrow$ 
  - Luminosity functions
  - (Specific) Star formation rates
  - Far-infrared-radio correlation
  - Spectral indices as function of flux
  - Polarization fraction as function of flux
  - Two-point correlation function
  - HI mass function + evolution...
  - Split by population (using best-fit templates)

### Options for beating the noise:

- 1. **Observe** for as long as  $\sqrt{t}$  holds (but systematics)
- 2. Build a new telescope
- Dedicated P(D) (Scheuer 1957): Blind analysis of map's flux 'deflections' to measure total noise contribution from faint confusing sources, and hence count these as function of flux (> 1 source/beam → confusion-limited)
- Stacking (various): Select target population and use their prior catalogue positions to measure fluxes in some other map, even if undetected in that map ('many' beams/source please)

## Stacking = Covariance of a map with a catalogue

2											matte	melght		
- 8			1004084		-4.99363	23.22642	273.	54.	1,24	-0.211	16.833	0.00282		
			1044095		-4.99356	22.94054	#95.	64.	1.62	-1.326	10.238	0.00385	- 2	
	2		1000005	24.55377	+4-93375	23.12902	1024-		0.225	-1.284	18.644	0.00288	- +2	
	(100)		2000104		64.9324	22.29867	1478.	11.	01413	-1.043	18.539	0.00395	100	4
B.I	4		1006104	36.01836	-4.993343	23.27664	2256.	65.	2,774	1.589	19.545	0.00262		
	5		1000009	20.59715	-4.99371	22,59793	1814.	64.	2,102	2.245	10.564	0.0925	- A.	1
P			1000111	14.58358	-4.99339	23.16512	1239.	64.	0.01	0.043	17.364	6.04332		
	1.7		20040355	34.41972	-4-99362	23.31822	962.	64.	3.668	0.01	39.248	0.8427		
			1004117	26.42584	+4.99253	23.11029	2993.	63.	0,801	-0.056	10.527	0.04291	- 11	
- 22	1.0	1.0	1000118	36.4827	-4.33345	23.3593	1294.	#1.	3,876	-1.012	16.602	0.00372	6.4	
12	. 10		1000123	36,958	-4.99254	23, 27224	258.		0.229	-0.099	18.992	0.00274		
12	11		1000124	24.75478	-4.99357	22.76257	678.	64.	0.968	6.549	17.957	0.0031	- 1	
1.0	12		10040229	16.01105	-4.99324	23,44295	574.	65.	2,911	-9.32	17,947	0.0931		
	12		1004138		.4.93343	22.01388	1143.	85.	0.799	-9.159	17.611	0.04215	- 5	
15	14		1000134		-5-33365	22.28707	682.		1.851	-0.625	11.857	0.00314	1.1	
26	15		1000134		-4.99383	22.4059	2319.		1.647	2.316	18.445	0.00293	1	
12.	16		1044137		-4.99343	22.26144	2399.	64.	3.43	0.675	19.909	0.00252	- 61	
18	127		1000149		-4.99329	22.59548	2454.	45.	2,074	-9,343	19.625	0.0024		
	14		2044142		-4.3933	23.28757	160.	45.	1.563	0,891	18.004	0.86309	- 5	
28	- 62	- 2	1004145	10.99139	-4.99324	22,94655	885.	45.	0.893	-0.101	39.15	0.80273		
- 20	22		1000144		-4.33323	22,26179	2247-	#5.	2,674	-0.953	30.232	0.01244	- 1	
32	21		1000148		-4-33244	23.05548	1826		0.633	-0.561	31.233	0.00328		
23	22		1000158		-4.99223	22.27174	2285.	85.	3.295	-2.049	16.842	0.00353	1.1	
		- 12 -	1000158	16.8208	-4.99323	23.427274			1.523	-0.049				
24	22						491.	65.			17,866	0.09313 0.09377		
- 25			1004154	26.49401		22.42947	2262.	45.	1,044	-0.548	16.285			
- 26	25		1004158	36.0814	-4-33353	23, 32542	2249.	85.	1,961	-0.284	19.633	8.04255		
27	28		1000143		-4.993322	22,49769	1000.	45.	0,874	0.522	17.078	0.09343		
28	- 27		1006144		+4.99323	22.4039	492.	45.	0.202	1.155	17.931	0.00311	- 1	
28.	24		1004174		-4.,99323	22.65117	124-	45.	0.292	0,634	21.116	8,01224		
- 28	29		1844177		-4,99352	22.5542	862.	54.	2,205	-0.004	15.63	0.0626		
- 11	38		1044188	34.5554	-4.33299	23.15#23	1234.	46.	3,607	0,392	16.533	0.00344		
- 52	35		1009182	26.4964	-4.99533	22.50871	1257.		0.789	0,688	16.576	0.09364		
	32		1050183		+4	22.15097	348-	45.	0.29	-0.819	39-647	0.00288	+3	A second s
34	33		10001#7	36.19136		22.11494	1996.	45.	0.206	0.311	37.920	6.00311		
- 35	- 24		1000188		-4.993214	22.40007	814.	- 65.	2,525	0.84	19.365	6.00249	t.	
- 26	35		1044193		-4.99204	23.39157		64.	2,624	-1.079	17,984	0.08399	-1	
37	36		1004135		-4.99307	23.39401	1471.	86.	1,24	-1.634	37.984	0.04503	+1	
	37		1000194		-4-99347	22.54299	1244.	45.	0,964	-0.708	14.049	0.00386	- 1	
- 89.	34		1004195	26.58793		22.88741	2235.	65.	1,363	1.438	19.954	0.09251	1	1
40	28		1000199		-4.99274	21.3488	2909.	66.	2,262	-0.119	15.853	5.00388		
45.	43		1044292	36.6174	-4.99348	21,95674	847.	#5.	3,544	-1.324	19,037	0.04276	-1	
42	41		1004284		-4.99269	23.21764	495.	66.	1.000	-0.764	17.632	6.88322	-1	
43	62		1000212		+4-39283	22.28112	337.		0.57	1.099	17.648	0.0832	- A.	
44	43	- G.	1000213		+4.93253	22.78418	134.		1.129	0.784	14.24	8.093	- iii	
45			1000214		+4.99282	21.99029	2288.		3.165	-0.309	20.335	0.00242	- 4	
46	45	- CR	1004218		-4.99347	21.22122	528.	45.	3,194	-1.779	37.903	0.04312	-1	

- Or use ALL the pixels in the map
- (P(D) experiment = arrange for confused data)

#### Data: Bin $\rightarrow$ detected, intermediate, noisy



#### Directly from counts to parameter space

- 'Beyond stacking' (Mitchell-Wynne+ 2014)
- 'Bayesian likelihood analysis' (Vernstrom+ 2014)
- 'Parametric stacking' (Roseboom & Best 2014)
- 'Far beyond stacking' (Zwart, Santos & Jarvis 2015)
- Need a generative, parametric model for observed pixel-count distributions (deflections — use Power' theorem for this with

distributions/deflections — use Bayes' theorem for this, with Poisson likelihood function:

## Short interlude: Bayes' theorem

$$\frac{\mathcal{P}\left(\boldsymbol{\Theta}|\boldsymbol{\mathsf{D}}\right)}{\mathcal{Z}\left(\boldsymbol{\mathsf{D}}\right)} = \frac{\mathcal{L}\left(\boldsymbol{\mathsf{D}}|\boldsymbol{\Theta}\right)\Pi\left(\boldsymbol{\Theta}\right)}{\mathcal{Z}\left(\boldsymbol{\mathsf{D}}\right)}$$

Use it for:

- Parameter estimation probably familiar to you (beware: assumes know model)
- Model selection (even these inescapably need own priors often neglected...), i.e. Occam's razor

**NOT** maximum likelihood, etc. — rather, use all available information, explore full posterior distribution via MCMC/nested sampling, propagate uncertainties and correlations

## The stacking algorithm for source counts

- 1. start with a radio map
- 2. use a catalogue of source positions (usually from a survey at other wavelengths) this is our "target population"
- 3. extract flux from radio map at source positions (assume only the source flux is contributing + thermal noise)
- 4. Histogram: bin number of sources per extracted flux bin our flux bins will have negative values (because of noise and average subtraction from the interferometer). There can also be bins above the typical flux cut (for strong sources) - usually neglect these ones in the fitting.
- 5. Choose the dN/dS model it will have to include a minimum flux cut (below which you assume your population does not have any sources) and a maximum flux cut (only needs to be above your maximum data flux cut so to be able to describe the data you observe (noise might "move" high fluxes into measured lower fluxes).
- 6. fit the model to the obtained histogram using the algorithm and an assumed probability distribution for your histogram values (close to Gaussian for lots of sources in each bin)

- For source counts, use piecewise power laws or polynomials or independent bins/flat bands
- For other quantities, zone data into separate histograms by noise, redshift, polarization, stellar mass etc. and just add log-likelihoods
- Then use Schechters or double PLs or...
- Eventually analyse on a per-object basis (Ocran; hard and still assumes a perfect map!)

### Results

## 1. VIDEO-VLA 1.4-GHz source counts (Zwart+)



## 2. ELAIS-N1-JVLA 4.8-GHz I/P source counts (Zwart+)

- Added Rice/Rayleigh noise model
- Added multiple noise zones
  - $\rightarrow$  deepest GHz counts to date
  - $\rightarrow$  existence of polarized signal



## 3. SDSS Quasars stacked in FIRST (Malefahlo+)

Adding luminosity-function generative model



### 4. The deepest 150-MHz counts (Hale+)

#### ▶ µJy LOFAR counts!



## **Systematics**

## Salient equation (Mitchell-Wynne)

 In order to generate model counts per bin (for sampling), convolve source-count model (however generated) with noise:

$$I_{\rm bin} = \int_{S_{min}}^{S_{max}} \mathrm{d}S \frac{\mathrm{d}N(S)}{\mathrm{d}S} \int_{S_{m_i}}^{S_{m_i} + \Delta S_{m_i}} \mathrm{d}S_m \frac{1}{\sigma_n \sqrt{2\pi}} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(S-S_m)^2}{2\sigma_n^2}}$$

The noise (red) can be Gaussian in each polarization, or we can incorporate confusion:

$$I_{\rm bin} = \int_{S_{min}}^{S_{max}} \mathrm{d}S \frac{\mathrm{d}N(S)}{\mathrm{d}S} \int_{S_{m_i}}^{S_{m_i} + \Delta S_{m_i}} \mathrm{d}S_m P(D \equiv S - S_m)$$

## Thinking about confusion now:

- Scheuer derived P(D), idea later developed by Condon
- ► Analytic expression for counts → confusion noise/histogram (capitalized on by Vernstrom+)
- ► Fourier analysis → computationally intensive
- ▶ So for time being, can just use measured P(D) for OFF pixels
- ► This will let us pierce the confusion wall with stacking (which goes as  $\sqrt{N}$ )
- So MIGHTEE is fine
- Eventually fit confusion counts too

# 5. Stacking in presence of confusion (Chen+ in prep.)



- Left: Bias noticed by Zwart+ 2015 when stacking SKADS sources assuming Gaussian noise (VIDEO-VLA setup)
- Right: Now correct for effect of confusion

#### Effects on confusion of thermal noise and resolution



# Elephant trap: Caveats & biases (astro-ph.GA/1412.5743)

#### Sky-side

- Source clustering and sample variance (Heywood+ 2013)
- Extended sources... (Vernstrom+ 2015)
- Parent population (prior-based, so NB selection effects)
- Confusion

#### Instrument-side

- Biases are usually downwards smearing
- Resolution bias (oversampling: 20 per cent  $\rightarrow$  1 per cent)
- ► CLEAN/snapshot bias (< 1µJy Bondi+ 2003)</p>
- Astrometry (X-band)
- The eggbox varying map noise
- Noise model
- Calibration, sidelobe confusion, ghosts etc. (Smirnov+)
- Use of a single-point statistic

#### Prospects are good

- Santos says: Don't detect....
- Stacking gets us orders of magnitude deeper
- The days of median stacking are behind us
- Bayesian framework for sub-threshold work now well established
- Code available BAYESTACK (jz@uwcastro.org)
- Not short of applications
- Full end-to-end imaging simulations are (still) the Achilles' heel — but this is generally true
- Ultimately only a visibility analysis (BIRO/RIME) will hand systematics correctly