

## MAORY LGS WFS trade-Off: Truncation and Regularization, and a few tricks

### Christophe Verinaud,

Sylvain Oberti, Miska Le Louarn, Pierre-Yves Madec, Michel Tallon Guido Agapito, Cedric Plantet, Lorenzo Busoni, Simone Esposito



# What is the best size for the FOV of the sub-apertures of a LGSWFS ?



I asked my bro-law who knows everything, this is his answer:





ARCSEC

. . . . .

## NOT SO BAD ! JUST WRONG BY A FACTOR OF 2 OR SO...

WFS in the ELT/VLT era, Florence, 28/10/2019

== 84 🛌 += 84 == 88 == 60 📼 🖬 🛨 💥 🛍





### We want computation time < 10000 years With Q-OCTOPUS

### $\rightarrow$ Quantization of FOV









### We want computation time < 10000 years With Q-OCTOPUS

### $\rightarrow$ Quantization of FOV





WFS in the ELT/VLT era, Florence, 28/10/2019



## **MAORY simulation case**



#### Target SR(K) = 60% for simulations (in center of FOV)



- 6 LGS WFS @ 45" radius
  - Flux=470 photons / sub-aperture (percentile 90%)
- 2 Post-Focal DMs
- LISA  $\rightarrow$  10x10 pixels / sub-aperture
  - > RON=3
- 3 NGS WFSs looking at bright stars
- 35 layers profile, r0=0.157m @ zenith L0=25 m
- Turbulence profile:
  - Cn2 mean
  - > Cn2 bad (percentile 90%)
- Na profile:
  - Na Mean: Multi-Peak
  - Na Bad: Top-Hat-Peak,
- POLC-MMSE reconstruction 6 layers : OCTOPUS+FRIM





### When Na profile varies (and turbulence WF=0) A LGS SH in the Telescope sees only Tip-Tilt and Defoc





DIAM\_TEL

Each point **j** with intensity  $I_j$  in LGS cigare is seen from M1 as Wavefront with only 3 components  $Z1_i=Tip_i$ 



Z3<sub>j</sub>=Focus<sub>j</sub>

The LGS SH measures the ponderated linear combination of the  $3 Zi_j$ 

### Only TT and Defoc = F(I<sub>Na</sub>) AND THOSE ARE FILTERED!

**WF**(I<sub>Na</sub>) = 1/N 
$$\sum_{j=0}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{3} I_{j} Zi_{j}$$

WFS in the ELT/VLT era, Florence, 28/10/2019



## Q-Static Bias: Single LGS Reconsted WF for Flat WF



### Gentle Na profile



WFS in the ELT/VLT era, Florence, 28/10/2019



### Extreme Na profile (depends from which perspective)



WFS in the ELT/VLT era, Florence, 28/10/2019









## **Binary windows to damp RON**



Wthre = 0.5 % Wthre = 1 % Wthre = 2 % Binary windows for most elongated spots in function of parameter Wthre Binary windows for NON elongated spots in function of parameter Wthre

### (User's) Choice of Truncated sub-apertures: **Projection Regularization** (tG: threshold, Gauss. model)



#### Parameters tuning recipe:

- 1. Noise variance:  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_n$  uniform in P
- 2. Elongation:  $\beta$  non uniform in P
- 3. Elongation discard threshold: *tG*



WFS in the ELT/VLT era, Florence, 28/10/2019

$$[\mathbf{C}_n]_{2\times 2,\text{cut}}^{-1} = \frac{\eta}{\sigma_n^2 \beta^2} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_2^2 & -\beta_1 \beta_2 \\ -\beta_1 \beta_2 & \beta_1^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

 $C_n$ : Measurements covariance

#### Michel Tallon and Clementine Bechet, 2009

### OCTOPUS UNITS

- $\sigma_n$ : noise on slopes (no elong): nm
  - NPH,RON, FWHM (transverse)
- βmax:elong. maxkm
  - > 10 km → ~10 arcsec

#### tG

- ➢ tG such X% sub-ap truncated
- (note real Values in plots are in other units that are unprocatical)

tG / X%

### (User's) Choice of Truncated sub-apertures: **Projection Regularization** (tG: threshold, Gauss. model



#### Parameters tuning recipe:

- 1. Noise variance:  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_n$  uniform in P
- 2. Elongation:  $\beta$  non uniform in P
- 3. Elongation discard threshold: *tG*



WFS in the ELT/VLT era, Florence, 28/10/2019

$$[\mathbf{C}_n]_{2\times 2,\mathrm{cut}}^{-1} = \frac{\eta}{\sigma_n^2 \beta^2} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_2^2 & -\beta_1 \beta_2 \\ -\beta_1 \beta_2 & \beta_1^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

 $C_n$ : Measurements covariance

#### Michel Tallon and Clementine Bechet, 2009

### OCTOPUS UNITS

- $\sigma_n$ : noise on slopes (no elong): nm
  - > NPH,RON, FWHM (transverse)
- βmax: elong. maxkm
  - ➤ 10 km → ~10 arcsec

#### tG

- on truncated
- tG such X% sub-ap truncated
- (note real Values in plots are in other units that are unprocatical)

tG / X%



### **Optimising tG:**



Select Sub-apertures on which to apply the projection regularization



WFS in the ELT/VLT era, Florence, 28/10/2019



## **Optimization of tG**



### Truncation induces dynamical noise and static bias: tG fixes both...

#### FOV=10, Na Multi-Peak, REFs (bias calibrated)

#### NPH=470. FOV=10, FWHMt=1.1, dH=10.e3, NOISE term =60 NM NPH=470, FOV=10, FWHMt=1.1, dH=10.e3, NOISE term =60 NM REF=0 0.8 0.1 **Dynamical Noise** 0.6 Robustness SR(K) SR(K) Static Bias Less sub-ap with proj. regularization (¥) 25 0.4 (×) 0.4 More sub-ap with Attention: 2 figures 0.2 proj. regularization 0.2 not at same scale. This is REFs tG/50% 0.0 0.0 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.0 0.00 0.05 0.10 0.15 0.20 THRESHOLD S THRESHOLD S tG/75% tG/50% tG tG tG/80% tG/66%

FOV=10. SR Performance in function of tG (threshold S). Optimum value between 0.1 and 0.01 [50%-75%]. BETA=10. KM, NOISE=60 nm. REFs.
WFS in the ELT/VLT era. Florence. 28/10/2019

FOV=10. W1%. SR Performance in function of tG (threshold S). Optimum value between 0.05 and 0.001 [66%-80%] . BETA=10. KM, NOISE=60 nm. **REF0.** 

FOV=10, Na Multi-Peak, REF0 (bias NOT calibrated)



## **Performance: simulations**



- With Regularisation values in table below:
- Determined for for NPH=470, RON=3
- **σ**<sub>n</sub> and **β** fixed analytically and KEPT CONSTANT
- **tG** can be put to 100% and KEPT CONSTANT
  - > →Simulations show a Loss of SR < 2% (worst case)

For all the following simulations results:

Binary Windowing Wthre=1% fixed

REF0 (bias NOT calibrated)

	FOV=10 arcsec	FOV=15 arcsec	FOV=20 arcsec
σ <sub>n</sub>	50 nm	60 nm	80 nm
β <sub>max</sub>	10 km	10 km	10 km
tG %	66%	66%	0%



## **Performance: LGS flux**



#### **REF0** (bias NOT calibrated)





## **Performance, Impact of Bad Na Profile**





WFS in the ELT/VLT era, Florence, 28/10/2019

#### +ES+ 0 +

## **Performance: impact of bad Na Profile**







## **Performance: impact of bad Na Profile**







## **Conclusions / Recommendations**



- Main Result: Fix all the regularization parameters once for all to a "reasonable value" and you are near optimality in 90% of time
- If you wish to do better then I recommend:
  - $> \sigma_n$ : update it if you want to be optimal at low flux
- Be careful with spot lateral width sampling: **non-linearity**
- **On the Quasi-Statics**: Regularization plays an (too?) enormous role...
- ➡ → Having no Quasi-Static Bias at all would be certainly an asset for Non Common Path Aberrartions compensation



## **Towards Decoherence of MAORY**



### $| FOV \rangle = \alpha | 10 \rangle + \beta | 15 \rangle + \gamma | 20 \rangle$ arcsec

- FOV = 10 arcsec
   α ↑: Good at low flux Spot well sampled
   α ↓: Strong Static Bias Needs Regularization Not good at adverse Na profiles
   FOV = 20 arcsec γ ↑: No Static Bias No need of Regularization Performing in All Conditions
   γ ↓: Needs spot shaping
  - FOV = 15 arcsec
  - $\blacksquare$   $\beta$  measures the SWISS probability



## **Reject RON with windowing**

10x10: lots of pixels with big leverage on slopes

### → Binary Windows:

- > Pixels with No signal  $\rightarrow 0$  (threshold few ~1-2 %)
- > Add pixels with value 1 to Centro-Symmetrize the Window

### Idea: Fixed Windows adapted to all conditions

- > Spot width, Na profiles, Jitter, NCPA offsets...
- If needed some borderline pixels can be Weighted



REFs: Bias Calibrated REF0: Bias NOT Calibrated W1%: Bin. Window Thre=0.01

 SR (W1%, REF0):
 66%

 SR(THRE=9, REFs):
 66%

 SR(THRE=9,REF0):
 47%







## **Performance: Windowing VS Thresholding**



#### Iterations

Solid line in bold: Performance of FOV=20 with REF0 and windowing W1%. Dashed line: REF0 and no thresholding (RON not attenuated). Doted-Dashed: REF0 and application of thresholding (no zero BIAS hurts ). 3-Dotted Dahsed: Classical threshold with Bias calibrated.

SOLID LINE: Windowing W1%, REF0

All other lines are without windowing

The only case that performs as good as windowing is Thresholding+ REFs

Other curves' performance is either dominated by RON or by the BIAS

#### $\rightarrow$ Windowing is used for the rest of the study

WFS in the ELT/VLT era, Florence, 28/10/2019

Mettre def de REFs REF0



SR in function of angular separation. CN2 mean. FOV=20 NPH=470, RON=3, W1%, Optimum regularisation parameters (Table 1). Solid line: profile NA1200. Dashed line: Profile Top-Hat-Peak

SR in function of angular separation. CN2 mean. FOV=15 NPH=470, RON=3, W1%, Optimum regularisation parameters (Table 1). Solid line: profile NA1200. Dashed line: Profile Top-Hat-Peak.

## Spot enlargement to reduce non-linearity



- FWHMt = Lateral LGS spot size in Sodium layer at uplink
- Optimal reconstructor as defined later
- For the rest of the study the LGS Spot is enlarged such that sampling is 1 pixel / FWHMt





## **Optimization of tG: Threshold ?**



• tG can also "fix" Static Bias due to Thresholding but needs to regularize harder



**FOV=10**. **W1%**. SR Performance in function of tG (threshold S). Optimum value between 0.05 and 0.001 [66%-80%] . BETA=10. KM, NOISE=60 nm. **REF0**.

FOV=10. SR Performance in function of tG (threshold S). Optimum value between 0.05 and 0.001 [66%-80%] . BETA=10. KM, NOISE=60 nm. **REF0. THRESHOLD=9**.