LOWFS: sensing and control

Design approach: use light rejected by coronagraph



Modulates the light in such a way as to cause it to fall completely outside the Lyot stop mask (by causing complete destructive interference inside the Lyot stop)

→ Almost ALL starlight is directed to LOWFS camera, for optimal LOWFS sensitivity and calibration

 \rightarrow The interaction between PSF and focal plane mask (diffraction) creates a diffraction pattern that is strongly dependent on low order aberrations, yielding a LOWFS response that is largely free of non-common path errors: TT is measured as a pattern shape, NOT a photocenter on a reflected spot

 \rightarrow Almost ALL starlight is directed away from pupil, yielding a high throughput, high contrast coronagraph

Low-order WFC

- **Problem**: planets at small separation look very similar to pointing error signature
- **Solution**: measure real-time pointing inside coronagraph using starlight, for both correction and calibration





Subaru testbed results



Fig. 10.— Laboratory performance for the CLOWFS. Upper left: Measured CLOWFS reference frame and influence functions for the 5 axis controlled in the experiment. Pre-PIAA and post-PIAA modes look extremely similar, as expected. Top right: Open loop simultaneous measurement of pre and post-PIAA modes. The measured amplitudes match very well the sine-wave signals sent to the actuators, and the CLOWFS is able to accurately measure all 4 modes shown here with little cross-talk. Since this measurement was performed in open loop, the measurement also include unknown drifts due to the limited stability of the testbed. Bottom left: Closed loop measurement of the residual error for the 5 modes controlled. The achieved pointing stability is about $10^{-3} \lambda/D$ for both the pre-PIAA and post-PIAA tip/tilt. Bottom right: Position of the actuators during the same closed loop test.

HCIT LOWFS results

See Brian Kern's talk



Temporal bandwidth estimate

Assumptions:

- Simple integrator controller, with a gain between 0 and 1 (no PID, no Kalman filter, no on-board processing of PSDs to optimize loop controller)
- CCD camera, 10 MHz pixel readout rate max, 5e- RON
- LOWFS is 5x5 pix, readout frame area is $30x30 \text{ pix} \rightarrow 10 \text{ kHz}$ max frame rate
- LOWFS is taking diffracted starlight from Lyot stop (as done on SCExAO) to eliminate non-common path errors, and offer high efficiency
- Star is mV=5, 50% bandpass (LOWFS before filter), 20% system efficiency -> 2e8 ph/s -> 4e6 ph/s/pix

10 kHz frame rate: 400 ph/pix/exposure, which is OK for RON single measurement precision at 10 kHz (photon noise): 2/sqrt(2e4) rad = 0.014 rad RMS = 1/112 lambda/D = 0.42 mas \rightarrow Loop should run at full speed, gain ~1. We assume gain = 0.5 (1.0 for HCIT)

Photon noise contribution = 0.27 mas RMS 0 dB point in transfer function at ~500 Hz Rejection at 50 Hz = 10x, Rejection at 5 Hz = 100x **LOWFS: telemetry**

Overall LOWFS control and calibration architecture



Coronagraph leaks calibrated to 1% in SCExAO (Vogt et al. 2011)

Co-added science image

Standard PSF subtraction

MMA





Building the "dictionary"

Problem: Flux in science image << flux in LOWFS

 \rightarrow associating a single LOWFS image to a single science image is not possible

Solutions:

(1) Pseudo long exposure
Use noise-free (EMCCD) detector in science channel
Group LOWFS frames by similarity
Coadd large number of corresponding science images to build dictionary
Requires large on-board data storage and computation

(2) Linear algebra solving Record short LOWFS exposures (L_{ii}) and long science camera exposures (S_i)

S_i = sum_j(S_{i,j}) Dictionary : L_{i,j} ↔ S_{i,j} After grouping L_{i,j} by similarity, a dictionary L entry is built (L_k) L_k can be written as linear sum of L_i = sum_i(L_{i,i})

 \rightarrow corresponding dictionary enty S_k is the same linear sum of S_is

Other LOWFS-inspired concepts

Motivations

LOWFS is only useful for low-order aberrations Can unused starlight be used to also control mid-spatial frequencies ?

What does it take to maintain dark hole ?

DM probes (minimum of 3, plus unprobed image): >4 images

 \rightarrow process is slow and inversion is prone to DM calibration errors

If dark hole could be maintained without probes, temporal bandwidth could be increased

Two concepts:

(1) use light outside dark hole

(2) use out-of band light

Benefits:

DM commands derived from single image

Strong coherent coupling: easy to overcome readout noise, zodi

Using light outside dark hole & outside spectral band

mean:5.95e-07, median:2.17e-07, 1.2 - 2.0 I/D mean:1.01e-07, median:6.79e-08, 2.0 - 4.0 I/D



Light outside dark hole is ~5 orders of magnitude brighter than inside dark hole

 \rightarrow intensity is a linear function of wavefront errors on essentially all pixels outside dark hole (as opposed to quadratic)

Std linear algebra AO control (response, control matrix, SVD, modal control)

MAIN STEPS:

Response matrix acquisition by poking DM(s) actuators \rightarrow pseudo-inverse \rightarrow control matrix

Intensity is also a linear function of wavefront errors on essentially all pixels outside spectral band

Using light outside dark hole: segmented apertures

Outer diffraction structures encode cophasing errors that have impact on dark home

