

Interferometry of Solar System Objects



Bryan Butler

National Radio Astronomy Observatory

Atacama Large Millimeter/submillimeter Array

Expanded Very Large Array

Robert C. Byrd Green Bank Telescope

Very Long Baseline Array



Solar System Bodies

- Sun
- IPM
- Giant planets
- Terrestrial planets
- Moons
- Small bodies





Why Interferometry?

resolution, resolution, resolution!

maximum angular extent of some bodies:

Sun & Moon - 0.5°

Venus - $60''$

Jupiter - $50''$

Mars - $25''$

Saturn - $20''$

Mercury - $12''$

Uranus - $4''$

Neptune - $2.4''$

Galilean Satellites - $1-2''$

Titan - $1''$

Triton - $0.1''$

Pluto - $0.1''$

MBA - $.05 - .5''$

NEA, KBO - $0.005 - 0.05''$

(interferometry also helps with confusion!)



Solar System Oddities

Radio interferometric observations of solar system bodies are similar in many ways to other observations, including the data collection, calibration, reduction, etc...

So why am I here talking to you? In fact, there are some differences which are significant (and serve to illustrate some fundamentals of interferometry).

Differences


- Object motion
- Time variability
- Confusion
- Scheduling complexities
- Source strength
- Coherence
- Source distance
- Knowledge of source
- Optical depth

Object Motion


All solar system bodies move against the (relatively fixed) background sources on the celestial sphere. This motion has two components:

- “Horizontal Parallax” - caused by rotation of the observatory around the Earth.
- “Orbital Motions” - caused by motion of the Earth and the observed body around the Sun.

Object Motion - an example




Object Motion - an example



Credit: CometWatch (youtube)

Object Motion - a practical example


1998 September 19



2.1°

Jupiter

1998 September 20



4C-04.89

4C-04.88

Time Variability

Time variability is a significant problem in solar system observations:

- Sun - very fast fluctuations (< 1 sec)
- Jupiter, Venus (others?) – lightning (< 1 sec)
- Others - rotation (hours to days), plus other intrinsic variability (clouds, seasons, etc.)
- Distance may change appreciably (need “common” distance measurements)


– These must be dealt with.

Time Variability - an example

Mars radar

snapshots made
every 10 mins

Butler, Muhleman &
Slade 1994



Implications

- Often can't use same calibrators
- Often can't easily add together data from different days
- Solar confusion
- Other confusion sources move in the beam
- Antenna and phase center pointing must be tracked
(must have accurate ephemeris)
- Scheduling/planning - need a good match of source
apparent size and interferometer spacings



Source Strength & Coherence

Some solar system bodies are very bright. They can be so bright that they raise the antenna temperature:


- Sun \sim 6000 K (or brighter)
- Moon \sim 200 K
- Venus, Jupiter \sim 1-100s of K

In the case of the Sun, special hardware may be required. In other cases, special processing may be needed (e.g., Van Vleck correction). In all cases, the system temperature (the noise) is increased.

Some types of emission from the Sun are coherent. In addition, reflection from planetary bodies in radar experiments is coherent (over at least part of the image). This complicates the interpretation of images made of these phenomena, and in fact violates one of the fundamental assumptions in radio interferometry.

Source Distance - Wave Curvature

C
ir
c
re
w
th
b
w
b



e
ne
in
g
st



Short Spacing Problem


As with other large, bright objects, there is usually a serious short spacing problem when observing the planets. This can produce a large negative “bowl” in images if care is not taken. This can usually be avoided with careful planning, and the use of appropriate models during imaging and deconvolution.





Source Knowledge

There **is** an advantage in most solar system observations - we have a very good idea of what the general source characteristics are, including general expected flux densities and extent of emission. This can be used to great advantage in the imaging, deconvolution, and self-calibration stages of data reduction.

Conversion of Coordinates



Conversion of Coordinates







Correcting for Rotation

If a planet rotates rapidly, we can either just live with the “smearing” in the final image (but note also that this violates our assumption about sources not varying), or try to make snapshots and use them separately (difficult in most cases because SNR is low). There are now two techniques to try to solve this problem; one for optically thin targets like Jupiter synchrotron radiation (Sault+ 1997; Leblanc+ 1997; de Pater & Sault 1998), one for optically thick targets (described in Sault+ 2004). This is possible because we know the viewing geometry and planetary cartographic systems precisely.


Correcting for Rotation - Jupiter

Jupiter at 20 cm (de Pater+ 1997) and 1.3 cm (Butler+ 2009) averaged over full track (period is ~ 10 h):




Correcting for Rotation - Jupiter

Jupiter at 2cm from several tracks – Sault+ 2004:




Correcting for Rotation - Jupiter

Jupiter at 1.3cm from a more recent observation – de Pater+ 2016 – showing the dramatic increase in sensitivity of the VLA:




Correcting for Rotation - Jupiter

If the emission mechanism is optically thin (this is only the case for the synchrotron emission), then we can make a full 3-D reconstruction of the emission:




Correcting for Rotation - Jupiter



Spectral Lines

Species in the
just as they
strength of
abundance.

$\gamma \sim p * 3 \Gamma$
are probing
widths are




Spectral lines,
The
molecular

ts, where we
the line



Spectral Lines – Venus Example

By knowing the geometry, we can get both abundances and winds as a function of latitude, or time of day, for Venus.




Spectral Lines – Mars Example

Similarly, we can get water vapor abundances on Mars as a function of latitude and time of day, or season.



Clancy+ 1992

Butler+ 2005





Lack of Source Knowledge

If the true source position is not where the phase center of the instrument was pointed, then a phase error is induced in the visibilities.

If you don't think that you knew the positions beforehand, then the phases can be "fixed." If you think you knew the positions beforehand, then the phases may be used to derive an offset.

Expected Flux Density


For optically thick objects with small brightness temperature (most solar system bodies), we must take into account the fact that the body blocks out the background radiation. The expected flux density is:

$$S = (B_p - B_{bg})\Omega_p$$

For body brightness B_p and solid angle Ω_p . B_{bg} is the brightness of the background, which is mostly the CMB and galactic emission. Since the magnitude of the background brightness (at least that of the 2.725 K CMB) is a significant fraction of the brightness of most solar system objects, this effect must be accounted for when deriving brightness temperature (the interesting physical quantity) from the measured flux density.

Real Data - what to expect

But...



Real Data - what to expect

If the sky brightness is circularly symmetric, then the 2-D Fourier relationship between sky brightness and visibility reduces to a 1-D Hankel transform:

$$V(q) = 2\pi R \int_0^R A(r)I(r)J_0(2\pi r q)r dr$$

For a “uniform disk” of total flux density F , this reduces to:


$$V(\beta) = F\pi R^2 \frac{J_1(2\pi\beta)}{\pi\beta}$$

and for a “limb-darkened disk” (of a particular form), this reduces to:

$$V(\beta) = F\pi R^2 \Lambda_q(2\pi\beta)$$


Real Data - what to expect

Theoretical visibility functions for a circularly symmetric “uniform disk” and 2 limb-darkened disks.




Short Spacing Problem Revisited


True visibility function




True sky brightness




True




Measured




Missing




Measured




True




Missing




Measured



True



Missing



Real Data - polarization

For emission from solid surfaces on planetary bodies, the relationship between sky brightness and *polarized* visibility becomes (again assuming circular symmetry) a different Hankel transform (order 2):


$$V_p(\beta) = \int_0^1 A(\rho)(R_{\parallel} - R_{\perp})J_2(2\pi\rho\beta)\rho d\rho$$

this cannot be solved analytically. Note that roughness of the surface is a confusion (it modifies the effective Fresnel reflectivities). For circular measured polarization, this visibility is formed via:

$$V_p = \frac{\Re\{V_{RL} + V_{LR}\}\cos 2\psi + \Im\{V_{RL} - V_{LR}\}\sin 2\psi}{V_0}$$

Real Data - polarization


Examples of expected polarization response:



Real I


Visibility c
distance in

Plot file version 2 created 27-JUN-2000 09:05:07
Phase vs UV dist for VENUS_TEST.UBAND.6 Source:VENUS
Ants * - * Stokes I IF# 1-2 Chan# 1




Real Data - an example

The resultant
image:




Real Data - an example

Venus models
at C, X, Ku,
and K-bands:




Real Data - an example

Venus residual
images at U- and
K-bands:



Real Data - a polarization example

Mitchell & de Pater (1994) observations of Mercury showing the polarization pattern on the sky:



Real Data - a polarization example

Similarly for Mars (Perley & Butler 2013):

