

AN EXAMINATION OF SELECTIVE IMAGING TECHNIQUES

By

Andrew Grant Smith

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS & ASTRONOMY
AUGUST 2010



Except where acknowledged in the customary manner, the material presented in this thesis is, to the best of my knowledge, original and has not been submitted in whole or part for a degree in any university.

Andrew Grant Smith

Acknowledgements

My greatest thanks to my supervisors for sharing their experience and expertise: to Alan Vaughan, who made me worry about uncertainties, and who quietly soldiered on in the face of great adversity; to Mark Wardle, for taking me on when Alan retired, and for seeing it through; and most of all to Jeremy Bailey, for starting the whole project off and including me in it, for the experiences of the observing trips, and for patience when my study took me significantly longer than I expected.

My appreciation to the Director of the AAO, Matthew Colless, for provision of time on the AAT, and the RSAA Time Allocation Committee for assignments of time on the ANU 1m telescope. I would like to thank Steve Massey, as well as the support staff at SSO and the AAO, especially Steven Lee, for their assistance during our observations.

My hawk-eyed proof-readers, Stan Fry and Rachel Merton, thanks for your time and diligence.

Many of my fellow postgraduate students in the Astronomy group at Macquarie gave assistance with technical problems, friendship and light relief, listened to gripes, and also shared the fun and challenge of organising the Harley Wood Winter School. Thanks to all of these stars, most especially Korinne McDonnell.

Undertaking a postgraduate degree part-time while working almost full-time hours is very demanding. Life keeps getting in the way. For understanding and accommodating my needs, thanks to my boss Darren Vogrig, and to his boss David Trotter for allowing me study leave. Also, a big hug to all my colleagues at the Sydney CSIROSEC, for making it a great, fun place to work.

To all of my friends who have been waiting, patiently or otherwise, for me to finish this thesis, thank you all for your friendship, teasing, fun and encouragement.

To my mother, Nancye, for instilling in me a critical and inquiring mind, and to my father, David, for technical aptitude, thank you.

Two men who have helped keep me sane, and helped me to see that I have something worthwhile to say, were David Lonie and Mark Howard. I would not have had the confidence to see this through without them.

Finally, to my loving partner in life, Sue, who first encouraged me to return to tertiary study. It was tough on you, especially as the years dragged on. You provided a home, encouragement, patience above and beyond, reality checks, and nagging when needed. I hope I can repay the debt.

Abstract

An extensive empirical study of the frame selection method of high-resolution astronomical imaging, also known as lucky imaging, has been carried out. This method involves the capture of many hundreds or thousands of short exposure frames, the scanning and ranking of all the frames for sharpness, and the co-alignment and averaging of only the best frames into a final image. The performance of the selective imaging technique was tested by imaging several bright stars, binaries and clusters, and using the brightest pixel value in each frame as the sharpness metric. The lucky imaging parameters are the frame exposure time, telescope aperture, seeing, frame selection fraction, colour band, and distance from the co-alignment position. By using a range of aperture masks and colour filters, and a camera with adjustable exposure, we explored the widest range of parameter space of any frame selection study to date.

The results from the stellar images show that frame selection is very effective at reducing the effects of atmospheric turbulence on astronomical images. When all frames in an observation are combined, the seeing disc is diminished and a bright central core is apparent. By selecting just the best 1% of frames the core is brighter while the halo almost vanishes. In many of these cases faint spikes and dark rings appeared, indicating diffraction limited images. The results were best when small apertures were used, particularly at longer wavelengths. It was found that, for the Siding Spring site, the exposure time should be limited to 10 ms, although images were improved at all times tested. It was also found that when image frames of binaries and clusters were co-aligned on the brightest star, the improvement in sharpness was greatest at this point, and the improvement decreased with angular radius.

To prepare for future research, solar system planets and lunar features were also

imaged. These were processed with sharpness metrics suited to extended objects. It was found that frame selection was effective at improving the planetary images over traditional long exposure images. However the results were not as good as for the stellar images. Possible reasons for this are discussed.

Contents

Acknowledgements	v
Abstract	vii
List of Figures	xiii
List of Tables	xvii
1 Introduction	1
2 The Problem: “Seeing”	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Description of Seeing	5
2.3 Methods of Overcoming Seeing	13
2.3.1 Speckle Interferometry and Imaging	14
2.3.2 Adaptive Optics	17
2.4 Summary	19
3 Selective Imaging	21
3.1 Introduction	21
3.2 History	21
3.3 Frame Selection Methods	26
3.3.1 Image Sharpness Metrics	27
3.4 Summary	30

4	Observing with the <i>Macquarie University Selective Imaging Camera</i>	31
4.1	Introduction	31
4.2	Aims	32
4.3	Methods	33
4.4	Hardware Setup	33
4.4.1	Macquarie University 40cm Telescope	35
4.4.2	ANU 1.0m Telescope	36
4.4.3	Anglo-Australian Telescope	36
4.5	Image Acquisition	38
4.6	Summary	39
5	Processing of <i>MUSIC</i> Images	41
5.1	Introduction	41
5.2	Stellar image processing.	41
5.3	Planetary image processing.	44
5.4	<i>MUSIC</i> program origins and development.	45
5.5	Summary	46
6	Analysis of Stellar Images	49
6.1	Introduction	49
6.2	Stellar Image Results.	50
6.2.1	Frame selection rate FSR	50
6.2.2	Seeing-normalised aperture D/r_0	54
6.2.3	Colour band λ	56
6.2.4	Frame exposure time t	56
6.2.5	Strehl ratio versus angular distance θ	58
6.3	<i>MUSIC</i> data compared with other studies	60
6.4	Limitation of the brightest pixel criterion	62
6.4.1	Atmospheric Dispersion	62
6.4.2	Small magnitude differences in binaries and multiples	64

6.4.3	Hot pixels	65
6.4.4	Comparison of the peak-pixel and S_{S1} metrics	66
6.5	Summary	68
7	Analysis of Planetary Images	71
7.1	Introduction	71
7.2	General planetary imaging	72
7.3	Imaging transient events	74
7.4	Comparison of the S_{S1} metric with a contrast operator	76
7.5	Limitations of the S_{S1} and S_4 metrics	82
7.6	Summary	84
8	Conclusions	87
A	<i>MUSIC</i> Software Programs	91
B	Stellar Objects Observed with <i>MUSIC</i>	93
C	<i>MUSIC</i> Observation Log	97
	References	127

List of Figures

2.1	Graphs and images of diffraction-limited and seeing-limited point spread functions of a star image.	11
2.2	Diagram of the effect of aperture D on the ideal and seeing PSFs for given seeing.	13
2.3	Point spread function of a star image with tilt removed.	15
4.1	The video camera and aperture masks mounted on the ANU 1m telescope.	35
4.2	The camera and aperture masks mounted on the AAT.	37
6.1	Best, worst and median ranked frames from an observation of the binary τ Ophuchi.	49
6.2	Frame selected images of τ Ophuchi.	51
6.3	Images of binary ζ Orionis.	53
6.4	Strehl ratio versus D/r_0 for stellar images binned in D/r_0	53
6.5	Strehl ratio gain versus D/r_0 for stellar images binned in D/r_0	55
6.6	Strehl ratio versus D/r_0 for infrared and visual bands.	55
6.7	Strehl ratio and Strehl improvement factor as a function of exposure time.	57
6.8	Images of Binary system α Centauri.	59
6.9	Graph of normalised Strehl ratio versus radius for long exposures, $FSR = 100\%$, 10% and 1%	59
6.10	Graph of normalised Strehl ratio versus radius for $D/r_0 \leq 6$ and $D/r_0 > 6$.	61
6.11	Strehl ratio versus D/r_0 , for all stellar images where $D/r_0 < 20$, compared with data from other studies.	61

6.12	Binary stars k2 and k1 Puppis.	63
6.13	Images and 3-D plots of the Trapezium cluster in M42 in Orion, showing the effects of a hot pixel on frame selection.	63
6.14	Images of binary kPuppis, comparing the 1% frame selected images pro- duced using the peak-pixel algorithm with that from the S_{S1} metric and the long exposure image.	65
6.15	Images and 3-D plots of the Trapezium, but frame selected using Fourier methods.	65
6.16	Images and 3-D plots of the Trapezium taken in extremely bad seeing, frame selected using Fourier methods.	67
6.17	Images and 3-D plots of the Trapezium taken in extremely bad seeing, frame selected using the peak-pixel method.	67
7.1	The best, median and worst ranked frames from an observation of the lunar crater Clavius.	71
7.2	Images of lunar crater Clavius, with frame selection regime as shown. .	73
7.3	A table of images of Saturn comparing different seeing conditions. . . .	75
7.4	Graph of sharpness scores for frames from the FITS cubes used in figure 7.3.	75
7.5	Images of Jupiter and Io shortly after a transit.	77
7.6	Images of lunar crater Clavius, from the same FITS cube as in figure 7.2, with best frames and 1% FSR , comparing selection by Fourier methods with the contrast operator.	77
7.7	Images of Mercury, with the long exposure, 1% FSR and best frames selected from the same FITS cube by Fourier methods and the contrast operator.	79
7.8	Images of Venus, with the long exposure, 1% FSR and best frames se- lected from the same FITS cube by Fourier methods and the contrast operator.	79

7.9	Images of Mars, with the long exposure, 1% <i>FSR</i> and best frames selected from the same FITS cube by Fourier methods and the contrast operator.	81
7.10	Images of Saturn, with the long exposure, 1% <i>FSR</i> and best frames selected from the same FITS cube by Fourier methods and the contrast operator.	81
7.11	1% <i>FSR</i> and best frame images of Mars from figure 7.9 showing the size and shape of Mars in the images compared to the known morphology. .	85

List of Tables

4.1	Summary of <i>MUSIC</i> Observing Trips	34
4.2	Imaging parameters of telescopes used with <i>MUSIC</i>	34
6.1	Strehl ratios of peaks in images of α Centauri in figure 6.8.	58
7.1	Sharpness scores of images in figure 7.3.	74
A.1	<i>MUSIC</i> Software Summary	91
B.1	Data on single stars imaged for <i>MUSIC</i>	93
B.2	Data on binary and multiple systems imaged for <i>MUSIC</i>	95
C.1	<i>MUSIC</i> Observing Log	98

