

serm Gamma-ray Space Telescope

Effects of Biases of the **Interstellar Emission Models** on Point Source Finding and **Characterization with the** Fermi-LAT

#### **Eric Charles**

On Behalf of the Fermi-LAT Collaboration 7<sup>th</sup> Fermi Symposium Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany Oct. 19, 2017



- Questions:
  - How much do uncertainties of the interstellar emission models (IEMs) affect point source detection?
  - How much do they affect our characterization of the spectra of the detected sources?
  - How can we account for these uncertainties in data analysis?
- Results & Discussion:
  - Comparison of data analysis pipeline using two different IEMs.
  - Quantifying the level of the systematic errors in the IEMs.
  - Applying likelihood de-weighting to account for systematic errors.



## **2FIG Analysis Pipeline and Results**



- 2FIG source list: *Fermipy*-based source-finding pipeline in the inner 40°x40° of the Galaxy
  - Run twice, using different IEMs: Official (Off., 374 srcs) and Alternate (Alt., 385)
  - See arXiv:1705.00009 for details of analysis pipeline
  - Detection criteria TS =  $-2 \Delta \log L > 25$

## **Effect of IEM on Source Detection Significance**



- Away from the Galactic plane ( |b| > 2.5°) we observe good correlation between the source detection significance seen with the two IEMs
- Along the galactic plane the correlation is poor ( rms ~  $5\sigma$  )

Samma-ray Gamma-ray pace Telescope

## **Effect of IEM on Spectral Curvature Significance**



- Away from the Galactic plane ( |b| > 2.5° ) we observe good correlation between the spectral curvature significance seen with the two IEMs
- Again, along the galactic plane the correlation is poor

Samma-ray Gamma-ray pace Telescope



#### **Test for Spectral Biases**

Scaled residuals w.r.t. spectral fit in two different energy bins 30 ŧ E = 0.35 GeV $E = 2 \, \mathrm{GeV}$ 2520 ≥ 15 10 50 -3-12 2 3  $\mathbf{0}$  $(dN/dE_{\rm data} - dN/dE_{\rm model})/\sigma_{\rm data}$ 

- The flux value in individual energy bins agrees reasonable well with the broadband spectral models
- No evidence of strong biases, but a few outliers, both positive and negative

### **Unmatched Sources Along the Plane**

serm



- Most source found with only one IEM are either low-significance or found at subthreshold significance with the other IEM (cyan and green markers)
- Sources found with high-significance with only one IEM (large white markers) occur in regions where the two IEMs differ significantly (color scale)

Gamma-ray Space Telescope

### **Unmatched Sources and Residual Maps**



- Examination of 8°x8° fit regions along Galactic plane shows structured residuals, we consider two cases
  - Regions where both IEMs under-fit the data: potential spurious sources
  - Regions where both IEMs over-fit the data: potential lost sources
    - Equivalently: modeled point-source sensitivity is too good



#### **Scaled Residuals**

Histogram of scaled residuals for 0.48° x 0.48° pixels for regions along Galactic plane



- With both models, scaled residuals are significantly wider than Normal distribution, this implies systematic uncertainties that are, on average, slightly large than statistical uncertainties.
- Low-end tail out to  $\sim 6\sigma$ : some regions where models badly overfit the data

### **Likelihood Weights Maps**



- We are developing method of de-weighting likelihood to account for systematic uncertainties (see e.g., <u>2015ICRC...34..848B</u> for additional details)
  - For now, we assume systematic uncertainties are a fixed fraction of total counts. These maps were generated with  $\varepsilon = 0.02$



### Likelihood De-weighting Decreases Source Detection Significance

#### Correlation between detection significance with and without likelihood de-weighting



- As expected, apply de-weighting almost always reduces source detection significance
- Amount of reduction depends on source spectrum, local background, confusion with nearby sources

### Likelihood De-weighting Narrows Scaled Residual Distribution

12

#### Comparison of scaled residuals with and without likelihood de-weighting for Off. IEM



- It appears that these likelihood weights under-estimate systematic uncertainties close to the plane
- In other regions/ or with different IEMs this is less the case (see extra slides)



### Summary

- Source detection and spectral parameter estimation are biased by errors in the IEMs
  - Away from the Galactic plane ( |b| > 2.5°), on average the effect is roughly similar in magnitude to the statistical uncertainties
  - Along the Galactic plane ( |b| > 2.5°) the effect can be several times the statistical uncertainties
    - Large enough to create spurious sources or significantly degrade sensitivity for real sources
- Likelihood de-weighting scheme performs as expected, reduces source detection significance and narrows scaled residual distribution
  - Some additional tuning of weighting scheme is still warranted



# **EXTRA SLIDES**



### Scaled Residuals for 40°x40° Region

Comparison of scaled residuals with and without likelihood de-weighting for entire 40x40 Region



 Over the entire 40°x40° region the weights come closer to estimating level of systematic uncertainty (which is lower)



### **Scaled Residuals for Alt. IEM**

#### Comparison of scaled residuals with and without likelihood de-weighting for Alt. IEM



- Using the weights derived for the Off. IEM with the Alt. IEM analysis we are underestimating the systematic uncertainties substantially
- This suggests that the Alt. IEM may have biases in regions where the weights are closer to 1, i.e., away from the highest statistics areas