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Overview

- Motivation
- Defining the SCDA task
- Selection of apertures, comparison of their relative merits
- Funded Teams
- Progress on Apodized Pupil Lyot Coronagraph (APLC)
- New Optimization approach: Auxiliary Field Optimization (AFO)
- Progress on Vortex and Lyot Coronagraphs (VC, LC)
- Progress on Phase Induced Amplitude Apodization Coronagraphs
- Science Yield Modeling
- Plans for the coming year
- 12 m telescope
- $10^{10}$ suppression
- IWA = 2 $\lambda$/D or 3.6 $\lambda$/D
- IFU R=70-100
- Band 400 – 2000 nm
- Goal: characterize dozens of exo-Earths
Defining the SCDA Task

- Find coronagraph designs that enable direct imaging of exo-earths with large, segmented-aperture, partially obscured telescopes.
- Identify attributes of reference apertures that impact performance: central obscuration, spiders, gaps, aperture perimeter.
- Optimize for science return.
- Consider the fundamental limit set by finite stellar diameter:
  - Assume pointing errors are small compared to stellar diameter, e.g. sub-mas.
- Ignore polarization since that is a function of f/#, on- or off-axis, coating, bandpass, and bandwidth.

- Initial design investigation
- Collaboration/ Cross-fertilization encouraged
- Will inform technology gap and future technology investments.
This set of apertures and secondary mirror supports represents the likely range of segmented apertures that could be manufactured and launched without on-orbit assembly.

An SLS is assumed.

The optical prescription for all telescopes is the same: $f/1.25$ 12-m diameter primary, nearly parabolic, with secondary mirror 13.1 m in front of primary. Secondary obscuration is 14%. Cassegrain field is 10 arcsec diameter.

Gaps: 20 mm (6 mm spacing, 7 mm edge roll-off). Spiders 25 mm wide.
Some Space Telescope concepts

Large Optical Segment Project

AOSD

SM

LAMP telescope
**Comments on the Apertures**

- **4-ring**: stiffer, lighter, HST size.
  - Requires the most actuators
- **3-, 2-, 1-ring as segments grow, the system sees increasing**...
  - Challenges to segment stiffness
  - Gravity sag
  - Testing difficulty including gravity offloading, model fidelity, GSE
- **1-ring – >4 m tip-to-tip**
  - Closed back ULE demonstrated. Open back Zerodur possible but risky due to depth.
- **Keystone, piewedge**
  - Asymmetry complicates mounting and control. Warping harness?
  - Also impacts metrology needs.
- **Piewedges have 5-m long sides.**
- **Thermal stability is dominated by front-to-back gradients.**
  - Wavefront varies as radius^2.
  - Gradients decrease with thermal time constant (want more thermal mass).
  - 1-2 pm stability possible with 1 mK control on 1.5 m ULE mirrors. Could be 10x worse on 5 m segments.
Some Deployment Approaches

Figure 2 Some possible fold lines.
Comparison of Aperture Relative Merits

Table 1 Relative challenges of designs under consideration. Green to red designates least to most challenging. No absolute scale of difficulty is implied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APERTURES</th>
<th>4 ring</th>
<th>3 ring</th>
<th>2 ring</th>
<th>1 ring</th>
<th>Keystone 24</th>
<th>Pie wedge 12</th>
<th>Pie wedge 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment Shape</td>
<td>4 ring</td>
<td>3 ring</td>
<td>2 ring</td>
<td>1 ring</td>
<td>Keystone 24</td>
<td>Pie wedge 12</td>
<td>Pie wedge 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Segm. Dimension</td>
<td>1.54 m</td>
<td>1.98 m</td>
<td>2.77 m</td>
<td>4.62 m</td>
<td>2.5 m x 3.14 m</td>
<td>5 m x 3.14 m</td>
<td>5 m x 4.71 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backplane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch Configuration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A document detailing the trades is available at: https://exoplanets.nasa.gov/system/.../211_SCDAApertureDocument050416.pdf

Authors: Feinberg, Hull, Knight, Krist, Lightsey, Matthews, Stahl, Shaklan
Funded Teams

- **Apodized Pupil Lyot Coronagraph (APLC)**
  - Led by R. Soummer, with N. Zimmerman, M. Ndiaye (Post-doc), J. Mazoyer (Post-doc), C. Stark

- **Vortex Coronagraph (VC) and Lyot Coronagraph (LC)**
  - Led by D. Mawet, with G. Ruane (Post-doc), and J. Jewell (JPL)

- **Phase Induced Amplitude Apodization Complex Mask Coronagraph (PIAACMC)**
  - Led by O. Guyon, with J. Codona, R. Belikov, students.

- **Optimization approaches**
  - R. Vanderbei working with the teams

- Teams began work early in CY16.

- Presently the Visible Nuller team is not funded through SCDA as they are focused on TDEM activities.
The following slides from the APLC group at STScI detail:

- Advancements in coronagraph throughput and bandwidth since starting the SCDA study.
- Improving robustness against magnification and alignment errors.
- A comparison of throughput for different apertures, showing that presently Keystone segments are preferred over hex segments.
- The Keystone segments in the obscured, on-axis design have nearly the same science return as an off-axis circular monolith.

Note: These are intermediate results requiring further study.
**APLC performance progress, before/after SCDA**

"ATLAST" APLC

$10^{-10}$ contrast over 10% BW
Working angle $4 - 10 \lambda/D$

$T_{0.7/\text{circ}} = 7.0\%$

SCDA 3-ring Hex APLC

$10^{-10}$ contrast over 15% BW
Working angle $4 - 10 \lambda/D$

$T_{0.7/\text{circ}} = 15.5\%$

The throughput metric $T_{0.7/\text{circ}}$ is the coronagraph PSF energy inside of a photometric aperture of radius 0.7 $\lambda/D$, normalized to the energy incident on a circular area matched to the telescope aperture. This gives an aperture-independent metric for how efficiently the combined telescope and coronagraph can direct available energy to the planet PSF core.
Toward robust APLC/SP designs

- Development of robust designs to produce dark zone for multiple, translated versions of the Lyot stop simultaneously

- First results: increase in alignment tolerance by ~10 for $10^8$ contrast design

- Next step: find robust solutions with $10^{10}$ contrast

SP for APLC with 4.3λ/D radius FPM to produce a $10^8$ contrast dark zone between 6-10λ/D

Non robust

Robust

Relative loss in transmission/throughput

Dark zone averaged intensity vs y-axis Lyot shift

- Non Robust ± 0.045%
- Robust ±0.6%

in Lyot stop size

Averaged Intensity in log scale

Shift in % Lyot stop size
August-Sep 2016: New APLC design survey with expanded parameter range

- 3100 new designs optimized on NCCS Discover supercomputer
- All SCDA reference apertures (hexagonal, pie, and keystone primaries)
- Inner working angles down to 2.5 \( \lambda/D \)
- With and without central obscuration (on-axis versus off-axis)
- Contrast fixed at \( 10^{-10} \) throughout

**Throughput** of best designs as a function of IWA
August-Sep 2016: New APLC design survey with expanded parameter range

Applying a provisional scientific yield metric from C. Stark’s 2015 analysis:

\[ \text{Yield} \propto (\text{throughput})^{0.35} \times (\text{bandwidth})^{0.30} \times (\text{contrast})^{-0.1} \times (\text{IWA})^{-1} \]

Proportional *yield metric* of best designs as a function of IWA
Progress on Vortex and Coronagraphs

The following slides from G. Ruane (Caltech) and J. Jewell (JPL) detail:

- A new optimization approach that solves for an “auxiliary field” that maximizes dark hole characteristics.
- Prior to SCDA, no high-contrast VC solutions for segmented aperture. The new optimization has led to viable designs.
- Designs for charge 4, 6, and 8 vortices.
- Improving robustness using wave front control.
- As with APLC, Keystone/Pie-wedge has higher throughput than Hex segment apertures.

Note 1: No interesting solutions have been found for Lyot Coronagraphs. Image plane mask optimization is required for broadband performance. So far we have worked on pupil plane, not image plane, optimization.

Note 2: As with APLC, these are intermediate results requiring further study.
Auxiliary Field Optimization: Powerful New Approach to Optimizing the DM shapes and Pupil Amplitude Profile

Iterative Solution of Phase Control with an Auxiliary Field (Jeff Jewell, JPL)

Goal: Minimize diffracted light in region ‘Q’ in image plane

Coronagraph Linear Operator denoted ‘C’

Aux Field, denoted ‘W’, lives in this plane!

Fresnel Propagators denoted $P_f$ and (backwards) $P_f^+$

Goal is to find phase solutions in the entrance pupil $e^{i\Phi}$ and out of plane $e^{i\Psi}$ for any aperture in order to directly minimize on-axis source light in the image plane “dark hole”

Iteration to solve for phase control D.o.F:

1) $\min_W \left( \| Q C W \|^2 + \lambda \| W - P_f^+ e^{i\Psi} P_f e^{i\Phi} A \|^2 \right)$

$$W = \left( \lambda I + C^+ Q C \right)^{-1} \lambda P_f^+ e^{i\Psi} P_f e^{i\Phi} A$$

2) $\min_{\{\Psi, \Phi\}} \| W - P_f^+ e^{i\Psi} P_f e^{i\Phi} A \|^2$
Domains of AFO, EFC/SM, and ACAD

Aux. Field:
- Generalized Solutions
- Rejection of unwanted modes
- Linearity Pupil to image plane
- DM only, Amplitude only, combo
- Optimize DOFs in pupil or image plane

ACAD:
- Preconditioner simplifies the starting condition

EFC/SM:
- Fine tuning
- Limited range
- Physically realizable soln's
August-Sep 2016: New APLC design survey with expanded parameter range

Key results from new survey

- Designs with unobscured (off-axis) pie/keystone primaries approach the performance ceiling defined by the circular monolith APLC.

- At IWA 3.5 \(\lambda/D\) and above, performance on all hexagonal apertures is similar, but at smaller IWA the 1-ring Hex designs maintain significantly higher throughput.
Apodized vortex coronagraphs may now be designed for segmented aperture telescopes. (charge 4 shown)
New Class of VC Solutions: Amplitude Masks

- The Dark hole is formed using a gray scale apodizer at a pupil plane, a charge-4 vortex mask, and an annular Lyot stop. It is not necessary to use DMs for diffraction control; their stroke can be used to compensate for aberrations.

DMs are not used to form the dark hole. The gray-scale mask can be manufactured using a half-tone approach with ~10 um pixel resolution.
New Class of VC Solutions: Amplitude Masks

- Solutions are shown for the Pie-wedge aperture.

The gray scale mask solutions will be broad band to the extent that the Vortex image plane masks can be made broad band.
Higher charge VCs to reduce sensitivity to finite stellar size and tip/tilt

Angular size of star: $0.01\lambda/D$ (top row) and $0.1\lambda/D$ (bottom row)
The following slides from O. Guyon, J. Codona, and R. Belikov detail:

- Calculations on theoretical limits of the rejection of starlight due to the finite diameter of the star and pointing jitter.
- Novel linear optimization approach has been developed to aid in robustness against finite size of star and broad band performance.

- Example design shown for 3-ring hex, 10% bandpass, point source target.
PIAACMC Design Result

10% bandpass at 800 nm, point source

Input Pupil 3-ring Hex

Typical focal plane complex mask (phase only transmission).

Light amplitude on 2nd PIAA mirror, showing apodization.

Post-focal plane mask light distribution

Light distribution immediately after Lyot Stop #1

After Lyot Stop #2

After Lyot Stop #3

After Lyot Stop #4

Dark Hole 1.5-8 I/D
2.8e-9 average contrast

Wider view showing scatter beyond dark hole.
Science Yield Modeling

- APLC and VC have submitted designs to Chris Stark.
- Chris runs them through his DRM tool and evaluates the observational completeness for a number of designs.

- Target list generated using Hipparcos catalog
  - Nearest stars < 50 pc
  - Main sequence and sub-giant stars without companions.
  - Model-based angular size
- $\eta_{\text{Earth}} = 0.1$
- Exozodi density $\sim$ solar system density (so 3 ‘zodis’ of dust)
- Telescope throughput = 0.56 (without coronagraph losses).
- Total integration time = 1 year
- V band photometric detection limit S/N=7
- Systematic limit: Planet flux $> 0.1$ Stellar leakage flux
- Multiple visits allowed.
- Finite stellar diameter included, aberrations / pointing / imperfections not included.
Preliminary Yield Modeling Results
Detection in Visible Light

• NOTE: These results will change as designs evolve. The results below are for ‘non-robust’ designs that assume an ideal telescope, perfect alignment of the masks, and no polarization losses.
  – Yields will go up with improved designs.
  – Yields will come down when robustness and aberrations are included.
  – Characterization yields will be much smaller.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>APLC On-Axis</th>
<th>APLC Off-Axis</th>
<th>VC On-Axis</th>
<th>VC Off-Axis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 m</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hex 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hex 4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone 24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.5 m</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hex 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hex 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone 24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 m</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hex 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hex 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone 24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY16 Results Summary

- Generated white paper on segmented coronagraph aperture
- **Powerful new optimization approaches** employed for Vortex and PIAA coronagraphs.
- Significant advances have been made in *coronagraph throughput* for on-axis segmented mirrors.
  - Throughput of APLC has doubled, and bandwidth increased by 50% compared to 2015.
- Significant advances in *coronagraph robustness*.
  - APLC designs allow ~0.6% scale errors, and wavefront control allows an additional 0.2% margin.
- Significant progress in *coronagraph contrast*.
  - Broadband (10%) contrast of 1e-10 for both APLC and VC.
  - Viable VC designs did not exist for segmented apertures in 2015.
- *Inner working angles* of >3 lambda/D for APLC and VC.
- **Supercomputers** employed to explore thousands of designs (APLC).
- **Powerful new optimization approach** opens design space for VC.
  - Viable solutions with amplitude-only masks (DMs not needed).
- Pie-wedge and Keystone emerging as significantly higher throughput than Hex segment apertures.
  - On-axis APLC designs approach off-axis (unobscured) in coronagraph performance.
  - With VC, off-axis design has double the throughput of on-axis.
FY17 Plans

- Continue design of HLC and VC coronagraphs (Mawet, CIT)
  - Battery of designs, robustness, science return, supercomputers
  - Explore mask optimization for HLC
  - Gray-scale mask studies (in collaboration with STScI and JPL)
  - Laboratory demo of high contrast solution (1e-7 or better)
- Continue design of APLC coronagraphs (Soummer, STScI)
  - Battery of designs, add DoFs in focal plane, combine with WFC, robustness, science return
  - Gray-scale mask studies (in collaboration with CIT and JPL)
  - Laboratory demo of high contrast solution (1e-7 or better)
- Continue design of PIAACMC (Guyon and Belikov)
  - Explore design space
  - Battery of designs, robustness, science return
- Continue development of Auxiliary Field Optimization (Jewell, JPL)
- Evaluation of designs (JPL)
- Dynamics error budget for one of the designs (JPL)
Powerful New Optimization Approaches: 
Auxiliary Field, and Linear Coronagraph Theory

- Two new approaches, Auxiliary Field Optimization (AFO) and Linear Coronagraph Theory (LCT) have been developed under SCDA funding.
  - These complement the approaches used to date: Electric Field Conjugation (EFC) and its close cousin Stroke Minimization (SM), and Active Correction of Amplitude Discontinuities (ACAD).

- A quick summary of the approaches, with EFC and ACAD discussed as reference points:
  - **AFO**: for generalized solutions with segmented pupils
    - New algorithm finds the complex pupil field that best minimizes the dark hole, subject to physical limitations of DMs. Developed in conjunction with the vortex coronagraph design effort.
    - Linear between pupil and image plane.
    - Proven useful for addressing pupil discontinuities in a wide range of conditions: DMs only, amplitude masks only, combinations of both.
    - So far used only to address the pupils and wavefronts, not the design of the coronagraph masks or Lyot Stop.
  
  - **LCT**: for design of focal plane masks given an apodization function
    - New algorithm for optimizing the focal plane mask given a pupil apodization. Developed as part of the PIAA design effort.
    - Linear approach based on expressing arbitrary apodized pupil complex max coronagraph as a series of linear matrix operations.
    - Linear operators provide a means of projecting out undesired modes, e.g. rejecting leakage from tip-tilt or finite star diameter.

- **EFC/SM**: for ‘fine-tuning’ the broadband dark hole.
  - Use DMs to minimize scatter in the dark hole. EFC sets the contrast goal to $C=0$. SM minimizes the stroke subject to an iteratively decreasing contrast goal.
  - This algorithm maps DM phase to image plane electric field, which is a non-linear mapping. It requires recalculation of large Jacobian matrices as the DM shapes evolve.

- **ACAD**: for pre-conditioning the pupil to account for obscuring struts and segment gaps
  - Use ray optics to compute DM shapes that flatten the pupil, effectively filling in segment gaps.
  - Use EFC/SM to account for diffraction and optimize the dark hole.
  - Tends to lead to large DM strokes. Recent developments show that a patient application of SM (thousands of iterations, careful control of convergence) leads to better solutions with smaller DM strokes.
Wavefront control (WFC) to compensate for contrast degradation due to Lyot stop offsets

- Combination of non robust APLC/SP design with Stroke Minimization algorithm as WFC (Pueyo et al. 2009, Mazoyer et al. 2016) - code provided by J. Mazoyer

- Assumptions: 2 32x32 Boston DMs with 9.6mm size, z=300mm device separation, 10 nm rms wavefront errors.

- Results: increase in robustness by ~10 for $10^{10}$ contrast design over 10% bandpass

- Next steps: combine WFC with alignment-robust design at $10^{10}$ contrast
August-Sep 2016: New APLC design survey with expanded parameter range

- 3100 new designs optimized on NCCS Discover supercomputer
- All SCDA reference apertures (hexagonal, pie, and keystone primaries)
- Inner working angles down to 2.5 $\lambda/D$
- With and without central obscuration (on-axis versus off-axis)
- Contrast fixed at $10^{-10}$ throughout

NCCS Discover is an efficient tool for running many linear optimization programs to survey the APLC design parameter space.

Up to 50 optimization jobs run concurrently, with typical completion times < 6 hours.

STScI team is preparing to submit a proposal to renew the NCCS allocation in November.
Apodize with DMs or Gray-Scale Masks?

- DM solutions: higher throughput but likely lower bandwidth and less robust than amplitude mask solution.

Here, DMs are used instead of gray scale masks, leading to significantly improved throughput. Bandwidth will be limited (trying for 10% minimum bandpass)
Does obstruction affect ideal coronagraph performance?

IWA gets more aggressive

Sensitivity to tip/tilt gets slightly worse
IWA, Contrast, and aberration sensitivity trades for ideal coronagraph

- For an ideal coronagraph of n-th order,
  \[ \text{IWA} \sim \sqrt{\frac{n^2+2n}{8\pi}} \]
  - Meaning: “blind spot” area in units of \((\lambda/D)^2\) is equal to the number of blocked modes
  - n-th order ideal coronagraph blocks an additional n/2 modes compared to n-1\(^{st}\) order
  - Tip/tilt sensitivity: \(\text{Contrast} = C r^n\), where
    - \(C = o(1)\) is a constant
    - \(r\) is the amount of tip/tilt error in units of \(\lambda/D\)
- Eliminating order \(n\) leads to fundamental limit:
  - \(\text{Contrast} \sim r^{\sqrt{8\pi IWA^2+1}} - 1\)

Example: D=2.4 m, unobstructed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IWA ((\lambda/D))</th>
<th>(r): tip/tilt error</th>
<th>Contrast</th>
<th>n (order)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4 mas</td>
<td>3e-9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7 mas</td>
<td>1e-10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- At 0.4 mas, can in principle achieve 1 I/D IWA (increasing science yield by a factor of 3-10?)
- At 2.2 I/D IWA, can tolerate uncorrected jitter of 7mas
- These limits are roughly similar for segmented and monolithic telescopes, and do not strongly depend on obstruction.