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## Overview

- Q: Can SIM-Lite, with RV, detect Earths in multi-planet systems?
- A: Yes, as shown by the following double-blind study.
- Four teams:
- Team-A: planetary models (5 groups, ~500 systems total)
- Team-B: data simulation (1 group, 48 systems)
- Team-C: data analysis (5 groups)
- Team-D: synthesis (1 group)
- Phase-1: January-August 2008, results presented here.
- Phase-2: Through January 2009.


## Participants

## Team-A groups

- A-1: Eric Ford, Univ. of Florida
- A-2: Greg Laughlin, UC Santa Cruz
- A-3: Hal Levison, Southwest Research Institute
- A-4: Doug Lin, UC Santa Cruz
- A-5: Sean Raymond, Univ. of Colorado


## Team-B
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- C-1: Stefano Casertano, STScI
- C-2: Debra Fischer, San Francisco State Univ.
- C-3: Jeremy Kasdin, Princeton Univ.
- C-4: Matt Muterspaugh, UC Berkeley
- C-5: Mike Shao, JPL


## Team-D

- Chair: Wes Traub, JPL
- Vice-Chair: Alan Boss, Carnegie Institution
- Chas Beichman, MSC
- Andy Gould, Ohio State Univ.
- Each PI from Team-C groups


## External Independent Readiness Board

- Chair: Vern Weyers, GSFC retired
- Alan Boss, Carnegie Institution
- Ed Groth, Princeton Univ.
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## Constraints

- Fully double-blind exercise.
- Time was very short.
- All teams worked to a common schedule.
- Team-A groups all delivered on time, but for A-4.
- Team-C groups all delivered on time, but for C-3.
- Most experienced team (C5), with a head start, did the best.
- Expect that with more experience, all teams will do very well.
- Detection by one team is a success for this test.
- This is not a test of the teams, it is a test of the technique.
- Addressed more than just Solar System analogs so that teams would not know what to expect.
- Definition: expected SNR = RMS_signal / mission_noise


## Summary of Blind Test Results

- Inputs: 48 planetary systems (all 1 Sun @ 10 pc ).
- 32 random
- 8 Solar-system-analogs
- 4 single terrestrial in HZ
- 4 no-planets.
- Noise added to all signals(4 levels for astro, 1 level for RV).
- Two timelines: (5 yr astro, 15 yr RV ) and (10 yr astro, 20 yr RV ).
- Outputs: reliability of detections was $40 \%$ to $100 \%$ ( 3 teams $>80 \%$ )
- 48 of 95 planets were reasonably detectable, i.e. above threshhold.
- All were found by at least one team (most by 3 or 4 teams).
- 16 HZ planets: all found by at least 2 teams.
- 12 HZ terrestrials: all found by at least 2 teams.

Major Conclusions:

- Single-planet detection is not degraded by presence of other planets.
- Astrometry plus RV can find HZ Earths in multi-planet systems.
- Statistical testing methods need improvement.


## Team-A Models

- Team-A groups each generated $\sim 100$ model planetary systems using their own planet formation theory.
- These 529 models formed the Random-System data pool.
- We randomly selected 32 systems for this study.
- Models were requested to be consistent with Cumming et al. 2008, i.e., $10.5 \%$ of FGK stars have a Jupiter ( $2<\mathrm{P}<200$ days, $0.3<\mathrm{M}<10$ Jup.)


## Team-A Inputs: Planet-System Statistics

| Group | PI | $\#$ <br> Stars | Planets <br> IStar <br> (ave.) | Period <br> (median) <br> years | Mass <br> (median) <br> Earths | e <br> (median) | i <br> (median) <br> degrees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-1 | E. Ford | 156 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 0.11 | 5 |
| A-2 | G. Laughlin | 159 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0.09 | 4 |
| A-3 | H. Levison | 74 | 5 | 12 | 17 | 0.06 | 2 |
| A-4 | D. Lin | 190 | 20 | 0.6 | 0.05 | 0.005 | - |
| A-5 | S. Raymond | 140 | 17 | 6 | 0.005 | 0.00 | 0.06 |

Medians

| Group | Period <br> $(\min , \max )$ <br> years | Mass <br> $(\min , \max )$ <br> Earths | e <br> $(\min , \max )$ | i <br> (min, max) <br> degrees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-1 | $0.007--784$. | $0.05-7250$. | $0.001-0.99$ | $0.03-175$. |
| A-2 | $0.008-39$. | $0.001-1340$. | $0--0.49$ | $0.02-19$. |
| A-3 | $0.2-270$. | $0.02-1270$. | $0.001-0.93$ | $0.0003-58$. |
| A-4 | $0.003-44$. | $0.01-51$. | $0.0001-0.57$ | -------- |
| A-5 | $0.005-164$. | $0.00001-4060$. | $0-0.71$ | $0-42$. |

## Data Pool: 527 stars, 3862 Objects



## Blind Test Data: 48 stars and 581 objects



## Team-B Synthetic Data

- Planetary Systems:
- Random, Solar-system analogs, One-Earth, No-Planets.
- Randomized orientations and orbital phase.
- Generated synthetic SIM-Lite \& RV data.
- Target stars:
- One solar mass, $10 \mathrm{pc}, 30^{\circ}$ latitude.
- All significant effects are included in synthetic data:
- Motion of observer (parallax effect).
- Space motion of target star (3D space motion).
- Realistic sampling cadence.
- Astrophysical noise.
- Instrument systematic noise.


## Team-B Data Generation

- MATLAB code, many modules.
- Planetary Systems:
- Random, SS analogs, 1 \& 0 Planets.
- Random orientations \& phases.
- Generated synthetic SIM-Lite \& RV data.
- Target stars:
- One solar mass, $10 \mathrm{pc}, 30^{\circ}$ latitude.
- All significant effects are included:
- Motion of observer (parallax effect).
- Space motion of target star in 3D.
- Realistic sampling cadence.
- Astrophysical noise.

- Instrument systematic noise.


## Systems vs Type \& Noise

## SNR Primer (1 of 2)

The signal to noise ratio (SNR), for astrometry or RV, is defined as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SNR }=\frac{\text { signal }}{\text { mission_noise }}=\frac{\alpha}{\sigma_{1} / \sqrt{N}} \\
& \text { so.........SNR }(\text { astro, Earth })=\frac{0.30 \mu a s}{0.82 \mu a s / \sqrt{250}}=\frac{0.30}{0.052}=5.8 \\
& \text { and.......SNR }(R V, \text { Earth })=\frac{0.090 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}}{1.0 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s} / \sqrt{150}}=\frac{0.090}{0.082}=1.1 \ll 5.8
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\alpha=$ RMS motion, $\sigma_{1}=$ single-measurement noise, and $\mathrm{N}=\#$ measurements.

SNR. From statistics, if we have $\mathbf{S N R}=\mathbf{5 . 8}$ or more, then we get good completeness (over 50\%) and few false alarms (under 1\%).

## SNR Primer (2 of 2)

For a given SNR, we find minimum mass:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{m}(\text { astro })=\left(\sigma_{1} \times \text { SNR } / \alpha_{0} \times \mathrm{N}^{1 / 2}\right) \mathrm{P}^{-2 / 3} \\
\mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{RV})=\left(\sigma_{1} \times \text { SNR } / \beta_{0} \times \mathrm{N}^{1 / 2}\right) \mathrm{P}^{+1 / 3}
\end{gathered}
$$

A minimum-variance bound analysis gives the expected uncertainties:
mass: $\quad \sigma_{m} / m=\operatorname{sqrt}(2) /$ SNR $\sim 1.4 /$ SNR
period: $\quad \sigma_{P} / P=(\operatorname{sqrt}(6) / \pi) \times(P / T) / S N R \sim 0.8(P / T) / S N R$

For long-period planets, an approximate correction factor is mass: $\quad 1+((P / T-0.70) / 0.18)^{2} \quad$ for $P / T>0.70$ period: $1+((\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{T}-0.52) / 0.27)^{2} \quad$ for $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{T}>0.52$
So the noise is roughly a factor of $4 \times$ worse at $P / T=1$.

## What are the Interesting Questions?

1. Is the expected threshold of SNR~5.8 valid?
2. Do other planets interfere with the detection of HZ terrestrials?
3. What is the reliability of detection (probability that a detection is true)?
4. What is the completeness (probability that a planet will be detected)?
5. We can ask the above questions for

- All planets,
- Terrestrial planets,
- Habitable zone planets and
- Habitable Terrestrial planets.


## 1. Completeness of detection (vs SNR)



- Completeness is the detected fraction of planets.
- Curve is theoretical for $1 \%$ FAP (Catanzarite et al 2006).
- Points are \# correct planets / \# total planets, for any team.
- Shows that at $\mathrm{SNR}>5.8$, measured completeness is excellent, as predicted.
- Here SNR is the RSS of the combined RV and Astro SNRs.


## 2. Errors are $\sim$ Gaussian plus a few outliers

For each Team-C group, when a good, marginal, or "clean-up" planet was reported, we calculated the period and mass offsets in units of the expected astro +RV error. A few cases with $\sigma_{x} / x>1$ were rejected, and $\sigma_{x} / x<0.01$ were set to 0.01 ; little change.

| Table entries are number of detectionsper group | $x(o b s)-x$ (model) I sig(model) $=$ | <-3 | -3 to -2 | -2 to -1 | -1 to 0 | 0 to 1 | 1 to 2 | 2 to 3 | >3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Period C1 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 11 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 6 |
|  | Period C2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 31 | 31 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Period C4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 34 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
|  | Period C5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 25 | 33 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Mass C1 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 13 |
|  | Mass C2 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 7 | 6 |
|  | Mass C4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 16 | 14 | 8 | 2 | 17 |
|  | Mass C5 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 18 | 12 | 4 | 6 |
|  | ~Gaussian | 0.1 | 1 | 9 | 22 | 22 | 9 | 1 | 0.1 |

Periods are slightly better than expected, masses slightly worse.
May need a better theory. But this data suggests that planets are as detectable in multi-planet systems as in single-planet ones.

## 3. Reliability (vs planet type)

- Astrometric \& RV detection uses a periodogram in the presence of noise.
- A low threshold increases detections, but also increases false alarms.
- Reliability: if we claim to see a planet, what is the probability that it is true?
- Define: reliability = \#detected I (\#detected + false alarms)


| Reliability | Team <br> C1 | Team <br> C2 | Team <br> C4 | Team <br> C5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | $70 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| Terrestrial | $41 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $96 \%$ |
| HZ | $44 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Terr \& HZ | $40 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Figure shows SNR-based detection limits for
RV (blue, upper) 5 \& 10 yrs and
SIM-Lite (red, lower) 5 \& 10 yrs.

## 4. Completeness (vs planet type)

- There are 70 high SNR (>5.8) planets (plotted).
- 48 of these have a period shorter than 10 years.
- We should have detected all of these, and we did.
- Define: completeness = \#detected I \#detectable


| Completeness | Team <br> C1 | Team <br> C2 | Team <br> C4 | Team <br> C5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | $60 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| Terrestrial | $28 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| HZ | $53 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Terr \& HZ | $42 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

Chart shows SNR-based detection limits for
RV (blue, upper), 5 \& 10 yrs and
SIM-Lite (red, lower) 5 \& 10 yrs.

## Blind Test Summary/Conclusion

- Study set out to determine:
- Can Earths be detected in Solar Systems at 10 pc?

Answer: Yes

- What is the sensitivity needed to detect Earths?

Answer: $40 \%$ of 5 -year, $0.82 \mu \mathrm{as}, 6-\mathrm{m}$ astrometry mission plus 15 years of RV data on $\sim 60$ stars.

- Study was constrained by time.
- Given more time, team performance expected to improve and converge to the best team's results.
- Phase 2 will address additional important questions.


## Tentative Plans for Phase 2 Study

- Double-blind style continued.
- Extend study to real target stars.
- Complete by Winter AAS.
- Improve detection criteria (e.g., F-Test, stability, others TBD).
- Build theoretical model of astro plus RV.
- Future topics:
- non-gaussian, non-stationary instrumental noise
- explicit astrophysical noise
- prediction of planet position for imaging instruments

