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2016 UG Recommendations

Recommendation 2016-06-08/01:

- As result of some recent investigations, there is now a requirement to implement an iterative adjustment to the parameters for the 2-D PSF. [...] This activity needs to be considered as of the highest priority because of its impact on many other aspects of the calibration.

Recommendation 2015-05-22/02: The UG identifies the following tasks in order of priority;

1. Cross-calibration of the responses of the XMM-Newton X-ray cameras and spectrometers. This is a longstanding issue, and it should be resolved as far as is possible in the near future.
2. Evidence for a shift in gain of the PN detectors, which is dependent on the quiescent background. This should be investigated and quantified, and a correction implemented.
3. Calibrated spectra from NuSTAR and XMM-Newton sometimes show a significant mis-match in spectral slope and offset above 3keV. This is a matter which the IACHEC should be encouraged to investigate.
4. Complete the calibration of the PN Burst Mode, RDPHA correction.

Recommendation 2016-06-08/02:

- The time and energy reconstruction of the pn Timing mode should be studied with respect to recently observed discrepancies.
EPIC: PSF Investigations

PKS 2155-304
- Piled-up
- Annular extraction regions for EPIC

Sample of non-piled-up on-axis sources

Read el al. 2014
EPIC: PSF Investigations

NGC 5506 (Seyfert 2)

Dominated (>90%) by point source emission.

PN spectral comparison:

- annuli from 20″-25″ to 40″-45″
- compared with 20″ circle

Other sources show similar results
EPIC: PSF Investigations

- Systematics in the current PSF modelling for all 3 XRTs
- Hopefully can be improved by tuning the PSF model parameters
- Source sample consists of 11 observations of bright non-piled-up point sources located at the nominal aim point
- 5-6 nested annuli being compared (up to 60” outer radius)
- 2 PSF model parameters (r0 and a) being varied – changes affect off-axis angles < 3’
Iterative scheme for the empirical correction of XRT XPSF parameters:

- Per source:
  - Extract spectrum from circular region
  - Extract spectra from several nested annular regions
  - Create respective RMFs
  - Create respective ARFs
  - Fit model to circular region spectrum
  - Apply this as reference model to annular spectra, derive residuals

- For all annular spectra, and all sources, determine a suitable statistic:
  \[
  \sum_i \frac{(d_i - m_i)^2}{e_i^2}
  \]

- Modify ELLBETA parameters in order to minimise the statistic
EPIC: PSF Investigations
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EPIC: PSF Investigations

PN: MCG-5-23-16
EPIC: PSF Investigations

PN: Mkn 6
EPIC: PSF Investigations

MOS2: PKS B1334-127
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EPIC: PSF Investigations
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**RGS: Effective Area Correction**

**Algorithm and Implementation:**

Time and wavelength dependent correction RGS1 and RGS2, 1st and 2nd order

For each 0.05 Å bin:

\[ t < 0.538 \quad P_1 + \left( \frac{t}{0.538} \right) P_2 \]

\[ 0.538 \leq t < 1.408 \quad P_1 + P_2 + P_5 + \left( \frac{t - 0.538}{0.870} \right) P_3 \]

\[ 1.408 \leq t < 2.112 \quad P_1 + P_2 + P_3 + P_5 + P_7 + \left( \frac{t - 1.408}{0.704} \right) P_4 \]

\[ 2.112 \leq t < 2.816 \quad P_1 + P_2 + P_3 + P_4 + P_6 + P_7 + \left( \frac{t - 2.112}{0.704} \right) P_5 \]

\[ t > 2.816 \quad P_1 + P_2 + P_3 + P_4 + P_5 + P_6 + P_7 + \text{narrow gaussians at specific wavelengths} \]

**Estimated calibration uncertainty of the effective area after the application of this correction:**

1-2% in first order

**Algorithm and Implementation:**

- Correction
- \( P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4, P_5, P_6, P_7 \)
- \( t = \text{rev} \)
- \( P_1 \) correction at time 0
- \( P_2 - P_5 \) slopes
- \( P_6 \) discontinuity at cooling
- \( P_7 \) discontinuity at change to RGS2
- Single Node Readout mode

**Implemented in SASv16 as a non-default option**

**new CCF issued**

XMM-CCF-REL-340

J. Kaastra, C. de Vries & J.W. den Herder
RGS: Effective Area Correction

Testing: RGS1 v. RGS2

3C 273 @ rev 1465

![Graph showing RGS1 and RGS2 with and without effective area correction](image)

- **without correction**
  - RGS1
  - RGS2

- **with correction**
  - RGS1
  - RGS2

residuals with respect to best fit RGS1 model [two absorbed power-laws]
## RGS: Effective Area Correction

### Testing: RGS1 v. RGS2

**Model:** two absorbed power-laws

Independent RGS1 and RGS2 fits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RGS1</th>
<th>RGS2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( N_H (10^{20}) )</td>
<td>( 2.28^{+0.55}_{-0.56} )</td>
<td>( 1.89^{+0.95}_{-0.79} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1.85^{+0.53}_{-0.52} )</td>
<td>( 2.19^{+0.77}_{-0.69} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope power-law #1</td>
<td>( 1.68^{+0.15}_{-0.33} )</td>
<td>( 1.68^{+0.17}_{-0.41} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1.51^{+0.22}_{-0.43} )</td>
<td>( 1.52^{+0.26}_{-0.56} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm ( (10^{-2}) ) power-law #1</td>
<td>( 3.61^{+0.41}_{-1.02} )</td>
<td>( 3.52^{+0.42}_{-1.28} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3.13^{+0.67}_{-1.20} )</td>
<td>( 3.20^{+0.78}_{-1.52} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope power-law #2</td>
<td>( 3.61^{+0.76}_{-0.70} )</td>
<td>( 3.69^{+1.18}_{-0.97} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3.16^{+0.70}_{-0.52} )</td>
<td>( 3.20^{+0.93}_{-0.65} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm ( (10^{-2}) ) power-law #2</td>
<td>( 0.56^{+0.94}_{-0.34} )</td>
<td>( 0.43^{+1.19}_{-0.31} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 0.97^{+1.14}_{-0.61} )</td>
<td>( 1.01^{+1.45}_{-0.69} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graphs

- **without correction**
- **with correction**
RGS: Effective Area Correction
Testing: RGS2 / RGS1 Flux Ratio

Based on observations of PKS 2155-304 and 3C 273
RGS: Effective Area Correction
Testing: RGS to EPIC-pn Rectification Factors

Based on 42 observations of bright BL Lac
EPIC-pn in Small Window mode
EPIC: Update of the CORRAREA Correction

The CORRAREA tool was implemented in SAS 14 (autumn 2014):

- Applies an empirical correction to the EPIC effective areas.
- Can be used to evaluate the impact that the current relative EPIC $A_{\text{eff}}$ uncertainties have on astrophysical parameters derived from spectral fitting.
- Currently, a non-default SAS option.

A recalibration and full validation of the CORRAREA correction is currently being undertaken:

- Based on SAS 15.1, and latest calibration (as of Oct 2016).
- Revised screening: common GTIs, background selections, pile-up evaluation.
- Largely automated pipeline from data reduction to spectral and residual fitting.
- A new CORRAREA correction is close to release (⇒ summer 2017).

Outlook:

- Include a wider sample of sources, observing modes (LW, SW) and filters (Thick) (⇒ autumn 2017).
- Cross-mission comparison in order to justify absolute $A_{\text{eff}}$ correction.
Mirrors: Effective Area Simulations

- In mid 2016 an investigation (by D. Lumb) was started into possible unaccounted for mirror contamination present pre-launch.

- Using industry reports on expected contamination, SciSim was used to compare telescope effective areas. Results show the currently implemented values are inconsistent.

- The discrepancies are telescope-dependent, implying absolute and relative changes to the EPIC (and RGS) effective area calibration.

- Progress has been made, resulting in preliminary estimates based on the best knowledge of the telescope contamination. Assuming this contamination is present after launch this would mean:
  - Absolute changes in telescope effective area: ~ 2 - 4%.
  - Relative changes between EPICs (esp. XRT3 and XRT1/2): ~ 0 – 3%.
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PN: Quiescent Background Gain Correction

- Details of the quiescent background gain correction (QBGC) were presented at the 2016 Users’ Group meeting.

- In order to correct the PN gain, the discarded line rate is used as proxy for the quiescent background.

- Original implementation envisaged the use of an observation averaged rate, already stored in the events file (NDISCLIN keyword).

- However, the QB may vary significantly within an observation, necessitating the use of the instantaneous discarded line rates, included in the housekeeping data stream.

- This requires a fundamentally different implementation at S/W level.

- Main issue is the robust handling of telemetry gaps, outlier values, intrinsic noise.

⇒ Aim is for SAS 17 implementation (end of 2017).
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EPIC-pn / NuSTAR Comparison

Comparison of 18 AGN spectra:
- PN imaging modes
- Strictly simultaneous PN-NuSTAR data
- Models fit to PN
  ⇒ Systematic NuSTAR residuals
  ⇒ Slope differences of ~0.15

However:
- Recent NuSTAR results (Madsen et al. 2017, comparing focused with non-focused measurements of the Crab) confirm NuSTAR normalisation underestimated by ~ 10%.
- Change in PSF parameters may affect EPIC spectral slope.
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PN: Timing & Burst Mode Issues

PN Timing Mode observations show several cases of sources with:

- larger than expected residuals at instrumental edges
- significant differences in line energies with respect to e.g. grating data (up to 70 eV at ~ 6 keV)

Sources are in the moderate count rate regime.
Possible issue with rate dependent correction in Timing Mode (and Burst Mode).

The chain of corrections affecting the TI & BU mode energy scale is being systematically evaluated.

Work in progress...

- Rate dependent correction (pattern recognition)
- Find event patterns
- Rate dependent correction (applied to charges)
- Gain correction
- Mode-specific gain correction
- CTI correction
- Long-term CTI correction
- CCD offset correction
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Summary of Calibration Monitoring

- EPIC bad pixels (XMM-CCF-REL-338)
- EPIC background and offset maps (XMM-CCF-REL-339)
- EPIC energy scale (XMM-CCF-REL-336)
- EPIC variable boresight (XMM-CCF-REL-343)
- EPIC-MOS contamination
- EPIC-pn flux stability
- EPIC-pn timing

- OM sensitivity degradation (XMM-CCF-REL-346)
- OM photometric stability
- OM grism flux stability
- OM astrometry
- OM variable boresight (XMM-CCF-REL-343)

- RGS bad columns (XMM-CCF-REL-347)
- RGS wavelength scale
- RGS CTI & gain (XMM-CCF-REL-345)
- RGS background
- RGS contamination
- RGS flux stability
- RGS offsets (XMM-CCF-REL-342)
RGS: Contamination Monitoring

Carbon contamination layer building-up slowly

No changes in the trend
RGS: Bad Surface Monitoring

- **<<1% of detector surface**
- **<1.5% of detector surface**

**Graphs:***

1. **Columns found hot in >95% of the observations**
2. **Columns found hot in >25% of the observations**

**Legend:**
- RGS1
- RGS2

**Yearly Data:**
- 2000: 5, 36
- 2001: 6, 34
- 2002: 3, 30
- 2003: 4, 20
- 2004: 1, 21
- 2005: 3, 24
- 2006: 4, 21
- 2007: 4, 17
- 2008: 4, 17
- 2009: 4, 17
- 2010: 3, 17
- 2011: 3, 17
- 2012: 3, 17
- 2013: 3, 17
- 2014: 4, 16
- 2015: 4, 16
- 2016: 3, 17

**Note:**
- XMM-SOC-CAL-TN-0209
- C.Gabriel

**Slide 30**
RGS: Wavelength Scale Monitoring

Bright sample
85 observations of AB Dor, Capella, HR 1099 and Procyon

Faint sample
70 observations of fainter emission line stars

Heliocentric and Sun angle corrections applied; most recent XMM variable boresight
MOS: Contamination Monitoring

Primary monitoring source: SNR 1E0102

Contamination status shows no change in trend:

- MOS1 stable
- MOS2 steadily increasing
OM: Time Sensitivity Degradation

Originally based on linear fit to standard stars: OM_PHOTTONAT_0005.CCF

Now based on a quadratic fit to selected catalogue sources: OM_PHOTTONAT_0006.CCF
OM: Time Sensitivity Degradation

Testing of the new correction on standard stars:

- old correction

- new correction
## OM: Repeatability of Filter Photometry

SAS 16 data processing:
Count rates (cts/s) of standard stars observed regularly since 2001:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Star</th>
<th>Nobs</th>
<th>UVW2</th>
<th>UVM2</th>
<th>UVW1</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GD 153</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>161.8</td>
<td>329.5</td>
<td>420.5</td>
<td>283.5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error (%)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hz 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>168.8</td>
<td>148.8</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error (%)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPM 16274</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>112.7</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error (%)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OM: Serendipitous UV Source Survey

- New version 3 of the XMM-Newton Serendipitous Source Survey ("the OM Catalogue"): SUSS3
- Released in March 2017
- Observations till mid-2015:
  - 7866 XMM-Newton pointings
  - 6.9 million entries
  - 4.8 million sources
  - 0.9 million sources with multiple observations
- Full reprocessing with SAS 15 & new time-dependent sensitivity degradation correction (OM_PHOTONAT_0006.CCF)
- New flag: Sky Image to identify sources detected in mosaic / stacked images
- Available through the ESA XSA: query I/F or full catalogue download
- Catalogue sources can be overlaid in the ESA-Sky utility

UV data from the XMM-Newton Optical Monitor

UVW1 filter (291 nm):
- 75 exposures (2001 – 2015)
- 221 ks exposure time
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Additional Future Calibration Activities

**EPIC-pn:** Include Cu-Ka fluorescence emission (8.0 keV) in the long-term CTI correction; will complement the existing data points at 1.5 keV (Al-Ka) and 5.9 keV (Mn-Ka).

**OM:** Continued study of time-dependent sensitivity degradation.

**RGS:** Re-evaluation of effective area corrections.
Assessment of background templates and background correction methods.

**Cross-Calibration:**
Streamlining the XMM-Newton Cross Calibration Archive in order to improve flexibility in validating calibration products.

- 51 targets
- 228 exposures
- on and off-axis
- point and extended sources

Additional Future Calibration Activities
Summary of Calibration Plans & Activities

- EPIC encircled energy correction: new XRTn XPSF parameters (Summer 2017)
- EPIC CORRAREA:
  - recalculation (Summer 2017)
  - extended validation (Autumn 2017)
- EPIC-pn quiescent background gain correction in SAS 17 (End of 2017)
- EPIC-pn empirical RMF modelling
- Implications of mirror contaminant simulations (In progress)
- Re-evaluation of EPIC-pn fast mode energy scale corrections