



Processing of uGMRT data using the SPAM pipeline

Huib Intema

Senior Research Fellow

Curtin Institute of Radio Astronomy International Centre for Radio Astronomy Research







- Radio astronomy's large data era moves us towards automated data processing and multi-purpose large sky surveys
 - Personal interests: automated data processing, merging galaxy clusters, radio surveys
 - Heavy user of GMRT; projects already include many Indian collaborators
 - Relevant activities include:
 - SPAM algorithm for direction-dependent (ionospheric) calibration and imaging
 - SPAM end-to-end pipeline for automated processing of continuum GMRT and VLA data (< 1 GHz)
 - Alternative data release of the TIFR GMRT Sky Survey (TGSS) at 150 MHz
- Opportunities for new / improved collaborations
 - Increase user base of the SPAM pipeline; accelerate scientific throughput
 - Encourage further scientific exploration of the TGSS
 - Development of a pipeline for uGMRT, a dish-based pathfinder for SKA_LOW
 - Astrophysical explorations using (u)GMRT data in combination with complementary radio telescopes (MWA, ASKAP, ATCA, but also LOFAR, MeerKAT, JVLA)



SPAM pipeline

- Robust, end-to-end data processing pipeline for GMRT (and VLA) low-frequency observations (Interna+ 2017)
 - Python/C implementation based on AIPS functionality, accessed through ParselTongue interface (Kettenis+ 2006) using Obit library (Cotton 2008)
- Performs wide-field (direction-dependent) ionospheric calibration, modeling, and imaging (Interna+ 2009) (SPAM = Source Peeling & Atmospheric Modeling)
- Publicly available, designed to deliver science-ready data products with minimal user interaction
- SPAM pipeline is split into a 'pre-processing' part and a 'main pipeline' part
- Each pipeline (part) instance runs as a single thread
- Parallelization only achieved when processing multiple data sets



Data flow of the SPAM pipeline for processing the TGSS ADR1 project at NRAO (from Intema+ 2017)



SPAM pros and cons

- Successfully applied to 100's of GMRT observations, producing (near-) science-ready data products
 - Robust & fast processing, high success rate
 - Acceleration of scientific output
- Enabled very large projects like TGSS ADR1 and GAPP
- Dependence on 2013 AIPS and Obit poses some compatibility issues during installation
- Largely disconnected from latest algorithm developments
 - No multi-scale, multi-term deconvolution
 - No W-projection, W-stacking, etc.
- Limited to processing narrow-band stokes I observations with simple primary beam patterns
 - No A-projection, IDG, etc.
- Although some concepts are transferable, the SPAM pipeline itself has limited applicability
 - GMRT below 1 GHz^(*), VLA at 4/P-band
- Developments for a wide-band SPAM based on CASA and/or LOFAR software have started (C-SPAM), but progress is slow



Publications referencing the SPAM pipeline (from ADS, 06/11/2019)



SPAM pipeline for uGMRT?

- While uGMRT awaits the development of a full wide-band pipeline, the current SPAM pipeline can be used to process uGMRT frequency slices
 - Fractional bandwidth < 10-20 percent
- Functionality added to support wide-band data processing
 - Updated primary beam models
 - Updated processing parameters
 - Automated frequency slicing
 - 6x 33.3 MHz for uGMRT band 3 (300-500 MHz)
 - 8x 50 MHz for uGMRT band 4 (550-950 MHz)
 - Each frequency slice can be processed independently in parallel
 - Wide-band (GWB) processing time not too different from narrow-band (GSB)



SPAM uGMRT band 4 example

- uGMRT cycle 36 observations of merging galaxy cluster
 - 8 hours in band 4 (550-750 MHz) yielded 5.9 hours on-target
 - 610 MHz narrow-band data (GSB: 33.3 MHz) recorded alongside wide-band data (GWB: 200 MHz)
- Please respect that these are preliminary results on proprietary data, presented with permission of the PI
- Band 4 data processed in 4x 50 MHz frequency slices
 610 MHz narrow-band data (33.3 MHz) processed in parallel
- SPAM data processing done within 2.5 days
 - Produced final image and calibrated visibilities
- Following images are not corrected for primary beam attenuation ...



SPAM uGMRT band 4 example (2)





SPAM uGMRT band 4 example (3)





SPAM uGMRT band 4 example (4)





SPAM uGMRT band 4 combination

- uGMRT band 4 performance is superior compared to GMRT 610 MHz
 - Much better than naïve bandwidth scaling (33.3->50 MHz gives factor 1.22)
- Combining the 4 frequency slices should yield even better results
- Two possible approaches:
 - Image plane combination (linear stacking)
 - UV plane combination (concatenating visibilities)
- Image plane combination:
 - Simple, quick operation
 - Robust against small flux and astrometric offsets between images
 - Limited by resolution of lowest frequency slice
 - Low-level artifacts due to CLEAN limit in images of individual frequency slices
- UV plane combination:
 - Imaging at full resolution possible
 - Deeper CLEANing than in images of individual frequency slices
 - Requires concatenation and re-imaging of visibilities
 - Small flux and astrometric offsets will introduce additional image artifacts



SPAM uGMRT band 4 combination (2)





SPAM uGMRT band 4 combination (3)





SPAM uGMRT band 4 combination (4)





SPAM uGMRT band 4 combination (5)





SPAM uGMRT summary

- UV plane combination yields the best sensitivity at high resolution
 - In this example, 4-5 times better sensitivity than the legacy 610 MHz band
 - Note that no primary beam corrections were applied; needs to be incorporated
 - Experiments with uGMRT band 3 shows similar behavior
- UV plane combination requires
 - An imager that supports joined deconvolution of independently flux-calibrated frequency slices (WSClean)
 - Careful preparations when processing the frequency slices
 - Matching frequency bands and resolution
 - Accurate astrometric alignment
- Approach still needs a way to correct for frequency-dependent primary beam attenuation
- Automated generation of an in-band spectral index map will be added value
- Full recipe will be published on the SPAM webpage



Radio-optical image

