Resolving the Chandra / ACIS PSF using Actual Data Deron Pease, Diab Jerius,

and CXC Optics Group

Credit: NASA/CXC/Northwestern U./C.Heinke et al.

# **Previous Studies: HRC**

AR Lac HRC-I

- AR Lac on HRC-I ObsID 1385 (~19ks)
- correct for systematic errors in event positions
- Model: HRMA + 20 μm HRC blur
  + 0."06 Aspect blur



# Previous Studies: ACIS

- DJ's SPIE paper from 2003
- 12 sources
- ACIS-I & -S
- Various coadditions
- Energy cuts
- Comparison with HRC-I AR Lac



Extended, "puffy"

**Expectations**?

### Source Selection Criteria

- Point sources (stars, QSOs)
- Within 50" of optical axis
- High galactic latitude  $\Rightarrow |b| > 10^{\circ}$
- Low counts per frame  $\Rightarrow < 0.1$
- High counts  $\Rightarrow \ge 100$ , prefer  $\ge 1000 *$
- FAINT, VFAINT mode to further select low count rates
- No grating (excludes most high energy sources) \*
- Preferably uncrowded fields
- Any other concerns literature info

### Sources Found & Analyzed

- I. Start with ~100,000 sources
- 2. I<sup>st</sup> cut  $\Rightarrow$  ~250 Stars ~290 AGN (all followed up)
- 3.  $2^{nd}$  cut  $\Rightarrow$  28 Stars 12 AGN (these fully analyzed)
- 4.  $3^{rd}$  cut  $\Rightarrow$  3 Stars 2 AGN (these best by far)

#### ➡ 47 Tuc & PG 1634+70

- Visual inspection
- De-Roll
- Clean & filter data properly (dmtools, funtools)
- Light-curve inspection
- Grade analysis looking for pile-up effects
- Encircled energy & radial profile analysis

### Observations

Source	ObsID	Detector	Exposure (sec)
PG 1634+70 (QSO)	69	ACIS-S	5713.55
	1269	ACIS-S	13309.95
47 Tuc (GC)	953	ACIS-I	33368.23
	955	ACIS-I	33368.73
AR Lac	1385	HRC-I	18831.93

**ACIS Results** 

PG1634+70 ACIS-S & 47 Tuc ACIS-I



## Chandra ECF

AR Lac HRC-I vs. PG1634+70 ACIS-S vs. HRMA



## Conclusions

- ✓ We've shown that the ACIS PSF (with pixel randomization) is comparable to the HRC PSF
- But what's going on with pixel randomization off?
  - One might say: pixel randomization is necessary because we don't know where an event landed in a pixel. EOS
  - But clearly there is a significant difference:



Credit: NASA/CXC/Northwestern U./C.Heinke et al.