

Understanding systematics in exoplanet observations

Pieter Deroo (1), Mark Swain (1) & Tom Greene (2)

1: NASA/Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology; 2: NASA/Ames

Abstract:

The most successful exoplanet characterization method to date – combined light photometry – relies on extremely accurate spectrophotometric differential precision. The required dynamic range has pushed exoplanet observations into previously unexplored instrument systematics. Mitigating these small but very significant effects is core to exoplanet science and the methodology how to remove the instrument noise is frequently a source of controversy.

Here, we model the systematic noise floor induced by the most significant instrument systematic effects. We focus on near-IR spectroscopic characterization of exoplanet atmospheres using HgCdTe detectors. We establish the:

1. Raw systematics noise floor

2. Decorrelated/post-processed systematics noise floor

and this for a range in instrument parameters (right-hand side). Three specific instruments are considered as well (bottom): HST/NICMOS which allowed for the first spectroscopic comparative exoplanetology; JWST/NIRSpec &FINESSE, which are future instruments that will characterize exoplanet atmospheres from the optical to the near-IR ($\sim 0.5 - 5 \mu m$). FINESSE is a 76 cm aperture Explorer mission with well-sampled spectra at $R \sim 1000$.

Instrument design vs spectrophotometric differential precision:



Methodology:

A Monte Carlo simulation in which common instrument errors (pointing & focus errors) are used as forcing functions for photometric variation induced by:

Position dependent gain variations and uncertainties in the focal plane array

2. Slit-losses



Conclusions:

Our simulations quantify the expected systematic noise floor for exoplanet spectroscopic observations and the improvements using the current-best decorrelation/post-processing [right, bottom]. Our simulations for HST/NICMOS are in agreement with the observed pre- and post-processed values, validating the simulations [**bottom**].

Simple trades in the instrument design can significantly optimize it for exoplanet spectrosopy [right]. As such, the well-sampled spectra of a modest aperture mission like FINESSE could have better limiting signal-to-noise than the poorly sampled JWST/NIRSpec at short wavelengths [bottom].



Assuming: state-of-the-art HgCdTe inter and intra pixel response; Gaussian instrument errors. **Overall systematics noise floor:** combine the different partials appropriately The approximate location for NIRSpec & FINESSE @ 2 µm is annotated. The error distribution for those instruments can significantly differ from the assumed Gaussian. Our instrument specific results are given below.

Instrument specific systematics

Overall systematics noise floor per eclipse [8 hr] @ 1.7 µm

	HST/NICMOS	JWST/NIRSpec	FINESSE
RAW	1048 ppm/eclipse	1052 ppm/eclipse	67 ppm/eclipse
DECORRELATED	146 ppm/eclipse	217 ppm/eclipse	5 ppm/eclipse

Raw instrument noise partials @ 1.7 µm

	HST/NICMOS	JWST/NIRSpec	FINESSE
Pointing induced gain changes	480 ppm/orbit	364 ppm/10,000s	17 ppm/orbit
Systematic PSF variations	932 ppm/orbit	3434 ppm/2wks	60 ppm/orbit
Pointing induced slit-loss	NA	1 ppm/10,000s	22 ppm/orbit

Decorrelated instrument noise partials @ 1.7 µm

	HST/NICMOS	JWST/NIRSpec	FINESSE
Pointing induced gain changes	21ppm/orbit	75 ppm/10.000s	0.3 ppm/orbit



Systematics and exoplanet spectroscopy:

49 ppm/2wks 4 ppm/orbit 145ppm/orbit Systematic PSF variations 1 ppm/10,000s 2 ppm/orbit Pointing induced slit-loss NA

