

On the Statistical Analysis of X-ray Polarization Measurements

T. E. Strohmayer and T. R. Kallman

X-ray Astrophysics Lab, Astrophysics Science Division, NASA's Goddard Space Flight
Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771

Received _____; accepted _____

ABSTRACT

In many polarimetry applications, including observations in the X-ray band, the measurement of a polarization signal can be reduced to the detection and quantification of a deviation from uniformity of a distribution of measured angles of the form $A + B \cos^2(\phi - \phi_0)$ ($0 < \phi < \pi$). We explore the statistics of such polarization measurements using Monte Carlo simulations and χ^2 fitting methods. We compare our results to those derived using the traditional probability density used to characterize polarization measurements and quantify how they deviate as the intrinsic modulation amplitude grows. We derive relations for the number of counts required to reach a given detection level (parameterized by β the “number of σ ’s” of the measurement) appropriate for measuring the modulation amplitude a by itself (single interesting parameter case) or jointly with the position angle ϕ (two interesting parameters case). We show that for the former case when the intrinsic amplitude is equal to the well known minimum detectable polarization (MDP) it is, on average, detected at the 3σ level. For the latter case, when one requires a joint measurement at the same confidence level, then more counts are needed than that required to achieve the MDP level. This additional factor is amplitude-dependent, but is ≈ 2.2 for intrinsic amplitudes less than about 20%. It decreases slowly with amplitude and is ≈ 1.8 when the amplitude is 50%. We find that the position angle uncertainty at 1σ confidence is well described by the relation $\sigma_\phi = 28.5(\text{degrees})/\beta$.

Subject headings: polarimetry: general — statistical analysis: Monte Carlo simulations

1. Introduction

Emission and scattering processes thought to be important in many astrophysical X-ray sources are likely to impart specific polarization signatures, but to date there have only been a few positive detections of polarization from cosmic X-ray sources, largely due to sensitivity limitations. Some of the earliest and highest precision measurements were made with the OSO-8 Bragg reflection polarimeter (Kestenbaum et al. 1976; Weisskopf et al. 1976), and include high significance measurements of the linear polarization properties of the Crab nebula in several energy bands (Weisskopf et al. 1978).

More recently, observations with the *INTEGRAL* spectrometer SPI and imager IBIS have exploited the polarization dependence of Compton scattering to infer the linear polarization properties of the Crab at γ -ray energies (Dean et al. 2008; Forot et al. 2009). These results indicate that the > 200 keV flux from the Crab nebula is highly polarized ($\approx 50\%$), with a position angle consistent with the pulsar rotation axis.

In the last few years the development of micropattern gas detectors has enabled the capability to directly image the charge tracks produced by photoelectrons, thus enabling use of photoelectric absorption in a detection gas as a direct probe of X-ray polarization (Costa et al. 2001; Black et al. 2004; 2010). It is likely that such technology will be employed in the not-too-distant future to sensitively explore the polarization properties of many classes of astrophysical X-ray sources for the first time.

In this paper we explore the question of how one detects, measures, and characterizes a polarization signal with a photoelectric polarimeter. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows; in §2 we outline the basic problem of detecting a modulation in a distribution of angles, and we describe the angle distributions used throughout the paper. In §3 we briefly outline the probability distribution relevant to such polarization measurements. In §4 we describe our Monte Carlo simulations and present our results. We

conclude with a short summary in §5.

2. Statement of the Problem

The angular distribution of photoelectrons ejected by a linearly polarized beam of photons (X-rays) is proportional to $\sin^2(\theta) \cos^2(\phi)/(1 - \beta \cos(\theta))^4$ (see, for example, Costa et al. 2001), where θ is the emission angle measured from the direction of the incident photon ($0 < \theta < \pi$), and ϕ is the azimuthal angle measured relative to the polarization vector of the incident photon (see Figure 1 for the basic geometry applicable to a photoelectric polarimeter). In most practical situations the angle θ is not inferred directly, but the electron charge track projected into the plane orthogonal to the direction of the photon (the plane defined by $\theta = 90$ deg) is imaged and thus ϕ can be estimated for each detected photon. The angle ϕ is measured around the line of sight to the target of interest and can be referenced to, for example, local North on the sky. In principle ϕ can be measured in the range from $0 - 2\pi$ (0 - 360 degrees), however, due to the two-fold symmetry of the $\cos^2(\phi)$ dependence of the angular distribution above, it is sufficient to consider distributions over the range of angles from 0 to π (0 - 180 degrees).

The presence of a significant linear polarization component is then evident in the distribution of azimuthal angles. For example, an unpolarized photon flux will produce a uniform distribution in the angle ϕ , whereas a linear polarization component produces a distribution peaked at a particular azimuthal angle, ϕ_0 . We emphasize that such a polarimeter does not require rotation of the detector to achieve its sensitivity. Rather, because a photoelectron is ejected preferentially—though with a quantum mechanical probability distribution—along the polarization vector of the photon, measurement of the distribution of the azimuthal angles of photoelectrons provides a *direct* probe of the linear polarization properties of the source.

Due to the $\cos^2(\phi)$ dependence of the angular distribution of photoelectrons, the observed number density of photon events with measured angle between ϕ and $\phi + d\phi$, which we denote as $S(\phi)d\phi$, can be expressed in the form (see, for example, Pacciani et al. 2003; Costa et al. 2001),

$$S(\phi) = A + B \cos^2(\phi - \phi_0). \quad (1)$$

The total intensity of photons is then just the integral, $\int_0^\pi S(\phi)d\phi$, which in this case can be readily shown to be $(A + B/2)\pi$. From equation 1 the unpolarized (unmodulated) component of the intensity is evidently $A\pi$, and since the total intensity can be expressed as the sum of the polarized and unpolarized intensities, the polarized intensity is then simply $B\pi/2$. This angular distribution has an amplitude of modulation defined as, $a \equiv (S_{max} - S_{min})/(S_{max} + S_{min}) = B/(2A + B)$, and a position angle (the angle at which the distribution has a maximum) given by ϕ_0 , thus, the detection of polarization can be reduced to a statistical detection of a modulation in the distribution of angles, ϕ . Such a distribution is often referred to as a modulation curve.

Now, the amplitude of modulation a is not in general equal to the source polarization amplitude, a_p , because a detector is not a perfect analyzer and will not provide an exact measurement of the true photoelectron angle ϕ . That is, individual angle estimates will have some uncertainty associated with them and these will produce a uniform (unmodulated) component to the measured distribution even in the case of a 100% polarized beam. This “lossiness” of the angle estimates is quantified in terms of the so-called detector modulation, μ , which is the modulation amplitude produced in the detector by a 100% polarized X-ray beam.

In general, μ can depend on a number of factors, including the energy of the incident photons, and the composition and pressure of the absorbing gas, among others (see Paciani et al. 2003, Bellazini et al. 2003). In the absence of background, the amplitude

of polarization is just $a_p = a/\mu$. In general, a_p is larger than the measured amplitude of modulation, a , because as noted above, detectors are not 100% efficient, and some of the intrinsic polarization amplitude is smeared out.

An X-ray source's linear polarization characteristics can thus be described by the modulation amplitude, a , and position angle, ϕ (in the range from 0 - π), that would be produced in a particular detector system. In making an observation a total of N photons are observed for each of which an angle ϕ_i is estimated for the ejected photoelectron in the range from 0 - π (0 - 180 deg). One can then create a histogram, or modulation curve, of the number of events (photons), n_j , in each of M position angle bins, where the bin size (in degrees) is $\Delta\phi = 180/M$, and then perform least-squares (χ^2) fitting to estimate both a , ϕ , and their 1σ uncertainties. We call this a measurement of polarization. The counts in any position angle bin, n_j , are independent, Poisson-distributed random variables whose expectation value is determined by $S(\phi)$. It is the statistics of such measurements that we explore in the remainder of this paper. In effect, what is measured is the modulation amplitude, a , and it is the knowledge of the detector system, expressed in terms of μ , that enables this to be converted to a source polarization amplitude via the expression $a_p = a/\mu$.

With the help of some trigonometric identities equation 1 can be re-written as,

$$S(\phi) = A + B \left[\frac{1}{2} (1 + \cos(2\phi) \cos(2\phi_0) + \sin(2\phi) \sin(2\phi_0)) \right], \quad (2)$$

which is equivalent to,

$$S(\phi) = \left(A + \frac{B}{2} \right) + \left(\frac{B}{2} \sin(2\phi_0) \right) \sin(2\phi) + \left(\frac{B}{2} \cos(2\phi_0) \right) \cos(2\phi). \quad (3)$$

If we define $I = (A + B/2)$, $Q = (B/2) \sin(2\phi_0)$, and $U = (B/2) \cos(2\phi_0)$, this gives the so-called Stokes decomposition (in this case specific to linear polarization),

$$S(\phi) = I + Q \sin(2\phi) + U \cos(2\phi), \quad (4)$$

where I , Q and U are the well-known Stokes parameters. The modulation amplitude, $a = B/(2A + B)$, can now be written as $a = (Q^2 + U^2)^{1/2}/I$, and by dividing Q by U we can express the position angle as $\phi_0 = 1/2 \tan^{-1}(Q/U)$. It is also straightforward to show that in this form the unpolarized intensity is given by $A\pi = (I - (Q^2 + U^2)^{1/2})\pi$, and the polarized intensity $(B/2)\pi = (Q^2 + U^2)^{1/2}\pi$. The sum of these gives the total intensity, $I\pi = (A + B/2)\pi$.

We note that the form of equation 4 is familiar as a partial Fourier series, with the Stokes parameters as the Fourier coefficients. We can argue that they are Gaussian distributed random variables to good approximation as long as a reasonably large number of position angle bins are used to construct the modulation curves. To see this we sketch an example of how one of the Stokes parameters can be expressed as a Fourier coefficient. If we multiply both sides of equation (4) by $\cos(2\phi)$ and integrate we obtain,

$$\int_0^\pi S(\phi) \cos(2\phi) d\phi = I \int_0^\pi \cos(2\phi) d\phi + U \int_0^\pi \cos^2(2\phi) d\phi + Q \int_0^\pi \cos(2\phi) \sin(2\phi) d\phi. \quad (5)$$

Because of the angular integrals only the 2nd term on the right-hand side of equation (5) is non-zero, leading to the following expression for U ,

$$U = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\pi S(\phi) \cos(2\phi) d\phi. \quad (6)$$

Now, this integral can be approximated as a sum over all bins in the measured (or simulated) modulation curve with $S(\phi_j) = n_j$, the number of photon events in each bin. Since the n_j are random, Poisson distributed values their sum will approach a normal distribution as M (the number of bins in the modulation curve) becomes large enough via the central limit theorem. While this ensures that the distributions will tend toward the normal distribution, it does not necessarily enforce statistical independence of the parameters, but this can be tested carefully with Monte Carlo simulations. Below we show that under such circumstances the Stokes parameters are not completely independent, but that in the limit

of small amplitudes the approximation of independence is a very good one. Indeed, we show that while Q and U are statistically independent, both Q and U are correlated with I in an amplitude-dependent manner. Moreover, we show that the distributions of Q and U are characterized by a variance that decreases with increasing amplitude.

3. Probability Distribution

Assuming the independent and normally distributed properties of the Stokes parameters are satisfied, previous studies have shown that the joint probability distribution for a measurement of linear polarization characterized by amplitude, a , and position angle, ϕ is given by

$$P(N, a, a_0, \phi, \phi_0) = \frac{Na}{4\pi} \exp \left(-\frac{N}{4}(a^2 + a_0^2 - 2aa_0 \cos 2((\phi - \phi_0))) \right), \quad (7)$$

where a , a_0 , ϕ , ϕ_0 , and N are the measured amplitude, the true amplitude, the measured position angle, the true position angle, and the number of detected photons, respectively (see, for example, Simmons & Stewart 1985; Vaillancourt 2006; Weisskopf, Elsner & O'Dell 2010). In the case of no intrinsic polarization, $a_0 = 0$, the distribution simplifies substantially to

$$P(N, a) = \frac{Na}{4\pi} \exp \left(-\frac{N}{4}a^2 \right), \quad (8)$$

and this expression can be readily integrated to find the probability of measuring an amplitude, a , if there is no intrinsic polarization. The amplitude that has a 1% chance of being measured is referred to as the *minimum detectable amplitude* (MDA), and it is relatively straightforward to show that $MDA = 4.29/\sqrt{N}$. The polarization amplitude that would produce this modulation amplitude in a particular detector system is called the *minimum detectable polarization* (MDP), and based on the discussion above is just $MDP = MDA/\mu = 4.29/(\mu\sqrt{N})$.

Furthermore, if we are not concerned with the position angle, ϕ , then we can integrate equation (3) over angles and obtain the distribution,

$$P(N, a, a_0) = \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} P(a, \phi) d\phi = \frac{a}{\sigma^2} \exp\left(-\frac{(a^2 + a_0^2)}{2\sigma^2}\right) I_0\left(\frac{aa_0}{\sigma^2}\right) \quad (9)$$

where I_0 is the modified Bessel function of order zero, and $\sigma^2 = 2/N$. This distribution is known as the Rice distribution (Rice 1945) and it reflects the fact that the amplitude is always a positive quantity, and so the distribution must go to zero for $a = 0$. An important property of this distribution concerns the second moment, which is related to the width, and is given by: $\langle a^2 \rangle = a_0^2 + 4/N$ which shows that the distribution width increases with a_0 .

The Rice distribution has relevance to a number of other research fields, including various signal processing applications (Abdi et al. 2001), magnetic resonance imaging (Sijbers et al. 1998) and radar signal analysis (Nilsson & Glisson 1980; Marzetta 1995). It is a common goal in many of these applications to estimate the amplitude parameter, a , of the Rice distribution from observed data. We note that the X-ray polarization case discussed here has similarities to these other applications but is more general in the sense that one is often interested in estimating both the amplitude, a , as well as the position angle, ϕ . It is beyond the scope of this paper to explore and compare a wide range of different parameter estimation methods, rather, here we focus on the case of least squares fitting using χ^2 methods.

4. Monte Carlo Simulations

We emphasize that the probability distribution given in the previous section is only rigorously correct under the assumption that the Stokes parameters are normally distributed and independent. Here we begin by exploring the accuracy of that assumption.

The procedure of generating modulation curves based on a particular choice of $S(\phi)$ is quite amenable to simulation with Monte Carlo techniques, and here we present results of such simulations, both in the case with $a_0 = 0$ and $a_0 > 0$, and essentially map-out the exact probability density numerically. For now we ignore background considerations and work only in terms of modulation amplitudes, that is, the following results can be considered applicable to any detector system, regardless of the μ value that characterizes its polarization sensitivity (see Elsner, O’Dell & Weisskopf 2012 for further discussion on the effect of backgrounds).

The simulations proceed as follows, for a given set of true parameter values, a_0 and ϕ_0 , we compute a number, M_{sim} , of simulated data sets. The total number of events in a particular realization is Poisson distributed with a mean of N photons. For the case of $a_0 = 0$ the distribution of angles, ϕ , is uniform, which can be readily simulated with a random number generator that produces uniform deviates. When $a_0 > 0$ we sample random angles from the true distributions by the so-called transformation method. We first compute the cumulative distribution of $S(\phi)$, then draw uniform deviates, x , and find the corresponding value of $\phi(x)$ in the cumulative distribution. We use the root finder *ZBRENT* implemented in *IDL* to solve for ϕ given x . We can thus draw a specific number of random events, N , from any true distribution.

For each simulated data set we bin the resulting angles to form a modulation curve and for each the Stokes form of the distribution (equation 4) is fitted to determine best-fit values for Q , U , and I , and their 1σ uncertainties, σ_Q , σ_U , and σ_I , respectively. We can then use the fitted Stokes parameters to express the results in terms of a and ϕ using the expressions defined above. The 1σ uncertainties, σ_a and σ_ϕ , can also be estimated by standard error propagation methods, which yields,

$$\sigma_a^2 = a^2 \left(\frac{Q^2 \sigma_Q^2}{(Q^2 + U^2)^2} + \frac{U^2 \sigma_U^2}{(Q^2 + U^2)^2} + \frac{\sigma_I^2}{I^2} \right), \quad (10)$$

and

$$\sigma_\phi \text{ (deg)} = (180/\pi) \left(\sqrt{(x^2)/(2(1+x^2))} \right) \left((\sigma_Q/Q)^2 + (\sigma_U/U)^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad (11)$$

where, $x = Q/U$, and σ_I , σ_Q , and σ_U are the standard 1σ uncertainties on the fitted quantities, I , Q and U . The procedure can then be repeated with different values of N . All the Monte Carlo simulations described here were done using *IDL*, and uniform deviates were obtained with *IDL*'s random number generator *randomu*. We use a least-squares fitting routine developed within *IDL* that is based on MINPACK-1 (Markwardt 2009). In all of the least squares fits all parameters are allowed to vary.

The basic procedure is illustrated in Figure 2, which shows a simulated modulation curve (solid histogram with error bars) and best fitting model (smooth black curve). The fitted Stokes parameter components are also indicated and labelled. This example is a single statistical realization of 15,000 events in $M = 16$ angle bins from the distribution $S(\phi) = 10 + 5\cos^2(\phi - 30(\text{deg}))$. The best-fit values and 1σ standard errors from the fit for I , Q , and U are 936.94 ± 7.65 , 148.29 ± 10.76 , and 96.84 ± 10.76 , respectively. The inferred amplitude and position angle are $a = (Q^2 + U^2)^{1/2}/I = 0.189 \pm 0.0115$ and $\phi_0 = (1/2)\tan^{-1}(Q/U) = 28.43 \pm 1.74$ deg, and are entirely consistent with the true values $a = 5/(20 + 5) = 0.2$, and $\phi_0 = 30$ deg.

From the results of many such simulations one can compute the distributions of the fitted parameters, I , Q and U . In doing this we confirm that these distributions are Gaussian to very good accuracy. Examples are given in Figure 3, which shows the resulting distributions of I , Q and U (with their means subtracted) from 10,000 realizations using the same angular distribution as used to produce Figure 2, but with $M = 40$. Since the mean-subtracted distributions of Q and U were consistent with each other, we fit a Gaussian model to the summed distribution. The best-fitting Gaussian models are also plotted in Figure 3.

We next explored simulations using a wide range of intrinsic amplitudes, a_0 , and searched for correlations amongst the resulting mean-subtracted distributions. From this analysis it is evident that the parameters Q and U are statistically independent for any intrinsic amplitude. That is, a scatter plot of $Q - \langle Q \rangle$ versus $U - \langle U \rangle$ is circularly symmetric about the origin. However, we find that both Q and U are not independent of I , indeed they are correlated in a manner which is proportional to the intrinsic amplitude. Figure 4 shows a pair of scatter plots computed from a simulation using the angular distribution $S(\phi) = 7 + 16\cos^2(\phi - 55(\text{deg}))$, which has a large modulation amplitude of $16/30 = 0.533$. Plotted are the mean-subtracted best-fit values of I versus Q (black symbols), and Q versus U (red symbols) for 100,000 realizations. These simulations were computed with a mean number of counts $N = 30,000$. A positive correlation is evident in the I versus Q points (black symbols), but the Q versus U distribution appears circularly symmetric, that is, uncorrelated. To further quantify this we also computed the linear correlation coefficients as a function of amplitude for a set of simulations. The results are shown in Figure 5 where the coefficients for Q versus U , Q versus I , and U versus I are denoted by the “error bar,” “square,” and “ $\times$ ” symbols, respectively. This clearly demonstrates that Q and U are uncorrelated, but that Q and U are both correlated with I , with the magnitude of the correlation coefficient increasing with amplitude.

In addition, we find that the variance of the distributions of Q and U depends on the intrinsic amplitude. To quantify this effect we computed the fractional change in the standard deviation, $(\sigma - \sigma_0)/\sigma_0$, for each fitted parameter (I , Q and U) from a large suite of simulations. Because the variance of the distributions in Q and U are equal, as a practical matter we compute the average of the two. Here, σ is the standard deviation of each fitted parameter computed from simulations, and $\sigma_0^2 = N/M^2$ and $2N/M^2$ for the distributions in I , and Q and U , respectively. These are the expected variances in the limit that the intrinsic amplitude is small and equation (7) is exact. The results are shown in Figure 6,

where the values for I and the average of the Q and U distributions are denoted by the “diamond” and “square” symbols, respectively. Each pair of points here was computed from 400,000 realizations. From Figure 6 it is evident that the variance of I is independent of the amplitude and is consistent with $\sigma_0^2 = N/M^2$, but that the variance in both Q and U is systematically smaller than σ_0 in an amplitude-dependent manner. The inset panel of Figure 6 shows a zoom-in of the low amplitude portion of the plot, and demonstrates that the change is quite small for low amplitudes. Even at an amplitude of 30% the percentage decrease in the standard deviation is only about 1%. However, above 50% the deviation increases sharply, and approaches 20% as the amplitude reaches unity. A polynomial in powers of the amplitude (up to a^4) provides a good fit to the values for the Q and U distributions from these simulations, and this functional form is the solid curve in Figure 6. It has the form $(\sigma - \sigma_0)/\sigma_0 = P_0 - P_1 a_0 - P_2 a_0^2 - P_3 a_0^3 - P_4 a_0^4$. The best fitting coefficients for P_0 through P_4 are, -1.79×10^{-3} , -0.0451 , 0.40 , -0.594 , and 0.458 , respectively.

The above results demonstrate that for the measurement of modulation curves appropriate to X-ray polarimetric data the Stokes parameters are independent, gaussian random variables to good approximation as long as the intrinsic amplitude is not too large. Our results have quantified how accurate the approximation is as a function of the modulation amplitude. For example, even at an intrinsic amplitude of 30% the distributions of Q and U are only about 1% narrower than the same distributions at zero amplitude. Thus, for many applications use of equation (7) is warranted, however, for cases where large modulation amplitudes are expected, or very precise results required, then some caution should be exercised in its use.

4.1. Results with $a_0 = 0$: Minimum Detectable Amplitude (MDA)

For the case of $a_0 = 0$ we can compute the distribution of best-fit amplitudes, a , for a large number of simulations. From this distribution we can then estimate the value $a_{1\%}$ that has a 1% chance probability of being measured. This is just the familiar MDA described above. Figure 7 shows a comparison of the results from such simulations (blue square symbols) versus the analytic expression given above, $4.29/\sqrt{N}$ (solid line). We computed $M_{sim} = 10,000$ simulations for these results, and we used $M = 16$ position angle bins for the modulation curves. Figure 7 shows that the $a_0 = 0$ simulations are in good agreement with the analytic result, as we would expect in this case since as we showed above equation (7) is exact in the limit as $a_0 = 0$. This gives us further confidence that our simulation procedures are correct.

4.2. Results with $a_0 > 0$: Detection of Polarization

We can now explore a number of issues with regard to detection of polarization. For example, how many counts are needed to measure a modulation amplitude to a particular precision, and for a given precision in the amplitude measurement, how accurately can the position angle be measured?

To address these questions we perform additional simulations using true distributions with specified amplitudes and position angles. For the illustrative examples below we used two different amplitudes, both with $\phi_0 = 0$, however, we have explored many different cases and all the results summarized here are independent of the particular values of a_0 or ϕ_0 used. The example distributions described below are; $S(\phi) = 10 + 1 \cos^2(\phi - 0)$ and $S(\phi) = 10 + 2 \cos^2(\phi - 0)$. These examples correspond to intrinsic modulation amplitudes, a_0 , of $1/21$ and $2/22$, respectively. For a specific detector these would correspond to

polarization amplitudes, $a_p = 1/(21\mu)$, and $2/(22\mu)$. We emphasize that for these modest amplitudes use of equation (7) to describe the probability density should be a very good approximation.

To determine the number of counts, N , needed to reach a polarization sensitivity given by the MDP value we require that $\text{MDP} = 4.29/\mu\sqrt{N} = a_p = a/\mu$, and thus $a = 4.29/\sqrt{N}$. Note that here μ cancels out, and to achieve MDP values at these amplitudes requires $(21^2) * 4.29^2 = 8116.21$, and $(22/2)^2 * (4.29)^2 = 2226.90$ counts, respectively. Note that this may seem a trivial point, but it's important to keep the terminology as precise as possible. Below we will compare the counts needed to reach a certain MDP, N_{mdp} , and the counts needed to measure the same amplitude of polarization to a certain precision, N . While N and N_{mdp} will individually depend on μ , the ratio, N/N_{mdp} , cannot depend on μ , that is, it is independent of the detector system employed.

With $a_0 > 0$ we compute for different values of N a large number, M_{sim} , of realizations, to each of which is fitted the Stokes distribution (equation 4) to determine the best fit values of I , Q , and U (and thus a and ϕ), and their 1σ uncertainties (as illustrated in Figure 2). We thus simulate the distributions of a and ϕ for different N .

4.3. Single Parameter Confidence Regions

Here we present the results of our simulations in several ways. First, we used the results from $M_{sim} = 1,000$ realizations for different values of N to find the mean values of a , and ϕ and their 68% confidence ranges. These are derived for each parameter independently of the other, that is, they are 1-dimensional (single parameter) ranges. For example, if one were interested in asking the question, is a source (or population of sources) polarized, without regard to the particular position angle of the electric vector, then the 1-d distribution would

be appropriate. We explore the joint, 2-dimensional distributions below in §4.4.

Figure 8 shows an example simulated distribution of measured amplitudes, a , computed with $N = 20,000$ events and $a_0 = 2/22$ (with $\phi_0 = 0$). The left panel shows the differential (binned) distribution, and the right panel shows the same results expressed as a cumulative distribution. We also computed similar distributions for the measured position angle, ϕ .

Procedurally we use the estimated cumulative distributions to identify the mean of each distribution (ie., for both a and ϕ), and the two values a_{max} and a_{min} that enclose 68% of the distribution. This then gives the 1σ uncertainty, $\sigma_{a,1d} = (a_{max} - a_{min})/2$ (we also compute the corresponding values for the ϕ distribution). We can then compute the quantity $\beta_{1d} = a_{mean}/\sigma_{a,1d}$, which can be thought of as the “number of sigmas” of the measurement. We now explore the behavior of several quantities as a function of β_{1d} .

The first is the ratio N/N_{mdp} (see Figure 9), where N is simply the number of events (photons) simulated (ie. the number of observed counts in the modulation curve), and $N_{mdp} = 4.29^2/a_0^2$ is just the number of counts that would be required to reach an MDA equal to the true amplitude, a_0 . This ratio can be thought of as the additional observing time required to measure the true amplitude to a given significance compared to the time needed to reach an MDA equivalent to the true amplitude. How might we expect this ratio to depend on β ? From equation (10) and the fact that $\sigma_Q = \sigma_U$ it is straightforward to show that $\sigma_a^2/a^2 \equiv \beta^{-2} \approx 2/(Na^2)$ (there is strict equality in the limit of small a). We can then substitute $a^2 = a_{MDP}^2 = (4.29)^2/N_{MDP}$, and a little arithmetic then demonstrates that $N/N_{MDP} = \beta^2(2/4.29^2)$. The black diamond symbols in Figure 9 show the results of simulations using the example distributions described above with $M_{sim} = 1,000$ for different values of N , and that the expected β^2 dependence is a good match to the simulations.

One can also present the results in a slightly different but complementary way. In the above simulations we have essentially carried out many simulated observations and

computed the distribution of “observed” values of the amplitude and position angle, but in reality an observer may not have the luxury of making such a large number of independent observations of a particular source. All any observer can do is to observe some number, N , of photons from the source, construct a modulation curve and fit it as we have done in the simulations described above. From this procedure we obtain four quantities, a , σ_a , ϕ , and σ_ϕ . This constitutes a measurement of the polarization parameters, or more simply, a measurement of polarization. Here, the uncertainties, σ_a , and σ_ϕ , are obtained for a specified confidence level and number of degrees of freedom. For example, for the 1σ (68.3%), single parameter confidence ranges we would find the change in each parameter that produces a $\Delta\chi^2 = 1$ (while allowing the other parameter to vary in the fitting procedure). For a 2-dimensional, joint confidence region at the same level of confidence (68.3%) we would find the $\Delta\chi^2 = 2.3$ contour in the $a - \phi$ plane (see, for example, Lampton et al. 1976).

For the diamond symbols in Figure 9 above we used the mean values and 1σ uncertainties derived from the distributions computed from many simulated observations to obtain β_{1d} , however, one can also use the “measured” quantities from each simulated observation to compute $\beta_{obs,1d} = a/\sigma_{a,1d}$. One can then plot the observed quantities for each simulated observation, where now $N_{mdp}(a)$ is computed using the best-fit value for a and the formula $a = 4.29/N_{mdp}^{1/2}$. We have done this and show the results in Figure 9 with the colored symbols. That is, the colored points are these “measured” values from individual simulations. The red symbols were computed with $N = 10,000$, $a_0 = 2/22$, $\phi_0 = 0$ (deg), the blue used $N = 20,000$, $a_0 = 2/22$, $\phi_0 = 0$ (deg), and the green with $N = 24,000$, $a_0 = 3/25$, and $\phi_0 = 22.5$ (deg). We see that the distribution of “measured” points falls along the same relations as that deduced from the simulated distributions of a , and ϕ , as indeed they should since they are sampling the same distributions. This way of presenting the results of the simulations makes a more direct connection with actual polarimetric observations, as we only plot quantities that one would obtain directly from a

single observation. To the extent that actual observations are dominated only by Poisson counting noise and for which the background is small, then they must fall along the relations followed by the simulated observations shown in Figure 6. Indeed, the locus of points traced out by the “measured” values from individual simulations can be easily approximated by simply plotting curves that intersect the entire swarm of simulated points. Doing this we find that $N/N_{mdp} = \beta_{obs,1d}^2/9.2$ (lower dashed curve in Figure 9), which agrees with the result deduced above from equation 10.

We also explored simulations where the true amplitude a_0 was set equal to the MDA. Figure 10 shows the cumulative distribution of the “measured” values of β from several such simulations. One can see from Figure 10 that roughly 60% of the time one would “measure” the amplitude, a , at the 3σ level, or better. We emphasize that this relation is based on the 1-d (single parameter) confidence range for a , and would be appropriate only for the case of addressing the question of the detection of a significant modulation amplitude independent of the position angle. We now explore the joint, 2-dimensional confidence regions.

4.4. Joint Confidence Regions for a and ϕ

For a 2-dimensional confidence region we need to find the contour in the $a - \phi$ plane that encloses a specified fraction of the best-fit pairs. For a 1σ region (68.3% confidence) this is the contour that satisfies $\Delta\chi^2(a, \phi) = 2.3$, where $\Delta\chi^2 = \chi^2(a, \phi) - \chi_{min}^2(a_{best}, \phi_{best})$. We again use the Stokes decomposition and compute $\Delta\chi^2(I, Q, U)$ on grids of I , Q and U around the best-fit values, I_{best} , Q_{best} , and U_{best} . We can then convert the grids of Stokes parameters into the appropriate values of a and ϕ and find the boundaries of the region that satisfies $\Delta\chi^2 \leq 2.3$. We next find the maximum and minimum value on the boundary for each parameter. We can then define $\sigma_{a,2d} = (a_{max} - a_{min})/2$ and $\sigma_{\phi} = (\phi_{max} - \phi_{min})/2$, where a_{max} , a_{min} , ϕ_{max} and ϕ_{min} are the maximum and minimum values on the contour

of a and ϕ , respectively. Figure 11 shows a pair of 1σ confidence regions computed in this fashion. Results from two simulations are shown, one with a lower amplitude, $a_{0,low} = 2/24$, and one with a higher amplitude, $a_{0,hi} = 3/25$. Both simulations were performed with $\phi_0 = 25$ deg (these true parameters are marked by the red diamond symbols), and $N = 10000$. In each case a modulation curve was randomly sampled using the true amplitude and position angle, and the simulated data were then fitted to determine the best-fit values of the amplitude and position angle. These points are shown by the green square symbols. The shaded areas show the regions of a and ϕ around each best-fit pair that satisfy $\Delta\chi^2 \leq 2.3$. The horizontal and vertical dotted lines mark the maximum and minimum values on the regions for each parameter. One can see that the size of the confidence region grows for smaller intrinsic modulation amplitudes (as one would expect), and that the confidence regions are in general not circular. The fact that the best fit value (green square symbol) and 1σ contours did not enclose the “true” values (red diamond symbol) for the higher amplitude example was just the “luck of the draw” for this single realization.

The probability distribution expressed earlier (§3) in equation (7) can also be used to derive an analytic expression for the 2-d confidence contour in the $a - \phi$ plane for any desired level of confidence, as long as the intrinsic amplitude is not very large (as is satisfied by the simulations just presented). This approach has been investigated by Weisskopf et al. (2010). They derive a pair of parametric relations for the values of a and ϕ on any confidence contour (see their equation 8). These expressions predict the correct range (extremes) in the amplitude, a , but overpredict the range in ϕ by a factor of 2, apparently because their original derivation neglected a switch from phase angle to position angle (Weisskopf, private communication). Thus, if one replaces all occurrences of ϕ , ϕ_0 and ψ with 2x the respective angle (eg., $\sin \phi_0 \rightarrow \sin 2\phi_0$) beginning at their equation (6), one obtains the following expressions;

$$a = \left(a_0^2 + \Delta a_C^2 + 2a_0\Delta a_C \cos 2(\psi - \phi_0) \right)^{1/2} \quad (12)$$

and

$$\phi = 1/2 \tan^{-1} ((a_0 \sin 2\phi_0 + \Delta a_C \sin 2\psi)/(a_0 \cos 2\phi_0 + \Delta a_C \cos 2\psi)), \quad (13)$$

where $\Delta a_C = (-4 \ln(1 - C)/N)^{1/2}$, with C and N being the desired confidence level and number of detected photons, respectively, and ψ is just a parametric angle that varies around the contour. The thick blue curves in Figure 11 were drawn using these expressions with $N = 10,000$, $C = 0.683$ (ie., 1σ), and the pair (a_0, ϕ_0) given by the appropriate best fit values (green square symbols). These contour curves provide an excellent match to the boundaries of the shaded regions, as we would expect at these relatively low amplitudes for which equation (7) is a good approximation to the exact probability density.

We can now compute the value $\beta_{2d} = a_{best}/\sigma_{a,2d}$ for each particular simulation. This again quantifies the “number of sigmas” of the measurement, but now reflects the fact that it is a *joint* measurement of both a and ϕ together. Results from a number of such simulations are also shown in Figure 9, where we plot the same figure of merit, N/N_{mdp} , as before, but now using $\beta = a_{best}/\sigma_{a,2d}$. This curve is again quadratic in β but rises more steeply than the 1d relation, because $\sigma_{a,2d}$ is larger than $\sigma_{a,1d}$. In agreement with Weisskopf et al. (2010) we find that the 2d relation is very well approximated as $N/N_{mdp} = \beta^2/4.1$, and this is the dashed line running through the square symbols.

To further quantify the behavior as a function of amplitude we explored additional simulations with larger modulation amplitudes. An example of how the confidence contours defined by equations (12) and (13) (which were derived from equation (7)) over-predict the true size at large amplitudes is shown in Figure 12. The symbols have the same meanings as in Figure 11. This simulation had $a_0 = 2/3$ and $\phi_0 = 30$ (deg), and was computed with $N = 8000$ events. The shaded region is again the joint 1σ confidence region satisfying $\Delta\chi^2 \leq 2.3$, and the blue curve, which clearly over-predicts the confidence region, is from equations (12) and (13). For completeness we also determined N/N_{mdp} for several larger

amplitude values. We find that for amplitudes $a_0 = 1/3$, $1/2$, and $2/3$, $N/N_{mdp} \approx \beta^2/4.4$, $\beta^2/5.1$, and $\beta^2/6.1$, respectively.

We also show in Figure 13 the position angle uncertainty, σ_ϕ in degrees (at 1σ confidence) as a function of $\beta = a_{best}/\sigma_{a,2d}$. We find that this relation can be very well approximated as $\sigma_\phi = 28.5(\text{deg})/\beta$. The β^{-1} dependence can be seen starting with equation 11. With $\sigma_Q = \sigma_U \equiv \sigma_{Q,U}$ and a bit of algebra one can show that $\sigma_\phi^2 = (180/\pi)^2 \sigma_{Q,U}^2 / 4(U^2 + Q^2)$. Substituting for $\sigma_{Q,U}^2 \approx 2N/M^2$ and replacing $(Q^2 + U^2) = a^2 I^2$ we find that $\sigma_\phi \propto (1/a)(1/N^{1/2})$. A final substitution of $a = a_{MDP} = 4.29/N_{MDP}^{1/2}$ shows that $\sigma_\phi \propto (N/N_{MDP})^{-1/2}$. Since we previously demonstrated that N/N_{MDP} scales like β^2 , this shows that $\sigma_\phi \propto \beta^{-1}$. Thus, a joint 3σ measurement constrains the position angle to better than 10 degrees.

5. Discussion and Summary

The MDP is a very commonly employed figure of merit to describe the polarization sensitivity of a detector system. In their recent paper Weisskopf et al. (2010) have argued that “more counts would be needed” to *measure* the polarization corresponding to the 99% confidence MDA rather than to just establish the same level. As we have shown this is correct in the sense of a “polarization measurement” being a joint measurement of both the amplitude a and position angle ϕ . This seems sensible, since it adds an additional requirement, that the measured a and ϕ both fall within a 2d confidence region. We have also shown that in the limit of small amplitudes the additional number of counts required is given by a factor of ≈ 2.2 . This factor decreases slowly with increasing intrinsic amplitude. For example, it has a value of ≈ 1.5 when $a_0 = 2/3$.

However, if one were to ask a different question, and were interested in establishing

simply that a source is polarized, with say, a 3σ measurement of the amplitude, a , without concern for the position angle ϕ , then the 1d (one interesting parameter) case is appropriate, and no extra counts are needed to measure the MDA. So, in some sense the answer one obtains depends on the question asked.

The MDP value has often been used to estimate observing times required to reach particular sensitivity levels. The results shown here demonstrate that exposure requests should clearly match the measurement goals of the desired scientific program. For example, if source modeling requires a joint measurement of both polarization parameters, then the appropriate time to reach a required precision for two interesting parameters should be requested.

It is a pleasure to thank Jean Swank, Keith Jahoda, Kevin Black, Joe Hill, Craig Markwardt, Phil Kaaret and Charles Montgomery for helpful discussions related to X-ray polarization measurements and instrumentation. We also thank Martin Weisskopf, Ronald Elsner and Stephen O’Dell for reviewing an earlier version of this manuscript, and much helpful feedback on the question of measuring polarization in the X-ray band. Finally, we thank the anonymous referee for their careful review which helped us improve this paper.

REFERENCES

- Abdi, A. et al. 2001, IEEE Communications Letters, Vol. 5, No. 3
- Bellazzini, R., Angelini, F., Baldini, L., et al. 2003, Proc. SPIE, 4843, 372
- Black, J. K., Deines-Jones, P., Hill, J. E., et al. 2010, Proc. SPIE, 7732, 25
- Black, J. K., Deines-Jones, P., Jahoda, K., Ready, S. E., & Street, R. A. 2004, Proc. SPIE, 5165, 346
- Costa, E., Soffitta, P., Bellazzini, R., et al. 2001, Nature, 411, 662
- Dean, A. J., Clark, D. J., Stephen, J. B., et al. 2008, Science, 321, 1183
- Elsner, R. F., O'Dell, S. L., & Weisskopf, M. C. 2012, Proc. SPIE, 8443
- Forot, M., Laurent, P., Grenier, I. A., Gouiffès, C., & Lebrun, F. 2008, ApJ, 688, L29
- Kestenbaum, H. L., Cohen, G. G., Long, K. S., et al. 1976, ApJ, 210, 805
- Lampton, M., Margon, B., & Bowyer, S. 1976, ApJ, 208, 177
- Markwardt, C. B. 2009, Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XVIII, 411, 251
- Marzetta, T. L. 1995, in Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoust., Speech, Signal Processing, Detroit, MI, 3651
- Nilsson, A. A. & Glisson, T. H., 1980, IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems, Vol 16, No. 6
- Pacciani, L., Costa, E., Di Persio, G., et al. 2003, Proc. SPIE, 4843, 394
- Rice, S. O. 1945, Bell System Technical Journal 24, 46-156
- Sijbers, J. et al., 1998, IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging.

Simmons, J. F. L., & Stewart, B. G. 1985, *A&A*, 142, 100

Vaillancourt, J. E. 2006, *PASP*, 118, 1340

Weisskopf, M. C., Silver, E. H., Kestenbaum, H. L., Long, K. S., & Novick, R. 1978, *ApJ*, 220, L117

Weisskopf, M. C., Cohen, G. G., Kestenbaum, H. L., et al. 1976, *ApJ*, 208, L125

Weisskopf, M. C., Elsner, R. F., & O’Dell, S. L. 2010, *Proc. SPIE*, 7732, 11




Fig. 1.— Geometry relevant for photoelectric polarimeter measurements. Photons travel from figure top to bottom. Photoelectrons are preferentially emitted in the plane perpendicular to the photon direction of travel (in this case the X - Y plane), and their initial direction is indicated by the azimuthal angle ϕ .




Fig. 2.— An example of a simulated modulation curve (histogram with error bars) and best fitting model (smooth black curve). This example is a single statistical realization of 15,000 events from the distribution $S(\phi) = 10 + 5\cos^2(\phi - 30(deg))$. The three best-fit Stokes components, I (blue), Q (red), and U (green) are also indicated. The solid black curve is the sum of the colored curves. The unpolarized level, $I - (Q^2 + U^2)^{1/2}$, is also indicated. See the text (§4) for further details of this particular simulation.




Fig. 3.— Example distributions of the fitted Stokes parameters I , Q and U from 10,000 simulations of the same angular distribution, $S(\phi)$, shown in Figure 2. For each simulation a modulation curve was computed with $M = 40$ phase angle bins. Shown are the mean-subtracted distributions of I and $(Q + U)/2$ along with the best-fitting Gaussian functions. The standard deviations determined from the fits are indicated by vertical dashed lines, and are consistent with $\sigma_I = (15,000/(40^2))^{1/2}$ and $\sigma_{Q,U} = (2 * 15,000/(40^2))^{1/2}$.




Fig. 4.— Distributions of $I - \langle I \rangle$ versus $Q - \langle Q \rangle$ (black diamonds) and $Q - \langle Q \rangle$ versus $U - \langle U \rangle$ (red diamonds) from a representative simulation with a large intrinsic amplitude of $16/30$. The black diamonds show a clear correlation whereas the red symbols are circularly symmetric (no evident correlation). See §4 for further details of this particular simulation.




Fig. 5.— Linear correlation coefficients as a function of intrinsic amplitude for a representative set of simulations. The coefficients for Q versus U , Q versus I , and U versus I are denoted by the “error bar,” “square,” and “ $\times$ ” symbols, respectively. These results were computed from 100,000 realizations. The error bars have a size of $(1/100,000)^{1/2}$, and are only plotted for the Q versus U results but are appropriate to all the coefficients. The simulations with $a < 35\%$ had $\phi_0 = 30(\text{deg})$, while those with $a > 35\%$ had $\phi_0 = 55(\text{deg})$. This accounts for the “discontinuous” behavior of the Q versus I and U versus I coefficients. This plot clearly demonstrates that Q and U are statistically independent variables, but that Q and U are both correlated with I in an amplitude dependent manner.




Fig. 6.— Standard deviations of the distributions in I , Q and U versus amplitude from a large suite of simulations. The results are shown as the percentage deviation from σ_0 , the expected variance in the limit that equation (7) is valid. Shown are the results for the distribution of I (diamond symbols) and, since the distributions of Q and U have the same variance, the average for the Q and U standard deviations (square symbols) from 400,000 realizations at each amplitude value. The solid curve is a 4th order polynomial fit to the Q and U values. The inset panel shows an expanded view of the low amplitude behavior. See §4 for further details of these simulations.




Fig. 7.— The amplitude, $a_{1\%} \equiv MDP$ ($\mu = 1$), vs the number of counts, N , obtained from simulations described in §4.1 (blue squares), and the analytic formula (solid curve, §3).




Fig. 8.— Example 1d distributions in the amplitude, a , computed from Monte Carlo simulations. The left panel shows the differential distribution (binned), and the right panel shows the cumulative distribution. To estimate the mean we find the midpoint (triangle symbol), and the 1σ extremes, a_{min} and a_{max} at cumulative fractions of 0.16 and 0.84, respectively (square symbols, enclosing 68% of the distribution). The corresponding amplitude values are also indicated with vertical dotted lines in the left panel.




Fig. 9.— Plot of $N/N_{\text{mdp}}(a)$ as a function of β , the “number of sigmas” of the measurement. Both the 1d amplitude distribution ($\sigma_{a,1d}$, independent of the position angle) and the 2d joint distribution ($\sigma_{a,2d}$), are shown. The black diamond symbols are derived from the results of $M_{\text{sim}} = 1000$ simulations for different values of N (see discussion in §4.3). The colored symbols are the results of individual simulations where β is derived from the best-fit amplitude, a , and its 1d, 1σ uncertainty, $\sigma_{a,1d}$. The red symbols were computed with $N = 10,000$, $a_0 = 2/22$, $\phi_0 = 0$ (deg), the blue used $N = 20,000$, $a_0 = 2/22$, $\phi_0 = 0$ (deg), and the green with $N = 24,000$, $a_0 = 3/25$, and $\phi_0 = 22.5$ (deg). The solid dashed curve for the 1d case is given by $N/N_{\text{mdp}}(a) = \beta^2/9.2$. The black square symbols show the 2d confidence region results (see discussion in §4.4). The curve running through the 2d results is given by $N/N_{\text{mdp}}(a) = \beta^2/4.1$




Fig. 10.— Plot of the cumulative distribution of $\beta = a/\sigma_{a,1d}$ for several different simulations all satisfying the condition that $a = \text{MDA}$. A vertical line is plotted at $\beta = 3$ (the nominal 3σ detection criterion), and which is close to the most probable value (the distribution is not exactly gaussian, ie. symmetric). See the discussion in §4.3 for more details.




Fig. 11.— Confidence regions and contours in the (a, ϕ) plane. Results from two simulations are shown. Simulated modulation curves were computed with $N=10,000$ counts for two different intrinsic amplitudes both with a position angle of 25 degrees. These values are marked by the red diamond symbols. The resulting best fit parameter values (green squares) and confidence regions (shaded areas) are shown. The shaded regions are the $\Delta\chi^2 < 2.3$ regions (1σ for 2d confidence regions). The horizontal and vertical dotted lines denote the extremes in each parameter and are used to compute $\sigma_{a,2d}$ and $\sigma_{\phi,2d}$. The blue contour curves were computed from the analytical expressions in §4.4.




Fig. 12.— Confidence region in the (a, ϕ) plane from a simulation with a large intrinsic amplitude $a_0 = 2/3$. Symbols are the same as in Figure 11. The shaded area is the $\Delta\chi^2 < 2.3$ region (1σ for 2d confidence regions). The blue contour curve was computed from the analytical expressions in §4.4 (equations 12 and 13), and clearly overpredicts the size of the confidence region for this large amplitude. See the text in §4.4 for further details.




Fig. 13.— Plot of the position angle uncertainty, σ_ϕ (1σ , in degrees), derived from the 2d confidence regions, as a function of β_{2d} , the “number of sigmas” of the measurement. The solid dashed curve is given by $\sigma_\phi = 28.5 / \beta_{2d}$.