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Closure phase is the phase of a closed-loop product of spatial coherences formed by a \( \geq 3 \)-element interferometer array. Its invariance to phase corruption attributable to individual array elements acquired during the propagation and the measurement processes, subsequent phase calibration, and errors therein, makes it a valuable tool in interferometry applications that otherwise require high-accuracy phase calibration. However, its understanding has remained mainly mathematical and limited to the aperture plane (Fourier dual of the image plane). Here, we lay the foundations for a geometrical insight which has been lacking. We develop and demonstrate a shape-orientation-size (SOS) conservation theorem for images made from a closed triad of elements, in which the relative location and orientation of the Null Phase Curves (NPCs) of the three interferometer responses (“fringes”) are preserved, even in the presence of large element-based phase errors, besides overall translation of the fringe pattern. We present two geometric methods to measure the closure phase directly in the image plane (without requiring an aperture-plane view) with a simple 3-element array and its interference pattern: (i) the closure phase is directly measurable from the positional offset of the NPC of one fringe from the intersection of the other two fringe NPCs, and (ii) the squared closure phase is proportional to the product of the areas enclosed by the triad of elements and the three fringe NPCs in the aperture and image planes, respectively. We validate the geometric understanding of closure phase in the image plane using observations with the Karl G. Jansky Very Large Array radio telescope, and with the Event Horizon Telescope. These results verify the SOS conservation theorem across a wide range of radio interferometric conditions. We also generalize these geometric relationships to an N-element interferometer. This geometric insight can be potentially valuable to other interferometric applications, particularly, optical interferometry. We also highlight close parallels existing between interferometric closure phases, structure invariants in crystallography, geosciences including interferometric synthetic aperture radar and seismic imaging, time-delay interferometry in gravitational wave experiments, and phases of Bargmann invariants in quantum mechanics.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of closure phase in radio interferometry can be traced back to Jennison in 1958 \textsuperscript{14}. Closure phase provides information on the phase encoded in the spatial coherences due only to the intensity distribution of sources of electromagnetic (EM) radiation in the sky, without the need for calibration to correct for corruption of the phases of the EM waves due to propagation effects and the array receiver elements themselves. The invariance of the closure phase to phase corruptions of the incident EM wave that can be factorized into element-based phase terms, has been extensively tested and applied in interferometry. This property has played a significant role in the development of a popular calibration scheme called “self-calibration” \textsuperscript{22,23}. Moreover, closure phase is known for its measure of the centrosymmetry or point-symmetry (morphological symmetry around a point) as well as for its invariance to translation of the spatial intensity distribution of the EM radiation \textsuperscript{23}.

These properties have made it a valuable tool in experiments that face challenges due to the requirement of high-accuracy phase calibration of the instrument to correct for the phase corruptions introduced by array elements, as well as by the propagation medium. Closure phases have thus been used in optical interferometry to deduce the structures of stars \textsuperscript{9,9} Very Long Baseline Interferometry (VLBI) experiments, such as the Event Horizon Telescope (EHT) imaging of the shadow of the supermassive black hole in M87 \textsuperscript{10,11}. Recently, closure phase has provided a useful avenue towards detecting the neutral Hydrogen structures during the cosmic reionization (at redshifts, \( z \gtrsim 6 \)) using its characteristic 21 cm spectral line redshifted to low radio frequencies with interferometer arrays \textsuperscript{16,20}.

Closure phase has close parallels with the “structure invariants” (such as the triplet and quartet phases) in crystallography \textsuperscript{21,22}, geosciences applications using seismic imaging \textsuperscript{23} and references therein], interferometric synthesis aperture radar (InSAR; \textsuperscript{24} and synthesis aperture sonar \textsuperscript{25}, time delay interferometry (TDI) \textsuperscript{26} and references therein] in gravitational wave (GW)
detection experiments, as well as with the phase of the $N$-vertex Bargmann invariants [27], also known as the geometric phase or the Pancharatnam phase or the Berry phase [28–31] in optics and quantum mechanics, the understanding of which has made significant advances [32].

Despite extensive use and successful applications spanning several decades, a physical insight into the interferometric closure phase has remained elusive. The complex, higher-order dependence on the moments of the spatial intensity and spatial coherence [19] [33] makes it very challenging to gain a geometric intuition of this special quantity. The primary aim of this paper is to provide foundational steps towards building a geometric insight for closure phases measured in an interferometer array. It is anticipated that this insight will result in the aiding of, and the benefiting from, parallels in other fields such as those mentioned above as well as in widening the spectrum of similar synthesis interferometry applications.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II sets up the interferometry context. Section III introduces the closure phase of an $N$-polygon interferometer array. In section IV, we present the geometrical characteristics, and direct geometrical methods for the estimation of closure phase in the image plane using a 3-element interferometer, through a derivation of the shape-orientation-size conserving property of closure phase. A validation via an application to real radio interferometric data from observations of bright cosmic objects at centimeter wavelengths using the Karl G. Jansky Very Large Array (VLA) radio telescope, as well as in the VLBI regime at millimeter wavelengths using publicly available EHT data is provided in Section V. We also identify and discuss analogs of closure phase in other fields such as optical interferometry, crystallography, gravitational waves, geometries, and quantum mechanics in Section VI and appendix C. In Section VII, we provide a generalization to a closed $N$-polygon array of interferometer elements accompanied by details of the derivation in the appendices. The findings are summarized in Section VIII.

II. THE INTERFEROMETRY CONTEXT

Consider measurements of a single polarization state of a complex-valued, quasi-monochromatic electric field, $E_a(\lambda)$, integrated over a narrow band around the wavelength, $\lambda$, of the incident EM radiation by $N_A$ array elements at locations $x_a$, with $a = 1, 2, \ldots, N_A$ in the aperture plane. The space between any pair of array elements (commonly referred to as the baseline vector in radio interferometry) is denoted by $x_{ab} \equiv x_b - x_a$. The spatial distribution of the intensity of the EM radiation in the image plane, $I(\hat{s}, \lambda)$, and the corresponding spatial coherence of the electric fields (also known as visibilities in radio interferometry) in the aperture plane, $V_{ab}(\lambda)$, exhibit a Fourier-transform relationship with each other

\[ V_{ab}(\lambda) \equiv \langle E_a^*(\lambda) E_b(\lambda) \rangle \]

\[ = \int_\Omega \Theta(\hat{s}, \lambda) I(\hat{s}, \lambda) e^{-i2\pi u_{ab} \cdot \hat{s}} d\Omega, \]  

where, the angular brackets, $\langle \cdot \rangle$, represent a true ensemble average, $\hat{s}$ denotes a unit vector in the direction of any location in the image, $u_{ab} \equiv x_{ab}/\lambda$ defined on the aperture plane denotes the array element spacings projected on the plane perpendicular to the direction of the phase center, $\hat{s}_0$, in the image. In the Fourier relationship, $u_{ab}$, by definition, represents the spatial frequencies of the structures in $I(\hat{s}, \lambda)$. The array element’s power response in a given direction, $\hat{s}$, is denoted by $\Theta(\hat{s}, \lambda)$, and $d\Omega$ denotes the differential solid angle in the image plane perpendicular to $\hat{s}$. The vectors $\hat{s}$ and $u_{ab}$ can be represented on a Cartesian coordinate frame with orthogonal basis vectors, $\hat{e}_x$, $\hat{e}_y$, and $\hat{e}_z$. In this frame, $\hat{s} \equiv l \hat{e}_x + m \hat{e}_y + n \hat{e}_z$ with $l^2 + m^2 + n^2 = 1$, where $l$, $m$, and $n$ denote the direction-cosines of $\hat{s}$. And, $u_{ab} \equiv u_{ab} \hat{e}_x + v_{ab} \hat{e}_y + w_{ab} \hat{e}_z$.

Figure II depicts the modeled locations of three array elements in units of wavelengths (chosen at $\lambda = 21$ cm) that will be used in the initial examples that follow. The cyclic ordering of the element indices is indicated by the arrowed circle. The three spatial frequencies, $u_{ab}$, are shown by dashed, dash-dotted, and dotted lines, which will be used to denote the corresponding fringes in the image plane in subsequent figures.
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ray elements are inevitably corrupted by complex-valued “gain” factors introduced by the intervening medium as well as the array element response. The corrupted measurements are denoted by $E_a'(\lambda) = g_a(\lambda)E_a(\lambda)$, where $g_a(\lambda)$ denotes the net corruption factors introduced in the measurement process factorizable in such a way that it is attributable to the individual elements. Thus, a calibration process, which estimates $g_a(\lambda)$ [denoted by $\tilde{g}_a(\lambda)$], is usually required to correct for these gains to estimate the true electric fields,

$$\tilde{E}_a(\lambda) = \tilde{g}_a^{-1}(\lambda)g_a(\lambda)E_a(\lambda) = G_a(\lambda)E_a(\lambda),$$

(3)

where, $G_a(\lambda) = \tilde{g}_a^{-1}(\lambda)g_a(\lambda)$ is the net residual gain after calibration.

The calibrated estimate of the spatial coherence is

$$\tilde{V}_{ab}(\lambda) = G_{ab}(\lambda)(E_{a}(\lambda)E_{b}(\lambda)) = G_{ab}(\lambda)\left|V_{ab}(\lambda)\right|e^{i\delta_{ab}(\lambda)} \tag{4}$$

where, $\xi_a(\lambda) = \arg G_a(\lambda)$, $\phi_{ab}(\lambda) = \arg V_{ab}(\lambda)$, and

$$\hat{\phi}_{ab}(\lambda) = \arg \tilde{V}_{ab}(\lambda) = \phi_{ab}(\hat{\lambda}) + \xi_b(\lambda) - \xi_a(\lambda). \tag{7}$$

In an ideal calibration process, $G_a(\lambda) = 1$, and thus $\xi_a(\lambda) = 0$, $\forall \lambda$. However, it is often difficult to realize in practice.

A basic image of the apparent intensity, $\Theta(\hat{s}, \lambda) \tilde{I}(\hat{s}, \lambda)$ (also known as “dirty” image in synthesis imaging in radio interferometry), can be reconstructed by superposition of the image plane responses from the calibrated spatial coherence measured on each of the array element spacings in the aperture plane,

$$\Theta(\hat{s}, \lambda) \tilde{I}(\hat{s}, \lambda) \equiv \sum_{a,b=1}^{N_x} \tilde{F}_{ab}(\hat{s}, \lambda) = \sum_{a,b=1}^{N_x} \tilde{V}_{ab}(\lambda) e^{i2\pi u_{ab} \cdot \hat{s}}, \tag{8}$$

where, $\tilde{F}_{ab}(\hat{s}, \lambda)$ is the response of a single interferometer (visibility measured on one baseline), called the “fringe” on the image plane corresponding to $\tilde{V}_{ab}(\lambda)$, and is defined as

$$\tilde{F}_{ab}(\hat{s}, \lambda) \equiv \left|\tilde{V}_{ab}(\lambda)\right|e^{i[2\pi u_{ab} \cdot \hat{s} + \phi_{ab}(\lambda) + \xi_b(\lambda) - \xi_a(\lambda)]} \tag{9}$$

with $\arg \tilde{F}_{ab}(\hat{s}, \lambda) = 2\pi u_{ab} \cdot \hat{s} + \phi_{ab}(\lambda) + \xi_b(\lambda) - \xi_a(\lambda)$. Ideally, $\xi_a(\lambda) = \xi_b(\lambda) = 0$, in which case $\arg F_{ab}(\hat{s}, \lambda) = 2\pi u_{ab} \cdot \hat{s} + \phi_{ab}(\lambda)$.

The null-valued (or zero-valued) isophase contours (and their equivalents offset by multiples of $2\pi$), hereafter referred to as the null phase curves (NPC) of the fringes, are given by

$$2\pi u_{ab} \cdot \hat{s} + \psi_{ab}(\lambda) = 0, \quad a, b = 1, \ldots, N, \text{ with } a \neq b, \tag{10}$$

where, $\psi_{ab}(\lambda) = \phi_{ab}(\lambda) + 2\pi n_{ab}$, and $n_{ab}$ (an integer) accounts for the NPC offset from the principal NPC ($n_{ab} = 0$) by integer multiples ($n_{ab}$) of $2\pi$. When traversing anywhere on these NPC, no change in phase is acquired, and hence this set of NPCs can be considered as isophase contours in the image plane.

Using coordinate geometry, it can be shown that the signed positional offset, $\delta s_{ab}(\lambda)$, of the fringe NPC from the phase center (origin) along a perpendicular and the corresponding phase offset, $\psi_{ab}(\lambda)$, are related by

$$\psi_{ab}(\lambda) = 2\pi \left|u_{ab}\right| \delta s_{ab}(\lambda). \tag{11}$$

Because $u_{ab}$ is the spatial frequency of a fringe, $1/|u_{ab}|$ represents the spatial period of the periodic fringe (or the fringe spacing) in the image plane and corresponds to a phase change of $2\pi$, as verified by setting $\delta s_{ab}(\lambda) = 1/|u_{ab}|$ in Equation (11).

Figure 2 shows the ideal fringes, $F_{ab}(\hat{s}, \lambda)$, in the image plane in direction-cosine coordinates, $(\ell, m)$, given by Equation (3) for the three modeled array element spacings and the corresponding visibilities shown in Figure 1. The + symbol marks the phase center (origin). The fringe NPCs, described by Equation (11), are shown in line styles corresponding to those in Figure 1. The black line in each panel denotes the principal NPC ($n_{ab} = 0$) of the corresponding fringe. The various gray lines denote the secondary NPCs ($n_{ab} > 0$) of the fringes. The positional offset, $\delta s_{ab}(\lambda)$, of the principal fringe NPC from the phase center is shown by the magenta segments and corresponds to $\phi_{ab}(\lambda)$ (the principal visibility phase) according to Equation (11). In the case of uncalibrated visibilities, these phase offsets also include the corruption due to the complex voltage gains, $\xi_a(\lambda)$, of the array elements.

### III. CLOSURE PHASE IN INTERFEROMETRY

Hereafter, we will assume that the apparent intensity as “seen” by the array elements, $\Theta(\hat{s}, \lambda) I(\hat{s}, \lambda)$, remains identical between them. Consider $N$ elements forming an $N$-vertex polygon in the aperture plane. The element spacings in the adjacent sides in the polygon are given by $x_{a[a+1],N} \equiv x_{a+1,N} - x_a$, where $[a]_N \equiv a \mod N$. Thus, a closed loop in the aperture plane is expressed as

$$\sum_{a=1}^{N} u_{a[a+1],N} \equiv 0. \tag{12}$$

The interferometric closure phase measured post-calibration on the closed $N$-polygon is

$$\hat{\phi}_N(\lambda) \equiv \sum_{a=1}^{N} \arg \tilde{V}_{a[a+1],N}(\lambda) = \sum_{a=1}^{N} \arg \tilde{V}_{a[a+1],N}(\lambda). \tag{13}$$

Because $\sum_{a=1}^{N} \arg G_a^*(\lambda)G_{a[a+1],N}(\lambda) \equiv 0$,

$$\hat{\phi}_N(\lambda) = \phi_N(\lambda) = \sum_{a=1}^{N} \arg V_{a[a+1],N}(\lambda), \tag{14}$$
where, $\phi_N(\lambda)$ is the true closure phase on the $N$-polygon. Therefore, the closure phase is invariant to element-based voltage gains, $g_a(\lambda)$, the corrections from calibration, $\tilde{g}_n(\lambda)$ and $G_a(\lambda)$, as well as the errors therein, making it a true observable physical property of the structures in the image-plane intensity distribution. This property is a form of **gauge-invariance** with respect to any element-based phases acquired during the measurement process.

One of the consequences of this gauge-invariance in interferometry is that the closure phase is also invariant to translation in the image plane. This can be shown by replacing $\hat{s}$ with $\hat{s}' = \hat{s} - \hat{s}_0$, where $\hat{s}_0$ is an arbitrary choice for the origin of the image plane, usually referred to as the **phase center** in interferometry. From Equation (2), such a translation modifies the spatial coherence as

$$V'_{ab}(\lambda) = e^{i2\pi u_{ab} \cdot \hat{s}_0} V_{ab}(\lambda),$$

which simply introduces an additional phase factor, $e^{i2\pi u_{ab} \cdot \hat{s}_0}$, that is factorizable into element-based phase factors as $e^{i2\pi x_{ab} \cdot \hat{s}_0}/\lambda$ and $e^{-i2\pi x_{ab} \cdot \hat{s}_0}/\lambda$. Due to the gauge-invariance discussed above, the closure phase is therefore independent of the phase factors introduced by translation in the image plane. Conversely, the translation invariance of the closure phase is simply a special case of the gauge-invariance to the phase factors attributable locally to the array elements.

The gauge-invariance property of the closure phase has proved to be invaluable in astronomy applications involving detection of structures using interferometry, particularly in situations where the phase calibration of the array elements to a very high level of accuracy is challenging. A few of the diverse applications include the goal of detecting of neutral hydrogen structures in the cosmic web from the early universe [18, 20], the EHT imaging of the supermassive black hole in M87 [13], and characterizing the complex structures on stellar surfaces and their surroundings [6-9] and references therein.

### IV. SHAPE-ORIENTATION-SIZE (SOS) CONSERVING GEOMETRY OF CLOSURE PHASE

In the following, we mathematically derive, and then demonstrate with model and real data, the underlying geometric nature of closure phase using the image-plane fringes of a closed triad of array elements, in the case when visibility phase corruption can be assigned to individual elements, and is not idiosyncratic to a given baseline. The geometric behavior manifests itself as a ‘shape-orientation-size’ (SOS) conservation, in which the relative locations and orientations of the three NPCs from a closed triad of array elements are conserved in the presence of large phase errors, except possibly an overall translation in the image plane. The derivation relies on two key points.

First, by definition, the position of an interferometric fringe in the image plane relative to some chosen reference point (such as the phase tracking center in radio interferometry), is directly proportional to the visibility phase relative to that phase reference point. The phase reference point itself can be adjusted to fit the situation, with no loss of generality.

And second, if the phase of one element of the closed
triad is corrupted, this corruption affects the phases of the two fringes that contain this array element in an opposite sense, such that the location of the three-fringe pattern in the image plane for a closed loop of elements just shifts, while the pattern itself is preserved exactly. The element-based phase corruption for a triad can be visualized as a tilt of the aperture plane of the triad, which then shifts, but does not alter the geometry of the three-fringe interference pattern in the image plane (discussed in detail later using Figure 4).

Below, we provide a mathematical basis for the geometric characteristics of closure phase in the image plane, beginning with a triad (3-polygon). We derive mathematical methods to measure the closure phase using the three-fringe image pattern, without resort to an aperture plane transform. Hereafter, we assume that the locations of the array elements are coplanar, and thus without loss of generality, we choose a plane where $w_{ab} \equiv 0$. We further assume a flat image plane without significant curvature effects, usually referred to as narrow field of view or “flat sky” approximation ($\ell, m \ll 1$) in radio interferometry. The effects of non-coplanarity and curvature of the image plane will be the subject of future study.

A triad ($N = 3$) is the simplest closed shape for studying the closure phase or the bispectrum phase and will form the basis later for characterizing the behavior on N-polynomials with $N > 3$. Consider the three fringes $F_{a[a+1]N}(s, \lambda)$ corresponding to $V_{ab}(\lambda)$ with $N = 3$ and $a, b = 1, 2, 3$. The set of NPCs for each fringe, $F_{a[a+1]3}(s, \lambda)$, in the image plane is simply obtained from Equation (10) as

$$2\pi u_{a[a+1]3} \cdot s + \psi_{a[a+1]3}(\lambda) = 0, \quad a = 1, 2, 3.$$ (15)

A. Relation to the Phase Center

In Equation (15), $\psi_{a[a+1]3}(\lambda)$ represents the phase offset from the phase center, which has been implicitly assumed to be at $s_0 \equiv (0, 0, 1)$. Thus, the closure phase on the 3-polygon is

$$\psi_3(\lambda) \equiv \sum_{a=1}^{3} \psi_{a[a+1]3}(\lambda),$$ (16)

which is the sum of the phase offsets of the individual fringe NPC from the phase center. Geometrically, the phase offsets are obtained from Equation (11) by measuring the respective positional offsets along the perpendiculars dropped from the phase center to each of these fringe NPC [Equation (15)] normalized by the respective fringe spacing along the perpendiculars. For a calibrated interferometer, these measured phase offsets from the phase center for the fringes relate directly to the object’s position and structure on the sky, modulo $2\pi u_{a[a+1]3}$.

If the phase center is shifted to some arbitrary $s_0$, then by defining $s' = s - s_0$, Equation (15) can be written as

$$2\pi u_{a[a+1]3} \cdot s' + \psi_{a[a+1]3}'(\lambda) = 0, \quad a = 1, 2, 3.$$ (17)

Then, the closure phase with the shifted phase center is

$$\psi_3'(\lambda) \equiv \sum_{a=1}^{3} \psi_{a[a+1]3}'(\lambda) = \sum_{a=1}^{3} \psi_{a[a+1]3}(\lambda) + 2\pi \delta s_0 \sum_{a=1}^{3} u_{a[a+1]3} = \psi_3(\lambda) + 2\pi \delta s_0 \sum_{a=1}^{3} u_{a[a+1]3},$$ (18)

where, we have used Equations (12) and (16). This reiterates, using a fringe-based geometric viewpoint in the image plane, that the closure phase is invariant under translation.

Moreover, the phase center, $s_0$, can be conveniently chosen to be at the point of intersection of any of the two fringe NPCs, for instance, $F_{12}(s, \lambda)$ and $F_{23}(s, \lambda)$. Because $s_0$ lies on the NPCs of both $F_{12}(s, \lambda)$ and $F_{23}(s, \lambda)$, by definition, $\delta s_{12}'(\lambda) = \delta s_{23}'(\lambda) = 0$, and therefore, $\psi_{12}'(\lambda) = \psi_{23}'(\lambda) = 0$ from Equation (11). Hence,

$$\psi_3'(\lambda) = \psi_{31}'(\lambda) = \psi_{31}(\lambda) + 2\pi u_{31} \cdot s_0 = \psi_{31}(\lambda) - 2\pi \left(u_{12} + u_{23}\right) \cdot s_0 = \sum_{a=1}^{3} \psi_{a[a+1]3}(\lambda) = \psi_3(\lambda).$$ (19)

Thus, when the phase center is chosen to be at the intersection of any of the two fringe NPCs, the closure phase has a simple relation

$$\psi_3(\lambda) = \psi_{a[a+1]3}(\lambda) = 2\pi u_{a[a+1]3} \delta s_{a[a+1]3}'(\lambda).$$ (20)

from Equations (11) and (19), where, $\delta s_{a[a+1]3}'(\lambda)$ is the positional separation of the intersection vertex, which is now the chosen phase center, from the opposite fringe NPC corresponding to $F_{a[a+1]3}(s, \lambda)$.

Figure 3a illustrates these relations geometrically. The color scale shows the net superposition of the three ideal interfering fringes, $F_{a[a+1]3}(s, \lambda)$, in the image plane shown individually earlier in Figure 2. The black and gray lines denote the principal and secondary NPCs of the fringes, respectively, with line styles corresponding to those in Figures 1 and 2. The + symbol marks the phase center (or the origin) and is denoted by O in magenta. The positional offsets, $\delta s_{a[a+1]3}'(\lambda)$, of the principal fringe NPCs from the phase center are shown as magenta lines annotated by the corresponding principal visibility phases, $\phi_{a[a+1]3}(\lambda)$, obtained using Equation (11). When the phase center is conveniently chosen to be the intersection of any two of the three principal fringe NPCs (denoted by $O'$ in red, blue, and brown), the modified visibility phases, $\phi_{a[a+1]3}'(\lambda)$, are proportional to the positional offsets, $\delta s_{a[a+1]3}'(\lambda)$, of the principal fringe NPCs from the so-chosen phase center shown by the corresponding colored lines, according to Equation (20). The same equation also implies that each of

---

3 We note that, for a given vertex, there can be flipped or com-
these modified principal visibility phases, \( \phi'_a f_{(a+1)j} (\lambda) \), is equal to the principal closure phase, \( \phi_3 (\lambda) \), or in general, \( \psi_3 (\lambda) = \psi'_a f_{(a+1)j} (\lambda) , \forall a \) when the 2\( \pi \) phase ambiguity (represented by \( n_{ab} \)) is accounted for.

Figure 3 illustrates geometrically the gauge-invariance of the 3-polygon closure phase for uncalibrated and translated (in the image plane) fringes in the left and the right panels, respectively, but the discussion applies to both scenarios equally. Both scenarios cause a displacement of the fringes and the NPCs relative to the ideal case in Figure 3a. As a result, the individual principal visibility phases, \( \phi_{a(a+1)j} (\lambda) \), relative to the default phase center, \( O \), are differently offset relative to the ideal case. However, the closure phase, which is the sum of these three phases remains unchanged. This is also clear when the phase center is shifted to one of the three vertices of intersection between any pair of the fringe NPCs (denoted by \( O' \) in red, blue, and brown), the modified phase offset, \( \phi'_{a(a+1)j} (\lambda) \), corresponding to the positional offset of an intersection vertex from its corresponding opposite fringe NPC, \( \delta \phi_{a(a+1)j} (\lambda) \) given by Equation (20), remains unchanged compared to the ideal case. It is important to note that the displacement of the fringes in either case is constrained to be parallel to themselves such that the triangle enclosed by the three vertices of intersection (the gray shaded region), while translated, conserves its shape, orientation, and size (SOS), and thus the area too, independent of the choice of the phase center. Through a geometric picture, we can clearly confirm that the closure phase is gauge-invariant and closely related to the properties of the triangle enclosed by the fringe NPCs in the aperture plane, and not to the phase center, calibration, or image-plane translations.

Note that the option to choose the phase center to be a point of intersection of the fringe NPCs applies only when the fringe NPCs are not parallel to each other. A special case arises when the array elements lie on a collinear arrangement on the aperture plane. The resulting fringes are all parallel to each other yielding no definite intersections between the fringe NPCs that could serve as the preferred phase centers. In fact, due to the presence of the element-based phase terms, the uncalibrated fringes will be offset from each other differently relative to the calibrated case. However, the closure phase is well-defined even in this scenario. An arbitrary phase center can be still chosen, including anywhere on one of the fringe NPCs, and the closure phase is given by Equation (18), which is still valid and cancels the element-based phase terms as in the general case.

B. Relation between Areas in Aperture and Image planes

In the preceding section, we have seen clear evidence that the closure phase is intricately linked to the geometric characteristics of the triangle determined by the fringe NPCs, encapsulated by SOS conservation. This motivates further investigation of geometric properties, specifically the relation between the areas of the triangles enclosed by the fringes and the array elements in the image and aperture planes, and the closure phase. Indeed, it can be shown that

\[
\psi_3^2 (\lambda) = 16\pi^2 A_{43} (\lambda) A_{T3} (\lambda),
\]

where, \( A_{T3} (\lambda) \) is the area of the triangle enclosed by the three fringe NPCs in the image plane, \( A_{43} (\lambda) \) denotes the area of the triangle formed by the three vertices denoting the array elements in the aperture plane in units of wavelengths squared. The subscripts \( T \) and \( A \) in \( A_{43} (\lambda) \) \( A_{T3} (\lambda) \) and \( A_{43} (\lambda) \) denote the image and the aperture plane, respectively, while the subscript 3 denotes a 3-polygon. \( A_{T3} (\lambda) \) is dimensionless as it is obtained using direction-cosine coordinates. See Appendix [A] for a detailed derivation of this result and associated caveats.

Thus, the product of the areas enclosed by the triad of array elements and the 3-fringe NPC in the aperture and image planes, respectively, is proportional to the closure phase squared, and is thus gauge-invariant too. Figure 3 illustrates the quantities in this relationship. \( A_{T3} (\lambda) \) is denoted by the gray shaded area, while \( A_{43} (\lambda) \) is the area enclosed by the array elements in Figure 1 in wavelength squared units. In this example, \( A_{T3} (\lambda) \approx 1.78 \times 10^{-6}, \)

\( A_{43} (\lambda) \approx 34410.43, \) and \( \psi_3 (\lambda) \approx -3.11 \) radians, thereby confirming the validity of Equation (21). Thus, using coordinate geometry in the image plane in angular coordinates, this work provides a detailed derivation of the equivalent findings using a quantum mechanical formalism in [38].

C. A Geometric Reasoning for the Translation

Here, we provide a geometrical reasoning for the translation of the three-fringe interference pattern in the presence of one or more aperture element-based phase errors. Although fully valid in a radio interferometric context, it is easily described from an optical interferometry viewpoint.

In the context of aperture masking in optical interferometry, the three circles (indexed by 1, 2, and 3) in the aperture plane (Figure 1), correspond to the small unmasked regions of a larger parabolic mirror.² If we assume beam combination of the type used in most aperture masking experiments, i.e., image-plane combination

² The mask, of course, is usually implemented in the pupil plane.
where pupil rescaling is the only type of pupil remapping performed, the fringe patterns in Figure 2 then correspond to the imaged fringes at the CCD in the focal plane of the telescope. In this case, the geometric dels are set by the shape and accuracy of the parabolic surface, and sidereal tracking of the fringes is performed by moving the full telescope. In radio interferometers, the array elements in the aperture plane coherently amplify the voltages, and geometric delays and sidereal fringe tracking are performed electronically, followed by cross-correlation of voltages from different array elements [see Equation (1)].

In this picture, a distortion of the wavefront’s phase at one of the unmasked apertures caused by turbulence in the propagation medium along its path, effectively translates to a simple displacement of the aperture element toward or away from the prime focus, resulting in a net path length or phase difference to the focus. We have shown that such a disturbance will shift the closed three-fringe pattern on the image plane, but will obey SOS conservation. It is easy to see why the three angles of the fringe triangle, and its orientation, are preserved, since these are set strictly by the geometry of the projected baselines which are predetermined, and thus the fringes can only shift perpendicular to the fringe length, as seen earlier and described by Equations (10) or (15). While less obvious, it remains physically intuitive that the lengths of the triangle’s sides are also preserved, since a phase distortion that can be associated with a single aperture affects the visibilities on the two baseline vectors that include this aperture with equal but opposite values, so that the two fringes involved shift relative to each other in such a way that the lengths between the intersecting vertices are preserved.
Figure 4 shows a schematic representation of what occurs when the electronic phase of one element in a closed triad is corrupted. The three dark circles indicate the elements in the aperture plane (in dark shade of gray), assumed to be on the \( Z = 0 \) plane, whose normal vector is indicated by the thick, solid upward arrow. These apertures can be considered unmasked regions in an aperture mask of an optical telescope, or radio antennas in a radio interferometer. The radiation is then directed from the elements to the focal (image) plane, wherein a three-fringe image is synthesized by the interference of the EM waves. Consider a phase corruption of one array element (indexed by \( a \)) by an amount \( \delta \xi_a(\lambda) \). Such a phase corruption is equivalent to a change in path length, \( \Delta D_a \) related by \( \delta \xi_a(\lambda) = 2\pi \Delta D_a/\lambda \), from that aperture element to the focal plane. Since three points usually determine a plane, one can visualize this phase corruption, or the extra path length, at one of the aperture elements as a tilting of the aperture plane relative to the original. The tilted aperture plane and its normal are shown by the light gray-shaded region and the dashed arrow, respectively. Such a tilt then directs the light in a different direction, leading to a shift of the interference pattern in the image plane. Each of the fringes from baselines that contain the phase-corrupted aperture element will be subject to a position offset in the image plane given by Equation (11), \( \Delta \delta \xi_{ab}(\lambda) = \delta \xi_a(\lambda)/(|u_{ab}|) \). Except for the shift, the three-fringe pattern, including the SOS characteristic, is otherwise conserved. This argument can be generalized to a scenario when more than one aperture element in a triad are subject to phase corruption because the three virtually phase-displaced elements will still define a tilted plane that will result in a translation, while obeying SOS conservation.

V. APPLICATION TO REAL DATA

We present three examples of closure phase visualization in the image plane, and the image-plane methods to estimate closure phase, using data from the Karl G. Jansky Very Large Array [VLA; 10], and from the Event Horizon Telescope (EHT). The VLA is a radio interferometer in New Mexico, comprised of 27 antennas of 25 m diameter each, arranged in a Y-pattern. The EHT is a global millimeter VLBI array involving 8 stations extending from Europe to Hawaii.

The first example involves VLA observations of the compact radio quasar 3C 286, including both calibrated data and uncalibrated data. The second involves VLA observations of a powerful extended radio galaxy with a complex morphology, Cygnus A, using calibrated data, and then purposefully phase-corrupted data. The third example involves EHT observations at high frequencies of the active nucleus in the nearby radio galaxy, M87 [11].

These examples span the range from simple to complex morphologies in the image plane, and from low to high frequencies with very different phase-stability criteria for the visibilities. These examples will demonstrate geometrically the well known fact that the closure phase is robust to phase errors that are interferometric element-based, but not baseline-based. We will characterize the geometric behavior of the fringe patterns in the image plane from calibrated and uncalibrated, or corrupted, data from a closed triad of element spacings, thereby demonstrating the SOS conservation property of closure phase, while remaining invariant to clearly noticeable translations in the image plane resulting from element-based phase corruptions. We will also verify that the closure phases can be estimated geometrically from the image plane, and that the results agree with those derived from the aperture plane data (visibilities) to within the estimated uncertainties.
A. Radio Quasar 3C 286

The first example employs observations of the radio quasar, 3C 286, which is a bright and highly compact object, often used for flux density and complex bandpass calibration at radio wavelengths. We employ the VLA in its largest (‘A’) configuration, and selected three antennas from the array, corresponding to a triangle with spacings (baselines) of 12.4 km, 7.5 km, and 15.0 km projected on a plane perpendicular to the direction of the phase center (coincident with the position of 3C 286). The flux density of the target object, 3C 286, at the observing wavelength of $\lambda = 3.2$ cm ($\nu = 9.4$ GHz), measured on these antenna spacings is $\approx 4.4$ Jy (1 Jy = $10^{-26}$ W m$^{-2}$ Hz$^{-1}$). 3C 286 is the dominant source of emission in the field of view. It has a compact core-jet structure, which on the spatial frequencies being considered herein essentially appears as an unresolved, point-like object [42].

The nearly point-like structure of 3C 286 implies a closure phase very close to zero, which further implies that the three fringe NPCs will intersect nearly at a point. Equation (20) then implies that the positional offset of the fringe NPC along its perpendicular from the opposite intersection vertex will be $\delta s_\perp (\lambda) \approx 0$.

We use a short 20 s observation made at $\lambda = 3.2$ cm with a narrow bandwidth of 20 MHz. At this wavelength, the spatial frequencies (in units of number of wavelengths) are $u_{ab} \approx 3.912 \times 10^5, \approx 2.371 \times 10^5$, and $\approx 4.749 \times 10^5$, respectively. The root-mean-square (RMS) level of thermal noise in the calibrated visibilities is $\approx 33$ mJy, estimated using the VLA exposure calculator using a 2 MHz spectral channel and a 20 s averaging time interval.

We consider both calibrated and uncalibrated data. With the former, the visibilities are expected to add coherently for a sky image, since instrumental and tropospheric phase terms at each element have been determined via a strong celestial calibrator (in this case, 3C 286 itself). The uncalibrated data includes electronics- and troposphere-induced phase offsets for each aperture element in the interferometer array, which need to be corrected via calibration before a coherent image of the target object can be synthesized.

From the superposed interference pattern from a triad of elements, there are numerous ways in which the fringe NPCs can be geometrically and directly determined from the image plane without recourse to the visibility data in the aperture plane. Here, we employed the following method. In the first step, we determine the intersecting vertices, $(\ell_{abc}, m_{abc})$, from the interference pattern of any pair of fringes in the image plane, typically using a peak-fitting algorithm. Of the many possible vertices, we preferentially choose the ones closest to the peak of the antenna power pattern which will yield the best signal-noise-ratio $(S/N)$. Next, given this vertex and the slopes of the two fringe NPCs from the accurately pre-determined projected element spacings (or spatial frequencies), $u_{ab}$, the individual fringe NPCs that contain this intersecting vertex can be determined. Finally, with the three vertices and the fringe NPCs determined, the closure phase can be measured geometrically using either the positional offset of an intersecting vertex from the opposite fringe NPC [see Equation (20)] or the area enclosed by the fringe NPCs [see Equation (21)].

The thermal noise in the measurements and other systematics will lead to uncertainties in the determined positions of the intersecting vertices of the fringe NPCs which will result in an uncertainty on the measured closure phase. The phase deviations on the measured visibility phases, $\psi_{ab} (\lambda)$, from thermal noise and random systematics in a high-$S/N$ regime ($S/N \gg 1$) follow a Gaussian distribution with a standard deviation that is inversely proportional to the $S/N$ [38,39]. The corresponding position error in the fringe NPCs is given by standard error propagation between the pertinent quantities, $\psi_{ab} (\lambda)$ and $\delta s_{ab} (\lambda)$, in Equation (11) as

$$[\text{Var} (\delta s_{ab} (\lambda))]^{1/2} = \frac{[\text{Var} (\psi_{ab} (\lambda))]^{1/2}}{2\pi |u_{ab}|} \approx \frac{(S/N)^{-1}}{2\pi |u_{ab}|},$$

which implies that the fractional phase error (relative to $2\pi$), $[\text{Var} (\psi_{ab} (\lambda))]^{1/2}/(2\pi)$, is equal to the fractional position error (relative to the fringe spacing, $1/|u_{ab}|$), $[\text{Var} (\delta s_{ab} (\lambda))]^{1/2}/(1/|u_{ab}|)$, in the image plane. This is also typically the case with astrometric errors in VLBI applications [30]. This error will also propagate into the estimate of closure phase. In the 3C 286 data analyzed here (2 MHz spectral channel, 20 s integration), the signal strength from 3C 286 and the thermal noise RMS in the visibilities are roughly uniform across the different aperture element spacings giving a $S/N \approx 133$ on each visibility.

Figure 5 shows the individual visibility fringes (color maps) before any amplitude or phase calibration for the projected array element spacings of $\approx 12.4$ km, $\approx 7.5$ km, and $\approx 15.0$ km in the left, middle, and right panels, respectively. The fringe NPCs shown by black lines (dashed, dot-dashed, and dotted for 12.4 km, 7.5 km, and 15.0 km element spacings, respectively) and the uncertainties therein were geometrically determined using the simple peak-fitting procedure described above. Note that the fitted fringe NPCs align remarkably well with the fringes due to the relatively high $S/N$ in the 3C 286 data. It must be emphasized that in the determination of the fringe NPCs, we did not use any aperture-plane measurements involving the visibilities, except the mathematically pre-determined aperture element spacings, $u_{ab}$. The J2000 Right Ascension (R.A.) and the Declination (Dec.) coordinates used are equivalent to the direction-cosine coordinates introduced earlier [36,37].
Figure 5 shows the images made by superposing the three fringes from calibrated (left panel) and uncalibrated (middle panel) data. The principal fringe NPCs are shown as black lines using the same line styles as in Figure 5. For the calibrated data, the fringe NPCs nearly intersect at a point, indeed, on a grid of points, including the position of 3C 286. Importantly, the uncalibrated fringes also result in a similar grid of points. The only change is that the grid shifts by about 0\′′.2 relative to the pattern seen in the calibrated data.

We also consider a counter-example in the right panel in which an 80° phase corruption occurs in a visibility in a baseline-dependent manner rather than through one or more individual antennas. In this case, two of the fringe NPCs whose visibilities were not corrupted will remain unchanged as they are unaffected by the corruption. Only the fringe NPC of the phase-corrupted baseline will be shifted (uncorrupted in white dashed line and corrupted in black dashed line). This will not result in a change of shape or orientation (which are set by the geometry of the baseline vectors), but will change the size of the triangle enclosed by the three NPCs which effectively modifies the closure phase. And the net three-fringe interference pattern appears to be very different than the calibrated and uncalibrated cases. Therefore, the closure phase and the SOS characteristic will no longer be conserved implying that the three-fringe interference pattern in the presence of baseline-dependent phase errors is no longer a true physical observable. This clearly demonstrates that strict closure phase and SOS conservation only occurs if the phase error can be attributed to individual array elements (thereby affecting the visibilities in two baselines with opposite signs), not an individual baseline.

Figure 7 shows a highly zoomed-in view of the left (calibrated) and middle (uncalibrated) panels of Figure 6 around the intersection points of the fringe NPCs. The gray-shaded regions denote twice the best-case RMS error expected in the geometrical determination of the principal fringe NPCs due to thermal noise as given by Equation 15. The principal fringe NPCs due to thermal noise are illustrated in Figure 7. The phase center is at the center of the images. The image coordinates are in Right Ascension (R.A.) and Declination (Dec.) at the J2000 epoch, which are equivalent to the direction-cosine coordinates used earlier [39, 37].
FIG. 6. (Color) Images made with the superposition of the three fringe patterns shown in Figure 5 from calibrated (left), uncalibrated (middle), and baseline-dependent phase-corrupted 3C 286 data (one visibility phase corrupted by 80°) from the VLA using the same black-colored line styles as before for the principal fringe NPCs. The calibrated and uncalibrated three-fringe interference patterns look identical except that the lack of calibration results in a net displacement of the interference pattern by ≈ 0′′2 relative to the calibrated fringes, which indicates the magnitude of the required phase calibration terms. Independent of calibration, the principal fringe NPCs in both cases are nearly coincident with each other which geometrically confirm that 3C 286 has a highly compact structure and the closure phase, φ(λ) ≈ 0 as expected, remains invariant even when the element-based instrumental and tropospheric phase corruption terms remain undetermined. A baseline-dependent phase error (80°, relative to the calibrated case) on one of the visibilities results in a shifting of the fringes corresponding to that corrupted visibility (from the uncorrupted fringe NPC shown in white dashed line to the corrupted fringe NPC in black dashed line), while the other two remain unchanged. The resulting three-fringe interference pattern is very different from the other two panels, and the fringe NPCs are no longer coincident as evident from the non-zero area of the triangle enclosed by the three black lines, and hence, the closure phase, φ(λ) ≠ 0 even for 3C 286, a point-like source. Thus, in the presence of baseline-dependent phase errors, the SOS conservation does not apply to the enclosed triangle, and the three-fringe interference image is no longer a true physical observable.

FIG. 7. (Color) A zoomed-in view of the left and middle panels in Figure 6. The gray-shaded regions indicate twice the RMS uncertainties in the determined positions of the fringe NPCs, which depend on the RMS phase errors [≈ (S/N)^-1 when S/N ≫ 1] in the measured visibilities, as in Equation (21). In this case, S/N ≈ 133. The level of these uncertainties imply that the differences in the measured closure phases [based on both the positional offset from any vertex to the opposite fringe NPC given by Equation (20), and the areas enclosed by the three fringes given by Equation (21)] using the calibrated and the uncalibrated cases are statistically consistent with each other (only ≲ 1σ significance in difference) and are also consistent with zero (only ≲ 2σ significance of being non-zero).

This result demonstrates a few important principles. First, the fact that the fringes intersect at a point even for the uncalibrated data confirms the invariance of closure phase (zero, for a point-like morphology), for an instrument in which the instrumental and tropospheric phase contributions can be factored into element-based terms as in Equation (4). But closure phase is not invariant to baseline-dependent phase errors. Second, the shift in the grid pattern in Figure 6 is a measure of the magnitude of antenna-based phase corruptions due to the instrument and troposphere. And third, the fact that the fringes intersect at close to a point implies that, for the VLA, the atmospheric and electronic phase corruptions to the data are predominantly factorizable into antenna-based gains, and are not dominated by corruptions that may be idiosyncratic to a given interferometric baseline.
B. Radio Galaxy Cygnus A (3C 405)

As a second example, we employ VLA observations at λ = 3.75 cm (ν = 8.0 GHz) of the bright, extended radio galaxy, Cygnus A [43]. Cygnus A has a total flux density of 170 Jy at this wavelength, distributed in two extended lobes with a full extent of 120″. The observations were made in the ‘D’ configuration of the VLA, which has a longest baseline of ≈ 1 km, corresponding to a spatial resolution of ≈ 8″. Figure 8 shows an image synthesized from 4 min and 128 MHz of these data. Cygnus A is noted to have complex spatial structure typical of an FR II morphology (edge-brightened with bright hotspots at the outer edges of their lobes) [43].

We choose three baselines in a rough equilateral triangle for estimating the closure phase, with baseline lengths and correlated flux densities = (797.1 m, 22.7 Jy), (773.7 m, 26.4 Jy), and (819.7 m, 38.3 Jy). We employ a single record with an integration time of 8 s and spectral channel width of 8 MHz, giving a thermal noise of ≈ 82 mJy in a single polarization.

We employ calibrated data, and then corrupt the phase of one of the array elements in a closed triad by 80″, as would occur if, for instance, there was a significant mis-calibration. From the aperture-plane visibilities, we calculate a closure phase for both the calibrated and corrupted visibilities of 112.7° ± 0.3°, where the uncertainty is set by the quadrature sum of the individual phase errors based on the respective visibility S/N (≥ 275) using Equation (22).

The images from summing all three fringes for calibrated and corrupted data are shown in Figure 9. In this case, the closure phase is clearly non-zero, and hence the three fringe NPCs do not intersect in a grid of points, as for 3C 286. However, a grid pattern remains visible in the three-fringe images, and this pattern repeats exactly, with a simple shift between the calibrated and corrupted data in the left and right panels, respectively. The phase corruption of a single antenna in the triad leads to a corresponding phase (or position) shift of the two corrupted fringes containing this antenna, and no change in the third fringe. The shifting of the pattern will then occur parallel to the uncorrupted fringe, as seen in Figure 9. From these, we calculate the closure phase in the image plane using the same process as employed for 3C 286 above, and find it to be 112.9° ± 1.5°, where the uncertainties were estimated using the uncertainties in the points of intersection determined using the peak-fitting procedure.

The closure phases were also estimated using the relations between the areas in the aperture and image planes. For the chosen triad, A_{23}(λ) ≈ 1.976 × 10^8 (in units of wavelengths squared). The corresponding image-plane areas enclosed by the NPCs, A_{23}(λ), are found to be ≈ 1.236 × 10^{-10} and ≈ 1.263 × 10^{-10} for the calibrated and corrupted fringes, respectively. Hence, the respective closure phases estimated are ≈ 112.5° and = 113.7°, which are consistent with the estimates above and confirm the relations derived in Section IV.

Although the image-plane estimate appears to have a higher uncertainty, it must be noted that our aperture-plane uncertainty calculation represents a best-case scenario assuming ideal thermal noise, ignoring imaging systematics around a bright, complex object such as Cygnus A. The value of closure phase inferred from the image plane is not only consistent with that estimated from the corrupted visibilities in the aperture plane, but also geometrically confirms that it is indeed independent of element-based calibration.

C. Event Horizon Telescope Observations of M87

As a third example, we have analyzed data provided by the VLBI-based EHT observations of the supermassive black hole in M87 [10–15]. We chose this example in order to sample a very different regime in radio interferometry, namely, much higher frequencies and much longer baselines. Therefore, the data are at a much finer spatial resolution (~ 20 μas), and the phase stability is more of a challenge relative to tied-array interferometry with the VLA.

5 Tied-array implies a distributed timing signal from a central local oscillator that provides relative stability for element phases across the array. For VLBI observations spanning intercontinental baselines, such as is employed with the EHT, phase-stable local oscillator distribution is impossible, and local timing has to be maintained via accurate hydrogen maser clocks at each station in the array. The synchronization of these clocks is one...
The EHT collaboration provides data\textsuperscript{6} that have had a priori gain (visibility flux density scale) calibration applied based on the measured system parameters at each telescope, as well as delay calibration via visibility fringe fitting, plus further adjustments based on a few redundant baselines in the array\textsuperscript{12}. The gain calibration provides reasonable visibility amplitudes (to within ~10%). The delay calibration provides enough phase stability to average the data in time to 10 s records, and in frequency to a single 1.875 GHz channel. Following the EHT collaboration nomenclature, we designate these data as the ‘network-calibrated data’. However, the EHT collaboration emphasizes that the initial calibration alone does not allow for phase-coherent imaging, since large element-based phase offsets can remain due to residual errors in the tropospheric model, or in station clocks, polarization leakage, or other errors. Subsequent element-based phase self-calibration is required to produce a phase-coherent astronomical image. They state: ‘Lack of absolute phase information and a priori calibration uncertainties in EHT measurements require multiple consecutive iterations of CLEAN followed by self-calibration, a routine that solves for station gains to maximize consistency with visibilities of a specified trial image (Pearson & Readhead 1984).’

We have performed a standard hybrid mapping process [imaging and self-calibration;\textsuperscript{4}, the results of which will be presented in (Carilli & Thyagarajan (2021)). In this section, we present the results of the closure phase image analysis that parallels the sections above on 3C 286 and Cygnus A.

Figure\textsuperscript{10} shows the results from our hybrid mapping process of the EHT data. We show the images synthesized at 229.1 GHz from the network-calibrated data, and after the hybrid mapping process in the left and right panels, respectively. The former does not produce a coherent image, due to the presence of large residual element-based phase uncertainties. After a simple hybrid mapping and self-calibration process, the image converges to an asymmetric ring with a maximum diameter of about 50 \mu m, consistent with the analysis of the EHT collaboration\textsuperscript{10, 13}. While we show the results using a starting model consisting of an annulus for the first iteration of phase self-calibration, the final ring morphology is robust to changes in simple starting models in the hybrid mapping process (see Carilli & Thyagarajan (2021)).

We select for our image plane closure calculation, a short integration (1 min) with the most sensitive closed triad in the array, namely, the baselines between the Atacama Large Millimeter Array (ALMA), the Large Millimeter Telescope (LMT), and the Submillimeter Array (SMA). We then generate the three-fringe images under three scenarios: (i) the network-calibrated data, (ii) the network-calibrated data, with the phase of one element corrected by 80°, and (iii) the self-calibrated data. The

\textsuperscript{6} The EHT data are publicly available at \url{https://eventhorizontelescope.org/for-astronomers/data}
results are shown in Figure 11 from left to right, respectively. The three-fringe interference image in all scenarios are identical besides an overall shift, thus clearly demonstrating the SOS conservation.

From the visibility data themselves, we derive closure phases for these three fringes of $+37.1^\circ$ for the network-calibrated data, $+37.9^\circ$ for the self-calibrated data, and $+37.1^\circ$ for the corrupted data. We calculate the uncertainty on these values by examining the scatter of the phases on the least sensitive baseline in the triad (LMT to SMA), over scans of 10 min to 15 min using 1 min records. The resulting phase RMS is $\sim 15^\circ$. This value is consistent with the signal-to-noise ratio on that visibility, which is between 4 and 5 (Lecture 9 [Wrobel & Walker]). We consider this RMS to be the error on the closure phase measurements, since the RMS phase scatter on baselines that include ALMA is more than 10 times lower, and hence does not contribute appreciably to the closure phase uncertainty.

Figure 11 also shows the three principal NPCs (black lines) determined geometrically in the image plane for each of the three scenarios. The right panel shows a zoomed-in view of the triangle enclosed by the three fringe NPCs. From this triangle enclosing a finite area, we estimate the closure phase in the image plane by applying the methods described in Section IV, similar to the 3C 286 and Cygnus A examples above. The calculation of closure phase from the phase-position offset method are $37.9^\circ$, $37.4^\circ$, and $41^\circ$ for scenarios 1, 2, and 3, respectively, with errors estimated from the fitting process of $\sim 20^\circ$. The closure phase estimates from the “product of areas” method are $37.8^\circ$, $37.1^\circ$, and $40.6^\circ$ for the three scenarios. Once again, the image-plane methods are not only consistent with each other, but also with the standard aperture-plane method based on summing the visibility phases presented above.

These results demonstrate that closure phases can be estimated in the image plane even in challenging interferometric experiments, such as high frequency EHT VLBI imaging of M87. Moreover, after a priori flux density calibration, Figure 11 shows that the snapshot three-fringe images are good observable representations of the true sky brightness, independent of antenna-based self-calibration or phase corruption, besides the overall translations. This can be compared to the network-calibrated vs. self-calibrated images in Figure 10 in which the former does not produce a coherent image. The reason is, while the snapshot three-fringe images on closed baselines may be true representations of the sky, they have independent unconstrained translations that, after summing, would not produce a coherent image.

The fact that the three fringe closure images are a good representation of the sky brightness, with arbitrary overall translations, raises the possibility of an image plane self-calibration, in which a simple starting model, such as a point source, is used to first align all the three fringe images, the sum of which provides an improved sky model. This second model can used to refine the alignments, with subsequent iteration as in any hybrid mapping sequence. Such a process would be the image-plane analog of closure phase imaging techniques described, for example, in [35] [35].

VI. PARALLELS TO OPTICAL INTERFEROMETRY AND OTHER DISCIPLINES

Here, we highlight an analogous application of closure phase in optical interferometric imaging in astronomy. Further in appendix C we also present a few examples of close parallels to the interferometric closure phase in other areas of physics such as crystallography, gravitational waves using laser interferometer arrays, quantum mechanics and polarized states of light, and geophysics that includes seismic tomography, and imaging using interferometric synthetic aperture radar (InSAR) and synthetic aperture sonar (SAS).

We have approached this problem from the perspective of radio interferometry imaging, but the insight is applicable to optical interferometry, with particular relevance to aperture masking interferometry [7] [46] [47]. Indeed, consideration of simple aperture masking provides further physical insight into the interpretation of closure phase in the image domain [35] [35].

In radio astronomy, the visibility phases are measured as the argument of the complex cross-correlation products of voltages between the antennas, as per Equa-
FIG. 11. (Color) Three-fringe interference images of M87 using a snapshot (1 min) of data from the EHT at 229.1 GHz. The stations involved are: ALMA, the LMT, and the SMA. The first panel (from left) shows the three-fringe interference pattern from the public EHT data on M87 that has a priori flux density scale and delay calibration applied. The second panel corresponds to the public data but with one element (ALMA) phase corrupted by 80°. The third panel is obtained by hybrid mapping and self-calibration. The three-fringe interference pattern is found to be the same across these panels except for an overall translation relative to each other. The fourth panel is an inset showing the zoomed-in view of the self-calibrated three-fringe interference pattern in the third panel. The fringe NPCs enclose a triangle of a finite area, thereby indicating a non-zero value for closure phase that was estimated from the image plane to be ≈38.8° and ≈38.5° from the “phase-position” and “product of areas” methods, respectively. These agree, within errors, with the value of ≈37.5° derived from the aperture plane measurements (i.e., the visibilities). Besides confirming that the three-fringe interference pattern remains the same except for relative overall shifts, these closure phase estimates were found to be consistent between the three panels denoting different degrees of calibration accuracy, thereby verifying the SOS conservation theorem.

In aperture masking optical interferometry, and in some other applications of interferometric structure determination, the magnitude of amplitude errors in the aperture element-based complex gains, and of non-closing (i.e., baseline-based) phase errors, is negligible. In this case, the conservation of the relative positions of the NPCs on a closed triad of apertures implies a stricter conservation of the true image of the sky itself for that baseline, contributes to a given spatial frequency in the image plane. Without the mask, the many redundant spatial frequencies that would normally occur using the full mirror, will incoherently add in the image plane (incoherence arising from turbulent phase structure over the telescope), leading to decoherence of the measured visibility. The exception is in the high Strehl ratio regime, meaning close to diffraction-limited optics, where the element-based phase errors, or “piston phases”, are small, and hence decoherence of redundant fringes is small. Such is the case for space telescopes.

\footnote{A non-redundant mask ensures that only one aperture pair, or}
VII. CLOSURE PHASES ON N-POLYGONS

The relations established for closure phases on a triad of array elements can be extended to generic closed N-polygons in the aperture plane. A closed N-polygon can be decomposed into \( N - 2 \) adjacent triads with each adjacent pair sharing a side and all such triads sharing a common vertex. The net closure phase on the N-polygon is simply the sum of the closure phases on the adjacent elemental triads defined here. This is because the visibility phase measured by the element spacing on the shared side between adjacent triads appears as the negative of each other and thus vanishes perfectly in the net sum (see also [51]).

As before, assuming non-parallel fringes, the intersection between the NPCs of fringes, \( F_{12}(\hat{s}, \lambda) \) and \( F_{N1}(\hat{s}, \lambda) \), can be chosen, for example, as the phase center, \( \hat{s}_0 \). Then, the visibility phases on these two fringes vanish because the NPCs of fringes \( F_{12}(\hat{s}, \lambda) \) and \( F_{N1}(\hat{s}, \lambda) \) pass through \( \hat{s}_0 \). The closure phase on the N-polygon is then determined by the rest of the \( N - 2 \) fringe NPCs. From Equation (15), the visibility phases of the fringe NPCs for the chosen phase center are

\[
\psi'_{ab}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 
0, & a = 1, N, \\
2\pi u_{ab} \cdot \hat{s}_0 + \psi_{ab}(\lambda), & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases}
\]  

with

\[
\psi_a[\alpha+1]_N(\lambda) = -2\pi u_a[\alpha+1]_N \cdot \hat{s}, \quad a = 1, 2, \ldots, N.
\]

Here, \( \psi'_{ab}(\lambda) \) is simply the phase offset proportional to the positional offset between \( \hat{s}_0 \) and each of the fringe NPCs given by Equation (11). Using Equation (15), the closure phase is obtained by summing the closure phases of each of the adjacent triads, which are effectively identical to the phase offsets, \( \psi_a[\alpha+1]_N(\lambda) \), corresponding to these position offsets. Thus, similar to Equation (18), we get

\[
\psi_N(\lambda) = \sum_{q=1}^{N-2} \psi_3(q)(\lambda) = \sum_{a=1}^{N} \psi'_{a[\alpha+1]_N}(\lambda),
\]

(24)

where the subscript \( q \) indexes the \( N - 2 \) adjacent triads constituting the closed N-polygon, and \( \psi_3(q)(\lambda) \) denotes the closure phase on triad \( q \). Note that, by choice of the phase center adopted here, \( \psi_{12}(\lambda) = \psi_{N1}(\lambda) = 0 \) from Equation (23), Equation (24) is a generalization of Equation (18) for the N-polygon. Figure 12 illustrates the above relation.

Note that all the relations throughout the paper hold for any arbitrary closed polygon in any configuration between the available vertices, including self-intersecting polygons, and not limited to only the convex or concave configurations. Each polygon configuration will have a unique closure phase, in general, of course.

We now examine whether the SOS conservation property applies directly to an N-polygon of fringe NPCs in the image plane when \( N \geq 4 \). This can be understood by perturbing the phase of one of the aperture array elements. This phase perturbation will affect two fringes whose baseline vectors contain this aperture element with opposite displacements of their respective fringe NPCs. However, the rest of the fringe NPCs will remain unchanged and are unconstrained by this change. Therefore, the superposed fringe interference pattern from all the \( N \) array elements \( (N \geq 4) \) will not be conserved on the whole. However, when the N-polygon is decomposed into adjacent, elemental triads, as described above, then the individual triad patterns will obey the SOS conservation theorem as discussed in earlier sections. This is further explained using a 4-polygon example in Appendix III.

The relationship established in Section [IVB] between the closure phase and the areas in the aperture and the image planes can be extended to an N-polygon by expressing it in terms of adjacent and elemental 3-polygon units as above, each of which obey gauge-invariance and SOS conservation. Consider the elemental triads (indexed by \( q = 1, 2, \ldots, N - 2 \)) all sharing a common vertex (denoted by index \( a = 1 \)) in the aperture plane. In a simple example with a 4-polygon \( (N = 4, q = 1, 2) \), it...
can be shown that
\[
\psi_1^2(\lambda) = 16\pi^2 \sum_{q=1}^{2} A_{A3(q)}(\lambda) A_{I3(q)}(\lambda) \\
+ 2 \sum_{q=1}^{2} \psi_{3(q)}(\lambda) \psi_{3(r)}(\lambda). \quad (25)
\]

It can be easily generalized to an \(N\)-polygon as
\[
\psi_N^2(\lambda) = 16\pi^2 \sum_{q=1}^{N-2} A_{A3(q)}(\lambda) A_{I3(q)}(\lambda) \\
+ 2 \sum_{q=1}^{N-2} \sum_{r=q+1}^{N-2} \psi_{3(q)}(\lambda) \psi_{3(r)}(\lambda). \quad (26)
\]

Alternatively, we can also express the relation between the area of the \(N\)-polygon in the aperture plane and the closure phases in the adjacent elemental triads as
\[
A_{AN}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \sum_{q=1}^{N-2} A_{A3(q)}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \sum_{q=1}^{N-2} \psi_{3(q)}(\lambda) A_{I3(q)}(\lambda). \quad (27)
\]

Both Equations (26) and (27) are gauge-invariant. The former expresses the closure phase on the \(N\)-polygon in terms of its adjacent elemental triads. The latter expresses the area of the \(N\)-polygon in the aperture plane as a weighted sum of closure phases on the adjacent elemental triads where the weights are inversely proportional to the areas enclosed by the fringe NPCs of the elemental triads. See Appendix B for details of the derivation and related caveats.

Although a detailed discussion of the propagation of measurement noise into the measured closure phases is beyond the scope of this paper and discussed in detail elsewhere [57, 58], the general trends of the noise properties of closure phases on \(N\)-polygons can be easily inferred. The phase noise in the individual fringe is, in general, analytically involved but is well approximated by a Gaussian distribution in a high S/N regime [31, 32]. The same applies to closure phases as well [57, 58]. Since the closure phase of an \(N\)-polygon interferometric array is the sum of the \(N\) individual fringe phases from Equation (24), the net uncertainty increases if the individual phase noises of the fringes are uncorrelated. As \(N\) increases, the net uncertainty in the closure phase will tend to follow a Gaussian distribution as governed by the Central Limit Theorem. In a high S/N regime, the net uncertainty will follow closely a Gaussian distribution and grow as \(\sim N^{1/2}\).

**VIII. SUMMARY**

Although the closure phase has been critically useful in interferometric applications, especially in astronomy, its inherently higher-order nature has made a detailed geometric intuition of this extremely valuable quantity elusive. This paper provides a basis for such an insight. We show how the closure phase can be visualized in the image plane, and we derive and demonstrate the shape-orientation-size (SOS) conservation theorem, in which the relative location and orientation of the three NPCs of a closed triad of array elements are preserved, even in the presence of large element-based phase errors, besides possibly an overall translation of the fringe pattern. We measure closure phase directly from interferometric images using two geometric methods, as opposed to using conventional visibility-based phase measurements in the Fourier domain (or the aperture plane).

The closure phase from a triad (3-polygon) of aperture elements is geometrically derived in the image plane to be the sum of the phase offsets of the fringe null phase curves (NPC), which are related to the positional offsets of the fringe NPCs from the phase center and the fringe spacings (inverse of the spatial frequencies of the image-plane intensity distribution or the element spacings, in units of number of wavelengths, projected onto a plane perpendicular to the direction of the phase center) through Equation (11). In most cases, the phase center can be conveniently chosen to be the vertex of intersection between any pair of fringe NPCs, and the closure phase is then the phase offset of the third fringe NPC relative to this vertex, which is obtained from the corresponding positional offset between this vertex and the third fringe NPC using Equation (24). Additionally, a gauge-invariant relationship is found to exist between the squared closure phase and the product of the areas enclosed by the triad of array elements and the triad of fringe NPCs in the aperture and image planes, respectively. We have now geometrically demonstrated in the image plane, via the SOS conservation theorem, the gauge-invariant nature of closure phase, namely, its invariance to phase corrections introduced by the propagation medium and the measurement elements, as well as any translations of the intensity distribution in the image, which has only been understood mathematically from the viewpoint of the aperture plane so far.

By analyzing real interferometric VLA observations of the bright radio quasar 3C 286 and the radio galaxy Cygnus A, and high frequency EHT VLBI observations of M87, we have independently estimated the closure phase using the conventional aperture-plane method and the direct geometric method in the image plane. The resulting closure phase values derived from the image and aperture planes are consistent with each other to within the expected levels of uncertainties. We also verify that the closure phase in real data is robust to antenna-based phase errors and calibration. The results confirm the SOS conservation over a wide range of radio interferometric conditions.

Although this geometric understanding of closure phase in the image plane (namely, SOS conservation), was motivated by radio interferometry for astronomy applications, we identify the existence of close parallels in,
The invariance of the interferometric closure phase to phase corruptions acquired locally during the propagation and the measurement processes that are locally attributable to the array elements is a form of gauge invariance, and thus, the closure phase is a true observable physical property of the spatial intensity distribution on the image plane, specifically the degree of centrosymmetry. Its invariance to translation is simply a manifestation of this gauge invariance.

We have generalized these gauge invariant relationships derived for closure phases on a triad, to an N-polygon interferometric array. Such higher-order closure phases are expected to have higher levels of uncertainty that grow as $\sim N^{1/2}$ due to intrinsic noise in real-world measurements.
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**Appendix A: Derivation of Closure Phase Relation to Areas in the Aperture and the Image Planes for a Closed Triad of Aperture elements**

There are multiple ways in which the area of a triangle formed by three intersecting coplanar lines can be determined. Here we present two methods of deriving the relationship between the closure phase and the areas in the image and the aperture planes given in Section IV B.

**Method 1**

This method, relatively more complicated than the alternate method presented further below, relies on determining the area of the triangle when the three vertices are known. As shown in Figure 3a, Equation (15) representing the three fringe NPCs reduces to three straight lines when expressed in the $(e_x, e_y, e_z)$-basis,

$$K_{\Delta} \cdot s + \Psi_{\Delta}(\lambda) = 0,$$

where the subscript $\Delta$ denotes that these equations apply to a closed 3-polygon consisting of three visibility phases.

When the fringe NPCs are not parallel to each other (the special case when they are parallel is discussed later), there are 3 points of intersection – one for each pair of adjacent rows permuted cyclically. Using the Cramer’s rule, the intersection between the fringe NPCs, $F_{ab}(s, \lambda)$ and $F_{bc}(s, \lambda)$, is given by

$$\ell_{abc} \cdot m_{abc} = \begin{pmatrix} 2\pi & \psi_{ab} & \psi_{bc} \\ 2\pi & \psi_{bc} & \psi_{ab} \end{pmatrix}$$

with, $C_{abc} = (2\pi)^2 \det \left( \begin{pmatrix} u_{ab} & v_{ab} \\ u_{bc} & v_{bc} \end{pmatrix} \right), (A4)$

$b = [a + 1]_3, \quad c = [a + 2]_3, \quad a = 1, 2, 3.$

The underline used in index $b$ denotes that this index is shared by the two intersecting fringes, $F_{ab}(s, \lambda)$ and $F_{bc}(s, \lambda)$. In Equation $[A3]$, $|M| = \det(M)$ for an arbitrary matrix $M$. The three points of intersection can be obtained by permuting the indices $a$, $b$, and $c$ cyclically as $1 \rightarrow 2, 2 \rightarrow 3$, and $3 \rightarrow 1$. If $K_{\Delta}(\lambda)$, an “augmented” version of $K_{\Delta}$, is defined as

$$K'_{\Delta}(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} 2\pi u_{12} & 2\pi v_{12} & \psi_{12}(\lambda) \\ 2\pi u_{23} & 2\pi v_{23} & \psi_{23}(\lambda) \\ 2\pi u_{31} & 2\pi v_{31} & \psi_{31}(\lambda) \end{pmatrix},$$

then the area of the triangle enclosed by the three fringe NPCs in the image plane is obtained using standard co-
ordinate geometry as
\[ A_{3}(\lambda) = \left[ \frac{\det(K_{\Delta}(\lambda))}{2} \right]^2 = \left[ \sum_{a=1}^{3} \psi_{ab}(\lambda) C_{abc} \right]^2 \]

where, the subscripts 1 and 3 in \( A_{3}(\lambda) \) denote the image plane and a 3-polygon (triad), respectively. \( A_{3}(\lambda) \) is dimensionless as it is obtained using direction-cosine coordinates. Noting that \( k = 2\pi/\lambda \) denotes the wavenumber of the incident EM radiation, it can be shown using Equation (12) that for a 3-polygon (triad) formed by vertices 1, 2, and 3,
\[ C_{123} = C_{213} = C_{312} = 2k^2 \tilde{A}_{A3} = 8\pi^2 A_{A3}(\lambda), \] with,
\[ A_{A3}(\lambda) \equiv \tilde{A}_{A3}/\lambda^2, \]
where, \( \tilde{A}_{A3} \) denotes the area of the triangle formed by the vertices \( a, b, \) and \( c \) in the aperture plane in units of physical distance squared, and \( A_{A3}(\lambda) \) denotes the same area normalized to have units of wavelengths squared. The subscripts \( A \) and 3 in \( A_{A3}(\lambda) \) and \( \tilde{A}_{A3} \) denote the aperture plane and a 3-polygon, respectively. Therefore,
\[ \psi_{A}^2(\lambda) = 16\pi^2 A_{A3}(\lambda) A_{3}(\lambda). \] Note that both the areas, \( A_{A3}(\lambda) \) and \( A_{3}(\lambda) \), individually are signed quantities depending on the sense of the cyclic order adopted while traversing the triad vertices, but they will have the same signs thereby ensuring that \( \psi_{A}^2(\lambda) \geq 0. \)

**Method 2**

This method is relatively simpler and relies on the standard algebraic expression for the area of a triangle, namely, half the product of the base, \( b(\lambda) \), and the height, \( h(\lambda) \). In Figure 3a, consider the segment bounded by the vertices of the intersection of the NPC of fringe \( F_{12}(\hat{s}, \lambda) \) with the other two fringe NPCs as the base of the triangle. Let \( \theta_{23}(\lambda) \) be the angle between the NPCs of the fringes \( F_{12}(\hat{s}, \lambda) \) and \( F_{23}(\hat{s}, \lambda) \). Then \( \theta_{23}(\lambda) \) is also the angle between \( u_{12} \) and \( u_{23} \) in the aperture plane. Thus, \( b(\lambda) = \delta s_{23}(\lambda)/\sin_{123} \theta(\lambda), \) where \( \delta s_{23}(\lambda) \) is the perpendicular positional offset of the NPC of the fringe \( F_{23}(\hat{s}, \lambda) \) from its opposite vertex. The height is simply given by \( h(\lambda) = \delta s'_{12}(\lambda). \) Then, using Equation (20), the area enclosed by the fringe NPCs in the image plane is
\[ A_{3}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta s'_{12}(\lambda) \delta s'_{23}(\lambda)}{\sin \theta_{123}(\lambda)} = \frac{\psi_{A}^2(\lambda) \psi_{A}^2(\lambda)}{8\pi^2 |u_{12}| |u_{23}| |\sin \theta_{123}(\lambda)|} \]
where, \( \theta_{23}(\lambda) = (1/2) |u_{12}| |u_{23}| \sin \theta_{123}(\lambda). \) This result is identical to that derived using the first method above.

Note that the equations in this section are directly applicable only to non-parallel fringes (or equivalently, the array elements are non-collinear in the aperture plane) for which \( C_{abc} \neq 0 \), or equivalently, \( \theta_{123}(\lambda) \neq 0 \) and \( A_{A3}(\lambda) \neq 0. \) In the limiting case when the triad of array elements are collinear in the aperture plane, \( \theta_{123}(\lambda) = 0, \) and hence, \( C_{abc} = 0 \) and \( A_{A3}(\lambda) = 0. \) Because the fringe NPCs are parallel to each other and do not have a distinct point of intersection between them, the area enclosed by the fringe NPCs on the tangent-plane of the image is infinite or indeterminate from Equation (A6). However, the product of these two areas is still a well-defined, finite value proportional to the closure phase squared, given by Equation (A9).

**Appendix B: Generalization of Closure Phase Relation to Areas in the Aperture and the Image Planes in a Closed N-polygon**

Following Section VII consider adjacent triangles all sharing a common vertex (denoted by index \( a = 1 \)) in the aperture plane. As a simple example, consider a 4-polygon in the aperture plane with four vertices indexed by \( a = 1, \ldots, N \), with \( N = 4. \) The two adjacent triangles with a common vertex at \( a = 1 \) are denoted by \( \Delta_{123} \) and \( \Delta_{134} \) with areas \( A_{A3}(\lambda) \) with \( q = 1 \) and \( q = 2, \) respectively, in the aperture plane. The area of the 4-polygon is \( A_{A4}(\lambda) = \sum_{q=1}^{2} A_{A3}(\lambda) \). Note that the segment joining the vertices 1 and 3 in these elemental triangle units is a diagonal and not a side in the chosen 4-polygon configuration. However, this construction is only intermediate and eventually the visibility phase on the baseline between vertices 1 and 3 will be immaterial as we will express the results using only gauge-invariant quantities from the individual elemental triads.

The closure phase relations apply to each of the \( N - 2 \) adjacent elemental triads (indexed by \( q \)) constituting the \( N \)-polygon. For the 4-polygon, \( q = 1, 2. \) Thus, from Equation (A9) or (A10),
\[ \psi_{3(q)}^2(\lambda) = 16\pi^2 A_{A3}(\lambda) A_{3}(\lambda), \quad q = 1, 2. \] Because \( \psi_{4}(\lambda) = \sum_{q=1}^{2} \psi_{3(q)}(\lambda) \) from Equation (24),
\[ \psi_{4}^2(\lambda) = 16\pi^2 \sum_{q=1}^{2} A_{A3}(\lambda) A_{3}(\lambda) \]
\[ + 2 \sum_{q=1}^{2} \sum_{r=q+1}^{2} \psi_{3(q)}(\lambda) \psi_{3(r)}(\lambda), \] (B2)
which can be generalized to an $N$-polygon as

$$
\psi_N^2(\lambda) = 16\pi^2 \sum_{q=1}^{N-2} A_{A3(q)}(\lambda) A_{I3(q)}(\lambda)
+ 2 \sum_{q=1}^{N-3} \sum_{r=q+1}^{N-2} \psi_{3(q)}(\lambda) \psi_{3(r)}(\lambda).
$$

(A3)

Alternatively, we can also express the relation between the area of the $N$-polygon in the aperture plane and the closure phases in the adjacent elemental triads as

$$
A_{AN}(\lambda) = \sum_{q=1}^{N-2} A_{A3(q)}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \sum_{q=1}^{N-2} A_{I3(q)}(\lambda).
$$

(A4)

It is noted that both Equations (A3) and (A4) are gauge invariant. In either case, the gauge invariant closure phase relations on each of the elemental triads, and hence on the $N$-polygon, can be measured geometrically as shown using the 4-polygon example in Figure 13.

Note that in either of the equations above, the area under the fringe NPCs is expressed only in terms of the elemental triangle NPCs and not the $N$-polygon in the image plane. This is because the area enclosed by the fringe NPCs of the $N$-polygon is not the sum of the elemental triangle NPC of the image plane. This is apparent in Figure 13. Therefore, $A_{I3}(\lambda) \neq \sum_{q=1}^{N-2} A_{I3(q)}(\lambda)$.

This inequality results from the fact that the SOS conservation is not expected to directly apply for the 4-fringe pattern. For example, perturbing the phase of array element “2” will only displace the NPCs of fringes $F_{12}(\lambda)$ and $F_{23}(\lambda)$ leaving the NPCs of fringes $F_{34}(\lambda)$ and $F_{41}(\lambda)$ unchanged. The resulting change in NPCs of fringes $F_{12}(\lambda)$ and $F_{23}(\lambda)$ and the lack of constraint on NPCs of fringes $F_{34}(\lambda)$ and $F_{41}(\lambda)$ will result in a distortion or shearing of the 4-fringe interference pattern (solid black lines) in the image plane shown on the right panel of Figure 13. Hence, the SOS conservation does not apply to the 4-fringe interference pattern as a whole. This explains the area inequality expressed above. However, the yellow regions denoting the 3-fringe interference patterns from the two adjacent, elemental triads will individually obey the SOS conservation property despite the non-conservation of the net 4-fringe interference pattern.

Appendix C: Parallels to Other Disciplines

Here, we outline close parallels to the interferometric closure phase in other fields of physics such as crystallography, gravitational waves using laser interferometer arrays, quantum mechanics and polarized light, and geophysics including seismic imaging of the Earth’s interior, and imaging using interferometric synthetic aperture radar and synthetic aperture sonar.

1. Crystallography

Here, we provide a short summary of the key similarities between closure phase in interferometry and structure invariants in crystal lattice structure analysis using X-ray, electron, or neutron crystallography. Rigorous details are provided in the references cited herein.

When a beam of radiation (X-rays, for example) is incident on a crystal, the radiation is scattered in discrete directions by the electron density distribution, $\rho(r)$, in the crystal lattice. $r$ denotes the position vector in three-dimensional (3-D) space. In such a scattering experiment, the scattered wave or the “reflection”, $S_h$, is rep-
At discrete locations, \( h_j \),

\[
S_{h_j} = \int_{V} \rho(r) e^{-i2\pi h_j \cdot r} dV ,
\]

(C1)

where, the integration is performed over the unit cell volume, \( V \). In crystallography literature, \( S_h \) is commonly referred to as the “structure factor” \( \psi \) volume, where, the integration is performed over the unit cell denoted by \( h \). \( h \) is a complex number with an amplitude, \( |S_h| \) and a phase, \( \psi_h \). If the complex-valued structure factor is known, then the electron density distribution and the underlying crystal structure can be inferred via a Fourier series summation

\[
\rho(r) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_j S_{h_j} e^{i2\pi h_j \cdot r} .
\]

(C2)

Similarities between this formulation and the interferometry context introduced in Section [IV] are conspicuous when we identify the correspondence between \( r \) and \( \hat{s} \), \( h_j \) and \( u_{ab} \), \( S_h \) and \( V_{ab} (\lambda) \), and \( \rho(r) \) and \( \Theta(\hat{s}, \lambda) / I(\hat{s}, \lambda) \). One of the differences is that typically the Fourier transforms are three-dimensional and two-dimensional in crystallography and radio interferometric synthesis imaging, respectively, and the implications are discussed further below.

In crystal structure analysis, only the amplitudes of the structure factor are measured in the form of intensities, \( |S_h| \), but not their phases. And any guessed phases will have ambiguities due to the arbitrariness in the choice of the origin (or the phase center). The lack of information about the phases constitutes the classic “phase problem” or the “origin problem” in crystallography [21, 22, 69, 70] and references therein.

A number of methods have been developed to estimate the phases and ultimately the lattice structure, some of which are referred to as the “direct” methods in contrast to others such as the Patterson [71], molecular replacement [72], isomorphous replacement [73, 74] and references therein], and anomalous dispersion techniques [75, 76]. The direct methods typically use a priori structural and symmetry constraints [21, 22, 69, 70, 77] and references therein] to estimate the phases and the structure. They rely heavily on the use of structure invariants [21, 22, 69, 70, 78], defined as

\[
\psi_N = \arg \prod_{j=1}^{N} \arg S_{h_j} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \psi_{h_j} ,
\]

(C3)

which are invariant to origin translation if

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{N} h_j = 0 .
\]

(C4)

Notice the close correspondence of the definition and the properties of these structure invariants to those of the interferometric closure phase developed in Section [III].

The most important structure variants in crystallography are the triplet \( N = 3 \) and quartet \( N = 4 \) phases. They have played a key role in crystallography in making the determination of many molecular structures possible [79]. Another difference to note here is that unlike in radio interferometry, the structure invariants in crystallography are not measured, but are estimated from the intensities by the use of a priori information, such as the fact that the electron density distribution function, \( \rho(r) \), consists of well separated peaks.

Now we extend the geometric insight developed for the interferometric closure phase to the the structure invariants in crystallography. Because the latter is described in 3-D, the NPCs derived in 2-D now become null phase surfaces (NPS) in 3-D real space. Let us consider \( N = 3 \). The fringe NPS in real space is given by

\[
2\pi h_j \cdot r + \psi_{h_j} = 0 , \quad j = 1, 2, 3 .
\]

(C5)

The phases, \( \psi_{h_j} \), only change along the direction of the vector, \( h_j \), but remain constant in the plane perpendicular to \( h_j \). Thus, Equation (C5) is the 3-D equivalent of Equation (15), where the NPC straight lines are replaced with NPS planes. Translating the origin to \( r_0 \) simply modifies the phases to

\[
\psi'_{h_j} = \psi_{h_j} + 2\pi h_j \cdot r_0
\]

(C6)

as seen earlier in Section [IV A].

Assuming that \( h_j \) are not collinear, the intersection of each of the three fringe NPS planes with the other will be a straight line (instead of a point in the 2-D interferometric closure phase case). Since the three locations, \( h_j \), determine a plane in reciprocal lattice space, each of the three fringe NPS planes in real space will be perpendicular to this plane. Thus, a situation where the three planes could intersect at a single point will not arise and does not require further consideration. We consider two plausible scenarios: (1) each fringe NPS plane intersects the other two along a line resulting in three parallel lines each perpendicular to the plane determined by the three \( h_j \), and (2) all three planes intersect along a single line which is also perpendicular to the plane determined by the three \( h_j \).

Since the structure invariant is invariant to origin translation, using the same reasoning as in Section [IV A].
the phase center (origin), \( r_0 \), can be chosen to lie anywhere along one of the intersecting lines. Then the triplet invariant phase is simply the phase corresponding to the positional offset, \( \delta r_j' \), of the phase center (which is now chosen to lie on one of the intersecting lines) from the opposite fringe NPS plane (which is not participating in the intersection and is parallel to the intersecting line), and is given by

\[
\psi_3 = \psi_j' = 2\pi |h_j| \delta r_j'.
\]  
(C7)

When the intersection of three planes results in a single line, then \( r_j' = 0 \) and \( \psi_3 = 0 \), and this would indicate centrosymmetry in the crystal [80].

By slicing the three fringe NPS planes using a plane that is parallel to the one determined by \( h_j \) in the reciprocal lattice space, which will yield three intersecting lines just as in Section [V A], the SOS conservation and area relations in Section [V B] can be readily extended to the triplet phase invariant. Equation (21) will continue to apply, where the area in real space corresponding to \( A_{T3}(\lambda) \) will be the area of this sliced cross-section that is parallel to the triangle in the reciprocal lattice (Fourier) space and \( A_{A3}(\lambda) \) will be half the area enclosed by \( h_j \) in the reciprocal lattice space.

When \( h_j \) are collinear, the three planes are parallel to each other wherein two or all of them may be coincident and a distinct line of intersection between the fringe NPS may not be available. Nevertheless, the structure invariant is still well-defined.

Though we focussed here on a specific application, namely, crystallography, the geometric insight and the formalism presented here are generic. Therefore, they can be readily extended to other interferometry applications used in the determination of structures.

2. Geophysics

a. Seismic Imaging

Seismic imaging or tomography is a technique used to map the Earth’s subsurface structure and subsurface velocity anomalies using elastic waves emitted by natural or artificial sources of seismic vibration such as earthquakes or explosions. Receivers, called geophones, record the waveforms from the reflected or refracted seismic waves. The data from an array of such receivers is “inverted” to map the Earth’s interior at different depths as well as determine the spatial and temporal origin (hypocenter) of the seismic event, such as an earthquake or an explosion.

The process to determine the map of the Earth’s interior usually involves a cross-correlation of the waveforms at all the receivers as a function of the vector separation between them and the time lag when one receiver records the signal relative to the other. This spatio-temporal cross-correlation is denoted by \( \tilde{V}_{ab}(\tau) \), where, \( a \) and \( b \) are any two receivers. Effectively, \( \tilde{V}_{ab}(\tau) \) constitutes the information usually presented in the form of “travel time – distance offset” (or stacked shot gather) plots in seismology. Note that this is simply analogous to the delay spectrum in radio interferometry [81, 82], where, \( \tilde{V}_{ab}(\tau) \) is obtained by a Fourier transform along the spectral direction of the measured visibility spectrum, \( V_{ab}(\nu) \). Each lag, \( \tau \), in \( \tilde{V}_{ab}(\tau) \) corresponds to specific locations of radio-emitting objects on the sky, given by

\[
\tau = \frac{x_{ab} \cdot \hat{s}}{c},
\]  
(C8)

where \( c \) is the speed of light. Henceforth, we will interchangeably refer to the spatio-temporal cross-correlations as delay spectra for easier identification with the radio interferometry parlance.

The determination of the subsurface structure using the “inversion” process requires an accurate calibration of the lags in \( \tilde{V}_{ab}(\tau) \), or equivalently, the phases, given by \( \phi_{ab} = 2\pi c_s \tau/\lambda \), where, \( c_s \) is the speed of the seismic wave in the subsurface medium. However, the presence of unexplained velocity anomalies in the Earth velocity model usually modifies the path lengths, thereby leading to phase corruptions in the receiver measurements. If the velocity anomalies are localized to regions below the receiving elements, they are defined as static anomalies. The corresponding path length delays or phase corruptions in \( \tilde{V}_{ab}(\tau) \) are called “statics”. Measurements at both receivers and sources are affected by the presence of statics. These phase corruptions are analogous to the element-based phase corruptions in radio interferometry, \( \xi_0 \), caused by the ionosphere, troposphere, or the measuring instruments themselves. Correcting for these statics is essential for ensuring high-quality imaging and accurate determination of the subsurface structure and the hypocenter.

Unlike in radio interferometry where the visibility measurements are natively made as a function of frequency from which the delay spectrum, \( \tilde{V}_{ab}(\tau) \), is then obtained through a Fourier transform along the frequency axis, the analogous spatio-temporal correlations in seismic imaging are measured natively in the temporal domain. However, the principle of application of closure phases in either case is the same. The following discussion on the use of closure phase in seismic imaging is reviewed in detail in [23]. Here, we summarize it using the parlance of radio interferometry adopted in this paper.

Elimination of both receiver and source statics using closure phase is called total closure phase correction while elimination of statics only in the sources or the receivers is called partial closure phase correction. The former will usually involve a closed loop of measurements while the latter typically will not. Because we have only considered closure phase in this paper in the context of measurements on a closed loop, we restrict this discussion on seismic imaging to the total closure phase correction scenario.

A total closure phase correction scenario is usually applicable in the case of transmission, refraction, and reflection tomography. Each of these may have a different un-
In seismology, sometimes the convention adopted is to use the first index in the subscript for the source and the second for the receiver, using the fact that $T_{ba} = -T_{ab}$. When the difference in convention is accounted for, Equation (C10) is identical to the expression for total closure phase provided [23].

The presence of $N$ terms in a $N$-polygon closed loop implies that they are obtained from the phases of the product of the $N$ cross-correlations corresponding to each segment in the $N$-polygon. If in addition to the inter-receiver time delays, the inter-source time delays are also recorded as would be in the case of controlled sources of explosion, then the $N$-polygon can be decomposed into elemental triads as discussed in Section [VII]. Thus, the visualization and estimation of closure phase geometrically in the Fourier domain as presented in earlier sections will be fully applicable here as well.

b. Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (InSAR)

A review of InSAR is provided in [28] and references therein while an application of closure phase is discussed in [24] and references therein. The recent developments in InSAR have removed certain limitations of conventional synthetic aperture radar (SAR) systems such as...
in enhancing the quality of depth measurement in three-dimensional topography, thereby providing a more accurate interpretation of the images.

InSAR has been extensively used in interferometric determination of topography and surface change. The former is identifiable with conventional radio interferometric aperture synthesis for astronomical imaging. The latter tracks surface motion by imaging the surface at multiple times using repeat-track interferometry wherein the orbits of SAR satellites or aircrafts repeat their flight paths recording data of the same region multiple times, which are ideally expected to be phase-coherent with each other.

Besides standard interferometric imaging using aperture synthesis, closure phase in InSAR is more prevalent in repeat-track interferometry to detect temporal changes between the individual images, and thus changes in the surface properties. Consider a stack of coregistered images (aligned SAR images) from multiple passes which are expected to be phase-coherent with each other, denoted by $E_a$, where $a$ indexes the temporal position in the stack. We will assume that $E_a$ is a two-dimensional image (in range and azimuth), although the dimensionality is immaterial for this discussion. The interferogram image, obtained by pixel-wise image cross-correlation between two coregistered images, $E_b$ and $E_b$ in the stack, will be

$$V_{ab} = \langle E_a^* E_b \rangle,$$

and

$$V'_{ab} = g_a g_b \langle E_a^* E_b \rangle,$$

where $V_{ab}$ and $V'_{ab}$ are the uncorrupted and corrupted interferograms with phases $\phi_{ab}$ and $\phi'_{ab}$, respectively. The angular brackets denote spatial averaging of a group of pixels with a finer resolution to a coarser resolution. $g_a$, a scalar quantity, encapsulates the time-dependent corruption of wavefronts from the imagery at temporal index $a$, which is typically caused by the troposphere, target motion, and topography, and results in phase corruptions (or equivalently delays) of the wavefronts, denoted by $\xi_a$. Thus,

$$\phi'_{ab} = \phi_{ab} + \xi_b - \xi_a.$$

$V_{ab}$ and $V'_{ab}$ are interferogram images with possibly reduced dimensions, relative to $E_a$ and $E_b$, due to the spatial averaging.

The closure phase image in repeat-track InSAR, defined between three coregistered images with temporal indices $a$, $b$, and $c$, is

$$\phi_3 = \phi'_{ab} + \phi'_{bc} + \phi'_{ca} = \phi_{ab} + \phi_{bc} + \phi_{ca}.$$

It is independent of the phase corruptions occurring at different times, and is thus invariant to phase calibration, as expected.

Temporal changes in the imagery can be determined robustly using the closure phase defined in Equation (C15). A single fine pixel in the closure phase image is always zero-valued independent of a temporal change of phase. However, a coarse pixel obtained by averaging several finer pixels will be zero-valued in the closure phase image only if there were no temporal changes in the phases of any of the finer pixels. Otherwise, the closure phase in that coarse pixel will result in an intrinsic non-zero value (called closure phase inconsistency) depending on the magnitude of the temporal phase change $\delta \phi$. Thus, closure phase inconsistencies through repeat-track InSAR can be used as a sensitive probe of temporal changes in the scatterer properties, such as soil moisture variations, vegetation water content variations, etc.

In contrast with the interferometric imaging in astronomy where the visibilities are obtained by cross-correlation between spatially separated antennas, the cross-correlation in Equation (C12) is between temporally separated, coregistered images. Thus, closure phase in repeat-track InSAR can be defined for each pixel in the image where the spacing is temporal rather than spatial as is common in standard astronomical interferometry. This strongly points to a potential astronomical application in which sporadic transient events in an otherwise static image of the sky can be robustly determined on timescales on which the phase corruption from various propagation effects is significant and difficult to calibrate.

c. Synthetic Aperture Sonar (SAS)

A detailed description of SAS and application of closure phase is provided in [24] and references therein. SAS predominantly appears to use closure phases in the determination of phases by bispectrum or triple-correlation imaging [51, 54–56], much like in optical interferometry in astronomy [see Section VI]. Thus, the geometric insight developed here using interferometry in astronomy can be directly extended to the field of SAS. Because SAS and SAR share a lot of common principles, repeat-track interferometry, as in the case of InSAR (see above), can also be applied to SAS wherein the inconsistencies in the closure phase image obtained from three or more coregistered images can be used to robustly detect temporal changes in the image under study.

3. Gravitational Waves

Here, we will highlight a very close relation between the concepts of closure phase in interferometric imaging and time-delay interferometry (TDI) in gravitational wave (GW) interferometers consisting of three or more elements such as the planned Laser Interferometer Space Antenna (LISA) [34, 55], DECi-hertz Interferometer Gravitational-wave Observatory (DECIGO; 80), and the Einstein Telescope (ET; [87].

Einstein predicted that when a GW event occurs, such as the merger of two massive objects, it will emit gravitational radiation, which will manifest as distur-
bances or waves in space-time [88, 89]. The detection of a GW is carried out interferometrically by exchanging and combining phase-coherent laser beams originating from widely separated locations. The disturbance in space-time geometry due to the passage of the GW causes the physical distance between locations to oscillate. Thus combining the laser beams, which would have acquired different phase offsets relative to each other due to the differential stretching and compression of space-time upon passage of the GW, will result in a characteristic interference pattern that depends on the underlying GW mechanism.

The current generation of GW experiments include the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatories (LIGO) and Virgo[14] which have succeeded in detecting a number of GW events, such as mergers of binary black holes (BBH), binary neutron stars (BNS), and binaries consisting of a black hole and a neutron star (BH-NS) in the ∼ 10–1000 Hz frequency range [89, 91]. Some of the next-generation experiments have proposed the use of three or more interferometer elements, for additional directivity and better diagnostic capabilities. These include space-based missions such as LISA and DECIGO, with sensitivities in the ∼ 10^{-3}–10^{-1} Hz and ∼ 0.1–10 Hz frequency ranges, respectively, and ground-based concepts such as the ET with sensitivities in the 10–1000 Hz frequency ranges, respectively, and ground-based detectors such as LIGO, three each in clockwise and anti-clockwise directions. The links and the associated arm lengths are denoted by the index of the opposite spacecraft that is not a part of that link. The link indices will be overlined and underlined for clockwise and anti-clockwise directions, respectively. The time taken by the laser beam to traverse the arm length of the link between spacecrafts a and b is denoted by τa and τb for clockwise and anti-clockwise transit intervals, respectively. Because of the rotation of the LISA constellation due to its orbital motion, τa ≠ τb in general [101, 102].

A link observable is defined as the phase difference measurement, φab(t), recorded by a phasemeter when a laser beam transmitted from the optical bench on spacecraft a traveling on the clockwise link, v, is mixed with the local laser beam on the receiving optical bench on spacecraft b. In other words, φab(t) and φ′ab(t) are simply the phases of the ideal and corrupted correlations, Vab(t) and V′ab(t), respectively, between the laser signals at spacecrafts a and b. Then, Vab(t) and V′ab(t) can be identified with radio interferometric visibilities, Vab(λ) and V′ab(λ), but with an explicit distinction made for the link direction (v, in this case) connecting the two measurement devices. This is because the Hermitian symmetry, wherein Vab(λ) = V∗ba(λ), that is valid in radio interferometry, does not hold in GW-TDI since Vab(t) ≠ V∗ba(t) in the presence of time-dependent orbital motion and rotation of the constellation of spacecrafts.

The main source of phase corruption in each of these interfering laser beams arises from the stochastic phase noise, denoted by ξ(t). If φab(t) is the true GW-induced phase difference experienced between the laser beams, the measured (corrupted) differential phase on a link can be written as

\[ φ′_{ab}(t) = φ_{ab}(t) + ξ(t) - τ_v - ξ_0(t), \quad (C16) \]

or,

\[ τ_v = φ_{ab} + ξ_0 - ξ_v. \quad (C17) \]

where, following the convention in [26], the quantities will be assumed to carry implicit time-dependence, and the

---

time delays in a quantity are denoted by indices of the corresponding links after the semicolon in the subscript. Thus,
\[ \phi_{ab}'(t) \equiv \phi_{ab} \cdot \phi_{ab}(t) \equiv \phi_{ab} \cdot \xi_{b}(t) \equiv \xi_{b}, \]
and, \[ \xi_{a}(t - \tau) \equiv \xi_{a,\tau}. \] (C18)

Here, we have ignored residual Doppler noise sources which are subdominant by many orders of magnitude relative to the laser phase noises. Equation (C17) looks very similar to Equation (7). The key difference is that the former (GW-TDI) uses retarded time, \( t - \tau \), for the phase noise in the transmitted laser beam of spacecraft, \( a \), to account for the finite time of propagation, \( \tau \), for the laser beam along the arm length of link, \( \tau \), and the temporal changes in its phase noise, \( \xi_{a} \), during that interval. If the variation in phase noise is negligible during the propagation time interval, \( \tau \), then \( \xi_{a,\tau} \approx \xi_{a} \), and Equation (C17) will directly correspond to Equation (7).

Because the laser phase noise is made of stochastic fluctuations which are non-negligible during the propagation time along the link, the equivalent closure phase relations for GW-TDI have to be modified relative to that in astronomical interferometry, where the temporal effects can be usually ignored (unless the antenna spacings are large, such as in VLBI).

The equivalent closure phase relations in GW-TDI are the TDI observables. They span a wide range of linear combinations of phase difference measurements from the six laser links with appropriate time shifts to cancel the phase noise precisely, and are thus true observable properties of the gravitational waves. The “first generation” of TDI observables works for non-rotating and rigid LISA configurations including unequal arm lengths, while the “second generation” TDI observables can work for a rotating LISA configuration as well, where the arm lengths can also be time-dependent. Although the discussion below will focus on a specific first-generation TDI observable as an example, it can be easily extended to second-generation TDI observables as well with inclusion of appropriate terms in the linear combinations.

Consider the first-generation TDI observable, denoted as “Sagnac \( \alpha \)”. It measures the phase difference between two closed loops starting and ending at the same spacecraft, \( a \), but along opposite directions as shown in Figure 15.

The phase measurement of the laser beam combinations around closed anti-clockwise and clockwise loops can be written, respectively, as
\[ \phi_{ac\alpha} + \phi_{bc\beta} + \phi_{ba\gamma} = \phi_{ac\alpha} + \phi_{bc\beta} + \phi_{ba} + \xi_{a;bc\beta} - \xi_{a} \] (C19)
and, \[ \phi_{ab\alpha} + \phi_{bc\beta} + \phi_{ca\gamma} = \phi_{ab\alpha} + \phi_{bc\beta} + \phi_{ca} + \xi_{a;bc\beta} - \xi_{a}. \] (C20)

Each of these equations represents the phase measurement on a closed loop, very similar to the measurement of closure phase on a triad of array elements in astronomical interferometry. However, because of time-dependence, \( \xi_{a;bc\beta} \neq \xi_{a} \) and thus both of these closed loops individually still exhibit non-closure effects, unlike in radio interferometry. But in the first-generation case where there is neither orbital rotation of the spacecraft constellation nor temporal variation in the arm lengths, \( \xi_{a;bc\beta} = \xi_{a,\tau} \) because \( \tau_{a} + \tau_{b} + \tau_{c} = \tau_{a} + \tau_{b} + \tau_{c} \) even if none of the light travel times along the six links is equal to each other. Hence, an additional step, namely, the differential phase measurement between these two closed loops (denoted as Sagnac \( \alpha \)),
\[ \alpha = (\phi_{ac\alpha} + \phi_{bc\beta} + \phi_{ba}) - (\phi_{ab\alpha} + \phi_{bc\beta} + \phi_{ca}) \]
\[ = (\phi_{ac\alpha} + \phi_{bc\beta} + \phi_{ba}) - (\phi_{ab\alpha} + \phi_{bc\beta} + \phi_{ca}) \] (C21)
is required to completely eliminate the time-dependent laser phase noise and yield a true observable of the gravitational waves. The indices can be permutated cyclically to yield the Sagnac \( \beta \) and \( \gamma \) observables. Here, the sum inside each parenthesis represents the net phase acquired along a closed loop (clockwise or anti-clockwise), which individually have non-closure effects, but when differentiated from each other, yield a true TDI observable (Sagnac \( \alpha \) in this case) in the form of a 6-term closure phase that eliminates the laser phase noises while accounting for their time-dependence.
Each of these six terms in the Sagnac α combination is the phase of a time-corrected two-point correlation, identifiable with a visibility in the parlance of astronomical interferometry. Such an identification can be made with other TDI observables as well, such as the Michelson combinations [26] and references therein. The principle behind the construction of TDI observables for canceling time-dependent laser phase noises can have potential uses in other fields of interferometry, including VLBI and optical interferometry in astronomy, where situations like temporal variations of the phase corruptions due to atmospheric and ionospheric turbulences as well as instrumental effects are significant on time scales comparable to or shorter than the differential time it takes for light from a distant object to arrive at the different array elements.

4. Quantum Mechanics and Polarized Light

A close analogy found in quantum mechanics is noteworthy here. Using the Dirac bra-ket notation, by identifying the signals, $E_a(\lambda)$, with the states, $|E_a(\lambda)\rangle$, as vectors in complex Hilbert space, the true and the calibrated spatial coherence, $V_{ab}(\lambda)$ and $\tilde{V}_{ab}(\lambda)$, can be expressed as $\langle E_a(\lambda)|E_b(\lambda)\rangle$ and $G^*(\lambda)G_\lambda(\lambda)\langle E_a(\lambda)|E_b(\lambda)\rangle$, respectively, which are inner products of the signal vectors in Hilbert space. Then, $\phi_{ab}(\lambda) \equiv \arg \langle E_a(\lambda)|E_b(\lambda)\rangle$ and $\phi_{ab}(\lambda) = \phi_{ab}(\lambda) + \xi_b(\lambda) - \xi_a(\lambda)$. Such a representation of signals in Hilbert space has also been used in radio astronomy [103]. In this section, we will assume implicit dependence on $\lambda$, if any, and drop it from our expressions for convenience.

The closure phase on an $N$-polygon has a close correspondence to the phase of the $N$-vertex Bargmann invariant [27] in quantum mechanics, which is defined as

$$\phi_N = \arg \Delta_N(E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_N) \equiv \arg \prod_{a=1}^{N} \langle E_a|E_{a+1}\rangle_N$$

(C22)

$$= \sum_{a=1}^{N} \arg \langle E_a|E_{a+1}\rangle_N = \sum_{a=1}^{N} \phi_a[a+1]_N$$

(C23)

It must be emphasized that the Bargmann phase is independent of the choice of local phase factors such as $\xi_a$ that each state could be subject to in the same way that the closure phase is independent of aperture element-based phase corruptions because of the high degree of similarity in their underlying mathematical formulation [see Equation (14)].

A close connection between the phase of the Bargmann invariant and the geometric phase [28] and references therein has been known to exist [104]. When the quantum states refer to the states of polarization of light, the geometric phase is also familiarly recognized as the Pancharatnam phase [28, 29, 105]. When the variation of states is cyclic, the Bargmann phase or the geometric phase is gauge-invariant to the local phases acquired by the states and depends only on the cyclic path taken, and is thus a true observable property of the system. The geometric phase acquired during this cyclical state change is equal to half the solid angle the cyclical path, $E_1 \rightarrow E_2 \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow E_N \rightarrow E_1$, subtends on the Bloch sphere, or the Poincaré sphere in case of the Pancharatnam phase arising from the polarized states of light.

The correspondence between the geometric phase and the spurious interferometric closure phase introduced by the polarization leakage in individual antennas of a radio interferometer even for a point-like object was pointed out in [106]. The contribution to the intrinsic closure phase from the polarization leakage is indeed equal to half the solid angle subtended by the points represented by the antenna measurements, $E_a$, on the Poincaré sphere, which is zero for perfectly co-polar visibilities when the polarizations states of the antennas are identical, and is non-zero otherwise even for a compact, point-like object.


