

# On the Simulation of Gravitational Lensing

Hans Georg Schaathun<sup>1</sup>  
 <georg@schaathun.net>

Ben David Normann  
 <ben.d.normann@ntnu.no>

Einar Leite Austnes  
 <eaustnes@gmail.com>

Simon Ingebrigtsen  
 <simon.ing.89@gmail.com>

Sondre Westbø Remøy  
 <sore@live.no>

Simon Nedreberg Runde  
 <simonrun@hotmail.com>

Department of ICT and Natural Sciences  
 Faculty of Information Technology and Electrical Engineering  
 N-6025 Ålesund, Norway

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author

## KEYWORDS

Gravitational Lensing; Simulation; Dark Matter

## ABSTRACT

Gravitational lensing refers to the deflection of light by the gravity of celestial bodies, often predominantly composed of dark matter. Seen through a gravitational lens, the images of distant galaxies appear distorted. In this paper we discuss simulation of the image distortion by gravitational lensing. The objective is to enhance our understanding of how gravitational lensing works through a simple tool to visualise hypotheses. The simulator can also generate synthetic data for the purpose of machine learning, which will hopefully allow us to invert the distortion function, something which is not analytically possible at present.

## I. INTRODUCTION

One of the big questions in astrophysics is the mapping of the Universe. Modern telescopes provide enormous amounts of images of the night sky, but about 85% of the mass is dark matter (DM). Emitting no light, this dark matter is not visible on the images. However, because of gravity, the dark matter can distort the light from more remote objects. This is called a gravitational lens (GL) (e.g. Bertone & Tait, 2018), because it works analogously to an optical lens.

The shape and location of gravitational lenses can be inferred by studying images of galaxies which appear distorted from our viewpoint, but the calculations are complex and may amount to days of manual work for a single lens. Attempts to automate this process, for instance using machine learning (e.g. Hezaveh et al., 2017), are promising but still limited to selected cases.

In this paper we develop a framework for simulating gravitational lenses, that is, to synthesise authentic distorted images, given an undistorted source image and a lens model. This has two purposes. Firstly, it enables bulk generation of synthetic data sets which can be used for training in machine learning. Secondly, it provides a graphical user interface where cosmologists can experiment to test and explore hypotheses. As simulation model we use the Roulettes formalism (Clarkson, 2016a), which is notable by unifying weak

and strong lensing in one paradigm. This formalism provides the forward calculation of the distorted image, but is not analytically invertible, which means that we cannot immediately infer the lens or source profiles from the distorted image.

## II. BACKGROUND ON GRAVITATIONAL LENSING

All matter, ordinary or dark alike, acts as a lens, distorting the images of distant galaxies. In 1919, the deflection of light by the sun was measured by Eddington during a solar eclipse, and shown to agree with Einstein's theory of general relativity. Since then, theoretical work on lensing has been extensively developed. The scarcity and low resolution of observations, have however caused pessimism concerning the applicability of this tool for actual observation. But one step at a time, the cosmological community has found ways to observe the phenomenon, and at present, it is booming both with applications and observation. Indeed, GL has become one of the major tools for mining information from the night sky.

One of the clear applications of GL is in understanding the nature of dark matter, which according to the present paradigm of cosmology is one of the main constituents in the universe. The other two are ordinary luminous matter ( $\sim 5\%$ ) and the so-called dark energy ( $\sim 68\%$ ). While the former is the stuff that make up stars, planets and all the rest, dark energy is what causes the accelerated expansion of the late universe. Finally, dark matter ( $\sim 27\%$ ) is the name given to mass indirectly observed in galaxies, but yet not seen. Its elusive nature has haunted cosmology since the 1930s. Although dark matter does not emit light, it must have mass, and thus it bends light like ordinary (so-called luminous) matter. This means that a study of lensing by a distant galaxy is implicitly a study of the dark matter in the lens. By studying lenses at different locations in the sky, one may thus create maps of the distribution of dark matter in the universe. This is important in order to understand the nature of dark matter, since the distribution of a substance says much about the nature of it.

Traditionally, the algebraic framework for GL is divided into two regimes; *weak* and *strong* GL, depending on the level of distortion. These are two sides of

the same physical phenomenon, and both types may be used to reconstruct DM distribution in cosmological surveys. It is therefore unfortunate, and artificial, that both lensing effects are not studied within the same algebraic framework. Especially when it comes to cluster-lenses, where effects from both regimes appear.

Clarkson (2016a, 2016b) found a way of solving this problem by developing an algebraic framework that can model both weak and strong GL, henceforth referred to as the *Roulette formalism*. In theory, it should be possible to use the Roulette formalism to reconstruct the lens mass from images of distant galaxies subject to GL. The usefulness of this formalism is also seen in its ability to go beyond shear measurements, by incorporating higher-order effects (to arbitrary order). The ability to do so could prove useful as data received from the night sky drastically increases in amount and accuracy.

In order to make use of the Roulette formalism to such ends, a number of questions should be answered. Firstly, since the Roulette formalism builds on a series expansion which has to be truncated, it is important to know if the region of convergence is large enough to give satisfactory images in practice. Secondly, is it possible to generate images at a reasonable speed? In this work we answer these questions by implementing numerical computation of the Roulettes formalism.

### III. THE ROULETTE FORMALISM AND ITS COMPUTATION

The Roulette formalism was introduced by Clarkson (2016a), and Clarkson (2016b) provide complete details. Our presentation below will differ a little from conventional presentations in physics, in order to emphasise computable functions which can be used to calculate the distorted image. Readers who want a fuller understanding of the algebraic model should consult Clarkson's original work.

We study two distant objects in the universe, namely the (gravitational) lens  $L$  at distance  $D_L$  from Earth and the (light) source  $S$  at distance  $D_S$ . Adopting the *thin-lens approximation*, we assume that the lens mass is concentrated in a plane orthogonal on the line of sight through its centre. The source image is considered only as the 2D projection (image) of its emitted light. With astronomical distances and a relatively small angle of view, we can assume planar projections; this is known as the *flat-sky approximation*. We consider two different images of the source. The source image is the ideal projection, as it would have been observed absent any obstructions. The distorted image is the image as it can be observed when light is deflected by the lens.

The observed lensing is decomposed into two steps, as shown in Figure 2. The first step is a translation (deflection), corresponding to the difference  $\Delta\eta$  between actual ( $\eta_{\text{act}}$ ) and apparent ( $\eta_{\text{app}}$ ) source-plane position. In the roulette formalism, this translational part of the lensing is given as

$$\Delta\eta = \eta_{\text{app}} - \eta_{\text{act}} = -D_S \cdot (\alpha_1^0, \beta_1^0), \quad (5)$$

where  $(\alpha_1^0, \beta_1^0)$  is a vector of roulette amplitudes, as




Fig. 1: The figure shows the set-up for the flat-sky approximation, with the source plane (the lens plane) a distance  $D_S$  ( $D_L$ ) from the observer. Compare with Figure 2 for more details.

defined in Table I. The second step is the actual, non-linear distortion. The distorted image is drawn in a local co-ordinate system in the lens plane, centred at  $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2)$ , which corresponds to  $\eta_{\text{app}}$  in the source plane. We write  $\xi = |\xi|$  for the distance between the distorted image and the lens in the lens plane. Since  $\xi$  and  $\eta_{\text{app}}$  lie on the same line through the viewpoint (cf. Figure 1), we have

$$\xi = |\xi| = \frac{D_L}{D_S} \cdot |\eta_{\text{app}}|.$$

Following Clarkson, we use polar co-ordinates  $(r, \phi)$  for the distorted image. The source image is described in Cartesian co-ordinates  $(x', y')$  centered at  $\eta_{\text{act}}$  in the source plane. Thus the light observed at a position (pixel)  $(r, \phi)$  is drawn from a different position (pixel)  $(x', y') = \mathcal{D}(r, \phi)$  in the source image. From Eq. 48 in Clarkson (2016b) it is possible to show that the mapping  $\mathcal{D}$  is given as

$$\frac{D_L}{D_S} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x' \\ y' \end{bmatrix} = r \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi \\ \sin \phi \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{r^m}{m! \cdot D_L^{m-1}} F_s^m \quad (6)$$



point-mass lenses as a special case:

$$\frac{D_L}{D_S} \begin{bmatrix} x' \\ y' \end{bmatrix} = r \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi \\ \sin \phi \end{bmatrix} - \frac{R_E^2}{\xi} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \left( \frac{r}{\xi} \right)^m \begin{bmatrix} \cos(m\phi) \\ -\sin(m\phi) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

In the above,  $R_E$  is the Einstein radius, which is determined by the gravity (or mass) of the point-mass lens, and thus determines the strength of the lensing effect. An approximation of the mapping can be calculated using the sum from  $m = 1$  to some finite number  $m_0$  with increasing accuracy as  $m_0 \rightarrow \infty$ . This model will be referred to as the *finite point-mass model*. Using analytic continuation, the infinite sum can be calculated and extended outside this region. Using geometric series, it can be written in closed form as follows (Clarkson, 2016b):

$$\frac{D_L}{D_S} \begin{bmatrix} x' \\ y' \end{bmatrix} = r \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi \\ \sin \phi \end{bmatrix} + \frac{R_E^2 r}{r^2 + \xi^2 + 2r\xi \cos(\phi)} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{r}{\xi} + \cos(\phi) \\ -\sin(\phi) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

This is a standard result in the case of a point mass, and is not a result unique to the Roulette formalism. This model will be referred to as the *exact point-mass model*. The apparent position by the following well-known formula,

$$|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{app}}| = \frac{|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{act}}|}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{act}}|^2}{4} + \left( \frac{D_S R_E}{D_L} \right)^2}. \quad (14)$$

### B. General recursive formulae

A key element of the Roulettes formalism is recursive expressions for the amplitudes  $\alpha_s^m$  and  $\beta_s^m$ . Proofs are given by Normann and Clarkson (2020). The base case is given as,

$$\alpha_1^0 = -D_L \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \xi_1} \quad (15)$$

$$\beta_1^0 = -D_L \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \xi_2} \quad (16)$$

The recursive relations are given as

$$\alpha_{s+1}^{m+1} = (C_+^+)^{m+1} \left( \frac{\partial \alpha_s^m}{\partial \xi_1} - \frac{\partial \beta_s^m}{\partial \xi_2} \right) \quad (17)$$

$$\beta_{s+1}^{m+1} = (C_+^+)^{m+1} \left( \frac{\partial \beta_s^m}{\partial \xi_1} + \frac{\partial \alpha_s^m}{\partial \xi_2} \right) \quad (18)$$

$$\alpha_{s-1}^{m+1} = (C_-^+)^{m+1} \left( \frac{\partial \alpha_s^m}{\partial \xi_1} + \frac{\partial \beta_s^m}{\partial \xi_2} \right) \quad (19)$$

$$\beta_{s-1}^{m+1} = (C_-^+)^{m+1} \left( \frac{\partial \beta_s^m}{\partial \xi_1} - \frac{\partial \alpha_s^m}{\partial \xi_2} \right) \quad (20)$$

with

$$(C_+^+)^m = 2^{\delta_{0(s-1)}} \frac{m+1}{m+1+s} D_L \quad (21)$$

$$(C_-^+)^m = 2^{-\delta_{0s}} \frac{m+1}{m+1-s} D_L \quad (22)$$

The astute reader may notice that amplitudes for even sums  $s + m$  cannot be found through these relations. However, the contribution from these terms are equal to zero, because of the factor  $c_{m+s}$  in Equation (6). In other words, one can calculate all the amplitudes needed from the aforementioned relations.

### C. The Singular Isothermal Sphere (SIS)

The SIS model is somewhat similar to the point-mass model as they both have circular symmetry. The SIS-model however, assumes that the mass of the GL is distributed in a spherical shape rather than concentrated at a single point. This means that the final simplifications that was used to get the simple equations (12) and (13) cannot be used for the SIS model. However, we can use the recursive formulae from the previous subsection, with the lens potential given as

$$\psi_{\text{SIS}}(\xi) = \frac{R_E}{D_L^2} \xi. \quad (23)$$

In this case, the Einstein radius  $R_E$  depends not only on the total mass, but also on the size of the SIS lens. In general it is determined by the mass distribution of the lens.

*Remark 1:* Readers who inspect the source code will note that we use have omitted the factors  $D_L$  in  $\psi$ ,  $\alpha_s^m$  and  $\beta_s^m$  ( $C_{\pm}^{\pm}$ ), and the right hand side of (6). The reason for this is that they all cancel out. Verifying this is tedious but straight forward.

The formula for the apparent position is also different. From Eq. (5) it follows that

$$|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{app}}| = |\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{act}}| + \frac{D_S R_E}{D_L}, \quad (24)$$

and consequently

$$\xi = \frac{D_L}{D_S} \cdot |\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{app}}| = \frac{D_L}{D_S} \cdot |\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{act}}| + R_E.$$

## IV. THE SIMULATOR SOFTWARE

The simulator works with pixmap representations of the source image and the distorted image. The Roulettes model maps Cartesian co-ordinates in the lens plane to polar co-ordinates in the source plane. Hence it is trivial to generate the distorted image pixel by pixel, by simply looking up the corresponding pixel (light ray) in the source image. Fractional pixel co-ordinates may be interpolated, but if high-resolution images are used, this is not necessary. Even though the distorted image is calculated in the lens plane according to the Roulettes formalism, we project it back into the source plane, so that the scale (size) is comparable to the source image.

The simulator is implemented as a C++ library, using OpenCV for image manipulation. Front-end tools are implemented in Python, using Pybind11 to wrap the C++ library. There is a GUI tool, as shown in Figure 3, and a command line tool to generate images in bulk. The software is available in Open Source on github<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>The release used in this paper is v2.0.2 at <https://github.com/CosmoAI-AES/CosmoSim/releases/tag/v2.0.2>.




Fig. 3: The GUI for the Simulator.

The simulator is a very simple object-oriented structure, where new lens and source models can easily be added. The abstract *Source* class represents the source image, with concrete subclasses for spherical and ellipsoid lenses. These classes store the source image which is generated upon instantiation. The abstract *LensModel* class represents the gravitational lens with subclasses for point mass and spherical (SIS) lenses. These classes implement the distortion function  $\mathcal{D}(r, \phi)$ , and store the distorted image as well as a reference to the source object. An update method computes the distorted image, which can be retrieved with a getter function.

The python wrapper does not expose the object model. The *CosmoSim* class has setters for types of lens and source models as well as all the relevant parameters. It exposes the Lens Model's update method and getters for the distorted and the actual image. This reduces code size and simplifies maintenance, since we do not have to keep wrapper classes for all the classes in the C++ library. Still it gives complete access to all the features of the simulator.

A critical step in the SIS model is to calculate all the amplitudes  $\alpha_s^m$  and  $\beta_s^m$ . We use Python to pre-generate expressions for each  $(m, s)$  pair up to some maximum truncation limit  $m_0$ , using the sympy module to differentiate  $\psi$ . The resulting algebraic expressions are loaded by the C++ code from a text file and evaluated numerically using the symengine library.

## V. RESULTS

The GUI interface (Figure 3) allows the user quickly to experiment with different parameter settings, and visually review resulting distorted images. For the cosmologist on the team, this has proved an invaluable tool, particularly to develop intuition and develop a deeper understanding of both the phenomenon (GL) and the model (Roulettes). A particular point where it proved useful was in understanding the convergence




Fig. 4: Examples with a spherical source and point mass lens;  $D_L/D_S = 50\%$ ,  $\xi = 22$ ,  $\theta = 45^\circ$ ,  $R_E = 14$ ,  $\sigma = 7$ .

ring and the spurious images which we discuss below. Moreover, it has allowed us to verify the theory.

The spurious images is a model artifact. Calculating the distorted images in the Roulettes formalism with an even truncation threshold  $m_0$  produces  $m_0 + 1$  spurious images in a ring roughly centred on the local origin  $\xi$ . The model is exact at the origin, and a good approximation in a neighborhood around it. This is clearly seen in the comparison of the exact point mass model and the Roulettes approximations in Figure 4. On one hand,




Fig. 5: Examples with a spherical source and SIS lens, with different source positions;  $D_L/D_S = 50\%$ ,  $\theta = 45^\circ$ ,  $\xi = 24$ ,  $\sigma = 7$ .

these simulations show how well the Roulettes formalism matches the exact solution, something which can also be verified quantitatively by computing difference images. On the other hand it illustrates the convergence ring, outside of which the model is meaningless, with the spurious images as a blatant example.

Asymptotically, when the number of terms  $m_0$  tends to infinity, it can be shown that this ring has radius  $\xi$  centred on  $\xi$ , and that it approaches the limit from the outside. This result is provided by Clarkson (2016b) and is called the ring of convergence. We can also see in Figure 4 how the spurious images are smaller for large  $m_0$ , as the light is distributed between more images. When the number of images tends to infinity, the size of each one will tend to zero.

Figure 5 shows an example of the behaviour for different degrees on lensing. When the distance  $\xi$  between the lens and the distorted images is smaller, compared to the Einstein radius  $R_E$ , the lensing effect is weaker. If it is sufficiently small, the image fits well inside the convergence ring and is a good representation of the physical behaviour. For stronger lensing effects (Figure 5d), we can see how the image is drawn out towards the spurious image. Thus we have demonstrated a limit for when the Roulettes formalism is satisfactory. Even though the Roulettes unify weak and strong lensing in one paradigm, it is not yet satisfactory in the case of very strong lenses.

Knowing the shape of the convergence ring, it is possible to mask away everything close to or outside the ring. This is important to speed up the simulation, as the distortion equation (6) is computationally expensive, although it depends heavily on the image size and




Fig. 6: Examples of the spurious images for various numbers of terms;  $D_L/D_S = 50\%$ ,  $\theta = 135^\circ$ ,  $\xi = 12$ ,  $R_E = 8$ ,  $\sigma = 7$ .

on  $m_0$ . However, there is no reason to calculate pixels outside the convergence ring, and taking this into account, we get a reasonably responsive GUI for image size  $512 \times 512$  and  $m_0 = 50$ . This masking is made optional in the tools. Without the masking, the GUI is usable around  $m_0 = 16$ , but it quickly gets irresponsible for  $m_0 \geq 20$ . This tests have used a desktop computer with an AMD Ryzen 9 5900X 12-Core Processor at 2195.8MHz. The image size of  $512 \times 512$  is, of course, a lot higher than typical empirical images, but the high resolution may be important for the testing of the theory.

For a more objective performance test, we have done bulk generation of images, using the same desktop computer. Generating 1000 images at  $400 \times 400$  resolution took 35½s walltime and 10 minutes 5 seconds CPU time for  $m_0 = 16$ . For  $m_0 = 50$ , it took 4 minutes 38 seconds walltime and 81 minutes 24 seconds CPU time, and for  $m_0 = 150$ , 44'41" walltime and 11h19 CPU time. This is very acceptable, although interactive applications may not be able to go much above  $m_0 = 50$ . For the purpose of machine learning, the training set generation is negligible compared to the training time, as it should be.

## VI. IMPACT AND CONCLUSION

Our simulation model provides a computational representation of the algebraic Roulettes formalism (Clarkson, 2016a). An important motivation has been to bridge the gap between computer scientists and physicists, by developing a model which is meaningful in both domains. This is a necessary first step to open up this important research field from cosmology for a

wider community, most importantly for machine learning which may be able to invert the distortion function.

Similar simulators have been reported in the literature, each with their own limitations. The lenstronomy package (Birrer & Amara, 2018) is a comprehensive package, with other features in addition to the generation of distorted images, but it is limited to strong lensing. Other works we have found do not provide source code or sufficient detail to reproduce it, making them difficult to validate or extend. Thus the present transparent simulation model with support for both weak and strong lensing is a considerable step forward. We provide the first computational implementation of the Roulettes formalism, and also a framework which can be extended with new lens models, be they expressed in the Roulettes formalism or other frameworks.

We have not given any results on machine learning. The first rudimentary tests are promising, but more work is needed before it is ready for discussion. The simulator has other uses, as a visual tool for testing and exploring hypotheses in cosmology. Somewhat unanticipated, our simulations have revealed problems and limitations in the Roulettes formalism, and thus identified needs for further research.

This work is a mere starting point, leaving several interesting open problems. Development of machine learning models to reconstruct the lens profile and possibly the source image has already been mentioned. To achieve this, we will also have to adapt our system to simulate the noisy, low-resolution data in real images of the night sky. An independent line of research is computational models for a broader range of lens models. It would be particularly interesting if we could use sampled representations of the lens potential  $\psi$ .

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The first prototype of the simulator was a final year project (BSc) by four of the authors (Ingebrigtsen et al., 2022), and the work would have been impossible without their initial work. The models and prototypes have since been extended and improved by the other two authors. Also, we would like to thank Chris Clarkson at QMUL for his various inputs.

#### REFERENCES

- Bertone, G. & Tait, T. M. P. (2018). A new era in the search for dark matter. *Nature*, 562(7725), 51–56. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0542-z>
- Birrer, S. & Amara, A. (2018). Lenstronomy: Multipurpose gravitational lens modelling software package. *Physics of the Dark Universe*, 22, 189–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dark.2018.11.002>
- Clarkson, C. (2016a). Roulettes: A weak lensing formalism for strong lensing: I. overview. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 33(16). <https://doi.org/Artn16lt0110.1088/0264-9381/33/16/16lt01>

- Clarkson, C. (2016b). Roulettes: A weak lensing formalism for strong lensing: II. derivation and analysis. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 33(24), 245003. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/33/24/245003>
- Hezaveh, Y. D., Levasseur, L. P. & Marshall, P. J. (2017). Fast automated analysis of strong gravitational lenses with convolutional neural networks. *Nature*, 548(7669), 555–557. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature23463>
- Ingebrigtsen, S., Remøy, S. W., Runde, S. N. & Austnes, E. L. (2022). Cosmoai: A study of gravitational lensing through simulation and machine learning [Final year dissertation]. <https://ntnuopen.ntnu.no/ntnu-xmlui/handle/11250/3003634>
- Normann, B. D. & Clarkson, C. (2020). Recursion relations for gravitational lensing. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 52(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10714-020-02677-z>
- Schneider, P., Ehlers, J. & Falco, E. E. (1992). *Gravitational Lenses*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-03758-4>