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ABSTRACT. We describe the data reduction algorithms for the Multiband Imaging Photometer for Spitzer (MIPS). These algorithms were based on extensive preflight testing and modeling of the Si:As (24 μm) and Ge:Ga (70 and 160 μm) arrays in MIPS and have been refined based on initial flight data. The behaviors we describe are typical of state-of-the-art infrared focal planes operated in the low backgrounds of space. The Ge arrays are bulk photoconductors and therefore show a variety of artifacts that must be removed to calibrate the data. The Si array, while better behaved than the Ge arrays, does show a handful of artifacts that must also be removed to calibrate the data. The data reduction to remove these effects is divided into three parts. The first part converts the nondestructively read data ramps into slopes while removing artifacts with time constants of the order of the exposure time. The second part calibrates the slope measurements while removing artifacts with time constants longer than the exposure time. The third part uses the redundancy inherent in the MIPS observing modes to improve the artifact removal iteratively. For each of these steps, we illustrate the relevant laboratory experiments or theoretical arguments, along with the mathematical approaches taken to calibrate the data. Finally, we describe how these preflight algorithms have performed on actual flight data.

1. INTRODUCTION

Most of our knowledge of the universe at far-infrared wavelengths has been obtained with photoconductive detectors, particularly as used in the Infrared Astronomy Satellite (IRAS) and the Infrared Space Observatory (ISO). These detectors have been selected because they provide excellent performance at relatively elevated operating temperatures (compared with those needed to suppress thermal noise in bolometers). Similar considerations led to development of high-performance photoconductor arrays for the Multiband Imaging Photometer for Spitzer (MIPS), namely a Ge:Ga array and a stressed Ge:Ga array operating at 70 and 160 μm, respectively, which were built at the University of Arizona. To provide complementary measurements at 24 μm, the instrument also includes a Si:As Blocked Impurity Band (BIB) array, built at Boeing North America (BNA) under contract to the Infrared Spectrograph (IRS) team.

In the BIB or Impurity Band Conduction (IBC) architecture, the high impedance required to minimize Johnson noise is provided by a thin, high-purity layer of silicon. The infrared absorption occurs in a second layer, which can be relatively strongly doped. Due to the separation of these two functions, the detector layers can be optimized separately. Thus, these devices can be designed and built to have a fast response, high resistance to cosmic-ray irradiation induced responsivity shifts, high quantum efficiency, and good photometric behavior. Because the processing necessary for high-performance silicon IBC devices has only relatively recently become possible, there is relatively little experience with them in space astronomy missions. An early-generation detector array was used in the Short Wavelength Spectrometer (SWS) in ISO (Kessler et al. 1996). Initially, the device showed degradation due to damage by large ionizing particle exposures when the satellite passed through the trapped radiation belts. Once the operating conditions were adjusted to minimize these effects, the SWS detectors showed the expected virtues of this type of device, even though they did not achieve their preflight sensitivity expec-
tations (de Graauw et al. 1996; Heras et al. 2000; Valentijn & Thi 2000).

At wavelengths longer than 40 μm, photoconductors are typically built in germanium, because of the availability of impurity levels in this material that are much shallower than those in silicon. Achieving the appropriate structure and simultaneously the stringent impurity control for germanium IBC devices has proven difficult. As a result, all far-infrared space astronomy missions have used simple bulk photoconductors. MIPS uses bulk gallium doped germanium (Ge:Ga) detectors, both unstressed and stressed. In such detectors, the same volume of material determines both the electrical and photoabsorptive properties, making the optimization less flexible than with Si IBC detectors. Consequently, their behavior retains some undesirable properties that can be circumvented through the more complex architecture of IBC devices. Nonetheless, generally satisfactory performance is possible and has been achieved in past space astronomy missions.

The 60 and 100 μm bands in IRAS (Neugebauer et al. 1984) utilized 15 Ge:Ga photoconductors each. The detectors were read out with transimpedance amplifiers that used junction field effect transistor (JFET) first stages mounted in a way that isolated them thermally. This allowed these transistors to be heated, resulting in low noise and stable operation (Rieke et al. 1981; Low et al. 1984). Detector calibration was maintained by flashing reverse bolometer stimulators mounted in the center of the telescope secondary mirror, and cosmic-ray effects were erased by boosting the detector bias to breakdown (Beichman et al. 1988). The intrinsic performance of the detectors was limited by the Johnson noise of the transimpedance amplifier (TIA) feedback resistors and by other noise sources associated with the readout. The inflight performance was similar to expectations from preflight calibrations.

The ISOPHOT instrument (Lemke et al. 1996) carried a 3 × 3 array of unstressed Ge:Ga detectors operating from 50 to 105 μm and a 2 × 2 array of stressed devices operating from 120 to 200 μm. The readout was by a capacitive transimpedance metal oxide semiconductor field-effect transistor (MOSFET) amplifier whose processing had been adjusted to improve its performance at low temperatures (Dierckx et al. 1992). Calibration was assisted with a stimulator built into the instrument, which could be viewed by adjusting the position of a scan mirror. In practice, the unstressed focal plane never achieved the performance level anticipated from laboratory measurements of its noise equivalent power (NEP). The performance of the stressed devices was substantially better, due in part to the relatively large fast-response component of these devices (compared with the slow component) and their better thermal isolation from the readout amplifiers.

The Long Wavelength Spectrometer (LWS) on ISO (Swinyard et al. 1996) used a single Ge:Be detector, five Ge:Ga detectors, and four stressed Ge:Ga detectors. The readouts were based on JFETs mounted in thermal isolation and heated to a temperature at which they operated with good stability and low noise. The readout circuit was an integrating source follower, and NEPs of $1 \times 10^{-18} \text{W Hz}^{1/2}$ were measured in the laboratory (Church et al. 1993). Calibration was assisted with built-in stimulators that were flashed between spectral scans. On-orbit, it was found that frequent small glitches, probably associated with cosmic-ray hits, limited the maximum integration times to shorter values than had been anticipated and also required a lower operating voltage (Burgdorf et al. 1998; Swinyard et al. 2000). With these mitigations, the NEPs were found to be ~4 times higher in orbit than expected from ground test data (Swinyard et al. 2000).

In MIPS, the Ge:Ga detectors are carefully isolated thermally from their readouts and operated at sufficiently cold temperatures that their dark currents are low and stable. The MOSFET-based readouts use a specialized foundry process that provides them with good DC stability even at the low operating temperature of ~1.5 K. This feature, combined with the capacitive TIA (CTIA) circuit, maintains the detector bias accurately. A scan mirror (based on a design provided by T. de Graauw 1994, private communication) modulates the signals on a pixel so measurements can be obtained from the relatively well-behaved (Haegel et al. 2001) fast component of the detector response. Responsivity variations are tracked with the aid of frequent Stimulator flashes. Finally, the instrument operations force observers to combine many short observations of a source into a single measurement. The high level of redundancy in the data helps identify outlier signals and also improves the calibration by simple averaging over variations. The efficacy of this operational approach is confirmed by the on-orbit results. Details of the design and construction of MIPS can be found in Heim et al. (1998), Schnurr et al. (1998), and Young et al. (1998). The inflight performance of MIPS is described by Rieke et al. (2004).

This paper describes the approaches to the reduction and calibration of the MIPS data. Section 2 details the challenges of using Si and Ge detectors in a space astronomy mission. Section 3 gives a summary of the design and operational features of MIPS that address these challenges. Section 4 gives an overview of the three stages of MIPS data reduction. These stages are discussed in more detail in the following three sections. Section 5 details the processing steps to turn the integration ramps into measured slopes. Section 6 discusses the corrections to transform the slopes into calibrated fluxes. Section 7 gives a brief overview of the use of the inherent redundancy in the observations to further improve the reduction. Section 8 gives the results of initial testing of these reduction techniques with flight data. Finally, § 9 provides a summary.

2. THE CHALLENGE

2.1. Germanium Arrays (70 and 160 μm)

At high backgrounds, such as might be encountered in an airborne instrument, far-infrared photoconductors behave relatively well, with rapid adjustment of the detector resistance
appropriate to a change in illumination level. As the background is decreased, the adjustment to equilibrium levels occurs in a multistep process with multiple associated time constants, as discussed below. Thus, the detectors can be used in a straightforward manner at high backgrounds, but precautions must be taken at low ones to track the calibration. For a more detailed discussion, see Rieke (2002).

The fast-response component in these detectors results from the current conducted within the detector volume associated with the drift of charge carriers freed by the absorption of photons. The speed of this component is controlled by the propagation of a zone boundary with drift velocity \( v_\mu \), so that the time constant is given by the free carrier lifetime divided by the photoconductive gain. This time is very fast (microseconds or shorter) in comparison to normal detection standards. However, as a charge moves within the detector, the electrical equilibrium must be maintained. For example, charge carriers generated by photoionization are removed from the detector when they drift to a contact. They are replaced by the injection of new charge carriers from the opposite contact, but the necessity for new charge can only be conveyed across the detector at a characteristic time proportional to the “dielectric relaxation time,” basically its capacitive or RC time constant:

\[
\tau_d = \frac{k_0 \epsilon_0}{\mu n_0 q} .
\]  

(1)

Here \( \epsilon_0 \) is the dielectric constant of the material, \( \mu \) is the mobility of the charge carrier of interest, \( \epsilon_0 \) is the permittivity of free space, \( n_0 \) is the density of free carriers, and \( q \) is the charge of the electron.

The slow-response components arise from this phenomenon. The form of this time constant makes explicit the dependence on the illumination level through the density of free charge carriers, \( n_0 \). In fully illuminated detectors (for example, the integrating cavities used for the 160 \( \mu \)m array) and at the low backgrounds appropriate for space-borne operation, \( \tau_d \) can be tens of seconds. In transverse contact detectors, such as those used for the MIPS 70 \( \mu \)m array, the part of the detector volume near the injecting contact may be poorly illuminated and have large resistance. The detector therefore adjusts to a new equilibrium only at the large dielectric time constant of this layer, which can be hundreds of seconds at low backgrounds. The initial shift of charge in the detector can set up a space charge that reduces the field in the bulk of the device, leading to a reduction of responsivity following the initial fast response. From its appearance on a plot of response versus time, this behavior is described as a “hook” response. As the field is restored at a characteristic rate of \( \tau_p \), the response grows slowly to a new equilibrium value. See Haegel et al. (2001) for detailed modeling of these effects.

In space applications, ionizing particles such as cosmic rays also affect the calibration of these detectors. The electrons freed by a cosmic-ray hit can be captured by ionized minority impurities, reducing the effective compensation and increasing the responsivity. The shifts in detector characteristics can be removed by warming it to a temperature that reestablishes thermal equilibrium, and then cooling it back to proper operating conditions. Between such anneal cycles, the responsivity needs to be tracked to yield calibrated data. All successful uses of far-infrared photoconductors at low backgrounds have included local relative calibrators of reverse bolometer design that allow an accurately repeatable amount of light to be put on the detector. These stimulators allow frequent measurement of the relative detector responsivity. In general, this strategy is most successful when the conditions of measurement are minimally changed to carry out the relative calibration. The MIPS instrument includes such calibrators, which are flashed approximately every 2 minutes. Based on data obtained at a proton accelerator and in space, the average increase in responsivity over a 2 minute period in the space environment can be 0.5%–1%, so the calibration interval allows for accurate tracking of the response.

2.2. Silicon Array (24 \( \mu \)m)

Although the detectors in the silicon array are expected to perform well photometrically, the array as a system shows a number of effects that must be removed to obtain calibrated data. The array is operated well below the freezeout temperature for the dopants in the silicon readout (the readout circuit uses a different foundry process from that developed for the Ge detectors). Therefore, the array must be operated in a continuous read mode to avoid setting up drifts in the outputs that would degrade the read noise. The flight electronics and software are designed to maintain a steady read rate of once per half MIPS second (see § 3.5). When the array is first turned on, the transient effects of the readout cause a slow drift in the outputs. Much of this effect can be removed by annealing the array, which is the standard procedure for starting the MIPS 24 \( \mu \)m operations.

The array shows an effect termed “droop.” The output of the device is proportional to the signal it has collected, plus a second term that is proportional to the average signal over the entire array. In addition, the 24 \( \mu \)m array has a number of smaller effects (e.g., row-droop, electronic nonlinearities, etc.), which are described later in this paper.

3. DESIGN AND OPERATION OF MIPS

The design and operation of MIPS is summarized here, paying special attention to those areas that answer the challenges outlined above and therefore produce data that can be reduced successfully.

3.1. Instrument Overview

MIPS has three instrument sections, one for 24 \( \mu \)m imaging, one for 70 \( \mu \)m imaging and low-resolution spectroscopy, and
one for 160 μm imaging. Light is directed into the three sections off a single-axis scan mirror.

The 24 μm section uses a 128 × 128 pixel Si:As IBC array and operates in a fixed broad spectral band extending from 21 to about 27 μm (the long-wavelength cutoff is determined by the photoabsorptive cutoff of the detector array). After light enters this arm of the instrument from a pickoff mirror, it is brought to a pupil on a facet of the scan mirror. It is reflected off this mirror into imaging optics that relay the telescope focal plane to the detector array at a scale of 2.55 pixel⁻¹, corresponding to a λ/2.2D sampling of the point-spread function, where D is the telescope aperture. The surface area of a 24 μm pixel is 75 × 75 μm². The field of view provided by this array is 5.3. A reverse bolometer stimulator in this optical train allows relative calibration signals to be projected onto the array. The scan mirror allows images to be dithered on the array without the overheads associated with moving and stabilizing the spacecraft. It also enables an efficient mode of mapping (scan mapping) in which the spacecraft is scanned slowly across the sky, and the scan mirror is driven in a sawtooth waveform that counters the spacecraft motion, freezing the images on the detector array during integrations.

The 70 μm section uses a 32 × 32 pixel Ge:Ga array, sensitive from 53 to 107 μm. A cable failure external to the instrument has disabled half of the array, and the following description reflects this situation. The light from the telescope is reflected into the instrument off a second pickoff mirror. It is brought to a pupil at a second facet of the scan mirror and from there passes through optics that bring it to the detector array. For this arm of the instrument, there are actually three optical trains that can relay the light to the array; the scan mirror is used to select the path to be used for an observation. One train provides imaging over a 2.7 × 5.3 field, with a pixel scale of 0.8’’ corresponding to a λ/1.8D sampling of the point-spread function. The physical size of a 70 μm pixel is 0.75 × 0.75 mm² and 2 mm long in the direction of the optical axis. This train provides imaging over a fixed photometric band from 55 to 86 μm. The scan mirror feeds this mode when it is in position to feed the other two arrays, so imaging can be done on all three arrays simultaneously. A second train also provides imaging in the same band, but with the focal plane magnified by a factor of 2 to 4’’ pixel⁻¹. This mode is provided for imaging compact sources, for which the maximum possible angular resolution is desired: the pixel scale corresponds to λ/3.5D at the center wavelength of the filter band. The third train brings the light into a spectrometer, with a spectral resolution of R = λ/Δλ ∼ 25–15 from 53 to 107 μm. In this spectral energy distribution (SED) instrument mode, light is directed to a reflective “slit” and then to a concave reflective diffraction grating that disperses the light and images the spectrum onto a portion of the 70 μm array. The slit is 16 pixels long and 2 pixels wide, corresponding to 2.7 × 0.32 on the sky. The dispersion is 1.73 μm pixel⁻¹. Reverse bolometer stimulators are provided for calibration, and the scan mirror provides the dithered and scan mapping modes of operation at 70 μm as described for the 24 μm array.

The 160 μm section shares the pickoff mirror and scan mirror facet with the 24 μm band. After the light has been reflected off the scan mirror, the telescope focal plane is reimaged and divided, with part going to the Si:As array and part going to a stressed Ge:Ga array, operating in a fixed filter band from 140 to 180 μm. This array has 2 × 20 pixels, arranged to provide an imaging field 5.3 long in the direction orthogonal to the scan mirror motion, with the two rows of detectors spaced such that there is a gap 1 pixel wide between the two rows. This pixel size provides λ/2.2D sampling of the point-spread function. The physical size of a 160 μm pixel is 0.81 × 0.81 × 0.81 mm³. Reverse bolometer stimulators are included in the optical train, and the scan mirror provides modes similar to those with the other two arrays.

3.2. Stimulators

A key aspect of the calibration of the MIPS Ge arrays is the frequent use of stimulators (Beeman & Haller 2002) to track responsivity variations. The emitters in these devices are sapphire plates blackened with a thin deposition of bismuth, which also acts as an electrical resistor. The emitters are suspended in a metal ring by nylon supports and their electrical leads.

When a controlled current is run through the device, the sapphire plate is rapidly heated by ohmic losses in the metallized layer. The thermal emission is used to track changes in detector response in a relative manner; hence, these devices are described as stimulators rather than calibrators. Because of the large responsivity of the detector arrays, it is necessary to operate these stimulators highly inefficiently to ensure accurate control without blinding the detectors. They are mounted inside cavities that are intentionally designed to be inefficient (e.g., black walls, small exit holes). This allows the stimulators to be run at high enough voltage to be stable and emit at a reasonable effective temperature.

The constant-amplitude stimulator flashes provide a means of tracking the responsivity drift inherent in the Ge detectors. Figure 1 illustrates the importance of tracking the responsivity variations of Ge detectors with as fine a time resolution as feasible. The repeatability of the stimulator measurements is a function of both the background seen by the detector element and the amplitude of the stimulator (stim) signal above the background. The repeatability of a measurement of the stim signal improves with decreasing background and increasing stim amplitude. For both the 70 and 160 μm arrays, in ground-based testing, stim amplitudes of greater than ~7500 DN s⁻¹ above the background yielded a repeatability of better than ~1% on most backgrounds. Setting the stim amplitudes at this level provides a balance between repeatability of the stim and the range of backgrounds accessible to observation without
saturation. At this level, well over 95% of the sky should be observable without saturating stim flash measurements at both 70 and 160 \( \mu \text{m} \).

Additional complications at 160 \( \mu \text{m} \) include a strong illumination gradient in the stim flash illumination pattern from one end of the array to the other, in addition to a large increase in the responsivity of the array with exposure to cosmic rays. It is not possible to set the stim amplitude at the optimum 7500 DN s\(^{-1}\) across the whole array, due to a factor of 4 gradient in the stim amplitude across the array. The on-orbit stim amplitude was set to provide an optimal amplitude over the majority of the 160 \( \mu \text{m} \) pixels. The degradation in stim repeatability on the low-illumination region can be mitigated by an observing strategy that dithers the image such that the same region of the sky spends equal amounts of time on both regions of the detector.

### 3.3. Anneals

Both of the Ge arrays show calibration shifts with even small exposure to ionizing radiation. The effects of ionizing particles were tested using characterization arrays (see § 4.1) at the University of California, Davis, accelerator. The proton beam was attenuated to reduce the particle impact rate to a level similar to that expected on orbit. The energy of the particles was such that each impact was strongly ionizing, depositing much more energy in the detector volume than is expected from a typical cosmic ray. Thus, these tests served as a worst-case model of the detector response to cosmic rays on orbit.

The detector responsivity slowly increased with time under exposure to the proton beam. The rate of responsivity increase on the 70 \( \mu \text{m} \) array was comparable to that observed under typical illumination conditions (e.g., Fig. 1) without the proton beam, suggesting that accumulated transient response from the background and signals inside the cold test chamber and the photon flux at the accelerator contribute similarly to the responsivity increase. If the particle impacts at the accelerator really represent a worst-case scenario, this suggests that the on-orbit responsivity increase of the 70 \( \mu \text{m} \) array may be dominated by photon flux rather than cosmic-ray effects. In contrast, the 160 \( \mu \text{m} \) array showed a large responsivity increase with increasing radiation dose.

If they are of modest size, such responsivity shifts can be determined and removed during calibration through the use of the stimulator observations. However, when the shifts are large, they are also highly unstable and can result in substantial excess noise. Three methods were tested to remove such effects: rethermalization of the detectors by heating them (anneals), exposing the detectors to a bright photon source, and boosting the detector bias above breakdown. Our experiments indicated that the latter two methods produced little benefit. Although the instrument design permits the use of all three techniques, we remove radiation damage to the Ge arrays by periodically thermally annealing the detectors.

### 3.4. Observing Modes

There are four MIPS observing modes, all of which have been designed to provide a high level of redundancy to ensure good quality data (especially for the Ge arrays). The “photometry mode” is for point and small sources. As an example of the redundancy inherit in MIPS observations, a visualization of a single photometry-mode cycle is shown in Figure 2 for 70 \( \mu \text{m} \). The “scan map mode” provides efficient, simultaneous mapping at 24, 70, and 160 \( \mu \text{m} \) by using a ramp motion for the scan mirror to compensate for continuous telescope motion,
effectively freezing images of the sky on the arrays. A visualization of a small portion of a scan leg is shown in Figure 3. The SED mode provides 53 to 107 \( \mu m \) spectra with a resolution \( R \approx 25–15 \). The “total power mode” (TPM) is for making absolute measurements of extended emissions.

3.5. Data Collection

The pacing of the MIPS data collection is based on a “MIPS second.” A MIPS second is approximately 1.049 s and has been selected to synchronize the data collection with potential sources of periodic noise, such as the computer clock or the oscillators in the power supplies. To first order, this design prevents the down-conversion of pickup from these potential noise sources into the astronomical signals. The data are taken in data collection events (DCEs); at the end of a DCE, the array is reset before taking more data. DCEs are currently limited to 3, 4, 10, or 30 MIPS seconds for the 24 \( \mu m \) array and 3, 10, or 10 MIPS seconds for the 70 and 160 \( \mu m \) arrays.

During a DCE, each pixel generates a voltage ramp on the array output, as the charge from incoming photons is accumulated on the input node of its integrating amplifier. These ramps are the basic data collected by all three arrays. The 24 \( \mu m \) array is nondestructively read out every 1/2 MIPS second, while the 70 and 160 \( \mu m \) arrays are nondestructively read out every 1/4 MIPS second. All the samples are downlinked for the 70 and 160 \( \mu m \) arrays, but this is not possible for the 24 \( \mu m \) array, due to bandwidth restrictions. The 24 \( \mu m \) array has two data modes, SUR and RAW. Most 24 \( \mu m \) data are taken in SUR mode, in which the ramps are fitted to a line and only the fitted slope and first difference (the difference between the first two reads in the ramp) are downlinked. The RAW mode downlinks the full 24 \( \mu m \) ramps, but this mode is used only for engineering observations.

4. OVERVIEW OF MIPS DATA PROCESSING

There are three natural steps in reducing data from integrating amplifiers: (1) converting the integration ramps to slopes, (2) further time-domain processing of the slope images, and (3) processing of dithered images in the spatial domain. For detectors that do not have time-dependent responsivities, only the first and last steps are usually important.

This is strongly not the case for the MIPS Ge arrays, and also mildly not so for the MIPS Si array. As a result, MIPS processing includes all three steps. First, the integration ramps are converted into slopes (DN s\(^{-1}\)) while removing instrumental signatures with time constants on the order of the DCE exposure times (§ 5). Second, the slopes are calibrated, and instrumental signatures with time constants longer than the DCE exposure times are removed (§ 6). Third, the redundancy inherent in the MIPS observing modes allows a second pass at removing instrumental signatures (§ 7). The algorithms used in the first two steps have mostly been determined. The main algorithms used by the third step are being optimized with actual data taken on orbit. Portions of the reduction algorithms described in this paper were presented in a preliminary form by Hesselroth et al. (2000).

We made extensive use of laboratory testing and theoretical investigations in choosing and ordering the relevant steps. Figure 4 is a graphical representation of the specific tasks in each of the three processing steps.
4.1. Laboratory Testing of Ge Arrays

Three versions of the 70 and 160 μm arrays were constructed: a flight array, a flight spare array, and a characterization array. Before integration into the instrument, the basic performance of the flight and flight spare arrays was measured (i.e., read noise, dark current, NEP, etc.). The characterization arrays were then installed in the two specialized Dewars previously used for the flight and flight spare array testing. These arrays are used to determine the detailed behaviors of the 70 and 160 μm detectors. This knowledge was then used to design observations with the flight arrays to remove specific Ge detector effects. The ability to do extensive testing on the characterization arrays has been crucial to the development of the data reduction algorithms for the Ge arrays detailed in this paper.

In addition to testing at the array level, testing at the instrument level was carried out using the Low Background Test Chamber (LBTC). The LBTC was constructed to allow for testing of the full MIPS instrument and thus had a number of independently controlled stimulators, including pinhole stimulators providing point sources for testing. The LBTC allowed the imaging performance of the full instrument to be tested and also provided extensive testing of the 24 μm array.

Additional details of the laboratory testing can be found in Young et al. (2003).

4.2. Numerical Modeling of Ge Arrays

We also carried out detailed numerical modeling of the behavior of the Ge arrays. This modeling allowed effects found in the laboratory testing to be investigated in more detail. For example, the modeling was able to show that the difference in hook behaviors between the 70 and 160 μm arrays was due to their different illuminations (Haegel et al. 2001). The numerical modeling was also crucial to the understanding of the behavior of small signals on the detectors. For example, this modeling was able to determine that the stim flash latents (see § 5.2.1) were additive, not multiplicative. This understanding then guided the efforts to remove this signal.

5. RAMPS TO SLOPES

The first part of the processing fits the ramps to produce slopes for each DCE. The processing for the Ge (70 and 160 μm) and Si (24 μm) RAW mode data is similar, differing only in the instrumental signatures removed. First, reads that should be rejected from the linear fits are identified. Reads are rejected if they represent missing data, autoreject reads, or saturated data. Second, the ramps are corrected for instrumental effects. These are dark current (Si only), row-droop (Si only), droop (Si only), electronic nonlinearities, and stim flash latents.
Fig. 4.—Graphical representation of the flow of the reduction of MIPS data.

(Ge only). Third, jumps in the ramps usually caused by cosmic rays are identified. In the process, reads that are abnormally noisy are identified as noise spikes. Finally, all the continuous segments in each ramp are fitted with lines and the resulting slopes are averaged to produce the final slope for each pixel. An example of a 24 μm ramp is given in Figure 5. The 70 and 160 μm ramps are very similar to the 24 μm ramp, except they do not have droop. The graphical representation of the data processing shown in Figure 4 gives the ordering of the reduction steps. The processing for the Si SUR-mode data is necessarily different, as the ramps are fitted onboard and only the slope and first difference images are downlinked. The following subsections describe the Si and Ge RAW-mode processing, followed by a description of the necessary differences for the Si SUR-mode processing.

5.1. Steps Common to Si and Ge RAW Modes

5.1.1. Rejected Reads—Autoreject and Saturated Reads

There are two reasons to automatically reject (autoreject) reads: to avoid reset signatures and having to use the ramps beyond 2 MIPS seconds for stim flash DCEs. All MIPS arrays
are reset at the beginning of a ramp, and this has been seen to leave a signature in the first few reads. In general, this reset signature only affects the first read. The first read is automatically rejected for all three arrays. This is even true for SUR data for which the line fit is done onboard Spitzer. The 70 and 160 μm arrays can be operated with a reset in the middle of the DCE to improve performance. When this mode is used, the reset signature has been seen to last for four reads, and these four reads are then automatically rejected. In a stim flash DCE, only the first 2 MIPS seconds of a ramp are valid. After 2 MIPS seconds, the stim is turned off, and after 2.5 MIPS seconds, a reset is applied.

Finally, all reads that are below or above the allowed limits for the MIPS analog-to-digital converters (ADCs; soft saturation) or saturating the 70 and 160 μm readout circuits (hard saturation) are flagged as low or high saturation, respectively.

### 5.1.2. Electronic Nonlinearity Correction

All three MIPS arrays display nonlinearities that have been traced to the electronics. For the 24 μm array, these nonlinearities are mainly due to a gradual debiasing that occurs as charge accumulates in each pixel during an exposure. For the 70 and 160 μm arrays, the readout circuits have been constructed to keep the same bias voltage across the detectors, even as charge accumulates. Nevertheless, electronic nonlinearities arise due to the simplified CTIA circuit.

The behavior of the electronic nonlinearities was determined from extensive ground-based testing on the flight arrays. For the 24 μm array, the functional form was characterized from RAW-mode data ramps; a typical case is shown in Figure 5. The ramps for most of the pixels can be nearly perfectly described by quadratic polynomial fits; the linear component of the fit directly gives the linearized signal. For the 70 and 160 μm arrays, the electronic nonlinearities have been shown to generally have a quadratic shape with significant deviations. Corrections were tabulated as a lookup table to allow for the semiarbitrary forms. For the 24, 70, and 160 μm arrays, the maximum nonlinearity at full well (ADC saturation) ranges over the array from ~10% to 15%, ~1% to 2%, and ~0.5% to 1%, respectively.

### 5.1.3. Ramp Jumps—Cosmic Rays, Readout Jumps, and Noise Spikes

The main reason discontinuities or jumps appear in MIPS ramps is cosmic rays. Cosmic rays strike the Ge detectors (70 and 160 μm arrays) at a rate of one per pixel per 12 s. The rate on the Si detector (24 μm array) is much lower, due to its smaller pixels. It is also possible to get a ramp jump due to an anomaly we have termed a “readout jump.” Ground-based testing has shown that the entire output of one of the 32 readouts (4 × 8 pixels) on the 70 μm array occasionally jumps up and then jumps back down by the same DN amount approximately 1 s later.

Jumps in the ramps are detected using a combination of two methods. First, \((n-1)\) two-point differences are constructed from the \(n\) reads, and outliers are flagged as potential ramp jumps using an iterative \(\sigma\)-clipping algorithm. These potential jumps are tested to see if they are noise spikes or actual ramp jumps by fitting lines to the segments on either side of the potential jump. If the two fitted lines imply a jump that is smaller than the expected noise, then the jump is actually a noise spike, not a cosmic-ray or readout jump.

Second, a more sensitive test for ramp jumps is performed (Hesselroth et al. 2000). This method works by assuming each read in a ramp segment has a ramp jump after it and by fitting lines to the resulting two subsegments on either side. The most significant ramp jump in the segment implied from the two line fits is then tested to see if it is larger than the noise. If so, then this read is labeled as a ramp jump. The process can be repeated on the subsequent ramp segments until no more jumps are found or a preset number of iterations have been performed.

As this second method is more sensitive than the first, but significantly more computationally intensive, we combine the two methods to achieve the best sensitivity to ramp jumps with the least computation time.

We explored the signatures of cosmic rays in ramps using several hours’ worth of 70 and 160 μm array data that were subject to constant illumination. We then extracted those ramps where we detected ramp jumps (assumed to be due to energetic particle impacts) and assessed the effects on the ramp after the impact. On the 70 μm array, we find two main effects: a steepening of the ramp that lasts for a few reads and a persistent responsivity increase of ~1% after a big hit (see Fig. 6). This
is consistent with the slow responsivity increase observed during the radiation run. These results dictate our strategy for dealing with cosmic-ray hits on this array: several reads that follow a hit should be rejected from slope fitting to ensure that the fast transient does not bias the slope measurement, while the small responsivity increase after large hits will be tracked by the stim flash measurements.

The 160 \textmu m array response to cosmic rays is somewhat different. We detected no fast transient within the ramp, but the slope of the ramp after a hit was often different from the slope before the hit. This slope change typically did not persist into the next DCE after a reset had occurred, as shown in Figure 6. Thus, we were unable to detect a persistent responsivity increase due to particle impacts, in contrast to the accelerator data (§ 3.3). Given that we are unable to predict how the slope will change after a particle hit, and that the slope returns to its previous value after the next reset (usually the next DCE), the conservative strategy for dealing with particle impacts on this array is to simply ignore all data between a particle hit and the next reset.

5.1.4. Line Fitting

Slopes are determined for each ramp by fitting lines to all the good segments in a ramp. The slope for a ramp is then the weighted average of the slopes of the ramp segments. The weight of each segment is determined from the uncertainty in the segment slope, as discussed in the next paragraph. Each good segment of a ramp is identified as containing only good reads and not containing any ramp jumps. Lines are fitted to these segments with the standard linear regression algorithm.

Calculating the uncertainties on the fitted slope and zero point is not as straightforward. The uncertainties on each read have both a correlated and random component. The correlated component is due to photon noise, as the reads are a running sum of the total number of photons detected. The random component is the read noise. We have derived equations for the linear fit uncertainties for the correlated component, following the work of Sparks (1998). The details of this derivation are given in Appendix A. The slope and zero-point uncertainties are calculated for the correlated and random read uncertainties separately and then combined in quadrature to get the final uncertainties.

5.2. Steps for Ge Raw Mode Only

5.2.1. Stim Flash Latent Correction

The calibration of the 70 and 160 \textmu m arrays is directly tied to the stim flashes measured approximately every 2 minutes. The brightness of these stim flashes is set as high as possible to ensure the best calibration (see § 3.2). These stim flashes produce a memory effect called a “stim flash latent” that is persistent for a brief time. Intensive measurements of stim flash latents have been performed at the University of Arizona on the 70 and 160 \textmu m characterization arrays. We determined the time constants, amplitudes, variations with the background, and repeatability of the stim flash latents, as well as the accuracy of the correction and the effects on the calibration of sources observed during the latent.

To characterize the decay behavior of the latents, we fit an exponential law to the time signal of each array pixel. Each
cycle is divided by the stim amplitude value, to have dimensionless data (fraction signal per stim). The function $F$ used to fit the latent is a double-exponential,

$$F(t) = b + a_1 e^{-t/\tau_1} - a_2 e^{-t/\tau_2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $t$ is the time after the stim is turned off, $b$ is the background level, $a_1$ and $a_2$ give the component amplitudes, and $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$ give the time constants.

At 70 $\mu$m, only a single exponential is needed (thus $a_2 = 0$). The amplitude $a_1$ is always less than 3% of the stim amplitude, and in most of the cases below 0.5%. The time constant $\tau_1$ ranges from 5 to 20 s. As a function of increasing background, $a_1$ increases and $\tau_1$ decreases. The latents are repeatable to 15% or better. An example of the stim latent of 1 pixel on the 70 $\mu$m characterization array is given in Figure 7.

At 160 $\mu$m, the latency effect is more pronounced than at 70 $\mu$m. The amplitude $a_1$ is less than 5% of the stim amplitude. The time constant $\tau_1$ ranges from 5 to 20 s. The amplitude $a_2$ is less than 3%. The time constant $\tau_2$ equals 20 s at high background and is negligible at low background. The amplitude $a_1$ and time constant $\tau_1$ are almost insensitive to the background. The latents are repeatable to 20% or better. Figure 7 also gives an example of the stim latent of 1 pixel on the 160 $\mu$m characterization array.

In general, the stim flash latents are negligible $\sim$30 s after the stim is turned off. In the first 30 s, the calibration of a point source might be overestimated by 1% at 70 $\mu$m and 12% at 160 $\mu$m if no correction is applied. To correct for the stim latent contribution to the pixel signal, we apply a time-dependent correction at the ramp level. We subtract the latent contribution, which is obtained by integrating equation (2). On preflight data, the amplitude of the latents after correction is reduced by a factor of $\sim$2 at 70 $\mu$m and $\sim$4 at 160 $\mu$m.

5.3. Steps for Si RAW Mode Only

5.3.1. Row-Droop Subtraction

The row-droop effect manifests itself as an additive constant to each individual pixel and is proportional to the sum of the number of counts measured by all pixels on its row, where a row is in the cross-readout direction. This effect is not completely understood and is similar to (but separate from) the droop phenomenon (see § 5.3.2). The additive signal imparted to each pixel on a row is constant and exhibits no gradient or dependence with pixel position; thus, it is not related to a charge bleed, or “Mux bleed,” effect. The row-droop contributes a small amount to the flux of an individual pixel and will only significantly affect pixels on rows with high-intensity sources. An example of row-droop from ground-based testing is shown in Figure 8.

Using images of pinhole sources obtained in ground testing, we have computed the row-droop constant of proportionality, $K_{rd}$. This is the factor that gives the fraction of the total counts in a row, which is the result of row droop and should be subtracted from each pixel in that row. We find that the constant of proportionality for the MIPS 24 $\mu$m array is $K_{rd} = 7.6 \pm 2.5 \times 10^{-5}$. Thus, the row-droop contributes $\approx$1% of the total number of counts on a row. The row-droop is corrected for on a read-by-read basis.
5.3.2. Droop Subtraction

Droop is a constant signal added to each pixel by the read-outs. The exact cause of droop is unclear. This extraneous signal, akin to a DC offset, is directly proportional to the total number of counts on the entire array at any given time. We have measured the constant of proportionality from ground test data. The droop-coupling constant was measured to be $0.33 \pm 0.01$, which agrees well with the 0.32 determined by BNA.

The droop-correction algorithm first computes the mean signal on the array, which is then multiplied by the droop-coupling constant to derive the droop signal, as given by

$$F_d = \frac{\sum_{i,j} F_{i,j}}{N_{\text{pix}}} C_d,$$

where $F_d$ is the droop signal, $F_{i,j}$ is the signal on each pixel (comprising both the actual incident flux and the droop), $N_{\text{pix}}$ is the number of pixels, and $C_d$ is the droop-coupling constant. The resultant droop signal is then subtracted from the original signal on each pixel.

Under normal circumstances, the uncertainty associated with this process is at the $\sim 1\%$ level, limited mainly by the uncertainty on the coupling constant. However, greater uncertainties arise when pixels are saturated; since ADC saturation occurs well before hard detector saturation, a droop signal will still accumulate for an incident flux above the ADC saturation level. In this case, the actual signal ramp must be extrapolated beyond the saturation point. The droop signal is determined by extrapolating a fit to the unsaturated portion of the ramp. As with the row-droop correction, the droop correction is done on a read-by-read basis for RAW-mode $24 \mu m$ data.

5.3.3. Dark Subtraction

Dark subtraction is done at each read using a dark calibration image containing the full dark ramp for each pixel. This step serves to remove both the (small) dark current contribution and the offset ramp starting points so that each ramp starts near zero.

5.4. Steps for Si SUR Mode Only

The majority of the $24 \mu m$ data are taken in the SUR mode instead of the RAW mode. In the SUR mode, a line is fitted to the data ramp onboard the spacecraft. The resulting slope and first difference (difference between the first two reads of the data ramp) images are downlinked instead of the full ramp. The first difference frame effectively increases the dynamic range of the SUR mode, as signals that saturate somewhere in the ramp, but after the second read, will have a valid measurement in the first difference frame. To reduce the data downlinked, any first difference value that is from a ramp that does not
not saturate is set to zero. This increases the compressibility of the first difference frame.

5.4.1. SUR Saturation Detection

There can be a degeneracy of SUR slope values, due to the possibility of saturation. The possible slope value for a given pixel reaches a maximum at full well, the point of ADC saturation. After that point, as the data ramp reaches saturation at the last few reads, the slope value will begin to decrease because the onboard SUR algorithm does not reject saturated reads. In cases of extreme saturation, the slope becomes quite small and can eventually become zero if saturation occurs within the first few reads. The first difference value is provided at the last few reads, in which case both the slope and the first difference would be zero. For all pixels that have been flagged for saturation, the first difference value should be used in place of the slope.

5.4.2. Row-Droop, Droop, and Dark Subtraction

The row-droop and droop subtraction is done in the same way for SUR mode as it is for the RAW mode, except that the corrections are performed on the slope and first difference images.

5.4.3. Electronic Nonlinearity Correction

Because the SUR data do not preserve the actual data ramps, the linearity correction is made somewhat complicated. Nevertheless, the quadratic behavior of the ramps can be used to analytically determine the linearization of the SUR slope values. This correction depends on the observed SUR slope value, exposure time, and known quadratic nonlinearity. Note that saturation invalidates this method, as the SUR slope-fitting algorithm does not reject saturated reads. In this case, no linearity correction is applied.

6. SLOPE IMAGE CALIBRATION

The next step in the MIPS data reduction is to calibrate the slope images while removing instrumental effects with time constants longer than the DCE exposure times. The instrumental effects corrected at this stage include latents (24 μm), responsivity drift (70 and 160 μm), pixel-to-pixel responsivity variations, the telescope illumination pattern, and flux nonlinearities (70 and 160 μm). The graphical representation of the data processing shown in Figure 4 gives the ordering of the reduction steps. Since the time-dependent responsivity of the Ge arrays requires more calibration steps than is usual for more common array detectors, we give the mathematical basis of our Ge slope calibration in § 6.1.

6.1. Principles

Ignoring the 70 and 160 μm flux nonlinearities, an uncalibrated slope image can be represented by

\[ U(i, j, t_n) = [I(i, j)O(i, j) + D(i, j)]R(i, j, t_n), \]

where \( I(i, j) \) is the science image of interest, \( O(i, j) \) represents the telescope and instrument optics (the mean of \( O[i, j] \) is one), \( D(i, j) \) is the dark current, and \( R(i, j, t) \) is the instantaneous responsivity of the array; \( i, j \) represent the pixel coordinates and \( t_n \) the time of the \( n \)th DCE. Calibration involves isolating \( I(i, j) \), the flux from the sky + object in the above equation. The term \( O(i, j)R(i, j, t_n) \) is the equivalent of a traditional flat-field term. As \( R(i, j, t_n) \) is a rather sensitive function of time for the 70 and 160 μm detectors, however, a global “flat field” cannot be determined, but must be derived for each DCE separately. The stimulators provide the means to monitor \( R(i, j, t_n) \), and all science observations will be bracketed by stim flashes. Stim flash images will be equivalent to science frames, with the addition of a stimulator illumination pattern

\[ U_{th, N} = [S(i, j) + I(i, j)O(i, j) + D(i, j)]R(i, j, t_n), \]

where \( S(i, j) \) is the illumination pattern introduced on the array by the stim flash, with the mean of \( S(i, j) \) equal to 1. MIPS observations include the requirement that each stimulator flash be preceded by a background exposure with the identical telescope pointing; thus, for the \( N \)th stimulator DCE, there exists a background DCE taken at time \( t_N - \epsilon \):

\[ U_{bkgd, N} = [I(i, j)O(i, j) + D(i, j)]R(i, j, t_N - \epsilon). \]

If we assume that the responsivity of the array \( R(i, j, t) \) does not change dramatically between times \( t_N \) and \( t_N - \epsilon \) [i.e., \( R(i, j, t_N) \sim R(i, j, t_N - \epsilon) \)], we can construct for each stimulator flash a background-subtracted stim flash

\[ U_{in, N} - U_{bkgd, N - \epsilon} \sim S(i, j)R(i, j, t_N). \]

With background-subtracted stim flashes determined from equation (7) for all stim flashes in the data set, an instantaneous stim can be determined for any time \( t_n \) by interpolation from
bracketing stim flashes:

$$S(i, j)R(i, j, t_n) = F[S(i, j)R(i, j, t_n)],$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)$$

where $F[...]$ is some interpolating function on background-subtracted storms for times $t_n$ bracketing $t_s$. Analysis of Ge characterization array data indicates that a weighted linear fit (weighted by the uncertainty in the stim flash frames) to two stim flashes on either side of the data frame (a total of four stim flashes) provides the optimal strategy for determining the instantaneous stim amplitude (repeatability to $\sim1\%$ on most backgrounds). Dividing science frames (eq. [4]) by the interpolated instantaneous stim frame (eq. [8]) produces

$$U_{\text{data}}(i, j) = [I_{\text{data}}(i, j)O(i, j) + D(i, j)]/S(i, j).$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)$$

While we have removed the time-dependent responsivity variation, the data of interest, $I_{\text{data}}(i, j)$, are still modified by the optical response and the dark current. In addition, we have introduced the stimulator illumination pattern into our data. Fortunately, since the time dependence has been removed, we can remove these other instrumental signatures through carefully accumulated calibration data.

First, the dark correction $D(i, j)$ can be determined from a sequence of exposures as above, with the additional constraint that the scan mirror be positioned such that no light from the “sky” falls on the detector. Thus, the data and stim flashes in a dark current data sequence are represented by

$$U(i, j, t_n) = D(i, j)R(i, j, t_n)$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)$$

and

$$U_{\text{dark}} = [S(i, j) + D(i, j)]R(i, j, t_n),$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)$$

respectively. The dark data are corrected for responsivity variations exactly as described above, and the individual frames are combined to produce an average dark current, $D(i, j)/S(i, j)$. Subtracting this dark current from science frames that have been corrected for responsivity variations, equation (9) yields

$$U_{\text{data}}(i, j) = I_{\text{data}}(i, j)O(i, j)/S(i, j).$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)$$

our responsivity, dark corrected science frame. What remains is to correct for the telescope optics $O(i, j)$ and the stim illumination pattern $S(i, j)$.

Correcting for the combined illumination pattern of the telescope and stim involves a standard series of MIPS exposures; i.e., data frames interspersed with stim flashes. As such, they may be represented by equations of the form of equation (4), where the $I_{\text{data}}(i, j)$ represent dithered images of “blank” sky fields. Calibrating the sequence by correcting for responsivity variations and dark current as above results in a series of images

$$U_{\text{illum}}(i, j, t_n) = I_{\text{illum}}(i, j)O(i, j)/S(i, j).$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)$$

Since by construction the $I_{\text{illum}}(i, j)$ are dithered images of “smooth” regions, if a large number of $I_{\text{illum}}(i, j)$ are acquired, they may be median combined to remove point sources (and extended sources, if dithered “sufficiently”), cosmic rays, etc., resulting in

$$U_{\text{illum}}(i, j) = \langle I_{\text{illum}}(i, j) \rangle O(i, j)/S(i, j) = C O(i, j)/S(i, j),$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)$$

where $O(i, j)$ and $S(i, j)$ are constant, regardless of telescope pointing. Hence, the median only affects the changing sky image as the telescope is dithered. The constant $C$ in equation (15) can be set to 1, resulting in the illumination correction frame

$$U_{\text{illum}}(i, j) = O(i, j)/S(i, j).$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)$$

The responsivity corrected, dark subtracted data (eq. [12]) are now divided by the illumination correction, resulting in

$$U_{\text{data}}(i, j) = I_{\text{data}}(i, j)O(i, j)/S(i, j) = I(i, j).$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)$$

and we have recovered the quantity of interest, the astronomical sky $I(i, j)$. Suitable observations of standard stars can then be used to convert instrumental counts to physical units (e.g., Janskies).

### 6.2. Dark, Flat-Field, and Illumination Correction

The dark, flat-field, and illumination correction calibration images described above will be obtained throughout the life of the mission. Example preflight calibration images are shown in Figures 9–11. Simulations indicate that high signal-to-noise ratio (S/N) flat-field and illumination correction images ($\sim0.5\%$ rms) can be obtained with dithered observations of “smooth” areas of the sky: $\sim$60–100 DCEs at 24 $\mu$m and $\sim$200 DCEs at 70 $\mu$m are required. At 160 $\mu$m, the situation is less ideal, with simulations indicating as many as 500 DCEs may be required to produce flats to better than 1% rms.

### 6.3. Si Latent Correction

Si IBC arrays are known to have considerable latency, where the signal induced by bright illumination persists after the illumination has terminated. Ideally, if one knows the position of a source exposed on the array and the latency decay behavior, these artifacts can be subtracted from an image. We have characterized the latent behavior from ground test data. Several different conditions were explored, including varying bright-
nesses of the illuminating source, varying brightnesses of the background, initial bias boosts, and changing the number of resets via different exposure times. A bias boost can flush out most of the trapped charge, but resets are not nearly as effective. Since bias boosts will only be done in the first DCE of each observation, we correct for latent residuals in the data processing.

The latent decay curve can be described by single exponential, given by

$$m(t) = m_0 + pe^{-\tau t},$$

where $m_0$ is the slope in the absence of a latent, $p$ is the initial value of the latent, and $\tau$ is the latent time constant. Based on the limited ground data, the latent parameters ($p$ and $\tau$) appear to be functions of background levels, number of resets, and possibly location on the array. In general, the latent contribution is about $\sim1\%$ of the initial source brightness $\sim5$ s after that source has shut off. Higher background levels yield slightly higher values for $p$ and lower values of $\tau$. The value of $\tau$ is in the range of $12 \pm 5$ s.

### 6.4. Ge Flux Nonlinearity Correction

Both the 70 and 160 $\mu$m arrays exhibit nonlinearities that are dependent on the incident point-source flux as well as the background. These are termed "flux nonlinearities" and have been observed in data taken with the characterization array as well as the flight array. As is usual for the Ge arrays, each pixel shows flux nonlinearities, with a different dependence on source flux and background. Correction for this effect can be divided into two parts: (1) removing the pixel-to-pixel differences in the nonlinearity, followed by (2) the application of a global nonlinearity correction as a function of the source brightness and background.

The pixel-to-pixel variations in the flux nonlinearity can be mapped by analyzing the ratio of two stim flashes, one of which is the standard on-orbit calibrating stim flash. Measured dif-
ferences in the ratio from pixel to pixel can be used to correct each pixel to the same flux nonlinearity for the given background and source (second stim flash) amplitude. Repeating the measurement for a variety of second stim flash amplitudes (up to saturation for each pixel) and backgrounds will map out the correction. The second, global stage of the correction can be characterized by observations of calibration stars with a range of known brightness ratios on similar backgrounds. The combination of these two tasks outlined above should provide a good measurement of the flux nonlinearity correction for a range of backgrounds. This correction will improve continuously during the mission as the range of backgrounds and calibration stars expands.

6.5. Flux Calibration

The absolute calibration of MIPS will rely on a well-determined anchor at 10.6 μm, using the fundamental calibrators \( \alpha \) Boo, \( \alpha \) Tau, and \( \beta \) Gem (Rieke et al. 1985; Cohen et al. 1992). Three independent methods will be used to extrapolate the calibration at 10.6 μm to the MIPS bands: (1) solar analogs, (2) A star atmospheric models, and (3) semi-empirical models of K giants. Grids of stars for each method have been observed from the ground and tied to the fundamental calibrators at 10.6 μm. For the solar analog stars, on-orbit observations at 24, 70, and 160 μm are being compared with extrapolations of empirical measurements of the Sun into the MIPS bands. A grid of A stars has been observed in all three bands on orbit and compared to extrapolations of A-star atmosphere models to the MIPS bands. While the solar analog and A-star calibrators will be observed in the MIPS 160 μm band, the K giant calibrators will be the only ones detectable at a high S/N in that band. On-orbit observations of the K giant calibrators are being compared to theoretical extrapolations of model atmospheres; e.g., Cohen et al. (1995, 1996a, 1996b) extrapolated to longer wavelengths using the Engelke function (Engelke 1992). Absolute flux calibrators will be observed throughout the lifetime of the mission.

7. USING REDUNDANCY TO IMPROVE CALIBRATION

The last step in the reduction of MIPS data is to use the redundancy inherent in the observing modes to improve the removal of instrumental signatures. This step is mainly for the 70 and 160 μm data, due to the challenging aspects of Ge detector calibration. We define the level of redundancy to be the number of different pixels that measure the same point on the sky. Our approach will be to look for known instrumental signatures (as a function of time) in the difference between what a particular pixel detects and what all the other pixels detected for the same sky locations. This is possible because the observing strategy has been designed so that each point on the sky will be observed multiple times by different pixels.

Table 1 shows the minimum level of redundancy for each MIPS observing mode. Many MIPS observations are taken with multiple cycles, resulting in significantly higher redundancies. It is recommended to have a minimum redundancy of four.

7.1. Algorithm

The basic algorithm for using redundancy to refine the instrumental signature removal is as follows.

1. Create a mosaic of all the images in question. During the mosaic creation, use a \( \sigma \)-rejection algorithm to remove data that deviate from the majority of the observations.
2. Use the mosaic as a “truth” image of what each image should have measured.
3. For each pixel, subtract the actual from the “truth” measurements to create a measurement of the time history differences.
4. Examine the difference time history for known instrumental signatures. While many instrumental signatures could be present, we plan to concentrate on stim latent residuals and systematic differences between “extended” sources and point sources. Actual on-orbit data will guide the details and number of instrumental signatures that are corrected using redundancy.
5. Correct for all instrumental signatures that are found to be significant.
6. Iterate steps 1–5 until no new significant instrumental signatures are found.
7.2. Distortions of Arrays

To use the redundancy to remove additional instrumental signatures, we must first co-add all related observations into a single mosaic. Because the MIPS optical train is made up of purely off-axis reflective elements, there exist scale changes and rotations across the re-imaged focal plane. To co-add images taken at different places on the array, it is crucial to correct the data for these distortions.

We used the Code V optical models for the Spitzer MIPS to estimate the distortions present in the images from the three MIPS detectors. The results from Code V allow us to determine distortion polynomials that can then be used to correct for the distortions. We estimated the distortions by setting up a grid of equally spaced points in the field of view at a specific scan mirror angle. The chief ray from each object point was traced through the system to where it was imaged on the focal plane.

In a perfect optical system, the image points would map perfectly from the object, with a possible change in magnification. The difference between the ideal location and the actual location is the distortion. For example, Figure 12 is a vector plot of the distortions present in the 70 µm narrow-field array. The equally spaced grid of points presents the focal plane points, and the ends of the vectors correspond to the object points, after a plate scale factor was applied. The difference in the points (the length of the vector) is caused by the distortions.

Table 2 lists the scale change of the field of view of the different MIPS arrays. The scale change is defined as (maximum length of distorted field/minimum length of the distorted field)/(minimum length of the distorted field). From a distortion standpoint, it is useful to look closely at individual pixels to see how distortion changes the area imaged on the pixel. Figure 13 is a plot of a distorted pixel in the 70 µm narrow-field array. One can see that the distorted pixel changes from a square to a somewhat trapezoidal shape. The ratio of the distorted to undistorted pixel area is 1.19. Table 3 lists information on how distortion affects the area imaged on individual pixels on the

![Fig. 12.—70 µm narrow-field mode residuals between the distorted and undistorted points after the object angles were converted to pixels. Note the 1 pixel scale in the lower left-hand corner.](image1)

![Fig. 13.—70 µm NF mode distorted pixel. This pixel is located in the right-hand corner of the array, with (area distorted/area undistorted) = 1.1929. In this plot, the distorted pixel is plotted with a solid line, and the undistorted pixel is plotted with a dot-dashed line.](image2)

### Table 2

| Detector   | % FOV Scale |
|------------|-------------|
| 24 µm      | 2.84        |
| 70 µm, wide| 0.2         |
| 70 µm, narrow | 7.70     |
| 160 µm     | 7.78        |

### Table 3

| Detector   | Area Ratio |
|------------|------------|
| 24 µm      | 0.9998     |
| 70 µm, wide| 1.0027     |
| 70 µm, narrow | 1.0129   |
| 160 µm     | 0.9781     |
Following the procedure of converting the pixel coordinates to world coordinates as outlined in Greisen & Calabretta (2002), the distortion correction is applied to the pixel coordinates before any other transformations. The distortion correction is accounted for by distortion polynomials, which give the additive correction to map the distorted pixel coordinates \((u, v)\) to the distortion-corrected pixel coordinates \((p, q)\). Thus, 
\[
p = u + F(u, v)\quad \text{and} \quad q = v + G(u, v),
\]
where
\[
F(u, v) = A_{20}u^2 + A_{20}v^2 + A_{11}uv + A_{30}u^3 + A_{21}u^2v + A_{12}uv^2 + A_{03}v^3,
\]
and
\[
G(u, v) = B_{20}u^2 + B_{20}v^2 + B_{11}uv + B_{30}u^3 + B_{21}u^2v + B_{12}uv^2 + B_{03}v^3.
\]

7.3. Mosaicking Details

The ability to remove additional instrumental signatures is dependent on creating a high-resolution mosaicked image. For the mosaicked image to be of sufficient resolution, the mosaicked pixel sizes must be smaller than the original input pixels. While many mosaicking programs compensate for undersampling by making use of dithered data, the MIPS data are well sampled and do not require this compensation. Instead, our focus is on adding the related calibrated images into a single image, without interpolating between pixels. Therefore, we always work on the coordinates of the corners of a pixel, transforming them from the input image coordinate system to the output mosaicked coordinate system. The output mosaic image is on a single tangent plane. In the transformation of the pixel corners in the input image pixels to their location on the output mosaic image, the corners are corrected for distortion, converted to right ascension and declination, and then projected onto the tangent plane defined by the right ascension and declination of the mosaic center. Figure 14 is an example of three images that overlap each other on the mosaicked plane. In the process of establishing the location of the image pixel corners on the mosaicked plane, the link and overlap coverage between the input pixel and the output pixels it falls on is determined. A critical step in removing residual instrumental signatures based on the co-added mosaic image depends on correctly linking each mosaic pixel with each image pixel that overlaps it (and vice versa) and accurately determining the degree of overlap. Essentially, each output subsampled mosaic pixel becomes a cube of data, with each plane in this cube representing the information in each overlapping image pixel. The surface brightness and uncertainty associated with each mosaic pixel is found by a weighted averaging of the overlapping planes of data. In the surface brightness case, the weighting is based on the overlap coverage and uncertainty associated with the input image pixel.

The information in each mosaic pixel is based on multiple observations of a single area on the sky. This redundancy of data can be used to identify cosmic rays or any single image pixel measurement that deviates from the expected mean of multiple observations and expected noise. For example, for a 70 \(\mu m\) photometry observing mode cycle, if one of the pixels suffers from a much larger signal than the other observations, it will stand out and be identified as an outlier. As an outlier, it will not be used in creating the mosaicked image. After all the outliers have been determined, then the links between the output mosaic pixel and the input image pixels are used to tally the number of times an image pixel was flagged as an outlier. If the majority of the time an image pixel was flagged as deviant, then this pixel is flagged in the original data as an outlier. If a sufficiently large number (about 1%) of the input image pixels are flagged as outliers, then the mosaic step is repeated. The final output is a mosaic image that can then be used as the “truth” image of what each image should have measured. Following the steps outlined in § 7.1, this truth image is used to remove residual instrumental signatures.

8. INITIAL TESTING WITH FLIGHT DATA

With the successful launch of the Spitzer Space Telescope in 2003 August, these reduction algorithms were tested against MIPS flight data of astronomical sources. This testing has validated the algorithms described in this paper, but has also shown that a number of modifications will be needed to handle the realities of flight data. The initial results of this testing are summarized here and in Gordon et al. (2004), but a full accounting will be a subject of a future paper when the final MIPS flight data of astronomical sources. This testing has validated the algorithms described in this paper, but has also shown that a number of modifications will be needed to handle the realities of flight data. The initial results of this testing are summarized here and in Gordon et al. (2004), but a full accounting will be a subject of a future paper when the final MIPS flight data are known.

There were two significant changes in the instrument operations that are not easily correctable by reduction algorithms. The 70 \(\mu m\) array was found to suffer from a cable short induced sometime between ground testing and flight. This short injects a large amount of noise into one half of the 70 \(\mu m\) array, resulting in a useful array of only 16 \(\times\) 32 pixels. The 160 \(\mu m\) array was found to suffer from a “blue leak” caused by an unintended reflection from the blocking filter that passes through the bandpass filter. This “blue leak” results in a factor of \(\sim 15\) image leak for stellar sources. This leak means that asteroids are now the primary calibrators for 160 \(\mu m\). Other than bright stars, the leak signal is below the confusion limit for most science targets, as they have much smaller blue/160 \(\mu m\) ratios.

At 24 \(\mu m\), the preflight reduction algorithms were found to work well, with only three changes necessary. First, the row-drop correction does not seem necessary, but extensive testing has yet to be completed. Second, an additive offset in the second read of every ramp was found, which produced a low-level (1%–2%) gradient in final mosaics. A straightforward correction for this has been implemented using RAW and SUR data for cali-
Fig. 14.—Example of how a single pixel from three different images (only $4 \times 4$ pixels shown) are overlapped on the mosaic image. The solid point represents the same location on the sky as it would be observed in each image.

At 70 $\mu$m, flight data has validated the basic structure of the preflight reduction algorithms, but significant modification is required to account for time-dependent behaviors. The stim flash latents were found to grow in amplitude quickly after anneals. With a similar timescale, the residual background time dependence (after correction using the stim flash amplitudes) was seen to grow. These two facts required hand reductions to remove the stim flash latents and background variations to produce good quality mosaics at 70 $\mu$m. These two effects are prime candidates for removal using redundancy, but the effectiveness of automatic removal has not been demonstrated yet.

At 160 $\mu$m, the basic preflight algorithms have been validated from comparison with flight data. Some differences in detector behavior were seen in flight data. For example, the stim flash latents have a faster time constant than in preflight data. At this time, the nonlinearities in the 70 and 160 $\mu$m arrays have not been sufficiently characterized with flight data to validate this section of the preflight algorithms. Finally, the cosmic-ray rate seen in the Ge arrays has been seen to be about a factor of 2 higher than preflight predictions, 1 cosmic ray every 12 or so seconds. The ramp jump detection has been seen to work well, and line segment fitting removes the majority of the effects of these cosmic rays. Some residual effects remain, and additional characterization may lead to algorithms to remove these additional effects.

The effectiveness of the algorithms described in this paper, as well as the design of MIPS, is attested by the point-spread functions (PSFs) constructed from flight data at 24, 70, and
160 μm, shown in Figure 15. These PSFs all clearly have a well-defined first Airy ring with the 24 μm PSF also exhibiting a well-defined second Airy ring. All three PSFs are well represented by the predictions of Tiny Tim models (Krist 1993) adapted to MIPS. In addition, there are many papers written using MIPS flight data for the Spitzer special Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series issue (2004, ApJS, 154).

9. SUMMARY

This paper has described the preflight data reduction algorithms for all three arrays for the MIPS instrument on Spitzer. These algorithms have been guided by extensive laboratory testing of the Si (24 μm) and Ge (70 and 160 μm) arrays. In addition, numerical modeling of the Ge arrays has provided important insights into their behavior.

The design and operation of the MIPS instrument has been summarized to give sufficient background for understanding the data reduction algorithms. The specifications of the MIPS instrument are mainly driven by the needs of the Ge arrays. As Ge detectors display significant responsivity drift over time, due mainly to cosmic-ray damage, the MIPS observing modes include frequent observations of an internal illumination source. In addition, most MIPS operating modes have been designed to provide significant redundancy to increase the robustness of the MIPS observations against detector effects.

The data reduction for the MIPS arrays is divided into three parts. The first part converts the data ramps into slope measurements and removes detector signatures with time constants less than approximately 10 s. These detector signatures at 24 μm include saturation, dark current, row-droop, droop, electronic nonlinearities, and cosmic rays. At 70 and 160 μm, the detector signatures removed include saturation, electronic nonlinearities, stim flash latents, and cosmic rays. The resulting slopes are determined from linear fits, and their uncertainties are computed, accounting for both the random and correlated nature of the data ramp uncertainties.

The second part of the MIPS data reduction converts the slopes to calibrated slopes and removes detector signatures with time constants larger than approximately 10 s. At 24 μm, this translates to applying a flat field, correcting for object latents, and applying the flux calibration. At 70 and 160 μm, this step includes subtracting the dark, flat fielding using an instantaneous flat field, correcting for the flux nonlinearities, and applying the flux calibration. A flat field specific to each 70 and 160 μm image is required to correct for the time-dependent responsivity of the Ge arrays. It is constructed from the frequent stim flashes and a previously determined illumination correction.

The third data reduction step is to use the spatial redundancy inherent in the MIPS observing modes to improve the removal of instrumental signatures. This step is only applied to the Ge data. Known instrumental signatures are searched for in the difference between what a specific pixel and what all other pixels from the same sky locations detected. If instrument signatures are detected, they are removed and the process is repeated. This method is iterative in nature and will require care to avoid introducing spurious signals into the data. The design of this portion of the data reduction algorithms is necessarily the least developed, because only after Spitzer launches will it be known which instrumental signatures are important to correct with this method.

Finally, initial testing using flight data from MIPS has validated these data reduction algorithms, but some modification is necessary to account for the realities of flight. A future paper will describe these modifications in detail, once they have been devised and tested.

We wish to thank J. W. Beeman and E. E. Haller for their contributions to the design and building of the MIPS instrument. This work was supported by NASA JPL contract 960785.
When a detector is nondestructively read out multiple times before resetting, the resulting data ramps represent correlated measurements. This is because measurement \( y_{i+1} \) is equal to \( y_i + p_i \), where \( p_i \) is number of photons detected in the time between \( y_i \) and \( y_{i+1} \). This statement ignores the effects of read noise, which produces uncorrelated uncertainties on the \( y_i \) measurements. While fitting lines to data with correlations is a complex subject, the form of the correlations in the case of nondestructive readouts allows analytic equations to be derived for the linear fit parameters and uncertainties. We present a derivation of equations for linear fit parameters and their uncertainties for the case of a data ramp with correlated reads and no read noise. This derivation is based on a similar derivation by Sparks (1998) for NICMOS data ramps, but is slightly more general. As part of this derivation, it can be seen that the linear fit parameters derived assuming either random or correlated uncertainties are equivalent. This is not the case for the uncertainties on the fit parameters, which is the main motivation for this derivation.

The basics of fitting a line to data with random uncertainties are given in Bevington & Robinson (1992). We repeat their results here, as the derivation for correlated uncertainties draws directly from this work. In fitting data to a line of the form

\[
y_i = a + bx_i,
\]

the fit parameters and their uncertainties are

\[
a = \frac{S_{xy}S - S_xS_y}{\Delta}, \quad (A2)
\]

\[
b = \frac{SS_{xy} - S_xS_y}{\Delta}, \quad (A3)
\]

\[
\sigma_{y(ran)}^2 = \frac{S_{xx}}{\Delta}, \quad (A4)
\]

and

\[
\sigma_{y(ran)}^2 = \frac{S}{\Delta}, \quad (A5)
\]

where \( N \) is the number of \((x_i, y_i)\) measurements, \( \sigma(y_i) \) is the uncertainty on each measurement of \( y_i \),

\[
S = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma(y_i)^2}, \quad (A6)
\]

\[
S_x = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{x_i}{\sigma(y_i)^2}, \quad (A7)
\]

\[
S_{xx} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{x_i^2}{\sigma(y_i)^2}, \quad (A8)
\]

\[
S_y = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{y_i}{\sigma(y_i)^2}, \quad (A9)
\]

\[
S_{xy} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{x_iy_i}{\sigma(y_i)^2}, \quad (A10)
\]

and

\[
\Delta = SS_{xx} - (S_x)^2. \quad (A11)
\]

These equations assume that the measurements of \( y_i \) are independent.

To determine the linear fit terms for a line fit to correlated data ramps, the assumption that the \( y_i \) measurements are independent is not correct. The standard formulae need to be modified to sum over terms that are independent. The modifications start by realizing that

\[
p_i = y_i - y_{i-1}, \quad (A12)
\]

is the independent quantity in the absence of read noise. Any equation in the standard derivation that relies on the independence of \( y_i \) needs to be modified to only depend on \( p_i \). Thus,

\[
S_y = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{y_i}{\sigma(y_i)^2} \quad (A13)
\]

\[
= y_1 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma(y_i)^2} + y_1 + p_2 + \sum_{i=2}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma(y_i)^2} + p_3 + \sum_{i=3}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma(y_i)^2} + \cdots \quad (A14)
\]

\[
= y_1 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma(y_i)^2} + \sum_{i=2}^{N} \left[ p_i \sum_{k=i}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma(y_k)^2} \right] \quad (A15)
\]

\[
= y_1 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma(y_i)^2} + \sum_{i=2}^{N} \left[ p_i \sum_{k=i}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma(y_k)^2} \right] \quad (A16)
\]

\[
= y_1S + \sum_{i=2}^{N} \left[ p_i \sum_{k=i}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma(y_k)^2} \right] \quad (A17)
\]
and using a similar derivation,

$$S_{xy} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{x_i y_i}{\sigma(y_i)^2}$$  

(A18)

$$= y_i \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{x_i}{\sigma(y_i)^2} + \sum_{i=2}^{N} \left[ p_i \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{x_i}{\sigma(y_i)^2} \right]$$  

(A19)

$$= y_i S_x + \sum_{i=2}^{N} \left[ p_i \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{x_i}{\sigma(y_i)^2} \right]$$  

(A20)

The standard equations (A2) and (A3) can then be used to determine the best-fit values of $a$ and $b$ for the case of correlated uncertainties. In fact, the values of $a$ and $b$ derived assuming correlated or uncorrelated uncertainties are exactly the same. The differences between the two types of uncertainties arises in determining $\sigma_a$ and $\sigma_b$.

To derive $\sigma_a$ and $\sigma_b$ for a data ramp with correlated measurements, we start with equations (6.19) and (6.20) of Bevington & Robinson (1992). Converting from $y_i$ to $p_i$ as the independent variable gives

$$\sigma(a)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[ \sigma(y_i)^2 \left( \frac{\partial a}{\partial y_i} \right)^2 \right]$$  

(A21)

$$= \sum_{i=2}^{N} \left[ \sigma(p_i)^2 \left( \frac{\partial a}{\partial p_i} \right)^2 \right]$$  

(A22)

where $z$ is either $a$ or $b$. The partial derivatives needed are then

$$\frac{\partial a}{\partial p_i} = \frac{1}{\Delta} \left[ S_{xx} \frac{\partial S_x}{\partial p_i} - S_x \frac{\partial S}{\partial p_i} \right]$$  

(A23)

and

$$\frac{\partial b}{\partial p_i} = \frac{1}{\Delta} \left[ S_{xx} \frac{\partial S_x}{\partial p_i} - S_x \frac{\partial S}{\partial p_i} \right]$$  

(A24)

$$\frac{\partial b}{\partial p_i} = \frac{1}{\Delta} \left[ S \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{x_k}{\sigma(y_i)^2} - S \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma(y_i)^2} \right]$$  

(A25)

$$\frac{\partial b}{\partial p_i} = \frac{1}{\Delta} \left[ S \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{x_k}{\sigma(y_i)^2} - S \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma(y_i)^2} \right]$$  

(A26)

Thus,

$$\sigma_a(corr)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\sigma(p_i)^2}{\Delta^2} \left[ S_{xx} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma(y_i)^2} - S \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{x_k}{\sigma(y_i)^2} \right]$$  

(A27)

and

$$\sigma_b(corr)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\sigma(p_i)^2}{\Delta^2} \left[ S \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma(y_i)^2} - S \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma(y_i)^2} \right]$$  

(A28)

Finally, the uncertainties of the linear fit parameters for fits to data with both correlated and random uncertainties
The assumption that the uncertainties can be calculated separately for the correlated and random measurement uncertainties was tested via Monte Carlo simulations. Simulations for cases similar to that expected for the 70 μm array are plotted in Figure 16. As can be seen from these plots, equations (A29) and (A30) give very good estimates of the actual uncertainties.
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