



François Hénault UMR 6525 H. Fizeau, Université de Nice-Sophia Antipolis Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique Observatoire de la Côte d'Azur Parc Valrose, 06108 Nice – France





# **Previous publications**

- "Analysis of stellar interferometers as wavefront sensors," Appl. Opt. vol. 44, p. 4733-4744 (2005)
- "Conceptual design of a phase shifting telescope-interferometer," Optics Communications vol. 261, p. 34-42 (2006)
- "Signal-to-noise ratio of phase sensing telescope interferometers," J. Opt. Soc. Am. A vol. 25, p. 631-642 (2008)
- "Telescope interferometers: an alternative to classical wavefront sensors," Proceedings of the SPIE vol. 7015, n° 70155N (2008)
- "Multi-spectral piston sensor for co-phasing giant segmented mirrors and multi-aperture interferometric arrays," Journal of Optics A vol. 11, n° 125503 (2009)





# **General principle**

- There must be a reference subpupil (or segment) on the optical surface of the telescope
- Its dimensions are ≤ other segments. It is not necessarily centred
- Three (or four) phase-shifts are successively introduced into the reference sub-pupil:

$$\phi = 0, 2\pi/3 \text{ and } -2\pi/3$$



- Three different telescope PSFs are acquired and linearly combined with complex coefficients {1, exp $[2i\pi/3]$ , exp $[-2i\pi/3]$ }
- The result is inverse Fourier transformed → Smoothed replica of the original entrance wavefront <u>including phase</u>

Conf. 8149 Astronomical Adaptive Optics Systems and Applications V

San Diego, 08-21-11





### Extending measurement range beyond $[-\lambda/2,\lambda/2]$

- **Goal**: Given a piston error  $\delta p$ , remove the <u>2 $\pi$  ambiguity</u> of this WFS
- Use of a "synthetic wavelength" method based on three neighboring wavelengths  $\lambda_1$ ,  $\lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_3$
- Linear system to be solved

$$\begin{split} \delta p &= (n_1 + \phi_1) \ \lambda_1 \\ \delta p &= (n_2 + \phi_2) \ \lambda_2 \\ \delta p &= (n_3 + \phi_3) \ \lambda_3 \end{split}$$

 $(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3 \text{ measured})$  fractional phases)

• Synthetic wavelength  $\lambda_s$ 

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{\rm S}} = \frac{1}{\lambda_{\rm 1}} - \frac{2}{\lambda_{\rm 2}} + \frac{1}{\lambda_{\rm 3}}$$

Algorithm  

$$\begin{split} \delta p_0 &= \lambda_S \left( \phi_1 - 2\phi_2 + \phi_3 \right) \\ n_1 &= \text{NINT}(\delta p_0 / \lambda_1 - \phi_1) \\ n_2 &= \text{NINT}(\delta p_0 / \lambda_2 - \phi_2) \\ n_3 &= \text{NINT}(\delta p_0 / \lambda_3 - \phi_3) \\ \delta p_1 &= \lambda_1 \left( n_1 + \phi_1 \right) \\ \delta p_2 &= \lambda_2 \left( n_2 + \phi_2 \right) \\ \delta p_3 &= \lambda_3 \left( n_3 + \phi_3 \right) \\ \delta p &= \left( \delta p_1 + \delta p_2 + \delta p_3 \right) / 3 \end{split}$$

Self-sanity check

$$\Sigma_{\delta p}^{2} = \left[ (\delta p_{1} - \delta p_{2})^{2} + (\delta p_{2} - \delta p_{3})^{2} + (\delta p_{3} - \delta p_{1})^{2} \right] / 3$$

Conf. 8149 Astronomical Adaptive Optics Systems and Applications V





## WFS optical scheme





![](_page_5_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Picture_2.jpeg)

**Piston errors reconstruction (1/2)** 

![](_page_6_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### **Piston errors reconstruction (2/2)**

![](_page_7_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Limiting magnitudes in AO mode

![](_page_8_Figure_4.jpeg)

 For a 30-m telescope diameter, V = 4, 8 and 11 respectively in <u>medium</u>, <u>good</u> and <u>excellen</u>t seeing conditions

Conf. 8149 Astronomical Adaptive Optics Systems and Applications V

![](_page_9_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### Piston measurement error vs. spectral bandwidth

![](_page_9_Figure_4.jpeg)

Conf. 8149 Astronomical Adaptive Optics Systems and Applications V

San Diego, 08-21-11

![](_page_10_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Noise analysis (1/3)

![](_page_10_Figure_4.jpeg)

Conf. 8149 Astronomical Adaptive Optics Systems and Applications V

San Diego, 08-21-11

![](_page_11_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Noise analysis (2/3)

![](_page_11_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Noise analysis (3/3)

Measurement accuracy and Success ratio vs. Magnitude of guide star and Read-out noise

![](_page_12_Figure_5.jpeg)

Telescope diameter = 6 m;  $\delta\lambda/\lambda \approx$  5 %; integration time = 1 sec

Conf. 8149 Astronomical Adaptive Optics Systems and Applications V

![](_page_13_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Conclusion

- Image plane wavefront sensors can be operated in a phaseshifting mode, introducing different phase-shifts into a reference sub-pupil
- They can perform multi-spectral measurements in order to remove the  $2\pi$  ambiguity and extend their capture range to [-10,+10 µm] and beyond
- They perform better in space, but may attain magnitude 11 in AO regime, with residual errors around 20 nm RMS
- They are suitable for cophasing large segmented mirrors, but also sparse aperture interferometers
- They can be envisaged as low-order AO wavefront sensors, or as a special form of "phase diversity" methods