Space- vs. Ground-Based Observations

Tim Schrabback, Marco Hetterscheidt, Patrick Simon



Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn

17. August 2007



A $19'' \times 15''$ cutout of the A901 field Left: WFI@2.2m (pixel scale: 0''238; seeing: \approx 0''8). Right: ACS@HST (pixel scale: 0''03).

- Strong smearing effect of the Earth's atmosphere!
- KSB basically developed for ground-based data (assumption: isotropic PSF + small anisotropic part)
- HENCE: Do space-and ground-based observation yield similar results if KSB+ is used?

Space- and ground-based weak lensing pipelines (KSB+)

	space	ground
galaxy selection	$r_{ m h} \in [2.8, 10] \ { m tr}(P_{ m g})/2 > 0.1$	$r_{\rm h} > r_{\rm h}^*$ tr($P_{\rm g}$)/2 > 0.1
shear calibration PSF anisotropy correction	$\gamma/0.93$ template PSFs	$\gamma/0.93$ low-order polynomial fit over the total FOV
integration of stellar images	out to $4.5 \times r_g{}^{\ast}$	out to 3 \times r_{g}^{\ast}

Common to both are the object detection with SExtractor, the shape measurements, interpolation across sub-pixel, and the use of the trace for $P_{\rm g}$.

A galaxy-by-galaxy comparison of the CDFS & A901 fields $(\sim$ 20000 galaxies)



Left: $R \in [20, 23]$: γ_{ground} is underestimated by 8%. *Right*: All galaxies usable for weak lensing studies (*snr* > 5.0).



Left: Galaxies with $snr \in [4.0, 5.0]$. *Right*: Ground-based shear measurements of galaxies with snr < 4.0 do not contain any shear information.

Calibration bias as a function of the ground-based magnitude (snr > 5.0)



red line: average bias: γ (WFI) is on average 3% larger then γ (ACS)



<ロ> <=> <=> <=> <=> <=> <=> のへで

E- and B-modes from the matched catalogues of the A901 field (\sim 8000 galaxies, *snr* > 5.0)



Left: E-modes, right: B-modes.

The strength of space-based data: DEPTH



 $\langle M_{\rm ap}^2 \rangle$ for the matched space- and ground-based galaxy catalogues of A901 for three magnitude bins. No *snr* cut is performed.