



MAORY design trade-off study: tomography dimensioning

Sylvain Oberti, Miska Le Louarn – ESO Garching Emiliano Diolaiti, Carmelo Arcidiacono, Laura Schreiber, Matteo Lombini – INAF Bologna and the rest of the MAORY consortium

Multi-conjugate Adaptive Optics RelaY for the S-ELT



MAORY serves MICADO + future second port INS (TBD)

Outline: phase B design trade-off



1- Analysis of dimensioning parameters constrained by tomographic and generalized fitting error

- Number of post-focal DMs conjugated in altitude
- DM pitch
- DM altitudes
- □ LGS asterism angle
- Number of LGS
- □ LGS and NGS asterism geometry not shown in this talk

under some constraints

- □ Seeing
- Cn2 profile
- Zenith distance
- □ Telescope phase 1 / phase 2
 - Number of LGSs: 4/6
 - M1 central obstruction: 28%/57%

Driver: MAORY main specifications



Performance in best conditions

- □ Q1 seeing (0.234 m) and wind, as close to zenith as possible
- Over 20" FoV
- □ SR > 50% @ 2.2 microns (goal 60%)
- □ Sky coverage requirement not applicable

Performance in median conditions

- □ median seeing (0.157 m) and wind, as close to zenith as possible
- Over 1' FoV
- □ SR > 30% @ 2.2 microns (goal 50% @ 2 microns)

Performance in sub optimal conditions

- □ Q3 seeing (0.139 m) and wind, zenith distance 30 degrees
- Over 2' FoV
- □ SR > 15% @ 2.2 microns (goal 30%)
- ✤ SR uniformity < 10% absolute PTV across FoV of interest</p>
- ✤ Sky coverage > 50%

OCTOPUS[®] end-to-end simulation



Simulated MCAO WFE terms





Ш,

high flux and no spot elongation

high flux

cone effect and anisoplanatism but optimal reconstruction of 35 layers

Command computation:

- □ Tomographic reconstruction to estimate the multi layer turbulent phase: FRIM3D/POLC with perfect priors on Cn² profile
- □ Projection of the estimated 3D phase onto the DMs space. The projection is optimized on a specific FoV

No other error budget term

Typical simulated FoV





Cn² profiles





+ other profiles measured by stereo scidar

Gen. fitting: N DMs and pitch





- □ 2 post-focal DMs: performance flat for pitch < 1.5 m
- □ 1 post-focal DM: performance flat for pitch < 2 m
- Strong impact from Cn2 profile

Benefit 2 vs. 1 post-focal DM(s)





2 post-focal DMs provide performance improvement of up to 25% in the science field and 100% in the technical field in K band, 250% in J band

2 post-focal DMs desirable to increase sky coverage

Benefit 2 vs. 1 post-focal DM(s)





□ 2 post-focal DMs improve tolerance to Cn2 profile variation

E-ELT phase 1 / phase 2 – K band



□ M1 doughnut impact on Sr is marginal. How about NGS sky coverage ?

- □ Significant impact 6 LGSs → 4 LGSs
- \Box E-ELT phase 1: limited by tomographic error \rightarrow DM pitch irrelevant
- □ 6 LGSs enable benefit from 2 post-focal DMs and finer pitch



E-ELT phase 1 / phase 2 – J band



□ M1 doughnut impact on Sr is not significant. How about NGS sky coverage ?

K band: 2.2 µm

r_o=0.129 m, Z=30°

- □ Dramatic impact 6 LGSs → 4 LGSs
- Lower wavelength performance pushes for:
 - 6 LGSs
 - 2 post-focal DMs
 - finer DM pitch





Photon noise σ^2 x3.8 long axis



Post-focal DM altitude: single DM



1 post-focal DM: conjugation altitude matters and should be > 14 km
 The conjugation altitude should be higher to cope with larger airmass cases

Post-focal DM altitude: 2 DMs case





- Results confirmed by Cn² sensitivity study
- □ Performance insensitive to DM1 altitude
- □ DM2 optimal altitude naturally increases with airmass
- 16 km conjugation is a good trade-off
- □ 16 km is also close to optimal for a single post-focal DM \rightarrow Upgradability⁴

Sensitivity Cn² profile: DM2 altitude





- DM2 altitude should obviously be increased at larger airmass
 Dependency on profile is not significant
- Again 16 km conjugation looks like a good compromise

Sensitivity Cn² profile: DM1 altitude





- ❑ DM1 altitude has a weak influence
- □ No clear dependency on Cn2 profile
- The opto-mechanical design should drive the DM1 altitude

LGS asterism angle – full field optim





□ Tomography reconstruction maximizes performance in full field here

LGSs @ 1.75' off axis

Closer LGSs improve Sr on axis, decrease uniformity across the MICADO field and decrease the Sr in the technical field

Star position off axis radius ["]

□ Trade-off between 45" and 1' radii → other FoV optimization to check

LGS angle – projection optimization





- Tomography reconstruction maximizes performance in 3 different FoVs with NGS @ 70" off axis
- □ Maximum and average Sr in MICADO field highest for LGS @ 45" off axis
- □ Average performance in 2' FoV highest for LGS @ 1' off axis
- Baseline: 45" radius

Ultimate performance in 20" square





□ Best performance on axis (LTAO with on axis NGS) is achieved with 20" radius @ Z=60

□ NGS cannot be closer than 30" radius without vignetting the science FoV

□ Confirmation that a fixed 45" radius is almost optimal for MICADO at any airmass for both small field and wide field: one single asterism configuration → less complexity

Conclusions on design trade-off



2 post-focal DMs (baseline: 1) are desirable in order to enhance:

- Performance in the technical field → sky coverage and robustness (acquisition)
- Performance in the blue for NGS sky coverage and MICADO performance
- Robustness to Cn2 profile variation and zenith distance
- □ DM pitch between 2m and 1.5m → better for worse seeing and with 2 DMs
- Post-focal DMs altitude: 4-6 and 16 km to be robust to larger airmass and accommodate 2 post-focal DMs later
- □ LGS asterism angle: fixed @ 45" radius + optimization of tomography projection depending on FoV of interest
- E-ELT phase 1 / phase 2:
 - M1 doughnut main impact on sky coverage and PSF shape: TBC
 - 6 LGSs are highly desirable

Thank you for your attention !



