GW burst vetoes using known instrumental couplings:

Application to GEO S5 data

P. Ajith

(Albert Einstein Institute)

for the LIGO Scientific Collaboration

GWDAW 11

2006 Dec 18, Potsdam

LIGO-G060644-00-Z

VETOES USING KNOWN INSTRUMENTAL COUPLINGS

- **Method** A veto strategy making use of the measured coupling of detector subsystems to the detector output (channel *H*).

- **Basic idea** The noise in an instrumental channel *X* can be *transferred* ('projected') into channel *H* using the measured transfer function from *X* to *H*. If a particular burst trigger originates in *X*, data in channels *X* and *H* should be consistent with the transfer function.

- **Advantage** Allows us to veto a trigger with a very high confidence – very low accidental veto rate. Uses the full information contained in the data.

ALGORITHM

- **Step 1** Identify coincident burst triggers between channels *X* and *H*, allowing a 'liberal' time window.

ALGORITHM

- **Step 1** Identify coincident burst triggers between channels *X* and *H*, allowing a 'liberal' time window.

- **Step 2** Transfer a short segment of noise in *X* to *H* using the transfer function ('noise projection').

$$\tilde{x}'(f) = \tilde{x}(f)\, T_{\mathrm{XH}}(f)$$

ALGORITHM

- **Step 1** Identify coincident burst triggers between channels *X* and *H*, allowing a 'liberal' time window.

- **Step 2** Transfer a short segment of noise in *X* to *H* using the transfer function ('noise projection').

$$\tilde{x}'(f) = \tilde{x}(f)\, T_{\mathrm{XH}}(f)$$

Noise vector (Fourier domain) in *X*, mapped into *H*

Noise vector (Fourier domain) in *X*

Transfer function from *X* to *H*

ALGORITHM

- **Step 1** Identify coincident burst triggers between channels *X* and *H*, allowing a 'liberal' time window.

- **Step 2** Transfer a short segment of noise in *X* to *H* using the transfer function ('noise projection').

$$\tilde{x}'(f) = \tilde{x}(f)\, T_{\mathrm{XH}}(f)$$

- **Step 3** Test the consistency of $\tilde{x}'(f)$ and $\tilde{h}(f)$. If consistent, veto the trigger.

TEST STATISTIC

- Possible to use different statistics to test the consistency of **h** with **x'**.

- **Null-stream** Construct a 'null-stream' between **h** and **x'**.

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}} = \tilde{\mathbf{h}} - \mathrm{proj}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}'} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}$$

Compute the *excess-power* statistic ϵ from $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ and $\mathbf{h}$. If the glitch originates in X, $\epsilon_{\delta} << \epsilon_{\mathrm{h}}$.

REF P. Ajith, M Hewitson, J R Smith and K A Strain, CQG **23** 5825-5837 (2006).

TEST STATISTIC

- Possible to use different statistics to test the consistency of **h** with **x'**.

- **Null-stream** Construct a 'null-stream' between **h** and **x'**.

$$\tilde{\delta} = \tilde{\mathbf{h}} - \mathrm{proj}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}'} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}$$

Compute the *excess-power* statistic ϵ from δ and **h**. If the glitch originates in *X*, $\epsilon_\delta << \epsilon_\mathrm{h}$.

Projection operator

$$\mathrm{proj}_{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}} \tilde{\mathbf{v}} = \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \rangle} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$$

REF P. Ajith, M Hewitson, J R Smith and K A Strain, CQG **23** 5825-5837 (2006).

TEST STATISTIC

- Possible to use different statistics to test the consistency of **h** with **x'**.

- **Null-stream** Construct a 'null-stream' between **h** and **x'**.

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\delta}} = \tilde{\mathbf{h}} - \mathrm{proj}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}'} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}$$

Compute the *excess-power* statistic ϵ from $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ and $\mathbf{h}$. If the glitch originates in X, $\epsilon_{\delta} << \epsilon_{\mathrm{h}}$.

- **Cross-correlation** Compute the linear cross-correlation coefficient between **h** and **x'**.

$$r = \mathrm{Re} \frac{\left\langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}', \tilde{\mathbf{h}} \right\rangle}{||\tilde{\mathbf{x}}'||\ ||\tilde{\mathbf{h}}||}$$

If the glitch originates in X, $r \simeq 1$.

REF P. Ajith, M Hewitson, J R Smith and K A Strain, CQG **23** 5825-5837 (2006).

HARDWARE INJECTIONS IN GEO

- **Injections** Sine-Gaussian burst injections into different subsystems to mimic four different noise sources: laser amplitude and frequency noise; phase and amplitude noise of MI control sidebands. One hour long injections for each channel. One injection in every 12 sec.

- **Transfer functions** Transfer functions were measured one week before.

- **Analysis** Accidental rate was estimated by performing 62 time-shifts (from -100s to 100s). Veto analysis on HW injections showed that more than 95% of the injections can be vetoed with an accidental rate of 1 per day.

HARDWARE INJECTIONS

An example

- Oscillator phase noise channel: Analysis using null-stream statistic

- Coincident triggers with $\epsilon_h / \epsilon_\delta > 2.6$ are vetoed.

- 99.6 % of the injections can be vetoed with an accidental rate of 1 per day.



HARDWARE INJECTIONS

An example

- Oscillator phase noise channel: Analysis using null-stream statistic

- Coincident triggers with $\epsilon_h / \epsilon_\delta > 2.6$ are vetoed.

- 99.6 % of the injections can be vetoed with an accidental rate of 1 per day.



HARDWARE INJECTIONS

An example

- Oscillator phase noise channel: Analysis using cross-correlation statistic

- Coincident triggers with $r > 0.37$ are vetoed.

- 98.3 % of the injections can be vetoed with an accidental rate of 1 per day.



HARDWARE INJECTIONS

An example

- Oscillator phase noise channel: Analysis using cross-correlation statistic

- Coincident triggers with $r > 0.37$ are vetoed.

- 98.3 % of the injections can be vetoed with an accidental rate of 1 per day.



APPLICATION TO GEO S5

- Excess glitch rate was observed in June 2006, due to glitches in the laser frequency noise.
- Analysis using the PR EP as veto channel showed that 90 % of the coincident triggers with this channel can be vetoed.



APPLICATION TO GEO S5

Vetoing laser frequency noise glitches

- Power-recycling error point (MIC_EP) as veto channel. Analysis using null-stream statistic.
- 5 days of data from June.
- Coincident triggers with $\epsilon_h / \epsilon_\delta > 3.94$ are vetoed.
- 61 % of the coincident triggers can be vetoed with an accidental rate of 1 per week



APPLICATION TO GEO S5

Vetoing laser frequency noise glitches

- Power-recycling error point (MIC_EP) as veto channel. Analysis using null-stream statistic.
- 5 days of data from June.
- Coincident triggers with $\epsilon_h / \epsilon_\delta > 3.94$ are vetoed.
- 61 % of the coincident triggers can be vetoed with an accidental rate of 1 per week



APPLICATION TO GEO S5

Vetoing laser frequency noise glitches

- Power-recycling error point (MIC_EP) as veto channel. Analysis using cross-correlation statistic.
- 5 days of data from June.
- Coincident triggers with $r > 0.69$ are vetoed.
- 90 % of the coincident triggers can be vetoed with an accidental rate of 1 per week



APPLICATION TO GEO S5

Vetoing laser frequency noise glitches

- Power-recycling error point (MIC_EP) as veto channel. Analysis using cross-correlation statistic.
- 5 days of data from June.
- Coincident triggers with $r > 0.69$ are vetoed.
- 90 % of the coincident triggers can be vetoed with an accidental rate of 1 per week



APPLICATION TO GEO S5

TF plot Time-frequency plot of *H* triggers with SNR > 6.

Summary

N. Trigs **5331**
Coinc **38 %**



APPLICATION TO GEO S5

TF plot Time-frequency plot of coincident triggers vetoed using the null-stream statistic

Summary

N. Trigs **5331**
Coinc **38 %**
Veto **24%**



APPLICATION TO GEO S5

TF plot Time-frequency plot of coincident triggers vetoed using the cross-correlation statistic

Summary

N. Trigs **5331**
Coinc **38 %**
Veto **34.5 %**



COMPARING THE TWO STATISTICS

Comparing the performance

- For this particular case, the cross-correlation statistic seems to be more powerful.

- But this depends on a number of parameters (errors in the transfer function measurements, stationarity of the noise and transfer functions etc.) and should not be taken as the general answer.



SUMMARY

- Formulated and demonstrated a veto method making use of known instrumental couplings.
- Basic idea: If a non-stationarity in the channel H is causally related to one in channel X, they have to be consistent with the transfer function from X to H.
- Tested the robustness of the veto by performing hardware injections (mimicking instrumental glitches) in GEO 600.
- The method was found to be very useful in vetoing the frequency noise glitches in the S5 run of GEO 600.